thou wilt listen to the word of God. And if thy sin be so grievous that thou canst not wash thyself with the tears of penitence, let thy mother the Church weep for thee, for she pleads for each one, as a widowed mother her only son.' He might well have been thinking of St Monica and St Augustine at that moment. That 'only son' echoes always that other only Son.

St Ambrose, although he was born in the year 340 and died in the year 397, is always modern, for holy scripture for him is always transparent of the eternal providence of God. He does not read it as a mere recital of past events, but as it were transposes them from the focus of God's views for us. Thus, when he talks of Simeon's receiving the holy child into his arms in the temple, it is not only Simeon that he sees, but each one of us, ever seeking our Saviour, that he may be renewed in Christ. He sees each of us enmeshed in the consciousness of our own failure, yet ever hoping: 'Let him who wishes to depart, come into the temple', the temple that each one is, 'come to Jerusalem'—that is the Church—'let him await the Christ . . . and let him receive in his hands the Word of God'. But St Ambrose's contemplation overflows into his daily life, for he continues: 'Let him lay hold on him by his works and with the arms of his faith. Then he will depart, as one who shall not see death, for he has seen him, who is Life.' (On Luke, Book 2, Ch. 2.)

GAMALIEL

ED. And have you got the soul all nicely buttoned up, Gamaliel?
GAM. I *beg* your pardon?
ED. You know, the soul-theory, soul and spirit; we broached a question on it last time, and left it to be dealt with this time.
GAM. Oh, that. But what makes you think I think the soul is something you can button up, and presumably put on and take off, like the skin of Kipling's archetypal and 'just-so' rhinoceros?
ED. Come off it, man. It's an expression, the way one talks nowadays, up-to-date, contemporary.

GAM. Oh, I see, like mixed metaphors. But look here, I thought it was *I* who had to urge *you* to be contemporary, not the other way round.

ED. Perhaps the printer has mixed our lines up, and I am really you, and you are really me.

GAM. You mean we have buttoned on the wrong souls? But modern or not—and I must say the phrase sounds as dated to me as prang or prune and handlebar moustaches—I do think it is a thoroughly misleading metaphor to talk about buttoning up the soul. It conjures up a worse picture than the ghost in the machine, and that is a picture we must never, never, have any truck with whatsoever.

ED. No no no no NO! When I said 'Have you got the soul buttoned up', I meant 'Have you got your thoughts, your ideas, concepts, etc., etc., about the soul buttoned up?' I meant soul in inverted commas—the word or idea, not the thing.

GAM. Ah, the word, not the thing. Well, that was a very enlightening little confusion, Ed, because I don't think it is any good our discussing what the thing, soul, is—discussing soul-theories, in other words, while there is such a tremendous muddle in people's minds, as one finds among both believers and unbelievers alike, about what the word 'soul' means.

ED. I'm not sure that I agree with you there. You get a vast difference of opinion about what the soul is—or rather whether there is such a thing; but everybody agrees that the word has a definite religious meaning as—

GAM. A religious meaning! As the immortal spiritual element in man, or something like that, eh? That is precisely my complaint. 'Soul' has no business to be treated as a purely religious word. Perhaps I shouldn't have talked about muddle about what the word means. Perhaps you are right, and nearly everybody is agreed, so that there is almost universal misunderstanding and misuse of the word; the result being that it is practically impossible to think and talk straight about the reality.

ED. Many people deny there is any such reality.

GAM. Not the reality I want the word to signify; not the reality signified by the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words normally translated 'soul'; not the reality which I am willing to bet our Anglo-Saxon ancestors had in mind when they used their Anglo-Saxon equivalent of 'soul'. People would no more think of

saying that they don't believe there is such a thing as soul in that sense, than they would dream of saying they don't believe there is such a thing as weather, or they are very doubtful whether there is such a thing as life, or as passion, or as energy, or as gravity.

ED. But these are all words which have more or less immediate reference to elementary and universal experience.

GAM. And so, my dear boy, ought 'soul' to be. There is an elementary and universal experience that some things in this world are alive and some are not. And we call the things that are alive, from microbes and fungi to elephants and men, 'animate', and the things that are not alive we call 'inanimate'; which two words being interpreted literally from Latin into English, we could say—and ought to say—that living things are 'ensouled', and non-living things are 'unensouled'. That is what the word 'soul' means, the difference between living and non-living things. To put it more positively, you can say it means the principle of life.

ED. You seem to be making it almost a biological concept.

GAM. But of course. That is precisely what it ought to be—as biological a word as 'heart' or 'blood' or 'liver' or 'digestion'. And what's more, it is a word that is very necessary to the biologists, and one of which they have been robbed by the thoughtless spiritual writers of the last few centuries, who have treated 'soul' as an esoteric religious concept, which is the speciality of the very devout, something that needs guidance from spiritual directors.

ED. I'm sorry to hear you don't believe in spiritual direction. I had an article on the necessity of it last month.

GAM. I never said I don't believe in spiritual direction. But it is people, men and women, that need to get it, not souls. It is men and women who are commanded to be perfect like their Father in heaven, and whom our Lord came to save, not souls.

