

Record of Christian Work

VOL. XIX.

JULY, 1900.

NO. 7.

AS subscriptions continue to be received for the Northfield Echoes, at the greatly reduced rate of seventy cents a set for 1900, we must call the attention of our readers to the limited time of our offer. This offer was only good during April and May, and we are no longer able to fill orders at the reduced price.

WE would call special attention to our publishers' announcement on the last of our advertising pages. In the coming season we want to more than double our present circulation, and the growth of the magazine during the last six months leads us to believe it will increase still more rapidly if our readers will cooperate with us in giving it a wider introduction among their friends. If you find the magazine profitable to your own needs, it is probable that your friends will find it equally so.

AMONG the many memorable sayings at the Ecumenical Conference was Dr. Pierson's statement that "History is a mystery until it is read as His story." It is most bewildering to try to solve the problems that await the coming century, and the results of present political conditions are certainly still a deep mystery. But viewed in the light of Dr. Pierson's aphorism there is the reassurance that God is ruling and over-ruling in all His great universe.

REPORTS of missionary work in Korea indicate a widespread religious interest in the sections of the country where the gospel has been proclaimed. It is stated that twenty new workers are needed at the present time, and many more

would soon find opportunities of an exceptional character for missionary work. Although a comparatively new field for missionary labor, Korea is yielding most encouraging returns to the labors of the devoted workers who have been sent out in the last twelve years.

AT this season of the year there are many parents who are seriously questioning the wisdom of sending their sons to college. Is a college education a good investment in time and money for their sons? Do not the temptations of college life allure and deceive many a young man? Is it not better to have a young man enter his life work after receiving a good common school education, unless he looks toward a professional career? In answer to the first question we would quote Benjamin Franklin's familiar declaration that, "if a man empties his purse into his head no man can take it from him. An investment in knowledge always pays the best interest." Other questions we have attempted to answer by securing articles that treat on these very problems. Dr. Burrell has shown who should and who should not be sent to college, and other articles, by Robert E. Speer and Paul D. Moody, portray different aspects of college life.

PRESIDENT Patton of Princeton, in a recent article in the *Saturday Evening Post*, thus defines the object of not only a college education, but all true training:—

"A college education must be looked at apart from its bearing upon a man's success in making money, or

lege, though it is by far the largest, having a membership of eleven hundred and sixty-four, including its branches in the law, medical, and graduate schools. The Episcopalians have a Berkely Association, which works in harmony with the Young Men's Christian Association and uses the rooms in Dwight Hall. Until recently the Methodists have had an Oxford Club, but this was wisely considered unnecessary and it was merged into the association as a branch. There is also a club for those who intend entering the ministry.

Having seen the activities it is well to look at the spirit behind them. It was stated some time ago that a young man was nowhere so subject to religious influences as at college. Whatever may be the conditions elsewhere it is true at Yale. An idea of the spirit may be gained when it is said that at a special series of early morning prayer meetings in the autumn a good number of men regularly attended. There is throughout

an earnestness and intensity which is indicative of the constantly improving undertone of college sentiment. The day when it was considered essential for a gentleman to drink has long gone by, and the drinker to-day is more pitied than anything else. Evils exist, it is true, but for the most part they do not come after a man. Let a freshman coming to college make his colors known and in a month's time he will never be urged to drink, and if he does not go to look for it he can almost pass through college without seeing drunkenness and lose none of the pleasures of college life thereby. In short, one nearly always has to go out of his way to meet the coarse temptations. To be a Christian at Yale opens the way to more opportunities in friendships and spiritual development than one is ever likely to find again, and not only shuts one out from the enjoyment of no truly good thing, but affords much that in after years it will be a pleasure to recollect.

IS THE BIBLE THE WORD OF GOD?

B. B. Warfield.

THE ACTS.

Our primary reason for believing the Book of Acts to be the word of God is that it comes into our hands as a substantive portion of those "holy Scriptures" which the Lord, acting through His apostles, whom He had appointed to found His church, gave His church as its authoritative rule of faith and practice.

