



1-1-1948

The Psychology of Action Applied to Works and Faith

William Harold Neeriemer
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Neeriemer, William Harold, "The Psychology of Action Applied to Works and Faith" (1948). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. 379.

<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses/379>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

(This certification-sheet is to be bound with the thesis. The major professor should have it filled out at the oral examination.)

Name of candidate:

Wm. L. Neerincus

Oral examination:

Date May 14, 1948

Committee:

E. A. Holmes, Chairman

S. Marion Smith

L. D. Kershner

Thesis title:

The Psychology of
Action Applied to
Starks of Faith

Thesis approved in final form:

Date May 1, 1948

Major Professor E. A. Holmes

(Please return this certification-sheet, along with two copies of the thesis and the candidate's record, to the Graduate Office, Room 105, Jordan Hall. The third copy of the thesis should be returned to the candidate immediately after the oral examination.)

B.
19

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ACTION APPLIED TO WORKS AND FAITH

by

William Harold Neeriemer

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
School of Religion

Division of Graduate Instruction
Butler University
Indianapolis
1948

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1.The Problem of Works and Faith	
2.Value of the Study	
3.Statement of Thesis	
4.Study is Psychological not Theological	
5.Plan of the Study	
6.Summary	
II. THE DEFINITION OF WORKS	12
1.What is Work?	
2.Bible Usages of the Word.	
3.The Roman Catholic View Of Works	
4.Present Day Definitions	
5.Antonyms and Synonyms	
6.Our Definition	
7.Summary	
III.THE DEFINITION OF FAITH	29
1.What is Faith?	
2.History of the Word	
3.Usage in The Old and New Testament	
4.Antonyms and Synonyms	
5.Our Definition	
6.Summary	
IV. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ACTION APPLIED TO WORKS AND FAITH .	44
1.The Purpose of Works Psychologically Defined	
A. End of Works	
B. Purpose of Works	
2.The Function of Works Psychologically Defined	
A. The Means	
B. The Method	
3.The Purpose of Faith Psychologically Defined	
A. The End of Faith	
B. The Purpose of Faith	
4.The Function of Faith Psychologically Defined	
A. The Means	
B. The Method	
5.The Relationship of the Inner and the Outer	
6.Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSION	70
1.Review and Summary	
2.Conclusions	
3.Conclusions listed	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of works and faith -- A problem of long standing -- Will faith "alone" save? Or Works? -- Extremes on this issue lead to indifference -- The value of this study is the psychological approach -- It will support the tenets of the Reformation of the Nineteenth Century -- This study supports the combination of works and faith -- The believing man -- To him the combination is essential - - The study is psychological, not theological -- The plan of the study is (1) a definition of works, (2) a definition of faith, and (3) the application of the psychology of action to works and faith -- This will be followed by a conclusion -- Summary.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the problems confronting the man who would be a follower of Christ is the problem of works and faith. He also meets this same problem in the contrary teachings of the various Churches claiming to be the institutions of Christ. A great group of churches will teach that faith is all sufficient; another group of evangelical churches will teach that works alone are sufficient, and that faith without "works" is of no avail; and some will teach that there must be a combination of the two. In general most of these churches will admit that the combination of the two is desirable.

However, this is a problem that has been with the church through several centuries. Each Christian generation has debated anew the problem with little progress being made toward its solution. Thus we find the issue still existing in the Christian world today and challenging the church to re-study the problem in the light of any new advances in knowledge.

As the question now exists it presents several aspects which we will not have time to trace in any great detail in this chapter. But, that our minds may be orientated to the discussion of this thesis it is necessary that we view briefly the two sides of the problem. The problem may be summarized in some such statement as this; on the one side we have those who teach that faith alone is sufficient and that God does all the saving, while on the other side of the issue we have

those who teach that works are all sufficient and that man earns his own salvation, that it is not dependent on the will of God, but that by his works he has earned for himself the right to eternal reward. These, then, are the two extremes, and we find between them many shades of tendency toward one side or the other. With the "faith alone" group the idea is an opus operatum; man is passive and God does all the work, all that is required is that a man believe God will save him. On the other side of the issue man does all the work and God does nothing.

The common man confronted with such confusion as this is often lead to the point of agnosticism not knowing which way to turn. He beholds in his own nature a will to believe, and given with his belief the will to do. He beholds that when he has a desire his natural inclination is to satisfy it in some planned action. Further, he derives no character benefit from working without knowing why he does it, and even finds it puzzling to his mind.

The value of the study presented in this thesis will be that we shall approach this problem from the standpoint of psychology. In other words we shall approach it from man's viewpoint and not theologically. We shall deal with the believing man and what he desires in both works and faith. We shall describe his mental processes and the place of work in those processes. The study will throw new light on the issue of works and faith in the nature of this approach. It will support the belief of those who believe in the combination of

works and faith. It will present to the religious teacher the motive for religious works and the necessity for faith as the forerunner of the works. And, it is hoped that it will make some progress toward the solution of the age-old problem of the relative value of faith and works.

It is believed, also, that it will support the tenets of the Reformation Movement of the Nineteenth Century. In that movement the tables were turned in regard to baptism from the question "What does God do" to the question "what does man do". In this study in which we apply psychology to works and faith we are approaching the issue from the human side, our question is what does man do?

The study presented in this thesis will support the combination of works and faith. This is the statement of our thesis. Perhaps it will be well at this point to give a little special consideration to this statement. Psychology demands that every idea in the mind be given physical expression. Thus bodily activity is the result of a man's religious beliefs. What a man believes will determine his actions.

In this case a man comes to believe that alone he is lost and that Jesus alone can save. In order to that salvation he accepts Christ and the goal that He has given for his followers; perfection. In his natural state the man was torn in many ways, going first toward this goal and then toward that. But now he has a goal which serves as a master purpose about which he becomes integrated. The ideal is to become like Christ, who is the perfect man. Thus the ideal in mind is

Christlikeness. The bodily actions will be determined and guided in accord with this ideal. Religious works are a means toward that end. The job of Christian work is making men. Salvation is the everlasting process of being transformed into the moral image of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

It becomes obvious then that the combination of works and faith is essential to the well-being of the man. His nature demands that he express his ideas in physical action. Therefore, taking as his goal the moral perfection of God, his nature demands that he perform physical acts which shall incarnate his ideal. With Christ as his ideal he must perform Christlike acts. Works are the natural result in action of faith and embody that faith in a physical act. If a value judgement is to be made as to which is the more important we must say that, of the two, faith is the more important. This is true because faith is the necessary precedent of works. It is true also in view of the fact that God looketh upon the heart. We shall have more to say in this regard in Chapter Four so we will pass it with this brief mention at this time.

The reader must keep in mind the fact that this study is psychological and not theological. We are concerned in this study with the believing man and his mental processes. We are concerned with what man sees in the acts of religious works and in the place of faith in his mind. We are interested in what man does and believes -not in what God does in religious works. It may be that in some religious rites God does work but in our study we are concerned with what the man does and

the effect that the doing has on him, and not its effect on God. We leave these problems to the theologians. Though this is true we do not believe that our study will in any wise contradict the truths of theology. In so far as man comes into the study of theology, in that degree psychology has a voice for it is the study of man and his mental processes. We believe that in this degree this study will constructively aid theology. But it must be remembered that if there is a problem arising, this is a psychological and not a theological study. Psychology in this year (1948) is applied to many fields. Among the fields to which it is applied is religion. Psychology deals with persons, it describes the mental processes of persons. Thus it may lay claim to be applied to these acts of religious works and of faith in which a person is involved. But be it remembered that our study is what man does, not what God does.

The plan and support of this study will be (1) a definition of works, (2) a definition of faith, and (3) the application of the psychology of action to works and faith.

It is obvious that a study of this nature will demand a definition of the works to which we shall apply the psychology of action. In Chapter Two we shall survey the concept of works from the standpoint of defining the term in view of its relation to the psychology of action. We shall note the structure of the word, thus determining its meaning in this regard. We shall trace the concept both in the Bible and in history. We shall then deal with the present day meaning of the term,

and formulate our own definition.

Further it is obvious that it will be necessary to define faith. Our approach to the definition of this term will be similar to that of Chapter Two. In Chapter Three we shall take up the task of defining faith. We shall first note the structure of the word. We will trace it to its origin in the Sanscrit, "Budd", and then trace the history of the term in the Bible and in secular history coming to its use in the present day. We shall then formulate our own definition of the word.

In Chapter Four we shall apply the psychology of action to works and faith. We shall describe the mental processes involved in works and show that the works, to be intelligent, must be the outcome of ideas in the mind of the worker. We shall show that for the well being of the person himself it is necessary that his ideas and beliefs be expressed in physical action. We will see that the normal man desires to so express his ideas. Turning to faith we will show that it is the necessary instigator of works. We will show that it must precede the performing of religious works else the works have no meaning. We will then show that for the good of all concerned the combination of works and faith is essential. This will be seen as the demand of the psychology of action. However, it will be shown that, of the two, faith is the psychological essential in that it is the necessary precedent of Christian works. This will be further evident when it will be shown that God looketh upon the heart. We shall show that

from the human point of view it is dangerous to interfere with the physical expression of belief; that it is the healthy thing for a man to so express his faith. In this way the man lays hold of peace, avoids anxiety, and from a social point of view satisfies the demands of society. The last statement is true in that society looks upon the work which a man does, he is judged by other men by his deeds. But, in the eyes of God who looketh upon the heart, works of the body are merely mechanical and spiritual work ceases when a cortical cell sets the body in motion in accord with the will. From the social point of view works have great value, though they be mechanical. But from the point of view of God faith is of great value, and maintains that value though the man be prohibited from expressing the faith in works.

Finally we shall conclude with a Fifth Chapter in which we shall summarize our study and point out a few of the conclusions to which it leads us. The Chapter shall fall into two parts. In the first part we shall review and summarize the study which has preceded. In the second part of the Chapter we shall state our conclusions and then list them in shortened form.

Summary. In this chapter we introduce the reader to the study of the psychology of action applied to works and faith. We first pointed out the problem which has existed through the ages and is still present with us in our own day. Perhaps one cause of the indifference of man today in regard to the Church is to be found in the confusion in regard to faith and

works. There is so much confusion engendered in telling him what he must do that in desperation he does nothing. Man will act out his ideas. Psychology teaches that any idea in the mind will work itself out in physical action unless kept from doing so by some other equally strong idea. This is just what happens in regard to the church. The man wants salvation. He listens to instruction as to how it is obtained. But the voices cry with equal strength "faith alone" and "works alone". So, the person has two ideas, equally strong, no decision can be reached, neither can carry itself into action, and the result is that the man becomes indifferent. Can the two camps be reconciled? Is there error on the part of those groups which teach that "faith alone" is sufficient, and that works be relegated to an unimportant position? Is there error on the part of those who go to the other extreme and proclaim the all sufficiency of "works" and relegate faith to a position of unimportance? Of course we will find a few who will insist there must be a union of faith and works. But upon investigation we find that many of them are not at all clear in explaining how this union is to function. They have little knowledge of the nature of man psychologically and the place which ideas and beliefs and resultant works must hold in his life. We shall see in this study that faith is the necessary precedent of works and that for the sake of personality and character works are a necessary outcome of faith.

This study will confirm the faith of those who do believe in the combination of faith and works. It will further

point the way toward the unity of the two opposed positions held in history by showing the value of the two concepts in psychological relationship to one another. It will give us a better understanding of man in relation to works and faith. It will give to the mass and personal evangelist an understanding of the point at which to bring about religious works. It will enable the religious leaders to explain the value of faith and works in man. They will be better enabled to meet the needs of human nature in this regard. It will give the believing man a new insight into the meaning of religious rites and the means whereby he may use them in attaining his goal. In some cases it may mean that some religious rites will be done away with as of no value in this new light. But, though some must fall by the wayside, those that remain will have purpose for the performer and in that way be of greater value to him. This study will combat the indifference of the present day in regard to both faith and works and, it is hoped, point the way toward the solution of their relative value. In showing the harmonious way in which psychologically they work together, it is hoped, the way will be pointed to the harmonious reconciliation of the two extreme positions which have been taken upon this issue.

