THE NATURE OF THE HUMAN SOUL IN ST. PAUL'S THOUGHT

BY
ATHENAGORAS (NIKOLAOS) ZAKOPOULOS, Ph.D.

1. St. Paul's concept of the human soul (ψυχή) *with special reference to modern scholars.*

The infrequent use of the term ψυχή in St. Paul (only 13 times as agaist the frequent use of πνεῦμα) makes it difficult to conclude which use embodies the word's essential meaning, and indeed, to distinguish clearly among the various uses themselves.

Nevertheless St. Paul's theory of the soul must be reconstructed exclusively from these thirteen passages, which can, however, in the interest of clarity, be classified into three groups:

a) Soul as life, vitality, life principle.
b) Soul as the seat of the feeling, will, emotion and thought.
c) Soul as individual.

a) Soul as life, vitality, life principle.

The world *Psyche*, denoting life, life principle, vitality or principle of the physical life, «without psychological content,»[1] occurs six times in Pauline letters.

In Romans Paul twice uses the word *Psyche* instead of life. In 11,3, where he freely and no doubt from memory quotes[2] the LXX I Kings 10.10, 14, 18,[3] he recalls Elijah's words that they are seeking

1. H. W. Robinson, «Hebrew psychology in relation to Pauline anthropology» in *Mansfield College Essays*, Hodder, London (1909) p. 280; idem, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, T. T. Clark, Edinburgh (1928³) p. 108.

2. F. I. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans*, London (1961) pp. 278-9.

3. F. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Edinburgh (1881) Vol. 2, p. 224; also W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Edinburgh (ICC) (1898³) p. 11; William Barclay, *The Letter to the Romans*, Edinburgh (1960) p. 155; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, London (1957) p. 208; F. I. Leenhardt, *Ibid.* p.

«my life»; in 16,4, he speaks about Prisca and Aquila, his fellow-workers, who risked their own lives to save his «life».

Let me cite two further passages: «For he (Epaphroditus) nearly died for the work of Christ, risking his life to complete your service to me,»[4] and «ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves.»[5] These must be understood and interpreted in exactly the same way.

There remain two other cases. The words, «The first Adam became a living soul,»[6] are taken from Gen. 2,7 and are an exact translation of the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה. In 2 Corinthians 1,23 the translation of the word psyche is problematic, and there are various renderings of the original.[7] Moreover, Stacey, while he does not rule out other possible translations, favours «life» as the most appropriate here.[8]

In the preceding examples, then, St. Paul relies on the word *psyche* to express life, life principle, vitality, principle of the physical life.

b) Soul as the seat of the feeling, will, emotion and thought.

In only three instances does St. Paul use «soul» to refer to the seat of the will or feeling. He exhorts the slaves to do the will of God «not grudgingly or formally, but *ex animo*, with readiness of heart,»[9]

278; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, London (1963) p. 213; P. M. J. Lagrange, *St. Paul Epître aux Romains*, Paris (1950) p. 268; V. Taylor, *The Epistle to the Romans*, London (1955) p. 73; K. Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, London (1933) p. 395.

4. *Philip.* 2.30 RSV; comp. also with *Matth.* 2.20; 6.25; 10.39; 16.25; 20.28; *Mark* 8.35-36; *Luke* 12.20-23; *John* 10.11; 15.17; 12.25; 13.37; *Acts* 5.26; 20.10-24; 27.10; 22; I *Pet.* 4.19; I *John* 3.16; *Apoc.* 12.11.

5. 1 *Thess.* 2.8; RSV; Vulg. «etiam animas nostras»; AV «our own souls»; NEB «our very selves»; JB «our whole lives».

6. 1 *Corinthians* 15.45 «ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν»; RSV «a living being»; Vulg. «animal viventem»; AV «a living soul»; NEB «an animate being»; JB «a living soul.»

7. AV «upon my soul»; RSV «against me»; NEB «I stake my life upon it»; Moffatt and RS «against my soul»; also Vulg. «In animan meam». Aug. «super animam meam» quoted in A. Plummer, 2 *Corinthians* (ICC) p. 43. Today's English version «my heart»; New International Version «you»; JB «by my life»; PME «my life»; LB «against me».

8. W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, Macmillan, London (1956) p. 122; R. V. G. Tasker, 2 *Corinthians*, Tyndale Press, London (1958) p 49. It appears from his comments on 5.23, that he inclines toward the RSV rendering.

9. S. D. F. Salmond, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* in EGT (1903) p. 378.

as servants of Christ.[10] In Col. 3.23, the same exhortations are repeated, and the meaning of ἐκ ψυχῆς is similar to that of Eph. 6.6. The presence of ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι in the same sentence (Phil. 1.27) makes μιᾷ ψυχῇ susceptible of more than one meaning. AV and RSV have it «in one spirit, with one mind» and NEB, «one in spirit, one in mind.» H. W. Robinson considers that it means «desire,»[11] and R. Smith treats it as «life.»[12] Bultmann and Stacey also elaborate on this point. Bultmann states: «The phrase 'with one *psyche*' (like in one spirit) means in agreement, i. e. having the same attitude or the same orientation of will; and there is no difference between *psyche* here and other expressions that mean tendency of one's will, one's intention (cf. I Cor. 1.19 'united in the same mind —*nous* — and the same judgment'). Words compounded with the root *psyche* indicate the same thing. *Sympsychos* means 'being in agreement' (of one mind) Phil. 2.2 RSV; the *isopsychos* (Phil. 2.20) is 'the like-minded'. *Eupsychein*, 'be of good cheer, hopeful, confident', (Phil. 2.19), offers a somewhat different nuance. It does not mean the willing of something, it is true, but it does also express the intention element of that vitality which is denoted by *psyche*.»[13] Stacey, on the other hand, remarks, «The key is that it is meant to emphasize ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι. Paul wanted a word that would repeat the sense of πνεῦμα. He used ψυχὴ because in one sense πνεῦμα and ψυχὴ are synonyms. Thus he attributes to ψυχὴ a meaning which it does not usually have, but one which often appears in πνεῦμα.»[14]

c) Soul as individual.

