VOLUME II

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

The Fiscus Judaicus Tax And Adventist Theories of Sabbath Abandonment

By Kerry B. Wynne, William H. Hohmann, Robert K. Sanders, and Larry Dean, J. D.

Coordinating the fact that Christian doctrine and practice emanated from the Eastern Orthodox Church to the Western Church (Church of Rome) is a wealth of information long known to Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant scholars. It would appear, unfortunately, that once the pioneer SDA church "historian," J. N. Andrews, accepted his belief in the Sabbath from a purported prophet of God, everything he studied about early church history thereafter had to be interpreted along the line that Sabbath abandonment represented apostasy. Thus Andrews and White abetted each other in creating an interpretation of history that disagreed with well-established facts. Their naïve view of things implied that the early Christians who abandoned the Jewish Sabbath kept Sundays as one would observe the Sabbath. Thus, White and Andrews failed to notice that while some of the Jewish Christians did continue to keep the Sabbath by resting from labor on that day, they would have been free to meet in fellowship with their Gentile counterparts for table fellowship along with corporate worship and prayers on the next day, which example we see in Acts 20:7. As Jews they would have tended to remain in their homes on the Sabbath according to the requirements of the Law.

What, then, if the Gentile Christians were observing Sundays along the lines of the Sabbath? The Jewish Christians would not have been able to have any concourse with the Gentile Christians for the same reasons! What Jesus' death had accomplished in order to bring the two disparate groups together would have been undone and reversed by the early church had they observed Sundays along the pattern of the Sabbath!

> Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; [12]That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: [13]But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. [14] For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; [15]Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; [16]And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: [17]And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. [18]For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. [19]Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; [20]And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets,

> Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; [21]In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: [22]In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. — Ephesians 2:11-22 (KJV)

Sundays had no sacredness associated with it in the early Church. Early writings show that Christians either gathered early on Sunday mornings for communal worship and prayers before going off to work on that day, or meeting together after work on that day for the same purpose as well as to share a communal meal.

> 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. (Justin Martyr (65-155 AD.) From: **The First Apology of Justin,** Chapter LXVII.-Weekly Worship of the Christians.)

The early church associated Sundays with the resurrection of Christ. His resurrection ushered in a new beginning that was not to be trivialized.

The first Christians were Jews and they understood, as Hebrews, reading the books of Moses in Aramaic, that the Sabbath ordinance was not given at Creation. They understood the subordinate relationship of the Sabbath to the ordinance of circumcision. It was Jewish Christians who, at the Council of Jerusalem, vetoed the move by the Pharisaical members to require the new Gentile believers coming into the Church be circumcised and keep the law.

There is no hope of salvaging Ellen White's concept that Sunday observance began in the Western Church (Rome). Sunday observance came from the East to the Western churches by its missionaries and that the Eastern Orthodox Church exerted powerful control over the church at Rome that these missionaries established.

As we mentioned earlier, the Eastern Church was the center of Christianity for the first few hundred years of the Christian Faith. This is where Christian doctrine and practice were established. The Western Church did not develop into any prominence within Christianity until after 500-600 AD. The center of political power shifted to the East (think Asia versus Europe) when Constantine moved the seat of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 324 AD. The fact that the Roman Empire survived in the East for around 1,000 years longer than it did in the West suggests that the Eastern Orthodox Church would likely retain preeminence in matters of the Christian Faith for hundreds of additional years. The emperor didn't move the bishop of Rome to Constantinople with him.

Therefore, speculative claims about how Sunday observance might have developed in the West (Rome) is an exercise in futility and deception. All the theories developed by SDA scholars to place the development of Sunday observance in the West have been successfully refuted, and these theories include **(1)** Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's Jewish Persecution Theory, **(2)** Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi's "Influence of Sun Worship Theory," **(3)** the Dual Day Theory as developed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and **(4)** Kenneth W. Strand's Out of Easter Theory.

During the time that Adventists claim all these various influences were coming together to bring about Sunday observance in the West (Rome), Christian doctrine and practice was flowing from the East to the West. As the significant councils of the Christian Faith began to be held, they were conducted in the East, and the bishop of Rome traveled to Asia to participate as one of a number of others from the Christian world of their day. These bishops returned at the conclusion of these councils to

implement the decisions of these councils in their bishoprics. In a manner of speaking, the bishop of Rome received his "marching orders" from the East as did all the other bishops from around the Christian world.

If we did not already know that Sunday observance and Sabbath breaking were universal by 140 AD– and if we did not already know that the Eastern Church never kept the Sabbath– and if we did not already know that Christian doctrine and practice originated in the East and flowed to the West during this time of ecclesiastical history– we would still conclude that the Western Church (Rome) did not develop the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath-breaking on its own, but that it was imposed on it around 363-365 AD by the Council of Laodicea!

While not classified as one of the "Great Councils," the Council of Laodicea, circa 363-365 AD, was also held in the East. Laodicea is located in what is modern-day Turkey, and is not to be confused with the Laodicea in Syria. (See *Wikipedia* article, "Council of Laodicea.") This council was convened to address many questions, including which books should be in the Bible and the Sabbath-Sunday question. Please read Canon #29 carefully:

> Canon 29: Christians must not Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honouring the Lord's Day; and, **if they can**, resting then as Christians. But if any shall be found to be Judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ.

(See http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3806.htm, New Advent is a Roman Catholic website.)

Notice that the Council, by its directive to have Christians rest on Sunday IF THEY CAN, purposed to establish Christian practice (think tradition) rather than Christian doctrine in regard to resting on Sunday. If the Council had intended to transfer the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, resting would not have been treated as an option. The Council wished to provide a day where Christians could worship God and spend time with their families, and working would interfere with these things. There was no element of sacredness of time involved.

This provision of Canon #29 casts even more doubt on **Bob Pickle's** SDA theory that we could still say that the pope changed the Sabbath because this "change" was not complete until rest required by the Jewish Sabbath was transferred to Sunday.

Like all the other bishops in the Christian world, the bishop of Rome continued to receive– not impart– Christian doctrine and practice throughout all the centuries through which Sunday observance and Sabbath rejection ensued. Note that as discussed in the comments of R.J. Baukham in the next section, the bishop of Rome utterly failed to influence the other bishops of his day to adopt his preferred date for Easter and to enforce the Sabbath fast. It is not very realistic to think that he would have had a chance to "impose" Sunday observance on the entire Christian church, even if he had tried to do so. A review of the Great Councils of the East clearly demonstrates that the center of Christian thought and influence was in the Eastern Orthodox Church during the entire period of time that Adventists like to talk about the role of Rome in establishing Sunday observance, and even to centuries beyond that point: (See *Wikipedia* article, "First Seven Ecumenical Councils"):

> The First Seven Ecumenical Councils, as commonly understood, are:
>
> 1. First Council of Nicaea (325)
> 2. First Council of Constantinople (381)
> 3. Council of Ephesus (431)

4. Council of Chalcedon (451)
5. Second Council of Constantinople (553)
6. Third Council of Constantinople (680)
7. Second Council of Nicaea (787)

The first council held in the West, Lateran, was held in the year 1123 in the Basilica in Rome after the Great Schism between the Eastern and Western churches had existed for some time.
Nicaea, the home of the First Great Council, took place about 40 years before the Council of Laodicea in what is now present day Turkey in 321 AD. While Roman Catholics like to claim that it was the Bishop of Rome who was responsible for establishing the doctrine of the full divinity of Christ at this Council, Protestants quote the following Council's statement that shows that the Bishop of Rome was mentioned only as a peer with the bishops of other major jurisdictions:

> "Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis, prevail. Let the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction over all of these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the churches retain their privileges (*Canon 6*)."

The *Wikipedia* article, "First Council of Nicaea," makes this interesting observation:

> "According to Protestant theologian Philip Schaff, 'The Nicene fathers passed this canon not as introducing anything new, but merely as confirming an existing relation on the basis of church tradition; and that, with special reference to Alexandria, on account of the troubles existing there. Rome was named only for illustration; and Antioch and all the other eparchies or provinces were secured their admitted rights. The bishoprics of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch were placed substantially on equal footing'. (Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 3, pp. 275-276.)

