

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXXIII

1951



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY

THE INSTITUTE, 21, LOWER BELGRAVE STREET, WESTMINSTER,
S.W.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

897TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN THE LECTURE HALL OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, 69, GREAT PETER STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1951.

REV. CANON A. ST. J. THORPE, M.A., L.Th., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Ernest White, Esq., M.B., B.S., to read his Paper, entitled "A Preface to Biblical Psychology."

A PREFACE TO BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By ERNEST WHITE, ESQ., M.B., B.S.

SYNOPSIS.

The Bible, in its numerous statements about the nature of man, and in its biographical records, contains rich material for psychological study.

This paper is limited to the discussion of three words used frequently in describing the personality of man, namely soul, heart and spirit. An attempt is made to discover the meanings of these words as used in the Bible, and to compare their significance with modern psychological theories of the structure of human personality. The particular school of psychology chosen is the psycho-analytical school.

In the Bible, the Soul is the principle of life, and corresponds in some respects to certain features of the Id described by Freud.

The Heart appears to include all the functions of the conscious mind as described by modern psychology, and probably includes the conative elements of the Unconscious.

The Spirit lies in the depths of personality. It is related to God and to eternity. A comparison is made with Jung's theory of the spirit as a separate consciousness containing an awareness of the total living processes of body and mind.

It is emphasised that man must not be thought of as being made up of separate parts which can be clearly distinguished. He is a unity of which Spirit, Soul, Heart and Body are different aspects.

THE Bible is essentially a book of life. It deals with men and women who lived and played their part in history, and it contains a progressive unfolding of the character of God and of His dealings with individuals and with nations. It treats of the relationship of men and women to one another in family, social, national and international affairs. Above all it reveals God's relationship to man, and man's status before God.

We may search the Bible in vain to find therein a systematic exposition of science, metaphysics, psychology, or even of ethics or theology. It deals with all these subjects in so far as they concern Divine and human nature, but although it is concerned with profound problems of theology and morals, it contains no clear-cut system of morals and theology in a logical form. It presents the raw, uncodified materials from which men have built up various systems of theology and moral philosophy from sub-apostolic times to the present day.

It would be an error to suppose that we should be able to find the Bible to be in agreement with all modern scientific theories. Scientific hypotheses are constantly undergoing modifications in the light of new discoveries. They are but the scaffolding employed in the process of building the Temple of Truth, and as the building grows, much of the scaffolding may have to be scrapped. If the Bible agreed with the science of to-day it is highly improbable that it would tally with the science of to-morrow. It speaks in general terms which are true for all time.

These considerations are often lost sight of, and people are at great pains to try to make the Bible fit in with modern scientific ideas, or *vice versa*. No sooner is the task accomplished to their satisfaction, than another new scientific discovery is made, or a new hypothesis put forward, and the work of reconciliation has to start all over again. The literature of the last hundred years provides ample illustrations of this. This should not deter us from the constant search for truth, or from continual efforts to reconcile the various aspects of truth as they unfold. The mistake lies in attempting to make a final synthesis. The limitations of human knowledge exclude the possibility of such a synthesis. It is often both necessary and wise to suspend judgment, and not to allow ourselves to be disturbed by apparent contradictions, which may be resolved as we achieve further knowledge. Nor should we mistake the scaffolding for the Temple of Truth itself, so falling into the error of accepting hypotheses as final statements of truth rather than regarding them as tentative steps leading to further investigation and discovery.

Bearing the foregoing consideration in mind, we may now go on to discuss certain points in the psychology of the Bible and attempt to compare them with modern psychological theories. Any book dealing with human nature must, to some extent, touch on psychology, because psychology is essentially the study

of human nature and an attempt to interpret it. Psychology studies the personality of man and his various reactions to the society in which he lives and to the events which befall him in his journey through life. The Bible also deals with these themes, and its contents afford abundant material for exploration on psychological lines. At the very outset of our study we are faced with several difficulties. The first difficulty lies in the mass of material available. We find in the Bible a very large number of statements about the nature of man, and rich and varied material for psychological study in the sayings and doings of the men and women portrayed in its pages. On the psychological side, hundreds of books and thousands of articles have been published dealing with psychological research and the various theories founded on them.

A second, and more serious difficulty becomes apparent when we come to study the nature of the material which presents itself.

First of all we find that the same Hebrew or Greek word is translated by several different words in our English version, and conversely, the same English word is used in different places as a translation of several different words in the original. Again we discover that some of the Greek words used in the New Testament do not bear the same meaning as they did in classical Greek. We also find that in modern usage certain words, *e.g.*, soul, have come to represent theological conceptions not contained in the original meaning of these words as used in the Bible.

If we seek to surmount the language difficulty, we are then met by the considerable complexity in Biblical psychology. There are no cut and dried statements or theories on which to construct anything approaching an ordered pattern of psychology in the Bible. This need not occasion surprise in view of the immense complexity of human personality revealed by modern research.

When we turn to modern psychology we find confusion worse confounded. There are various schools of psychology, each with its particular theories often appearing in contradiction to one another.

We are almost led to despair of finding anything approaching to a scientific exposition, and we are tempted to conclude that psychology is neither an exact science nor a consistent art. On further reflection however, it is obvious that psychology is yet in its infancy, and that the different schools represent different lines of approach. Not enough has yet been discovered to

enable a larger synthesis to be made. This, we hope, will come later, but much further patient research will be necessary before general principles can be formulated, and unity achieved.

To avoid submersion in a sea of hypothesis, it is proposed to limit the present discussion to the theories of the psycho-analytical school founded by Freud, and to select only a very few Biblical terms and their meanings. Having discussed these Biblical terms, I shall then compare them with psycho-analytical conceptions.

It has now doubtless become apparent that in order to make a study of the subject of this paper certain qualifications are desirable. These should include a thorough knowledge of the Bible, a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, an ability to distinguish the meaning of the Greek of the New Testament from the meaning of classical Greek, an acquaintance with Greek philosophy, and lastly, wide reading in modern psychological literature. Unfortunately I can lay claim to none of these qualifications save the last, and even to that, only partially. My only apology for presuming to venture on this immense subject is that I do it in the hope that some person of deep scholarship may be stimulated to engage in a line of research which would surely prove to be both interesting and profitable.

