

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OCT 10 1911

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

OCTOBER, 1911

NUMBER 4

ON FAITH IN ITS PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS.

The English word "Faith" came into the language under the influence of the French, and is but a modification of the Latin "Fides", which is itself cognate with the Greek *πίστις*. Its root-meaning seems to be that of "binding". Whatever we discover to be "binding" on us, is the object of "faith".¹ The corresponding Germanic term, represented by the English word "Believe" (and the German, "Glauben") goes back to a root meaning "to be agreeable" (represented by our English "lief"), and seems to present the object of belief as something which we "esteem"—which we have "estimated" or "weighed" and "approved". The notion of "constraint" is perhaps less prominent in "belief" than in "faith", its place being taken in "belief" by that of "approval". We "believe" in what we find worthy of our confidence; we "have faith" in what compels our confidence. But it would be easy to press this too far, and it is likely that the two terms "faith", "belief" really express much the same idea.² In the natural use of language, therefore, which is normally controlled by what we call etymology, that is, by the intrinsic connotation of the terms, when we say "faith", "belief", our minds are pre-

¹ The Hebrew *אמונה, האמין* go back to the idea of "holding": we believe in what "holds". In both the sacred languages, therefore, the fundamental meaning of faith is "surety". Cf. Latin "*credo*".

² Cf. M. Heyne's German Dictionary *sub voc.* "Glaube": "*Glaube* is confiding acceptance of a truth. At the basis of the word is the root *lub*, which, with the general meaning of agreeing with and of approving, appears also in *erlauben* and *loben*."

not only that it came from within, but also that it moves on various levels, high and low. And to the question: "What right, then, have we to speak of the Spirit at all? How do we know that the book is in the deepest sense true?" the answer is given: "Simply because our Christian consciousness recognizes it as such." And "we believe it to contain the 'Word of God', because the Divine in us answers to the Divine mind of the writer". Which amounts to saying that the test of inspiration is such as by its very nature to make inspiration superfluous.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. By HENRY C. SHELDON, Professor in Boston University and Author of "Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century", "Sacerdotalism in the Nineteenth Century", etc. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. 8° pp. 364. \$1.50 net.

Prof. Sheldon's book bears evidence on almost every page of thorough acquaintance with the subject and of quite unusual skill in presenting its matter to the best advantage. The field of New Testament Theology is a large one in itself and the intensified discussion of its many intricate problems during the last decades has vastly extended it. Yet in 364 pages the author succeeds in giving a fairly adequate, if not exhaustive, survey of its entire compass. No important phase of teaching or problem is passed by without at least some suggestive and illuminating reference. The condensation is even greater than the size of the volume indicates, for out of 364 no less than 76 pages are devoted to introductory discussion of the literary provenience of the sources. But the compression is not secured at the expense of thoroughness. Of the sketchy, superficial character which is apt to belong to small handbooks of theological science there is not a trace. To be sure the author has had to sacrifice, in order to secure this reduced compass, on the one hand all detailed exegetical discussion, on the other hand all but the most meagre reference to the literature. The naming of scholars prominently identified with certain problems or theories is avoided even where the text plainly shows that some well-known name was in the author's mind. Still another thing that is perhaps connected with the compactness of the book consists in what might be called its anatomical character. It analyzes and summarizes the doctrinal content of each source and does this admirably. But it scarcely ventures beyond this to describe the development of New Testament truth as a living organism, or to raise genetic questions. E. g., while attention is duly called to Paul's peculiar doctrine of the Spirit as the substratum of the entire Christian life, the problem how this peculiar Pauline advance upon the previously attained position is to be explained, is not discussed. It is only fair, however, to remember that the incorporation of these other, more abstruse, matters might have easily interfered with the positive and straightforward presentation which forms one of the main attractions of the book. While

in the sphere of anatomy the student deals largely with assured facts, in that of biology nearly everything is problematic and hypothetical. The origins and connections in the history of revelation are highly mysterious.

There are, of course, individual points wherein other students of the subject might take issue with the writer's conclusions. Thus is the treatment of the Pauline antithesis of "flesh" and "Spirit"; we believe that it is a mistake to choose one's point of departure in the psychological conception of "spirit". The contrast is not between the predominance of one part or element in man and that of another part or element, but between the natural and the supernatural. With the psychological use of *pneuma*, also found in Paul, this has little to do. On p. 238 a few words might have been devoted to the modern Ritschlian conception of "the righteousness of God" as a gracious principle, especially in connection with Rom. iii. 21ff. Exception also must be taken to the summary way in which the author disposes of the predestinarian element in the Pauline and Johannine teaching, principally on the ground that it is irreconcilable with the obvious universalism of their presentation of the Gospel as a whole, and that therefore the apparently absolute predestinarian statements must be explained as oratorical effusions not meant to be expressive of any fixed theory. It is entirely overlooked that both in Paul and John the principle of predestination is turned to the eminently practical account of furnishing the basis of the believer's assurance. Why is the one passage 1 Cor ii. 27 quoted to prove the possibility to Paul's mind of his own falling from grace, whilst all the numerous passages, which voice his absolute assurance of salvation are passed by in silence? But it were too much to expect from Prof. Sheldon an adequate exhibition of the predestinarian strand in New Testament teaching even as a matter of purely historical interest. Let us congratulate ourselves that in regard to the other, more common and fundamental issues, which the Church has at stake in the interpretation of the New Testament, such as the supernaturalism of religion and revelation, the deity of Christ, the vicarious character of the atonement, the supremacy of grace in salvation, the author throws the weight of his opinion unqualifiedly on the side of the old historic faith. While undogmatic in its methods, the book is essentially an orthodox book in its results. It proves that the Evangelical Protestant doctrine is in a large sense the faithful reproduction of New Testament teaching.

Princeton.

CEERHARDUS VOS.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. International Theological Library. By JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911. Pp. xli, 630. Price \$2.50 net.

In the days when the Tübingen criticism was in the ascendant