Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

perfect, *must* remove mountains ; and it encourages us with the hope that, if our faith be vital and growing, every mountain to which we say, " Remove hence," will remove, and that " nothing shall be impossible " to us, however impossible it may seem.

ALMONI PELONI.

FAITH NOT MERE ASSENT.

THE present inquiry relates not to faith as a general principle, but to that special exercise of it known as saving faith, faith in the gospel, or faith in Jesus Christ. It is the faith which is effectual to salvation in its widest sense, by which we are both justified and sanctified—the initial, determining, and formative principle of the whole Christian life. Now the question is, Is the faith on which such momentous issues hang merely an intellectual act? or is it also emotional and moral ?—merely the assent of the understanding to certain propositions, or, in addition to this, the trust of the heart, or, as we prefer to put it, the self-surrendering trust of heart and will, in a personal Saviour ?

The question may not be one of such living interest at the present time as it possessed a generation or century ago, but it is by no means a dead controversy, or a question of barren metaphysics, or a mere dispute about words. Touching, as it does, the apple of the spiritual eye, it has a vital and abiding interest both for theology and for practical religion. Not that a correct theory of faith is essential to the possession of a real or even of a strong faith. To assume that it is would be an aggravated form of one of the worst vices of the intellectual theory of religion, which it is our object to impugn. To walk, we do not require to

ascertain the precise number, structure, and movements of
the muscles brought into play in walking.   To see, it is not
necessary that we understand the laws of optics and know
the true theory of light.   While the Greeks were the most
imaginative of peoples, it was not till the time of Aristotle
that they analysed the processes of imagination, or even
possessed a word to designate that faculty.[1]   And, in like
manner, one may not only have faith, but even the "full
assurance" of faith, without a correct knowledge, or even
without any theory at all, of the mental process it involves.
Still, serious error here may be productive of grave mischief,
as even wrong theories about walking may bring one into
trouble.   Lord Bacon has pointed out two opposite errors
as incidental to all explanations of phenomena ; namely,
that of needless complexity on the one hand, and that of
excessive simplicity on the other.   Now both errors have
been committed here.   On the one hand, the view held by
Bishops Bull,[2] Burnett,[3] and Jeremy Taylor,[4] that faith is
the sum total of all Christian graces and good works, errs
on the side of complexity.   It strains the meaning of the
term beyond all reasonable and Scriptural warrant.   It
practically denies the immediateness and absoluteness of
the Divine forgiveness, and so encumbers the simplicity and
freeness of the gospel as to exert a depressing and repelling
influence on sensitive consciences, and to foster in others
a legal and self-righteous spirit.   On the other hand, the
theory that faith is mere assent is an exaggeration of
its simplicity, and tends to encourage a false confidence
in a merely intellectual salvation.   It was held, among
others, by Bishop Pearson,[5] Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen,[6]

[1] Sir A. Grant's *Aristotle* (in Blackwood's *Ancient Classics*), p. 93.
[2] *Harmonia Apostolica. Diss. Post.*, cap. 4, § 4.
[3] *Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles :* on Art. XI.
[4] *Life of Christ*, Part II. Sec. 10, Disc. vii. 4, 7.
[5] *Exposition of the Creed*, Dobson's edition, p. 14, and 23, note.
[6] *Essay on Faith.*