In adopting the theories of the psycho-analytical school of thought rather than other psychological systems, there is a preliminary difficulty to be faced before proceeding with the discussion. Freud and his followers, with the exception of Jung, hold the theory of determinism. Freud taught that an individual's mental state and behaviour at any particular moment are the result of all that has gone before in the heredity and environment of the person concerned. There is no possibility of free choice. At any period of a man's life, his emotions, thoughts, feelings, and actions are predetermined by all that has gone before. Hence we find no reference to the will in modern psycho-analytical literature. It is assumed that all mental processes obey certain laws. It would take us too far afield to discuss the philosophical questions here raised. Free-will *versus* determinism has been the battle ground of philosophers for many centuries. It must suffice to point out that this deterministic view is in direct conflict with much of the teaching to be found in the Bible. It is there repeatedly implied that man has the power to choose, and that he is morally responsible to God for the choices he makes. This is implicit in both the Old and the

New Testaments. For instance, in Deuteronomy 30 : 19, Moses says to the people of Israel, " I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing ; therefore choose life." Our Lord said to the Jews, " Ye will not come to Me that ye might have life " (John 5 : 40). The last appeal made to men in the Apocalypse is to their will : " Whosoever *will*, let him take of the water of life freely " (Rev. 22 : 17).

This, however, is not the only line of Bible teaching about the will. There are other passages in Scripture which imply that man is not quite so free in his choice as we are apt to assume. Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and Cyrus, King of Persia, are both referred to in the book of Isaiah in a way which leaves no doubt that they will carry out God's purposes toward Israel and other nations, not in conscious obedience to God, or by their own choice to serve Him, but because He used them as the instruments of His will. A study of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans raises doubts as to whether the will of man is quite so free as some would like to believe.

The Bible seems to make it clear that man has some power of choice, but whether his will is free in the ordinarily accepted sense of the term, is very much open to question. The will of man can operate only within the limitations of the purposes of God, and ultimately God's will must prevail in spite of the rebellion and disobedience of man.

When we begin to study the statements of Scripture about the personality of man, and attempt to reduce them to some sort of order, and when, having done that, we try to relate them to psycho-analytic findings and theories, we soon discover that we are up against very complicated problems. The terms used in the Bible are different from the terms used in modern psychology. It is not easy to form a clear conception of the meaning of certain terms used, and we discover further that the psychology of man as unfolded in the Bible is very complex, and difficult to arrange in a clear pattern. Another problem is that Greek thought has so penetrated into Christian theology, and has become so intermingled with Christian thought, that it is often a matter of some difficulty to disentangle the New Testament teaching about certain subjects from classical Greek conceptions. This is particularly true of the word *psyche*, usually translated " soul." We shall discover that the word as used in the New Testament has a meaning very different from its connotation either in ancient Greek thought or in the popular theology of to-day.

In reading through the Bible it soon becomes evident that there are a few words used so frequently concerning the being of man, that other words describing his personality seem to occupy a subordinate position. These frequently recurring words are "soul," "heart" and "spirit." The words "soul" and "heart" are of very frequent occurrence. The word "spirit" occurs very often in connection with God, less often as applied to man. The Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of God, are of very frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. Similarly in the New Testament we find the terms Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Truth, and often simply the Spirit. Consideration of these terms lies outside the scope of this paper, and the word "spirit" will be discussed only when it applies to the spirit of man.

We will now go on to take the words "soul," "heart" and "spirit" in turn, exploring their meaning as used in the Bible, and comparing them with modern psychological conceptions.

The word "soul" in our Authorised Version of the Old Testament occurs usually as a translation of a Hebrew word meaning breath (*nephesh*).

The same Hebrew word is also translated sometimes by other words: "heart," "As he thinketh in his heart (soul) so is he" (Proverbs 23: 9); "mind," seven times in the book of Ezekiel; "breath," "His breath kindleth the coals and a flame goeth out of his mouth" (Job 41: 21).

The Hebrew word is very frequently translated by the word "life" throughout the Old Testament.

In the New Testament the Greek word *psyche* is variously translated as "soul," "life," "heart" and "mind."

It would take too long to make out a list of all the different texts in which the word "soul" occurs in the Bible, and to specify each of the various attributes assigned to it. All that is attempted here is to give a summary of the conclusions arrived at after a study of all the references. The same applies to the discussion of the two other words chosen, "heart" and "spirit."

The word "soul" is sometimes used to denote the whole person just as we use the word "body" when we say somebody or everybody: "All the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls" (Exodus 1: 5); "The soul that sinneth it shall die" (Ezek. 18: 20).

Certain mental processes are attributed to the soul, such as **thinking, choosing, purposing and a variety of emotional reactions.**

On studying the use of the Hebrew words *leb*, *lebab*, and *libbah*, translated "heart" in the Authorised Version, and the word *ruach*, translated "spirit," we find that the various functions of thinking, willing and feeling are also attributed to them. The same applies to the corresponding Greek words in the New Testament. All the various functions of the mind as described in modern psychology are attributed indifferently to heart, soul and spirit. At first sight this seems to be very confusing, but as we shall see later, it has an important significance.

In addition to the attributes affixed in common to "soul," "heart" and "spirit," each of these words is used with a specific and technical meaning of its own.

The distinctive meaning of the word *nepshesh* ("soul") is life, animal life whether in man or in animals. In this respect there is no difference between man and the lower animals; animals have souls as well as man, *e.g.*, Genesis 1: 20: "The living creature that hath life" (*nepshesh*, soul). In several places the blood is said to be the seat of the life, or soul of animals. When people die the soul leaves the body, that is, the life or breath leaves the body. It is important to note that the word soul, as used in the Old Testament has nothing in it of the metaphysical content attached to it by theologians. It is simply the life principle, the life of the man or animal. It includes psychical life, for the mind is a living thing.

When we turn to the New Testament we find that the Greek word *psyche* is similarly, in its more technical meaning, merely the animal life principle. With only two exceptions, both occurring in the Apocalypse, the soul is not the immortal part of man which survives the death of the body. It is, as in the Old Testament, the life principle of his existence here on earth. When the Apostle writes that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," he uses a word derived from *psyche*. The "psychical" or animal man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God. Similarly, where we read concerning the resurrection of the body, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," the same word, "psychical," is used, and placed in direct contrast with the enduring spiritual body of the new resurrection existence.

