

instance, but a single sentence is devoted; and that, if sufficient for a discourse, is hardly so for an exposition.

3. Exposition by B. N. G.—This is a discourse in which the application abounds almost to the exclusion of exposition. With a little more care in the use of figures and figurative speech it would be effective in many pulpits. The tone is earnest, and the appeals to experience are direct and close.

#### THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY.

A paper is received on "Clement of Rome" (A. S.), and one on "The Work of the Holy Spirit on Christ" (M. J. B.). The former is full and interesting, and in scholarship quite up to date. But it is hurriedly written, and would require a good deal of overhauling to prepare it for the press. The latter is most carefully written, in a fine spirit and with true insight. Its defect is the rush at the close, not due to carelessness, but to want of space.

The two literary papers are reviews of "Lux Mundi," the one (W. D. R.) of the whole book, the other (T. N.) a more

elaborate criticism of Mr. Gore's essay alone. In the latter there is evidence of careful reading and capacity to handle the subject chosen, but the style is somewhat slow and pointless. The best paper of the four is by W. D. R.—the Rev. W. Douglass Reid, M.A., Clapton Presbyterian Church, London.

Will Mr. Burns, Mr. Clemens, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Reid kindly let the publishers know which of the following volumes they wish sent to them:—

Dorner's System of Christian Ethics, 14s.

Lichtenberger's History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 14s.

Orelli's Prophecies of Isaiah, 10s. 6d.

Orelli's Prophecies of Jeremiah, 10s. 6d.

Stählin's Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl, 9s.

Workman's Text of Jeremiah, 9s.

Cassel's Commentary on Esther, 10s. 6d.

Frank's Christian Certainty, 10s. 6d.

Sartorius's Doctrine of Divine Love, 10s. 6d.

## Note on ψυχή and ζωή

### AND THEIR ENGLISH RENDERINGS IN AUTHORISED VERSION AND REVISED VERSION.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL J. B. M'CLELLAN, M.A., CIRENCESTER.

THE "Notes of Recent Exposition" are, I have no doubt, of great interest and convenience to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In the September issue, on p. 268, there is a reference to an article by the Rev. C. W. Darling in the *Clergyman's Magazine* for August on the difference between the two Greek words ψυχή and ζωή, and their renderings in the A.V. and R.V. Mr. Darling's statements and arguments are briefly reproduced, with the cautious and suggestive addition, "There are five passages which create a little difficulty. . . . We do not think that Mr. Darling has successfully disposed of them all." Mr. Darling's view being, to quote THE EXPOSITORY TIMES' *resumé*, that "the two words are not only distinct, but in their distinction lies a whole theology: ψυχή means our *present temporal life*, ζωή the *eternal life*;" and that while "the A.V. sometimes offers *soul* as a translation of ψυχή, but with no gain and some loss, the Revisers uniformly render both by *life*."

Now, assuming that THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has correctly reproduced Mr. Darling's view, it is desirable to utter a warning against its acceptance. With the exception of the statement that "the two words are distinct," the representations and assertions are not only not correct, but are entirely erroneous. It is not even true that "the Revisers uniformly render both words by *life*," as will be

seen by referring to Luke xii. 19, 20 (R.V.), "*Soul thou hast much goods,*" etc. . . . "this night is thy *soul* required of thee" (ψυχή in both cases). But the main and fundamental error is the utter misconception of the distinction between ψυχή and ζωή, as one between *life temporal* and *life eternal*. If ζωή itself were *life eternal*, then the constantly recurring phrase ζωή αἰώνιος would be needless. There is, certainly, a real and great distinction between the two words; but neither in one nor the other is the idea of *temporal* or *eternal* involved. Whether the one or the other refers to *eternal life* in any particular passage, or otherwise, must be judged by the context and by the phraseology employed. That, contrary to Mr. Darling, ζωή undoubtedly *is* used at times of *life temporal*, is clear from James iv. 14 ("What is your ζωή, a vapour," etc.); and that ψυχή may at times *seem* to be rendered correctly by *life*, is no more a proof that the word means *life temporal*, or *life* at all, than that *caput* means *death* because *damnari capitis* is rightly rendered in English by "*condemned to death*." It is purely an accident of *phrase* and *idiom*; and translators, whether in A.V. or R.V., are right or wrong according as they pay the proper attention to the *context* and the *idiom*, and render accordingly. That the R.V. generally falls far below our venerable A.V. in its renderings, I, for one, believe to be capable of demonstration

