

# HOW SUNDAY became the popular day of WORSHIP

Kenneth A. Strand

A REPRINT FROM  
THE AWARD-WINNING  
*THESE TIMES* MAGAZINE



## Part 1

*Scholars and laymen are questioning the validity of Sunday as the Biblical day of worship.*

**T**HE QUESTION of how Sunday, the first day of the week, replaced Saturday, the seventh day of the week, as the main day of Christian worship has received increasing attention in recent years.

One widely acclaimed study, for example, suggests that the weekly Christian Sunday arose from Sunday evening Communion services in the

immediate postresurrection period, with Sunday itself being a workday until after the time of Constantine the Great in the early fourth century.<sup>1</sup> Eventually, however, Sunday ceased to be a workday and became a Christian "Sabbath."<sup>2</sup>

Some simpler and more popular views are that either (1) Sunday was substituted immediately after Christ's resur-



rection for the seventh-day Sabbath, or (2) Sunday-keeping was introduced directly from paganism during the second century or later.

But is either of these views correct? What do the actual source materials tell us?

**Both days observed.** One thing is clear: The weekly Christian Sunday—whenever it did arise—did not at first generally become a substitute for the Bible seventh-day Sabbath, Saturday; for both Saturday and Sunday were widely kept side by side for several centuries in early Christian history. Socrates Scholasticus, a church historian of the fifth century AD, wrote, "For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries [the Lord's Supper] 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."<sup>3</sup>

And Sozomen, a contemporary of Socrates, wrote, "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."<sup>4</sup>

Thus, "almost everywhere" throughout Christendom, except in Rome and Alexandria, there were Christian worship services on both Saturday and Sunday as late as the fifth century. A number of other sources from the third to the fifth centuries also depict Christian observance of both Saturday and Sunday.

For example, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, compiled in the fourth century,

*Kenneth Strand is professor of church history, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. © 1979 by Kenneth A. Strand.*

furnished instruction to "keep the Sabbath [Saturday], and the Lord's day [Sunday] festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection." "Let the slaves work five days; but on the Sabbath-day [Saturday] and the Lord's day [Sunday] let them have leisure to go to church for instruction in piety."<sup>5</sup>

**About the same time** an anonymous writer, known as the interpolator of Ignatius, advised, "Let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law. . . . And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's Day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and chief of all the days."<sup>6</sup> And in the fifth century, John Cassian refers to attendance in church on both Saturday and Sunday, stating that he had even seen a certain monk who sometimes fasted five days a week but would go to church on Saturday or on Sunday and bring home guests for a meal on those two days.<sup>7</sup>

Gregory of Nyssa in the late fourth century referred to the Sabbath and Sunday as "sisters."<sup>8</sup> And about AD 400 Asterius of Amasea declared that it was beautiful for Christians that the "team of these two days comes together"—"the Sabbath and the Lord's day,"<sup>9</sup> which each week gathers together the people with priests as their instructors.

It is clear that none of these early writers confused Sunday with the Bible Sabbath. Sunday, the first day of the week, always followed the Sabbath, the seventh day. Furthermore, the historical records are clear in showing that the weekly cycle has remained unchanged from Christ's time till now, so that the Saturday and Sunday of those early centuries are still the Saturday and Sunday of today.



In two subsequent articles we will return to data from early church history of the second and subsequent centuries to trace the manner in which Sunday eventually eclipsed the Sabbath, but first it is important here to take a look at the New Testament evidence, inasmuch as the New Testament is normative for Christian practice. How did Christ and the apostles regard the Sabbath and Sunday?

**Sabbath in the New Testament.** According to Luke 4:16, it was Christ's "custom" to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath day. Moreover, at the time of Christ's death and burial, the women who had followed Him from Galilee "rested the sabbath day according to the commandment" (Luke 23:56), indicating that there had been no instruction from Him to the contrary. They were still observing the seventh day of the week!

We may, in addition, take note of the fact that the implication of this text is that when Luke wrote the account several decades after Christ's crucifixion he took for granted that no change in Sabbath observance had occurred. He reports this Sabbath observance "according to the commandment" in a totally matter-of-fact way, with no hint that there had been any new day of worship added in the interim.

On the other hand we must also recognize, of course, that Christ was accused of Sabbath-breaking by the scribes and Pharisees. We may take, for example, the incident where Christ's disciples plucked grain as they walked through a grain field, rubbed it in their hands, and ate it (Matthew 12:1-8). And we could also notice several instances of Christ's healing work that ran counter to the Sabbath-keeping views of the Jewish leaders—perhaps most strikingly the incident regarding the man with a

withered hand (Matthew 12:10-13). What do these experiences mean?

In order to understand the situation, one must recognize that Jewish Sabbath observance in Christ's day did not mean simply following Scripture laws but also adherence to strict regulations in Jewish oral tradition. The Mishnah, wherein multitudinous regulations of this so-called oral law were written down about AD 200, gives an idea of what Sabbath observance was like among the scribes and Pharisees. There were both major laws and minor laws.

**Additional Sabbath regulations.** The thirty-nine major laws listed in the tractate (or section) of the Mishnah entitled "Shabbath" are given as follows: "The main classes of work are forty save one: sowing, ploughing, reaping, binding sheaves, threshing, winnowing, cleansing crops, grinding, sifting, kneading, baking, shearing wool, washing or beating or dyeing it, spinning, weaving, making two loops, weaving two threads, separating two threads, tying [a knot], loosening [a knot], sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches, hunting a gazelle, slaughtering or flaying or salting it or curing its skin, scraping it or cutting it up, writing two letters, erasing in order to write two letters, building, pulling down, putting out a fire, lighting a fire, striking with a hammer, and taking out aught from one domain into another. These are the main classes of work: forty save one."<sup>10</sup>

These thirty-nine laws had many variations and ramifications. It would make a difference, for instance, whether two letters of the alphabet were written in such a way that they could both be seen at the same time. If an individual scribbled one letter on one face of a wall, and on another around the corner so that the two letters were placed on walls that



could be seen at the same time, the person would have broken the Sabbath.<sup>11</sup>