THE "CHURCH AT ROME" THEORY

Dr. Bacchiocchi theorized that the Church at Rome, which developed into the Roman Catholic Church hundreds of years later, might have had a significant role pushing Christians away from the Jewish Sabbath in order to adopt Sunday observance. Dr. Bacchiocchi further theorized that it was the supposedly preeminent authority of the bishop of the Church at Rome (the predecessor of the pope of the Roman Catholic Church) who influenced the entire church to adopt the "new" practice of Sunday observance (*From Sabbath to Sunday*, pp. 207-212). R.J. Baukham, who lectured in the Department of Theology at the University of Manchester, said this about Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory in his essay, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church:"

> This is probably the weakest of Bacchiocchi's arguments, but it is essential to his thesis. Only this assertion of the primacy of Rome can begin to explain how a custom originating in the early second century could have become as universal in the Christian church as Sunday worship did.
>
> Against Bacchiocchi's argument, it must be said that the evidence he presents for the authority of the Church of Rome in the second century is not convincing. The Church of Rome had great prestige, but the kind of jurisdictional authority his thesis presupposes is

anachronistic in the second century. No church of that period had sufficient authority to change the weekly day of worship throughout Christendom. Furthermore, Bacchiocchi's other two examples of liturgical change in the second century, the Sunday Easter and fasting on the Sabbath, do not, as he thinks, support his case, but rather highlight its weakness. Whether or not Bacchiocchi is correct in locating the origin of the Sunday Easter in early second-century Rome, it is quite clear that the see of Rome did not have the authority to impose it on the rest of the church. It was not until the *end* of the second century that bishop Victor of Rome attempted to convert the Quartodeciman churches to the observance of the Sunday Easter, and his attempt encountered stubborn resistance in Asia. Similarly, the Church of Rome was singularly unsuccessful in promoting the practice of fasting on the Sabbath. As Bacchiocchi himself admits, as late as the fifth century it was still confined to the Church of Rome, itself and a few other western churches. Both in the case of the Sunday Easter and in the case of the Sabbath fast, the surviving historical records indicate considerable debate and controversy in the churches. It therefore seems extremely unlikely that already in the *early* second century the authority of the Roman see was such that it could impose Sunday worship throughout the church, superseding a universal practice of Sabbath observance handed down from the apostles, without leaving any trace of controversy or resistance in the historical records. Bacchiocchi's own comparison with Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast shows up the difficulty of his explanations of the origins of Sunday worship. Like all attempts to date the origins of Sunday worship in the second century, it fails to account for the universality of the custom. Unlike the Sunday Easter and the Sabbath fast, Sunday worship was never, so far as the evidence goes, disputed. There is no record of any Christian group (except the extreme part of the Ebonites) that did not observe Sunday, either in the second century or in later centuries of the patristic era. (*From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, Carson, p.271, 272)

Michael Morrison, in his article, "*Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories*," posted at the Grace Community International website, provides a list of additional reasons that provide evidence that the Roman Church did not have the power to legislate any particular practice to the other churches in the Roman Empire:

As evidence that Rome did not have such power, we can note:

Ignatius does not greet a bishop of Rome.

Irenaeus disagreed with the bishop of Rome regarding policy toward Quartodecimans.

Polycarp and Polycrates acted as equals with the bishop of Rome.

It was only with difficulty and recorded controversy that Rome pressured a change in the date of Easter for one area in Asia Minor.

Even in later centuries, Rome was unable to force other cities to observe the seventh day as a fast day.

In the fourth century, when many Eastern Christians began to observe the Sabbath as well as Sunday, Rome was unable or unwilling to stop the practice.

(**Kenneth A. Strand**, ***From Sabbath to Sunday in the Early Christian Church: A***

Review of Some Recent Literature. Part II: "Samuele Bacchiocchi's Reconstruction," Andrews University Seminary Studies (AUSS) 17 (1979), pp. 96-99. Strand also notes that "Christian influences were still moving largely from East to West rather than vice versa" (*Sabbath*, p. 332, n. 22)

Now we know where Sunday observance came from. The first Christians met on Sundays because the Jews were meeting on Saturdays. The Jews threw the Christians out of the synagogues. The Council of Jerusalem voted not to impose the ordinance of circumcision on the Gentle converts, thereby bringing them under the law with its Sabbath. It is doubtful that many of the Jewish Christians kept the Sabbath, but if they did, they abandoned it within several decades. It is unlikely that the Gentile Christians ever kept it. Sunday observance quickly became the tradition of the Eastern Church, which from the beginning was the center of Christian belief, practice, and influence. Sunday observance was never a church doctrine. The early Christians had no illusions about it having any intrinsic sacredness that had been transferred to it from the Jewish Sabbath. As we have seen, the practice of Sunday observance spread from the East to the West– not from the West to the East. The doctrines of Rome were imposed on it by the important church councils, all of which were held in the East. There is no evidence that Rome originated and imposed one single doctrine or practice on the Christian world until many centuries after the practice of Sunday observance and Sabbath "abandonment" had become the unquestioned, universal practice of the Christian Faith for hundreds of years.

Bacchiocchi's "From Pagan Sun Worship" Theory

Dr. Bacchiocchi tried to salvage some components of Ellen White's conspiracy/apostasy theory– that pagan sun worship influenced Christians to adopt Sunday observance. The sun has always had its worshipers throughout the world, especially in ancient times. For Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory to have credibility, he must prove two things beyond reasonable doubt:

.

1. **First**, he must demonstrate that sun worship was popular enough in the Roman Empire between 100 and 140 AD. to potentially have influenced Christianity in the choice of a day of worship on the basis of a perceived need for commonality.

2. **Second**, he must provide adequate evidence to show a high degree of probability that it actually DID influence Christianity in this manner. The more incredible any theory appears to be, the greater demand there is that the supportive evidence and arguments be strong.

In Dr. Bacchiocchi's book, ***Sabbath under Crossfire*** (1998), Dr. Bacchiocchi spends nearly an entire chapter discussing the *possibility* that this sun cult or that sun cult was popular between 70 and 140 AD., but there is no consensus among his sources. During the period of time in question, sun worship was not predominant in general and Mithraism was not widely practiced in specific. Bacchiocchi, in an apparent contradiction of himself, concedes:

> The Christian Sunday and the pagan veneration of the day of the Sun is not explicit before the time of Eusebius (ca. AD. 260-340)... *From Sabbath to Sunday*, p. 264.

Therefore, **requirement #1 is not met.**
In the remainder of this same chapter, Dr. Bacchiocchi attempts to make a case for the probability that the Romans were using a 7-day calendar that corresponded with the 7-day Jewish calendar. It is

painfully evident that he is grasping at straws to show that a 7-day calendar had even limited use anywhere in the Roman Empire during this period of time. Most of the historical sources we could locate indicate that the Romans used an 8-day calendar during New Testament times and that the day named in honor of the sun was the second day of that 8-day week. These sources are fairly consistent in stating that, so far as can be reconstructed, the Romans did not *completely* adopt a 7-day calendar until around 300 AD. On the other hand there are a few sources we found which see evidence that the Roman Empire might possibly have partially adopted a 7-day week 100 years or more before the birth of Christ, but that the vast majority of Romans continued using the customary 8 day week. **Robert Cox**, a contemporary of Andrews and White who is quoted in other areas by Andrews, examined this historical question. This book would have been available to J. N. Andrews and Ellen White in that era. Here is what Cox says in his chapter entitled "Origin and Prevalence of the Week:"

> The opinion, still frequently expressed, that the week is and ever has been a universal institution, appears to be now untenable. Although anciently employed by the Hindoos, Assyrians, and Egyptians, the week was unknown to the Greeks and Etrurians, and was adopted by the Romans only in the second century, when they borrowed it from Egypt.

In his book ***From Sabbath to Sunday***, Dr. Bacchiocchi states that some historians believe that a 7-day calendar was in widespread use in the Roman Empire by the latter part of the Second Century (150-199 AD). The trouble is that the transition from "Sabbath keeping" to Sunday observance was universal by 140 AD as conceded by Dr. Bacchiocchi himself. As we will explain subsequently, none of the Roman gods were worshiped on a weekly basis. But let us, for the sake of argument, pretend for a moment that the Roman sun worshipers did get together on the day of their "week" that was named in honor of the Sun. The Romans are using an eight-day week. It is the SECOND day of the eight-day Roman week that is named in honor of the Sun. The Jews are using a seven-day week, and it is the 7th day of their week that has been set aside as their sacred day of worship. In this hypothetical case, the day of worship for the Sun worshipers would only fall on the same day as the Jewish Sabbath occasionally. Compound this with the likelihood that the Jews were still using a lunar calendar to calculate the Sabbath, resetting their weeks according to the new moon, and the disparity widens even further.

Since the Romans did not worship their gods on a weekly basis, there was no such thing a day of sun worship during any kind of a week that the Jewish Sabbath could be changed to, even if both weekly systems were the same! The followers of any particular god visited that god's temple whenever they felt the need, and there were special days of a calendar year set aside to honor specific deities. Again, and for a somewhat different reason, we are faced with the impossibility that any worship day was "changed." There was no weekly day of sun worship that the papacy could have moved the Jewish Sabbath to.

In 1997 Evangelical biblical scholar, Ralph Woodrow, startled the Christian world by publishing a book, *The Two Babylons?* which refuted virtually everything he had taught in his best-selling 1966 book, *The Two Babylons.* In the 1966 book he taught that a lot of Christian customs, including its day of worship, had been borrowed from the Pagans. Years later Woodrow was informed by another scholar that his teachings were in error, and he determined to set out to find out the truth for himself. He had based *The Two Babylons* largely on the work of a much earlier religious writer, Alexander Hislop (1807-1862). Woodrow began to examine Hislop's sources. Soon he discovered that those sources did not validate his claims! Pursuing additional historical records, he managed to stumble across the historical research of D. M. Canright. In his 1997 book, he drew extensively from Canright's findings to show that his initial premise— that Christians had borrowed a lot of pagan

customs— was not true. The Christian world was impressed that he had the humility to admit that he was wrong and to try to correct his error. Sunday observance could not have come from Pagans because they had no such custom to borrow from.