In three other instances the word *psyche* stands for everyone, for the living person, for the self.[15] St. Paul affirms that there is no

10. *Eph.* 6.6; Vulg. «ex animo»; AV and RSV «from the heart»; NEB «whole-heartedly»; TEV «with all your heart»; NIV «from your heart»; JB «whole-heartedly»; cp. *Matth.* 22.37; *Mark* 12.30; *Luke* 12.27.

11. «Hebrew Psychology in relation to Pauline Anthropology» in *Mansfield College Essays*, p. 280; Idem, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 108.

12. R. Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, London (1951) p. 138.

13. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, tr. K. Grobel, S.C.M. Press, London (1952) pp. 204-5.

14. W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline Doctrine of Man*, pp. 122-3; F. W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians* in BNTC, London (1959) p. 67, seems to oppose here any distinction between «soul» and «spirit» and to emphasize the demand for the «entire inward unity.»

15. In favour of this meaning are H. Gramer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, of N.T., p. 585; G. Bauer, *Lexicon*, Cambridge, pp. 901-3; W. F. Arndt and G. W.

favouritism with God. Every single man, every human being, every individual,[16] either Jew or Greek, who sins and is against God will be punished. Here it is apparent that the word *psyche* implies the whole man, the total man, the whole person, the self.[17] The expression πᾶσα ψυχή,[18] a Hebraism[19] which emphasizes individuality in general, means simply every person, every individual,[20] or as we might say, the living person.[21] 2 Cor. 12.15 offers another instance: St. Paul emphatically says to the Corinthians, I will most gladly and willingly spend all I have (money, property, time), and even be spent for your souls' sake.[22] Stacey notes here that one might ascribe to *psyche* the force of spiritual state but goes on to say that such an interpretation, though possible, does not exclude others. Rather he prefers self-consciousness to *pneuma*.[23]

Gingoich, *E. T. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Literature*, pp. 901-3; W. J. Cameron, «Soul», *The New Bible Dictionary*, ed. by J. D. Douglas IVF (1962) p. 1208-9; H. W. Robinson, *Hebrew Psychology in relation to Pauline Anthropology*, p. 280; Idem, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 108; E. D. W. Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, Chicago (1918) p. 183; W. Guthbrod, *Die Paulinische Anthropologie*, in Beitsag zum wissenschaft von Alten und Neuen Testament von R. Kittel, A. F. Stuttgart, (1934) p. 77; C. R. Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 138; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 123; T. Lord, *The Unity of Body and Soul*, London (1929) p. 56; C. Spicq, *Dieu et L' homme*, Paris (1961) p. 156 n. 1; H. Mehl-Koehnlein *L' homme selon l'apôtre Paul*, Neuchatel-Paris (1951) p. 21; R. Bultmann, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 204; W. Barclay, *Flesh and Spirit*, London (1962) pp. 12-13.

16. *Romans* 2.9; «Ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχήν»; Vulg. «in omnem animam hominis»; AV «every soul of man»; RSV, NEB «every human being»; 13.1; see also *Acts* 2.41, 43; 3.23; 7.14; *Rev.* 18.13; etc.

17. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, p. 204; also in W. D. Stacey, *op. cit.* p. 123; H. M. Koehnlein *L' Homme selon l' apôtre Paul*, p. 21.

18. *Romans* 13.1; comp. also p. 16 n. 1 and *Epict.* 1.28.4; *Lev.* 7.27; «πᾶσα ψυχή, ἣ ἂν φάγῃ αἷμα» *Rev.* 16.31 «καὶ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ζωῆς ἀπέθανε»; see also for references only in F. J. Leengardt, *Romans*, p. 325.

19. W. Sanday and A. Headlam, *Romans*, in (ICC) p. 366 n. on 5.1; also in J. Denney, *Romans*, in (EGT) p. 695 n. on 1; V. Taylor, *To the Romans*, p. 84; K. Barrett, *Romans*, in ENTC p. 245.

20. AV «every soul»; RSV, NEB «every person»; F. F. Bruce, *Romans* (TNTC) p. 236.

21. W. Barclay, *Flesh and Spirit*, pp. 12-13.

22. 2 *Cor.* 12.15 «ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν»; Vulg. «animabus vestris»; AV and RSV «for your souls»; NEB «for you»; see also R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, p. 204; W. H. Robinson, *The Christian View of Man*, p. 108.

23. W.D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 123; J.H. Bernard, 2 *Corinthians* in EGT p. 113 n. on 5.15, says something similar: «Ψυχὴ is here used (as at Heb. 13. 11.17, 1 Pet. 2.11) of the spiritual part of man, the interests of which are eternal.»

There remain to be considered I Thesss. 5.23 and the adjectives ψυχικὸς-πνευματικός, but we say nothing about them here as we will discuss them in special articles.