An object could be carried in a manner other than the usual one, and food could be carried out of a house in two acts (to the threshold, and then later the rest of the way) or by two people, for then it would not be work in a technical, purposeful sense; but to carry anything out of a house in the normal way on the Sabbath would be to violate the major Sabbath law against "taking out aught from one domain to another."<sup>12</sup>

If water were to be drawn from a well in a gourd, a stone used as a weight in the gourd would be considered as part of the vessel if it did not fall out. However, if it should happen to fall out, it would be considered as an object being lifted, and therefore the individual with such an experience would be guilty of Sabbath-breaking.<sup>13</sup> Objects could be tossed on the Sabbath, but there were regulations pertaining to allowable distance and as to whether the object went from a private domain to a public domain, for example.<sup>14</sup>

The foregoing are but a very few of the specifics mentioned in the tractate "Shabbath." And in addition to the laws mentioned in that tractate, the Mishnah contains other Sabbath regulations, the largest number of which deal with the Sabbath day's journey. (These are treated in the tractate "Erubin.")

**In the context** of this sort of casuistry regarding Sabbathkeeping, it is obvious why Christ's disciples were being accused of Sabbathbreaking by their picking and rubbing kernels of grain. One of the thirty-nine major Sabbath laws was "reaping"; another was "threshing." Thus Christ's disciples were both reaping and threshing—breaking *two* of the *major* laws of the Sabbath.

If they blew the chaff away, they could

also possibly have been considered as engaged in "sifting"—in which case they would have broken *three different major Sabbath laws*. Such "Sabbathbreaking," it must be emphasized, was not against God's *commandments* as given in Scripture but was purely and solely against the Jewish restrictions.

As for the matter of healing illness and taking care of suffering on the Sabbath, the Rabbinic laws made certain exceptions, such as allowing an animal to be lifted out of a pit.<sup>15</sup> However, there were some Jews in Christ's time that were stricter than the Rabbinic requirements and who would not even allow a newborn animal to be rescued on the Sabbath if it happened to fall into a hole. Also, they would not permit nurses to carry babies around on the Sabbath.<sup>16</sup>

In considering the various miracles that Christ performed on the Sabbath for the purpose of alleviating suffering, it is interesting that Christ Himself never accepted the Pharisees' criticism that He was breaking the Sabbath. Indeed, in connection with the case of the man with the withered hand, He raised a question, "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days" (Matthew 12:11, 12).

After this, He proceeded to heal the man. Thus He emphasized the *lawfulness* of this kind of deed on the Sabbath.

If one reads details of all the Sabbath activities of Christ, it is clear that (1) He attended worship services; (2) He performed works of mercy which He, as Lord of the Sabbath (Matthew 12:8; Mark 2:28), claimed were in harmony with the intent of the Sabbath; (3) and He never claimed to abrogate the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship for His



followers. Indeed, with respect to the last point, His followers, as we have already noted, rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment at the time Christ was in the grave.

**How about the apostles?** But now, what can we say about *apostolic practice after Christ's resurrection*? The Book of Acts reveals that the only day on which the apostles repeatedly were engaged in worship services on a weekly basis was Saturday, the seventh day of the week. The apostle Paul and his company, when visiting Antioch in Pisidia, "went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down" (Acts 13:14). After the Scripture reading, they were called upon to speak. They stayed in Antioch a further week, and that "next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God" (verse 44).

In Philippi Paul and his company went out of the city by a riverside on the Sabbath day, to the place where prayer was customarily made (Acts 16:13). In Thessalonica, "as his manner was," Paul went to the synagogue and "three sabbath days reasoned with them [the Jews] out of the scriptures" (Acts 17:2). And in Corinth, where Paul resided for a year and a half, "he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks" (Acts 18:4; compare verse 11).

Thus the evidence in the Book of Acts multiplied regarding apostolic attendance at worship services on Saturday.

**Sunday as a worship day?** On the other hand, the only case in the entire Book of Acts where there is record of a Sunday meeting is Acts 20:7-11. This was an evening service—probably Saturday evening (even translated "the Saturday night" by the New English Bible). It was obviously a special meeting that con-

tinued all night, inasmuch as Paul was planning to depart (and did depart) the next day.

But are there not other New Testament texts that indicate there were regular Sunday worship services in New Testament times? *Not one!*

It is true, of course, that there was an occasion or two where Christ met with the disciples on a Sunday evening. He came to them, for example, on the very night after His resurrection; but they were not assembled to celebrate the resurrection, for they did not even recognize that it had occurred (John 20:19-25; Mark 16:14). And eight days later He again met with them (John 20:26-29).

But prior to His ascension He also appeared to the disciples on a number of other occasions, and the record of the one or two specific Sunday evening meetings gives no indication that a new day of worship had been instituted. Indeed, not once in the Gospel records, nor anywhere else in the New Testament, is there any claim that a Sunday meeting of Christ with His disciples set a precedent for Sunday worship services among Christians. Saturday continued to be, as we have seen, the regular day when apostles attended worship services.

**Two other texts** that some mention as evidence for Sunday worship services in New Testament times are 1 Corinthians 16:2 and Revelation 1:10. But it must be immediately noticed that *neither of these texts so much as mentions a worship service!*

In 1 Corinthians 16:2 we read, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." In the King James Version the phrase "by him in store" indicates no more than an indi-



vidualized savings plan. Other translations seem to render the Greek more clearly on this point, to the effect that the money was to be set aside *at home*.

It may be of interest to add here that the church father John Chrysostom (died AD 407), in commenting on this verse, says, "He [Paul] said not, 'Let him bring it into the church,' lest they might feel ashamed because of the smallness of the sum; but 'having by gradual additions swelled his contribution, let him then produce it, when I am come: but for the present lay it up,' saith he, 'at home, and make thine house a church; thy little box a treasury.'" <sup>17</sup> Chrysostom, himself a Sunday-keeper, interestingly enough did not seem to think of 1 Corinthians 16:2 as evidence for a Sunday worship service.