No later than 1915, D.M. Canright had confronted the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church with overwhelming historical evidence that their claim that pagan sun worship influenced Christians to abandon the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath was dead wrong. In Canright's book, *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans: An Answer to Seventh-day Adventism on this Subject* (1915), he had presented the scholarly opinion of a number of noted American historians that the pagans had never had a weekly day set aside to worship any of their gods. You can read this story at: http://hwarmstrong.com/sunday-worship.htm http://hwarmstrong.com/sunday-worship.htm

Finally, if Dr. Bacchiocchi's apostasy theory were true, we would be forced to believe that the early Christians were willing to break the Sabbath, which they supposedly believed was based on an eternal, moral principle, while at the same time they were willing to give up their lives rather than to bow the knee to an idol or publicly renounce Christ.

R.J. Baukham, in his essay, "*Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church*," answers Dr. Bacchiocchi as follows:

> Bacchiocchi argues that the reason why the church of Rome adopted *Sunday* as the Christian day of worship, instead of the Sabbath, was that the pagan day of the sun, in the planetary week, had already gained special significance in pagan sun cults, and by adopting this day Christians were able to exploit the symbolism of God or Christ as sun or light, which was already present in their own religious tradition.
>
> Bacchiocchi here underestimates the resistance to pagan customs in second century Christianity. The desire for differentiation from paganism had deeper Christian roots than the second-century desire for differentiation from Judaism. It is true that, from Justin onwards, the Fathers exploited the symbolism of the pagan title "Sunday," but to have actually adopted the pagan day as the Christian day of worship *because* it was prominent in the pagan sun cults would have been a very bold step indeed. Even if the Church of Rome had taken this step, it becomes even more inexplicable that the rest of the church followed suit without argument. (D.A. Carson, ed., *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, p. 272)

Mithraism is the sun cult that Sabbatarians most suspect was influential in causing the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping for the adoption of the so-called "pagan" Sunday as the day of worship for Christians. Bacchiocchi knew of this possible link, but declined to say that he had proof that such was the case. Since Mithraism had only been present in the Roman Empire for a few centuries before Christ, it did not reach its peak of popularity until a couple of hundred years after Sunday observance had become universal. Here is what The *Encyclopedia Wikipedia* has to say about the relationship of Mithraism with Christianity. You can read it in its full context at this link:

http://www.faculty.umb.edu/gary_zabel/Courses/Phil%20281b/Philosophy%20of%20Magic/Pythagoras,%20Empedocles,%20Plato/Mithraism.htm

> Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the legions from the east in the first century BC. As an action god of armies and the champion of heroes, he appealed to the professional Roman soldiers, who carried his cult to Iberia, Britain, the German frontiers and Dacia.

The cult of Mithras began to attract attention at Rome about the end of the first century AD, perhaps in connection with the conquest of then-Zoroastrian Armenia. The earliest material evidence for the Roman worship of Mithras dates from that period, in a record of Roman soldiers who came from the military garrison at Carnuntum in the Roman province of Upper Pannonia (near the Danube River in modern Austria, near the Hungarian border). These soldiers fought against the Parthians and were involved in the suppression of the revolts in Jerusalem from 60 A.D. to about 70 A.D. When they returned home, they made Mithraic dedications, probably in the year 71 or 72.

Statius mentions the typical Mithraic relief in his Thebaid (Book i. 719,720), around A. D. 80; Plutarch's Life of Pompey also makes it clear that the worship of Mithras was well known at that time.

By A. D. 200, Mithraism had spread widely through the army, and also among traders and slaves. The German frontiers have yielded most of the archaeological evidence of its prosperity: small cult objects connected with Mithra turn up in archaeological digs from Romania to Hadrian's Wall.

At Rome, the third century emperors encouraged Mithraism, because of the support which it afforded to the divine nature of monarchs. Mithras thus became the giver of authority and victory to the Imperial House. From the time of Commodus, who participated in its mysteries, its supporters were to be found in all classes.

Concentrations of Mithraic temples are found on the outskirts of the Roman Empire: along Hadrian's Wall in northern England three mithraeum have been identified, at Housesteads, Carrawburgh and Rudchester. The discoveries are in the University of Newcastle's Museum of Antiquities, where a mithraeum has been recreated. Recent excavations in London have uncovered the remains of a Mithraic temple near to the center of the once walled Roman settlement, on the bank of the Walbrook stream. Mithraea have also been found along the Danube and Rhine river frontier, in the province of Dacia (where in 2003 a temple was found in Alba-Iulia) and as far afield as Numidia in North Africa.

As would be expected, Mithraic ruins are also found in the port city of Ostia, and in Rome the capital, where as many as seven hundred mithraeum may have existed (a dozen have been identified). Its importance at Rome may be judged from the abundance of monumental remains: more than 75 pieces of sculpture, 100 Mithraic inscriptions, and ruins of temples and shrines in all parts of the city and its suburbs. A well-preserved late 2nd century mithraeum, with its altar and built-in stone benches, originally built beneath a Roman house (as was a common practice), survives in the crypt over which has been built the Basilica of San Clemente, Rome.

Worship of the sun (Sol) did exist within the indigenous Roman pantheon, as a minor part, and always as a pairing with the moon. However, in the East, there were many solar deities, including the Greek Helios, who was largely displaced by Apollo. **By the 3rd century, the**

popular cults of Apollo and Mithras had started to merge into the syncretic cult known as Sol Invictus, and in 274 CE the emperor Aurelian (whose mother had been a priestess of the sun) made worship of Sol Invictus official. Subsequently Aurelian built a splendid new temple in Rome, and created a new body of priests to support it (pontifex solis invicti), attributing his victories in the East to Sol Invictus. But none of this affected the existing cult of Mithras, which remained a non-official cult. Some senators held positions in both cults.

However, this period was also the beginning of the decline of Mithraism, as Dacia was lost to the empire, and invasions of the northern peoples resulted in the destruction of temples along a great stretch of frontier, the main stronghold of the cult. The spread of Christianity through the Empire, boosted by Constantine's tolerance of it from around 310 CE, also took its toll - particularly as Christianity admitted women while Mithraism did not, which obviously limited its potential for rapid growth.

The reign of Julian, who attempted to restore the faith, and suppress Christianity, and the usurpation of Eugenius renewed the hopes of its devotees, but the decree secured by Theodosius in 394, totally forbidding non-Christian worship, may be considered the end of Mithraism's formal public existence. Mithraism arrived fully mature at Rome with the return of the legions from the east in the first century BC.

The idea that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday faces seemingly impossible barriers at every turn. The writings of the first Christians indicate that the Jewish Sabbath was "abandoned" on biblical grounds. The leaders of the Reformation cited biblical concepts for abandoning the Jewish Sabbath. The truth of the matter, when the rhetoric is set aside, is that the early gentile Christian churches never embraced the Sabbath to begin with. The early Christians do not deserve the derogation that Sabbatarians have subjected them to over the years with the false claim that they went along with a conspiracy-apostasy to circumvent the Law of God.

NOT ACCORDING TO BACCHIOCCHI'S "JEWISH PERSECUTION THEORY"

As we have seen, Dr. Bacchiocchi has conceded himself into a historical box canyon. He admits the early date of 140 CE for universal adoption of Sunday observance and wisely refuses to suggest that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day. He concedes that he cannot prove a link between sun worship and Sabbath abandonment before 140 CE. His last hope is to prove that the Roman Empire's persecution of the rebellious Jews between 100 CE–140 CE caused the Christians at Rome to distance themselves from Sabbath-keeping in order to escape the possible threat of associated persecution. Dr. Bacchiocchi presupposes that Christians believed they were still required to keep the Sabbath at that time– something difficult to prove since Sunday observance was already widespread by 100 CE. He further theorizes that the Church at Rome used its influence over the Christians throughout the vast Roman Empire to distance itself from Sabbath-keeping to escape the possibility of such a persecution on the basis of this key religious practice supposedly being common to both Jews and Christians.

The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways

It turns out Christianity's reason for "distancing itself" from Sabbath keeping Jews was more banal

and less heroic that avoiding persecution. The *fiscus Judaicus* was a tax imposed on the Jews of the Roman Empire by Emperor Vespasian in the early 70s C.E. Whereas formerly the Jews had sent a half shekel (two drachmas) annually to the Temple of Jerusalem, now, after the Roman destruction, they would be required to send that same amount to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome, which had been badly damaged by fire and was in need of repair and restoration. The Roman victory over Judea in 70 C.E. was celebrated widely in Rome in the 70s and 80s C.E. because it was so important to the new ruling dynasty. It turns out that Christians did not want to appear to be "Jewish" simply to avoid additional taxation. This theory has been explored at length here:

> *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways*, By Marius Heemstra (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010)

Although no Christian text mentions the *fiscus Judaicus*, Marius Heemstra argues that this tax had a crucial role in the development of "Christianity" as a social and cultural system separate from "Judaism," a process commonly called "the parting of the ways." Christianity was now seen by the Romans as not-Judaism; the *fiscus Judaic* was applied to neither gentile Christians nor Jewish Christians. Bacchiocchi never mentions the fact that the *fiscus Judaicus* had completely severed Christianity from Judaism by CE 80. These Christians did not pay the *fiscus Judaicus* because they did not see themselves as obligated to do so, because they did not see themselves as Jews. In other words, this was merely a confirmation of what Christians, both Jewish Christians and gentile Christians, already believed, namely, that Christianity was not Judaism. Thus, Christians avoided being seen keeping the Sabbath out of a desire to avoid the tax on Judaism.

