

5-1-1966

An Examination of the Constituent Elements of Human Nature

Paul R. Lund

Recommended Citation

Lund, Paul R., "An Examination of the Constituent Elements of Human Nature" (1966). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 247.
https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/247

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Nobel V. Sack

Cooperative Reader: Eldon Fuhrman

36062

AN EXAMINATION OF THE
CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS
OF HUMAN NATURE

A Thesis
Presented to
the faculty of the
Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Paul R. Lund
May 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE	1
Introduction to the Problem	2
Statement of the Problem	4
Justification of the Problem	4
Limitation of the Problem	7
Definition of Important Terms	7
Organization and Procedure of the Study	8
Assumptions	9
Sources	9
II. A SURVEY OF REPRESENTATIVE THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE SUBJECT .	11
The Early Church	12
Reformation Times	18
Modern Theologians (19th and 20th Centuries)	21
Trichotomists	21
Dichotomists	27
Monochotomists	37
Summary	47
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE BIBLICAL WORDS INVOLVED	49
Soul (<u>nephesh-psyche</u>)	50
Old Testament usage (<u>nephesh</u>)	50
New Testament usage (<u>psyche</u>)	65
Spirit (<u>ruach-pneuma</u>)	74

CHAPTER	PAGE
Old Testament usage (<u>ruach</u>)	74
New Testament usage (<u>pneuma</u>)	88
Summary	94
IV. AN EXPOSITION OF THE PROBLEM TEXTS	97
First Thessalonians 5:23	99
Hebrews 4:12	104
Other passages	109
Summary	114
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	117
Summary	118
Conclusions	123
Related areas of suggested research	125
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127
APPENDIX	133

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

An age-old problem still facing the church and one which still finds advocates on both sides in modern evangelical thought is the question as to whether man consists of body, soul and spirit or only of body and spirit (or soul). The former position would insist that the constituent elements of man's nature are three and that there is some essential distinction between the Biblical terms "soul" and "spirit". The latter position insists that there are only two distinct elements in man's nature and that there is no essential distinction (although many would admit a functional distinction) between the Biblical terms "soul" and "spirit".

To these two views may be added a third position which must be taken more or less seriously, and that is that man's nature is essentially a single unit and cannot or should not be divided into any so-called constituent parts. This view must be considered, but even those who hold it (within a Biblical frame of reference) admit that the soul (or spirit) can and does leave or separate from the body at the time of death, and thus they more or less come under one or the other of the two aforementioned points of view.

One commonly hears reference to one or the other of these views in popular preaching as well as in more serious studies of theology and

the Bible. Not everyone seriously intends to be taking one position or the other when commonly using the terms "soul" or "spirit", although the use of these terms does reveal something of a basic underlying assumption. Some use these terms in a sense which is more poetic than definitive as Robert Browning, in his Death in the Desert, describes body, soul, and spirit as "What does, what knows, what is--three souls, one man."¹

Again, there have been many attempts at illustration which in themselves may serve a purpose, but do not give any true light from a Biblical point of view. James Stalker cites the following:

It is an ancient notion that human nature ought to be like a chariot: the body is the material framework; the powers of the soul are the steeds by which this is wheeled along; but the spirit is the charioteer by whose keen eye the course is determined and in whose hands the reins are held. Other thinkers have compared human nature, as it ought to be, with the Hebrew temple: the body is the outer court, the soul the holy place, the spirit the holy of holies.²

Much popular preaching and even Bible teaching on this subject is limited to a superficial evaluation of the terms and factors involved, or to no evaluation at all and simply a use of terms without definition or meaning. But to those who take the Bible seriously, and who desire to represent accurately the teaching therein contained, these terms and distinctions should be clarified and definitely stated. It is not enough simply to echo traditional or popular modes of thinking.

¹As quoted in A. H. Strong, Systematic Theology (Philadelphia: The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1907), II, 487.

²James Stalker, Christian Psychology (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914), pp. 60-61.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It was the problem of this study (1) to survey the representative theological views on the subject of the constituent elements of human nature; (2) to attempt to analyze and define the Biblical words for "soul" and "spirit"; and (3) to determine from this analysis of the Biblical usage whether there are one, two, or three constituent elements in human nature. It is obvious that if any substantial distinction could be found in Biblical usage between "soul" and "spirit", a conclusion could be made for trichotomy; the absence of such a distinction would lead to the conclusion that man's nature has only two constituent elements, or perhaps one only, in a limited sense.

III. JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

The importance of this study can be seen first of all from the very fact that there is so much disagreement about it even in evangelical, Bible-believing circles. Harold Lindsell has simply stated in his new Harper Study Bible that "Theologians disagree as to whether man is trichotomous (consisting of three parts) or dichotomous (consisting of two parts)."¹

Not only is there present disagreement, but the issue itself has significant implications in other areas of Christian doctrine. It has

¹Harold Lindsell (ed.), Harper Study Bible (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 1775.

been stated by Hodge, who definitely supports the two-part view, that

The Scriptural doctrine of the nature of man as a created spirit in vital union with an organized body, consisting, therefore, of two, and only two, distinct elements or substances, matter and mind, is one of great importance. It is intimately connected with some of the most important doctrines of the Bible; with the constitution of the person of Christ, and consequently with the nature of his redeeming work and of his relation to the children of men; with the doctrine of the fall, original sin, and of regeneration; and with the doctrines of a future state and of the resurrection. It is because of this connection, and not because of its interest as a question in psychology, that the true idea of man demands the careful investigation of the theologian.¹

Another author points out that:

. . . the choice between dichotomy and trichotomy is 'not indifferent, but stands in close relation to the Christian doctrines of the unity of human nature, the value of the body and the meaning of the resurrection and therefore also with the doctrine of the Creation and the Incarnation.'²

Again, it has been noted by still another author that the correct view on this subject

. . . is not only important in itself as giving its due share of honour to the body, and harmonising with the close relation between soul and body on which modern psychology lays increasing stress; but will be found to shed much light on other doctrines of Scripture --for instance, on death, on immortality, on resurrection, on the full scope of Christ's redemption.³

As to the bearing of this doctrine on the Person of Christ, C. A. Beckwith has witnessed that ". . . The true knowledge of the relation of

¹Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1946), II, 46.

²G. C. Berkouwer, Man: The Image of God (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 208.

³James Orr, God's Image in Man (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 53.

the soul and the spirit is of great significance in relation to the person of Christ."¹ The reason for this is that out of the tri-partite view have grown several heresies in regard to Christ's nature and person. This has been considered later in this study.

The fact that other areas of Christian doctrine are vitally concerned with the outcome of this issue of one, two, or three parts in man has been evidenced in other studies. One student has written as basic to his study, "The question of immortality is involved basically in the nature of man. Is man body, soul and spirit, --three distinct entities within the one man?"² And yet it was necessary to proceed with the study of the intermediate state on the basis of an assumption as to the correct Biblical view rather than on any definitive study of the problem.

H. Orton Wiley, in stating the two views which have existed, declares that they ". . . lay the foundation for widely divergent opinions in later theological study."³ Thus it can be seen that one should not presume to take the position that this is an unimportant issue, and can be dropped as not having Biblical significance nor possibility of resolution.

¹Samuel Macauley Jackson (ed.), The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1911), XI, 14.

²Ben O. Taylor, "A Comparative Study of the Conservative Evangelical View and the Seventh-Day Adventist View of the Doctrine of an Intermediate State" (Portland, Oregon: unpublished thesis at Western Evangelical Seminary, 1963), p. 11.

³H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology (Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, 1941), II, 15.

IV. LIMITATION OF THE PROBLEM

This study has been limited to a survey of the representative views on this subject by those authors who take the Bible seriously, and to an analysis of the Biblical usage itself. It has not been the purpose of this study to seek to investigate nor to correlate the viewpoints of modern secular psychologists, although this could be profitable to a certain extent. The sole purpose of the study has been to examine the Biblical view of human psychology--or in other words, the constituent nature of man.

V. DEFINITION OF IMPORTANT TERMS

In this study the following words have been used consistently, unless otherwise specified, as herein defined:

Body is used as the translation of the Greek word σῶμα (soma). There is no definite word for body as such in the Hebrew Old Testament.

Soul is used as the translation of the Hebrew term נֶפֶשׁ (nephesh), and of the Greek word ψυχή (psyche).

Spirit is used as the translation of the Hebrew word רוּחַ (ruach), and of the Greek word πνεῦμα (pneuma).

Trichotomy comes from the Greek words τρίχα (tricha), meaning 'in three parts', and τέμνω (temno), meaning 'to cut', and thus signifies composed of three parts, i.e., body, soul, and spirit.¹

¹Strong, op. cit., p. 484.

Dichotomy comes from the Greek words δίχα (dicha), meaning 'in two', and τέμνω (temno), meaning 'to cut', and thus signifies composed of two parts, i.e., body and spirit (or soul).¹

Monochotomy comes from the Greek words μονω (mono), meaning 'one', and τέμνω (temno), meaning 'to cut', and thus signifies composed of only one part.

VI. ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The method of procedure has been first of all to survey and attempt to categorize the representative theological views on the subject of trichotomy versus dichotomy down through the centuries of church history. Chapter II has presented this survey with appropriate conclusions about the tendencies in Christian theology on this subject.

In Chapter III an analysis was made of the Biblical words involved and how they may be defined and related in keeping with the total Biblical presentation.

Chapter IV has endeavored to give a satisfactory exposition of certain problem texts in order to harmonize these with the overall usage of the words involved ("soul" and "spirit") as found in Chapter III.

The final chapter has presented a summary of the findings of this study and the conclusions which have been drawn from it, as well as suggestions for further study.

¹Ibid., p. 483.

VII. ASSUMPTIONS

It has been assumed in undertaking this study that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and is a revelation from God of Himself and of His creation. The Bible has been taken as the final authority for all areas of theological understanding as well as of practice in the Christian life. Human reason must be submitted to the authority of God's Word, and is useful only for the understanding and analysis of the Bible and not for the origination of basic truths or propositions.

It has been further assumed that the New Testament is basically related to the Old Testament as a unit. There must be a logical progression and yet a unity of thought from the Old Testament into the New. As the entire Bible is received as revelation from God, it is assumed that there is to be found no contradiction between the parts.

VIII. SOURCES

The Holy Scriptures in the American Standard Version of 1901 has been the final source of authority in this study, and quotations have been made from this version unless otherwise indicated. Reference has been made, however, to the original languages (Hebrew and Greek) where necessary. Encyclopedias, Bible and theological dictionaries, systematic theologies and commentaries as well as many books on the subject have been referred to. Where it has been possible the original writings were employed as primary sources. However, certain basic reference material on this subject has not been available to the author. This would include

Henry Wheeler Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Man (London: The Epworth Press, 1951), Sydney Cave, The Christian Estimate of Man (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1944), J. Laidlaw, The Bible Doctrine of Man (1879), and Delitzsch, System of Biblical Psychology.

While unquestionably it would have been of value to have had access to these sources, much of the viewpoints they represent has been conveyed by the other sources in which reference is made to these works.

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF REPRESENTATIVE THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE SUBJECT

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF REPRESENTATIVE THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE SUBJECT

I. THE EARLY CHURCH

The question of whether man is composed of body and soul only (dichotomy), or is there a third element to be added, namely spirit (trichotomy), has been much discussed throughout the history of the church. "Either theory is supposed to be supported by Scripture, and both have had their defenders in all ages of the church."¹ It is generally accepted, however, that the early church in the beginning held to the trichotomy view, although not perhaps for good and sound reasons. As Pope says, "The early Christian Church inherited the ancient philosophical Trichotomy, as expounded by Plato."² Another theologian asserts that "In the early history of the Church trichotomy flourished mostly in the school of Alexandria, and was introduced into Christian theology through the Platonic philosophy."³

This tri-partite conception of man originating in Greek philosophy,

conceived of the relation of the body and the spirit of man to

¹James Orr (ed.), The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1943), IV, 2496.

²William Burt Pope, A Compendium of Christian Theology (New York: Hunt & Eaton, n.d.), I, 435.

³John Miley, Systematic Theology (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1892), I, 399.

each other after the analogy of the mutual relation between the material universe and God. It was thought that, just as the latter could enter into communion with each other only by means of a third substance or an intermediate being, so the former could enter into mutual vital relationships only by means of a third or intermediate element, namely, the soul. The soul was regarded as, on the one hand, immaterial, and on the other, adapted to the body. . . . The most familiar but also the crudest form of trichotomy is that which takes the body for the material part of man's nature, the soul as the principle of animal life, and the spirit as the God-related rational and immortal element in man.¹

This same fact as to the source and origin of Christian trichotomy in Greek philosophy is pointed out by another author:

We should note, in the first place, that the idea of trichotomy does not originate in Christendom, but in Greek philosophy. It arises from the need for some intermediary between the two poles of visible and invisible things, for something which should bridge the gulf between the two worlds of body and spirit. . . . This need was met with the "soul", which so to speak formed the bond, the juncture, between two things which could actually not be united. Only in this way could a certain unity of human nature be arrived at. The idea of trichotomy thus rests not at all on a fortuitous preference for a trichotomy rather than a dichotomy, but rather finds its origin in the problem of mediating between the two worlds of Greek dualism.²

Although trichotomy, under the influence of Platonic philosophy, found favor in the early church, it was soon discredited and given up by the majority on account of the heretical views into which it led. John Miley summarizes this point well when he says:

For a while it (trichotomy) seemed fairly on the way to a common acceptance, when adverse influences checked its progress and brought it into disrepute. Tertullian strongly opposed it, and

¹L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), p. 191.

²Berkouwer, op. cit., pp. 208-209.

his influence was very great. Even the seeming indifference of Augustine was indirectly much against it; for his influence was so great on all doctrinal questions that nothing without his open support could hold a position of much favor in the more orthodox thought of the Church.¹

The first and apparently most significant heresy which appropriated the theory of trichotomy, or as some would have it, was actually based upon and grew out of the theory, was that of Apollinarianism. Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (d. 382), attempted to explain the mystery of Christ's person by teaching that "... in assuming human nature, He partook only of the body (soma) and soul (psyche); but that the spirit in man was in Christ replaced by the divine Logos."² This resulted in a deficient human nature and was accordingly condemned as heretical at the council of Chalcedon in A. D. 451. Miley further explains this relationship between Apollinarianism and trichotomy:

The Christology of Apollinaris denied to Christ the human mind in its distinct rational sense, and provided for its functions in his personality by the presence of the Logos as the divine reason. Such a view requires the trichotomic anthropology, for the presence of the Logos in the place of the rational mind could not account for the sensibilities of Christ in the likeness of our own. In the absence of the rational mind, the soul must have been present as the ground of the manifold affections which lie below the purely rational life. Therefore the soul must be a distinct existence, for otherwise it could not be thus present in the absence of the rational mind. Such being the facts in the case, the only relation of trichotomy to the Apollinarian Christology is that it is the requirement and the possibility of such a Christology.³

¹Miley, op. cit.

²Wiley, op. cit., p. 18.

³Miley, op. cit., pp. 399-400.

It should be acknowledged, however, that the tri-partite view does not necessarily involve one in the Apollinarian heresy. As Miley concluded:

. . . this heresy is in no sense the logical implication or consequence of the trichotomy. Hence, with entire consistency, many trichotomists are thoroughly orthodox in their Christology. It follows that this heretical appropriation of trichotomy is no evidence against its truth, and no reason for the disrepute which it suffered in consequence.¹

Other errors or heresies have developed out of the theory of trichotomy. As Wiley says, ". . . trichotomy. . . led the church into a number of grievous errors. . . "² He proceeds to list six of these including that of Apollinarianism already mentioned. These include the doctrine of the Gnostics, who taught that the spirit in man was an emanation from God, or in other words a part of the divine essence. It was thus regarded as incapable of sin. This undermined the true doctrine of the fall, and the very foundation of redemption.

Another error was that of the Semi-Pelagian doctrine of original sin. This held that the purely spiritual nature of man (the spirit) was exempt from the effects of Adamic sin, and that original sin was transmitted only through the soul. Since they felt that the physical nature could not be the ground of all that was suffered in the human race, the soul as a distinct nature from the spirit was necessary, as sufficient ground for the transmission of original sin. "If the spiritual nature

¹Ibid.

²Wiley, op. cit., p. 17.

is excepted from the effect of Adamic sin, trichotomy must be true because it is the requirement of facts in the case of such exception."¹

Again, however, the exception of the spirit from the effects of the fall is no logical implication of the theory of trichotomy. The theory only has been used to serve as the basis for such an error.

Wiley mentions also the error of Placaeus, ". . . whose name is generally associated with the theory of mediate imputation," and who taught that "the pneuma (spirit) only was directly created by God."² He regarded the soul as mere animal life, created with the body, and therefore perishing with it.

Still another error mentioned by Wiley is that of Julius Mueller, who taught that the psyche (soul) is derived from Adam, but that the pneuma (spirit) was pre-existent. "He explains the doctrine of depravity by supposing that these pre-existent spirits which are embodied at birth had previously been corrupted."³ Again, the theory is based on the idea of a tri-partite division of man's nature, but does not of necessity derive from this idea.

The last error listed by Wiley is that of annihilationism, although it is not certain that this existed in the early church period or is from later times only. This is the doctrine of those who hold that man by sin lost the divine element called spirit which had been breathed

¹Wiley, op. cit.

²Wiley, op. cit., p. 18.

³Ibid.

into his body at the time of creation. They believe that this is regained by regeneration only and therefore only those who have been regenerated will live forever; those who are unregenerated, the unsaved, will cease to exist at death. Immortality, therefore, is considered to be conditional and only the possession of those who have been regenerated --or in other words, those who have received again their eternal spirit which was lost in the fall. This heresy also is clearly seen to depend upon the trichotomic view of human nature.

Thus the early church largely moved away from the trichotomy they had inherited from the Greeks, and this was due to the multitude of heresies which surrounded that view. Pope summarizes thus:

Hence the healthier tone of Christian teaching, especially in the West, found it needful to hold fast the Dichotomy of human nature: body and soul, flesh and spirit, being interchangeable expressions for the dual nature of man.¹

The division of opinion in Church history regarding dichotomy or trichotomy has followed generally the division of the Church in east and west. Berkhof declares:

The trichotomic conception of man found considerable favor with the Greek or Alexandrian Church Fathers of the early Christian centuries. It is found, though not always in exactly the same form, in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Gregory of Nyssa. But after Apollinaris employed it in a manner impinging on the perfect humanity of Jesus, it was gradually discredited. Some of the Greek Fathers still adhered to it, though Athanasius and Theodoret explicitly repudiated it. In the Latin Church the leading theologians distinctly favored the twofold division of human nature. It was especially the psychology of Augustine that gave prominence to this view. During the Middle Ages it

¹Pope, op. cit.

had become a matter of common belief.¹

Both Wiley and Thiessen witness to this fact: "The Eastern church in general, held to the theory of trichotomy, the Western church to dichotomy."² "The Western church generally held to dichotomy, and is best represented by Anselm, while the Eastern church generally held to trichotomy, and is best represented by John of Damascus."³

II. REFORMATION TIMES

The continuing importance of dissociating themselves from the errors that had crept into the early church surrounding the theory of trichotomy was no doubt the most important factor which held the reformers to a firm belief in the two-fold nature of man. Berkhof says, "The Reformation brought no change in this respect, though a few lesser lights defended the trichotomic theory."⁴

It has been asserted that Luther may be quoted on both sides of the controversy, but a careful study of his writings reveals that he clearly held to dichotomy.⁵

In his "Treatise on Christian Liberty" Martin Luther states that

¹Berkhof, op. cit., pp. 191-192.

