

GRADUATION THESIS
OF
JACOB B. KROHNGOLD, 1916
ON
THE CONCEPTION OF THE SOUL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INDEX.

Introduction.

The Nature of the Soul as Presented in the O.T.

The Universality of the Soul Idea.

The Basis of the Soul Idea in the O.T.

Based upon the Observation of the Breath.

Based upon the Observation of the Blood.

Identification of the Soul and the Blood.

Prohibition of Eating the Blood.

Blood must be Spilled upon the Ground.

The Origin of the Soul.

The Substance of the Soul.

The Form of the Soul.

The Seat of the Soul.

The Functions of the Soul.

The Functions of the Nephesh.

The Functions of the Ruah.

The O.T. Conception of Death.

The Disposal of the Dead.

Burial Regarded as Necessary and Essential.

Desecration of the Graves of the Dead.

Burial in the Family Grave.

Disposal of the Dead by Burning.

Mourning Customs.

Burial Customs.

Life after Death.

Total Extinction of the Personality Unknown in the O.T.

The Origin of the Idea of Sheol.

The Shades.

Biblical Conceptions of Sheol.

God's Power in Sheol.

Early Belief in the Reincarnation of the Soul.

Conclusion.

Bibliography.

THE CONCEPTION OF THE SOUL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

It is now generally acknowledged that early Hebrew thought and practice were largely based upon early Semitic animistic ideas and conceptions. "It is highly probable", says Margoliouth, "that a common stock of ideas underlies both branches of early Semitic belief and custom (Babylonian and Hebrew) for it is becoming more and more clear that pre-Mosaic Hebraism was thoroughly rooted--not by borrowing, but by original affinities--in the widespread traditions of the general Semitic family". (#1) As a general rule Yahwism warred against all primitive heathen customs and practices with which it came in contact, eradicating those it was able to eradicate, and transforming those it was unable to root out, so as to make them conformable to the religion of Yahweh. We must not imagine, however, that there was any deep and broad chasm between primitive Semitic thought and practice and that of the yahweh religion. Says Charles, "In the formation of Yahwism there was no absolute break with the past. The traditions and the spiritual limitations that Israel had in the past in common with Semitic kindred reappear in the early forms of yahwism". (#2) Thus it is plain that a complete understanding of the O.T. idea of the soul can only be gained by going back to a study of pre-Yahwistic times, so far as possible, and tracing the survivals of these times down through Yahwistic thought and practice as far as they go. Whether we agree with Charles that Biblical testimony warrants the assumption that the pre-Yahwistic Hebrews believed in ancestor worship, (#3) or whether we agree with Margoliouth that such testimony is insufficient (#4) we must ultimately go back to animism, our starting-point. Our study of the soul-conception in the O.T. must begin, therefore, with a review of the conceptions of the soul entertained by primitive peoples.

#1. Art. Ancestor Worship. *Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Ethics*. Vol. I. p. 444 b. #2. *Eschatology*, p. 8 (2nd. ed.) #3. *Ibid.* p. 19 ff. #4. Art. Ancestor Worship, *Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth.* Vol. I. p. 449 b.

To begin with, then, there are two questions which we ought to ask ourselves, viz. "What conditions gave rise to the idea of the soul among primitive men?" and "What explanations have been offered to account for the idea of the soul and its rise?"

Andrew Lang answers the first of these questions as follows:

"We set out to discover a stage of human intellectual development which would necessarily produce the essential elements of myth. We think we have found the stage in the condition of savagery.....For the purposes of this inquiry, it is enough to select a few peculiarities of savage thought.

1. "First we have that nebulous and confused frame of mind to which all things, animate or inanimate, human, animal, vegetable, or inorganic, seems on the same level of life, passion or reason. The savage draws no hard and fast line between himself and the things of the world
2. "The second point to note in savage opinion is the belief in magic and sorcery. The world and all the things in it, being vaguely conceived of as sensible and rational, obey the commands of certain members of the tribe, chiefs, jugglers, conjurors, or what you will.....
3. "Another peculiarity of savage belief naturally connects itself with that which has just been described. The savage has very strong ideas about the persistent existence of the souls of the dead.. They retain much of their own nature, but are very often more malignant after death than they had been during life. They are frequently at the beck and call of the conjuror, whom they aid with their advice and with their magical power. By virtue of the close connection spoken of between man and animals, the souls of the dead are not rarely supposed to migrate into the bodies of beasts, or to revert to the condition of that species of creatures with which each tribe supposes itself to be related by ties of kinship. With the usual inconsistency of mythical belief, the souls of the dead are spoken of, at other times, as if they inhabited a spiritual world, usually a gloomy place, which mortal man may visit, but whence no one can escape who has tasted of the food of the ghosts.
4. "In connection with spirits a far-reaching savage philosophy prevails. It is not unusual to assign a ghost to all objects, animate or inanimate, and the strength or spirit of a man

is frequently regarded as something separable, or something with a definite locality in the body. A man's strength or spirit may reside in his kidney fat, in his heart, in a lock of his hair, or may even be stored by him in some receptacle. Very frequently a man is held capable of detaching his soul from his body and letting it roam about on business, sometimes in the form of a bird or other animals.

5 6 "....The savage, like the civilized man, is curious. The first faint stirrings of the scientific impulses are at work in his brain; he is anxious to give himself an account of the world in which he finds himself. But he is not more curious than he is, on occasion, credulous. His intellect is eager to ask questions, as is the habit of children, but his intellect is also lazy, and he is content with the first answer that comes to hand."

(#5)

- In answer to the second of the questions stated above we bring the following explanations. The first is by Frazer, who says, "As the savage explains the processes of inanimate nature by supposing that they are produced by living beings working in or behind the phenomena, so he explains the phenomena of life itself. If an animal lives and moves it can only be, he thinks, because there is a little animal inside who moves him. The animal inside the animal, the man inside the man, is the soul."

(#6)

According to Tylor, the soul or spirit is defined among the lower races as follows: "It is a thin, unsubstantial, human image, in its nature a sort of vapor, film or shadow; the cause of life and thought in the individual it animates; independently possessing the personal consciousness and volition of its corporeal owner, past or present; capable of leaving the body far behind, to flash swiftly from place to place, mostly impalpable and invisible, yet also manifesting physical power, and especially appearing to man waking or asleep as a phantasm separate from the body of which it bears the likeness; continuing to exist and appear to men after the death of that body; able to enter into possession, and act in the bodies of other men, of animals, and even of things". (#7) Though this definition is

#5. *Mythology, Ritual and Myth*, Vol. I. pp. 48-51. #6. *The Golden Bough*³, Vol. I. p. 121. #7. *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I. p. 429.

of sufficient generality to be taken as a standard, the author by no means claims for it universal application.

Bancroft informs us that the native races of America explain the soul as follows: "The most general idea of the soul seems to have been that of a double self, possessing all the essence and attributes of the individual, except the carnal embodiment, and independent of the body in so far as it was able to leave it and revel in other scenes and spheres. It would accordingly appear to another person, by day or night, as a phantom, with recognizable form and features, and leave the impression of its visit, in ideas, remembrances, or dreams." (#8)

La Flesche, in his account of the Omaha Indians, says, "Some think that the soul at once starts upon its journey to the spirit-land; others that it hovers about the grave as if reluctant to depart. Because of this latter belief, food and water are placed at the head of the grave for several days after the burial. The spirit is supposed to partake of this food. No Indians would touch any article of food thus exposed; if he did the ghost would snatch away the food and paralyze the mouth of the thief, and twist his face out of shape for the rest of his life; or else he would be pursued by the ghost, and food would lose its taste, and hunger ever after haunt the offender". (#9)

Spencer believes that "dream experience² necessarily precede the conception of a mental self; and are the experiences out of which the conception of a mental self eventually grows". (#10) In another place he remarks that "hunger and repletion, both very common with primitive man, excite dreams of great vividness. Now after a bootless chase and a long fast, he lies exhausted; and, while slumbering, goes through a successful hunt, kills, skins and cooks his prey; and suddenly awakens when about to take the first morsel. To suppose him saying to himself, 'It was a dream', is to suppose him already in possession of that hypothesis which we see he cannot have. He takes the facts as they occur" (#11)

#8. Native Races, Vol.III, p. 514. #9. Jour. of Folklore, Vol.I, for 1888, p.11. #10. Sociology, Vol.I. p. 157. #11. Prin. of Sociology, p. 142.

In still another place Spencer tells us that "Primitive man knows nothing of sensations and ideas--has no words for them. Still less has he any such highly abstract word or conception as consciousness. He does not think about thought; neither do his faculties suffice for this. During early stages he merely thinks without observing that he thinks; and therefore never asks how he thinks. His senses make him conversant only with things externally existing and with his own body". (#12)

Arnett says that among primitive peoples "the soul is most frequently described: first, as a shadow; second, as a breath; third, as wind; then as life, heart, echo, etc. The dream is revealed as the strongest influence in giving birth to an idea of the soul.....The primitive idea of the soul cannot be classed as psychological, or philosophical. It is connected more or less with superstitious beliefs, and as such may be classified with their religion. By soul the savage probably means life; it is related to no personal God, nor is any thought of mind conveyed in the idea. It is most frequently a shadow-like form of the individual that will enjoy certain favors after death". (#13)

These few excerpts, culled from the most authoritative literature upon the subject, must serve us as a preliminary survey of the field. Enough has been said, however, to furnish us with an adequate orientation of the subject with which we now propose to deal.

#12. Sociology, Vol. I. p.146.

#13. Art. The Soul, Amer. Jour. of Psychol. Vol. XV, p. 153.

THE NATURE OF THE SOUL AS PRESENTED IN THE O.T.

The Universality of the Soul idea.

"The belief", says Toy, "in an interior something in man, different from the body, appears to be practically universal in early human history; the ideas concerning the nature of the soul have changed from time to time, but no tribe of men has yet been found in which it is certain that there is no belief in its existence". (#14) There is no reason to believe that the Hebrews are an exception to this rule. Hardly a page of the O.T. but bears ample testimony to the prevalence of the belief in the existence of the soul in one form or another. It will be our task to set forth in detail what view or views concerning the soul are entertained by the O.T.

The basis of the Soul idea in the O.T.

Among primitive peoples, as we have seen above, the idea of the soul took its rise from the observation of the human shadow, the breath, the blood, dreams, etc. The Hebrews, or more correctly the Semites from whom they sprang, came upon their conception of the soul after the same fashion, namely from the observation of the breath and the blood.

(a) Based upon the Observation of the Breath.

One of the most valuable sources of information concerning primitive man, Max Müller tells us, is the language. Every language contains indestructible monuments to the past history of the people for whom it served. This truth stands us in good stead here. The Hebrew equivalents for "soul" are three, namely, "nephesh", "ruah", and "n'shamah", each of which originally possessed the meaning of "breath" or "wind". Traces of this ancient and original use are still to be found in the language. "Nephesh" used in this sense is found in Jer. xv,9; Job xi,20; xxxi,39; Pro. xxvii,9; Job xli,13 and perhaps also Isai. iii,20. "Ruah" is still plentifully employed in the same original sense. Cf. Gen. vi,17; Job ix,18; Ps. lxxviii,39; Gen. iii,8 and 2 Sam. xxi,11. "N'shamah" in all occurs only eight times, but only in the following passages does it possess the sense of breath or wind: 1 Ki. xvii,17; Gen. ii,7 and vii,22. One may raise the question, "How came the early Semites to identify the soul with

the breath?" Very naturally. It seems hardly possible that primitive man should not have noticed that when the breath ceased, life came to an end. The ^{most obvious} fundamental difference between a living and a dead body was the absence of the breath. The cessation of the respiratory function meant clearly the cessation of life, (cf. Ps. cxlvi,4) and conversely, the return of the breath indicated the return of life (cf. 1 Ki. xvii,21 ff.; 1 Sam. xxx,12.) This same conception of the soul as breath may be followed up not only through the Semitic "nefs" and "ruh", but also in the Sanscrit "atman" and "prana", the Greek "psyche" and "pneuma", the Latin "anima" and "spiritus", the Slavonic "duch", the German "Geist", and the English "ghost". These words have all the same history, passing from the original meaning "breath" to the final meaning "soul" or "spirit". According to the O.T. the breath or the life which it represented and with which it is often identified, had its origin in the breath of the Creator (Gen. ii,7) . This is not unique among the Hebrews but may be noted among many primitive peoples. Among the Malaysians, for instance, the soul is said to escape from the nostrils. In Java the word "nava" is used for breath, spirit and soul. Tylor tells us that among the Seminoles of Florida, when a woman died in child-birth, the infant was held over her face to receive the departing spirit, and thus acquired strength and knowledge for its future use. At the death bed of an ancient Roman, the nearest kinsman leant over to inhale the last breath of the departing. To this day the Tyrolese peasants fancy a good man's soul to issue from his mouth at death like a little white cloud. (# 15) We must also guard against concluding that this spirit or breath of life is peculiar to man, for animals possess it also, cf. Gen. ii,17. (#16)

#15. Cf. Tylor, Prim. Cult. Vol.I p.436.

#16. "What then", asks Kautzsch (Rel. of Israel, Hast. Dict. Bible, Vol.V, p.665) is the precise difference which under all circumstances must be assumed to exist between man and beast?" The answer, he says, is not found in the difference of their origin, for the animals possess the same origin as man (cf. Nu. xv,22; xxvii,16; Ps.civ,29 f.; Jb. xxiv,14 f.) but in the fact that in the case of animals there is no mention of an animating by the inbreathing of the divine breath of life, and in this alone the distinction between ~~man~~ and beast may be seen: "Man received the breath of life immediately from God, while in the case of animals nothing more than a general animating (of the whole species) is assumed".