That the apostles were appointed by Christ Himself as His authoritative agents in founding His church needs no proof to the unsophisticated reader of the New Testament; and as little does it require proof that they enjoyed the inward guidance of Christ by His Holy Spirit in the performance of their high function. Nothing can be more explicit than their claim to have been "made sufficient as minis-

ters of a new covenant," and to be clothed with divine authority in their ordering of the affairs of the church of Christ. (1 Thess. iv. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 37.) And nothing can be more clear than that one of the chief arrangements which they made for the establishment and edification of the churches consisted in the placing of the "holy Scriptures" in their hands as their code of law, of divine authority for the determination of their faith and the guidance of their life. It would be difficult to read two consecutive pages of the apostolical Epistles without meeting with indisputable indications of the supreme authority which was ascribed by the apostles, in their dealings with the infant churches, to what they

called the "Scriptures." These "Scriptures," thus made the divine rule of the churches' faith and life, were, in the first instance, to be sure, the "Scriptures" of the Old Testament, which constituted a "Word of God" already at hand and already reverently received as such by the people of God. But they were not the Old Testament "Scriptures" alone. The apostles thought of nothing so little as to ascribe to the prophets of the old covenant more authority than dwelt in them, the apostles of the new; they looked upon the gospel that they preached as equally, with the law itself, the product, in substance and form, of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (1 Pet. i. 12; 1 Cor. ii. 13); and they claimed divine authority for their writings as sharply as for the earlier "Scriptures" (2 Thess. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 37). To Peter, Paul's Epistles found their proper place among "the *other* Scriptures" (2 Pet. iii. 16)—that is, of course, alongside of the "Scriptures" of the Old Testament—as equally precious with them; and by Paul himself the Gospel of Luke is as readily quoted as "Scripture" as the Book of Deuteronomy (1 Tim. v. 18). Accordingly we find that "the Bible," received by the churches from the apostles, has from the beginning consisted of both New and Old Testaments—no more of the law and the prophets than of the gospel and the apostles—and has from the beginning been looked upon, in all its parts equally, as the written law of the church, the authoritative Word of God.

Nor is there room for legitimate doubt that the writing which we call the Book of Acts has from the beginning had its assured place among the new books, which, along with the books of the Old Testament, the apostles gave the churches as the completed "Bible."

This is implicated, indeed, in the ascription of Scriptural character to the Gospel of Luke by Paul's wholly natural citation of it by the side of Deuteronomy as "Scripture." (1

Tim. v. 18.) For we must not forget that the title which we now give the book—"The Acts of the Apostles"—though a very ancient title, is nevertheless not the original one, nor, indeed, precisely appropriate to the contents of the book. To the author of the book it was not an independent treatise, but only a section of a treatise—the "Second Book," in a word (as we speak of the Second Book of the Histories of Herodotus or of the "Iliad"), of the one great treatise he had in hand, the "First Book" of which we call the Gospel of Luke. The First Book of the treatise, he tells us (Acts i. 1, 2), concerned "all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach until the day in which he was received up"; the Second Book is accordingly to treat of what Jesus *continued* to do after He was received up—through His apostles, to wit, under the inspiration of the Spirit Whom He had promised them. This Second Book is, therefore, specifically and accurately "the Acts of the risen Jesus," and the "Acts of the Apostles" only in a secondary sense, viz., so far as they are conceived as the instruments through whom the risen Jesus works by His Spirit. The importance of all this to us now is that the Book of Acts, not being an independent treatise, but only the second section of the one treatise of which the Gospel of Luke is the first, goes with that Gospel and necessarily shares in the estimate that is put upon it. When Paul, therefore, places the Gospel of Luke by the side of Deuteronomy as "Scripture" this carries with it the Scriptural character of Acts also, on the authority of the Apostle Paul himself. And whatever further evidence—which is copious and decisive—is adducible for the inclusion of the Gospel of Luke in "the Bible" of Christians from the beginning is available equally for the inclusion of the Book of Acts also in that sacred collection.

