

Theological Aspects of the Seventh-day Sabbath

5 V. NORSKOV OLSEN

[The occasion for the presentation of this paper represents a historical way-mark for Loma Linda University and an honor for the author. Doctor Olsen was chosen by the University Lecture Committee (from nominations originating in the schools of the university) as the person to give the first DISTINGUISHED FACULTY LECTURE. This distinction was initiated for the following purposes: "to honor individual teachers for creative and relevant scholarship; to provide a means for teachers to encourage each other in the enjoyment of study and investigation and in the satisfaction of fostering student incentive for the full development of individual powers; to give opportunity for discourse among members of diverse disciplines toward the end of enlarging common understandings and of discerning the congruence of all knowledge." EDITOR.]

To give the setting for this presentation,¹ let me first define the terminology.

During the pre-Reformation era, Sunday was kept as a holy day, like the other feast days of the church, but *not as a Sabbath*. The Puritans in England are the first who attached to Sunday all that was theologically embedded in the Sabbath — which is something the Continental Reformers never did. To avoid confusion with the Puritan Sunday-Sabbath, therefore, I use the term *seventh-day Sabbath*.

Theologically, the keeping of a *rest day* and the keeping of *the Sabbath* are two very different things. The keeping of the Sabbath has far-reaching theological implications which form the doctrine of the Sabbath. It is these theological aspects and their correlations (five in number) that I shall consider.

When I refer to the Sabbath as a *constitutive norm*, I mean a doctrine

which is so pertinent that other doctrines are not truly established unless they are erected within the theological framework of the former, which thus functions as the constitution.

When I speak of the Sabbath as a *corrective norm*, I mean a doctrine which at all times is a tuning fork, by which one can ascertain whether or not the other doctrines are in tune both on the spiritual and on the pragmatic levels.

THE CORRECT GOD-CONCEPT

6 When Nietzsche declared that "God is dead," he said only what would become commonplace for a considerable part of the human race in this century. There is the fierce, dogmatic atheism of world communism. There is the quieter, less sensational, intellectual conviction that nothing exists beyond a natural order explicable and discoverable by science. This is, by now, the normal outlook in most of the educated West. Within the churches, the confession "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth" has been undermined by liberal theology. In other words, the influence of Darwin and the evolutionary theory have destroyed faith in God as the Creator.

A classic example in this respect is the book *Honest to God*, written by John A. T. Robinson, the Anglican bishop of Woolwich, England.² Within a few hours of publication, the first printing was sold out. In about a year the book passed through ten editions; half a million copies were sold; and ten translations in all the major languages of Europe were on the market. Doctor Robinson's statements harmonize with the antitheistic spirit of our age as he advocates a "Christianity" that dispenses with all thought of a personal, transcendent deity. The bishop has told the world just what our generation wants to hear: "Glory to man in the highest; for man is the master of all things."

The Seventh-day Adventist church has correctly emphasized that the theology of the Sabbath restores the right God-concept: a transcendent God who is absolute, personal, and holy; the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. Further, a person's God-concept expresses more clearly than anything else his theology and has a direct bearing on his view and interpretation of the Bible. As to views of the Bible, the spectrum is large. Here, I am concerned with two aspects: (1) the *orthodoxy*, often leading to creedalism, the end result of which is ice-cold confessionalism, dead formalism, and self-righteous ghettoism; (2) *rationalism*, the intellectual approach most often leading to humanism and liberalism.

Christianity is a historical religion. The God of this historical religion is Yahweh, or the I AM. It is tempting at first glance to think that reference to God as the I AM is reference to God's changeless being. The ancient Greeks, who struggled philosophically with the problem of the changing and the changeless, would have favored such a view. But in Israel's faith and in the Christian faith, the Hebrew words *Yahweh* and *I am* have a dynamic meaning: *he causes to be*. The emphasis is on divine activity — not passive, eternal being. God discloses himself in his acts: Creation; the Flood; the call of Abraham; the Exodus; Sinai; Saul, David, Solomon; the Exile; the Return; the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of Christ; Pentecost; the Second Coming.

7 God who acts — I like to define him as "the acting God" — says to man: "If you wish to know how the I AM acts, go to the Bible, and the Spirit who is moving will make the acting God real to you." Redemption is based on some specific historical acts that occurred within historical time and that God made part and parcel of the plan of salvation. Biblical theology is anchored in these acts. But for liberalism, rationalism, and subjective existentialism there is a common denominator: the Scriptures are approached with preconceived philosophical ideas and/or a subjective religious experience, which now becomes the judge of the Bible, making the redemptive acts in history a "stumbling block" — which, as in Paul's time, men always seek to remove in one way or another.