We may thus understand how the breath, which to the primitive Semite meant not only life, but all that constituted man, his thoughts, his feelings, his speech and his entire activities, came in time to be viewed as the soul (or the seat of the soul) in its widest sense.

(b) Based upon the Observation of the Blood.

(1) Identification of the Soul and the Blood.

Just as the primitive Semite connected the soul, or the life-principle, at one time with the breath, so at another, or perhaps at the same, time he connected it with the blood, observing that for the most part ~~that~~ the loss of the blood was accompanied by the loss of life. Thus he came to regard the blood either as the soul itself (cf. Gen. ix, 4; Lev. xvii, 11 b; Deut. xii, 23) or as the seat of the soul (Lev. xvii, 11 a). (#17) Delitzsch ascribes the following reason for the identification of the soul and the blood: "All activity of the body--namely that of the nervous and muscular systems--depends on the quantity of the blood; for if a part of the body be deprived of the flow of the blood, all the activity therein ceases--a sensible part in a few minutes loses all sensibility--a muscle no longer either serves the volition, nor is susceptible of reflex irritability. The consequence which antiquity gathered from the phenomenon that blood-shedding and death coincide was thus perfectly justified on physiological grounds". (#18)

This conception of the blood as the seat of the soul, i.e. the life, or identified with it, was within easy reach of the early Semite. Daily observance made it clear to him that as the blood poured forth from the wound the powers of life were sensibly diminished, an observation which Kautzsch correctly remarks, "could always be made afresh when animals were slaughtered".

The idea of the unity of the soul and the blood comes to light everywhere in the Scriptures where it speaks of violent death, especially when we note the suggestive forms of expression employed. Thus in speaking of one mortally wounded, it says,

#17. This phenomenon of identifying the soul and the blood is not uncommon among primitive peoples. Cf. Delitzsch, *Bib. Psy.* pp. 286-287; Frazer, *Gold. Bough*, Vol. iii, pp. 240, 241, 247, 250; Tylor, *prim. Cult.* Vol. i, p. 431; Arnett, *The Soul*, *Amer. Jour. Psy.* Vol. xv, p. 148 f. #18. *Bib. Psy.* p. 289 f.

"his soul flows forth" (Lam. ii,12). One who voluntarily sacrifices himself is spoken of as one who "pours out his soul unto death" (Isai. Liii,12). The blood of a murdered man cries out for vengeance (Gen. iv, 10). (#19) We also find such phrases as "the soul of the blood of the innocent" (Deut. xxvii,25), and again, "the blood of the souls of the innocent cleaves to his skirts" (Jer. ii,34. cp. "the blood of a soul" Prov. xxviii,18). Again, "Shall I drink the blood of these men?" (1 Chr. xi,19). Another example is "Her princes are like wolves...to shed blood, to destroy souls" (Ezek. xxi,27) where the blood and the soul seem to be used synonymously. Further, since the soul is identified with the blood, that which is said of the person is also said of the blood. Thus we have the phrase "daam nakki", innocent blood (Ps. xciv,21; Deut. xix,10; xxi,8; xxvii,25; 1 Sam. xix,5; 2 Ki. xxi,16; xxiv,4; Isai. Lix,7; Jer. vii,6; xxii,3; xxvi,25; Ps. cvi,38; Pro. vi,17). Perhaps we may also include here the phrase "Do not pour out my life" (Ps. cxli,8). Yet, in spite of all this apparent identification, Delitzsch warns us that we must not conclude that the Scriptures knows no distinction. "The soul", he observes, "(the nephesh) is that which always combines with the blood--nowhere the spirit (ruah)..... It is only the soul on its physical side which is so pre-eminently in the blood; not in the sense of identity, for the expression "the soul is the blood" alternates with "the soul is in the blood", and not in the sense of local inclosure, for the soul, although an unextended nature, is certainly capable of being localized in an organic body, but not in such a way as that one part of the organism should exclusively include it in itself. The Scriptural view is entirely opposed to such a localizing of the soul in one part of the human corporeity. According to the Scriptures, the soul is not in the blood in such a way that it could not also be outside the blood. For it is also in the organs of respiration and of nutrition; the breath is actually called "nephesh" (Job xli,13) and even the yawning mouth is called "nephesh" (Isa. v,14). It is everywhere where bodily life is; and where it is, there it is always entire, although here and there in different manifestation". (#20)

#19. Cp. Job xxiv,12, where it is said that the soul of those slain cries out. #20. Bib. Psy. p.288 f.

(2) The Prohibition of Eating the Blood.

Since the blood is, then, actually the basis of the physical life, and since the soul is pre-eminently representative of the life, it is easy to understand the prohibition against the eating of the blood. This prohibition occurs seven times in the Mosaic legislation. (Cf. Lev.iii,17; vii,25-27; xvii,10-14; Deut.xii,16,23,24; xv,23. Cf. also Gen. ix,6 and Lev. xix,26). In the later literature the eating of the blood was also acknowledged as a sin. (Cf. 1 Sam. xiv,33; Ezek.xxxiii,25; Isai.Lxvi,3). Down to the present day, among the Jews who still observe the Mosaic laws in all their minutiae, this prohibition is scrupulously observed, and all flesh that is intended for food is first thoroughly drained of its blood. The thought underlying this prohibition, as may easily be seen, is that in the eating of the blood another life might be absorbed. (#21) Another reason for this strict prohibition suggests itself, namely, that the blood of the sacrifice belonged to the Deity, and hence must be reserved for Him. Coming, as it does, from Yahweh, to Yahweh it must be restored. (#22) Morgenstern points out, however, "that this is, strictly speaking, no sacrificial procedure is clear from the fact that not only the blood of the animals suitable for sacrifice, must be so disposed of, but also the blood of game, such as the hart and the stag, cf. Deut. xii. It is evident that the prohibition rests upon a consideration other than that of sacrifice, and in its origin probably antedates even the actual conception of the sacrifice". (#23) Kennedy, on the other hand, believes that the blood is important because of its power of working expiation for sin. "The blood, which contains the life is withdrawn from ordinary use as an article of food, because it has been reserved by God for a special and sacred purpose. By divine appointment blood is the medium for the expiation of the sins of men. It makes atonement, however, not 'qua blood', but 'by reason of the life', i.e. in virtue of the life that is in it. The Hebrew lawgiver does not take the final

#21. "The desire to bring about such an identification of different lives", says Harper, "was the basis of the earlier sacrificial meals, of which, however, no instance occurs in the O. T. literature. The significance of this conception of the blood upon the later development of sacrifice is very evident". Cf. Intro. to Amos and Hosea, I.C.C. p.97 f. #22. Cf. Kautzsch, Rel. of Israel, Hast. Dict. Bib. Vol. v, p. 618 b. #23. Cf. Paper, "Bones of the paschal lamb", unpublished.

step and explain how the life that is in the blood makes expiation; in other words, the so-called substitutionary theory of atonement, the principle of a life for a life, is not explicitly taught...although the thought lies near." (#24) This blood taboo, as might be expected, is not peculiar to the Hebrews. It is found among widely scattered peoples the world over. (#25) Musil says that among some of the Arabian tribes which he visited he found that "Das Blut soll ebenfalls nicht gegessen werden weil darin die Seele, Nefs, wohnt, die dann in den Esser übergehen würde. Als diesem Grunde soll man auch das Fleisch der erstickten Tiere nicht geniessen". (#26) Sometimes, however, primitive men were led by the power thought to be inherent in the blood, not to abstain from eating or drinking it, but to do just the reverse. "Such primitive views of the blood", says Skinner, "are widespread, and amongst some races formed a motive not for abstinence, but for drinking it". (#27)

(3) Blood must be spilled upon the ground and covered with Dust.

Since, then, the blood might not be consumed as food, some provision had to be made for its disposal. Possessing, as it did, a taboo character, it surely could not be cast aside negligently or carelessly because of its power, in common with all taboo objects, to defile everything with which it came in contact. We find that such provision was made, first in Leviticus and later in Deuteronomy. Thus we read that anyone who hunts and catches a beast or a fowl that may be eaten "shall pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dust". (Lev. xvii,13) Later on we read "Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it upon the ground as water" (Deut.xii,16,24; cf.also xv,23). (#28)

24. Lev. and Num., The new cent. Bib. pp.122-23. Cf. also Toy, Intro. Hist. Rel. p.487. #25. Cf. Frazer, Perils of the Soul, pp.239-251. #26. Arabia Petraea, p.150. Cf. also Acts xv,20,29; xxi,25. #27. Gen. I.C.C. p.170. Cf. also Wm.R. Smith, Rel. of Semites, p.234 f. (2nd ed.); Frazer, Gold.Bough, Vol.i, p.133 f., 352 f. (2nd.ed.); Kennedy, E.B. p.154; Trumbull, The Blood Covenant, Index. #28. In the Deuteronomic passage nothing is said of covering the blood with dust as is enjoined in Lev. xvii,13. Why was this omitted? Schwally thinks that "the covering of the blood is either passed over as understood or it is believed that the same purpose is served by the blood's soaking into the ground". (Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.52) The same purpose, no doubt, was served by dashing the blood of the sacrifice upon the sides of the altar. (Cf. Lev. i,5,11,15).

The explanation of this practice of spilling the blood upon the ground is that the blood is pre-eminently the life, which belongs to the deity and to whom it must be restored. What conception underlay the belief that spilling the blood upon the ground restored it to the deity is difficult to say. Dietrich suggests (*Mutter Erde*) that it was an ancient belief that all souls came out of the earth and at death returned to the earth. We may assert, however, that even when poured upon the ground the blood did not lose its vitality, but continued to have intelligent relations with the deity. (#29) This fact is to be ascertained from Gen. iv,10, where Abel's blood is represented as crying out to yahweh for vengeance. We must not be deceived into believing that it is Abel's memory which is so represented, but Abel's actual self, his soul or his life. (#30) This passage is not to be taken in the light of a metaphor, because it is actually the blood that is crying out to Yahweh to avenge the crime of Cain. (#31) This conception of the voicefulness of the human blood continued to prevail even as late as Tannaitic times. Thus we find that both the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds tell of the irrepressible voice of Zechariah, the son of Jehoida, who was slain by King Joash in the court of the priests of the Temple. His blood which was left there continued to bubble and would not be quiet. (#32) Although the Book of Deuteronomy seems to have overlooked or forgotten entirely the practice of covering the blood it would appear, nevertheless, that at one time the practice possessed quite a hold upon the people. In Gen. xxxvii,26 Judah asks his brothers, "What profit is there if we slay our brother and conceal his blood?" The idea certainly seems to be that it was looked upon as imperative that the blood of the slain man be covered with dust (#33) so that the soul or spirit continue to live. If then, they took these necessary measures to preserve the blood, the murder of their brother would accomplish little, for his soul or spirit would not have been annihilated, and might, perhaps, return to do them injury.

#29. Cf. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant*, p.212.

#30. *Ibid.* p. 360. Cf. also Heb. xi,4; xii,24.

#31. Cf. Skinner, *Gen. I.C.C.* in loco.

#32. *Jer. Tal. Taaneeth*, fol.69:1,2; *Bab. Tal. San.* fol. 92:2.

#33. Perhaps to safeguard it from prowling animals, cf. *Jer.xvi* 9.

This interpretation receives corroboration from Lev. xvii, 13 where it is commanded to cover the blood of wild animals slain in the hunt. The reason for this command, as Morgenstern points out, is the belief that so long as the blood is returned unharmed to the earth, the animal would be reborn, and so continue to supply an undiminished number of animals for the chase, the number of which had originally been fixed by the deity. (#34) Thus the covering of the blood meant protection to the soul, and was a guarantee of future resurrection. (#35) No doubt the passage in Job voices the same belief when Job cries out, "O earth, cover not my blood, and let my cry have no place" (xvi, 18).

In concluding this particular section of our subject we will bring one other bit of evidence to show how closely bound up with one another were the early conceptions of the blood and the soul. This identity of the blood and the soul is evidenced by the etymology of the word **דָּם** blood, which, allowing for dialectic variations, is the same in all Semitic languages. The word is ordinarily explained as being a derivative of the root **דָּמָה** the original **דָּ** having been dropped. More probable, however, since the word nowhere appears in any of the Semitic dialects with the original **דָּ**, is its derivation from the root **"דָּמָה"**, to be like, a qat'l formation similar to **דָּם, דָּם, דָּם, דָּם**, and comparable also to such qit'l formations as **דָּם** from **דָּם** and **דָּם** from **דָּם**. If this etymology is correct the original significance of the word would be that the blood was conceived as the likeness, or as containing the likeness, i.e. the soul. (#36)

We might, if necessary, go on to show how the primitive conceptions of the blood gave rise to the idea of blood-kinship, the blood-covenant, blood-revenge and the like, but enough has been said to make plain the close relationship existing in the minds of the early Semites between the blood and the soul, i.e. the life, and how from the observation of the former they came at their conception of the latter. (#37)

#34. Paper, Bones of the paschal Lamb.

#35. This subject will be discussed more in detail in a later paragraph.

#36. Paper, Bones of the Paschal Lamb.

#37. For further data concerning this very interesting subject of the primitive conceptions of the blood cf. Trumbull, The Blood Covenant.

The Origin of the Soul.

