

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 the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

VOL. VI.



LONDON :

(Published for the Institute)

ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY, W.

1873.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ORDINARY MEETING, APRIL 10, 1871.

CHARLES BROOKE, ESQ., F.R.S., VICE-PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN.—Before I ask our present Honorary Secretary to read the minutes of the last meeting, I wish to call your attention to the very great loss which we have sustained in the decease of our much respected and much regretted Honorary Secretary, Mr. Reddie. You are all aware that this Institute mainly owes its existence to his exertions. Not having been a member of the Institute at its commencement, I cannot take upon myself to assign to Mr. Reddie his particular share in its foundation; but he was one of the most influential in the foundation of this Society, and to its welfare and its interests he devoted himself most thoroughly ever since it came into existence. You all know how suddenly he was taken from us, the cause of his death being disease of the heart. He had been earnestly solicited by his medical attendant to abstain from work of all kinds, his state of health being evident, but he would not do so; he still held the labouring oar even unto the last. The great loss we have sustained has been to the Council, as I am sure it is to all here present, a source of deep regret, and I should not have done my duty in opening this meeting had I not called your attention to the subject.*

The minutes of the last meeting were then read and confirmed.

The Honorary Secretary (Capt. F. Petrie) stated that Dr. Constantine de Tischendorf had been elected an Honorary Foreign Correspondent, and read the following letter, received from him:—

“Monsieur,—“Je suis très-sensible à la communication que vous avez bien voulu me faire en votre nom et en celui du Conseil du ‘Victoria Institute.’ Le but de votre Institut est des plus nobles, et répond, ce me semble, à un besoin de notre temps. L’offre de m’y associer ne peut que m’honorer, et c’est avec satisfaction que j’accepte l’invitation d’en être un ‘Honorary Foreign Correspondent.’

“Que les travaux de l’Institut soient couronnés d’un véritable succès.

“En vous priant d’agréer vous-même et de présenter au Conseil de l’Institut mes profonds respects, j’ai l’honneur d’être,

“Monsieur, Tout le vôtre,

“Leipzig, le 30 Mars, 1871.”

“CONSTANTIN DE TISCHENDORF.

* At a Special Meeting of the Council, held 3rd April, 1871, the following resolution was adopted, and ordered to be recorded in the proceedings of the Institute:—“The Council desire to record its deep sense of the loss which the Institute has sustained in the death of its late Honorary Secretary, Mr. James Reddie, and at the same time to express the great honour with which it feels sure his name will ever be associated in its annals, not only as the Founder of the Institute, but as one who, uniting many literary and scientific attainments with untiring energy and zeal, proved eminently successful in contributing to its popularity and prosperity.”

After which, the following additional elections were announced :—

MEMBERS :—The Rev. John Robbins, D.D. (Barrister-at-Law), 'St. Peter's Parsonage, Bayswater.

ASSOCIATES :—The Rev. Canon H. P. Liddon, D.D., Ireland Professor of Biblical Exegesis at Oxford University, Christ Church, Oxford; the Rev. Canon William Selwyn, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, St. John's, Cambridge; H. S. Mitchell, Esq., 135, Adelaide Road, Hampstead; E. Poulson, Esq., 135, St. George Street East; F. K. Shrapnell, Esq., 2, Lansdown Crescent, Stockwell.

The following paper was then read by the author :—

SOME SCRIPTURAL ASPECTS OF MAN'S TRIPARTITE NATURE. By the Rev. CHARLES GRAHAM, M.V.I.

1. **H**OLY Scripture is the revelation of the Divine will to fallen man in relation to his salvation. It comes to man as man. It addresses itself to the Jew and to the Greek; to the wise and to the unwise. The peasant has the same interest in it as the prince; the most unlearned as the wisest philosopher. It was not given to teach us science. Science is valuable for time; but divine truth contemplates our highest interests both for time and eternity.

2. Parents, while they sat in the house, or walked by the way, were to teach the law of Moses to their children. Ezra, after the restoration from Babylon, read it in the hearing of all the people. Prophets spoke and wrote their inspired communications to all conditions of men. When, in some of the churches, a disposition to monopolize his epistles manifested itself, Paul enjoined that they should be read by all the members.

3. As a revelation to man as man, sacred Scripture is written in the language of the people. Its style is popular. Neither Paul nor the other writers of the New Testament employed Attic Greek, but the Greek ordinarily spoken by the people among whom they mingled. It is, to a great extent, because of its popular character that the Bible has suffered less from translation than any ancient author.

4. To look to the Bible to teach us astronomy, or physiology, is practically to mistake its divine intention. We know, for example, that the brain in man is the organ of thought; the Bible conveys ethical and religious truth in connection with the old physiological idea that the heart, as the centre of man, is the organ of both thought and feeling.

There is only one book in the Bible which attributes the function of thought to the head. This is the book of Daniel. Daniel explained to Nebuchadnezzar "the visions of his head upon his bed." He tells us also how "the visions of his own head troubled him."

5. But as the Bible addresses itself to man's intellect, conscience, and affections, we naturally look for psychological as well as ethical correctness in its teachings. In this, we believe, we shall not be disappointed. Correct theology implies, as its correlative, correct psychology. Given by inspiration of God, all Scripture is profitable for doctrine. In following its teachings here we feel that our feet are upon the rock.

Human Trichotomy a Scriptural Fact.

6. The tripartite nature of man meets us in the Old Testament. It is, however, in the New, where the truth of revelation culminates, that it is most distinctly seen. Thus in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, v. 23, Paul prays, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and may your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." In Hebrews iv. 12, the author of that epistle tells us, "The word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit."

7. In Genesis ii. 7 we read, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of *lives*—*nishmath chayim*—and man became a living soul." We have here an intimation of the dignity and superiority, in relation to all other earthly creatures, of that which was communicated. It was something *inspired* into man by God himself. And just as the word *Elohim* afterwards unfolds into Trinity, so this *nishmath* expands into the pneumatical, psychical, and animal. What God imparted to man at his creation we must naturally regard as having a special relation to Himself; that in which His own likeness or image chiefly subsisted. Animal life was imparted, but not animal life only. "The first Adam," Paul tells us, "was made a living soul; the last Adam, a quickening spirit." A common signification of soul, *nephesh*, in the Old Testament—a sense in which *psyche* is also used in the New—is person, oftener still, a living organic being. When it is said that Adam became a living *nephesh*, one of these is obviously the sense. In the living man were body, soul, and spirit.

8. But in the first Adam, formed from the earth, to be

sustained by it, and derive much of his enjoyment from it, the earthly and psychical preponderated. He thus stands in contrast with the second Adam, who is from heaven, and therefore pre-eminently pneumatical.

9. In connection with this contrast between the first Adam and the second the distinction between *psyche* and *pneuma* is placed in strong relief in relation to resurrection. The body is represented under the image of a seed which is sown to germinate and become fruitful. "It is sown a psychical body, *soma psuchikon*; it rises a spiritual body, *soma pneumatikon*." Here the idea of the soul is in connection with animal or bodily life; the idea of the spirit with that which is future and eternal.

10. In the development of his complex nature, we may discern man's superior rank in the scale of being. We may regard it as a rule, that, according to its intrinsic excellency, everything that lives is slow in coming to maturity. The mushroom grows up in a night; but the oak takes half a millenary to reach its perfection. There are insects which come to maturity and die in a day. The elephant is about twenty years in reaching his prime; the lion somewhat less. No animal is so long in coming to maturity as man, and none either physically or psychically can compare with him. In his lower nature we see, almost as soon as he is born, the display of a perfect instinct in the way in which he draws his aliment from his mother's breast. His senses are speedily developed by exercise; but how slowly do his reason and conscience become matured! These, however, may continue to grow while his inferior nature sinks into decay.

Materialism contradicted by Revelation.

11. Sacred Scripture gives no countenance to the idea that the soul, or spirit, in man is either a subtle form of matter or the effect of its organization. Thus our Lord, addressing His disciples after His resurrection, says, "Handle Me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have." The judgment of Paul on this point is quite evident from his second Epistle to the Corinthians. "I know a man in Christ, about fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not: God knoweth;) such an one caught up even unto the third heaven." Paul believed that his thinking conscious self—that in which his personality centred—could exist apart from the body. This he calls "the inner man," dwelling in the body as in a tabernacle. His desire was to put off the tabernacle, in order to depart

and be with Christ, which he judged to be far better. The same figure of a tabernacle and its inhabitant is employed by the apostle Peter. To the dying thief Christ declared, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." The rich man and Lazarus die, but find themselves existing in another state of being.* On the Mount of Transfiguration, Moses, whose body had been buried in the land of Moab, appeared in glory, as well as Elijah, who had ascended in his body to the Divine presence. The language of the Evangelist is remarkable: "There appeared unto them [the disciples] Moses and Elias, talking with Him."