The weekly Sabbath is a reminder that God acts in history, and he sanctifies time and events taking place within history. In the study of comparative religions we find that what was new "in the teaching of Judaism was that the idea of holiness was shifted from space to time, from the realm of nature to the realm of history, from things to events."³ Notice that the shift of emphasis is to time, history, and events. Accordingly, God sanctifies specific events taking place within historical time.

Here, I cannot enter into a discussion of this aspect. All I can do is to challenge the scientist and the philosopher by saying that the answers to the deep scientific and philosophical problems of being, space, and time can best be met by the God-concept embedded theologically in the Sabbath doctrine. The Sabbath teaches us that "there is a realm of time where the goal is not to have but to be, not to own but to give, not to control but to share, not to subdue but to be in accord."⁴ The God-concept of the Sabbath answers the question: From where did man come and when? Also it is able to answer the question: Why is man here?

When the pioneers of this church chose the name Seventh-day Adventist, they were convinced that the name itself would convey the significance of two very pertinent doctrines for the latter days. In that conviction they were correct. In God's providence the two doctrines were reviewed together, for the Second Advent of Christ is theologically embedded in the Sabbath doctrine.

8

In the Old Testament the Sabbath is closely linked to the world to come. Accordingly, the full theological impact of the Sabbath truth will give that dimension from which we can face and answer not only the question "from where?" but also the question of the final God-intended destiny of man. The Sabbath as a sign of the latter became so much a part of Jewish religion that, in the thoughts of the rabbis, the Sabbath is the essence of the world to come; or, to express the relationship in another way, the world to come is all-Sabbath. Although early Christian writers and the Reformers of the sixteenth century disregarded the Sabbath as a day, they nevertheless spoke about the eschatological truth expressed in the Sabbath doctrine.

Theologians very often make their contributions by calling attention to the significance of a neglected aspect of a certain doctrine — for which one must be thankful. However, having done that, very often they make that neglected point the center of their theological system. Here is a pitfall, for fragmented theology always leads to a distortion of the biblical truth. I believe that the eschatological aspect of the Sabbath could and should become a constitutive and corrective norm in the midst of the conflicting eschatological concepts of modern theology. To explain:

Futuristic eschatology is the belief that all principal eschatological events are yet in the future.

Symbolic eschatology is the view of Tillich and Niebuhr, for whom the Second Coming is not an event on a heavenly timetable, but a symbol, a reminder, and a promise that happiness is transhistorical.

Realized eschatology is the theory that the kingdom of God, the Second Advent, and the Resurrection are fulfilled in a personal encounter with Christ — the new birth and a new society resulting.

Time would fail me if I should deal with the latest eschatological concept expressed by the German theologians Pannenberg and Moltmann. All that needs to be said is that their "theology of hope" was sketched out by the Jewish Marxist, Ernst Bloch, who wrote his work *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* between 1939 and 1949 during his exile in America from Nazi Germany.

The General Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala in

1968 was permeated by this new eschatology. The most definitive statement of joint Protestant-orthodox authorship, issued at Uppsala, took stock of "a new world of exciting prospects" in which "the new technological possibilities turn what were dreams into realities." Through almost every paragraph of a closely reasoned document on world economic and social development ran the idea of "change," "radical transformation," "revolution," and "drastic innovation." The key concept was a plea for death to the old order as a prelude for the new.

The theme of the meeting in Uppsala was expressed in the most beautiful eschatological words of the Bible: "Behold, I make all things new." But this promise was going to be fulfilled as understood by the new theology of hope just referred to.

9

Inaugurated eschatology, which comes closest to the eschatology of the Sabbath, embraces the most vital aspects of biblical eschatology. Inaugurated eschatology can be explained by the D day and V day of World War II. The First Advent is the D day. The decisive battle was won, and this was consequential for life here and now. The Second Advent is V day; the consequences of the victory will then be fully realized. This form of eschatology moves in an ellipse which has two foci, the First Advent and the Second Advent.

Let us imagine that the religious liberty secretary has the eleven o'clock Sabbath service. In the first part of the sermon he states that the end is near and Christ is even at the door. (For that, one must be happy, for only the Advent can solve the world problems.) The proof of the end, he says, is the sign that religious liberty is on the way out. Part two of the sermon is an exhortation to circulate the magazine *Liberty* and write letters to congressmen so that laws curtailing religious liberty may not be enacted. By doing as the speaker advises, the members are actually holding back the signs which must precede Christ's coming, which alone in turn can solve the problems of the world.