In conclusion, then, for St. Paul the word *psyche* is neither a significant term or idea (dass ψυχὴ bei Pls. Kein bezeichnender Begriff ist)[24] nor a word determining his thought[25]. Far from it. Rather St. Paul considers the ψυχὴ in the light of Old Testament teaching. In other words, the Pauline concept of *psyche* is equivalent to the נֶפֶשׁ and mainly denotes life, breathing, the vital principle, the principle of physical life, of «man as a living being.»[26] Further, by metonomy, *psyche*, on the one hand, designates the individual, the human being, and on the other hand, stands for a conscious being, thinking, feeling and acting.

Bultmann's words do not readily admit of summary but state the case well: «Hence it is incorrect to understand *psyche* in Paul as meaning only «the principle of animal life» and as standing in close relations to «flesh» understood as the matter enlivened by that *psyche*. Rather *psyche* is that specifically human state of being alive which inheres in man as a striving, willing, purposing, self.»[27]

2. *Trichotomy: Some General Remarks on I Thess. 5.23.*

In I Thess. we have the only genuine Pauline passage, probably the only one in the New Testament, which speaks clearly and directly about trichotomy, that is about man's three-fold nature: «May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and

---

24. W. Guthbrod, *Die Paulinische Anthropologie*, p. 79.

25. W. D. Stacey, *Contributions and Comments*, a reply to R. Laurin's article, «The Concept of Man as a Soul», *The Expository Times*, Vol. 72, Oct. 1960-Sept. 1961, p. 349.

26. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, p. 204.

27. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, p. 205; see also H. Mehl-Kochlein, *L'homme selon L' Apôtre Paul*, p. 21; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 125 n. 1. C. Spicq, *Dieu et l' homme Selon le Nouveau Testament*, pp. 155-6. O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, Vol. I, N. Y. (1906) pp. 271-2, seems to express a somewhat similar view to that of Bultmann's with what he remarks below: «We must not conclude however... that Paul thought of the latter (viz. soul) as a purely animal principle with the exclusion of spiritual functions; rather he uses «Soul» as well as spirit for subject of personal states of consciousness, especially feelings, in which the whole undivided man is concerned.»

soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.»[28]

I do not purport to examine the quotation exhaustively, but only to give a brief historical review, noting some scholars, ancient and modern, who favor and some who oppose trichotomy.

I shall not refer to the early Greek and Latin Fathers at length, for they are not directly concerned with the text under consideration. When they do deal with the matter, either directly commenting on I Thess 5.23, or in a more general manner discussing the trichotomistic problem, they express themselves in a vague and ambiguous way. It may be said that their views tend to be rather Platonic or Aristotelian. It should be noted, however, that certain Fathers favor a dichotomistic view,[29] while others hold to the trichotomistic.[30]

---

28. I. *Thess.* 5.23;

«Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη».

29. In favor of the dichotomistic view are: Athenagoras, *de Resur.*, 15 (12) B. 4. 322-23 and 320-321, MPG 1004A-D, 1005A; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.*, 4,18, MPG 33, 477; Athanasius, *oratio contra Gentes*, 33, MPG 25, 65B-D; Gregory of Nazian. (Theolog.) *Orat.* 45 *in Sanc. Pascha*, 7, MPG 36, 632AB; Gregory of Nyssa, *De hom. Opificio*, 29. MPG 44, 233D; St. Basil, *Comment. in Isaiam Proph.*, cap. 1,13, MPG 30A, 140A; St. Chrysostom, in Cap. 1, *Genes. homil.*, 14, 5, MPG 53, 117; Idem. *in Epist. ad Rom. homil.* 13, 2, MPG 60, 510; the view of St. Augustine and St. John of Damascus are quite relevant, well stated and represent the consensus of opinion of all the above mentioned Fathers; for that reason, they are worth quoting: St. Augustine, *The City of God*, London (1945) a rev. and translation by R. V. Tasker, in Dent's Everyman's Library, Vol. 2, book 13 cf. 24, p. 22; «This man therefore being frame of dust or loam... when it received a soul was made an animate body... being neither soul only, nor body only, but consisting of both. It is true, the soul is not the whole man but the better part only; nor the body the whole man but the worse part only, and both conjoined make man; ... Yes, it both calls (the H. Scripture) the body and the soul conjoined by the name of man...» St. John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox faith*, book 2, ch. 12, trans. by S. D. F. Salmond, in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Oxford (1898) Vol. 9, pp. 30-31; «...He creates with his own hands man of a visible nature and an invisible... on the other his reasoning and thinking soul bestowed upon him by his inbreathing... Further, body and soul were formed at one and the same time.»

30. In favor of the trichotomistic view are the following Fathers: Justin, *fragmenta*, 8 *and* 10, MPG 1585 and 1589; Irenaeus, *contra hereses*, 5. 8, 2; 5, 6, 1; 2, 33 chaps. 4 and 5; 5, 9, 1; 5, 10, 1, MPG 7, 114, 833, 1137 and 1144; Clement of Alex., *Strom.*, 6, 12; MPG 9, 283; Idem, *Paedag.*, 3, 1; MPG 8, 92; Origen, *comment in Joan.*, tom. 22, 2; MPG 741-5; Idem, *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.*, Lib. 1, 18 MPG

Among the modern writers who support the trichotomistic view of man without hesitation are C. Vitriuga,[31] Olshausen,[32] Ellicott,[33] A.T. Mason,[34] J. Hutshicon,[35] F. Delitzsch,[36] J. B. Heard,[37] G. Lunemann,[38]

865-8; Tertullian, *Adv. Narc.*, Lib. 4, ch. 37, also Lib. 5, ch. 15; MPL, 2, 483AB, 552; Tatianus, *Orat. adv. Graecos*, 1, 4, 12, MPG 6, 829C; St. Didymus of Alex., *De spiritu Sancto*, 54, 55, 59, MPG 39, 1079-82; Idem, *De Trinitate*, 3, 31, MPG 39, 956-7.