Plato's teaching about the *psyche* has bitten so deeply into Christian thought that soul has become almost equivalent in meaning to spirit. As the word psychology tells us, it has also come to mean the mind. These meanings, however, are not to

be found in Scripture. In the Bible the soul is the animal life of earthly existence, and death is the separation of the animal life or breath from the material body. It is not the immortal personality or part of that personality which survives death. Whether that life does or does not survive after the death of the body is a separate question nowhere referred to in Scripture. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is founded on Greek philosophy, but it was very early introduced into Christian thought.

In the Pentateuch the blood is said to be the seat of the soul or life in man and in animals. This belief was associated with the taboo which forbade the drinking of blood. This belief has far-reaching roots in primitive beliefs, but it would take us away from the subject to follow this out.

When we turn to the very numerous statements about the heart in Scripture, we find a considerable amount of support for the commonly held view that the heart is the centre of emotional life. In modern English we describe a man as hard-hearted, or tender-hearted or lion-hearted, thereby describing emotional attitudes otherwise described as stubborn, sympathetic and courageous respectively. We distinguish between knowing a thing with the head and knowing it with the heart, thus comparing intellectual knowledge with emotional or intuitive knowledge. We may know on a cold intellectual level, or we may feel on a deep emotional plane, that a statement is true.

Another way in which we can use the word heart is in describing the inner meaning or essence of a matter, as the heart of the matter. Hence the word "core," derived from the Greek word for heart, *kardia*, via the Latin *cor*.

These various usages all occur in the Bible. We find, in addition, that the heart is the centre of will and purpose, and it is the fountain from which thoughts, words, and actions proceed. As well as being the seat of all kinds of emotions, it is the source from which motives and conduct, both good and evil, arise.

The general trend of Bible teaching is to regard the heart of man as evil, although it is occasionally good. Our Lord speaks of the "good treasure," and of the "evil treasure," of the heart (Luke 6: 43) and of "an honest and good heart" (Luke 8: 15).

Furthermore, the heart is the seat of understanding, of discrimination and the forming of judgments, and of thoughts and knowledge.

Perhaps enough has been said to show that in the Bible the

heart is the seat of all the various mental functions which modern psychology classifies under the headings of conation (urge), feeling (or affect) and intellect or knowing (cognition). The heart described in the Bible is equivalent to the conscious mind or Ego of modern psychology. I must qualify this by adding that the Ego is not entirely conscious. It has roots going down into the Unconscious (the Id) and is in communication with it. Even here there are hints that the analogy holds good. When our Lord said, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts" etc., there is a hint of the depths of the mind from whence deeper impulses rise into the Ego from the Unconscious.

The third word used frequently in relation to man's being is the Hebrew word *ruach* in the Old Testament and the corresponding Greek word *pneuma* in the New Testament. Both these words mean literally "wind," and are usually translated "spirit." We may see how wind (spirit) is contrasted with breath (life or soul). Breath is an obvious phenomenon connected with the living body of man and beast.

It is the breath of life which leaves a man's body when he dies.

Wind is a mysterious, invisible, power whose effects are manifest, but whose origin and destination are unknown. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth" (John 3 : 8).

So wind came to symbolise that mysterious force in man which sometimes takes possession of him and appears to drive him hither and thither apart from his conscious will and intelligence. It becomes associated in thought with that other self which arises when a man is swayed by uncontrollable emotions, good or evil, and which takes possession of him in states of ecstasy or in trance-like conditions. This is expressed in colloquial speech in such expressions as "He is beside himself" or "He is not himself," suggesting another self besides the one with which we are familiar.

In the Old Testament the references to the spirit of man are not numerous. The word is more frequently used of God, or of evil spirits.

It sometimes has the meaning of a disposition of character (e.g., the spirit of Elijah which rested on Elisha), but it is more often used in relation to the emotions, e.g., "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit" (Job 7 : 11); "Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry" (Eccl. 12 : 9). At death "the spirit returns to God who gave it" (Eccl. 12 : 7).

On the whole, there is very little development of teaching about the spirit of man until we reach the New Testament. There the theme is amply expounded. The spirit of man there becomes that part of man's personality in direct relationship with God. It is the seat of the operation of God's Spirit in the New Birth (John 3: 6, 8). It is the centre of worship (John 4: 23) and of service (Romans 1: 9; 7: 6).

In the apostolic writings, it is not always easy to distinguish the Holy Spirit of God from the spirit of the believer where the word *pneuma* is used alone. This is understandable because the Spirit of God regenerates the spirit of man and indwells the believer, so that the body of the believer becomes the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6: 19).

The new spiritual life in man becomes the discernor of spiritual things relating to God, things which are outside the knowledge of the natural or psychical man (1 Cor. 2: 11-15).

Besides the technical use of the word *pneuma* in the New Testament, it is sometimes represented as the seat of the emotions, as we have already found in the Old Testament.

Although at first sight it appears to be somewhat confusing to find various mental processes such as emotions and understanding attributed indifferently to heart, soul and spirit, this is not without significance. It emphasises a truth which is apt to retreat into the background, the truth that man is a unity. He is not made up of several separate and distinct parts, he is a complete whole. The same error of thinking of the different parts of the mind as things in themselves is apt to creep into modern psychological conceptions. The Super Ego, the Ego, the Unconscious are apt to be thought of as though they were separate things in themselves with separate existences. Such terms are merely abstractions, useful for descriptive purposes, but actually only different aspects of one unity.

When the body is taken into account, the temptation to divide man into parts becomes even more apparent. Endless arguments have arisen about theories of dualism, psycho-physical parallelism, and so on. In his book, *Man the Unknown*, Dr. Carrel has pointed out the fallacy of dividing the personality of man into separate parts, and of thinking of those parts as entities in themselves.

It is only in death that man's being undergoes disruption, and the Bible teaches that this dissolution is temporary and not final. Whatever views may be held about the resurrection,

the doctrine implies that the human personality will be eventually re-integrated in a body given by the power of God. Man is not to remain permanently as a disembodied spirit. As individual human beings we are not minds or spirits, souls, or hearts, or even bodies. We are individual entities containing all these conceptions in one unity. Nevertheless we are obliged, by the limitation of our knowledge, to describe the different aspects of human personality as though they were different things.