Neither the Jews of Rome, nor the Christians ***anywhere*** joined in with the Jewish revolts. Christians didn't join with the 135 CE revolt because Simon bar Kokhba, the commander, was regarded by many Jews as the prophesied Messiah, a heroic figure who would restore political independence. ***Christians already had their Messiah.*** The end result of the 135 CE revolt was 580,000 Jews were massacred and Judaea was depopulated. Not one Christian was killed during the revolt that led to the destruction of the Temple, nor were any killed in the 135 CE revolt. The Bible, and second century Christian writers, say NOTHING about these major catastrophes of Judaism, because neither of those major wars ***had the slightest effect on Christianity.*** The centers of Christianity were no longer anywhere near to Jerusalem by CE 70: they were in Antioch, Corinth, Rome, and Athens. Just 20 years after the Council of Jerusalem, which had ruled that Gentile Christian converts need not circumcise or observe the Mosaic Law, Christianity had spread far beyond Jerusalem and the Temple. Since the vast majority of Christian converts were Gentiles long before 70 CE, the destruction of the Second Jewish Temple had no effect on them. The Destruction of the Temple was trivial, not even important enough for a sentence in the New Testament. Since the Sabbath required a number of sacrifices that are set forth in the Old Testament, the Temple was necessary to keep the Sabbath "holy." Adventists seize on various verses in the *Book of Acts* that demonstrate the Apostles preached to the Gentiles on the Sabbath, at the Temple. If this proves the continuing obligation to keep the Sabbath, what happened to this supposed obligation after the Temple was destroyed? Similarly, in the aftermath of the 135 CE Bar Kokhba revolts, Judea was depopulated and the Jews dispersed throughout the Roman Empire. Sabbath-keeping, circumcision and the food laws were criminalized. Yet no mention of either of these events is made in any of the first and second century Christian literature, because none of this had any bearing or effect on Christianity. Those laws had no effect on Apostolic Christianity. Obviously, that was a direct result of the AD 52 Council of Jerusalem's verdict.

By around 100 CE there were large numbers of Jewish Christians in Rome. The Jewish population of the Church at Rome might have been keeping the Sabbath as part of their Jewish culture, rather than

as a requirement for salvation. More likely, Jews who lived in Rome were like the Hellenized Jews that lived in Greek cities and had abandoned the Mosaic Law long before the time of Christ, during the Greek occupation of Judea. If they were keeping the Sabbath merely as a part of their Jewish culture, it is reasonable to assume they would be willing to abandon their Sabbath-keeping to avoid the threat of Roman persecution, Roman taxes on Judaism, or under peer pressure from other Hellenized Jews. On the other hand, if they were keeping the Sabbath from the perspective of a salvation requirement, as Dr. Bacchiocchi supposes, it is very difficult to imagine that they would be willing to risk their eternal salvation to avoid persecution.

The Christians of this era were eager to give up their lives for the Gospel. Since the Jewish Christians in Rome understood that circumcision and Sabbath-keeping cannot be separated, they would understand that Sabbath-keeping was not required of them or their Gentile brethren, but parental and cultural pressure could have kept them grudgingly compliant. Paul did not condemn the Christians at Rome for keeping the Sabbath, but urged that the Jews and the Gentiles of the Church be tolerant of one another in matters that were not essential to salvation. There was no threat of Jewish persecution that could have been a powerful enough factor to induce Christians to stop an alleged Sabbath-keeping.

While these facts certainly do not absolutely preclude the possibility that Dr. Bacchiocchi's theory is correct, it would collapse if a better explanation could be offered.

There is no evidence that the Christians in the Early Church were persecuted for an unwillingness to work on the Sabbath. If the Early Church had maintained a Sabbath stance, the Romans would have made a record of it. Supporting this idea is the fact that the Jews had such a bad reputation with the Romans for their Sabbath keeping that they were generally exempt from military service and were not valued for slaves, but this was not true for Christians. See Henry Chadwick, ***The Early Church*** (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 9-13. See also William Barclay, ***The Ten Commandments for Today*** (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973), pp. 31-2; Werner Forster, ***Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*** (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1964), p. 72; Eduard Lohse, art. "**Sabbath,"** ***Theological Dictionary of the New Testament***, 7:9. [Credit for this concept goes to Robert Brinsmead, and it is his references we have cited.]

Brinsmead, in his "**A Digest of the Sabbath Question,"** provides this observation from a well-respected New Testament scholar:

> "Whereas circumcision would have been practicable for Gentile converts, Sabbath observance simply was not. Unless they came inside the Jewish ghetto, where there was an ordered life adjusted to the cessation of work on the Sabbath, they could not earn their living or subsist while observing the Sabbath. If they were slaves, Gentile masters would not release them from work; and if they were independent and earning their own living, they would still have had to pursue their trade on a Sabbath. It was no doubt because circumcision was a practical possibility for Gentile Christians, as the Sabbath was not, that it was the centre of controversy" (Moule, *Birth of the New Testament,* 1961, p. 49).

NOT ACCORDING TO KENNETH A. STRAND'S "OUT OF EASTER THEORY"

SDA Bible scholar, **Kenneth A. Strand**, theorizes that Sunday observance grew out of the Quartodeciman Controversy, which was regarding which week Easter should be celebrated, and then over which Sunday Easter should be celebrated, and how the days-dates being considered were

related to the Jewish calendar. Michael Morrison explains in his article, “Sabbath and Sunday–Adventist Theories,” at the Grace Communion International website:

> Strand suggests that weekly Sunday observance grew out of an annual Easter observance. He gives a possible reconstruction for the origin of the Quartodeciman controversy, with some Christians observing Sunday and others a day of the month, both with roots in the Jewish calendar(s). He then notes that some early Christians "not only observed both Easter and Pentecost on Sundays but also considered the whole seven-week season between the two holidays to have special significance. He suggests that Christians began meeting on every Sunday in that season, and then eventually to every Sunday every week: "Throughout the Christian world Sunday observance simply arose alongside observance of Saturday."
>
> *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*. Edited by Kenneth A. Strand. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982, p. 327, p. 327, and p. 323, respectively.

Morrison summarizes the weaknesses of Strand's theory, which are many:

> This theory, however, in addition to being entirely speculative, does not explain the universality of Sunday observance. Either we must suppose that this custom began before the Gentile mission did, or that it was so obvious that Gentiles everywhere came to the same conclusion (and if it was that obvious, then it would have begun before the Gentile mission!). Also, this theory does not work for the Quartodeciman Christians, and all evidence is that even the Quartodecimans observed Sunday. [16] Strand feels that his theory explains why Sunday is a "resurrection festival," but no explanation for that is really needed; it would genuinely be an obvious connection for anyone meeting on a Sunday.
>
> [16] "The Quartodeciman controversy had nothing to do with Sabbath observance; the Quartodecimans appear to have observed the weekly Sunday like most other Christians did at the time.” C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 96.

Additionally, Strand, like most Adventist authors is unaware of the “Christian Sabbath Festivals” that bookend either end of Holy Week. The Quartodeciman controversy codified both the date and manner of the yearly-Resurrection festival, including the “Christian Sabbath Festivals.” And as we mentioned earlier, the Easter Controversy was settled by the Eastern Church—not by the Western Church.

NOT ACCORDING TO THE “DUAL DAY” THEORY PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS IN 1988

Again, Michael Morrison outlines the “**Dual Day” Theory** as developed by SDA theologians for the official release of a new book designed to provide so-called biblical support for the Church's 27 key

beliefs (***Seventh-day Adventists Believe...: A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines*** (Washington, DC.: Review and Herald, 1988), p. 259, footnoting as source Justin, Bacchiocchi, and Socrates 5.22. Please keep in mind that there is no evidence that Christians in any of the very early centuries observed Sunday like the Jews kept the Sabbath. There is no evidence, for example, that they ceased from labor or thought of it as a sacred period of time, much less than observed it for a 24-hour period of time such as from sunset on Saturday night to sunset on Sunday night. It was thought of as a celebration of Christ's resurrection. Here is the mythical theory proposed by the SDA Church in 1988:

> By the middle of the [second] century some Christians were voluntarily observing Sunday as a day of worship, not a day of rest.
>
> The Church of Rome, largely made up of Gentile believers (Rom. 11:13), led in the trend toward Sunday worship. In Rome, the capital of the empire, strong anti-Jewish sentiments arose.... Reacting to these sentiments, the Christians in that city attempted to distinguish themselves from the Jews. They dropped some practices held in common with the Jews and initiated a trend away from the veneration of the Sabbath, moving toward the exclusive observance of the Sunday.
>
> From the second to the fifth centuries, while Sunday was rising in influence, Christians continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath nearly everywhere throughout the Roman Empire. The fifth-century historian Socrates wrote: "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this."

