

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

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



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

# The Use of רוּחַ in the Old Testament, and of πνεῦμα in the New Testament.

## A LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDY

BY

WILLIAM ROSS SCHOEMAKER, PH.D.

MENOMINEE, MICH.

## PART I.

### THE USE OF רוּחַ IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE following investigation is an attempt to trace the growth in meaning, as well as to classify every occurrence in the Old Testament, of the Hebrew term רוּחַ. For this purpose, it becomes necessary to arrange the literature of the Old Testament, whose writing covered a period of several hundred years, as nearly as possible in chronological order. Since the dating of most of it has been done quite thoroughly, we shall in the study before us assume the commonly accepted dates. In the course of the investigation it was found that the development in the conceptions and meanings connected with the term would best be displayed by arranging the biblical material in four chronological groups.

#### I. *The Use of רוּחַ in the Oldest Documents of the Old Testament Literature, dating approximately from 900 to 700 B.C.*<sup>1</sup>

In this period the word has but two general meanings, *wind* and *spirit*. The idea of *breath* does not seem to have become attached to it until exilic and post-exilic times. At least there are no clear examples of this use before that time.

##### 1. רוּחַ used to denote *wind*.

Of the two uses of the term, "wind" and "spirit," *wind* seems to

<sup>1</sup> J and E of the Hexateuch; the oldest portions of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and the writings of the eighth-century prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah (omitting the later additions to their prophecies).

be the more clearly defined. It is the customary meaning of the Hebrew word when unaccompanied by any explanatory modifier. No other term is used to denote wind in this early literature. It is used of both a zephyr and a storm. The conception of wind as air in motion is, of course, entirely absent from the thought of the early Hebrews. Nor did they seem to know that in breathing a man inhaled air or wind. Such conceptions were not reached by the Hebrews until much later in their history. When רוח came to be employed of breath as well as of wind, it was not through any idea of the physical identity of the two, but rather through the recognition of a similarity between the phenomena. Breath was nothing more than a miniature wind. For the early Hebrews the two leading characteristics of the wind were energy and invisibility. At first it was the energy and power of the wind which attracted the most attention; later, as in Job and Ecclesiastes, it was its invisibility and emptiness. The power of the wind is very well illustrated in the Elijah and Elisha narratives. It is a great and strong wind that rends the mountains (1 K. 19<sup>11</sup>); and a storm wind that brings the rain (2 K. 3<sup>17</sup>; cf. 1 K. 18<sup>45</sup>). Isaiah pictures the trees of the wood swayed to and fro by it (Isa. 7<sup>2</sup>), and the chaff driven before it (Isa. 17<sup>13</sup>). The idea of the invisibility and emptiness of the wind is set forth by Hosea when he affirms that Ephraim feeds upon wind, and says that the wind hath wrapped her up in its wings (Hos. 12<sup>10,2</sup> and 4<sup>19</sup>; cf. 8<sup>7</sup>).

This powerful and invisible force is under the direct control of God. It goes forth from him to do his bidding. Thus, by an east wind the Lord brings the locusts upon the land of Egypt (Exod. 10<sup>13</sup> [J]); and again by a strong west wind he drives them into the sea (Exod. 10<sup>19</sup> [J]). By the east wind he causes the waters of the Red Sea to go back all the night in order that his people may cross on dry land (Exod. 14<sup>21</sup> [J]). By a wind which goes forth from him, he brings the quails in order that Israel may be fed in the wilderness (Num. 11<sup>31</sup> [J]). The hot wind which comes up from the desert is called the wind of the Lord (Hos. 13<sup>15</sup>).

With the conception of the wind as an invisible power of God, it seems probable that the early Hebrews easily carried over the term רוח to designate the unseen but powerful influences which appeared to operate within the physical and psychical life of man. God, by his unseen but powerful רוח (spirit), acted upon man in much the same way as, through his רוח (wind), he acted upon natural objects.

## 2. רוּחַ used to denote spirit.

## a) Spirit of God.

There were two leading conceptions (at bottom one) of the function of the spirit of God.

(1) *The non-prophetic function* in which the spirit of the Lord fell suddenly upon some leader or hero, arousing him to action and imparting to him the physical strength and courage to perform some extraordinary deed of valor. This is well illustrated by the stories of Gideon and Samson in the Book of Judges. Thus, when the spirit came upon Samson, he tore the lion in pieces with perfect ease (Judg. 14<sup>5-6</sup> [J]), and at another time he rent asunder the cord with which his hands were bound (Judg. 15<sup>14</sup> [J]). It was when the spirit clothed Gideon that he blew the trumpet and gathered the armies of Israel together (Judg. 6<sup>33-35</sup> [J]; cf. Judg. 13<sup>25</sup> with 14<sup>4</sup> [J]). Likewise Saul, under a similar impulse, summoned the warriors to the defence of Jabesh (1 Sam. 11<sup>6</sup> [J]). In this case the spirit of the Lord not only stirred up Saul's courage but his anger (indignation) as well. In fact, in this early period, anger seems to have been regarded as one of the legitimate and necessary means of self-defence, hence not essentially evil. Strength, courage, and anger were so closely linked together that it is probable that they were distinguished only in a vague and general way. A similar view of the power and courage imparted by the spirit of God is set forth by Isaiah when he says of the Egyptians that they are men and not God, and that their horses are flesh (weak and powerless) and not spirit (the power imparted by God. Isa. 31<sup>8</sup>). Micah asserts that he is full of power by the spirit (Mic. 3<sup>8</sup>. Wellhausen, Nowack, and Briggs regard "by the spirit" in this passage as a gloss of some later scribe), and asks whether the spirit of the Lord is shortened (Mic. 2<sup>7</sup>). "Shortened" (קָצַר) can mean impotent, powerless, as in Isa. 50<sup>2</sup>; or impatient, angry, as in Job 21<sup>4</sup> Prov. 14<sup>29</sup> Exod. 6<sup>9</sup> [P]. G translates the present passage in the latter way, and most interpreters follow this version. A still more striking example of the power of the spirit is presented in the stories connected with Elijah. An early writer represents Elijah as transported from place to place by the spirit of God (1 K. 18<sup>12</sup> 2 K. 2<sup>16</sup>; cf. Ezek. 8<sup>3</sup> etc. Acts 8<sup>39</sup>).

(2) *The prophetic function*, in which the spirit of the Lord came upon the prophets and stirred them up to a state of ecstasy, or religious frenzy, in which state they were able to receive and communicate the divine message imparted to them. This function of the spirit is well illustrated in 1 Sam. 10<sup>6-13</sup>. The band of inspired

prophets, who roam about carrying their musical instruments with them, are clearly in a state of ecstasy. When Saul met them, the spirit fell suddenly upon him, and he, too, prophesied with the rest (1 Sam. 10<sup>10</sup>; cf. 1 Sam. 19<sup>20, 23</sup>). Because of his frenzy and ecstasy, he is said to be changed into another man (1 Sam. 10<sup>6</sup>). Men so enthused by the spirit of God regarded themselves as entirely under the spirit's control. Hence what they said and did was looked upon as coming directly from God (Num. 24<sup>3</sup> [J]; cf. 24<sup>3, 12, 16</sup>). The primary function of the spirit, however, was not that of message-bearing. God more often conveyed his messages to men by means of direct discourse (Gen. 21<sup>22</sup> 22<sup>1</sup> Exod. 3<sup>6</sup>; cf. 4<sup>27</sup> [all E]), or by an angel (Gen. 22<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>17</sup> 31<sup>11</sup> 32<sup>1</sup> [all E], Gen. 24<sup>7</sup> 16<sup>7-11</sup> Exod. 3<sup>3</sup> [all J]), or in a dream (Gen. 20<sup>2, 6</sup> 31<sup>11</sup> 31<sup>24</sup> 37<sup>2-20</sup> [all E]). In this early period, the primary function of the spirit of God was that of arousing in the prophet the state of ecstasy. God by his spirit enthused the prophet — stirred him up. Thus we see that at bottom the prophetic function of the spirit was identical with the non-prophetic. In both cases the spirit stirred up and energized men. In the case of Gideon, the spirit aroused to action; in the case of the prophet, to a state of ecstasy. It is evident that until this factor of ecstasy could be eliminated, or reduced to a minimum, the message of the prophet would be discredited. This elimination of the ecstatic occurred during the following, the Deuteronomic, period. There are many indications that, at the time of our earliest literature, these ecstatic prophets were already under the ban. Hosea calls the prophet a fool, and says that the man of the spirit is mad (Hos. 9<sup>7, 8</sup>; cf. 2 K. 9<sup>11</sup> and Jer. 29<sup>20</sup>); and Micah affirms that they speak lies and prophesy of wine and strong drink (Micah 2<sup>11</sup>). None of the writing prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Micah, state explicitly that they prophesied by means of the spirit of God, though in the case of some of them this may be implied.

The spirit was regarded as operative only while the prophet was in the state of ecstasy. When Saul had finished prophesying he returned to his ordinary vocation (1 Sam. 10<sup>13</sup>). However, the man in whom the spirit repeatedly manifested itself came to be designated as "the man of the spirit" (Hos. 9<sup>7</sup>). So it was with Elijah and Elisha. Elisha prayed that a double portion (the portion that falls by right to the eldest son) of the spirit possessed by his master might rest upon him (2 K. 2<sup>9</sup>). In this latter case the possession of the spirit meant also the power to work miracles. The prophets who stood at a distance perceived that the spirit of Elijah rested

upon Elisha when they saw the latter perform the same miracle which the former had just accomplished (2 K. 2<sup>14, 15</sup>; cf. 2<sup>7, 8</sup>). In the case of Joseph the possession of the spirit gave him the ability to interpret dreams (Gen. 41<sup>68, 69</sup> [E]).

In all of these cases the work of the spirit was beneficent to all concerned, but there were some ecstatic phenomena where the results were harmful. When, as in the case of Saul, the frenzy took the form of a dangerous insanity, the cause was said to be the spirit of God (for) evil (1 Sam. 16<sup>14, 16, 23</sup> [J]), or the spirit of evil from the Lord (1 Sam. 16<sup>14, 23</sup> [J]). The spirit itself is not said to be evil or to have an evil disposition. It is only the effect upon the man that is said to be evil. The spirit terrorizes him and causes him to be injurious to others. The spirit is not viewed as a separate personality existing alongside of God (as Satan in the Book of Job), but rather as an influence or power proceeding from him. The work done is conceived to be from God as much as in the case of the "spirit for good" (cf. 1 K. 22<sup>22-24</sup> and see Briggs, *JOUR. OF BIB. LIT.*, Vol. XIX. p. 141). A kindred conception is presented by Isaiah when he tells erring Israel to stupefy and blind themselves, to be drunken and stagger but not with drink, for the Lord has poured out upon them "spirit of deep sleep" (Isa. 29<sup>10</sup>). Here the effect produced by the spirit is clearly an ecstatic one. The people stagger and reel as if drunken (cf. Mic. 2<sup>11</sup>). The spirit, instead of enabling the prophets and seers to speak forth the will of God, silences them. The function of the spirit described in this Isaiah passage is thus the opposite of its true function. As a warning to erring Israel, Isaiah could not well have chosen a more striking figure. Israel had neglected to follow the guidance of the spirit, hence God used it as a means of leading her astray. Hosea used a similar figure, but in his case the metonymy is still more apparent. He says that Israel seeks counsel of her idols, implying that she will not be guided by God. She prefers to be directed by the spirit of whoredom and thus to wander away from him (Hos. 4<sup>12, 5</sup>). She follows her own lustful impulses rather than the dictates of the spirit of God. The prophet is not to be understood as affirming that he believes there is a demoniac spirit possessing the people and leading them astray. A clear case of the use of רִיחַ to denote a demon does not seem to occur in the Old Testament. Nor does his language imply that he conceived the lust to proceed from their own spirits. This again would be a use of רִיחַ entirely without parallel, since lust is never attributed to the human spirit. Hence it seems probable that we

have here simply an analogic metonymy, in which  $\text{רוּחַ}$  stands for guiding and impelling power without designating its source.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, for the early Hebrews, the idea of spirit seems to have been almost as general as the idea of wind. Both were energies or powers proceeding from God. The quantitative notion attached to the one as much as to the other. That they did not ascribe to the spirit a personality separate from God is made more certain from the fact that in no Old Testament writing is there a clear case of the use of  $\text{רוּחַ}$  to denote separate, individual, disembodied, personal spirits, either good or bad. The plural form of the term is never used in this sense. To all intents and purposes there was but one spirit of God.

*b) רוּחַ used to denote physical strength, courage, and anger, and viewed sometimes as the seat or source of these and especially of violent agitation.*

These phenomena are so strikingly a reflection of the phenomena connected with the spirit of God that one is immediately driven to the conclusion that there must be some genetic relation between the two. What that relation is can best be stated when we have examined the passages of Scripture in which this meaning occurs. To illustrate the use of  $\text{רוּחַ}$  to denote physical strength and courage, there are three examples. Samson's spirit ( $\text{רוּחַ}$ ) returned and he revived as soon as his thirst was quenched (Judg. 15<sup>19</sup> [J]). Likewise the spirit of an Egyptian returned after he had eaten (1 Sam. 30<sup>12</sup> [J]). Jacob's spirit revived when he saw the wagons which Joseph had sent to carry him to Egypt (Gen. 45<sup>27</sup> [E]). Under the head of anger or the seat of stubbornness and violent agitation there are also three passages. The spirit (anger) of the men of Ephraim was abated toward Gideon when he had explained to them why they were not called out to battle (Judg. 8<sup>3</sup> [E]). Ahab's spirit was sullen when he could not get the vineyard of Naboth (1 K. 21<sup>5</sup>). And Pharaoh's spirit was agitated (stirred up  $\text{רוּחַ}$ ) when he awoke from his dream (Gen. 41<sup>8</sup> [E]). These examples are the only ones found in this period. The preëxilic prophets do not use the term in this sense unless Micah 2<sup>7</sup> is a case in point.

On the basis of these examples, the conclusion seems certain that the concept of the spirit of man (denoting thereby strength, courage,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the use of *νόμος*, law, in a similar way in Rom. 7<sup>23</sup>, where "a different law," not a law at all in the strict sense, but a force tending, as law serves, to control action, is by "analogic metonymy" called law, in contrast to the [real] law which acts in the opposite direction.

and anger) is an outgrowth from the concept of the spirit of God. Since God imparts his spirit of strength and courage to man, strength and courage are themselves in time called spirit. Or again, since the spirit of God stirs up men to warlike actions, what more natural than to call that in man which is stirred up his spirit (cf. Judg. 13<sup>25</sup> [J] with Gen. 41<sup>8</sup> [E] where the same verb [רָעַע] is used. Also cf. 1 Sam. 11<sup>6</sup> with Judg. 8<sup>3</sup> [E], both of which involve anger)? Or, viewed from another standpoint, such kindred phenomena as strength, courage, and anger, which in their most striking manifestations, at least, were at one time attributed to the divine power, were later, owing perhaps to their frequency, designated the spirit of man. Judges 9<sup>23</sup> is a passage which bears the marks of such a transition. It is there said that God sent a spirit for evil between Abimelech and the men of Shechem. On the one hand, this reminds us of the language used concerning the spirit of evil from the Lord (1 Sam. 16<sup>14-23</sup>); on the other, of the phenomenon of anger called the spirit of man. In a later period, the thought of the passage would have been expressed by saying that God *stirred up* the spirit of Abimelech and of the men of Shechem (cf. 1 Chron. 5<sup>26</sup> 2 Chron. 21<sup>16</sup>).

If now we have discovered the true genetic relationship between the spirit of God and the spirit of man, it seems clear that the latter was not, in its earliest stages at least, regarded as a faculty of the soul or mind. It was simply the name of certain striking physical and mental phenomena related to the active side of life, such as strength, courage, and anger. It was in no way regarded as the seat of life or the bearer of the man's personality. It was not used as a synonym of either soul (נֶפֶשׁ) or heart (לֵב), the leading psychological terms of the period. The spirit was not localized in any part of the body. From its very nature this was impossible. The man's spirit (strength, courage, and anger) departed and returned, but no one thought of asking where it had been. Even in the popular language of to-day, courage and anger are not localized. We speak of their coming and going in the same vague and general way that the people of old spoke of the spirit.



## II. *The Use of רוח in the Deuteronomic Period dating from about 700 to about 550 B.C.*<sup>3</sup>

In general the term is used in the same senses as in the previous period. The one striking exception occurs in the case of the spirit of God. There is an entire absence of that term from the main body of the literature of this period.

### 1. *The use of רוח for wind.*

Jeremiah very often refers to the destructive power of the wind (Jer. 4<sup>11, 12</sup> 13<sup>24</sup> 18<sup>17</sup>). He also speaks of the wind as a shepherd of the pastors of Israel, who have caused the people to go astray (Jer. 22<sup>22</sup>). Habakkuk, in describing the pride and haughtiness of the Chaldean, says that he sweeps by as a wind and passes on (Hab. 1<sup>11</sup>). Jeremiah, on the other hand, also uses the wind as a symbol of emptiness. The prophets, he says, shall become wind since the word is not in them (Jer. 5<sup>13</sup>). Israel, in her inordinate desire after strange gods, is like a wild ass with open mouth catching at the wind (Jer. 2<sup>24</sup> 14<sup>6</sup>). In Jer. 49<sup>22, 26</sup> רוח is used by metonymy for the points of the compass — the directions from which the wind blows.

### 2. *The use of רוח for spirit.*

#### a) *Spirit of God.*

As stated above, the phrase "spirit of God" does not occur in the main body of the literature of this period. It is not found in D. of the Hexateuch (only once in the Book of Deuteronomy and that in a late passage), nor in the Deuteronomic portions of the books of Kings, nor even in the prophecies of Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk. This abandonment of the term spirit of God was probably due to the disrepute into which the ecstatic prophets had fallen.<sup>4</sup> The period had at its heart the religio-ethical revival of Josiah, and ethics and ecstasy have little in common. However, there are certain fragments of literature belonging to this period in which the phrase spirit of God is used, and some of these are quite instructive for our purpose.

(1) *The non-prophetic function of the spirit.* — The spirit of the Lord stirs up and empowers certain persons to do acts requiring great physical strength and courage. Thus when the spirit of God

<sup>3</sup> The literature of the period includes D of the Hexateuch; the Deuteronomic portions of the Books of Judges and Kings; and, with the exception of later additions, the prophecies of Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk.