The statement of this thesis is that the combination of faith and works is necessary psychologically. This study will support the combination of works and faith, showing that works are the physical action appropriate to the belief in the mind of the worker. The study will show that psychology

demand that when a man has faith he express that faith in physical action. It will be seen that from the man's viewpoint the combination is essential and that for him works have much value. However, if a choice must be made it must rest upon faith, for it is the necessary precedent of works. Without the faith the works have no character value. But without the works the faith is still of value in the sight of God for God looketh upon the heart.

We emphasize the fact that this study follows a psychological method, not a theological one. We are interested in what man does, not in what God does.

The study will be supported by (1) a definition of works, (2) a definition of faith, and (3) the application of the psychology of action to works and faith. Let us turn our attention to the definition of works.

CHAPTER II

THE DEFINITION OF WORKS

Why define works? -- With so much confusion on the
it seems that a definition would be profitable -- The broad-
est definition -- The word in the Bible -- Paul's use --
James usage -- James a Jewish-Christian -- Paul is emanci-
pated from the Jewish Law -- Herein is the basis for a
part of the present day confusion -- The basic psychology
involved -- For men the external is most important -- God
focusses His attention on the spirit -- The Roman Catholic
view -- Fear that teaching of justification by faith alone
would lead to laxity in morals and lack of seriousness in
religion -- Work to the Romanist means primarily the sacraments
and other such channels of grace through which salvation is
secured -- Their lists show inadequate knowledge of psychology
of man -- Definition of the Church have been formulated for
material ends -- The Roman definition of faith is wholly in-
adequate and false -- Modern definitions of human work --
Synonyms and Antonyms -- Religious works seperated from secular
works -- Works which are not Christian works -- Leaves only
voluntary rational actions -- God rejects the outward show --
The internal operations of a man's mind are real Christian
works -- Our definition -- Deserves some special consideration
-- Religious work determined by the purpose -- Summary.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITION OF WORKS

Someone may say, "Why define work? I know what it is, I do it every day!" On the surface it would appear that the meaning of work is common to all but yet when one digs deeper he finds that there is much confusion about the meaning of this common term. It is not unusual to hear the laborer, he who works with body and hand, say of the white-collared worker, "Oh he doesn't have much work to do, just sits at a desk all day!" Then perhaps both of them may think of the artist or writer as a man who never does any work, perhaps even calling him lazy.

With so much confusion in this way it appears that it would be profitable to define work. Perhaps one reason for so much confusion down through the ages in regard to faith and works is due to no proper definition of work. So often when a thing is defined it loses its mysteriousness and becomes of use to men. This is easily seen in the practice of the present day psychiatrist. People come to him with all sorts of phobias. There is hydrophobia and claustrophobia etc. The psychiatrist urges the sufferer to search out the cause of his fear. Sometimes it is found that in his early years a water was thrown in his face or he was locked in a dark room as punishment. Once he knows the nature of his fear and defines it, it ceases to be a fear. A definition of "works" will aid in advancing the reconciliation between faith and works. Thus we may turn our attention to the journey toward an adequate

definition of work.

The broadest definition of work is that it is the expenditure of energy. Work is an Anglo-Saxon word bearing a similarity to the word "were" and "was". It seems to have the connotation of something done. Work is doing, it is the spending of the energies physical or spiritual. The problem confronting us here is : For what? Therefore we must find a definition which limits the subject.

Since this study deals particularly with the subject of works and faith it will be necessary to trace the use of the word in the Bible. In the International Encyclopaedia we find the Anglo-Saxon word "work" identified with the Greek word erga. We find them stating;

The word "Works" (erga) is a favorite designation in John for the wonderful works of Jesus (5:36; 10:38; 15:24, etc; "Miracles" to us, "works" to Him).¹.

Thus it is indicated that the word "work" is derived from the Greek word erga and is closely related to the term "miracles". It is further stated;

"Works" is used by Paul and James, in a special sense, as denoting (with Paul) those legal performances by means of which men sought to be accepted of God, in contradistinction to that faith in Christ through which the sinner is justified apart from all legal works (Rom.3:27; 4:2,6, etc; Gal.2:16; 3:2,5,10), "working through love" (Gal.5:6; I Thess.1:3), and is fruitful in all truly "good works", in which Christian believers are expected to abound (II Cor.9:8; Eph.2:10; Col.1:10; II Thess.2:17 etc).².

1. International Encyclopaedia, Vol. V, p. 3105

2. Ibid.

This quotation on works in the writings of Paul deserves some special consideration. It will be noted in a reading of the Scriptures referred to that Paul attacks the "works of the law", but that on the other hand he exhorts his readers to what he calls "good works". In both the works of the law and "good works" the work is the expenditure of energy; it is doing. The line of distinction to be drawn is that of motive. In the legal works or "works of the law" as stated above, the motive was the seeking of acceptance by God. In the "good works" the purpose is not that a man seeks acceptance of God, but instead he has already been accepted by God so he believes and with that faith does these works. That is, he does works befitting his faith in God. In the former case the works are merely legalistic, imposed from without the man by the law for the benefit of society; in the latter case the works are an expression of the agents own choice, resting on his faith in the value of the deed. The importance of this distinction will become apparent in our further study in Chapter Four.

Continuing our discussion of the Biblical use of the term as discussed in the above article we find in regard to James the statement:

When James speaks of being justified by "works" as well as by "faith" (2:14-26), he has in view those works which show faith to be real and vital. "Dead works" avail nothing (cf. Heb.9:14; 10:24). Judgement is according to "works" (Mt.16:27; Rv. "deeds", m "Gr. doing" praxis; Rom.2:6; I Peter 1:17 etc.), the new life being therein evidenced. A contrast between "faith" and "good works" is never drawn in the NT.¹

1.Ibid.

The attempted reconciliation in the above quotation is not entirely clear. It may be that an absolute reconciliation of the view of Paul and James cannot be accomplished.

James is a Jewish-Christian, much influenced by the Law, and in this instance (2:14f) is thinking primarily about men's duties to each other, which, as a Jew he believed were ordained by God. Viewing human actions from the social level, he naturally insists upon their physical side. What men do to men counts heavily with him. In this he joins all men who "look upon the outward man". For such a view the motives, intentions and decisions of will are secondary and merely incidental to the "faith" that includes both the inner and outer phases.

Paul, on the other hand, is thoroughly emancipated from the Jewish Law and all other law in his religious actions. He views the matter of "faith" from the point of view of God who "looks upon the inner man". In that inner realm of the motive, which ought to be love, or intelligent-good-will, and of intention or the moral improvement of all concerned, and decisions of will, the Gentile Apostle, as much at home with the Greek conceptions of morality as with the Jewish ethics of divine Law, finds the true and real realm of faith.

Here the basis is found for the confusion of our day. Men have taken James as a proof that bodily works are the essential. They are not entirely in error when they insist on bodily works as efficacious for certain accomplishments affecting bodies. To the character of the human being works are of

great value, as they are also from a social point of view. However, there are situations in which conditions beyond the control of the agent prevent him from carrying into physical action the ideas or beliefs in his mind. Does this in any way prove that his faith is not real and vital? It does not for the spiritual work is done in the spirit, desiring, planning and in the willing to do, and the bodily act is mere mechanism having social but no spiritual value. The work of the spirit is not beheld by men and they can pass no judgement on work which they cannot know (John 3:8; Matt.6:3,6; Rom.2:29; 14:4, etc.). Further than this, the Scriptures also say that God looketh upon the heart, but man looketh upon the outer man, (1 Sam. 16:7; Prov.21:2; 21:27; Matt.5:8; 5:22,28; 6:1,4,6,18, etc.). If then, God looketh upon the heart the only spiritual work would be that which took place in the inner man.

The basic psychology involved here is that whatever a morally responsible man wills after deliberate reflection as a means to a desired end, he always and inevitably carries into action. Normally, a sane man does what he believes. This is a basic psychological necessity. But men can and often do refuse to carry out their convictions in action. They separate the inner and the outer. Sometimes they do this from (1) a change of mind which discovers (a) the evil of doing what they believed ought to be done; or (b) its uselessness; or (c) because they find a better way; and sometimes (2) because they are foolish, or insane, or obdurate, stubborn, or ruled by some other irrational motive. Such divisions in faith between

inward belief and outer action present the problem of which aspect of the whole action is essential.

For men, the external, or behavior-side is the most important. Men care little about the motives and intentions of others who labor for them. Their "work" consists of some visible and tangible product accomplished by manual labor or the visible results of mental occupations. Even a church would refuse to pay for silent sermons well thought out, but not delivered vocally.

On the other hand, God, who is Spirit, focusses his attention upon the spiritual part of believing, and is satisfied with what men desire, plan and adopt. The consequent actions are all non-moral; for they are all reflexive. The brain-cell action, nervous impulse, the contraction of muscle-fibers, the resulting motion are all mechanical. They do not belong to the moral world.¹.

With this brief study of the issue in the Bible, especially in the New Testament we turn our attention to the Roman Catholic view of works.

As has been indicated above in reference to the concept in James, even in the New Testament period there is a modification of Paulinism afoot. Between the close of the Apostolic Age and the life of St. Augustine (354-430) the "faith alone" had given place to "faith and works" and this doctrine remained firmly established until the Reformation of

1. Holmes, A. Morality and Religion Syllabus, p.7.

the 16th century. This particular historical development of the dogma has been treated by Adolf Harnack¹.

Harnack finds the motive and the historical thread that runs all the way through this situation in the fear soon engendered and entertained, that the teaching of justification and of salvation by faith alone would soon lead to laxity in morals and lack of seriousness in religion. No doubt, a growing institutionalism and a developing hierarchy with their own interests sometimes quite different from the justification, edification and salvation of souls, also aided in the revolution of thought. The Church Fathers beginning with Clement of Rome, followed by the Shepherd of Hermas indicate the tendency toward the deadening of religion as an experience. In the third century, the problem of sinning after baptism subjected the Faith to a great strain. "Christianity", said Tertullian "rests upon faith inexorable discipline". Christianity asserted (Pope) Kallistos, "rests upon grace which can always be won by repentance". Tertullian's heir, Cyprian, did more to transfer the emphasis from grace to works than any other ancient teacher in the Church. He taught the startling doctrine that while the heathen are justified by baptism, Christians are saved by their own efforts expressed in alms giving, penance and fasting.² Though St. Augustine seized on "faith alone" and for a time restored such a doctrine to the church, the tendency was toward the view presented above in Cyprian.

1.Cf. Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche, Erster Jahrgang, Sweites Heft, 1891, s.82-178.

2.Cf. Williston Walker, History of the Christian Church, 1929, p.1-67.

Thus, we find the Roman Catholic today taking the term "works" to mean primarily the sacraments and other such channels, he believes, of grace through which salvation is secured. What some of these other channels are, is seen in their listing of "works of mercy". We find them making the distinction between corporal and spiritual works. The corporal works are; (1) Feed the hungry, (2) Give drink to the thirsty, (3) cloth the naked, (4) Harbor the harborless, (5) visit the sick, (6) Ransom the captive, and (7) Bury the dead. The Spiritual works are; (1) Instruct the ignorant, (2) Council the doubtful, (3) Admonish sinners, (4) Bear wrongs patiently, (5) Forgive offences willingly, (6) comfort the afflicted, and (7) pray for the living and the dead.¹. But in these examples it is hard to see the distinction between the expenditure of physical energy and that of mental energy, both of which are involved in each voluntary or moral action.

This list of works is a good example of the insufficiency of psychological knowledge of human nature held by men when such lists were formulated. A glance shows that both lists are complexes of inner and outer, of the spirit and the body. The lists are for the most part outmoded and no intelligent man today, acquainted with his own nature and freedom, would believe that they offer any category of deeds essential to salvation in any form.

The definitions given by the Church are not final, they may be wrong, and have been wrong. The definitions of faith and

1. Delany, J.F. "Works of Mercy" The Catholic Encyclopaedia
V. 10, p.198.

works formulated by the Church have been formulated for material end, not for spiritual ends, but for increase of sacerdotal power, for riches, etc. As such they are not moral or religious. The Roman Catholic definition of works is naive, antequated, inadequate, misleading, based on ignorance of human nature and God's nature and above all, upon the distortion of the purpose of the Church which is to perfect the saints, not to aggrandize its officers nor protect nor increase its material wealth. No Pope has ever died a martyr's death. Safety and security have been placed first in their policies.