"In the early stages of human culture", says Toy, "the soul is taken as a natural part of the human constitution. The analysis of man is not carried so far as to raise the question of separate beginning of the two constituents of the personality except as this is partially involved in the hypothesis of reincarnation. The child is born into the world equipped with all the capacities of man. Further investigation as to how these capacities originally came is not made". (#38) But in the later age of culture, in which the writers of the O.T. lived, the creation of the soul was regarded as a special act of creation of Yahweh. In the Biblical account of the creation of man (Gen.11, 7) we learn that man was conceived as formed out of the dust, and that into this earthly frame the soul, the breath of life, was breathed by God, and thus man became a "living soul". The soul of man, therefore, had its origin in the divine breath. With the further nature and origin of this divine breath the O.T. has no concern. (#39)

The Substance of the Soul.

Primitive peoples never conceive of the soul as something immaterial. This conception is a product of metaphysics, and has no meaning for the savage or primitive man. For him the soul is always a substance, sometimes, indeed, so very fine as to be ethereal, intangible and invisible, but a substance nevertheless (#40) The nearest approach that the early Semite made to the conception of the immateriality of the soul was when he conceived of it as a breath. This, as we have seen in a preceding paragraph, is the O.T. view. Even Talmudic literature fails to go beyond this point, and the writers of the Midrash content themselves with the statement that the soul-substance must remain undefined even as is God Himself. (#41) That they too conceived

#38. Intro. to the Hist. of Rel. p.17. #39. We are not to infer, however, Kautzsch warns us, that the same process, i.e. the inbreathing of the divine breath, takes place at the birth of each individual. The O.T. nowhere teaches this so-called 'Creationism', but is based rather upon 'Traducianism' which teaches that the body and the soul are begotten at the same time, for otherwise the view would be impossible that the inclination to sin passes from parents to children, a view by which the O.T. is unquestionably dominated, cf. Gen. viii, 1 and passim. (Cf. Kautzsch, Rel. of Israel, East. Dict. of the Bible, Vol. v, p.665)
 #40. Cf. Tylor, prim. Cult. Vol. i, p.453 ff.; Frazer, Gold. Bough Index. #41. Mid. Rab. 14, 11.

of the soul-substance as a breath we learn from the tradition that at the death of Moses God drew out his soul by a kiss. (#42) The substance of the soul is a subject upon which the O.T. has little to say because its writers had little or no interest in it. That the soul is everywhere looked upon as a substance is, however, irrefutable. Such expressions as "that soul shall be cut off" (Gen.xvii,14); "bound up with his soul" (Gen.xliv,30); "cast his soul far away" (Jud.ix,17); "my soul is continually in my hand" (Ps.cxix,109) and others show that originally the soul was conceived to be something material and tangible.

The Form of the Soul.

Just as the writers of the O.T. found little to say concerning the substance of the soul, so do they find even less to say concerning its form. We know that primitive peoples frequently conceive of the soul as possessing a definite form. (#43) But the O.T. authors must have rid themselves of these primitive notions because in the Scriptures we find but one reference to the form of the soul, "How can you say to my soul, Flee as a bird to your mountain?" (Ps.xi,1). This single instance is, however, insufficient to justify us in maintaining that this was anything more than a metaphorical expression.

Perhaps just as doubtful is the suggestion that offers itself when we consider the etymology of the word *נֶפֶשׁ*, lit. the "little man", the Hebrew word for the pupil of the eye. "The term", says Morgenstern, "would hardly imply consciousness that the image seen in the pupil is actually the reflection of the form of the beholder, and can best be explained as the product of the popular conception that the soul looked out through the eye upon the world without and thus was visible to others". (#44) If it is true that the image seen in the pupil was thought to be "the little man" inside, then we have here a very ancient conception of the soul's form. Frazer mentions an instance where the soul is supposed to assume the form of a mannikin. (#45)

#42. Tan. Vaethan 56. #43. Thus the Eurons thought of the soul as a mannikin, a complete miniature model of the man himself; the Varena conceived of the soul as a butterfly, as did the Greeks of Homer's day; the form of a bird is commonly ascribed to the soul, especially among the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians; the forms of the lizard, the fly, the mouse, the lark, the fire-fly, an insect, a stone, etc. have been ascribed to the soul by various primitive peoples. (Cf. Frazer, *Gold. Bough*, iii, p. 33 seq.; Arnett, *The Soul*, Jour. Amer. Psy. Vol.xv, pp. 132 ff.; A.Wiedemann, *The Anc. Egy. Doc. of Immort.* pp.33-41; Jastrow, *Rel. of Baby. and Assy.* p.568; Rohde, *Psyche*, Index). #44. *Bones of the Paschal Lamb*. #45. *Perils of the Soul*, p.26.

Again, Max Muller tells us that among some savage Australian tribes the practice was found to exist of eating the eyes of the dead enemy. (#46) The eating of the eyes, like the eating of the heart, had its origin in the savage logic, without doubt, that these organs contain the soul. It may be, then, that at one time the Hebrews likewise believed that the soul dwelt in the eye, or at least looked out through the eyes and was seen by the observer in the form of a little man.

It may here occur to the reader that we have neglected to speak of the Shades in Sheol to which the O.T. frequently gives definite forms. Thus, for instance, the returned shade of Samuel bore the form of an old man with a mantle, so that Saul perceived that it was Samuel. (1 Sam. xxviii, 14). The belief prevailed at one time that the shades of the departed take the form which they possessed at the moment of their death. (Cf. Gen. xxxvii, 35; 1 Ki. ii, 9; Isai. xiv, 9-11; Ezek. xxxii, 20 ff; etc.) But to thus identify the souls of the living with the shades of the dead seems to the writer particularly hazardous, because the shades in Sheol are never referred to as "souls". We must, however, leave this discussion for later consideration, and be satisfied for the present, at least, that the living soul is not conceived as having any particular form, especially since it is only a breath.

The Seat of the Soul.

In the most primitive stages of human culture the savage frequently identifies the soul with the breath, or, at least, looks upon the breath as the seat of the soul. That this was also the case with the primitive Semites the etymology of the words "ruah", "nephesh" and "n'shamah" clearly attests. (Vide supra p. 6) But with the advance in anatomical knowledge the O.T. writers gave up this primitive idea and placed the seat of the soul in the blood generally, or, more specifically, in the heart, the liver, the intestines, the kidneys and the like. The head is rarely spoken of as the locality of the soul, and is found very late. (Cf. Dan. ii, 28; iv, 10; vii, 1, 15.)

According to ~~astrow~~, the belief in the liver as the seat of the soul preceded that of the heart. ^(#47) Traces of the former belief are still to be found among primitive people of today. Thus the natives of Borneo pursue the practice of consulting the liver of a pig before entering upon a war, or to determine whether a sick person will recover. (#48) Some traces of the belief in the liver as the seat of the soul are found in the O.T. also. Thus the author of the book of Lamentations represents Jerusalem as a mother bereft of her children, crying out, "My liver is poured upon the ground", meaning that her very soul or life is crushed. (ii,2). In proverbs the young man is pictured as struck through the liver by the arrows of the harlot, which thus strike at his very life. "Until the arrow pierces his liver, as the bird rushes to his trap, not knowing that it means his life (nepesh). (vii,23). In Psalms there are a number of passages which, according to ~~astrow~~, must be read "kabed", liver, instead of "kabod", honor, as the text has it. Thus, "Let him tread down my life to the earth, and drag my liver to the dust". (vii,6). Or, "That my liver may sing praise unto thee and not be silent". (xxx,13) Again, "Therefore my heart is glad and my liver exulteth". (xvi,9) And finally, "My heart is steadfast, O God. I will chant and I will sing--aye, my liver (shall sing)" (cviii,2).

In the vast majority of cases, however, the heart is looked upon as the source and seat of life in its various aspects. Thus we read in proverbs, "Keep thy heart with all diligence for out of it are the sources of life". (iv,3) Or in Prov. xiv,10, "The heart knoweth the bitterness of his soul". It is clear from these passages that in the mind of the author the heart is the seat of the soul. In time this close connection between the heart and the soul led to a partial identification, so that we find all the powers and faculties of the soul being attributed to the heart, such as thought, understanding, wisdom, love, hatred, joy, sorrow, contempt, despair, etc. The fact that the heart and the soul share these in common proves how closely related in Hebrew thought were the heart and the soul, and how originally the heart was regarded as the seat of the soul. (Cf. Gen.vi,5; xxxi,26; xxiv,25; Ex.xxviii,3; Nu. xvi,26; 1 Ki.iii,9; Neh.v,7; Job xxxiv,10; etc.)

#47. Rel. of Baby. and Assyr. pp. 149 ff. Cf. also Art. The Liver, the seat of the Soul, Studies in the Hist. of Rel. Presented to C.N.Toy, p.143. #48. We find this practice of using the liver in hepatoscopy mentioned once in the O.T., Ezek.xxi,24.

Although we find the soul most frequently localized in the heart it is by no means restricted to it, but is frequently found in other organs. Sometimes, indeed, the soul is spoken of as merely within the body, the word "קֶרֶב", inwards, being employed. Thus "kereb" appears as the locale of feeling (Isai. xvi, 11; Ps. ciii, 1) and of the spirit (Zech. xii, 1), of the spiritual life (Ps. li, 12; Isai. xxiv, 9), of divine wisdom (1 Ki. iii, 28) "בֶּטֶן", belly, is likewise used in the O.T. as the seat of the soul, i.e. of that in man which thinks and wills (Job xv, 35), the recipient of that which is spiritual (Prov. xxii, 18; Job xxiii, 19.

Cf. also Prov. xx, 27; Ps. xxi, 9; Eccles. xix, 12; Li, 21). Another phrase used in the same sense, i.e. as designating the seat of the soul, is "כִּלְכִּיל", bowels. (Cf. Isai. xvi, 11; Jer. xxxi, 20; Isai. lxiii, 15; Jer. iv, 19; Lam. i, 20; ii, 11; Job xxx, 27; Cant. v, 4) The kidneys, "כִּלְכִּיל", are similarly employed as the seat of the soul. Thus in deep suffering (Ps. lxxiii, 21), in affliction (Job xvi, 13; cp. Lam. iii, 13), in joy (Prov. xxiii, 16), in chastisement (Ps. xvi, 7), in longing (Job xix, 27); God tries the heart and the reins (Ps. vii, 10); He is far from the reins of the ungodly (Jer. xii, 2). The word "קִינֹה", inward parts, which Delitzsch believes to be another name for kidneys, is likewise referred to as the seat of the soul (Ps. li, 8; Job xxxviii, 36). The strange story of Samson's loss of strength when shorn of his locks may be a trace of the belief which in ancient times made the hair the seat of the soul. (#49)

We are thus enabled to understand how the O.T. writers conceived of the soul as localized somewhere in the body, first in the blood, then in the heart or liver as the source of the blood, and finally in the several internal organs surrounding the heart. Says Delitzsch, "The heart is the center, whence according to Scripture, the soul pervades the body--everywhere present in a manner which manifests itself locally, but yet is not local.... The nervous system, which extends through the entire corporeity, even to its most delicate and extreme subdivision of tissue, is the inner body of the soul, ever anew restoring itself from the blood". (#50)

#49. Cf. Frazer, Gold. Bough, Vol. xi, p. 103 seq.; Wm. R. Smith, Rel. of the Semites, p. 335 ff. #50. Bib. Psy. p. 318.

The Functions of the Soul.

The functions ascribed to the soul in the O.T. are many and varied. All the attributes commonly ascribed to the individual are accredited to the soul, from the lowest animal appetites to the highest intellectual and emotional functions. We will consider the functions of "nephesh" and "ruah" separately, so that we may compare them to discover whether there is any vital difference between them, or whether they are identical and may be used synonymously. "N'shamah" is used too infrequently to make a comparison with the other terms of much value.

(a) The Functions of Nephesh.

We find that "nephesh" is used as the seat of the appetites from the earliest literature to the latest. To it there may be ascribed: (1) Hunger (Ps. cvii, 9; Pro. xxvii, 7; Isai. xxxii, 6; Pro. x, 3; vi, 20; Isai. xxix, 8); (2) Thirst (Pro. xxv, 25; Jer. xxxi, 25; Ps. cxliii, 6; xlii, 3; lxiii, 2; xlii, 2; Jer. xxxi, 14, 25; Is. lviii, 11); (3) Appetite in general (Ps. cvii, 5; xvii, 9; Isai. v, 14; Hab. ii, 5). To it there may also be ascribed the feelings and emotions: (4) Desire (Deut. xii, 20; Job xxiii, 13; Pro. xiii, 19; Isai. xxvi, 8; Jer. ii, 24; Ezek. xvi, 27; Ps. xxxv, 25; Mi. vii, 3; Ct. vi, 12; 1 Sam. i, 15; Hos. iv, 8; Ex. xv, 9; 1 Ki. xi, 37); (5) Abhorrence, loathing (Lev. xxvi, 11, 15, 30, 43; Jer. xiv, 19; Zech. xi, 8); (6) Sorrow and Distress (Jud. xviii, 25; 2 Sam. xvii, 15; Job iii, 20; Jud. x, 16; Isai. xix, 10; Jer. iv, 31; Job xxiv, 12; Ps. lxxxviii, 4; Lam. iii, 51; Gen. xlii, 21; Ezek. xxvii, 31); (7) Joy (Ps. xxxv, 9; Isai. lxi, 10; Ps. lxxxvi, 4; Pro. xxix, 17; Ps. xciv, 19; cxxxviii, 3); (8) Love (Ct. i, 7; iii, 1, 2, 3, 4; Jer. xii, 7; Gen. xxxiv, 3; Ps. lxiii, 9; Gen. xxxiv, 8); (9) Alienation, hatred, revenge (Jer. vi, 8; Ezek. xxiii, 17, 18, 22, 28; 2 Sam. v, 8; Ps. xi, 5; Isai. i, 14; Ezek. xxv, 6, 15; xxxvi, 5; Jer. v, 9, 29; ix, 8; Pro. vi, 16); (10) Other emotions and feelings (Ps. xix, 8; 1 Sam. i, 11, 16, 19; Pro. xxv, 13; Ru. iv, 15; Ps. xxiii, 3; cxxxi, 2; Ezek. xxiv, 21; Job vi, 11; Ex. xxiii, 9).