²Wiley, op. cit., p. 17.

³Henry C. Thiessen, Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), p. 225.

⁴Berkhof, op. cit., p. 192.

⁵Strong, op. cit., p. 487.

Man has a wofold nature, a spiritual and a bodily. According to the spiritual nature, which men call the soul, he is called a spiritual, or inner, or new man; according to the bodily nature, which men call the flesh, he is called a carnal, or outward, or old man. . .¹

In another writing when he was speaking of the Scriptural expressions of body, soul and spirit, Martin Luther indicated his loyalty to the dichotomic view. Although he began with the statement that the Scriptures assign three parts to man and quoted the passage from I Thesalonians 5:23, he went on to explain what he believed about these distinctive words:

The first part, the spirit, is the highest, deepest and noblest part of man. By it he is enabled to lay hold on things incomprehensible, invisible, and eternal. . . The second part, or the soul, is this same spirit, so far as its nature is concerned, but viewed as performing a different function, namely, giving life to the body and working through the body.²

It is true that Luther goes on to illustrate human nature in the following fashion:

In the tabernacle fashioned by Moses there were three separate compartments. The first was called the holy of holies: here was God's dwelling-place, and in it there was no light. The second was called the holy place: here stood a candlestick with seven arms and seven lamps. The third was called the outer court: this lay under the open sky and in the full light of the sun. In this tabernacle we have a figure of the Christian man. His spirit is the holy of holies, where God dwells in the darkness of faith, where no light is; for he believes that which he neither sees nor feels nor comprehends. His soul is the holy place, with its seven lamps, that is, all manner of reason, discrimination, knowledge and understanding of visible and bodily things. His body is the

¹Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. (ed.), A Compend of Luther's Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. 77.

²Ibid., p. 78 (Italics not in the original).

forecourt, open to all, so that men may see his works and manner of life.¹

But this illustration, as with probably all illustrations, cannot be definitive, and should probably be taken in more of a poetic sense than of a true statement of Luther's position. This is especially true in view of the fact that he has elsewhere strongly declared for the two-fold view of human nature, and has here stated his view that the spirit and the soul are essentially the same and only differ in function or relationship.

As to John Calvin, another important figure of Reformation times, we have his witness that

Man, body and soul, is a creature, created ex nihilo. Certainly as compared to the body the soul must be regarded as having something essential by which it survives the body and is distinguished from it, as that which inhabits or is imprisoned by the body.²

In his Institutes Calvin declares

That man consists of soul and body, ought not to be controverted. By the "soul" I understand an immortal, yet created essence, which is the nobler part of him. Sometimes it is called a "spirit;" for though, when these names are connected, they have a different signification, yet when "spirit" is used separately, it means the same as "soul;"³

Calvin went on to defend the concept of the true existence of the soul as an entity that exists apart from the body. This he did, evident-

¹Ibid.

²T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 26. (Italics in the original).

³John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1932), I, 171.

ly, to controvert those who would teach a form of materialism and deny the very existence of a spiritual nature in man. He declared on the subject of the final resurrection that, "Unless our souls survive our bodies, what is it that is present with God when separated from the body?"¹

Thus it may be seen that both Luther and Calvin of the Reformation times held to the dichotomous view of human nature. In referring to the errors which crept into the early Church as a result of the trichotomic view, Charles Hodge concludes

All Protestants, Lutheran and Reformed, were, therefore, the more zealous in maintaining that the soul and spirit, psyche and pneuma are one and the same substance and essence. And this, as before remarked, has been the common doctrine of the Church.²

III. MODERN THEOLOGIANS (19th AND 20th CENTURIES)

Every form of conception of human nature is to be found today among theologians, all the way from an outright trichotomic view to an essential monochotomy. It has been necessary to consider the representative viewpoints under the following classifications.

Trichotomists

Not very many outstanding theologians are found under this heading, and those who may be classified as trichotomists are for the most part those who have only superficially treated this subject. They

¹Ibid., II, 208.

²Hodge, op. cit., p. 51.

appear to have not given much consideration to the history of Christian doctrine and to the past results of those who have embraced this theory. Some even give evidence of falling into the error of the Greek dualists who taught that spirit and matter could not join or come together without an intermediary. Some examples follow.

Mark G. Cambron, a Baptist preacher and Bible teacher, in his book on Bible Doctrines, has a section entitled "Man's Nature Seen in Man's Tri-unity". He quotes Genesis 2:7 and then 1 Thessalonians 5:23 with emphasis on the words "spirit", "soul", and "body". He declares concerning the soul that

The soul is the seat of the emotions and appetites. Plants, animals and man have bodies; only animals and man have a soul; but only man has a spirit. The soul is the conscious life which is in man and animal. Plants have life, but it is unconscious life. There is a difference between the souls of men and the souls of animals. The animal's soul is connected with his body, while man's soul is connected with his spirit. The soul of an animal dies with the animal, but man's soul never dies, for he was made a "living soul"--a soul that would never die.¹

As has been shown later in this study, some of the statements made here regarding the soul and spirit have no basis in the Bible although this man was purporting to outline what the Bible teaches on this subject.

The Baptist theologian Emery H. Bancroft has also declared that the Scriptures teach a tri-partite view of human nature. He states, "Thus in the very beginning of Scripture we are warned against the popular phraseology of soul and body, which has long sustained an erroneous

¹Mark G. Cambron, Bible Doctrines (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954), pp. 157-159.

belief that man consists of but two parts."¹

Although Bancroft states that "The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that man as constituted by creation has a material nature and an immaterial nature," he goes on to say that, "The immaterial nature consists of his soul and spirit."² His further explanation of this two-fold division of man's immaterial nature appears to go back to and depend upon the Platonic Greek conception of dualism.

Man was thus made up of only two independent elements, the corporeal and the spiritual: but when God placed the spirit within the casing of earth, the combination of these produced a third part, and man became a living soul. For direct communication between spirit and flesh is impossible: their intercourse can be carried on only by means of a medium, and the instant production of one was the result of their contact in Adam.³

Another present-day preacher and expositor who embraces the trichotomic view is Herbert Lockyer. He declares that

Man is a tripartite being, made up of spirit, soul and body. There are those expositors who reject this trinity-in-unity possession, and accept the dual nature of man. Soul and spirit are treated as being identical and not separate and distinct elements. While it is a fact that spirit and soul are sometimes used as interchangeable terms, in the majority of cases they are employed as contrasted terms.⁴

It is notable that this writer then proceeds to give two examples of what he calls "the majority of cases".

¹Emery H. Bancroft, Christian Theology (Johnson City, N.Y.: Johnson City Publishing Company, 1946), p. 119.

²Ibid., p. 118.

³Ibid., p. 119.

⁴Herbert Lockyer, All the Doctrines of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964), p. 143.

Again, this viewpoint holds to the origination of the soul as a result of the union of spirit and body.

The soul is derived from the union of the body and the spirit, and in turn is that which unifies them. Man has a body and a spirit, but he is a soul. He "became a living soul." The infusion of the immaterial spirit into the material frame produced the third possession, a soul, and it is reasonable to suppose that with the separation of the body from the spirit, that which depended upon their union ceases to be. Spirit can exist apart from body, and body can exist apart from spirit, but the soul cannot exist while spirit and body are apart.¹

A more well-known representative of the trichotomic view is James Stalker. In his book on Christian Psychology he states that

If any person of ordinary intelligence were asked to say of what elements a human being is composed, the likelihood is that he would reply, Body and soul; for such is the modern and popular view of human nature. The Bible, however, takes a different view: it speaks of man as composed of body, soul and spirit. That is to say, while the modern division of human nature is twofold, the biblical is threefold; or, in learned language, the one is a dichotomy and the other a trichotomy.²

Stalker, also, believes that "The soul is the intermediate element in man's nature, between the body at the bottom and the spirit at the top."³

He elaborates on this further when he continues:

Let it be repeated, that this is not modern but scriptural language. Even in the Scripture it is not used scientifically, but popularly; as is clearly proved by the fact that the Bible does not use it consistently, but sometimes speaks of the soul, as we do, as a name for the whole of the inner man, and only now and then speaks of soul and spirit as distinct from each other. . . . On the whole, however,

¹Ibid., p. 144.

²Stalker, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

³Ibid., p. 53.

the Bible splits the entity which we call the soul into two parts--soul and spirit...¹

Another trichotomist, this time from the Arminian tradition in theology, is Oswald Chambers. In his classic on Biblical Psychology he holds that, "Thus in man, degenerate or regenerate, there are three aspects, spirit, soul and body."²

Chambers also holds to the view that the soul is a result of the union of the spirit and the body. He states

The soul is the holder of the body and spirit together, and when the spirit has gone back to God who gave it, the soul goes with the body. But in the resurrection there is another body, a glorified body, a body impossible to describe in words, either a glorified or a damnation body, and instantly you have the soul life manifested again. (See John 5:28, 29).³

Further expressions of this idea can be seen in his statements that "So man's soul is not his body or his spirit, but is that creation which holds his spirit and his body together, and is the medium of expressing his spirit in his body."⁴ "Soul is the holder of spirit and body together."⁵ In answering his own question as to what is the relationship between soul and spirit and where did the soul come from, he proposed that "Soul has no existence until spirit and body come together."⁶

¹Ibid., pp. 53-54.

²Oswald Chambers, Biblical Psychology (Cincinnati, Ohio: God's Revivalist Office, 1914), p. 14.

³Ibid., p. 95.

⁴Ibid., p. 15.

⁵Ibid., p. 46.

⁶Ibid., p. 48.

The former Methodist bishop R. S. Foster supported the trichotomic view in his Studies in Theology. He says, "A strict analysis, we think, favors the tripartite view of man..."¹ He held, however, that spirit alone was man in his true essence, and that body and soul were both temporary and accidental to man's true existence.

. . . man is shrined in a body which is also the abode of an animal soul; and in this sense man is triplex as to his present mode of existence. But we shall now endeavor to show that two of the members of the complex are not essential to the man, and therefore not component parts, but only temporary incidents of his existence for a purpose.²

. . . it is our contention that the immortal spirit is man, and that the physical organism and the animal soul which are made with it and for it are both and alike but temporary adjuncts to him, serving an end and then disappearing forever.³

In essence, then, Foster is a monochotomist, but for the present existence of man he admits to trichotomy.

One other view should be mentioned here. This is represented by Amos Binney and Daniel Steele who hold that

Man is a compound being, having a mortal body and spirit which is devoid of all material qualities, and is immortal, continuing to live after separation from the body in a state of conscious existence.⁴

Yet, after seeming to represent a dichotomous viewpoint, they proceed to

¹Randolph S. Foster, Studies in Theology (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1895), IV, 250.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 221.

⁴Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, Binney's Theological Compend Improved (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1902), p. 110.

elaborate in a trichotomous fashion:

Paul speaks of a third element, the soul. By this he means the psyche, the lower or animal soul, containing the passions and desires which we have in common with the brutes. . . but this in Christians is ennobled and spiritualized. The spirit is that part whereby we are receptive of the Holy Spirit. In the unbeliever it is crushed down and subordinated to the animal soul, and hence he is called a natural or merely animal man.¹

These are the representative views advocating trichotomy. As has been seen most of them regard the soul as being a result and coming into existence due to the uniting of spirit and body.

Dichotomists

There are far many more theologians, it appears, who hold to the dichotomic theory of man's nature than to trichotomy. However, not all of those who hold this view do so with equal clarity. It has been necessary to divide this group into two classes--those who hold an ambiguous theory of dichotomy, and those who stand for a definite and clear-cut position of dichotomy.

The Baptist theologian H. C. Thiessen seems to follow A. H. Strong quite closely, but whereas Strong quite clearly denies trichotomy, Thiessen hesitates and concludes that ". . . man's immaterial nature is looked upon as one nature, but as composed of two parts."² He further declares his purpose in taking this "in-between" view: "This variation from the traditional trichotomous view makes it possible to conserve the arguments for the dichotomous view, and yet explain how some Christians

¹Ibid.

²Thiessen, op. cit., p. 227.

are 'carnal' and others 'spiritual'.^{#1}

Thiessen's main reasons for leaning toward trichotomy seem to be the Scripture passages which he feels indicate this. "These Scriptures seem to point to trichotomy."² Yet he comes close to a possible resolution of his problem in the statement, "But is it not possible that they are merely intended to include the whole man?"³

He ascribes to the soul ". . . man's imagination, memory, understanding; to the spirit, his powers of reason, conscience, and free will."⁴

Another who holds such an ambiguous position is William Burt Pope.

He states:

It will be obvious, however, to those who weigh well the utterances of Scripture, that, provided the original constituent elements of human nature are only two, the whole religious history of man requires a certain distinction between soul and spirit: his one personality being connected by his soul with the world of sense, and by his spirit with the world of faith. Yet soul and spirit make up one person.⁵

The old-time standard Methodist theologian Miley takes the position that this whole question is inconsequential and that there can be no conclusive decision. Although well aware of the background in church history of the trichotomic view and its attendant heresies, Miley feels

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Pope, op. cit.

that the theory of trichotomy is not necessarily brought into disrepute just because these heresies have used it. He declares that trichotomy

... does not seriously concern any important doctrine of Christian theology. It is a question of speculative interest in biblical psychology, but has no doctrinal implications decisive of either its truth or falsity.¹

Otherwise, Miley holds to a dichotomy. He says under the heading of the "Constituent Natures of Man",

On the face of the sacred narrative there are two distinct natures, body and mind, in the original constitution of man. This fact itself decides nothing respecting the theory of trichotomy, but is so far the obvious truth of the Mosaic narrative. Man is certainly dichotomic.²

The reason why Miley holds essentially to dichotomy is that he finds no distinction between the Scriptural use of the words "spirit" and "soul".

"We thus find a concurrence of meanings in the Scripture use of soul and spirit which precludes any essential distinction between them."³ Therefore he concludes:

It was previously stated that a uniform distinction of Hebrew and Greek terms for the designation of the animal and the rational life of man would constitute a strong argument for trichotomy. In the total absence of such discrimination there is no such argument. On the other hand, the indiscriminate and interchanging use of these terms may fairly be claimed as an argument for the dichotomic view of man. We do not think it conclusive. It follows that we have reached no dogmatic conclusion on the question of trichotomy. We are not concerned for the attainment of such a result, and for the reason previously stated, that the question does not seriously concern any important truth of Christian theology.⁴

¹Miley, op. cit., p. 400.

²Ibid., p. 397.

³Ibid., p. 402.

⁴Ibid., pp. 402-403.

It is apparent from further study that not many theologians take this sort of noncommittal view toward this issue. Most regard the decision as truly important and actually affecting one's views on other theological doctrines.

Such is H. Orton Wiley, who has been quoted previously on the fact that widely divergent opinions can develop in later theological study according to which view is taken.¹ However, Wiley himself is somewhat ambiguous on this question. He commences his discussion of this subject with this comment:

The twofold position of man, at once a part of nature, and a free spirit transcending nature, gives rise to perplexing questions concerning the constituent elements of his personality.²

Wiley espouses the dichotomic position in saying that "This simpler position seems to be more in harmony with the scriptural representations of the constituent elements of man than the more elaborately worked out hypotheses."³ He then indicates the background for the trichotomic theory:

There is another class of scriptures, found more especially in the New Testament Epistles, which seem to indicate that man is of a three-fold or trichotomous nature. This usage grew out of the Platonic philosophy which the church inherited, and which regarded man as of a threefold essence. Pythagoras, and following him Plato, taught that man consists of three constituent elements, the rational spirit..., the animal soul..., and the body.... This classification was so generally accepted by the later Greek and Roman philosophers that its usage came to be stamped upon popular

¹See above, p. 6.

²Wiley, op. cit., p. 15.

³Ibid., pp. 16-17.

speech as expressive of the entire nature of man. When, therefore, St. Paul would stress man in the totality of his being, he prays that the 'whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless' (I Thess. 5:23).¹

After outlining the errors to which the trichotomic theory has led in the Church, Wiley affirms

We must conclude, then, that the Scriptures bear out the theory of dichotomy, in so far as the essential elements of man are concerned, that is, he is body and spirit, a material and an immaterial essence conjoined to form one person.²

But then he creates an ambiguous impression by going on to say, "But we may admit, also, a practical trichotomy in both ordinary speech and in scriptural terminology."³ He adds later that

While man is composed of a material and an immaterial portion, the latter in exact Scripture terminology is viewed in a twofold manner. When viewed as the power of animating a physical organism it is called psyche or soul; when viewed as a rational and moral agent, this same immaterial portion is known as pneuma or spirit. In the usage of St. Paul, the pneuma is man's higher part in relation to spiritual things; the psyche is that same higher part in relation to bodily things.⁴

This latter explanation of the soul being "the same higher part" as the spirit but viewed in a different relationship, is the general approach of most theologians who clearly stand for the dichotomio position.

The renowned Baptist theologian A. H. Strong forcefully supports

¹Ibid., p. 17.

²Ibid., pp. 18-19.

³Ibid., p. 19.

⁴Ibid.

the dichotomic theory. Under the heading of "Essential Elements of Human Nature" he declares,

Man has a two-fold nature, --on the one hand material, on the other hand immaterial. He consists of body, and of spirit, or soul. That there are two, and only two, elements in man's being, is a fact to which consciousness testifies. This testimony is confirmed by Scripture, in which the prevailing representation of man's constitution is that of dichotomy.¹

Strong definitely opposes the tri-partite view. He says,

The trichotomous theory...as it is ordinarily defined, endangers the unity and immateriality of our higher nature, by holding that man consists of three substances, or three component parts--body, soul, and spirit--and that soul and spirit are as distinct from each other as are soul and body.²

As to the supposed supporting Scripture passages for trichotomy

Strong declares,

The passages chiefly relied upon as supporting trichotomy may be better explained upon the view already indicated, that soul and spirit are not two distinct substances or parts, but that they designate the immaterial principle from different points of view.³

Thus, Strong takes an unequivocal stand for dichotomy and gives his clearly stated reasons for doing so. The important point to be noted here is the way in which he absolutely denies that man is composed of three substances, but, on the other hand, allows the one immaterial part of man to be regarded from more than one point of view, and in this manner be given more than one name--namely, soul or spirit.