**The Lord's day.** As for Revelation 1:10, John here simply states that he "was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Although it is true that eventually the term "Lord's day" came to be used for Sunday, no evidence indicates this was the case until about a century after the Book of Revelation was written. <sup>18</sup> In fact, as we shall see in our next article, there is likelihood that the term was applied to Easter Sunday before it was applied to a weekly Sunday.

But the Roman province of Asia, to which the Revelation applies, had no Sunday-Easter tradition, either at the time the Revelation was written or even a century later. <sup>19</sup> Thus "Lord's day" in Revelation 1:10 could not refer to an Easter Sunday.

Most pointedly of all, there is neither prior nor contemporary evidence that Sunday had achieved in New Testament times a status which would have caused it to be called "Lord's day." Another day—the seventh-day Sabbath—had, of course, been the Lord's holy day from

antiquity (see Isaiah 58:13) and was the day on which Christ Himself and His followers, including the apostle Paul, had attended religious services, as we have seen.

In this connection, a statement from the apocryphal "Acts of John" may be of interest in spite of its dubious worth: "And the soldiers, having taken the public conveyances, travelled fast, having seated him [John] in the midst of them. And when they came to the first change, it being the hour of breakfast, they entreated him to be of good courage, and to take bread, and eat with them. And John said: I rejoice in soul indeed, but in the meantime I do not wish to take any food. . . . And on the seventh day, it being the Lord's day, he said to them: Now it is time for me also to partake of food." <sup>20</sup>

(The "seventh day" here may refer to the seventh-day Sabbath specifically or to the seventh day of the journey. If it is the latter, it would be the seventh-day Sabbath as well, inasmuch as the practice in John's area was not to fast on the Sabbath. <sup>21</sup>)

In sum total, there is not one piece of concrete evidence anywhere in the New Testament that Sunday was considered as a weekly day of worship for Christians. Rather, Christ Himself, His followers at the time of His death, and apostles after His resurrection regularly attended worship services on Saturday, the seventh day of the week.

Moreover, when widespread Christian Sunday observance finally did become evident during the third to fifth centuries, this was *side by side with the seventh-day Sabbath*, as we have seen. The question now arises as to when and how Christian Sunday observance arose. This vital question will be dealt with as we probe the historical sources further in our next two articles.



<sup>1</sup>Willy Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, trans. A. A. K. Graham from the German ed. of 1962 (Philadelphia, 1968).

<sup>2</sup>This development will be treated in a later article in this series.

<sup>3</sup>Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, ch. 22 (*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* [NPNF] 2nd Series, Vol. 2, p. 132).

<sup>4</sup>Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 7, ch. 19 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. 12, pp. 7, 8).

<sup>5</sup>*Apostolic Constitutions*, bk. 7, ch. 23; bk. 8, ch. 33 (*The Ante-Nicene Fathers* [ANF], Vol. 7, pp. 469, 495).

<sup>6</sup>Pseudo-Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*, ch. 9 (ANF, Vol. 1, pp. 62, 63).

<sup>7</sup>Cassian, *Institutes of the Coenobia*, bk. 5, ch. 26 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. 11, p. 243). Cf. *Institutes* iii. 2 and *Conferences* iii. 1 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. 11, pp. 213, 319).

<sup>8</sup>Gregory of Nyssa, *De Castigatione* ("On Reproof"), in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 46, col. 309 (Greek) and col. 310 (Latin).

<sup>9</sup>Asterius, Homily 5, on Matthew 19:3, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 40, col. 225 (Greek) and col. 226 (Latin).

<sup>10</sup>"Shabbath," 7.2 (in Herbert Danby, trans., *The Mishnah* [London, 1933], p. 106).

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 12.5 (Danby, p. 112).

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 10.2-5 (Danby, p. 109).

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 17.6 (Danby, p. 115).

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 11.1-6 (Danby, pp. 110-111).

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Matthew 12:11 and Luke 14:5. Rabbinic interpretation also allowed the saving of life (in real emergency) as taking precedence over the Sabbath regulations. Compare, e.g., "Mekilta Shabbath," 1, where an interpretation is given to the effect that one Sabbath could be disregarded for the sake of saving a person's life so that the person could observe many Sabbaths.

<sup>16</sup>*The Damascus Document (Zadokite Document)*, x. 14-xi. 18, mentions these and other restrictions.

<sup>17</sup>From comment on 1 Corinthians 16:2 in Homily 43: 1 Corinthians 16:1-9 (NPNF, 1st Series, Vol. 12, p. 259).

<sup>18</sup>The earliest clear patristic source is Clement of Alexandria. See, e.g., his *Miscellanies*, ch. 14 (ANF, Vol. 2, p. 469). Further reference to this will appear in our next article.

<sup>19</sup>In the Easter controversy of cAD 190 the Roman province of Asia held to Quartodecimanism (celebration of the 14th of Nisan, regardless of the day of the week), a practice which Polycrates of Ephesus traced back to the apostles John and Philip. The account of this controversy is given in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, ch. 23-25 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. 1, pp. 241-244).

<sup>20</sup>English translation from ANF, Vol. 8, pp. 560, 561.

<sup>21</sup>The East, including the Roman province of Asia, never adopted the weekly Sabbath fast. Further details will appear in the next two articles in this series.

## Part 2

*Historians reveal how, where, and when Sunday came into the picture as the day of worship.*

IN MY article last month I pointed out that during the third through fifth centuries of the Christian era *both* the Sabbath (Saturday) and Sunday were observed side by side generally throughout Christendom. Also we found that in the New Testament the day for weekly worship services had been Saturday, with no hint that Sunday had enjoyed such a role at all.

When, where, and how, then, did the transition take place that brought Sunday into the picture as a special day for Christians?

