

# THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPT OF THE SOUL

Lectures read at the Pastors' Institute held at Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minnesota,  
July 8–12, 1963, by Professor Heinrich J. Vogel

We are accustomed to speak of the human being as consisting of body and soul, that is to say, that man has a mortal, material body which is subject to growth and development, to injury and disease, to deterioration and to death. This body has weight and extension, it is located at one place at a time. In many respects it resembles the bodies of the higher animals. We also believe that man has an immortal soul which is not material, not subject to growth and development, not subject to physical injury or disease, will not deteriorate and cannot die. It has no weight or extension, is not limited by time and space in the same manner as the body, but during the lifetime of the individual on earth is intimately connected with the body. In fact, it is the soul which gives life to the body. When the soul is separated from the body, the body dies, that is, it ceases to function as it should and begins to disintegrate. It is by virtue of the indwelling of the soul that man is not only a living being, but also a rational creature. The soul enables man to premeditate his actions and then to carry them out, to plan a course of action and to follow it through to its successful conclusion. The soul enables man to communicate his thoughts to other human beings by the spoken or written word. It enables him to experience a great number of different emotions and to react to any of these. The soul in man makes of man not only the crown of creation, God's most complex creature, but enables him to occupy that position in this world which God had intended for man, "to subdue the earth and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28).

I suppose that most of us have always regarded man as consisting of body and soul, and would unhesitatingly say that this is what Scripture teaches concerning man from cover to cover. Today, however, there are those who call these self-evident facts into question. Proceeding from the standpoint of the Evolutionist who regards man as a very highly developed animal many so-called theologians today believe that religious thought too has developed from very simple beginnings to the complex religious systems we have today. They contend that in earlier ages man did not have this concept of a human soul which we today have. If that is the case, then there must be a development of this concept which can be traced in history, yes, which can be traced in Biblical literature. They then proceed to reconstruct what they believe was this development from data which they believe they can discern in the writings of the prophets and apostles. They find that in the New Testament this idea of man's body and soul was taken for granted. They realize also that heathen philosophers have had similar ideas about man. Then they look into the apocryphal writings for traces of this concept. Here they believe that they find the concept of the soul, but not quite as clearly set forth as in Paul's writings, for example. Then they investigate the Old Testament. Here they find whole books which say little or nothing about the soul of man, and conclude that the writer was not familiar with the concept. In this manner it has been thought possible to show that the Old Testament does not contain the concept of the human soul until such time as it came under the influence of Greek philosophy. They believe that they can trace this influence through the books of the Old Testament, and then proceed to build theories concerning the development of the soul concept in man's thinking.

Believing, as they do, that religious thought has evolved from simpler beginnings they try to establish a connection between the basic animism still found among primitive peoples, the ancestor worship which is regarded as a step forward from superstitious animism, and the concept of the human soul. Of this we shall have more to say toward the end of this essay.

The purpose of this series of lectures is first of all to examine the Old Testament Scriptures themselves to ascertain what they say concerning the soul of man, and then to examine the modern theories which regard this concept of the human soul as a late development in religious thought, perhaps strongly influenced by Greek philosophy. It will also be interesting to see how such modern critics of the Scriptures deal with clear passages which contradict their theories.

In searching the Old Testament for evidence concerning the concept of the human soul we shall first make a careful word study of the terms used to refer to the soul and from their use in the sacred Scriptures endeavor to ascertain their intended meaning and scope. In this connection we shall also have to address ourselves to the question whether soul and spirit are two different parts or the same part of man. Then we shall proceed to learn from the pages of the Old Testament itself what it teaches concerning the soul, its essence, its functions, its capabilities, and its relation to the body. At the end of this series of lectures we shall endeavor to show how modern critics attempt to develop the concept of the soul from its supposed simple beginnings, and what the Platonic concept of the soul is and how it differs from the Biblical.

The practical value of a study such as this lies in the consequences or deductions which may be drawn from these various aspects of the concept of the soul. These range from mysticism on the one extreme to crass materialism at the other, as we shall attempt to show.

## I

The Old Testament uses particularly four terms in referring to the soul of man: 1. *nephesh* which occurs about 700 times in the Old Testament. In 472 of these instances it is translated in the AV as “soul” and in at least 215 other occurrences it is rendered by an assortment of 38 other translations. 2. *neshāmāh* which is translated “soul” in Isaiah 57:16, but is rendered in four other translations in the eighteen other passages where it occurs in the Old Testament. 3. *nedibāthī* which is translated “my soul” in Job 30:15, but is rather an appellative meaning “my magnanimous or noble one.” 4. *rūach* which in 233 instances is translated in the AV as “spirit” but in the 135 other occurrences is rendered by no less than fifteen other translations. In addition to these four terms we might also give some attention to the pair of words *lēb* and *lēbāb*, which are closely related in meaning to the words just mentioned, being translated in the AV at least 755 times as “heart” but rendered in the 88 other occurrences by 25 other translations.

According to Ernst Meier, *Hebraisches Wurzelwoerterbuch*, 1846, *nephesh* is derived from the verb *nāphash*, which means to exhale, to breathe out, and in the Niphal to breathe oneself out, to catch a breath. Fritz Rienecker in his *Lexicon zur Bibel*, 1960, declares that the Hebrew word *nephesh* originally denoted the esophagus or throat as is discernible from the use of the word in Isaiah 5:14, “Therefore hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure ...” The word rendered in the AV by “herself” in the Hebrew is *naphshāh* which seems to stand parallel with *pīhā*, “mouth,” in the next phrase. Specifically it refers to the breath, in which respect it resembles the word *rūach* as in Job 41:13(21), “His (leviathan) breath kindles coals ...” where Luther translated *naphshō* with *Odem*. Wilhelm Gesenius in His *Hebraisches und Aramaeisches Handwoerterbuch* gives five definitions for the word, 1. “breath” or “odor,” for which he cites three passages: the above-mentioned verse in Job 41, where it obviously means “breath”, and Proverbs 7:9 where *mē'atsath-nāphesh* is rendered in the AV “by hearty counsel,” more literally “by counsel that is sweet-smelling,” and Isaiah 3:20, where it seems from the context to be a piece of feminine adornment, the *bāttēy hannephesh* being mentioned together with chains, bracelets, mufflers, bonnets, ornaments of the legs, and the headbands ... and the earrings, the expression is translated in the AV as “tablets” which Daiches in the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* interprets to mean a breast-ornament. In all of these cases the word definitely has something to do with breathing. This may be the basic etymological meaning of the word. 2. Gesenius gives as his second definition: “that which makes a physical body, either human or animal, a living being, the soul (ψυχή, *anima*), the bearer of which is thought to be the blood.” Accordingly we find the expression *nephesh chayyāh* for “living soul” Gen. 1:20. To die is the *nāphach nephesh* “to breathe out the soul” (or as some translate this expression “to be sorrowful”) or *shāphakh nephesh* as in Lamentations 2:12 *behishtappēkh naphshām el-chēq immōthām* “when their soul was poured out into their mother’s bosom,” and also *ārāh nephesh* as in Isaiah 53:12 *tachath asher he'erah lammāvēth naphshō*, “because he hath poured out his soul unto death.”

The death of Rachel in Genesis 35:18 is referred to with the words *betsē'th naphshāh* “as her soul was in departing.” Elijah’s prayer for the son of the widow at Zarephath was: *'Adonay Elōhāy tāshob-nā nephesh hayyeled hazzeh 'al qirbō*: “Oh Lord, my God, I pray thee, let this child’s soul come into him again” (I Kings

17:21). In Psalm 56:6(7) *qivvū naphshī* then means “they wait for my soul,” i.e. “they are waiting for me to die.” In II Samuel 18:13 *'āsīthī benaphshī sheqer* means “I should have wrought falsehood against mine own life.” When Elijah had slain the prophets of Baal, Jezebel threatened him: *'asīm 'ethnaphshekhā kenephesh 'achad mēhem*, “I (will) make ... thy life as the life of one of them” (I Kings 19:2). Of the soul in the sense of “life” it is said that the Lord made it (Jer. 38:16), that it lives (Ps. 119:175), that it dies (*tāmōth naphshī 'im-Pelishtīm* “let me die with the Philistines” Judg. 16:30)—this is never said of the spirit (*rūach*)—it can be killed (*kol hōrēg nephesh* “whosoever hath killed any person”), it is devoured (Ezek. 22:25), it can be demanded or asked (I Kings 3:11), it can be risked or forfeited (Judg. 9:17), it can be redeemed (Ps. 34:22 (23), it can be converted (Ps. 19:7(8), and relieved (Lam. 1:11), one may fear for his life (Josh. 9:24; Ezek. 32:10). Sometimes it is used as a second object with *nākhāh* to denote smiting someone mortally or killing someone (Deut. 19:11 *vehikkāhū nephesh vāmēth* “and smite him mortally that he die”). Saul says that his soul was precious in David’s eyes (I Sam. 26:21). When Elijah fled from Jezebel to Beersheba he “went for his life” (*vayyēlekh 'el-naphshō*). When three mighty men of David broke through the Philistine lines to draw water for David at the well in Bethlehem and brought it to him, he would not drink it because these men had gone “in jeopardy of their lives” (*benaphshōthām*). Korah and his company, who were swallowed up by the earth because they had presumed to have equal rights with the Levitic priests, are called “sinners against their own souls” (*hachatā'īm hā'ēlleh benaphshōthām*, Num. 16:38).

God’s people are also exhorted to “take good heed unto themselves” (*nishmartem me'ōd lenaphshothēykhem*, Deut. 4:15; Josh. 23:11). Jeremiah says, “the sword reacheth unto the soul” (*nāge'āh chereb 'ad-hannāphesh*, Jer. 4:10). All the functions by which life is sustained or strengthened are predicated of the soul. Thus it is said to be hungry (Ps. 107:9), thirsty (Prov. 25:25), chastened by fasting (Ps. 69:10[11]), full or satisfied (Prov. 27:27), satiated with drink (Jer. 31:24[25]), it delights itself in fatness (Isa. 55:2), loathes light bread (Num. 21:5), and pollutes itself with defiled food (Ezek. 4:14). In all of these passages the soul is spoken of as that which animates the body and makes of it a functioning living being.

The third definition Gesenius gives is “*animus*, soul, heart, the seat of the emotions, affections, and inner feelings of all kinds.” Thus the love of Shechem for Dinah is expressed thus: “his soul clave unto Dinah” (*vattidbaq naphshō bedīnah*, Gen. 34:3). The yearning of the soul for God is expressed thus in Psalm 42:2(3): “My soul thirsteth for God” (*tsāme'āh naphshī lē'lōhīm*). David prays Psalm 86:4, “Rejoice the soul of thy servant” (*sammēach nephesh 'abdekhā*). Desire is predicated of the soul Deuteronomy 12:20, “thy soul longeth to eat flesh,” thus a greedy man, “a man given to appetite” is simply called a *ba'al nephesh*. Even the desire and pleasure of animals is thus expressed, as eg. Jeremiah 2:24, “A wild ass used to the wilderness, that snuffeth up the wind at her pleasure” (*be'avvath naphshāh*). In Psalm 27:12 David prays, “Deliver me not over unto the will of mine enemies” (*'al-tittenēni benephesh tsārāy*), lit. “give me not into the (murderous) soul of my oppressors.” The heathen are said to have spiteful minds (*bish'āt nephesh*, Ezek. 36:5) and spiteful hearts (*bish'āt benephesh*). Hatred is predicated of the soul when “deadly enemies” are called *'ōyebay benephesh* in Psalm 17:9. Sorrow is attributed to the soul when Job asks his friends, “How long will ye vex my soul?” (*'ad-ānāh tōgeyūn naphshī*, Job 19:2). “Angry fellows” are called Judges 18:25 *'anāshim mārēy nephesh*. In Exodus 23:9 *nephesh* is used in the sense of “feelings” when Israel is exhorted not to oppress a stranger; for ye know the heart of a stranger (*yeda'tem 'eth-nephesh haggēr*). Hannah tells Eli I Samuel 1:15, “I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul (*vā'eshpōkh 'eth-naphshī*) before the Lord.” The expression of emotions is also predicated of the soul. The soul is said to melt for heaviness (Ps. 119:28), it is poured out in tears (Job 30:16). Isaac’s soul wants to bless Esau (Gen. 27:4, 25). “He that is of proud heart” is called Proverbs 28:25 *rechab-nephesh*. Abraham asks concerning the willingness of the children of Heth to let him bury Sarah, “if it be your mind that I should bury my dead” (*'im-yēsh 'ethnaphshekhem liqbōr 'eth-mēthi*), Genesis 23:8. In Psalm 105:22 “at his pleasure” is simply *benaphshō*. Intellectual knowledge is attributed to the soul Psalm 139:14, “that my soul knoweth right well” (*venaphshi yōda'ath me'ōd*), Recollection is also attributed to the soul in Lamentations 3:20, “My soul hath them still in remembrance” (*zākhōr tizkōr ... naphshi*). In many of these uses the word *rūach* is also found and sometimes the word *lēb*.