(b) The Functions of Ruah.

We find "ruah" used likewise in expressions of (1) Grief, sadness, anguish (Gen. xxvi, 25; xli, 8; Ex. vi, 9; 1 Ki. xxi, 5; Job vii, 11; xx, 4; Ezek. i, 1), (2) Obstinacy, hardness, anger (Deut. ii, 30; Ju. viii, 3; ix, 23; Job xv, 13; Pro. xxv, 28; xxix, 11; xvi, 32; Zech. vi, 8); (3) Humility (Ps. xxxiv, 18; Pro. xxix, 23; xvi, 19); (4) Up-

rightness, excellence (Ps.Li,10; Pro.xi,13; xvi,32; xxv,28); (5) Animation, vivacity (1 Ki.x,5; 2 Chr.ix,4; 1 Ki.xxi,5; Gen.xLv, 27; Ju.xv,19; 1 Sam.xxx,12); (6) Courage (Jos.v,1; Ps.Lvi,13; Is. xix,3; ps.Lxxvii,4; cxLii,4; cxLiii,4; Jos.ii,11); (7) Impatience (Ex.vi,9; Mi.ii,7; Pro.xiv,29); (8) Patience (Job xxxii,18, xxi,4; Eccles.vii,8); (9) Misgiving, trouble (Gen.xLi,8; Man.ii, 3; Gen.xxvi,35; Isai.Liv,6); (10) Jealousy (Nu.v,14,30; Hos.iv, 12; v,4; Isai. xix,14; xxviii,6; Gen.xLi,38).

A careful comparison of the functions of "nephesh" and "ruah" leads us to the conclusion that though in a large multitude of cases it is impossible to distinguish between them, yet in general we can say that the functions ascribed to "ruah" are of a superior grade to those ascribed to "nephesh", and that in consequence "nephesh" is of a lower nature than "ruah". In this opinion we have the support of Charles, who points out that the two terms "are partially differentiated, the term "spirit" being appropriated to mark the stronger side of the soul, and designated the stronger and stormier emotions". (#51) Delitzsch further distinguishes the two terms in this wise: "The spirit is superior to the soul. The soul is its product, or what is more expressive, its manifestation". (#52) Whether the two terms were ever synonymous, and were only differentiated at a later time is, of course, a matter of conjecture.

#51. Eschat. p. 45. Cf. also Stade, Gesch. d. Volks Israel, Vol.1, p.418.

#52. Bib. Psy. p.100.

THE O.T. CONCEPTION OF DEATH.

Among primitive peoples there are found various theories, or rather myths, to account for the origin of death. Frazer divides the several scattered stories of the origin of death into four general classes. (#53) Many savages believe that they would never die if their lives were not cut short by sorcery. (#54) Death is likewise attributed to the machinations of evil spirits. (#55) Whatever the cause, however, death is regarded by primitive man as an abnormal event, produced by supernatural agency, and brought about by accident or error. (#56) The best known type of the origin of death is that contained in Gen.iii. Death is here brought into the world as a result of disobedience on the part of the first man (#57) or by his failure to eat of the tree of life. (#58) Bennett, however, believes that "the narrative in Gen.iii. stands apart from the general course of O.T. thought, which regards death as the natural end of life. The righteous man, according to the widely prevalent view, enjoys a long and happy life, and is gathered to his fathers in a good old age". (#59)

Be the origin of death what it may, according to savage and primitive philosophy, it is immediately the result of the separation of the body and the soul. (#60) According to this primitive conception, the temporary absence of the soul results in either sleep, trance, swoon or coma, while the permanent separations means death. (#61) This is the conception found in the O.T. In death the "nephesh" leaves the body unreservedly. This doctrine of death is plainly stated in Gen.XXXV,18, "And it came to pass as her soul was departing, for she died...." (Cf. also Jer.xv,9; Job xi,20; xxxi,39; Jon.iv,3; 2 Sam.i,9.) Conversely, the return of the soul to the body means the restoration of life. (Cf. 1 Ki. xvii,21,22.) Yet it also appears as

#53. Bel. in Immort. pp.59-73. #54. Ibid. p.33f. Cf. also Tylor, Prim.Cult. I. p.138. #55. Frazer, Ibid.p.37. #56. Cf. Toy, Intro. to Hist.of Rel. p.366. #57. Cf. E.S.Hartland, Art. Death, Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth. Vol.iv,p.411. #58. Cf. Toy, Ibid,p.366. #59. Art. Death and Disposal of the dead, Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth. Vol.iv,p.400. #60. Cf. Frazer, Perils of the Soul,p.26 ff. #61. Cf.Tylor, prim. Cult. Vol.I,p.436 ff.

though the "nephesh" does not always leave the body immediately at death, but apparently only upon the corruption of the flesh. This is evidenced by the fact that in certain cases, after the outward death of the body, the soul is regarded as still being in or near the body, as the corpse is called "nephesh". (Cf. Lev.xix,28; xxi,1; xxii,4; Nu.ix,6,7,10; Hag.ii,13.) In such cases the soul of the individual is spoken of as "nephesh meth". (Cf. Nu.vii,6; Lev.xxi,11. Cp. Gen.ii,7 where a living man is spoken of as "nephesh hayyah".) Schwally further points out that death ensues not only upon the withdrawal of the "nephesh", but also upon the withdrawal of the "ruah". (#62) (Cf. Ps. lxxviii,39; cxlvi,4; civ,29; xxxi,6; Isai.xxxviii,16; Job xvii,1; xxxiv,1,15; Isai.lvii,16; Eccles.viii,8,8; ix,5; iii,21; xii,7.) The nephesh, itself, is also subject to death, though not, it seems, to complete annihilation. Thus we find that the Scripture speaks of the soul as dying. (Cf. Nu.xxiii,10; Nu. xvi,30; Job xxxvi,14. Cp. Wis.i,11; Mk.iii,4; Gen.xxxii,21; Deut. xxii,26; Isai.liii,12; Ps.cxli,8; Job xi,20; xxxi,39; Jer.xv,9; Lam. ii,12; 1 Ki. xvii,17.) According to the account of the creation of man in gen.ii,7, man is quickened into life by the inbreathing of the divine breath (ruah), the presence of which manifests itself by the "nephesh". According to this view the nephesh has no independent existence of its own but is dependent upon the presence of the "ruah", and upon the withdrawal of the latter--- which then returns to the Creator who gave it---the "nephesh" dies. (Cf. eccles.xii,7.) And yet we must not understand that this death is a complete annihilation---a conception foreign to the early Semitic mind---for an indestructible residue continues to lead a vague, shadowy and unsubstantial existence in Sheol. Schwally explains this remarkable phenomenon as follows: "Die nephesh des Toten ist natürlich keine 'nephesh hayyah', sondern sie ist tot. (Jud.xvi,30; Nu.xxiii,10). Aber der Tod der Seele ist nicht in absolutem Sinne zu nehmen. Denn wenn vergossenes Blut--und in dem Blute wird ja die Seele gedacht--zum Himmal schreit Gen.iv,10, oder wenn Hen.ix,10 Apoc.vi,9 ausdrücklich von gestorbenen Seelen gesagt ist, dass sie schreien und zum Himmal klagen, so schliessen wir, dass die ruah beraubten Seelen noch bis zu einem gewissen Grade fungiren. Der Tod bedeutet

also nicht das vollige Aufhören der Seinsweise, sondern ist eher mit einer Ohnmacht zu vergleichen, in die man vor plötzlichem Schrecken, oder vor Mattigkeit fallen kann (1 Ki. x,5; Jud.xv, 17; Sam.xxx,12.) Denn auch in der Ohnmacht verlässt zwar die ruah den Menschen (ibidem), aber das Leben ist nicht gänzlich erloschen, sondern nur auf ein Minimum reduziert". (#63) Concerning the death of the "nephesh" Melitzsch says, "It is true of the soul in a certain sense that it dies. It dies, so far as it was wont to centralize in itself the natural powers of the body, and to pervade the organs of the body with its own spirit-like life. It does not die, so far as it is of the spirit; but it dies, so far as it has become of the body. Its life that has emanated from the spirit endures; but its life that is immanent in the body, perishes with the body itself". (#64) Ordinarily, however, this differentiation between the "nephesh" and the "ruah" is not made, and with the entrance of death into the body the soul, be it either the "nephesh" or the "ruah" withdraws.

There are a few passages in the O.T. which compare the death of the body to sleep--though we are not to infer from this that the O.T. regards the soul in death as asleep--which may perhaps be regarded as traces of the early Semitic conceptions that conceived of the absence of the soul as productive of sleep, trance, swoon, etc. (Cf. Ps.xiii,4; Jer.Li,39,57; Job xiv,12; vii,21; Gen.xLvii,30; Deut.xxxi,16.)

#63. Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.8 f.

#64. Bib. Psy. p.469.

DISPOSAL OF THE DEAD.

Among the Hebrews we find that the dead were disposed of in three ways, viz. burial, embalming and burning. The first of these was by far the most general and approved of practice; the second was probably never a common practice among the Hebrews, and according to Wilkinson was an Egyptian practice which the Jews followed. (#65) (Cf. Gen.L,2,26.) But even in these two cases, of which mention is made, Jacob and Joseph are regarded as Egyptians. 2 Chron.xvi,14 cannot be strictly classed as an act of embalming. The third method, that of burning, was reserved almost entirely for criminals, and only once is mention made of honorable burning, cf.1 Sam.xxi,12. Of this more below.

Burial Regarded as Necessary and Essential.

The burial of the dead body was regarded by the Jews as necessary and highly desirable, while the lack of burial was considered one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall a man, as well as a terrible disgrace. (Cf. Ps.Lxxix,2,3; Ez.xxix,5; Jer.xxxvi,30; vii,33; xxv,33; xxi,19, where the burial of an ass is equivalent to no burial at all; xvi,16; xvi,4-5; ix,22; viii,1; Isai.xiv,19-20; Lev.lxvi,24.) Wicked monarchs are refused burial and the right to repose in the sepulchres of their fathers. Thus Jezebel is refused burial by Elisha. (2 Ki.ix, 10. Cf. also 1 Ki.xiv,11; xvi,4.) Still we find that Jehu would not deny her the right of burial, and orders that she be interred. (2 Ki.ix,34.) But her bones cannot all be found and so the curse of Elisha is fulfilled. Rulers sometimes refuse burial to their enemies. Thus David refuses burial to the sons of Rimmon, the slayers of Ish-bosheth. (2 Sam.iv,12) (#66) Criminals, who ordinarily are denied burial (2 Sam.xxi,9 f.) might even receive it according to the Deuteronomic writer. (Deut.xxi, 22 f. Cf. Josh.vii,24-26.) Even the deadliest enemies of Israel might be given burial (Ezek.xxxix,12.) The very poorest people, who possessed no burial-ground of their own and who could not buy one, also receive a burial, even though it was only in the potter's field (Deut.xxvi,23; 2 Ki.xxiii,6.) There also the

#65. Anc. Egypt, Vol.ii,p.287. #66. Jeremias calls attention to a strikingly similar case where Assurbanipal denies proper burial to his enemy Nabu-bel-Zikre. Leben nach dem Tode,p.57.

criminals were buried (Isai. llii, 9) as was also the prophet U-
 riah, following his execution (Jer. xxvi, 23.) Every bone demand-
 ed burial (Ezek. xxxix, 15.) A man who had been hanged must re-
 ceive burial the same day (Deut. xxi, 23.) Likewise, after the
 hanging of the five kings, Joshua buries them in the cave (Jos.
 x, 27.)⁽⁵⁷⁾ Later on the burial of relatives, friends and even strang-
 ers came to be regarded as a supreme duty (2 Sam. xxi, 14. Cp.
 Tob. i, 2.) Job complains that even the wicked are permitted
 honorable burial (xxi, 32.)

From all this we learn that burial was regarded as most essen-
 tial, and its lack most deplorable. Charles explains it as fol-
 lows: "This horror of being unburied cannot be explained as in
 the Greek and Roman religions, where it involved the penalty of
 non-admission to *hades*; for according to Hebrew views all without
 exception descended into *Sheol*. It may be explained on two
 grounds: (1) In earlier times no sacrifice could be offered to
 the dead unless they had received burial. Sacrifices were offer-
 ed at the grave; for the grave was in some measure the Temple in
 Ancestor Worship. (2) The soul was conceived as connected with
 the body even after death. Hence every outrage to the dead body
 was also an outrage to the departed soul. This view appears as
 late as Job's time, xiv, 22". (#68)

#67. "The anxiety for a hasty burial", says Schwally (*Das Leben
 nach dem Tode*, p. 50 f.) "is usually explained by the fact that
 the corpse, as unclean, will make the land unclean. (Deut. xxi,
 23.) Were this true, however, the means employed to prevent
 this, viz. speedy burial, would not answer the need, for the
 graves are likewise unclean (Nu. xix, 16.) But this uncleanness
 is not to be avoided. One can only take precautions not to come
 into contact with the spirits. It was perhaps for this reason
 that in later times they used to cover the graves with lime "seed",
Maaser Sheni V, 1; Mt. xxiii, 27; *Shequalim* i, 1".

#68. *Eschat.* p. 3.

Desecration of the graves of the dead.