The first clear evidence for weekly Sunday observance by Christians comes in the second century from two places—Alexandria and Rome. About AD 130 Barnabas of Alexandria, in a highly allegorical discourse, refers to the seventh-day Sabbath as representing the seventh millennium of earth's history. He goes on to say that the present sabbaths were unacceptable to God, who would make "a beginning of the eighth day [Sunday], that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness,



the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead."<sup>1</sup>

About AD 150, Justin Martyr in Rome provides a more clear and direct reference to Sunday observance, actually describing briefly in his *Apology* the worship service held on Sunday: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things." Next follow prayer, communion, and an offering for the poor.<sup>2</sup>

The same writer in his *Dialogue With Trypho the Jew* manifests an anti-Sabbath bent in a number of statements, including the following: "Do you see that the elements are not idle, and keep no Sabbaths? Remain as you were born."<sup>3</sup>

**Rome and Alexandria.** Thus both Barnabas of Alexandria and Justin Martyr in Rome not only refer to the practice of Sunday observance, but they both also manifest a negative attitude toward the Sabbath. Interestingly, it is precisely these same two cities—Alexandria and Rome—that are mentioned by two fifth-century historians, Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen, as being exceptions to the general rule that worship services were still held on Saturday throughout the Christian world as late as the fifth century. (The statements of these two historians were noted in our first article.)

What particular circumstances could have led Rome and Alexandria to their early adoption of Sunday observance? Moreover, why was Sunday observance soon (at least by the third century) so readily accepted throughout the rest of

Christendom, even when the Sabbath was not abandoned?

Obviously, the evidence thus far presented shatters the theory that Sunday was substituted for the seventh-day Sabbath immediately after Christ's resurrection. But likewise incorrect is the opposing view that the Christian Sunday was borrowed directly from paganism early in post-New Testament times. Not only does this theory lack proof, but the sheer improbability that virtually all Christendom suddenly shifted to a purely pagan practice should alert us to the need for a more plausible explanation. Especially is this so when we remember that numerous early Christians accepted martyrdom rather than compromise their faith. Justin himself was such a Christian, suffering martyrdom in Rome about AD 165.<sup>4</sup>

**Not a substitute for the Sabbath.** At such a time as this, would a purely pagan worship day have suddenly captured the entire Christian world, apparently without any serious protest? Furthermore, if this were the case, how would we account for the fact that the Christian Sunday, when it did arise, was regularly looked upon by the Christians as a day honoring Christ's resurrection, not as a Sabbath?

This latter point deserves special attention. In the New Testament, Christ's resurrection is symbolically related to the firstfruits of the harvest just as His death is related to the slaying of the paschal lamb (see 1 Corinthians 15:20 and 5:7). The offering of the wave sheaf (grain sample) of the firstfruits of the harvest was an annual event among the Jews. But in New Testament times there were two different methods of reckoning the day for this celebration.

According to Leviticus 23:11, the wave sheaf was to be offered in the sea-



son of unleavened bread on "the morrow after the sabbath." The Pharisees interpreted this as the day after the Passover sabbath. They killed the paschal lamb on Nisan 14, celebrated the Passover sabbath on Nisan 15, and offered the firstfruits wave sheaf on Nisan 16, regardless of the days of the week on which these dates might fall. Their celebration thus would parallel our method for reckoning Christmas, which falls on different days of the week in different years.

On the other hand, the Essenes and Sadducean Boethusians interpreted "the morrow after the sabbath" as *the day after a weekly Sabbath—always a Sunday*. Their day of Pentecost also always fell on a Sunday—"the morrow after the seventh sabbath" from the day of the offering of the firstfruits (see Leviticus 23:15, 16).<sup>5</sup>

It would be natural for Christians to continue the firstfruits celebration. They would keep it, not as a Jewish festival, but in honor of Christ's resurrection. After all, was not Christ the *True Firstfruits* (1 Corinthians 15:20), and was not His resurrection of the utmost importance (see 1 Corinthians 15:14, 17-19)?

**But when would Christians** keep such a resurrection festival? Would they do it every week? No. Rather, they would do it annually, as had been their custom in the Jewish celebration of the firstfruits.

But which of the two types of reckoning would they choose—the Pharisaic or the Essene-Boethusian? Probably both. Those who had been influenced by the Pharisees would hold their Easter festival on a different day of the week every year, and those who had been influenced by the Boethusians and Essenes would hold their Easter festival upon a Sunday every year.

And this is precisely the situation we find in the Easter controversy that broke out toward the end of the second century.<sup>6</sup> At that time Asian Christians (in the Roman province of Asia in western Asia Minor) celebrated the Easter events on the Nisan 14-15-16 basis, irrespective of the days of the week. But Christians throughout most of the rest of the world—including Gaul, Corinth, Pontus (in northern Asia Minor), Alexandria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine (even Jerusalem itself)—held to a Sunday-Easter. Early sources indicate that both practices stemmed from apostolic tradition.<sup>7</sup>

This is a view more plausible than that the Sunday Easter was a late Roman innovation. After all, at a time when Christian influences were still moving from east to west, how could a Roman innovation so suddenly and so thoroughly have uprooted an entrenched apostolic practice throughout virtually the whole Christian world, East as well as West?<sup>8</sup>

A reconstruction of church history that sees the earliest Christian Sunday as an *annual* Easter one rather than as a weekly observance makes historical sense. The habit of keeping the annual Jewish firstfruits festival day could be easily transferred into an *annual* resurrection celebration in honor of Christ, the Firstfruits. But there was no such habit or psychological background for keeping a *weekly* resurrection celebration. It is probable that the weekly Christian Sunday developed later as an extension of the annual one.

**Various factors** could have had a part in such a development. In the first place, not only did almost all early Christians observe both Easter and Pentecost on Sunday, but the whole seven-week season between the two holidays had special significance.<sup>9</sup>



As J. van Goudoever has suggested, perhaps the Sundays between the two annual festivals had special importance too.<sup>10</sup> If so, elements already present could have aided in extending Sunday observance to a weekly basis, spreading first to the Sundays during the Easter-to-Pentecost season itself and then eventually throughout the entire year.<sup>11</sup>

Thus the annual Sunday celebration could have furnished a source from which the early Christians in Alexandria and Rome inaugurated a weekly Sunday as a substitute for the Sabbath. But there is no reason why this kind of weekly Resurrection festival had to supplant the Sabbath. And indeed, elsewhere throughout Christianity we find it simply emerging as a special day observed *side by side with the Sabbath*.