As a fourth definition Gesenius gives “living being” or rather that wherein there is life or a soul. Thus when Joshua captured Canaanite cities and “smote ... all the souls therein” we understand that *'eth-kol-hannephesh* refers to all living creatures in the city, men and animals, Joshua 10:28, 30, 32, 35, 37. The full form for this expression is *nepheš chayyāh* as we find it in Genesis 1:21, 24; 2:7, 19; 9:10. This universal designation of living creatures is similar to the legal designation of “any person” as *nepheš*. “If any soul shall sin” is in Hebrew simply: *nepheš kī-techetā'*, Leviticus 4:2; 5:1, 2, 4, 15, 17, etc. Often *nepheš* simply designates a person or individual, as when Numbers 19:13 reads, “Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man (*bemēth benepheš hā'dām*) that soul (*hannepheš hahī'*) shall be cut off from Israel. In the enumeration of people the word used for people is as we still use it in English “souls” (*shib'īm nāpesh*—seventy souls, Ex. 1:5). In Genesis 14:21 a distinction seems to be made between people (*hannepheš*) and cattle and possessions (*hārekhush*) when the king of Sodom says, “Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself.” Slaves are referred to as *nepheš* when “Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot ... and the souls that they had gotten in Haran (*hannepheš 'asher 'asū bechārān*) and went forth to go into the land of Canaan.” A rather strange use of this meaning of the term is its combination with *mēth* to designate a dead person as in Numbers 6:6, where a Nazarite is forbidden to approach a corpse: “he shall come at no dead body” (*'al-nepheš mēth lō'yābō'*). The term *nepheš* is used even without the word *mēth* in this meaning as in Leviticus 19:28, “Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead” (*veseret lānepheš lō' tittenū bibesarkhem*).

Because the term *nepheš* may often refer to persons as such, the Hebrew language uses it for the non-existent reflexive pronoun to express such terms as “myself, thyself, himself, herself, yourselves, and themselves.” Gesenius lists this as the fifth possible definition of *nepheš*. Thus Mordecai commanded to answer Esther, “Think not with thyself (*'al-tedammī benephešhēkh*) that thou shalt escape in the king’s house, more than all the Jews” (Esther 4:13). When Elijah sat down under a juniper tree on his flight into the wilderness, he “requested for himself (*vayyish'al 'eth-naphshō*) that he might die” (I Kings 19:4). “Themselves are gone into captivity” in Isaiah 46:2 reads in the Hebrew: *venephešhām bashshebī hālākhāh*. This prepositional use as well as the occasional use of *nepheš* to substitute for the personal pronoun is not to be stressed too greatly, as often the basic meaning of *nepheš* is still discernible in the sentence, as eg. Psalm 3:2[3], “Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God.” This is not merely a reference to the person of the Psalmist David, but more directly to his life, for which many hold out little hope.

The word *nepheš* is translated variously in the AV of the Old Testament, at least 39 different methods having been used to render the term into English. Many of these occur rather rarely and sometimes in an effort to circumscribe the Hebrew idiom. Thus “any” is found three times (Lev. 2:1; 4:27; Deut. 24:7), “appetite” twice (Prov. 23:2; Eccles. 6:7), “beast” three times in Lev. 24:18, “body” nine times (Lev. 21:11; Num. 6:6; 9:6; 9:7; 9:10; 19:11; 19:13; 19:16; Hag. 2:13), “breath” once (Job 41:21), “creature” nine times (Gen. 1:21; 1:24; 2:19; 9:10; 9:12; 9:15; Lev. 11:46 twice), “dead” eight times (Lev. 19:28; 21:1; 22:4; Num. 5:2; 6:11; 9:6; 9:7; 9:10), “deadly” once (Ps. 17:9), “desire” five times (Eccles. 6:9; Jer. 22:27; 44:14; Mic. 7:3; Hab. 2:5), “discontented” once (I Sam. 22:2), “fish” once (Isa. 19:10), “ghost” twice (Job. 11:20; Jer. 15:9), “greedy” once (Isa. 56:11), “he” an undetermined number of times, “heart” eleven times (Ex. 23:9; Lev. 26:16; Deut. 24:15; II Sam. 3:21; Prov. 23:7; 28:25; Lam. 3:51; Ezek. 25:6; 25:15; 27:31; Hos. 4:8), “heartly” once (Prov. 27:9), “life” 91 times (Gen. 9:4; 9:5; 19:17; 19:19; 32:30; 44:30; Exod. 4:19; 21:23; 21:30; Lev. 17:11; 17:14 three times; Num. 35:31; Deut. 12:23 twice; 19:21; 24:6; Josh. 2:14; Judg. 9:17; 12:3; 18:25; Ruth 4:15; I Sam. 19:5; 19:11; 20:1; 22:23; 23:15; 26:24 twice; 28:9; 28:21; II Sam. 1:9; 4:8; 14:7; 16:11; 18:13; 19:5; I Kings 1:12 twice; 2:23; 3:11; 19:2; 19:3; 19:4; 19:10; 19:14; 20:31; 20:39; 20:42; II Kings 1:13; 1:14; 7:7; 10:24; II Chron. 1:11; Esther 7:3; 7:7; 8:11; Job 2:4; 2:6; 6:11; 13:14; 31:39; Ps. 31:13; 38:12; Prov. 1:19; 6:26; 7:23; 12:10; 13:3; 13:8; Isa. 15:4; 43:4; Jer. 4:30; 11:21; 21:7; 21:9; 22:25; 34:20; 34:21; 38:2; 38:16; 39:18; 44:30 twice; 45:5; 49:37; Lam. 2:19; Ezek. 32:10; Jonah 1:14; 4:3), “lust” twice (Exod. 15:9; Ps. 78:18), “man” three times (Exod. 12:16; II Kings 12:4; Isa. 49:7); “me” an undetermined number of times, “mind” eleven times (Gen. 23:8; Deut. 18:6; 28:65; I Sam. 2:35; I Chron. 28:9; Jer. 15:1; Ezek. 23:17; 23:18 twice; 23:22; 23:28), “mortally” once (Deut. 19:11), “one” once (Lev. 4:27), “own” once (Prov. 14:10), “person” 14 times (Num. 5:6; 31:19; 35:11; 35:15; 35:30 twice; Deut. 27:25; Josh. 20:9; II Sam. 14:14; Prov. 28:17; Jer. 43:6; Ezek. 16:5;

33:6), “pleasure” four times (Deut. 23:24; Ps. 105:22; Jer. 2:24; 34:16), “herself” once (Isa. 5:14), “himself” eight times (I Kings 19:4; Job 18:4; 32:2; Jer. 51:14; Amos 2:14; 2:15; 6:8; Jonah 4:8), “myself” once (Ps. 131:2). “thyselves” once (Esther 4:13), “themselves” three times (Esther 9:31; Isa. 46:2; 47:14), “yourselves” six times (Lev. 11:43; 11:44 twice; Deut. 4:15; Jer. 17:21; 37:9), “slay” once (Jer. 40:14), “soul” 415 times in the singular; once in the singular possessive; 56 times in the plural, “tablets” once (Isa. 3:20), “they” an undetermined number of times, “thing” twice (Lev. 11:10; Ezek. 47:9), “will” four times (Deut. 21:14; Ps. 27:12; 41:2; Ezek. 16:27), “would” once (Pa. 35:25). The word occurs in one or more definitions in 31 of the 39 books of the Old Testament, absent only in Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Malachi. This is a rather wide distribution of the term. Noteworthy is the frequent occurrence in the older books of the Old Testament. This indicates not only the antiquity of the term but also of the concept it denotes.

The second term we find in the Old Testament with the meaning of “soul” is not nearly as frequently found, occurring only nineteen times in all. Only once is it translated with “soul” in Isaiah 57:16, where it occurs in the plural in the expression “the souls which I have made” (*neshāmōth 'anī 'āsīthī*). Twice it occurs in the sense of “spirit” (Job 26:4 “whose spirit came from thee?” and Prov. 20:27 “The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord”). Once it is rendered “inspiration” (Job 32:8 “But there is a spirit [*rūach*] in man; and the inspiration [*nisbmāth*] of the Almighty giveth them understanding”). Twice it is translated in the AV with “blast” (II Sam. 22:16 and Ps. 18:15 “at the blast of the breath of his nostrils”) with *rūach*, once without *rūach* (Job 4:9 “by the blast of God they perish”). In the twelve remaining occurrences of the word in the OT (Gen. 2:7; 7:22; I Kings 17:17; Job 27:3; 33:4; 34:14; 37:10; Ps. 150:6; Isa. 2:22; 30:33; 42:5; Dan. 10:17) it is rendered by its basic etymological meaning “breath.”

One other term is found in the OT which is translated “soul” in the AV, that is the word *nedībāthī* which occurs in Job 30:15 with reference to the soul. The verse reads in part: “They pursue my soul as the wind” (*tirdōph kārūach nedībāthī*). The word is actually a substantivized adjective meaning “willing” or “noble.” “Magnanimous” and “my noble one” in the feminine is an obvious reference to the soul, although in dictionaries the meanings of “nobility” and “highness” are given for its occurrence in this verse. The word occurs only twice more in the entire OT, once in Psalm 51:12[14], which reads “Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit” (*verūach nedībāh thismekheni*), literally, “and let the spirit of willingness support or sustain me.” In Isaiah 32:8 the word occurs in the plural in the verse: “But the liberal deviseth liberal things (*nedībōth*); and by liberal things (*nedībōth*) shall he stand.” From the context it is evident that noble deeds are here being contrasted with the wicked devices of the wicked, hence the meaning is obviously, “the noble-minded devises noble things or deeds, and by noble deeds shall he stand.”

Another word, which, although never translated “soul” in the OT, is nevertheless a synonym of *nephesh* since it is often used and modified in the same manner, is *rūach*. The etymology of this word is closely related with that of *nephesh*. Ernst Meier in his *Hebraeisches Wurzelwoerterbuch* gives three basic definitions for the word. The first of these is “wind,” “moving air,” “breath” with its many transferred meanings. The second is “breath of life,” that which animates living creatures and gives them life. In this sense it is a close synonym for *nephesh*. His third definition is “the rational soul, the spiritual part of man,” in which sense it is synonymous with *nephesh* and *lēb*. This word *rūach* is also used for the third person of the Godhead, God’s Holy Spirit, and is mentioned as such in the OT as the Spirit of God by which He made the universe. The Greek equivalent of the word is πνεῦμα, which has similar uses in that language and is an accurate translation for *rūach* in the LXX.

Wilhelm Gesenius in his *Hebraeisches Handwoerterbuch* gives four definitions for *rūach* which in the main parallel those he gave for *nephesh*. The first of these is “breath,” “wind,” Lat. *animus* or *spiritus*. As such it is used of the breath of life of living beings (*rūach chayyīm*) Genesis 6:17; 7:15, 22. It is sometimes indicative of the transitory nature of things as in Job 7:7, “O remember that my life is wind” (*zekhōr kī-rūach chayyāy*). Sometimes it is combined with *'aph* as in Job 4:9 “by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed” (*mērūach 'appō yikhllū*). Thus the word *rūach* alone sometimes denotes anger, as in Judges 8:3 “then their anger was abated toward him” (*'āz rāphethāh rūchām mē'ālāyiv*). The word in its simple meaning is also used of the wind, both gentle breezes and violent storms.

As a second definition Gesenius gives the principle which gives life to living creatures. The difference between *rūach* and *nephesh* in this respect is that *nephesh* is often used for the living creature itself, whereas *rūach* always refers to the living principle in man and beast. In one respect these are alike, “that which befalleth the sons of man befalleth beasts; ... they have all one breath (*rūach*),” but in another respect they differ, “Who knoweth the spirit (*rūach*) of man that goeth upward, and the spirit (*rūach*) of the beast that goeth downward to the earth” (Eccles. 3:19, 21). When Jacob received the news of Joseph’s exaltation “the spirit (*rūach*) of Jacob their father revived.” (Gen. 45:27). Idols are described as lacking the breath of life (Hab. 2:19), “Behold it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath at all in the midst of it” (*vekol rūach 'ēyn beqirbō*). Since it is God who bestows the breath of life on living creatures, it is also called *rūach 'Elōha* Job 27:3, “the spirit of God is in my nostrils.” When life ceases, “the spirit shall return unto God who gave it” (*vehārūach tāshub 'el hā'Elōhīm 'asher nethanah*, Eccles. 12:7). As the living, functioning principle *rūach* is opposed to *bāsār* the material substance, and designates the divine over against the purely human principle, “Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh and not spirit” (Isa. 31:3).

