this idea we have in the Wisdom of Proverbs. There can be no doubt that the conceptions of Wisdom just referred to entered into the Messianic consciousness of Israel and enriched it, and they are reproduced in the New Testament in connection with the Son. "The Word was with God." "All things were made by him." "In him do all things subsist."

A. B. DAVIDSON.

A NEW TESTAMENT ANTITHESIS.

Πνευματικός, Ψυχικός.

If I may adapt to the Bible the reverse of a saying applied not long ago to a well-known English politician—science is not its *forte*, nor is omniscience its foible. One science alone it makes bold to grapple with, the science of the redemption of man from sin. Yet even here its science deals with practice rather than theory; and he that looks for philosophical categories will as surely fail to find them as he that hunts for the classifications of geology. As with philosophy in general, so with psychology in particular. The three souls of Plato by which he sought to solve the problem of evil—the driver and his two steeds—the rational holding the reins of the courageous and the appetitive; Aristotle's differentiation of the human soul from the souls of all other orders of animate existence, by its active and passive, its speculative and impressionable reason; the eight subdivisions of the Stoics—the five senses, the faculties of speech and generation, and the governing part which dwelt in the breast, whence the voice came—all these are samples of an analysis which seems not to have interested the writers

of the Old and New Testaments. They all started with the same consciousness of the broad popular distinction—body and soul, the outer and the inner, the apparent and the real man: with this their formal analysis ended. The ethical and not the psychological is the native air of one and all, from Moses until John: their philosophy is the philosophy of plain men; their wisdom "uttereth her voice in the streets," and knows nothing of the niceties of the schools.

And yet the antithesis at the head of this article suggests that the popular usage they followed seems to recognize such an opposition between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, *soul* and *spirit*, as, to all appearance, not only distinguishes them, but makes them separable—as separable as body and soul. The task I have set myself, therefore, is to seek for some *rationale* of this antithesis and seeming separation, some explanation of its origin and meaning.

Etymology will not help us much, though it is not altogether barren of suggestion. Both words are derived from roots signifying *to blow;* but while ψυχή, to judge from its connection with ψῦχος, *coolness*, and ψύχω, *I cool, I refresh*, denotes a *gentle* breath, πνεῦμα embraces every kind of air in motion, whether the breath of a man; the wind, that is, the breath of nature; or the breath, that is, the draught, of a fire. And in harmony with this distinction we find ψυχή representing in Homeric Greek the life or life principle which, like a soft breath, permeates the whole body, and which, on the death of the body, may escape not only through the mouth,[1] but also through a wound;[2] and likewise the spectre which, like an impalpable

[1] *Iliad* ix. 409. [2] Ibid. xiv. 518.

breath, a body in form but not in substance, flits hither and thither amid the shadows of the under-world.[1] *Πνοιή* (*πνοή*), on the contrary—for *πνεῦμα* does not appear in this early Greek—stands for the hot breath of the race-horse as he pants towards the goal;[2] for the breath of Hephæstus, the god of fire;[3] for the breeze that winnows the chaff from the wheat;[4] and for the winds with whose speed fleet coursers can vie;[5] while *πνέω*, the verb, describes the breathing of force and fury by warriors in the face of the foe.[6] In the only passage where the verb *ψύχω* appears in Homer, *πνοιὴ* is found in the preceding clause with a difference of meaning that is easily discernible. The spear hurled by Hector at Achilles, Athene turned aside *with a breath*, *πνοιῇ*. But the comprehensive *πνοιὴ* might denote breath either soft or violent; hence Homer, desiring to exclude the latter, and thereby to bring out more emphatically the might of the goddess, adds, *ἦκα μάλα ψύξασα*, "breathing all gently."[7] In later classical Greek the usages are equally distinct, though each word is gathering new force. *Ψυχὴ* retains the sense of *life* and *life principle*, whether of man or of beast, but has advanced from the mere *life-breath* and *bodiless ghost* of Homer to the *soul* or *spirit in man*, which, with the *σῶμα*, *the body*, constitutes the whole man;[8] according to the popular notion, dying with the body;[9] according to the philosophers, akin to the divine,[10] and continuing after death,[11] though in what form they do not profess to decide. It is now regarded as the seat of the emotions and appetites, and as the organ

[1] *Odyssey* xi. 601, *seq.* [2] *Iliad* xxiii. 380 [3] Ibid. xxi. 355.
[4] Ibid. xiii. 590. [5] Ibid. xvi. 149 [6] Ibid. xi. 508.
[7] Ibid. xx. 440. [8] Xenophon, *Anabasis*, iii. 2. 20. [9] Plato, *Phædo*, 70 A.
[10] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, iv. 3. 14. [11] Plato, *Phædrus*, 245 E.