If you have been following our discussion of Early Church History, you already see some very serious problems with this alternate theory, including the fact that Christians observed the Christian Sabbath Festivals as part of their liturgical year. Morrison outlines the theory's problems for us as follows:

> This theory has numerous deficiencies and inaccuracies, some of which we have already covered. First, it was in the early second century that some Christians were observing Sunday, and this was in Antioch and Asia Minor as well as at Rome and Alexandria. Rome did not initiate this trend, nor is there evidence that anti-Jewish sentiments motivated them to abandon customs they held in common with the Jews.
>
> Moreover, second-century Christians were not observing two days, but only one. Second-century writers are uniformly negative toward literal Sabbath-keeping. There is no evidence that anyone (other than Ebionites) kept the Sabbath in the second century.

The yearly “Christian Sabbath Festivals” of Holy Week distanced the nature of them from any Jewish-related requirements. How the Christian Sabbath festivals were observed varied from church to church and from area to area, and some of the components included public worship, observance of the communion ordinance, and sometimes even fasting, along with wholesome festivities. Holy Week was a Christ-centered celebration that further distinguished Christianity from its Jewish roots.

Thomas M. Preble, joined the Seventh-day Adventist Church when it was founded in 1863. After four years he apostatized and published a book, ***The First Day Sabbath Proved***, which refuted the

biblical and historical claims of the first Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath scholar and church "historian," J. N. Andrews. He drew from historical facts to demonstrate that Adventists were misunderstanding and misrepresenting the intent of some of the early Christian writers who, according to the terminology of the day, meant Sunday, the "Christian" Sabbath, when they referred to their day of worship. Preble explained to Andrews that once the terminology of the age is understood, references to the "Christian" Sabbath and the Sabbath festival cannot be used as evidence that the early Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath. Andrews' future work never provided any evidence that he acknowledged his errors, and he continued to teach his false understanding of the history of the early church throughout the remainder of his life.

THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH BETWEEN 200 AND 500 CE

There are numerous references to the Sabbath by early Christian historians between 200 and 500 CE in addition to those of Tertullian. Except for the writings of the heretical sects, including those who rejected the apostleship of St. Paul, none of the early fathers of the Church write in support of the concept that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath so far as we can tell.

The Eastern Orthodox churches never kept the Sabbath. For the first 3 – 5 centuries after the death of St. Paul the Eastern Church greatly eclipsed the Western Church. **D. M. Canright** in his extensively documented book, ***The Lord's Day Neither From Catholics Nor Pagans***, gives this appropriate reference provided to him by Raphael Hawaweeny, Bishop of Brooklyn, The Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church, around 1914:

> The Longer Catechism of the Syrian Orthodox Catholic Church says:
> "Is the Sabbath kept in the Eastern Church?"
> "It is not kept strictly speaking."
> ---
> "How does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment?"
> "She still every six days keeps the seventh, only not the last day of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day of every week, which is the day of the Resurrection, or Lord's Day."
> ---
> "Since when do we keep the day of the Resurrection?"
> "From the very time of Christ's Resurrection."

An understanding of the overshadowing supremacy of the Eastern Orthodox Churches during the first few centuries after the death of St. Paul is essential to grasping the immensity of the problem these facts pose to Sabbatarians. It is no wonder that Sabbatarian literature never mentions this subject. A study of Canright's extensive scholarly research on this subject is well worth the effort for anyone who truly wishes to understand the Sabbath-Sunday question. We cover Canright's research in another chapter.

Early historians from the East and the West also wrote about the Christian practice of celebrating the Sabbath *festival*. In these two passages the historians commented on which groups of Christians celebrated it with fasting or by eating the Lord's Supper. **Socrates Scholasticus** lived approximately between 379 and 450 AD, and **Sozomen** between 363 and 420 AD:

> Since however no one can produce a written command as an authority, it is evident that

> the apostles left each one to his own free will in the matter, to the end that each might perform what is good not by constraint or necessity. Such is the difference in the churches on the subject of fasts. Nor is there less variation in regard to religious assemblies. For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebaïs, hold their religious assemblies on the Sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their offerings they partake of the mysteries. At Alexandria again, on the Wednesday in Passion Week and on Good Friday, the scriptures are read, and the doctors expound them; and all the usual services are performed in their assemblies, except the celebration of the mysteries. This practice in Alexandria is of great antiquity, for it appears that Origen most commonly taught in the church on those days. He being a very learned teacher in the Sacred Books, and perceiving that the importance of the Law of Moses (Romans 8:3) was weakened by literal explanation, gave it a spiritual interpretation; declaring that there has never been but one true Passover, which the Saviour celebrated when he hung upon the cross: for that he then vanquished the adverse powers, and erected this as a trophy against the devil.— **Socrates Scholasticus**, circa 379-450 A.D., ***Ecclesiastical History***, Book 5, quoted from www.newadvent.org

That **Socrates Scholasticus** is not discussing Sabbath-keeping in this passage is clearly proved by his introductory words to Book 5, Chapter 22. He sounds very much like an anti-Sabbatarian writing after the Bacchiocchi Sabbath fiasco, quoting principles from St. Paul and linking Sabbath-keeping to the ordinance of circumcision:

> As we have touched the subject I deem it not unreasonable to say a few words concerning Easter. It appears to me that neither the ancients nor moderns who have affected to follow the Jews, have had any rational foundation for contending so obstinately about it. For they have not taken into consideration the fact that when Judaism was changed into Christianity, the obligation to observe the Mosaic Law and the ceremonial types ceased. And the proof of the matter is plain; for no law of Christ permits Christians to imitate the Jews. On the contrary the apostle expressly forbids it; not only rejecting circumcision, but also deprecating contention about festival days. In his epistle to the Galatians, verse, 4:21 he writes, 'Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law.' And continuing his train of argument, he demonstrates that the Jews were in bondage as servants, but that those who have come to Christ are 'called into the liberty of sons.' (Galatians 5:13) Moreover he exhorts them in no way to regard 'days, and months, and years.' (Galatians 4:10) Again in his epistle to the Colossians (2:16-17) he distinctly declares, that such observances are merely shadows: wherefore he says, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of any holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come.' The same truths are also confirmed by him in the epistle to the Hebrews (7:12) in these words: 'For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.' Neither the apostles, therefore, nor the Gospels, have anywhere imposed the 'yoke of servitude' (Galatians 5:1) on those who have embraced the truth; but have left Easter and every other feast to be

> honored by the gratitude of the recipients of grace. Wherefore, inasmuch as men love festivals, because they afford them cessation from labor: each individual in every place, according to his own pleasure, has by a prevalent custom celebrated the memory of the saving passion. The Saviour and his apostles have enjoined us by no law to keep this feast: nor do the Gospels and apostles threaten us with any penalty, punishment, or curse for the neglect of it, as the Mosaic Law does the Jews. (Book 5, Chapter 22, within the first couple of paragraphs) Quoted from: www.newadvent.org

Seventh-day Adventist theologians and church leaders, since no later than 1992, have known that this particular passage from Socrates cannot be used to support the idea that Christians were keeping the Sabbath into the 300's and 400's, as evidenced by this assessment by SDA theologians Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt:

> In actual fact, Socrates did not say that the churches of Rome and Alexandria had ceased to observe the Lord's Supper (the "sacred mysteries") on the Sabbath, implying that once upon a time they had so observed it. Instead, he said that the churches do not observe the Supper on the Sabbath, leaving the reader to conclude, if he wishes, that the church in these places never did so observe it. (Part 3, Note 27, (C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday*; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992, as cited in the Internet article, "Sabbath and Sunday: Adventist Theories," by Michael Morrison, posted on the Grace Community International website.)

Morrison, himself says, "Socrates actually said, "Almost all the churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, do not do this." He was commenting on fourth-century practices, with no implications about what had been done in earlier centuries. His comment cannot be used as evidence about the second century, especially if it contradicts all the other evidence we have from second-century documents.

Another early historian, **Sozomen**, mentions the term *Sabbath* in only one passage in his entire history of the church. He lived between circa 375 and 447 A. D. It is mentioned only in the concept, once more, of which groups fasted on the Sabbath "festival" or celebrated the Lord's Supper on it. He states, as you will notice, that he has digressed from his main topic to address the concept of fasting:

> In some churches the people fast three alternate weeks, during the space of six or seven weeks, whereas in others they fast continuously during the three weeks immediately preceding the festival. Some people, as the Montanists, only fast for two weeks. Assemblies are not held in all churches at the same time or manner. The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usage established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings, and, although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited nor the same selections read on the same occasions in all churches. Thus the book entitled The Apocalypse of Peter, which was considered altogether spurious by the ancients, is still read in some of the churches of Palestine, on the day of preparation, when the people observe a fast in memory of the

> passion of the Saviour. So the work entitled The Apocalypse of the Apostle Paul, though unrecognized by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. Some persons affirm that the book was found during this reign, by Divine revelation, in a marble box, buried beneath the soil in the house of Paul at Tarsus in Cilicia. I have been informed that this report is false by Cilix, a presbyter of the church in Tarsus, a man of very advanced age, as is indicated by his gray hairs, who says that no such occurrence is known among them, and wonders if the heretics did not invent the story. What I have said upon this subject must now suffice. Many other customs are still to be observed in cities and villages; and those who have been brought up in their observance would, from respect to the great men who instituted and perpetuated these customs, consider it wrong to abolish them. Similar motives must be attributed to those who observe different practices in the celebration of the feast which has led us into this long digression.—*The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, bk. 7, ch. 19. (Quoted from: www.newadvent.org)

Additionally, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which can be dated from 375 to 380 AD. (*Wikipedia* article, "Apostolic Constitutions"), mentions the Sabbath. Leading to much confusion is the fact that Chapter 7 is a "remake" of the still more ancient document, the *Didache*. One section of the *Didache* talks about the first Christians meeting together on the Lord's Day (Sunday) for worship, and early church historians have dated this section of the *Didache* to between 50 AD and 125 AD. Since the Christian church observed the Sabbath as a festival, rather than keeping the Sabbath and often debated about whether or not one should fast on the Sabbath festival, it is easy to assume, incorrectly, that these references provide support for Sabbatarianism. A passage like this one, taken out of context, does not do justice to the problem because it ignores its relevance to fasting and that fasting in regard to the Sabbath "festival".