The third definition of *rūach* is very similar to the third definition of *nephesh*, *animus*, rational soul, spirit, temperament. As such it is the seat of the affections and sensations, such as unrest (Gen. 41:8) like that of Pharaoh when he could not recall his dream, or of sorrow and vexation (Isa. 65:14) “ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit” (*ūmishshēber rūach*). Anguish of spirit is mentioned in Exodus 6:9 as afflicting Israel in Egypt. “for they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit (*miqqōtser rūach*). When Job asks, “Why should not my spirit be troubled?” he says *maddūa' lō'tiktzar rūchi*. Ecclesiastes 7:8 we read that “the patient in spirit is better than the proud in spirit” (*tōb 'erekh-rūach miggebah rūach*). Despair and heaviness are also associated with the spirit in Isaiah 61:3 “to give unto them ... the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness” (*tachath rūach kēhāh*). Sometimes *rūach* simply means “courage” as in Joshua 2:11, “our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man” (*velō'-qāmāh 'ōd rūach be'ish*). Sometimes the word seems to mean “a good disposition” as when Jezebel asked Ahab, “Why is thy spirit so sad?” Literally she said, “Why has thy good disposition departed?” (*mah-zeh rūchakhā sārāh*). The word often denotes the passions and desires of man generally, as in Proverbs 25:28, which speaks of the man “that hath no rule over his own spirit” (*ish 'asher 'ēyn-ma'tsar lerūcho*). A firm character is called *rūach nākhōn* in Psalm 51:10[12], a manly character “the spirit of a man” *rūach ish* in Proverbs 18:14. He that is of a faithful spirit is called *ne'eman-rūach* in Proverbs 11:13, and Ezekiel promises the believers a “new spirit” (*rūach chadāshāh*) in Ezekiel 11:19 and 18:31. Proverbs 17:27 a man with a calm spirit is called *qar-rūach*, literally a cool spirit, although the *Qerē* here suggests reading *yāqār* which the translators render “excellent” spirit. The word *rūach* often designates the ruling power that governs a man’s actions. Thus *rūach qin'āh* is “the spirit of jealousy” (Num. 5:14), *rūach zenūnīm* is “the spirit of whoredoms.” Hosea 4:12 and 5:4, *rūach 'iv'im* is “a perverse spirit,” actually a spirit of confusion (Isa. 19:14), *rūach tardēmāh* is “the spirit of deep sleep” (Isa. 29:10), and *rūach hattum'āh* is “the unclean spirit” (Zech. 13:2). These powers are then sometimes personified, as the “evil spirit” (*rūach rā'āh*) that troubled Saul (I Sam. 16:14), and the spirit in I Kings 22:21 who volunteered to go up and persuade Ahab to go to Ramothgilead. Sometimes the word *rūach* refers to the will and determination of a man as eg. Haggai 1:14, “the Lord stirred up the spirit (*rūach*) of Jerubbabel,” “the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia” (Ezra 1:5), etc. It also refers to skills as in the case of the craftsmen who prepared the tabernacle, whom God “filled with the spirit of wisdom” (*rūach chokhmāh*), Exodus 28:3, as well as to the deeper insight or wisdom of the wise (Job 20:3), “the spirit of my understanding causeth me to answer” (*rūach mebīnāh*).

The fourth definition for *rūach* which Gesenius lists is that of the *rūach 'Elōhīm* or the *rūach 'Adonay*, the Spirit of God, sometimes merely called *rūach* or *hārūach*, and sometimes *rūach qodshō*. The Spirit of God is that power which gave the world existence and which sustains it (Job 33:4), “The Spirit (*rūach*) of God hath made me, and the breath (*nishmath shadday*) of the Almighty hath given me life.” “Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps. 104:30). It is the power of God which makes men truly wise, “There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding” (Job 32:8). The Spirit of God equips men for various tasks. God tells Moses that he has filled Bezaleel “with the

spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship” (Exod. 31:3). Of Othniel the judge of Israel we read, “the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he judged Israel” (Judg. 3:10). When Balaam prophesied to Balak concerning Israel’s glorious future, “the Spirit of God came upon him” (Num. 24:2). Even Pharaoh recognized in Joseph a man endowed with the Spirit of God, when he asked, “Can we find such a one as this is, in whom the Spirit of God is?” (Gen. 41:38). Hosea calls a prophet an *ʾish hārūach* in Hos. 9:7, when he says, “The prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad.” We note that the Spirit of God came upon David at his anointment (I Sam. 16:13) and departed from Saul, when he forsook God (I Sam. 16:14). In the days of the NT God promises to pour out His Spirit upon all men, “It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh” (Joel 2:28[3:1]).

The word *rūach* is translated in sixteen different ways in the AV. Once it is rendered with “air” (Job 41:16), once with “anger” (Judg. 8:3), four times with “blast” (Exod. 15:8; II Kings 19:7; Isa. 25:4; 37:7), 27 times with “breath” (Gen. 6:17; 7:15; II Sam. 22:16; Job 4:9; 9:18; 12:10; 15:30; 17:1; 19:17; Ps. 18:15; 33:6; 104:29; 135:17; 146:4; Eccles. 3:19; Isa. 11:4; 30:28; 33:11; Jer. 10:14; 51:17; Lam. 4:20; Ezek. 37:5; 37:6; 37:8; 37:9; 37:10; Hab. 2:19), once with “cool” (Gen. 3:8), once with “courage” (Josh. 2:11), five times with “mind” (Gen. 26:35; Prov. 29:11; Ezek. 11:5; 20:32; Dan. 5:20), once with “quarter” (I Chron. 9:24), five times with “side” (Jer. 52:23; Ezek. 42:16; 42:17; 42:18; 42:19), 233 times with “spirit” in 28 of the 39 books of the Old Testament, once as “spiritual” (Hos. 9:7), once as “tempest” (Ps. 11:6), twice as “vain” (Job 15:2; 16:3), once as “whirlwind” (Ezek. 1:4), 83 times as “wind” in 18 of the 39 books of the OT, and once as “windy” (Ps. 55:8).

In some respects the terms *rūach* and *nephesh* are interchangeable. Both refer to the spiritual part of man. Yet there is a clearly discernible difference in their use. *nephesh* or “soul” seems to be the essence of this spiritual part of man, whereas *rūach* or “spirit” seems to be its active force or its activity. Of this we shall have to say more later.

There is another pair of words which should be studied briefly in this connection, because they are closely related in meaning with the terms we have studied thus far. They are the words *lēb* and *lēbāb*, both of which mean “heart.” In the physical sense of the word, this is the organ of the body which beats, and the beat of which can be felt as the pulse in all living creatures. When the heart stops beating death sets in. It is therefore as intimately associated with life as the breathing process, for when breathing stops life also ceases. In fact, if either breathing or the heart-beat stop, the other ceases simultaneously. Both seem essential to life. Both cease when life ends.

Ernst Meier in his *Wurzelwoerterbuch* distinguishes two definitions of these terms, a) in the physical sense the organ of the body, and then in a transferred sense of this meaning the interior or middle of anything, as eg. “the midst of the sea” (*leb-yām*), b) in the spiritual sense the word represents the seat of the will, of knowledge, and of thinking, in general more for the entire spiritual being of man, for the deeper insight and contemplation, for his real disposition, than as the seat of the feelings, emotions, and passions.

Wilhelm Gesenius divides his definition of these two terms (they are completely synonymous) into the literal and the transferred sense of the word. As the literal meaning of either *lēb* or *lēbāb* he gives first the heart as the organ of a body, either animal or human. In Job 41:24[16] it refers to the heart of leviathan, an animal; but in Exodus 28:29f. the high priest is told to wear the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, where the same word obviously refers to the human heart, or perhaps to the general region of the body in which the heart is located. In Psalm 73:26 *lēbāb* is combined with *she’ēr* in the expression “my flesh (*she’ērī*) and my heart (*lebābī*) faileth,” and in Psalm 84:2[3] “my heart and my flesh” is a rendering of *libbī ūbesārī*.

The heart is looked upon as the seat of life, when we read in Psalm 22:26[27], “your heart shall live forever” (*yechī lebabbhem lā’ad*). It is subject to sickness (Isa. 1:5), “the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint” (*vekol lēbāb davvāy*). Food and drink refresh it according to Psalm 104:15; “and wine that maketh glad the heart of man ... and bread which strengtheneth man’s heart.”

The most frequent use of these words seems to be in their sense of the center of spiritual or soul-life. It is regarded as the seat of sensations, emotions and inner feelings such as love, when Delilah chides Samson, “How canst thou say, I love thee, when thine heart is not with me” (*velibbekhā ’ēyn ’ittī*), joy (Ps. 104:15—see above),

heaviness (Prov. 25:20—*leb-rā'*), sickness caused by sorrow (Prov. 13:12), “hope deferred maketh the heart sick” (*machalāh lēb*), sorrow (Prov. 14:13), “Even in laughter the heart is sorrowful” (*yikh'ab lēb*), brokenheartedness (Isa. 61:1), “to bind up the *nishberēy-lēb*, the brokenhearted,” despair (Ps. 109:16), “that he might slay the broken (i.e. despairing) heart” (*nikh'ēh lēbāb*), fear (Ps. 27:3), “my heart shall not fear” (*lō' yīrāh libbī*), and many others.

It is also regarded as the seat of thoughts and concepts. In Canticles 5:2 we read: “I sleep, but my heart waketh” (*velibbī 'ēr*). It refers to the intuition of the prophet, when Elisha says to Gehazi, “Went not my heart with thee, when the man turned again,” etc. (*lō' libbī hālakh*)—II Kings 5:26. In Jeremiah 7:31 the Lord says that he has not commanded his people to burn their sons and daughters in the fire, “neither came it into my heart” (*velō 'ālethāh 'al-libbī*). “Consider it in thine heart” in Deuteronomy 4:39 is *hashēbōthā 'el-lebābekhā*. Forgetting is considered as something slipping from one’s heart in Psalm 31:12[13], where “I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind” in Hebrew is *nishkachī kemēth millēb*. Deliberations are described as “searchings of the heart” in Judges 5:16 (*chiqrēy-lēb*). Interest in something is expressed simply by saying that one’s heart is there, as God said to Solomon after the dedication of the temple, “Mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually” (I Kings 9:3).

The heart is also pictured as the seat of motivation, inclination, determination and planning. What you intend is what you have in your heart (I Sam. 14:7) as the armor-bearer replied to Jonathan, “Do all that is in thine heart.” Samuel says of David (I Sam. 13:14), “The Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart.” The heart stirs people up to do what they do according to Exodus 35:21, where we are told that the people brought offerings for the tabernacle, “every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whose spirit made him willing.” King Ahasuerus asked Esther, “Who is he, and where is he, that durst presume in his heart to do so?” Literally this reads “that has filled his heart to do so” (*'asher-melā'o libbō la'asōth kēn*).

The heart is also called the seat of understanding and wisdom. In I Kings 10:24 we read that God had put wisdom into the heart of Solomon. Moses prays (Ps. 90:12), “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.” When Jeremiah wanted to say, “O foolish people, and without understanding,” he needed only to say *'am sākhal ve'ēyn lēb*. Job says of God, “He is wise in heart (*chakham lēbāb*—Job 9:4), and “men of understanding” (Job 34:10) are *'anshēy lēbāb*. Comprehensive understanding is called *rōchab lēb* in I Kings 5:9[4:29], where the AV renders it “largeness of heart” in a more literal translation.

The heart is also the center of the moral life of a person. Thus we read of a clean heart (Ps. 51:10[12]), uprightness of heart (I Kings 3:6), a faithful heart (Neh. 9:8), integrity of heart (I Kings 9:4), an evil heart (Jer. 3:17), a froward heart (Ps. 101:4), a subtle heart (Prov. 7:10), an uncircumcised heart (Lev. 26:41), a deep heart (Ps. 64:6). The heart is made better (Eccles. 7:3). Men should seek the Lord with all their heart (Deut. 4:29), love the Lord with all their heart (Deut. 6:5), return to the Lord with all their heart (Jer. 24:7). Deceitful men speak with a double heart (*lelēb vālēb yedabbērū*), but the men of Zebulun described in I Chronicles 12:33 “were not of a double heart” (*belō' lēb vālēb*).

Gesenius gives as his second definition the transferred sense of the word, “in the middle or midst of,” much as we say today “deep in the heart of Texas.” In Jonah’s prayer he says, “Thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas” (*bilebab yammīm*), literally “in the heart of the seas.” Moses reports that Mt. Sinai “burned with fire unto the midst of the heaven” (*'ad-lēb hashāmayim*).