From the Reformed tradition of theology Hodge and Berkhof both

¹Strong, op. cit., p. 483.

²Ibid., p. 484.

³Ibid.

espouse the dichotomic position. Hodge states that

The Scriptures teach that God formed the body of man out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life and he became a living soul. According to this account, man consists of two distinct principles, a body and a soul: the one material, the other immaterial; the one corporeal, the other spiritual. It is involved in this statement, first, that the soul of man is a substance; and secondly, that it is a substance distinct from the body. So that in the constitution of man two distinct substances are included.¹

He further declares that

The Scriptures do not formally teach any system of psychology, but there are certain truths relating both to our physical and mental constitution, which they constantly assume. They assume, as we have seen, that the soul is a substance; that it is a substance distinct from the body; and that there are two, and not more than two, essential elements in the constitution of man.²

Again, it is clear that Hodge also is opposed to trichotomy. He declares of this theory that it has greatly influenced the form in which other doctrines of the Church have been presented. He feels that the trichotomic theory has been held to a greater or less extent in the Church because ". . . it has some semblance of support from the Scriptures themselves."³ Hodge then proceeds, however, to show that trichotomy is actually "anti-Scriptural", in his terms.

Berkhof clearly declares that "The two words, "soul" and "spirit" do not denote two different elements in man, but serve to designate the one spiritual substance of man."⁴ After considering several Biblical

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 42.

²Ibid., p. 43.

³Ibid., p. 47.

⁴Louis Berkhof, Manual of Reformed Doctrine (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1933), pp. 121-122.

passages to support his viewpoint he concludes that

These two terms merely serve to designate the spiritual element of man from two different points of view. The word "spirit" contemplates it as the principle of life and action which controls the body; while the word "soul" refers to it as the personal subject in man, which thinks and feels and wills, and in some cases particularly as the seat of affections.¹

This theologian's opposition to trichotomy is seen in his statement that "This conception of man did not result from the study of Scripture, but was born of the study of Greek philosophy."² He concludes by pointing out that a proper understanding of the Biblical passages where support is sought for trichotomy reveals no real support for that theory.

Other supporters of the dichotomy view include William Newton Clarke, who speaks of the human constitution of body and spirit. He states that, "This twofold division of man is the one that we most readily put forward, because it is the one that is most naturally and instinctively discerned in common life."³

M. Maldwyn Hughes in his book entitled Basic Beliefs adds his voice to the majority when he declares concerning the words "soul" and "spirit":

It is not easy to distinguish clearly between the use of these two terms in the New Testament. Sometimes they are synonymous. It seems best to regard soul and spirit together as representing the higher side of man's nature and spirit as having special reference

¹Ibid., p. 122.

²Ibid.

³William Newton Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), p. 182.

to the higher nature as redeemed by Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.¹

F. G. Smith, of the Church of God, simply asserts that, "The Scriptures represent man as a twofold, or dual, being, possessed of body and soul, or body and spirit."²

From the Episcopal tradition, W. Norman Pittenger states that "Man is neither soul alone, nor body alone, but body-soul unity..."³ This sort of viewpoint begins to approach a monochotomy, but only in that it stresses the true unity of the human constitution. It actually affirms the essential existence of the two parts in human nature.

Another person who would wish to stress the essential unity of human nature but yet tacitly admits the twofold nature of the human personality is Warren C. Young. He declares that "The Christian philosophy is built on the teaching that man is twofold, body and soul..."⁴ Young rightfully emphasizes the fact that man should be considered as a unit. He says

The body is necessary for the complete and perfect expression of personality, hence, the importance of the teaching on the resurrection body. While the soul or spirit may exist in separation

¹H. Maldwyn Hughes, Basic Beliefs (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929), p. 62.

²F. G. Smith, What the Bible Teaches (Anderson, Indiana: Warner Press, Inc., 1955), condensed edition, p. 18.

³W. Norman Pittenger, The Christian Understanding of Human Nature (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 19.

⁴Warren C. Young, A Christian Approach to Philosophy (Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1954), p. 214.

from the body, such a state is always one of incompleteness.¹

He states in another place that "The separation of the body and the soul, even temporarily, is viewed as unnatural [in the Bible]."²

Even Emil Brunner, from the Neo-orthodox tradition, has witnessed to the twofold division of human nature while yet emphasizing the unity. He says,

It is a well-known fact, at least within the Christian Church, and among readers of the Bible, that the Bible understands man as a whole, as an entity consisting of "soul" or "spirit" and "body".³

One final representative of the dichotomous view to be presented here is that of the Methodist theologian Henry C. Sheldon. He takes the slightly unusual approach that the only way to settle the trichotomy-dichotomy issue is by human reason. He declares:

In short, if it were to be contended that the Scriptures prescribe any theory, more could probably be said in favor of their teaching dichotomy than for the notion that they inculcate trichotomy. But the better conclusion is that they authoritatively teach neither the one nor the other. . . . the Bible leaves open the question whether man is dual or triple in his essence. This question must be determined on rational grounds.

Viewing the subject from this standpoint, we have no hesitation in pronouncing for dichotomy, as being commended by its greater simplicity and intelligibility.⁴

So for one reason or many, the majority of Protestant theologians

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 220.

³Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 61.

⁴Henry C. Sheldon, System of Christian Doctrine (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1903), p. 274.

of recent times have espoused the theory of dichotomy and have opposed the theory of trichotomy, some more strongly and clearly than others.

Monochotomists

There are a few theologians who place a strong emphasis on the unitary nature of man's being. The monochotomic view is, of course, that held by the materialist who denies the existence or reality of soul or spirit. Such a person regards man as essentially a functioning organism. This viewpoint might be called a materialistic monochotomy; the following has been said of it:

The foregoing point is illustrated by a recent publication in which the author attempts to show that mental life, spirit, values, beauty, and the soul are all inherent in the human self-regulated cell. The living organism is thought of as "a magician of nature."¹

This, of course, is not what is meant by those Christian theologians who hold to a monochotomist position. But they all have the problem of how to distinguish the reality of a continuing spiritual something within the physical organism that will continue to exist after the organism has ceased to function.

Various expressions of this view may be found. The authors of the book just referred to, a symposium from the Lutheran standpoint, appear to hold to such a monochotomy. They declare:

The emphasis should also be made that man is an indivisible unity, according to the presentation of the Scriptures. He cannot be split into several parts. Total man is presented as a "living

¹Paul Meehl, et. al., What, Then, Is Man? (Saint Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), p. 317. The book referred to is Edmund W. Sinnott, The Biology of the Spirit (New York: The Viking Press, 1955).

soul," and each bodily function is merely an aspect of the entire functioning person.¹

These authors express their opinion as to the use of words which have given rise to trichotomy. Their position is as follows:

A brief reference to the word spirit as used in Holy Writ seems necessary, since its use is at times interpreted as indicating that man is a tripartite being, having body, soul, and spirit. Spirit, as used in Scripture, must, of course, also be interpreted in terms of its immediate context as well as within the frame of Scripture. Frequently the word means Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost. In several instances it refers to angels. At times it is used synonymously with soul. Beyond these meanings the word is used over and over in the sense of what might be termed the operational content and direction of man's thoughts, words, and actions. Spirit, then, is a fruit, an outcome of the individual's life and experience. It is a reaction to stimuli in the light of one's past experience.²

The conclusion reached in this symposium is that man is not composed of either two or three constituent elements but is a single entity. The authors state, "If spirit is regarded as a functional outcome rather than a separate structural entity, the difficult and troublesome trichotomy theory becomes entirely unnecessary."³ They claim that if the various Biblical terms (body, soul, spirit, mind, heart, strength) are interpreted "...as descriptive terms to include the whole man, the entire being, we arrive, as previously, at a unitary being."⁴

Another expression of the monochotomic view is found in the book

¹Ibid., p. 53.

²Ibid., p. 319.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 319-320.

by I. Howard Marshall, entitled Christian Beliefs. He declares first of all that

Just as the Bible does not try to give us a scientific account of the world in general, so it does not give us a systematic account of the nature of man couched in scientific terminology. It is in fact dangerous to attempt to construct a biblical 'psychology' because the same psychological terms are used in the different books of the Bible with different shades of meaning.¹

The author goes on to summarize his view of what the Bible teaches in regard to the terms describing man:

In general...we can say that in the Old Testament man is regarded as a creature made of flesh and bones; he is described as being (not 'having') a living soul, and his life is inbreathed by God. ...In the New Testament, man has a body composed of flesh and blood...and he has, or is, a soul (psyche) and a spirit (pneuma) ...Roughly speaking, the word 'body' is used of man as a physical being, 'soul' of him as a being who associates with other men, and 'spirit' of him as a being who has fellowship with God. This is not to say that he has three 'parts'; rather, there are three different ways of looking at man.²

Thus Marshall appears to hold to a true monochotomic position, indicating that the three terms--body, soul, and spirit--are merely representative of different ways of looking at man.

The Baptist theologian Knudsen also appears to hold to this position. After an extensive discussion of the terms soul and spirit he makes this conclusion:

The suggestive terms, sarx, psyche, and pneuma, are not attempts to interpret man in three parts, or even in two parts, for "man is a living unity". Sarx is the material of the body, while psyche

¹I. Howard Marshall, Christian Beliefs (Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1963), p. 39.

²Ibid.

and pneuma are the expressions of the inner self or ego capable of life in conscious and willful reality in mutual relationship with God and man. This is the unity of man living in a body but as a conscious being who can have fellowship with God.¹

The expression in quotation marks above is from Rudolf Bultmann's book entitled Theology of the New Testament, and is thus somewhat indicative of his espousal of the monochotomic viewpoint as well.

A somewhat unusual attitude toward the monochotomic viewpoint coming from one who apparently accepts the Bible and is not an outright materialist, is that expressed by Dr. C. L. Ives in his book, Bible Doctrines of the Soul:

There is no real distinction between the body and the soul. The body is the soul, and the soul is the body. All that the Bible has to say of a soul, we say of an organism. It appertains to man and to animals. It is material: it is liable to death. Hence death is the end of human existence....It must be inferred that the current notion of a soul surviving the body is opposed to the Bible.²

It appears that one of the dangerous tendencies that can be a consequence of the monochotomic view is this return to essential materialism. If no possible distinction can be made between the organism and that which functions in and through the organism, one is left with the conclusion that the organism itself is all that exists and really matters.

Such does not seem to be the attitude of those truly evangelical theologians who nevertheless espouse the monochotomic view. They are essentially interested in stressing the unity of human existence--the

¹Ralph E. Knudsen, Theology in the New Testament (Valley Forge, Pa.: The Judson Press, 1964), p. 227.

²quoted in Taylor, op. cit., p. 12.

fundamental necessity of man being united body and soul for his complete and perfect existence. Erich Sauer in his book, The King of the Earth, seems to express this when he speaks of a "psycho-somatic unity" of man.¹ In this expression he tacitly admits the twofold nature of man (psyche and soma) while at the same time emphasizing the essential unity.

Perhaps the most outstanding proponent of the monochotomic view is G. C. Berkouwer, Reformed theologian of the Netherlands. In his book, Man: The Image of God, he insists strongly for a monochotomic view and yet seems to admit the reality of the dual nature of man--body and soul. What he is attempting to set forth is apparently just what has been mentioned above--an emphasis on the necessity of regarding man as a unified being. He regards man as a whole because he insists that the image of God penetrates the whole being of man. Berkouwer declares:

The discussion has especially turned on this point, whether the term "soul" as used in Scripture has some special religious emphasis in the sense that we must deduce at least some sort of dichotomy. And this is more and more denied by theologians. Their denial does not mean that the soul should become "secularized", but rather that it may not be made the special seat of religion, in dichotomistic and anthropological fashion, since religion deals precisely with the relation of the whole man with God.²

Berkouwer does not feel that it is possible to systematize the different Biblical terms regarding man in any way and that to do so leads to something less than the Biblical view of the image of God in

¹Erich Sauer, The King of the Earth (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 109.

²G. C. Berkouwer, Man: The Image of God (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 201.

man. He states:

We have already in another chapter seen that theologians have often, in connection with man as the image of God, made various distinctions and in sometimes peculiar fashion have localized the image in man's soul in distinction from his body, which was thus not part of the image.

They asked that attention be given to the fact that Scripture appears to concern itself not merely with man in his totality, but as well with man in terms of his various aspects, and makes distinctions which appear to show a certain anthropological concentration on one or another kind of composition or structuredness of man.¹

Berkouwer admits that the Scriptures do indeed speak of man in very differing ways and that these distinctions "...are enough to raise the problem whether our attention is not thereby directed to clearly defined parts of man in terms of an independent anthropological interest."² But his interest is in the question, "...whether Scripture directs its attention to some part of man in which his uniqueness or essence can be found, in distinction from other parts of his humanness."³ He believes that if this were so, "...Scripture would demand attention not so much for the whole man as for the essence of his humanness."⁴

Berkouwer comments on the fact that many attempts have been made to search through the Biblical material bearing on man's nature in order to deduce a clear-cut system of anthropology or psychology. He declares that these attempts have only made it clear that due to the great variety

¹Ibid., p. 198.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 199.

of concepts used in the Bible, it is not possible to synthesize them into a clear structure of the nature of man. He refers to the fact that J. A. T. Robinson, in his book entitled A Study in Pauline Theology, even speaks of a "chaotic" use of terms. Berkouwer quotes Robinson as saying, "...from the standpoint of analytic psychology and physiology, the usage of the O. T. is chaotic; it is the nightmare of the anatomist, when any part can stand at any moment for the whole."¹ Yet Berkouwer feels that in making such a statement Robinson is implying too much of a scientific context of fixed usage in the Bible.

Berkouwer concludes that there is a fairly general consensus of opinion among theologians as a result of Biblical research, that man is an impressive diversity and yet, at the same time, the Biblical view never loses sight of the unity of the whole man--in fact, it "...rather brings it out and accentuates it."²

The main purpose Berkouwer has in mind in holding to a monochotomy is that he feels that the religious in man cannot be specifically related to one or another part of man as such.³ He feels that such a localization is, indeed, used at times in the Bible to show God's relation to the whole man, but that when it is used it is for the purpose of referring to the whole man. He declares:

Such words have as their purpose not the shedding of light on the

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 200.

³Ibid., p. 201.

compositional structure of man, but rather to deal with the whole man in all his complex of functions; not to deal with a part of man in distinction from other parts, but to deal with man in his total existence, which lies open before the examining eye of God.¹

In this sense, Berkouwer is very much like the dichotomists who recognize a functional distinction (but not an essential distinction) between soul and spirit. He simply goes one step farther and says that the only distinction between body and soul (or body and spirit) is a functional one. In doing this, he seems interested solely in bringing to the forefront the unity of man's nature and the fact that man in his totality is involved in a religious way. This, by the way, is something that most dichotomists recognize also. Berkouwer summarizes thus:

It appears clearly, then, that Scripture never pictures man as a dualistic, or pluralistic being, but that in all its varied expressions the whole man comes to the fore, in all his guilt and sin, his need and oppression, his longings and his nostalgia. And it is thus a priori unlikely that the Biblical view of man will distinguish a higher and a lower part in man implying that the higher part is holier than the lower and stands closer to God, the lower as such then being impure and sinful and further away from the God of life.²

In an extended discussion, Berkouwer deals still further with the problem of dichotomy, which he recognizes is not easily resolved. He goes on to state that

It is, however, understandable that theologians, even when acknowledging the many-sided terminological usage of Scripture, have time and again raised the question whether there is not at least one important distinction which springs so clearly to the fore that we can hardly avoid the impression that we have to do with a normative Biblical distinction: namely, the dichotomy between soul and

¹Ibid., p. 202.

²Ibid., p. 203.

body, the duality-in-unity of two substances. Do we not here encounter a certain anthropological and structural reference in God's revelation? And may we not then rightly conclude that this dichotomy is a Biblical anthropological given?¹

Berkouwer appears to answer these latter two questions in the negative. This is not to say that he does not recognize the legitimate use of the two terms, body and soul, for they have been used in the creeds of the church as well as in the Bible and he professes to accept both.² Rather, he is dealing with the question whether we must accept as Biblical teaching that man is composed of two substances, soul and body. Apparently he regards the legitimate use of the two terms to be when they are taken as different ways of referring to the whole man, but he is definitely opposed to regarding them as different substances. He declares:

Once man is thought of as put together of psychic and physical components, immortality is naturally associated with the psychic; and thus arises the dialectic that earmarks dichotomy, for the psychic (the soul) is now abstracted and isolated from the concrete context of human life, and made into the definitive immortal substance in man.³

Thus it seems that Berkouwer, among those theologians professing monochotomy, takes the strongest position for this view. And yet the essential purpose of his espousal of this view, as with the others, is to emphasize the real unity of human nature. This is undoubtedly a Scriptural emphasis and one that is equally maintained by most of the theologians accepting dichotomy; yet they do not see the necessity for

¹Ibid., p. 207.

²Ibid., p. 208.

³Ibid., pp. 215-216.

denying the separate and substantial existence of body and soul. The very fact that something of the essential nature of man survives the death of the body seems to be a reason against the monochotomic theory. Yet the emphasis should remain that body and soul are inextricably bound together in one existence in this lifetime and also once again in the resurrection life.

The following quotation from Raymond, in his Systematic Theology, volume II, page 24, is an instance of a dichotomist who nevertheless recognizes the unity of human nature:

God formed man's body of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul. This has been understood to teach that there are two, and only two, elements in the human constitution--one material and the other spiritual--the one matter and the other mind. These two are substances, entities, actually existing things, united in a manner to human thought, inscrutable, mysterious, incomprehensible, yet really united, and so united as to constitute one nature--a nature individualized, one, and yet both material and spiritual. It is only by the actuality of such union that certain facts of consciousness can be conceivably possible, such as pain from a fleshly wound. A spirit cannot be punctured by a pin, and though a dead body be punctured, pain is not produced. Matter is indispensable to the phenomenon, and mind to the consciousness produced by it. Man is not materialized mind, nor spiritualized matter, nor is he somewhat that is neither--or a somewhat between the two; but he is both, material as to his body, spiritual as to his mind, mysteriously united during his earthly existence in one individual person.¹

Here we have what is basically a monochotomy in dichotomy, a unity with duality.

The importance of emphasizing this unity is due to the fact that it makes the whole person responsible for sin and involved in the Fall,

¹quoted in Wiley, op. cit., p. 15. (Italics not in the original).

it honors the whole person as a being created by God and endowed with His image, it recognizes the possibility of God's Spirit inhabiting not only the soul but also the body, and it gives a "raison d'etre" for the future resurrection of the body to be reunited with the soul.