The Roman definition of faith is wholly inadequate and false. Faith is not the power conferred by the sacraments. Normal men need no new power to believe the Gospel. It is not intellectual assent, for the will not the intellect, assents.

With this we may turn now to the modern definition of the human work in mind. In the dictionary we find it first defined as the;

Exertion of strength of faculties to accomplish something; toil, labor; also, employment; occupation; as to be out of work.¹

The first part of this definition may be applied to either physical or spiritual works. The latter part of the definition is generally applied to the work of the body or physical work. A further definition is also given stating that work is "the matter on which one is working". This of course we recognize as work but it is not the subject with which we are here deal-

1. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, "Work".

ing. The definition given of Biblical work is;

Performance of moral duties or prescribed ceremonial acts, or both.¹.

Whether or not this definition will fit the New Testament conception of works is debatable. It would fit well into the Old Testament. It will not suffice for our definition in that it is limited to outward behavior and the psychology of action deals with that which takes place in the inner man. For a full and sufficient definition it must be applicable both to the spirit and to the outer man.

We may at this point introduce the synonyms for work. They are such terms as; labor, toil, drudgery, action, performance, movement, execution, conduct, deed, and perhaps animation. The antonyms are such words as play, diversion, recreation, rest, relaxation, inaction, passiveness, neglect, idleness, loafing, sloth, indolence, dullness, lethargy, sleep, idler, drone, and sluggard.

Having surveyed the ground on which our subject rests we must now go beneath the surface in an effort to define work in such a way as to apply it to the concept of Christian works. Our question is what are religious works? They have usually been separated from secular works consisting of the useful labor done in the world. Distinguished from such secular labor, the religious mind usually conceives of religious works as self chosen privations, pains, menial services to the needy, and long virgils spent in spiritual exercises, all personified in the pale monk or nun, or the emaciated figure of the hermit .

In general, the works have consisted, first, in privations and poverty --like that of St. Francis of Assisi; --secondly, in bodily pains self-inflicted; thirdly, of services to the sick, the needy and the poor; and fourthly, spiritual exercises consisting of prayer and meditation, and finally, in the churches, active participation in its activities. These traditional works in their composition seldom present any overt signs of physical pleasure, though those who practice them often testify to a profound peace and ecstatic joy in the soul. True worship, play, and artistic creation are alike in that they are all performed, not for some ulterior end held before the mind, but for the joy of performing the operation itself.

Perhaps it would clarify the subject if we stated here in a paragraph those works which are not Christian works. Christian works are not mechanical motions, either inherited as reflexes, or acquired by many repetitions in rituals: they are not instinctive actions. Even among the voluntary or deliberate conscious performances done with a desire for a known end, some are eliminated. All ascetic practices inflicting austerities upon the body are rejected (Col 2:16-23; Matt.6:16; 9:14; Lk.5:33). All of them, like fasting, excites new temptations and lowers the individual's power to resist all temptation (Col 2:23). Even legitimate forms of worship when they interfere with service to fellowmen, are eliminated (Mt.5:23, 24; Mk. 7:11). In general then we may say that Christian works rejects all merely mechanical actions, including ritualistic forms unconsciously done, all austerities practiced on the body which is the temple of the Holy Spirit, and an instrument

of worship (Rom 12:1), and all other actions done without deliberate purpose.

The elimination of non-Christian works leaves behind only the voluntary, rational, purposive, deliberate, actions of Christians to be counted as legitimate "works". But even here not the whole of any voluntary action can be included. But, first, only its internal spiritual concomitants of feeling, thinking, and willing, and secondly, only those resultant bodily movements that are congruent and in harmony with the voluntary actions, or which carry out the purpose or intention of the agent. A Christian "work" includes the whole man --his emotion, intellect and will, and then the fitting bodily behavior. But even in this organic whole, it is the internal, or mental operation, that is the essential or real Christian work. Thus we approach the concept which we before said was held by Paul. It is the heart on which the Lord looketh. The body is but an instrument, and its motions are mechanical, and no more morally responsible than the bullet that kills a man. The body acts only as the spirit directs it, and then works as does a machine. The spirit works and sets up a movement in a cell of the brain and from there on the body simply carries out the impulse, just as the radio responds to the hand that operates its dial and controls.

God rejects the outward show in burnt offerings and ritualistic practices, as His will is expressed in Amos and Hosea. Hosea summarizes; "for I desire goodness and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings".

Neither the work of the law nor the labor of our hands can be classified as Christian works. For the Christian doctrine insists that we are under grace and not under law. If righteousness comes by law then Christ died for naught; Works done solely because they are commanded, moral or ritualistic, are futile (Gal 2:21). Men wishing so to justify themselves, are fallen away from Grace (Gal 5:4). Not "the labor of our hands, can fulfill the law's demands". Our bodies are temples in which and through which our spirits may worship God (1 Cor.3:16,17; Rom.12:1). The service itself is spiritual --that is, done by the spirit.

The reason that only the internal operations of a man's mind, and not the bodily behavior, are counted real Christian works comes to light when we see God's supreme end or purpose set before Christians to be attained by their faith and works. That end is nothing less than the moral perfection of God, manifested in Jesus Christ (Matt.5:48). St. Paul especially emphasises this adoption of the Man in Christ as our Ideal, and the Christians slow but steady and sure progress in realizing that Ideal, always approachable but never attainable in his own person,(Cf.Rom.12:1; Phil.3:8-14; Rom.6:14; 4:5,7; 3:23).¹ Such a union with God in Christ is a moral harmony, and not a mystical oneness. Being under the control of man's will, the process can be accomplished by any and every moral being. Such deliberate striving for a known and desired Ideal is al-

1.Cf. Holmes, Arthur. Morality and Religion Syllabus, p.63

together different from "the works of the law" done blindly simply because they are commanded, and without the agent's understanding of their purpose. Mere blind obedience to law cannot make Christian character (Phil. 3:2-15).

With this background in mind we are now ready to formulate a definition of works. In general work as we stated in the beginning of this chapter is the expenditure of both physical and spiritual energy. The house builder displays his work where all can see it. The thinker waits until such time as it appears in a work, as we say, where all may see it also. Even when he thus sets immobile he is doing the most real work in the world.

Our definition is that Christian work is the expenditure of human energy; composed of thinking, feeling, and willing, and used for the moral perfection of the worker.

This definition deserves some special consideration. First of all it will be noted that it includes the whole man. Though the definition may seem to include only the spirit, it shall be our purpose in Chapter Four to show that the rest is mere mechanism and so the whole man is included in the definition. Mechanical actions or works are ruled out of our definition, as are mere reflexes and habits or ritual, in that we have made it teleological or purposive, and not mere blind ritual.

In the final analysis, then, religious work is determined by the purpose the agent has in mind. The desired end which he has chosen inspires action and guides his conduct from the beginning of a project to its consummation. Further,

it is the graving tool of God by which He sculptures his moral image in the Christian whose purpose in every thing is to glorify God by transforming himself into the moral likeness of God (Matt.5:48; II Cor.3:18). This is the end and purpose of religious work, the one essential feature without which religious work does not exist. It fulfills the injunction of the Lord, "By their fruits ye shall know them". Only rational, moral, spiritual beings can do such work, and the product is "The spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb.12:23). The bodies of men are never made perfect. Their cycle is from dust to dust again. The cycle of the Spirit is from God to God (Ecc.12:7).¹

In this chapter our purpose was to define works. This we did by first noticing the word and its broadest meaning. We then turned to the New Testament usages of the word and found that Paul who wrote most of the New Testament did not apply the term in a Christian sense to the works of the Law nor to physical expenditure of energy. We next noted the Roman Catholic works and found them inadequate to our needs, due first, to no proper psychological understanding of man, and secondly, to the fact that they were listed primarily for the good of the Church and its leaders rather than for the perfection of the saints. We then turned to present day definitions using the dictionary. We found this definitionn of Biblical works insufficient to meet our needs and turned then to a discussion of the problem of work in the Christian sense. We

Cf.

1. Du Nouy, Lecomte Human Destiny, (Longmans, Green and Co. New York. 1947). pp. 104, 116, 123, 137, 151.

defined work as the expenditure of energy including the forms of thinking, feeling and willing, and used for the moral perfection of the worker. This definition was then given some special consideration and found to be adequate to our needs.

CHAPTER III

THE DEFINITION OF FAITH

The need for a definition -- Faith an attitude toward probability -- History of the term -- More than mere "belief"-
- The term in the Old and New Testament -- Old Testament points toward the New -- In the New Testament we have a larger concept -- Man believes many things, but not all are Christian faith -- Dictionary definitions -- Synonyms and Antonyms -- What we have accomplished thus far -- Our definition -- In brief faith is an attitude toward probability -- In the believing man -- Implication for this thesis -- We shall further elaborate this point in Chapter Four -- Summary.

CHAPTER III

THE DEFINITION OF FAITH

We turn now to the task of defining the term faith. This is a task of some magnitude for it has been a perennial issue in the history of the church. To some extent, at least, the old problem of faith versus work revolves around the problem of the definition of the terms. Too often men have been prone to use terms without bothering to let us know exactly what they mean by them, and this has caused no end of confusion to the generations which follow.

Therefore we shall attempt in this chapter to point the way to a definition of faith. We shall attempt to trace the word from its origin down to the present day and with this background in mind will then formulate our own definition.

In view of the fact that so much confusion has been generated about the word faith through the centuries, it seems proper at this point to set it off from some of the contraries by statements asserting what it is not. It is not a mechanical thing, not a mechanical motion, nor a mere state of a person, not a hypostatized action existing by itself separated from human beings, nor a part or portion of a person and neither his mental activities nor bodily behavior alone. It is not an activity limited to religion, nor one implying something supernatural or superhuman; as faith in secular truths, in people, and in things held by myriads of men for ages, fully attests. It is not limited in modern usage alone to content, or what is believed, but applied also to the process of believing. It is

not a mere abstract idea, but is best studied as it is perceived in a believing man, who thinks, feels, and wills and then carries his decision into practice.

As a beginning we may say that faith is an attitude toward probability. It has been said that we live according to probability and Shiller states;

In science and in practical life probability is all important, and hence any answer to the question of life need not be more than probable.¹

In science a proposition is believed if seventy-five percent of the facts are in favor of the proposition. All scientific truths and facts are based on probability. Thus scientific faith is an attitude toward probability, faith in a proposition that is probably true, trust in a person that is probably trustworthy.

With this much of a definition before us we may turn to the history of the word. It is an ancient word going back to the Sanscrit "budd", appearing as Greek peithein "to bind"; Latin, fid; German Bitten; with its Anglo-Saxon cognates -- believe, to value, to hold dear, which eventually connects with German , lieben, "to love", thus revealing that primary and always attendant element of emotion in all faith, religious, commonsense or scientific. In Christianity it is an activity of mind called by psychologists an "attitude", which integrates ideation, emotion and will with a disposition to accept a proposition as probably true, or to trust a person or thing

1. Shiller, F.C.S. The Riddles of The Sphinx, (N.Y.: The Macmillan Co. 1916). p.4.

as probably trustworthy.