Drs. Chalmers [1] and John Brown,[2] of Edinburgh, and, in its baldest form, by Robert Sandeman,[3] from whom it is sometimes called the Sandemanian theory. His favourite definition of faith was, " bare belief of the bare truth," his idea being that the mind is purely passive in believing, that to believe is simply to receive " a correct impression " or " just notion " of the truth, and that we are justified by this while still we are ungodly or unrenewed; otherwise faith would be " a work exerted by the mind," and justification would be by works. The theory, as formulated by Sandeman, can hardly be said to have survived the incisive " Strictures " of Andrew Fuller, but in its more guarded and moderate form it still finds able advocates. The doctrine of the Church of Rome is a singular combination of extremes, a medley of the discordant views of Sandeman and Bull. It is, that faith is, properly, assent, but that this assent is not necessarily saving. There is indeed a saving grace of faith, but this is really only another name for love, *fides formata caritate*, as distinguished from *fides informis*, which does not save ; we are justified much more by love than by faith.[4] Now we hold with Rome that assent is not necessarily saving, but the conclusion we draw from this is, not that faith alone does not save, but that assent is not the faith that saves. We fully admit that faith includes the knowledge of the truth and assent to it, that it is intelligent conviction, though based on evidence other than that of the senses or of logical demonstration. We protest as earnestly as any intellectualist against the divorce of religion from intelligence and the highest reason, whether as exemplified in the agnosticism which resolves all religion into emotion

[1] *Institutes of Theology*, vol. ii. chap. 6.

[2] *Commentary on Romans.*

[3] *Letters of Theron and Aspasio*, vol. i. p. 483 ; *Epist. Corresp. with Pike.* Letter II.

[4] Bellarmin's *Disputationes : De Justif.* i. 4, and ii. 4. *Council of Trent*, session vi. canon 28.

excited by the Unknown and the Unknowable, in the
obscurantism which is satisfied with *implicit faith, i.e.* an
intention to believe whatever the Church believes, in the
pietism which mistakes rapture, or blind trust, or caprice
for the witness of the Spirit, or in the sentimentalism which
revels in mere spectacular emotion, like that displayed
by the weeping daughters of Jerusalem.   Feeling without
knowledge or rational thought is as worthless, morally, as
knowledge without feeling; for it has no criterion within
itself by which to distinguish one feeling from another, the
holiest from the most impure, faith from the veriest fetichism.
An ignorant believer is an anomaly, an absolutely ignorant
believer is a contradiction in terms.   What we propose to
shew is, not that faith is mere feeling, but that it is the
fusion of feeling, conviction, and volition; not assent alone,
but affiance and self-surrender.

Our arguments rest on a variety of grounds, philological,
biblico-exegetical, theological, psychological, and ethical;
but while our remarks will proceed generally along these
lines, yet as they cross each other at various points, it may
be more conducive to logical order to present the arguments
in a more detailed and explicit form.

I.

Our first ground of objection to the intellectual theory
of faith is *the primary and natural meaning of the term.*

Take first the Hebrew הֶאֱמִין (He'emin), translated
πιστεύειν in the Septuagint, and *believe* in our English
version.   It is the Hiphil of אָמַן to nurse, rear, uphold; in
the Niphal, to be nursed, to be firmly established, to be
trustworthy: in Hiphil, to *regard as trustworthy,* to *place
reliance upon,* to *trust,* to believe.   Undoubtedly it often
means to believe or credit a statement as well as to trust in
a person or thing; and the general rule for distinguishing

the two senses is that with ל it means to believe, and with
בְּ to trust, though the rule is not absolute ; but the deriva-
tion of the word seems to shew that the primary idea is
trust. Firmness or stability, that which sustains our trust
or confidence, is the quality to which it has respect, and it
is thus conceived as making the subject of it firm and sted-
fast. This idea is strikingly expressed in 2 Chronicles xx.
20, "*Believe in* the Lord your God, *so shall ye be estab-
lished*" (וְתֵאָמֵנוּ), the two words for *believe* and *be estab-
lished* being different parts of the same verb. (Cf. Isa. vii.
9.) In Psalm cxix. 66 it is used of believing *in command-
ments*, and in Deuteronomy xxviii. 66 of *being assured
of one's life*, ideas of a moral and fiduciary kind, and
considerably more complex than that of mere assent to
propositions. Though used variously with reference to
God, to his prophets (as in 2 Chron. xx. 20 ; Exod. xix. 9),
to his works (Ps. lxxviii. 32), to his words (Ps. cxix. 66),
and to men generally (Prov. xxvi. 25 ; Mic. vii. 5), yet
when it denotes justifying or saving faith (as in Gen. xv. 6,
"Abraham *believed in* (בְּ) the Lord "), it has generally
God for its object, and denotes, as Cremer says, "reliance
upon Him, a firm trust which surrenders self to Him, feels
sure of God as 'my God,' and thus gives strength and
stedfastness to the subject of it."