of the thought; "that which gives life and motion to the entire nature of the body;"[1] yet all the while hampered by the body as by a "mass of evil," and a "source of endless trouble," "filling us full of loves and lusts and fears and fancies and all kinds of folly,"[2] from which the soul will have no deliverance till the body is "cleared away." It would seem that, with such philosophers, the ψυχὴ is *quasi*-passive rather than directly active; is rather the *life* which enables the appetites and thoughts to act, than that which immediately thinks for itself, and immediately prompts to action: the sphere in which the νοῦς and the θυμός, *the thought* and *the appetite*, realize themselves; or, in the phrase of Aristotle, the ἐντελέχεια of the body, that by which the potentialities ultimately become actualities. With Aristotle, the only immortal part of man is the *active reason* which, coming from without as something divine, produces impressions through the *passive reason*; and consequently he has left behind him an unsettled controversy whether he admits the ψυχή, *the individual, impressionable man*, to immortality. Πνοὴ and πνεῦμα, on the other hand (the latter form all but supplanting the πνοὴ in prose), besides retaining the sense of physical breath and wind, are found here and there representing, by a natural figure, whatever imperceptible influence carries away the inner man as with the force and suddenness and mystery of a gale; or agitates it with the violent breathing, so to say, of an overpowering emotion, natural or inspired. Thus does Io bemoan herself that she is swept out of her course like a ship by a tumultuous "gust of madness" (λύσσης πνεύματι);[3] thus

[1] Plato, *Cratylus*, 400 A. [2] Plato, *Phædo*, 66.
[3] Æschylus, *Prometheus Vinctus*, 884.

does Jocasta entreat Eteocles to stay the "blasts of his passion" (*σχάσον . . . θυμοῦ πνοάς*);[1] and thus were the Bacchant women maddened by the "afflatus of the god" (*θεοῦ πνοαῖσιν*).[2] This sense of a *divine power inbreathed* has its earnest, no doubt, in the use of the verb *ἐμπνέω* when Homer tells how the god "inbreathed fierce ardour" (*θάρσος ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα δαίμων*)[3] into Odysseus and his comrades for their attack upon the Cyclops; and how likewise the god inbreathed into the mind of Penelope the thought to weave the shroud for Laertes (*φᾶρος . . . ἐνέπνευσε φρεσὶ δαίμων . . . ὑφαίνειν*);[4] and prepares us for the use of *πνεῦμα* to express the less tumultuous form of the divine *afflatus*, as conceived in the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* —a *θεῖον πνεῦμα* [*ἐν*] *τῇ ψυχῇ*, bringing intelligence and knowledge; as well as for Plutarch's "sacred and divine spirit" (*ἱερὸν καὶ δαιμόνιον πνεῦμα*) dwelling in the Muses. But this is a late and as yet undeveloped sense of the word; and we shall be quite justified in affirming that *πνεῦμα* in *classical* Greek is purely *physiological*, with such rare tendency to metaphor as is natural to poetic diction. It will be seen, moreover, from what has been said, that energy and activity are specially characteristic of *πνεῦμα*.

The Biblical usage of the two words runs along the same lines, but goes further. The Hebrew *Nephesh*, which answers to *ψυχή*, has as its cognate verb *Naphash, to refresh;* and we think at once of the soft, cool air suggested to us by *ψῦχος*. *Ruach*, the Hebrew equivalent of *πνεῦμα*, has two cognate verbs: *Ravach, to be airy*, and then, *to refresh;* and *Riach* or

[1] Euripides, *Phœnissæ*, 454.
[2] *Bacchæ*, 1094.
[3] *Odyssey* ix. 381.
[4] Ibid. xix. 138.