31. C. Vitriuga, Observationem Sacrarum, Amstelodomi, MDCCXXVII, pp. 549-50.

32. «The πνεῦμα being vis superior, agens, imperans in homine; the vis inferior quae agitur movetur, in imperio tenetur,» Olshausen: de naturae humanae trichotomia in Opusc. p. 154, qtd. in (as I have been unable to trace it elsewhere). C. Ellicott's *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, London (1866[3]) p. 85 n. on 5.23; see also H. Olshausen, *Thessalonians*, E. T. in T. T. Clark, Edinburgh (1851) pp. 457-8.

33. C. Ellicott, *Destiny of the Creature*, Sermon 5, pp. 99-120, discussing the text at some length and citing Scriptural and patristic passages, draws the general conclusion « that a body, soul and spirit are the three component parts of man's nature. That the spirit is the realm of the intellectual forces, and the shrine of the Holy Ghost. That the soul is the region of the feelings, affections, and impulses, all that peculiarly individualizes and personifies. Lastly, that these three parts, especially the two incorporeal parts, are intimately associated and united, and form the media of communication, both with each other, and with the higher and the lower elements»; further, in his Epistle, *ibid.*, p. 85 n. on 5.23, he maintains the same view, rejecting D. Wette's assertion as rhetorical enumerations and Jowett's argument against any kind of distinction as setting aside «all sound rules of scriptural exegesis.» Finally, he finds Lumnemann's attribution to Plato unsatisfactory and remarks, «And if Plato or Philo have maintained (as appears demonstrable) substantially the same view, then God has permitted a heathen and a Jewish philosopher to advance conjectural opinions which have been since confirmed by the independent teaching of an inspired Apostle.»

34. *Thessalonians*, London, ed. by C. I. Ellicott, Cassell & Co. Ltd., Vol. VIII, p. 146 n. on 5.23, «This is St. Paul's fullest and most scientific psychology, not merely a rhetorical piling up of words without any particular meaning being assigned to them.»

35. *Lectures on the Epistle to the Thessalonians*, Edinburgh (1884) pp. 238-246 and cf. pp. 239-242, where he favours such a view.

36. *A System of Biblical Psychology*, Edinburgh (1869[2]) p. 110: «It appears therefore, that Paul distinguishes three essential elements of man, to everyone of which the work of sanctifying grace extends in its manner.»

37. *The tripartite Nature of Man, Spirit, Soul, Body*, Edinburgh (1866). The title is indicative, but for our case see especially pp. 67-70.

38. *Thessalonians* in H A. W. Meyer's critical and exeg. comm. T. T. Clark (1880) pp. 163-4, who argues that: «the totality of man is here divided into three parts... we are not to assume that this has a purely rhetorical signification... The

B. F. Westcott,[39] W. Borneman,[40] and J. B. Lightfoot.[41] With all due respect to their scholarship, the fact remains that these scholars have not seriously discussed the subject, and «their statements are more in the nature of incidental reflections.»[42] As the late Prof. J. Leidlaw puts it, «...Their utterances on this point are little more than *obiter dicta*.»[43]

In our own day Festugière and Allo hold a form of the tripartite view and «Rattachelent de la pensée de l' apôtre à une conception Greque.»[44] Festugière's informative research,[45] does not succeed in interpreting 1 Thess. 5,23 in a trichotomistic Greek way; that is, he fails to discover borrowings from Plato and Aristotle through their posterity down to St. Paul. Because he fails in his effort, his conclusions are unbiblical and entirely un-Pauline. Allo, on the other hand, excluding Paul's borrowings from pagan Hellenic psychology and even from Philo, thinks with Festugière[46] «that the two had common sources, and that the St. Paul's trichotomy, like that of the older philosopher, is 'a Jewish concept,' or elaborated after Jewish conceptions based on the text of Genesis.»[47] Further, he is unsure about trichotomy, noting that for the Apostle, there exists in 1 Thess. 5,23 «a model difference only

---

origin of the trichotomy is Platonic... but Paul has it not from the writings of Plato and his scholars, but from the current language of Society, into which it has passed from the narrow circle of the school.»

39. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London (1889), pp. 114-15; add. note on v. 4.12 where he equates the analysis of man's constitution of Heb. 4.12 to 1 Thess. 5.23.

40. *Die Thessalonisher briefe...* von H. A. W. Meyer, Gottingen (1894) p. 247. While he admits that the origin of trichotomy is Platonic, he observes that in its present form St. Paul did not derive it directly from Plato and his School of Writers. Nevertheless, he adds: «πνεῦμα ist dann die hohere, rein geistige Seite des inneren Lebens (νοῦς), ψυχὴ die neidere, physischanimalische Seite des nichtsinnlichen Wesensteiles, Welche mit dem Gebiet der Sinnlichkeit in Beruhrung tritt.»

41. *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, London (1895) *pp.* 88-9 n. on 5.23; he sees here a tripartite division of man and is opposed to the idea of treating the reference «as a mere rhetorical expression.»