In psycho-analytical theory, the Id, as its name suggests, is the impersonal, unconscious basis of mental life. By its contact with the outer world by means of the sense organs, part of the Id becomes organised or differentiated to form the Ego. The Ego contains all the conscious mental processes, and it is in continual relationship with the outer world by means of the organ of sense. The Ego is also in constant communication with the unconscious Id. Modern investigation shows that the Id, in addition to supplying the instinctive drives which rise to consciousness as desires and emotions, also activates physical energies, and is closely connected with processes of healing. It is intimately associated with the animal life of both mind and body. This animal function of the Id as the source of bodily health and life may be equated with the soul of Scripture. It is largely unconscious and impersonal, and is the principle of life without which the body would be a mass of inert matter.

Analysis shows that in certain mental disorders the normal free intercommunication between Ego and Id becomes partly blocked by the process known as repression, so that some dissociation of personality occurs. This state of affairs often shows itself in lowered physical vitality, and in various physical symptoms. It is as though the individual has cut himself off partially from the sources of life within himself. He is only half alive. This has been described as an unconscious compromise with suicide. It is often discovered, on deep analysis, that the patient has unconsciously sentenced himself to death, often as the result of an overwhelming feeling of guilt. Consciously he desires to live. The wish to die is repressed, but by withdrawal of some of the Id energy from the Ego, the healthy functioning of the body is impaired, sometimes to a serious degree. Patients sometimes express this state of affairs by saying that their souls are dead, or that they have lost their souls.

The healthy normal free communication between the Id on the one hand, and the Ego and the body on the other, is interfered

with, and illness ensues. The tempo of mental and physical processes is slowed down.

The soul may therefore be thought of as the life principle behind both bodily and mental processes, and corresponds to one aspect of the Id of modern psychology.

Before giving further consideration to the spirit, we might summarise what has so far been said about personality as described in the Bible by a diagrammatic representation. If we draw three intersecting circles representing heart, soul, and spirit, respectively, we might think of the area of intersection as the properties, mostly emotional, which they have in common in Biblical psychology. The remaining free area of each circle would then represent the specific properties of each. Furthermore, each of those areas is connected with the body, and the central nervous system forms the link of mediation between the body and the rest of the personality. This last statement is not, of course, Biblical, although St. Paul comes very near to modern psychology when he uses the analogy of the head and the body applied to Christ and the Church.

When we come to the relationship between the Bible teaching about the spirit, and the views of modern psychology, we enter upon very difficult territory, territory which lies very largely in the region of the unknown. Even its outer fringes have been scarcely mapped out. Generally speaking, the psycho-analytical school does not recognise spirit. In his later years, Freud's eyes began to be opened to the existence of spiritual values, but his vision was dim and distorted. His great pupil, Jung, struck out an independent line of thought, and his researches and thinking led him to take a far wider spiritual view of human nature than the orthodox psycho-analysts have ever seen or expressed. He probed deeply into the spiritual realm, and he put forward a very interesting hypothesis in an Essay on "Life and Spirit" in his book *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*.

A brief summary of his hypothesis is as follows. He likens consciousness to the beam of a searchlight which brings only a small area of the mind into view at a time. Outside the rays of the beam lies the larger part of the mind, hidden in the darkness of unconsciousness. As the beam alters its direction from time to time, various areas of the mind become conscious, but never the whole of it. Much of it remains outside consciousness altogether, and its existence can only be inferred by its effects. Investigation of the Unconscious by deep psychological analysis

points to the conclusion that it is the source of instincts and emotions, but that it exercises other functions as well. It contains activities usually only associated with conscious mental activity, such as memory and power of reasoning. Furthermore, this unconscious area controls the automatic bodily processes via the autonomic nervous system. These bodily processes include such activities as respiration, digestion, the beating of the heart, the secretion of the internal glands, etc. Many of these bodily processes, normally outside our consciousness, appear as though they acted under intelligent guidance. Many processes which take place within the body both in health and in disease are very difficult or impossible to explain on physio-chemical grounds alone.

Jung goes on to suggest the possibility of a larger consciousness which lies outside our personal conscious, and which has an unsleeping awareness of the whole processes of the living organism.

This larger consciousness includes within its sphere both mind and body, and has a guiding or directive function over all vital processes. We know that during both waking and sleeping hours there is ceaseless activity, certainly of bodily organs, probably of mental life, of which we have no direct awareness. Jung suggests that the direction of these ceaseless activities is centred in this super or extra consciousness which lies completely outside our ordinary conscious mental life. He equates this super consciousness with spirit.

Freud pointed out that there are good reasons for believing that certain phenomena in the Unconscious appear to bear no relation to time. For instance, unconscious memories and emotions do not fade or lessen with the passage of time. Conscious memories of events gradually fade as time goes on, and their emotional content is often faint or altogether lost. On the other hand, emotions and images long forgotten may reappear in all their original intensity under certain conditions. Sometimes in dreams, often during hypnosis, the events of early childhood are recalled with the greatest vividness and with intense emotion.

Again, as Professor James pointed out in his well-known book on *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, many of the experiences recorded by mystics point to a subliminal sphere outside the range of ordinary conscious processes. The spirit seems to transcend time and space. The work of Professor Myers along the lines of psychical research led him to a similar conclusion.

This very brief and rather bald summary is perhaps sufficient to lend support to a conception of spirit as the other self in the depths of our being. This self is not limited by time and space in the same way as the rest of the personality. It is largely unrecognised by consciousness, and extends far beyond the limits of mind and body as usually conceived.

All this agrees with the striking words of the Apostle already referred to when he says: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him, but God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God . . . The natural (psychical) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things" (1 Cor. 2: 9-15).

There is here a statement about a spiritual intuition which is different in quality from normal cognition. The spirit acquires, or is given an ability to perceive spiritual things related to God and the things which He has prepared—not in a distant future but here and now—for those who love Him.

It is this spiritual nature of man which marks the fundamental difference between man and animals. The higher animals possess animal life in common with man. They possess a certain degree of intellectual and emotional life, perhaps the same in kind as that possessed by man, although in man these mental qualities show a vastly greater development.

