TOWARD A BIBLICAL VIEW OF MAN:

SOME READINGS

edited by

Dr. Arnold H. De Graaff
Dr. James H. Olthuis

INSTITUTE FOR CHRISTIAN STUDIES
Toronto, Ontario

1978 ✓

NEPHESH AND THE FULFILLMENT IT RECEIVES AS PSUCHE

by

Tory Hoff

General Outline

Introduction, p. 1
Common definition for soul; Greek influence; 20th-Century emphasis on the wholeness and unity of man; problem of interpreting nephesh in light of present-day views of soul; influence of cultural anthropology on early Biblical classics; synthetic thinking revealed in a 'grasping of a totality'.

Further assumptions, p. 6
Hebrews thought and lived in the concrete and not the abstract; linguistic unity and fluidity of nephesh; synthetic thinking of the Hebrews' perceived imagery associated with nephesh which created a 'theme' that was intrinsic to the meaning of nephesh.

Linguistic data, p. 11
Throat or neck as the organ through which nephesh breathed; Accadian and Ugaritic cognates; nephesh in the blood; questions on the nature of the association of nephesh to the throat, neck, breath, and blood.

Nephesh in the Old Testament, p. 13
A. thematic imagery: the threat of danger and the need for deliverance, p. 13
theme from an experiential viewpoint revealed emotional content in a peculiar context.
B. nature of man described in Gen. 2:7, p. 15
nephesh of a stranger and the implication; views of Pedersen, Johnson, and Wolff; nephesh and its particular status in creation.
C. nephesh dependent upon nourishment, especially food, p. 17
to afflict nephesh was to fast; emotional aspect in context of a 'nephesh experience'.
D. answer to questions on the relation of nephesh to body parts, p. 19
throat as the organ through which nephesh received vital nourishment and breathed neshamah and life-giving ruah; nephesh vulnerable at the neck; nephesh equated with the blood; sacred nephesh as the 'core' of human living.
E. nephesh and leb, p. 23
both desired yet not in the same way; wicked nephesh devoured.
F. nephesh and death, p. 25
death as the weakest form of life; rephaim dwelt in sheol but not nephesh; sheol and the sea; Jonah overboard; to die in honour or shame; nephesh ceased at death; corpse as nephesh could bring defilement; semantic polarization?
G. demonstration of unity and fluidity of nephesh, p. 27
magical necklets of Is. 3:20; nephesh hayyah referred to either man or animal; God as nephesh could almost perish if...; enumerated nephesh in bondage but are given a promise.

Nephesh and the Fulfillment It Receives as Psuchē

This study investigates the relation between the Old Testament (OT) Hebrew word nephesh, the New Testament (NT) word psuchē, and soul, the English word often used to translate nephesh and psuchē.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines soul as the immaterial essence, animating principle, or actual cause of an individual life. Other definitions are 1) the spiritual principle embodied in human beings 2) a person's total self 3) an active or essential part 4) man's moral and emotional nature or the quality that arouses emotion and sentiment. It adds, "both soul and spirit refer to an immaterial entity distinguishable from the body but the word soul is preferred when the emphasis is on the entity having functions, responsibilities, aspects, or a destiny, or when its connection with the body is in view."

The understanding of soul pervasive in contemporary Western culture and here defined in Webster's is similar to the Platonic view of soul prominent in ancient Greek culture. The basic framework for each definition is the same: immaterial entity in contrast to physical body. The growing emphasis from 20th Century scholarship argues against this body/soul dualism that has dominated the history of Western thought. (see van Peursen, Body, Soul, Spirit) Intellectuals have argued for the unity of man as opposed to a Platonic or Cartesian dualism. Man is then viewed as essentially one whole organism and not as two substantial entities.

This trend in affirming the 'wholeness' of man has had its influence upon Christian philosophy and Biblical studies. An increasing number of Christians point to differences between Hebrew views and those of the Greco-Roman world. The tendency is to emphasize that the ancient Hebrews did not approach man dualistically as have the Greeks nor, by implication, the general public of contemporary Western society. Claude Tresmontant in A Study of Hebrew Thought is representative of this development.

