



# 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*."

On p. 225 O. Holtzmann is represented as regarding "Christ's verdict on this woman as an incident at the beginning of the Monday when he ate the passover meal with his disciples", etc. Of course, Holtzmann does not place the eating of the passover meal on Monday. He is arguing to show the accuracy of the Johannine tradition in dating Jesus' death on Friday Nisan 14 and in definitely fixing the time of the supper in Bethany on Monday Nisan 10. Again on p. 259 the Gospel according to the Hebrews is said to represent Jesus as refusing "at first to accompany his father and mother" to John's baptism, but the passage in question, which is preserved by Jerome (contra Pelag. iii. 2) speaks only of the mother of the Lord and his brethren (Ecce mater domini et fratres eius).

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

THE CHILDHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST according to the Canonical Gospels.

With an Historical Essay on the Brethren of the Lord. By A. DURAND, S.J. An Authorized Translation from the French, Edited by Rev. JOSEPH BRUNEAU, S.S., D.D. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey. 1910. Pp. xxv, 316. \$1.50 net, prepaid.

The Modernist movement is helping to bring Roman Catholic scholarship to bear upon historical questions relating to the Bible. Startled by division within their own ranks, scholars of the Roman Church have rallied to the support of supernatural Christianity. The book of Père Durand is an example of this activity. It is a sensible defence of the historicity of the Virgin Birth, with full reference to recent discussion both Catholic and Protestant. The last chapter, on the Lord's Brethren, brings a defence of the perpetual virginity of Mary. Though probably inferior to the contributions of Bardenhewer and Steinmetzer, the book should not be neglected.

Detailed criticism would consume too much space. When Père Durand concludes (p. 61) from the well-known passage, Justin Martyr, *dial* 48, that most Christians even in Palestine believed in the Virgin Birth, the conclusion is correct, but it is insufficiently grounded. On pp. 86f., Harnack is quoted in favor of the view that Lk. i. 34, 35 was inserted by Luke himself into a Judæo-Christian document; whereas even in the article which Père Durand is here referring to (1901), and even more decidedly in his later contributions, Harnack represents the two verses as an interpolation into the completed Gospel, and favors the view that in the first two chapters of the Gospel Luke was employing merely oral tradition. On p. 100, the articles of T. Allen Hoben in the *American Journal of Theology* for 1902 are apparently included (erroneously) among treatises in defence of the Virgin Birth. On p. 179, in speaking of the "Hebrew ring" of Lk. i-ii, Harnack's investigations of the style of the two chapters should have been at least noticed if not refuted in detail.

Although the reviewer has not been able to examine the book in

its original language, he has the impression that a good deal has been lost in translation. On p. xi, *pur bavardage* has been translated "mere gossip" with doubtful propriety. On p. xiv, the "apparition" of the canonical Gospels is spoken of. In general the style of the translation is not all that might have been desired.

The "Ferrara" group of manuscripts appears several times (for example on p. 4) instead of the Ferrar group. Typographical errors are not infrequent. On p. 86, Haecke appears instead of Haecker. Greek accents and breathings have occasionally been a snare to the proof-reader.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

VORSCHLÄGE FÜR EINE KRITISCHE AUSGABE DES GRIECHISCHEN NEUEN TESTAMENTS. VON CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1911. pp. 52. M. 1.50.

A generation has passed since the great editions of the Greek Testament by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort were published, and the need has long been felt of a new edition which should bring the critical apparatus up to date, and review the evidence for readings in the light of recent discovery and research. Two scholars in Germany, as is well known, Gregory in Leipzig and von Soden in Berlin, are now working independently upon such an enterprise, and Dr. Gregory has sent this pamphlet, outlining his plans and asking for suggestions and advice, to all the New Testament students whose names he could learn.

Up to the present the honors in textual criticism are pretty evenly divided between Germany and Great Britain. Tischendorf has added to the materials of textual criticism, especially by his discovery of the Sinai manuscript, and in the successive editions of his critical apparatus has made these materials accessible to scholars. Westcott and Hort, on the other hand, have done the most for the principles of criticism, and their *Introduction*, written by Hort, is still the glory of British scholarship in this field. Both the new editions are to appear in Germany, but it is a satisfaction to know that one of the editors, Dr. Gregory, while a Frenchman by descent, and for the greater half of his life a resident in Germany, is by birth and training an American, born in Philadelphia and a graduate of Princeton Seminary.

Both editors have been compelled by the multiplication of uncial manuscripts to alter the old method of designating them by letters, but it is unfortunate that a common system of notation has not been agreed upon. Von Soden has an elaborate system of numbers prefixed by Greek letters ( $\delta$ ., *διαθήκη*, for the whole N. T.,  $\epsilon$ ., *εὐαγγέλιον* for the Gospels,  $\alpha$  *ἀπόστολος*, for Acts, Epistles and Apocalypse) intended to show at a glance, to those who master his system, the age, contents and in some cases the character of a manuscript. Gregory's notation is simpler, heavy faced numerals prefixed by **O** being used for