42. A. McGaig, «Thoughts on the tripartite theory of human nature» in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 3 (1931) p. 122.

43. *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 67.

44. B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul les Epîtres aux Thessalonians*, Paris (1956) p. 597 n. on 5.23.

45. A.J. Festugière, «La trichotomic de 1 Thess. 5.23 et la philosophie grecque», in *Recherches de science Religieuse*, 930. XIX 13 pp. 386-415.

46. Le P. E. B. Allo, *Saint Paul Première Epître aux Corinthians*, Paris (1956²) p. 104.

47. Le P. E. B. Allo, *Saint Paul Première Epître aux Corinthians*, pp. 103-4.

between ψυχή, as the soul in the totality of its functions, above all living and conscious, and πνεῦμα as the same soul in its high intellectual functions, without implying two creative acts by God.»[48]

Contrary to these trichotomistic views are those who see the Divine Spirit in the believer and relate *pneuma* here to the Divine Spirit granted to Christians. In the Martyrium of Polycarpus we read, «Εἰς Ἀνάστασιν Ζωῆς αἰωνίου Ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.»[49] Theodore of Mopseuestia, taking the same view, says that «God has never placed the three, soul, spirit, and body in an unbeliever, but only in believers. Of these, the soul and the body are natural, but the spirit is a special benefit *(energesia)* to us, a gift of grace to those who believe.» (Trans. from W. Barclay, *Flesh and Spirit.* p. 14).[50] E. von Dobshutz,[51] J. E. Frame,[52] E. Fuchs,[53] and W. G. Kummel[54] share this view.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

49. Τῆς Σμυρναίων Ἐκκλησίας περὶ μαρτυρίου Ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκύκλιος, 15-17 in *Patres Apostolice* ed. by G. Jacobson, Tom. II, Oxonii (1863) p. 640.

50. «Οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ ἀπίστου τὰ τρία τέθεικεν, πνεῦμα, Ψυχήν, καὶ σῶμα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μόνων τῶν πιστευόντων ὧν Ψυχὴ μὲν καὶ σῶμα τῆς φύσεως, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τῆς εὐεργεσίας, τοὐτέστιν τὸ χάρισμα τῶν πιστευόντων.» in H. B. Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopseuesteni in epistolas R. Pauli, Commentarii,* Cambridge (1882) Vol. II, p. 39; J. E. Frame, *Thessalonians,* p. 212 n. on 5.23. See also J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in N.T.*, Oxonii, (1844) p. 374.

51. *Die Thessalonischen briefe,* Gottingen (1909) in Meyer's Commenrtary on N. T., Vol. 10, especially: Exkurszur Trichotomic, pp. 230-32. The author insists that trichotomy is not biblical at all, that it is alien to Josephus, Philo, Aristotle, that it appears for the first time clearly in the Neoplatonists from whom it passed to the Christian Neoplatonists (Origen, Apollinaris). Further, he believes *soma* and *psyche* and *pneuma* to be the new living element from God, which enters into Christians. To prove his case he cites Chrysostom's, Theodoret's, anonymous writer's Cramer's, Mart. Polycarpus' Ambrosiaster's, Pelagius' and Ambrose's word.

52. *Thessalonians* in ICC, London, 1912, p. 212: «The divine in man and the human individuality must be kept intact, an undivided whole.»

53. *Christus unter Geist bei Paulus,* Leipzig (1932) in untersuchungen, zum NT Heff. 23, pp. 42-44, cf. p. 44 where he ends as follows: «When Paul speaks of the body and the soul, he means the border lines of the respectively human and Christian dealings and not the constituent parts of human nature. This shows itself already previously in exposition of the passage 1 Thess. 5.23. Consequently the word pneuma—where it signifies the Christian ego, has nothing to do with trichotomical anthropology, but it stands in the last analysis for an entirely different thing... it is related to the Holy Spirit.»

54. *Man in the New Testament,* London (1963) pp. 44-45: «There appears to be a trichotomy here, with a distinction between psyche as the lower and pneuma as

Neither the trichotomistic view nor the view of the Divine Spirit in the believer is entirely satisfactory. Others, taking a moderate view, have put it better. They write that either St. Paul «is not writing a treatise on the soul, but pouring forth, from the fulness of his heart, a prayer for his converts»[55] or «the enumeration is not systematic but hortatory, to emphasize the completeness of the preservation.» And that this enumeration «should be compared with the somewhat similar enumeration of Deut. 6.4, 5 (cf. 4.29, 10.12 etc.): «Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul, and with all thy might.»[56] There are even some who regard it «as a popular statement, and not as an expression of the Apostle's own psychology.»[57] As an eminent bibli-

---

the higher function of man's inner life. But that would be very strange, and one must either accept that Paul, without further thought, places *psyche* and *pneuma* beside one another here in a liturgical form, without the *pneuma* being distinguished in any way as standing closer to God, or else one must (which is more probable) relate *pneuma* here to the Divine Spirit accorded to Christians.»

55. B. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*, Galatians, and Romans, A Translation and Commentary, London (1894), p. 51 n. on 5.23; G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians*, London (1932) p. 78 n. on 5.23; E. J. Bicknell, *The First and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, London (1932) in WC p. 64, n. on 5.23, while indirectly referring to Jowett, remarks that «St. Paul is not giving a lesson in psychology. It is a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the passage to base on it a system of trichotomy... What he is concerned with is the preservation and consecration of the whole man. There is an element of rhetoric in his description of the totality of human nature.»

