

in every book of the New Testament;<sup>1</sup> 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 *man*, but also 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,<sup>2</sup> as *ζωή*, *life*, is to *θάνατος*, *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).

## Ζωή and ψυχή in the New Testament.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. T. DAVISON, M.A.

*From "Biblical and Literary Notes," in the Methodist Recorder, 16th October 1890.*

A MINISTERIAL correspondent asks whether the distinction that has been drawn between two Greek words *zoé* and *psyché* (*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 above 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. *Ζωή* 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

Version). Indicating in itself that which is the complete antithesis to death, the word lends itself easily in the New Testament, as Trench pointed out long ago, to that true life which alone triumphs over death, physical and spiritual. "No wonder, then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than this to set forth the blessedness of God and the blessedness of the creature in communion with God." In this general signification, ζωή is used with a variety of shades of meaning. Sometimes it refers to the future state only, sometimes to the whole sum of blessed life in God here and hereafter. In St. Paul it often describes the sum of the Divine promises in the gospel; St. John uses it with a stately significance characteristic of his style as that which primarily and essentially belongs to God alone, but which becomes man's possession through the self-revelation of the Father in the Son.

Our correspondent is, however, right in assuming that ζωή had not originally this meaning, and does not always preserve it in the New Testament. As the antithesis of *thanatos* (θάνατος), death, it does sometimes refer to our natural life in the present state. See Acts xvii. 25, "He giveth to all *life* and breath and all things;" 1 Cor. xv. 19, "In this *life* only;" Luke xvi. 25, "Thou in thy *life*-time receivest thy good things;" Jas. iv. 14, "For what is your *life*? It is even a vapour." The passage Rom. viii. 38 also should probably be understood in this connection, "For I am persuaded that neither death nor *life*," etc.; compare 1 Cor. iii. 32, "The world, or *life*, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours." It is true that the able writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES judges otherwise. He says, "It is not this present life St. Paul takes notice of,

it is the life beyond; not even in death, not even in the life beyond death, the life eternal, will he be separated from the love of Christ." We venture to think this a mistake. The antithesis points in quite a different direction, and if ζωή be here used of that higher spiritual life which transcends our present state of mortality and corruption, it cannot be conceived of as that which would separate us from Christ.

The presence of these very few passages, however, cannot hide from us the fact that in the New Testament the word ζωή has been ennobled. If we might so paraphrase the scriptural expression of 2 Cor. v. 4, that which is mortal in it has been swallowed up of higher life. On the other hand, ψυχή is, as our correspondent puts it, essentially the principle of natural life. It is used in the New Testament nearly always of the life of man, and mainly of his individual existence. The translation "soul," appropriate in some respects, is often misleading, because we speak of "saving the soul" in contradistinction to preservation of the mere life of the body. There can be no question that the Revisers give our Lord's meaning more correctly in passages such as Matt. xvi. 26, "What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his *life*?" The saving of the *life* (not "soul") in verse 25 points only to our present state of existence, the true meaning of which can only be realised, and its true end attained, by our renouncing self and serving Christ. But the subject is a large one, beyond the scope of these brief notes. We have referred to it thus far because it is suggestive, and may be followed up by readers for themselves. Those who do not read Greek will find all the help they require in Young's *Concordance*.

## The Sunday School.

### Exposition of the International Lessons.

#### I.

November 30.—Luke xxiv. 1-12.

#### *Jesus Risen.*

This is both a short and an unusually easy lesson. No doubt there may be found difficulties enough in harmonising the different narratives of the resurrection. But of all barren things to discuss in the Sunday School supposed discrepancies in the Gospels is the most barren and fruitless. When a critic of Archdeacon Farrar's capacity and freedom (witness for *freedom* his recent book on the *Minor Prophets*) holds 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