**Sunday replaces Sabbath in Rome.** But what factor or factors prompted the displacement of the Sabbath by a weekly Sunday in Rome and Alexandria? Undoubtedly the most significant was a growing anti-Jewish sentiment in the early second century. Several Jewish revolts, culminating in that of Bar Cocheba in AD 132-135, aroused Roman antagonism against the Jews to a high level—so high, in fact, that Emperor Hadrian expelled the Jews from Palestine. His predecessor, Trajan, had been vexed too with Jewish outbreaks; and Hadrian himself prior to the Bar Cocheba Revolt had outlawed such Jewish practices as circumcision and Sabbathkeeping.<sup>12</sup>

Especially in Alexandria, where there was a strong contingent of Jews, and in the Roman capital itself would Christians be prone to feel in danger of identification with the Jews. Thus, especially in these two places would they be likely to seek a substitute for the weekly Sabbath to avoid being associated with the

Sabbathkeeping Jews.

Moreover, with respect to Rome (and some other places in the West), the practice of fasting on the Sabbath every week also tended to enhance the development of Sunday observance by making the Sabbath a gloomy day.<sup>13</sup> This obviously had negative effects on the Sabbath and could have served as an inducement in Rome and in some neighboring areas to replace such a sad and hungry Sabbath with a joyous weekly Resurrection festival on Sunday.

Undoubtedly other influences were also at work in Rome and Alexandria in the early steps taken to displace the Sabbath with Sunday in those places. Perhaps allowance should be made for *some* influence from paganism in this connection, even though Sunday observance did not enter the church directly from this source in the second century. Indeed, the effect of the pagan Sunday on Christianity was mainly a post-Constantinian development.<sup>14</sup>

As the weekly Sunday arose side by side with the Sabbath throughout Christendom, elsewhere than at Rome and Alexandria, perhaps it was inevitable that *eventually* the two days would clash quite generally, as they had done as early as the second century in Rome and Alexandria. This did in fact happen, and the final article in this series will survey the process by which Sunday finally displaced the Sabbath as the main day for Christian worship throughout Christendom.

**What is the "Lord's day"?** We need now to look quickly at one further line of evidence: certain "Lord's day" references. Could the term "Lord's day" in its earliest usage refer, as C. W. Dugmore has suggested, to an annual Easter Sunday? <sup>15</sup>

The first post-Biblical reference to the



weekly Sunday as "Lord's day" derives from Clement of Alexandria toward the end of the second century. He mentions "the Lord's day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the *Republic*, in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth they are to set out and arrive in four days.' " <sup>16</sup>

Shortly before this, however, Irenaeus, of Gaul, had made a curious statement, speaking of Pentecost as "of equal significance with the Lord's day." <sup>17</sup> As the editors of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* have observed, this reference must be to Easter. <sup>18</sup> It seems clear that two *annual* events are intended.

Still earlier, however, there are two further patristic references that often are considered as "Lord's day" statements, although neither of them actually contains the word *day* in the text:

1. *Didache* 14:1: "On the Lord's own [day], come together," or possibly, "According to the Lord's own [commandment], come together."

If "Lord's [day]" is the correct rendition, Easter may be meant, inasmuch as the *Didache* is a sort of baptismal manual, and baptism seems to have been connected with Easter in the early church. <sup>19</sup>

2. Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*, chapter 9: "No longer . . . [sabbatizing], but living in observance of the Lord's Day" or possibly, "living according to the Lord's [life]"—"on which also our life has sprung up again." <sup>20</sup>

Even if "day" is the correct rendition, Ignatius still could not have been referring to a weekly Sunday observance, for the people he describes as "no longer sabbatizing, but living according to the Lord's [day]," were, as the context shows, none other than the *Old Testament* prophets. As Ignatius well knew, the Old Testament prophets kept the

seventh-day Sabbath—not Sunday.

Consequently the phrase "no longer sabbatizing" cannot mean, "no longer keeping the Sabbath day," but rather suggests avoiding Jewish legalism (as the whole context makes clear). Nor can the phrase "living according to the Lord's [day]" mean keeping Sunday. The whole intent is toward living a life according to the "Lord's life" (which is undoubtedly the better translation). <sup>21</sup>

Even the third- or fourth-century interpolater of Ignatius recognized that the conflict was not between two different days, for he approved the observance of both days—the Sabbath in a "spiritual manner," after which the "Lord's day" was also to be observed. <sup>22</sup>

**A brief summary** of the main facts ascertained in the previous article and the present one will now be in order:

1. The New Testament silence about the weekly observance of Sunday, in contrast to the recurring statements about the Sabbath, provides convincing evidence that there was no such Sunday observance in New Testament Christianity. (Moreover the second-century silence regarding the Sabbath and Sunday, except for Rome and Alexandria, is in large part due to the fact that basically no controversy had developed over the two weekly days except in those two places.)

2. The mushrooming literary evidence from the third through fifth centuries reveals that at last a weekly Sunday had become quite generally observed. Furthermore, throughout most of Christendom it was observed side by side with the Sabbath.

3. The background from Judaism for an *annual* "firstfruits" celebration on Sunday provided the basis for an *annual* Resurrection celebration among Christians. This was undoubtedly the first



step toward a weekly Sunday Resurrection festival. (To be concluded next month.)



<sup>1</sup>Epistle of Barnabas, ch. 15 (Ante-Nicene Fathers [ANF], Vol. 1, pp. 146, 147).

<sup>2</sup>1 Apology, ch. 67 (ANF, Vol. 1, p. 186).

<sup>3</sup>Dialogue, ch. 33 (ANF, Vol. 1, p. 206). Several other statements in the Dialogue reveal a similar feeling.

<sup>4</sup>The interrogation of Justin and his companions is described vividly in a document appearing in ANF, Vol. 1, pp. 305, 306. Compare the remarks on Justin by C. Mervyn Maxwell, "They Loved Jesus," *The Ministry*, January 1977, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup>J. van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars*, 2nd rev. ed. (Leiden, 1961), pp. 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 29. The Boethusians and Essenes actually chose Sundays a week apart because of a difference in their understanding of whether the Sabbath of Leviticus 23:11 was the Sabbath during or the Sabbath after the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Moreover, they used a solar calendar in contrast to the lunar calendar of the Pharisees.

