

OCT 1911  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

# 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".<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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-

<sup>1</sup> 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*".

<sup>2</sup> 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*."

## GENERAL THEOLOGY.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute; Member of the Council of the Palestine Exploration Fund; Editor of *Dictionary of the Bible*, and *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. With the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A., D.D., and other scholars. VOLUME III: BURIAL-CONFESSIONS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1911. 4to, pp. xvi, 901.

It is not necessary on the appearance of this third volume of Dr. Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, to describe again the general scope and character of the work. For this, the reader must be referred to the notices of the first and second volumes, printed in this REVIEW for April 1909, p. 326, and April 1910, p. 271, respectively. Suffice it to say, the third volume carries forward this great undertaking—the greatness of which is increasingly manifest as the work progresses—in the same spirit and with the same large success with which it was inaugurated in the former volumes. Some hundred and sixty-seven contributors have been at work on this volume (of whom some twenty-four are Americans) and their work is throughout painstaking and careful. The long articles in the volume are those constituting the groups on "Calendar" (80 pages), "Charms and Amulets" (80 pages), "Communion with Deity" (40 pages), "Church" (40 pages), and the long discussion—the longest single article—on "Confessions". But many others approach these in length and it is not always the longest articles which are the best. The alphabet seems to be fairly complete for the section covered, and it will be seldom that one in search of guidance on a matter of ethical or religious lore will go away from this Encyclopaedia disappointed.

We shall attempt only a few desultory remarks on points which have attracted our attention as we have turned over the pages of the book.

In an editorial note printed in *The Expository Times*, it is said that it is the policy of the Encyclopaedia to have its articles written from the inside. Accordingly we have "Christian Science" treated by a member of the sect (3 pages). No doubt, from her own point of view, the author has contributed a good article. But it sharply raises the question whether the policy of having subjects treated "from the inside" is a good one in the case of "strong delusions". If it enters into the purpose of the Encyclopaedia to give its readers reliable information concerning religious phenomena and trustworthy scientific guidance in estimating their significance, obviously this policy may be pushed too far. It might give us an Encyclopaedia of unique interest to have "Crime" treated by the greatest criminal accessible, "Falsehood" dealt with by a consummate liar, "Lunacy" by a thoroughly deranged person; but such a collection of human documents would hardly serve the purpose of scientific digests of what is known on these subjects. Why should not the readers of this Encyclopaedia have a sane, critical account

of the movement which calls itself "Christian Science"? The best thing about the article we are given is that it is short. It is shorter, for example, than the article on "Christianity", to which is given twenty-one pages. Proportionate emphasis in this Encyclopaedia has not always been on this side: there has been observable a tendency, which is far from unnatural, but which should, we think, be resisted, to give fuller treatment to obscure and little-known topics in the ethical and religious world, than to matters of real importance but already generally known. No doubt an Encyclopaedia is the place to record items of curious information; but surely it has a higher function also,—and it need not be misleading. We may agree, for example, that "Christianity" is seven times as important as "Christian Science", but shall we agree that "Charms and Amulets" are four times as important as Christianity? The illustration we have chanced on is a bad one; for Christianity finds treatment elsewhere than in the article specifically devoted to it—there are numerous subordinate articles on Christian subjects; the whole Encyclopaedia is filled with them—whereas "Charms and Amulets" scarcely stray out of their own article. But the general fault complained of is real.

We may as well say at once, we do not like the article on "Christianity". Not merely because we are not in full agreement with Dr. Garvie's standpoint. We are not in full agreement with it; but our disagreement with the standpoint of many other articles which we like better is greater. It seems to us a wooden article, joined together with pegs, and to jolt along very much on the surface of things. We should like to have had a non-apologetical article, "written from the inside" in the deepest sense of that phrase. Could not some Christian be found who would do for Christianity just what Miss Ramsay has done for "Christian Science"—tell positively what it is and let it speak for itself? Surely it has enough to say for itself, if it is only permitted to say it. Such an article, we take it, is Dr. Orr's article on "Calvinism". We have faults to find with this article, too; but they concern details. The substance is all here, taken up into a rich and sympathetic mind, and given out in a clear and illuminating account. The bibliographers have misled Dr. Orr as to the existence of Greek and Arabic versions of the *Institutes* (p. 147), and he himself (or his printers) may mislead his readers by a sentence in his own Bibliography like this (p. 155): "A good edition of the *Institutes* is that by Tholuck (2nd ed. 1846, re-edited by Baur, Cunitz and Reuss in 2 vols. 1869)." "Baur" is, of course, a misprint for Baum (there are other misprints in this "Literature"). But, of course, Dr. Orr did not mean to say that the Baum, Cunitz and Reuss edition of 1869 was a re-editing of Tholuck's second edition of 1846; it is simply the separate issue of the two volumes containing the *Institutes* of the Brunswick *Opera*, mentioned immediately before, but assigned to 1860-1900 instead of 1869-1900. Dr. Orr is in error in supposing that Augustine does not teach the *pre-destinatio bipartita* (p. 151a), in attributing the doctrine of "mediate imputation" to Calvin (150a), and supposing him to have held to an

"indefinite atonement" (p. 150b), as well as in representing the Westminster Confession as attempting a compromise "between 'Supralapsarian' and 'Sublapsarian' modes of statement—only with the result, however, of introducing inconsistency into the total presentation" (p. 154b). There are modes of statement of his own also (e. g. p. 151b, bottom of page) which are scarcely perfectly exact. But the article in its general presentation is thoroughly good.