ED. The word 'soul' occurs pretty frequently in the new testament, doesn't it? Are you going to tell me that in the new testament it never means more than life-force, or the difference between living and non-living things?

GAM. I am going to tell you that it is no more religious a word in the new testament, and probably rather less, than 'body', 'flesh', 'man', 'people'. I challenge you to find me one text where 'soul' means what it is commonly taken to mean nowa-

days, namely the religiously involved, immortal part of man, to the exclusion of his secular aspects and life.

ED. That is a rather sweeping description of the modern meaning, but let it pass. Let me see; what about this? 'Come to me all you that labour . . . and learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart; and you shall find rest to your souls' (Matt. xi, 29). Or this from I Peter ii, 11: 'Refrain yourselves from carnal desires which war against the soul'; and again from the same epistle (ii, 25): 'But you are now converted to the shepherd and bishop of your souls'.

GAM. I agree they are easy to take in the modern way; but to do so is to mistake them, and consequently to miss some of their full meaning. Of course the biblical meaning of the word is not usually precise and clear cut, and it shifts about a little. So it should; living words do. But the centre of its orbit is always the common experience of *life*. Often indeed our English translations have to put 'life' for the 'soul' words of the Greek and Latin originals. Thus in the sermon on the mount (Matt, vi, 25), our Lord says, putting 'soul' for the corresponding 'soul' word of the original, 'Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your *soul*, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the *soul* more than the meat, and the body more than the raiment?' Or take this saying of our Lord's, and see what heretical nonsense it makes of your modern meaning of 'soul': 'He that findeth his *soul* shall lose it; and he that shall LOSE HIS *SOUL* FOR ME shall find it'. How do you like that doctrine?

ED. I grant quite willingly it means life in these instances; I approve the standard translation. But—

GAM. But it doesn't simply mean life in these cases, and something else in others. In these cases it means life in a total sense, including and not separate from your religious implications. And in your instances it has a more restricted reference to life in some of its more particular manifestations.

ED. Could you translate my first instance '. . . you shall find rest to your *lives*'?

GAM. No, I don't think you could. But you could translate it 'you shall find rest to your*selves*'. This is a common Hebrew poetic idiom—and we are dealing with a distinctly poetic utterance of our Lord's. 'My soul' is just a rather emphatic and solemn way of saying 'I', or 'myself'—you get this usage frequently in

the psalms. And what is my*self*, precisely? Why, surely, it is what I experience as the living me. Incidentally, the Hebrews had another way of using 'soul' that it is not so easy to find an English equivalent for, as the principle, or subject, of that particular manifestation of life which we call appetite or emotion. They talk about the soul being hungry and thirsty, and they said about manna in the wilderness, after they had been eating it day in day out for several years, 'Our soul loathes this very light food'. There is something of that meaning too, I think, in this saying of our Lord's.

ED. Well, I think you convince me; even those uses of the word in I Peter would seem to have a wider sort of background than 'soul' has in modern English. But it's all very well your saying what 'soul' ought to mean. We are still faced with the fact of its usual meaning in modern English.

GAM. A most unfortunate fact, which makes the word useless not only for biology but also for theology. It prevents the theologian from putting across very important truths about man and human life for which he has traditionally used the word 'anima'. 'Soul' has become as theologically useless, to all intents and purposes, as the words 'fairy' or 'leprechaun'; and more dangerously so, because it is not generally recognized for what it is, a dead word. I think we should scrap it, and translate 'anima' by some such word as 'life-principle', ugly and artificial though it is.

ED. So much for 'soul' then. But I believe the questioner asked us to explain the difference between 'soul' and 'spirit'.

GAM. And we were also requested to define 'mind'. We are still, I presume, concerned with the words, not the things.

ED. I would say that 'mind' is the easiest and least controversial of the trio.

GAM. Yes, I think it is—and also the most living, in the sense that it has a universally recognized reference to common experience, the common experience of thought.

ED. So we could define it as the capacity for thought. But that is not its only, or even its primary, meaning. Could you, after all, define it as capacity for thought in the sentence 'I have half a mind to thrash you'?

GAM. There it signifies actual purposive thought. And it also often means something like memory, as the verb 'to mind' means

'remember' in Scotch. But the fact that these meanings are primary merely illustrates the truth that activity words come before capacity words. But its commonest modern meaning is, surely, the capacity for thought.

ED. Synonymous with 'intellect' then, or 'the understanding'?

GAM. No, not quite. Those are more specialized words, more sophisticated words. Though thought is the principal activity of the mind, you can do more than just think or understand with it. (We are still only talking about the word, all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.) You can make it up, for example, which signifies will, determination, purpose. You can also have such unintellectual things as hunches with it. St Augustine used the Latin word *mens* to include the functions of memory, understanding, and will; in a word, for the spiritual part of the soul.

ED. That last statement seems to me to beg a great many questions, questions of realities, not just words. It assumes that mind is the factor that distinguishes man from other animals, and it qualifies it metaphysically as 'spirit'.