Not only was the lack of burial considered a terrible misfortune, but likewise the desecration of the graves of the dead. (2 Ki.xxiii,16; Jer.viii,1.) The reason for this was, no doubt, as Charles has pointed out (#69) that indignities offered to the corpses of the dead were keenly felt by the departed shades. Jeremias finds a close resemblance to this in the action of King Saneherib in connection with the unfortunate Merodachbaladan the bones of whose ancestors he exhumed out of their mausoleums. (#70)

Burial in the Family Grave.

While the lack of proper burial was considered the crowning misfortune that could come upon the dead, it was not the only misfortune that they could experience. Even when the corpse received burial, unless it was properly buried in the family sepulchre, it suffered great disgrace and indignity (1 Ki.xiii,22; ii,10; xiv,13.) Burial elsewhere than in the grave of the ancestors was ever looked upon with disfavor, and certainly we may easily understand that burial in the "kivre b'nai ha-am", the graves of the common people, along with the poor and the criminal, had some degree of disgrace attached to it. Failure to receive proper interment with one's ancestors was looked upon as a sort of posthumous punishment, a manifestation of divine anger. Thus the man of God is compelled to forego the honor of sleeping in the burying place of his ancestors because he had disobeyed the command of the Lord, and only finds a grave and burial because of the graciousness of the prophet, who shares his own grave with him (1 Ki.xiii,21 f.) Those whom the Lord wishes to dishonor he does not permit to be buried in the tombs of their fathers (Ezek.xxviii,10; xxxii,21.) Burial in the sepulchres of kings was afforded to rulers, except in cases where they had incurred divine wrath, as was the case with Jehoram and Joash (2 Chr. xxiv,25; xxi,20.) Pashur, who had also aroused God's wrath, lost the privilege of burial in the grave of his fathers and was condemned to die and receive burial in a strange land (Jer. xx,6. Cf. also xxi,12.) We are likewise led to be-

#69 Eschat. p.32.

#70. Leben nach dem Tode, p.55.

lieve by the writer of Kings that Amon and Manasseh, who were buried in the sepulchre in the garden of Uzzah, did not share the privilege of being buried in the sepulchre of kings because of their sins (2 Ki.xxi,25,18.)

It was ever considered the most fitting end for an individual to be gathered to his fathers, and so, indeed, we find that the Scriptures rarely omit to make mention of the fact that patriarch, judge or king was "gathered to his fathers", or "laid himself with his fathers", or that "he came into the grave of his fathers", or "the grave of his father and mother". (Gen. xlix,33; xxv,8,17; xxxv,29; Nu.xxvii,13; xxxi,2; xx,24,26; Deut. xxxii,50; 2 Chr.xxxiv,28; 2 Ki.xxii,30; Gen.xv,15; Jud.ii,10; 2 Sam.xvii,23; xxi,14; 1 Ki.xiii,22; 2 sam.xix,38.) Jacob and Joseph both request that their bones be interred with the bones of their fathers. (Gen.xlvii,30; L,13,25; Ex.xiii,19; Cf. also Jos.xxiv,32; 2 Sam.ii,32; xix,38; iv,12; xxi,13; Neh.ii,5; Judith xvi,23; Tob.iv,3,4; xiv,10,12; 1 Mac.xiii,25.) Perhaps the best known of the family sepulchres mentioned in the O.T. is that of Macpelah, in which were buried Sarah, (Gen.xxiii,19) Abraham, (Gen. xxv,9) Isaac, Rebecca, Leah, (Gen.xlix,31) and Jacob (Gen.L,13.) The family grave of Joseph was located at Shechem (Jos.xxiv,32.)

The possession of a family grave could fall naturally only to those individuals that owned their own ground, the poor, as was elsewhere explained, being buried in the common burying ground. Originally, no doubt, the family grave or sepulchre was located in the house or in the immediate vicinity. Thus both Joab and Samuel were buried in their own houses (1 Ki.ii,34; 1 Sam.xxv,1; xxviii,3) as were also Manasseh and Amon (vide supra). Rohde tells us that the ancient Greeks likewise buried their dead in their houses (#71) and Jastrow tells of a similar practice in ancient Babylon (#72.) Mr.H.P.Smith is of the opinion that the practice of burying the dead in the house of the living originated out of "the desire of the family to have the spirit of the ancestor as protector of the house". (#73)

#71. Psyche, Vol.1,p.288.
p.599.

#72. Rel. of Baby. and Assyr.
p.29.

#73. Rel. of Israel, p.29.

Whatever other motive may have operated, burial within the house in the case of the poor may well have originated out of the pressure of economic necessity, since the poor man, who owned only his little patrimony, could hardly afford to buy an extra plot of ground for a burying place.

Be the reason for burial in the house what it may, we have yet to discover the purpose of burial in the family grave, and why such great importance was attached thereto. Certainly, the practice of burying one with his ancestors rested on some ground more potent than mere sentiment. It may, perhaps, have been, as Harper suggests, that "they identified, to a certain extent, the grave with the world of spirits, so that only those buried together could associate with each other, while the unburied, as with the Greeks and the Romans, were considered to wander as restless spirits with no fixed abode". (#74) That the unburied dead wander about as restless spirits with no fixed abode Charles does not admit, since, according to him, everyone without exception enters Sheol (*vide supra*). But he can find no fault with the hypothesis that burial in the family grave was an attempt to bring about a community of interests among the departed spirits, for he himself says, "In the earliest times this society (of the spirits of the departed) was conceived to exist either in the family grave or in its immediate neighborhood". (#75) Schwally is of the same opinion. "Burial in the family grave", he says, "can have but one object, i.e. to introduce a community among the ancestors. This community can have meaning only if the dead live. The continued existence of the dead is not only a hypothesis of burial, but also of burial in the family grave. Just as in the land of the living no individual exists for himself, so it would be an unheard of horror to deny the same thing to the future life". (#76) Certainly, we cannot doubt that the custom of burying the dead with their ancestors must originally have rested upon such a conception, which will find further corroboration when we come to the discussion of the origin and the rise of the idea of Sheol.

#74. Amos and Hosea, I.C.C. p.10 f.
 #76. Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.57.

#75. Eschat. p.32.

Disposal of the dead by burning.

Embalming, as we have already remarked, was never a general *mode* of disposing of the dead among the Hebrews. This practice is peculiar to Egypt, and is not to be found in either Babylonia or Assyria. (#77) The infrequent mention of the practice in the O.T. may, therefore, be attributed to Egyptian influence entirely.

Burning also, though more frequently encountered in the O.T. history, is likewise a practice which seldom gained great favor or popularity. (#78) Burning was almost entirely restricted to criminals, and was considered a disgrace, as were stoning and hanging. (Cf. Lev.xx,14; xxi,9.) It is even doubtful whether the law of burning, as a death penalty, was ever fully enforced, for even as late as the Tannaitic times we find the Hebrews employing subterfuges in cases of criminals who were condemned by the law to death by burning. (Cf. San.ii,2.)

The fact seems to be that there was a well defined feeling of opposition to the burning of the body whether dead or alive.

It will be remarked, perhaps, that in 1 Sam.xxxi,11-13, we have a well-authenticated case of burning, for we are told that after recovering the bodies of Saul and his sons from the Philistines, the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead burn them. That this procedure was unusual no one who is familiar with O.T. history will deny. It could, of course, have taken place only under pressure of the greatest necessity. Bennett ventures the opinion that this was done to prevent the bodies from falling into the hands of the Philistines. (#79) Wm.R.Smith is of the same opinion. "Saul's body", he says, "was burned possibly to save it from the risk of exhumation by the Philistines...." (#80)

#77. Cf. Jastrow, Rel. Beliefs, p.362; Rel. of Baby. and Assyr. p.596. #78. In ancient Greece the opposite was the case. At one time cremation was the rule, as it was believed that the soul was thus definitely freed from the body and thus the living were relieved from the fear of the return of the spirit of the dead to torment them. Cf. Rohde, psyche, Vol.i, pp.228 ff. In Babylonia, however, according to Jastrow, the dead were always buried, never cremated. Cf. Jastrow, Rel. of Baby. and Assyr. p.596 f.

#79. Cf. Art. Death, Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth.

#80. Rel. of the Sem. p.353, note 3.

This view, however, seems hardly reasonable, since the Philistines had already had the bodies in their possession and had subjected them to all the indignities possible, having removed the armor and cut off the heads and exposed the bodies to the public view upon the walls of their city (1 Sam. xxxi, 9-10.) It is highly improbable that, after having vented their spleen to this extent, the Philistines would still seek to disturb the bodies after their interment. But even so, what was to prevent them, if they so desired, from exhuming the bones, which, we are told (v. 13) were buried under the sacred tamarisk at Jabesh? But if the bones were buried, how then could the bodies have been burnt? It is possible that the bodies were only partially burnt, so that the bones remained intact, the latter then being buried. There is, however, so far as we can learn, nothing in the O.T. to justify this conjecture. A partial burning may or may not have taken place, but a complete burning could not have taken place in any case, and the fact that 1 Chron. x, 12 omits any mention of burning, while Josephus states that the bodies were buried would seem to verify us in this opinion. (#81)

But can the same thing be said in regard to Amos vi, 10, where it is said of those that died of the plague that "one's uncle, even his brother (יָדָא) shall take him up to bring out the body from his house". Wm. R. Smith believes that this can be understood by comparing it with Lev. xx, 14; xxi, 9 and Amos ii, 1, "and remembering that plague was a special mark of divine wrath (2 Sam. xxiv), so that its victims might well be regarded as intensely taboo". (#82) Here too, we must differ with Smith, because, as Harper so conclusively points out, "the reference is not....to the burning of the body, but to the burning of spices in honor of the dead". (#83) Cf. Jer. xxxiv, 5, and especially 2 Chr. xvi, 14 and xxi, 19 b.

#81. Antiq. VI, xiv, 8. #82. Rel. of the Sem. p. 353, note 3.

#83. Amos and Hosea, I.C.C. p. 154.

There is found another reference to burning, namely, Jos.vii, 25 f., where we are told that for his sin Achan suffered both stoning and burning. But the language is odd. We read, "All Israel stoned him with stones and burned them with fire (and again) and stoned them with stones, and they raised over him a great heap of stones...." (#84) There is a very strong indication here that Achan was not burnt at all (the burning and the second stoning having been inserted or added by a scribe or later redactor out of excess of religious (?) zeal) for we read that "they raised over him a great heap of stones", thus showing that he could not have been burnt. We know too that the erection of a heap of stones was the accompaniment of burial and not burning (Cf. 2 Sam.xviii,17.)

It is thus highly probable that the actual burning of the bodies, or, at least, of the bones, was seldom, if ever, practiced by the Hebrews in Biblical times. Even the burning of children to the God Moloch, which practice is so vigorously denounced (2 Ki.xxiii,10; Jer.xxxii,35; Lev.xviii,21; xx,2,3,4), and which undoubtedly dates back to the early primitive practice of sacrificing the first-born, came later on to be merely a symbolic practice in which the child was merely passed through the flame, as the phrase " לִפְנֵי הָאֵשׁ " would signify. (#85)

#84. Schwally remarks (Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.24) that "otham" may refer to the possessions of Achan, which at his death were buried, a reference to a practice, which, he believes, was common in ancient times. The same conclusion, he thinks, may be drawn from the phrase "with all that appertaineth unto them", (Nu.xvi,30). We believe, however, that this is far-fetched.

#85. Concerning this phrase, Morgenstern says, (Paper, Bones of the Paschal lamb) that literally it would seem "to indicate that the sacrifice was not actually consumed in fire, but was merely made to pass through, presumably unharmed. In other words, the act of sacrifice was merely symbolized rather than actually fulfilled. But numerous references to the actual burning prove conclusively that the children were actually burned. The phrase " לִפְנֵי הָאֵשׁ " can therefore at best be merely a euphemistic expression for sacrifice by burning. At the same time the literal basis of the expression can be readily discerned in the conception that these firstborn children and the firstlings were not actually destroyed; they merely passed through the fire, where the bodies were consumed, but the soul and the life continued unharmed, to live again in the next offspring. At a considerably later period, when actual child-sacrifice had long since been completely outgrown, the expression " לִפְנֵי הָאֵשׁ " came to be literally interpreted, as a quick leaping or passing through the fire. Undoubtedly, the almost universal conception of fire as a means of purification contributed much to this latest practice. Thus Theodoret (Quest. 47 in reg.) relates that once a year it was customary to erect pyres in the streets, through which men and boys sprang, while little children were carried through by their mothers. This was for the sake of purification. Similar practices are reported by Procopius of Gaza, and by modern/recent travelers."

With what horror this practice of burning the body, and especially the bones, was viewed, may be gathered from Amos ii,1, where the prophet curses Moab with inevitable doom "because he burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime". Concerning this passage Schwally remarks, "The abomination of this proceeding is to be seen in the fact that according to prevailing beliefs of the time terrible consequences would ensue as regarded the life of the individual in Hades....A dead person without a grave was like a living man without a house". (#86) To our mind, however, Schwally seems to have missed the point. If we compare this passage with 2 Ki.xxiii,18, we are at once impressed with the fact that there was a great respect showed for the bones of the dead. Only in the case of the wicked was this respect for the bones lacking. (Cf. 2 Ki.xxiii,18; Ps.Lxxix,2-3; Ezek.xxix,5; Jer.ix,22; xvi,4; xvi,6; xxii,19; xxv,33; 2 Ki.ix,10; Is.xiv,19-20.) It will be noted that in every one of these passages cited the threat of non-burial is made as a punishment for the sins of the individual. The terrible thing, however, is not so much the lack of burial, which to the Hebrew mind was bad enough, but the fact that the bones might be scattered and destroyed. This was the great calamity which was always understood to be the concomitant of non-burial, and it was for this reason and this reason only, that the lack of burial took on such awful consequences in their minds. We understand now why it was necessary that every bone receive burial (Ezek.xxxix,15). It was because of the belief in the resurrection of the body and the reincarnation of the soul in the new body which the primitive Semites must have held. Long afterward, in Biblical times, the belief had vanished, or left only faint traces, but the horror of non-burial remained. The basis for our assumption that the primitive Semites entertained such a theory of reincarnation of the soul will be furnished in a later paragraph.