In the possession of spirit able to communicate with God and to worship Him, man stands alone amid all living species on the earth. It is here that we discover the true meaning of the words "God created man in His own image." God is spirit, and in man He has created spiritual life. The spirit of man is an echo, often faint and blurred, of the Spirit of God. It is within man's spirit that the work of redemption begins, transforming him not from without by changing his environment, but from within by the inflow of new life. The New Birth takes place in the innermost depths of Man's being, from whence it works outwards, gradually transforming the whole of his personality.

By this time it will have become evident that the old theological conception of man as body, soul and spirit is not adequate. It omits the heart, and the heart plays a large part in the psychology of man as set forth in the Bible. The early Fathers of the Church were no doubt influenced in their thinking by the doctrine of the Trinity, and they based their description of man on an analogy between the being of man and the being of God. The words in Genesis about man being created in the image of God were interpreted as meaning that the body, soul and spirit of man formed a trinity analogous to Father, Son and Holy Spirit of the Holy Trinity. It seems to me that this is a mistaken assumption and a false analogy. God is Spirit, and the image of God is to be found in the spiritual nature of man which distinguishes him from the lower creatures. On the earthly side man shares with the animals the possession of body and soul (life), on the heavenly side he is akin to God in the possession of Spirit.

In the Incarnation the Word was made flesh at a definite point in the time-sequence of history. We cannot suppose that the Eternal God is in any sense a material being like a man.

From whatever angle the Holy Trinity is considered, any attempted comparison between the nature of God and the nature of man breaks down, except on the spiritual plane.

In conclusion, I should like to make it clear that the views put forward in this paper are purely tentative. They are intended only as a preliminary and very imperfect survey of an immense field of thought and research. The Bible is a book containing vast treasures of truth about man and profound depths of revelation concerning God. The personality of man as revealed by modern psychology is similarly profound. As we contemplate the immensity of these theories, we realise our ignorance. We are reminded of the words of Sir Isaac Newton who likened himself to a child playing with a few pebbles on the shore of a vast ocean of truth.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (REV. CANON A. ST. J. THORPE) said: You would like me to thank Dr. White for that most interesting and stimulating paper, and now I have to take my part—a part I did not realise I had to take until I came here this evening. Fortunately, I had a copy of his paper beforehand and read it carefully more than once, and I have been making notes while the doctor has been speaking.

I was interested in his reference to Freud's views on Determinism which, I think, appeal to the human mind in a time of mental stress. Under mental stress and inexplicable sorrow some are led to think "What is the good of it all? What must be, will be"—and such a view leads to despair. But Dr. White went on to show that there is quite definitely in the Bible an opposite point of view, and it is therein that the Bible can give us hope and security.

With regard to Determinism and Choice, St. Paul is careful never to write of the two together. He certainly deals with Determinism and the Will of God, as he does with man's power of Choice, but never together.

Another interesting point was his mention of the "Id" and the "Ego" with the latter having its roots in the former. I have sometimes found, when preparing a sermon in the evening, I have been unable to clarify my thoughts and so have given up trying and gone to bed. In the morning the outline of a sermon has quickly taken shape in my mind. This, I feel, bears out the point that the unconscious "Id" during sleep is preparing what the conscious "Ego" will express.

Lastly, I was interested in the paragraph that reads: "Whatever views may be held about the resurrection, the doctrine implies that the human personality will be eventually re-integrated in a body given by the power of God. Man is not to remain permanently as a disembodied spirit." It is for this reason the word "body" is used in the Apostles' Creed, in the article which reads "the resurrection of the body," rather than the resurrection of the dead.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. F. F. BRUCE wrote: Although Dr. White disclaims qualification for this subject outside the field of modern psychology, he is to be congratulated upon his accurate and lucid presentation of the Biblical terminology. It is to be hoped that, after this Preface, either he or someone equally competent will make a careful study along these lines of such Biblical phenomena as glossolalia and demon-possession, or even such basic Christian doctrines as Biblical inspiration and the relation of the Two Natures in our Lord's Person (especially the link between His human consciousness and His eternal deity). I do not suggest that such a restatement would

possess any final authority, but I believe it might have considerable apologetic value for our generation.

What Dr. White calls "the old theological conception of man as body, soul and spirit" is based, of course, on 1 Thessalonians 5 : 23 but 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. What the Bible appears to present is rather a general dichotomy of the material and non-material elements in our being, the non-material element being further distinguished as heart, soul and spirit (as Dr. White has shown). Sometimes other organs are named metaphorically in Scripture in much the same way as "heart," e.g., the kidneys and the liver, though the latter term is obscured in our ordinary versions through confusion with another word having the same root-letters in Hebrew. For example, it is likely that Ps. 16 : 9a literally means : "Therefore my heart is glad and my *liver* rejoices"—a good example of synonymous parallelism. For the rest, Dr. White's paper seems to indicate that Biblical psychology presents much more striking analogies to modern psychological doctrine than to the outmoded faculty psychology of Greek origin. And we may be sure that further advances in this science will do more to show how aptly the Bible mirrors the true nature of man.

Rev. J. STAFFORD WRIGHT wrote : I am sure that Dr. White is right in not trying to tie down the Biblical usages to hard and fast definitions. In dealing with "things" like Soul, Spirit, Life, Mind, etc., we are bound to attempt the impossibility of expressing unsubstantial realities in material terms. Both the Biblical writers and modern psychologists are forced to do this, and those who insist on cut-and-dried and consistent schemes are bound to be disappointed when they cannot find the formal diagrammatic consistency that they desire.

It is, however, possible to see how certain words come to be employed as vehicles of psychological thought, even though they may express different aspects on different occasions. I think that Dr. White has found an unreal antithesis between *nephesh* as "breath" and *ruach* as "wind" on page 59. While it is true that *nephesh* in origin may mean "breath", this usage is so rare as to

be negligible, whereas *ruach* is translated "breath" 28 times, and this is a normal meaning in addition to its meaning of "wind." In the Vision of the Dry Bones in Ezekiel 37, *ruach* has to be translated within the compass of a few verses as "wind," "breath," and "spirit." One can see how a word like *ruach* or *pneuma* is well fitted to give the picture of the Spirit of God or the spirit of man. If a baby needs breath to live, so the "born-again" can only live if the Spirit-breath comes in. This is the significance of John 3.