12. The last words of Stephen were, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Having said this, "he fell asleep." The body slept, the spirit ascended to the Lord. In no part of Scripture is the spirit said to sleep when the body dies. Wherever such men as the late highly-gifted Archbishop Whately found the idea, they could never, by fair interpretation, draw it from the oracles of God. The body of the believer sleeps, to be awaked in the first resurrection; the spirit, from its nature, requires not to sleep. Literal sleep is "tired nature's sweet restorer"; but we have no reason to think that the spirit is capable of fatigue. We have, therefore, no ground to conclude that it sleeps; but rather that, when it has put off the body, it becomes increasingly active.

13. In proving to the Sadducees, from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the doctrine of the resurrection, our Lord refers to the words spoken to Moses at the Bush: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." His comment is, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him." At that hour the patriarchs were living *unto* God, that is, living with Him.

14. Instead of the putting off of the body, in any sense injuriously affecting the spirit, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that by faith we are come to the spirits of "just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23). The perfection of the spirit, which would seem to imply both purity and intelligence, is here connected with its release from the body.

15. That the spirit of man survives the death of the body seems to be either a universal instinct of our race, or a universal tradition from the patriarchs through all subsequent generations. We may not be wrong in regarding it as both the one and the other. As to its universality, we have abundant testimony. We have it in a disfigured form in the Eastern

* Though this be regarded as a parable, it must, nevertheless, teach truth.

doctrine of transmigration. The Elysium and Tartarus of Greece and Rome testify to it. In the present day, the Red Indian bears witness to it in his belief of those happy hunting-grounds in another world where his faithful dog will accompany him. When the Greenlanders see the play of the Aurora Borealis in the sky, they believe it to be the spirits of their ancestors, manifesting their happiness and joy in heaven. It is where the moral nature is exceptionally dwarfed and stunted that this doctrine is not held even among the rudest savages.

Pneuma and Psyche one in Essence.

16. Soul and spirit are ideally, not actually, separable. The mind distinguishes between them, but, in their essence, they are one. Soul and spirit can exist without the body; but the body without them is dead. The departure of the soul is a Scriptural form for expressing the dying of the body. The departure of the spirit expresses the same fact. The apostle James asserts that the body without the spirit is dead. This evidently implies that the psyche departs with the pneuma. The psyche never remains in the body to animate it when the pneuma is gone. That there is an animal life which we have in common with inferior living creatures, and which dies with the body, we do not deny, but we hope to show that this is not the rational psyche, which survives the body as well as the pneuma.

17. In our present state, the psyche cannot act without the *soma*: so neither can the pneuma without the psyche. The descending order, in which they are regarded by the apostle Paul, and in which he prays for their sanctification, is spirit, soul, body. Consciousness, we may add, is the common term which unites these three natures. Their mode of subsistence we do not undertake to explain. Just as sacred Scripture does not teach us the mode in which the three persons subsist in the ever blessed Trinity, neither does it teach us the mode of relative subsistence in the human trichotomy.

18. Though, as we have stated, distinct in idea, the terms soul and spirit are sometimes used with scarcely any difference in their signification. Thus, in Isa. lvii. 16, Jehovah says, in relation to His people, Israel, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wrath: for the spirit would fail before me, and the souls which I have made."* We have again, in the Virgin's song, a similar instance: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God

* *Neshamoth* has obviously here the sense of *nephashoth*.

my Saviour." It is common in Scripture to predicate that of the soul which is predicated of the spirit. In 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18, Paul says of Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, "They refreshed my spirit and yours." In 2 Cor. vii. 13, of Titus, he says his spirit was refreshed by them all. In Matt. xi. 28, the invitation of Christ is, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Rendered literally, it is, "I will refresh you." The word is the same which is used in the two former instances. But the question arises what is it which receives this refreshment? It is the psyche, as the next verse shows: "Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." "Rest" here is *anapausis*, refreshment, from the verb *anapauo*, used in the passages cited. That it is our spiritual nature which is susceptible of divine refreshment, not our animal, it is not necessary to stop to prove. There is then obviously this spiritual nature in the psyche.

19. If the spirit is the seat of sorrow and anguish, so is the soul. At the grave of Lazarus Jesus was troubled in spirit, and wept. After this, in the prospect of the cross, we hear Him say, "Now is My soul troubled." Examples to this effect might be largely adduced.

20. The highest functions of the spiritual nature are exercised by the soul. It prays to God: "Unto Thee do I lift up my soul." It praises God and blesses man: "Bless the Lord, O my soul." The soul of Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau. It exercises faith: "My soul trusteth in Thee."

21. The spirit is the seat of intelligence: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" But man's "rational soul" is the seat of intelligence also: "I will praise Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are Thy works: and that my soul knoweth right well" (Ps. cxxxix. 14). "For the soul," says Solomon, "to be without knowledge it is not good."

22. "God is a Spirit"; yet in His infinitely pure essence there is soul. Thus in Matt. xii. 18, the Evangelist quotes the prophet Isaiah: "Behold My servant whom I have chosen; My beloved in whom My soul is well pleased." Here the nephesh of the Old Testament is psyche in the New. In Hebrews x. 38 we read, "Now the just shall live by faith: but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." It is a fair inference that, as in the Blessed God, soul and spirit are one essence, so are they in His creature man, made after His image.

23. That breath of lives—*nishmath chaiyim*—which God breathed into man's nostrils, and which constituted him, in

the concrete sense, a living soul, is elsewhere called spirit. Thus, in Job xxxii. 8 Elihu says, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty—*nishmath Shaddai*—giveth them understanding." Again, in Prov. xx. 27, "The spirit of man—*nishmath Adam*—is the candle of the Lord, searching all his inward parts. In this, I take it, is intimated the identity in essence between *nephesh* in its higher sense and *ruach*.

24. Spirit and soul are united by Paul as one in intelligence in our Christian warfare. The Philippians he exhorts to "stand fast in one spirit, with one soul—*mia psuche*—striving together for the faith of the Gospel." (Phil. i. 27.)

25. This oneness of essence between spirit and soul, in its higher signification, will receive increased confirmation as we advance in our subject.

The Relation between the Mind, Heart, Conscience, and the Soul and Spirit.

26. The word "mind" (*nous*) occurs twenty-three times in the New Testament, and always implies understanding or intelligence. It is employed in relation to the Divine intelligence as well as the human. It is predicable, as we have just seen, both of the *pneuma* and *psyche*, and so furnishes another evidence of their essential unity. In several instances, our translators have rendered the *psyche* of the New Testament by what they regarded, from the context, as its equivalent—*mind*. See Acts xiv. 2; Phil. i. 27.

27. The term "heart" (Heb. *lêv*, Gr. *kardia*) is almost invariably employed in Scripture in a moral sense. It is a generic word.

(a) It is a name for the affections, more especially for love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart." "My son, give me thine heart."

(b) Intelligence is also ascribed to it. Hence the understanding heart given to Solomon. "I also," says Job, "have understanding (*lêv*) as well as you" (Job xii. 3).

(c) It is used for the *will*—the power which chooses and determines. "To destroy is in his heart" (Is. x. 3). "The day of vengeance is in my heart" (Is. lxii. 4).

We shall see by-and-by that it is also used synonymously with conscience.

28. No creature adorns the body but man. In all ages the fair sex, that needs adorning least, has practised it most. To these the apostle Peter addresses the exhortation, "Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel: but let it be the hidden man of the heart . . . the orna-

ment of a meek and quiet spirit." (1 Peter iii. 3, 4). Here the spirit is recognized as the seat of grace, the centre of man's being, and is used synonymously with "heart."