in every book of the New Testament;<sup>1</sup> but at all events it has not so far fallen as to be guilty of rendering *ψυχή* by *life* in Luke xii. 19, above cited, or, again, in such passages as Matthew x. 28 ("not able to kill the *soul*," etc.). The fact is, that a comparison between *ψυχή* and *ζωή* is almost like a comparison between *eye* and *sight*, or between *matter* and *energy*; and the difference between the words is simply this, that *ψυχή*, *soul*, is the *organism* or *substance* in which *ζωή*, *life*, partly resides as a *state* or *activity* which may be either *temporal* or *eternal* according to circumstances, and may be predicated (as frequently) not only of *man*, but also of the *lower animals* and even of *plants*. *Ψυχή*, *soul*, is thus the antithesis to *σῶμα*, *body*, (as in Matthew x. 28; also in vi. 25, where it is to be regretted that the rendering *soul* is inadmissible according to usage), the loss of point being considerable in consequence,<sup>2</sup> as *ζωή*, *life*, is to *θάνατος*, *death*. The application to *temporal* or *eternal* conditions is not in the words themselves, but in the phrases and arguments of the writer; and when the true distinction between the words is recognised, no difficulty can arise either in any of the passages referred to by THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, or in any other. The phrases and contexts explain the meaning, and to all who are familiar with the idioms of the two languages will suggest the correct or most practicable English equivalent, *viz.*, for *ζωή*, *life*, always, whether *temporal* or

*eternal*; for *ψυχή*, *soul* or *life*, according to requirement. In such cases as Luke xvi. 25, and 1 Cor. xv. 19, where the reference is to *temporal life*, the employment of *ψυχή* would be absolutely impossible, whereas *ζωή* is correct: and, on the other hand, in such passages as Matthew xvi. 25, and Acts ii. 27 ("Whosoever shall lose his *ψυχή* for my sake shall find IT;" and "He will not leave my *ψυχή* in Hades"), where *ψυχή* is correctly employed, to assign the reference to *temporal life* would be to reduce the statements to absurdity.

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

## Ζωή and ψυχή in the New Testament.

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

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

A MINISTERIAL correspondent asks whether the distinction that has been drawn between two Greek words *zoé* and *psyché* (*ζωή* and *ψυχή*), both translated "life," in the New Testament is tenable. An allusion to this distinction is found in an interesting note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, where it is said "*ψυχή* means our present temporal life, *ζωή* the eternal life." Thus it is said of our Saviour, "The Son of man came to give His life (*ψυχή*, His human, temporal life)

a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28), but "I am the resurrection and the life" (*ζωή*, the divine, the eternal life) (John xi. 25). Our correspondent doubts whether this distinction can be upheld, and suggests that "*ψυχή* refers to the principle of natural life, *ζωή* to the duration of life, either natural, spiritual, or eternal."

We think there can be no doubt that the distinction above referred to is amply sustained by New Testament usage. It is not new; the writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES merely points out some interesting results of observing the distinction as indicated by another writer, the Rev. C. W. Darling. *Ζωή* occurs about 150 times (roughly speaking) in the New Testament, and only in some eight or ten of these does it denote the earthly life of the individual or existence in the present state; and even of these instances, some are doubtful. In other passages it denotes that which is "life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19, Revised

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

<sup>2</sup> Anxiety for the *ψυχή*, *soul*, is not forbidden, save as to *eating* and *drinking*; anxiety for the *σῶμα*, *body*, not forbidden, save as to *raiment*. For "the *SOUL* is more than *food*," etc.