

The Complete Testimony Of the Early Fathers

Proving the Universal

Observance of Sunday in the
First Centuries

By

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT

*Author of "Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced," "The
Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans,"
"Adventism Refuted in Ten Tracts," "Bible
from Heaven," etc.*

"So great a cloud of Witnesses."—*Heb. xii. 1.*



NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1916, by
D. M. CANRIGHT

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 125 North Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond Street, W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

Preface

THE object of this pamphlet is to present in a convenient form the clear and decisive testimony of the early Christian Fathers proving that Sunday was observed by all Christians immediately following the close of the New Testament. Their exact words are given with references to where found. All the important ones during the second, third and fourth century are quoted. These strongly refute the claim of Adventists that Sunday observance originated with the Pagan Romans centuries after Christ. Then there was no Roman Pope nor Papacy till hundreds of years after that. So it could not have begun with either of these. Ministers will find these early witnesses of special value in meeting the efforts of Adventists to confuse their members. I believe this is the only pamphlet in print where all these valuable historical quotations are given together in a few pages. It will be seen that they are reliable and can be quoted with confidence. The Scripture evidence for the Lord's Day is only briefly touched on here as this is given fully in my book, "Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced," noticed on the cover. After fifty years of careful study of the Sabbath question on both sides, I am thoroughly satisfied that Chris-

tians are right in observing Sunday as the Lord's Day instead of the Jewish Sabbath.

It will be seen that this pamphlet is a chapter out of my book "The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans." (See notice on second page of cover.)

As Christians generally know absolutely nothing about the evidence for the observance of the Lord's Day immediately after the time of the Apostles, Adventists easily confuse them with their strong assertions. Hence pastors would do them a Christian service if they would devote a sermon to reading most of these quotations and showing what they prove for the Lord's Day. Then if this little book could be placed in the hands of those being troubled about the Sabbath question, it would help to set them right on this important subject.

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT,
Pastor emeritus of the Berean Baptist
Church.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

Eighty Facts About Sunday Keeping

(The author of this pamphlet kept Saturday for twenty-eight years, hence knows of what he writes. The tract is put in brief statements for careful study with Bible in hand. Each reference should be looked up.)

1. The Old Testament, as a rule of life, has passed away. Heb. viii. 13.
2. Jesus introduced a New Testament, or Covenant. Luke xxii. 19, 20.
3. The New Covenant is better than the old one. Heb. viii. 6.
4. It is a "new way." Heb. x. 20.
5. The new is not to be patched onto the old. Mark ii. 22.
6. This is the dispensation of grace, not of law. John i. 17; Eph. iii. 2.
7. We are not under the law of the Old Testament. Gal. iii. 19-25.
8. But we live under "the law of liberty." Jas. ii. 12; Gal. v. 13, 14.
9. Under the Gospel, we are no longer as hired "servants," but are "sons," Gal. iv. 1-7, "the household of God," Eph. ii. 19; "friends," John xv. 15.

10. Christians are not under obligations to keep any of the holy days of the Old Testament. Col. ii. 14-17; Gal. iv. 10, 11, 21.

11. Some Jewish Christians still thought it necessary to observe the old law with regard to the eating of certain meats and observing the Jewish Sabbath and the other holy days. The Gentile Christian disregarded both the distinction in meats and the holy days. Paul says both were matters of indifference which each man could decide for himself. Rom. xiv. 1-6. That this does include the Jewish Sabbath is shown by the fact that Paul is speaking of the ten commandments. Read Rom. xiii. 8-xiv. 1-6. Also Col. ii. 14-16. Hence it is the privilege of each one to regard or disregard those old holy days and the distinctions in meats. Rom. xiv. 1-6.

12. Under the Old Covenant there were several memorial days, as the Sabbath, the Passover, Pentecost, etc., all of which passed away with that covenant. Col. ii. 14-17.

13. So we would expect that under the New Covenant there would be new memorial days appropriate to the new order of things, and observed for new reasons. Matt. ix. 15-17.

14. Jesus only "began" the work of teaching the Gospel, and instructing the disciples. Acts i. 1, 2; John xvi. 12.

15. After the ascension the Holy Spirit was to finish teaching them what before they could not understand. John xvi. 12, 13.

Certainly they could not understand about the resurrection day till after Christ had risen. Luke xxiv. 25-27. Ten years later even Peter had failed to understand that the distinctions of the Jewish law had passed away. Read Acts x., especially verse 28. Hence, necessarily the increasing regard for the day of the resurrection was a natural growth in the new Church. It was twenty years before circumcision was officially discarded. Acts xv.

16. They were not prepared to teach the Church till this Spirit gave them power at Pentecost. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5; ii. 1-4.

17. We are to hear the apostles the same as Jesus Himself. Luke x. 16.

18. What they "write are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. xiv. 37.

19. They were authorized by the Holy Ghost to deliver the decrees and ordinances for the Church to keep. Acts xv. 28; xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xi. 2.

20. Apostolical example in matters of faith and doctrine is to be followed. 1 Cor. xi. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 7-9; Heb. xiii. 7.

21. A memorial day for the Gospel should commemorate the greatest event of the gospel age. What was that? The resurrection, certainly.

22. Christ's life alone did not, and could not, save a soul.

23. His holy teachings could not save any one.

24. All His miracles could not wash away one sin.

25. Had He died, but never risen again, the world would have been lost. 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18.

26. The salvation, then, of a lost world all hinged upon one infinitely important fact—His resurrection from the power of death. Rom. i. 4.

27. Jesus Himself pointed to His resurrection as the test of His divinity. John ii. 18–21; Matt. xii. 38–40.

28. His enemies all understood this and tried to defeat it. Matt. xxvii. 63, 64.

29. It was His resurrection which declared Him to be the Son of God, Rom. i. 4, the judge of the world, Acts xvii. 31; and secured our salvation. 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18.

30. We may well be assured that all the angels in heaven and all the devils in hell watched for that event with intent anxiety.

31. But this stupendous event, in God's wise arrangement, occurred on Sunday. Mark xvi. 9.

32. On that day the power of death and hell was broken. Rev. i. 18.

33. On that day He first appeared alive to His disciples. Mark xvi. 9.

34. On Sunday He met with them repeatedly and at different places. Mark xvi. 9–14; Matt. xxviii. 8–10; Luke xxiv. 34; John xx. 19–23, etc.

35. On this day He pronounced peace upon them. John xx. 19.

36. On that day He gave them the Holy Ghost. John xx. 22.

37. On this day He first commissioned them to preach the Gospel to all the world. John xx. 21 with Mark xvi. 9–15.

38. On that day He gave them power over His Church. John xx. 23.

39. On that day Jesus ascended to His Father. John xx. 17; Eph. i. 20.

40. On this day many of the dead saints arose. Matt. xxvii. 51–53.

41. On this day the glad tidings of the risen Christ was first preached. Luke xxiv. 34.

42. On that Sunday Jesus opened their minds to understand the Scriptures. Luke xxiv. 27, 45.

43. On this day the crowning event occurred which made Jesus a complete Saviour. Rom. i. 4.

44. Here Sunday became the day of joy and gladness to His people. John xx. 20.

45. The resurrection of Christ on Sunday made Him the head stone of the corner. Ps. cxviii. 22; Acts iv. 10, 11; Eph. i. 20–22.

46. It was predicted that this day was to be a day of joy to the Church. Ps. cxviii. 22–24. And it has been such ever since.

47. No other day in the week could have become the memorial day of the risen Christ and His rejoicing Church. Think over all the days of the week. What occurred on Monday to mark it above others? or on Tuesday? Wednesday? Thursday came the betrayal and Gethsemane; Friday, the trial and death of Christ; Saturday was the deepest day of gloom—the Son of God is dead! Surely not one of these days could be appropriate to commemorate the triumph of Christ and the new hope of the infant Church.

48. But with the dawn of Sunday morning what a glorious revolution in all this! An angel of glory descends from heaven, the grave opens, Christ arises, dead saints come forth, the divinity of Christ is demonstrated, salvation for a world is made sure, Satan's doom is sealed, all the faith and hopes of the disciples suddenly revive, the first day of the new era, the new dispensation, has burst upon the world!