29. But from the uses of the word "heart," which we have noticed, it is not necessary to spend time in proving what is apparent, that it is essentially the same as "spirit." What is of more importance is to show that it is used interchangeably with "soul." Here I think the proof is satisfactory. In Eph. vi. 5, 6, we have the apostolic command, "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart—*kardia*—as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart." Now the latter word "heart" here is not *kardia*, it is *psyche*. Our translators have given the true idea. In *psyche*, in this place, are implied all the elements of *kardia*—love, intelligence, will, conscientiousness.

30. In Col. iii. 23 we have a similar instance. "And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men." Here again the word is *psyche*, but containing all the attributes of *kardia*. The inference is obvious: things which are equal to the same are equal to one another. While we may freely admit that, in the terms of a language, this principle will not rigidly apply, as perhaps no two words are absolutely synonymous; yet they apply so far as to prove that *psyche* and *pneuma* are essentially one.

31. Conscience (*suneidēsis*, *conscientia*) is a term of the New Testament. In its active aspect it is our moral judgment, the state of the mind censuring or approving its own acts or condition, or both. It is called by many philosophers "the moral sense." This denomination does not apply to the pain or pleasure felt upon its exercise. These are effects produced by it, not constituents of itself. It is a "moral sense" in relation to the instinct or impulse which causes its judgments, and, as a consequence, impels us to, or restrains us from, action. To this moral instinct or sense Paul seems to allude, when he speaks of those who had their conscience cauterized.

32. If we regard conscience with some as simply the moral judgment which the mind pronounces on its actions, as in harmony, or otherwise, with the moral relations in which we stand, its root will be in our ethical and religious nature. If we regard it more as a function or faculty of the mind, it will be mainly, if not altogether, that nature itself.

33. If we except one passage (John viii. 9), which is of very doubtful authority, the word conscience is never used by

the apostle John. He employs instead of it the word "heart." "If our heart condemn us," and "if our heart condemn us not," are his expressions for the approbation and disapprobation of conscience. It occurs about thirty times in the New Testament, and in twenty-one of these is used by the apostle Paul. If we accept this apostle as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, he is the only New Testament writer who uses the word, except the apostle Peter, who employs it three times.

34. Conscience, though shared by the psyche, is mainly, as we hope by-and-by to show, the great organ of the pneuma.

35. Conscience, from its etymology, implies the knowledge of a divine rule; then that such and such acts agree with or contradict that rule. In Rom. ii. Paul shows that the heathen have that rule in nature. The eternal power and divinity of God, he affirms, are apparent from the things which He has made. Without a rule the human mind can form no judgement. Hence it is that conscience, to be a correct guide, must itself be instructed by an infallible standard. It is only safe to follow it when it is divinely enlightened. Some of the worst deeds that ever disgraced humanity have been done by its promptings. "The time will come," said Christ to His disciples, "that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." The rivers of righteous blood which have flowed in Christendom, in the name of conscience and of God, are a comment upon these words. Follow conscience, however, we must; hence our deep responsibility to have it enlightened from the infallible fountains of knowledge.

Pneuma the Possession of Universal Man.

36. I am not aware that any believer in Revelation denies that every man possesses a soul. If our previous citations be apposite, and our reasonings just, it is equally evident that every man possesses also a spirit. But as this is denied by some, it may be well to establish it by distinct testimony.

37. The doctrine of not a few, in the present day, is that while man by nature possesses a soul which is mortal, he only receives a spirit, which is immortal, when he is born again. This, I am bold to affirm, is neither the psychology nor pneumatology of sacred Scripture.

38. To affirm that any man possesses not a spirit, in the sense in which we have hitherto, in this paper, employed the term, and the sense intended by those with whom we join issue, is, we submit, to deny his proper humanity. The pneuma

is a part of humanity. It existed in Adam. Any of his descendants who possesses it not is not a man: he wants the main constituent of humanity.

39. We have already shown that, though we understand not their mode of subsistence, soul and spirit are inseparable; one in essence, however distinct in idea. To possess a rational soul is therefore to possess also a rational spirit.

40. One of the titles by which Moses and Aaron, when pleading for Israel, on the rebellion of Korah, address Jehovah, is "The God of the spirits of all flesh" (Num. xvi. 22). On this relationship they base their plea and prevail. In the same book (xxvii. 16) we have again, in the lips of Moses, the same expression. Compare this with the words of Elihu (Job xxxii. 8), "There is a spirit in man," that is, in man as man. Spirit is an integral part of his being. That this is the meaning, the sentence, when finished, makes sufficiently clear. "There is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth THEM understanding."

41. On this point the language of the New Testament is equally clear. It recognizes spirit as a part of our humanity. "What man," asks Paul, "knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him?" "The spirit of the man" is surely a part of himself. Paul delivered the incestuous Corinthian to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord.

42. If the spirit is something divinely given in regeneration, it is holy, and needs not to be saved. The spirit of this man needed salvation. We infer, therefore, that it was a part of his own fallen humanity.

43. That spirit is not something breathed into man at his conversion, but an original part of himself, is evident from the Apostle's prayer for the Thessalonians: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly"—*holoteleis*, in reference to the three departments which follow—"and may your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The words *holoklēron humōn*, in which *pneuma*, *psyche*, and *soma* all participate, greatly strengthen my argument (1 Thess. v. 23). The spirit is "your spirit" just as much as the soul is "your soul," or the body "your body." As a part of fallen human nature, it needs sanctification, and when sanctified, requires, like the soul, to be kept from sinning.

The Rational Psyche survives the Dissolution of the Body.

44. It is clear that if we have established the essential

union of the rational psyche and the pneuma, their coeval existence, as a consequence, will follow: the pneuma surviving the body, the rational psyche will also survive it. But on this point we have the distinct teaching of Scripture.

45. It is important to notice that *nephesh* and *psyche*, as well as *ruach* and *pneuma*, are employed, in Scripture, in various low significations. In Num. vi. 6, *nephesh* stands for the mere animal frame when the life has departed—*nephesh mēth*.

46. In several other places *nephesh* by itself is the dead body. Again, it is put for desire: "He enlargeth his desire (*naphsho*) as *sheol*." (Hab. ii. 5).

47. But a very common use of *nephesh* in the Old Testament, and *psyche* in the New, is life—life whether in man or the lower animals. They are also used in both applications as concretes.

48. But *nephesh* and *psyche* are also unquestionably used in a high spiritual sense. We cannot consistently regard *nephesh*, in such places as the following, as mere animal life. "Lay up these words in your soul" (Deut. xi. 18). Elisha prays, "Let this child's soul come into him again" (1 Kings xvii. 21). In the view only that the idea of soul here contains within it that of spirit is this prayer reasonable; for "the body without the spirit is dead." "Set your soul to seek the Lord." Here in "soul" is contained the idea of the intelligent mind. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." "The redemption of the soul"—which is surely more than the perishable life—"is precious." "Rejoice the soul of thy servant." "For the soul to be without knowledge it is not good." "Hear, and your soul shall live."

49. When, in the New Testament, it is said to the rich fool, "This night shall thy soul be required of thee," more is meant than that his animal life should perish. It contains the more deeply solemn idea of the soul returning to God to render an account of his abused trust. When Paul and Barnabas, in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, confirmed the souls of the disciples, it surely does not mean that they strengthened their animal life. Reason and faith are here regarded as dwelling in the soul.

50. The converse of this ministry, when Judaizing teachers subverted the souls of the disciples, contains the same ideas. When Paul calls God for a witness upon his soul, he appeals both to his intelligent purpose and conscientiousness. Hope is the anchor of the soul—not surely of the animal life. That could neither understand the hope of the Gospel nor be comforted by it. We believe to the saving of the soul, not surely

to the saving of the animal life. He that converteth a sinning brother from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death, and shall hide the multitude of sins which that erring one hath committed. When the apostle John prays that Gaius may prosper and be in health, even as his soul prospers, the soul is contemplated as possessed of both grace and intelligence. *Soul*, we have seen, belongs to the Blessed God Himself. One inference, we think, is clear, that if "soul" is used in Scripture for the mere animal life, it is also used in a sense which implies the mind and spirit.

51. Any argument drawn against the immortality of the soul, because the word is used in Scripture for life, lies equally against the immortality of the spirit. In Eccles. iii. 19, beasts and men are said to have one spirit (*ruach*). In ver. 21 it is asked, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Again the word used is *ruach*. *Nephesh* and *ruach*, *psyche* and *pneuma*, and the Latin *animus* and *anima*, have all one radical idea, that of breath or wind, all seeming to carry in them a memorial of the revealed fact, that God at the first breathed into man the breath of lives.