<sup>4</sup> See Briggs, *JOUR. OF BIB. LIT.*, Vol. XIX. p. 140; also Jer. 5<sup>12</sup>; 29<sup>26, 27</sup>; Isa. 30<sup>9, 10</sup>; 1 Sam. 10<sup>11-12</sup>; Hos. 9<sup>7, 8</sup>; Micah 2<sup>11</sup>.

was upon Othniel, he went out to war and vindicated Israel (Judg. 3<sup>10</sup>). So, too, the spirit of the Lord stirred up Jephthah and he went forth to conquer Ammon (Judg. 11<sup>29</sup>). Likewise, when the spirit of the Lord fell upon Samson he went down to Ashkelon and killed thirty men (Judg. 14<sup>19</sup>).

(2) *The prophetic function of the spirit.*—The spirit of the Lord arouses certain men—the prophets—to a state of ecstasy and thus enables them to prophesy for God. There are but two passages which can properly be classed here. In Num. 11<sup>17-29</sup>, the Lord tells Moses that he will take of the spirit which is upon him and will put it upon the seventy elders. After the Lord had transferred a portion of the spirit from Moses to each of the elders, they, including the two who had remained in the camp, began to prophesy. When Joshua remonstrated with Moses against the two latter prophesying in the camp, Moses replied, “Would God that all the Lord’s people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them” (Num. 11<sup>29</sup>). We have here one of the first instances in which the spirit of the Lord is designated simply as “the spirit.” This passage, like those of 2 K. 2<sup>9</sup> and Isa. 29<sup>13</sup>, presents a general or quantitative conception of the spirit. Each elder participated in the one spirit of God. A view like this seems to preclude any thought of the separate personality of the spirit. The second passage is 1 K. 22<sup>19-24</sup>. Micaiah, in narrating his vision to the king of Israel, says that he saw the Lord sitting upon his throne and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. When the Lord had inquired of them who would go and deceive Ahab, and no one of them volunteered, *the spirit* came forward and said, “I will entice him by becoming a spirit of deceit in the mouth of his prophets.” That the writer of this passage has personified the spirit is quite evident. He represents the spirit as speaking and acting just as a person would do under similar circumstances. That, however, he did not intend to go beyond personification is also quite evident. In the first place, we must remember that the writer is narrating, in vivid language, a vision which he had had. He is not speaking in plain prose and with theological accuracy. In the second place, we must note that when he is describing the real work of the spirit he falls back upon the ordinary view of its nature. The spirit is not said to have gone to Ahab or to one of his prophets simply as an angel would, but on the contrary becomes a lying spirit in the mouth of all the four hundred prophets. All of these prophets participate in and are stimulated by the one spirit. The use of the article in v.<sup>21</sup> does not

indicate that *the* spirit was one among other *spirits* standing about the throne. Neither in the singular nor in the plural is רִיחַ ever used of the heavenly hosts. It was only after the host (the angels) had given their opinions that the one divine spirit came forward to proffer its aid. Nor does its task of deception make it an evil spirit. The writer does not even call it the spirit of God for evil as is done in 1 Sam. 16<sup>13-23</sup>. In spite of the function which it performed it is simply the spirit of the Lord (1 K. 22<sup>24</sup>). A similar function of the spirit appears in 2 K. 19<sup>f</sup> (= Isa. 37<sup>f</sup>). God by his spirit arouses in the king of Assyria a feeling of fear and quickens in him the impulse to withdraw his army from Jewish territory. רִיחַ is here used without the article, and is viewed simply as a power of God — that power by which he enters into and influences men.

b) רִיחַ used to denote physical strength, courage, anger, stubbornness, etc., or their seat or source.

This usage is not found in the writings of any prophet of this period (nor indeed of any preëxilic prophet) and but once in the Book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 2<sup>30</sup>). In those fragments of literature in which it does occur, it is used in precisely the same way as in the previous period. As examples of רִיחַ used to denote physical strength and courage, we have at least two passages. It is said of the queen of Sheba, that after she had seen the wisdom of Solomon and the house that he had built, there was no more spirit in her (1 K. 10<sup>5</sup> [= 2 Chron. 9<sup>f</sup>]). There was no more spirit in the kings of the Amorites and Canaanites when they heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of the Red Sea and the Jordan River (Josh. 2<sup>11</sup> 5<sup>1</sup>). Of its use to denote anger or the seat of stubbornness and obstinacy, we have three examples. It is said that the Lord hardened (made obstinate or angry) the spirit of Sihon, king of Heshbon, so that he would not permit Israel to pass by (Deut. 2<sup>30</sup>). Hannah said that she was a woman of a hard (or rebellious) spirit and so had come to pour out her soul before the Lord (1 Sam. 1<sup>15</sup>). Caleb was permitted to enter the promised land because he had shown another spirit, *i.e.* had not provoked the Lord by his obstinacy and rebelliousness as the others had done (Num. 14<sup>24</sup>).

It thus seems clear that the Deuteronomic period added nothing to the concept or use of the term רִיחַ. This is all the more remarkable when we remember that it was during this very period that the most rapid development occurred in the meanings of such psychological terms as soul (נֶפֶשׁ) and heart (לֵב). The word "spirit" found no place in the fundamental ethical precept of the time,

"Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6<sup>5</sup>).

### III. *The Use of רִיחַ in the Babylonian (Exilic) and Early Persian Periods, dating from about 550 to about 400 B.C.*<sup>b</sup>

If, on the one hand, the Deuteronomic period was characterized by the least possible (or even a negative) development in the use of רִיחַ; on the other hand, the Babylonian and early Persian periods were characterized by the most rapid development in all the meanings of the term. In connection with the meaning *wind*, we have the term used to denote *breath*, and also (since breathing is necessary to life) by metonymy for *life* itself; the phrase *spirit of God* is rescued from its former reproach and has a larger and more religious content put into it; and, finally, the concept of the spirit of man is extended to include a portion of the realm of conduct and character.

1. רִיחַ used to denote wind and breath.

a) To denote wind.

The wind is still viewed as one of the most powerful forces of nature. It transports objects from place to place (Ezek. 5<sup>2</sup> Isa. 41<sup>16</sup> 57<sup>15</sup> 64<sup>6,7</sup> Zech. 5<sup>9</sup> Ps. 1<sup>4</sup> 18<sup>48[48]</sup> 35<sup>5</sup>). It tears down walls (Ezek. 13<sup>11,15</sup>); and dashes into pieces the ships at sea (Ezek. 27<sup>26</sup> Ps. 48<sup>7</sup>). Man stands in awe of it at all times (Ps. 55<sup>6,7</sup>). When the east wind comes with scorching heat from the desert it withers all vegetation (Ezek. 17<sup>10</sup> 19<sup>12</sup>). This powerful wind is still spoken of as under the direct control of God. When he manifests himself to Ezekiel it is through a storm wind coming out of the north (Ezek. 1<sup>4</sup>). God is also pictured as riding upon the wings of the wind (2 Sam. 22<sup>11</sup> [= Ps. 18<sup>10[11]</sup>]); and it goes forth to do his bidding (Zech. 6<sup>5</sup> Gen. 8<sup>1</sup> [P]). Because of its invisibility, it is used as the symbol of emptiness and nothingness. The molten images are characterized as wind and confusion (Isa. 41<sup>29</sup>); and the psalmist says that God had compassion upon Israel because he remembered that they were flesh, a wind that passed and came not again (Ps. 78<sup>39</sup>). By metonymy, רִיחַ is used for the points of the compass—the directions from which the wind blows (Ezek. 5<sup>10,12</sup> 17<sup>21</sup> 42<sup>16,17,18,19,20</sup>).

<sup>b</sup> Literature: Ezekiel; Babylonian Isaiah; Zechariah, ch. 1–8; Haggai; Malachi; H and P of the Hexateuch; Memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah; and many of the Psalms.

*δ) To denote breath.*

The first certain and definite instances of the use of רִיחַ for *breath* occur in the literature of this period. The breath is viewed as a wind from the mouth similar in manifestation to the wind outside. Ezekiel is the first writer, whose writings can be dated with any degree of certainty, who uses the word in this sense. In his vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek. 37<sup>1-10</sup>), the breath of life which reanimated the dead came not from God directly but from the four quarters (four winds, Ezek. 37<sup>9</sup>). There is no clear evidence, however, that he identified breath with wind,<sup>6</sup> much less that he knew that a man in breathing inhaled and exhaled air (or wind). Breath was rather the permanent possession of the living man. Since the breath is warm, several writers of this period speak of the hot desert wind as the destructive breath of God. The grass withers because the breath of the Lord breathes or blows upon it (Isa. 40<sup>7</sup>). With the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked and purge Jerusalem by the breath of judgment and the breath of burning (Isa. 11<sup>4</sup> 4<sup>1</sup>). The breath of the Lord is an overflowing stream to sift the nations (Isa. 30<sup>25</sup>).<sup>7</sup> By the breath of his nostrils the waters were gathered together (Exod. 15<sup>8</sup> 2 Sam. 22<sup>16</sup> [= Ps. 18<sup>15(18)</sup>]). The enemy comes as a rushing stream which the breath of the Lord driveth on (Isa. 59<sup>19</sup>).

The breath was put within man by God (Ezek. 37<sup>6</sup> Num. 16<sup>22</sup> 27<sup>16</sup> Mal. 2<sup>15</sup>), and during life it is under his immediate protection (Ps. 31<sup>5(6)</sup>; cf. 143<sup>7</sup>). It was one of the most precious possessions belonging to man (Lam. 4<sup>20</sup>). It was not, however, viewed as the bearer of his personality. This was the function of the soul (שׁוּפְרוֹת). Neither during life nor after death was the man himself in any way identified with his spirit or breath. The spirit, in the sense of breath or life, was rather the possession of the man which belonged to him while he was alive. Death occurred because it was withdrawn from him (Gen. 6<sup>3</sup>).<sup>8</sup> רִיחַ is often used as a synonym for

<sup>6</sup> On the correct translation of רִיחַ in the passage, see Toy: *Ezekiel* (English Polychrome Bible).

<sup>7</sup> As to the date of these passages, see Cheyne: *Isaiah* (English Polychrome Bible).

<sup>8</sup> This difficult passage is but loosely connected with its context, and since the last clause of the verse, which clearly governs the meaning to be applied to רִיחַ, is most probably post-exilic, we have classified the passage in this period. The present Hebrew text is so corrupt that it is hard to determine what the original meaning was. (On the text and interpretation see Dillmann: *Genesis*, and Mitchell: *The World before Abraham*, pp. 192-194.)

רִיחַ), the older and more common word for breath. Thus in Gen. 7<sup>22</sup> (J), a passage in one of the oldest documents of the Hexateuch, a post-exilic redactor has inserted the former term alongside of the latter.<sup>9</sup> In Isaiah we read that God gives breath (רִיחַ) to the people upon the earth, and life (חַיִּים) to them that walk therein (Isa. 42<sup>6</sup>; cf. 57<sup>16</sup>).

Since breath is necessary to life, by metonymy רִיחַ easily comes to stand for *life* itself. The beginning of this process is seen in such passages as Gen. 6<sup>17</sup> 7<sup>15</sup> and Num. 16<sup>22</sup> 27<sup>16</sup>; the culmination, in such passages as Mal. 2<sup>15a, 16</sup> and Ps. 31<sup>6(6)</sup>. Though the term is ordinarily used with reference to man alone, yet occasionally it is used also of animals, or rather of man and animals classified as a single group (Gen. 6<sup>17</sup> [P] 7<sup>15</sup> [P]; cf. Isa. 34<sup>16</sup>).

2. *The use of רִיחַ for spirit in this period.*

a) *Spirit of God.*

This meaning occurs very often in the prophetic writings of the period, but very seldom in the priestly writings. In fact, this usage of the term might be called a prophetic one. Not, however, in the sense that the prophets considered themselves the sole bearers of the spirit. On the contrary they seldom if ever make any explicit claim to having received their prophecies through the mediation of the spirit. Not only their messages, but their visions as well were viewed as coming directly from God. The most striking feature in the use of the phrase "spirit of God" during this time was the almost complete absence of the ecstatic from its realm. According to the dominant conception of the period, the spirit is the *energizing, directing, guiding, and enlightening power of God*. The realm of its operation is still man, but no longer confined to the individual. The spirit is now conceived of as guiding the nation as well.

(1) *The spirit is first of all the energizing, directing, and transporting power of God.*—This is the common usage in the prophecies of Ezekiel. That prophet speaks of being transported from place to place by the spirit. The spirit sets him upon his feet (Ezek. 2<sup>2</sup> 3<sup>24</sup>), lifts him up (Ezek. 3<sup>15</sup>), bears him away (Ezek. 3<sup>16</sup>) to the temple at Jerusalem (Ezek. 8<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>1</sup> 43<sup>6</sup>) or to the captivity in Chaldea (Ezek. 11<sup>24</sup>). It is true that this is all done in vision, but that does not affect the underlying conception of the function of the spirit. The vision itself is not attributed to the spirit but to the hand of God

<sup>9</sup> See Carpenter and Harford-Battersby: *The Hexateuch*, Vol. II, p. 12. G omits רִיחַ in translating.

resting upon the prophet (Ezek. 1<sup>3</sup> 3<sup>23</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>24</sup>). The messages which the prophet receives come directly from God (Ezek. 1<sup>28</sup> 2<sup>1-3</sup> 3<sup>4-23</sup>; etc.). Even the passages which seem to imply that the spirit spoke to the prophet (Ezek. 13<sup>24</sup> 11<sup>5</sup>) are more consistently rendered by making God the speaker.<sup>10</sup> In the employment of the term to denote the physical strength imparted by God to man, Ezekiel is in complete harmony with the older usage. The only point in which he departs from that terminology is in employing the term without the limiting phrase "of God." This shows that the meaning of *strength* and *power* had become so closely bound up with the term that it was no longer necessary to say "spirit of God." Spirit alone meant that (cf. Ezek. 11<sup>5, 24</sup> 37<sup>1</sup> with Ezek. 2<sup>2</sup> 3<sup>24, 12, 14</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>1</sup> 43<sup>5</sup>). But the spirit was not only the power of God that energized and transported the prophet. It was likewise the energizing and directing power of the theophany (Ezek. 1<sup>12, 20, 21</sup> 10<sup>17</sup>). The spirit impelled the symbolic creatures and the wheels to go whither it would. It coördinated and directed the whole complex phenomenon.

(2) *The spirit is the enlightening and directing power of God in such men as are called of him to perform some great task.*—There are three passages in the priestly writings in which the usage of רִיחַ lies on the border line between the last and the present one. In these instances, the spirit is no longer viewed as imparting to men physical strength and courage, but rather technical skill and knowledge. Thus those whom the Lord has filled with the spirit of wisdom are to make Aaron's priestly garments (Exod. 28<sup>3</sup> [P]). The Lord filled Bezaleel with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship in order that he might construct the tabernacle and its furnishings (Exod. 31<sup>3</sup> 35<sup>31</sup> [P]). This usage of spirit seems to be confined to the skill and knowledge required by men to construct the sacred articles belonging to God's worship, and does not seem to have been extended beyond this.

In such a passage<sup>11</sup> as Isa. 11<sup>2</sup>, in which the ideal king is pictured as possessing the spirit of the Lord, we reach a stage still higher. The spirit imparts to him wisdom and understanding, counsel and might, knowledge and the fear of the Lord, so that he will not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears (Isa. 11<sup>2-5</sup>). Similarly, the Lord will be for a spirit of judgment

<sup>10</sup> See Toy: *Ezekiel* (English Polychrome Bible), on these passages.

<sup>11</sup> Probably post-exilic—See Cheyne: *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 62-64; and Cheyne: *Isaiah* (English Polychrome Bible), p. 24.

to those who sit in judgment and for strength to those who turn the battle at the gate (Isa. 28<sup>6</sup>). The Lord will put his spirit upon his servant, and then he will bring forth judgment to the Gentiles (Isa. 42<sup>1</sup>). The spirit of the Lord God is upon him in order that he may preach good tidings to the meek and proclaim liberty to the captives (Isa. 61<sup>1</sup>). The spirit accompanied him in his work (Isa. 48<sup>16</sup>).<sup>12</sup> According to a priestly writer, it is because Joshua was filled with the spirit of wisdom that he became the leader of the children of Israel (Num. 27<sup>18</sup> [P]; Deut. 34<sup>9</sup> [P]). Zerubbabel is to accomplish his task of rebuilding the temple, not by the aid of an army, but by the help of the spirit of the Lord (Zech. 4<sup>6</sup>); and the Psalmist cries out, "Let thy good spirit lead me" (Ps. 143<sup>10</sup>).

(3) *The spirit represents God's directing and protecting presence with the people of Israel — not as individuals but as a nation.*

The writers of this period, in looking back upon Israel's wilderness journey, never tire of telling how God through his spirit was present with his people, hovering over, guiding, and prospering them. Such a conception of the function of the spirit could hardly have arisen before the idea of the transcendence of God had become somewhat strongly developed. The spirit is thus the medium by which a transcendent and holy God comes into contact with a wayward and sinful people. Under such circumstances it is not strange that the spirit itself is soon looked upon as holy and called a "spirit of holiness" (Ps. 51<sup>11</sup>[<sup>13</sup>] Isa. 63<sup>10, 11</sup>). It cannot abide where there is impurity or rebelliousness. Examples of this new and general function of the spirit are quite numerous. Ezekiel, speaking in the name of the Lord to captive Israel, says, "I will no longer leave any of them there, nor hide my face from them, when I shall have poured out my spirit on the house of Israel" (Ezek. 39<sup>30</sup>). This is the reviving spoken of in Ezek. 37<sup>14</sup>, when the Lord promises to put his spirit in their midst (cf. 36<sup>26-30</sup>). According to Isaiah the Lord promises to pour out his spirit in added blessings upon Israel and its posterity down to its latest descendants (Isa. 44<sup>3</sup> 59<sup>21</sup> 63<sup>14</sup>). And this, too, in spite of the fact that they had resisted the guidance of his spirit of holiness when they came out of Egypt (Isa. 63<sup>10, 11</sup>; cf. Ps. 106<sup>35</sup>). According to the covenant which the Lord made with Israel when the people came out of Egypt, his spirit has remained among them (Hag. 2<sup>5</sup>). It corrected and instructed them in their wilderness journey (Neh. 9<sup>30</sup>; cf. 9<sup>30</sup>). The Psalmist has in mind this all-em-

<sup>12</sup> The word "spirit" in this passage is possibly a gloss — See Cheyne: *Isaiah* (English Polychrome Bible).



bracing presence of God when he cries out, "Whither can I go from thy spirit and whither can I flee from thy presence"? (Ps. 139<sup>7</sup>). And, if the 51st Psalm is a community psalm, we have the same thought expressed in the prayer, "Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy spirit of holiness from me" (Ps. 51<sup>11(13)</sup>).