Here is an anomaly. Yet the preacher is theologically sound. On account of the First Advent of Christ there is a realized eschatology with social implications here and now. The principles of the kingdom of God must be demonstrated here and now. The fourth commandment states the social implications when it says that the Sabbath is not for those only who have entered the kingdom of God, but for their son, daughter, servant, stranger, and even the cattle within the gates.

Let me bring together the two main points dealt with so far: the Sabbath as the expression of (a) a true God-concept and (b) true eschatology. At

the time of the Reformation the sovereignty of the transcendental God was stressed to the degree that all the Reformers believed in predestination. Rationalism followed, and God was pushed further back into the universe in the theology of the deist, whose God had left man and the universe to be ruled by inherited laws and man's own reason.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, reason had failed in the realm of religion. Schleiermacher turned the tide by emphasizing that our feelings are the seat of our God-consciousness. The immanence of God was now stressed; this God-concept pressed to its extreme led to pantheism as taught in the nineteenth century. The doctrine of the immanence of God laid the early foundation for religious existentialism. For man it meant the subjective experience with God in the I-Thou relationship, and the eschatological hope of the Resurrection was fulfilled here and now in the new birth. For society it meant world progress, for God is in society, and the eschatological hope of a new world was to be brought about by a God who is now immanent in the social structure. In other words, to deny the progress of man and society is to deny one's God-concept and one's faith in the immanence of God. Further, this concept of God was in full harmony with the scientific theory of evolution.

Now it becomes clear that there is a close relationship between the God-concept and eschatology, and now it is clear why the true God-concept and eschatology should be reviewed together. Both are expressed in the Sabbath doctrine; therefore, the Sabbath doctrine should be a constitutive and corrective norm of eschatology.

JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION

The Sabbath, as related to man's personal salvation, should be a sign of justification and sanctification. One can speak thus about the Sabbath "with-in." When the Sabbath has been considered as a sign of the central spiritual realities of man's salvation, it has often led to two opposite and dangerous positions: *legalism* and *antinomianism*, which allegorized the actual day.

The Jews at the time of Christ observed the Sabbath day scrupulously, but the Sabbath became a stumbling block for their spiritual advancement. The Talmud has page after page of minute Sabbath regulations. For example, "He who has a toothache may not rinse his teeth with vinegar and spit it out again, for this would be to apply a medicine; but he may wash them with vinegar and then swallow it, as this is but taking food." Regulations are given for dressing on Sabbath morning so as to be sure not to wear anything — such as pins or necklaces — which might tempt one to some

form of labor by the removal of anything. Women are forbidden to look in a mirror on the Sabbath, because they might discover a white hair and try to pull it out, which would be a grievous sin.⁵

In the early history of the Christian Church some Christians went to the opposite extreme. In the second century, antinomianism was strongly expressed by some theologians; and with the entrance of Sunday into the church it is significant that some of the first statements against the Sabbath and in favor of Sunday are from these men.

The church fathers and the reformers spiritualized the Sabbath by making it a symbol of the spiritual rest in Christ to a degree that the day as such was allegorized away. Thus, when the Sabbath as a day was done away with, the church lost the Sabbath as a fence or hedge within which some basic doctrinal truths were realistically symbolized. When the spiritual truths imbedded in the Sabbath are divorced from the realities of the day itself, they die. Therefore the essential spiritual truths represented by the Sabbath cannot be divorced from the day itself.

However, the early fathers and the reformers were correct in the view that the Sabbath is a sign of the spiritual rest from sin through forgiveness by faith in Jesus Christ. Here Christ is in the Sabbath; and this testifies to the spirituality of the law, a spirituality which seeks to realize the kingdom of God in what is called sanctification, thus confirming the immutability of the law as an ethical standard.

The correct understanding of the Sabbath "within" should be the constitutive and corrective norm in a theological and existential consideration of the relationship between grace and law.

THE SIGN OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE

The dilemma of the doctrine of the rest day at the time of the Reformation is seen in three different concepts. *First*, there are the reformers with a rather ethical and social attitude toward the use of Sunday: worship is encouraged on that day, but work and activities of pleasure are not denied; Sunday is chosen because it is the most convenient day, but any of the other days in the week would be acceptable. *Next*, there is a mystical concept of the Sabbath, which advocates that the Sabbath as a day is done away with, but mystically or spiritually fulfilled in Christ and the lives of the believers. *Finally*, there is the Puritan observance of Sunday as the biblical Sabbath. It is this last which is important to a consideration of the Sabbath as a sign between God and his covenant people.