We say that the term faith gives rise to a richer and larger idea than that of the term "belief". First, it stands for content or dogma, or "what" is believed; and secondly, for the process of believing which itself engenders and develops germinal "belief". In the Christian religion it has referred to historic faith, the increasing body of dogma enlarged from the "faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3); to miraculous faith immediately imparted by the Holy Spirit to freely chosen vessels (I Cor.12:1-9), and able to perform miracles; and finally "saving" faith, or the ordinary believing done by ordinary Christians, --derived from a "primitive or inborn credulity or power" to believe assigned to every normal human being by God. The origin is thus a primitive credulity and not a power given by the sacrament as the Roman Catholics teach, nor by miracle. Faith begins by perceiving, (Rom.10:17; Acts 2:38; 16:30-34), hearing (Acts 13:12), seeing (Acts 8:31,32), and by understanding through human aid (Acts 8:31,32), by adding emotion (Gal 5:6; I Cor 13:13), and then by making a decision or repenting, (Acts 2:38).¹ Not one of these mental operations can stand alone. They involve the entire person. They are knit together in an organic whole; and more, according to inexorable psychological law, they ~~to~~ together express themselves involuntarily and reflexly in some overt or concealed motions of body, in nervous

1.Holmes, A. The Human Side of Religion (N.Y.: The Hobson Book Press, 1947) p.71,72.

and muscular disturbance that may flow out into smooth appropriate bodily behavior, or be consumed in internal storms and stresses, leading to possible serious frustrations and repressions. Such is the view of Christian saving faith as depicted by the New Testament, and especially by Saint Paul; and which has been lost and restored to the Church more than once in its history. It represents not a fragmentary intellectual process, not an abstract idea, but a believing man, a whole man, integrated by the harmonious functioning of both his inner and outer, or mental and physical activities. What a man believes, that he does --or else suffers the disintegration of his personality.

We may now turn our attention to the study of the term faith in the Old and New Testaments. Under the Old Covenant the people or group formed the religious unit and the individual relationships were mediated through the institutions. The Law demanded outward obedience, thus we find little of the New Testament concept of Faith in the Old Testament. Findlay states:

Under the Old Covenant the people formed the religious unit; the relations of the individual Israelite to Jehovah were mediated through the sacred institutions, and the Law demanded outward obedience rather than inner faith - hearing the voice of Jehovah, "keeping his statutes", "walking in his way"; so (in the language of Gal 3:23) the age of faith was not yet.¹.

The word corresponding to the New Testament concept is found but twice in the Old Testament;

This word, the normal N.T. expression for the religious

1. Hastings Dictionary of The Bible (Complete In One Volume)
"Faith" by G.G. Findlay, p. 255.

bond, is found but twice in the O.T. (EV) - in Dt 32:20, signifying steadfastness, fidelity; and in Hab 2:4, where a slightly different noun from the same Heb. stem (contained in amen and denoting what is firm, reliable), may carry a meaning identical with the above - "the just shall live by His faithfulness". 1.

The corresponding verb occurs above twenty times in regard to God as object, and with the connotation to rely on. Findlay states:

The corresponding vb. (from the root amen: in active and passive, to rely on and to have reliance or be reliable) occurs above 20 times with God, His character, word, or messengers, for the object. More than half these examples (in Ex., Dt., Ps.) refer to faith or unbelief in the mission of Moses and Jehovah's redemptive acts at the foundation of the national Covenant.²

It will be seen in the study of the word, thus far made as it appears in the Old Testament, that though it appears but few times still it does appear at salient points and with basic import for that concept which was to come. These occurrences are not overlooked by the New Testament writers when they wish to use Scriptures in their persuasion. As Findlay again states:

Thus the cardinal import of faith is marked at salient points of Israelite history, which NT interpreters seized with a sure instinct. At the head of the OT sayings on this subject stands Gn 15:6, the text on which St. Paul founded his doctrine of justification by faith (see Ro 4:9,22; Gal 3:6; also Ja 2:23); "and Abraham believed Jehovah, and he counted it to him for righteousness" - a crucial passage in Jewish controversy.³

Thus it appears that the Jewish or Old Testament revelation or "faith", was lacking and merely preparatory; it was the hope of

1.Ibid.

2.Ibid.

3.Ibid., p.256.

things that were to come, it is expectation;

...., the Israelite revelation was consciously defective and preparatory, "the law made nothing perfect," when St. Paul would express to his fellow-contrymen in a word what was most precious to himself and them, he speaks not of "the faith" but "the hope of Israel" (Ac.28:20 etc), and the writer of Heb 11 defines the faith of his OT heroes as "the assurance of things hoped for"; accordingly, Hebrew terms giving to faith the aspect of expectation - trusting, waiting, looking to Jehovah - are much commoner than those containing the word "believe". 1.

So we see that in the Old Testament faith seems to be hope, trust, and cleaving to Jehovah.

In the New Testament we come --as one would expect -- to a larger view. In the New Testament faith involves the whole man, his thought, emotions, and will. A few quotations will suffice to elaborate this new concept of faith. In the New Testament the words used are pistis and pisteuo, the radical idea of which is persuasion. In the New Testament this gave rise to two conceptions; one ethical, the other intellectual. Findlay says:

The NT use of pistis, pisteuo, is based on that of common Greek, where persuasion is the radical idea of the word. From this sprang two principle notions, meeting in the NT conception (a) the ethical notion of confidence, trust in a person, his word, promise, etc., and then mutual trust, or the expression thereof in troth or pledge - a usage with only a casual religious application in non-Biblical Greek; and (b) the intellectual notion of conviction, belief (in distinction from knowledge), covering all the shades of meaning from practical assurance down to conjecture, but always connoting sincerity, a belief held in good faith. 2.

It was in sense (b) that faith came into the language of theology, referring to that which was beyond the reach of the phy-

1.Ibid.

2.Ibid.

sical senses, as Findlay says;

In sense (b) pistis came into the language of theology, the gods being referred (e.g. by Plutarch as a religious philosopher) to the province of faith, since they are beyond the reach of sense perception and logical demonstration.

(1) In this way faith came to signify the religious faculty in the broadest sense, - a generalization foreign to the OT.¹

Man believes in many things but this is not Christian faith. The New Testament concept of faith is more than mere belief. One may believe and yet not make much of a change in his daily life, as seen in belief that the earth rotates about the sun and other such scientific beliefs. The New Testament concept of faith contains belief, but a belief which brings one to join forces with that in which he believes;

There is nothing distinctly Christian about faith understood in the bare significance of 'seeing the invisible' - "the demons believe, and shudder"; the belief that contains no more is the "dead faith", which condemns instead of justifying (Ja. 2:14-26). As St. James and St. Paul both saw from different standpoints, Abraham, beyond the "belief that God is", recognized what God is and yielded Him a loyal trust, which carried the whole man with it and determined character and action; his faith included sense (a) of pisteuo (which lies in the Heb. vb. "believe") along with (b). In this combination lies the rich and powerful import of NT "believing": it is a spiritual apprehension joined with personal affiance; the recognition of truth in, and the plighting of troth with, the Unseen; in this twofold sense, "with the heart (the entire inner self) man believeth unto righteousness".²

The word greatly increased in use and became much more meaningful with the life of Christ. He became the object of belief. The disciples believed in him. Further "believers", or "they that had believed", became the name for the followers of Christ

1.Ibid.

2.Ibid. (see Ro 10:10).

(Ac 2:44, Rom.10:4, I Cor. 14:22, Mk.16:17). And, faith was the cardinal teaching of our Lord, it was his oft repeated demand upon men;

Faith is our Lord's chief and incessant demand from men; He preaches, He works "powers", to elicit and direct it - the "miracle-faith" attracted by "signs and wonders" being a stepping stone to faith in the Person and doctrine of God's Messenger.¹

But all through our Lord's ministry He lay emphasis on the spirit and the spiritual and though these physical (we might even say material) means were used in eliciting the beginnings of faith it was necessary that the faith of his followers rise above that of the physical. Their faith must be of the spirit, it must be rooted in the eternal order;

The Lord's departure, and the shock and trial of His death, were needful to perfect His disciples' faith (Jn 16:7) removing its earthly supports and breaking its links with all materialistic Messianism, As Jesus "goes to the Father", they realize that He and the Father "are one"; their faith rests no longer, in any degree, on "a Christ after the flesh"; they are ready to receive, and to work in, the power of the Spirit whom he sends to them "from the Father". Jesus is henceforth identified with the spiritual and eternal order; to the faith which thus acknowledges Him, He gives the benediction, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (Jn 20:29 cf I Peter 1:8). To define this specific faith a new grammatical construction appears in NT Greek: one does not simply believe Jesus, or believe on Him, one believes into or unto Him, or His name (which contains the import of His person and offices) - so in Mt.18:6, and continually in Jn (2:11, 23; 3:18,36; 4:39; 6:29,35; 7:38; 9:35; 11:25f; 12:36f; 14:1,12; 17:20 etc. also in Paul) - which signifies so believing in Him as to "come to Him" realizing that He is.²

Thus we see that faith comes to mean more than merely believing determined intellectually by probability and so it includes

1.Ibid.

2.Ibid., p.257.

more than merely the intellect. It becomes the whole man in relationship to Christ. It includes the intellect, the emotions, and the will;

Christian faith is the decisive action of the whole inner man -understanding, feeling, will; it is the trustful and self-surrendering acknowledgement of God in Christ.¹

With this background in mind we may now turn to the present day usages of the word which we find in the dictionary. There we find this statement:

Belief in God, revelation, or the like; as, soundness of faith; esp., orthodoxy in theology; in a practical religious sense, trust in God.²

This definition on the whole readily shows itself to be incompatible and inadequate with the above discussion of faith as used in the New Testament. The first part of the definition could apply only to the intellect in which case we would have no more than intellectual assent as found in science. As we saw above, the New Testament concept demands more than this. The latter part of the definition termed "practical" does go a little beyond mere intellectual assent to that of trust which more nearly involves the whole man. A second definition which is given to faith in the dictionary is "that which is believed; esp., a system of religious beliefs". But, here too we rise little above the realm of mere intellectual assent. Further, in the New Testament concept it was not belief in a system, but an attitude involving the whole man toward a person. Thus this definition also proves inadequate to our needs.

1. Ibid.

2. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

A third definition given to the word in modern dictionaries is; "Complete confidence, esp., in someone or something open to question or suspicion". This definition comes closer than any of the previous definitions to the concept of the New Testament. Complete confidence or assurance involves the whole man and since it is rooted in a person, as the term "someone" would imply, this definition more adequately meets our needs. But, though it does this, still it is lacking in that it lacks precision. It is not specific enough to fully satisfy the meaning of Christian faith. Thus we must still seek a more precise definition.

We may turn now, however, to the synonyms and antonyms of this word, in building the foundation of our definition. The synonyms are such words as; assurance, reliance, trust, confidence, conviction, probability, reasonable, credible, certainty etc. The antonyms are such terms as; unbelief, skepticism, doubt, infidelity, suspicion, agnostic, incredibility, uncertainty, hesitation, suspense, perplexity, dilemma, and bewilderment.

Let us now see what we have accomplished in our search for the definition of faith. We saw first of all that faith was not something mechanical nor a mere part of a person such as merely his intellect or action alone, nor was it merely what was believed. We see that it contains a large element of probability and is a state of mind termed by psychologists "attitude", which integrates ideation, emotion, and will with a disposition to accept a proposition as probably true, or to

trust a person as probably trustworthy. Thus it involves the whole man. In the New Testament we see that Faith is the decisive action of the whole inner man.

With this background in mind we are now ready to formulate our own definition of faith. We will, then, define faith as an attitude of the whole person toward a proposition that is probably true or toward a person probably trustworthy, derived from reflection, logical testing for contradiction, and from practical testing, and used to economize human energy in both thinking and acting.

In brief, then, faith is our attitude towards probability, --as knowledge is our attitude toward certainty. Secular faith expresses itself in all those labor-saving devices manifest in machines and productive processes. Christian faith aims at making the believer progressively more and more like Christ in character. Perhaps a simple illustration of secular faith will suffice to illuminate the above definition. Two men approach a stream over which a board has been placed. The one man looks at the board over the stream and refuses to even attempt a crossing, he has no faith in the ability of the board to hold his weight. On the other hand the second man approaches the board with caution, timidly he places his weight on it, every feature of his being shows his tension. Then he straightens up, confidently places his whole weight on the board and with head erect and no indication of fear walks across the board. It is readily seen in even so simple an illustration that the whole man is involved in faith. Faith is always best seen in

the believing man. In this organism described as the believing man, three constituents combine to form the whole: (1) the inner, mental or spiritual processes; (2) the content believed, that God does indeed justify the penitent believer; and (3) the outer, proper behavior..These three, in sane Christian believers always for the whole man. But this truth is often concealed and overlooked because outer expression of inward faith is sometimes prevented and frustrated by circumstances --consisting of habits, appetites, or external circumstances -- over which the bleiever has no control. Again, they are sometimes prevented and frustrated because after believing the believer changes his mind, or in fact, changes his belief, and so act quite differently from what would be expected from his first confession of faith. In some cases men do not express their faith in ways expected of them because they cherish other, more powerful beliefs which inhibit the expression of their stated belief --like men who assent to the being of God, Lordship of Christ etc, but do not believe ~~that~~ they will suffer much if they do not join a church, or gain much by doing it. Thus we see that in dealing with faith we are dealing with a whole ~~man~~ and not with just a part of his being, nor some abstract thing.