These examples seem to make it perfectly clear that the spirit was one of the concepts through which the omnipresence and immanence of God were maintained in spite of the growing belief in his transcendence. By the spirit, God could be present everywhere operating for good in the midst of his people. In fact, the sphere of his operation through the spirit extended even farther than this, for at the time of the creation his creative presence was manifested in the spirit which brooded over the waters (Gen. 1<sup>2</sup> [P]; cf. Isa. 40<sup>13</sup>). In none of these examples is there any clear evidence of a belief in the separate personality of the spirit. The spirit is rather a function or power of God, — the means or medium of God's operation upon man and nation.

b) רִיב used for the spirit of man.

(1) *As in the former periods, רִיב is used of anger, wrath, courage, etc., or of their seat or source in man.*

Ezekiel took up the Lord's work in the fury (רִיב hot anger) of his spirit (Ezek. 3<sup>14</sup>). The spirit (wrath) of Egypt is to be emptied out in the midst of her (Isa. 19<sup>3</sup>), for the Lord has mingled a spirit of perversities within her (Isa. 19<sup>14</sup>). The anger (spirit) of the enemies of Israel will be turned against themselves and burn them up as a fire (Isa. 33<sup>11</sup>). The Lord will cut short the spirit (anger) of princes (Ps. 76<sup>12(13)</sup>). For shortness of spirit, the children of Israel in bondage hearkened not to Moses (Ex. 6<sup>9</sup> [P]). It caused Isaac and Rebekah bitterness of spirit (made them angry) that Esau married a Canaanitish woman (Gen. 26<sup>36</sup> [P]; cf. 28<sup>8</sup> [P]). Even of the Lord it can be said that his spirit (anger) is quieted (assuaged, Zech. 6<sup>6</sup>). Anger in itself was not regarded as blameworthy. Its legitimacy depended entirely upon the object toward which it was directed. A spirit of jealousy (envy, indignation) was sanctioned by the Levitical law in such extreme cases as the violation of the marriage vow (Num. 5<sup>14.30</sup> [P]).

Of the use of רִיב as the seat of courage or of its lack we have several examples. The tidings of the destruction of Jerusalem would make every spirit of the land faint (feeble, Ezek. 21<sup>12(17)</sup>). Downcast Israel is to be given a garment of praise for her spirit of heaviness (Isa. 61<sup>8</sup> 54<sup>6</sup>); but the unfaithful shall wail for breaking of

spirit (Isa. 65<sup>14</sup>). The psalmists in the midst of their afflictions cry out that their spirit is overwhelmed (Ps. 77<sup>34</sup> 142<sup>34</sup> 143<sup>4</sup>).

(2) *The spirit as the seat of humility.*

This usage of רִיבִּי grows naturally out of the preceding. Already, from the earliest period down, the spirit was viewed as the seat of pride and opposition to God as well as the seat of depression and sadness, but it was left for this period to erect humility the suppression of pride and stubbornness into a religious and moral virtue and to attach it to the spirit. Since pride and stubbornness were also attributed to the heart, it was only natural that humility should be referred to the one as well as to the other. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a crushed heart the Lord will not despise (Ps. 51<sup>17(19)</sup>). He is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart and saves such as are of a contrite spirit (Ps. 34<sup>10</sup>). He dwells with those of a contrite and a humble spirit, in order to revive the spirit of the humble and the heart of the contrite (Isa. 57<sup>15</sup> 66<sup>2</sup>).

(3) *The human spirit as the energizing and directing power or faculty in man.*

This meaning is so clearly a correlate of the similar function of the spirit of God that we have not far to seek for the origin of the usage. As the spirit of God is the directing and energizing power of God imparted to certain men in their divinely appointed tasks, so the spirit of man guides and impels him in his conduct toward God. The two usages seem to have grown up side by side. The modern term which most nearly expresses this new meaning for the human spirit is *will*. However, since the latter term carries with it so many meanings and associations not contained in the former, it will be better not to adopt it. To translate רִיבִּי by mind (Ezek. 20<sup>32</sup> A.V. and R.V.) would be still farther afield. The Hebrew term "heart" comes nearer to our term "mind" (in the broad sense of feelings, intellect, and will), since the former covers mental phenomena of fully as wide a range as the latter. The Hebrew words "heart" (לֵב) and "spirit" (רוּחַ in this new sense) bear much the same relation to each other as our words "mind" and "will." In fact the two are often used in parallel lines or in synonymous phrases (Ezek. 11<sup>19</sup> 18<sup>31</sup> 36<sup>26</sup> Isa. 57<sup>15</sup> Ps. 34<sup>18</sup> 51<sup>10(12)</sup> 17<sup>(19)</sup> 78<sup>6</sup>).

That the use of רִיבִּי to denote the energizing and directing power or faculty in man grew out of the corresponding function of the spirit of God is confirmed by certain passages in Ezekiel. In Ezek. 13<sup>3</sup>, it is said that the false prophets walk after their own spirit and have seen nothing, implying that they follow their own purposes and incli-

nations rather than those of the spirit of God. In Ezek. 36<sup>26, 27</sup>, after speaking of the new spirit of obedience which Israel is to receive and which clearly refers to the human spirit (cf. Ezek. 11<sup>19</sup> 18<sup>21</sup>), the prophet glides over very easily to the corresponding function of the divine spirit, and tells them that God will put his spirit within them and thus cause them to walk in his statutes. With Ezekiel the human spirit is also the seat and source of plans and purposes. When Israel purposed in their spirit to worship idols as the heathen did (Ezek. 20<sup>32</sup>), God knew all about it and frustrated their plans. Likewise he knew the plans of the war party in Jerusalem (Ezek. 11<sup>4</sup>) and threatened to bring forth their leaders to be slain outside the city. This planning and purposing function of the human spirit is the highest point of the development in the Old Testament usage of the term. No other writer seems to go beyond Ezekiel in this line. It is with his spirit that a man keeps his attention fixed upon God and remains steadfast and faithful in his service. One psalmist warns Israel not to become as their fathers, who were not faithful in their spirit to God (Ps. 78<sup>8</sup>); and another prays that he may have a steadfast spirit renewed within him (Ps. 51<sup>10, 12</sup>; cf. 78<sup>37</sup>). He asks that a willing (ready) spirit to do His will may be given to him (Ps. 51<sup>12, 14</sup>; cf. Exod. 35<sup>21</sup> [P]). Haggai says that the Lord stirred up (made willing) the spirit of Zerubbabel and of Joshua and of all the people to go on with the construction of the temple (Haggai 1<sup>14</sup>). To wander away from God in one's spirit (Isa. 29<sup>24</sup>) is considered one of the greatest follies; and a psalmist says, "Blessed is the man in whose spirit there is no deceit" (Ps. 32<sup>2</sup>; cf. Hos. 7<sup>16</sup> on the word "deceit"), *i.e.* the man upon whom God can depend.

#### IV. *The Use of רִיחַ in the Later Persian and the Greek Periods, dating from about 400 B.C. to Maccabean Times.*<sup>18</sup>

##### 1. רִיחַ used to denote wind and breath.

###### a) For wind.

As in the three former periods this powerful agency is still viewed as under the direct control of God. He created it (Amos 4<sup>13</sup>), and brings it forth out of his treasures (Jer. 10<sup>13</sup> 51<sup>16</sup> Ps. 135<sup>7</sup>). It is his messenger and he rides upon its wings (Ps. 104<sup>3, 4</sup>). He raises the storm wind (Ps. 107<sup>25</sup> 147<sup>18</sup> Jonah 1<sup>4</sup> 4<sup>8</sup> Jer. 51<sup>1</sup>), and it fulfils his

<sup>18</sup> Literature: Joel, Jonah, Job, Proverbs, Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, certain Psalms, and the later additions to the prophets.

will (Ps. 148<sup>8</sup> Isa. 11<sup>15</sup> 27<sup>8</sup>). It is even more mysterious than before (Eccles. 1<sup>6</sup> 11<sup>4.5</sup>). It can penetrate the smallest crevice (Job 41<sup>16</sup>). No one can retain it (Eccles. 8<sup>8</sup> Prov. 27<sup>16</sup>), except God who holds it in his fists (Prov. 30<sup>4</sup>). It is his wind (Job 26<sup>13</sup>);<sup>14</sup> and he gave it its force (Job 28<sup>25</sup>). It transports the stubble (Job 21<sup>18</sup> Ps. 83<sup>13,14</sup>) and the chaff (Job 30<sup>15</sup> Dan. 2<sup>26</sup>) and brings the clouds and the rain (Job 37<sup>21</sup> Prov. 25<sup>14.23</sup>). It overturns houses (Job 1<sup>19</sup>) and destroys life (Job 30<sup>22</sup> Jer. 51<sup>1</sup> Isa. 32<sup>2</sup> Ps. 58<sup>9(10)</sup>). It lashes the sea into waves (Dan. 7<sup>2</sup>), and causes the fruit tree to cast her fruit before its season (Job 15<sup>30</sup>, see emended text by Budde and Duhm). The hot wind from the desert dries up the grass of the field (Ps. 103<sup>16</sup>), and is a fit symbol of the torments which befall the wicked (Ps. 11<sup>6</sup>).

As in the former periods, רִיחַ is also used by metonymy for the points of the compass, the directions from which the wind blows (1 Chron. 9<sup>24</sup> Dan. 8<sup>8</sup> 11<sup>4</sup> Jer. 52<sup>20</sup>). But in this period more than in any other, the wind, because of its invisibility and intangibility, is used as a symbol of nothingness, emptiness, folly, and vanity. This usage is especially marked in such wisdom books as Job and Ecclesiastes. Job bewails his fate and cries out: that his life is wind (Job 7<sup>7</sup>). The words of his friends are wind to him, and his in turn are wind to them (Job 6<sup>26</sup> 8<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>2</sup> 16<sup>3</sup> 20<sup>8</sup>). The writer of Ecclesiastes, in his pessimism, characterizes everything as "striving for wind" (Eccles. 1<sup>14.17</sup> 2<sup>11.17.28</sup> 4<sup>4.6.16</sup>), and asks sneeringly what profit a man has who labors for the wind (Eccles. 5<sup>16(17)</sup>). One of the proverbs affirms that he who troubles his own house shall possess the wind (Prov. 11<sup>20</sup>. See Toy: *Proverbs*); and the writer of Isa. 26<sup>18</sup> complains that Israel has brought forth nothing but wind.

b) *For breath.*

In Job 4<sup>9</sup>, it is said that the wicked perish by the breath (רִיחַ) of God, and are consumed by the breath (רִיחַ) of his nostrils. The common interpretation of this passage makes the warm breath a symbol of God's anger. The writer, however, may have had in mind the destructive east wind from the desert which, as we have seen, was sometimes referred to as God's breath. In a Maccabean psalm, breath seems to be used by metonymy for the word spoken by means of the breath or mouth (Ps. 33<sup>6</sup>).<sup>15</sup>

Breath is looked upon as necessary to life, and more often than in the former period stands for life itself. The breath of man and beast alike came from God (Ps. 104<sup>30</sup> Job 27<sup>8</sup> 32<sup>8</sup> 33<sup>4</sup> Eccles. 3<sup>19</sup> Zech.

<sup>14</sup> See Commentaries of Davidson, Duhm, and Budde on this passage.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Prov. 1<sup>22</sup> where G translates רִיחַ by πνοή.

12<sup>1</sup>), not simply at the time of the original creation but in the case of each new individual. At death the breath returns to God who gave it (Ps. 104<sup>29</sup> 146<sup>4</sup> Job 34<sup>14</sup> Eccles. 3<sup>21</sup> 12<sup>7</sup>)<sup>16</sup>. Idols do not live and move because there is no breath in them (Hab. 2<sup>19</sup> Jer. 10<sup>14</sup> 51<sup>17</sup> Ps. 135<sup>17</sup>, all late passages). Men live as long as they retain their breath (Job 10<sup>12</sup> 27<sup>9</sup>), and die when it departs from them (Job 17<sup>1</sup>). Even during life it is under God's protecting care (Job 10<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>10</sup> Isa. 38<sup>16</sup>, Song of Hezekiah). The first clear reference to respiration is found in the Book of Job. Job complains that the Lord will not permit him to take his breath (Job 9<sup>18</sup>; cf. Job 32<sup>18</sup>, see Duhm), and that his breath is loathsome to his wife (Job 19<sup>17</sup>).

There seems to be little evidence in any of these passages that the spirit (breath) of man was regarded as the bearer of his personality. It was rather looked upon as a gift from God to be possessed by the man during his lifetime. At death the Lord withdrew it and the man departed to Sheol.<sup>17</sup>

2. רִיחַ used to denote spirit.

a) Spirit of God.

The literature of this period has no new contribution to make to the conception and use of the phrase "spirit of God." In fact the high-water mark attained in the last period is no longer maintained in this. To all intents and purposes prophecy has disappeared (Zech. 13<sup>3-6</sup>), and along with it the peculiar concepts and terms in which it had expressed itself. The phrase, "spirit of God," is not found in any of the wisdom books, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, or Ecclesiastes, and in those writings where it is still employed it is often connected with persons long since dead, or is made the hope of the glorious future. The priest and the sage found little need for personal revelations through the spirit of God. For the former, the written law was a sufficient guide of conduct and worship; and for the latter, the human understanding was adequate to cope with the practical precepts and problems of life. Hence once more the concept of the spirit of God falls into the background, but for another reason than that which produced the same result in the Deuteronomic period. However, as in that case so also now the surviving usage is well worth study, for it is the link which binds a glorious past to a more glorious future.

<sup>16</sup> On the latter passage see Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 87 ff. In Eccles. 3<sup>21</sup>, the writer raises the question as to whether the breath of man really does ascend, *i.e.* return to God.

<sup>17</sup> See Schwally, *l.c.*, p. 87 ff.

(1) *The prophetic function of the spirit of God.*

One of the most interesting passages, if it really dates from this period, is found in the Book of Joel (Joel 2<sup>26, 29</sup> [3<sup>1, 2</sup>]). The prophet in picturing the glorious future says God will pour out His spirit upon all Israel: their sons and daughters shall prophesy; their old men shall dream dreams, and their young men see visions; and even upon the servants and the handmaids will He pour out His spirit. The function assigned to the spirit in this passage reminds us somewhat of the old ecstatic view of prophecy. However, that is not the point of greatest interest for our present purpose. This lies rather in the universality of the bestowal of the spirit. The spirit is to become the personal possession of every true Israelite. This passage shows that even though the spirit hovered over and directed the people of Israel as a nation, that did not imply that the individuals as such participated in it in a personal way. That still remained the privilege of the chosen few. The extension of the privilege to the many was not expected to occur until the Messianic age. In general, the conception of the function of the spirit grew more definite and stereotyped during this period. The spirit no longer simply brought the prophet into a state in which he was capable of receiving messages from God; rather, the spirit was now regarded as the medium through which the message was brought. Thus a late poetic writer makes David say that the spirit spoke to him (2 Sam. 23<sup>2</sup>); and the chronicler affirms that he (David) learned the dimensions of the temple through the spirit (1 Chron. 28<sup>12</sup>). The chronicler repeatedly sets forth the message-bearing function of the spirit (1 Chron. 12<sup>18</sup> 2 Chron. 15<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>14</sup> 24<sup>30</sup>), though in so doing he is biased by the mode of expression of the older writers (cf. his use of  $\text{לִבְשׁ}$  with Judg. 6<sup>34</sup>).

Another usage which is also reflected in the older literature is found in the Aramaic portion of Daniel. Here the spirit bestows upon the man who possesses it the ability to interpret dreams (Dan. 4<sup>8, 9</sup>:  $\text{אֲנִי אֶלְמַד}; 5^{11} 12 14; 6^{14}$ ).

(2) *The spirit as the helpful presence of God with his people Israel.*

This usage, which was rather common in the last period, occurs but rarely in this period. In Zechariah (12<sup>10</sup>) we read that God will pour out upon Israel the spirit of grace and supplication; and in Isaiah (32<sup>15</sup>) that the wilderness will become a land of gardens for them when the spirit is poured out from on high.

*b) The human spirit.*

(1) אַרַף for anger, wrath, courage, stubbornness, pride, etc., or for their seat or source.

Job's friends accuse him of turning his spirit (anger, fury) against God (Job 15<sup>13</sup>); but he justifies himself by asking why his spirit should not be impatient (shortened קָצַף Job 21<sup>4</sup>; cf. Prov. 14<sup>29</sup>). It drinks up the poison (הַקֹּחַ inflaming, wrath-producing) of the arrows of the Almighty (Job 6<sup>4</sup>). In the Book of Proverbs this usage occurs several times. He that rules his spirit is better than he that takes a city (Prov. 16<sup>22</sup>; cf. 25<sup>28</sup>). A fool utters all his spirit (Prov. 29<sup>11</sup>); but one of a cool spirit is a man of understanding (Prov. 17<sup>27</sup>). The Lord stirs up the spirit (anger) of the kings of the Medes (Jer. 51<sup>11</sup>) and of Pul and Tilgath-pilneser (1 Chron. 5<sup>26</sup>). It is even said that he stirred up the spirit of the Philistines and of the Arabians against Jehoram (2 Chron. 21<sup>16</sup>). Akin to anger is stubbornness, haughtiness, and pride especially when directed toward God. Nebuchadnezzar was deposed from his kingly throne because his heart was lifted up and his spirit was strong to deal proudly (Dan. 5<sup>20</sup> Aramaic). And one of the proverbs says that pride goes before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall (Prov. 16<sup>18</sup>).