There developed among the Puritans a covenant theology that has its

roots in the theology of Calvin. It teaches that the plan of redemption is administered in a covenant relationship with God and man, originally made with Adam and Abraham. There is only one plan of redemption. Likewise, there is only one covenant. A unity between the Old Testament and the New and between the old Israel and the new is thus shown, and the immutability of the moral law in man's covenant relationship with God is emphasized. As this covenant-concept developed, the theological significance of the Sabbath emerged. One of the greatest authorities on English Puritanism accordingly states that the doctrine of the Sabbath "represents a bit of English originality and is the first and perhaps the only important English contribution to the development of Reformed theology in the first century of its history."⁸

12

The paradox of Puritan Sabbatarianism in its earliest phase was pointed out by those who could not implant all that is biblically attached to the Sabbath as the seventh day of the week into Sunday as the first day of the week. In this paradox, early in the seventeenth century, seventh-day Sabbath-keepers originated within the English-speaking world. In America they were found among the Baptists in Rhode Island in the middle of the seventeenth century. However, their concept of the millennium fell within Jewish apocalypticism, a belief in an earthly utopia. It was in the nineteenth century that the Sabbath created a world movement when correct eschatology was first united with the Sabbath.

Puritanism has been characterized by its moral and ethical consciousness and strict discipline, but at the same time it has been accused of legalism. However, there is a legitimate legalism on the practical — shall we say administrative? — level when the people of God realize that in their vocations and institutions they are in a covenant relationship with God. Since the Sabbath is the sign of the covenant, the community of the covenant people must administratively enforce the letter of the law, hoping that each person who is in its community voluntarily may also have the spirit. Even if the son, the daughter, the servant, the stranger may not have the spirit of the law, God's commandments are still a hedge and a tutor. This was the strength of Puritanism in the early history of the English-speaking people. The tragedy of present-day society is, of course, that the hedge has been broken down and the tutor is gone; this is the source of the moral deterioration among the English-speaking people. Only the constant preaching of divine justice can give true meaning to human justice. If this preaching ceases, human justice will collapse, for its only justification lies in the existence of a divine standard.

Puritanism has shaped the quality of human life and society in the English-speaking world to a degree and in a manner not approached by any other form of religious expression. The spirit of the Puritan religious genius is found in their covenant-concept, which in turn renewed the theological significance of the Sabbath.

The Sabbath as the sign of the covenant leads to a demonstration of the principles of the kingdom of God within the community of the covenant people. The Sabbath is a foretaste of the eternal Sabbath, but the whole law should be demonstrated in the work days of the week and also be a foretaste of heaven. The endowment and the support of institutions for that purpose are found, therefore, within Puritanism. The covenant-concept taught the Puritan that his "property" really belonged to God and was lent to him by God to be used in God's service. And the Sabbath as a sign of the covenant teaches the same.

13

I said earlier that the Sabbath teaches us that there is a realm of time when the goal is not to have but to be, not to own but to give, not to control but to share. The institutional aspects of the Seventh-day Adventist church endeavors — an integral part of the church from its earliest days — are built on a theological foundation embedded in the covenant-concept of the Sabbath and rooted in true Puritanism. The Holy Spirit guided the pioneers in formulating "present truth" but at the same time guided them in the establishment and operation of institutions as part of that "present truth." These institutions were founded on a theological basis and nourished on the same. The theology of the Sabbath and these institutions belong together as a sign of the covenant relationship between God and the remnant church.

CHURCH AND STATE

The history of the Sunday-Sabbath issue pinpoints the truth of the New Testament concept of a free church in a free state, even though from the negative point of view. (I use the expression "a free church in a free state" because I think this expression best conveys the ideal New Testament concept of church-state relationships. Also, it is a positive expression, for it points out that the church is not just free *from* something but free *for the purpose* of something. The latter, of course, is the important point.)

In *The Great Controversy* Ellen White points out that through the centuries the church councils and civil legislation "pressed down" the Sabbath "while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted."⁷ This fact has never been spelled out in Adventist literature. Therefore, I will attempt briefly to do so,

taking a bird's-eye view of the church-state Christianization of Sunday in the light of the prophetic time period of 1260 days, interpreted to cover the historical period from 533-38 to 1793-98.