<sup>6</sup>Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, v. 23-25, provides the details.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, v. 23.1, and v. 24.2, 3; also Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, vii. 19.

<sup>8</sup>The fact that Victor of Rome could not successfully excommunicate the Asian Christians (see Eusebius, v. 24.9-17) provides further substantiation of this view. If Rome could earlier have influenced almost the entire Christian world, both East and West, to give up an apostolic practice in favor of a Roman innovation, why was she now incapable of stamping out the last remaining vestige of this practice? The only reasonable explanation of all the data seems to be that the Sunday-Easter was not a late Roman innovation, but that both it and Quartodecimanism (observance of Nisan 14) stemmed from apostolic times. For further details, see my "John as Quartodecimanism: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), pp. 251-258.

<sup>9</sup>In addition to the citation in footnote 19, below, see Tertullian, *The Chaplet*, ch. 3, and *On Fasting*, ch. 14 (ANF, Vol. 3, p. 94 and Vol. 4, p. 112); and see also the reference from Irenaeus mentioned in footnote 17.

<sup>10</sup>Van Goudoever, p. 167.

<sup>11</sup>Philip Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (Cambridge, England, 1952), p. 38, has made this suggestion: since crops could hardly have been ripe everywhere on the two Sundays especially set aside (day of barley firstfruits and Pentecost day), may it not have been implied that any Sunday within the fifty days was a proper day for the offering of the firstfruits? For an excellent discussion of the whole

question of Easter in relation to the weekly Sunday, see Lawrence T. Geraty, "The Pascha and the Origin of Sunday Observance," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (hereafter cited as AUSS) III (1965), pp. 85-96.

<sup>12</sup>See Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, lxxviii.32 and lxxix.12-14; and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iv.2.6.

<sup>13</sup>For details about the Sabbath fast, see my article "Some Notes on the Sabbath Fast in Early Christianity," AUSS III (1965), pp. 167-174.

<sup>14</sup>Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity* (New York, 1928), p. 145, may be too severe in saying that "the Church made a sacred day of Sunday, partly because it was the day of the resurrection, but largely because it was the weekly festival of the sun." Nevertheless, after the nominal adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire in the fourth century, there was definitely an increase of pagan influence on Christianity.

<sup>15</sup>"Lord's Day and Easter" in Oscar Cullmann *Festschrift* volume *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. 6 (Leiden, 1962), pp. 272-281.

<sup>16</sup>*Miscellanies*, v. 14 (ANF, Vol. 2, p. 2, 469).

<sup>17</sup>*Fragments From the Lost Writings of Irenaeus*, 7 (ANF, Vol. 1, pp. 569, 570). Geraty, p. 89, has spoken of this as "one of the strongest hints that 'Lord's Day' may have originally referred to an annual resurrection day."

<sup>18</sup>ANF, Vol. 1, p. 569, note 9.

<sup>19</sup>Tertullian, *On Baptism*, ch. 19 (ANF, Vol. 3, p. 678), says: "The Passover affords a more than usually solemn day for baptism. . . . After that, Pentecost is a most joyous space for conferring baptisms; wherein, too, the resurrection of the Lord was repeatedly proved among the disciples." That the *Didache* is a sort of baptismal manual has been generally recognized.

<sup>20</sup>Compare ANF, Vol. 1, p. 62, and see footnote 21 for sources giving information on better translations.

<sup>21</sup>See Robert A. Kraft, "Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity," AUSS III (1965), page 28; Fritz Guy "The Lord's Day" in the Letter of Ignatius to the Magnesians," AUSS II (1964), pp. 13, 14; Richard B. Lewis, "Ignatius and the 'Lord's Day,'" AUSS VI (1968), pp. 46-59.

<sup>22</sup>The text of the expanded version of Ignatius is found in ANF, Vol. 1, pp. 62, 63. It may be of interest to note that Pliny, governor of Bythinia, about AD 112 wrote to Roman Emperor Trajan regarding Christians in Pliny's province. In interrogating some of the former Christians who under pressure had given up Christianity, he learned from them that the extent of their "guilt" had been to have an early-morning service before sunrise on a "stated" or "fixed" day (*stato die*). Although many scholars have simply assumed that this was a weekly Sunday, the details given by Pliny would point more in the direction of an Easter Sunday, as Geraty, pages 88, 89, has pointed out.

## Part 3

*The gradual transition of worship from Saturday to Sunday culminated in the enactment of laws against work on Sunday.*

IT IS a curious fact that the references dealing with both Sabbath and Sunday increased sharply in the fourth century

AD and that many of these had overtones of controversy. In some instances, there was an emphasis to keep both days



(as, for example, in the *Apostolic Constitutions*), and Gregory of Nyssa and Asterius of Amaseia could refer to the Sabbath and Sunday as "sisters" and as a "team," respectively. These were among the references discussed in our first article.<sup>1</sup>

On the other side, however, stood the anti-Sabbath church leaders. For example, John Chrysostom, a contemporary of Gregory and Asterius, went so far as to declare, "There are many among us now, who fast on the same day as the Jews, and keep the sabbaths in the same manner; and we endure it nobly or rather ignobly and basely!"<sup>2</sup>

**A day of fasting.** In the previous article in this series, we noted that the Sabbath fast—which made the Sabbath a sad and hungry day—helped bring about the rise of Sunday observance in Rome and in some other places in the West. Indeed, as early as the first quarter of the third century Tertullian of Carthage in North Africa argued against the practice.<sup>3</sup> About the same time Hippolytus in Rome took issue with those who observed the Sabbath fast.<sup>4</sup>

However, in the fourth and fifth centuries evidence of controversy on this matter heightened. Augustine (died AD 430) dealt with the issue in several of his letters, including one in which he gave rebuttal to a zealous Roman advocate of Sabbath fasting—an individual who caustically denounced those who refused to fast on the Sabbath.<sup>5</sup>

**As another evidence** of the controversy, Canon 64 of the *Apostolic Constitutions* specifies that "if any one of the clergy be found to fast on the Lord's day, or on the Sabbath-day, excepting one only, let him be deprived; but if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended."<sup>6</sup>

The interpolater of Ignatius, who

probably wrote at about the same time, even declared that "if any one fasts on the Lord's Day or on the Sabbath, except on the paschal Sabbath only, he is a murderer of Christ."<sup>7</sup> (On the paschal Sabbath, the anniversary of the Sabbath during which Christ was in the tomb, Christians considered it appropriate to fast.)