As the seat of courage or of depression, anguish, and distress, there are several examples. Job complains of the anguish (אָרַף) of his spirit (Job 7<sup>11</sup>). The spirit is often said to be crushed (שָׁבַר Prov. 15<sup>4</sup>; cf. Isa. 65<sup>14</sup>) and smitten down (נָכַח Prov. 15<sup>13</sup> 17<sup>22</sup> 18<sup>14</sup>). Nebuchadnezzar's spirit was troubled (מָצַח) when he could not discover the meaning of his dream (Dan. 2<sup>1-3</sup>); and Daniel was troubled (מָצַח) in spirit when he could not understand the visions that were given to him (Dan. 7<sup>15</sup> Aramaic).

(2) *The seat of humility.*

When the man who is poor and crushed down in spirit preserves his faith and hope in God, this state of mind is acceptable to the Lord. It is better to be of an humble (שָׁפַל) spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud (Prov. 16<sup>19</sup>). A man's pride shall bring him low; but honor shall uphold the humble in spirit (Prov. 29<sup>23</sup>).

(3) *The directing power in conduct (especially conduct toward God) or the seat of steadfastness, purpose, and motive.* — All the ways of a man are pure in his own eyes, but the Lord is the weigher of spirits (purposes and motives. Prov. 16<sup>2</sup>; cf. 21<sup>2</sup> 24<sup>12</sup> where heart is used). A talebearer reveals secrets, but he that is faithful (steadfast

רִּיחַ) in spirit conceals a matter (Prov. 11<sup>15</sup>). The Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus (2 Chron. 36<sup>22</sup> [= Ezra 1<sup>1</sup>]), and of all those whom He desired to build the temple (Ezra 1<sup>5</sup>).

---

## PART II.

### THE USE OF Πνεῦμα<sup>18</sup> IN THE CLASSICAL WRITINGS, THE SEPTUAGINT, THE APOCRYPHA, PHILO, JOSEPHUS, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In order to define the Greek term Πνεῦμα as it is used in the New Testament, it is necessary, first of all, to determine from a careful study of its use in other writings the range of possible meanings which may be applied to it. As material for such a study we have the classical authors, the Septuagint translation of the Canonical Old Testament Scriptures, the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the writings of Philo and Josephus.

#### I. *The Use of Πνεῦμα in the Classical Writings.*

Πνεῦμα in the classical authors has but two meanings — *wind* and *breath*. The term is not found in Homer, nor in any writer prior to Aeschylus. In later writers the word is quite common. It is impossible to determine from the usage which of the two meanings is the older. Aeschylus employs the word about as often for wind as for breath, though in succeeding writers the preponderance is often strongly in favor of wind.<sup>19</sup> In none of these writers does the term seem to be used in any other sense than the two named.<sup>20</sup> When used for wind it denotes either a zephyr (Aesch.: *Sept.* 708; Soph.: *Ajax* 674 and 558) or a storm (Aesch.: *Prom.* 1047; *Pers.* 110;

<sup>18</sup> The Greek word which corresponds to the Hebrew term רִּיחַ.

<sup>19</sup> An examination of the instances given in concordances and indexes yields the following figures for wind and breath, respectively: Aeschylus 6 and 5; Herodotus 1 and 0; Sophocles 9 and 0; Euripides 12 and 12; Thucydides 8 and 1; Aristophanes 4 and 0; Xenophon 6 and 1; Plato 22 and 5; Aristotle 183 and 124.

<sup>20</sup> Plato, *Axiochus* 37 C (quoted in lexicons) is only an apparent exception. In the first place, the book in which it is found belongs among the spurious writings of Plato, and in the second place πνεῦμα in the passage probably means divine *breath*.



*Suppl.* 165 and 175; *Soph.*: *Philoc.* 1093; *Eurip.*: *Her.* F 216; *Ion.* 1507; *Helena* 413; Herodotus 7, 16, 1). Plato defines πνεῦμα as air in motion (*Cratylus* 410 B). When πνεῦμα refers to breath it often denotes simply the breath of respiration without any reference to life (Aesch.: *Sept.* 464; *Eurip.*: *Orest.* 277; *Phoen.* 858; *Med.* 1119; *Thucyd.*: II. 49[23]; *Xen.*: *Cyneget.* 7<sup>s</sup>; *Plato*: *Tim.* 91 C; *Phileb.* 47 A). Many times, however, emphasis is placed on its necessity to life (Aesch.: *Pers.* 507; *Sept.* 981; *Eurip.*: *Hecuba* 571; *Orest.* 864; *Troad.* 751; *Plato*: *Leg.* IX. 865 B). When the breath leaves the body death ensues. In no case do these Greek writers make of πνεῦμα a psychological term. With them it was a purely physical term. That wind and breath continued to be the only meanings of πνεῦμα in common use among Greek-speaking Gentiles up to the first century A.D., is evident on at least two grounds: (1) The lack of examples of any other usage in the surviving literature from that period. Even in the case of the Stoics who maintained that God was spirit (πνεῦμα), spirit was identified with the all-pervading air or at least was conceived as airlike.<sup>21</sup> (2) Philo and Josephus (Jewish authors who wrote for Gentile readers) customarily use the term only in these two senses. When biblical usage compels them to depart from these ordinary meanings, they are usually careful to explain the new meaning attached to the term.

## II. *The Use of Πνεῦμα in the "Septuagint" Translation of the Canonical Scriptures.*

The translators show a strong tendency to render אֵלֶּךְ by πνεῦμα, and this in spite of the fact that the former term had a much wider range of meanings than the latter. The term πνεῦμα covered only the meanings wind and breath; but since there was no Greek word to correspond to the Hebrew concept "spirit of God," it seemed natural to widen the use of the term to include this also.

### 1. *The use of πνεῦμα for wind and breath.*

#### a) *For wind.*

When it was perfectly clear to the translator that, in any particular case אֵלֶּךְ denoted wind, there was a strong tendency to translate it by ἀνεμος rather than by πνεῦμα. This occurs about forty times, or more than one-third the total number of times that אֵלֶּךְ is used for wind. There seems, however, to be no real distinction in the meaning

<sup>21</sup> For a discussion of this usage, together with examples, see Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, Vol. I. pp. 85-87.

of ἀνεμος and πνεῦμα when applied to wind. If the terms are not identical, they are at least closely synonymous. There are a few cases in which the translators so change the sense of the expression as to obviate the use of either term (Isa. 41<sup>20</sup> Jer. 10<sup>13</sup> 49<sup>38</sup> 51<sup>16</sup>).

*b) For breath.*

When רִיחַ denotes breath it is almost always translated by πνεῦμα. There are a few cases in which it is translated by πνοή (Isa. 38<sup>16</sup> Ezek. 13<sup>13</sup> Prov. 1<sup>23</sup>), but outside these there is scarcely a variation. Sometimes רִיחַ the other Hebrew word for breath, is also translated by πνεῦμα (1 Kings 17<sup>17</sup> Dan. 5<sup>23</sup> [Theod. uses πνοή]). This shows how fixed was the meaning breath for πνεῦμα. In one instance (Job 7<sup>15</sup>) the soul (ψυχή) is said by the translators to reside in the breath (πνεῦμα).

*2. The use of πνεῦμα for spirit.*

*a) Spirit of God.*

Since the Greeks had nothing that corresponded to this Hebrew concept, it is not strange that they lacked a terminology to express it. Hence it was only natural that the translators should extend the term used for wind and breath (πνεῦμα) to cover this meaning also. And this they did quite uniformly. There seems to be the same general conception of the nature and function of the spirit that the Hebrew writers had. Separate personality was not ascribed to it. It was simply an attribute or power of God.

*b) For non-embodied personal spirits, good and bad.*

This usage seems to have grown up, in part at least, out of a misinterpretation of the old Hebrew conception of the function of the spirit of God. To the translators, the spirit of God was so holy that nothing which savored of evil could be attributed to it. Hence when they came to such a passage as 1 Sam. 16<sup>14-23</sup>, there was no way but to render "the spirit of God (for) evil" by the phrase "evil spirit" (1 Sam. 16<sup>16, 23</sup>). Likewise the spirit which deceived Ahab through his prophets is called simply a spirit (1 Kings 22<sup>21</sup>, note the omission of the article in G), as if it were one among many spirits surrounding the throne of God. As a further evidence that the host of angels which surround the throne of God were called spirits (πνεύματα) by the translators, we have their rendering of Num. 16<sup>22</sup> and 27<sup>16</sup>. For the Hebrew "God of the spirits (breath) of all flesh," the LXX. have "God of the spirits *and* of all flesh."<sup>22</sup> רִיחַ in the former referred to the breath or lives of men; πνεύματα in the latter most

<sup>22</sup> Philo quotes this passage in the same form: *Post. Caini.* 19; *Agri. Noe.* 10.

likely to the unembodied spirits who act as God's messengers. In Ethiopic Enoch, the phrase "Lord of spirits" is used instead of "Lord of hosts" more than a hundred times.<sup>23</sup> The translators do not seem to use πνεῦμα to denote a disembodied human spirit.

c) *For spirit, when it denotes physical strength, courage, anger, or the seat of pride, depression, humility, etc.*

There is more variation in the translation of רִיחַ in this usage than in any other. Only about half of the passages in which this sense of רִיחַ occurs are translated by πνεῦμα. This might have been expected since we saw above that, among Greek-speaking Gentiles, such a use of πνεῦμα does not occur. They did not use the term in a psychological sense. To obviate its use in this sense, the translators resorted to several expedients. They sometimes used ψυχή, or some form of this word (Gen. 41<sup>8</sup> Ex. 6<sup>9</sup> 35<sup>21</sup> Prov. 14<sup>29</sup> Isa. 54<sup>9</sup>); or more often, where the word denoted anger, some form of the word θυμός (Prov. 16<sup>19, 22</sup> 17<sup>27</sup> 18<sup>14</sup> 29<sup>11</sup> Eccles. 7<sup>8, 9</sup> Zech. 6<sup>8</sup> Isa. 57<sup>15</sup> Ezek. 39<sup>29</sup>). More frequently, however, they substituted a different expression for the Hebrew phrase and thus avoided a direct translation of the word.<sup>24</sup> So uniformly did the translator of the Book of Proverbs use these and other expedients that only once (Prov. 15<sup>4</sup>) out of twenty times, and then in consequence of a misconception of the meaning of the passage, does he render רִיחַ by πνεῦμα.

### III. *The use of Πνεῦμα in the Apocrypha and the Greek portions of the Pseudepigrapha.*

In general the usage of πνεῦμα in these writings is the same as that in the Greek translation of the canonical books already considered. There is some difference, however, between its use in those books which are merely translations of some Hebrew original,<sup>25</sup> and in those which were composed originally in the Greek in non-Palestinian countries.<sup>26</sup> Of course for the determination of the ordinary usage of a Greek term, the latter class of literature is far more important than the former. A translator is sometimes impelled to use a certain

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Enoch 39<sup>12</sup> 40<sup>1-10</sup> 46<sup>2-8</sup> etc. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 110 note, enumerates 104 instances of this usage.

<sup>24</sup> Gen. 26<sup>28</sup> Josh. 5<sup>1</sup> 1 Sam. 1<sup>15</sup> 1 Kings 10<sup>5</sup> [= 2 Chron. 9<sup>4</sup>] 2 Chron. 21<sup>16</sup> Job 6<sup>4</sup> 7<sup>12</sup> Ps. 31 [32]<sup>3</sup> Prov. 15<sup>13</sup> 16<sup>2, 18</sup> Prov. 17<sup>23</sup> 25<sup>28</sup> Isa. 66<sup>2</sup> Ezek. 13<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> Wisdom of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, 1 Maccabees, 1 Esdras, Baruch, Psalms of Solomon, Enoch, etc.

<sup>26</sup> Wisdom of Solomon, Epistle of Jeremiah, Second, Third, and Fourth Maccabees.

term, when an author would express the thought in some other way or by the use of some other term.

1. Πνεῦμα used of wind and breath.

a) Of wind.

There are several passages in which this meaning of the word occurs, both in the translated books (Sir. 39<sup>28</sup> 43<sup>17</sup> Song of the Three Children 27, 43 [= Dan. 3<sup>80, 85</sup>]) and in those composed in Greek (Wisdom 5<sup>11, 28</sup> 7<sup>20</sup> 11<sup>20</sup> 13<sup>2</sup> 17<sup>18</sup> Epistle of Jer. 61 [60]). These writers still emphasize the power of the wind, especially its destructive power (Sir. 39<sup>28</sup> Wisdom 5<sup>28</sup> 7<sup>20</sup> 11<sup>20</sup>), and affirm that it is under the control of the Lord (Sir. 43<sup>17</sup>).

b) Of breath.

There are illustrations of this usage in almost every book of the Apocrypha, both in the translated books (Sir. 38<sup>23</sup> Judith 10<sup>18</sup> 14<sup>6</sup> 16<sup>14</sup> Esther 8<sup>13</sup> [Greek additions] Enoch 13<sup>6</sup> Tobit 3<sup>6</sup> Baruch 2<sup>17</sup>) and in those composed in Greek (Wisdom 2<sup>3</sup> 12<sup>1</sup> 15<sup>11, 16</sup> 16<sup>14</sup> Epistle of Jer. 25 [24] 2 Macc. 7<sup>22, 28</sup> 14<sup>46</sup> 3 Macc. 6<sup>24</sup> 4 Macc. 11<sup>11</sup>). When the breath departs, the man dies (Sir. 38<sup>23</sup> Judith 14<sup>6</sup> Wisdom 16<sup>14</sup>). He borrows it from God during life (Judith 16<sup>14</sup> Wisdom 12<sup>1</sup> 15<sup>11, 16</sup>), and God can order it taken away at any time (Tobit 3<sup>6</sup> Baruch 2<sup>17</sup> cf. Apoc. of Baruch 3<sup>2</sup>). Even after death God can cause it to be returned to the man and he will live again (2 Macc. 7<sup>23</sup> 14<sup>46</sup>). For this reason a living man may be fitly called a breath of life (Judith 10<sup>18</sup>). In none of these passages, however, is there any clear evidence that the personality of man himself was in any way identified with his spirit or breath.<sup>27</sup> At death the spirit was taken away from the man. In one or two passages breath is used by metonymy for word spoken by means of the breath (Enoch 14<sup>3</sup> cf. Judith 16<sup>14</sup>), and in one instance, by metonymy for the living person (Song of the Three Children 64 [= Dan. 3<sup>80</sup>]).

2. Πνεῦμα used for spirit.

a) Spirit of God.

The concept spirit of God, or divine spirit, is not often employed in the Apocryphal writings.<sup>28</sup> Most of the books make no use of it. This is not strange since very little of this literature is permeated with the old prophetic ideas. Prophecy in its nobler form had disappeared, and along with it had gone the prophetic terminology. The

<sup>27</sup> The term which covered the personality of the man was soul (ψυχή, corresponding to the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ) Wisdom 3<sup>1</sup> 4<sup>14</sup> 8<sup>19</sup> 9<sup>16</sup> 16<sup>14</sup> 4 Macc. 10<sup>4</sup> 18<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Only in Sir. 39<sup>6</sup> 48<sup>12, 24</sup> Wisdom 1<sup>6, 6</sup> 7<sup>7, 22</sup> 9<sup>17</sup> 4 Macc. 7<sup>14</sup> Susanna 42 (45) 64 (62) Ps. Sol. 17<sup>42</sup> 18<sup>6</sup>.

term *spirit of God* is now seldom seen outside the wisdom books. In almost all cases in which it occurs the spirit is conceived as the mediator of God's wisdom to men. So closely are wisdom and spirit bound up together that the terms become almost identical in meaning.<sup>29</sup> For this reason one can speak of the wisdom of spirit (Ps. Sol. 18<sup>6</sup>) just as properly as of the spirit of wisdom (Wisdom 7<sup>7</sup>). Both phrases emphasize the wisdom embodied in and conveyed by the divine spirit. Wisdom and spirit are both conceived of as emanations from the great divine fountain and capable of penetrating all things (Wisdom 7<sup>22</sup> <sup>α</sup>). The holy spirit of instruction will come and impart its wisdom to those only who are pure in thought and deed (Wisdom 1<sup>5,6</sup>; cf. Susanna 42, 64 [see footnote 28]). Without possessing this spirit one cannot know the things pertaining to the counsels of God (Wisdom 9<sup>17</sup> Sir. 39<sup>6</sup>). The Messiah was to possess this spirit in its fulness (Ps. Sol. 17<sup>43</sup> 18<sup>6</sup>). We have thus reached the sage's conception of the function of the spirit of God. It brings intellectual enlightenment concerning divine things to those who are worthy and capable of receiving it. The older prophetic view of the spirit is reflected in two passages in the Wisdom of Sirach (48<sup>12</sup> <sup>20</sup>), but these are scarcely more than Old Testament references.

*b) For unembodied or disembodied personal spirits.*

This use of πνεῦμα is almost confined to the Book of Enoch.

(1) *Spirits originally good, angelic beings, whose home is in heaven with God.*

The angelic beings who had their home in heaven and left it to defile themselves with women are called spirits (Enoch 15<sup>4-6</sup>). These spirits are capable of assuming many different forms (Enoch 19<sup>1</sup>). Some of them are said to have sinned in spirit (Enoch 20<sup>6</sup>; see Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 356 note). In the Ethiopic portions of Enoch the phrase "Lord of spirits" seems to take the place of the older "Lord of hosts."

(2) *Evil spirits capable of tormenting living persons.*

The spirits which went forth from the giants at their death are called evil spirits (Enoch 15<sup>8-12</sup> 16<sup>1</sup>). These spirits are demons, not confined to any place of torment, but allowed to roam at large and vex living persons. This is probably why they are called spirits rather than souls. In the Book of Tobit a demon inhabiting a human being is called an evil spirit (Tobit 6<sup>7</sup> <sup>(8)</sup>).

<sup>29</sup> On the identification of the two in Wisdom of Solomon, see Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, Vol. I. pp. 215-218.