56. W. H. Robinson, «Hebrew psychology and its relation to Pauline Anthropology», *Manfield College Essays*, p. 280; idem., *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 108; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, p. 27 n. 2; E. Schweizer, πνεῦμα in TWNT, p. 433 n. 685, E. T. *op. cit.* 85 n. 1; cf. also with D. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 272 n. 2, who asserts that soul and spirit are not different parts, but only different names for the one human being. He adds: «Even 1 Thess. 5,23 is not inconsistent with this, since here the apparent trichotomy πνεῦμα, ψυχὴ and σῶμα is only a rhetorical emphasizing of the completeness of the man, just as in Phil. 1.17 ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ and in Luke 1.46 ἡ ψυχή μου, τὸ πνεῦμά μου are placed in rhetorical parallelism without any reference to different subjects being intended.» Similarly, F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, tr. J. L. Stoddard, London (1957), Vol. II, p. 54 n. 4, writes «the enumeration (τὸ πνεῦμα, ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα) seems to prove that it is a question here of grandeurs of the same order.» B. Rigaux, *Thessalonians*, p. 597 n. on 5.23, adds: «Il y a un élément de rhétorique dans ces fins de développement Paulinien. On ne doit pas y chercher une doctrine sur la psychologie, qu' il n'a pas voulu y mettre.»

57. R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, London (1913) p. 468; see also J. E. Frame, *Thessalonians*, in ICC, p. 213 n. on 5.23.

cal scholar has it, it is a formulation coming from liturgical-rhetorical (perhaps traditional) diction.[58]

In addition, the liturgical-traditional-rhetorical origin and nature of the passage under discussion is well stated by Masson. Placing side by side similarly worded Pauline texts (Gal. 6.18, Phil. 4.13, Philemon 25 and 2 Tim. 4.22), he concludes that the formula μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is simply «another, more solemn manner of saying μεθ' ὑμῶν» and goes on to equate πνεῦμα in this context with person: «ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα = you, personally». From this, he is able to render the cognate phrase ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα, «your whole person,» indicating two constituent elements — soul and body.[59]

---

58. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol I, pp. 205-6; cf. also M. Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher I, II and die Philipper*, in HZNT. Tubingen (1937) p. 32, who says, «the Apostle here follows the customary liturgical terminology usage.» W. Gutbrod *op. cit.*, 90-91, argues St. Paul in all probability has not considered the question whether man consists of a trichotomy or dichotomy and that he employs these particular expressions wholly unemphasized. See also Prof. F. F. Bruce, from his written communication to Dr. White, paper *op. cit.*, p. 67, «...1 Thess. 5.23. It is not certain that Paul is propounding a formal trichotomy in these words. It would be equally valid to deduce a formal tetrachotomy of heart, soul, mind and strength from Mark 12.30.» Dr. A. McCaig, *op. cit.*, p. 136, arrives at the same conclusion: «Paul without further thought, places psyche and pneuma beside one another here in a liturgical form.» E. Schweizer, TWNT, p. 422 n. 685, E. T. *op. cit.*, p. 85 n. 1, goes on: «The greeting is very likely traditional, if not liturgical, and so tells us little about Paul's conception of man (Dibelius Thess. 3 ad. loc).» On the other hand, W. Neil, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians*, in the Moffat NT, London (1950) 133, observes, «The triple combination may indeed have been a current liturgical formula in Christian or Jewish circles. At all events, Paul is certainly as unconcerned about psychology as was our Lord when he gave us the chief commandment to love God with heart, soul, mind and strength (Mark 12.30).»

59. C. Masson, *Les Deux Epîtres aux Thessalonians*, Paris (1957) in CNT, 11a, pp. 77-78. While I agree with his account of the text as liturgical, I am dissatisfied with his statement on pages 77 and 78: «L' esprit serait l' élément supérieur, purement spirituel, psychologique, plus directement en rapport avec le corps, «This suggests that the *pneuma* is the superior element of the inmost being of man and consequently the whole man, soul and body, therefore, become its inferior parts. I should like to record with W. G. Kummel, *op. cit.*, p. 45 n. 51, my own disagreement. In fact, does not Masson here approach a Plato's view of man? We might note that Π. Μπρατσιώτης, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ, 'Αθῆναι (1955) pp. 10-11, while he rejects the trichotomistic view of 1 Thess. 5.23, understands the distinction between psyche and pneuma as that between the animal and spiritual (higher-lower) life principle; see also W. G. Kummel, *ibid.*, p. 45 n. 51, *Man in the N.T.* tr. J. J. Vincent, London (1963).

What conclusions can be drawn among such diverse opinions? First of all St. Paul was not a psychologist or a philosopher in the true sense of the word; consequently, he did not use anthropological terminology with scientific precision. Rather he relied on the current, popular, approximate language of his time.[60] Here, Paul speaks rhetorically, not theologically, in a traditional, liturgical fashion.

St. Paul does not look at human nature in a trichotomistic way; he does not consider man to be composed of three distinct or exclusive elements, not does he divide the human being «into three well-defined compartments.»[61] On the contrary, in the present text, he speaks for the whole man. He is concerned for the preservation and sanctification of man's entire being, for his totality, for his personality, as it exists in the whole man. Milligan has it: They (Paul's words) are evidently chosen in accordance with the general O.T. view of the constitution of man to emphasize a sanctification which shall extend to man's whole being, whether on its immortal, its personal, or its bodily side.»[62] Or again, as G. C. Findlay puts it, «here the entire man is surveyed, with his whole nature in its manifold aspects and functions, as the subject of sanctifying grace.»[63] Once more then, St. Paul emphasizes the preservation and sanctification of man in his completeness, in his totality, in his entire being.