The last two sources noted may indicate that the controversy had extended beyond Western Christianity; but as far as the actual official practice was concerned, only Rome and certain other Western churches adopted it. John Cassian (died about AD 440) speaks of "some people in some countries of the West, and especially in the city [Rome]" who fasted on the Sabbath.<sup>8</sup> And Augustine refers to "the Roman Church and some other churches . . . near to it or remote from it" where the Sabbath fast was observed.

But Milan, an important church in northern Italy, was among the Western churches that did not observe the Sabbath fast, as Augustine also makes clear.<sup>9</sup> Nor did the Eastern churches ever adopt it. The question remained a point of disagreement between East and West as late as the eleventh century.<sup>10</sup>

**The increase in references** about the Sabbath—both for and against—indicate that some sort of struggle was beginning to manifest itself on a rather widespread basis. No longer did the controversy center in only Rome and Alexandria. What could have triggered this struggle on such a wide scale in the fourth and fifth centuries?

Undoubtedly, one of the most important factors is to be found in the activities of Emperor Constantine the Great in the early fourth century, followed by later "Christian emperors." Not only did Constantine give Chris-



tianity a new status within the Roman Empire (from being persecuted to being honored), but he also gave Sunday a "new look." By his civil legislation, he made Sunday a *rest day*. His famous Sunday law of March 7, 321, reads:

"On the venerable Day of the Sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of heaven should be lost."<sup>11</sup>

This was the first in a series of steps taken by Constantine and by later "Christian emperors" in regulating Sunday observance. It is obvious that this first Sunday law was not particularly Christian in orientation (note the pagan designation "venerable Day of the Sun"); but very likely Constantine, on political and social grounds, endeavored to merge together heathen and Christian elements of his constituency by focusing on a common practice.

In AD 386, Theodosius I and Gratian Valentinian extended Sunday restrictions so that litigation should entirely cease on that day and there would be no public or private payment of debt.<sup>12</sup> Laws forbidding circus, theater, and horse racing also followed and were reiterated as felt necessary.<sup>13</sup>

**Reaction to early Sunday laws.** How did the Christian church react to Constantine's Sunday edict of March, 321, and to subsequent civil legislation that made Sunday a rest day? As desirable as such legislation may have seemed to Christians from one standpoint, it also placed them in a dilemma. Heretofore, Sunday had been a workday, except for

special worship services. What would happen, for example, to nuns such as those described by Jerome in Bethlehem, who, after following their mother superior to church and then back to their communions, the rest of their time on Sunday devoted "themselves to their allotted tasks, and made garments either for themselves or else for others"?<sup>14</sup>

There is no evidence that Constantine's Sunday laws were ever specifically made the basis for Christian regulations of the day, but it is obvious that Christian leaders must do something to keep the day from becoming one of idleness and vain amusement. Added emphasis on worship and reference to the Sabbath commandment in the Old Testament seem to have been the twin routes now taken. (It is interesting to note that even Constantine did not intend to reflect the Sabbath commandment of the Decalogue in his Sunday law, inasmuch as he exempted agricultural work—a type of work strictly prohibited in the Sabbath commandment.)

Perhaps a first inkling of the new trend comes as early as the time of Constantine himself—through the church historian Eusebius, who was also Constantine's biographer and keen admirer. In his commentary on Psalm 92, "the Sabbath Psalm," Eusebius writes that Christians would fulfill on the Lord's day all that in this Psalm was prescribed for the Sabbath—including worship of God early in the morning. He then adds that through the new covenant the Sabbath celebration was transferred to "the first day of light [Sunday]."<sup>15</sup>

Later in the fourth century Ephraem Syrus suggested that honor was due "to the Lord's day, the firstborn of all days," which had "taken away the right of the firstborn from the Sabbath." Then he goes on to point out that the law prescribes that rest should be given to ser-



vants and animals.<sup>16</sup> The reflection of the Old Testament Sabbath commandment is obvious.

**With this sort of Sabbath emphasis** now being placed on Sunday, it was inevitable that the Sabbath day itself (Saturday) would take on lesser and lesser importance. And the controversy that is evident in literature of the fourth and fifth centuries between those who would debase the Sabbath and those who would honor it reflects the struggle.

Moreover, it was a struggle that did not terminate quickly; for as we have seen, the fifth-century church historians Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen provide a picture of Sabbath worship services alongside Sunday worship services as being the pattern throughout Christendom in their day, except in Rome and Alexandria. It appears that the "Christian Sabbath" as a replacement for the earlier Biblical Sabbath was mainly a development of the sixth century and later.

The earliest church council to deal with the matter was a regional eastern one meeting in Laodicea about AD 364. Although this council still manifested respect for the Sabbath as well as Sunday in the special lections (Scripture readings) designated for those two days, it nonetheless stipulated the following in its Canon 29: "Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ."<sup>17</sup>

The regulation with regard to working on Sunday was rather moderate in that Christians should not work on that day if possible! However, more significant was the fact that this council reversed the

original command of God and the practice of the earliest Christians with regard to the seventh-day Sabbath.

God had said, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work; but the seventh day is a sabbath to the Lord your God; in it you shall not do any work" (Exodus 20:8-10, RSV). This council said, instead, "Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday but shall work on that day."