(3) *Disembodied human spirits.*

This new meaning for πνεῦμα is found only in the Book of Enoch (9<sup>a</sup> 10 [see Charles, *Enoch*, p. 70, critical note] 20<sup>3</sup> 22<sup>3-13</sup>). The term, in this sense, seems to be used by the writer as a synonym of soul (ψυχή). In the twenty-second chapter of Enoch the two terms are used interchangeably. The writer was probably led to this use of πνεῦμα by his application of it to the evil spirits which proceeded from the bodies of the giants. The spirits of men, however, are not free to roam about as the spirits of the giants. They are confined to underground places to await the final judgment. The abode of the spirits (or souls) of the righteous has light and water in it, but the abode of sinners is made for torment and pain. While it is thus clear that in the Book of Enoch πνεῦμα is used as a synonym of soul to designate the disembodied personality of the man after death, yet it does not seem that the innovation was followed by any other writer of the period. In both Hebrew and Greek thought the term for soul in this sense was too common and too well fixed to be easily displaced by any similar term.

c) Πνεῦμα for strength, courage, anger, or as the seat and source of excitement, distress, and humility.

This use of πνεῦμα is not found in any book of the Apocrypha which was composed in the Greek. This is another evidence that among Greek-speaking people there was no such meaning in vogue. There are, however, several instances of the use of the term in the translated portions of the Apocrypha. Thus the spirit (courage) of the people revived when they chose Simeon for their leader (1 Macc. 13<sup>7</sup>; cf. Sir. 31[34]<sup>18(14)</sup>). God changed the spirit (fierce anger) of King Ahasuerus into mildness toward Esther (Esther 5<sup>1</sup> Greek addition). The Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus to make a proclamation (1 Esdras 2<sup>2</sup>; cf. 2 Chron. 36<sup>22</sup>), and the spirit of the priests and Levites to build the temple at Jerusalem (1 Esdras 2<sup>9</sup>). The spirit is the seat of excitement and impulse (Sir. 9<sup>9</sup>). It is also the seat of cowardice (Judith 7<sup>19</sup>), anguish (Baruch 3<sup>1</sup>), and humility (Song of the Three Children 16 [=Dan. 3<sup>39</sup>]). These examples, which comprise the full list, show that πνεῦμα in the Apocrypha does not go beyond the usage of נִשְׁמָה in the Old Testament. In fact they show that the latter term forces this particular meaning upon the former.

IV. *Use of Πνεῦμα by Philo.*

Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, was not familiar with the Aramaic language and only meagrely with the Old Testament Hebrew. His biblical ideas, therefore, and to a certain extent his religious terms, came to him through the medium of the Septuagint, though in general he wrote the literary Greek of the period but little affected by Hebrew or Septuagint usage. He composed his voluminous works during the first half of the first century A.D., hence ought to be a valuable witness to the ordinary usage of Greek terms among non-Palestinian Jews during New Testament times. Unfortunately there is no concordance or index to his writings, and in a cursory reading one cannot be sure of securing all the instances of the use of any particular word. In the more than eighteen hundred pages of the Greek text of Philo, however, the word *πνεῦμα* occurs only about one hundred and sixteen times, while the term "soul" (*ψυχή*) is used nearly eighteen hundred times, or on an average of once to every page. This shows that the leading term with Philo was *soul*, not *spirit*.

Philo, following to this extent the Greek O.T., uses the term *πνεῦμα* in the four traditional senses, — wind, breath, spirit of God, and spirit of man, though in the case of the two latter he deviates considerably from the ordinary Jewish conceptions.

1. *Πνεῦμα used for wind and breath.*a) *For wind.*

There are about forty-five cases of this usage in Philo.<sup>80</sup> With Plato he defines wind as air in motion (*Quod Det. Pot. Ins.* 23). *Πνεῦμα* is used both of a violent wind and a zephyr, but more often of the former than of the latter. The wind is said to hold the earth together (*Mund. Op.* 45), and to be necessary for the nourishment and growth of plants as well as of animals (*Mund. Op.* 8; *Gigant.* 2; *Abr.* 19; *Creat. Prin.* 12; and two of the fragments). The old Jewish idea of the wind as under the immediate control of God seems to be almost entirely abandoned, in consequence of the fact that Philo had adopted Greek conceptions of physical nature.

<sup>80</sup> *Mund. Op.* 8, 19, 45; *Leg. Alleg.* III. 17; *Cherub.* 11 (twice), 31; *Post. Caini.* 7; *Gigant.* 2 (twice); *Quod Deus Immut.* 13; *Agri. Noe.* 40; *Ebriet.* 27; *Migrat. Abr.* 27, 39; *Quis Rer. Div. Her.* 43; *Congr. Erud. Gr.* 24; *Somn.* II. 2, 9, 13 (twice), 24; *Abr.* 8, 19, 31; *Josepho.* 7; *Vita Mos.* I. 8, 32; III. 10; *Monarch.* I. 2; II. 5; *Vict. Offer.* 8; *Sept.* 8; *Special. Leg.* (VIII.-X.) 6; *Creat. Prin.* 12; *Praem. et Poen.* 7; *Incor. Mund.* 3, 26; *Lib. in Flacc.* 19; *Leg. ad Cai.* 27; *Mund.* 20; *Fragments* (four times).

δ) *For breath.*

In this sense, Philo uses πνεῦμα about eleven times.<sup>81</sup> Breath is considered as necessary to life. It is akin to the air outside, being, in fact, a part of it. It is inhaled through the nostrils and mouth and travels in the arteries (Quod Deus Immut. 18; Exsecrat. 5; Leg. ad Cai. 9, 18). In this meaning of πνεῦμα, Philo follows the classical authors more closely than he does the biblical writers. He scarcely ever, if at all, speaks of the physical breath as coming from God, and never of its return to God. According to Philo, what God really breathed into man was his rational nature, not his physical breath.

## 2. Πνεῦμα for spirit.

a) *Spirit of God.*

Philo uses πνεῦμα in this sense about forty-seven times.<sup>82</sup> The phrase "spirit of God" he scarcely ever uses unless called upon to do so in order to explain some passage of Scripture. But in the meaning which he assigns to it he almost always departs from biblical usage. He usually gives the phrase such a definition as will harmonize with his system of philosophy. He says the term has two senses: (1) the air blowing upon the earth and borne aloft by the water (Gen. 1<sup>2</sup>); and (2) the pure knowledge in which every wise man participates (Ex. 31<sup>1</sup>; Gigant. 5). The latter definition Philo adopts as the true one. The spirit is universal wisdom, and as such belongs to the very nature of God. God can, however, impart it to man. In fact at the time of the creation he breathed his spirit (the divine power of reasoning) into the mind of man, thus enabling him to understand divine things (Leg. Alleg. 13; Mund. Op. 46, 50; Concup. 11). Hence the spirit of God is also the very essence of the mind of man (Quis Rer. Div. Her. 11; cf. Concup. 11). It was this all-wise spirit in which Moses so fully participated; a portion of which God imparted to the seventy elders (Num. 11<sup>17</sup>); and this, too, though the divine spirit is indivisible, continuous (*i.e.* without separation), and undiminished by communication (Gigant. 6). Because Moses was the most perfect among the prophets, God was

<sup>81</sup> Leg. Alleg. I. 29; Quod Deus Immut. 18; Somn. I. 6; Vita Mos. I. 16; Exsecrat. 5; Incor. Mund. 24; Leg. ad Cai. 9, 18, 29, 33; Fragments (once).

<sup>82</sup> Mund. Op. 46, 50; Leg. Alleg. I. 13 (eight times); Gigant. 5 (six times), 6 (four times), 7 (twice), 11, 12 (twice); Quod Deus Immut. 1 (twice); Plantat. Noe. 5, 6, 11; Quis Rer. Div. Her. 11, 12, 53; Fuga et Invent. 33; Somn. II. 38; Josepho, 21; Vita Mos. I. 31; II. 7; III. 36; Decalog. 33; Special. Leg. (VIII-X.), 8; Concup. 11 (three times); Caritate, 18; Nobil. 5; Fragments (once).



enabled through His spirit to promulgate His laws through him (Decalog. 33). So sensitive were the prophets to this spirit that the mind (*νοῦς*) which was in them departed at the arrival of the divine spirit (Quis Rer. Div. Her. 53). When the spirit took up its abode in such a prophet, it operated upon all the organization of his voice and made it utter forth the prophecies which he was delivering (Spec. Leg. [VIII., IX., X.]8). The divine spirit which Abraham possessed changed everything in him for the better,—his eyes, his complexion, his size, his motions, and his voice. It even clothed his body with extraordinary beauty, and invested his words with persuasiveness, while at the same time it endowed his hearers with understanding (Nobil. 5). Philo thus carries to completion the intellectual conception of the nature and function of the spirit of God, which had been emphasized by the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon and in other books of the Apocrypha. In this case, however, the spirit is more than the bearer of wisdom—it is wisdom itself.<sup>33</sup>

*b) For the spirit or mind of man.*

Philo uses *πνεῦμα* with this meaning about thirteen times.<sup>34</sup> Here again it is the influence of the Greek O.T. which causes him to employ the term, though as before he almost wholly abandons the meanings there given and supplies one of his own more consonant with his philosophy, and with his view of the divine spirit. With him the human spirit is simply a portion of the divine spirit. When God breathed into man, he did not communicate to him literal breath, but a ray from his blessed and thrice-happy nature (De Concup. 11). He stimulated the mind (*νοῦς*) of man in such a way as to impart to him the ability to reason and to understand divine things (Leg. Alleg. 13). This mind or rational part of the soul, Philo calls the spirit (Fuga et Invent. 24; Mutat. Nom. 21; Victimis, 3; Vict. Offer. 4). It is an image or representation of the divine rational nature (Quod Det. Pot. Ins. 22, 23), a part of its very essence (Quis Rer. Div. Her. 11). In only one passage does Philo use the term in the sense of strength and courage, the common Old Testament meaning (Quod Omn. Prob. Lib. 5).

We thus see that Philo not only makes the concept and function of the spirit of God harmonize with his conception of universal reason,

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, Vol. II. pp. 214–217.

<sup>34</sup> Quod Det. Pot. Ins. 22 (twice), 23 (twice); Post. Caini. 19; Gigant. 6; Agr. Noe. 10; Fuga et Invent. 24, 32; Mutat. Nom. 21; Victimis. 3; Vict. Offer. 4; Quod Omn. Prob. Lib. 5.

but he does the same with the spirit of man. Man's spirit is his reasoning faculty — his mind — that part of him by which he is made superior to the animals.

### V. *The Use of Πνεῦμα by Josephus.*

Flavius Josephus, being a Palestinian Jew, was thoroughly acquainted with the Aramaic language, in which, indeed, he says he first composed his *Wars of the Jews*.<sup>85</sup> His voluminous works, in the Greek, were produced while residing in Rome during the latter half of the first century A.D. This is precisely the period in which the larger portion of the New Testament books were composed. For this reason his use of Greek words ought to be a valuable auxiliary in determining the meaning of New Testament terms. A cursory reading of the more than two thousand pages (Ed. Niese) of the Greek text of Josephus's works discovers the word πνεῦμα only about twenty-eight times, while the word "soul" (ψυχή) occurs more than two hundred times. Josephus seldom, if ever, employs the term πνεῦμα with any other meaning than wind or breath, unless compelled to do so by biblical or other Jewish usage. Since Josephus, as well as Philo, wrote for Greek-speaking Gentiles, this shows that wind and breath were the only meanings in common use.

#### 1. Πνεῦμα used for wind and breath.

##### a) For wind.

This usage occurs about eleven times.<sup>86</sup> It is used more often of a storm wind than of a light breeze. The spirit of God which moved upon the waters (Gen. 1<sup>2</sup>) is understood by Josephus, as well as Philo (Gigant. 5), to refer to the wind (*Antiq.* 1, 1, 1).

##### b) For breath or life.

There are only about four cases of this usage, — two of simple breath (*Antiq.* 3, 12, 6; 17, 6, 5), and two involving the idea of life (*Antiq.* 1, 1, 2; 3, 11, 2). The two latter are based upon Gen. 2<sup>7a</sup>. From the second of these it is clear that πνεῦμα refers to breath or life, since spirit in any other sense was not attributed to animals.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>85</sup> See the preface to his *Wars*.

<sup>86</sup> *Antiq.* 1, 1, 1; 2, 16, 3; 2, 16, 6; 8, 13, 6; 9, 10, 2; 10, 11, 7; 12, 2, 9; 14, 2, 2; 16, 2, 2; 16, 2, 5; *Wars*, 4, 8, 4.

<sup>87</sup> Philo maintained that breath was mingled with the blood in the veins and arteries. Fragments in a Monkish MS. See Ed. Richter, Vol. VI. p. 230 (translated by Yonge, Vol. IV. p. 268).

## 2. Πνεῦμα used for spirit.

## a) For the spirit of God.

Josephus employs the term in this sense only about eight times.<sup>88</sup> Like Philo, he never uses it except when he is explaining some Old Testament reference. He does not seem to attribute personality to the spirit. He views it rather as a power or attribute of God. The quantitative conception seems to be uppermost in his mind, for he says that Solomon prayed that some portion of the divine spirit might dwell in the temple, though the heavens were too small a habitation for God himself (*Antiq.* 8, 4, 3). Like Philo, he conceives the prophets to be passive agents of the divine spirit. The spirit put the exact words of the prophecy into the mouth of Balaam so that the prophet could speak no other even if he desired to do so.<sup>89</sup> In commenting upon 1 Sam. 16<sup>14-23</sup> Josephus says that the divine spirit in departing from Saul removed to David, and in its place there came demons (δαιμόνια) upon Saul (*Antiq.* 6, 8, 2).

## b) For disembodied personal spirits.

## (1) For good spirits.

There is but one example. Josephus calls the angel who met Balaam in the way a spirit (*Antiq.* 4, 6, 3).

## (2) For evil spirits possessing and tormenting men.

The demon which came upon Saul and which only David could cast out is called an evil spirit (*Antiq.* 6, 11, 2; cf. 6, 8, 2). In another passage (*Wars*, 7, 6, 3) he says that the demons are the spirits of the wicked which enter into living men. There is here probably a reflection of the same idea of evil spirits as proceeding from giants which is found in the Book of Enoch.

## c) For strength and courage.

There are but two examples of this meaning, and these are in agreement with Septuagint and Apocryphal usage. He says that when Esther came into the presence of the king, her spirit departed from her and she fainted (*Antiq.* 11, 6, 9; cf. Esther 5<sup>1</sup> LXX. addition). Also that the Roman soldiers, filled with a certain warlike spirit (*i.e.* the spirit viewed as the seat of animation and courage), when asked if they are ready to go to war, throw up their hands and reply, "We are ready" (*Wars*, 3, 5, 4).

<sup>88</sup> *Antiq.* 4, 6, 5 (twice); 6, 8, 2; 6, 11, 5 (twice); 8, 4, 3; 8, 15, 4; 10, 11, 3.

<sup>89</sup> *Antiq.* 4, 6, 5; cf. Num. 23<sup>12</sup> where it is said that *the Lord* put the words in Balaam's mouth.

## VI. *The Use of Πνεῦμα in the New Testament.*

Fortunately the composition of the New Testament writings took place within so short a period that it will be unnecessary for our present purpose to treat them chronologically. Since, however, the authors, in consequence of difference of nationality, environment, and education, differ somewhat widely in thought and terminology, it will be convenient to arrange their writings in groups. Thus, for example, in certain uses of the term πνεῦμα it will be found that the sayings of Jesus form one group; the evangelists, a second; the Book of Acts, the catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse, a third; and the Pauline writings, a fourth.

In general, the meanings of πνεῦμα in the New Testament correspond with those in the Greek O.T. and Apocrypha. There are, however, marked deviations from that usage. In spite of the fact that, among Greek-speaking Gentiles, πνεῦμα was still a physical term, among Christians it was tending rapidly to become an exclusively religious and psychological term. This tendency is shown not alone by New Testament authors, but to the same extent by the apostolic fathers. In all of this Christian literature, the word is seldom employed to denote wind or breath, but is used much more frequently in the sense of spirit of God and (especially in the Pauline writings) of the spirit of man.

### 1. *The use of πνεῦμα for wind and breath.*

#### a) *For wind.*

Numerous as are the examples of this use in the Greek literature of this period, there is but one clear instance in the New Testament. In the Gospel of John it is said that the wind blows where it wills (John 3<sup>8</sup>). A possible second instance is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews where the writer, in speaking of the angels, quotes Psalm 104: "He makes the winds his messengers (angels); his ministers a flame of fire" (Heb. 1<sup>7</sup>). Though it is clear that the psalmist refers to winds, it is possible that the writer of *Hebrews* understood him to mean spirits, since in the same connection he speaks of the angels as ministering spirits (Heb. 1<sup>14</sup>).

#### b) *For breath.*

To illustrate this meaning of πνεῦμα there are but six clear examples in the New Testament. In nearly all of these cases it is implied that breath is necessary to life. It seemed a truism to say that the

body without breath was dead (James 2<sup>26</sup>).<sup>40</sup> The image of the beast did not live until breath was given to it (Rev. 13<sup>15</sup>). This breath of life comes from God (Rev. 11<sup>11</sup>; cf. Acts 17<sup>25</sup> where *πνοή* is used), and at death is delivered up again to him (John 19<sup>30</sup>). Matthew says that when Jesus died he sent forth (*ἀφῆκεν*) his breath.<sup>41</sup> It is possible that *πνεῦμα* is used in the sense of breath in three similar passages in the writings of Luke (Luke 23<sup>46</sup> 8<sup>55</sup> Acts 7<sup>59</sup>). The context of these passages, however, as well as the mode in which they are expressed, together with the fact that Luke is a Gentile writer under the influence of Pauline conceptions, make it more probable that he has given the term another meaning (see below).

It is uncertain whether Paul ever used the term *πνεῦμα* in the sense of breath, since the only example which can be appealed to occurs in a book whose Pauline authorship is questioned. The writer, adopting the language of those Old Testament passages in which by a metonymy the hot destructive desert wind is spoken of as the breath of God (cf. Isa. 11<sup>4</sup>; Job 4<sup>9</sup>), says that the Lord (Jesus) will slay (or consume) with the breath<sup>42</sup> of his mouth the lawless one (2 Thess. 2<sup>8</sup>).