If the editor's policy is to have the articles "written from the inside", one wonders why an American Lutheran pastor was selected to write the article on the Heidelberg and Westminster Catechisms (pp. 255-256). Dr Horn is a man of a fine and varied culture; but he has no particular interest in, or special knowledge of these Catechisms. The result is what might have been expected. The information given concerning them is meagre, antiquated and inaccurate. Of the extensive literature which has grown up about them, he seems to know nothing. There is not even mention made of the critical studies of Gooszen and A. Lang on the Heidelberg Catechism or of the work of Mitchell and Carruthers on the Shorter Catechism. We are still told that the Larger Catechism "was chiefly the work of Anthony Tuckney and is based on Usher's *Body of Divinity* and Wollebius' *Compendium Theologiae*", and that the "concise and severely logical answers" of the Shorter Catechism "are traced to" John Wallis,—for none of which statements is there the least justification. Nor is it true that the two Catechisms were "approved by Parliament, 15. Sept. 1648." Having said this of Dr. Horn's unfortunate article, candor compels us to go on and say that when these Catechisms come up again for treatment later in the volume, under the head of "Confessions", by a Presbyterian writer, we get very little better accounts of them. This article is by Professor W. A. Curtis of Aberdeen, and is written fluently and interestingly. As a whole, it offers a good survey of its subject. But its treatment of the Westminster Catechisms is very superficial. Dr. Curtis tells us, quite erroneously in both items, that the Larger Catechism was composed in "1647", "simultaneously with the Confession", and adds with no warrant that it was "drafted by Herbert Palmer and Anthony Tuckney"; and later connects Tuckney's and Wallis' names with the composition of the Shorter Catechism with as little justification. The accompanying account of the Westminster Assembly and Confession is no more exact. The status of the Scottish Commissioners is not clearly set forth. The protestation taken by the members is inaccurately given. Only three (instead of four) "parts of uniformity" are enumerated as constituting the work of the Assembly. It is erroneously said that the Confession was issued in 1648 by Parliament in both English and Latin (the Latin version was not issued until 1656, and then, not by Parliament and not in the Parliamentary form). It is strangely remarked that the Confession "anticipates" a modern order of topics. It is wrongly asserted that it is "strictly infralapsarian" in theology. Dr. Orr declares, as we will remember, that it unsuccessfully attempted to compromise between

"Supra-" and "Sublapasarianism." Neither is true—the Confession states the fundamental doctrine in which both parties agree and leaves this dispute untouched. The Amyraldians are spoken of as preferring the term "preterition" to "reprobation", a matter in which they had no difference with other Calvinists; and it is absurdly said that the Confession "seems to halt" "between 'particular election' and 'hypothetical universalism'"—as if all "hypothetical universalists" did not believe in "particular election". Already at p. 864 b, however, the Amyraldians are said to have taught "at variance from accepted views on 'particular' Predestination", "that the decree of Divine grace was of conditional universality." Amyraut would rise in his grave to protest, could he hear these things said of him; no one could be more emphatic in his assertions of his faith in "particular election", or "particular Predestination", and that, the *predestinatio bipartita*. Professor Curtis appears to be confusing "particular redemption" (cf. Orr, p. 150b.) with "particular election", and so de-Calvinizing the Amyraldians despite their strongest protest. The history of the "Covenant" idea is also misconceived,—but we forbear. To speak quite frankly, the treatment of the Westminster formularies by Drs. Horn and Curtis falls below the standard of accuracy which one has the right to expect in such an Encyclopaedia, and it is much to be hoped that under some such head as "Westminster Assembly and Formularies" the editor will give us later something more adequate as well as more accurate on the subject.

This volume is not rich in biographical articles. There is, of course, some account of Calvin's life and influence incorporated in Dr. Orr's "Calvinism". Then we have good but short articles—among the moderns on Bushnell, Butler, Carlyle, Chalmers, Coleridge,—the last by a Roman Catholic divine, but fair and judicious in tone. Professor Davidson of Aberdeen writes admirable articles on Cleanthes and Chrysippus. There is a careful short account of Cerinthus. The orientals are represented only by Chaitanga and Chandragupta. If we add Cecrops we have the whole list of separate biographical articles, although the articles on Cambridge Platonists and Cappadocian Theology need to be kept in mind if we would survey the whole biographical material.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

#### THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

Based on the Third Edition of the Realencyklopädie founded by J. J. HERZOG and edited by ALBERT HAUCK. Prepared by more than six hundred scholars and specialists under the supervision of SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D., with a distinguished staff of associate and department editors. To be complete in twelve volumes, large quarto. Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York and London. \$5. per volume in cloth. Volume IX. Petri-Reuchlin.

According to the "statistics" given by the publishers the number of