There is a further interesting point that the other prime necessity for life is blood, and, as this paper points out, the blood is associated with *nephesh*. Yet, curiously enough, *nephesh* is not used of the new life, though the giving of the *nephesh* through the pouring out of the blood in sacrifice is the one pillar of our regeneration—the new *ruach* being the other.

These small points of interpretation do not affect Dr. White's argument in the least, since he has wisely based his argument on usage rather than derivation. I am sure that his attempt to link up Biblical truth with the discoveries of psychology is good. We cannot keep our thinking in watertight compartments. I very much like Dr. White's connection of one Biblical aspect of the *psyche* with the Id, and of the Heart with the Ego.

Dr. BASIL F. C. ATKINSON wrote: I have read with great interest Dr. Ernest White's valuable paper. While disavowing any competence to comment on its substance, I should like to bring forward three points of Biblical terminology which appear to me to arise from it. (1) Is not the term "heart" used in Scripture to connote the *will* more generally than the writer implies? For instance have we not in Mark 12: 30 four terms denoting respectively the will, the emotions, the intellect and the physical strength? (2) Are we not justified in gathering from Gen. 2: 7 that the combination of *spirit* with *body*, and its action upon it, constitute *soul*? The same seems to be the case with animals, the difference lying, as the writer of the paper has pointed out, in the nature of the human spirit. The spirit is thus both a life principle and a disposition, and these two meanings are strikingly combined in the references to spirit in John 3. (3) On page 57 of his paper the writer excepts two instances in the Apocalypse from the otherwise general meaning of the word "soul." I assume the two instances to be Rev. 6: 9

and 20 : 4. May I suggest that the two passages are no exceptions ? In 20 : 4 may we not see the regular meaning "personality" and understand the passage to refer to personalities reconstituted in resurrection ? In 6 : 9, in view of the statement in the Pentateuch, quoted by the writer, that the blood is the seat of the soul, may we not see an equivalence with Gen. 4 : 10 ?

Mr. TITTERINGTON wrote : I am glad that Dr. White has given us this most interesting paper, and hope that now that a start has been made, the way may be open for a fuller and yet more comprehensive study of the psychology of the Bible.

Dr. White suggests that in order to perform this task adequately, a formidable array of qualifications is desirable—a thorough knowledge, not only of current psychological thought and knowledge, but of Greek and Hebrew, not to speak of ancient philosophy. If we are to proceed on these lines, there will be the added difficulty in the New Testament of determining whether a Greek word is used in the classical sense, or in the sense of the Koine ; as the equivalent of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, or as expressing some concept of Greek philosophy. But I think it is easy to exaggerate these difficulties—indeed, to pay too much attention to matters like these may be misleading rather than helpful. After all, in his present paper Dr. White has recognised that the meaning to be attached to the various terms is to be determined by the usage. Scripture does not simply borrow words and conceptions from other sources, but in doing so gives them a new content of its own. We only have to think of words like *ἀγάπη* and *λόγος* in order to see this. It is this Scriptural usage we have to understand and interpret. Surely we can learn more of what is meant by the "heart" from a passage like Matt. 15 : 19 than from all the lexicons that were ever written. So I hope that Dr. White will not be deterred from following up his present study by any misgivings on this score.

With regard to the word "heart," I should like to draw attention to the curious use of the word in Eph. 1 : 18, where the A.V. translates it "understanding"—the R.V. gives "heart," in accordance with the Greek.

As the present paper is limited mainly to the consideration of the terms "heart," "soul," and "spirit," one does not wish to wander too far afield ; nevertheless, I should be glad if Dr. White could

throw any light upon the meaning of St. Paul's expressions, "the old man" and "the new man," in Rom. 6, Eph. 4 and Col. 3. They must have some relation to the conscious part of our being, for they are, at least in part, subject to our own volition and control.

MR. DOUGLAS DEWAR wrote : To me one of the most interesting parts of Dr. White's most interesting paper are his remarks about the heart. My impression is that heart is the noun which occurs most frequently in the Bible. There are passages which indicate that this wonderful organ contains the seat of emotion and memory and that thoughts originate in it.

For years past scientific men have conducted their investigations on the assumption that the seat of thoughts and memory lies in the brain. But we have to admit that we are still completely ignorant of how or where thoughts originate. This being so, and in view of the many references to the heart in the Bible, I am surprised that more attention has not been paid to this organ.

Two years ago Mr. C. W. Deans wrote to me from Vancouver suggesting that, as the brain appears to be a transformer of nervous energy, more attention should be paid to the heart, and that it may be that the nerve bundle of Hiss or the auriculo-ventricular node has something to do with emotions and thought. I replied that I was not competent to give a useful opinion on this, but that, in my view, it would be very rash to brush aside his suggestion, because the heart is very richly supplied with nerves, and seems to be quite as wonderful an organ as the brain, and, in a sense even more important, because the heart can function to some extent when severed from the brain, but the brain ceases to function very soon after the heart ceases to beat.

Might not this aspect of the matter be considered with advantage by physiologists and neurologists ?

Lt.-Col. L. MERSON DAVIES wrote : I agree with much in this interesting paper but would point out that the conception of man as consisting of "body, soul and spirit" is not just an "old theological" one but is Scriptural. See 1 Thess. 5:23. And as Paul did not mention the heart as a fourth constituent part I have always regarded Bible references to the heart as being to man's inner emotional self. "If thou shalt . . . believe in thine heart"

(Rom. 10 : 9) would mean believe sincerely, not just conventionally. So the heart would, if I am right, refer to the inner, or deeper, part of the soul and not to something separate from the soul.

On the other hand, the soul is definitely represented, in Scripture, as distinct from the spirit, although intimately correlated with it. The Word of God is keen enough to divide the one from the other (Heb. 4 : 12). And a man's spirit is the God-conscious part of him. Note the change of tense in Mary's words : " My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour " (Luke 1 46-47). Obviously her spirit acted first, comprehending and rejoicing ; and then moved her soul—or physical mind—to praise accordingly.