It is quite possible, if not probable, that *πνεῦμα* in Heb. 4<sup>12</sup> denotes breath of life. In this case the writer would mean that the living and active word of God (*i.e.* God's judgments against evil-doers) can destroy those who harden their hearts against him, just as surely as he destroyed the disobedient Israelites (Heb. 3<sup>11-18</sup> 4<sup>5</sup>). The word of God is thus, as the context requires, punitive as well as discerning. Like a two-edged sword it penetrates the body until soul (life) and spirit (breath) are released.<sup>43</sup> Nor does it stop until it has gone to the utmost recesses of the physical organism, penetrating even to the joints and marrow,<sup>44</sup> and discerning the thoughts and intents of

<sup>40</sup> Note the use of the article before body (*σῶμα*), but its omission before *πνεῦμα* (cf. Rev. 11<sup>11</sup> 13<sup>15</sup>). This tends to show that *πνεῦμα* is used of the general concept breath, and not of the spirit (of man) as the seat of thought, or as the bearer of his personality (cf. footnotes 50 and 51).

<sup>41</sup> Matt. 27<sup>50</sup> (cf. Mark 15<sup>37</sup> where the verb *ἐκπνέω* is used). In this passage, as well as in John 19<sup>30</sup>, the article employed with *πνεῦμα* is used with the force of the personal pronoun "his."

<sup>42</sup> It is possible that breath here is used by metonymy for word spoken by means of the breath. See the 17th Psalm of Solomon, "He shall destroy the ungodly nations with the word of his mouth."

<sup>43</sup> The dividing (*μερισμοῦ*) or separating would thus be either of soul from the breath (cf. Job 7<sup>15</sup> in the LXX.), or, more probably, of soul and breath (both used as synonyms of life) from the body.

<sup>44</sup> In this case "joints and marrow" would be coördinate with *μερισμοῦ*, not governed by it.

the heart. Most interpreters, however, take  $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  in this passage to denote mind, the higher faculty of the soul.<sup>45</sup> If this is the meaning the usage must be classed along with certain Pauline examples.

2. *The use of  $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  for spirit.*

a) *For the spirit of God, or Holy Spirit.*

As was intimated above, the New Testament literature shows a rapid advance in the conception of the function of the spirit of God. Not only was the term used in almost every sense known in the earlier Jewish writings, but new meanings were coined for it. Early Christianity was, to a great extent, a revival of prophetic conceptions and ideals as over against the priestly ideals then in vogue. And as the prophetic conceptions again came to the front, the old prophetic terms took on new life and meaning. This, then, was preëminently the age of the spirit.

(1) *The use of the term "Holy Spirit," or "spirit of God" in the teachings of Jesus.*

(a) *In the synoptic gospels.* It is remarkable how rarely Jesus makes any reference to the Holy Spirit in the sayings recorded of him in these gospels, and how limited are the functions which he there assigns to it. This fact is all the more significant when it is remembered that these sayings were handed down and committed to writing during a period when the church was most actively engaged in elaborating the doctrine of the spirit.

In silencing the Pharisees, Jesus prefaces his quotation of a prophecy commonly regarded as messianic with the words, "How then doth David *in spirit* call him Lord" (Matt. 22<sup>43</sup> Mark 12<sup>36</sup>). In another quotation recorded only in the gospel of Luke (4<sup>18</sup>; cf. Matt. 12<sup>18</sup>), he implies that he accomplishes his messianic mission through the possession of the spirit of God. In a saying recorded in the gospel of Matthew (12<sup>28</sup>) he affirms that it is by the spirit of God<sup>46</sup> that he casts out demons. The unpardonable sin, the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12<sup>31, 32</sup> Mark 3<sup>29</sup> Luke 12<sup>10</sup>), seems to

<sup>45</sup>This as we have seen is one of the meanings which Philo gives to  $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , hence is not impossible, especially if the book was written in Alexandria. Nevertheless, as will be shown, this usage was not common or widespread. Furthermore, under this interpretation  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  seems to be deprived largely of its force, and the words "joints and marrow" are compelled to assume strained and unnatural meanings.

<sup>46</sup>In the Lucan parallel (11<sup>21</sup>) we have "by the finger of God." This variation seems to be due to Luke's conception of the fundamental nature of the spirit, viz. as the *power* of God (cf. Luke 1<sup>35</sup> Acts 10<sup>38</sup>), the phrase "finger of God" being equivalent to the latter (cf. Ex. 8<sup>19</sup>).

consist in ascribing to Satan (Matt. 12<sup>24, 26</sup>) or to an unclean spirit (Mark 3<sup>29</sup>) the deeds performed by him through the power of the spirit of God.

As to the function of the spirit with reference to his disciples Jesus has almost as little to say. In a saying recorded by the three synoptists, Jesus tells the disciples that when they are brought before kings and magistrates, the Holy Spirit will teach them what they ought to speak, or rather the spirit will speak in or through them (Matt. 10<sup>20</sup> Mark 13<sup>11</sup> Luke 12<sup>12</sup>); and in another saying recorded by Luke (11<sup>13</sup>) he says that their heavenly Father is more ready to give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him, than an earthly father is to give good gifts to his children.<sup>47</sup> If the baptismal formula<sup>48</sup> recorded in Matt. 28<sup>19</sup> is a genuine saying of Jesus, we find him after his resurrection commanding his disciples to baptize all believers into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. These few passages constitute the sum of Jesus' teaching in the synoptic gospels concerning the function of the Holy Spirit in its relation to himself and to his disciples. The work which he assigns to the spirit pertains almost wholly to the extraordinary and miraculous. That, however, which seems to be lacking in these gospels is supplied in the teaching of Jesus as set forth

(b) *In the gospel of John.*

In this gospel, moral transformation and spiritual enlightenment are the functions which Jesus assigns to the spirit. The spirit is the transforming power in the operation called the new birth. Jesus says (John 3<sup>5</sup>) that except a man be born of water<sup>49</sup> and spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. By this operation of the indwelling spirit the man becomes a spiritual man (3<sup>6</sup>).<sup>50</sup> The *how* of the process remains a mystery (3<sup>8</sup>), but the *fact* is perfectly clear. It is the spirit that gives life (6<sup>66</sup>). But the work of the spirit does

<sup>47</sup> The original form of this saying may be that found in the gospel of Matthew (7<sup>11</sup>), where there is no specific mention made of the spirit.

<sup>48</sup> On the date of this passage see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 61; and on the use of the trinitarian formula in the early church see Harnack, *History of Dogma* (Eng. trans.), Vol. I. p. 157.

<sup>49</sup> By a metonymy, growing out of the baptism into repentance instituted by John, water probably stands in this passage for repentance. See Burton and Mathews, *Constructive Studies in the Life of Christ*, on this passage.

<sup>50</sup> Observe that the second πνεῦμα is without the article, i.e. used qualitatively. It does not, with any probability, refer to the quickened spirit of the man (since in the gospel of John πνεῦμα is not used with reference to the mind of man) but rather to the man quickened by the spirit of God — the spiritual man.

not end with regeneration. Without the aid of the spirit true worship is impossible. Jesus tells the woman of Samaria that the time is coming and now is when the true worshipper will worship the Father in spirit and in truth, *i.e.* through the possession of His spirit and the truth which it conveys (John 4<sup>23, 24</sup>; cf. 16<sup>13</sup>). That this is the meaning of the passage seems to be quite clear from the fact that the phrase "in spirit" (*ἐν πνεύματι* — the preposition *ἐν* and the noun usually without the article) is used by Jewish writers of the spirit of God only.<sup>51</sup> To be "in spirit" (*ἐν πνεύματι*) meant to possess the spirit of God or to be possessed by that spirit. When in the same passage it is said that God is spirit, the writer probably means nothing more than that God in His dealings with men operates through the spirit (cf. 2 Cor. 3<sup>17</sup>). Most interpreters, however, make spirit refer to God's non-embodied existence, and this meaning is not without basis in current usage or wholly out of harmony with the context.

Spiritual enlightenment is still the function ascribed to the spirit, when the spirit is spoken of by Jesus as helper or advocate (*παράκλητος*, John 14<sup>17, 26</sup> 15<sup>26</sup> 16<sup>13</sup>). Jesus tells his disciples that when he goes away he will pray the Father to send the spirit of truth, who shall lead them into all truth. The spirit is here presented as the great enlightener — the bearer of truth to those who believe in Jesus. This view of the work of the spirit is similar to that presented in the Apocrypha, and in Philo, where the spirit is regarded as the bearer of wisdom to men. Jesus implies (John 20<sup>22, 23</sup>) that the possession of the spirit will enable the disciples to gain such insight into the lives and motives of men that they will have the right to exercise the divine prerogative of pardoning sins.

We thus see, on comparing the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the gospel of John with that in the synoptic gospels, how great is the advance in the doctrine of the spirit. In the gospel of John there is a wholly new order of functions ascribed to the spirit; and, it may

<sup>51</sup> See Matt. 22<sup>48</sup> Luke 1<sup>17</sup> 2<sup>27</sup> 4<sup>1</sup> Rom. 2<sup>29</sup> (cf. 2 Cor. 3<sup>8</sup>) 8<sup>9</sup> Eph. 2<sup>22</sup> 3<sup>5</sup> 5<sup>18</sup> 6<sup>18</sup> Rev. 1<sup>10</sup> 4<sup>2</sup> 17<sup>3</sup> 21<sup>10</sup>. See also the following passages in which the phrase has a defining modifier attached: Matt. 3<sup>11</sup> 12<sup>28</sup> Mark 12<sup>28</sup> Luke 3<sup>16</sup> John 1<sup>33</sup> Acts 1<sup>6</sup> 11<sup>16</sup> Rom. 9<sup>1</sup> 14<sup>17</sup> 15<sup>16</sup> 1 Cor. 12<sup>2, 9, 13</sup> 14<sup>16</sup> 2 Cor. 6<sup>6</sup> Eph. 2<sup>18</sup> Phil. 1<sup>27</sup> Col. 1<sup>8</sup> 1 Thess. 1<sup>6</sup> Jude 20. To the above may be added many examples from the LXX. and the apostolic fathers. There are but two clear exceptions to this usage of the phrase in the New Testament, one (Acts 19<sup>21</sup>) found in Luke's (a Gentile's) writings, and the other (Gal. 6<sup>1</sup>) in Paul's; cf., however, 1 Tim. 3<sup>16</sup> which may be another instance. Had the writer of John 4<sup>23, 24</sup> meant the human spirit he would have omitted the *ἐν* and used the article, see John 11<sup>28</sup> 13<sup>21</sup>; cf. Matt. 5<sup>8</sup> Mark 8<sup>12</sup> Acts 18<sup>26</sup> Rom. 12<sup>11</sup> 1 Cor. 5<sup>8</sup> 2 Cor. 2<sup>18</sup> Eph. 4<sup>28</sup>.



be added, that this new order is found only in the teaching of Jesus.<sup>62</sup>

(2) *The usage of the four evangelists in respect to the Holy Spirit.*

The gospel writers (omitting for the present certain portions of the infancy narratives in the gospel of Luke, which reflect a conception not elsewhere expressed in the gospels) have very little to say of the function of the spirit with reference to believers. The disciples are not thought of as permanently endowed with the spirit before the death of Jesus, hence these writers deal almost wholly with the relation of the spirit to Jesus himself. The gospels of Matthew and Luke concur in ascribing to the Holy Spirit a share in the physical generation of Jesus (Matt. 1<sup>18, 20</sup> Luke 1<sup>35</sup>). This particular function of the Holy Spirit is entirely unique. Nothing like it is found elsewhere either in the Old or New Testaments. The conception of the nature of the spirit, however, seems to be the same as before. Luke uses the phrase "Holy Spirit" synonymously with the phrase "power of the Most High" (Luke 1<sup>35</sup>). Hence according to his conception the real cause in the generation of Jesus was God. The spirit was simply God's means of accomplishing it. Thus in a unique way Jesus was the Son of God. The holiness of his life and character could be explained in no other way. Nothing is said of his relation to the spirit during his youth and early manhood, but when he comes to maturity and enters upon his life work, the gospel writers all maintain that he received a special outpouring of the spirit. In fact the synoptic gospels as well as the gospel of John picture Jesus as the only person who, in the Christian dispensation prior to the ascension, was permanently endowed with the Holy Spirit. The spirit descended upon him at the time of his baptism (Matt. 3<sup>16</sup> Mark 1<sup>10</sup> Luke 3<sup>22</sup> John 1<sup>33</sup>). It seems to have been because he was already pure and holy, God's beloved Son, that the spirit was bestowed upon him.

There is no clear evidence in these passages that the writers intended to ascribe to the spirit a personality separate from God. As a matter of fact, the quantitative conception of it is so strongly marked that the other is practically ruled out. The heavens were opened, rent asunder, and the spirit descended as a dove upon Jesus. Luke says that God *anointed* Jesus with the Holy Spirit (Acts 10<sup>38</sup>) and John says that God did not bestow the spirit *by measure* (John 3<sup>34</sup>). As in the Old Testament, so also here, the spirit is viewed as an attri-

<sup>62</sup> If these ideas emanate from the evangelist rather than from Jesus himself, the former has always been careful to express them in words ascribed to the latter.

bute or power of God. Through it he guides and empowers Jesus. The spirit (or God through the spirit) impels Jesus to enter the wilderness to be tempted of Satan (Matt. 4<sup>1</sup> Mark 1<sup>13</sup> Luke 4<sup>1</sup>). Through the spirit God imparts to Jesus the power to do the work assigned to him as the founder of the kingdom (Luke 4<sup>18</sup> John 3<sup>34</sup> Matt. 12<sup>18</sup>), especially the power to work miracles (Luke 4<sup>14</sup>; cf. Acts 10<sup>38</sup>).

But Jesus is set forth by the gospel writers not only as the bearer of the spirit, he is also viewed as the communicator of it to his followers. The evangelists regard it as the mission of Jesus to bestow the Holy Spirit upon those who are members of his kingdom. They all report the announcement of John the Baptist that his greater successor will baptize with Holy Spirit.<sup>63</sup> John and Luke alone record the fulfilment of this prediction, and both of these writers place it after the resurrection of Jesus. Indeed John says explicitly that the spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified (John 7<sup>39</sup>). As to the precise time when the spirit was communicated to the disciples, John and Luke differ. John places it before the ascension (John 20<sup>22</sup>), Luke places it after (Acts 2<sup>1-4</sup>). As to the way in which he communicated the spirit, they differ also. John says that he breathed it upon them, Luke that he poured it forth from heaven. Both writers, however, agree that the Father is the ultimate source of the spirit (1 John 3<sup>34</sup> 4<sup>18</sup> Acts 1<sup>4-5</sup> 2<sup>38</sup> 15<sup>5</sup>; cf. John 14<sup>17-26</sup> 15<sup>26</sup> Luke 11<sup>13</sup>).

(3) *The usage of the Book of Acts (together with the infancy narratives in the gospel of Luke), the catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse in respect to the Holy Spirit.*

In these writings little is said of Jesus' relation to the spirit. Luke, in his preface to Acts, says that at the time of the ascension Jesus

<sup>63</sup> Matt. 3<sup>11</sup> Mark 1<sup>8</sup> Luke 3<sup>16</sup> John 1<sup>33</sup>; cf. Acts 1<sup>5</sup> 11<sup>16</sup>. The Matthew and Luke accounts add the word "fire," but since it is probable that the Mark and John accounts are the older, the former must be regarded as elaborations of the latter. According to the longer narratives the Pharisees came to John to be baptized. He accuses them of hypocrisy and says that when Jesus comes he will baptize with Holy Spirit and fire. He will gather the wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire (Matt. 3<sup>7-12</sup> Luke 3<sup>7-17</sup>). In the light of this latter expression we must understand that it is only his followers whom he will baptize with Holy Spirit. Those who reject him and persist in evil he will baptize with fire. This interpretation of the added word "fire" is further borne out by the fact that Luke, when referring in Acts 1<sup>5</sup> and 11<sup>16</sup> to this passage, quotes it in the Mark form and applies it to the descent of the spirit on the day of Pentecost. Furthermore, it would be contrary to the biblical usage and conception of the spirit of God to assign to it a punitive or destructive function.

gave commandment to the apostles through the Holy Spirit (Acts 1<sup>5</sup>). According to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it was because Jesus possessed the eternal spirit that the one act in which he gave up his life, obtained for his followers an eternal redemption (Heb. 9<sup>14</sup>; cf. 9<sup>12, 28-29</sup> 10<sup>1, 12, 14</sup>). The author of 1 Peter calls it the spirit of Christ, and says that it testified beforehand, through the prophets, of the sufferings of Christ and the glories which should follow them (1 Pet. 1<sup>11</sup>; cf. Acts 16<sup>7</sup>). But with the exception of a few such passages these writers deal only with the relation of the spirit to believers. As we noted above, the gospels do not represent the disciples as permanently endowed with the spirit before the death of Jesus. Prior to that time the spirit came to them only on certain occasions and for particular purposes. After the ascension of Jesus, however, according to the Book of Acts, as well as according to the epistles, *all believers* possess the spirit of God as a *permanent endowment*. On the original group of Jesus' followers the spirit was poured forth from heaven on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2<sup>4, 38</sup>). Other believers received it at the time when (or soon after) they signified their allegiance to Jesus as the Christ (Acts 2<sup>38</sup> 5<sup>32</sup> 8<sup>15, 16, 17</sup> 9<sup>17</sup> 10<sup>43-48</sup> 11<sup>16, 17</sup>; cf. Gal. 3<sup>2, 3, 14</sup> 5<sup>6</sup>). Often, according to the Book of Acts, the method by which the spirit is conveyed to them is through the laying on of hands, either of the apostles or of some disciple, as though it were communicated from one believer to another (Acts 8<sup>15-19</sup> 9<sup>17</sup> 19<sup>2-6</sup>; cf. Heb. 6<sup>2, 4</sup>).