Ruach, to draw breath, to smell, and so, *to be keen, of quick understanding*, and, *to take delight in.* We cannot be far wrong, I think, in concluding from these hints that, in original idea, *Nephesh* was a less energetic word than *Ruach*, the difference being much the same as between ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα. And, so far as the words are not used interchangeably, the Biblical usage bears out this distinction. Out of the immense number of passages where *Nephesh* appears in the Old Testament, only one gives it the meaning of *breath in motion*, and that only in the poetical book of Job:[1] "His breath kindleth coals;" and even here it is just possible that stress may be laid on the consummate ease with which the leviathan exercises his power. Another exceptional passage (Isa. iii. 20), where the majority of critics accept the interpretation of "exhaled odour," would under these circumstances afford additional confirmation of the *gentleness* of *Nephesh*. *Ruach*, on the contrary, is the regular word for *breath in activity*; *N'shamah*, a much rarer word, being, apparently, a synonym at one time for *Ruach* as *breath*,[2] and, at another, for *Nephesh* as *a breathing being*;[3] and usually translated in the Septuagint Version by πνοή, more, it may be thought, for the sake of consistency than with a view to distinction. *Ruach*, moreover, is the constant expression in the Old Testament for the *wind*—whether the πνεῦμα (with πνοὴ) of the Septuagint, or the ἄνεμος which, for special reasons, is, with one or two intelligible exceptions, preferred in the New Testament. The lines of separation in the Old Testament between the significations of *wind* and *breath* and *the source of life*

[1] Job xli. 21. [2] Compare Genesis ii. 7 and vi. 17.
[3] Compare Joshua x. 28 and 40 (LXX. ἐμπνέον in both cases).

are at times very hard to trace, so suitably do the wind and the breath symbolize the invisible force which infuses and sustains life. In the vision concerning the dry bones, for example (Ezek. xxxvii.), the prophet, as the mouthpiece of God, declares that He will cause *breath* (LXX. πνεῦμα) to enter into them, and they shall live; and afterwards prophesies to the *wind* (πνεῦμα), saying, "Thus saith the Lord God: Come from the four winds (πνεύματα), O breath (*Ruach* —not translated in LXX.), and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." And the Old Testament writers can think of nothing better than this πνεῦμα whereby to denote the unseen yet all-powerful influence proceeding from God, independent, like the wind, of space and time; now mysteriously inspiring life, and now as mysteriously taking it away; sometimes brooding gently and creatively, like a soft breeze, upon the face of the primeval waters; sometimes blowing fiercely and destructively with the blast of a sweeping tempest. It is this πνεῦμα that God breathed into man as the breath of life;[1] and this, when God withdraws it, takes life in its train.[2] It is this that melts the winter ice;[3] this, "the breath of God's lips," that "shall slay the wicked;"[4] this by which "the channels of the sea appear, and the foundations of the world are discovered, at the rebuking of the Lord, at the blast of the breath of his nostrils."[5]

But in the New Testament the usual word for *wind*, as has been said above, is ἄνεμος; πνεῦμα and πνοή are used, each of them, only once in this sense; "the wind (πνεῦμα) blowing where it listeth," of which Jesus spoke

[1] Gen. ii. 7 compared with vi. 17, vii. 15. [2] Psa. civ. 29.
[3] Psa. cxlvii. 18. [4] Isa. xi. 4. [5] 2 Sam. xxii. 16.

to Nicodemus;[1] and the "rushing mighty wind (πνοὴ)" of the day of Pentecost;[2] and in these places, apparently, for the purpose of making vivid the parallel between the invisible unfettered power of the wind and of the Spirit of God. They are again used, each once, in the sense of *breath*—πνεῦμα, of the breath of destruction from God consuming "that wicked one" (2 Thess. ii. 8); and πνοὴ, of the breath of life when Paul tells the men of Athens that God "giveth to all life and *breath* and all things" (Acts xvii. 25). Of course if the substantive, *breath*, had been required elsewhere, they would probably have been pressed into service more frequently. But, on the whole, we may fairly maintain that πνεῦμα in the New Testament has risen more completely into the hyper-physical region; while ψυχὴ remains very much where it was, except that there is a far larger proportion of passages in which the deeper meaning of the *ego* is assigned to it. We shall best justify this rise in the usage of πνεῦμα by studying how it was attained.

The Hebrew references to the creation, with the Septuagint rendering of them, are not only consistent with the essential distinction between the two words, but are the key to the antithesis which is the main subject of our consideration. God breathed into the first man the *breath of life*, πνεῦμα or πνοὴ ζωῆς,[3] and he became a *living soul*, ψυχὴ ζῶσα. Not that all the links are here, but they can be easily supplied. The πνεῦμα ζωῆς—the breath of life as an abstract state of being antithetical to death[4]—when applied to an individual, produces or results in ψυχή, that is, *individual life*.

[1] John iii. 8. [2] Acts ii. 2. [3] Gen. ii. 7 compared with vi. 17.
[4] Deut. xxx. 19: "I have set before you life (ζωὴν) and death."