49. Necessarily, the hallowed memories of that glorious day immediately became the one theme of apostles, disciples and saints. Around it all their hopes clustered. Of it they argued, preached, prayed and sung. With it stood or fell their all. It needed no law or thunders of Sinai to compel them to remember it. It was enshrined in their hearts with their risen Lord. They could not forget it.

50. Here was the origin of the observance of "the Lord's Day." In all His life it was the one and only day that could become the memorial day of the new dispensation—new creation. That it did soon become such facts abundantly prove.

51. On the next return of the resurrection day Jesus again purposely met them. John xx. 26. Proof: "After three days," Mark viii. 31, is the same as "the third day." Matt. xvi. 21. So "after eight days" would be the same as "the eighth day," Jewish reckoning, which would be the next Sunday.

52. The wonderful outpouring of the Holy

Spirit on Pentecost, Acts ii., when the first converts to the risen Christ were gathered, was on Sunday. The law said positively that the Pentecost must come on "the morrow after the seventh Sabbath." Lev. xxiii. 15, 16. Hence it had to come on Sunday by God's own appointment.

53. Pentecost! never could it be forgotten by the Church. Here was added a second reason why it became the memorial day of the gospel age.

54. Acts xx. 6-11 indicates clearly that the disciples held their meetings and communion on that day. Paul had been there seven days including the Jewish Sabbath (see verse 6), yet no meetings were held. Not a hint is given of any meeting on the Jewish Sabbath. It is not even mentioned.

55. But it is carefully stated that "upon the first day of the week the disciples came together." Verse 7.

56. The object of their meeting is as clearly stated: it was "to break bread,"—the communion.

57. This shows that Sunday was the day on which they were accustomed to hold that sacred service.

58. There is not the slightest intimation that Paul called them together for a special meeting. On the contrary, the record plainly shows that he waited till they "came together" in their accustomed place, at their accustomed time, and for their accustomed service. He then embraced the opportunity to preach to them.

59. The claim of the Adventists that this was

Saturday night is fallacious. (1) This meeting was on "the first day of the week," and they "departed on the morrow" (verse 7), which could not have been the same day. (2) Troas was a Roman town, under Roman rule, 1,000 miles from Jerusalem, where Roman time was used. (3) Luke addressed Acts to Theophilus (Acts i. 1), a Roman of Italy who used Roman time. (4) Even the apostles in their last writings used Roman time as John xx. 19 shows where Sunday evening is reckoned a part of "the first day."

60. Hence Acts xx. shows apostolical example for meeting on Sunday and we are to follow them. 2 Thess. iii. 7+9.

61. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 confirms this fact. Here is a direct command of an apostle to observe the first day of the week for a religious purpose—to give their contribution for the poor on that day.

62. The making of such sacrifices for the needy is an act of the most acceptable religious service to God. Phil. iv. 15–18.

63. The day on which this is to be done is specified and commanded, viz.: "the first day of the week."

64. This command is not simply to one church, but to "all the churches of Galatia," and to "all in every place." Chap. i. 2, universal.

65. In the same letter Paul says to them emphatically, "The things that I write unto you are the 'Commandments of the Lord.'" Chap. xiv. 37.

66. Here is a direct "commandment of the Lord" requiring a religious service on Sunday. Can Adventists show any command whatever for the Jewish Sabbath, after the resurrection? No, indeed.

67. Whether this was to be done at home or at church matters little. It implies that on that day they would be at leisure from other business so as to attend to this. There must have been a good reason why Sunday was thus named on which all the churches were to do this. What reason can Adventists give? None whatever. But we give the best and only reason that could have existed for it.—It was their day of rest and worship.

68. Rev. i. 10: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." This is the resurrection day as may be abundantly proved. In not a single instance in all the Bible is this term ever applied to the seventh day.

69. Even Adventists never say "Lord's Day" for the seventh day except in arguing on this text. They invariably call it "The Sabbath."

70. Every dictionary, lexicon, and encyclopedia defines "Lord's Day" as the first day of the week. There must be good ground for so universal an agreement of all scholars and authorities.

71. All commentators of every school also say it was Sunday.

72. "Sabbath" was the term invariably used for the seventh day in all the Bible; but that is not the word here used.

73. "The Lord's Day" is a new name never found before the resurrection.

74. If the new institution of the Gospel was to have a new memorial day, it must be designated by a new name, as is here done. If the new day had been called by the same name as the old day, "the Sabbath," it would have made confusion.

75. Adventists quote Ex. xx. 10; Isa. lviii. 13; Mark ii. 28 to prove that the Sabbath is the Lord's day. The answer is easy. (1) "Sabbath" is the word used in all these texts but not in Rev. i. 10. (2) All these texts were spoken before the cross; Rev. i. 10 after it. (3) The Jewish Sabbath was abolished at the cross. Col. ii. 16. Hence it could not be the Lord's Day of our text, which was sixty years later.

76. The Greek word, kuriake, occurs in only one other place in the Bible, 1 Cor. xi. 20, "The Lord's Supper." Beyond dispute, it here applies to the Lord Jesus. So it does in Rev. i. 10. It is His day, the day of His triumph at His resurrection.

77. "The Lord's Day" proves that there is a sacred day in the gospel age as definitely as there was a sacred day in the Jewish age.

78. What settles this beyond reasonable doubt is the fact that immediately following the close of the New Testament, every Christian writer, who uses the term Lord's Day, invariably and always uses it of the resurrection day, never once of the seventh day. For proof of this read the following pages.

79. The observance of Sunday as a memorial of the resurrection of Christ has been the most prominent ordinance of the Christian Church in all ages and nations and by all the different sects from the apostles down.

80. Finally, God's blessing has attended the observance of the day as millions have testified. Its effects have always been good on the person, the family, the society, or the nation which has kept it. All experiences and history agree in this.

We must recognize the fact that God's providence in the history of His Church does teach something. It is a stubborn fact that from the birth of Christianity the chief services of the Gospel have been held on the day of the resurrection which has been universally in all the centuries recognized by the Church as the "Lord's Day." The sincere purpose in all has always been, and still is, to honor Christ and commemorate His resurrection. If this day had been as hateful to Christ as it is to Adventists, would He have blessed this observance of the day as He always has? Please study this a little.

"Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible," Article "Lord's Day," says, "When Jesus uttered the cry, 'It is finished,' the Mosaic dispensation virtually passed away. His resurrection, ascension, and outpouring of the Holy Spirit were successive affirmations of the great fact, and the destruction of the temple made it plain to all but the blindest. But in the meantime nothing is more striking than

the tender way in which the apostles and Christians of Jewish birth were weaned from the old religion. The dead leaves of Judaism fell off gradually. They were not rudely torn off by man. The new facts, the new dogmas, the new ordinances first established themselves, and then, little by little, the incompatibility of the old and the new was realized which necessarily issued in the casting off of the old.

"The old things of Judaism were made new in Christianity. This, however, was not accomplished by a deliberate substitution of one ordinance for another; but first the old ordinances were simply antiquated, and their experience matured under the influence of the Holy Spirit, proved that the positive institutions of the new religion more than fulfilled those of the old." "Jesus enunciated the great truths of the Gospel, and left them to germinate and bear fruit through their own inherent power." Lewis.

FIVE MEMORIALS OF CHRIST'S LIFE

We have with us to-day five memorials witnessing to the life and mission of Christ. All started at the dawn of Christianity, all have been universally observed by the Church in all its various branches through all the centuries and stand to-day as the five great witnesses to the world of our faith in Christ.

1. *The New Testament writings.*—"These are

written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ." John xx. 31.

2. *The Church.*—"Upon this rock I will build my church." Matt. xvi. 18.

3. *Baptism.*—"Go . . . baptizing them." Matt. xxviii. 19.

4. *The Lord's Supper.*—"Eat the Lord's Supper." 1 Cor. xi. 20.

5. *The Lord's Day.*—"I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Rev. i. 10.

All five of these had the same origin, at the same time, by the same authority, for the same purpose, have come down together in some form, have been equally cherished by the Church universal, and equally owned and blessed of Christ, the head of the Church. Candidly, is it the spirit of Christ which is now inciting some to tear down one of these great memorials to our risen Lord? Better consider prayerfully what the fruit of such work will be.