52. Conceding that many inferior animals possess a measure of intelligence, still it is clear that in them an unreasoning instinct is in the ascendant. The soul of man, in the sense in which we contemplate it, while distinguished by a moral and religious nature, is also separated from that of the beast by reason. In him reason holds the higher place; instinct the lower. Reason is the great instrument by which he maintains his lordship in creation. The Arctic fox stores up provisions for the winter. Instinct is to him a safer guide in this respect than reason to the Esquimaux. Nevertheless the Esquimaux, defectively developed as their reasoning faculty is, are sovereigns over him and all other creatures in the regions in which they live.

53. The inferiority of instinct to reason is seen in the tame beaver, which will build a dam in the corner of a room, with brushes, fire-irons, and books, and then sit down behind it. Reason, in its higher sense, is peculiar to the human soul. It is "that power which it has of deducing universal truths from particular appearances, or of contemplating the ideal relations of things." Hence the human soul, in this lower creation, stands peerless.

54. The rational soul is a magazine in which knowledge can be stored almost without limit. But it is more; it is a living plant, whose nature is to grow, to bud and shoot out in all directions. The soul of man is naturally curious and

observant. It compares ideas, reflects on them, reasons, and draws its inferences. It is always receiving accessions to its knowledge, and always turning them to account. It can do what is beyond the power of any inferior creature; it can bring its ideas to the test of first principles, or compare them with those of other minds.

55. That this rational soul survives the body is, we think, a distinct doctrine of Revelation. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28). The plain meaning here is that the body may be killed, that is, the animal soul or life may be destroyed, but the rational soul cannot. We are to fear Him, who shall yet make the resurrection body the dwelling of the soul, and can then cast both into Gehenna. Let it be observed that nothing is here said of the spirit. This evidently implies that the spirit, as we have shown, is included in the soul.

56. When the fifth seal was opened, John saw under the altar, "the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they bore: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, Thou Master, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. vi. 9, 10.) Here we have an exemplification of the words of our Lord in Matthew's Gospel. Men had slain the bodies of these martyrs, but could not kill the soul. The soul lives, cries for vengeance, receives the divine response, and, in the gift of white robes, a token of the Divine approval. These are the same souls whom John sees, in chap. xx., living and reigning with Christ for a thousand years.

57. If we have succeeded in proving the soul and spirit, though distinct in idea, to be one in essence, then it follows that the soul of Lazarus, after death, passed away to the bosom of Abraham; that Abraham's soul and his, had fellowship; and that it was the soul of the rich man, as well as his spirit, which went to the place of torment. It will also follow that the soul of Moses was on the Mount of Transfiguration.

The Source of our Ethical and Religious Nature in the Pneuma.

58. "God is a Spirit." This very fact suggests that it is spirit in us which apprehends and enjoys Him. So we find it in His word. To our spirit He reveals Himself. The life which He imparts to us in our fallen state—a state described as a "death in trespasses and sins"—is spiritual life. Of *spiritual* life spirit is the natural recipient. The Divine Spirit

takes His denomination "Holy Spirit" from His office as Sanctifier. It is natural to conclude that the department of our nature in which His agency is more immediately exercised, is that which resembles His own. "That which is born of the spirit is spirit." Regeneration begins in the pneuma, but extends to the psyche. Its effect is felt by the intellect and affections, which are brought under the control of the renewed pneuma. Between the holy soul and its Redeemer there is a unity of nature and life: "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." He dwells in God, and God in him.

59. That our spirit is the seat of the religious consciousness, is the direct teaching of Paul in Rom. viii. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness to our spirits that we are the children of God."

60. No man needs a divine quickening to make him active in a psychical sense; to make him pneumatical he needs the quickening of the Holy Spirit. When renewed in "the spirit of his mind," that is, made spiritually-minded, his condition, the apostle tells us, is that of "life and peace." It is in the pneuma, where the faculty of "God-consciousness," as it has been forcibly called by Heard in his book on man's tripartite nature, resides, that man is in that morally torpid condition which Scripture calls death. Men without the renewing of the Divine Spirit may possess the dread of God; but love to God, childlike affection and confidence, they possess not.

61. That divine grace is regarded as dwelling in the spirit may be seen from such passages as these: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk, not after the flesh, but after the spirit." "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; and they that are after the spirit, the things of the spirit." "The flesh desires against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." The Psalmist pronounces the man blessed in whose spirit there is no guile. His prayer for himself, on the remembrance of his great sin, is, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." Exercise and cultivation will improve our intellect and bodily powers; but holy Scripture teaches us that the pneuma in us can only be quickened and raised to the enjoyment of God by His Holy Spirit. To enjoy Him we must resemble Him, and it is the office of His Spirit to make us like Him. The natural conscience of the pneuma may condemn sin, but it has little power to hold back from its commission. It may approve the right, but it wants strength to propel us onward in the path of duty.

62. Disease in the body follows lowness of the vital power.

Thus has the deadness of the pneuma been followed by moral and spiritual disease in our entire inner man: the sarx and the psyche prevail over the pneuma. Renewal in the spirit of the mind removes the pride of the intellect, and gives it a God-ward direction. It then falls in with the pneuma to control the lower appetites of the flesh.

63. "Rex noster est animus." Let animus here stand for the pneuma, and we have a fact of the first importance, a key which unlocks the mystery of our condition. The sceptre has fallen from the monarch's hand—hence the anarchy of the kingdom—the servant is on horseback, and the prince walks on the earth. In the pneuma the Holy Spirit finds an innermost sanctuary in man. When He takes possession of this, His power and purity are felt through the whole of man's tripartite nature.

64. That the pneuma is the sanctum sanctorum in which the Divine presence dwells is the beautiful idea of Luther. Now, it was this presence which made both the holy place and the court sacred. We have in this, moreover, a striking illustration of the essential unity of the pneuma and the psyche. The holy and most holy places were one building. Both were surrounded by the court, in which they appeared to reside, as the psyche and pneuma in the human body.

65. Moreover, the holy place was the medium of access from the court to the most holy. It thus connected the court and the most holy place together. It is thus the psyche seems to stand as the connecting link between the soma and the pneuma. It is of the essence of the pneuma, yet mixes itself up with the animal appetites and affections of the soma. But we do not, in any sense, regard it as dying with the animal life of the soma. Animal life in Scripture, as in modern physiology, is connected with the blood; the rational psyche, being of the essence of the pneuma, is unaffected by its death.

66. The animal life with its appetites and passions, often called psyche in Scripture, is distinguished from the rational or higher psyche by the apostle James. "The double-minded man," he says, "is unstable in all his ways" (James i. 8). This, in the Greek, is *dipsuchos*, double-souled. This, by Alford, is interpreted, "one soul drawn upward to God, the other drawn downward to the world." We find the same word afterwards in an address to rich oppressors and persecutors: "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-souled" (James iv. 8).

67. "The spirit of a man," Solomon tells us, "is the candle of the Lord, searching his inward parts" (Prov. xx. 27). Now

it is conscience which searches, and pronounces its judgment on our inward moral state. Enlightened "by wisdom from on high," conscience is the candle of the Lord. Man's spirit is here said to do what it is the office of conscience to do. Is not the inference clear: conscience is the organ of the spirit?

68. It is by the pneuma that God is worshipped. "They that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." "We are the circumcision," says Paul, "who worship God in the spirit." Again, "Whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of His Son." The faculty by which we worship God is that by which we know Him. We can only worship Him as He reveals Himself to us. It was in spirit David called Christ Lord, because it was to his spirit He was revealed.

69. It is remarked by Heard, in his book already referred to, that, while there is the same relation between nephesh and ruach in the Old Testament as between psyche and pneuma in the New, with the progress of Divine Revelation these latter words acquire a deeper signification. This is specially true in relation to the pneuma. This deeper signification is, perhaps, most apparent in the use of the adjective pneumatical. Gifts for proclaiming and expounding New Testament truths are pneumatical gifts, as coming from the Divine Pneuma and being received by the pneuma in us. By these pneumatical gifts we "sow pneumatical things." The law is pneumatical, because it acts upon the conscience of our pneuma. The pneumatical man, because of the divine illumination of the pneuma, judgeth all things. Hence, says Paul to the Corinthians, "If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or pneumatical, let him acknowledge that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." The blessings of salvation, as received by the pneuma, are pneumatical blessings; and the comprehension of them pneumatical understanding.