**Work forbidden on Sunday.** The Third Synod of Orleans in 538, though deploring Jewish Sabbatarianism, forbade "field labours" so that "people may be able to come to church and worship."<sup>18</sup> Half a century later, the Second Synod of Macon in 585 and the Council of Narbonne in 589 stipulated strict Sunday observance.<sup>19</sup> The ordinances of the former "were published by King Guntram in a decree of November 10, 585, in which he enforced careful observance of the Sunday."<sup>20</sup>

Finally, during the Carolingian Age a great emphasis was placed on Lord's day observance according to the Sabbath commandment. Walter W. Hyde, in his *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, has well summed up several centuries of the history of Sabbath and Sunday up to Charlemagne:

"The emperors after Constantine made Sunday observance more stringent but in no case was their legislation based on the Old Testament. . . . At the Third Synod of Aureliani (Orleans) in 538 rural work was forbidden but the restriction against preparing meals and similar work on Sunday was regarded as a superstition.

"After Justinian's death in 565 various *epistolae decretales* were passed by the popes about Sunday. One of Gregory I (590-604) forbade men 'to yoke oxen or to



perform any other work, except for approved reasons,' while another of Gregory II (715-731) said: 'We decree that all Sundays be observed from vespers to vespers and that all unlawful work be abstained from.' . . .

"Charlemagne at Aquisgranum (Aachen) in 788 decreed that all ordinary labor on the Lord's Day be forbidden, since it was against the Fourth Commandment, especially labor in the field or vineyard which Constantine had exempted."<sup>21</sup>

**God's Sabbath never forgotten.** And thus Sunday came to be the Christian rest day substitute for the Sabbath. But the seventh-day Sabbath was never entirely forgotten, of course. This was true in Europe itself. But particularly in Ethiopia, for example, groups kept both Saturday and Sunday as "Sabbaths," not only in the early Christian centuries but down into modern times.<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, for a good share of Christendom, the history of the Sabbath and Sunday had by the sixth through eighth centuries taken a complete circle. For most Christians, God's rest day of both Old Testament and New Testament times had through a gradual process become a workday and had been supplanted by a substitute rest day. God's command that on the seventh day "you shall not do any work" had been replaced by the command of man: Work on the seventh day; rest on the first.

However, all Christians who consider the New Testament as the normative guide for their lives, rather than the decisions of men hundreds of years later, will ask whether the worship day of Christ and the apostles—Saturday, the seventh day of the week—should not still be observed today. We believe it should.

<sup>1</sup>See *These Times*, November, 1978.

<sup>2</sup>Comment on Galatians 1:7 in *Commentary on Galatians (The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers [NPNF], 1st Series, Vol. 13, p. 8)*.

<sup>3</sup>In *On Fasting*, ch. 14 (*The Ante-Nicene Fathers [ANF], Vol. 4, p. 112*), Tertullian indicates that the Sabbath is "a day never to be kept as a fast except at the passover season, according to a reason elsewhere given." He also indicates his opposition to the Sabbath fast in *Against Marcion*, iv. 12 (*ANF, Vol. 3, p. 363*).

<sup>4</sup>Hippolytus mentions some who "give heed to doctrines of devils" and "often appoint a fast on the Sabbath and on the Lord's day, which Christ has, however, not appointed" (from his *Commentary on Daniel*, iv. 20; the Greek text and French translation are given by Maurice Lefevre [Paris, 1947], pp. 300-303).

<sup>5</sup>See Augustine's Epistles 36 (to Casulanus), 54 (to Januarius), and 82 (to Jerome) (NPNF, 1st Series, Vol. 1, pp. 265-270, 300, 301, 353, 354). They are dated between AD 396 and 405. It is Epistle 36 that gives rebuttal to the Roman advocate of the Sabbath fast.

<sup>6</sup>English trans. in *ANF, Vol. 7, p. 504*. This canon is numbered 66 in the Hefele edition (see note 17, below).

<sup>7</sup>Pseudo-Ignatius, *To the Philippians*, ch. 13 (*ANF, Vol. 1, p. 119*).

<sup>8</sup>*Institutes*, iii. 10 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. 11, p. 218).

<sup>9</sup>The first statement appears in Epistle 36, par. 27 (NPNF, 1st Series, Vol. 1, p. 268), and a similar remark is made in Epistle 82, par. 14 (*ibid.*, p. 353). References to Milan are found in Epistle 36, par. 32, and in Epistle 54, par. 3 (*ibid.*, pp. 270, 300, 301).

<sup>10</sup>See R. L. Odom, "The Sabbath in the Great Schism of AD 1054," *Andrews University Seminary Studies [AUSS]*, Vol. 1 (1963), pp. 77, 78.

<sup>11</sup>*Codex Justinianus*, iii., Tit. 12.3, trans. in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5th ed. (New York, 1902), Vol. 3, p. 380, note 1.

<sup>12</sup>*Theodosian Code*, 11.7.13, trans. by Clyde Pharr (Princeton, N. J., 1952), p. 300.

<sup>13</sup>The further laws include a law of Theodosius II in 425, in *Theodosian Code*, 15.5.5, p. 433.

<sup>14</sup>See Jerome, Epistle cviii., 20 (NPNF, 2nd Series, Vol. VI, p. 206).

<sup>15</sup>Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 23, col. 1169.

<sup>16</sup>S. Ephraem Syri *hymni et sermones*, ed. by T. J. Lamy (1882), Vol. 1, pp. 542-544.

<sup>17</sup>Charles J. Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church*, trans. Henry N. Oxenham, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1896), p. 316. Canon 16 (*ibid.*, p. 310) refers to lections; and the fact that Saturday as well as Sunday had special consideration during Lent, as indicated in Canons 49 and 51 (*ibid.*, p. 320), also reveals that regard for the Sabbath was not entirely lacking.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 208, 209.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 407, 422.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 409.

<sup>21</sup>W. W. Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire* (Philadelphia, 1946, p. 261).

<sup>22</sup>For a brief discussion of the early period, see my article "A Further Note on the Sabbath in Coptic Sources," *AUSS* Vol. 6 (1968), pp. 150-157. For the reference mentioning both Saturday and Sunday as being "named Sabbaths," see p. 151. The source is Statute 66 in G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles* (London, 1904 and 1915), pp. 211, 212. A number of sources deal with the Sabbath in later Ethiopian history.