The character and good influence of the Lord's Day are no longer open questions. They have been settled by the consensus of the ages in their influence on the individual, on the Church, on the community, and on the nation. We cannot in justice be silent when they are denounced as evil.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE THAT OUR LORD'S
DAY WAS OBSERVED FROM THE TIME
OF THE APOSTLES¹

WE will now present historical evidence, proving that the observance of the first day of the week, as a day of worship, was universal among Christians in the days immediately following the apostles. If Sunday observance existed here, then it did not originate several hundred years later with Constantine, or with the Papacy. We will begin soon after the close of the New Testament.

PLINY'S LETTER, A. D. 107

Pliny was governor of Bithynia, Asia Minor, A. D. 106-108. He wrote A. D. 107 to Trajan, the emperor, concerning the Christians, thus: "They were wont to meet together, on a *stated day* before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as God. . . . When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate and then to come together again to a meal which they ate in common without any disorder."² That this was Sunday is evident. 1. They came together to worship Christ. 2. They assembled to

¹ A chapter from the author's "The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans." (See notice on cover page.)

² Horne's "Introduction," Vol. I, Chap. iii, Sec. 2, p. 84.

eat a meal together, the Lord's Supper. The "stated day" for this was Sunday. "Upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread" (Acts xx. 7). This is exactly parallel to Pliny's statement.

Eusebius, the historian, A. D. 324, says: "I think that he [the Psalmist] describes the morning assemblies in which we are accustomed to assemble throughout the world." "By this is prophetically signified the service which is performed very early and every morning of the resurrection day throughout the whole world."¹ This is exactly what Pliny says: They met together "on a stated day before it was light;" they assembled to eat together a meal. Eusebius says it was the custom of all Christians "to meet very early and every morning of the resurrection day." This ought to settle it and does. Pliny's stated day was Sunday. This was in the very region where the apostles labored, and only *eleven* years after St. John died.

The "Advent History of the Sabbath," edition of 1912, is compelled to admit that Sunday observance was in the Christian Church at the beginning of the second century. The author says: "The results of our investigation concerning the origin of Sunday [is] that it was not introduced into the Christian Church until the beginning of the second century" (page 450). That is exactly the date when Pliny wrote,—immediately following the death of the last apostle.

¹ "Sabbath Manual," p. 125.

BARNABAS, A. D. 120

This epistle was highly prized in the earliest Churches, read in some of them as part of Scripture, and is found in the oldest manuscript of the Scriptures, *namely the Sinaitic*. That it was written by a pious man of learning and influence cannot be doubted.

Johnson's "New Universal Encyclopedia" says: "It is frequently cited by the Fathers, and was by many regarded as being of authority in the Church; some even claiming for it a place in the sacred canon."

This is a summary of the best modern criticism as to the date, character and authority of the epistle of Barnabas. Read and revered in the Church as next to the Gospels themselves as early as A. D. 120, or within twenty-four years of the death of St. John, it shows what Christians believed and practiced immediately after the apostles. In this epistle we read: "Incense is a vain abomination unto me, and your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot endure. He has, therefore, abolished these things" (Chapter II). Elder Andrews admits that "he presently asserts the abolition of the Sabbath of the Lord."¹ Coming to the first day of the week, Barnabas says: "Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day, also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead" (Chapter XV).

Notice this fact: All admit that this epistle of

¹ "Testimony," etc., p. 22.

Barnabas was in existence in the beginning of the second century, or not later than the middle of it. At that time it was supposed by the Churches to have been written as a part of the New Testament Scriptures. It is in the oldest copy of the Bible right after Revelation. It states in positive terms that the Jewish Sabbath was abolished and that Christians kept the day of the resurrection. Now would the Churches, week after week, read this language as inspired, and then not keep Sunday? That is not reasonable. Hence this book does show what Christians believed and practiced at that date, A. D. 120.

But Adventists say this writing was a forgery. It was no such thing. There is not a word in the whole epistle claiming that the author was the apostle Barnabas. No name is attached to it nor is there any claim that it was written by an apostle. For some reason, not now known, it came to be attributed to Barnabas. The book of Hebrews has no name to it; it is supposed that Paul wrote it and we accept it as such, but some doubt it, and it cannot be proved. Shall we call it a forgery? Just as well as to call the epistle of Barnabas a forgery.

Here, once for all, we will notice the chief argument on which Adventists depend to invalidate the testimony of all the early Fathers in favor of the Lord's Day. They try to show that Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Origen, etc., held some notions which none of us now believe. Hence their testi-

mony must be unreliable. This argument they repeat over and over at great length in the case of every early writer who witnesses for Sunday. Now it occurs that one of their writers, Elder J. H. Waggoner, when it happens to suit his purpose, has himself answered this argument. Of the Reformers he says: "We think the Reformers retained a grievous error of their early training; but that does not invalidate their testimony in regard to a *matter of fact* with which they were well acquainted."¹

Now apply that to the early Fathers. They lived there, and state over and over, all agreeing in it, that they themselves and all Christians then observed Sunday. This was a simple matter of *fact* with which they were well acquainted. Waggoner says such testimony is reliable. Of course it is. It proves beyond question that the Lord's Day was an unquestioned practice of the early Church.

We do not quote these Fathers to prove a doctrine; for that we go only to the Bible. We quote them to prove a simple, historical fact, viz.: that the early Christians did keep Sunday, hence it could not have started with the Popes centuries later.

THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES, A. D. 125

This was not written by the apostles; yet its date is very early. Some place it as early as A. D. 80.

¹ "Replies to Caunright," p. 164.

Professor Harnack, of Berlin, says many place it between A. D. 90, and A. D. 120. This is the date most favored. It cannot be much later. The New York *Independent* says of it: "By all odds the most important writing exterior to New Testament." Prof. D. R. Dungan, President of Drake University, says: "It is evident that it is not far on this side of the death of the apostle John." The noted scholar, Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, in his "Sabbath for Man," page 383, says: It was "written, as the best scholars almost unanimously agree, not later than forty years after the death of the last of the apostles, and during the lifetime of many who had heard John's teaching." In the preface to this important document, the editors, Professors Hitchcock and Brown in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, say: "The genuineness of the document can hardly be doubted." "The document belongs undoubtedly to the second century; possibly as far back as 120 A. D.; hardly later than 160" (Introduction).

Chapter fourteen of the "Teaching of the Apostles" says: "But every Lord's Day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving," etc. This testimony is clear and decisive that the Lord's Day was the established day of worship, at that early day.

JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 140

I quote from "The Testimony of the Fathers," by Elder Andrews: "Justin's 'Apology' was

written at Rome about the year 140," "and this at a distance of only forty-four years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos." "It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt" (page 33).

This is the confession which even the historian of the Seventh-Day Adventists is compelled to make. The Jewish Sabbath was disregarded by Christians within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle. And this is proven by the testimony of an eminent Christian minister who lived right there.

Justin in his "Apology" for them to the emperor fairly represented what Christians generally held then, just as he should have done. Elder Andrews conveys the impression that Justin represented only a small party of apostate Christians at Rome and that he is quite unreliable. But the facts are just the reverse. He was a Greek, born in Palestine and held his "Dialogue with Trypho" at Ephesus, Asia Minor, in the church where St. John lived and died, the very center of the Eastern Church, and only forty-four years after John's death. Of Justin the "Encyclopedia Americana" says: "One of the earliest and most learned writers of the Christian Church. . . . He was also equally zealous in opposing alleged heretics." "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says: "In these works Justin professes to present the system of doctrine held by *all*

Christians and seeks to be orthodox on all points. The only difference he knows of as existing between Christians concerned the millennium. Thus Justin is an incontrovertible witness for the unity of the faith in the Church of his day, and to the fact that the Gentile type of Christianity prevailed."

Notice carefully: At that date, A. D. 140, the only difference among Christians was about the millennium. Then they must all have agreed in keeping Sunday, as Justin says that was the day all kept as we will soon see.

"Eusebius says that he overshadowed all the great men who illuminated the second century by the splendor of his name." His writings are "the most important that have come to us from the second century."