The independent evidence for the assured place of Acts itself in this collection is, however, separately quite sufficient. It finds its natural

place in all the early catalogues of the books of the New Testament, including the earliest of them all, the celebrated fragment unearthed by Muratori and since called by his name. It is an unquestioned portion of the New Testament of all the great Christian writers of the last quarter of the second century; and if explicit mention of it before that date fails this is only because a copious literature, in which it might naturally be mentioned, does not come down to us from an earlier period. Sufficient traces of its natural use by Christians throughout the whole of this most primitive period are discernible, however, even in the meagre fragments which have been preserved for our inspection, to assure us that there never was a time when the Book of Acts did not hold a secure place in the Bible of Christians. If there be any such thing, therefore, as a "Word of God written," the Book of Acts assuredly is a part of it.

Taking into our hands the book thus commended to us as a part of the Word of God, we shall certainly find nothing in it inconsistent with these high claims for it. This will not be because we shall be allowed to give it an uncritical acceptance. In the attempts which have been made in our century to reconstruct the origins of Christianity upon a naturalistic basis the Book of Acts has been found to throw itself in a very marked way across the path of the theorizers. This is not merely due to the fact that its whole narrative is as deeply colored as possible with the supernatural, as, to be sure, could not fail to be the case with a narrative which proposes to give an account of the "Acts of the risen Jesus." It is even more due to the fact that the general account given in it of the course of events in the apostolic age, and of the relations of the several leaders and parties that arose in the infant church, is hopelessly inconsistent with any construction that has suggested itself to men as capable of being considered the natural conditions out of which and through which the church,

conceived of as a purely natural growth, might have evolved. Accordingly, the Book of Acts has been made the especial mark of criticism, and every instrumentality of learning and acuteness has been exhausted in the effort to discredit it as even a trustworthy history of the Christian origins. Suffice it to say that the whole tremendous assault has ingloriously failed. The Book of Acts comes out of the ordeal not only negatively unharmed, but positively enhanced in the estimation of all discerning men. We might have been content, before the trial, to assert for it only the veracity of a simple and artless narrative, running on, bunglingly if you choose, but nevertheless ingenuously, to its awkward end. After the trial we find ourselves in the possession of a precious piece of highly wrought historical literature, exhibiting consummate art as literature and equally consummate grasp and precision as history. The old presentation of "undesigned coincidences" by Paley and Blunt, while not in any way discredited in point of validity, may be said thus to be superceded in point of necessity.

The book has evinced itself as the work of a historian of the first rank—of one who is possessed of the very best of historical material and who knows how to use it in the very best way—who has not merely set before himself the production of a simple chronicle of events as they occurred, but, having a clear conception of the course of events and their real significance, has marshaled the facts so as to throw out into relief the deeper meaning of the first age of the Christian church. The firmness of his grasp of his general subject, and the skill of his use of the material, are equaled only by the sureness and the precision with which he moves among the complicated conditions and deals with the multiplicity of facts which the course of his narrative brings under his hands. Not only does he make no mistakes, but he writes with that fullness, clearness and exactness of detail which betray

the combined confidence and simplicity of an eye-witness. Of much that he records the writer was certainly himself a witness; for much more he assuredly draws directly from the stores of eye-witnesses; for all, we have the testimony of one who proves himself, by every test, a historian of quite remarkable ability and conscientiousness. For one of the gains of recent criticism is that the book is all of a piece—conceived as a whole in one capable brain, and written from a to izard from carefully collected materials by one hand. The attempt to separate the passages written in the first person as by a participant of the acts described, in point of authorship from the rest of the book, has utterly failed; sources of information have varied, but not the framer of the narrative—and the sources of information are good in all parts alike, and the narrative often preserves traces of eye-witness vividness in the sources used, even when no implied claim is made that the author himself was present at the scenes described. Every speech recorded—to name but a single instance of underlying indications of genuineness—bears a flavor of the speaker; and when we have other productions of the speaker in hand—as, for example, in the letters of Paul, or Peter, or James—we can catch hints of their well-known peculiarities and language. There is, indeed, one exception to this—an exception which in the strictest sense proves the rule: the speech that Paul is said to have delivered in the Hebrew tongue does not contain the ordinary traces of his Greek style. There is no need, however, to multiply words in emphasizing a fact now put beyond question. Those who are best acquainted with the life of the ancient world in the regions where the scene of the narrative is laid are most impressed with the ability of the historian and the exactness of the correspondences of his details with the conditions as known.