The Greek words πίστις and πιστεύειν are also used to
express both *belief* and *trust*, alike in classic Greek and
in the New Testament, though the πίστις θεῶν of classic
writers denotes no such personal relationship as we under-
stand by faith in God, and πιστεύειν is never used at all by
them in a religious sense. But of the two meanings, *belief*
and *trust*, the best lexicographers, like Liddell and Scott,
and Cremer, give *trust* the precedence both as regards origin
and common use. Πείθω, from which they are derived,
favours, though it does not necessitate, the idea of personal
influence on the one hand, and of personal trust on the

other; and, at all events, πεποίθησις certainly means *strong confidence*. The idea of trust appears also in the expression πιστεύειν τινί τι, to *entrust* anything to any one;[1] in the secondary meaning of πίστις, fidelity; in πιστός, faithful; and in ἀπειθής and ἀπειθέω, (to be) disobedient.

So too the Latin *fides* means first (acc. to Andrews) *trust* in a person or thing, then credit in the mercantile sense, then faithfulness. Hence *fidus*, faithful; and (acc. to Peile) *fœdus*, a covenant. So also *credere* is originally to give as a loan, then to entrust, then to trust, then to believe. But we can trace the history of the term to a remoter origin than *faith, fides*, or πείθω. The root, according to Professor Skeat, is the Aryan *Bhidh*, to *unite*, from *Bhadh*, or more fully *Bhandh*, to *bind*; which suggests, as the radical idea, not mere assent, but *consent, affiance*, or a binding of one's self to another in personal *union* or *covenant*. It also sheds a striking reflex light on the fact that faith—the mutual trust of man in man—is the great *bond* and *cement* of society, that socially as well as spiritually we are saved by faith. This tendency to trust in our fellow men, which is an ultimate fact of our nature, and which our whole environment from our birth onwards is fitted to develop, is thus at once the ethical basis of society and the psychological mould or type of all religious faith.[2]

Even our word *believe* (from Anglo-Saxon ge-*lyfan*) is shown by Skeat, Wedgwood, and Ogilvie to be identical or closely allied with *leave, lief*, and *love*; with the Latin *libet*, it pleases; with the German *loben*, to praise; *glauben*, to believe; *verloben*, to promise; *erlauben*, to permit, give *leave*; and, they might have added, with the expressive Scottish

---

[1] Luke xvi. 11; John ii. 24.

[2] May not this derivation of faith throw light also on the disputed etymology of "religion"? Does it not favour the view of Augustine that it is from *re-ligare*, as that which *binds* man *again* to a higher power, as against the Ciceronian derivation of it from *re-legere*, the gathering of one's thoughts, careful pondering about Divine things?

lippen, used with telling effect by Dr. Chalmers in conversation with a Scotchwoman to explain faith : the common Aryan root being *lubh,* to *desire,* and the fundamental idea common to all being that of *approving, sanctioning,* or *having satisfaction with.* The opinion of Richardson, cited approvingly by Dr. Hodge,[1] that believe is etymologically connected with *live,* and that belief may thus be viewed as that which we *live by,* though highly suggestive, is apparently without foundation, being entirely ignored by the other and more trustworthy authorities just named, who give an entirely different account of its origin.