This being so it has certain implications for the present thesis, in regard to faith and works. Christian faith is far more than intellectual assent, far more than merely a mental activity, and far more than a mere bodily action. It is a believing man, a whole person thinking, feeling, and willing and carrying out the decision of the will into congruent

15
action. But it may be viewed from a human and Divine point of view. God looketh upon the heart or the inner man, while men see the outer or bodily behavior. This naturally gives rise to the question: What is the essential feature of faith? the inward? the outer? or both combined? About the last there is no question. About the relative importance of the other two the historical discussion has revolved. It appears that the two views as seen historically and stemming from the viewpoints as expressed by Paul and James can be explained in that very thing; a difference in viewpoint. James is looking at "faith" or Christianity from the social position, and he expresses the judgement of man upon his fellowman's faith determined by outer conduct (Jas.1: 27; 2:15,18,21-23). The Apostle to the Gentiles, freed from the Jewish emphasis on Law and works, looks not upon the outer man but, like God, looks upon the heart. There he finds the essential of saving **faith**. The bodily action is merely the means to the end determined by the believer. Both cite Abraham, and James mentions the offering of Isaac as proof of justification by works. As a matter of fact Isaac was not sacrificed, God stopped the act in mid-air, being satisfied with Abraham's inner belief, inner love, and inner decision.

It shall be our purpose in Chapter Four to elaborate psychologically this principle, so we pass now to a summary of the progress made in this chapter.

In this chapter we saw first that faith was not a mere mechanical thing, nor an activity limited to religion, nor a part nor portion of a person and neither his bodily behavior

nor mental activity alone, nor is it merely content. We saw that faith is best studied in the believing man. Early we decided that probability was all important in the life of man and that faith was an attitude toward probability. We then traced the word from the Sanscrit into the various languages of this day, and saw that it readily contained an element and close relationship to the emotions. We saw that the term faith was a larger concept than that contained in the word belief. In the Old Testament we found it to mean hope, trust, and a cleaving to Jehovah. In the New Testament we found this view enlarged. There we found it to be one of the cardinal points in the teachings of Jesus and one of the prominent marks of those who followed Him. There we found that it involved the whole man, his thinking, feeling, and willing. We then turned to the dictionary for the present day definitions of the word and though we found them worthwhile they were not quite adequate for our needs. We then defined faith as an attitude of the whole person toward a proposition that is probably true or toward a person that is probably trustworthy, derived from reflection, logical testing for contradiction, and from practical testing, and used to economize human energy in thinking and acting. It was then hinted that there were two ways in which to view faith, the inner or mental (spiritual) and the outer or bodily behavior. Both are essential but God looketh upon the heart. Thus we are prepared to deal with the psychology of faith and works, applying to them the psychology of action.

CHAPTER IV

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ACTION APPLIED TO WORKS AND FAITH

What has been done in the preceding chapters -- In this chapter we come to the crux of our discussion -- We shall first discuss the purpose of works -- What purpose does a person wish to realize in religious works? -- What is a person? -- A self-conscious organism -- That which all men seek is perfection -- Works are a healthy means toward this end -- What this means in conversion -- The progress thus far made -- The end of works -- The rational man with the ideal of Christ -- The preceding mental processes are essential -- The application of all this to Christian experience -- The psychological function of religious works -- The rational man and religious works -- The method by which the means are used -- The function of works is to provide action which fully expresses the idea in the mind of the actor -- The purpose of faith psychologically -- It is the idea of the end -- The means of faith -- The method -- Some practical questions -- Is the physical act necessary in the eyes of God? -- Seen in the realm of legality -- The essential is the inner, spiritual -- But the mere inner is not sufficient -- Nor the mere outer -- The need for physical expression in man -- Summary.

CHAPTER IV

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ACTION APPLIED TO WORKS AND FAITH

In the preceding chapters we have shown the essential nature of works and faith. We have analyzed them into their component parts, have shown how they originate and defined them for the purposes of this thesis. We have shown that works originate as the physical expression of the idea in mind. We have shown that faith is an attitude of mind toward that which is probably trustworthy. We have seen that historically these two principles have been often in conflict, and often one has been presented as more important than the other; even to the point of exclusion of one or the other. The problem now remaining before us is to view these two principles through the lenses of the psychology of action in an effort to point the way to the solution of the age old conflict. What is the relation of works to faith psychologically? Which is the more important psychologically to Christianity, faith or works? To this task we now turn our attention.

In this chapter we thus come to the crux of our discussion. The reader must remember that we are not discussing the theology of works and faith, but we are concerned with what takes place in the mind of the believing man, or the psychology of the believing man. It is therefore our purpose in this chapter to deal with the mental processes involved in works and faith. To do this, of course, we must deal with the whole person and his mental processes which lead him to works and faith.

We shall first discuss the purpose of works. In such a discussion we must first of all deal with the end of works. The term "end" is used in two senses. Spatially it is that point at which an object ceases; thus we speak of two ends, the beginning and the end. However, it is also used to denote that point at which human striving ceases, thus it is an idea in the mind of a person. It is in this latter sense that we here use it. Therefore we may say that the end of works is the purpose in a man's mind which he wishes to realize by the acts.

As our problem now stands before us it is: What purpose does a person wish to realize in religious works? If we were to go about the streets asking each person met what he expected to realize in the work he was doing we should conceivably receive as many answers as persons asked. Perhaps several would answer that they expected to realize money. However, few indeed are they in this world who simply want money, or merely money. When the question is pressed we find that they want the money in order that they may "better themselves." Thus the money is not the end they wish to realize but rather a means chosen to the end in mind, the betterment of the self. Herein is the very thing which all men seek.

In order to understand that that which all men seek is self-betterment carried to perfection, let us clarify our thought in regard to what we mean by a person. Briefly, a person is a self-conscious organism. His consciousness consists in warring appetites, instincts, sentiments, ideas, reflexes, automatisms, acquired habits, beliefs, etc. This is the pic-

ture of the unintegrated natural man. For a time one instinct, appetite or sentiment may rule only to be overthrown by another. Or possibly one instinct may become so strong as to destroy the self. In William Seabrook's Asylum he points out how each of the men in the asylum was taken over dictatorially by some element in his personality. Perhaps at this point one case from Seabrook will suffice to make the above statement clear. He states:

Then there was Professor Jeffries, the mathematician. His mind raced. Cube roots cluttered his brain and whirled in it. He had been a brilliant teacher and a "lightning calculator" as well, using this latter freakish talent to amuse himself or friends, since he didn't have to commercialize it. Now he had lost control of it. Uncontrolled, it had put him here.¹

He then summarizes all the cases in this manner:

This whole bunch of grown men, who had lost control of themselves in one way or another, now had to be controlled by others that is, put back in the nursery.²

Mr. Seabrook came to see that in order to become a person the warring consciousness must be brought under the control of a supreme sentiment or idea. Man early comes to the realization that the essential of personality is self-identity. As a poet has expressed it:

Thou all thy days must live,
Thyself the quest.³

Many statements could be given to show that the rational man

1. Seabrook, William. "Asylum", Coronet, V. XX, No. 5, p. 127.

2. Ibid.

3. Housman, Lawrence, The Continuing City.

wants to know himself, to be a unit, but perhaps a few will here suffice. William McDougall thus states it:

Happy the man whose character has been formed from a well balanced disposition under the influence of unquestioned ideals and of a definite supreme goal or master purpose. His self-respect and ideals to which he is attached (... ..) will supply him with dominate motives in all ordinary situations, motives strong enough to overcome all crude promptings of his instinctive nature; he is in little danger of becoming the scene of serious enduring conflicts; especially is this true if he has learned to know himself, has learned by reflection and frank self-criticism to understand, in some measure, his own motives, and has formed a sober, well-balanced estimate of himself, of his capacities, his purposes, and his duties.¹.

The terms "ideals" and "master purpose" in this quotation, express the crux of the matter. The same author states, while dealing with personality:

If a unitary personality is to be achieved, the various sentiments must be brought into one system within which their impulses shall be harmonised, each duly subordinated to the higher integration of which it becomes a member.

The only sentiment which can adequately fulfill the function of dominating and harmonising all other sentiments is the sentiment of self-regard, taking the form of a self-conscious devotion to an ideal of character.².

It was just at this point that the men mentioned above in the asylum failed. The result of all psychological investigation shows that all human beings are striving for perfection.

William James illuminates this idea when he states;

A tolerably unanimous opinion ranges the different selves of which a man may be seized and possessed, "and the

1. McDougal, Wm. Outline of Abnormal Psychology, (Chicago: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926). p. 216.

2. Ibid., p. 525, 526.

consequent different orders of his self-regard, in an hierarchial scale, with the bodily Self at the bottom, the Spiritual Self at the top, and the extra-corporeal material selves and the various social selves between.¹.

Dr. Lightner Witmer has expressed this desire for perfection in his definition of psychology:

Human psychology is an examination of man's spiritual nature. The unit of observation is a performance, but the unit of consideration is a personality defined by perfectability of behavior, which is measured or estimated in the unit of progress which men make toward the perfection which they prefer.².

The reader should keep in mind that this man was not trying to give us a theology but he came to this conclusion after years of work with many human beings. His conclusion is that human beings are striving for individual perfection.

Thus it is seen that the one thing which all men seek is perfection, and that the first step toward this goal is self-integration. We have at some length shown that the unintegrated self at the best is a dissipating force, at worst it ends in the asylum. Therefore, any growth at all must start with the integration of the self. The only suitable means of self-integration is integration about an ideal. Therefore the common goal of mankind is perfection. Now can this goal be realized in works of religion? The end of perfection itself cannot be realized in religious works. However, that religious works are a healthy means toward that end we shall now endeavor to show.

1. James, Wm. The Principles of Psychology, (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1910). Vol. II. p. 313.