IV. SUMMARY

It has been seen that the early church appeared to embrace a form of trichotomy and that this was greatly influenced by the Greek ideas of Plato. The church very early, however, began to shift away from this position as it became more and more involved with heretical ideas regarding the nature of Christ, the nature of the Fall of man, the nature of original sin, and other doctrines. Thus the early church, at least in the West, came to hold generally to the idea of dichotomy.

The reformers continued to believe, as the church had generally held up to that time, in dichotomy. Both Luther and Calvin have been shown to hold the dichotomic view of human nature.

Among present-day theologians, however, there is more variety of viewpoints on this subject. A few hold to trichotomy, although those who appear to do so often treat this subject only superficially. It has also been found among those who hold trichotomy that they often fall into the ancient idea that spirit and matter can not join together without an intermediary of some sort. This they posit as the soul.

It seems that the majority of outstanding theologians today (including those of the past century as well) embrace the dichotomic view. Some of these theologians support this view more strongly and

with clearer conviction than others, while some tend to dismiss the subject as lacking real significance. It is interesting to note that generally the Reformed theologians come out most strongly for dichotomy, and that some Arminian theologians, especially the older Methodists, while leaning strongly towards dichotomy, take the attitude that the Biblical evidence is inconclusive and that the issue is really unimportant.

A few representatives of the monochotomic view may be found. While this view is obviously that held by the materialist who recognizes no other element in human nature but that of the organism functioning in itself, there are also some Christian theologians today (even Evangelical ones) who feel that this view alone represents the true Biblical way of viewing human nature. They wish to emphasize strongly the unity of human nature. Some who appear to support monochotomy actually recognize and admit to a greater or lesser degree the legitimate existence of soul (or spirit) as well as body. They thus, in actuality, end up with a sort of monochotomy in dichotomy, or a unity with duality.

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BIBLICAL WORDS INVOLVED

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BIBLICAL WORDS INVOLVED

While it is true that there are several words used in the Bible in regard to man's nature other than soul and spirit, such as mind, heart, and conscience, it should not be necessary to consider them all. Even as Stalker says in his comprehensive volume entitled Christian Psychology, "...it is not necessary in this place to expound all the terms belonging to Biblical Psychology."¹ He gives special attention to two terms only--soul and spirit. This, likewise, has been the purpose of this study--to investigate the Biblical usage of these two terms, in both their Old Testament and their New Testament usage. The Biblical words for the physical body of man are not much in question and thus have not been dealt with to any great extent here. If only a clear conception of the Biblical usage of the two words, soul and spirit, can be found it will help greatly to clarify the dichotomy-trichotomy issue.

I. SOUL (NEPHESH-PSYCHE)Old Testament Usage (nephesh)

The usual Hebrew word translated "soul" in the Old Testament is נֶפֶשׁ (nephesh). It occurs some 754 times in the Old Testament.²

¹Stalker, op. cit., p. 65.

²J. D. Douglas (ed.), The New Bible Dictionary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 1208.

The primary meaning of the word seems to be "possessing life".¹ Girdlestone says that it is "...properly speaking, the animating principle of the body..."² The first and primary use of this word where it is translated as "soul" is found in Genesis 2:7, "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

It is important to notice here that it is not said that man was first a living soul, and that then God breathed into him a spirit, nor even that man received a spirit from God, but simply that "...as a result of the inbreathing of the divine Spirit, the body becomes possessed and vitalized by a single principle--the living soul."³ It is not that man received a soul, but that man became "a living soul".

As a word indicating "possessing life", nephesh is frequently used of animals as well as of men. The Hebrew word has frequently been translated as a "living creature" or a "breathing creature". Examples of this usage are to be found in the first chapter of Genesis. "And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature (nephesh) that moveth, wherewith the waters swarmed...and every winged bird..."⁴ "And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their

¹Ibid.

²Robert Baker Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 56.

³Strong, op. cit., p. 483.

⁴Genesis 1:21.

kind...^{#1}

Again in Genesis chapter two, the Hebrew word nephesh is used in the statement that Adam named all the animals:

And out of the ground Jehovah God formed every beast of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called every living creature (nephesh, or literally, "soul"), that was the name thereof.²

The ninth chapter of Genesis contains no less than four occurrences of the Hebrew word nephesh, in each of which cases it has been translated "living creature", but is literally the word commonly translated "soul".³

In Leviticus 11:46 there are two occurrences of the word nephesh, one translated "living creature" and the other simply "creature". There is no doubt about the fact that reference is made to animals for as the text says, "This is the law of the beast, and of the bird, and of every living creature (nephesh) that moveth in the waters, and of every creature (nephesh) that creepeth upon the earth;"⁴

Thus it can be seen from these instances that the "living soul" which man became by the divine act described in Genesis 2:7, is something which man shares in common with the animals, at least so far as Old Testament usage is concerned. This should not be construed to mean that man is nothing more than the animals, or that there was not possibly

¹Genesis 1:24

²Genesis 2:19

³See Genesis 9:10, 12, 15, 16.

⁴See also Leviticus 11:10 and Ezekiel 47:9.

something unique in the divine act described in Genesis 2:7. But it must be recognized that the Hebrew concept of "soul" meant basically a "living creature".

It might be well to add here a comment as to just how man is distinct from the animals. Hodge says of the living principle called "soul" (or "spirit"): "That principle in the brute creation is irrational and mortal; in man it is rational and immortal."¹ The difference is found in the fact that man's spirit is in the image of God, while that of beasts is not. Buswell emphasizes this when he says: "The difference between man and beast is not that man has a soul or spirit..., but that man is created in the image of God."²

Another instance of the use of nephesh is found in Leviticus 24:18, which reads, "He that killeth a beast (nephesh behemah) shall make it good; beast (nephesh) for beast (nephesh)."³ This is literally, "He that smiteth the soul of a beast shall recompense it; soul for soul."⁴

The preceeding instance is basically a usage of the word nephesh to indicate "life"; indeed, the A.S.V. has translated the last phrase, "life for life." There are many more instances where this Hebrew word has been translated "life". "But flesh with the life (nephesh, or "soul")

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 49.

²Merrill C. Tenney (ed.), Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963), p. 807.

³Leviticus 24:18, K. J. V.

⁴Girdlestone, op. cit.

thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."¹ The following verse is more explicit:

And surely your blood, the blood of your lives (nephesh), will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it: and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life (nephesh) of man.²

Here the "soul" (nephesh) seems to be identified with the blood, evidently as something which is essential to physical existence.³

Many other instances are found in the Old Testament where nephesh has been translated as "life". For example in the account of Lot fleeing from Sodom, he was told, "Escape for thy life (nephesh)..."⁴ Again, Lot speaks to the Lord, and says, "Behold now, thy servant hath found favor in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy lovingkindness, which thou hast showed unto me in saving my life (nephesh)..."⁵ In these cases the word could have been translated "soul".

From these many occurrences of the word nephesh translated as "life", one may conclude that this Hebrew word for soul carries not only the meaning of "possessing life" or being a "living creature", but also stands for "life" itself.

By an easy transistion from the previous usage the Hebrew word

¹Genesis 9:4

²Genesis 9:5

³See also Deuteronomy 12:23

⁴Genesis 19:17

⁵Genesis 19:19

nephesh comes to stand for the "individual", the "person". Girdlestone states:

In some passages nephesh has been rendered 'anyone'; the word is thus used in an indefinite sense, the soul representing the person, as when we speak of a city containing so many thousand 'souls'.¹

Examples of this usage to designate an individual or person are numerous.

The word nephesh has been translated as "any" in several instances: "And when any one offereth an oblation of a meal-offering unto Jehovah..."²

"And if any one of the common people sin unwittingly..."³ "And he that smiteth any man mortally shall surely be put to death."⁴ "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel..."⁵ These instances could have been translated "any soul" or "a soul".

In a couple of instances nephesh has been translated as "man". "All the money of the dedicated things that is brought into the house of the LORD, even the money of every one that passeth the account, the money that every man is set at..."⁶ The A. S. V. has here, "...the money of the persons for whom each man is rated..." In either case the word is literally "souls". Another example is found in I Chronicles 5:21:

¹Girdlestone, op. cit.

²Leviticus 2:1

³Leviticus 4:27

⁴Leviticus 24:17

⁵Deuteronomy 24:7

⁶II Kings 12:4, K. J. V.

"And they took away their cattle; of their camels fifty thousand, and of sheep two hundred and fifty thousand, and of asses two thousand, and of men a hundred thousand."

The word "person" has been used as a translation of nephesh in numerous instances. "And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself."¹ "And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the persons of his house..."² The A. S. V. renders this as "souls" here. "...Gather ye of it every man according to his eating, an omer a head, according to the number of your persons..."³

There are three instances where nephesh has been translated by the personal pronoun "me", and in each case it has something to do with dying. "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."⁴ "And Samson said, Let me die with the Philistines."⁵ "So they girded sackcloth on their loins, and put ropes on their heads, and came to the king of Israel, and said, Thy servant Benhadad saith, I pray thee, let me live."⁶ In each case the rendering could have been, "my

¹Genesis 14:21

²Genesis 36:6, K. J. V.

³Exodus 16:16. See also Leviticus 27:2; Numbers 5:6; 31:19; 35:11; 35:15; 35:30; Deuteronomy 10:22; 27:25; Joshua 20:3; 20:9; I Samuel 22:22; II Samuel 14:14; Proverbs 28:17; Jeremiah 43:6; 52:29; 52:30; Ezekiel 16:5; 17:17; 27:13; 33:6.

⁴Numbers 23:10

⁵Judges 16:30

⁶I Kings 20:32

soul".

In numerous places nephesh has been translated as "self" (himself, herself, thyself, myself, themselves, yourselves). Examples of this may be found in Leviticus 11:43, 44:

Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby. For I am Jehovah your God: sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.¹

Many of these references express emotions and activities which we often refer to the soul as such, but are here translated as "myself" or "himself", etc.

Again, there are many instances where the word nephesh has been translated as "soul", but still with this meaning of an individual or person: "Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean thing..."² "Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood..."³ "And the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, that came into Egypt, were threescore and ten."⁴ "And Joshua took Makkedah on that day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof: he

¹See also: Deuteronomy 4:15; Joshua 23:11; I Kings 19:4; Esther 4:13; 9:31; Job 18:4; 32:2; Psalm 131:2; Isaiah 5:14; 46:2; 47:14; Jeremiah 3:11; 17:21; 37:9; 51:14; Amos 2:14; 2:15; 6:8; Jonah 4:8.

²Leviticus 7:21, K. J. V. The A.S.V. has, "And when any one shall touch any unclean thing..."

³Leviticus 17:12

⁴Genesis 46:27

utterly destroyed them and all the souls that were therein..."¹ "The soul that sinneth, it shall die..."²

These passages use the word "soul" or "souls" to denote the entire person or persons. This is an important concept to be noted in the Old Testament usage of the word nephesh.

This sense of nephesh to indicate the person is extended, it seems, to even apply to a dead body (the corpse), although elsewhere, as in Genesis 35:18 and I Kings 17:21, the soul is spoken of as departing from the body at death. Examples of this usage are found in Leviticus 21:11, "Neither shall he go in to any dead body (nephesh), nor defile himself..." Also Numbers 6:6, "All the days that he separateth himself unto Jehovah he shall not come near to a dead body (nephesh)."; Numbers 19:11, 13, "He that toucheth the dead body (nephesh) of any man shall be unclean seven days...Whosoever toucheth a dead person (nephesh), the body of a man that died, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of Jehovah..."; Haggai 2:13, "...If one that is unclean by reason of a dead body (nephesh) touch any of these, shall it be unclean?..."³

Thus, nephesh in the Old Testament has been translated and used in several ways to indicate life, or a living being, and also to indicate the individual or the person, even on occasion after "life" had left the body of the individual.

¹Joshua 10:28

²Ezekiel 18:20

³There is another Hebrew word for "dead body" or "carcase" (nebelah), as used in Psalm 79:1; Isaiah 26:19; Jeremiah 26:23; 34:20; 36:30.

In speaking directly of the soul, the Old Testament indicates that it may be the seat of physical appetites or feelings: "...our soul loatheth this light bread."¹ "...thou mayest...eat flesh...after all the desire of thy soul..."² "...thy soul desireth to eat flesh..."³ Job 33:20 declares of man in his distress that, "...his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty food." Again we read, "Hungry and thirsty, Their soul fainted in them."⁴ Verse 9 of this Psalm speaks of "the longing soul" and of "the hungry soul". Micah 7:1 says, "My soul desireth the first-ripe fig." These are all expressions of physical appetites or feelings.

Sometimes the word nephesh has been translated directly as "appetite". Such an occurrence is found in Proverbs 23:2, "And put a knife to thy throat if thou be a man given to appetite (nephesh)."⁵ Again, in Ecclesiastes 6:7, "All the labor of man is for his mouth, and yet the appetite (nephesh or "soul") is not filled."

Twice the word nephesh is translated as "lust" in the K. J. V. The A. S. V. renders the word as "desire" in these instances: "The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them..."⁵ "And they tempted God in their

¹Numbers 21:5

²Deuteronomy 12:15

³Deuteronomy 12:20

⁴Psalm 107:5

⁵Exodus 15:9

heart by asking meat for their lust (nephesh or "soul").¹

Three times in the Old Testament the word nephesh has been translated as "pleasure", indicating "desire". "When thou comest into thy neighbor's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own pleasure (nephesh)..."² "To bind his princes at his pleasure; and teach his elders wisdom."³ "But ye...caused every man his servant...whom ye had let go free at their pleasure, to return..."⁴

The soul (nephesh) is the seat of various emotions or emotional feelings: Gen. 42:21 indicates that the soul can be distressed, "...we saw the distress of his soul..." Lev. 26:11, although speaking of God, as if He has, or is, a soul (and this is an interesting concept in itself), indicates that the soul can abhor someone, "...and my soul shall not abhor you." Job 30:25 reveals that the soul can grieve, "...was not my soul grieved for the needy?" Psalm 86:4 indicates that the soul can rejoice, "Rejoice the soul of thy servant; for unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul." Psalm 107:26, on the other hand, indicates that the soul can be brought to low depths, "They mount up to the heavens, they go down again to the depths: Their soul melteth away because of trouble." Another Psalm states, "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art

¹Psalm 78:18

²Deuteronomy 23:24

³Psalm 105:22

⁴Jeremiah 34:16

thou disquieted in me?"¹ Song of Solomon 1:7 speaks of the soul loving, and on the other hand, Isaiah 1:14 speaks of the soul hating. The soul, of course, is included in the commandment to love the Lord.²

Other passages refer to the soul in the sense of the will or moral action: Deut. 4:29 declares, "But from thence ye shall seek Jehovah thy God, and thou shalt find him when thou searchest after him with all thy heart and with all thy soul." Job 7:15 speaks of the soul choosing in a moral situation, "So that my soul chooseth strangling, And death rather than these my bones." Several references in the Psalms refer to the lifting up of the soul to God.³ In the 119th Psalm reference is made to the soul keeping God's laws: "Thy testimonies are wonderful; Therefore doth my soul keep them."⁴ "My soul hath observed thy testimonies; And I love them exceedingly."⁵

Besides these instances where nephesh is translated "soul" but with the sense of will or moral decision, there are at least three places where the Hebrew word has been translated directly as "will": "Deliver me not over unto the will (nephesh) of mine adversaries..."⁶ "... And deliver not thou him unto the will (nephesh) of his ene-

¹Psalms 42:5

²Deuteronomy 6:5

³Psalms 24:4; 25:1

⁴Psalms 119:129

⁵Psalms 119:167

⁶Psalms 27:12

mies."¹ "Behold therefore, I have stretched out my hand over thee...and delivered thee unto the will (nephesh) of them that hate thee..."²

There are a number of instances in the Old Testament where the Hebrew word nephesh has been translated as "mind": "...if it be your mind (nephesh) that I should bury my dead out of my sight;"³ "And if a Levite come...with all the desire of his mind unto the place which the LORD shall choose;"⁴ "...but the LORD shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind;"⁵ "And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind..."⁶ In this last passage it is God who is speaking, and the word nephesh is used of Himself.

There are also a number of instances in the Old Testament where nephesh has been translated as "heart", although there are several other Hebrew words which may indicate this idea. "And a sojourner shalt thou not oppress: for ye know the heart of a sojourner, seeing ye were sojourners in the land of Egypt."⁷ "I also will do this unto you: I will

¹Psalms 41:2

²Ezekiel 16:27

³Genesis 23:8

⁴Deuteronomy 18:6, K. J. V. The A.S.V. has "soul".

⁵Deuteronomy 28:65, K. J. V. The A.S.V. says "pining of soul".

⁶I Samuel 2:35; see also II Samuel 17:8; II Kings 9:15; I Chronicles 28:9; Jeremiah 15:1; Ezekiel 23:17, 18, 22, 28; 24:25; 36:5.

⁷Exodus 23:9

even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart..."¹ "In his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it..."² "And the man of thine, whom I shall not cut off from mine altar, shall be to consume thine eyes, and to grieve thy heart..."³

Thus, it is evident that there is a great interchanging of word usage to indicate the various aspects of human consciousness and emotions. If a study were made of the word "heart" for instance, throughout the Bible, it would be found that it too is often used for the ideas of "mind", "will", and "reason", as well as for emotional feelings.⁴

W. J. Cameron, in The New Bible Dictionary, makes the observation that, "Since Hebrew psychology lacked precise terminology, there is some overlapping in the uses of nepes [soul], leb (lebab) [heart], and ruah [spirit]..."⁵

Another aspect of the usage of the word nephesh is the fact that there are several passages which mention body and soul together as contrasted and together apparently making up the whole man. "But his flesh

¹Leviticus 26:16, K. J. V. The A.S.V. says "...make the soul to pine away."

²Deuteronomy 24:15

³I Samuel 2:33; see also II Samuel 3:21; Psalm 10:3; Proverbs 23:7; 28:25; 31:6; Jeremiah 42:20; Lamentations 3:51; Ezekiel 25:6; 25:15; 27:31; Hosea 4:8.