Doctor Schaff says of him: "After his conversion Justin devoted himself wholly to the vindication of the Christian religion, as an *itinerant* evangelist, with no fixed abode."² Not only were his books accepted without dispute as expressing the practice of the Church, but his itinerant life, now in Palestine, then in Rome, Greece and Ephesus, enabled him to know this practice, and stamps his testimony with a force equal to demonstration. So, then, Justin is an unimpeachable witness for the faith and practice of Christians

¹ McClintock and Strong's "Encyclopedia," Article "Justin Martyr."

² "Church History," Vol. I, p. 482.

generally a few years after the death of the apostles.

Now hear what Justin says about the first day of the week: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and

on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration."¹

This "Apology" was written by Justin when Christians were being terribly persecuted. It was addressed to Antoninus, the emperor, "also to the sacred senate and the *whole Roman people* in behalf of those who of *all nations* are now unjustly hated and aspersed."²

It was in behalf of the entire Christian Church in all the vast Roman Empire, as he plainly states. Hence it presents the practice of the general Church, not simply a local church at Rome as Adventists unfairly state. It was addressed to the Roman emperor and the senate to correctly inform them of the faith and practice of Roman Christian subjects. Justin was martyred because he would not sacrifice to pagan gods. Notice that he says that, "On the day called Sunday, *all who live in the cities, or in the country* gather together to one place," etc. "But Sunday is the day on which *we all* hold our common assembly." This practice was general among all Christians as far as he had travelled, and he was an itinerant preacher like Moody, or General Booth of the Salvation Army. Hence this is positive proof that Sunday-keeping was general in the Christian Church at that early

¹ "The First Apology of Justin," Chap. xlvii.

² Eusebius, "Ecc. History," Book IV, Chap. xii, p. 139.

date. Justin does not state simply his opinion, but a *fact* then existing, viz., that all Christians "whether in cities or country" "in all nations" held their assemblies on Sunday.

Justin does not call Sunday the Sabbath nor the Lord's Day! This is readily answered by the fact that Justin was writing to a heathen emperor who would have been wholly ignorant of the meaning of either of those terms. But there the naked facts stand, clear, positive and undeniable, that within forty-four years after the book of Revelation was written Christians did hold their assemblies on Sunday. And Justin says that Jesus taught these things to the apostles.

Probably the Jewish Christians did continue to observe the Sabbath the same as they did other Jewish customs for a time. But even these also kept the Lord's Day as will be seen later.

Justin plainly states that the Gentile believers did not keep the Sabbath. He says: "The Gentiles who have believed on Him, although they neither keep the Sabbath, nor are circumcised, nor observe the feasts" yet are God's children.¹

So to-day: go to any part of the globe and wherever you find Christians of any sect or nation, there you find them keeping Sunday. A few Sabbatarians of late origin are the only exceptions to this. How did this universal custom come about if not started at the very foundation of the Church by the apostles themselves?

¹ "Dialogue with Trypho," Chap. xxvi.

DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF CORINTH IN GREECE,
A. D. 170

But we will hear further from these Fathers themselves as to whether they kept Sunday. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, the Church which Paul raised up and to which he gave the command about Sunday collections, 1 Cor. xvi. 1-2, says: "We passed this holy Lord's Day, in which we read your letter, from the constant reading of which we shall be able to draw admonition."¹ That the Lord's Day is the resurrection day we have seen. This term is never applied to any other than the first day. Notice that this witness is from Greece, not Rome. So the resurrection day was a "holy" day, A. D. 170.

In this chapter Eusebius gives quite a lengthy account of Dionysius as a most devoted Christian, a bishop of great and wide influence. He warned others against all heresies in many letters he wrote. Eusebius quotes his exact words about the "Holy Lord's Day" as above. As these letters were sent to many other Churches it shows that the Lord's Day was by all regarded as a holy day.

BARDESANES OF EDESSA, SYRIA, A. D. 180

Coming down only ten years later, we have the testimony of the heretic Bardesanes, the Syrian, who flourished about A. D. 180. He belonged to the sect of the Gnostics which was very numerous all over the far East. He says: "What then shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who

¹ Eusebius, "Ecl. History," Book IV, Chap. xxiii.

are Christians, whom in every country, and in every region the Messiah established at His coming? For, lo, wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, Christians, and upon one day, which is the first day of the week, we assemble ourselves together.”¹

Notice that these Christians were scattered widely “in every country and every region.” Bardesanes says just the same as Justin Martyr, “We assemble ourselves together” upon the first day of the week. These two witnesses are much alike as to Sunday. Justin, strictly orthodox, says that “all in cities and country” assemble on Sunday. Bardesanes, heretic, says the same for all the countries of the far East. The observance of Sunday was general both among orthodox and heretics.

Notice here also a refutation of the idea so strongly urged by Sabbatarians, that Sunday-keeping originated at Rome, and was for a long time confined there. Elder Andrews has to admit that the Gnostics at this date used Sunday as a day of worship. But, 1. The Gnostics were emphatically an *eastern* sect, originating in Syria, and were most numerous in Alexandria, Asia Minor, and the East. Rome never had any influence over them. Bardesanes himself lived at Edessa, in Mesopotamia, 2,500 miles east of Rome, on another continent, under another nation. 2. This sect was numerous in the East as early as A. D. 150, or fifty-five years after the death of John. So we have Sunday-keep-

¹ “Laws of Countries,” A. D. 180.

ing not only at Rome, but all over the East as early as A. D. 150, hundreds of years before there was any “Pope” at Rome.

No exception to this can be found whether orthodox or heretic. All observe the Lord’s Day. Even Sabbatarians are compelled to admit this. Elder Andrews says: “Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord’s Day.”¹

Yes, while some did, for a while, keep the Sabbath, yet even they, in every instance, also kept the Lord’s Day.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT, A. D. 194

Clement was one of the most celebrated of the Christian Fathers. He writes about A. D. 194. He says: “He, in fulfillment of the precept, keeps the Lord’s Day when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord’s resurrection in himself” (Book VII, Chapter XII). The Lord’s Day, it will be seen here, and all along, is the resurrection day. Clement lived, not at Rome, but in Egypt. So Sunday-keeping was not simply a Roman usage, as Adventists claim.

Adventists seek to discredit Clement’s testimony about the Lord’s Day by saying that he was influenced by Greek philosophy as taught by Plato, Socrates, etc. But this is easily answered by the fact that neither the Greeks in general, nor any of the philosophers, ever practiced, or taught, any ob-

¹ “Testimony of the Fathers,” p. 11.

servance of Sunday. They never knew anything about a weekly day of rest or worship. The weekly calendar was unknown to them till taught it by Christians at a later date. Hence, whatever else Clement and the Church at Alexandria gathered from Greek philosophers, they did not get the Lord's Day from them. When they adopted Christianity they accepted the Lord's Day as a part of it. Heathen Gnosticism knew nothing of any weekly rest day; hence, Christian Gnostics could not get their Lord's Day from them.

TERTULLIAN OF AFRICA, A. D. 200

Tertullian was one of the most noted of the early Fathers. Was born A. D. 160. He was highly educated, bred to the law, and very talented. Brought up a pagan, he was converted to Christ and vehemently opposed heathenism ever after. Radically severe in his principles, opposed to all conformity to the world, the laxity of the Roman Church drove him to withdraw from it, which he ever after hotly opposed. So he was not a Romanist, nor did Rome have a particle of influence over him only to drive him the other way. He was strictly orthodox in faith and a lover of the Scriptures. Hence if it were true that Sunday-keeping, as a heathen institution, was being introduced into the Church by Rome, Tertullian is just the man who would have opposed and fearlessly condemned it.

Johnson's "Cyclopedia" says of him: "One of the greatest men of the early Church." He

"joined the Puritanic sect of the Montanists. They were orthodox in doctrine, but stern in spirit and discipline." "He remained true to the faith of the Catholics, but fought them vehemently on matters of morality and discipline. He was also a representative of the African opposition to Rome." The "Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia" says of him: "One of the grandest and most original characters of the ancient Church." "*Greek philosophy he despised.*" Of his great book they say: "One of the magnificent monuments of the ancient Church." Authon's "Classical Dictionary" says of him: "He informs us more correctly than any other writer respecting the Christian doctrines of his time. . . . Tertullian was held in very high esteem by the subsequent Fathers of the Church." Neander says: "Tertullian is a writer of peculiar importance."¹

Here then is a competent and unimpeachable witness to the doctrines and practices of the universal Church, A. D. 200, or only 104 years after John.