What has been said may have a value beyond the merely negative one of showing that there is nothing in

the book inconsistent with the claim for it of a place in the complex of the "Word of God written." But it is only when we lift our eyes from these details and consider the positive substance of the book that we realize how worthy it is of its place in this sacred collection, and how fully it serves its function of "making man wise unto salvation." For it is no dry chronicle of external events that we have here, nor even merely an able and penetrating historical sketch of the first stages of the Christian church. Baur or Weizsäcker has given us this, and with an ability comparable to that displayed by Luke himself. But every reader will feel that there is a difference in *kind* between works like Baur's and Luke's. The difference is that Luke's is truly sacred history, and is written from a different standpoint, not only in the ordinary sense of that word, but in the deeper sense that his point of sight is situated not on this earth of ours. This narrative, in a word, is not an account of how the church spread from Jerusalem to Antioch and from Antioch to Rome; it is not an account of "the Acts of the Apostles"; it is, as Luke himself describes it, an account of the acts of the risen Jesus as He established His church in the world. It is as much of "Scripture," therefore, as much a revelation, as the Apocalypse itself, and differs from it only in that it deals with what has occurred instead of prevailing with what is yet to come to pass. As truly as is done in the Apocalypse it draws aside the veil that we may see, in the events of earth, what is the real agency at work, who are the real actors, and to what end things are really tending. This is indeed dimly perceived by even the literary student of the book; it is this, for example, that makes Mr. Headlam, in his excellent article on the Acts in Dr. Hastings's new "Dictionary of the Bible," insist that the book is primarily intended to exhibit the "divine credentials of the apostles as exhibited in their *power*."

It is true. The book is intended

to exhibit the gospel in action as what Paul proclaimed it—"the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." As such it takes its fitting place in the organism of the Scriptures, and we read it after the Gospels and before Romans and the Apocalypse with no sense of incongruity, but rather with more quickly beating hearts as we perceive the Son of God marching forth to war against the powers of the world, and, despite the weakness of His instruments, winning the victory. He who reads this book with the heart and under-

standing also comes better to know God; learns more fully His power and purpose to save the world; understands more deeply the true sources of movement in the world; and feels more profoundly that Jesus Christ is God over all, blessed forever, and that God is in Him reconciling the world to Himself. And as he reads and ponders it will be hard if his heart does not set its seal to this book also, as one which speaks of God, and leads to God, and which doubtless also came from God.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

Rev. G. Campbell Morgan.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." Ex. xx. 8-11.

This fourth word of the Decalogue closes its first section. That section, as we have already seen, deals with man in his relation to God. Having stated the fact of the deity and urged the claims of God on man in the first three, and before passing to the second half of the law, which deals with man in relation to men, the present command is given. It provides for the perpetual maintenance of a symbol of the relationship that exists between God and man. At regular intervals through all the days man is to turn wholly from that which is material to that which is spiritual. By the recurrence of the Sabbath he is to be reminded that every day is measured and planned in the counsels of God. By turning from the

activities of his physical being, in order that his spiritual nature may without distraction take hold upon spiritual verities, the fact is to be kept in his memory that his whole being is of God, and its well-being conditioned on His government.

In every hour of human life the physical and the spiritual interact upon each other, and in their proper inter-relation each contributes to the strengthening of the other. Of this fundamental law of human nature the Sabbath is the perpetual symbol. For the days of earthly probation the value of the Sabbath is created by the intervening days, in which in a thousand varied ways the possibilities of man's nature are being tested and developed. During these intervening days the light of the seventh is a perpetual suggestion of their true meaning and final import. The right understanding of this relation is all-important to a true conception of the meaning and method of the fourth commandment.

Let us consider, first, the twofold command, and secondly, its application to our own day.

I. THE TWOFOLD COMMAND.

This commandment has been spoken of as referring only to the