⁴See Appendix A

⁵Douglas (ed.), op. cit.

upon him hath pain, And his soul within him mourneth."¹ "And he stretched himself upon the child i.e., the body three times, and cried unto Jehovah, and said O Jehovah my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again."² "And it came to pass, as her soul was departing from the body (for she died), that she called his name Benoni: but his father called him Benjamin."³

Thus, in the Old Testament, the Hebrew word nephesh is found to be used for "life", "living creature", a "person" (including a "dead person" occasionally), and as the feeling, thinking, willing aspects of a person. J. Barton Payne summarizes the usage of nephesh in this way:

The néfesh, "soul," is the entire man and néfesh may therefore often be translated simply as "self," a "person" (Gen. 12:5; 17:14). In poetry, a synonym used for a man's soul is his kavodh, or "glory" (Gen. 49:6; Ps. 16:9). The basic meaning of néfesh appears to be "breath" or "throat" (Isa. 5:14; Hab. 2:5). So in passages such as Job 11:20; 31:39 to lose one's life is literally to "breathe out néfesh, soul." Then, since the breathing being is alive, néfesh comes to mean life (cf. Jer. 38:16) or living creatures (Gen. 9:12). This significance is demonstrated in Deuteronomy 12:23 where blood, meaning "life blood," has a similar connotation: "The blood is the néfesh (life), and you shall not eat the néfesh with the blood." Or again, perhaps from the "throat" etymology, néfesh may mean "appetite, desire" (Eccl. 6:9; cf. v. 7). In any event, néfesh comes eventually to equal what thinks and feels, namely, the whole man (Gen. 34:3; Ps. 42:2), an individual "soul." Though usually treated as immortal, the soul may thus be said to "die" (Judg. 16:30; Num. 23:10). As Schultz puts it:

"Souls" just means men, persons. Hence since a dead person is still "somebody," it is strictly correct to call him "a soul." Thus a man can say, "let my soul die," "my soul lives"; while, on the other hand, death

¹Job 14:22

²I Kings 17:21

³Genesis 35:18

is the departure of the soul, and a person lives by his soul. (Old Testament Theology, II: 249, and note his many proof texts.)¹

Another summary of the Old Testament usage of the word nephesh is given by Girdlestone:

Thus the soul, according to the O.T., is the personal centre of desire, inclination, and appetite, and its normal condition is to be operating in or through means of a physical organisation, whether human or otherwise. Hence, when we read that man or Adam became a living soul (Gen. 2:7), we are to understand that the structure which had been moulded from the dust became the habitation and, to a certain extent, the servant of a ego or conscious centre of desire or appetite. When the soul departs (Gen. 35:18), the body becomes untenanted, and the ego which has grown with the growth of the body is dislodged from its habitation. It may, however, return again to its old home through the operation of God, as was the case with the widow's child (I Kings 17:21; compare Ps. 16:10).²

New Testament Usage (psyche)

The usual Greek word translated "soul" in the New Testament is ψυχή (psyche). By count in Young's Analytical Concordance the word psyche occurs some 105 times, translated by several English words other than soul on a number of occasions.³ The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible declares that

As compared with (nephesh) in the OT, (psyche) is relatively infrequent in the NT. This is partly due to the fact that so much of the OT is poetry, which encourages the use of synonyms and pathetic periphrases.⁴

¹J. Barton Payne, The Theology of the Older Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), p. 224.

²Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 58.

³Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1924).

⁴George Arthur Buttrick (ed.), The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. IV, p. 429.

The New Testament word for soul (psyche) carries on many of the same meanings as the Old Testament equivalent. It is frequently translated as "life" and thus stands for the "life principle" just as the Old Testament word, nephesh. Examples may be cited where the "soul" is spoken of as the "life": "Arise, and take the young child and his mother...for they are dead that sought the young child's life (psyche)."¹ "Be not anxious for your life (psyche), what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life (psyche) more than food, and the body than raiment?"² "He that findeth his life (psyche) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life (psyche) for my sake shall find it."³ "For whosoever would save his life (psyche) shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life (psyche) for my sake shall find it."⁴ "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life (psyche) a ransom for many."⁵

Other examples could be given where the life (soul) is said to be risked⁶, or laid down.⁷ On at least two occasions the word is used of

¹Matthew 2:20

²Matthew 6:25

³Matthew 10:39

⁴Matthew 16:25

⁵Matthew 20:28

⁶Philippians 2:30

⁷John 10:11

animal life: "And there died the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, even they that had life (psyche, or "soul")...^{#1} "...and every living soul (psyche) died, even the things that were in the sea."^{#2}

Again, as with the Old Testament word for "soul", psyche becomes personified and can represent the entire person. "And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles."^{#3} "And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people."^{#4} "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers."^{#5}

Other examples of this usage of personification are seen in several other translations of the word psyche. "How long dost thou hold us (literally, "our souls") in suspense?"^{#6} "And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you."^{#7} The latter case is literally, "for your souls", and the A. S. V. has thus rendered it.

In Acts 7:14 psyche is used in enumeration of persons: "And Joseph went, and called to him Jacob his father, and all his kindred, three-score and fifteen souls."^{#8}

¹Revelation 8:9

²Revelation 16:3; see also other uses of "life": Mark 3:4; 8:35; 10:45; Luke 6:9; 9:24 (2x); 9:56; 12:22, 23; 14:26; 17:33 (2x); John 10:15; 10:17; 12:25 (2x); 13:37, 38; 15:13; Acts 15:26; 20:10, 24; 27:22; Rom. 11:3; 16:4; I John 3:16 (2x); Revelation 12:11.

³Acts 2:43

⁴Acts 3:23

⁵Romans 13:1

⁶John 10:24

⁷II Corinthians 12:15, K. J. V.

⁸See also Acts 2:41; 27:37; I Peter 3:20.

There is a reflexive use to be noted in at least two instances, with the soul standing once again for the person. "But I call God for a witness upon my soul, that to spare you I forbore to come unto Corinth."¹ "...we were well pleased to impart unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were become very dear to us."² In these instances the word could have been translated "myself", and "ourselves."

There are three instances in the New Testament where psyche has been rendered as "mind". This again, even as with the Old Testament equivalent, gives evidence of the looseness with which these terms are used and the interchangeableness of their usage. It is interesting to note that in these three instances the A. S. V. has rendered the word as "soul", although it has already been noted that this version does not uniformly render the words nephesh or psyche by the English word "soul". The following examples are from the K. J. V.: "But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds (psychoi) evil affected against the brethren."³ "For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds (psychoi)."⁴ "...that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind

¹II Corinthians 1:23

²I Thessalonians 2:8

³Acts 14:2, K. J. V. The A.S.V. has "...stirred up the souls of the Gentiles and made them evil affected against the brethren."

⁴Hebrews 12:3, K. J. V. The A.S.V. has "...fainting in your souls."

(psyche) striving together for the faith of the gospel."¹

The latter reference uses the concept of "one soul" to express unity. This also appears in Acts 4:32: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul..." Here it would seem that the doubling of reference to both the heart and the soul serves only a rhetorical purpose and is not intended to indicate that men have some entity called a "heart" which is necessarily different from some other entity called a "soul."²

It is a fact that the word psyche (soul) has been translated as "heart" at least two times in the New Testament. "Not in the way of eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart (literally, "from the soul")."³ "Whatsoever ye do, work heartily (ek psyches, "from the soul"), as unto the Lord, and not unto men."⁴

The remaining instances of the usage of psyche in the New Testament have all been translated as "soul", the basic meaning of the word. There is one general statement, equivalent to that in the Old Testament found in Genesis 2:7: "So also it is written, The first man Adam became a living soul."⁵

¹Philippians 1:27, K. J. V. The A.S.V. has, "...with one soul..."

²See Appendix A.

³Ephesians 6:6

⁴Colossians 3:23

⁵I Corinthians 15:45

In a number of instances the word seems to indicate the personal essence of man, the ego, and as such, can last beyond death. The account of the rich man in Luke, chapter 12, uses the word in this sense:

And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee...¹

In Peter's sermon in the second chapter of Acts, he refers to Christ's soul: "Because thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades..."² "...he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he (literally, "his soul") left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption."³ It is important to note here also how the soul is contrasted to the body ("flesh") and that by implication the two together make up the whole man.

In the book of the Revelation John speaks of "souls of men" being bought and sold in trade: "...no man buyeth their merchandise any more; merchandise of gold, and silver...and slaves (literally, "of bodies"), and souls of men."⁴ Again, there is an interesting contrast (or uniting) of "the bodies and souls of men" (somaton kai psyches anthropon).

On two other occasions in the book of the Revelation John speaks of the souls of men who have died. "I saw underneath the altar the

¹Luke 12:19, 20

²Acts 2:27

³Acts 2:31

⁴Revelation 18:11-13

souls of them that had been slain for the word of God..."¹ "...and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God..."² It is important that in these instances it is "souls" that are noted as existing after death, and not, according to these passages, the "spirits", although that may be equally true.

There are other occasions in the New Testament where the soul of man is spoken of in a sense as having eternal value. It might be said that it is that part of man which has a spiritual and eternal value. Jesus said, "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? (literally, "his soul") or what shall a man give in exchange for his life? (literally, "his soul")."³

The author of the book of Hebrews states, "But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul."⁴ "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls..."⁵

James exhorts to "...receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls."⁶ And again, "...he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death..."⁷

¹Revelation 6:9

²Revelation 20:4

³Matthew 16:26; the K.J.V. has "soul" here. See also Mark 8:36, 37.

⁴Hebrews 10:39

⁵Hebrews 13:17

⁶James 1:21

⁷James 5:20

Peter speaks of "...the salvation of your souls,"¹ and of those who "...have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth..."² He also speaks of "...fleshly lusts, which war against the soul,"³ and refers to Jesus as the "Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."⁴

Peter also tells those who are suffering to "commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator."⁵ In his second epistle he refers to Lot's "righteous soul" and to souls that are "unstedfast" spiritually.⁶

The apostle John prays in his third epistle that Gaius might prosper physically as much as his soul prospered, evidently meaning spiritually.⁷

Thus it is evident from these examples of New Testament usage that the soul is far from being merely the secondary element in man's immaterial part of his constitution as some would say. That is, it is not simply the part of man's constitution capable of consciousness and feelings on the emotional level only, but as evidenced from these passages, it is capable of the highest spiritual experiences with God, and has eternal value to be preserved and not to be lost. Hodge declares

¹I Peter 1:9

²I Peter 1:22

³I Peter 2:11

⁴I Peter 2:25

⁵I Peter 4:19

⁶II Peter 2:8 and 2:14

⁷III John 2

concerning this fact that

From all this it is evident that the word psuche, or soul, does not designate the mere animal part of our nature, and is not a substance different from the pneuma, or spirit.¹

Just as with the Old Testament equivalent, nephesh, psyche is found to be contrasted with the body and the two together apparently regarded as making up the whole man. "And 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."²

What was previously stated regarding the soul's capability of the highest spiritual experiences in contrast to consciousness and feelings on the emotional level is not intended to deny the fact that the latter are also legitimate functions of the soul according to New Testament usage. Indeed, a number of references indicate that the soul can experience a wide variety of emotions. Reference is made to the fact that the soul can "find rest"³, be "pleased"⁴, "love"⁵, or be "sorrowful".⁶

The soul can "magnify the Lord"⁷, or can be pierced with a "sword".⁸ The soul can be possessed with patience,⁹ or it can be

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 48.

²Matthew 10:28

³Matthew 11:29

⁴Matthew 12:18

⁵Matthew 22:37; see also Mark 12:30, 33; Luke 10:27.

⁶Matthew 26:38 and Mark 14:34

⁷Luke 1:46

⁸Luke 2:35

⁹Luke 21:19, K. J. V.

"troubled".¹ "Anguish" can come upon the soul, or the soul can have "pleasure".² Hope can be "an anchor of the soul".³ In the book of the Revelation it is indicated that the soul can lust after food; this has already been noted as a quality of the Old Testament word for the soul as well.⁴

Thus the New Testament word for "soul", psyche, has much the same meaning according to its usage as the Old Testament word, nephesh. It is used for the "life principle" or simply to stand for the idea of "life". The word becomes personified and can stand for the person as such, as in enumerations and other uses. It is somewhat flexible and interchangeable with other words, such as "heart" and "mind". It is distinguished from the body and considered together with the body as making up the total man. The soul is considered as that part of man that has lasting, eternal value and is capable of the highest spiritual experiences. And it is considered as being that part of man which also experiences the emotions, desires, and feelings of human consciousness.

II. SPIRIT (RUACH-PNEUMA)

Old Testament Usage (ruach)

The common Hebrew word translated as "spirit" in the Old Testa-

¹John 12:27; cp. Acts 15:24

²Romans 2:9 and Hebrews 10:38

³Hebrews 6:19

⁴Revelation 18:14

ment is רוּחַ (ruach). It is generally understood in the sense of the incorporeal aspect of human nature.¹ On many occasions it is linked with the adjective "holy" and thus refers to the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. On other occasions reference is made to the "spirit of God". Ruach is also the only Hebrew word used in the Old Testament for wind.² By count in Young's Concordance it is thus used some 91 times.³ W. J. Cameron, in The New Bible Dictionary, declares:

Ruah occurs 378 times in the Old Testament. Of these the larger number of instances have a physical, physiological, or psychical connotation, but a considerable number have a supernatural reference. The noun derives from a verb meaning to breathe out through the nose with violence. Sometimes it stands for the 'life centre' and is virtually a synonym for nepes [nephesh], but such cases are comparatively few, and generally ruah is to be regarded as the animating principle in relation to which nepes is the living being.⁴

There are a few unusual derivative uses of the word ruach which might be noted. In speaking of the scales on the body of "leviathan" it is said that "One is so near to another, that no air (ruach) can come between them."⁵ The relation to the basic sense of "breath" is easily seen here.

Gideon said to the men of Ephraim who were incensed against him,

¹Everett F. Harrison (ed.), Baker's Dictionary of Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960), p. 493.

²Ibid.

³Young, op. cit.

⁴Douglas (ed.), op. cit., p. 1211.

⁵Job 41:16

"God hath delivered into your hands the princes of Midian, Oreb and Zeeb: and what was I able to do in comparison of you? Then their anger (ruach, or literally, "their spirit") was abated toward him, when he had said that."¹ Here "spirit" is used in the sense of "anger"; even today a "spirited argument" can be an euphemistic expression for an "angry argument".

In the Garden of Eden it is said that God walked "in the cool of the day."² The word "cool" is ruach in the original Hebrew. The derivation here must be due to the sense of "breath" or "wind".

The harlot Rahab in the city of Jericho related to the spies that, "...as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage (ruach, or literally, "spirit") in any man, because of you..."³ Again, in modern speech it is common to say that a person faced something with a great spirit, as a synonym of courage.

The word ruach has been translated in a few instances in a quite unusual fashion as "quarters" or "sides". "On the four sides (literally, "towards the four winds", "winds" being the Hebrew word ruach) were the porters, toward the east, west, north, and south."⁴ "And there were ninety and six pomegranates on the sides (literally, "towards the [four]

¹Judges 8:3

²Genesis 3:8

³Joshua 2:11, K. J. V.

⁴I Chronicles 9:24; the K.J.V. has "In four quarters were the..."

winds")....¹ "He measured the east side (ruach, or literally, "wind") with the measuring reed, five hundred reeds..."² In these instances the translation is based on the basic sense of ruach as "wind".

Again the word ruach has been used in an apparently derivative sense twice in the book of Job; it has been translated as "vain".

"Should a wise man make answer with vain (ruach) knowledge, and fill himself with the east wind?"³ "Shall vain (ruach) words have an end?..."⁴

In these cases the word "vain" apparently bears a relationship to the sense of "breath" or "wind" found in ruach; "vain knowledge" and "vain words" would be as "windy knowledge" and "windy words", or "knowledge of wind" and "words of wind".

The third most frequent usage of ruach in the Old Testament is as "breath". In some instances this usage appears only natural according to the context. In these cases it would appear that the word is applied to the natural breath of man: "He will not suffer me to take my breath, but filleth me with bitterness."⁵ There are some instances where, according to the context, it is a little difficult to determine if the natural breath is meant or if perhaps it might refer to the "life principle" as such: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: Thou takest

¹Jeremiah 52:23

²Ezekiel 42:16; also verses 17, 18, 19, 20.

³Job 15:2

⁴Job 16:3

⁵Job 9:18; see also Job 15:30; 17:1; 19:17.

away their breath, they die, and return to their dust."¹

There are several references to the fact that idols have no "breath" in them, and again it is difficult to know whether the natural, simple idea of breath, as such, is meant, or the idea of a life principle. "They have ears, but they hear not; neither is there any breath (ruach) in their mouths."² "Every man is become brutish and is without knowledge...for his molton image is falsehood, and there is no breath in them."³ "Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise! Shall this teach? Behold, it is overlaid with gold and silver, and there is no breath (ruach) at all in the midst of it."⁴ It is to be remembered that in each of these passages, the word translated "breath" is the Hebrew word ruach, and could have been translated as "spirit".

Again, in several instances the word "breath" is used in reference to God. In most of these cases "the breath of God" is seen in a destructive sense. "Then the channels of the sea appeared, The foundations of the world were laid bare, by the rebuke of Jehovah, At the blast of the breath (ruach) of his nostrils."⁵ "By the breath of God they perish, and by the blast of his anger are they consumed."⁶

¹Psalm 104:29; see also Psalm 146:4; Isaiah 33:11; Lamentations 4:20.

²Psalm 135:17

³Jeremiah 10:14; see also 51:17.

⁴Habakkuk 2:19

⁵II Samuel 22:16; see also Psalm 18:15.

⁶Job 4:9

But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath (ruach) of his lips shall he slay the wicked.¹

There is one instance where "the breath of God" is mentioned in a creative sense: "By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made, And all the host of them by the breath of his mouth."²

The remaining instances of the rendering of ruach as "breath" all seem to have reference to the "life principle" in man and/or in animals. In this the word is used in much the same sense as was the Hebrew word nephesh (soul), and the two appear to be synonymous. In the account of the Flood there are several references to the fact that all living things were to die. These references declare that animals have a "spirit" or, as it is translated, "breath":

And I, behold, I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die.³

"And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath (ruach, or literally, "spirit") of life."⁴ "All in whose nostrils was the breath (ruach, or "spirit") of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."⁵ The A. S. V. adds here: "All in whose nos-

¹Isaiah 11:4; see also 30:28.

²Psalms 33:6; might this not be a direct reference to the Holy Spirit's activity in creation, with an anthropomorphic allusion to the "mouth"?

³Genesis 6:17

⁴Genesis 7:15

⁵Genesis 7:22, K. J. V.

trills was the breath of the spirit of life..."

Another outstanding passage in the Old Testament, one often referred to, which indicates that animals have a "spirit", just as man, is found in Ecclesiastes 3:19-21:

For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath (ruach, or "spirit"); and man hath no preëminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit (ruach) of man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit (ruach) of the beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?

Here, as in the previous examples of the reference to animals, the term ruach apparently indicates "life principle"; this is, indeed, something in common between men and animals, and it is synonymous with "soul" (nephesh).