The decree issued by Emperor Justinian in 533 is well known in Adventist circles, dealing as it does with the "subjecting and uniting" of all clergy under the bishop of Rome. However, I have never found in any Adventist literature the answer given by the pope when he received this decree. His reply is equally significant. Accepting the decree in the most literal sense, the pope answered: "Preserving the reverence due to the Roman See, you have subjected all things unto her and reduced all churches to that unity which dwelleth in her alone, to whom the Lord, through the Prince of the Apostles, did delegate all power."⁸ If one wishes to make Adventist prophetic preaching relevant to modern religious trends, one should notice that present-day Roman Catholic ecumenism was expressed back in 533: "reduced all churches to that unity which dwelleth in her alone."

14

The more significant result of Justinian's decree regarding papal supremacy is seen in its relation to the Code of Justinian and to canon or ecclesiastical law. The philosophy undergirding the 1260 years is found here, and it could be utilized in Adventist prophetic preaching. Justinian codified the Roman laws and incorporated into this new codification doctrinal decisions made by the early church councils. Justinian withdrew from the West, and the bishop of Rome became the custodian of the Justinian laws by which the barbarian nations of Europe now were Christianized, and the unity of Europe as the *corpus Christianum* was established. From then on, popes and bishops were more lawyers than theologians, and civil and ecclesiastical laws were fused.

In subjecting the church to the state, the Protestant Reformers remained within this *corpus Christianum*. When Zwingli and Luther killed the Anabaptists, and when Calvin, with the consent of the other reformers, executed Servetus, who held antitrinitarian views, they all functioned in the strength of the law of Justinian, which declared that rebaptizers and antitrinitarians were liable to capital punishment.

In Europe there was no "free church in a free state." The church was not free, but neither was the state free. The men of the French Revolution realized that the state must be freed from ecclesiastical laws. The revolutionary government in its constitution of the year of 1793 states in article seven the same principle expressed in the First Amendment of the American Constitution. It is significant that 1260 years after Justinian made the bishop of Rome the head of all Christendom, and the latter thus became the

custodian of Roman law (which included ecclesiastical laws), France made null that whole judicial system and established the free exercise of religion.

With this illumination of the 1260 years, let me turn again to church-state Christianization of Sunday.

In 1961 the British government appointed a committee of eight parliamentarians whose task it was to ascertain whether or not there should be any Sunday laws in today's Britain. If so, on what principles should they be based? The committee began its study with the Sunday Fairs Law of 1448, the earliest Sunday law still on Great Britain's statute books. Undergirding this law and revisions that followed, the committee found, were two strongly religious motivations: (1) to encourage "church attendance and religious conformity . . . by prohibiting secular activities and restricting employment" and (2) to prohibit "entertainments and amusements [that] profaned the Lord's Day."⁹ The committee agreed that Sunday legislation founded on purely religious motives should be repealed. The report of the committee has been debated in the House of Commons and attempts have been made to amend the present Sunday law, but all have failed.

The picture of the church-state Christianization of Sunday in Great Britain is as follows.

About the year 600, the Celtic, or western, population of Britain adhered to an ancient form of Christianity, which included a certain Sabbath-keeping of the seventh day. The pagan Anglo-Saxons lived in eastern Britain, and the pope sent the monk Augustine to Christianize them. One of Britain's greatest authorities on the medieval church tells about the meeting between the representatives of the Celtic Christians and Augustine. Among the reasons why they could not unite he mentions the following: "The Celts held their own councils and enacted their own laws, independent of Rome. The Celts used a Latin Bible unlike the Vulgate, and kept Saturday as a day of rest."¹⁰

In 664 at the famous Synod of Whitby the English king submitted to Rome. In 697 a Sunday law was enacted, and thereupon one followed after another. There are at least twenty instances of either civil or canon law relating to Sunday before 1448, when the law was enacted on which the present-day English Sunday law is based. Although it is now recognized that all these laws were given for religious reasons, the British government is not ready to amend them. I think this is a most interesting chapter.

The next question that should be asked is: How is British development related to the Continent? This is a no less exciting story, which I will make short. The English Sunday law of 1448 is closely related in content to a

Continental law of the thirteenth century, and that one can be traced back to the legislation of Charlemagne, who after being crowned by the pope in A.D. 800 reinforced old and enacted new civil and canon laws in order to Christianize Europe. But the Sunday law of Charlemagne can be traced back to the Council of Orleans in 538, five years after Justinian's decree regarding the bishop of Rome.