Thus, *pneuma*, *psyche* and *soma* are not distinct elements but different aspects and functions of man himself, of his actuality, of his entire unity. Man does not consist of separate elements but is a living unity. Man here and throughout the Pauline letters and in the Bible generally is «an indissoluble whole, manifested under one aspect or another. It is a case not of a 'human composite' but of a monism.»[64]

---

60. F. C. Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*, New York (1950) pp. 162-3.

61. W. Neil, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians*, in the NTC, 1950, London 1918.

62. G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, p. 78; see also in L. Morris, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians* (1956) in TNT cf. p. 107.

63. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians*, Cambridge (1925) p. 133.

64. C. Spicq, *Dieu et l' homme selon le N.T.* Paris, 1961, p. 161 n. 3. E. Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, London, 1939, pp. 362-3 n. 1 (cf. p. 363 n. 1), insists that while the physical, psychical and spiritual functions are distinguishable in man, they cannot be isolated from their synthesis in him. All three are involved in man as a creature; all three will be involved in his eternal destiny. It is clear that Brunner

3. *A Note on Ψυχικὸς-Πνευματικός.*

The word *psychicos* is in sharp contrast to *pneumaticos* in the etymological as well as the ordinary sense (1 Cor. 2.14-15 and 15.44-46).[65] The *psychicos* (AV natural; Vulg. animalis homo; RSV and NEB unspiritual) is the «unrenewed,»[66] the «unregenerate»,[67] and is contrasted with the *pneumaticos* on the ground that the former does not welcome the things of spirit, but rather refuses or rejects them. Such a man is not equipped to discern the activities of God's Spirit. To him they are foolishness.[68]

Morris, however, points out that *psychicos* might be described as a biological rather than an ethical term, and that it is not, therefore, to be taken as equivalent to sinful.[69] This view is shared by Robertson, who sees no need to regard the word as stemming from a supposed «trichotomous» psychology; rather, he interprets the words as designating «the mere correlative of organic life.»[70] He goes on to say that *psychicos* is the unrenewed man, the natural man, as distinct from the man who is actuated by the Spirit.[71] Nevertheless, *psychicos* must be taken as synonymous with *sarkinos* or *sarkikos.*[72] This antithesis is still

refuses to regard any of the three as «dispensable matter» which eternity will ultimately consign to the dust-bin. Perhaps it is of interest to refer to Dr. A.Carrel's remarks on this point from a psychophysical and biological point of view, *Man the Unknown*, Penguin Books (1948) pp. 115-6, 138, 256.

65. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, 1 *Corinthians* in ICC, London, 1915, p. 48.

66. A. Robertson, *ibid.*, p. 49.

67. John Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 93.

68. L. Morris, 1 *Corinthians*, TNTC, London, 1958, p. 60.

69. L. Morris, *ibid.*, p. 60.

70. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *ibid.*, p. 49.

71. A. Robertson, A. Plummer, *I Corinthians* in ICC p. 49; cf. also G. Clavier, «Brèves remarques sur la notion de σῶμα πνευματικόν.» Ed. by 1W. D. Davies and D. Doube, Cambridge, 1956, in the *Background of the New Testament* and *its eschatology*, pp. 345-6, who remarks that ψυχικὸν the ending κὸν as in σαρκικὸν seems to indicate that this adjective does not designate a composition, a psychic formation, in ψυχὴ but a dependence or a direction.

72. A Robertson., *ibid.*, p. 49; E. D. Burton, *Spirit Soul and Flesh*, p. 205; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, London, 1913[2]; the proposition that the «soulish man» and «fleshly man» are used as kindred and interchangeable terms over against the spiritual man finds full support and approval in the following as well: O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, tr. W. Montgomery, London, 1906, I, p, 271; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1956, p. 341. However there is this difference between psychicos and sarkikos: «Yet the ψυχικός, μὴ ἔχων πνεῦμα (Jude 19) may be lower than the σαρκικὸς where the latter as in 3.3 and Gal. 5.13, 25 is al-

more clearly expressed in Jude 19, ψυχικοὶ μὴ πνεῦμα ἔχοντες (worldly people, devoid of the Spirit. RSV).[73] While the unspiritual man is more concerned with the things of this life, and cannot and does not appreciate the things of the Holy Spirit, the *pneumaticos*, on the contrary, who is gifted with the Spirit, «has an insight into the meaning of everything.»[74] This communion with God's Spirit and fellowship, which must not be thought of as a natural endowment different from that of the *psychicos*,[75] «enables him to penetrate the divine mysteries»[76] and «to acknowledge God's saving work»[77] for him personally.

The distinction between the two adjectives is still better illustrated in the words of Prof. Barclay: «Paul distinguishes two kinds of men: (a) There are those who are pneumatikoi. Pneuma is the word for Spirit; and the man who is pneumatikos is the man who is sensitive and obedient to the Spirit; the man whose life is guided and directed by the Spirit; the man who makes all his decisions and exercises all his judgments under the influence of and the guidance of the Spirit; the man who lives in the consciousness that there are things beyond the things of this world, that there are values beyond the values of this world; that there is a life beyond the life of this world. (b) There is the man who is psuchikos. Now psuche in Greek is often translated soul; but that is not its real meaning. Psuche is the principle of physical life. Everything which is alive has psuche: a dog, a cat, any animal has psuche, but it has not got pneuma. Psuche is that physical life which a man shares with every living thing; but pneuma, spirit, is that which makes man a man, that which makes him different from the rest of creation, that which makes him kin to God. So in verse 14 Paul speaks of the man who is psuchikos. He is the man who lives as if there was nothing beyond physical life; as if there were no needs other than physical and material needs, whose values are all physical and material values, who judges everything from purely physical and material standards. A man like that cannot understand spiritual things. A man who thinks that

---

ready touched by the life-giving πνεῦμα.» G. G. Findlay, I *Corinthians* in EGT, London 1908[1], p. 783 n. on v. 12, 14.