Such individuals, accordingly, both man and beast, are spoken of as possessing ψυχή;[1] and, by a step further, according to the analogy of our own tongue when we talk of a "young life," and of the sea as "teeming with life," ψυχὴ came to represent the *being possessing life*. Thus both the waters and the earth are bidden to bring forth "living *souls;*" in the one case, the fish and the fowl; in the other, "the cattle, and the creeping thing, and the beast of the earth:"[2] and the Lord bade Joshua (Chap. xx. 3) appoint cities of refuge for "the slayer that killed any *person* (ψυχὴν) unawares." This, then, is the force of the expression ψυχὴ ζῶσα, in the story of the creation; and also of ψυχή, with or without ζῶσα, in a multitude of other passages, chiefly in the Old Testament, even where the idea of *life* is not specially emphasized; for instance—"The *souls* of his (Jacob's) sons and his daughters were thirty and three" (Gen. xlvi. 15); "Levy a tribute unto the Lord of the men of war which went out to battle: one *soul* (ψυχὴν) of five hundred, both of the persons (ἀνθρώπων) and of the beeves, and of the asses and of the sheep" (Num. xxxi. 28); and similarly in the New Testament (Acts vii. 14): "Then sent Joseph and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." It is clearly in keeping with the *activity* of πνεῦμα that it should denote that which, when given, constitutes the ψυχή; and likewise with the *passivity* of ψυχή, that it should be the constituted life in the individual, so passing on to signify the individual himself, which πνεῦμα nowhere does: furthermore,

[1] Thus of Rachel, Gen. xxxv. 18; of beasts, Levit. xxiv. 18; and compare Rev. viii. 9: "The creatures which were in the sea and had life (τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχάς)."

[2] Gen. i. 20, 24. Compare in *N. T.* Rev. xvi. 3.

that ψυχὴ can be said to die, but πνεῦμα never. It may be remarked, in passing, that while both these words are applied to the brute creation,[1] this application is rare, and the πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ of man are regarded as partaking of his general superiority. Thus the Psalmist affirms (xlix. 20): "Man that is in honour and abideth not is like the beasts that perish." The same assumption appears to be latent in Elihu's declaration: "It is a spirit (πνεῦμα) in man, and the breath (πνοὴ) of the Almighty that giveth them understanding." This partial hedge round πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ was due, *in a degree*, no doubt, to the account of the creation, where the communication of the life principle to man is made special and immediate by the phrase (Gen. i. 26), "Let us make man," instead of the phrase of *quasi*-delegation, "Let the waters—the earth —bring forth the living creature."

But another distinction is suggested by the same account: ψυχὴ is directly allied with a material organisation. "The Lord God," we are told, "formed man *of the dust of the ground*, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul." Thus the blood is taken to represent the ψυχή: "The life (ψυχὴ) of the flesh is in the blood" (Lev. xvii. 11.), the visible blood representing the ψυχή, as the invisible wind represents the πνεῦμα. In the Old Testament man is not conceived of, *as man*, apart from a bodily organisation: so prominent was the *body* in thinking of the *man* that the *Nephesh* (ψυχὴ) could be said to die, and could even stand for a dead body,[2] yet only as

[1] Compare, for πνεῦμα, Eccles. iii. 19: "The *spirit* of the beast that goeth downward;" and Psa. civ. 29, 30: "Thou takest away their breath (πνεῦμα), they (all creatures) die . . . Thou sendest forth thy breath (πνεῦμα—*A. V.*, *spirit*), they are created, and thou renewest the face of the earth." [2] Num. v. 2.

we ourselves speak of a "dead man," without for a moment meaning that the *man* was there. Neither in the New Testament is the *man* brought before us, even after death, as independent of the body, though the body after death is of a different order—a consistency due to the new light which has displaced the darkness and uncertainty of the old dispensation. It may be said, however, that in the Old Testament a ψυχὴ is not unfrequently attributed to God; for instance, "The Lord of hosts hath sworn by his soul" (Jer. li. 14); and again (Lev. xxvi. 11), "My soul shall not abhor you." But this usage may be anthropomorphic, as seems to have been the opinion of some of the Seventy, if we may judge from their substitution of such words as "his arm" in the former passage: or it may be merely the Hebrew vivid idiom for the *self*, the *individual personality*, as was clearly the conception of others of the Seventy, and of the translators of the Authorized Version, ἑαυτοῦ and "himself" often appearing as the Greek and English renderings respectively. Yet even if such a usage and such passages as Revelation vi. 9 ("I saw the souls of them that were slain") induce us to admit that ψυχὴ occasionally signifies nothing more than *life individualised*, without the connotation of material organisation according to our notion of it, this admission would strengthen the position which we care most to maintain—that throughout the Bible πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ are regarded as inextricably bound up together; πνεῦμα, the universal life principle, ψυχή, that life individualised: while it leaves practically unassailed the position that, in the human sphere, πνεῦμα is the life from God, ψυχή, that life in man; πνεῦμα keeping the organisation in the back-