70. The songs of praise, which are acceptable to God, are pneumatical songs sung by the pneuma. Those qualified to deal with the conscience of one surprised by temptation, and to restore him, are pneumatical men.

71. All this testimony to the fact of the conscience and moral nature being in the pneuma is strengthened by striking contrasts. The psychical man, in the New Testament, is the unrenewed man, in opposition to the spiritual or renewed. "The psychical man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The wisdom from beneath, as opposed to that which comes from above, is

“earthly, psychical, devilish.” The scoffers and persecutors, described by the apostles Jude and Peter, are “psychical, having not spirit.” They are shown not to be devoid of reason, but the pneuma has never been quickened or renewed.

72. We may, at this point, pause to draw another inference, which will strengthen previous reasoning, that the human trichotomy, in its broad general features, consists of the animal, the rational, and the spiritual.

73. We are here prepared for another observation, by way of inference, that while pneumatically we may grow rapidly—make great progress in spiritual-mindedness—there may be no rapid growth in the strength of the understanding or reason. No one will, I think, deny that many who are remarkable for true Christian devotedness, by no means excel others in the acuteness or strength of their intellects in relation to the things of this life. In the region of spiritual truth it is different.

74. Man is the only religious being in the world, not because he alone possesses intelligence—a lower form of this belongs to some other creatures—but because in his pneuma there is a conscience and moral nature. To place the moral nature in the psyche is to exalt the psyche above the pneuma, which, as we have seen, is contrary to the teaching of Scripture. Much less can we regard the psyche as perishable; for then our moral nature, if lodged in it, would perish also. Another consequence, too, would follow: for, if the receptive faculty of divine grace is lost, the grace itself, if not wholly, must, to a great extent at least, be lost with it. But we trust what has already been said on this point will be regarded as decisive.

75. This paper would be incomplete without a few words on the Pauline distinction between the present soma psychikon and the future soma pneumatikon of resurrection. It is not the Divine intention that the pneuma and psyche should permanently remain without their appropriate soma. Hence the Apostle declares that, “If our earthly house of this tabernacle”—the present soma psychikon—“be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” The present body is a tent; the future will be a permanent dwelling. Putting off this tabernacle, he calls unclothing. This was not the goal of his hope, but to be clothed with his house from heaven. This, then, is the character of the soma pneumatikon, it is a house from heaven. The body falls a house of clay, but out of it will be raised a celestial, spiritual building.

76. In the New Testament we have the resurrection of the

soma, never of the sarx. In the Old Testament we have an allusion by Job to the resurrection of the *basar*, or flesh, by which we are evidently to understand "the body," a meaning which the word often bears.

77. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," for the reason that corruption cannot inherit incorruption. From the resurrection body the entire nutritive system shall disappear. "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats; but God shall destroy both it and them." The nutritive system implies the circulation of the blood, by which the body is nourished, and that which is nourished—flesh. All these shall be absent from the soma pneumatikon. There will be no repair, as there shall be no waste.

78. Paul's beautiful and striking image of resurrection is the corn of seed sown in the earth. "Thou sowest not," he says, "the body that shall be, but a bare grain of wheat, it may be, or of some other grain." The following words are noteworthy:—"God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him." The body then which we lay down in the grave is not the body that shall be. Out of it God will give, or raise up, a body as it pleases Him. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a psychical body; it is raised a pneumatical body."

79. "The most sublime efforts of philosophy," says Gibbon, "can extend no further than feebly to point out the desire, the hope, or at most, the probability, of a future state." As to the resurrection of the dead, the philosophers of Greece and Rome had no idea. When Paul preached it in Athens they turned the doctrine into ridicule. Their belief, or rather their unbelief, on this grand doctrine of Revelation, is expressed in the mournful utterance of Moschus on the death of Bion:—

"Our plants and trees revive, the breathing rose,
With annual youth, in pride of beauty glows;
But when the master-piece of Nature dies,
Man, who alone is great, and brave, and wise,
No more he rises to the realms of light,
But sleeps unwaking in eternal night."

Compare this with the words of the Apostle, and how great is the contrast! "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Taught by these infallible oracles, we know incomparably more than heathen philosophy could ever attain to: "We look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come."

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we all join in giving our most hearty thanks to Mr. Graham for this admirable paper. (Hear, hear.) I shall now be glad to hear any remarks that those present may desire to make upon the subject.

Rev. J. JAMES.—I agree with our Chairman that we ought to offer our best thanks to Mr. Graham for his paper. It contains some admirable passages, some of which are most eloquent and most true, such as that in the 10th section, which speaks of the various growths of God's creatures, and that in the 16th section, which deals with the soul and the spirit. But at the same time, there are two or three points which have struck me in connection with this paper, and in regard to which I cannot altogether agree with Mr. Graham; and I should like to throw them out for general consideration:—First of all, I think the title of Mr. Graham's paper is at variance with his argument, which favours a quadrupartite rather than a tripartite division of man's nature. Besides the body, Mr. Graham speaks of the animal soul, or that which we have in common with the brute creation; and then of the rational soul, which is something quite distinct from the animal soul, and also distinct from the spirit. There are, therefore, four parts of man's nature distinctly and elaborately described in this paper, with the exception of the first part, or body, of which very little is said, that being seemingly, for the most part, taken for granted as the basis of the human being. The body, soul, and spirit are the three parts spoken of by the apostle,* and that gives us a tripartite division; but here we have the body, the animal soul, the rational soul, and the spirit; or a fourfold division. It appears to me to be one of the great faults of the paper that its argument really tends to a quadrupartite, and not to a tripartite division of man's nature. Then there is another reason why I think it would have been better to have had a different title for the paper; because it is one of which the main tendency is to show that in the Holy Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testaments (with the exception, perhaps, of the writings of St. Paul), that canon is always followed with which Mr. Graham commences his third section:—

“As a revelation to man as man, Sacred Scripture is written in the language of the people. Its style is popular.”

The paper might almost have been entitled “An Argument to show that in the Scriptures the uses of the words ‘Soul’ and ‘Spirit’ are Popular Uses, and not Scientific, except in the writings of St. Paul.” The same may be said with regard to the word “heart.” There are elaborate passages in this paper to show that *nephesh* and the other Hebrew words, and *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, and

* 1 Thess. v. 23. “All animals have the body, all the living soul (Gen. i. 20, 21); but the breath of life, breathed into the nostrils by God himself, is said of man alone. Cp. ‘the body, soul, and spirit,’ of ancient philosophy and of the Apostle Paul.”—*Bp. Harold Browne*.—Ed.

the word "mind" also, are all used in a popular sense throughout the Bible, except where such words are used by St. Paul. That is what the paper really shows; not that the immortal spirit and the soul are identical or equivalent, but that they are common terms in the Bible, and are both used for one common substance, namely, the spirit. Of course I use the word "substance" in a philosophical sense. I confess that my own view of the subject, to go to the root of matter at once, is that the spirit of man alone will animate his body after the resurrection;* and that, as has been shown by a very able passage in the paper, the soul—the animal soul—will not survive after the resurrection. St. Thomas Aquinas is very clear upon the point that the body, at the resurrection, will be animated no longer by the soul of the flesh, but by the spirit alone. In short, this paper of Mr. Graham's only proves the unphilosophical character of the language of Holy Scripture. In popular language, man consists of two parts, soul and body; so entirely in popular use is the word "soul" used for spirit, that it was so used almost universally by the writers of the Old and New Testaments. But St. Paul, having a more methodical and systematic mind, expresses the difference distinctly and clearly in every passage. Indeed, I would undertake to show that in every passage that could be brought forward, where he uses the word "soul," he speaks of the animal soul. For example, in the 29th section of the paper, Mr. Graham has referred to the passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians, and pointed out that in the words translated "doing the will of God from the heart," the last word is *ψυχή*, and not *καρδία*, yet equally expressive of the operation of the animal soul, as distinct from the spirit or rational soul. Now the dog is the most faithful servant to the man who has found out and secured its affections; there is nothing that it will not do for its master, it is always on the look-out to fulfil his wishes, as expressed either by the eye or in any other way, and having found a protector and a friend in its master, it makes no attempt to gain any other friend, but looks to him as its one source of happiness, and does everything it can for him out of its heart—in fact, *ἐκ ψυχῆς*. The dog is capable of performing great services, and doing marvellous things for its master, its instinct rising almost up to the level of reason. In the same way, the affections of the heart and the energized powers of the body enable men and women to carry out into action the feelings within them; and St. Paul uses the phrase *ἐκ ψυχῆς* in this place to show that the Christian's obedience is to be so completely a part of his being as to partake of the character of instinct—pervading his whole soul-animated body. It is just a parallel case to the use of philosophical terms. We all understand the fact that the sun does not go round the earth, and