As regards the subject of " Man in the Image of God," I showed in my paper under that title (*Journ. Trans. Vict. Inst.*, 71 (1939), p. 170 ff.) that both the Bible and science distinguish man from beast by his intelligent *creative* powers, his powers of articulate *speech*, and his capacity for *spiritual* cognition and worship.

Mr. JOHN BYRT wrote : I class our Chairman's paper as one of the most interesting and most important I have read. He has treated a very complex subject with a simplicity which is greatly to be commended.

From his treatment of the Hebrew and Greek words that have been rendered " soul " and " spirit " it would appear that *nephesh* is used primarily to denote the whole person or entity ; and, secondarily, in respect of particular attributes, of which his life—" animal life "—is the most important. This understanding of the word is of interest in connection with two much-debated passages. First, Psa. 16 : 10, " Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (*sheol*) " becomes delightfully simple and straightforward if rendered " Thou wilt not leave me in the grave " (*cf.* the translation of Judges 16 : 30). Secondly, Gen. 2 : 7, " man became a living soul "—a live person.

As Dr. White further observes, " when people die the soul leaves the body, that is, the life or breath leaves the body," so that the person then becomes a dead soul. Rev. G. Waller, in listing the occurrences of " soul " in Scripture, states that " in the 754 places the Hebrew word *nephesh* (soul) occurs in the Old Testament Scripture, it is said in 326 places to be *subject to death*," and " in the 106 places where the Greek word *psyche* (soul) occurs in the New Testament

Scripture, it is said in 45 places to be *subject to death*" (*A Biblical Concordance on the Soul, the Intermediate State and the Resurrection*, 1906).

Dr. White quotes the words of the Preacher that at death "the spirit returns to God who gave it," and he states that "man is not to remain permanently as a disembodied spirit." If the spirit of man "lies in the depths of personality," it would seem that at death the personality reverts to the universal consciousness of the Deity. Mr. R. T. Lovelock, in a masterly paper on Personality, given in 1949, stated that in death "a hiatus in consciousness occurs" but that "for the Christian there is true continuity since he exists in the mind of God." Some objections were raised to certain details in Mr. Lovelock's paper, and it will be interesting to see the comments on this paper of Dr. White's. Yet the Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul has been questioned by such men as Rev. Edward White (*Life in Christ*, 1875); W. E. Gladstone (*Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler*), Dr. F. S. M. Bennett (*The Resurrection of the Dead*, 1929), and Dr. J. Agar Beet (*The Immortality of the Soul; A Protest*, 1902). The doctrine was rejected by Tyndale, by Luther, and even—according to Prof Saurat—by Milton (*Milton; Man and Thinker*, 1944).

The unfortunate feature of the idea of inherent immortality is that it often results in a loss of emphasis on the Christian hope of resurrection and immortality *through Christ*. That there has been a swing in emphasis since apostolic times is, of course, frequently recognised; as witness the Report of a Commission on Evangelism appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York: "The idea of the inherent indestructibility of the human soul owes its origin to Greek, not to Bible sources. The central theme of the New Testament is eternal life, not for anybody and everybody, but for believers in Christ as risen from the dead" (*Towards the Conversion of England*, 1945).

Because this aspect is so often allowed to fade into the background, it is most refreshing to encounter a paper such as Dr. White's, which forces us back to the fundamental issues that underlie our hope of future life.

Mr. H. K. AIRY SHAW wrote: This most interesting and valuable paper will put much of the Bible in an entirely new light, and many

of its implications will probably only become evident after the opportunity of an extended study of the Word in the light of it.

The importance, for the individual walk and warfare of the believer, of distinguishing clearly between "spiritual" and "soul" activity, cannot be over-emphasized. Much of the breakdown, confusion and frustration in Christian lives might be avoided if this vital distinction were recognized, and if Dr. White's paper did no more than bring this issue to the notice of some of God's people it would have been well worth while.

There are one or two points of detail that suggest comment.

Page 52, line 7: "The Bible . . . presents the raw, uncodified materials from which men have built up various systems," etc. I feel that the expression "raw, uncodified materials" is an inappropriate, and indeed irrelevant, one, to apply to the Word of God. It is, of course, tragically true that men have *treated* the Bible as so much "raw, uncodified material" from which to construct their own systems—but that is man's misuse, not God's intention. To the people of God the Book does not come within the category of "materials": it is, as Dr. White says, "a book of life"—indeed, one of the most precious sources of life itself.

Page 54, line 36. Free will. Can this not be more easily grasped by reference to the transcendent power and sovereignty of God? As Dr. White well expresses it (middle of page 55), "The will of man can operate only within the limitations of the purposes of God." God's infinite sovereignty is well able so to arrange, or manoeuvre, or, as it were "outflank" the circumstances of any given life, that, while the person himself exercises a perfectly free choice within the framework of those circumstances in which he finds himself, yet, because of those very circumstances (foreknown and allowed for by God from the beginning), his free choice is in fact caused to subserve the ultimate purposes of God. The supreme example of this was, of course, the Crucifixion: see Acts 2: 23. Compare also Genesis 50: 20, in the story of Joseph and his brothers.

Page 57, line 31. "Natural" and "psychical". I would like to ask whether Dr. White would agree that the term "carnal," as used by Paul, has usually much the same connotation as "psychical". The expressions "carnal" and "after the flesh" in the New Testament would seem to be almost as important as

those associated with the *psyche*. The whole of the first section of Romans 8, for instance (verses 1-14), is taken up with a very strong insistence on the antithesis between the flesh and the spirit, and the same distinction is brought out in 1 Cor. 3 : 1-3. It seems clear that for Paul the vital distinction was between "spirit," on the one hand, and "heart," "soul," "flesh," etc., on the other ; he was not greatly concerned to draw fine distinctions between the last three.

Page 58, line 12. Blood. I would deprecate the use of the term "taboo" here, in view of the supremely important place which the blood occupies in the teaching of the Bible. It might give the impression that this divinely given prohibition was on a level with the many superstitious "taboos" found among unenlightened peoples. And surely the next sentence is put the wrong way round, Is it not these so-called "primitive" beliefs which have *their* ultimate roots in an original, truly primitive revelation from God regarding the significance of blood ?

Page 58, line 38. May these references of our Lord to a "good heart," apparently conflicting with the general trend of Bible teaching, perhaps be explained as referring to *regenerate* hearts ? In Luke 8 : 15, for example, those referred to are they who, "having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit."