ground, ψυχὴ making that organisation prominent. In fact, in a constituted individuality πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ are, strictly speaking, no more separable than, say, an abstract principle and its concrete embodiment; for example, the principle of righteousness and righteousness in actuality. They may be distinguished: they cannot be disjoined.

But it is not the way of popular writing to trouble itself overmuch with distinctions of this kind: and hence πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ are often interchanged without any distinction that can be fairly judged to be intentional. Thus (1) they are broadly equivalent in denoting the *life*: 1 Kings xix. 4, "Lord, take away my life (ψυχήν);" Psalm civ. 29, "Thou takest away their breath (πνεῦμα);" Matthew xxvii. 50, "Jesus yielded up the ghost (πνεῦμα);" Acts xx. 10, "His life (ψυχὴ) is in him." Yet the original idea of πνεῦμα is here again so far maintained that the Divine power is usually associated, more or less consciously, with what is said of the πνεῦμα;[1] and that πνεῦμα could not be used in such expressions as "flee for thy life;" nor could Jesus be said to give his πνεῦμα a ransom for many, though He could surrender his *spirit* to God. The active sense of the πνεῦμα as that which brings to life the more passive ψυχὴ can in many of the passages be established without violence. (2) They are both used in contradistinction to the body or its material: Micah vi. 7, "The fruit of my body (literally, *belly*) for the sin of my soul (ψυχήν);" Isaiah xxxi. 3, "Their horses flesh

[1] Compare Mead on *The Soul Here and Hereafter*, chap. iii. I may here take the opportunity of mentioning the names of other books to which I am indebted in the course of this Article: Laidlaw's *Bible Doctrine of Man*, Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, Girdlestone's *Old Testament Synonyms*, Pfleiderer's *Paulinism*, and Schmid's *Synonymik* have been found useful.

and not spirit (πνεῦμα);" Matthew x. 28, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (ψυχή);" 1 Corinthians v. 3, "Absent in body, but present in spirit (πνεῦμα)." Yet here again πνεῦμα is the common antithesis, and ψυχὴ almost invariably bears the interpretation of that which gives the πνεῦμα constituted form, bodily or individual. (3) They are equivalent as the seat of yearning or emotion: Numbers xxi. 5, "Our soul (ψυχὴ) loatheth this light bread." Thus Jeremiah (ii. 24) speaks even of the "wild ass used to the wilderness that snuffeth up the wind in the greed of her soul (ψυχή)." So the *Ruach* of Ecclesiastes vii. 9, "Be not hasty in thy spirit," is paralleled by the *Nephesh* of Job iii. 20, "Life to the bitter in *soul*." And similarly in the New Testament: Acts xvii. 16, "His *spirit* was stirred in him," where the πνεῦμα cannot in fairness be made to differ (as though it were his *regenerated* seat of emotion) from the ψυχὴ of Acts xiv. 2, "The unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds (literally, *souls*, ψυχὰς) evil affected towards the brethren." They appear to be identical in Luke i. 46, 47, "My *soul* doth magnify the Lord, and my *spirit* hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." The *spirit* of Jesus is said to be troubled in John xiii. 21; and his *soul*, Matt. xxvi. 38. Akin to this synonymity is the interchangeableness of the two words when reference is made to the moral entity, the inner man, the *ego*, the essence as distinguished from the mere outward appearance. Oriental vividness found satisfaction in employing *Nephesh* (ψυχὴ) in the place of the personal or reflexive pronoun; for example, in such expressions as one already quoted (Lev. xxvi. 11), "My soul shall not abhor you;" and again (Psa. xi. 1),