The words *lēb* and *lēbāb* occur hundreds of times throughout the OT in at least twenty-eight different translations in the AV. Twice it is rendered “bethink themselves” (I Kings 8:47; II Chron. 6:37), twice “care for” (II Sam. 18:3), four times “comfortably” (II Sam. 19:7; II Chron. 30:22; Isa. 40:2; Hos. 2:14), once “consent” (Ps. 83:5), four times “consider” (Isa. 41:22; Hag. 1:5; 1:7; 2:15), once “courageous” (Amos 2:16), twice “friendly” (Judg. 19:3; Ruth 2:13), once “merryhearted” (Isa. 24:7), once “stiffhearted” (Ezek. 2:4), twice “stouthearted” (Ps. 76:5; Isa. 46:12), 705 times these two words are translated with “heart” in 34 of the 39 books of the OT. Eight times it is translated “wisehearted” (Ex. 28:3; 31:6; 35:10; 35:25; 36:1; 36:2; 36:8), once it occurs in the possessive singular “heart’s” (Ps. 21:2), 49 times in the plural “hearts,” once it is rendered “heed” (Eccles. 7:21), “my heart” is sometimes used for the pronoun “I”, twice the term is rendered “kindly” (Gen. 34:3; 50:21), twelve times “midst” (Deut. 4:11; II Sam. 18:14; Ps. 46:2; Prov. 23:34; 30:19; Jer. 51:1; Ezek.



27:4; 27:25; 27:26; 27:27; 28:2; 28:8), sixteen times “mind” (Num. 16:28; 24:13; Deut. 30:1; I Sam. 9:20; I Chron. 22:7; Neh. 4:6; Ps. 31:12; Isa. 46:8; 65:17; Jer. 3:16; 19:5; 32:35; 44:21; 51:50; Lam. 3:21; Ezek. 38:10), once with “minded” (II Chron. 24:4), three times with “regard” (I Sam. 4:20; 25:25; II Sam. 13:20), once with “regarded” (Exod. 9:21), twice with “unawares” (Gen. 31:20; 31:26), thirteen times with “understanding” (Job 12:3; 34:10; 34:34; Prov. 6:32; 7:7; 9:4; 9:16; 10:13; 12:11; 15:32; 17:18; 24:30; Jer. 5:21), once with “willingly” (Lam. 3:33), and six times with “wisdom” (Job 36:5; Prov. 10:21; 11:12; 15:21; 19:8; Eccles. 10:3).

The rather elaborate word study we have undertaken of the terms used in reference to the soul in the OT has the purpose of showing not only that these terms were well known in OT times, but also that their use was very common and general throughout the entire period during which the OT was written. A surprisingly large number of these references, as you perhaps noticed, are found in the Pentateuch, indicating that Moses, the author of the Pentateuch, was not only familiar and conversant with these terms, but knew their content and used them in the same manner as did later writers. The antiquity of this terminology is well attested. Familiarity with the content of these terms must therefore of necessity also be very ancient. Only such as ascribe later dates to the writings of the OT would undertake to contest that fact, as we shall see more in detail later.

At this point we might digress a bit to consider the question of the relationship between the two terms “soul” (*nephesh*) and “spirit” (*rūach*). There are those who contend that these are two entirely separate terms denoting essentially different parts of the human being. In that case they would arrive at a trichotomic anthropology, assuming that man is made up of three parts, body, soul, and spirit. Indeed there are a few passages in the Scriptures, both in the OT but primarily in the NT, which do seem to indicate a tripartite division of man. I say, seem to indicate, because on closer inspection it will become apparent that “soul” and “spirit” are essentially the same, being logically distinguished only according to their respective connotations and emphases. Sometimes Genesis 2:7 is cited as evidence of the difference between “soul” and “spirit.” The verse reads: “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (*nishmath chayyīm*); and man became a living soul (*nephesh chayyāh*).” Note, however, that the terms here used are *nephesh* and *nishmath*, and not *nephesh* and *rūach*. This passage has no bearing on the problem at all, but rather indicates the fact that *nephesh* and *nishmath* are synonymous, both designating the soul of man.

Our dogmaticians are quick to point out the logical fallacy that lurks behind this supposition. Quenstedt puts it in this way: *Non sequitur: Sacra scriptura uspiam distincte meminit animae et spiritus, ergo est essentialis distinctio animae et spiritus illius. Non enim omnis διαίρεσις καὶ μερισμός est distinctio essentialis.* He said, “It does not follow, that because Scripture often distinguishes between soul and spirit, that therefore this distinction between soul and spirit is an essential one. Not every distinction and division is an essential one.” What is easily overlooked here is that such a distinction is merely a logical one which brings out two features of the same concept. That is obviously the case here.

In our word study we have seen abundant evidence of this. You will recall that intelligence, emotions, affections, etc., were ascribed in some passages to the spirit, in others to the soul. We find identical expressions, some of which use *nephesh*, others *rūach*. Thus Psalm 6:3 we read “my soul is ... sore vexed” and I Kings 21:5 “Why is thy spirit so sad?” Psalm 33:20 says, “Our soul waiteth for the Lord” and Ecclesiastes 7:8 speaks of “the patient in spirit.” Such examples could be multiplied many times. Another similarity in expressions referring to death. In Psalm 31:5 we read, “Into thine hand I commit my spirit,” and in Genesis 35:18 Rachel’s death is described in these words, “As her soul was in departing.” Both terms are used synonymously. Both of these terms are also used figuratively to denote “mindedness.” Thus in Genesis 23:8 *nephesh* is translated with “mind” in the expression, “If it be your mind that I should bury my dead,” and in Genesis 26:35 *rūach* is translated with “mind” in the words, “Which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and Rebekah” (Esau’s heathen wives). This interchangeability of terms is not peculiar to OT usage, but is paralleled in the NT as well, where many more similar pairs of passages could be found, some using ψυχή where others use πνεῦμα. From these examples it must be concluded that the two terms are essentially the same, since either one can be used in any of these ways.

What then is the distinction between these terms? It is difficult to define this difference between soul and spirit exactly. It would appear that “spirit” refers to the spiritual “substance” as such, as opposed to matter.

When the emphasis is on the immateriality of something we would expect it to be called spirit rather than soul. “Soul” on the other hand seems to imply that this spiritual “substance” is, or ought to be, joined to some other substance, such as a material body. Consider that the angels are called spirits, but never souls. Persons, however, are often referred to as “souls” but never as spirits.

Another difference in usage can be detected in the fact that when the emotions and affections are spoken of, the term “soul” is preferred (although “spirit” is sometimes found in this usage). Thus we read “My soul waiteth upon God” (Ps. 62:1), “O God ... my soul thirsteth for thee” (Ps. 63:1), “my soul refused to be comforted” (Ps. 77:2), “My soul longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord” (Ps. 84:2), etc. On the other hand “spirit” is used with reference to the intelligent will (without, however, completely excluding the emotions). Thus Jacob’s spirit revived when he saw the wagons Joseph had sent from Egypt (Gen. 45:27). Moses was to speak to all the wise hearted, whom God had filled with the spirit of wisdom, that they make Aaron’s priestly garments (Exod. 28:3). God stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and he carried them away (I Chron. 5:26). “He that hath no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down” (Prov. 25:28). Try to substitute “soul” for “spirit” in any of these verses, and you will immediately sense that the term does not fit.

In a general way one could say that the term “spirit” seems to indicate an activity of the “soul” whereas “soul” seems to point to receptivity of some action. The difference is one largely of emphasis or point of view, but not an essential distinction. We conclude therefore that man consists of two parts, the one is the body, the other is sometimes called “soul” and sometimes “spirit.” We hold to a dichotomic, not a trichotomic anthropology. This is the way Scripture consistently seems to speak of man. In Ecclesiastes 12:7 we are told what happens when a man dies, “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was (that is a clear reference to the mortal, material body); and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” If the “spirit” mentioned here is not the “soul,” the question immediately would arise, what happens to the soul at death? This question is already answered in the second half of the verse quoted, it shall return unto God who gave it. The relation between the soul and the body is one of mutual interdependence. The body is the instrument of the spirit. It carries out what the spirit plans, intends, wills, desires, and determines. But without the body the spirit is helpless, lacking the means of accomplishing its purpose. Conversely, without the spirit the body is dead, and cannot function at all. Body and soul, or if you please, body and spirit must be united if the person is to live and function as the creator intended that it should.

The practical importance of this truth is that Scripture herewith leaves no room for a materialistic concept of man, as though he were merely a mass of matter, and what we call mind merely the result of certain chemical reactions. Neither does Scripture allow a purely spiritualistic view of man according to which man is really only spirit, and the mortal body were only a prison in which the spirit is confined until the time of its release at the death of the body, as Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, and others imagine.

## II

We now proceed to glean from the pages of the Old Testament what information we can find concerning the Scriptural teaching of the soul, its essence, its functions, its capabilities, and its relation to the body. Much of this detail we have already observed in passing as we did the word study of the terms involved in the doctrine of the soul. Here we wish to trace what the Scriptures teach, particularly in the books of the Old Testament concerning the soul and its activity.

We need not look far for the evidence. The information is given very early on the pages of Sacred Writ. In fact, you cannot read two chapters into the very first book of the Bible without discovering the basic fact concerning the human soul, its origin, its functions, and its capabilities. Where the creation of man is described a bit more in detail than was the case in Genesis 1, in the second chapter of the book of Genesis, we read these well-known words: “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (*nishmath chayyīm*); and man became a living soul (*lenephesh chayyāh*). It is important to note that this was quite a different procedure than that by which all other creatures were created. Of all of them we

read in Genesis 1, “And God said, Let there be light” (v. 3), “Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters” (v. 6), “Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together” (v. 9), “Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind” (v. 11), “Let there be lights in the firmament” (v. 14), “Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven” (v. 20), “Let the earth bring forth the living creature (*nephesh chayyāh*) after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind” (v. 24). Note that all of creation, man alone excepted, was brought into being by the simple pronouncement of the creative word of Almighty God, “Let there be”—and there was. It is only with man that God took special pains, used other methods, did something very special. This is already indicated in the abbreviated account in Genesis 1, where we read in verse 26, “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” In the following verse we read further, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” Four times in these two verses God emphasizes that this creative act is very different from the foregoing. Four times he says, “in our image,” “after our likeness,” “in his own image,” “in the image of God.” This indicates a very special creative act of God. The purpose is revealed at once. Man is to be the crown of creation, the Creator’s great masterpiece, who is to “have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” All the rest of creation is subordinated to man. All the rest of creation is there to serve him, to be subject to him, for him to use and to enjoy. Even if we had no further clue to man’s importance in creation, this chapter alone would give us enough assurance of the fact that man is a very special creature of God, like God in many ways, different from all other creatures in many respects.

But now when we look into the second chapter of Genesis, where as it were with a zoom lens we get a close-up view of the creation of man, we see how God proceeded to carry out His resolve to create man in His own image. God formed man of the dust of the earth. The chemical composition of the human body is identical with that of the earth’s surface. Approximately 97% of it is composed of four common chemical elements, Carbon, Hydrogen, Oxygen, and Nitrogen, combined into many complex chemical compounds, most abundant of which is the common compound H<sub>2</sub>O, or water. Organic chemists have found that the bodies of all animals and the tissues of all plants contain these four elements in very similar proportions and in many similar combinations of compounds. Besides these four basic elements, about a dozen other chemical elements are found in the bodies of man, of the animals, and in the crust of the earth, from which, according to Genesis 1 and 2 both were made. Science with all its prying investigation of the secrets of nature has only served to corroborate these facts revealed already in the opening chapters of the book of Genesis.

But the creation of man was a very special act of God. After forming man of the dust of the ground, thus giving man a material body similar to the bodies of some animals, he did something very special. He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. This spark of the divine in man is different from any other creature. This is what makes of man a rational creature. He can think, can plan a course of actions and carry them out, he can change his surroundings to suit his own advantage and comfort and convenience. He has control over the forces of nature which no other creature possesses. Everything on earth is subject to him. He uses the world and all that is in it as he pleases. True, since his fall into sin, the use he makes of these forces is not always good. Often it is contrary to God’s will and intention. Yet he retains this power, whether he uses it for good or for evil. Here animals, even the most “intelligent” among them, are not man’s equal. They are guided by instinct, which in some animals is indeed very complex, but also very rigid. An animal cannot knowingly and deliberately change its instincts. It will react to certain stimuli in its surroundings in the same manner every time, not knowing why it does so, nor being able to change its reaction. Subjected to different environmental conditions the reactions to these stimuli may take different forms. A bird will, e.g. build a nest on a fire escape or under the dormer of a roof instead of on the branches of a tree, but it will build that nest in the same manner and as much as possible of the same materials of which its ancestors before it have built their nests. Though animals sometimes seem to have very useful and appropriate reactions to outside stimuli, actions which are designed to protect the individual and the species from its enemies and from the forces of nature, yet they are not the thinking creatures that human beings are. Birds cannot decide to migrate along a different route to a different country, at a

different time of the year, or decide to go farther or not as far as usual. Their instincts determine their actions in these respects. When both man and the animals are referred to in Genesis as *nephesh chayyāh* the conclusion is not warranted that there are no differences between them, that man is nothing but a highly developed animal; but rather the truth is emphasized, that in some respects, such as having a physical body, in which there is blood, and which is capable of locomotion, and which breathes and has many similar organs and functions, man and the animals are similar. Both breathe, both live, both move, both reproduce their kind, both grow and develop, then degenerate and die.