> Once again we must be careful to avoid interpreting the Hebrew notion of soul in terms of Platonic dualism. Because they recognized no body-soul dichotomy, the Hebrews did not consider the soul the discarnate thing that we imagine it to be. And it is just because we oppose it to 'body' that we think of it in this way. In Hebrew the soul is the man. Indeed we should not say that man has a soul, but that he is a soul; nor consequently that he has a body, but that he is a body. (p. 94)

H.W. Robinson wrote a now famous phrase in Hebrew Psychology. "The Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul." (p. 362) (For a detailed examination of the distinction between Greek and Hebrew thought and the influence of Greek thought on the history of

Western thought, see also Lev Shestov's Athens and Jerusalem, D.R.G. Owen's Body and Soul, and O. Cullman's "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead".)

The investigation of the Hebrew view of man has focused on certain anthropological terms. Central to the discussion regarding soul is the Hebrew word nephesh (hereafter referred to as 'N'). Biblical scholars are becoming aware that they face the problem of using the contemporary view of soul to interpret N. Taking today's understanding of soul into a study of N can only distort the meaning of N in a way that is foreign to the actual Hebrew tradition. As Tresmontant put it, "By applying to the Hebrew N the characteristics of the Platonic psuchē,...we let the real meaning of N escape us and furthermore, we are left with innumerable pseudo-problems." (p. 94)

Once the basic framework of immaterial entity/physical body is included in an approach to the study of N, certain OT instances appear to conform to Webster's definition for soul while others do not. That is why N is sometimes, though not usually, translated in the OT with the word 'soul'. N becomes a very enigmatic word supposedly meaning soul yet often not--even to the point of referring to a human corpse. Such confusion will always remain as long as one views N in light of today's popular conception of soul which has its origin in ancient Greek thought.

Some problems 20th-Century scholars face when doing a study on a word in the language of a society existing two or three thousand years ago might become more clear if one entertains the hypothetical situation of a scholar in 5000 A.D. trying to understand how the ancient English used their anthropological term 'hand'. Given his perspective, the English word may initially appear just as diffuse and discrete in its various uses as the Hebrew word 'N' does from a 20th-Century viewpoint. He would discover seemingly unrelated things such as a 'second-hand object', a 'handicraft', a 'hand of cards', and an 'on one hand and not the other'. At best he could list the various uses of hand into categories according to parts of speech or similarity of phrases. Only a moment's reflection by the native English speaker is needed in order to recall that each of these examples tie together through a concept of 'hand'. The hypothetical scholar could only reconstruct the linguistic unity and fluidity of a constellation or field of meaning for 'hand' once he had gained some insight into how the 20th-Century English speaker perceived himself and the world he lived in. Otherwise, the term would appear as several smaller constellations that display little or no relationship.

Influenced by contemporary philosophy, Biblical scholars have turned to their own subject and found reason to emphasize that N referred to the 'whole man'. The thrust of the argument has been that N cannot possibly be understood in dualistic terms. However, the realization that N somehow referred to the 'whole man' does not automatically result in re-discovering the views of the ancient Hebrews. Nonetheless, this did free scholars to take a new approach to the subject of N, and thereby begin to better understand how the ancient Hebrews perceived themselves and their world.