"How say ye to my soul, Flee as a bird?" We might quote the words from the *Magnificat*, given above, as furnishing an instance of πνεῦμα in much the same sense. *Nephesh* is used of the inner man at Proverbs xxiii. 7, "As he thinketh in his soul (A. V., *heart*) so is he;" and *Ruach* at Proverbs xvi. 2, "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes; but the Lord weigheth the spirits." Paul urges the Ephesian servants to "do the will of God from the soul (ψυχή);"[1] and hopes to hear of the Philippians that they "stand fast in one spirit (πνεύματι), with one soul (ψυχῇ) striving together for (or with) the faith of the gospel."[2] But in this connection also we discern a preference, now for one word, now for the other; for ψυχή, when there is a desire to express the yearning of the *physical* appetite or to depict the inner man as *possessed by* the emotion; for πνεῦμα, when the writer is dealing with intellectual operations or the religious character. It is never said, "Thy spirit," but "Thy soul longeth for flesh" (Deut. xii. 20); nor are we unprepared to find *Ruach* instead of *Nephesh* when Isaiah (Chap. lxvi. 2) is speaking of "a contrite spirit," and the Deuteronomist, of Joshua the son of Nun as "full of the *spirit* of wisdom."[3] We at once recall the higher activity of πνεῦμα and its direct Divine derivation. (4) The *soul* and *spirit* are once more made equivalent as the subjects of renovation. The Psalmist who beseeches God to "renew a right *spirit* within" him, also declares the law of the Lord to be perfect, "restoring the *soul*;" Peter reminds those to whom he writes his first Epistle (Chap. i. 22) that they "have purified" their "souls;" and Paul adjures himself and the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii. 1),

[1] Ephes. vi. 6. [2] Phil. i. 27. [3] Deut. xxxiv. 9.

"Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and *spirit;*" exhorting the Ephesians in like manner (Chap. iv. 23), "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind." It is but natural that, as a sequel to this renovation, πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ should both be saved from eternal death; and that while James (Chap. v. 20) calls upon the "brethren" to "save the *soul*" of the erring sinner "from death," Paul should "judge to deliver" the incestuous one "unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the *spirit* may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 5).

But while, in speaking of a constituted individuality, popular thought drew no fine distinctions between the πνεῦμα and the ψυχή, the life principle and its individualisation, a tendency grew up with the later sacred writers, and especially with Paul, to oppose them to one another, in order to describe with emphasis the special circumstances of the individuality. This tendency, harmonising with the more active idea of πνεῦμα, arose from the original relations of πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ in the popular anthropology. First in order came πνεῦμα, then ψυχή: first the invisible and immaterial divine; then the visible and material human, by means of and partaking of the divine. So πνεῦμα could easily come to be regarded as higher than ψυχή; and from this conception sprang certain usages found in the Old Testament, and a larger number, as the tendency developed itself more fully, in the New. (1) Πνεῦμα, as we have before remarked, never denotes an *individual life.* But we may sometimes desire to emphasize, not so much the individual life itself, as some aspect of it which we have specially in view; and hence arose that use of πνεῦμα which seems to signify an individual life, but

with the suggestion that the garb of humanity is not present or is not required: the emphasis being rather on the *mode* of existence than on the personality. Of this we have an instance in the *spirit* which passed before the face of Eliphaz;[1] and in the *spirit* which the disciples thought they saw when Jesus suddenly stood in the midst of them after the resurrection. On this occasion He bade them handle Him and see; "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."[2] With the same idea the writer of the Hebrews (Chap. xii. 23) speaks of the "*spirits* of just men made perfect," and the agencies that possessed the demoniacs are described as evil spirits.[3] So when Jesus says, "God is a spirit,"[4] He declares to us not the *personality* of God, but his nature, as when it is said, "God is love," "God is light," He recalls and interprets to us the thought of the old Revelation: "The heaven of heavens cannot contain thee;" and presents to our view a Being absolutely free from all limitations of space and time. But God is an individual life all the same; and such a description is no justification for a separation of πνεῦμα and ψυχή in man.

(2) From the same desire for emphasis comes what we have already pointed out as the preference for πνεῦμα as the seat of the purely intellectual operations, the higher emotions, and the moral character generally; that is, as the inner man in the deepest sense, the man at the fountain head of his being: a preference parallel with the force of πνεῦμα as the first principle of life. This is the "spirit in man" which Job makes the throne of his understanding (Chap. xxxii. 8); and this

[1] Job v. 15.
[2] Luke xxiv. 39.
[3] Luke viii. 2.
[4] John iv. 24. See Westcott *in loco*.

is the *spirit* Paul is thinking of when he asks (1 Cor. ii. 11), "What man knoweth the things of man, save the *spirit* of man which is in him?"