Our investigation into what Adventists knew and when they knew it led to our discovery that in his 1912 book, ***Advent History of the Sabbath***, pioneer SDA expert in the history of the Christian church, J. N. Andrews, provides a very complete study of the section of Chapter 14 which has been translated in such a way that it demonstrates that Christians were meeting on the first day of the week as early as 50 AD. It is understandable that, failing to understand the real problems with Sabbatarianism, he would find it necessary to somehow demonstrate that the translation of this passage is wrong. The more evidence there is that Christians were keeping Sunday during the life-time of the apostles, the more difficult it is to make Ellen White's apostasy theory of the adoption of Sunday observance by Christians seem plausible— that is, unless you consider Peter to be the first pope.

The Greek wording of this passage is incomplete, making it impossible to be 100% certain how to translate it correctly into English. However, when all the facts presented by Andrews are taken together, it is easy to understand why scholars, for the most part, stand by the anti-Sabbatarian wording of the translation in English.

The following is a Greek/English Interlinear translation of the Didache Section 14 dealing with Sabbath observance. The majority of translators translate it as THE LORD'S DAY, although several meanings are possible. Please note that in my text, the Greek words are not represented in Greek characters:

> **1 According to 'the Lord's things' - of [the] Lord: gather break bread and give thanks, confessing out**

1 kata kuriakhn de kuriou sunacqentev klasate arton kai eucaristhsate, proexomologhsamenoi

the failings of you, so that pure the sacrifice of you be.

ta paraptwmata umwn, opwv kaqara h qusia umwn h.

(The above quotation is from a Greek/Interlinear translation by Wieland Willker from the critical edition of Funk/ Bihlmeyer (1924) at this address:

http://home.earthlink.net/~dybel/Documents/DidachelInr.htm

Here are the key points Andrews makes about the translation problem:

1. Other writers, contemporary to him, used the Greek word in question to mean, the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Day, or the Lord's Life.

2. Over the next 100 years, writers came to use this Greek word almost exclusively to mean the Lord's Day.

3. John used the adjective form of this Greek word in Revelation 1:10— "on the Lord's Day." Andrews seems to suggest the passage should be translated something like, "When you come together at the Lord's Supper, break bread and give thanks." The majority of scholars believe the passage should be translated something like, "When you come together on the Lord's Day, break bread and give thanks."

In the mind of Andrews, the issue is the supposed un-scriptural transfer of the sacredness of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday, making Sunday a man-made, rather than a God-given, ordinance. He is right about Sunday being a man-made ordinance in a sense of the word, but this fact is not relevant to the Sabbath-Sunday question at all. He knows nothing of the deliberate anti-Sabbatarian wording of Moses' account of the Creation events of the 7th day, the weekly Sabbath being a part of TORAH law only, and the absolute requirement that a Jew or Gentile must be circumcised before keeping the Sabbath. This knowledge deficit allows him to draw the illogical conclusion that since gospel writers and Justin Martyr— contemporary writers to the author(s) of the Didache— did not use the *Didache's* Greek word when designating the first day of the week, the writer/writers of the *Didache* were not likely to have used it to mean The Lord's Day. Andrews articulates his point-of-view as follows:

> But we have another chain of proof. All the Gospels give to Sunday its regular Bible name— first day of the week. If the *Didache* is said to be the first evidence that henceforth this Bible term was changed into *Kvpuucq,* then Justin Martyr, writing soon afterward, ought to have used it. But lo and behold he uses interchangeably the Bible term, "first day of the week," and the heathen designation, "day of the sun (p. 276)."

Justin Martyr was writing to a Jewish critic of Christians, Trypho, and would probably not risk offending his Jewish sensibilities by designating the first day of the week with this decidedly Christian term. The Gospel writers were telling the story of Jesus as it took place in His contemporary setting— before Sunday became known as the "Lord's Day." Note that John the Revelator, writing late in the First Century, used the adjective form of the Greek word. Furthermore, it would seem to be uncharacteristic of Greek literary usage to construct a sentence that would read something like, "At the Lord's Supper, break bread and give thanks." Andrews sums up his arguments as follows:

> We are now brought down to the close of the second century, and what is the result?—According to its first use, the term applied to the Lord's Supper. John uses the same adjective in speaking of the Lord's Day. The conclusion from its use in the New Testament is, the word means the Lord's or belonging to the Lord, whatever may be referred to. Ignatius uses the very *same* preposition, the *same* case, the *same* gender, as is found in the Didache, to be rendered, "according to the Lord's life." This fully sustains the first conclusion reached from the New Testament—it may be the *Lord's* Supper, the *Lord's Day*, or the *Lord's* life.

It would not make any sense to translate the passage something like, "According to the Lord's life, break bread and give thanks."

When all the facts are considered and the Sabbatarian bias is removed from one's thinking, it is clear why scholars had little choice but to choose to translate this passage in the best possible way, and that best possible way does not support Ellen White's apostasy/conspiracy theory of why Christians "ceased" to keep the Sabbath and adopted Sunday observance during the first years of the development of the Christian Faith.

An early Christian work, The *Apostolic Constitutions* (or *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*), possibly written between 375 to 380 CE, has the following to say about the Sabbath:

WHICH DAYS OF THE WEEK WE ARE TO FAST, AND WHICH NOT, AND FOR WHAT REASONS.

> But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; (15) for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week. But do you either fast the entire five days, or on the fourth day of the week, and on the day of the Preparation, because on the fourth day the condemnation went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray Him for money; and you must fast on the day of the Preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the cross under Pontius Pilate. **But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival.** For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures.

The author of the above statement specifically states that there is only one Sabbath of the year that is to be observed with fasting. Additional study of the *Constitutions* reveals that the early Christians honored the Passover Week with fasting on set days of that week and no fasting on the other days of that one particular week of the year.

We recommend that our readers do a search for the *Apostolic Constitutions* and search the entire document for all references to the word "Sabbath." Here is what you will find:

These references to the Sabbath refer to the Sabbath festival.

Virtually all references to the Sabbath are in regard to whether or not fasting should be done on the

day of the Sabbath festival.

The case for using the *Apostolic Constitutions* to teach that Christians were keeping the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word through the 300's into the 400's represents highly creative reasoning, or a lack of it.

THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH DURING THE REFORMATION

Ellen White's classic book, ***The Great Controversy*** gives her readers a patently dishonest view of how the reformers treated the Sabbath question. Four major reformers studied the Sabbath-Sunday Question and rejected it on biblical grounds, but she glossed over this fact without a comment. A study of what Advent Movement Sabbath historian, **J. N. Andrews**, knew and wrote about regarding the history of the early church, proves that he would have to have known that what Ellen White claimed God showed her about the Roman Catholic Church "changing the day" was historically impossible– regardless of whether Sabbatarianism was true or not. An examination of several major research studies published between the King James Era and the contemporary times of Andrews and White provides further evidence that both of them had to know that her account of the status of the Sabbath during the Reformation in ***The Great Controversy*** was patently dishonest. For example, her book devotes several chapters to Martin Luther, but she does not disclose the fact that an important Sabbath-Sunday debate arose at the beginning of the Reformation and that Luther was staunchly against Sabbatarianism on the basis of well-reasoned biblical principles. If White had given a fair treatment of her subject, she would have told her readers that he was anti-Sabbatarian and why he had made that choice.

Sanders observes, "Luther heard Carlstadt's teachings on Sabbath observance and he rejected them. Mrs. White states that "angels of light from God's throne" revealed treasures of truth to Luther. If indeed God had shown Luther "treasures of truth" as stated by EGW, then Luther would have accepted the Sabbath. EGW just could not get it right." Sanders furnishes these two EGW quotes from the Great Controversy:

> Ellen White says of him [Luther]: "Zealous, ardent, and devoted, knowing no fear but the fear of God, and acknowledging no foundation for religious faith but the Holy Scriptures. (p. 120)
>
> Angels of heaven were by his side, and rays of light from the throne of God revealed the treasures of truth to his understanding. (p. 122)

Sanders then contrasts what Luther himself said to what Ellen White claimed God had shown her about him:

> **Now hear Luther.** Carlstadt, a zealous and learned Sabbatarian, laid his arguments for the seventh day before Luther, who examined them. Here is Luther's decision in his own words: 'Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath– that is to say, Saturday– must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised; for that is true and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as the law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all.' — Heylyn, *History of the Sabbath* . 457.