Burial Customs.

There still remain several customs connected with the disposal of the dead which it may be well to mention here. One of these is the closing of the eyes of the dead, mentioned in Gen.

xLvi,4. (#87) Although no mention is made in the O.T. of the practice of closing the mouth of the dead, there is no doubt that the practice was observed, as mention of it is found in the Mishna. (#88) "These practices", says Schwally, "could have no other purpose except to make the appearance of the dead as much as possible like that of the living, i.e. as of people asleep". (#89) Mention is also made of kissing the dead (Gen.L, 1.) Whether this was prompted by filial love and respect or by some other motive we are unable to say. (cf. 1 Ki.xix,18; Hos. xiii,2.) The N.T. frequently speaks of washing the corpse and binding it in a linen cloth (Mk.xv,46; xvi,1), but upon these subjects the O.T. is silent. The appearance of samuel, however, when he was summoned by saul (1 sam.xxviii) would incline us to the opinion that the dead were buried in the garments they wore when alive. (Cf. Isai.xiv; Ezek.xxxii,17.) After the body was prepared for interment, its final resting place was filled with spices and various perfumes (2 Chr.xvi,14; xxi,19. Cf. also John xix,40; Mt.xxvii,59; Lk.xxiii,53.) Schwally is of the opinion that spices and aromatics have frequently the character of an offering to the dead (Jer.xxxiv,5, where the burning referred to is that of spices.) (#90) Only one mention is made in the O. T. of the use of the coffin, and that is in the case of Joseph whose remains were placed in the "aron" (Gen.L,26.) But this, like embalming, may have been an Egyptian practice. The O.T. does, however, make mention of the "mittah" (bier) upon which the dead were placed and carried to the grave (2 Sam. iii,31. Cf. also Lk.vii,14.) Burial on the same day, or within twenty-four hours, was necessary in palestine on account of the exigencies of the climate. This probably explains why the O.T. demands the burial of criminals on the day they are put to death.

#87. Classical examples of this practice in Greece are found in Homer, Iliad, xi,453; Od.xi,426; xxiv,296; Eurip. Phoen. 1451 f.; Hec. 430; Virg. Aen.ix,487. Cf. also Jub. 23 beg.)
 #88. Shab. 23,5; Ebel rabbati I par.2. Cf. also John ix,44.)
 #89. Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.8.
 #90. Ibid. p.24. Cf. also Isai.xxxiv,5; Jos. Antiq. XVII,viii,3. Jeremias tells us that from the ancient Babylonian inscriptions in the conclusion of "The descent of Ishtar" we learn that drink-offerings were brought to the manes of the dead, and that the death-bed was provided with spices. Cf. Leben nach dem Tode, p.52 f.

Mourning Customs.

There is still another class of customs which it were well not to omit, the mourning customs of ancient Israel, for an investigation of these may disclose some interesting facts that will throw some additional light upon the Hebrew conception of the soul. The explanation of the origin of mourning customs is no easy matter, and it is hazardous to attempt to find a single explanation for all of them. Most scholars agree, however, that we are not to suppose that all mourning customs are based upon sentiment, if, indeed, any of them were so based originally. Schwally offers a theory that most mourning customs arose out of a deep respect for the power of the dead. He says, "A reverence is shown to the dead, such as the living never receive", a fact that can only be explained when we understand "that the deceased is not dead like a block or a stone, but though dead is still possessed of a certain life. But not only this. This life must be thought powerful enough, in the opinion of the survivors, either to help or to harm them". (#91) Another writer says, "Hitherto no people has been met with which does not believe in the existence and the survival of human souls, which does not admit the possibility of their intervention in the affairs of the living, and which does not seek to enter into relations with them by processes which are everywhere clearly analogous--either by offering to them anything of which they were fond during their life-time, or by applying to them the methods resorted to by sorcery in order to avert or to control superhuman powers". (#92) Charles believes also that the primitive mourning usages in Israel "indicate reverence for the dead and the confession of dependence upon them". (#93) Frazer quotes numerous instances of this fear of the dead among primitive peoples. (#94) "The Narrinyeri" (an Australian tribe) he says, "indulge in extravagant demonstrations of grief at the death of their kinsfolks... Yet Mr. Taplin was persuaded 'that fear has more to do with most of these exhibitions than grief'". It is this fact, that the dead continue to exert an influence over the lives of the living, which undoubtedly forms the basis for many of the mourning rites of the ancient Israelites.

#91. Das Leben nach dem Tode, p.19. #92. Art. Animism, Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth. Vol.1, p.536. #93. Eschat. p.28.
 #94. Belief in Immort. p.152, 172 f. Perils of the Soul, p.90, 145, 350 ff. #95. Bel. in Immort. p.135.

The manifestations of grief in the event of death take on various forms in the O.T. (#96) There is the practice of tearing one's garment (2 Sam.i,11-12; iii,27 f; Ezra ix,3; 2 Ki.v,8; Job i,20); putting earth upon the head (2 Sam.i,2); sprinkling ashes upon the head (2 Sam.xiii,18; Est.iv,1); girding oneself in sackcloth (Ezek.vii,18; 2 Sam.iii,31; Lam.ii,10; 1 Ki.xx,31-32; xxi,27; Isai.iii,24; xv,3; xxii,12; Joel i,8; Jer.vi,26; iv,8; xlix,3); placing it upon the loins (Gen.xxxvii,34; Amos viii,10; Jer.xlviii,37; Isai.xx,2; 1 Ki.xx,31); putting off the shoes (2 Sam.xv,30; Ezek.xxiv,17); cutting off the hair or shaving the head (Job i,20; Isai.xxii,12; Jer.xvi,6; Amos viii,10; Mic.i,16; Ezek.vii,18; xxvii,31); and casting it to the ground (Jer.vii,29); cutting off the beard (Jer.xli,5); both the hair and the beard (Isai.xv,2-3; Jer.xlviii,37; Ezra ix,3); making oneself bald between the eyes (Deut.xiv,1-2); making cuttings in the flesh (Deut.xiv,1; Lev.xix,28; 1 Ki.xviii,28; Jer.xvi,6; xli,5); covering the head (2 Sam.xv,30; Est.vi,12; Jer.xiv,3); making a funeral feast (Hos.ix,4; 2 Sam.iii,35; Jer.xvi,7); fasting (1 Sam.xxxi,13); beating the breast (Isai.xxxi,12); sitting in ashes (Ezek.xxvii,31; Job ii,8; Jon.iii,6); sitting on the ground (Lam.ii,10); lying on the ground (2 Sam.xii,16; xiii,31); covering the lip (Ezek.xxiv,17; Mic.iii,7; Lev.xiii,45); giving one the cup of consolation for father or mother (Jer.xvi,7); putting ropes upon the head (1 Ki.xx,31-32); weeping and wailing for the dead (2 Sam. iii,31-35; Ezek.xxvii,31; Jer.xvi,5-7); sitting silent upon the ground (Job i,20; Ezra ix,3); mourning for a period of seven days (1 Sam.xxxi,13; 1 Chr.x,12; Gen.L,10; Judith xvi,24; Sira xxii,12); for thirty days (Nu.xx,29; Deut.xxxiv,8); for four days (Ju.xi,40); a widow wears mourning garments (Gen. xxxviii,4; Judith x,3); a *maçceba* is erected for the dead (Gen. xxxv,20; 2 Sam.xviii,18); placing the hand on the head (2 Sam. xiii,18 f; Jer.ii,37).

#96. Cf. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p.9 ff.; Charles, *Eschat.* pp.28-31; Bennett, *Art. Death and the Disposal of the Dead*, *Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Eth.*

LIFE AFTER DEATH.

Total Extinction of the Personality Unknown in the O.T.

Unlike the Buddhistic idea of Nirvana, an idea of the total extinction or absorption into the divine spirit of all the souls of the dead, the Hebrew conception of life after death is based upon the doctrine that some part of the personality is indestructible and continues its existence apart from the body which is subject to corruption and decay. In connection with the Hebrews' views of life after death Davidson remarks, "...this is certain, that there was a belief in the continued existence of the person. Death puts an end to the existence of no person".

(#97) Nowhere in the O.T. is the total extinction of the personality indicated (unless perhaps, it is implied in the threat of "carath", which is doubtful. Cf. Gen.xvii,14; Lev.vii,20,21,25,27; Nu.ix,13; etc.) The doctrine of the continuation of the existence of the personality (it was never referred to as "soul" or "spirit" in Sheol) was not only a common Semitic belief, but was also entertained by the Egyptians, the Chinese and the Indo-European people. The fact that it was so wide-spread would indicate its great age, and points to a primitive origin. In this connection Gastrow points out that, "Man, in the earlier stages of his development, is unable to conceive of life, once begun, as coming to an end...The doubt comes at a later stage of mental development". (#98) It was this belief that, despite the dissolution of the body, the personality continued to exist which gave rise to the conception of a life after death in Sheol.

The Origin of the Idea of Sheol.

"In all probability", says Charles, "Sheol was originally conceived as a combination of the graves of the clan or nation, and as thus its final abode. In due course this conception was naturally extended till it embraced the departed of all nations, and thus became the final abode of all mankind, good and bad alike". (#99) Burial in the family grave, we have noted above,

#97. The Theol. of the O.T. p.428. #98. Rel. beliefs of Baby. and Assy. p.351. #99. Eschat. p.53. Cf. also Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode, pp.59-63. The etymological derivation of "Sheol" is still uncertain. Some would derive it from *shaw* to ask, and hence a place of inquiry in connection with the

proceeded from the desire of the departed to continue their existence after bodily death in the company of their ancestors, that is, among their own kinsmen. Sheol was the place where the departed could enjoy such a community of interests. If the departed spirit or shade was to enjoy a kind of continued existence it was to his interest to see to it that his life in the next world be as pleasant and as comfortable as he could make it. Isolation from the clan or the tribe was one of the greatest misfortunes of the living. According to primitive logic the isolation of the departed must also be viewed as a misfortune. Therefore, since the wish was father to the thought, the idea of Sheol, the common resting-place of the departed, was evolved. Once the idea of a common resting-place for the departed ancestors took root, it took no great stretch of the primitive imagination to conceive of a common abode, first, for the tribe, then for the nation, and ultimately for all mankind. Schwally suggests that the unification of the Israelitish tribes into a people brought with it the idea of the unification of the dead who "could not be neglected in this wider social relation". (#100) Since the family burial-place was inadequate for this wider unification another place had to be provided where all the dead generations could dwell together. This place was called Sheol. When and where this idea was first evolved is impossible to say. The striking similarity between the Hebrew and the Babylonian-Assyrian conceptions of the netherworld, as Jastrow points out (#101), would lead us to believe that the Israelitish tribes brought these ideas with them in a more or less complete state of development when they entered Canaan. To penetrate deeper into their origin would require a study of the religion of ancient Babylon and Assyria.

practice of consulting the dead in necromancy. Cf. Jastrow. Dillman, however, believes the root to be *h y w* to be hollow; hence a hollow place, *Hölle*, hell. Still others would derive the word from the Assyrian *su-alu*. Thus Delitzsch and Jeremias. Kautzsch suggests that the root may be "shl", which includes the notions of wide-gaping and deep-sinking. All these suggestions, however, are mere conjectures as the lack of unanimity of opinion among the scholars would testify. For further suggestions consult B.D.B. Biblical Dict. #100. *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p.59. #101. *Rel. of Baby. and Assy.* p.606 ff.

It is not difficult to understand that although the early ideas of Sheol and the grave were originally closely related, in the course of time they came to designate two very distinct things. The grave contained only the dead corpse. Life was extinct. But in Sheol the personality still ~~to~~ continued a sort of shadowy existence. The dissimilarity was great and, as time passed, grew more and more so. Yet for a long time both ideas continued to prevail side by side, so that while we find in Ezek. xxxii that Sheol is the abode of all the departed of the world, in Isai. xv, 9 the dead are found in the graves of Sheol. (Cf. also Ezek. xxxvii, 12; Ps. xlix, 12; Ec. xii, 5; Tob. iii, 6.)

The Shades.

We have several times called attention to the fact that the departed are never referred to as "spirits" or "souls" in Sheol, except in Job xiv, 22 which is late. (#102) What is the reason for this? It cannot be that this practice of the O.T. writers is accidental and without meaning. It points undeniably to the ancient belief that the vital spirit, be it known as "ruah", "rephesh", or "n'shamah", returns to God who gave it, while the residue, or that something which is left, goes to Sheol. (The body, of course, is placed in the ground, and ultimately returns to dust.) Evidently, the personality of man is composed of some other element which hitherto we have not noticed. What is the nature of this element which makes its abode in Sheol after the bodily death of the man? The O.T. gives us little or no information regarding this subject, but if we were to make a conjecture we would say that the name "rephaim" which is sometimes applied to the inhabitants of Sheol, throws some light upon this obscure point. The word occurs eight times in this connection. (Job xxvi, 5; Isai. xiv, 9; xxvi, 14; xxvi, 19; Ps. lxxxviii, 11; Pro. ii, 18; xix, 18; xxi, 16.) It always refers to the shades, the ghosts of the dead. They possess only a weak existence, a shadowy reflection of their former life. The word is also found in Phoenician, in the Tabnith Inscription, c. 300 B.C. "Mayest thou have no seed among the living under the sun, nor resting-place with the "shades". The word is popularly derived from ~~797~~ to be weak, and hence has come to mean the weak or the enfeebled. This etymology, however, is uncertain. (#103)

#102. Cf. Charles, Eschat. p. 48.