(3) From the view of πνεῦμα as the breath of God, it is held to represent better than ψυχή—which recalls the earthly element also—the *God-like;* what in man corresponds to and is the point of contact with God. So, in the Old Testament, God is named the "God of the *spirits* of all flesh;" [1] in the New, He is opposed as "Father of spirits" to the "fathers of our flesh:" [2] and Paul declares that "the spirit (of adoption) bears witness with *our spirit* that we are children of God." [3] This "God in us," communicated at the creation, when we were made ψυχαὶ in God's image, has never absolutely departed from man; at any rate, there is no evidence in Scripture for its withdrawal: "it is for the perversion, not for the non-possession of it, that sinners are blamed." Sin did away with the normal operation of man's spirit, so that it was as good as dead; but, in the literal sense, it no more died than the ψυχὴ which individualised it: it is no more dead than the ψυχή, just as it is no more, in itself, holy than the ψυχή.[4]

(4) Accordingly no better word than πνεῦμα could be found to represent the "God in us" of the *new* creation —the Holy Spirit, creating man afresh. Here we have a higher application both of the essential activity of πνεῦμα and of the creation history and phraseology. This Spirit, in the Old Testament, was scarcely more, it would appear, as "the Spirit of God," than an undefined influence "poured out," according to the sensuous image, upon those to whom was given the prophetic

[1] Num. xvi. 22. [2] Heb. xii. 9. [3] Rom. viii. 16.
[4] See 2 Cor. vii. 1, and 1 Cor. vii. 34.

spirit of revelation; and promised to be poured out upon all men when the days of the Messiah should come.[1] The outpouring of this Messianic πνεῦμα appears, in the New Testament, at the day of Pentecost,[2] and in the supernatural gifts and miraculous effects which were from time to time the evidences and characteristics of God's "power towards them that believed." But side by side with this idea of the Messianic outpouring grew up another idea, an offshoot from it, but soon to overshadow it—that of the inward sanctifying power of the Spirit of God upon the whole nature of the believer. And what had been an undefined influence in the old dispensation, became a distinct personality in the new. For Jesus associates the Holy Spirit, as a third Person, with the Father and the Son;[3] calls him the Comforter,[4] and One that shall not speak "of himself," but shall speak "whatsoever he shall hear."[5] And just as at the first creation the breath of life produced a physically living ψυχή, so in the second the Holy Spirit, the breath of God, reanimates the morally dead ψυχή by his personal contact. Our spirits are renewed, our "souls are saved," by becoming individualisations of the universal, personal, renovating power: we have the "communion of the Holy Ghost,"[6] God has given us of his Spirit.[7] With graphic vividness He is depicted as dwelling in us,[8] yet not so as to produce in Paul any consciousness of pantheistic confusion: for the Apostle still worships God "with *his* spirit"[9]—a spirit, however, that is no longer in ignorance, enmity, or isolation. The spirit naturally be-

[1] Joel ii. 28.
[2] Acts ii. 17.
[3] Matt. xxviii. 19.
[4] John xv. 26.
[5] Ibid. xvi. 13.
[6] 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
[7] 1 John iv. 13.
[8] 1 Cor. iii. 16.
[9] Rom. i. 9.

longing to man *this* Spirit does not displace or repress: we have still a spirit which can be disturbed,"[1] refreshed,[2] cleansed from defilement,[3] kept pure,[4] and rescued from destruction[5]—freed and protected from all evil, prompted and adapted to all good, by the Holy Spirit working upon it. He co-exists with our spirits, bearing testimony against their fears,[6] helping their infirmities,[7] and making intercession for them when they know not what to pray for as they ought. But such indwelling, such communion, such working of the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit, producing in it a gradual approximation to Himself, naturally causes, at times, an apparent abolition of all distinction between them; as, for instance, in the case of "the spirit" which, contrasted with the mortal body of the Christian, is "life because of righteousness,"[8] life, of course, only from its unity with the Holy Spirit; and in the case of the "holy spirit" which is one of a list of Christian virtues at 2 Corinthians vi. 6, "In pureness, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in kindness, in a holy spirit, in love unfeigned,"—a spirit holy, of course, only on the ground of its renewal by the Spirit of God. From this stage it was not far for Paul to make πνεῦμα stand alone, as he so often does, without further qualification, for the life principle of the believer; to all appearance ignoring the natural πνεῦμα, or relegating it, with the more passive ψυχή, to the purely human sphere.

And this brings us to the antithesis at the head of the article—an antithesis found in several passages, as, for example, in the verse, "But the natural (ψυχικὸς) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . .

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 13. [3] Ibid vii. 1. [5] 1 Cor. v. 5. [7] Ibid. viii. 26.
[2] Ibid vii. 13. [4] 1 Cor. vii. 34. [6] Rom. viii. 16. [8] Ibid. viii. 10.

because they are spiritually (πνευματικῶς) discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things" (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15). What has been said will, it is hoped, have prepared the way for the explanation of this seeming dichotomy. Just as the problem of evil led Plato to conceive of higher and lower souls, so the religious consciousness of Paul and his fellow Christians—starting with a knowledge of God on the one side and sin on the other; with the πνεῦμα of the first creation as proceeding from God, and the ψυχὴ as that πνεῦμα constituted in material man; and, lastly, with the God-given πνεῦμα of the new creation—found itself constrained to express by the help of ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα respectively, the distinction between the actuality of man's natural sinful life, and its noble destiny as conceived and now rendered possible by God. This partial antagonism, in idea, of πνεῦμα and ψυχή, took occasionally with the Christian writers a *quasi*-ontological form, as if there were really two souls: not that πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ were literally separable, or that πνεῦμα was holy and ψυχὴ unholy, any more than a man's soul can be holier than the man: but that the association of the two terms in history afforded standing-ground for a division which was really ethical and only apparently ontological. By means of πνευματικός, then, the opposite to the natural and earthly is emphasized: by means of ψυχικός, the opposite to the Divine—the side of the constituted life, in and by itself, the earth-born, and so the depraved. The same explanation will cover the words of Jude when he describes those who separate themselves as ψυχικοί, "natural, not having the πνεῦμα:"[1] a phrase which is far from meaning, not having, psychologically,

[1] Jude 19.

a πνεῦμα at all; for this idea would be contrary to all Biblical usage; but rather, not having what the πνεῦμα had now come to represent: the life principle of the new creation, individualised in the regenerated ψυχή.

The words of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 45 are an eschatological application of the same idea, and must be explained in close connection with the earthly and heavenly bodies of Verse 44: "The first man Adam became a living soul (ψυχὴ ζῶσα), the last Adam became a quickening spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν)." There is no contrast here between the ψυχὴ and the πνεῦμα of Adam, nor any implication that he was destitute of a πνεῦμα. The contrast is between Adam and Christ, in respect of the natural and supra-natural. By ψυχὴ Paul emphasizes Adam as material, earthly, created, perishable —the first link in a chain of "living souls" with bodies doomed to perish: by πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν he emphasizes what Christ had become, partly in consequence of his heavenly origin (Verse 47), partly in consequence of what this supra-natural origin had rendered possible— the creative act of God by which the "last Adam" rose superior to death and was constituted with a heavenly and imperishable body; thus acquiring power to be the first link in the chain of a new humanity, endowed by Him with immortal life in bodies heavenly and imperishable like his own. But, in reference to the new humanity, the spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικὸν) is but the organ of the regenerated ψυχή, that individualisation of the regenerated πνεῦμα: the "new creature" (καινὴ κτίσις) possessing it is a constituted life, a "living soul" in the new creation.

In the face of the general usage, an isolated passage like 1 Thessalonians v. 23, or like Hebrews iv. 12—

passages in which the constitution of man appears to be divided into three parts, body, soul, and spirit,—must rather be outweighed by such general usage than allowed to outweigh it. And when we remember how common a thing it was for the Hebrews and Easterns generally to emphasize their ideas by the cumulation of expressions not radically different, such for, instance, as *heart and soul and mind*,[1] or *soul, heart, and flesh*,[2] we feel that it would be unfair to deduce any philosophical trichotomy from such passages as these. If any intentional distinction is to be admitted between the *spirit and soul* of the Thessalonian Epistle, the phrase may possibly be explained as a way of classifying the *inner* life and the *individual* life ; but this involves no *separation* between *individual* and *inner*. And in the passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, the division of *soul and spirit* by the Spirit of God, is no more separative than that of the "joints" *from* "the marrow," or that of the "thoughts" *from* the "intents of the heart."

To sum up in one word, πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ are not used by the Biblical writers to denote two separable elements in man's nature, but rather the soul under different aspects, namely, *from God*, and *in man;* and the specially Pauline πνεῦμα is ψυχὴ raised to its highest aspect, that of the ψυχὴ renewed by the restoring πνεῦμα of God. Accordingly, the antithesis, πνευματικὸς and ψυχικός, would seem to have arisen not from an actual dualism of πνεῦμα and ψυχή, but from a differentiation the seed of which was sown in the story of man's creation, and fostered and matured during the process of his redemption.

JOHN MASSIE.

[1] Matt. xxii. 37.

[2] Psa. lxxxiv. 2.