Only once has the ideal New Testament concept of church-state relationship — a free church in a free state — been realized, namely, in the United States of America. However, God's remnant church is universal; it lives within all types of governments. In most countries any type of government can change overnight. Because the church has to relate itself to these governments, it is necessary that there be a universal acid test in the church-state relationship. The universality of this test is even much more important because the church correctly bases the relationship on a theological foundation. The constitutive and corrective norm in the giving and receiving relationship of the church with society is the freedom for the Sabbath doctrine. With the Sabbath as the norm, the theologian and the church administrator will have to find God's way in any given practical situation.

16

As America is becoming a more and more complex society and in this process may change the principle of a free church in a free state, the church will face new problems in its relationship with society. On the road from the principle of a free church in a free state to the final denial of the freedom to observe the Sabbath, as the Adventists believe will be the end result, is a transitional period when the church may find itself in the situation it has experienced in other countries. It may be well to remember that in the Adventist world church (with three-fourths of its membership living and prospering under complex social conditions during its whole history) the Sabbath was always the acid test in any relationship with society. As long as the Sabbath norm, in God's providence, is workable or kept free for greater witness, there is a giving and receiving relationship with society. However, the church must constantly heed the warning by Mrs. White "that men will employ every policy to make less prominent the difference between the faith of Seventh-day Adventists and those who observe the first day of the week. In this controversy the whole world will be engaged, and the time is short. This is no time to haul down our colors."¹¹

The controversy in which the Sabbath is the central issue will be climaxed when the principle of a free church in a free state is lost by the final denial of the freedom of the Sabbath. Here is a situation where the giving and receiving relationship cannot operate, because the constitutive norm for that

relationship has disappeared. In some countries the Adventist church has already had such an experience.

CONCLUSION

If justice is done to the message contained in the Sabbath doctrine, the worldwide Sabbath-Sunday controversy will be centered, I expect, in a five-fold issue and not merely in the issue of Sunday laws. These issues are:

1. The right God-concept with its correlation of correct biblical hermeneutics.

2. A true eschatology centered in the events of the First and Second Advents of Christ.

3. The Sabbath within: the true understanding and experimental knowledge of justification and sanctification, of grace and law.

17

4. The doctrine of stewardship and the social implications expressed in the Sabbath as the sign of God's covenant with his people.

5. The Sabbath as the constitutive norm for deciding where the demarcation line is to be found for the covenant people in its giving and receiving relationship with society. (The Sabbath can also be said to be the measuring rod in the case of doubt as to how far to go in the relationship with society.)

More than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln said in a message to Congress at a time of great national crisis: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must arise with the occasion. . . . We must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country. We cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility."¹²

In most universities of today, all fields of education reflect the attempt to make a religion out of agnostic secular humanism or to change dynamic historical Christianity into religious humanism. My topic here has a most practical bearing on the very foundation of Adventistic educational philosophy.

The theology of the Sabbath makes Seventh-day Adventism distinct. I believe that unwavering faithfulness to that distinctiveness will be respected as long as the acting God has a work to do in and through his covenant people. More than that, it is in that distinctiveness that the Adventist church has its greatness. The world needs just that which is found in this distinctiveness. In many circles, even in those of governments (not only in

one nation but in many), this distinctiveness is recognized and sought. That opportunity must be met, while at the same time the greatest efforts should be made to strengthen the spiritual life of the theological distinctiveness.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1 Presented at a joint meeting February 22, 1972, of the faculties of the schools, key personnel, the administration, and the trustees of Loma Linda University.
- 2 John A. T. Robinson, *Honest to God* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press 1963).
- 3 Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Earth Is the Lord's and the Sabbath* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company 1963), part two, p. 79.
- 4 Heschel, p. 3.
- 5 See Henry K. Booth, *The Bridge between the Testaments* (London: C. Scribner's Sons 1929), pp. 106 ff.
- 6 Marshall M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Gloucester, Massachusetts: P. Smith 1963), p. 442.
- 7 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association 1950), p. 53.
- 8 Thomas Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri* (London: C. F. Stewart 1856), p. 137.
- 9 See V. Norskov Olsen, Britain's Sunday, *Liberty* 60:25-26 (July-August 1965).
- 10 Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (New York: Benjamin Franklin 1909), p. 237.
- 11 White, *Selected Messages*, book two (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association 1958), p. 384.
- 12 See John A. Hardon, *Christianity in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday and Company 1971), p. 364.