GAM. Granted. But it shows the range of meaning of the word, not synonymous indeed with thought or the thinking capacity, but centred on it, rather as the various meanings of 'soul', before the word's religious destruction, were centred on life and living capacity. And it also introduces us to our third word, 'spirit'.

ED. Perhaps we could say that while 'soul' is, or at least ought to be, basically a biological or physics word, 'spirit' is basically a metaphysical word, signifying whatever is immaterial or incorporeal.

GAM. That is certainly a legitimate use of it; but one I am inclined to distrust, because it is remote from experience, and tends to disguise the fact that when one is talking about the *im*material or *in*corporeal one is talking negatively, i.e. qualifying one's experience language by negation.

ED. How would you relate so rarefied a notion as spirit to experience?

GAM. Well, there is at least the possibility of rarefied experience. Consider such expressions as 'high spirits', 'a man of spirit', 'a spirited defence'. It signifies, to speak very loosely, a sort of psychic plus quantity, something that is not precisely of the essence or nature of a living being, of man in particular, but is shown in an excess, or superabundance of vitality.

ED. So you think the name of this journal means 'The life of the superabundant vitality'?

GAM. If it means anything, it should mean 'The superabundant life', the sort of life that our Lord came 'that they may have it more abundantly'.

ED. Yes, I am prepared to accept that. It would seem, then, that rather than being basically metaphysical, 'spirit' is first and foremost a value word, perhaps even a religious word, unlike the unhappy word 'soul'.

GAM. I think that is certainly true of its use in scripture, the new testament in particular. If one presses the word back, of course, one comes to its connection with, or derivation from, words meaning breath or wind. Hence its application to the experience of vitality, or volatile and invisible energy. Such energy can, to be sure, be good or bad, and there are plenty of evil spirits in scripture. But if it is not primarily an ethical value word, it is certainly a power value word. And supreme power being God's, you get the cardinal application of it to the Spirit of God.

ED. But when St Paul talks about the spiritual man, or contrasts the works of the flesh with the fruits of the spirit, it surely has an ethical value there.

GAM. I think that makes it altogether too pedestrian. The spiritual man is one who is in possession of, or rather possessed by, the Spirit of God. The fruits of the spirit are the fruits of the Spirit with a capital S, the Spirit manifesting his presence in the true believer, through the Christ-like life the true believer lives.

ED. In any case 'spirit' in the new testament does not signify simply one constitutive element in man, so that we can say that man is a complex of 'body, soul, and spirit'. 'Spirit' signifies a quality of soul, or rather of man, body and soul together, a quality given by God. Could you identify spirit with what we nowadays call grace?

GAM. I think you could. Not that the words have precisely the same meaning; but I think I would agree that they differ, not so much in signifying different realities, as in signifying different aspects of the same reality, which is what St Peter calls a participation in the divine nature, or in the life of God. 'Grace' signifies first the gratuitousness of this reality, its being *given* us by God *gratis*, and is then defined (if we mean sanctifying grace) as a quality or habit of the soul—i.e. of the 'life element' in man. 'Spirit' on

the other hand signifies the vitality, the verve and *élan* of this reality, and also its absolutely supernatural quality as coming from, and being an assimilation to, a possession of, the Holy Spirit.

ED. Well, I hope that satisfies our questioner, because I don't think we have time for more. Other questioners, I am afraid, will have to go unsatisfied.

GAM. On this topic I would just like to say one thing more. You mentioned the contrast between spirit and flesh, spiritual and carnal. It is most important, I am sure you will agree, to realize that the pair spirit-flesh are not in the least synonymous with the pair soul-body. Spirit and flesh, as used in the new testament, state values, soul and body state entities. So you can get a spiritual soul and a carnal soul—indeed 'soul', and words deriving from it, is sometime used as a value term *synonymous* with flesh; and besides a carnal body you also get a spiritual body—which is a concept that is absolutely necessary for making any sense at all of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

ED. Thank you, Gamaliel. And may I say that besides being sometimes quite instructive, it has been great fun knowing you? Goodbye.

REVIEWS

SON AND SAVIOUR: The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures. A Symposium translated by Anthony Wheaton. (Geoffrey Chapman; 12s. 6d.)

Instead of an armoury of proof-texts, the authors of these five articles (which first appeared in *Lumière et Vie* in April 1953) present an unfolding realization of Christ; discovery rather than demonstration is their key-note. The development is traced in the scriptures, but Fr Gelin warns us that '. . . the announcement of a new religious dimension to mankind is not simply a hard material fact. It must be lived before it can be adequately proclaimed' (p. 15). The patient reader will find his reward, but not in 'nice knock-down arguments'. The Messiah-King, Servant of Yahweh, Son of Man are various expressions of a hope which converges on a meeting with God in 'the last days'. Belief in the divine status of the risen Jesus, proclaimed in the early preaching as Lord and Saviour, was, as Fr Schmitt shows in his chapter on the apostolic Church, secondary, in a sense, to this theme of the inauguration of 'the last days'; the Lord reigns, raised