As to the function of the Holy Spirit, the ideas of the primitive church (with the exception of certain Pauline conceptions) were to a great extent derived from the Old Testament. Jesus is seldom appealed to on this subject. Almost every Old Testament usage can be duplicated in the New Testament, though often in a modified form. There is not only a return to the view of the spirit as the author of the ecstatic, but, even to a greater degree, as the author of the extraordinary and miraculous. The functions of the spirit as set forth in Acts (together with the infancy narratives in Luke) and the catholic epistles, may be arranged under three general heads:

(a) *The spirit as the author of prophecy.*

The larger part of the numerous examples which come under this head may be classed as *predictive* prophecies. In the proof that Jesus was the expected Messiah, it was natural to employ the predictive prophecies of the Old Testament (1 Pet. 1<sup>11</sup> Rev. 19<sup>10</sup>), and such employment carried with it the feeling that prediction was one of the highest functions of the spirit. The Holy Spirit was viewed as the active agent in the prophecy. The inspired man was simply the

mouthpiece of the spirit (Acts 1<sup>16</sup> 4<sup>25</sup> 28<sup>25</sup> Heb. 3<sup>7</sup> 10<sup>15</sup> 2 Pet. 1<sup>21</sup>; cf. Matt. 22<sup>45</sup> Mark 12<sup>30</sup>). Of the spirit as the author of predictions in the Christian dispensation, there are several instances, mostly found in the writings of Luke. Thus in the infancy narratives, Elizabeth, Zacharias, and Simeon, filled with the Holy Spirit, all make predictive prophecies (Luke 1<sup>41-67</sup> 2<sup>25, 26</sup>). Agabus, through the spirit, prophesies a great famine (Acts 11<sup>28</sup>), and also foretells Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (Acts 21<sup>11</sup>). Many times Paul was told by the prophets that he would be imprisoned if he ventured into the Holy City (Acts 20<sup>25</sup> 21<sup>9</sup>). The great Christian predictive prophecy, however, is the Apocalypse of John. In this case the message is conveyed to the writer by the spirit through a vision (Rev. 1<sup>10</sup> 4<sup>2</sup> 17<sup>3</sup> 21<sup>10</sup>). This reminds one of the function of the spirit in the visions of Ezekiel (Ezek. 1<sup>3</sup> 3<sup>23</sup> 8<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>30</sup>), only in the present case the spirit *speaks* through the prophet (Rev. 2<sup>7</sup> 14<sup>15</sup>; cf. 22<sup>17</sup>), as well as transports him in vision from place to place.

Akin to prophecy, if not actually a part of it, is the speaking with tongues mentioned in the second chapter of Acts. In fact the author interprets the phenomenon as a fulfilment of the prediction of Joel (2<sup>28</sup> [3<sup>1</sup>]) that in the last days God would pour forth of His spirit upon all flesh and their sons and daughters should prophesy (Acts 2<sup>17, 18</sup>). Under the symbols of a rushing wind and tongues like fire, the writer pictures the descent of the spirit on the day of Pentecost, and adds that those upon whom the Holy Spirit came began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2<sup>14</sup>). This speaking with tongues is, later in the chapter (2<sup>11</sup>) explained as the ability to set forth in different languages the "mighty works of God." According to this explanation there is nothing ecstatic or unintelligible in the phenomenon, such as Paul describes in 1 Cor. 14. It consists simply in the miraculous power to speak in one or more languages previously unknown to the speaker. It is possible, indeed, that the author of the second chapter of Acts was mistaken or misinformed in this interpretation of the phenomenon, and that it should be explained in the light of the Pauline usage.<sup>64</sup> There are still marks in the passage itself which may indicate this. Those who were under the influence of the spirit were thought to be drunk (Acts 2<sup>12-15</sup>), hence must have been in a state akin to ecstasy. Then, too, the other references in the Book of Acts (10<sup>44-47</sup> 19<sup>6</sup>) concerning the speaking with tongues seem to favor the Pauline meaning

<sup>64</sup> See McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 50-53; Weinel: *Wirkungen des Geistes*, pp. 72 ff.

rather than the other. There is no implication in these passages that it meant speaking in different languages. Yet the passage as it stands reflects the author's conceptions of the function of the Spirit.

(b) *The spirit as the helper and director of the believer, especially in the work of establishing the kingdom of God on earth.*

Luke is constantly speaking of this helping function of the spirit. It was in the spirit and power of Elijah that John the Baptist did his work. The Holy Spirit gave to the apostles power to become witnesses of Jesus both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria (Acts 1<sup>8</sup>; cf. 1 Pet. 1<sup>12</sup>). It was when the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit that they were enabled to speak the word of God with boldness (Acts 4<sup>8, 31</sup>). The seven deacons were filled with the spirit in order to accomplish their particular work (Acts 6<sup>2, 5</sup>). Under the inspiration of the same spirit, Barnabas exhorted the Christians of Antioch to cleave unto the Lord (Acts 11<sup>23</sup>); and Paul was enabled to withstand the sorcerer Elymas (Acts 13<sup>9</sup>). Paul tells the elders of Ephesus that the Holy Spirit has made them overseers of the church of God (Acts 20<sup>28</sup>).

But the spirit is also a helper in more specific ways than these. It guides and directs believers in cases of difficulty or unexpected crises. Thus, the spirit impels Simeon to go to the temple to see the infant Jesus (Luke 2<sup>27</sup>). It tells Philip to join the chariot of the eunuch (Acts 8<sup>29</sup>), and miraculously catches him away when his work is accomplished (Acts 8<sup>39</sup>; cf. 1 Kings 18<sup>12</sup> 2 Kings 2<sup>16</sup>). It commands Peter to go with the men sent from Cornelius (Acts 10<sup>19</sup> 11<sup>12</sup>). It directs Paul and Barnabas to go on a missionary journey (Acts 13<sup>2, 4</sup>), and guides them in the proper direction (Acts 16<sup>6, 7</sup>). It aids the church of Jerusalem in settling the difficult question which arose in the Antioch church (Acts 15<sup>28</sup>). It impels Paul to go to Jerusalem in spite of the fact that it testifies in every city that bonds and afflictions await him (Acts 20<sup>22, 23</sup>). In times of persecution and distress, it causes the believer to rejoice even in the midst of his adversity (Acts 13<sup>42</sup> 1 Pet. 4<sup>14</sup>; cf. Luke 10<sup>21</sup> 1 Thess. 1<sup>6</sup>).

(c) *The spirit as a witnessing and revealing power in the believer.*

This function of the spirit seems to be similar to that set forth by Jesus in the gospel of John, when he tells the disciples that the spirit of truth will lead them into all truth. The first Epistle of John represents the spirit as the great witnessing power in the believer that he has eternal life through Christ (1 John 5<sup>6-8</sup>; cf. 5<sup>11</sup>). Through the possession of the spirit he knows that he abides in God and God in him (1 John 3<sup>24</sup> 4<sup>13</sup>). According to the Book of Acts the Holy Spirit

is a witness, to the believer, of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 5<sup>35</sup>). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in referring to the fact that the high priest alone entered into the holy of holies, says that the Holy Spirit thus signified that the way into the holy place had not yet been made manifest (Heb. 9<sup>8</sup>). Through the spirit, in a vision, heaven itself was revealed to Stephen (Acts 7<sup>55</sup>), and by the spirit the sin of Ananias was made known to Peter (Acts 5<sup>9</sup>).<sup>85</sup> The Jews were not able to withstand the wisdom and the spirit by which Stephen spake (Acts 6<sup>10</sup>; cf. 6<sup>5</sup>). To resist his words was to resist the Holy Spirit (Acts 7<sup>51</sup>).

(4) *The usage of the Pauline writings in respect to the Holy Spirit.*

Paul gives us a deeper and broader view of the work of the spirit than any other New Testament writer. If we compare his teachings with those of Jesus as set forth in the gospel of John, we see that he is the only writer who develops the distinctly Christian conception of the spirit. He even goes beyond the teaching of Jesus in the emphasis which he lays on the transforming power of the spirit in the life of the believer. Paul at the same time sets forth in a more vital way than any other writer the relation existing between Jesus and the spirit. He tells the Galatians that God sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts crying Abba, Father (Gal. 4<sup>6</sup>; cf. Rom. 8<sup>15</sup>), and in writing to the Philippians, he mentions his desire for a fresh supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ (Phil. 1<sup>19</sup>). In Rom. 8<sup>9</sup>, he makes the phrase "spirit of Christ" synonymous with "spirit of God." He goes even one step beyond this and affirms that Christ, through the spirit, dwells in the believer (Rom. 8<sup>9, 10</sup>). This is probably what he means when in speaking of Christ, he says in 2 Cor. 3<sup>17</sup> that the "Lord is the spirit."<sup>86</sup> In the second clause of the same verse, he defines this as "spirit of (the) Lord."<sup>87</sup>

It will be noticed that all the passages which refer to the spirit as the spirit of Christ or the spirit of Jesus are found in the writings of Paul, or of those writers, Luke (Acts 16<sup>7</sup>) and the author of 1 Peter (1<sup>11</sup>), who are under the immediate influence of Paul. Paul thus

<sup>85</sup> Observe that the attempt on the part of Ananias to deceive the spirit is in Acts 5<sup>4</sup> defined as an attempt to deceive God.

<sup>86</sup> This identification is further borne out in 2 Cor. 3<sup>18</sup>, if, as seems to be the case κύριος and πνεῦμα are in apposition. If, as is less probable, the latter term limits the former, then we have Paul referring to Christ as the Lord of the spirit (see Meyer's "Commentary").

<sup>87</sup> Πνεῦμα κυρίου is a common phrase in the Septuagint, though it is seldom employed in the New Testament (Luke 4<sup>18</sup> Acts 5<sup>9</sup> 8<sup>39</sup>). It occurs in Paul's writings only in this passage.

seems responsible in the main for this usage. The explanation of this can be found only in his conception of the exalted Christ, and in his view of the personality of the spirit as indistinguishable in experience from that of God or Christ. Of the exalted and powerful place which Christ, since his resurrection, has occupied, Paul is continually speaking. Christ is in the place of power at the right hand of God (Rom. 8<sup>34</sup> Eph. 1<sup>20</sup> Col. 3<sup>1</sup>). God has highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name (Phil. 2<sup>9f.</sup>). By the resurrection, he has been constituted son of God with power (Rom. 1<sup>4</sup>).

The main evidence for Paul's conception of the spirit as having its personality in that of God will have to be given a little later on. It will be sufficient at this point to call attention to his view of the spirit as the great bond which binds together all Christians into a spiritual unity with Christ. Believers were all made to *drink* of the one spirit, and the participation in this one spirit binds them together into a single organism (1 Cor. 12<sup>13</sup>; cf. Eph. 4<sup>4</sup>). Of this organism Christ is the head (1 Cor. 11<sup>3</sup> Eph. 4<sup>16, 18</sup> Col. 1<sup>18</sup>). So closely is Christ bound to the believer through the spirit, that they can be called one spirit (1 Cor. 6<sup>17</sup>). It is Paul's earnest plea that this unity of believers through the spirit be preserved (Phil. 1<sup>27</sup> Eph. 4<sup>3</sup>), for it is through Christ that all believers have access by one spirit unto the Father (Eph. 2<sup>18</sup>). With this view of the exalted Christ, seated at the right hand of God, the head of the great Christian organism which is composed of his followers; and with this view of the penetrating, life-imparting spirit which binds all together into a spiritual unity with Christ, it is not strange that he could refer to the spirit as the spirit of Christ. But with Paul, as with the other New Testament writers, God was always regarded as the ultimate source of the spirit. It was his spirit and he bestowed it as a free gift (Rom. 5<sup>5</sup> 2 Cor. 1<sup>22</sup> 5<sup>5</sup> Gal. 3<sup>5</sup> 4<sup>6</sup> Eph. 1<sup>17</sup> 2 Tim. 1<sup>7</sup>).

As to the functions of the spirit Paul is much more explicit than other writers. In the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of 1 Corinthians, in writing to Gentile converts who had probably never heard of the spirit until they were converted to Christianity, he enumerates with some care the gifts of the spirit. Chief among these are speaking with tongues, prophesying, working miracles, and speaking the word of wisdom. For the edification of the church these gifts were not all on a par. In fact Paul mentions them in order to commend some above others.

(a) *The gift of speaking with tongues.* This was the most coveted and showy of the gifts of the spirit. The phenomena connected



with it are quite fully described in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of 1 Corinthians. It is perfectly clear from these chapters that the person who exercised this gift was, while doing so, in a state of ecstasy; and that what he said while in this state was unintelligible to the ordinary hearer, and usually to the speaker himself. This speaking with tongues seemed to consist largely, if not wholly, of prayers, thanksgivings, and songs, *i.e.* it was directed toward God, rather than, as prophecy was, toward men (1 Cor. 14<sup>2-4, 14-19</sup>). In these prayers and songs the intellect of the man took no active part (1 Cor. 14<sup>14-16</sup>). It needed some one, either the man himself or some other person, with a special gift of the spirit, to interpret what had been said (1 Cor. 12<sup>10</sup>; cf. 14<sup>28</sup>).

In this ecstatic phenomenon, which was regarded by the primitive church as the leading function of the spirit, we have a return in a somewhat modified form of one of the earliest views of the spirit and its work (1 Sam. 10<sup>10, 6</sup>; cf. 1 Sam. 19<sup>20, 23</sup>). As at that time it took prolonged and vigorous effort to disengage the ecstatic from the conception of the function of the spirit, so now again the same fight had to be made, and it was Paul who first began the conflict. It was only thus that the conception of the spirit in its higher functions could be retained.

In 1 Cor. 14<sup>11, 15</sup>, by a natural metonymy, we have the spirit of God which the man possesses spoken of as the man's spirit.<sup>68</sup> This is not an uncommon procedure, since in this same chapter Paul speaks of the "spirits of the prophets," meaning thereby the spirits (or spirit) possessed by the prophets (1 Cor. 14<sup>22</sup>). So, too, the writer of the Apocalypse, in the same sense, speaks of the "spirits of the prophets" (Rev. 22<sup>6</sup>; cf. Luke 1<sup>15-17</sup>, where John, who was said to be filled with the Holy Spirit from the time of his birth, is in the immediate context spoken of as going forth in the spirit and power of Elijah, *viz.*, the spirit of God given to Elijah).

(b) *The gift of prophecy.* Unlike other New Testament writers, Paul seldom limited this gift of the spirit to *prediction* (cf. 1 Tim. 4<sup>1</sup>). With him it meant the larger prophetic function connected

<sup>68</sup> That the writer does not here refer to the human spirit is clear from the context. For in 14<sup>2</sup> it is said that the man who speaks with a tongue speaks to God, for by the spirit (*i.e.* God's spirit) he speaks mysteries, which no man can understand; again, in 14<sup>16</sup>, that the unlearned cannot say amen if one gives thanks in or by the spirit (God's spirit). Furthermore, it would be contrary to any known meaning of πνεῦμα when used of the human spirit to give it a meaning diametrically opposed to that of mind (νοῦς), as on this view the author has done in these verses.



with the delivery of any message of God to men. He regarded the gift of prophecy as more to be desired than the gift of tongues, since it ministered to the edification of others (1 Cor. 14<sup>1-5</sup>). They were, however, gifts of the same spirit (1 Cor. 12<sup>9, 11</sup>), hence were both to be encouraged (1 Cor. 14<sup>1-5</sup>). He tells the Thessalonians not to quench the spirit or to despise prophesying (1 Thess. 5<sup>19 f.</sup>). He finds it necessary, however, to warn the Corinthians against excesses, hence he lays down the principle that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets (1 Cor. 14<sup>32</sup>). The writer of 2 Thessalonians warns believers not to be too easily disturbed by what a prophet says (2 Thess. 2<sup>2</sup>). Since, however, there are false as well as true prophets, and since only the latter are under the direction of the spirit of God (cf. 1 John 4<sup>1-3, 6</sup>), it is necessary to discriminate between them. This power to discriminate between the spirits of the true and false prophets Paul makes also a distinct function or gift of the spirit (1 Cor. 12<sup>10</sup>).

(c) *The gift of the spirit to work miracles.* This characteristic power of Jesus (Luke 4<sup>14</sup>; cf. Acts 10<sup>38</sup>) was also possessed, to a limited extent, by his followers. Paul distinctly names the ability to work miracles among the functions of the spirit (1 Cor. 12<sup>9, 10</sup>), and refers to it in connection with the spirit several times (Gal. 3<sup>5</sup> Rom. 15<sup>19</sup> 1 Thess. 1<sup>5</sup>). Other writers, though mentioning the power to work miracles, do not connect it immediately with the spirit.

(d) *The spirit as the bearer of wisdom and knowledge to the believer—especially knowledge concerning God and the way of salvation.* This is one of the functions of the spirit set forth by Jesus in the gospel of John. Paul is the only New Testament writer who elaborates it to any extent. In this he also carries to completion the views of the Apocrypha and Philo. Paul enumerates among the gifts of the spirit the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge (1 Cor. 12<sup>8</sup>). He tells the Corinthians that he did not come to them with the wisdom of this world, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power (1 Cor. 2<sup>4</sup>; cf. 2<sup>1-6</sup>). He compares the spirit of God to the spirit of man, and says that as none but the spirit of man knows the things of man so the spirit of God alone knows the things pertaining to God (1 Cor. 2<sup>11, 12</sup>). This knowledge of the things of God the spirit freely communicates to those, and those alone, who possess the spirit and have been renewed by it (1 Cor. 2<sup>10, 12, 14</sup>). This passage has often been used as evidence of Paul's belief in the separate personality of the spirit. However, the very comparison with the mind of man seems entirely to preclude such a concep-

tion.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, this is exactly the function ascribed to the spirit in the Apocrypha and Philo, and a personality separate from God is not ascribed to the spirit by those writers. In particular, the spirit bears witness to the believer that he is a son of God (Rom. 8<sup>15, 16</sup> Gal. 4<sup>6</sup> 2 Tim. 1<sup>7</sup>). Through the spirit the love of God for him is shed abroad in his heart (Rom. 5<sup>5</sup>). The very possession of the spirit is a guarantee of present reconciliation with God, and a pledge of complete salvation in the future (2 Cor. 1<sup>22</sup> 5<sup>5</sup> Eph. 1<sup>14</sup> 4<sup>30</sup> Rom. 8<sup>9</sup> Gal. 5<sup>5</sup>; cf. 1 John 3<sup>24</sup> 4<sup>13</sup>).