But now when we look farther into the books of the Old Testament we find many activities carried on by the soul in man which animals never are found doing. In fact, there are so many of these, that it has become customary to speak of man as a soul. Often when man refers to himself he calls himself (as well as others) a soul. When reading the Old Testament (as well as the New Testament) one must be careful not to overlook this fact that often “soul” is used metonymically for the entire person, even as we do today when we give the membership of our congregations as so many souls. All these souls also have bodies, of course, although we do not always bother to say so. Since it is the soul that makes man the glorious creature that he is, it is not surprising that this predominating feature should be singled out when speaking of him.

It is the indwelling of the soul that gives life to the body. When the soul is separated from the body, the body dies, it ceases to function, breathing no longer takes place, the blood no longer circulates, the warmth of the body disappears and a clammy coldness sets in, the muscles no longer contract and relax and move the various parts of the body as before, the corpse becomes rigid and stiff and cold, and decomposition sets in, which in the course of time returns the body to the earth from which it was taken. One can view this process from the opposite point of view. When the blood is drained from the body, the body dies. When breathing ceases, the body dies. When the heartbeat ceases, the body dies. These are all indicators of the proper functioning of the body, and these functions take place uninterruptedly and continually until death sets in for one cause or another. Thus the soul is the life of the body, or stated in another way, the indwelling of the soul in the body makes of it a living being.

But while the soul and body are properly joined, it is capable of many other functions than the physical ones which animals are also able to perform. Since man is a rational creature, can think, has emotions, feelings, passions, and sensations, man can enter into a much more intimate relationship with other human beings and with God the creator than can any animal. The soul of man is capable of love. Man can love his fellow man as we see in Canticles 3:1 “I sought him whom my soul loveth,” and 3:4 “I found him whom my soul loveth.” In Deuteronomy 6:5 we are told to “love the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our might.” Loving one’s fellowman and loving one’s God is something which man is capable of only because he has a God-given soul.

Man is able to decide what course of action he will follow, can decide to do evil or to do good, and when regenerate man by the power of God’s Holy Spirit given him through faith in His Savior does those things which are in conformity with the will of God, he pleases God with such actions. God expects such a life from His children, as we see from His promise to David at the time of his death, “If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel” (I Kings 2:4).

It is the soul of man that experiences joy, as the Psalmist David sings, “Rejoice the soul of thy servant; for unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul” (Ps. 86:4). The soul experiences sorrow and anxiety, “Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me?” (Ps. 42:5, 11). The soul expresses confidence and trust, as David sings Psalm 57:1, “My soul trusteth in thee.” Hatred is an emotion of the soul according to Isaiah 1:14: “Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth” and “Him that loveth violence his soul hateth” (Ps. 11:5). It is worth noting that in both of these verses it is God’s soul that is said to hate insincerity and violence. Contempt is also a function of the soul (mind) as we read in Ezekiel 36:5, “In the fire of my jealousy have I spoken against the residue of the heathen ... which have appointed my land into their possession with the joy of all their heart, with despiteful minds, to cast it out for a prey.” To the soul also are ascribed wish and desire. Abraham says to the children of Heth, “If it be your mind (*im-yēsh eth-naphshekhem*) that I should

bury my dead out of my sight” (Gen. 23:8). Jehu said (II Kings 9:15), “If it be your minds, then let none go forth nor escape.” The soul is also capable of memory, “My soul hath them still in remembrance” (Lam. 3:20).

Intelligence is ascribed to the soul in such passages as Exodus 28:3, “And thou shalt speak unto all that are wise hearted, whom I have filled with the spirit of wisdom...” Thus the soul can investigate and search out secrets. “I commune with mine own heart, and my spirit made diligent search” (Ps. 77:6). In Proverbs 14:10 we read “The heart knoweth his own bitterness.” Well known is the verse in Psalm 139:14, “I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.”

Particularly in the Book of Psalms the soul is often addressed by the Psalmist in the vocative in the formula, “O my soul” and in such connections the nobler activities of the person are referred to as eg. in Psalm 103:1, 2, “Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits.” And again in Psalm 104:1: “Bless the Lord, O my soul, O Lord my God, thou art very great.” Praise and thanksgiving, prayer and supplication are a specialty of the soul of man, as is evident from a perusal of the Psalms. “Unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul, O my God” (Ps. 25:1–2), “My soul shall be joyful in the Lord; it shall rejoice in his salvation” (Ps. 35:9), “As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God, my soul thirsteth for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God?” (Ps. 42:1–2), “Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? hope in God; for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God” (Ps. 43:5), “How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God” (Ps. 84:1–2), “Unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul, for thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive, and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon thee” (Ps. 86:4–5). The so-called Hallelujah Psalms, 146–150, are introduced by the verses, “Praise ye the Lord. Praise the Lord, O my soul. While I live will I praise the Lord; I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being” (Ps. 146:1–2). Worship of God, recognition of the many blessings which God bestows upon His creatures, songs of praise and thanksgiving, prayers for help in time of trouble, appreciation for the mercy and love of God evident particularly in His gracious forgiveness of sins—all these are the activities of the soul of men. It is only because man has a soul that he is capable of these nobler activities. In fact, that is the reason why God created man and why He created man as He did, so that there would be creatures in this world who could and who would worship their great and glorious God. The brute animals are not capable of such expressions. They serve only an auxiliary purpose in glorifying the Creator. They are indeed evidence of His creative power, of His wisdom, of His goodness, but they cannot respond to these qualities in God as can man, because man has a soul, which the animals lack. This fact alone ought to suffice to establish the truth that man has a soul.

The point is sometimes raised that the Old Testament does not mention body and soul as comprising man in so many words. We have already pointed out the passage in Genesis 2:7 which should suffice to settle this point. However, it is not entirely true that the Old Testament does not mention body and soul, or flesh and spirit as the two component parts of man elsewhere. There are at least a half dozen passages that can be adduced to show this. For example, in Isaiah 10, where God complains that Assyria, the nation which He has used to chastise Israel, believes that they have accomplished this by their own strength rather than by the permission and will of God, and prophesies the destruction of Assyria as a consequence, he expresses the judgment over Assyria with these words: “Therefore shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame; and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day; and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body (*minnephesh ve'ad-bāsār*) ...” (Isa. 10:16–18). Job says (Job 14:22), “But his flesh (*besārō*) upon him shall have pain, and his soul (*naphshō*) within him shall mourn.” Asaph complains (Psalm 73:26) “My flesh and my heart faileth” (*she'ērī ūlebābī*). Psalm 84:2 we read, “My soul longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh (*libbī ūbesārī*) crieth out for the living God.” In Isaiah 31:3 these two concepts are contrasted, not indeed with reference to human bodies alone, but in this case including the flesh of animal bodies: “Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit.” Finally we refer again to the well-known verse in Ecclesiastes 12:7,

which is as clear a statement as anyone might desire, “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.”

We must conclude therefore that the Old Testament believers knew that man consists of body and soul, as God created man, and in their writings have left ample evidence of such knowledge and belief. The very fact that the term “soul” is used so frequently and in so many different ways, is evidence of that alone.

### III

In the third part of this effort we shall endeavor to learn what modern biblical criticism teaches concerning the soul concept. In order to understand how they arrive at their results we must be familiar with their *modus operandi* with the Scriptures. First of all we must remember that these people do not necessarily believe that God has revealed Himself to man in His Word. To them the religion of Israel is no different from the religion of any other ancient nation. The fact that Judaism and Christianity are the outgrowths of Israel’s religion and that these two religious systems lie on a much higher plane than do the religions of many other nations is accounted for by the supposition that religious thought has been more highly developed in Israel and in their cultural heirs and successors than was the case in other nations. In other words, religion is regarded as something which has developed—like everything else is supposed to have done—from simple beginnings to what it is today. The denial of direct full divine revelation is very bluntly put by Robert Henry Charles, the noted authority on Jewish and Christian eschatology, whose book entitled *Eschatology, The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity, A Critical History*, has proved very helpful in developing this part of this series of lectures. He says, “All true growth in religion, whether in the past or the present, springs from the communion of man with the immediate living God, wherein man learns the will of God, and becomes thereby an organ of God, a personalized conscience, a revealer of divine truth for men less inspired than himself. The truth thus revealed through a man possesses a divine authority for men. In the Old Testament we have a catena of such revelations. At the Exodus God took Israel, Semitic heathens (sic) as they were for the most part, and taught them in the measure of their capacity; revealed Himself at the outset to them as their God, the God of their nation, and claimed Israel as His people. He did not make Himself known as the Creator and Moral Ruler of the world, for in the childhood of Israel’s religious history these ideas would have been impossible of comprehension. Yahwe was Israel’s God, and Israel was the people of Yahwe. Yahwe was a righteous God, and required righteousness in His people. From this stage the divine education of Israel is carried forward, till in Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah God becomes known to Israel as the Sole Supreme all-loving Creator and God of all mankind” (p.p. 3–4).

From this quotation it is apparent, that the modern school of Bible critics regards the religion of Israel as something which has developed from simple beginnings to the complex structure which it finally became. The theory proceeds to show how at first Yahwe was just another god among the many gods which various nations worshiped. But we shall have to go back farther than that. Before Israel worshiped Yahwe, as the Ammonites worshiped Milcom, the Zidonians Ashtoreth, and the Moabites Chemosh, there had been a slow and gradual development of religious (or superstitious) thought in individuals. Primitive religion is little more than superstitious fear of the forces of nature which the individual does not understand and know. This is commonly known as Animism and is still found among some of the primitive tribes of uncivilized people as for instance among the natives of Nigeria and Rhodesia. As various tribes band themselves together for mutual protection and safety, a religious problem arises. In a federation of tribes descended from different ancestors, different ancestral tribal gods are worshiped. If such a federation becomes a lasting one, the tendency is that the god of the most powerful tribe in the confederacy will predominate, and the other gods will be subordinated to him. Thus polytheism arises out of ancestor worship. It is believed that in Israel some such thing happened at an early date. It is known that Terah, the father of Abram, worshiped strange gods. We know that the branch of the family of Terah that lived in Mesopotamia had teraphim, for Rachel stole them from her father Laban when she left with Jacob. Just when and just how Israel came to worship not many household gods but one god, Yahwe, these learned men have not yet discovered. “The origin of Yahwism is still buried in mystery,” Charles says (p.

6). Another question which has never been answered is the question as to what type of god Yahwe originally was conceived to be, whether the god of the thunderstorm, the god of war, or of some other force or power. They have their difficulties with these questions, since the Yahwist in Genesis 4:26 points out that in the days of Enoch "Then began men to call on the name of Yahwe." This would give great antiquity to Yahwism. The Elohist, however, in Exodus 3:11–13, and the Priestly Code in Exodus 6:2–3 states that Yahwe was first revealed to Moses, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him: I am Yahwe, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as El Shaddai, but by my name Yahwe was I not known unto them." This latter view is supposed to be supported by the frequent compounding of Yahwe's name with proper names after Moses' time beginning with Joshua. Others again see that process already in the name of Joseph and assume that Yahwe was the tribal god of the tribe of Joseph. Moses is regarded as the true founder of the Israelite nation and of Yahwism. He freed Israel from Egyptian oppression, and his certainty that the living God was his inspirer and stay was the impelling force in this nation. But there was no break with the traditions of the past. The ancient Semitic traditions reappeared now in the early forms of Yahwism. The name Yahwe formed the point of departure and the mainstay of the religious movement in which Israel became a nation. It was not Israel that had chosen Yahwe, but Yahwe that had chosen Israel to be His people, and revealed Himself to Moses as the living God. This faith was the motive force in the formation of the nation of Israel.

As the national God, Yahwe was the invisible Head of the nation. He inspired and controlled its action and shaped its destinies. Thus the history and the religion of Israel were interwoven from the start. The first instance of this was the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Here Yahwe had shown Himself to be preeminently a war-god. He is called "A man of war" (Exod. 15:3). "Yahwe is my banner," we read in Exodus 17:15. He often fought the wars of Israel for the nation, since Israel's enemies were also His enemies, and He became known as "Yahwe of Hosts."