The root-idea then, not only of the Hebrew and Greek terms, but of the corresponding words in other languages, is not assent, but a mental act in which feeling, whether confidence, approval, or satisfaction, is an essential if not the principal element. We grant that etymology may put an inquirer on a false scent as to the true idea of a word, and one may well take warning from the fantastic metaphysical superstructure elaborated by Mr. Matthew Arnold from an etymological analysis of the parts of the verb *to be;* but when, as in the present case, the radical is also one of the recognized ·ideas of a term, etymology, though it cannot have the last word, may with advantage be allowed to have its say. That the recognized and current meaning of our own word *faith,* taken generally, is *trust,* and especially *trust with a view to some desired object,* a moment's reflection will suffice to shew. Conviction of the existence of the object is, of course, involved in it ; but this is not all, for if the object believed to exist is an evil, then it becomes an object, not of faith, but of distrust or fear. To believe in the devil, in the sense of believing in his existence and power, is one thing; to have faith in him is something entirely different. It has been thought by some that faith, and indeed all belief, has always respect to action, explicitly or

[1] *Systematic Theology,* vol. iii. p. 43.

implicitly, that it is the outgrowth of spontaneous activity,
and that action therefore is its true test.[1]   That this is the
case with many of our beliefs is certain, but whether it is so
or not depends on the nature of the particular belief.   Even
faith does not in all cases contemplate action.   It does so
very frequently, but not always, unless perhaps we include
in action what Aristotle calls the *potentiality* of action, *i.e.*
mental preparedness to act as soon as occasion requires or
opportunity offers.   The essential idea of faith is trust for
some desired good ; and if the attainment of the good is
conditional on our own action, then it necessarily becomes
purposive, is impregnated with will, and has action for its
test.   Belief, or assent, and faith are therefore distinguish-
able thus.   When I say that I *believe* that the sun will rise
to-morrow, I merely assent to a proposition viewed theoreti-
cally; but when I say that I have *faith* in to-morrow's
sunrise, I mean that I anticipate it with desire and confident
expectation, and also, as it so happens from the nature of
the case, that I contemplate being guided in my actions by
this belief.   When I say that I *believe* that a certain person
is honest, I express a general conviction which may have no
reference to my own personal or practical relations to him,
which might even apply to an inhabitant of Jupiter or
Saturn ; but when I say that I have *faith* in him, it is with
a view either to actual or possible relations of a personal or
practical kind, that is, to something touching my interests
or feelings.   The distinction is still more signally brought
out by the fact that, while we can say that we *believe* that
such a person is dishonest, it would be doing violence to the
language to say that we have *faith* in his dishonesty.   We
might say, indeed, that we have *faith* in the *statement* as to
his dishonesty : but even this expresses more than *believing*

---

[1] So Mr. Bain in his *Emotions and Will*, p. 554 ; but he has renounced this
view in the last edition of his *Compendium of Mental Science* (1872), Appendix,
note p. 100.

it, or even than *believing in* it; namely, that we repose in
it with a view to being guided by it in actual or possible
dealings either with the author of the statement or with
the subject of it. It is unfortunate that the English lan-
guage has no verb formed from *faith* like πιστεύειν from
πίστις, and that we are accordingly obliged to translate
that verb by a word of different origin, either by *trust*, or,
as is generally done in our version, by *believe*. The latter
does not quite express the full sense of *faith*; it marks
the transition from assent to faith. Bishop O'Brien well
expresses the common-sense view of the general meaning
of *faith* when he says, "They who know what is meant
by *faith* in a *promise* know what is meant by *faith* in the
gospel; they who know what is meant by *faith* in a *remedy*
know what is meant by *faith in the blood* of the Redeemer;
they who know what is meant by *faith in a physician, faith
in an advocate, faith in a friend,* know too what the
Scriptures mean to express when they speak of *faith in the
Lord Jesus Christ.*" [1]

THE SEPTUAGINT ADDITIONS TO THE
HEBREW TEXT.

VI. Some of the Greek additions are very familiar to
members of the Anglican Church owing to their being found
in the Prayer Book. Perhaps the most well known of these
is The Song of the Three Children, *Benedicite, omnia opera,*
allowed to be used in Morning Prayer as an alternative
for the *Te Deum.* This occurs among the *additamenta* to
Daniel after the 23rd verse of the third Chapter: "These
three men fell down bound into the midst of the burning
fiery furnace." "And," proceeds the Greek, "they walked

[1] *Nature and Effects of Faith*, Sermon I.