* See 1 Cor. xv. 44. "It is sown a natural body [*σῶμα ψυχικόν*], it is raised a spiritual body [*σῶμα πνευματικόν*]."

does not rise or set ; but we constantly use the phrase “ rising ” or “ setting ” as applied to the sun—we cannot help it, it is the popular language which we are always using ; but when we use philosophical language, we attach totally distinct meanings to our terms. In concluding my observations, I should like to quote one passage from Juvenal, which is very clear and distinct. I only quote it to show that a tripartite division of man’s nature is one that may be received and maintained against all comers. He says (I will not quote the original Latin):—“ In the beginning of the world, the common Creator endowed them”—the beasts that perish—“ only with *animam* (a soul) ; but to us He gave *animum quoque* (a mind also), in order that we may be able to fulfil our destiny in governing the other creatures of the world.” (Cheers.)

Mr. S. HANSON.—As a stranger, I may perhaps be permitted to offer a few observations on this subject, and I will endeavour not to transgress the ten minutes’ limit which I understand is imposed upon all the speakers here. I agree, upon one point, with the gentleman who has just sat down, for I think there is some confusion of thought in Mr. Graham’s paper. With some parts I do most cordially agree, but I as cordially dissent from others. I agree with the tripartite division of man’s nature, and I wish Mr. Graham had kept strictly to it ; and also to the fact that this tripartite division is common to our human nature, and not applicable merely to regenerate man. But I totally disagree with the manuer in which Mr. Graham has mixed up the soul and spirit in the course of his paper, assuming in many of the cases that they are used indifferently. In the third place, I altogether dissent from what he has said about the heart. While I agree most thoroughly in the tripartite division of man’s nature, and believe that it can be well sustained and established by the Scriptures, I do not think that any of the philosophers of old maintained such a theory. By the light of the Scriptures, and especially of the New Testament, the doctrine is brought out most clearly, and St. Paul distinctly enunciates it, not only in that single passage in the fifth chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, where the three parts are combined—“ your whole spirit, and soul, and body ”—but in several other places, and particularly in the second chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It is in that second chapter, especially, that the important point which has been ignored by Mr. Heard in his able book, is given, that every man has a spirit in him which is part of his constituted nature :—

“ For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him ? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”

Now that is a most important point in the teaching of St. Paul, because by Mr. Heard’s view, that the spirit died at the Fall, and that man thenceforward consisted only of body and soul, he necessarily relegates the intellect of man to the soul, which I believe to be distinctly contrary not only to the teaching of the New Testament, but also of the Old.

Mr. GRAHAM.—Mr. Heard duly contends for the torpidity of the spirit. He does not hold that it perished at the Fall.

Mr. HANSON.—In different parts of his book Mr. Heard applies the terms “dormant,” “dead,” and “unborn,” to the spirit.

Mr. GRAHAM.—He uses the words “dormant” and “dead” in the same sense.

Mr. HANSON.—I have frequently talked the matter over with Mr. Heard, and he does relegate the power of discernment to the soul or to the rational soul. Here, again, I feel bound to say that it is most unscriptural to speak of the animal soul and of the rational soul. It is a distinction of the schools, as may be seen by any one who refers to Bishop Ellicott's discourse. In the fourth sermon, in his volume called “The Destiny of the Creature,” the bishop gives an historical account of the annihilation, if I may so say, of the doctrine of the spirit in the fourth and fifth centuries, on account of the doctrine of Apollinarius. There is the fact that the “rational soul” was a term employed in those days, and especially by Augustine. It was brought into the Athanasian Creed in the words “of reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,” on account of the entire banishment of the spirit as a part of man. But in this paper of Mr. Graham's there is some confusion ; because, on reading it over carefully this afternoon, and in following Mr. Graham's reading of it to-night, it seemed to me that if his view be correct, we might to all intents and purposes just as well have the popular division of soul and body only. But I maintain, and, were there time, I think I could prove, that there is abundant scriptural testimony to show that in no place have the two words translated “soul” and “spirit” a synonymous meaning. I have gone carefully into this subject, examining every passage where the words *ruach*, *neshamah*, and *nephesh* occur in the Old Testament, or $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ occur in the New : and I believe that the Spirit of God has carefully preserved the two words as entirely distinct ; and I know of no single instance to the contrary, not forgetting the song of the Virgin Mary, where, as I believe, the fact that the two words are both used, shows that there is a distinctness of meaning between them. It is indeed most important in considering the tripartite nature of man, that we should preserve the distinctness of the soul equally with the distinctness of the body, or of the spirit. There is another point in the paper which I also strongly protest against, and that is the phrase “the essential unity of the two.” I do not believe it can properly be said that there is an essential unity. Of course it is a very difficult thing to know how to express this, because in the same sense that we should assert the essential unity of the Deity—of the Three in One—there is essential unity in these two terms ; but just as there is a perfect distinctness of person and of office in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in the same manner, if not in the same degree, do I see the perfect distinctness of the spirit and soul and body. Also I totally dissent from the idea that the soul will not be found in the raised man, whether saint or sinner ; because with regard to the persons of whom Paul, in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, was alone speaking, you read that

they are to have their whole spirit and soul and body preserved unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The spirit, and soul, and body are to enter into the consummation of bliss.

Mr. GRAHAM.—I contend for that in my paper.

Mr. HANSON.—Now Mr. James contended that the soul would have no part in the future man, whereas I say that the spirit and soul and body each formed part of man as originally created in the image of God, and that they will remain the constituent portions of man to all eternity. I have no time now even to allude to the heart, but I protest against the contrast of the heart and the head, which is, of all modern errors, the most popular, and the most decided; because, in the Scriptures, the heart is always used for the inner man, as opposed to the *πρόσωπον*, or outer man, and the heart includes the spirit and soul, or, in fact, the whole of the inner man. There is no difficulty in understanding what it means, especially in that passage in the third chapter of the First Book of Kings, where Solomon prays for an understanding heart that he may discern between good and evil. There is no doubt or difficulty in the scriptural use of the word heart—it always means the entire inner man, having reference more or less to the affections or to the thoughts, but always meaning the inner man; and I say to all who have not gone deeply into this subject, that it would amply repay their study. I believe this is the most practical question in the theology of the day, and that many questions, which we now dispute, will not be settled until we turn to the scriptural development of man's nature, and abandon that wretched Augustinian statement that man consists only of soul and body. And now allow me to make one more remark in reference to the soul. I see very plainly that soul, like spirit, is not always used in the same application, and I hope I may be permitted to illustrate this by a familiar instance from the Gospel of John. In chap. iii. 6-8, our Lord not only asserts the spirit of man in its relation to the Spirit of God, but illustrates it by the wind—*τὸ πνεῦμα πνεῖ*. Here we get three applications of the same word, having one root-meaning. There is a passage in Olshausen's *Opuscula Theologica* (which contains an important paper on this subject), where the author says that the meaning of scripture words is very rarely multiform, and that we should ascertain the one true signification, and then we would be able to show in what various modifications that one meaning might be applied. In another passage from Horne Tooke, which Richardson quotes in his Introduction, it is said that "a word has one meaning, and one only; from it all usages must spring; and from it, underlying in its depths, must be found its intrinsic meaning in case of other applications." Now there are five distinct applications of the one intrinsic meaning of the word "soul," and many of the difficulties of this paper are got rid of entirely when we see that there are these distinct applications. For instance, the soul means the blood, or the life, or the person, for we have the passage "there were converted three thousand souls." In the midst of all such usages, we must look, in support of the argument for the tripartite nature of man, to those passages in Scripture where the intrinsic and original meaning of the word

is preserved, and not to those by-meanings which every student knows must necessarily exist in all languages. (Cheers.)