The passage above from Ecclesiastes is questioned by some interpreters as being the erroneous ideas of Solomon in his human understanding (or lack of it). But with the witness from Genesis, chapters 6 and 7, there is little question but that ruach is applied to animals. This statement is made in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: "As the life principle, ruach pneuma, "spirit" dwells in living, breathing beings, in the flesh of both men and animals. In this sense it is parallel to nephesh or psyche."¹

Hodge also makes a pertinent comment in this regard:

If the Bible ascribed only a psyche to brutes, and both psyche and pneuma to men, there would be some ground for assuming that

¹Buttrick (ed.), op. cit., p. 433.

the two are essentially distinct. But such is not the case. The living principle in the brute is called both nephesh and ruah, psuche and pneuma.¹

Comment has already been made above as to what the real difference is between men and animals since it does not lie in the distinction of words found in the Bible for "soul" and "spirit".²

In Job 12:10 there is a reference to both the soul and the spirit in what appears to be nothing more than Hebrew parallelism: "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath ("spirit") of all mankind." Both terms make reference to the life principle.

In Ezekiel's prophecy of the dry bones ruach is rendered as "breath", and it may be debateable whether the simple, natural sense is intended or the sense as "life principle". It is not too important, since one involves the other. "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah unto these bones: Behold, I will cause breath ("spirit") to enter into you, and ye shall live."³

The second most frequent usage of ruach in the Old Testament is as "wind" or "windy" or "whirlwind" or "blast" (of wind), or "tempest". By count in Young's Concordance this occurs some 96 times.⁴ In most of these cases this rendering is necessary from the context and the word indicates the natural sense of "wind".

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 49.

²See above, p. 53.

³Ezekiel 37:5; see also verses 6, 8, 9, 10.

⁴Young, op. cit.

The Hebrew word ruach is translated by the word "spirit" some 224 times in the Old Testament.¹ On a number of occasions the word obviously refers to the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity. God's spirit came upon men in the Old Testament: "But there remained two men in the camp...and the Spirit rested upon them..."² "And Moses said... would God that all Jehovah's people were prophets, that Jehovah would put his Spirit upon them!"³ "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the Spirit, and lay thy hand upon him."⁴ "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?"⁵ It is interesting to note that in each of the above cited verses the King James Version had not capitalized the word "spirit", while the American Standard Version, quoted here, has done so.

There are other occasions when the word "spirit" seems to be used more as an attitude than of an entity: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."⁶ On the other hand, this might refer to a spiritual renewing of David's spirit as an entity.

The word "spirit" (ruach) is frequently used in reference to emotional feelings and states. For example, it is said that the spirit

¹Ibid.

²Numbers 11:26

³Numbers 11:29

⁴Numbers 27:18

⁵Psalms 139:7

⁶Psalms 51:10

may be troubled: "And it came to pass in the morning that his spirit was troubled..."¹ "...Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams; and his spirit was troubled, and his sleep went from him."² The spirit can be in anguish: "And Moses spake so unto the children of Israel: but they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage."³ The spirit can be sad: "But Jezebel his wife came to him and said unto him, Why is thy spirit so sad, that thou eatest no bread?"⁴ The spirit can be haughty or proud: "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall."⁵ It can also become angry: "Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry..."⁶

In Genesis 26:35 the word ruach has been rendered as "mind", and the emotion of grief is ascribed to it: "And they were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah." The marginal reading here has, "a bitterness of spirit". Girdlestone suggests that the sense of "breath" is involved in many of these relations, and that deep breathing is a sign of grief in this case, just as it is a sign of anger in Judges 8:3 where ruach is rendered as "anger", or as a sign of earnest prayer or perhaps of agitation of the heart as in I Samuel 1:15.⁷

¹Genesis 41:8

²Daniel 2:1

³Exodus 6:9

⁴I Kings 21:5

⁵Proverbs 16:18

⁶Ecclesiastes 7:9

⁷Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 60.

The word ruach is also rendered as "mind" in five other instances in the Old Testament (at least in the King James Version), and also appears to involve the intellectual function on other occasions.¹ This shows an overlapping in the usage of the various words to describe the psychological functions or the immaterial element in man. David W. Kerr, in Baker's Dictionary of Theology, endeavors to explain this:

Since the NT has a word for mind, which the Hebrew did not have, there are cognitive functions ascribed to the spirit in the OT which are not in the New. In both Testaments it is man's spirit which is the spring of his inmost thoughts and intents, and the child of God must be renewed in spirit if he is to serve God acceptably...²

There is at least one instance where the spirit is credited with having the function of the will: "And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing..."³ Again, this seems to be a case of Hebrew parallelism, for on other occasions the function of willing is ascribed to the "heart".⁴

There are some occurrences of the word "spirit" which appear to have a figurative use:

And it came to pass, when all the kings of the Amorites, that were beyond the Jordan westward, and all the kings of the Canaanites, that were by the sea, heard that Jehovah had dried up the waters of the Jordan from before the children of Israel, until

¹See Proverbs 29:11, K. J. V. (the A.S.V. has "anger"); Ezekiel 11:5; 20:32; Daniel 5:20, K. J. V. (the A.S.V. has "spirit"); Habakkuk 1:11, K. J. V. (the A.S.V. uses "wind").

²Harrison (ed.), op. cit.

³Exodus 35:21

⁴See Appendix A.

we were passed over, that their heart melted, neither was there spirit in them any more, because of the Children of Israel.¹

Here spirit is used in the sense of courage. Elsewhere spirit seems to mean strength: "But God clave the hollow place that was in Lehi, and there came water thereout; and when he had drunk, his spirit came again, and he revived..."² "And they gave him a piece of a cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins: and when he had eaten, his spirit came again to him; for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water three days..."³

Of course, there are many instances when the word "spirit" is used in the sense as the spiritual entity in man, that part of man which can be righteous or unrighteous, which can be saved or lost. "Blessed is the man unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile."⁴ Psalm 51:10 may be understood in this way: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; And renew a right spirit within me." Another example indicates that the spirit can be less than whole or ideal; this must be a spiritual sense: "A gentle tongue is a tree of life; but perverseness therein is a breaking of the spirit."⁵

There are at least two passages which might indicate that the spirit is an entity created in man by God: "For, lo, he that formeth

¹Joshua 5:1

²Judges 15:19

³I Samuel 30:12

⁴Psalm 32:2

⁵Proverbs 15:4

the mountains, and createth the wind (ruach, or "spirit"), and declar-
 eth unto man what is his thought; that maketh the morning darkness...
 Jehovah, the God of hosts, is his name."¹ Considering the context--the
 reference to mountains--the translation as wind, another physical entity
 or phenomenon, is probably correct; however, the word can be translated
 as "spirit". The following, however, is unmistakeably an expression of
 the creation of the spirit as an entity in man: "Thus saith Jehovah, who
 stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth,
 and formeth the spirit of man within him."²

Thus, it has been seen that ruach, the Hebrew word for "spirit",
 is frequently used as "life principle" in man, and is thus synonymous
 with nephesh or "soul". Apart from the other usages of ruach which have
 no bearing on the subject under consideration, this word is often used
 with reference to the thinking, feeling, willing functions of man. In
 this too, it is synonymous with nephesh or "soul". David W. Kerr, in
Baker's Dictionary of Theology, states: "In the OT the functions of soul
 and spirit sometimes coincide, especially where mental or emotional ac-
 tivities are concerned."³

Furthermore, spirit is applied to animals as well as to men, just
 as soul is likewise. On the other hand, both spirit and soul in man are

¹Amos 4:13

²Zechariah 12:1

³Harrison (ed.), op. cit., p. 493.

linked with the highest spiritual relationships.

There is perhaps one legitimate distinction between soul and spirit in the Old Testament and that is that the soul is used to refer to the individual or the person as such, while the spirit does not seem ever to be applied in this fashion. This fact is perhaps the reason which has led a number of writers to declare that man is a soul, man has a body and a spirit. This may be noted in the comparison of Genesis 2:7 with Zechariah 12:1: the one passage declares that "man became a living soul" while the other states that God "formeth the spirit of man within him."

This would be a dichotomous conclusion when the words were taken in these senses. C. A. Beckwith, in his article on "Biblical Conceptions of Soul and Spirit", although he ambiguously declares for both trichotomy and dichotomy, does appear to form some legitimate conclusions when he declares:

Whatever belongs to the spirit belongs to the soul also, but not everything that belongs to the soul belongs to the spirit. It does not suffice to speak of the inner being of man, now as spirit, now as soul; one must regard the spirit as the principle of the soul, the divine principle of life, included in but not identical with the individual. Spirit may be distinguished but not separated from the soul. Body and spirit are not two poles between which is the soul. Since the soul includes the spirit as part of itself, it may be called the spirit.¹

Dr. Kerr concludes, regarding Old Testament usage, that, "Man IS a soul, in OT thought: he does not have a soul. On the other hand, man HAS a

¹Jackson (ed.), op. cit., p. 12.

spirit but it is never said that he is a spirit."¹

In this sense, then, the individual is the soul, and the soul is the individual. The individual (or the soul) is made up of two entities, the body and the spirit. Thus different functions of the individual may be attributed to the soul or to the spirit. The spirit is the part of man which obviously survives death, but so also does the soul, since this is simply another word for the individual, and the individual--his true essence--does survive death.

New Testament Usage (pneuma)

The usual Greek word translated "spirit" in the New Testament is πνεῦμα (pneuma). It appears some 220 times in the New Testament.²

W. J. Cameron declares that of these references

No fewer than ninety-one of these, with or without qualification as to character or source, stand for the Holy Spirit. The general meanings of pneuma are similar to those of ruah, but there is a noticeable change of emphasis, especially in the Pauline letters, where it is seldom used to denote the life-principle or breath, and is much more common with higher associations.³

The word pneuma is rendered as "wind" only on one occasion in the New Testament; this is unlike the usage of its equivalent in the Old Testament. This one instance is in John 3:8: "The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

¹Harrison (ed.), op. cit., p 493.

²Douglas (ed.), op. cit., p. 1212.

³Ibid.

Although it would be possible to translate this verse as, "The spirit bloweth where it will..." etc., the sense of wind seems to be correct and proper here, and is in keeping with the immediate context. Elsewhere in the New Testament the Greek word anemos is used to indicate "wind".

On one occasion the word pneuma is rendered as "life" in the King James Version, although the thought of "breath" would undoubtedly be just as appropriate, and the American Standard Version so renders the word here. It is said of the beast of Revelation 13:11 that,

. . . it was given unto him to give life (pneuma) unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.¹

As it is translated in the King James Version, or even as rendered in the American Standard Version ("to give breath"), the sense here is as "life-principle".

The meaning as "breath" is relevant in another passage in connection with the breath of God's mouth: "And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath (pneuma) of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming."² This usage may be seen to be parallel to that of ruach in the Old Testament.³

In the New Testament the word pneuma is frequently used to indi-

¹Revelation 13:15, K. J. V.

²II Thessalonians 2:8

³See above, p. 78.

cate the immaterial part of man's constitution. This may be seen in its usage along with "flesh" (sarx) to denote the entirety of man: "Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."¹ In another instance, Paul refers to the two elements, flesh and spirit, but it is questionable whether he means the spirit in an actual sense or merely in a figurative sense: "For though I am absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit..."²

The same idea is brought out by the combination (and contrasting) of spirit and body (soma): "For I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already as though I were present judged him..."³ Regardless of whether spirit is, in these instances, used in a more figurative sense (unless one believes that Paul could actually be, by his spirit, in a place different from his body), the fact still remains that he comments on the two aspects of his being; he names the one his body or his flesh and the other his spirit.

Again, in I Corinthians 7:34, Paul refers to body and spirit in a sense that together they make up the entire person: "...the woman that is unmarried...is careful for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit..."

Closely linked with the preceding discussion of the spirit indi-

¹I Corinthians 7:1

²Colossians 2:5

³I Corinthians 5:3

ating the immaterial part of man's constitution in contrast with his body there is also the usage where the word pneuma is used to indicate the part of man which survives death. Concerning Jesus, it is said at the time of his death that, "And Jesus cried again with a loud voice, and yielded up his spirit (pneuma)."¹ In John's Gospel it states likewise: "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit (pneuma)."² Luke states: And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit (pneuma): and having said this, he gave up the ghost (literally, "he expired")."³

While obviously these statements are expressions of the act of dying, they unquestionably infer that the "spirit" which was "yielded up", "given up", or "commended" to the Father survived the death of the body.

Another interesting passage which throws some light on this subject is the account of the death and restoration of life to the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue. Luke states that Jesus took her by the hand and called to her, "And her spirit returned, and she arose up immediately..."⁴ This is a close parallel to the Old Testament account of the child restored to life by Elijah, except that in that instance it is

¹Matthew 27:50

²John 19:30

³Luke 23:46

⁴Luke 8:55

said that "the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived."¹

Another example quite like those of Jesus' death is found in the account of the death of Stephen: "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."² This would indicate that the spirit was to survive the death of the body.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews refers to "the spirits of just men made perfect" in a context which would indicate that he is making reference to those who have died.³ Thus it is indicated that the spirit is existing as a separate entity from the body after death. Another reference of this sort is made by Peter when he refers to the fact that Jesus "went and preached unto the spirits in prison."⁴

Another broad area of usage in the New Testament of the word pneuma, just as its Old Testament equivalent, ruach, is as a psychological term. That is, its usage in representing the seat of perception, of feeling, will, as a state of mind, etc. In Mark's Gospel there is an indication of similarity between the spirit and what we would call the mind: "And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves..."⁵ Emotional feelings are attributed to the spirit: "And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."⁶ "When

¹I Kings 17:22; see above, p. 64.

²Acts 7:59

³Hebrews 12:23

⁴I Peter 3:19

⁵Mark 2:8

⁶Luke 1:47

Jesus therefore saw her weeping...he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled."¹ "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in the spirit."²

When Paul was in Athens and saw the idolatry, "...his spirit was provoked within him..."³ Apollos is said to have been "fervent in spirit."⁴

The spirit can also possess the qualities of what one would call the will: "Now after these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit..."⁵ Jesus exhorted: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."⁶ This latter reference, it may be noted again, contrasts the spirit and the flesh as two elements in the human constitution.

Other references may be noted: Peter speaks of a "meek and quiet spirit";⁷ Paul indicates that the spirit can be refreshed.⁸ In another place Paul also speaks of the perceptive abilities of the spirit when he declares that God's Spirit "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God."⁹ Again Paul asks, "For who among men knoweth the

¹John 11:33

²John 13:21

³Acts 17:16

⁴Acts 18:25

⁵Acts 19:21

⁶Matthew 26:41

⁷I Peter 3:4

⁸I Corinthians 16:18

⁹Romans 8:16

things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him?"¹

Then also there are those references which indicate that the spirit is important in what we would call a spiritual sense--that is, in its relation to God. This has already been seen, perhaps, to a greater or lesser degree in other connections, but there are some passages which bear strongly on this point, such as those which indicate that the spirit may receive of God's grace: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren."²

Thus in the New Testament, the Greek word pneuma is found to be used in much the same way as its Old Testament equivalent, ruach. It can mean basically "life" or "breath". It indicates the immaterial part of man in contrast with the physical part, the body or the flesh. The pneuma is indicated in the New Testament as surviving death, just as nephesh, psyche and ruach are likewise. The "spirit" manifests various psychological functions in parallel with what is attributed to the "soul". And lastly, the "spirit" is that part of man which has spiritual or eternal value and can be related to God, while it has been shown previously that this is also true of the "soul".

III. SUMMARY

In summarizing the Biblical usage of the words for "soul" and "spirit" it becomes obvious that the two terms are quite synonymous, and

¹I Corinthians 2:11

²Galatians 6:18

no real distinction may be made between them according to general usage in the Old and New Testaments. Among the factors pointed out in this chapter which lead to this conclusion are the following:

- (1) Both terms stand for the life-principle, the self.
- (2) Both terms are applied to animals as well as to man.
- (3) Death is sometimes described as the giving up of the soul and in other cases as the giving up of the spirit.
- (4) The immaterial element of the dead is in some instances termed "soul" and in others "spirit".
- (5) The same psychological functions are ascribed to both terms.
- (6) The same spiritual qualities or values are ascribed to both terms.
- (7) There are several passages which clearly proceed on the assumption that man consists of only two parts, and in some instances it is the soul which is linked with the body in this way, and in other instances it is the spirit.

These evidences from the Biblical usage of the words involved give strong support for the position of dichotomy as opposed to trichotomy.

Hodge declares concerning this point:

This doctrine trichotomy is opposed to the uniform usage of Scripture. So far from the nephesh, psuche, anima, or soul, being distinguished from the ruah, pneuma, animus, or mind [spirit], as either originally different or as derived from it, these words all designate one and the same thing. They are constantly interchanged. The one is substituted for the other, and all that is, or can be predicated of the one, is predicated of the other.¹

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 48.

Milton S. Terry, in his book entitled Biblical Dogmatics, also witnesses to this fact:

It appears...that the words for soul and spirit are employed too indiscriminately...to accord with a consistent doctrine of trichotomy...It behooves the theologian and the biblical exegete to refrain from constructing theories of the human constitution out of the incidental and rhetorical language of biblical writers who follow no uniform usage of the same words.¹

Even when other psychological terms are brought into the study, an aspect which has not been the purpose of this thesis, the similarity of usage is still quite obvious. Floyd Hamilton comments:

There are five words used by Paul, in speaking of man's nature: nous, pneuma, psyche, kardia, and soma. The last is the physical body, but the first four are used almost interchangeably....we must bear in mind that in the New Testament the terms are used practically interchangeably, and any difference is one of emphasis rather than of meaning. All four deal with the whole personality of man, in its different aspects.²

Thus the Biblical evidence, it appears, cannot be used to make absolute distinctions between the soul and the spirit as different constituent elements in man's nature. As Berkhof says, "The two words, "soul" and "spirit" do not denote two different elements in man, but serve to designate the one spiritual substance of man."³

¹Milton S. Terry, Biblical Dogmatics (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1907), pp. 52-53.

²Floyd E. Hamilton, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), pp. 116-117.

³Berkhof, Manual of Reformed Doctrine, op. cit., p. 122.

CHAPTER IV

AN EXPOSITION OF THE PROBLEM TEXTS

CHAPTER IV

AN EXPOSITION OF THE PROBLEM TEXTS

In dealing with the analysis of the Biblical words "soul" and "spirit" in the previous chapter two or three important instances of Biblical usage have been omitted. This has been done on purpose because these texts are extremely important to this subject and deserve a more extensive and complete consideration. In truth, it might be said that if it were not for these crucial passages in the Bible there would be no problem of dichotomy versus trichotomy; the simple conclusion of Bible students would undoubtedly be for dichotomy, on the basis already developed in the last chapter.