In the first decades of this century the influence of cultural anthropology aided the new approach of early classics in Biblical anthropology such as H.W. Robinson's Christian Doctrine of Man (1911) and Hebrew Psychology (1925), and J. Pedersen's Israel (1920). Studies during this early period approached the OT as a book containing information about a specific culture with its societal structures and way of life. The work in cultural anthropology on primitive societies gave OT scholars a new way to look at the ancient world of the Hebrews. Though OT scholars then learned from monographs on primitive societies, they perhaps understood ancient Israel too much as another primitive society in the 20th Century. For instance, H.W. Robinson began Hebrew Psychology by stating, "The modern study of anthropology has done as much for the elucidation of the OT as that of archaeology. Just as we re-date the fall of Nineveh from 606 B.C. to 612 B.C., on the evidence of a Babylonian tablet, so we interpret the Hebrew idea of 'soul' from parallel ideas about the breath-soul amongst primitive peoples." (p. 353) Yet these classics did attempt to understand Hebrew living on its own terms rather than impose preconceived notions. Nonetheless, though N as referring to the person himself was emphasized, it was viewed too much through a view of the 'breath-soul' obtained from research on present-day 'primitives'.

The lasting contribution of the classics on Hebrew culture proved to be a deeper realization that understanding the OT involves more than a naive translation of Hebrew words into one's own language; classics on Hebrew culture saw the need to understand the setting in which the OT was written. The cultural context of the OT words is as important as the words themselves. Each can potentially aid in understanding the other. Perhaps an accurate translation of words is impossible unless the cultural context is sufficiently grasped. Is it that an understanding of an ancient culture must precede a translation of words in order to capture the significance of what was written down? The dilemma is that the words preserved from a deceased culture are often one of the few tools available for rediscovering that culture.

More recent scholars have continued, by and large, to perfect the view that N referred to the 'whole man' and have thereby further distinguished Greek and Hebrew thought. A.R. Johnson in Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel was particularly sensitive to the confusion between conceptions surrounding the English word soul and the Hebrew use of N. He repeatedly made references to "a questionable use of the term 'soul'" (notes pp. 2, 3, 21) in the works of previous authors. H.W. Wolff in Anthropology of the Old Testament was also aware of this confusion. In his Preliminary Remarks he stated:

> When the most frequent substantiatives are as a general rule translated by 'heart', 'soul', 'flesh', and 'spirit', misunderstandings arise which have important consequences. These translations go back to the Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation, and they lead in the false direction of a dichotomic or trichotomic anthropology, in which body, soul

> and spirit are in opposition to one another. The question still has to be investigated of how, with the Greek language, a Greek philosophy has here supplanted Semitic biblical views, overwhelming them with foreign influence. Old Testament linguistic usage must be clarified at this point. (p. 7)

Once Biblical scholars rejected the traditional notion of body/soul, they needed a more accurate starting point. Using their understanding of the Biblical 'cultural context', they reached a consensus that the fact that the Hebrew could use N to refer to the 'whole man' demonstrated a thought form which "is to grasp a totality". (Pedersen, p. 108) This grasping of a totality was seen as a form of 'synthetic thinking'. Johnson began his book with the statement, "Any attempt at a successful interpretation of the Bible seems bound to take note of the fact that Israelite thinking, like that of the so-called 'primitive' peoples of the present day, is predominantly synthetic. It is characterized in large measure by what has been called the grasping of a totality." (p. 1) Johnson also articulated the Hebrew perspective for N in terms of the phrase 'grasping of a totality' and not through the traditional body/soul dualism. To him the phrase suggested that the Israelites believed "psychical functions had close physical associations." (p. 4) This awareness of totality that the Hebrew had in common with primitive people of today meant "a potential unity is thought to exist between the whole and any such part". (p. 3)

J. Robinson in The Body commented, "Johnson sees the constant representation of the whole by the part as an instance of the 'grasping of a totality' so characteristic of Hebrew thought..." (p. 13, n. 1) Robinson added, "...though there are about 80 parts of the body named in the OT, there is no word for the whole." (p. 13) Scholars have concluded that the Hebrews employed a figure of speech called 'synecdoche' in which the part is put for the whole or vice versa, and thereby meant the 'whole man' when referring to a part of the body. For example, on the use of the Hebrew term for hand, Johnson wrote, "As already indicated, what we have here is again no more than that simple form of synecdoche whereby in certain circumstances an important part of one's N or person, as being the temporary focus of attention, may be used picturesquely and graphically with reference to the individual as a whole." (p. 64; also pp. 40, 52, 71f., 80f.)