2. Witmer, Lightner. Psychological Clinic, Vol. XVI, No. 1 and No. 2 (Jan. and Feb. 1925).

In order to show that works are a healthy means toward this end we must deal briefly with the mental processes preceding the acts of work. This step is necessary for thoughts and ideas must precede our overt acts. The acts or, in this case, the religious works are the physical expression of the idea or ideal which the person has in mind. Every idea expresses itself in activity. A few quotations will serve to illustrate this view:

The final outcome of all consciousness and nervous activity is bodily movement. In some form or other, every incoming sensory impulse and every central nervous process must issue in a motor discharge. It is equally true, tho by no means so obvious, that every form of conscious experience is related to behavior. The efforts of psychology in its earlier forms to distinguish between cognition and volition was a failure, because there is no form of cognition which does not involve also volition. we do not treat the distinction between volition and knowledge as a fundamental distinction.¹

McDougall makes a similar statement in regard to action:

Knowing,, is always for the sake of action; the function of cognition is to initiate action and to guide it in detail.²

William James agrees with the authors quoted above and goes to considerable length to thoroughly explain the view. He states:

Ideas lead to acts, but not merely acts in the sense of voluntary and deliberate muscular performances. Mental states occasion also changes in the calibre of

1. Judd, C.H. Psychology, (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907). p.71.

2. McDougall, Wm. An Introduction to Social Psychology, (Boston: John W. Luce and Co., 1926). p.367.

bloodvessels, or alternation in the heart-beats, or processes more subtle still, in glands and viscera. If these are taken into account, as well as acts which follow at some remote period because the mental state was once there, it will be safe to lay down the general law that no mental modification ever occurs which is not accompanied or followed by a bodily change.^{1.}

It is due to this fact, that any idea in the mind causes some form of physical manifestation, that modern criminologists have developed the lie detector. James further states that the idea of the end to be accomplished becomes all-sufficient for acts. He then illustrates this as follows:

A man says to himself, "I must change my shirt", and involuntarily he has taken off his coat, and his fingers are at work in their accustomed manner on his waistcoat-buttons, etc; or we say, "I must go downstairs", and ere we know it we have risen, walked, and turned the handle of the door; -all through the idea of an end coupled with a series of guiding sensations which successively arise.^{2.}

James then goes on to state that we give an idea central place in our mind by a resolute attention of will. The normal man has various ideas striving for the mastery in his mind, but when the action issues it shows that one of these ideas has gained the dominance. This is done by the person desiring one idea above the others and giving to it his attention. Thus James states:

Sustained in this way by a resolute effort of attention, the difficult object ere long begins to call up its own congeners and associates and ends by changing the disposition of the man's consciousness altogether, and with his consciousness, his action changes, for the

1. James, Wm. The Principles of Psychology, (N.Y.: Henry Holt and Co., 1910). Vol. I, p.5.

2. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 519.

new object, once stably in possession of the field of his thoughts, infallibly produces its own motor effects.¹

Turning now more directly to the problem before us we may again quote from James in regard to the meaning of this for religion. He states in regard to conversion:

To say that a man is "converted" means, in these terms, that religious ideas, previously peripheral in his consciousness, now take a central place, and that religious aims form the habitual centre of his energy.²

Thus the man is integrated about the religious ideal which is Jesus Christ. The ideal of Christ and such religious ideas as may harmoniously be associated with that ideal now have the central place in his mind. Thus with this one ideal and the desire to be like him the man is integrated. James states this when he says:

To be converted, to be regenerated, to receive grace, to experience religion, to gain an assurance, are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided, and consciously wrong inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right superior and happy, in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities.³

J.B.Pratt has also given expression to the idea of the unification of the person in the act of conversion. He states:

.... the essential thing about conversion is just the unification of character, the achievement of a new self, by which a man ceases to be a mere psychological thing or a divided self and becomes a unified being with a definite direction under the guidance of a group of consistent and har-

1.Ibid., Vol. II, p. 544.

2.James, Wm. The Varieties of Religious Experience, (N.Y.: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928). p. 196.

3.Ibid., p. 189.

monious purposes or ideals.^{1.}

Thus we see that the man is integrated about an ideal and with what has been said above this ideal will guide his actions. In fact the religious ideal must express itself in physical action or the individual will suffer frustration.

Let us now bring together the progress that has thus far been made in the discussion of works. We have shown that the desire of all men is to be integrated and to better themselves, the end desire being perfection. We have seen that in order to the goal of perfection one must first of all become integrated about an ideal which is worthy. The perfect ideal is Jesus Christ for in him we have the perfect man. When a person comes to this truth and accepts Christ he gives him the central place in his mind and is thus integrated about a religious ideal. We have seen that when an ideal gains the central place in the mind of man his action is guided in detail by that ideal and such ideas as are harmonious to it. Thus Christian works are the physical expression of the ideal in the mind of the believing man. Religious works then are steps in the process of perfection. We see that the steps are these: (1) an idea or ideal about which the personality may be integrated; (2) the desire to accept this ideal and then giving it the central place in the mind; and (3) the expression of all of this in physical activity. Thus the end of work is perfection, the various works being steps toward this goal.

1. Pratt, J.B. The Religious Consciousness, (1920), p.193.

In discussing the end of works we have also been discussing the purpose; for the purpose is a common average end result. The idea of purpose implies that of end and that of end necessitates purpose. The purpose is the idea of the actual end. It is an indication of rationality of mind that a thing is done for the purpose of accomplishing an end.

We are dealing with a person who is rational in that he has the ideal of Christ about which he wishes to integrate his life, the religious works which he chooses toward this end are the physical expressions of that ideal. Thus the works are purposeful in so far as they do aid in the attaining of this end. The rational man sees in religious works a means whereby he may give expression to his ideal in a physical act. Thus any work to be called a religious work must be a controlled purposeful act, it cannot be merely blind reflex action.

There is no psychological ground for the performing of any religious rite or action by any person save one who is of such an age and of such mind as to see in his action of the rite this end and the purposefulness of his action. For the work to be religious it must express the ideal in mind, that of Christlikeness, and this ideal must have the central place in the mind. For one to simply perform any religious rite does not constitute a religious work unless the preceding mental processes are present. The work must have the preceding mental processes else it has no end or purpose and so can have no meaning. We see that the leading player in our drama is the mental process. If this player is left out then the play has

no meaning. It is to give Hamlet and leave out Hamlet. Under such circumstances no normal person could possibly understand the action. Thus a true psychology demands that religious works remain purposeful, actions which present to the mind the idea of the end.

Having thus far in this chapter discussed (1) the nature of the rational man who must, to be rational, hold to a supreme purpose throughout changing conditions, (2) the nature of the integrated man, and (3) the human necessity for expressing ideas and beliefs in some appropriate form of behavior, we now come to the application of this Christian experience and its psychology to some practical problems about religious works. First, may we not omit all use of physical action in favor of spiritual or mental activity? Secondly, if we do any physical acts, may we not alter them to our satisfaction and make them as convenient as possible. In general, we answer, first, that human nature is so constituted by God that men are never satisfied by mere thinking alone, but always endeavor to work out their ideas in some form of conduct, a fact upon which Hegel built his magnificent philosophy of the spirit expressing himself in the world of visible things; and secondly, to substitute convenient actions for those which the ideal in mind demands altogether mangles, distorts, and renders maniacal the entire drama of religious works as an organic whole in which the internal and the external must fit together as a hand fits a glove. The failure to work out the faith in Christianity in some appropriate action brings consequences always detrimental

to spiritual development even if not recognized, and anxieties with which psychiatrists deal, and which the salve of suggestion applied by substituting human for divine authority may alleviate but cannot cure.

We have now reached the place where we must turn to the psychological function of religious works. Function implies means, so let us first give our attention to the means of religious works. The means is the medium by which a thing is done. The means of religious works are therefore, physical aids, and, psychologically, the person's mental attitude toward this act. What is the rational person's attitude toward religious works?

The rational man sees in religious works a means whereby he may give expression to the ideal in his mind, whereby he may announce publicly that Christ has the central place in his thought. The rational man always works towards ends and chooses means which contribute to that end. Thus the rational man must apply to any work applying to him in the name of religion the test of the end. He must ask, does this work manifest the idea in mind, does it take me toward the end I desire? And further, he must ask, is it the best means possible toward that end?

What is the method then by which the means of religious works is used? We have answered that question in stating that the method must be the complete physical expression of the ideal whether it be convenient or not. The value of the method is determined by the efficacy in accomplishing the desired end.

The function, then, of works is to provide action in

which full expression is given the idea in the mind of the actor and the end of perfection is brought nearer.

Having seen that the psychological purpose of religious works is the physical expression of the idea in mind and that the rational man sees in works the means of that expression and the embodiment of the end of perfection; we turn now to a similar discussion in regard to faith.

We may ask first of all, what is the purpose of faith psychologically defined? In order to answer this question we must first answer the question, what is the end of faith? The end of faith is perfection. Since faith is an attitude toward probability, the end of faith is certainty or perfect knowledge. Obviously, faith is a venture, there is in it an element of uncertainty and of risk. But faith is the willingness to try, the willingness to act beyond what knowledge would rigidly justify; and the end of such faith is certainty or perfect knowledge. William James has indicated this when he says:

Faith means belief in something concerning which doubt is still theoretically possible; and as the test of belief is willingness to act, one may say that faith is the readiness to act in a cause the prosperous issue of which is not certified to us in advance. It is in fact the same moral quality which we call courage in practical affairs; and there will be a very widespread tendency in men of vigorous nature to enjoy a certain amount of uncertainty in their philosophic creed, just as risk lends a zest to worldly activities.¹

It is apparent that faith is not just a mental concept but is the whole man. Faith is the believing man and that his actions are closely involved in his faith has been shown earlier in

1. James, Wm. The Will To Believe, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1896). p. 90.

this chapter. Thus we must look again at the believing man in regard to the end of faith.

We are here dealing with a man who has come to the place of belief in Jesus Christ. He believes that this man was the Son of God and the perfect man and that in Him and His teachings is to be found the perfect way of life for all men. His desire is to be like Him, and is stated in the words of Jesus "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt.5:48). Thus, believing this, his desire is to live in accord with his belief or the ideal he now has in his mind. The end of faith is to guide him in his thought, desire, and action to the position of perfection.

Turning then to the purpose of faith which is the idea of the end or the common average result, we see that the purpose of faith is the holding of this belief in the centre of consciousness that it may guide the believing man in every detail to the goal he has chosen.. The purpose of faith is the expression of the end, the expression of the belief. It is seen not only in mental processes but in the attitude of the individual and in his action. Seeing then that the end of faith is perfect knowledge or certainty and that the purpose of faith is to express that end by giving it the centre of the consciousness, we may turn to the function of faith psychologically defined.

In discussing the function of faith we must first give our attention to the means of faith. The means of faith are facts and desire. The facts are the physical means of faith

and desire is the person's mental attitude toward the facts. Psychology teaches that man is born with an innate credulity, that is, a will to believe. In all fields we express this in-born trait in rejecting some facts and accepting others when the weight of evidence is as strong for one as for the other. In the field of science we find facts in abundance but little is done with these facts until there is the desire to use them in a belief. That is, in science the hypothesis or belief is first formulated and then facts are garnered to uphold that theory, hypothesis, or, in our terms, faith. The scientist first derives a theory, he desires to believe it, to prove it true, then facts are a means to scientific faith. Turning to religious faith the process is similar. We are given the hypothesis or theory that in living the Christlike life we shall have the fullest life, the true life. There is the desire that this be the case and then the mobilization of facts from the many external stimuli to give evidence to our faith. Thus, the means of faith are desire and facts.

The method of our faith is the way in which we use our means. The rational man uses his desire and the facts of his world to minister to the goal he has chosen which is perfection in Jesus Christ. This is expressed by many writers in the field of psychology when they speak of conversion. Perhaps at this point one or two such quotations will serve to throw light upon this view. First we quote again from Pratt who says:

.... the essential thing about conversion is just the unification of character, the achievement of a new self,, by which a man ceases to

to be a mere psychological thing ~~on~~ a divided self and becomes a unified being with a definite direction under the guidance of a group of consistent and harmonious purposes or ideals.¹

The latter part of this quotation expresses the point in view -- that the person becomes unified with a definite direction, that direction being guided by consistent and harmonious purposes. Perhaps the following quotation will make this even clearer:

A converted man, as a rule, re-interprets every incident in his past life, and re-values every fact and purpose, setting them in quite a new order of preference. Love of the Good, the unconditional and final Good, which religion is, like all love, finds rare values in some apparently very small facts, and on the other hand shuts out what is a whole world for others as being of no consequence.²

Thus we see that the facts are reordered and revalued as means to the end of faith. Thus the method of faith is the purposeful use of the means; that is, our desires and the facts of our world to the end of building our faith toward the life of perfection.

Having thus far in this chapter seen the nature of works, that they are the physical expression of the idea in mind, in this case faith in Jesus Christ and his ability to save one from disintegration to a unified self with the true life; and having shown that faith is the ideal in mind from which the works issue, and that it is the attitude toward Christ and the goal which he set of perfection, we must now turn our attention

to

1. Pratt, J.B. The Religious Consciousness, (1920), p.193.

2. Jones, Sir Henry. A Faith That Inquires, (N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1922). p. 33.

to some practical questions in regard to works and faith. Some may say that we may do merely the works and omit the faith. Others may ask if we may not omit the works altogether in favor of spiritual works? Some may ask if the works are not elective, they may be done or not as one chooses? Is the mere inner sufficient, the mere outer? Must there always be a combination of the two? In general we may answer that there is no question but that the combination of the two is essential, but that the more essential of the two is faith. The truth of this position will best be seen in a discussion of the believing man. We have seen that work, in general, is the expenditure of energy. But, as we well know, energy is expended in two forms -- physical and spiritual. This being true, there are such things as spiritual works which in no wise require the aid of a material body. Let us view this psychologically in the believing man.