These texts which must be considered here are those which apparently contrast "soul" and "spirit", mentioning the two together. Since it has been the assumption of this thesis that the Bible is basically a unit and no contradiction is to be expected between its several parts, and since, as the previous chapter has shown, these two words are essentially synonymous in general Biblical usage, there must be found some reconciliation between the general context and these particular passages. It is a good principle of Biblical interpretation to allow the whole context of the Bible throw light upon any particular verse or passage. This is what has been done in this chapter.

The passages which have been considered are I Thessalonians 5:23, Hebrews 4:12, and a few others, including chiefly, I Corinthians 15:44.

I. FIRST THESSALONIANS 5:23

This verse, part of the apostle Paul's prayer for the Christians at Thessalonica, states

And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The important part here is that Paul mentions three things together regarding man: spirit (Grk.: pneuma), soul (Grk.: psyche), and body (Grk.: soma). The question posed by this usage of spirit and soul together with the body is whether Paul meant to indicate by this that these were two separate entities or elements in man's nature.

Some commentators and theologians, as has been pointed out, do take this as an essential distinction. One comments on this passage by Paul:

Now the body, we may term the sense-consciousness; the soul, the self-consciousness; and the spirit, the God-consciousness. For the body gives us the use of the five senses; the soul comprises the intellect which aids us in the present state of existence, and the emotions which proceed from the senses; while the spirit is our noblest part, which came directly from God, and by which alone we are able to apprehend and worship Him.¹

The previous chapter of this thesis has already demonstrated that some of the conclusions made in this statement are unwarranted. Further, the declaration that the spirit alone comes "directly from God" would appear to minimize God's creative action in the forming of man's body to say

¹Bancroft, op. cit., p. 120.

the least.¹

Milton S. Terry states that, "In this...text, especially, some writers find the doctrine of trichotomy, or the threefold nature of man."² This author goes on to refer to several different theories that are held as to the relation between the three terms, body, soul and spirit. However, he concludes,

But none of these theories of the invisible relations of soul and spirit find support in a sound interpretation of the Scriptures. Their speculative character is not in accord with the thought or the popular language of the biblical writers, who show no uniformity in the use of these various words.³

Terry declares that "The mention of spirit, and soul, and body, in I Thessalonians 5:23, has no real parallel in any other scripture."⁴ He also points out that the same apostle on other occasions speaks of "the body and the spirit" in a manner that implies dichotomy as clearly as this text seems to imply trichotomy. These facts should lead one to use caution in establishing or basing a theory of trichotomy on this single reference by the apostle Paul.

It is also interesting to note that in Matthew 22:37, Jesus refers

¹The sense in which the declaration was made, however, might be explained by Heard, in Tripartite Nature of Man: "God is the Creator ex traduce of the animal and intellectual part of every man...Not so with the spirit...It proceeds from God, not by creation, but by emanation." (quoted in Strong, op. cit., p. 484; Strong, nevertheless, follows this quote with the remark that he regards the trichotomous theory as untenable.)

²Terry, op. cit., p. 51.

³Ibid., p. 52.

⁴Ibid.

to "heart", "soul", and "mind" together: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." If one were to apply the same principles of exegesis which make Paul's statement a basis of trichotomy, this text would support a different trichotomy without at all including the body.

The parallel passage of this "first and great" commandment has four terms: heart, soul, might, and mind. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind..."¹ The text in the Old Testament from which the citation comes has three: "And thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."² It seems that no one has ever attempted to base their theory of the various elements in man's nature from these passages; from one at least they would have to declare for a four-fold division, a quadrichotomy!

A proper understanding of this phrase from Paul's prayer must recognize that he wanted to emphasize that the whole man was included in sanctification and that as an entire person he could be preserved blameless. As Theissen questions, "...is it not possible that they these problem passages are merely intended to include the whole man?"³ Terry declares concerning the various words, "It is obvious that the use of the various terms is largely rhetorical, and is so conspicuously diverse

¹Luke 10:27

²Deuteronomy 6:5

³Theissen, op. cit., p. 227.

as to nullify their value as proof-texts of trichotomy."¹

J. I. Marais, in his article on "Psychology" in The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, arrives at much the same conclusion. He refers to the fact that this is

. . . a text which is popularly interpreted as conveying that the "soul" stands for "our powers natural--those we have by nature," and that by "spirit" is meant "that life in man which in his natural state can scarcely be said to exist at all, but which is to be called out into power and vitality by regeneration" (F. W. Robertson, Sermons).²

But then he declares, "There is very little warrant in Scripture for such interpretation."³ Marais then quotes from Davidson, Old Testament Theology, who says

The language does not require a distinction of organs or substances, but may be accounted for by a vivid conception of one substance in different relations and under different aspects. The two terms are used to give exhaustive expression to the whole being and nature of man.⁴

Again quoting, this time from Abraham Kuyper in a work in the Dutch language, this article declares

In his "fervid desire for the complete and perfect sanctification of his disciples, the apostle accumulates these terms" in order to emphasize the doctrine of an entire renewal of the whole man by the working of the Holy Spirit.⁵

Another important aspect is then brought out from this same source:

¹Terry, op. cit., p. 52

²Orr (ed.), op. cit., IV, 2496.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

It has been pointed out--and this must be carefully borne in mind--that "the apostle does not use the word holomereis, 'in all your parts,' and then summarize these parts in body, soul and spirit, but holoteleis, a word that has no reference to parts, but to the telos, the end or aim. Calvin interprets 'soul' and 'spirit' here as referring to our rational and moral existence, as thinking, willing beings, both modes of operation of the one, undivided soul."¹

The theologian Charles Hodge also witnesses to this same interpretation when he says, "When Paul says to the Thessalonians, 'I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless...', he only uses a periphrasis for the whole man."²

Louis Berkhof has this same interpretation also:

Paul speaks...of "spirit and soul and body," but this does not necessarily mean that he regards these as three distinct elements in man rather than as three different aspects of man. When Jesus summarizes the first table of the Law by saying, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," in Matt. 22:37, He does not have in mind three distinct substances. Such expressions simply serve to emphasize the fact that the whole man is intended.³

A. H. Strong simply declares that I Thessalonians 5:23 is "...not a scientific enumeration of the constituent parts of human nature, but a comprehensive sketch of that nature in its chief relations."⁴

Thus, it may be said, to summarize, that (1) the mere mention of spirit and soul alongside of each other does not prove that, according to the Scripture, they are two distinct substances, any more than Mat-

¹Ibid.

²Hodge, op. cit., p. 50.

³Berkhof, Manual of Reformed Doctrine, op. cit., p. 123.

⁴Strong, op. cit., p. 484.

thw 22:37 proves that Jesus regarded heart and soul and mind as three distinct substances; (2) by application of the rule of Biblical interpretation often called "analogy of Scripture" such an exceptional statement should be interpreted in the light of the usual representation of Scripture, or in other words, synonymous usage of the two terms; (3) the apostle Paul here simply desires to strengthen the statement "And the God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly," by what Berkhof calls "...an epexegetical statement, in which the different aspects of man's existence are summed up..."¹ and (4) Paul could not very well have thought of soul and spirit as two different substances here, because he speaks elsewhere of man consisting of two parts (Rom. 8:10; I Cor. 5:5; 7:34; II Cor. 7:1; Eph. 2:3; Col. 2:5).

II. HEBREWS 4:12

The second passage which might be called a "problem text" and which must be considered here is found in the epistle to the Hebrews:

For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Buswell says that "Perhaps the most important argument of the trichotomists is based upon Hebrews 4:12..."²

The argument here is that if soul and spirit can be "divided

¹Berkhof, Systematic Theology, op. cit., p. 194.

²James Oliver Buswell, Jr., A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), I, 243.

asunder" they must be separable and hence, distinguishable as separate entities or substances. Buswell answers this argument in detail:

In answer it should be noted that this text does not indicate a division or separation of soul from spirit. That would have required some preposition such as metaksu, and a wording which suggests "dividing between soul and spirit." As a matter of fact, the objects of the participle "dividing" are a series of genitives, each one in itself naming something which is divided. We should more correctly read, "dividing asunder of soul and of spirit, of joints and of marrow." The Word is said to cleave the soul and to cleave the spirit by its piercing power, just as the joints are cleft and the marrow is cleft by the sword which slays the beast for sacrifice.¹

What seems to be intended by the writer here in Hebrews is not that the Word of God makes a separation between the soul and the spirit, which would naturally imply that these two are different substances, but that this Word, as a sword, can penetrate to the inner man in all of its aspects. That no division between is indicated but rather a division of soul, and of spirit, is evident by the last part of the verse, which says "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Obviously thoughts and intents cannot be regarded as separable substances. Intentions are actually a kind of thought; the Word is a discerner to the very depth and greatest extent of the thought processes. As Buswell says, the soul and spirit "...are no more separable than thoughts and intents are."²

Thus, again it is a case of rhetorical duplication of terms for the purpose of emphasis, or at most, a mentioning of different aspects

¹Ibid., pp. 243-244.

²Ibid., p. 244.

of function in the immaterial part of man. It is interesting that with the close mention and coupling of the term "heart" in this very same verse that exponents of the multiple division of the immaterial side of man's nature have not added this "substance" or "entity" along with soul and spirit.

In a slightly different approach to the exposition of this text, Hodge declares,

. . . when in Heb. 4:12 the Apostle says that the word of God pierces so as to penetrate soul and spirit, and the joints and marrow, he does not assume that soul and spirit are different substances. The joints and marrow are not different substances. They are both material; they are different forms of the same substance; and so soul and spirit are one and the same substance under different aspects or relations. We can say that the word of God reaches not only to the feelings, but also to the conscience, without assuming that the heart and conscience are distinct entities.¹

Again, this commentator insists that soul and spirit are one common substance and that the writer is only dealing with it under different aspects and relations.

Berkhof links up the last phrase of the verse regarding the "thoughts and intents of the heart" with the separation brought about by the Word of God:

Heb. 4:12 should not be taken to mean that the word of God, penetrating to the inner man, makes a separation between his soul and his spirit, which would naturally imply that these two are different substances; but simply as declaring that it brings about a separation in both between the thoughts and intents of the heart.²

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 50.

²Berkhof, Systematic Theology, op. cit., p. 195.

The unquestionable interchangeableness of usage between "heart", "soul", and "spirit" as found throughout the Bible should lead one to the simple, obvious conclusion in this verse that here too the terms are quite synonymous and interchangeable.

Strong emphasizes the thoroughness of the penetration, which certainly must be taken as the main import of this verse:

. . . not the dividing of soul from spirit, or of joints from marrow, but rather the piercing of the soul and of the spirit, even to the very joints and marrow; i.e., to the very depths of the spiritual nature.¹

However this verse is interpreted and expounded, this emphasis on the thoroughness of the power of God's Word must be held up as the most important aspect of the passage. It is useless to get bogged down in a dispute over whether soul and spirit can be separated and forget that God's Word is powerful enough to penetrate every aspect of man's being. The succeeding verse here emphasizes this also: "Nothing is hidden but everything is open before the eyes of the Word with whom we have to do."² As to the possibility of the separation, even one theologian who supports the trichotomy theory, in mentioning this verse as a proof-text, admits that, "However, there is no Scriptural proof that they are ever separated."³

One other commentator on this passage is worth mentioning. Marais, in The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, brings up the point

¹Strong, op. cit., p. 485.

²Hebrews 4:13, free translation by Buswell, op. cit., p. 244.

³Cambron, op. cit., p. 160.

that "spirit", "soul", and "heart" are brought together here in close correspondence. He believes that "heart" is used here "...evidently as the center of personality, manifesting itself in soul and spirit."¹ He recognizes that the only question here is whether the dividing which takes place by the piercing of the Word of God is

. . . one within the soul and spirit, causing a complete exposure of the inner man, a cutting asunder of all that composes his nature, or one between the soul and spirit, causing a division between them as separate parts of human nature.²

Marais feels that the probability lies with the first of these two contradictory views:

The writer evidently meant that, as a sharp two-edged sword pierces to the very marrow in its sundering process, so the sword of the spirit cuts through all obstacles, pierces the very heart, lays bare what hitherto was hidden to all observers, even to the man himself, and "discerns" the "thoughts and intents," which in the unity of soul and spirit have hitherto been kept in the background.³

In this same article Marais quotes again from Davidson, Old Testament Theology, who says:

The meaning is rather, that the word of God pierces and dissects both the soul and spirit, separates each into its parts, subtle though they may be, and analyzes their thoughts and intents.⁴

In conclusion, Marais asserts that to found a doctrine of trichotomy on what he calls "an isolated, variously interpreted text" is ex-

¹Orr (ed.), op. cit., p. 2498.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

tremely dangerous. He reminds the reader that the language of metaphor is not the language of literal speech, and that here we are evidently in the region of metaphor.

Thus, to summarize, some of the same things may be said about this passage which were said about the first, and they bear repeating: (1) the mere mention of spirit and soul alongside of each other does not prove that they are two distinct substances, since there are other Biblical examples of such parallelism in rhetoric; (2) by application of the rule of "analogy of Scripture" this verse should be interpreted in the light of the usual representation of Scripture, an interchangeable usage of the two terms; (3) the real point of this verse is to witness to the thorough penetrating power of God's Word and its ability to lay bare every part of man's nature; (4) the words used do not indicate so much a separation of soul from spirit as they do a separation or laying bare of the soul and of the spirit, or in other words, every aspect or every function of man's nature; and (5) the unproven assertion that the soul and spirit can be divided is nowhere else indicated in the Scripture.

III. OTHER PASSAGES

There are perhaps three or four other passages in the Bible which deserve some comment as to their relation to the subject under consideration. One of these is found in I Corinthians 15:44, where the apostle, in referring to the resurrection of our physical body says:

It is sown a natural body (Grk., soma psuchikon, or "soulish body"); it is raised a spiritual body (Grk., soma pneumatikon). If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body.

Some commentators claim that to make no difference between the soul and spirit is to assert that there is no difference between the mortal body (here called "a natural body", or literally in the Greek, "a soulish body"), and the resurrection body (here called "a spiritual body").¹

In answer to this accusation, Buswell answers:

. . . in the first place, the dichotomist does not say that "there is no difference" between soul and spirit. These words are...functional names which differ from one another as "heart" and "mind" differ from one another.²

Buswell goes on to point out that those who are raising this objection should remember that it is an important point of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection that the identity of the body is not lost in the change of the nature of the body in the resurrection; it is in some sense the same body which served as the habitation for man in this life which he will have once again in the resurrected state. It is a fundamental point of the Christian faith that the body of Christ with which He was born, in which He lived in the flesh, and in which He was crucified, is the same body in identity as His risen, glorious body, and we shall be like Him in our resurrection.

Charles Hodge declares concerning this passage that while it seems to imply that the soul exists in this life, but is not to exist hereafter where the spirit is still existing, and therefore the two are

¹So claims the Scofield Reference Bible in the note on I Thessalonians 5:23.

²Buswell, op. cit., p. 245.

separable and distinct, that actually this explanation cannot be applied here because it contradicts the general representation of Scripture. He says we are constrained to find some other explanation which will harmonize with other portions of the word of God.¹

The general meaning here is plain. We now have perishable, even dishonorable bodies. Hereafter we are to have glorious bodies, adapted to a higher state of existence. The only question is why did the apostle call the one "psychical" and the other "pneumatic" ("soulish" and "spiritual"). The simple answer is that the "soulish" body designates the human body as having those attributes which are appropriate for the life of the person in the flesh in this world during the present age, for the soul, while not strictly limited to this sense, is often related to the functions of human consciousness on the level of the physical. On the other hand, the "spiritual" body designates the same body, changed as it will be in the resurrection, and appropriate for the life of the person who is dwelling in heaven in communion with God.

There are a few other instances where reference is made to "the natural man" where the Greek has psyche, or "soul".² The idea to be conveyed is that this person is living on the level of physical existence or "natural things", in contrast to the "spiritual man" who is living in full awareness of contact with God through His Spirit. These are merely ways of contrasting the functioning of man's nature, and not

¹Hodge, op. cit., p. 50.

²See, for instance, I Corinthians 2:14.

necessarily distinctions as to entities making up man's nature.

Buswell refers to Franz Delitzsch's classic work on Biblical Psychology which appears to set forth a trichotomy. However, Buswell criticizes Delitzsch for not explicitly recognizing the difference between a distinction of "substantive entities" and a distinction of "functional names for the same substantive entity".¹ He feels that what Delitzsch really meant was just what he holds--that the difference between soul and spirit is merely a difference of functional names for the same substantive entity. Applying this principle to the various passages which seem to imply a difference between soul and spirit will help to clear up the problem.

Another passage which might appear to offer a problem is Philip-
pians 1:27, where Paul exhorts, "...that ye stand fast in one spirit,
(en eni pneumati) with one mind (mia psyche) striving together for the
faith..." This is certainly nothing more than a rhetorical parallelism
for the sake of emphasis, and no distinction is implied here.

Again, Luke 1:46, 47 offers another example of what would appear
to be rhetorical parallelism: "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the
Lord, And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." Both expressions
are quite similar; both indicate an emotional feeling. Yet, both may
also indicate a spiritual feeling or relationship, in what would be con-
sidered a higher plane than the mere emotional. The important thing to
note here is that both the soul and the spirit, or one might say, either

¹Buswell, op. cit., pp. 246-247.

the soul or the spirit, may be referred to in this regard.

A final "problem passage" to which reference may be made is Jude, verse 19: "These are they who make separations, sensual (psuchikoi), having not the Spirit (pneuma me echontes)."¹ A. H. Strong points out regarding this verse, that even if pneuma is here taken to be the human spirit, this does not mean that there is no spirit existing, "...but only that the spirit is torpid and inoperative--as we say of a weak man: 'he has no mind,' or of an unprincipled man: 'he has no conscience';"¹ This he said to counter the argument of certain trichotomists who teach that unregenerate man has lost the "spirit" from his human nature--to have it restored he must be regenerated. In the meantime he is a "soul-ish" person.

However, pneuma here probably means, as Strong also points out, the divine pneuma; several versions thus capitalize the word "spirit". Yet, even Strong's words above would leave the implication (which he elsewhere strongly denies) that the soul and the spirit could be considered as separate entities. And there is also the fact that this individual is called "soul-ish" who does not have the Holy Spirit. The simple explanation is, as pointed out before, that the person who does not live in the awareness of God's Spirit is considered as being ignorant of that aspect of his immaterial nature that is frequently called "spirit" in the Bible. Strong concludes his discussion of this verse (and of I Thess. 5: 23 and Hebrews 4:12) with a quotation from Goodwin (Society Biblical

¹Strong, op. cit., p. 485.