In his preliminary remarks to Anthropology of the Old Testament, Wolff presented two premises of the Semitic imagination and mind. "1. Concepts like heart, soul, flesh and spirit (but also ear and mouth, hand and arm) are not infrequently interchangeable in Hebrew poetry. In poetic parallelism, they can be used by turns for the whole man, almost like pronouns." (p. 7) He cited Ps. 84:2, "My soul longs, yea, faints for the courts of Yahweh, my heart and flesh sing for joy to the living God," and he viewed its parallelism between soul and heart and flesh as an example of 'stereometric thinking'. He then added, "2. Stereometric thinking thus simultaneously presupposes a synopsis of the members and organs of the human body with their capacities and functions. It is synthetic thinking, which by naming the part of the body means its function. When the prophet cries (Is. 52:7): 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings good tidings,'

it is not the graceful form of the feet that he means, but their swift movement: 'How beautiful it is that the messenger is hurrying over the mountains.'" (p. 8)

Wolff's discussion of synthetic thinking gives the impression that stereometry is peculiar to the Hebrew perspective or the Semitic people in general. However, this linguistic characteristic of Hebrew anthropological terms is typical of language usage in general and is not unique to the Hebrew language. Much of what Wolff wrote about the lingual characteristics of N are also found among English words designating a part of the body. For instance, 'hand', that word to be pondered by the hypothetical scholar of 5000 A.D., first denotes a certain part of the body. Yet the use of this word in the English language is not confined to just an anatomical structure; its use includes how that body part functions in human activity. Thus, the expressions 'a ranch hand', 'all hands on deck', 'try his hands at', and 'an old hand at' all suggest manual activity of which skill with the hands is very central. To say that someone has 'good hands' can mean that that person is good with his or her hands rather than one who has good-looking hands just as much as the beautiful feet of Is. 52:7 could suggest the runner is good with his feet. Thus the English language, as well as Hebrew, employs terms for parts of the body in a manner that includes imagery capturing the functioning of those parts. Anthropological terms indicating organ functioning is not evidence, by itself, for a way of thinking that is different than the native speaker of English.

Similarly, the above examples exhibit the fact that the English word 'hand' designates a body part which can stand for the whole person. The linguistic use of synecdoche does not necessarily indicate synthetic thinking on the part of one speaking that language. When the bride 'gives her hand in marriage' the groom is obviously marrying the 'whole woman' and not just her hand. That N was a part of the body which could stand for the whole cannot support the argument that the ancient Israelites did not have a dualistic view of man. The linguistic use of both hand and N enable each to allude to the whole man or whole woman as the case may be. Wolff's argument that stereometry presupposes synthetic thinking and that only synthetic thinking is able to allow a term for a body part to include the capabilities of the part breads down because the English language also demonstrates the same phenomenon. This linguistic use of N was something common to language in general.

The noun 'hand' also has the corresponding verb 'handle' just as N had the verb nph which meant to blow or breathe. In both cases the noun denotes a certain body structure but at the same time, through use of synecdoche, can allude to the functioning of that body part in the activities of the whole person. The verbs focus more on what that body part does; it emphasizes the functional aspect. The lingust B.L. Whorf noted the fact that certain nouns in many languages have corresponding verbs; he even termed them stavitations (or nominalizations) and verbations instead of nouns and verbs because of their close lexical relations.

It is a knowledge of Hebrew synthetic thinking which grasped a totality that has provided a key for Biblical scholars to unlock the Hebrew anthropological puzzle. Johnson wrote, "It is, perhaps, hardly too much to say that it is the 'Open Sesame' which unlocks the secrets of the Biblical language and reveals the riches of the Israelite mind." (p. 2) The synthetic thinking is considered the key for developing a context in which to understand, and then translate, Hebrew anthropological terms. However, this key must be viewed as embracing more than a use of synecdoche.