Here is a man who has come to the place of belief in Jesus Christ and has added to this the desire to become like Him, accepting the goal given by Jesus in the sermon on the mount, that of the perfection of the Father. Now, we may ask, just what has taken place in this man? He lives in a world in which many ideas are begging for his attention, in which numerous goals are forced upon his consciousness as desirable. But he has heard Jesus and has desired Him and the goal that is therein presented. His desire and will is to do the will of the Father, to approach His perfection. He has unified his personality in the quest of that goal, he believes in Christ and

has given that ideal the central place in his consciousness. This is all mental or spiritual and as yet no bodily or overt physical act has taken place. It is natural, however, that the normal man in which the above processes have taken place will desire to embody all this in a physical act, and we have seen in the earlier part of this chapter the desirability of such physical action. But, be it here noted, that the physical action is desirable for the well being of the man in whom the mental processes have taken place. That the physical action is necessary in the eyes of God, psychology can not claim. That the physical action without the preceding mental process is nothing, psychology stoutly affirms.

There is much evidence to the effect that the physical action is not necessary in the eyes of God. The physical action is an external which man may view, the mental process is internal and known only to the man and God. For instance, in the Old Testament when a king was being chosen the men who looked on believed that Eliab was the choice of Jehovah for the position. However, Jehovah said to Samuel that the externals did not count for he said, "Jehovah seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but Jehovah looketh on the heart". (I Sam.16:6,7). Again, in the New Testament Jesus teaches that it is out of the heart that the actions come; thus, the essential is the condition of the heart, (Matt.12:34, 35; Luke 6:45; Matt. 15:18f; Mark 7:21 etc.). Also in Paul's letter to the Romans where he deals with the act of circumcision he states that the essential is the inner and not the

outer (Rom.2:29f), and that the physical actions flow from the beliefs of the heart (Rom.6:17; 10:10). Thus it appears that the inner, or belief, or faith is the essential, and that the actions or works are mere mechanisms flowing from that which is inner or spiritual. The spiritual works take place in the spirit or the mind and are known only to the man and to God. That which man beholds in physical action is merely mechanical. When a cortical cell sets the body to work in accord with the will then religious work (work of the spirit) ceases. That which ensues is mechanical or physical work and as such not necessarily religious.

This may be seen in the realm of legality as well as in religion. In criminal law we may see the working of this concept. A man is killed by another in a shooting. But, does our law hold the gun which fired the bullet or even the bullet responsible? Do they hold the finger that pulled the trigger of the gun, thus setting the bullet in motion responsible? Do they even hold the arm which aimed the bullet responsible? Of course the answer to all these questions is no. We do not get moral responsibility until we come into the Spiritual realm. The muscles, the arm, the hand, and the finger are regarded as mechanical as the gun from which the mechanical bullet was fired. It is the man who is held responsible. Further, the problem of the jury will be to attempt to take a Godlike view of the man, to look on his heart, determine as best they can his motives or his mental processes, and the penalty will be based on these revelations. But the penalty will be passed on

the man, not on his arm or hand, or finger. The story is told of a judge who one time sentenced the arm of a thief, because it was the arm which had gone through the window and picked up the purse. When the thief heard the sentence he unfastened his coat and shirt and proceeded to unfasten a mechanical arm, which he deposited in the court and walked out a free man. Obviously this is neither right, just, or moral. The spirit, not the arm, nor the action of the arm, nor the eye, were guilty. Only the spirit was guilty. The poet Browning is emphatic at this point, saying,

"Not on the vulgar mass,
Called 'work' must sentence pass,
Things done that took the eye and had the price,
On which from level stand,
The low world laid its hand,
Found straightway to its mind, could
value in a trice."

It must be kept in mind in all that is here said that even though the essential of religious works is the inner or spiritual, still, for the sake of the believing man, the outer or conduct is necessary. The relation which the physical works bear to the spiritual works or religious works is that stated by Jesus at His baptism, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness". It is needful to the believing man who has a body which demands action that he give physical expression to the ideas in his mind. Earlier in this chapter we have shown the necessity, be it noted, to the man, not to God, of expressing his ideas in physical actions; perhaps at this point it would be well to recall one of those quotations. William James it will be recalled gave the illustration of the man who

says to himself, "I must change my shirt".¹ That man you will recall then involuntarily takes off his coat, and his fingers are at work in their accustomed manner on his waist-coat buttons. It is time now that we noted the way in which this is stated, for James uses the word Involuntarily in regard to the action which flows from the idea. This is evidence that the physical action is merely mechanical and not a spiritual work. The work of the spirit ceases when the idea becomes prominate and the impulse is started down the nerves to fulfill the idea. The impulse traveling down the nerves, the resulting flexing of the necessary muscles, and the act of taking off the shirt are mere mechanical actions, needful to the well being of the man but not spiritual works.

From such examples as these we may conclude that the thinking, feeling, and willing done by the spirit is, in God's sight, the essential to religious work.² But mechanical actions or work such as, baptizing babies, taking the communion without discerning the body, and other such acts done blindly and without the necessary mental processes are not religious works.

However, we must not conclude that work which consists of nothing but thinking, feeling, and willing is sufficient for religious works, especially from the point of view of the believing man. His nature, as we have insisted all along, demands that he act out his ideas. Therefore for his

1. James, Wm. quotation on page 46.

2. I Sam. 16:6,7; Matt. 12:34,35; Luke 6:45; Matt. 15:18f; etc.

satisfaction thinking, feeling, and willing alone will not suffice. Jesus states this thought in the close of His sermon on the mount, saying that the wise man is the man who not only hears these words of His but doeth them. That man is wise as to the well being of his own nature which demands that he act out the teachings which he has heard and believed. This principle is given further emphasis in the writing of James when he says; "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves" (James 1:22). The delusion is that of the man who does not understand his own nature in that he must express physically his ideas. He is the man who beholds himself and then forgets what manner of man he is.

Thus we come to the place where we must say that the mere inner is not sufficient, nor is the mere outer or that wrought in conduct sufficient. Thus we have a combination, but we must not insist that the combination is absolutely necessary. There are circumstances in which a man may be kept from carrying out his idea. Is he thus to be condemned? As we have pointed out above, the carrying out of the idea in bodily action is mere mechanism. It is important to the personality and wise is the man who understands this. But if, due to circumstances beyond the control of the man, he is prohibited from doing this he is not to be condemned, for God looketh upon the heart.

When a man has an idea and carries it out in physical action the resulting emotion is satisfaction. This he will call good. If the idea be that of Christ and becoming like Him, then

the result of the actions will be progress toward the goal of perfection. This results in the emotion of peace, the peace of progress toward the goal. For the well being of the believing man this is good. It unifies his life about his goal and gives purpose to his life. Herein is the importance of the physical act, the effect that it has on the actor. This is the criteria of good or bad. In the nature of the case this must be so for the results of the act in the world are non-ascertainable. Only at the end of time, the consummation of the ages will all the results of the act in the world be ascertainable. And, then only God will be able to judge whether or not they were good or bad. Our only criteria of physical acts must be the effect they have on the actor. Psychology demands that ideas must be carried out in acts. This is good for the actor, but let us remember that God looketh upon the heart.

Summary: We have seen in this chapter that the end of works is the purpose in the mind of the man, the purpose he wishes to realize in the works. We have shown that all men wish to realize perfection of some sort, in this case the moral perfection of God or Christlikeness. This we have seen must start with the integration of the self, and self-integration demands a worthy goal. The worthy goal is found in the ideal of Christlikeness. We have shown that works are the result of the idea in mind and that such physical expression is necessary to the well-being of the personality. We have shown also that the end of faith is perfection as seen in perfect knowledge or certainty. It involves the whole man, his thinking, feeling,

and willing. It is seen in the belief that a man cannot save himself, but that Jesus alone saves and thus the goal is given in his acceptance of such a Savior and the desire to be like Him; thus the integrating of the self about the ideal of Christ. The following quotation from Dr. Arthur Holmes aids in summarizing the argument of this chapter:

In personal Christian faith emotion decides the issue. Every man respects himself. That sentiment moves him to (1) accept an Ideal, (2) to use suitable means for progressively realizing that ideal. In so doing he makes use of all means that he believes will aid him. Upon this foundation his faith in God and in the verities of the Christian religion is grounded and built up by using the means and finding them efficacious.

The Christian's faith, though it grows out of felt need, comprehends the whole person. It begins with the intellectual process of perception (Romans 10:17; Acts 13:12, of understanding (Acts 8:30); passes on (2) to the emotions (Gal. 5:6; I Cor 13:13, John 14:23); and finally, (3) the will (John 7:17; Acts 26:19; Matt. 7:24-27). These activities of the believing man are all knit together in one whole, so that to separate them, or to neglect one of them, or to deny to the inner a harmonious outer expression, marks the foolish man. Such a man has torn himself asunder, and suffers the disquiet of inner discord which Paul calls "death". The function of Christian faith, both theologically and psychologically, is difficult to define. In a word, it "saves", both from and to; from death to life, sin to righteousness, both here and hereafter. It cannot be confined to mere inner, or conscious, processes, but acts like all consciousness, according to the fundamental psychological law that an impression always gives an expression in muscular action. A normal man must always express what he believes in some congruent form of behavior, or else suffer the violence of self-disintegration.¹

When it is asked, which is the most important, works or faith?, we must answer that physical works are essential to personal well-being. But, faith is the more important in that it is the necessary precedent of works and in view of the fact that God looketh upon the heart. We have shown that physical

1. Holmes, Arthur. The Human Side of Religion, (N.Y.: The Hobson Book Press, 1947) p. 71.

works are merely mechanical. Spiritual work ceases when a cortical cell sets the body in motion in accord with the will. Thus spiritual works are inner and beheld only by the believing man and God. They are the essential in this light, but to the man who has a physical body demanding action it is necessary to the health of his mind that he act out his belief in physical works even though they be mechanical. Thus the combination of faith and works is essential.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The importance of both faith and works -- Review -- In Chapter One we introduced the subject -- And stated our thesis -- In Chapter Two we turned to the definition of works -- And formulated our own definition -- In Chapter Three we turned to the definition of faith -- And formulated our definition -- We thus came to the essential nature of works and faith -- In Chapter Four we turned our attention to the psychology of action applied to works and faith -- Works are purposeful -- The rational man uses them to move toward his goal -- Then turning to faith -- It is the ideal in mind -- Works are its physical expression -- Conclusions -- Psychology has some claim to deal with works and faith -- Gives added weight to Scriptural emphasis on faith -- Religious works must fit the faith -- Works done blindly are of no value -- Faith is more than belief -- The combination of works and faith is most desirable -- Listed conclusions -- The combination of faith and work is essential to the nature of man.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

We have seen in the last chapter the relative importance of both faith and works. It was seen that the combination of faith and works is essential. It was shown that for the personal well-being works must express the ideal in mind or else the personality suffers frustration. But it was also seen that faith was the essential in that it necessarily preceded the physical expression or the works. In this chapter we desire to bring our study to a close. Let us first briefly review what we have done, and then state as briefly as possible our conclusions.

In Chapter One we introduced the subject of the psychology of action applied to works and faith. We saw that the subject was of great value. It had the theoretical value of confirming the position of those who believe in both faith and works. And, the further theoretical value of confirming the faith of those who believe in New Testament works and faith. Though we have not appealed to the New Testament to prove our position, it is evident that the study is in accord with the teachings of the New Testament. Secondly, though it is not the theology of works and faith, this psychological study of works and faith does reveal the rationality of the God who created a rational being, one who desires perfection and is integrated toward that Ideal, thus rational in his faith and bringing forth works in accord with that faith. A third value of the subject is that it provides the religious leader with

a clearer presentation of both works and faith, and the reason why both are necessary to personal well-being. It gives to man the motive for his work. And, fifth, it points the way toward the reconciliation of the two extremes involved in this historic problem.