Because the Reformation did not result in a so-called "return" to Sabbath-keeping, Sabbatarians have gone to the trouble to write books with titles like, "***Why the Reformation Failed***," based on the idea that Luther rejected the Sabbath light when it was presented to him, so God could not fully bless the Reformation. This kind of reasoning only makes sense if you ignore the problem that such thinking is circular reasoning and the assumption that Sabbatarianism is true. These writers also point to the fact that the **Council of Trent** (1545-1563), which was convened to deal with the Lutheran "heresy," decided to go with the authority of both the Scriptures and church tradition in the formation of its (The Catholic Church's) doctrine and practice on the basis that the Protestants had capitulated to the Mother Church in regard to the change of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

This claim was a Catholic lie, because in the ***Augsburg Confession*** (first presented at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530), the Protestants rebuked the Mother Church for its blasphemous claim that it had the authority to change the Sabbath. Then this Lutheran document spelled out the scriptural basis for Sabbath abandonment with many of the same arguments used by anti-Sabbatarians today, demonstrating that it was biblical authority, not church authority that caused the abandonment of Sabbath-keeping by Christians. Pro-Sabbatarian writers quote the following passage from the *Confession* to "prove" that the Roman Catholic Church claimed to have changed the Sabbath, while they ignore the significance of the fact that Lutherans understood and cited biblical reasons for their rejection of Sabbatarianism and called "bluff" on the Catholic Church's claim that it had "changed the day"– something Ellen White either never knew about or chose not to disclose in *The Great Controversy.* The first two quotes from *The Augsburg Confession* are taken from the translation posted at the web-site www.reformed.org and posted by the Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics. The third quote comes from a different translation as separately credited:

> Moreover, it is disputed whether bishops or pastors have the right to introduce ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, holy-days and grades, that is, orders of ministers, etc. They that give this right to the bishops refer to this testimony John 16, 12. 13: I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth. They also refer to the example of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood and from things strangled, Acts 15, 29. They refer to the Sabbath-day as having been changed into the Lord's Day, contrary to the Decalogue, as it seems. Neither is there any example whereof they [the Mother Church] make more than concerning the changing of the Sabbath-day. Great, say they, is the power of the Church, since it has dispensed with one of the Ten Commandments!
>
> But concerning this question it is taught on our part (as has been shown above) that bishops have no power to decree anything against the Gospel.

Then, after castigating the Mother Church for its presumptions, the Confession outlines the biblical reasons the Jewish Sabbath was abrogated in apostolic times:

> But there are clear testimonies which prohibit the making of such traditions, as though they merited grace or were necessary to salvation. Paul says, Col. 2, 16-23: "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days. If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not; taste not; handle not, which

> all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men! which things have indeed a show of wisdom." Also in Titus 1, 14 he openly forbids traditions: "Not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men that turn from the truth."

The Lutherans exhibit an excellent understanding that no day possesses intrinsic holiness and that the Church's decision to designate Sunday as the day of worship and Christian fellowship was utilitarian. A modern anti-Sabbatarian could not have said it better. Please read this passage carefully, as it is packed with significance for the Sabbath-Sunday Question:

> **[57]** Observing the Lord's Day, Easter, Pentecost, and other holy days and rituals are customs of this kind. [**58]** For those people make a big mistake by claiming that the church by its authority has decreed that Christians must worship on Sunday rather than the Sabbath Day. [**59]** For it was Scripture that did away with the observance of the Sabbath Day. The Bible teaches that since the gospel has now been revealed, none of the ceremonies of the Law of Moses need be followed. [**60]** Yet, since a day did have to be chosen so that Christians would know when they should gather for worship, it seems that the Christians chose Sunday for this purpose. It seems that this day was chosen for another reason as well. It gives people an example of how to use their Christian freedom, and shows them that it is not necessary to observe the Sabbath nor any other day in particular. (*The Unaltered Augsburg Confession A.D. 1530*, Translated by Glen L. Thompson, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; posted at Wordpress.Com.)

Therefore, Ellen White's book, ***The Great Controversy***, is not history. It is pure propaganda. Her claim that her information came from God is disturbing.

The Sabbath heresy has surfaced periodically throughout history, and it re-surfaces from time to time as the result of ignorance and poor Bible study methods (hermeneutics), including repeated attempts to apply the Mosaic Law to a dispensation for which is was never intended. Andrews, White, and the Adventist Sabbatarian apologists who have followed them failed to tell their unsuspecting readers that Sabbath-keeping was opposed on biblical grounds by the Christian Church at virtually all times, including the Early Fathers, the great Reformers, and subsequent Catholic and Protestant scholars.

The more you look into what Andrews and White knew, what they probably knew, and what they <u>should have known</u>, the more reason one has to question their motives and their integrity. Our research suggests that Andrews and White had access to the two most exhaustive histories of the controversy over the Sabbath ever written– Peter Heylyn's **1636** book, ***History of the Sabbath***, published during the reign of King Charles I of England (the successor to King James), and the massive two-volume study on the subject by Ellen White's contemporary, Robert Cox, published in 1865. <u>Andrews quotes both Heylyn and Cox.</u> Since Thomas Preble published *The First Day Sabbath Proved* in 1867, which was a direct rebuke of J.N. Andrews' apparent deliberate twisting of historical facts to fit the Sabbatarian agenda, it seems reasonable to assume that Andrews had access to it.

Heylyn compiled an exhaustive biblical and historical study of evidence up through the King James Era that demonstrated to the point of over-kill that Sabbatarianism was impossible. Robert Cox, after discovering Heylyn's work centuries later, compiled an exhaustive list of all the arguments for and against Sabbatarianism from apostolic times through 1865. We quote from Luther's ***Larger Catechism*** as quoted in Robert Cox's 1865 book, ***The Literature of the Sabbath Question, Volume One,*** p. 127:

> God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore, this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are not left free by Christ. But in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe **that we keep a festival**, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for these have no need of it...But that it is not bound to any particular time, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other... And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelties.

Please note that Luther discussed the church's view of the Sabbath as a festival. Later in our study the under-standing that the concept that the Christian church observed Saturday as a FESTIVAL while observing Sunday as the day of WORSHIP is key to correctly interpreting many of the passages that mention the Sabbath in the writings of the church fathers during the first 500-600 years of the Faith. In many cases the writings of the early fathers cannot be properly interpreted without a study of the entire context of their statements– a fact which requires, in some cases, the reading of the nearly entire work from which the excerpt is taken as well as its context within the author's entire set of writings. An analysis of the early, middle, and later work of SDA Sabbath historian, J.N. Andrews, proves that he was aware that the early church abandoned the Jewish concept of the Sabbath and created its own, non-sacred way of commemorating the Creation of the World by instituting the Sabbath Festival, which was observed on select seventh days during the liturgical year. Andrews says: "Those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's Day." (*Testimony of the Fathers*, p. 11, quoted in D. M. Canright, *The Lord's Day From Neither Catholics Nor Pagans*.)

According to Cox, the other reformers were of the same opinion as Luther and Melanchthon. Cox says in regard to this fact:

> The Reformers found more meaning than the Puritans and their followers have done, in Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Gal. IV. 10,11 and Col. ii.16,17; while they failed to see in the New Testament any of those indications which the Puritans were the first to discover, of a transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week by Jesus or His apostles. (*The Literature Of the Sabbath Question, Vol. 1, pp.* 127,128.)

Melanchthon, a close associate of Luther, and who, according to Cox (p. 131), was one of the most learned of the Great Reformers, said this about Sabbath-keeping for Christians:

> Of this nature is the observation of the Lord's Day, of Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like holidays and ceremonies. For those who think that the observance of the Lord's Day has been appointed by the authority of the church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scriptures allow that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches that the ceremonies of the Law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might

> know when to assemble together, it appears that the church appointed for this purpose the Lord's Day, which for this reason also seemed to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that observance, neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary.

Cox's research on **John Calvin**, who died in 1564, established him as firmly anti-Sabbatarian, even though his comments on Genesis 2 and Exodus 20 suggest that it is possible he might have still believed that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation. Cox quotes from Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* as translated by Henry Beveridge and printed in 1845:

> As the truth was delivered typically to the Jews, so it is imparted to us without figure; first, that during our whole lives we may aim at a constant rest from our own works, in order that the Lord may work in us by his Spirit; secondly, that every individual, as he has opportunity, may diligently exercise himself in private, in pious meditation on the works of God, and, at the same time, that all may observe the legitimate order appointed by the Church, for the hearing of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and public prayer; and, thirdly, that we may avoid oppressing those who are subject to us. In this way, we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets, who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment (this they term, in their language, the taxation of the seventh day), while the moral part remains, viz., the observance of one day in seven. But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews. And of a truth, we see what profit they have made by such a doctrine.
>
> Those who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews in the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism; so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah (Isa. I.13; viii.13) apply as much to those of the present day, as to those to whom the prophet addressed them. We must be careful, however, to observe the general doctrine, viz., in order that religion may neither be lost nor languish among us, we must diligently attend to our religious assemblies, and duly avail ourselves of those external aids which tend to promote the worship of God. — (Beverly's translation, volume I, p. 466.)