Further assumptions

This study assumes that Biblical scholars are correct when they point to synthetic thinking as a key concept for understanding the Hebrew mentality. However, it will emphasize that there are other aspects to the synthetic thinking of the ancient Hebrews besides stereometry and synecdoche.

For instance, the Hebrews lived life and viewed life in the concrete and not the abstract. As a representative of the Hebrew tradition, Christ used activities in nature to communicate points he wanted to make about human activity. He spoke of the human realm as analogous to, for instance, a mustard seed, a fig tree, a grain of wheat, yeast and leaven, and the wheat and the tares. Whereas Christ used analogies from nature, the modern man of science tends to develop theories of human activity based on an understanding of his technological devices. He makes his machines and then views mankind in terms of them. For instance, the brain is often considered a highly sophisticated computer, the heart considered a pump, and the organism considered an input-output stimulus-response system. This modern orientation is particularly beneficial when it comes to gaining some control over the contingencies of life but is problematic when it removes one from life as experienced. One does not experience his heart as a pump or brain as a computer and, hopefully, himself as an input-output system. Since the scientific viewpoint is a frame of reference different than life as experienced, it can be termed abstract.

To begin to understand the concrete world of the Hebrews one must imagine a world where one was unable to rely upon technological devices. Their primary form of communication was eye to eye and body to body -- few scrolls, no photographs, no telephones, no televisions nor computers. The ancient world was almost entirely limited to direct person to person interaction. Except for the few who were literate, the communication of information and the means of entertainment occurred through direct contact with people in one's presence rather than those on the page or on the screen. Furthermore, the Hebrews were immersed in a more direct exchange with the world as well as each other -- no clocks, no Six O'Clock News weather reports, no air conditioners nor sun glasses. Something is appealing about this solely concrete existence, yet it should be interjected that the Hebrews were thereby without the advantages of abstraction -- noteably a scientific outlook which remains in service to the concrete.

The ancient Hebrews also had a concrete orientation to matters of life and death. Now a blanket is quickly thrown over death. If at all possible, it is something removed to the hospital or nursing home. In modern society death is in the abstract in that it is usually one or more steps removed from personal experience. One reads about or hears about it daily, yet it is something for which one remains unprepared at the time it does enter the concrete world of felt experience. Today a piece of meat is bought in a cellophane wrapper and then cooked and eaten with no thought to the fact that it once participated in the life of an animal. In contrast to this life style, the Hebrews, for reasons that will soon become clear, even bothered to pound out the blood before eating the flesh of an animal they had quite likely slaughtered themselves. Moreoever, since they did not have the benefits of modern medical science, the ancient Hebrews were more often required to incorporate the realities of disease and death into their personal experience.

The ancient Israelites had not developed a subjective distance that is necessary to perceive something as a 'thing in itself' or a Cartesian 'substance'. They were much more imbedded in creation and their clan. The 'corporate personality' dominated their orientation to each other. The notion of the autonomous individual -- with a subjective, private mind in contrast to a measurable, mechanical, and objective public body -- is a relatively recent development that did not occur until after the Copernican Revolution and did not root itself in the thinking of the masses until the spread of Cartesian rationalism. (See the first chapter of M. Polanyi's Personal Knowledge for some interesting thoughts.) Nor did the Hebrews have in their history the idea that man has a mechanistic, machine-like body that houses a free-willed soul or rational mind of a different order.

They did not approach the human body in a scientific, analytic manner. In a sense they did not even approach the human 'body' for which they had no term. A physical, anatomical 'body' would not have been a part of their concrete experience. As Johnson has noted, psychical functions were tied closely to the physical. H.W. Robinson stated, "Psychical and ethical functions are considered to be just as appropriate to the bodily organs as the physiological..." (Hebrew Psychology, p. 353) Thus, the Hebrews did not conceive of an anatomical body which was separate from what is today termed the emotional. Likewise, the emotional, as embodied experience, was a concrete physical event. The Hebrews had a more naive, experiential awareness of themselves bodily.