Page 65. "Man shares with the animals the possession of body and soul." Would Dr. White say that animals also have a "heart" ?

Throughout the paper I feel that it would be good if Dr. White could make a little clearer the part that the New Birth plays in altering the whole "set-up" of the human personality. Most current psychology, I take it, deals with unregenerate mankind, whereas the New Testament is concerned almost entirely with those who have been born again and become "new creations" in Christ. I am not overlooking the illuminating references on pages 60 and 65 of this paper, but, for instance, on page 64, line 21, the "spiritual intuition" mentioned must be clearly understood as belonging to *regenerate* man only ; and in the next paragraph I would like to modify the third and fourth sentences somewhat as follows : "God is spirit, and to man He has also given a spirit, but apart from the New Birth man has no experience of spiritual life. At New Birth, however, the spirit becomes 'joined to the Lord,

one spirit,' and by the indwelling power of the Spirit of God the believer has thenceforth the possibility of being 'changed into the same image from glory to glory,' though, alas, the image as reflected in man is often faint and blurred."

The New Birth is surely the most stupendous factor in the psychology of the New Testament. It is a factor that literally alters *everything* and I feel that the present paper perhaps fails to take account of it quite extensively enough or to insist sufficiently strongly upon its utterly revolutionary effect upon the entire human psychological set-up.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am very grateful to Canon Thorpe for taking the chair, and for the kind remarks he has made. Also I am very grateful to those who have offered so many valuable criticisms and suggestions.

In reply to Mr. Airy Shaw, I did not mean to underrate the Bible in any way in the comment that the Bible contains raw uncodified material. What I mean to suggest is that the Bible is not a systematic treatise on theology or psychology, but that it does provide material in abundance for further thought and reflection about these great themes.

Concerning the words "natural" (psychical) and "flesh" as used by the Apostle Paul, these words raise several important questions. It seems to me that, broadly speaking, the flesh refers to all that in human nature which is opposed to God. It is the evil nature in man in contrast with the New Life imparted by the Holy Spirit when a man is born again into the Kingdom of God. To discuss this problem fully would take me beyond the scope of my paper into the realm of theology.

Mr. Airy Shaw does not like the use of the word "taboo" in connection with blood. This word is defined as "act of setting apart a person or thing as accursed or sacred, ban, prohibition" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*), so that I do not see why he should object to the word being used for the Mosaic prohibition of eating blood.

"Would Dr. White say that the animals also have a heart?" If I am correct in believing that the heart in Scripture is equivalent to the mind as described by modern psychology, it is difficult to determine whether animals have a mind or not. They certainly

show signs of emotion and even of reasoning to a limited extent, so it seems probable that they possess at least a rudimentary mind.

Mr. Airy Shaw wishes that I had written more about the New Birth. As I pointed out in my paper, I limited myself to certain terms. The subject of New Birth was outside the scope of my paper. It is a very interesting subject from a psychological point of view and would demand a paper to itself. It was not possible within the limits of my paper to deal either with this subject or with many others. The psychology of the Bible presents a very extensive field, and I found it necessary to limit myself strictly to one small portion of that field.

I am grateful to Mr. F. F. Bruce for his suggestions for further studies. To study some of the subjects he mentions, *e.g.*, Biblical Inspiration, and the relation of our Lord's consciousness to His eternal Deity, would be a very large and serious undertaking. His reference to the metaphorical use of other organs of the body besides the heart also suggests another interesting line of study.

Rev. J. Stafford Wright makes useful suggestions about the use of the words *nephesh* and *ruach*, which demand further consideration. He points out that *nephesh* is not used of the new life. Would this not rather support the theory that *nephesh* refers to the animal life of the body and mind, neither good nor bad in itself, whilst the new life belongs to a different realm, the realm of spirit?

The new life is eternal life, the life which we share with God Himself, in contrast with *nephesh*, which is closely associated with our inherited material nature.

Dr. Basil Atkinson asks whether the heart connotes the will more generally than I imply. Without going through the whole of the references and checking up on them, I agree that the heart is referred to as the seat of the will. It is also repeatedly referred to as the seat of emotion and of intellectual processes, and I still hold the opinion that it corresponds to the Ego of modern psychology, with its three aspects—will, emotion and intellect.

The statement that soul is the result of the action of spirit upon body seems to be an obscure hypothesis which would be equally difficult to prove or disprove. I do not think that we have sufficient evidence to form an opinion one way or the other. I am obliged

to Dr. Atkinson for pointing out that the word "soul" as used in Rev. 6:9 and 20:4 refers to human personality rather than to soul in its more limited sense.

Lt.-Col. Merson Davies states that the conception of man as consisting of body, soul and spirit is Scriptural. As far as I know the text he quotes is the only one in the Bible in which these three words occur together. As Mr. Bruce has pointed out, the Bible also speaks of "heart, soul, mind, strength" (Mark. 12:30).

It is not, perhaps, good theology to found a doctrine on a single text or phrase. Thereby many errors arise. It is surely better and safer to found our doctrines upon the general teaching of Scripture about a given subject.

I am very grateful to Mr. Titterington for his kind suggestion that I should follow up my present study. I hope to do so as far as my limited time and abilities permit.

In asking for light on the expression "the old man" and the "new man" he raises a large, and perhaps controversial, subject. Briefly, I would assume that the "old man" refers to the tendency to do wrong, the evil principle within, while the "new man" refers to the good motives and desires implanted by the Holy Spirit, the "new creation" taking place in those who are "in Christ."

In reply to Mr. Dewar's question about the heart, there is no evidence of any kind that the physical heart has anything at all to do with mental processes. The heart is a hollow muscle and its function is to pump blood through the circulatory system of the body. Its rich innervation governs the rhythmic working of its four chambers to ensure the propulsion of blood continuously in the right direction. The heart, in common with other organs of the body, undergoes changes in its action in association with emotional disturbances, but there is no evidence that it is the seat of emotions. It has been demonstrated that certain parts of the nervous system are directly associated with emotion, and that they form the organic seat of emotional changes and expression.

Again, I should like to thank all who have contributed to the discussion. Many of the questions raised and the suggestions made should prove very useful to anyone undertaking the study of Biblical Psychology.