According to the *Wikipedia* article, “Puritans,” the movement got it's beginning among the Marian exiles (See *Wikipedia* article, “Marian Exiles”) who earlier had fled England for the Continent to escape persecution, and then returned to England during the reign of Elizabeth I, who came to the English throne in 1559. This article explains that the Puritans adopted Sabbatarian views during this time. It was the combined forces of the Puritan “Sunday” Sabbatarians and traditional “Saturday” Sabbatarians that created the second major Sabbath crisis of the Christian World. In essence, then, the King James Era Sabbath Crisis in England was really a transplanted controversy that had been brewing in Holland for a long time prior to its eruption on English soil.

HISTORICAL BARRIER:

THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH IN ENGLAND

Ellen White, in her book, ***Great Controversy***, inexcusably failed to discuss the greatest Sabbath-Sunday battle in the history of the Faith— an event which took place during the post King James Era under the reign of Charles I. With the kind of historical writing and interpretation she undertook to write the book, it unavoidably appears that she deliberately chose to leave the information out. Therefore, few Adventists know that the Church of England came precariously close to establishing the Sabbath as official church doctrine within a few decades of the publication of the ***King James Bible***, which was published in 1611. Therefore, her readers remain unaware of the largest body of biblical and historical evidence ever assembled against the idea that Christians must keep the Jewish Sabbath assembled up until that time. Here is what happened.

During the reign of King James (1603-1625), two tremendously powerful Sabbatarian movements had developed and were putting pressure on the Church of England to require Sabbath-keeping. One faction was pushing for the adoption of the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday, and the other was pushing for the adoption of Sunday observance with Jewish-type Sabbath restrictions.

King Charles I, who succeeded King James, inherited the controversy. When things heated to the boiling point, he turned to his court chaplain, **Peter Heylyn**, for help. He ordered him to begin a "Manhattan Project"- like research marathon to provide him an account of all the arguments for and against the idea that Christians must keep the Sabbath. Thanks to the definitive research that resulted, the Church of England rejected both kinds of Sabbath-keeping.

Heylyn's monumental work, ***The History of the Sabbath,*** was first published in **1636**, and it appears to encompass almost all the arguments used by modern anti-Sabbatarians, with the exception of some of the advanced Hebrew linguistics studies of Genesis and Exodus. His major points were these: **(1)** The Sabbath commandment was not instituted until the manna was given in Exodus 16, **(2)** that the Sabbath was given to Israel and to Israel alone, **(3)** that the Sabbath commandment is predicated by the requirement of circumcision, was ceremonial in nature, and was abrogated at the Cross— officially and publicly— being officially "retired" at the Council of Jerusalem, **(4)** that Colossians 2:14-17 clearly abrogates the Sabbath, and **(5)** that the "abandonment" of Sabbath-keeping by the Gentiles was virtually immediate; the adoption of Sunday observance by them being virtually immediate, and that the Early Church observed the seventh day of the week only as a festival.

Seventh-day Adventists may be especially interested to know that the biblical and historical evidence Heylyn discovered demonstrated that Ellen White's concept that the Roman Catholic Church "changed" the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday was impossible.

As we noted earlier, Heylyn's work was familiar to pioneer Sabbath scholars of the Advent Movement, **J.N. Andrews**, and he had his own personal antagonist, Thomas Preble, who published a major volume which refuted his positions and exposed his blundering historical errors in the form of a book, ***The First Day Sabbath proved***. Andrews cited Heylyn in his own work, proving that he had no excuse for not understanding his many errors. Furthermore, he dialogued in published writings with Preble, proving that he could not possibly fail to understand that his historical claims were absurd. These books have been available to Seventh-day Adventist scholars and historians throughout the history of Adventism. It is difficult to imagine how Ellen White could have written about the history of the Sabbath without mentioning the Sabbath crisis in England at all. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine

that one of the most prominent Sabbath scholars of recent times, the late Seventh-day Adventist theologian, **Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi**, would write as if he were unfamiliar with the evidence Heylyn uncovered against the credibility of Sabbatarianism. If any assumptions can be made about this failure, one would have to think it received no mention because the Sabbath was summarily defeated by Heylyn's clearly defined biblical and historical arguments.

Heylyn also demonstrated an understanding of why Sabbatarianism destroys the Gospel principle that salvation comes by faith alone. In fact Heylyn labeled Sabbatarianism a heresy because it teaches that Sabbath-keeping is ultimately a requirement *for* salvation.

BOB PICKLE'S REST THEORY

Bob Pickle is an articulate apologist for Adventism, its Sabbath doctrine, and its Church prophetess, Ellen G. White. He contends that she was not in error when she accused the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy of “changing the day.” He contends that Ellen White was right despite the very early universal adoption of Sunday worship, because Christians did not actually rest on Sundays until after Constantine ordered cessation from labor on that day in the early 300's. He reasons that the sanctity of the Sabbath was not actually transferred to Sunday until the Sabbath rest was changed from the Jewish Sabbath to the “pagan” Sunday. This is an interesting approach to solving the Ellen White problem because the idea of resting from labor on Sunday came about primarily as a result of Constantine's new Sunday law. We thank Bob Pickle for acknowledging that Christians did not rest on Sundays prior to that event, but there is much more to the story. It is most interesting to observe that Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi has no such illusions about whether or not Ellen White's theory of how Sabbath-keeping began could be reconciled in this way. He publicly stated that he disagreed with Ellen's position on the matter:

In an email message to the "Free Catholic Mailing List" catholic@american.edu on 8 Feb 1997 [Bacchiocchi] said:

> I differ from Ellen White, for example, on the origin of Sunday. She teaches that in the first centuries all Christians observed the Sabbath and it was largely through the efforts of Constantine that Sunday-keeping was adopted by many Christians in the fourth century. My research shows otherwise. If you read my essay HOW DID SUNDAY KEEPING BEGIN? which summarizes my dissertation, you will notice that I place the origin of Sunday-keeping by the time of the Emperor Hadrian, in A. D. 135." (Posted at Bible.ca and available via search on Dr. Bacchiocchi's website, Biblical Perspectives.)

Here is an analysis of this interesting attempt to salvage Ellen White's historical blunders:

First, there is no sanctity to transfer. The Sabbath literally expired at the death of Christ. St. Paul clarified that under the New Covenant, that no day has any sacred importance in itself. The early Christians did not rest on Sunday because they thought of it as a celebration of the resurrection.

Second, since the Gentile churches probably never kept the Sabbath and certainly did not after the Council of Jerusalem, and since all Christians, including the Jewish Christians, did not keep the Sabbath on a universal basis after 140 AD, they were **working** on Saturdays or having a festival on some of those Saturdays. There was no “resting” left for Constantine to transfer from Saturday to Sunday by the 300's. Christians, and especially the Gentile Christians, began "desecrating" the Sabbath immediately by doing anything on that day that they wished to do, forsaking all Jewish

associations with that day from almost the beginning of the Faith.

Third, this prophecy is that the little horn (of Daniel 7) that was to change “times and laws.” This prophecy clearly foretells the exact number of days that the Roman emperor, Nero, was to persecute Christians. Nero did change times and applicable laws, and managed to turn the mainstream Christianity of the day into a form hardly recognizable in comparison with its original form. Even if this little horn somehow symbolized the papacy, **the little horn did not come into existence until after 500 AD, and Sunday observance was universal by no later than 140 AD. There is no way to rationalize that the little horn existed before 500 AD according to the wheel-within-a-wheel “prolepsis” concept Adventists use to force Antiochus Epiphanes to symbolize something that would come at some time in the future [the papacy], because the prolepsis concept, by its very definition, does not work backward. Even the delegates to the 1919 Bible Conference acknowledged this barrier to Adventist prophecy.** An example of a prolepsis is, “He was a dead man the moment he entered the room where the killer lay lying in wait.” A prolepsis is a one way street. To prove this to yourself, try to think of a way this last statement could be reversed, and you probably can't. Adventists cannot have their cake and eat it too. As you will see in a revealing transcript of the ***1919 Bible Conference Minutes***, the Adventist leaders of 1919 understood this problem and struggled with the seeming impossibility of propping up their prophetess' claim that the papacy (the little horns of Daniel 7,8,11) changed the Sabbath.

Fourth, Pickle ignores the problem that Rome had no more influence than any other bishopric in the Christian world of that era of early church history, and the Greek Orthodox Church was the center of the Christian world at this time.

How, then, can anyone say that the Sabbath was not “changed” until the time of Constantine when from almost the very beginning of the Christian Faith, the Gentile Christians constantly violated the Jewish Sabbath by not ceasing from labor and by celebrating it as a festival? By the Old Covenant Sabbath laws, Christians observing the Sabbath after their own ideas, would create activity which would demand they be stoned. These Christians were likely picking up firewood for their celebrations and preparing meals. One early Christian writer instructed his readers not to eat food that was prepared the day before, which would be Friday! (This quotation will be included in a later discussion.) The “sanctity” of the Sabbath was trampled on from the very beginning, at least by the Gentile Christians, and, according to Dr. Bacchiocchi, Sunday observance was “universal” by 140 AD, which means that even Christians of Jewish descent who chose to remain in the Gospel– rather than to become a part of the Sabbath-keeping, Paul-hating Ebionite heresy– never again kept the Sabbath in the Jewish sense of the word.