In Chapter One we also stated our thesis, which is that the combination of works and faith is essential to the believing man. In such a man faith involves the whole man and thus is vitally concerned in his works. It was shown that the works are the physical expression of the faith. It was indicated that if a value judgement must be passed as to the relative value of the two, then it must be said that faith is the essential in that it must precede works, for works are the expression of faith. We then emphasised the fact that this thesis was to be supported on a psychological basis and not on a theological basis.

In Chapter Two we turned our attention to the definition of works. It was seen that most people believed they knew what constituted work but that actually there is much confusion as to what constitutes work. What is work for one man turns out to be play for another. Even in the professions this is the case, for we find business executives playing at being artists and artists playing at being gardeners, etc. What is one man's profession or occupation may be for another man a hobby at which he plays. Due to the confusion as to what constitutes work it was seen that a definition was in order. It was suggested that perhaps one reason for the confusion in regard to faith

and works was the confusion in regard to what constituted work. We saw that in its broadest definition work was the expenditure of energy. It has the connotation of something done. Thus work is doing, it is the spending of the self in energy. In a Scriptural study of the word we found that the spiritual work is done by the spirit and that God looketh upon the heart and not on the outer man or the physical works (I Sam.16:7). In turning to the Roman Catholic view of works we found that they had been formulated mainly to enhance the ecclesiastical power and were thus inadequate to our needs. We then turned to present day definitions and listed also the antonyms and synonyms of the word. We saw then that Christian works were not merely mechanical actions, nor were they any actions done without deliberate purpose. Therefore, we have only the voluntary, rational, purposive, deliberate, actions of Christians which may be legitimately counted as "works". And, not all of these are religious works for the end or purpose determines the work.

We then formulated our own definition of works. We defined work as the expenditure of energy; composed of thinking, feeling, and willing, and used for the moral perfection of the worker. We then gave some special consideration to this definition and found it adequate for our purposes.

In Chapter Three we turned our attention to the definition of faith. We began this task by first listing a few of the things that faith is not in order to clear the issue with the purpose of defining the term. We then made a beginning toward

the definition by stating that faith is an attitude toward probability. It was found that in science a thing was believed if seventy-five percent of the facts were in favor of it. The history of the word was then traced going back to the Sanscrit "budd". It was revealed that there was always an attendant element of emotion in all faith. It was seen that faith was a larger and richer term than "belief". That it stood, first, for content, and secondly, for the process of believing which itself engenders and develops germinal "belief". We saw that faith begins by perceiving and by understanding through human aids; by adding emotion and then by making a decision or repenting. It represents not a fragmentary intellectual process, not an abstract idea, but a believing man, a whole man, integrated by the harmonious functioning of both mental and physical activities. It was found that the New Testament conception of faith involved the whole man and was such a belief as to lead one to join forces with that which he believed. Thus it came to include the whole man in relationship to Christ. Faith thus came to include the intellect, the emotion, and the will. We then observed the antonyms and synonyms of faith and with this background in mind we were ready to formulate our own definition.

We defined faith as an attitude of the whole person toward a proposition that is probably true or toward a person probably trustworthy, derived from reflection, logical testing for contradiction, and from practical testing, and used to economize human energy in both thinking and acting. This

definition was then given some special attention and found adequate to the needs of this study.

Thus far in this study we had shown the essential nature of works and faith. We had been primarily concerned with the definition of the two terms. We had analyzed them into their component parts and shown how they originate. Further we had defined them for the purposes of our thesis. We had shown that works originate as the physical expression of the idea in mind. We had shown that faith is an attitude of mind toward that which is probably trustworthy. The problem then remaining before us was to view these two principles through the lenses of the psychology of action in an effort to point the way to the solution of the age old conflict of which is the more important.

In Chapter Four we turned our attention to the concept of works and faith as they appear in the psychology of action. We turned first to a discussion of works. Our first problem was the purpose of works. In order to determine the end of works we found it necessary to discuss the meaning of the term, person, and his purpose. Briefly, we defined a person as a self-conscious organism. But, we found that his consciousness consisted of many contradictory and warring elements in its natural state. We saw that the desire of the rational man was for self-knowledge and integration. Many quotations were given from writers in the field of psychology to show that the rational man does desire self-integration and that the means to that end is a worthy goal. This goal is expressed by Dr. Lightner

Witmer as the desire for individual perfection. Thus it was found that the testimony of psychology was that all men are seeking perfection. It was then found that with the goal of perfection works were a healthy means toward the ideal in mind. Man is so constituted that he naturally desires to express his ideas in physical acts. If he is prohibited from so doing he suffers frustration. Therefore, it is essential to his well-being that he embody in works the goal toward which he is striving. Christian works are, then, the physical expression of the ideal in the mind of the believing man. We then saw that the steps in the process were these: (1) an idea or ideal about which to integrate the personality; (2) the desire to accept this ideal and then giving it the central place in the mind; and (3) the expression of all this in a physical activity. Thus the end of works is perfection, the various works being steps toward this goal.

It was found that the works were purposeful in that the rational and believing man chooses them as a means to the goal in his mind. We saw that in order for the works to be called religious works they must be controlled purposeful acts. Mere blind reflex action would not fill the need. It was seen that the chief actor in the drama was the mental process and that without it the works became meaningless, amounting to nothing. It was seen also that the value of the method by which works were done was determined by their efficacy in accomplishing the desired end. Thus the function of works was to provide an action in which full expression is given the idea in mind

and the end of perfection brought nearer.

We then turned our attention to a similar treatment of faith. It was seen that the end of faith was perfection. The purpose of faith was seen to be the holding of the ideal of Christlikeness in the centre of consciousness so that it might guide the believing man in every detail to the goal he has chosen. It was seen that the means of faith were facts and desires. The method of faith was seen to be that of reordering our facts and integrating our desires so that the end of faith was approached.

Having seen then that the works were the physical expression of the faith and that faith was the ideal in mind from which the works issued, we were ready to turn to the problem of the relative importance of faith and works. It was first pointed out that energy could be expended in two forms, spiritual and physical. Thus there are such things as spiritual works, which in no wise require the aid of a physical body. It was seen, however, that human nature demanded physical action as an expression of its mental ideas. Thus for man the physical action is essential. However, evidence was brought into the picture to the effect that in the eyes of God the external was mere mechanism and that the important in His eyes was the inner or spiritual work. It was concluded that the thinking, feeling, and willing done by the spirit is, in God's sight, the essential in religious works. But for the satisfaction of the believing man these alone will not suffice. It was seen that the mere inner was not sufficient, nor the mere outer. A combination of

the two is, as we saw, to be desired; but we must not insist that it is absolutely necessary. From the viewpoint of the man the physical acts are beneficial, but in the sight of God we cannot insist that they are necessary. Thus, the combination of works and faith is to be desired but if a choice must be made as to which is of more importance the answer must be faith.

Conclusions. Let us now point out a few of the conclusions to be derived from this study. First of all, we may conclude that since psychology deals with the whole person and since it is a person who is performing religious works, the science has some claim to be applied to works and faith. It does throw light on the mental process involved in faith and works. There is no other field of science which will give to us the light that is thrown upon this subject by psychology. Psychology does away with the idea of magic in the acts of Christian work. It deals with them by the method of empirical science and shows that they are normal rational actions.

Secondly, a psychological study of works and faith gives added weight to the scriptural emphasis on faith. But it gives equal weight to the human necessity for works. The rationality of man in Christian works illustrates the rationality of the God who demands his faith and perfection. Psychology shows the necessity of and reason for works by the nature of man, and that the scriptures are correct in proclaiming the efficacy of works.

Thirdly, this study shows that religious works must fit

the faith or ideal in mind as the glove fits the hand. Convenient, substituted, or half-done work will not suffice. Any idea must express itself in physical activity. But, not just any physical activity will suffice. The physical expression must be of such nature as to suitably and fully express the idea in mind. In Christian works the idea is that of faith in Jesus Christ. When that idea takes the central place in the consciousness, then the actions, desires, and mental processes of the person are changed and integrated about this ideal. Thus the works must express that ideal and the goal of Christlikeness.

Fourthly, this study shows that blind, so called "religious" works, that is works done without the preceding mental processes, are of no value. They have no value unless the person sees in them his purpose. Christian works can be performed only by a person of such an age and of such mind as to be capable of seeing in them the purpose of Christlikeness.

Fifthly, this study shows that faith is more than mere belief or mere intellectual assent. It shows that it involves the whole man. It shows that the very nature of man is to believe and that in this world there are many things begging for his belief. But, it further shows that the one worthy goal for man is perfection. The perfection which offers to him the fullest degree of integration and satisfaction is that of Jesus Christ. In Him is found the perfect man.

Sixthly, this study shows that a combination of works

and faith is the most desirable. It is desirable because faith gives to man his ideal and goal and works gives physical expression to the faith, both of which are essential to his nature. The two work hand in hand. Man's very nature demands that he give expression in action or works to his ideas. Therefore, the combination of faith and works is most to be desired. However, we must not insist that the combination is absolutely essential. It is seen that God looketh upon the heart. Thus, the essential of spiritual works is internal. The rest or the physical expression is merely mechanical, good for man but not absolutely essential in the sight of God.

Let us now, for the sake of a clearer picture, list briefly these conclusions. They are:

1. Psychology, since it deals with the whole person, can lay some claim to application to works and faith.
2. A psychological study of faith and works gives added weight to the scriptural emphasis on faith.
3. A psychological study of works shows that they are only of value in so far as they express the purpose of the worker.
4. A psychological study of works reveals that they must be of such a nature, whether convenient or not, as to express, and express fully, the idea in mind.
5. A psychological study of faith reveals that it involves the whole man and is not mere intellectual assent.
6. This study reveals that most desirable is the combination of faith and works.

The combination of faith and works is essential to the nature of man, this is the statement of our thesis. Faith is the inner and works are the outer or physical expression of the faith. The two fit perfectly together, work as a unit, and should be view as such. Psychologically, however, they may be viewed separately. When this is done there is a tendency in some to place a higher value on one than on the other. If this must be done then faith must receive the higher value for God looketh upon the heart and it is faith which gives meaning and value to the works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Baldwin, J. Mark. Handbook of Psychology. 1890.
- Du Nouy, Lecomte. Human Destiny. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1947.
- Holmes, Arthur. The Human Side of Religion. New York: The Hobson Book Press. 1947.
- Holmes, Arthur. Morality and Religion Syllabus. Published by Nethe. 1947.
- James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1928.
- James, William. The Principles of Psychology. 2 Vol. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1890.
- James, William. The Will to Believe. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press. 1896.
- Jones, Sir Henry. A Faith That Inquires. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1922.
- Judd, Charles Hubbard. Psychology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1907.
- Ladd, G. T. Primer of Psychology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1894.
- McDougall, William. Outline of Abnormal Psychology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926.
- McDougall, William. Outline of Psychology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1923.
- Pillsbury, W. B. The Fundamentals of Psychology. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916.
- Pratt, J. B. The Religious Consciousness. 1920.
- Schiller, F. C. S. The Riddles of The Sphinx. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1910.
- Sheldon, William H. Psychology and the Promethean Will. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1936.
- Stolz, Karl R. The Psychology of Religious Living. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1937.

Sully, James. The Human Mind, Vol. I. 1892.

Blanton, Smiley and Peale, Norman Vincent. Faith is the Answer.
New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1940.

Hastings, James. The Christian Doctrine of Faith. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons. 1919.

Reference Books

Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. IV, pp.104-
110.

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, "Faith" by G. G. Findlay.

The Catholic Encyclopaedia, "Works of Mercy" by J. F. Delany.
Vol. 10, p.198f.

The International Encyclopaedia, Vol. V. p. 3165f.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, "Work", "Faith".

The Bible, American Standard Version. 1901.

Articles

Seabrook, William. "Asylum", Coronet. Vol. XX, no. 5 and 6,
September and October 1946.

Witmer, Lightner. "Psychological Clinic" Vol. XVI, No. 1 and 2.
January and February, 1925.

Poems

Housman, Lawrence. "The Continuing City".

Unpublished Works

Hartling, Raymond L. "The Psychology of Faith Building"
Unpublished B.D. Thesis. School of Religion,
Butler University, Indianapolis.