#103. Schwally has suggested that there may be some etymological connection with the gentilic name "Rephaim", Deut. ii, 11.

Nevertheless, judged from the context in those passages where it occurs, its meaning is plain. The "rephaim" are shades, shadowy beings, or simply, just shadows. Is it possible perhaps to identify these shadows of the underworld with the shadow-souls of primitive peoples? (#104) The shadow-soul, we know, held a very important place in the polypsychic systems of early man. According to these beliefs every human being was possessed of two or more souls. Thus, according to Toy, "the Fijians, the Algonkins, the varens recognize two souls; the Malagasy, the Dahomi, and the Ashanti three; the Congoans, three or four, the Chinese three, the Dakotas four, the Malays (of the peninsula) seven". (#105) These souls have different functions and are differently named. Thus there is the vital-soul, or the principle of life; the dream-soul, which wanders abroad when the individual is asleep; the shadow-soul, which accompanies the individual by day, etc. etc. Toy remarks that "In the higher ancient religions there are only more or less obscure indications of an earlier polypsychic system". (#106) As an example we have the distinction made by the Egyptians between the soul (bai), the shadow (haibet) and the double (ka). The Semitic "nafs" and "ruh" may likewise, he suggests, be of similar origin. If this be true are we then not justified in seeking the Semitic or Hebrew equivalent of the shadow-soul? Etymologically we must exclude both "ruah" and "nephesh", as well as "n'shamah". "Rephaim", however, doubtful as its etymology may be, appears to fulfill all the conditions. It may be that in "rephaim" we have a trace of the ancient Semitic, or perhaps Phoenician system of polypsychism, not in its original form, but a trace nevertheless. If our conjecture be correct, then we have found what really goes to Sheol, namely the shadow, but not the soul proper, which upon the dissolution of the body returns to its maker. This would explain why the writers of the O.T. never refer to the inhabitants of Sheol as "souls" or "spirits".

#104. Cf. Frazer, *Gold. Bough*. Tylor, *prim. Cult.*

#105. *Intro. to the Hist. of Rel.* p. 20.

#106. *Ibid.*

Biblical Conceptions of Sheol.

The conceptions of Sheol found in the O.T. do not form a harmonious and correlated whole, but are confusing and contradictory in the extreme. The ideas which prevailed in early Israel concerning Sheol came perhaps from the Canaanites, or from the Babylonians, and were connected intimately with necromancy. For this reason, there was for a long time after Yahwism had made its appearance, a great opposition to the prevailing beliefs, and an attempt was made to discourage the continuance of these superstitious survivals of animism. Since, however, no adequate substitute had yet been worked out to take the place of these early beliefs great confusion ensued. As Charles has pointed out, "Early Yahwism had no eschatology of the individual, and concerned itself only with the existence of the nation. Thus the individual was left to his hereditary heathen beliefs, and these can best be interpreted as part and parcel of Ancestor Worship." (#107) The careful student may succeed, no doubt, in separating the early animistic survivals from the later conceptions which gradually took their place. To a large extent this work has already been done by Charles in his "Eschatology".

Sheol is frequently conceived of as a fortified city, protected by walls, through which barred and bolted gates and doors give entrance to the dead. (Cf. Jon. ii, 7; Job xvi, 16; Isai. xxxviii, 10; Ps. ix, 14; cvii, 18; Job xxxviii, 18. Cf. also Ps. of Sol. xvi, 2; Wis. xvi, 13; Mt. xvi, 18.) It is a place of dust. (Cf. Ps. xxii, 16, 30; Dan. xii, 2; Job vii, 21; xvii, 16.) It is a place of dense darkness (Job x, 21-22), a place of graves (Ezek. xxxii), a land of disorder (Job x, 22). It has separate chambers, *חֲבוּתִים* (Pro. vii, 27), and divisions *חֲבוּתִים* (Ez. xxxii, 23). It contains valleys or depths *סִדְדֵי* (Pro. ix, 16).

Sheol is known by a variety of names. Among these *חֲבוּתִים* pit is very common, although it occurs only in the later literature as a synonym for Sheol. (Cf. Ezek. xvi, 20; xxviii, 8; xxxi, 14, 16; xxxii, 18, 23; Lam. iii, 53, 55; Isai. xiv, 15, 19; xxxviii, 8; Prov. i, 2; xxviii, 17; Ps. xxviii, 1; cxliii, 7; xxx, 4; Lxxxviii, 5, 7; xL, 3; xLix, 10; xvi, 10; Lv, 2; ciii, 4, 11; xxviii, 1; xxx, 10.) Other

names are: **אֲבַדּוֹן** ABADDON (Pro.xv,11; xxvii,20; Job xxxvi,6; xxxviii,22; xxxi,12; Ps.Lxxxviii,12.); **שַׁחַת** SHACHATH (Isai. xxxviii,17; Job xxxiii,34; Ps.xvi,10; xlix,10.); **בֵּית עוֹלָם** AN ETERNAL HOUSE (Ec.xii,5); **בֵּית מוֹעֵד לְכָל הַחַיִּים** AN ASSEMBLY HOUSE FOR ALL THE LIVING (Job xxx,23.) (#108) In Ps.Lxxxviii,12-13 the realm of the dead is described in four synonymous terms: (1) the grave, (2) Abaddon, (3) the Dark Place, and (4) the Land of Forgetfulness.

Very frequently Sheol is spoken of in personified form. Thus we read of **יַד שְׁאוֹל**, the hand of Sheol, that draws men thither (Eos.xiii,14; Ps.Lxxxix,49; Isai.v,14; xiv,9.) In Isai.xxviii, 18 Sheol is represented as a person with whom one makes a covenant; in Isai.xiv,9-11, as a person who has all the dead under his control. Again, as a hunter who snares the living (Ps.xviii, 6; cxvi,3). Sometimes Sheol is represented as a monster. In Jon.ii,3 it is represented as a monster with a belly **בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל**. Elsewhere as a greedy monster (Hab.ii,5; Isai.v,14; Pro.i,12; xxvii,20; xxx,15f.; Cant.viii,6; Ps.Lix,16.)

The exact location of Sheol is not stated. It is generally conceived of as somewhere in the bowels of the earth, a place to which one must descend to reach it, (Ezek.xxvi,20; xxxi,14,15, 16,17,18; xxxii,19,20,21,29,30; Nu.xvi,33; Ezek.xxxviii,8; Ps.xxx, 10; Lv,16; Lxxxviii,5; cvii,23; xxviii,1; cxliii,7; xxx,4; Isai. xiv,19; xxxviii,18) somewhere in the depths of the earth (Nu. xvi,30; Isai.v,14; Gen.xxxvii,35; Isai.vii,11; Lvi,9; xiv,9,11; Job xi,8.) It is deep as the foundations of the mountains (Deut. xxxii,22; Jon.ii,7.) It lies beneath the waters (Ezek.xxvi,20; Job xxxvi,5-6.) It is in the utmost depths **תְּהוֹמוֹת תְּהוֹמִים** (Ps.Lxxxviii,7; Lam.iii,25; Ps.Lxxxvi,13; Deut.xxxii,22) or **אֶרֶץ תְּהוֹמוֹת** (Ezek.xxxi,14) or in the **אֶרֶץ תְּהוֹמוֹת** (Ezek. xxvi,20; xxxii,16,24; Isai. xlii,23; Ps.Lxiii,10; cxxxix,15.)

Life in Sheol, as we have already stated, is a shadowy replica of life on earth. The shades, according to one representation, lead a weak, inanimate kind of existence, without mundane power or significance, (Isai.xiv,9; xxvi,14,19; Ps.Lxxxviii,5) without occupation, (Ec.ix,10) where the pious are unable to render (rit-

#108. The dead were all supposed to descend into Sheol, whether they had received burial or not. This we learn from the words of Samuel to Saul (1 Sam.xxviii,19) "In the morning you and your sons will be with me", i.e. in Sheol.

ual) praise to God, (Isai.xxxviii,18; Ps.vi,6; Lxxxviii,11) in a sad and hopeless condition (2 Sam.xiv,14; Isai.xxxviii,18), where the good and the bad are powerless being without skill or energy, and doomed to spend eternity (Job xiv,7-12), in impenetrable darkness (Ps.xlix,20; Lxxxviii,13; cxliii,3; Job x,22; xvii,13 f.; Lam.iii,6), from whence none ever returns (Job vii,9-10), an unmeasurable cave (Ps.Lxxxviii,7), where eternal silence reigns (Job iii,13-19) and the inhabitants sleep forever (Jer.Li,39.)

But according to some of the earlier accounts the shades of the dead are endowed with considerable life and power (Isai.xiv.) That they possess a certain power and influence in the affairs of the living would seem to follow from the fact that Saul consults the shade of Samuel when all other means fail him in the attempt to determine future events (1 Sam.xxviii,13 f. Cf. also Isai.viii,19; xxix,4). Because of the knowledge which the dead were supposed to possess they were called **יְדוּעִים** "knowing ones" (Lev.xix,31; xx,6; Isai.xix,3). The dead are believed to be further possessed of supernatural power, such as Yahweh himself possesses, and hence are referred to as **אֱלֹהִים** Elohim (1 Sam.xxviii,13). (#109) Upon this belief was based the practice of incubation (Isai.lxxv,4; perhaps 1 Ki.xix,5). Another indication that the dead share in the pleasures and sorrows of their descendants, according to Schwally, is the reference to Rachael lamenting for her children who are dead (Jer.xciii,15). (#110) According to 1 Sam. xxviii,15, the dead are at rest and prefer to remain so, except when they are summoned to earth by the living, or when, on rare occasions, they rouse themselves to greet some new-comer with malicious joy at his becoming as weak (**חַלְשִׁים**) as they (Isai.xiv,9.)

As yet there are no moral distinctions in Sheol, only social and ritual ones. The uncircumcised and those who descend without proper ritual burial are assigned to the remote corners of Sheol (Ezek.xxxii,18-32; Isai.xiv,25). Kings and warriors are

#109. Cf. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p.66; Charles, *Eschat.* p.23. #110. *Ibid.* p.68. Cf. similar ideas among the Greeks, Charles, *Eschat.* p.40, note.

given the choice positions, each surrounded by his servants and followers (Isai.xiv,9). Each people has an abode to itself. Around the grave of the chief or the prince the grave of the masses are gathered (Ezek.xxxii,17-32). According to this view Sheol is a vast burying place, deep in the earth and full of graves. This confusion in ideas can be easily accounted for, as was pointed out above.

The appearance of the shades in Sheol, we ~~infer~~^{infer} from the name "rephaim", was the shadowy reflection of their former selves. From the words of Jacob (Gen.xxxvii,35) "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning", we may infer that the shade was believed to appear in Sheol in the condition in which he left the world. Again, the action of Abimelech (Jud.ix,54) is only to be explained on the ground that the dead in Sheol were believed to continue their existence in the same manner in which they left the earth. To have gone to his death at the hand of a woman would mean to Abimelech that he must bear eternal disgrace. Further, the shade of samuel (1 sam.xxviii,14) takes on the form of an old man wrapped in a mantle, such as he, no doubt, wore in his life-time. The shades of the departed, then, were the shadow-duplicates of the living at the moment of their death. (#111) The passages in 1 Ki.ii,6,9, no doubt, reflect the same ideas. Accordingly, we find that all the forms and customs of the living are reproduced in shadow-form in Sheol. The prophet, as we have seen is known by his mantle; kings are recognized by their thrones and their crowns; the uncircumcised are distinguished by their foreskins (Ezek.32); each nation is marked off from the rest by its individual dress and customs (Ezek.xxxii); those slain by the sword, or in some violent manner are made known by their wounds (Ezek.xxxii,25); those who died from grief are recognized by their features (Gen.xxxvii,35); while the bride and the bride-groom are easily distinguished by reason of their wedding array (Isai.Lxi,10).

#111. The fact that the shade of samuel is visible only to the witch is of the highest importance, for it shows us how closely related were the early views of Sheol with the practices of necromancy.

That the shades were believed to possess the power of speech is also to be inferred, not only from the account in Sam. (1 Sam xxviii) but also from Isai. viii, 19; xix, 3 and xxix, 4, where the spirits of the dead are said to "chirp and mutter", and the voice is low and whispering.

God's Power in Sheol.

We have already noted the difference between the early animistic views and the later prophetic views regarding Sheol. The former regard the dead as possessed of considerable life, knowledge and power, with a lively interest in the affairs of the living, whom upon urging, they are able to aid or advise. According to later Yahwistic views, however, the dead are denied any life, power or knowledge of the affairs of the living (Job xiv, 21.) What brought about this radical change? Charles asserts that it was the logical consequence that was to be expected from the prophetic conception of the creation of man as detailed in Gen. ii, 1-iii, wherein "the material form when animated by the spirit became a living soul". In conformity with this view the soul (nephesh) "is the result of the indwelling of the spirit (ruah), and has no independent existence of its own". Therefore, when death ensues, the spirit (ruah) returns to God (Eccl. xii, 7) while the soul (nephesh), or that which remains, a mere negative something, all faculties suspended, goes to Sheol, to lead there an absolutely colorless existence, without life, power or knowledge of any kind. It continues a sort of subsistence, though it cannot rightly be said to exist. According to the earlier animistic views, spirit and soul are identical, at least, so far as we are able to determine, but according to the later views "they differ alike in essence, in origin and in function". (#112)

This remarkable development is concomitant with the growth of Yahwism and parallels the growing power of Yahweh over Sheol. In the early beliefs Sheol was outside the power of Yahweh entirely, but in the later prophetic teachings Yahweh's power is ubiquitous, in Sheol as well as elsewhere. This too must have taken centuries, and the confusion resulting from the mingling of the two beliefs is very great. Sometimes both views are found, even in the same writer.