Tertullian says: "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day their Sabbath, and devote it to ease and eating, deviating from the old Jewish customs, which they are now very ignorant of."² Tertullian again declares that his brethren did not observe the days held sacred by the Jews: "We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor

¹ Rose's "Neander," p. 424.

² Tertullian's "Apology," Chap. xvi.

in their sacred days." "We, however (just as we have received), only on the day of the Lord's resurrection ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude; deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil."¹ Sunday, then, was observed by Christians at that early date, but Saturday was not.

The above testimony of this great Christian teacher is clear, positive, and decisive. The Jewish Sabbath was not kept; the Lord's Day was. Tertullian was one of the greatest Christian teachers of that day, A. D. 200. Could it be that these influential leaders taught and practiced thus, while all the Churches believed and did just the other way? That is, kept the Jewish Sabbath and did not keep the Lord's Day? Might as well say that Moody and Spurgeon taught Sunday observance while none of their followers believed it.

In the case of Tertullian, the last edition of the "Advent History of the Sabbath" devotes twelve large pages trying to discredit him. Why? Because his testimony is squarely against them and they fear it. It is a significant fact that Adventists do not find even one single Christian writer or leader for hundreds of years after Christ who is worthy of any reliance! All are fools, forgers, unreliable, apostates, semi-pagans, etc.! Why this effort to impeach them all? The reason is easy to find—all bear a decided witness against Sabbatarian teachings.

¹ "Tertullian on Prayer," Chap. xxiii.

ORIGEN, A. D. 225

Origen (about A. D. 225) was a man of immense learning, and his writings are numerous. "Origen may well be pronounced one of the ablest and worthiest of the church Fathers."¹

The following items about Origen are gathered from the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia." He was born at Alexandria, A. D. 185. Was carefully trained by Christian parents. His father was martyred. He was one of the most learned men of his age. He was devoutly pious. He became the teacher of the greatest men of his time, even teaching bishops and emperors. He travelled extensively to Rome, Arabia, Antioch, Greece, Tyre, Cappadocia, Jerusalem, Cæsarea, etc. Hence he was familiar with all the customs of Christians everywhere. This makes his testimony to the Lord's Day at that early date reliable and of great importance. He says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as, for example, the Lord's Day, the preparation, the passover, or pentecost."²

In his commentary on Exodus, Par. 5, he says: "It is plain from Holy Writ that manna was first given on earth on the Lord's Day. But if it be clear from the Holy Scriptures that God rained manna from Heaven on the Lord's Day, and rained none on the Sabbath Day, let the Jews understand that from that time our Lord's Day was set above

¹ McClintock and Strong's "Encyclopedia."

² "Origen against Celsus," Book VIII, Chap. xxii.

the true Sabbath—for on our Lord's Day God always rains down manna from Heaven; for the discourses which are delivered to us are from Heaven."

Here Origen shows that the Jewish Sabbath was set aside, and the Lord's Day was the superior day, the day on which Christians assembled to hear discourses from God's ministers. This agrees with Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and all as above. Notice that this witness is from the East, not from pagan Rome. Origen was a Greek, not a Latin. As Origen travelled extensively among the Churches and preached for them, and his books were read by them, it shows that the observance of the Lord's Day was general among them all. He would not have been everywhere invited to preach for them if they had not believed as he did.

THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, A. D. 250

Of the "Apostolical Constitutions" (A. D. 250) Elder Andrews, Adventist, says: "The so-called 'Apostolical Constitutions' were not the work of the apostles, but they were in existence as early as the third century, and were then very generally believed to express the doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important historical testimony to the practice of the Church at that time. Mosheim, in his 'Historical Commentaries,' Cent. 1, section 51, speaks thus of these 'constitutions': 'The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed among the Chris-

tians of the second and third centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions.'"¹ Notice again that this work was the product of the Eastern Church and hence shows the custom of the Church in the East instead of that at Rome.

These, then, will be good witnesses to the practice of the Church about A. D. 250. In section 7, paragraph 59, we read: "And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's Day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus and sent Him to us." "Otherwise what apology will He make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection." In Book VII, section 2, paragraph 30, he says: "On the day of the resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord's Day, assemble yourselves together, without fail, giving thanks to God," etc. In the same paragraph, in speaking of the resurrection of Christ, the writer says: "On which account we solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's Day," etc.

These testimonies are decisive, and do show beyond a doubt that the Christians of those early days used the Lord's Day just as it is used now for religious worship.

CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE, A. D. 253

Cyprian was one of the greatest scholars and men of influence in all Christendom about seventy-

¹ "Testimony," etc., p. 13.

five years before the date of Constantine's edict of A. D. 321. He was a most devoted Christian, had great wealth, half of which he gave to the poor. Refusing to reverence the pagan idols, he was martyred. He opposed the Roman Church and bishop. Of him the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says: "At the time when the controversy concerning baptism broke out between him and Bishop Stephen of Rome (255) Cyprian stood undoubtedly as the prominent and most influential leader in the Christian Church." "The Papacy was not yet born."

Of this great leader, the "Advent History of the Sabbath" (1912) says: "The next Father offering an argument for Sunday is Cyprian" (page 370). Hence there is no doubt that Cyprian kept the Lord's Day and defended it. He said: "Because the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give us circumcision of the Spirit; the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day, which went before in the figure."¹

Did not the Churches practice as this great leader did and taught? Surely. Then they kept the Lord's Day sixty years before Constantine's conversion, a generation before his Sunday law. Notice that Cyprian lived in Africa, not at Rome, and that he opposed Rome.

¹ Cyprian's "Epistles," No. 58, Sect. 4.

ANATOLIUS, A. D. 270, BISHOP OF LAODICEA, ASIA

He was Bishop of Laodicea, Asia Minor. Not a Roman, but a Greek. This Church was raised up by Paul himself, and must have been well acquainted with the apostle's doctrine. In his seventh canon Anatolius says: "The obligation of the Lord's resurrection binds us to keep the paschal festival on the Lord's Day." In his tenth canon he uses this language: "The solemn festival of the resurrection of the Lord can be celebrated only on the Lord's Day." In his sixteenth canon he says: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day will lead us to celebrate it on the same principle." See how all these early Christians call the resurrection day "the Lord's Day" and how they honor it. How entirely different from our Sabbatarians who can hardly find terms mean enough by which to express their contempt for Sunday! Why is this difference and what does it show?

VICTORINUS, BISHOP OF PETAU, A. D. 300

"On the former day [the sixth] we are accustomed to fast rigorously that on the Lord's Day we may go forth to our bread with giving of thanks. And let the parasceve become a rigorous fast lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews which Christ Himself, the Lord of the Sabbath, says by His prophets that His soul hateth which Sabbath He in His body abolished."

¹ "Creation of the World," section 4.

Here is another Christian bishop who says most distinctly that Christians did not keep the Jewish Sabbath and that the Lord had abolished it; but they did religiously regard the Lord's Day. This was twenty-one years before Constantine's Sunday law and sixty-four years before the Council of Laodicea.

PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, A. D. 306

"But the Lord's Day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it He rose again, on which day we have received it for a custom not even to bow the knee" (Canon 15). He gives the same reason for keeping the Lord's Day that Christians give now. This was more than two hundred years before the Pope came into power. Notice that these witnesses for Sunday are from all parts of the world, from Africa, Asia and Europe, not simply from Rome, as Seventh-Day Adventists say. These show that Sunday-keeping was as wide-spread as the Christian Church itself, and that from the earliest days.

