in every book of the New Testament; but at all events it has not so far fallen as to be guilty of rendering ψυχή by life in Luke xii. 19, above cited, or, again, in such passages as Matthew x. 28 ("not able to kill the soul," etc.). The fact is, that a comparison between ψυχή and ζωή is almost like a comparison between eye and sight, or between matter and energy; and the difference between the words is simply this, that ψυχή, soul, is the organism or substance in which ζωή, life, partly resides as a state or activity which may be either temporal or eternal according to circumstances, and may be predicated (as frequently) not only of the lower animals and even of plants. Ψυχή, soul, is thus the antithesis to σῶμα, body, (as in Matthew x. 28; also in vi. 25, where it is to be regretted that the rendering soul is inadmissible according to usage), the loss of point being considerable in consequence, as in Matthew x. 28; also in vi. 25, where it is to be considered in consequence,2 as ζωή, life, is to ἐναρκτός, death. The application to temporal or eternal conditions is not in the words themselves, but in the phrases and arguments of the writer; and when the true distinction between the words is recognised, no difficulty can arise either in any of the passages referred to by The Expository Times, or in any other. The phrases and contexts explain the meaning, and to all who are familiar with the idioms of the two languages will suggest the correct or most practicable English equivalent, viz., for ζωή, life, always, whether temporal or eternal; for ψυχή, soul or life, according to requirement. In such cases as Luke xvi. 25, and 1 Cor. xv. 19, where the reference is to temporal life, the employment of ψυχή would be absolutely impossible, whereas ζωή is correct; and, on the other hand, in such passages as Matthew xvi. 25, and Acts ii. 27 ("Whosoever shall lose his ψυχή for my sake shall find it;" and "He will not leave my ψυχή in Hades"), where ψυχή is correctly employed, to assign the reference to temporal life would be to reduce the statements to absurdity.

Furthermore (and with this remark I must bring this note to a close), even in the famous and often expounded passage, Matthew xvi. 26, "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own ψυχή" (A.V., soul; R.V., life), it is evident from a comparison with the parallel in Luke ix. 25 ("lose himself"); and with Matthew x. 28 ("Who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna"), that the R.V. change of soul into life, however acceptable on some grounds, is (through the idiomatic usage) not unattended by grave loss of force and of designed spiritual application; and that preachers, if not translators, may still wisely prefer the less sacrifice of meaning to the greater, and still urge the inquiry in the time-honoured form, "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" The ψυχή, soul, of the Christ, which was "not left in Hades" (Acts ii. 27), this it is which was given as the ransom (Matt. xx. 28).


By the Rev. Professor W. T. Davison, M.A.

From "Biblical and Literary Notes," in the Methodist Recorder, 16th October 1895.

A ministerial correspondent asks whether the distinction that has been drawn between two Greek words σῶμα and ψυχή (ζωή and ψυχή), both translated "life," in the New Testament is tenable. An allusion to this distinction is found in an interesting note in The Expository Times for September, where it is said "ψυχή means our present temporal life, ζωή the eternal life." Thus it is said of our Saviour, "The Son of man came to give His life (ψυχή, His human, temporal life) a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28), but "I am the resurrection and the life" (ζωή, the divine, the eternal life) (John xi. 25). Our correspondent doubts whether this distinction can be upheld, and suggests that "ψυχή refers to the principle of natural life, ζωή to the duration of life, either natural, spiritual, or eternal." We think there can be no doubt that the distinction referred to is amply sustained by New Testament usage. It is not new; the writer in The Expository Times merely points out some interesting results of observing the distinction as indicated by another writer, the Rev. C. W. Darling. Zwή occurs about 150 times (roughly speaking) in the New Testament, and only in some eight or ten of these does it denote the earthly life of the individual or existence in the present state; and even of these instances, some are doubtful. In other passages it denotes that which is "life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19, Revised

---

1 In the Theological Monthly for September last, Dr. Weymouth has most brilliantly and thoroughly exposed the Revisers' ignorance or neglect of the real force of Greek and English tenses, which mars their whole work. But even this is not the chief of their "disappointing and deplorable" results.

2 Anxiety for the ψυχή, soul, is not forbidden, save as to eating and drinking; anxiety for the σῶμα, body, not forbidden, save as to raiment. For "the soul is more than food," etc.
When a critic of Archdeacon Farrar’s capacity and freedom to discuss in the Sunday School supposed discrepancies in the Gospels is the most barren and fruitless. (witness for doubt there may be found difficulties enough in harmonising the different narratives of the resurrection. But of all barrenness, a very serious one is that there are no discrepancies, most teachers will be content.

Following St. Luke’s narrative, then, we receive a clear and most interesting impression of the earliest events of this first Lord’s Day.

It was very early in the morning when Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and other women came to the sepulchre in Joseph’s garden to anoint with spices the body of Jesus. Discussing as they came what they should do about the great stone which closed the entrance of the sepulchre, they were surprised, on arriving, to find it rolled away. But this was nothing to the surprise they got when they entered the tomb, for they “found not the body” there.

This is the first great fact in any proof of the resurrection of Jesus; and it is the more valuable that, as Dr. Farrar notices, it is admitted as a fact by the most rationalistic critics, the most advanced sceptics. The body of Jesus was gone from the sepulchre. The most ingenious theories have been