The old view stands out plainly in pro.ii,18: Sheol is here represented as being outside the jurisdiction of yahweh. He no longer takes account of the individual here because death takes man out of his power. Sheol, moreover, is not a place of punishment, which it later became. The punishment spoken of here is the premature and unhappy death, for such, it was believed was the retribution of the wicked (Pro.xxix,1; Ps.ix,18; x,27), while the good were rewarded with long life and prosperity (Ps.iii,16). Following is a list of passages which further show the old views of God's powerlessness in Sheol: Isai.xxxviii,18; Pro.i,18; Jon.ii,5; Ps.Lxxxix,49; vi,6. Note now the changed attitude in the following passages in which God's power is conceived of as extending out even over Sheol: Job xxvi,6; 1 sam. ii,6; Ps.xxx,4; Lxxi,20; cxxxix,8; Amos ix,2; Job x,28; ps. Lxxxviii,10-11; Job xi,8; Ps.Lxxxvi,13; Deut.xxxii,22; Job xiv,13; xiv,21; 1 Ki.xvii,22; 2 Ki.iv,36; xiii,21..

Note. The similarity between the early Israelitish and the ancient Babylonian conceptions of Sheol would lead us to suspect the existence of a god or pantheon of gods of the underworld, but no trace of such appears in the O.T.

EARLY BELIEF IN THE REINCARNATION OF THE SOUL.

We have already noted above the great importance attached to the proper burial of the body, and the care of and the solicitude for the bones of the dead. We further conjectured that this care and solicitude could betoken but one thing, viz. the early belief in the resurrection of the body and the reincarnation of the soul. That this was actually the case, i.e. that it was believed that the bones of the dead would be reclothed with flesh and re-inspired with the divine spirit, is attested to by Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, which though not to be taken literally (as it is intended here only in a national sense) presupposes, however, a common belief of the same kind, either in that age or the age preceding. Such metaphorical fancies must always have some basis of fact, and although Ezekiel himself need not have shared in this view of bodily resurrection, except in a national sense, he employs a well-known conception and makes a new use of it. The resurrection, or the rehabilitation of the dead was assuredly a belief of the Hebrews, in the light of which belief we shall be enabled to explain many things. It explains, for instance, the great repugnance of the time against burning the bodies whether dead or alive. Even criminals, as we have seen, were permitted burial for this reason. We can thus understand why it is highly improbable that the bodies of Achan and Saul were burned, and why Amos finds the burning of the bones of the King of Edom so utterly abominable. Only the enemies of Yahweh, those who had sinned beyond measure against the laws of humanity, deserve this everlasting punishment. Thus we find frequent threats of burning of the bones, often, indeed, of dead sinners (2 Ki. xxiii, 16; 1 Ki. xiii, 2). It may be that just because the idea was so fully understood and so prevalent in ancient Israel that so little is said concerning it in the O.T. But even so, traces of it crop out here and there, which afford verification for this hypothesis. One such instance is the prohibition against the breaking the bones of the Paschal Lamb.

Dr. Kaufman Kohler was the first to advance the hypothesis that this prohibition points to a belief in a subsequent resurrection of the body. (#113) Similar examples of the solicitude for the bones of the dead may be offered. According to the N.T. none of the bones of Jesus were injured, (John xix, 33-36). Frazer shows the practice to be widespread among primitive men. (#114) Dr. Kohler has pointed out still another instance of this practice (#115), the account in the Testament of Abraham, relating Abraham's reception of the three heavenly visitors. (#116) The text reads, "The flesh having been eaten, the calf arose again and sucked its mother in joy". Again, (#117) Dr. Kohler calls attention to the reference to Ezra's ass, the bones of which, after a hundred years, are reclothed with flesh and the body restored to life. (#118) A number of additional cases taken from Semitic life might be cited here. Lane, commenting upon the peculiar akikah-ceremony says, "The person should say on slaying the victim, 'God, verily this akikah is a ransom for my son, such a one; its blood for his blood and its flesh for his flesh, and its bone for his bone, and its skin for his skin and its hair for his hair. O God make it a ransom for my son from hell-fire'. A bone of the victim should not be broken". (#119) Curtiss likewise describes a festival of the Ismailiyah: "Am Heiligtum gibt es alljährlich ein Fest, wobei man Gelübde darbringt. Man muss sich dazu waschen und Festkleider anlegen. Man tanzt und singt zu Ehren des Weli, doch dürfen nur Männer und Frauen aus derselben Familie mit einander tanzen. Das Opfer für den Weli muss aus einem fehlerlosen, wenigstens ein Jahr alten Schafbock bestehen, dem aber kein Knochen gebrochen sein darf." (#120) A still more characteristic example is found in the Midrash, Ma'aseh 'al Dor Ha'asiri. (#121) Likewise one of the stories col-

-
- #113. Cf. Archiv. f. Relig. xiii, 153 f. #114. The Gold. Bq
Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, ii, 169-316. #115. Ibid.
#116. Recension A, Vi. edit. Barnes, 1892, p. 83. #117. J.Q.R.
V., p. 19. #118. Koran, Sure ii, 31 f. and note u.
#119. Arabian Nights, iv, p. 24. #120. 242, Germ. edit.
#121. Edit. by Kraus, in Haggoren, viii, 22.

lected by Prym and Socin (#122) tells how, after the hero had been dead for ten years, his widely scattered bones are collected by the wolves and sprinkled with the water of life by Ssimer, the great bird, that understood all the secrets of resurrection and eternal life, and the hero stood up once more as from a sleep. From the many examples collected by Frazer (op. cit.) a few may be adduced as typical. says Frazer, "With some savages a special reason for respecting the bones of game, and generally of animals which they eat, is a belief that, if the bones are preserved, they will in the course of time be reclothed with flesh, and thus the animal will come to life again. It is, therefore, clearly for the interest of the hunter to leave the bones intact, since to destroy them would be to diminish the supply of game. Many of the Minnetaree Indians 'believe that the bones of those bisons which they have slain and divested of flesh rise again clothed with renewed flesh, and quickened with life, and become fat and fit for slaughter the succeeding June'. Hence on the western prairies of America, the skulls of buffaloes may be seen arranged in circles and symmetrical piles, awaiting the resurrection. After feasting on a dog, the Dacotas carefully collect the bones, scrape, wash and bury them, 'partly, as it is said, to testify to the dog species, that in feasting on one of their number no disrespect was meant to the species itself, and partly also from the belief that the bones of the animal will rise and reproduce another'. Among the Esquimaux of Raffen Land and Hudson Bay, when a boy has killed his first seal, his mother gathers all the bones and throws them into a seal-hole. They think that these bones will become seals which the boy will catch in later life." Likewise the Indian tribes of the lower Frazer river, a main article of whose diet is fish, particularly salmon, believe that "the sockeye salmon must always be looked after carefully. Its bones have to be thrown into the river, after which the fish will revive and return to its chief in the west". Again Frazer remarks (#123), "We have already seen that

#122. Der neu-aramäische Dialekt des Tur'Abdin, i, p. 45, ii, 65.

#123. Op. cit. p. 259 f.

some rude races believe in a resurrection of men as well as of beasts, and it is quite natural that people who entertain such a belief should take care of the bones of their dead in order that the original owners of the bones may have them to hand at the critical moment. Hence in the Mexican territories of Guazacualco and Yluta, where the Indians thought that the dead would rise again, the bones of the departed were deposited in baskets and hung on trees, that their spirit might not be obliged to grub in the earth for them at the resurrection. On the other hand, the Luritcha tribe of Central Australia, who eat their enemies, takes steps to prevent their coming to life again, which might prove very inconvenient, by destroying the bones and especially the skulls of the bodies on which they have banqueted". Summing up Frazer says, "The objection commonly entertained by primitive peoples to break the bones of the animals which they have eaten or sacrificed may be based either on a belief in the resurrection of the animals, or on a fear of intimidating other creatures of the same species and offending the ghosts of the slain animals". Again, "The preceding review of customs observed by the savages for the conciliation and multiplication of animals which they hunt and kill, is fitted to impress us with a lively sense of the unquestioning faith which primitive man reposes in the immortality of the lower creatures. He appears to assume as an axiom too obvious to be disputed that beasts, birds and fishes have souls like his own, which survive the death of their bodies and can be reborn in other bodies to be killed again and eaten by the hunter. The whole series of customs described in the foregoing pages--customs which are apt to strike the civilized reader as quaint and absurd--rests on this fundamental assumption". (#124) One last example. Robinson relates that at Mt. Sinai the bodies of dead monks are laid on an iron grating until all the flesh is wasted away. Then they are buried for about three years, after which the bones are taken up, washed and placed in the great charnal house of

the convent. The skulls are cast upon an immense heap of skulls, while the remaining bones are piled neatly upon other heaps of leg bones, arm bones, ribs, etc. respectively. The purpose of this careful preservation of the bones can be no other than that of eventual resurrection, Morgenstern believes. (#125)

In consideration of this large mass of evidence there can be no doubt, therefore, that the prohibition of breaking the bones of the Paschal Lamb is the survival of a very ancient and very common primitive practice, a practice which is the outgrowth of the belief in the resurrection of the body and its corollary, the reincarnation of the soul. That this belief was held to apply to men and beasts alike is also highly probable, as is evidenced by the Vision of Ezekiel. Again, the great care which is to be taken of the blood (as containing the life or the soul) gives added support to this theory of the resurrection of the human body, for unless the spirit, or the soul, of the individual is likewise preserved, resurrection would be impossible, as there would be no animating spirit to restore the bones to their former state. We have thus a very potent reason why the blood of animals used in sacrifice, as also of animals slain in the hunt, such as the hart and the stag (Deut.xii) must be poured out upon the ground, for otherwise (should the blood be eaten or destroyed) the blood, and hence the life, or the soul, would have no opportunity to return to the deity and await the time of resurrection. This, as Frazer has already pointed out, would be calamitous for the primitive Semite, for it would deprive him of his future stock of animals for the hunt, and since he lived a nomad, pastoral life, dependent for the most part upon the produce of his sheep and cattle, it was to his interest to see that the number of his animals, both domestic and wild, remain undiminished, and thus secure for himself a stable food supply. Therefore he observed every precaution in his power, seeing to it that never, under any circumstance, was the blood eaten or drunk, or the bones injured, to the end that the animal might be ultimately restored to life.

#125. Researches in palestine, i, 99 f. For the collection of all these cases cited above I am greatly indebted to the kindness of Dr. Julian Morgenstern.

That this belief of the possible restoration of the body to life had its inception in the very earliest times is beyond question, for the O.T. (that is to say, at the very beginnings of literary activity) has already forgotten the original reason for abstaining from the blood, except that it is the seat of life, and that the eating thereof is prohibited by the deity, who will punish any violation. But the inference is clear, nevertheless, that originally the prohibition of eating the blood was prompted by an imaginary economic necessity, and further that it was believed that the number and the pre-existence of the souls of both animals and men had previously been determined by the deity. It was a matter of life and death, then, and one that demanded the most urgent caution, for unless such caution was scrupulously observed, there was great danger that the food supply would ultimately become exhausted and the world depopulated.

CONCLUSION.

This presentation of the idea of the soul in the O.T. is by no means as complete as it might be for it was the original intention of the writer to add a second part to this thesis, tracing the gradual development and growth of the idea of the soul from the earliest to the latest Biblical times. He found, however, that the task was a great deal more difficult than he had anticipated, and required a great deal more time and study than he was able to give to it. He trusts, however, that he will be able to complete the task in the not distant future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following works were consulted in the preparation of this thesis:

Art. Ancestor worship, Hastings Encyc. Religion and Ethics.

Charles, Eschatology.

Lang, Mythology, Ritual and Myth.

Frazer, The Golden Bough.

Tylor, Primitive Culture.

Bancroft, Native Races.

La Flesche, Journal of Folklore, Vol.I.

Spencer, Sociology; Principles of Sociology.

Arnett, Art. The Soul, Amer. Jour. of Psychology, Vol.XV.

Toy, Intro. to the History of Religion.

Kautzsch, Art. Religion of Israel, Hastings Dict. Bible, Vol.V.

Delitzsch, Biblical psychology.

Morgenstern, Paper, Bones of the Paschal Lamb, unpublished.

Kennedy, Lev. and Num., The New Cent. Bible.

Musil, Arabia Petraea.

Skinner, Gen. International Critical Commentary.

William R. Smith, Religion of the Semites.

Trumbull, The Blood Covenant.

Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode.

A. Wiedemann, The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality.

Morris Jastrow, Religion of Babylon and Assyria; Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria; Art. The Liver as the seat of the Soul, Studies in the History of Religions in volume presented to C.E. Toy.

Rohde, psyche.

Max Muller, Anthropological religion.

E.S. Hartland, Art. Death and Disposal of the Dead, Hastings Encyc. Religion and Ethics, Vol. IV.

Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt.

Jeremias, Leben nach dem Tode.

Harper, Amos and Hosea, Intern. Crit. Comm.

Josephus, Antiquities, VI.

Art. Animism, Hast. Encyc. Rel. and Ethics. Vol.I.

Davidson, The Theology of the O.T.