But Yahwe was also the God of righteousness, of justice and right. His sanctuary was the repository of the law, and the priests were the interpreters of His will. The Torah had both a legal and a moral character. In the course of many centuries (NB) this teaching came to assume a stereotyped form in the written Law or Pentateuch. Yahwe was also the God of purity. While many of the heathen religions had gross licentiousness connected with the worship of their gods, none such was ever connected with the uncorrupted worship of Yahwe. He had no other deity, no goddess beside Him or beneath Him. These are elements of Yahwism which eventually caused it to develop into monotheism.

In preprophetic times Yahwe as the God of Israel was considered on the same plane with the gods of other nations. The actual existence of such independent deities outside Israel was fully acknowledged(!). This is said to be apparent from a verse like Judges 11:24, where Jephthah in denying the false claims of the Ammonites to the territory of Israel said, "Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee to possess? So whomsoever Yahwe our God hath dispossessed before us, them will we possess." Likewise David complains (I Sam. 26:19): "If it be Yahwe that hath stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering; but if it be the children of men, cursed be they before Yahwe; for they have driven me out this day, that I should have no share in the inheritance of Yahwe, saying, Go serve other gods."

Because a national god is really the personification of the genius of a people, the embodiment of its virtues and its vices on a heroic scale are found in such a deity. This is supposed to account for the utterly unreasonable anger of Yahwe on occasion, eg., the destruction of Uzzah and of the men of Beth Shemesh for violating the sanctity of the ark (II Sam. 6:6–7; I Sam. 6:19). The interests of Yahwe were always identified with the Hebrew nation. Though temporarily estranged from them He could not forsake them permanently. These supposed defects in the conception of Yahwe are regarded as heathen survivals in the people's conception of Yahwe.

Whereas the heathen gods always remained on the low moral level of these heathen nations, Israel served its God with effort to become more righteous. Hardly had the people of Israel reached a higher level of morality and justice, when the prophets of Yahwe urged them on to even greater efforts. Thus one by one the false views attached to Yahwe were expelled from Israel. The essential superiority of Yahwism over the neighboring religions then lay not so much in its moral code, as in the righteous character of Yahwe which was

progressively revealed to His servants. Finally Yahwism reached the stage where it was regarded as the only true religion of Israel as expressed in the command, "Thou shalt have none other gods but me." But even this was not the end of the development. In the eighth and the seventh centuries B.C. the prophets of Yahwe set about to reform Yahwism still further. The bond between Israel and Yahwe was no longer thought of as natural, but as one which was ethically conditioned. Israel had been chosen in order to carry out the moral purposes of Yahwe. When Israel disobeyed Yahwe, it had to be punished, as was done when the Assyrian was used as the tool of Yahwe to punish rebellious Israel. The prophets became the saviors of Israel's religion by impressing upon Israel the truth that Yahwe pursued His own righteous purposes independently of Israel. This prevented Yahwism from perishing, even though Israel for a time ceased to be a nation.

Until this time Yahwism is looked upon as a religion involving a nation with its God. Now a new development is noted. The individual now becomes the religious unit, and is brought into immediate communion with God, not as a member of the nation, but as a person. From the time of the Exile on there are two separate but parallel developments of monotheism which can be traced. The nobler development as it appears in Jeremiah, which taught a monotheism as a living doctrine which shapes the teachings of its adherents on the religious duties and destinies not only of Israel but also of the other nations—and the parallel development initiated by Ezekiel in which monotheism is pictured as a fruitful doctrine for Israel, but not for the other nations.

A similar development is supposed to have taken place in the eschatology of the individual originally. What eschatology of the individual we may find in the Old Testament must then have come from some other source. That source is supposed to be ancestor worship, traces of which we have observed above in the references to the teraphim, which are of heathen origin. These teraphim were honored with sacrifices performed by a son of the departed. This is supposed to explain the necessity for the law of the levirate, for if a man died leaving no son, who would sacrifice to his teraphim?

The teraphim were doubtless images of the ancestors which were also consulted as oracles. The ceremony of making a slave a perpetual servant by piercing his ear with an awl at the doorpost of the master's house is regarded as a ceremony by which the servant became virtually a member of the family and was thus brought under the jurisdiction of the household gods. Later the teraphim were regarded as images of Yahwe. This cult of household gods was firmly established in the family of Jacob before he went down into Egypt.

Sacrifices were offered to the dead. Indications of this practice are found in Deuteronomy 26:14: "I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I put away thereof, being unclean, nor given thereof for the dead." At the death of Asa we read II Chronicles 16:14, "They made a great burning for him," but when Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat died, we are told II Chronicles 21:19, "His people made no burning for him, like the burning of his fathers." These offerings for the dead were to be brought by the son of the departed. Thus even in after-life men could be punished by Yahwe through the destruction of their posterity. This is supposed also to explain why all the sons of a king were killed by his successor, as this would deprive him of respect and worship in the lower world. The way to prevent this difficulty was either the levirate or the process of adoption. Thus the family formed a sacramentally united corporation, the father was the priest, these two terms being associated with each other in Judges 17:10 and 18:19. The family sacrifice which David attended at Bethlehem is supposed to be evidence of the family cult (I Sam. 20:29).

The various mourning usages of Israel are supposed to be remnants of this ancestor worship. Among these are girding oneself with sackcloth, putting off one's shoes, cutting off the hair, making cuttings in the flesh for the dead, and covering the head.

One of the most grievous calamities that could befall the dead was loss of burial (cf. the curse pronounced on Jezebel). One reason for this is thought to be that then no sacrifices could be offered to the dead, as these sacrifices had to be made at the grave of the departed. The other is thought to be that the soul was conceived as connected with the body even after death. Thus any outrage to a dead body was also an outrage to the departed soul. In ancestor worship the dead were not regarded as dead, but in a certain sense living and sharing the vicissitudes of their posterity. These shades of the departed ancestors are supposed to have given



rise to the concept of a soul that lives on after the death of the body. Burial in the family grave was deemed important for introducing the departed into the society of his ancestors.

The abode of the dead was called Sheol. It was supposed to be situated in the lowest parts of the earth, and is also called the "pit." It is without light and therefore called "the land of darkness" (Job 10:21–22). Sheol was thought to be outside the rule of Yahwe according to Psalm 88:5,

"Like the slain that lie in the grave  
Whom thou rememberest no more  
And they are cut off from thy hand."

and Isaiah 38:18,

"For the grave cannot praise thee:  
Death cannot celebrate thee.  
They that go down in the pit cannot  
hope for thy truth."

Interestingly enough, the doctrine of the soul developed in this manner is in many respects correct and biblical. The Old Testament teaches that man consists of two elements, soul or spirit, and body, not of three, soul, spirit, and body, as was later believed to be the case.

The soul was considered to be identical with the blood. Since the shedding of blood caused death, the soul was conceived to be in the blood, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood" (Lev. 17:11), or was actually identified with it, "Only be sure that thou eat not the blood; for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh" (Deuteronomy 12:23). This was also forbidden to Noah, "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat" (Gen. 9:4). Hence the eating of the blood was shunned and the blood was offered to God. Likewise, blood unjustly spilt on the earth (Gen. 4:10) cried to heaven for vengeance. Though the heart was associated with the blood, it had no connection with the soul. The heart was rather regarded as the organ of thought. Thus a "heartless" man was not an unkind or unsympathetic individual, but a man without intelligence (Hos. 7:11), "Ephraim also is like a silly dove without heart (*'ēyn lēb*). When a man thought, he was said to "speak in his heart." Thought is not ascribed to the soul, although intelligence in a limited degree is.

The soul is the seat of feeling and desire, and, in a secondary degree, of the intelligence, and is identified with the personality. As we have seen in the word study of the terms referring to the soul, not only purely animal functions such as hunger, thirst, and sexual desire, but also affections such as love, joy, fear, trust, hate, and contempt are attributed to the soul. These affections are hardly ever predicated of the spirit. To the soul are ascribed also wish and desire, and rarely also memory and knowledge. As the seat of feeling and desire and intelligence it becomes an expression for the individual conscious life. "My soul" thus means as much as "I," and "thy soul" means "thou." "Seventy souls" means seventy persons. "My spirit" is never used in this manner.

In death the soul leaves the body (Gen. 35:18, I Kings 17:21; II Sam. 1:9; Jonah 4:3). When the soul left the body, whether immediately after death set in or when the body disintegrated is not clear. In some cases the soul seems to be thought of as still residing in a corpse, for a dead body is referred to as a "soul" (*nephesh*) Leviticus 19:28; 21:1; 22:4; Numbers 9:6, 7, 10; Haggai 2:13. The "soul of a dead man" is referred to (*nishmath chayyim*) in Numbers 6:6; Leviticus 21:11. These expressions should perhaps be understood in the light of "a living soul" in Genesis 2:7, "soul meaning as much as person or individual.

Here our modern critics run into difficulties. There are two conflicting and to some extent concurrent views of the after-life in Sheol. What is considered to be the older view which originated in the period of Semitic heathenism, attributes to the departed a certain degree of knowledge and power in reference to the living and their affairs. The later view which is derived logically from the monotheistic doctrine of man's nature taught in Genesis 2 and 3, but which was unknown in pre-prophetic times, declares that there is neither knowledge, nor wisdom, nor life in the grave.

According to the older view the departed possessed a certain degree of self-consciousness and the power of speech and movement, a large measure of knowledge, for as "the knowing ones" they were consulted by necromancers (Lev. 19:31; 20:6; Isa. 19:3) and an acquaintance with the affairs of their living descendants, for Rachel mourns from the grave for her captive children (Jer. 31:15). They possessed the ability to foretell the

future and were consulted by the living regarding it, a practice which King Saul had abolished in Israel only to employ the services of the witch at Endor, when God would no longer reveal His will to Saul (I Sam. 28:13–20).

According to the “later” view the inhabitants of Sheol possessed neither life nor knowledge. This is supposedly based on Genesis 2 and 3, where we are told that the material form of man when animated by the spirit became a living soul. The breath of life (*nephesh chayyim*) mentioned here is identical with the spirit of life (*rūach chayyim*) in 6:17; 7:15, the former expression being found in “J” and the latter in “P,” and in Genesis 7:22 (J) the two expressions are combined in “the breath of the spirit of life” (*kol asher nishmath rūach chayyim*) which the Authorized Version renders “All in whose nostrils was the breath of life.” Since the “breath of life” or “the spirit of life” is common to both man and animals, it cannot be the bearer of the personality, but since the spirit remains in man as long as he lives and forms a thing apart by itself in man, it must be regarded as forming a part of man’s total essence. This would give us a real trichotomy of spirit (*rūach*), soul (*nephesh*), and body (*bāsār*). The next step is to regard the soul merely as the result of the indwelling of the spirit in the body, which would deny a real existence to the soul—it would be only a function of the material body when quickened by the spirit. As long as the spirit is present, so long the soul is a “living soul” (*nephesh chayyāh*), but when the spirit is withdrawn, the vitality of the soul is destroyed, and it becomes a soul of a dead man (*nephesh mēth*), i.e. a corpse (Num. 6:6; Lev. 21:11). In some instances, as we have seen, a dead body is simply called “a soul” (*nephesh*), (Lev. 19:28; 21:1; 22:4; Num. 9:6, 7, 10; Hag. 2:13). According to this view the annihilation of the soul ensues inevitably at death, that is when the spirit is withdrawn from the body. Evidence of this dissolution of the personality is said to be found in the verse Ecclesiastes 12:7 “the spirit shall return to God, who gave it.” Logically and historically this view is the parent of later Sadduceeism which taught that there is neither angel nor spirit. It is the materialistic view.

Those holding this view conclude that if the teaching of Genesis 2 and 3 is taken as a complete account of man’s composite nature, the soul must be regarded not only as the vital principle of the body, but as the seat of all the mental activities. With these the spirit, which is really the impersonal basis of life in man, stands in no direct relation. From these facts no advance in the direction of an immortality of the soul is possible, for in death the soul is extinguished and only the spirit survives. But since the spirit is only the impersonal force of life common to men and animals, it returns to the Fount of all Life, and thus all personal existence ceases at death. So the Sadducees concluded, and the result was materialism (which is still a popular view today).

The doctrine of Genesis 2 and 3 (which leads eventually to materialism) never succeeded in dispossessing the older and rival doctrine. These conflicting views of soul and spirit were current together, and not infrequently the same writers in the Old Testament have used these terms, sometimes with one meaning, sometimes with another.