73. See also E. D. Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 295; E. Schweizer, «πνεῦμα», TWNT p. 435 n. 701, 446, 432 ff, E. T. p. 87 n. 2 and pp. 102-3.

74. J. B. Phillips, *The New Testament in Modern English*, London, 1960.

75. L. Morris, 1 *Corinthians* in TNTC, p. 61.

76. W. Bawer, WZNT, E.T. 685.

77. E. Schweizer, «Πνεῦμα» in TWNT, p. 435, E.T. «Spirit of God» in the *Bible Keywords*, p. 87.

nothing is more important than the satisfaction of the sex urge cannot understand the meaning of chastity; a man who ranks the amassing of material things as the supreme end of life cannot understand generosity; a man who thinks his appetite the last word cannot understand purity; and a man who has never a thought beyond this world cannot understand the things of God. To him they look mere foolishness. No man need be like this; but if he forever stifles 'the immortal longings' that are in his soul he may make himself like this, and, if he does, the Spirit of God will speak and he will not hear.»[78]

Dr. E. White takes the same view, affirming that in the New Testament «soul stands for the animal life, the life of the mind and body». Man acquires this life by natural inheritance, so that *psychicos* can be translated in this context as «natural», whereas *pneuma* is a supernatural gift, derived directly from God. Dr. White goes on to describe the natural man as living on the temporal, material plane, with «no insight into spiritual things», which «belong to a different realm... a new realm of truth,» which is the level at which the spiritual man experiences existence.[79]

The distinction which we are examining becomes even clearer in 1 Corinthians 15.44, where St. Paul, presenting to his fellow Christians of Corinth his arguments about resurrection, sets the σῶμα ψυχικόν (natural AV; physical RSV; NEB animal), the present, the ordinary body in contrast to the σῶμα πνευματικόν, the spiritual, the post-resurrection body. Further, «the term is associated (v. 45) with the fact» that «just as the first Adam had introduced the order of animate life on the physical or earthly plane, so Christ, the second Adam, had introduced a new order of life in the Spirit.»[80]

We have said enough, I think, to point out the distinction between these two opposing epithets. It is not our purpose to trace their entire Pauline background, noting only that Reitzenstein claimed that

78. W. Barcley, *The Letters to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh, 1961, pp. 31-32.

79. E. White, «The Psychology of St. Paul's Epistle» in *Journal of the transaction of the Victoria Institute or philosophical Society of Gt. Britain*, Vol LXXXVII, (1955) p. 8. Prof. F. F. Bruce in his written communication on Dr. E. White's paper and in the same Vol. p. 110, describes as psychicos the man who is «self-centred, self-dominated» and «his spirit is unresponsive to the Divine Spirit,» and pneumaticos is the man who «is responsive and obedient to every prompting of the Holy Spirit» and «whose Spirit is *en rapport* with the Spirit of God.»

80. E. de W. Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, Chicago, 1918, p 205 and W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, 1958, p. 49.

satisfactory parallels to St. Paul's usage could be found in the Hellenistic Mystery Religions (cults).[81] He has been refuted at length by a number of scholars, particularly by Kennedy,[82] G. Vos,[83] and W. D. Stacey.[84] Kennedy and Davies argue that the relation of *psyche* to *pneuma* and *psychicos* to *pneumaticos* is best explained in the Old Testament usage,[85] in the light of Old Testament anthropology.[86] Bultmann, on the other hand, rules out a Greek or Old Testament influence and sees only a Gnostic one.[87]

I, for the reasons given ad loc. and explained by the critics themselves, endorse the following two conclusions: first «To begin with, it may be noted that these all-important adjectives are really the apostle's own coinage. No light can be shed on them from the Old Testament... The terms can only be understood from the apostle's own use of them.»[88] Second, «The general background of ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα is the Old Testament, and in an indirect way, the Old Testament lies behind the adjectives, but if Paul's view of πνεῦμα showed an advance on previous conceptions, his views on πνευματικὸς showed an even greater one... Moreover, Paul himself gave to the adjective subtle shades of meaning, all derived from his conception of πνεῦμα. Consequently, the word is Paul's and the force and effect of the contrast must be largely attributed to his own religious insight.»[89]

81. R. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterien Religionon*, Leipzig, und Berlin (1910) pp. 43-46 in general and here cf. p. 43.

82. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, London, 1913, pp. 142-9.

83. G. Vos, «The eschatological aspect of the Pauline conception of the Spirit,» in *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary*, New York, 1912, pp. 248-50 n. 55; also in J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, pp. 265-8 cf. 265 n. 1.

84. W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 150-52.

85. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 156.

86. W. D. Davies, *Paul and the Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 193.

87. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, p. 176.

88. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the last Things*, London, 1904, pp. 251-2; also W. D. Stacey, *op. cit.*, p. 153 n. 2.

89. W. D. Stacey, *op. cit.*, p. 153.