EUSEBIUS, A. D. 324

Eusebius was born in Palestine, the very home of Christ and the apostles and the cradle of the early Church. He was Bishop of Cæsarea where Paul abode two years (Acts xxiii. 33; xxiv. 27). He studied at Antioch where Paul labored for years (Acts xv. 1). He travelled to Egypt and over Asia Minor. He was one of the most noted

men of his age. He wrote the first history of the Christian Church and bears the title of "Father of Church History." The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says: "As a repertory of facts and documents, his work is invaluable." Johnson's "Cyclopedia" says: "He was very eminent for learning, as well as talents." Horne's "Introduction" says: "A man of extraordinary learning, diligence and judgment, and singularly studious in the Scriptures. . . . His chief work is his 'Ecclesiastical History,' in which he records the history of Christianity from its commencement to his own time. . . . He has delivered, not his own private opinion, but the opinion of the Church, the sum of what he had found in the writings of the primitive Christians."¹

He had every possible opportunity to know what Christians did throughout the world. Of him Justin Edwards, D. D., says: "He lived in the third century, was a man of vast reading, and was as well acquainted with the history of the Church from the days of the apostles as any man of his day." At Cæsarea was "a very extensive library, to which Eusebius had constant access. He was a learned and accurate historian and had the aid of the best helps for acquiring information upon all subjects connected with the Christian Church."² He lived right there, knew just what Christians did, and wrote about fifty years before the Council

¹ Vol. I, Chap. xi, Sec. 2, p. 42.

² "Sabbath Manual," pp. 124-125.

of Laodicea where Adventists say the Sabbath was changed to Sunday.

True, there was a small heretical sect who kept the Sabbath as Judaizers do now. Of them he says: They are "those who cherish low and mean opinions of Christ. . . . With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary [just like Seventh-Day Adventists] as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life. . . . They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them, but on the other hand they also celebrate the Lord's Days very much like us in commemoration of His resurrection." ¹ Even these Judaizers kept Sunday. On the Ninety-second Psalm he says: "The word by the new covenant translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light and gave us the true rest, viz., the saving Lord's Day." "On this day which is the first of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths, *even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world*, and do those things according to the spiritual law which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath." Again: "And all things whatsoever that it was the duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's Day as more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath." ²

This testimony of the great historian of the early

¹ "Ecclesiastical History," pp. 112-113.

² Commentary on Ps. xcii.

Church is decisive. It puts it beyond doubt that Christians in general in all the world did then keep Sunday, the Lord's Day, and did not keep the Jewish Sabbath.

Eusebius bears witness to an actual existing fact, not to some speculative theory. He says that all Christians throughout the world kept the Lord's Day. He lived there and knew of what he affirmed. Is not his testimony better than that of some sectarian Adventist 1,500 years later?

Eusebius says, "We have transferred" the duties of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day. On this Adventists try to make it appear that Eusebius himself with Constantine and others at that date, A. D. 324, were the ones who transferred the day. This is an unfair inference contradicted by all that has gone before. Eusebius writes this as a Christian History relating what the early Church had done. To illustrate: Roosevelt says: "We defeated the British in 1776." "We took Texas from Mexico." Does he mean that *he* and his officers did this now? All know better. Eusebius writes in the same way of what his brethren did centuries before. That is all.

TESTIMONY OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE, A. D. 325

This was the first general council. There were three hundred and eighteen bishops present from all Christendom with about fifteen hundred lower clergy. Surely these would know which day was then observed. The twentieth canon says: "As

some kneel on the Lord's Days, and on the days of Pentecost, the holy synod has decided that for the observance of a general rule, all shall offer their prayers to God standing."

There was no objection to this rule, no question about it, all agreed in it as a thing universally understood. The Lord's Day was the Christian day of worship. The Sabbath was not even mentioned, showing that none of them kept it.

As the delegates represented the entire Christian Church and in all nations, it proves that the observance of the Lord's Day was then kept the world over.

ATHANASIUS, A. D. 326

In the great council at Nice A. D. 325, the one man who towered above all others in influence was Athanasius, the "Father of Orthodoxy." There he defeated the heresy of Arianism and settled for the Church ever since the Deity of Christ. He travelled extensively among the Churches, knew their customs well, and was himself a leader among them. It is certain that his teaching and his custom as to the Lord's Day was that of the entire Church. I will quote from the "Seventh-Day Adventist History of the Sabbath," edition 1912, so that his position will not be questioned. The author says: "Of the early Fathers the later ones spare no effort to manufacture new, fanciful, rhetorical phrases to surround Sunday with greater luster, and to cause the Sabbath to fade out of sight. Athanasius of Alexandria (A. D. 326) gives

us a fair sample. The sixth psalm is said to be upon the Sheminith (the eighth) an instrument for the eighth key. This is seized upon by Athanasius as a proof for Sunday. "What else could this octave be but the resurrection of Christ?" Then again speaking of Psalm cxviii. 24, "What day can this be but the resurrection day of the Lord?—which has received its name from Him, to wit, the Lord's Day" (pages 418, 419). Then the author gives other quotations from Athanasius along the same line defending the Lord's Day.

Notice that all the great leaders of the Church kept the Lord's Day and defended it, but rejected the Jewish Sabbath. Then did not the general Church follow their leaders? Leaders determine what their Churches believe and practice. Lutherans follow Luther, Methodists follow Wesley, etc. All the leaders of the early Church condemned the Jewish Sabbath and observed the Lord's Day. Did not the Churches follow their teachers then the same as they do now?

Seventh-Day Adventists confess that the leading men, ministers, and writers, during the first centuries opposed the Jewish Sabbath. Thus Elder J. N. Andrews in "History of the Sabbath," edition of 1873, says:

"Several of the early Fathers wrote in opposition to the seventh day. We now give the reasons assigned by each for that opposition.

"The writer called Barnabas did not keep the seventh day" (page 299).

Andrews finds that Barnabas gave *seven* reasons why the Sabbath should not be kept! He wrote A. D. 120, at the very beginning of the second century. His book was read in the Churches as Scripture. Then did those Churches keep the Sabbath? Of course not.

JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 140

Of this renowned early Christian Father Andrews says: "He expressly affirms the abolition of both the Sabbath and the Law." "Here are three reasons" (pages 301, 303). So Justin gave his reasons for rejecting the Sabbath. Of him the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says: "In these works Justin professes to present the system of doctrine held by all Christians."

IRENÆUS, A. D. 178

Of him Andrews says: "These things indicate that Irenæus was opposed to Sabbath observance" (page 305). He was one of the greatest and most beloved of the early Fathers. Did he oppose the Sabbath and yet all his people keep it? Hardly.

TERTULLIAN, A. D. 200

Of him Andrews says: "Tertullian offers numerous reasons for not observing the Sabbath" (page 305). He not only did not keep it, but gave *numerous* reasons for his faith. Of him Authon's "Classical Dictionary" says: "He informs us more correctly than any other writer respecting the

Christian doctrine of his times." He had a tremendous influence on the Church then. Did they all keep the Sabbath while he opposed it? Reader, how is this?

EUSEBIUS, A. D. 324

No early church Father surpasses Eusebius for learning or influence in the Church.

Of him Andrews says: "Eusebius came out and declared that Christ transferred the Sabbath to Sunday" (page 358). The same "History of the Sabbath," edition of 1912, says: "Eusebius sets aside the Sabbath of the Lord" (page 396). Then that was what all Christians did the world over.

Now if the leaders and representative writers opposed the keeping of the Sabbath, will any one believe that the common Christians all kept a day which all their leaders and writers opposed? Elder Andrews in "History of the Sabbath," page 308, says: "The reasons offered by the early Fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they had no special light on the subject by reason of living in the first centuries, which we in this latter age do not possess." This is the confession from the ablest historian the seventh day ever had! He admits that "the early Fathers" "in the first centuries" neglected "the observance of the Sabbath and gave their reasons for it!" What further need have we for witness to prove that the seventh day was not observed in the first centuries? But how does this harmonize with the

theory that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the Pope several hundred years afterwards?

I could multiply indefinitely from Sabbatarian authors such confessions as these. Against their will, they are compelled to make them. They prove conclusively that the observance of the Jewish Sabbath had, largely at least, dropped out of the Church at that early date.

THE COUNCIL OF LAODICEA, A. D. 364

This Christian council plainly states that the Jewish Sabbath was no longer to be kept, while the Lord's Day was. The twenty-ninth canon says: "Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day; but preferring the Lord's Day, should rest, if possible, as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ."

Thirty-two bishops were present, all Greeks, in the Eastern Church. Did they know which day the Church kept at that date? Surely. They agree with all the witnesses already quoted. At that date keeping the Jewish Sabbath was condemned, and the Lord's Day approved.