According to the primitive Hebrew view, man was composed not of three essentially distinct elements—a trichotomy—spirit, soul, and body, but only of two—a dichotomy—spirit or soul, and body. The spirit and soul were really the same. The partial differentiation of these two naturally arose in time. The term spirit was appropriated to mark the stronger side of the soul and designated the stronger and stormier emotions. When it became customary to personify the psychical affections as *nephesh*, the practice began of naming the stronger expressions of this personification as spirit or *rūach*. Thus anger is an affection of spirit or *rūach*. As long as man was wholly master of his powers, he still possessed his *rūach*, but when he became lost in amazement, as the queen of Sheba (I Kings 10:5), or despair (Josh. 2:11), or fainted (I Sam. 30:12), his *rūach* left him, although on his reviving it returned (Gen. 45:27; Judg. 15:19). In keeping with this view of the spirit, it is said to be the subject of trouble (Gen. 41:8), anguish (Job 7:11), grief (Gen. 26:35; Isa. 54:6), contrition (Ps. 51:17; Isa. 66:2), and heaviness (Isa. 61:3). It is the seat of energetic volition and action. Thus we speak of a “haughty spirit” (Prov. 16:18), a “lowly spirit” (Prov. 29:23), an “impatient spirit” (Prov. 14:29), etc.

As the departure of the *rūach* entailed a paralysis of the will, it expresses therefore the impulse of the will (Exod. 35:21); the purposes of man are the outcome of the spirit (*maalōth ruchakhem*) (Ezek. 11:5); the false prophets follow their own spirit rather than that of Yahwe (Ezek. 13:3); God tries men’s spirit (Prov. 16:2). Also, it seems to express character as the result of the will in Numbers 14:24, “Caleb ... had another

spirit in him.” Thus in the course of a natural development, the *rūach* had become the seat of the highest spiritual functions of man. To sum up, then, *soul and spirit are at this early stage identical in essence and origin, though differentiated in function*. According to the later doctrine of Genesis 2 and 3 they *differed alike in essence, in origin, and function*.

According to the primitive view of the spirit as the stronger side of the soul, it is clear that it could not descend into Sheol. The soul, on the other hand, did descend, and enjoyed a considerable degree of life and knowledge there.

In opposition to the older view that in Sheol there is a certain degree of life, movement, and remembrance, the later view teaches that it is the land of forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12), of silence (Ps. 94:17; 115:17), of destruction (Job 26:6; 28:22). In opposition to the belief that the dead return to counsel the living, the later view teaches that the dead cannot return to earth (Job 7:9; 21:32.) In opposition to the belief that they are acquainted with the affairs of men, the later view teaches that they no longer know what befalls their living descendants on earth (Job 14:21). “His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.” In opposition to the belief in their superhuman knowledge of the future—as the “knowing ones”—the later view teaches that all knowledge has forsaken them (Eccles. 11:5). Whereas according to the older view they were called *elohim* in invocations, they are termed in the later view “dead ones” (Isa. 26:14; Ps. 88:10).

Finally, the relations of the upper world appear to be more faintly reproduced if at all; for all the inhabitants of Sheol, kings and slaves, oppressor and oppressed, good and bad, are buried in profound sleep (Job 3:14–20). Indeed, all existence seems to be absolutely at an end. Thus Psalm 39:13, “O spare me, that I may recover my strength before I go hence and be no more”; Job 14:7, 10, “There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again—but—man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?”

Although the soul leaves the body in death, the departed in Sheol are hardly ever designated as souls in the Old Testament. This fact is to be explained by the metaphysical inability of early Israel to conceive the body without psychical functions, or the soul without corporeity. Thus the departed were conceived as possessing a soul and a shadowy body. In the older days they were called “shades” (*rephaim*), or, when addressed, *elohim*. During the later times when such a doctrine of man’s being became current as that in Genesis 2 and 3, the departed were called “dead ones” or “shades,” as in the older days.

We should probably recognize in Job 14:22 an instance of the later usage of designating the inhabitants of Sheol as souls: “Only for himself his flesh hath pain, and for himself his soul mourneth.” Here the soul is in Sheol with all its feeling and interest limited to itself, and the body is in the grave. In this passage Job reflects the popular eschatology of his day. In Job 19:26–27, where he abandons this eschatology and rises to the expression of his highest hopes, he declares that without (sic) the body he will see God, that is, his soul or spirit will enjoy the divine vision at some period after death. Since only the highest powers of man’s soul were capable of the divine vision, it is clear that the writer had a lofty conception of the capabilities of the soul apart from the body(!). This point is deemed important, since it is almost universally taught that the Jew had no such conception of the soul till he came under the influence of the Greek. Whether there was a recognizable influence from Greek philosophic thought on the eschatology of the Jews can be determined only after a study of the teachings of the Greek philosophers concerning the soul and a comparison of those teachings with the corresponding doctrine of the Old Testament on the subject of the soul.

#### IV

The doctrine of the soul and of the future life among the Greeks can be traced from the time of Homer’s writings. According to Homer, only one part of man’s composite nature survived death, the soul or *ψυχή*. The Homeric conception of the soul is peculiar. It enjoys an independent and secret existence in the body, and on the death of the body independently withdraws itself. It exercises no function of the human spirit, whether of thought or emotion. These faculties belong to the mind (*θυμός*), which resides in the diaphragm (*φρένες*) II. xxii. 475. The *θυμός* is the most comprehensive expression in Homer for the various mental activities. This

θυμός, and such faculties of the mind as are represented more or less definitely by νόος μένος, or physical expressions like ἦτορ, καρδίη, κῆρ, στήθος, etc., are all *functions of the body and not of the soul*, and disappear with its resolution into its original elements. Homer never ascribes any activity to the soul in the *living* man. The soul is not mentioned till its separation from the body is impending, or has actually taken place. Accordingly after death, or rather after entrance into Hades, the soul loses consciousness and thought (Il. xxiii. 103, 104); it knows nothing of the upper world; it cannot return thither (Il. xxiii. 75, 76); it cannot exert any influence on the living; it is incapable of anguish as of affection. Wherein the personality consists in Homer is difficult of comprehension. At times the body, as opposed to the soul (Il. i. 3–5), is described as the person, at times the soul (Il. xv. 251, where it is the soul that speaks). The person fully conceived appears to be the living man, that is, the combination of the visible body and the invisible soul.

This is the normal, and all but universal, view of the soul in Homer. On the other hand, passages are occasionally to be met with in the *Odyssey* which assign a larger degree of consciousness, thought, and vitality to the shades. These passages attest belated survivals of Ancestor Worship. They are found especially in books x. and xi. of the *Odyssey*. In these books the poet attributes the restoration of the consciousness of the shades to their enjoyment of the blood of the slaughtered animals; but this is a misapprehension of the poet, who lived in an age that had forgotten the original significance of these rites. The shades, even according to these books, possess the faculties of thought, will, and action before drinking the blood. The blood is simply an offering to the souls of the departed to comfort them and feed them, but not to restore to them faculties which they had never lost. Moreover, the poet's account provides us with an exact and detailed description of a sacrifice to the dead.

Hence, according to the specific view of the Homeric times, the soul had no consciousness in Hades; but occasional survivals of the older view belonging to Animism are reproduced in the *Odyssey* without any consciousness of their true significance.

The question might be asked here, "How then can the soul achieve immortality?" Once it has descended into Hades the soul could never return. Hence, if immortality was to be vouchsafed to any individual man, it had of necessity to be given him when living through translation into Elysium (as in the case of Menelaus) or heaven (as in the case of Ganymede). Thus immortality was mainly a material immortality, and such was the immortality of the Homeric gods. Since immortality was necessarily a privilege limited in the main to mortals who were *physically* related to the gods, it is of no service in preparing the way for a doctrine of human immortality as such.

In the poems of Hesiod vigorous survivals of Animism are apparent. Souls cannot exist outside Erebus and possess consciousness in Homer; yet Hesiod believes that such is the case. Thus according to his *Works and Days*, 109–201, the men of the golden age became after death δαίμονες ἐπιχθόνιοι, watchers over mankind in a good sense, and endowed with large powers. Similarly, men of the silver age became δαίμονες ὑποχθόνιοι (not in Hades). Men in the Bronze Age (namely in Hesiod's own time) became phantoms (εἶδωλα) in Hades. These views regarding the two earlier ages are not the inventions of Hesiod, but survivals in the outlying Boeotia of a worship of souls which had existed long before Homer; and that such views prevailed with regard to earlier generations and not to the later is due to the fact that in Hesiod's age the Homeric doctrine had become supreme. Such views as to the conscious and independent activity of souls after life were undoubtedly helps to the formation of a doctrine of immortality. Certain classes of souls in the past belonging to the gold and silver ages could, it is true, become immortal, but this was not possible for members of the Bronze Age.

The first real contribution toward the doctrine of the immortality of the soul comes from the Dionysiac cult in Thrace. Underlying this cult is the presupposition of the original kinship of God and man. This being presumed, man could through certain ritual ceremonies and ecstasies become one with the gods. In such experiences the soul burst, as it were, the fetters of the body. But even so, the old Homeric view of the indispensableness of the body to the soul is not yet fully transcended. The soul has an eternal existence, but *not apart from the body*. A full and divine life apart from the body for men in general was still inconceivable. Hence the doctrine of the transmigration of souls was of necessity a factor in this belief. The soul could maintain its immortality only through successive incarnations.

With the Orphic teaching we enter on a new stage of development. So far from the body being the necessary complement of the soul, the union of body and soul has become an actual bar to the consummation of the latter. And this is easy to understand; for when the conviction that the soul and body can exist independently rises into a belief in the godlikeness and immortality of the soul, as opposed to the transitoriness of the body, the distinction between soul and body naturally leads to an antagonism of both. Thus the body comes to be conceived as the prisonhouse (δεσμωτήριον) or tomb of the soul (σῶμα—σῆμα, Plato, Crat. 400 C), and the connection of the soul and body to be regarded as a punishment of the soul. Under this view the tenet of transmigration necessarily changes its character. It is no longer the means whereby the soul preserves its vitality, as the Dionysiac religion conceived it, but has become a spiritual punishment and discipline of the soul, and the soul does not attain to its highest till it is freed from this cycle of necessity of rebirths (κύκλος ἀνάγκης or τρόχος τῆς γενέσεως), and lives eternally in God. As opposed, therefore, to the Homeric doctrine of the soul, we have here a new and well-defined doctrine as to the origin, essence, and destiny of the soul.

This transformation is to be traced to the Orphic doctrine of the indissoluble connection of guilt and expiation. In this phase of religion Hades becomes an intermediate abode where the soul meets with retributive judgment. There the initiated and purified live in communion with the gods of the lower world till the time for their return to the upper life has come. At last when the soul has passed through its cycle of rebirths and is fully cleansed, it ascends, as we have above remarked, to enjoy a never-ending existence with God. The soul, whether of the impure or the purified, is in itself immortal. But it is not only immortal, it is eternal, without beginning or end.

In the speculative systems of the philosophers the term “soul” assumes a new meaning, and becomes a comprehensive designation for all the human powers of thought and will. From the fifth century onward it is used in this sense in prose writers and non-philosophical poets. When the soul was thus absolutely identified with the mind, its individual existence after death was inconceivable in the speculative systems of such philosophers as Thales of Miletus, Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Heraclitus. Indeed, such a question would have been meaningless; for the soul was in their philosophies conceived merely as a function of the various elements of the body or as a transient individualization of the one primitive substance or force, and this individualization terminated in death.

In the pantheistic theories of the Eleatic philosophers Xenophanes of Colophon, Parmenides, and Zeno, there is no room for the future individual existence of the soul. And yet Parmenides quite inconsistently taught the preexistence of the soul and its survival on the death of the body, but this he did as a disciple of the Orphic and Pythagorean schools.

According to Pythagoras, the soul of man is immortal, and is confined in the body only in the way of punishment. It has no inner connection with the body in which it dwells; any soul may live in any body. It possesses a divine knowledge through memory. When death separates the soul from the body, the soul must after an interval of purification in Hades return to the upper world, and be reborn. Its conduct in the earlier life determines the nature of its new incarnation. Finally, after a series of transmigrations, it is raised from the earthly life and restored to a divine existence.

Empedocles’ doctrine of the soul is peculiar. The office of the soul, which is a stranger in the world of sense, is neither perception nor thought, which are merely functions of the body, but the philosophic vision into the complete truth of being and becoming which it brings with it out of its divine existence in the past. The faculty of thought (νόος) and the daimonic being which we may call soul (though Empedocles never used this term) thus exist side by side in man, the former of which perishes with the body, while the latter is not immortal, indeed, but long-lived. This dualism in the inner life which appears in Homer thus reappears in Empedocles, and later in Plato and Aristotle. The doctrine of transmigration naturally formed a part of his system; but between the various incorporations of the soul it did not, as in the Orphic or Pythagorean belief, descend into an underground Hades. Finally, when all the elements and powers return into their original unity, all souls and even the gods will be reunited in the divine universal spirit, in order again to come forth in individual existence in a newly restored world.