Exegesis, 1881:85): "The distinction between psuche and pneuma is a functional and not a substantial, distinction."¹

IV. SUMMARY

The few Bible passages which have been considered "problem passages" in the trichotomy-dichotomy issue have been found to be inconclusive in the support of trichotomy. These passages which mention soul and spirit together, and apparently as contrasted from one another, have been shown to be rhetorical in nature for stronger emphasis on the totality of human nature, or in the form of parallelism so common to Hebrew thought. Where there has been any intimation of a distinction between the two terms it has been found to be just as well explained, if not, indeed, better explained, on the basis of a functional difference--a different aspect--rather than a substantial difference in the immaterial part of man's nature.

This has been found to be the more satisfactory explanation due to the fact that elsewhere in Scripture the two terms "soul" and "spirit" are often used interchangeably without distinction to designate the immaterial part of man; and according to the rule of Biblical interpretation known as "analogy of Scripture" exceptional statements should be interpreted in the light of the usual representation of Scripture.

Thus it has been found that when Paul prayed that God sanctify the individual wholly in "spirit and soul and body" that he was simply

¹Ibid.

strengthening the force of his words by the reference to several aspects of man's existence, and not necessarily indicating that soul and spirit are two separate substances which make up man's nature. This usage, it has been pointed out, is parallel to that of Jesus who commanded men to love God with all their "heart...soul...might...mind...(and) strength."

Also it has been noted that the writer to the Hebrews was not necessarily indicating that the soul and the spirit could be divided or separated one from the other, as if they were two separate substances, when he spoke of the Word of God "dividing asunder...soul and spirit". He was rather undoubtedly attempting to simply indicate as strongly as possible that God's Word penetrates to the very depths of every aspect of man's nature; it is not a matter of separation of soul from spirit but of the laying bare of the soul and of the spirit.

It has been noted that there are some instances where the unregenerate man is called "natural", or literally, "soulish". This is an indication that man can live in ignorance of (ignoring) that aspect of life which is or can be directed God-ward. This aspect of man's nature is frequently referred to as his spirit although this is not so exclusive a usage as to distinguish the spirit absolutely from the soul as an entity--the soul also, on occasion, being referred to as capable of the highest order of spiritual capacity.

Thus this chapter can best be summarized in the words of A. H.

Strong already quoted above:

The passages chiefly relied upon as supporting trichotomy may be better explained upon the view already indicated, that soul

and spirit are not two distinct substances or parts, but that they designate the immaterial principle from different points of view.¹

¹Strong, op. cit., p. 485; see above, p. 32.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this study to survey the representative theological views on the subject of the constituent elements of human nature and then to attempt to analyze and define the Biblical words for "soul" and "spirit" in such a way as to determine from their usage whether such a distinction could be made between them as to necessitate and support the view that there are three constituent elements in human nature. In the absence of such a distinction a conclusion could be drawn that man's nature has essentially two elements, the material and the immaterial. It was further possible that these two elements might be found to be so intimately related and bound together as to be considered a unity.

It has been found in chapter two of this study, which was a survey of representative theological views on this subject, that the early church was in the beginning influenced by Greek philosophical thought, and embraced, for a while, the view of trichotomy--three elements in man's constituent nature. The church very shortly forsook this view however, for the most part, due to a number of heretical theories which grew up based on the trichotomic view. Among these were the Apollinarian heresy of the person of Christ, and the so-called Semi-Pelagian heresy regarding original sin. It was especially the Western church,

out of which came the Protestant reformation, which moved strongly to hold the idea of dichotomy.

The reformers, especially as seen in Luther and Calvin, continued to hold strongly to this dichotomic view, that man's nature is made up of two constituent elements.

Among more recent theologians, however, there has been more of a variety of viewpoints on this subject. Today, representatives may be found who hold to trichotomy, dichotomy or monochotomy. It is not a question of orthodoxy, for representatives of each of these views may be found who are equally fundamental and orthodox; this issue does not necessarily affect any fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith and it is mainly a matter of Biblical interpretation as to which view is embraced. There are, however, even today, those who would espouse a doctrine of annihilation of the wicked, a doctrine which is based on a view of trichotomy. So, while it is not essentially a question of orthodoxy as to which view is held, a number of authors have clearly indicated their concern that the view taken on this issue may greatly influence one in other theological matters.

It has been noted that among those who hold trichotomy they often (almost generally) resort to the idea that spirit and matter can not join together without an intermediary of some sort. This they believe is the soul, which, according to them, came into existence when the spirit was "breathed into" the body, in order to be a "buffer" between the other two elements. This is an ancient Greek philosophical idea which seems to spring clearly from basic dualism--a doctrine which is

most certainly non-Christian.

It would seem, however, that the majority of present-day theologians (those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) hold firmly to the dichotomic view. This has been the observation based on a rather widely representative survey of present-day thought on this subject. At any rate, the more serious and thorough theologians of the past and present have been aware of the tendencies toward heresy inherent in the trichotomic view and have strongly repudiated it. This has not, of course, been their only reason for embracing dichotomy. They have almost uniformly witnessed to the fact that the Biblical usage does not substantiate nor allow any substantial distinction between the words "soul" and "spirit", and that the general trend of Biblical usage rather equates these two terms and uses them quite interchangeably.

There have been noted a few theologians who support a monochotomic view. However, they also recognize the fact that the "spirit" may be separated from the "body" and exist thus until the resurrection. While it is a worthwhile and a Biblical emphasis--this unity of the body and soul (or spirit)--yet there is also in both Biblical and practical terms a distinction to be made between the body and that immaterial element in man's nature which is not physical. In distinguishing between the material and non-material parts of man's nature one should not neglect to realize that these two parts are held together in an intimate unity which makes up man. Only death separates these two and in some sense, man is not complete until the resurrection reunites them.

In chapter three of this study an analysis of the Biblical words

for "soul" and "spirit" was made. This has been, along with the following chapter, the most significant part of the study, for whatever other men may have thought, speculated, or reasoned, the Bible alone remains the sole authority and source for true theology.

It was found that both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament these two words are used quite interchangeably to refer to the same things. The following are some of the factors found in this study of the Biblical usage:

(1) Both terms are made to stand for the life-principle in men and also both terms are used in reference to the same in animals. This point contradicts an often-found assertion of trichotomists that while both men and animals have souls, only man has a spirit. This simply is not true according to Biblical usage. The difference between man and the animals must be found elsewhere; both are said to have souls and both are said to have spirits.

(2) In the Bible death is sometimes described as the giving up of the soul and in other cases as the giving up of the spirit. Also the immaterial element of the dead, that which is existing beyond death, is sometimes termed "soul" and other times "spirit".

(3) The same psychological functions are ascribed to the spirit as are elsewhere ascribed to the soul. This, too, is in contradiction to those trichotomists who assert that the soul is the earth-conscious part of man while the spirit is the God-conscious part. This distinction just does not hold up in Biblical usage.

(4) Likewise, both soul and spirit are regarded in the Bible as

having spiritual or eternal value. Man can worship God with his soul just as well as with his spirit according to Biblical usage. Again this contradicts the assertion of some who say that the spirit is distinct in that it alone may be God-conscious.

(5) And, finally, it has been pointed out that there are a number of passages in the Bible which indicate that man is made up of two parts and in some of these instances the parts are named as "body and soul" and in other instances as "body and spirit" (or "flesh and spirit"). This would lead one to conclude that "soul" and "spirit" may be used interchangeably for the "second" part of man's nature, the so-called immaterial part.

The next chapter of this study undertook to give an exposition of so-called "problem texts" in such a way as to harmonize them with the general usage of the Bible as established in chapter three. The texts considered were those which the trichotomists depend upon to support their view, principally I Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12. It was found, however, that these texts do not necessarily lend support to a distinction between soul and spirit as separate substances in man's constitution, necessitating a tri-partite division of man's nature. On the contrary, they may be understood as in no way necessitating this; they are chiefly examples of rhetorical parallelism or duplication for added emphasis to the point being made. In I Thessalonians this is that the whole man should be sanctified and preserved blameless; in Hebrews 4:12 it is that God's Word is powerful and able to penetrate thoroughly to every aspect of man's being. It has been found that the Bible does

occasionally refer to unregenerate man as "soulish" whereas he ought to be "spiritual", but this distinction need not be considered as necessitating different substances or entities in man's nature, but as referring to different functions of man's nature or different emphases in relation to man's nature. The point Scripture is trying to make in these cases is that man may place his life's emphasis on one or the other aspects of his existence which are respectively labelled as "soulish" or "spiritual". Thus, it may be found necessary to consider the Scripture as indicating some functional distinction between the soul and the spirit, or in other words, that these may be separate descriptive words of various functions of human nature. Yet they are no more separate entities than is the "heart", the "mind", the "will", or the "conscience". In fact, this study has revealed that the words "spirit" and "soul" in Biblical usage are often interchangeable with one or another of these other terms also.

II. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the foregoing study it would seem entirely within reason to conclude firmly that man's nature is made up of two constituent elements. In other words, this study leads to a conclusion for dichotomy. Not only does a study of church history reveal that this has been and is the most widely held view down through the centuries, but an objective study of the Biblical usage of the words "soul" and "spirit" also leads to this conclusion.

That man has a body is obvious to all who examine the physical

substance which makes up the organism we call man. But furthermore, that man has an immaterial nature as well, whether it be called "soul" or "spirit", is obvious to all who examine God's revelation, His Holy Word, the Bible. Moreover, this fact of an immaterial part to man's nature does present itself to human consciousness to those who honestly examine the subject. And it is interesting to note that man is aware in his consciousness of only one, indivisible element that makes up this non-physical part of his nature; this is the real "self", the real "person", in contrast to the body, which in a sense, only houses this person.

One must conclude, on the other hand, that man is a "psycho-somatic" unity. The soul (or spirit) is intimately wrapped up or related to the body in this life and the Bible witnesses to the fact that while this soul may continue to exist apart from the body after death (separation from the body), it will one day be reunited with a resurrected body in order to once again enjoy this unity which is part of human existence.

It is necessary to distinguish between substance and function in speaking of the various terms used in the Bible for man's nature and its constituent elements. It appears that there is no indication in the Biblical usage that soul and spirit are different substances in man's nature, while it is true that Biblical usage may indicate a functional distinction between these two terms in some instances. This is similar to distinguishing between "conscience" and "will" and other such aspects of human personality. Still, with the interchangeable usage of the two terms "soul" and "spirit" in the Bible it would be difficult to define

precisely what the different functional attributes of these two aspects might be.

A secondary conclusion, and one that the author would only hesitantly put forth, is that it may be proper to refer to man as a whole as "a living soul", an entity which is composed of two elements, body and spirit. In this conception, anything which is attributed to the spirit may also be attributed to the soul, for the soul is the whole; and yet, vice versa, things attributed to the soul may also be attributed to the spirit, for the spirit is, one could say, the more essential part of man's nature--the part which really encompasses most of man's real self. This view, which is unquestionably dichotomic, would seem to be in harmony with the findings related in the chapters on Biblical usage.

Related areas of suggested research

It would seem to this author that one great value of this study has been to clarify the meaning of the word "soul" and of its nature. This would seem to be an important step on the way toward defending the entire concept of the immaterial nature in man from those materialists who absolutely deny its existence. Therefore a further study could be made into the arguments presented by such materialists, or in other words, the arguments against the existence of the "soul" or "spirit".

Further study could also be made in a separate study to the bearing the results of this study would have on the subject of the intermediate state, and of the resurrection.

It would also be of great interest, as mentioned earlier, to relate the findings of this study to modern psychological views. Undoubt-

edly much correlation could be found between the two.

Two minor studies might be made as to all of the implications the conclusions of this study would have on the subject of sanctification (in view of the fact that one of the chief references involved here was in relation to that subject), and on the subject of the penetrating power of God's Word (again in view of the fact that another of the chief references involved in this study related to that subject).

And last, but certainly not least, a subject for further study or consideration could be made into the nature of "the image of God" in man. Does this extend only to the immaterial part of man's nature or does it extend to man in his entirety--body as well as soul?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BIBLES

1. English

American Standard. The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments.
New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.

King James. The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, n d

Lindsell, Harold (ed.). Harper Study Bible: Revised Standard Version.
New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

2. Greek

Nestle, D. Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. Verlag und Druck der
Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1952.

B. BOOKS

Bancroft, Emery H. Christian Theology. Johnson City, N.Y.: Johnson
City Publishing Company, 1946. Originally published, 1925.

Berkhof, Louis. Manual of Reformed Doctrine. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1933.

_____. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co., 1949.

Berkouwer, G. C. Man: The Image of God. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co., 1962.

Binney, Amos and Daniel Steele. Binney's Theological Compend Improved.
New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1902.

Buswell, James Oliver, Jr. A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.

Calhoun, Robert Lowry. What Is Man? New York: Association Press, 1939.

Cambron, Mark G. Bible Doctrines. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing
House, 1954.

- Chambers, Oswald. Biblical Psychology. Cincinnati, Ohio: God's Revivalist Office, 1914.
- Clarke, William Newton. An Outline of Christian Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Curtis, Olin Alfred. The Christian Faith. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1905.
- Girdlestone, Robert Baker. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951. A reproduction of the second edition which appeared in 1897.
- Hamilton, Floyd E. The Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Henry, Carl F. H. (ed.). Basic Christian Doctrines. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. Chapter by John H. Gerstner, "The Origin and Nature of Man: Imago Dei."
- Hughes, H. Malduyn. Basic Beliefs. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929.
- Jessop, T. E., et. al. The Christian Understanding of Man. New York: Willet, Clark & Company, 1938. A liberal view.
- Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr. (ed.). A Compend of Luther's Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.
- Knudsen, Ralph E. Theology in the New Testament. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Judson Press, 1964.
- Leitch, Addison H. Interpreting Basic Theology. New York: Channel Press, 1961. Pp. 55-59.
- Lockyer, Herbert. All the Doctrines of the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964.
- Marshall, I. Howard. Christian Beliefs. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1963.
- Meehl, Paul, Richard Klann, Alfred Schmieding, Kenneth Breimeier, and Sophie Schroeder-Sloman, What, Then, Is Man? Saint Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.
- Oehler, Gustav Friedrich. Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1883.
- Orr, James. God's Image in Man. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.

- Owen, D. R. G. Body and Soul. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- Payne, J. Barton. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Pearlman, Myer. Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible. Springfield, Mo.: The Gospel Publishing House, 1937.
- Pittenger, W. Norman. The Christian Understanding of Human Nature. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964. Episcopalian.
- Preus, Herman A. and Edmund Smits (eds.). The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Sauer, Erich. The King of the Earth. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962. Sub-title: The Nobility of Man according to the Bible and Science.
- Schep, J. A. The Nature of the Resurrection Body. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- Sheldon, Henry C. System of Christian Doctrine. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1903. Methodist.
- Smith, F. G. What the Bible Teaches. Anderson, Ind.: Warner Press Inc., 1955. Condensed edition.
- Stacey, W. David. The Pauline View of Man. London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1956.
- Stalker, James. Christian Psychology. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- Summers, Ray. The Life Beyond. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1959.
- Terry, Milton S. Biblical Dogmatics. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1907.
- Thiessen, Henry C. Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952.
- Torrance, T. G. Calvin's Doctrine of Man. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Weaver, Jonathan. Christian Theology. Dayton, Ohio: United Brethren Publishing House, 1900.

Young, Warren C. A Christian Approach to Philosophy. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1954.

C. BOOKS: PARTS OF SERIES

Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption (Dogmatics: Vol. II). Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.

Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1932. I, pp. 170-173; II, pp. 208-210.

Foster, Randolph S. Studies in Theology. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1895. IV, pp. 220-221, 249-252.

Hodge, Charles. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1946. II, pp. 42-51. Originally published by Charles Scribner & Co., 1871.

Miley, John. Systematic Theology. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1892. I, pp. 397-403.

Pope, William Burt. A Compendium of Christian Theology. New York: Hunt & Eaton, n.d. I, pp. 435-436.

Strong, Augustus Hopkins. Systematic Theology. Philadelphia: The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1907. II, pp. 483-487.

Wiley, H. Orton. Christian Theology. Kansas City, Mo.: Beacon Hill Press, 1941. II, pp. 15-19.

D. CONCORDANCES

Strong, James. The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1894.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1924.

E. DICTIONARIES

- Buttrick, George Arthur (ed.). The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Davis, John D. A Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1942.
- Douglas, J. D. (ed.). The New Bible Dictionary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962.
- Harrison, Everett F. (ed.). Baker's Dictionary of Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960.
- Tenney, Merrill C. (ed.). Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- Unger, Merrill F. (ed.). Unger's Bible Dictionary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1957.

F. ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- Jackson, Samuel Macauley (ed.). The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1911.
- Orr, James (ed.). The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943.

G. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Carroll, Richard Francis. "A Survey of Some Contemporary Philosophies of Man." Unpublished thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, 1961.
- Taylor, Ben O. "A Comparative Study of the Conservative Evangelical View and the Seventh-Day Adventist View of the Doctrine of an Intermediate State." Unpublished thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, 1963.

APPENDIX A

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BIBLICAL
USAGE OF THE WORD "HEART"

It is obvious that the Bible frequently refers to the "heart" in a figurative manner, not indicating the physical organ in man's body which pumps the blood through his system. It is also interesting to note how much the Biblical usage of the word "heart" parallels that of soul and spirit.

The Bible speaks of the heart as the center of our life; just as we today speak of the 'heart of the issue', the Biblical heart is at the core of our life. The spiritual heart seems to mean "the whole inner man", the real self: "Thy word have I hid in mine heart that I might not sin against Thee" (Psalm 119:11); "Let my heart be sound" (Psalm 119:80); "A good man out of the good treasures of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh" (Luke 6:45); "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life" (Proverbs 4:23).

But more specifically in Scriptural usage the "heart" is found to be related to the several aspects of what is commonly called human personality: intellect, emotions, and will. That is, these various aspects of human personality are variously attributed to the "heart". First there is the usage of "heart" as mind or intellect: "Why reason ye in your heart?" (Mark 2:8); "But as it is written, eye hath not seen, nor

ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (I Corinthians 2:9). The latter reference speaks of the imagination, the mind, as the "heart".

Then there are other references where the word "heart" is used in reference to man's emotional nature, his feelings: "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid" (John 14:27); "And the Lord direct your heart into the love of God" (I Thessalonians 3:5). Here emotions, such as worry, fear and love, are attributed to the heart; elsewhere these emotions are attributed to the soul or to the spirit.

There are, lastly, other references which attribute the function of the will to the "heart": "Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself..." (Daniel 1:8); Barnabas "...exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord" (Acts 11:23); "...serve in singleness of heart, fearing God" (Colossians 3:22); "...purify your hearts ye double-minded" (James 4:8). Singleness of purpose is obviously related to the will.

So "heart" is sometimes used inclusively, meaning the whole self, and sometimes specifically, meaning any of the various attributes of human personality--intellect, emotions, or will. These usages are very similar to those found in the Bible for the words "soul" and "spirit". This would seem to lead to the conclusion that the words refer to the same entity or substance, the immaterial part of man's nature.