ST. AUGUSTINE, A. D. 395

Next to Paul, probably Augustine has had a wider influence on the Christian Church than any other man. He was born in Numedia, Africa, A. D. 353. His mother was a devout Christian.

He became Bishop of Hippo, Africa. Of him the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says: "From his diocese a relentless war was waged upon every heresy." "These made him immortal, and have tempered the theology of all after times." "The Protestants emulate the Romanists in paying him honor." "He claims the reverence of the world." By him "the idea of the Trinity was for the first time clarified."

This great Christian leader, within three hundred years of St. John, had access to all the Christian writings before him, knew perfectly the practice of the Christians in his day the world over and wrote against pagans and every heresy then extant. He explicitly teaches that the Sabbath was not for Christians. Of Sunday he writes often and fully. We quote only a few lines. "That day which we now call Sunday is the first day of the week, as is clearly seen from the Gospels. The first day of the week is thus named as the day of the resurrection of the Lord, by all the four evangelists, and it is known that this is the day which was later called the Lord's Day." "Sunday was not appointed for the Jews, but through the resurrection of the Lord for Christians." "We celebrate the Lord's Day, and Easter, and other Christian festivities." "To fast on the Lord's Day is a great scandal."¹

Certainly this is plain enough. This brings us down to A. D. 400, with the Lord's Day so fully

¹ To Casulanus, Epistle 28.

and clearly recognized in all Christendom that it is useless to follow it further.

Now read the testimony of the ancient Eastern Greek Church, the first one founded by the apostles. Right Rev. Bishop Raphael, of Brooklyn, N. Y., head of that Church in America, writes me under date of March 30, 1914, as follows: "Our Church, which included all the very first Churches founded by the apostles, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Alexandria, and even Rome, for the first three hundred years, has kept the first day of the week as a day of rest and in holy remembrance of the resurrection of our blessed Lord from the dead. From the dawn of Christianity she bears witness that it has been the sacred day on which the faithful assembled for the partaking of the Lord's Supper, for the saying of public prayers, and the hearing of sermons. All our historians bear record to this fact."

This witness fully confirms the testimony of all the early Christian Fathers quoted in this chapter.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY FROM CYCLOPEDIAS

As a fair, impartial and clear statement of the teachings of the early Christian Fathers concerning the observance of Sunday, we refer the reader to the following from Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," Article "Lord's Day." Here is a book easy of access to all anywhere, unsectarian, embodying the results of the most thorough and scholarly examination of every passage in all the Fathers hav-

ing any bearing upon the Sunday question. Any one who has read the Fathers must confess that its statements are fair and truthful. I have only room for one short quotation:

"The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John are as follows: 'The Lord's Day existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of Scriptural Christianity. It was never defended; for it was never impugned, or at least only impugned as were other things received from the apostles. . . . Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the holy eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for almsgiving.'"

So Johnson's "New Universal Cyclopaedia," Article "Sabbath," says: "For a time the Jewish converts observed both the seventh day, to which the name Sabbath continued to be given exclusively, and the first day, which came to be called the Lord's Day. . . . Within a century after the death of the last of the apostles we find the observance of the first day of the week, under the name of the Lord's Day, established as a universal custom of the Church."

No higher authority than this could be quoted. It states the truth exactly. So the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," Article "Sunday," says: "In the second century its observance was universal. . . . The Jewish Christians ceased to observe the Sabbath after the destruction of Jerusalem."

Doctor Schaff, than whom there is no higher authority, says: "The universal and uncontradicted Sunday observance in the second century can only be explained by the fact that it had its roots in apostolic practice."¹

The man who will shut his eyes to all this mass of testimony and still insist that Sunday-keeping is only an institution of Popes of later ages, is simply held by a theory which he is bound to maintain anyway. I have had a sad experience in this matter, and know just how a seventh-day man feels in reading these historical facts. I read some of them then. They perplexed me some, but I got over this by my strong faith in our doctrines and by believing them to be mostly forgeries. Afterwards as I read more, I saw these testimonies were reliable and very decidedly against our theory of the Pope's Sunday. This disturbed me quite a little, but still I got over them by simply ceasing to think of them at all, and by dwelling upon other arguments in which I had perfect confidence. In debate I was always anxious to shut these out of the discussion. I know that Seventh-Day Adventist ministers generally feel as I did, for we often referred to these testimonies of the Fathers and the effect they had in debate. Of course, the great body of the members never read these things, and are in blissful ignorance concerning them. Or, if they do read them, it is in their own books where they are all explained away. Their unbounded faith in "the message"

¹ "History of the Christian Church," Vol. I, p. 478.

and in their leaders carries them right over these facts as matters of no consequence.

For myself, when once I decided to look these historical facts squarely in the face and give them whatever force they fairly deserved, I soon saw the utter falsity of the claim that the "Pope changed the Sabbath." The old feeling of uneasiness on this point is entirely gone. I feel that so far as the evidence of history is concerned, my feet stand on solid ground.

Catholics Locate the Change of the Sabbath Back With the Apostles the Same as Protestants Do

THE above is the universally accepted doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It is so taught in all her doctrinal works. I have examined a large number of her catechisms, her religious dictionary, her great "Encyclopedia," many of her doctrinal works, and I have interviewed one of her bishops and several of her priests, and find all agreeing in teaching this: The Sabbath was changed by the apostles. Notice carefully: We are not now inquiring as to whether the apostles did really change the Sabbath, but as to what the Catholic Church does believe and teach on this question. Adventists deny that the apostles had anything to do in changing the day, and quote Catholics in such a way as to give the impression that these Catholic authorities say that their Roman Church, hundreds of years after Christ, made the change. This is unfair. And then they studiously omit an important part of what Catholics plainly teach, and then construe the other part to mean what Catholics neither believe nor teach.

We will begin with the very highest authority in the Catholic Church. "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," published by order of Pius IV, contains the creed of the Church. Every member has to swear to this creed when he joins the Church,

hence it is authoritative. It says: "The Sabbath was kept holy from the time of the liberation of the people of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh; the obligation was to cease with the abrogation of the Jewish worship, of which it formed a part; and it therefore was no longer obligatory after the death of Christ. . . . The apostles therefore resolved to consecrate the first day of the week to the divine worship, and called it 'the Lord's Day'; St. John, in the Apocalypse, makes mention of 'the Lord's Day'; and the apostle commands collection to be made 'on the first day of the week,' that is, according to the interpretation of St. Chrysostom, on the Lord's Day; and thus we are given to understand that even then the Lord's Day was kept holy in the Church" (pages 264, 265).

Notice that this creed says the apostles consecrated the day; it was holy, and was called the Lord's Day. The Scriptures are quoted to prove all this. This is the creed of the Roman Church. Any Catholic priest or writer teaching differently contradicts the sacred creed of his own Church and violates his oath to believe and teach it.

Here is a comment on Acts xx. 7, in the Catholic Bible itself. Observe how they place the change just where Protestants do and quote the Bible to prove it:

"'And on the first day of the week.' Here St. Chrysostom, with many other interpreters of the Scripture, explain that the Christians, even at this time, must have changed the Sabbath into the first

day of the week (the Lord's Day), as all Christians now keep it."

Archbishop Ireland, in answer to my question as to *when* the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath, answered as follows :

St. Paul, March 2, 1914.

My dear Sir :

In answer to your question I would state that the Jewish Sabbath was simply a positive precept in the Mosaic law and lapsed with that law. The apostles and early Christians instituted the Sunday as a day of special prayer in honor of the great mysteries of the Christian religion, the resurrection and the coming of the Holy Spirit, both occurring on the first day of the week.

Very sincerely,
JOHN IRELAND.

That is clear, positive, and directly to the point.

TESTIMONY OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST

"Having lived for years among the Seventh-Day Adventists, I am familiar with their claims that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Such assertions are wholly unfounded. Catholics claim no such thing ; but maintain that the apostles themselves established the observance of Sunday and that we received it by tradition from them. The councils and popes afterwards simply confirmed the keeping of the day as received from the apostles.

"JOHN MEILER,

"Rector of St. John's Church, Healdsburg, Cal."