The immortality of the soul was inconceivable from Anaxagoras' principle of an all-pervading mind. For though this mind individualized itself in certain combinations, it retired into itself on the dissolution of these.

The views of the poet Pindar on the soul and the afterlife form an interesting study. Side by side we find two distinct and irreconcilable views on these questions. At times his poems reproduce the old Homeric doctrine of the soul and of Hades, the everlasting abode of the shades, combined with certain elements of soul worship, —at others they present us with a theology of an essentially Orphic type.

In the former he uses the language of the popular theology of the day, which was a medley of Homeric and animistic elements. This was indeed practically at all times the orthodox belief. Thus the soul departs after death to Hades (Pyth. xi. 19–22; Ol. ix. 33–35), where it is still acquainted with the affairs of the living (Pyth. v. 96–104). No rewards await it save the praise its virtues have won on earth. If individuals were to enjoy a blessed life, they were translated in the body, as in the Homeric view a perfect life was otherwise inconceivable. Yet instances of deification after death were also acknowledged, as of Semele.

The second view is closely connected with the first. The soul is, as in the former, the invisible double of the man. It is to a large degree dormant—though not wholly, as in Homer—during a man's living activities on earth. Soul is never used by Pindar in its philosophic meaning. Thus far, therefore, Pindar's conception corresponds mainly with the Homeric, but to this conception he adds, with the Orphics, that it is of divine origin, "an image of eternity" (αἰῶνος εἰδωλον) and springs from the gods only (μόνον ἐκ θεῶν, Frag. 131). Its descent into the body is due to ancient guilt. After death retributive judgment follows in Hades, and the condemned are plunged into Tartarus (Ol. ii. 57–60). The soul must be embodied at least three times before it can hope for an end of its earthly course. The past life determined the conditions of the present, and the present those of the future. After a final course of nine years in Hades the purified souls could "ascend the path of Zeus" and enter "the Isles of the Blessed" (Ol. ii. 69–75) and become heroes.

Aeschylus reproduces the old Homeric conceptions of Hades and the soul, but he goes beyond these in speaking in a few cases of a judgment beyond death in Hades. This judgment, however, is only a completion of the retribution which is generally executed on earth (Suppl. 230, 231, 416; Euro. 273–275; Choëph. 61–65). On the other hand, the belief in the community of interests existing between the living and the dead is reflected strongly—in other words, an essential factor belonging to Ancestor Worship. This same belief is attested also in Sophocles and Euripides, though the latter does not himself accept it.

The immortality of the soul was not originally a part of Plato's system. (No trace of the doctrine is to be found in the oldest part of the *Republic*, iii. 368-v. 460 C. The next portions that were composed were v. 460 D-471 C, viii., ix. [all but 580 D-588 A], x. [608 C to end]. In this part the doctrine of immortality is introduced and discussed, and further established in the third part, v. 471-vii., ix. 580–588, x. 595–608 B. Books i.-ii. 367 were finally written as an introduction to the whole. In this introduction a harmonizing of the above parts is attempted.) We have in the *Republic* the various stages through which his views passed before he arrived at his maturest convictions on the subject.

In the later Platonic doctrine of the soul, the soul is a purely spiritual being. It is uncreated (ἀγένητος, *Phaedr.* xxiv.), apparently eternal (ἄϊδιος, *Rep.* x. 611 B). In compliance with a universal cosmic law, according to the *Timaeus* (41 D sqq.), or else in consequence of an intellectual declension of the soul from its original destiny, according to the *Phaedrus* (246 sqq.) and the *Phaedon* (246 C), it enters into the body. In the body the soul lives as in a prison. However closely united, there can never be any true harmony between them. Yet this connection with the body can become the cause of unlimited impurity and degradation.

Plato's doctrine of the soul's immortality and preexistence are bound up together. The mythical representation of the *Timaeus*, where the creation of souls is attributed to the Demiurge, cannot be allowed any weight in the face of his frequent assertions that this pre-existence had no beginning (cf. *Phaedr.* 245 C, ψυχή πάσα ἀθάνατος. The soul is κινήσεως, ἀρχὴ δὲ ἀγένητον ... ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀρχὴ ἀγένητον τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴ ἄν εἴη.)

In his earlier speculations, i.e. the *Phaedrus*, Plato had ascribed a trichotomy of reason (τὸ λογιστικόν), courage (τὸ θυμοειδές), and desire (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), to the soul in its preexistent state, and explained its fall

by the presence of the two latter. Subsequently, however, the thought that such lower powers were indissolubly connected with the soul became inconceivable, since this conjunction would have logically involved the soul in a never-ending cycle of rebirths, and, henceforth, the soul was regarded by him as simple and indivisible, a power of pure thought (λογιστικόν.)<sup>1</sup> According, therefore, to his later speculations in the *Timaeus*, it was not until a soul was enclosed in the body that courage and desire were associated with it, these being proper to the body only. Though the passions are in this view left behind by the soul at death, yet the association of the soul with these in the body produces an inward deterioration of the soul—an idea by means of which Plato explains its desire for rebirth in the body.

Immediately after death the soul is judged, and placed in heaven or under the earth by way of reward or punishment, where it remains for 1000 years. When this interval has elapsed, the soul is forced to be incorporated anew. The nature of the new body is determined by the character of the soul in former life. The soul must pass through a series of such transmigrations.<sup>2</sup> In the course of these it can descend to the beast, or ascend into nobler forms of existence. Incurable sinners are cast into Tartarus. The aim of the soul is finally to be delivered from the body and to depart into the realm of pure being, that is, of the divine, the infallible, and the pure.

In Plato pre-existence and immortality stand or fall together, and if these are admitted, the doctrine, which appears first among the Orphics, receives at Plato's hands a philosophical exposition. It is necessary, he holds, in order to explain the facts of learning and knowledge. "We could not seek for what is yet unknown to us, nor recognize in what we find the thing that we sought for, if we had not unconsciously possessed it before we recognized and were conscious of it (see *Meno*, 80 D sq.). We could form no conception of Ideas, of the eternal essence of things which is hidden from our perception, if we had not attained to the intuition of these in a former existence."

Two phases of teaching on the question of retribution appear in Plato. In the earlier Plato the unconditional worth of morality in itself is set forth without reference to a hereafter. Thus, according to the *Republic*, iii. 144., the guardians are to pay no heed to what follows after death, but to make it their chief task to show that virtue carries with it its own reward. But this doctrine is handled very differently when Plato became convinced of the soul's immortality. Retribution hereafter appeared to follow necessarily from this doctrine, else divine justice would be at fault, and disturb the moral order of the universe (*Rep.*, x. 612 A sq.; cf. *Phaedo*, 63 C, 95 B, 114 D.).

Thus we have seen four different conceptions of the soul among the Greeks: 1. as a shade possessing thought, will, and activity and power to help or injure the living (the Animistic view), found in Homer and Hesiod, 2. as an unconscious helpless shade (the ordinary Homeric view), 3. as having no existence whatever, according to the philosophers, and 4. as an immortal spiritual being in Orphic teaching and in the writings of Plato.

Despite all the teaching of individual poets, philosophers, and schools, the popular beliefs of the Greeks remained from century to century in the main unaffected. The immortality of the soul never became a part of the national creed, but remained the peculiar property of individual theologians and philosophers. This is also indicated by the evidence of Greek epitaphs.

It is obvious that an immeasurable gulf divides Plato's doctrine of immortality of the soul from the Jewish and Christian doctrine. We need not call attention to such obvious differences as appear in his doctrine of the soul's transmigrations, its eternal pre-existence, and its antagonism to the body, but dare not overlook these two points: 1. it is not a human soul that Plato's final teaching deals with, but a pure intelligence; 2. his doctrine, as set over against the Jewish and Christian, is the glorification of an unbridled individualism. The

<sup>1</sup> When the entire content of the soul came to be regarded as λογιστικόν, a soul could no longer consistently be ascribed to animals, who only possessed θυμός and ἐπιθυμία. Further, if a soul could not justly be ascribed to animals, it follows further that a human soul could not rightly be said to descend into the body of an animal. Plato, however, maintained this view to the end, probably for ethical reasons.

<sup>2</sup> At least three (as in Pindar, Ol. ii. 68 sqq.) according to the *Phaedrus*, 249 A. Between each of the births there is a period of 1000 years (cf. *Rep.*, x. 615 A).

individual soul owes no duty practically but to itself. Its appearance in any single human community or family is of the nature of an accident. It existed before any such came into being, and will outlive them. However nobly the virtues relating to one's neighbor or the state are expounded in the Platonic system, they are related to the individual mainly as elements in its discipline and self-culture.

This should dispose of the theory that the concept of the soul found in the New Testament and even in the later writings of the Old Testament were influenced or even introduced by Greek philosophy, particularly that of Plato. Plato's concept of the human soul is entirely foreign to the Biblical one, being rationalistic and materialistic, rather than spiritual. The fact remains that the Bible not only speaks of the soul of man, but accurately describes its origin, its essence, and its capabilities, long before the Greek philosophers appeared on the scene. I rather suspect that some of their ideas concerning the soul may be a vestige of the divine revelation given to man by God in Old Testament times, grossly distorted and perverted by human imagination, but retaining recognizable features of the divine truth in some of their details.

## V

In conclusion we should give some thought to the practical implications of the modern concept of the soul. The doctrine of the soul is not merely a theological problem which may be of some professional interest to theologians but does not affect the faith of the individual believer. The implications of this doctrine are of great importance to every believer. Whether man has or has not an immortal soul, whether this immortal soul will or will not be reunited with the resurrected body on the last day, whether the entire person of the believer, body and soul, will live with God forever after the resurrection, these are questions which are of the greatest importance to every human being on earth.

If now the modern concept of the soul is correct, or if the view of the Greek philosophers is correct, if, for example, man's soul perishes with the body at death and death is the end of man's existence, then the only useful purpose which religion could serve here on earth would be to improve the conditions under which man lives while life on earth endures. Its moral precepts inasmuch as they affect the behavior of man toward his fellowman would then be the only useful and valuable feature of religious teaching. Then indeed the social gospel with its emphasis on the here and now and on social, economic, and political situations and problems here on earth would be the message which the church has for its fellowmen. Then the improvement of living conditions, the improvement of international relations, the improvement of the cultural and educational level of a greater segment of the population of a nation would be the great goals toward which the church should strive. St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians (I Cor. 15:19), "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." If the Church concentrates all its efforts on the life here on earth, then it is missing its chief mission in the world. Christ did not commission His disciples to make this world a better place to live in. He did not send the Apostles out to educate men, to raise their moral standards, or to improve living conditions on earth.

No, man has a nobler destiny. The image of God in which man was created and which was lost in the fall into sin must be regained. The death of body and soul eternally which is the consequence and wages of sin must be averted. How this can be accomplished is set forth in the Gospel of Christ, who gave Himself into death that men might live, who redeemed man from destruction and offers all believers eternal life as a gift of His grace. After His resurrection He ascended into heaven to prepare a place for us and to receive us unto Himself, so that where He is, there we may be also.

From these considerations we see the importance of knowing and believing that God has given us an immortal soul which distinguishes us from lower forms of life on earth, which came from God and goes to God, and for which together with our bodies God has prepared a blessed eternity for all believers.

The doctrine of the soul is thus not one of little consequence, but one of great importance. If man has no soul, if what is commonly referred to as the soul is merely a function of the body, if with the death of the body all existence ceases, then there is no retribution for man's misdeeds either. Then it would not matter what happens to man eventually. Then death would annihilate the individual, who would be responsible to no one,



not even to God, and would therefore do what he pleases, as long as he is able to escape the consequences of his deeds in this life. Man would become a materialist, whose philosophy of life would be the Epicurean, "Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we are dead." I suspect that this philosophy, this desire on the part of many to escape the consequences of their evil deeds, makes the denial of the existence of the soul so popular a dogma today.

On the other hand, there is the possibility that some in our time are placing too much emphasis on the doctrine of the soul, as though the only real and lasting part of man's being is the spirit or soul, which is imprisoned in the body for a time, only to be released eventually at death, whereupon it will be truly free. Such spiritism would lead to a misplaced emphasis on the soul at the expense of a more or less complete disregard for the body, which is, however, also given by God. We know that in the resurrection the body, too, is glorified and is intended to enter a blessed eternity.

It is important therefore to maintain an equilibrium between these two extremes of error, to cling to the Scriptural truth that man consists of a body and a soul, both given him by a benevolent Creator, both entrusted to his care, for both of which he is responsible to the God who made them, and both of which are intended for an eternity of bliss and joy in heaven. May the Lord grant us to cling steadfastly to the Scriptural truth revealed in His errorless Word concerning our souls, and preserve us, both body and soul, for a blessed eternity according to His grace.