REV. E. WHITE.—Though a stranger, perhaps I may be permitted to occupy your attention for a few minutes. I came here to-night expecting to get my mind settled on this subject. I have read statements in English as well as in German, on both sides of the question, and, generally speaking, I have been a humble disciple of Heard and De Retsch, agreeing that the body, soul, and spirit are the common properties of humanity. But I have begun to feel great and growing difficulties which lead me to question that opinion, those difficulties arising from the consideration of certain scriptural passages which have not been so thoroughly criticised to-night as I had hoped they would have been. That important passage in our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus, where He says : "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit," is a remarkably strong expression, the words τὸ γεγεννημένον being used in both cases. Well, I put that against the passage in Jude :—"They are sensual, not having spirit" (πνεῦμα without the article). From these passages, it would appear that the spiritual man is generically different from the ψυχικός, or animal man. Then St. Peter, in his first epistle, speaks of "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." When we have this absolute distinction made in genus between the two, I confess that I am brought to a halt.

REV. C. A. ROW.—So far as my own observation of the New Testament goes, I will venture to give an opinion of the criticisms contained in this paper. First of all, I believe that ψυχή is unquestionably used for the lower parts of man's nature—there can be no doubt about that—but it is also sometimes used in relation to the higher parts of his nature. In addition to this, there is the term πνεῦμα, which is invariably used to denote the higher, and not the lower, parts of his nature. This is the distinction between the two ; but the usage of the New Testament is simply popular. No one who has read it in Greek can think that there is a scientific usage of words. Then, so far as the tripartite division of man's nature is concerned, I take it for granted that the sacred writers, whenever they speak of that nature, have used the popular terms which were common at the time in which they wrote. And it was essentially necessary that they should do so, because, had they not, they must have made definitions, just as philosophical writers are in the habit of doing. Look at philosophical literature. If a writer uses a philosophical term relating to the mind, he always defines it, as is the case in the writings of Aristotle. For an example among modern writers, we have Coleridge. He has used the terms "understanding" and "reason" in a particular sense ; and when doing so, he always accompanies those terms with definitions. Indeed, it is absolutely impossible to use current language in a strictly scientific sense, unless the writers doing so accompany their terms with definitions of some sort. I cordially agree with a great portion of Mr. Graham's paper, and have been particularly satis-

fied with it in respect to some points. In the last one with which Mr. Graham deals, I was glad to find him strongly maintaining, as I do that the *πνεῦμα* is that in which human morality chiefly centres. Since our last meeting, I have read through the conclusion of Mr. Darwin's recent book on the Descent of Man, and I must say that I was perfectly amazed to find a man of such eminence using arguments which are so absolutely rotten; but that only proves that wherever men of science venture out of their own special province, they have no more light than ordinary men of intelligence, and indeed they very often have less. It is a point on which I feel strongly, when people tell me that the *ψυχή* may possibly perish, and yet that the whole weight of man's morality lies in the *ψυχή*. My own general idea of the terms in the New Testament is that they were not intended to give us a scientific division of man's nature, but were simply popular words—three Greek words, in their common acceptation, covering all that was to be found in man. There is, however, one important omission in Mr. Graham's paper, which has already been pointed out; he does not describe what the *σῶμα* really consists of, and our former discussion on this subject also left that point untouched. If you take the *σῶμα* as a portion of man, it must include some portion of feeling and of the lower operations which pertain to the *ψυχή*; for I am not prepared to say or believe that mere bodily matter, like this table for instance, can ever become the subject of feeling by any mere alteration of the particles of matter which compose it. It seems to me that these things always belong to something distinct from mere material organization. I do not suppose that you will ever get feeling into this table; and I think that these terms, and many others used by Mr. Graham, are in point of fact used simply in a popular sense. I have no doubt that the term *πνεῦμα* includes intelligence and the moral perceptions; and according to the usage of the New Testament Scriptures, the term *πνεῦμα* refers to all that is high, elevated, and grand in man, whatever it may be. I hold that the high poetic faculty in man would reside in the *πνεῦμα*, and that the higher powers of the affections would reside in the *πνεῦμα* also. I do not think they are separate essences in the least degree, but different species of mental phenomena; and in the *πνεῦμα*, I suppose, would be found all our moral intuitions. It is important that we should place this upon firm ground; because, if there is anything stable in man, it is his deep moral intuition, and if we are not careful here, we shall be in danger of falling into the worst form of infidelity; for now its most prevailing form is to resolve all that is moral in man simply into that which is merely physical; and if we go to the lower parts of man's nature we are in danger of resolving all these things, including the free will, into a mere physical law. We are distinctly conscious of a bipartite nature in man. There is the I, and that which is not the I—I speak of my body, my feelings, and affections—and I recognize the distinction between the I, which has will, and that which possesses these various attributes. We are conscious of some distinction between them; but beyond that we cannot go. All I contend for, and what I would press upon your con-

sideration, is the high importance of seeing clearly and distinctly that all the high elements of morality in man cannot be separated from that which is spiritual. I cannot see the line which separates spirituality from morality ; or, in other words, I believe that the motive of all morality is unquestionably to be found deep down in the human spirit. (Cheers.)

Rev. Sir TILSON-MARSH.—In rising to make one or two observations on this subject, I may just say that I should be sorry to do so without alluding for one moment to the deep sorrow I feel for the great loss which we as a society have sustained in the death of our excellent and most courteous friend Mr. Reddie. He has gone, as we believe, to that blessed land in which he has left the *σῶμα* behind at last, and carried the *πνεῦμα* to the presence of the Eternal *πνεῦμα*—τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the Holy Spirit—to the immediate presence of God Himself. He is happy, though his gain is our loss. And now one word on the subject before us, which I think I was the first to introduce to the Society, on an occasion when I was supported by our excellent friend Mr. James. I cordially agree with Mr. Graham in much of the admirable paper which he has presented to us. That paper contains a vast amount of scriptural truth to which the reasonable mind must accede. But I also agree with Mr. James that man's nature is clearly tripartite, and that the Apostle Paul, in laying down his definition, if I may so say, in the fifth chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, leaves us without doubt on that point. Man's nature is not quadrupartite—it is tripartite—there are the *σῶμα*, the *ψυχή*, and the *πνεῦμα*. The *σῶμα* we are all agreed upon, and we are also agreed upon the *πνεῦμα*. The only question, then, is—what is the *ψυχή*—and whether it lasts through the eternal world, or whether it ceases when the body dies in the present world. I confess to feeling very great difficulty on this point. My own inclination, derived from a close study of the Greek New Testament, is to believe that the *ψυχή* does cease for a time with the body—that the body lies in the grave, and the *ψυχή* disappears, but that the *πνεῦμα* is in existence in the intermediate state. It is clear that that state is a state of rational existence, in which there is a consciousness of what is passing, and in which there is a remembrance of past events ; because we find our Lord, although in parabolic language, implying that most distinctly in the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Our Lord would hardly lead us to believe that there could pass intelligent expression between the rational *πνεῦμα* of Dives in the world of the lost, and the rational *πνεῦμα* of Abraham in the world of the saved, without there being any such possibility ; and I am therefore led to believe that our Lord, in thus representing Dives as communicating with Abraham, was asserting the existence of his *πνεῦμα* in the world of the lost. Then, again, we find the spirits represented under the altar, as crying out to God : “ How long, O Lord ! how long ? ” anticipating that day when the complete work of redemption should be before the Church, when the present time of probation should have passed away ; and when, therefore, God's whole plan in this intermediate term of discipline for men would be exhibited to the Church and to the principalities and powers in heavenly places. I say that if these spirits are represented as under the