(c) *The spirit as the regenerating and sanctifying power in the character and conduct of the believer.* Here again the teaching of Paul accords with and completes that of Jesus in the gospel of John; and since no other writer, either in the Old or New Testament, elaborates this function of the spirit, it may be called the unique Christian contribution to the conception of the spirit. In this case, the spirit is viewed as an ethical dynamic, a transforming power within the man. In all other cases it is regarded as a power operating upon the man from without, the man being a sort of instrument or agent of the spirit. If the older functions of the spirit are called *gifts* (1 Cor. 12<sup>4</sup>), this newer one may be appropriately designated a *fruit* (Gal. 5<sup>22</sup>). Paul did not attempt to discredit the older views. He simply showed that there was a more ethical way of viewing the spirit (1 Cor. 12<sup>31</sup>). As early as the time of the Babylonian captivity the spirit was viewed as partaking of God's holiness (Ps. 51<sup>11[13]</sup> Isa. 63<sup>10, 11</sup>); and Paul, as well as other New Testament writers, but more thoroughly than they, was imbued with the same conception. In accordance with this view the spirit cannot dwell in a corrupt man (1 Cor. 3<sup>16</sup> 6<sup>17, 19</sup>; cf. Eph. 4<sup>30</sup> Heb. 10<sup>29</sup>), nor can it participate in any corrupt conduct (cf. Jas. 4<sup>5</sup> Jude 19).

Paul, as well as Jesus, uses the figure of birth for the vital transformation brought about by the spirit (Gal. 4<sup>29</sup>), but more often he simply speaks of the life-imparting power of the spirit, or of the life imparted by the spirit (Rom. 8<sup>2, 6, 11</sup> 2 Cor. 3<sup>2, 6, 8</sup> Gal. 5<sup>22</sup>). The spirit, however, not only performs the first act of regeneration in the believer; it continues to be in him a sanctifying power throughout life (Rom. 15<sup>19</sup> 1 Cor. 6<sup>11</sup> 3<sup>16</sup> 1 Thess. 4<sup>8</sup> 2 Thess. 2<sup>13</sup> Titus 3<sup>5</sup> 1 Pet. 1<sup>3</sup>), and at the end transforms his mortal body into one fitted for his eternal abode (Rom. 8<sup>11, 23</sup>). It helps him to pray (Eph. 6<sup>18</sup> Jude 20); in fact, intercedes for him when he does not know what he ought to

<sup>39</sup> See Drummond, *Commentaries on Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, etc.* (International Handbook series).

ask (Rom. 8<sup>28, 27</sup>). Thus, the fellowship of the spirit is necessary at all times (2 Cor. 13<sup>13(14)</sup> Phil. 2<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. 1<sup>14</sup> Eph. 6<sup>18</sup>). True worship is impossible without it (Phil. 3<sup>3</sup> Eph. 5<sup>18</sup>). The condition upon which this quickening spirit is bestowed upon man is faith in Christ (Gal. 3<sup>2, 5, 14</sup> 5<sup>5</sup>); but, on the other hand, the spirit produces more faith in the believer (1 Cor. 12<sup>9</sup> 2 Cor. 4<sup>13</sup> Gal. 5<sup>22</sup>). Other fruits produced by the spirit are righteousness, hope, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, meekness, and self-control (Rom. 14<sup>17</sup> 15<sup>13, 30</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 2 Cor. 6<sup>6</sup> Gal. 5<sup>22, 23</sup> Col. 1<sup>8</sup> 2 Tim. 1<sup>7</sup>). Since the believer has been renewed by the spirit, his conduct in all things ought to be governed by this same indwelling spirit (Gal. 5<sup>25</sup> Rom. 8<sup>4, 5, 14</sup>; cf. 1 Cor. 7<sup>40</sup>). And if a man so walk he will not be led astray by his fleshly appetites and impulses (Gal. 5<sup>16, 17</sup> Rom. 8<sup>4, 5, 9, 13</sup>). Neither will he be under the bondage of law (Gal. 5<sup>18</sup> 3<sup>5</sup>). He serves God in a new way made possible by the spirit, not in the old way of legalism (Rom. 7<sup>6</sup>). His circumcision has been that of the heart by the spirit, not that according to the Mosaic law (Rom. 2<sup>29</sup>; cf. 2 Cor. 3<sup>8, 6</sup>). Thus by continually sowing to the spirit the believer will finally of the spirit reap eternal life (Gal. 6<sup>8</sup>). We have already considered Paul's view of the spirit as the vital bond which unites Christ and his followers into a single organism. The examples there brought forward also illustrate the present usage of *πνεῦμα*. It is thus seen that in the great majority of cases in which Paul uses *πνεῦμα* for the spirit of God he gives it this ethical significance. So predominant is the use of the term in this sense that, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians, the term takes on a qualitative sense, which renders unnecessary a qualifying noun or even the article to distinguish its reference. When his Gentile converts in Corinth, possibly in consequence of their heathen conception of demons (cf. 1 Cor. 12<sup>2</sup>), seemed to be under the impression that they each possessed a separate spirit of God, Paul devoted a section of his letter (1 Cor. 12<sup>3-13</sup>) to pointing out to them that they all partook of the *one* spirit,<sup>60</sup> which distributed to each believer the gifts which he possessed. The quantitative conception of the spirit is still held by Paul, as it had been by older Jewish writers.<sup>61</sup> And his Gentile pupil, Luke, is

<sup>60</sup> It would seem probable that sooner or later the Gentile Christians, who had not been educated, as the Jews had, into a conception of the general, non-personal nature of the spirit of God, would come to conceive it as having a personality separate from God.

<sup>61</sup> Even in the benediction 2 Cor. 13<sup>13(14)</sup> there is little indication of a recognition by Paul of the separate personality of the spirit. For in the first place,

constantly using the phrase "filled with the spirit." There is but one passage in the New Testament which seems with any degree of probability to indicate a tendency toward the conception of the separate personality of the spirit. This is the baptismal formula in the closing chapter of Matthew (28<sup>19</sup>). As we saw above, the date of this passage is uncertain; and, furthermore, Deissmann<sup>62</sup> has shown quite conclusively, from Greek papyri, that the phrase "into the name" (*eis τὸ ὄνομα*) means "belonging to." The baptism of the believer into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit would thus mean into the possession of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and since the believer was always thought of as possessed by the Holy Spirit, this would not yet be clear evidence of a belief in the separate personality (apart from God) of the spirit.

b) *For the human spirit* (i.e. *the spirit of the living man*).

(1) *The seat or source of strong excitement, aroused activity (or corresponding depression), and in a very few cases of anger or impatience.* This, one of the oldest meanings of פָּנָה, was transferred directly to πνεῦμα by the Greek-speaking Jews. The characteristic note anger, however, has almost wholly disappeared (cf. John 11<sup>38</sup> Acts 17<sup>16</sup>). Jesus tells his disciples that the spirit is willing (eager, ready) but the flesh is weak (Matt. 26<sup>41</sup> Mark 14<sup>38</sup>). According to the gospel of Mark, it is said that he sighed deeply in his spirit<sup>63</sup> (8<sup>12</sup>); and according to John, that he groaned (literally was moved with indignation) in spirit and was troubled (John 11<sup>38</sup> 13<sup>21</sup>). Paul sometimes speaks of his spirit (or that of Titus) being refreshed (rested or relaxed) upon receiving some good news from or concerning his churches (1 Cor. 16<sup>18</sup> 2 Cor. 2<sup>13</sup> 7<sup>13</sup>; cf. 7<sup>5</sup> and Philem.<sup>20.7</sup>). His spirit was irritated (aroused to anger) when he beheld the city full of idols (Acts 17<sup>16</sup>). It is said of Apollos that he was fervent (*ἔωρον*, boiling) in the spirit (Acts 18<sup>25</sup>); and Paul exhorts the church at Rome to be fervent in spirit in their service of the Lord (Rom. 12<sup>11</sup>). It is probably in this sense that Paul uses the word in the

though naming the three in succession, he does not give them in the order, nor does he use the customary terms ("Father, Son, and Spirit") of the trinitarian formula; and in the second place, the function which he ascribes to each is that which is characteristic with him, viz., the "grace of the Lord Jesus, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit" (on the latter cf. Phil. 2<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>62</sup> *Bible Studies* (Eng. trans.), pp. 146-148, 196-198; see also Bernard in the *Expositor*, January, 1902, p. 43.

<sup>63</sup> Observe the use of the *article*, but not the preposition *ἐν*, as in the case of the spirit of God (see footnote 51). This seems to be the customary form when the human spirit is referred to. See the other passages under this head.

phrase "whom I serve in my spirit," when he calls God to witness how unceasingly he has prayed for them (Rom. 1<sup>9</sup>; cf. Acts 26<sup>7</sup> Rom. 7<sup>25</sup> 2 Tim. 1<sup>9</sup>).

(2) *The seat of humility.* This meaning has also been transferred from אֲנִי to πνεῦμα, though the former term was not used in this sense before the Babylonian exile. There are but few examples in the New Testament. Paul asks the Corinthian church whether he should come to them in love and a spirit of meekness (1 Cor. 4<sup>21</sup>). He tells the Galatians to restore an erring brother in a spirit of meekness (Gal. 6<sup>1</sup>). The author of 1 Peter exhorts believers to have a meek and quiet spirit (1 Pet. 3<sup>4</sup>); and Jesus in one of the beatitudes says, "Blessed are the poor in *the* (their) spirit" (Matt. 5<sup>3</sup>).<sup>64</sup>

(3) *As the seat and source of thoughts and purposes, sometimes used of mind in the broad sense in which that term is used to-day, viz., of the total psychic life.* Paul is almost the sole New Testament writer who employs the word in this sense, and the others who do so were probably under his influence. Since Philo is the only writer prior to Paul who uses πνεῦμα with this meaning, it is possible that the latter was under the direct influence of the former. There is, however, no clear evidence of this; hence it is more probable that the influence came through a school of writers of whom Philo and the author of the Wisdom of Solomon were only two leading representatives. We have already seen that Paul, like these writers, views the spirit of God as the bearer of wisdom and knowledge to man. Hence it is not strange that he should develop the meanings of πνεῦμα on the human side in the same direction, especially since he could not (as Philo could) use the term ψυχή (soul) in the full classical sense of mind. The Jewish usage of this term was much too narrow for that.

In comparing the divine spirit with the human spirit, Paul defines the latter as the seat of self-consciousness or self-knowledge (1 Cor. 2<sup>11</sup>). That it is in some sense synonymous with the Greek term νοῦς is clear from the way in which he relates the terms "spirit of the Lord" and "mind of the Lord" (cf. 1 Cor. 2<sup>14</sup> with 2<sup>16</sup> and Rom. 11<sup>34</sup>). A similar conception of the human spirit is expressed in Rom. 8<sup>16</sup>, where it is said that the spirit of God bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God. In several passages man is referred to

<sup>64</sup> Observe that the article is used with πνεῦμα, and cf. footnote 51. That this is the correct interpretation of the passage is also clear from a comparison with Matt. 13<sup>4</sup>.

as spirit and body. Paul tells his followers he is with them in spirit (thoughts, purposes, affections), though absent from them in body (1 Cor. 5<sup>3,4</sup> Col. 2<sup>8</sup>). A believer is to be pure in body and spirit (1 Cor. 7<sup>36</sup> 2 Cor. 7<sup>1</sup>). He is to put off the old man and be renewed in the spirit (thoughts and purposes) of his mind [νοῦς] (Eph. 4<sup>23</sup>; cf. Rom. 12<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 4<sup>16</sup> Col. 3<sup>10</sup>). Because of sin the body is dead (*i.e.* cannot expect to enter heaven), but the spirit is alive because of the righteousness which it possesses (Rom. 8<sup>10</sup>). Paul advises that the Corinthian fornicator be delivered over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,<sup>65</sup> in order that the spirit may be ready for salvation (*i.e.* may be righteous) when Jesus comes. His prayer for the Thessalonian church is that the God of peace might sanctify them wholly, and that their spirit and soul and body might be preserved entire and without blame until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. In 1 Tim. 3<sup>16</sup> Jesus is said to have been declared righteous in spirit.<sup>66</sup> So anxious is Paul concerning the welfare of the spirit of those to whom he writes that he closes several of his letters with the benediction, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren" (Gal. 6<sup>18</sup> Phil. 4<sup>23</sup> 2 Tim. 4<sup>22</sup> Philem. 25). Paul seems to have been led to this enlarged usage of πνεύμα for the human spirit by a feeling of need for a wider term than any in vogue to express the whole psychic life of man, especially of such a man as had been renewed by the spirit of God.<sup>67</sup> An evidence of this is seen in his use of such phrases as "the inner man" (Rom. 7<sup>22</sup> 2 Cor. 4<sup>16</sup> Eph. 3<sup>16</sup>), and "the new man" (Eph. 4<sup>24</sup> Col. 3<sup>10</sup>).

In this use of πνεύμα Paul is followed by very few writers. There are two or three examples in Luke's writings and one in Mark's. The child Jesus is said to have grown and waxed strong in spirit (Luke 1<sup>80</sup>; cf. 2<sup>40</sup>). Mary rejoiced in spirit (Luke 1<sup>47</sup>), and Paul purposed in the spirit (Acts 19<sup>21</sup>; cf. Luke 1<sup>86</sup>). In the gospel of Mark, Jesus is said to have perceived in his spirit what the scribes were reasoning about (Mark 2<sup>8</sup>; cf. 5<sup>30</sup> Luke 5<sup>22</sup> John 6<sup>61</sup>). These constitute the remaining New Testament examples. The only one of the Apostolic Fathers to adopt this usage of Paul is Ignatius, and the latter is far from employing it with the same clear-cut meaning as the former.

<sup>65</sup> σάρξ, since it is conceived by Paul to be the seat of the baser animal passions, is often used by metonymy for those passions.

<sup>66</sup> Since ἐν πνεύματι is the form, this may mean "by the spirit," referring to the divine spirit. Cf. footnote 51.

<sup>67</sup> Such terms as νοῦς, ψυχή, and καρδία expressed it only in separate phases.

*c) For unembodied or disembodied spirits.*

(1) *Divine and angelic beings capable of existence without a physical body.* The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the angels as ministering spirits (Heb. 1<sup>14</sup>; cf. 1<sup>7</sup>),<sup>68</sup> and the author of the Apocalypse, as spirits who stand before the throne (Rev. 1<sup>4</sup> 3<sup>1</sup> 4<sup>5</sup> 5<sup>6</sup>). Paul calls Jesus in his risen state a spirit, though in this case he clearly implies that Christ has a glorified body (1 Cor. 15<sup>45</sup>). In the description of Jesus which he gives in the first chapter of Romans (1<sup>3</sup> 4<sup>1</sup>), Paul characterizes him as born son of David according to the flesh (*i.e.* according to human kinship or relationship), but constituted son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead according to spirit of holiness (*i.e.* according to his spiritual relationship). Thus in this passage, πνεῦμα seems to be a general designation for the divine heavenly or holy beings among whom Jesus is now the highest personage. When, in John 4<sup>24</sup>, God is said to be spirit, πνεῦμα may denote nothing more than that God is not physically embodied. See, however, under "spirit of God" for another interpretation.

(2) *Demons, or evil spirits, non-embodied, i.e. having no proper bodies of their own, but often conceived as inhabiting the bodies of living persons.* The demons described in the synoptic gospels and the Book of Acts are usually regarded as the cause of physical disease or of mental derangement.<sup>69</sup> Paul does not use the term πνεῦμα in this sense. The evil spirits of which he speaks have an influence upon the morals of the people over whom they gain control. Thus, he says, the Gentiles walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience (Eph. 2<sup>2</sup>). Evidently referring to the same spirit he tells his converts that they have not received the spirit of the world (1 Cor. 2<sup>12</sup>), nor the spirit of bondage (Rom. 8<sup>15</sup>; cf. 11<sup>8</sup>), nor the spirit of fearfulness (2 Tim. 1<sup>7</sup>).<sup>70</sup> The false prophets are regarded as being possessed by evil spirits (1 John 4<sup>1, 3, 6</sup>; cf. 1 Cor. 12<sup>10</sup>). In a couple of passages, Luke uses πνεῦμα of disembodied beings without saying anything about their character (Luke 24<sup>37, 39</sup>; Acts 23<sup>8, 9</sup>).

<sup>68</sup> The spirits mentioned in 12<sup>9</sup> are probably angels. See footnote 23.

<sup>69</sup> Matt. 8<sup>16</sup> 10<sup>1</sup> 12<sup>43, 45</sup> Mark 1<sup>23, 26, 27</sup> 3<sup>11, 30</sup> 5<sup>2, 8, 13</sup> 6<sup>7</sup> 7<sup>26</sup> 9<sup>17, 20, 25</sup> Luke 4<sup>33, 36</sup> 6<sup>18</sup> 7<sup>21</sup> 8<sup>2, 29</sup> 9<sup>38, 42</sup> 10<sup>20</sup> 11<sup>24, 26</sup> 13<sup>11</sup> Acts 5<sup>16</sup> 8<sup>7</sup> 16<sup>16, 18</sup> 19<sup>12, 13, 16</sup> Rev. 16<sup>13, 14</sup> 18<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> Since the spirit mentioned in these passages is in every case contrasted with the Holy Spirit, and since it is also implied that it comes upon men from without, it is quite evident that the word πνεῦμα cannot here refer to the human spirit.

(3) *For disembodied human spirits.* This usage occurs but seldom. The common word for this in the New Testament, as well as elsewhere, is ψυχή (soul). When πνεῦμα is used in this sense it is clearly a synonym of ψυχή. Thus the author of 1 Peter, under the direct influence of the Book of Enoch, speaks of the spirits in prison unto whom Jesus went in spirit (*i.e.* in a disembodied state) to preach the gospel (1 Pet. 3<sup>18, 19</sup> 4<sup>6</sup>). The spirits of just ones made perfect, spoken of in the Book of Hebrews, are probably human spirits (12<sup>23</sup>). Luke also seems to use πνεῦμα in this sense, but apparently for another reason than that of the former writers. They called the souls of dead persons spirits because they possessed no physical bodies; he, under the influence of Paul, conceived of the spirit as departing from the body (Luke 8<sup>55</sup> 23<sup>46</sup> Acts 7<sup>59</sup>). Paul himself does not use the term of dead persons (except of Jesus), but from the way in which he uses it of living persons there can be little doubt as to his willingness to do so on occasion (*cf.* 1 Cor. 5<sup>5</sup> Rom. 8<sup>10</sup>). There is but one clear case of this use in the Apostolic Fathers (Shepherd of Hermas, Visions 1, 2, 4). This usage does not seem to have become popular until much later. The word ψυχή (soul) was too commonly used to be easily displaced.