The following statement I drew up, and read to a leading Catholic priest of Grand Rapids, Mich., who readily signed it, as will be seen below :

"The Catholic doctrine of the change of the Sabbath is this: The apostles, by instruction from Jesus Christ, changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday to commemorate the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost, both of which occurred on Sunday. The change was made by the apostles themselves, and hence by divine authority, at the very beginning of the Church. There are references to this change in Acts xx. 7 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 ; Rev. i. 10, etc. Yet these texts do not state positively such a change ; hence Catholics go to the statements of the early Christian Fathers, where this change by the apostles is confirmed and put beyond doubt. Catholics also rely upon the tradition of the Church which says that the change was made by the apostles. Catholics never teach that the change of the day was made by the Church two or three hundred years after Christ. Such a statement would be contrary to all the facts of history and the traditions of the Church.

"The Holy Catholic Church began with the apostles. St. Peter was the first Pope. Hence, when they say that the Church changed the Sabbath, they mean that it was done by the Church in the days of the apostles. Neither the Church nor the Pope, two or three hundred years after the apostles, had anything whatever to do with changing the Sabbath, for the change had been made

ages before. Catholics do not call the first day of the week the Sabbath, for that was Saturday; but they call it Sunday, or the Lord's Day."

This above statement by Rev. D. M. Canright is true and pure Catholic doctrine.—Rev. James C. Pulcher, Pastor of St. James' Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

See how all these Catholic authorities agree.

Now read "Rome's Challenge," "Father Enright's Challenge," and a lot of other Catholic "challenges," which Adventists gleefully gather up and endorse and peddle the world over as unanswerable. Read them very carefully and notice particularly that not one of these Catholic "challenges" ever locates the *time* when the "Catholic Church" made the change. In all these "challenges" they adroitly leave this point out, and presume on the ignorance of the general public, which supposes that the Catholic Church began centuries after Christ. Then Adventists take advantage of this popular idea of the Catholic Church and locate the change about 300 years after Christ.

The above quotations are only a few out of a large number given in my book "The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans." Notice on the cover. Read it.

The Pagan Romans and Greeks Had No Weekly Day of Rest, or Festival, or Worship on Sunday

ONE of the chief arguments which Seventh-Day Adventists make against Sunday observance is this: They say that the pagan nations, especially the Romans, regarded Sunday as a holiday, or festival day: a day of worship of their heathen gods, particularly the sun, on every Sunday,—hence Sun-day. When these pagans professed Christianity they gradually brought into the Church this pagan custom of a Sunday festival day. Then the apostate Roman Church adopted it from these heathens. So now we are keeping a pagan, papal day, hateful to God. Their literature against Sunday-keeping is largely based on this theory as fundamental. Their "History of the Sabbath" is saturated with this argument. It bristles in their tracts, pamphlets, books, and sermons everywhere and all the time. If they are wrong here the very bottom drops out of their anti-Sunday arguments.

Knowing that the great state and national institutions of learning maintain specialists in every line of knowledge, I decided to apply to them for information on this subject. These learned scholars would have no inducement to be one-sided or unfair. These specialists have every possible means of information at hand and devote a lifetime of

study to their particular branch of knowledge. Hence I drew up a list of questions fully covering every possible phase of this subject, as will be seen. I carefully avoided giving any intimation of my views, or of the use I wished to make of their replies, so as not in any way to influence their answers.

The world renowned British Museum is the highest authority to which I could refer, so I will give this first. I quote my letter to them with their answer to each question one after the other.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Dec. 8, 1914.
British Museum, Department of History,
London, England.

Dear Sirs:—For the information of many who are deeply interested in this subject, would you kindly answer briefly the enclosed questions?

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Here is the answer :

Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities,
British Museum,
London, W. C., Dec. 24, 1914.

Sir:

I am commanded by the Assistant Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities to reply as follows to your questions on the ancient week :

Q. 1. Did the pagan Romans and Greeks ever have any regular weekly day of rest from secular work?

Ans. No.

Q. 2. Did they have any regular weekly festival day?

Ans. No.

Q. 3. Did they have any regular weekly day when they assembled for pagan worship?

Ans. No.

Q. 4. Did they have any special day of the week when individuals went to the temples to pray or make offerings?

Ans. No; both for Greeks and Romans the *month* was the unit and not the *week*. The Greek calendar varied in different states but the month was generally divided into three periods of ten days. The Romans reckoned from three fixed points in the month, the Kalend or first, the Nones fifth or seventh, the Ides thirteenth or fifteenth. These subdivisions in themselves *had no religious significance*.

Q. 5. As Sunday was sacred to the Sun, Monday to the Moon, Saturday to Saturn, etc., were those supposed deities worshipped on their own particular days more than on any other days?

Ans. No; the old worship of the gods was disappearing when the seven-day week came about. The significance of the deities' names was *astrological, not religious*.

Q. 6. When was our week of seven days first introduced into the Roman calendar?

Ans. There are traces in the literature of the late republic (first cent. B. C.) that the Romans used the week of seven days for *astrological* purposes, in connection with the many Eastern superstitions of the period. It was probably the third century, A. D. before the seven day week came into common use.

Q. 7. From whom did the Romans learn the week of seven days?

Ans. From the Jews, alternately the Assyrians and Babylonians; the names were probably fixed by the Hellenistic Greeks.

Q. 8. Did the pagan Greeks ever adopt in common life, or in their calendar, the week of seven days?

Ans. No.

Q. 9. Did Apollo, the Sungod, either among the Romans or Greeks, have any special day on which he was worshipped with prayers or offerings more than on any other day?

Ans. There were certain set festivals at various temples; *these were annual, not weekly.*

Q. 10. Did the pagan reverence for Sunday have anything to do in influencing Christians to select that day as their rest day?

Ans. No; it can hardly be said that there was any special reverence for Sunday in pagan times (see answer to No. 5).

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. N. PRICE.

You see this historian gives an unqualified NO to all the questions. Notice particularly that the names of the days of the week were all only *astrological*, not religious. There was no religious sacredness attached to a day because it was named after some planet as Sun-day—Sun's day—or Monday, Moon's day, etc. The sun was not worshipped on Sunday, nor the moon on Monday, nor Saturn on Saturday, etc. Also notice carefully that Apollo was not worshipped on Sunday or on any week day. His festival days were *annual*, not weekly, as Adventists have taught. Then note that there was no special reverence for Sunday in pagan times. Hence, Sunday keeping, or Sunday sacredness, could not have originated with them.

Our next witness is from the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D. C. This great institution of learning is supported by the United States Government. Here the highest qualified specialists in every line of knowledge are employed. I addressed nearly the same questions to this learned body and the answers are the same as from the British Museum:

*Smithsonian Institute, Wash., D. C.,
September 23, 1914.*

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT,
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Sir:—I have referred your letter of September 14th to Dr. I. M. Casonawicz, Assistant Curator of Old World Archeology, who furnishes the following replies to your several inquiries:

Q. 1. Did the pagan Romans and Greeks ever have any regular weekly day of rest from secular work?

Ans. No.

2. Did they ever have any weekly festival day?

Ans. No.

3. Did they have any regular weekly day when they assembled for pagan worship?

Ans. No.

4. When was our calendar of the week first introduced among the Romans and Greeks?

Ans. The division of the month into weeks was introduced into Rome from Egypt. The date is uncertain, but it was not earlier than the second century, A. D.

5. When was our calendar of the week first recognized in Roman law?

Ans. The earliest Sunday legislation was en-

acted under Constantine I, 321 A. D. No legislation of earlier date on the division of the month is known.

6. As each day of the week was dedicated to some god, as Sunday to the Sun, Monday to the Moon, Saturday to Saturn, etc., was each of these supposed deities worshipped on one particular day more than any other day?

Ans. No.

7. Did the pagan Romans have any one special day in the week when individuals, if they chose, went to make prayers or offerings to their gods?

Ans. No.

8. Did Apollo have any special day in the week or month more than any other day when he was worshipped with prayers or offerings?

Ans. No.

Very truly yours,

R. RATHBORN,

Assistant Sec. in charge of National Museum.

The above are only a few out of a large number of similar historical testimonies given in my book, "The Lord's Day from Neither Catholics nor Pagans," noticed on cover, which see.