altar, anticipating this time and asking when it shall be—"How long, O Lord! how long?" it follows that there must evidently be consciousness in these spirits. But there is no mention, except in that passage, of the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$. I believe the word there is $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, and that forms my only difficulty. It certainly makes against my argument, and leaves me in doubt as to whether the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ does lie in the grave with the body, and rise again at the resurrection morning, or whether it is in existence in the intermediate state. I do not think we can resolve this difficulty, but this I do believe, that the statement of St. Paul when he prays that the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, shall be sanctified and preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, implies that the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ must have an eternal existence. I cannot get rid of that argument, and therefore I think that the $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, and $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ are evidently in existence on the resurrection morning. It is, however, possible, that the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ may lapse while the body is in the ground, and that the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ alone may be in existence in the intermediate state. I cordially agree with one of the previous speakers who said that this subject is one of immense importance in the scientific discussions of the day. I have many personal friends in the scientific world who, I am sure, would find their difficulties greatly reduced, if not altogether removed, if this fact were brought before them as stated by St. Paul in the Holy Scriptures, namely, that there is this tripartite division in man's nature—that in the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ man has sympathies with the animal world, and that his $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, having certain sympathies with what we call the instinctive nature of animals, explains to us how there is that agreement between man and the irrational world which we see existing. At the same time, the definition of man as a tripartite being having also the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$, would show to these people that there also exist in man powers which are entirely distinct from the capacities which he shares with the lower animals, and which dignify man and separate him entirely from the animal world. I think, therefore, that the discussion introduced here this evening is one of great importance in its bearings upon the controversies of the day. Many of these gentlemen of whom I have spoken are men of very high intelligence, thoroughly fitted to explore the facts of nature; but they do not see the line of separation between the intelligence of animals and what they call the soul of man. Give them the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, and their difficulties are resolved, and you give them also the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$, which is above the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$. Ask them to account for the differential peculiarities of man, and you will find that they cannot do so except on the supposition of the existence of the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$. For instance, take articulate speech. What animals are there which can exchange views and opinions as we are doing this evening? What gives us the power we possess? Is there any other animal in the world that has it? Certainly not. Then articulate speech differentiates man from the irrational creatures; and we may turn round on these men, although they may be good and honest men, and say: "How do you account for these differential peculiarities except on the supposition that man has within him the $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ in addition to the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$?" This is man's tripartite nature. It explains all these diffi-

culties, and I think may do much to reconcile men, and bring them in harmony to the Author of divine revelation.

The CHAIRMAN.—In relation to this subject, I cannot avoid offering my strong protest against the tendency of the work lately published by Mr. Darwin on the Descent of Man, and on Natural Selection. That work has been very ably reviewed in the *Times* lately, and I call attention to it because it appears to me that its obvious tendency is to rob man of that inestimably superior portion of his existence, the *πνεῦμα*, since the gist of that work is to show that man is derived from the lower animals, not by any sudden change, but by a gradual amelioration and adaptation to circumstances. The book also goes on to show that probably all kinds of animals are derived from those of inferior organization. The whole tendency of the work is simply this: It is elsewhere argued that the simplest forms of organic life are capable of being produced by a concurrence of inorganic particles without the influence of any pre-existing germ, and the doctrine is advanced by Mr. Darwin that we can ascend, step by step, from the lower to the higher forms of organic life, and even from apes to man himself. Now what is the effect of this but to show that there is no necessity for a Creator; that man has proceeded by degrees from inorganic matter simply in obedience to the laws of inorganic matter? Mr. Darwin does not say so much, but that is the obvious tendency of the work; as it tends to get rid of the *πνεῦμα* altogether—to annihilate it entirely—I enter on this occasion my intensely strong protest against that tendency. The book throughout is written in the potential mood: such and such things may be, and could be, and might be, if—but he does not supply the “if.” If there were no God, no Creator, no truth in the Bible—if the Bible were a series of ideas and notions having no solid foundation—then, perhaps, such things might be.

Rev. G. HENSLOW.—There is a passage at the end of Mr. Darwin’s book in which he protests against the idea that these things are not the work of a Creator.

The CHAIRMAN.—But I am simply stating what is the obvious tendency of the book. It is all very well for the author to say he does not mean it to be so. I am glad that point is disclaimed by Mr. Darwin, but I do not think it interferes with the obvious tendency of the work, and I merely mention this matter in connection with the very important subject of the tripartite nature of man. (Cheers.)

Mr. GRAHAM.—I have to thank the various speakers for their agreement with so much of my paper—indeed I think I may say for their agreement with all the essential principles contained in it. You, sir, have touched upon a point which, to me, is profoundly important,—the view, I mean, that our ethical and moral nature is not in the *ψυχή*, but in the *πνεῦμα*. I feel that the moment we admit that our ethical and moral nature is in the *ψυχή*, and then admit the fact that the *ψυχή* may perish, we give up what Mr. Row has properly denominated the dignity of our nature, and I think we give up the one great argument which distinguishes man from the in-

ferior creatures. As to the observations which fell from Mr. James, I am obliged to him for his commendation of my paper, but with regard to his remark that the title of it should have been the quadrupartite, and not the tripartite nature of man, I submit that he has forgotten the fact that I connect animal life with the body. I regard the *σῶμα* as embracing the animal life which dies with it; and then I make the *ψυχή* distinct—that which stands, as it were, between the *πνεῦμα* and the *σῶμα*. With that remark I leave the paper to speak for itself. I waited to hear some arguments from him as to where he disagreed with me; but I may say, not only with reference to him but with regard to others who have differed from me, that they have not really dealt with my arguments. If I were combating a paper, I should grapple with its arguments and endeavour to overthrow them, and then sustain my own positions upon distinct and independent grounds. Now with regard to the objection that I have confounded the *nephesh* and the *ruach*, the *ψυχή* and the *πνεῦμα*, I think that that objection is not valid. I have endeavoured to demonstrate two things,—and no one has attempted to overthrow my arguments,—unity of essence, and yet distinctness, as Holy Scripture recognizes it; that is to say, that the ethical and moral nature is in the *πνεῦμα*. I fancy Sir Tilson-Marsh has acknowledged the same thing, and that is the principal point which I wished to establish. I take it that when that is established, we do see that there is a clear distinction between the *nephesh* and the *ruach*, the *ψυχή* and the *πνεῦμα*. And yet I hold that they are obviously in Holy Scripture one in essence. I agree with those speakers who have said that the terms are not used in a strictly logical sense in either of the Testaments; in my paper I fully recognize that fact. With regard to Mr. White's observations, I have only to say that it would have been impossible for me to have entered into exegesis in this paper, and I did not do it except in an occasional word, to show the force of my quotations. But the Institute does not recognize exegesis as entering into the elements of its papers, unless it is absolutely necessary to make a passage of Scripture clear; and if I had been as exegetical as I wished to be, my paper would have been of much greater length. As to what has fallen from Mr. Row, I am gratified to find a gentleman of his acumen agreeing with me, and, in the main, defending my paper. As to the *nishmath chayim* I suppose there is a development of the meaning of those lives, afterwards, in the *nephesh* and *ruach* of the Old Testament; but I do not lay much stress upon that. On Elohim I would offer a few remarks. When the Blessed God says "Let us make man," you have there a plural pronoun connected with a plural noun; and in the opening of Genesis you have the united action of the Three Persons expressed in a singular verb; but you have also, in one case at least, a plural verb; and I take it that you have the great doctrine of the Trinity laid down there. The spirit of God brooded over them, as Milton correctly expresses the idea of the Hebrew, to make the waters pregnant. Now hear what Job says: "By His spirit he has garnished the heavens"; He has studded the blue dome above us with worlds of light. In the New Testament I find the development of the

Trinity still more full and forcible. I find it stated, at the opening of the gospel of St. John, that the *λόγος*, the Eternal Word, which expressed all that was in the Father, created all things, and that without Him was not anything made which was made ; and St. Paul says the same thing : “ By Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers.” He is the efficient and final cause, for all things were created by Him, and for Him. All that comes out of Elohim. It has been said that “ we ” is the style of potentates and kings, but in Scripture it is not the style of God. He speaks in the first person singular : “ I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods before Me,” not “ before Us.” You find the great principle of Monotheism maintained in His dealings with Jew and Gentile ; and you find the great truth of the Trinity displayed in the Old Testament, as in that passage of Isaiah, where He says, “ Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us ? ” I find the Trinity connected with Creation ; I find the three persons brought out clearly, just like the white ray of light that gives us the rainbow when it is broken into its original colours. I find the glorious and blessed God presenting Himself in this form of monotheism, and I find Him exhibiting the Trinity in unity in all its glory and majesty, and brought out in creation in connection with the Elohim : “ Let us make man in our image.” This is one of the grandest and most forcible arguments which Holy Scripture affords for the doctrine of the Trinity. I have only to thank again those speakers who have commended my paper. I thought there would have been many arrows levelled at me, and was trying to construct a seven-fold shield, such as Ajax bore, but find that I do not need it.

The Meeting was then adjourned.