Perhaps the origin of the meaning of Hebrew anthropological terms can be found in this basic concrete awareness. Ruah is a good example of this possiblilty since it was an onomatopoeic word referring to breath-wind-spirit. The Hebrews understood breath to be human wind. The nature of breathing, its importance to human functioning, and the meaning of ruah were integral; naming something and knowledge of that thing were intertwined. This Hebrew awareness, as Wolff has said, "presupposes a synopsis of the members and organs of the human body with

their capacities and functions." (p. 8) At the time of the ancient Israelites, a body structure and its function were relatively undifferentiated. Thus, a Hebrew did not conceive his breath to be separate or perhaps even distinct from its activity or its functions as understood at that time.

Could the nature of human wind be the origin of the meaning given to ruah and the basis for the significant place it had in Hebrew anthropology? The differentiation of internal 'organs' came more from the identification of localizable felt events than the recognition of anatomical organs. It is likely the Hebrew had a general knowledge of internal anatomy, but not having much medical knowledge, he found it of little use. An awareness of body experience may be the origin of vocabulary reflecting a Hebrew's interpretation of himself. The modern mind must re-live man's self-discovery at this earlier stage in order to comprehend the actual nature of the concrete, synthetic thinking of the ancient Hebrew.

This study also makes use of the view that the Hebrew anthropological terms had more linguistic unity than popular accounts and to some extent scholarly accounts tend to recognize. With N in particular, studies have concentrated on finding for a given passage the best concept or word with which to accurately understand or translate N. The tendency has been to establish a list of meanings in one's own language in to which uses for N could fit. H.W. Robinson developed three categories that covered all cases: A. Principle of Life -- 282 instances, B. Physical -- 249 instances, C. Personal -- 223 instances. (from Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 16) Johnson remarked on Robinson's classification, "The present writer would agree that each of these meanings may be distinguished in certain passages, but finds the meaning of the term as a whole far too fluid to be able to accept so definite a classification." (p. 8, n. 2) Others that followed Robinson may not have constructed so rigid a classification, but the precedent was set. Becker in Het begrip nefesj in het Oude Testament attempted an exact classification using five categories.

The New Bible Dictionary gives 'possessing life' as the primary meaning for N and notes it was identified with the blood and indicated 'the life principle'. It cites numerous instances in which N had a psychical reference that covered various states of consciousness including 1) the seat of physical appetites 2) a source of emotion 3) an association with will and moral action. The individual or person, the self, and a dead body are other meanings given.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs's A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament based on Briggs's "The Use of Nephesh in the Old Testament" gives a slightly different list of meanings. N was 'that which breathes'. N could refer to 1) a living being 2) a living being whose life resides in the blood 3) the man himself 4) the seat of emotions and passions such as desiring, abhorring and rejoicing 5) the seat of appetites such as hunger and thirst and 6) occasionaly mental acts.

The New Bible Dictionary and Brown, Driver and Briggs's Lexicon are

only examples of the general perspective expressed throughout the body of literature useful to the reader who is seeking a beginning knowledge of N. Although there are differences in definitions given, the more popular sources agree on most of the main points. Life, life principle, possessing life, or vital force are the primary meanings given. That N was connected with the blood is always mentioned, though some prefer to emphasize a connection with the breath. Each exposition states that N referred to the self or person and identifies it as the 'seat of emotions' and 'seat of appetites'.

This tendency to establish categories reflects the influence of structural linguistics from early decades of this century which gave a static, descriptive analysis of the lexical elements of language and how they were combined by certain grammatical rules into sentences. Like structuralism in psychology at the turn of the century, this approach to language reflected the empiricistic tradition in philosophy and the atomic model in chemistry. The structuralist school in the new discipline of experimental psychology operated out of the framework that sensory elements of mental experience combined to form sense experience analogous to the discovery that chemical elements combined to form new molecules. The empiricistic view that perceived combinations of sensory elements were the building blocks for knowledge antedated each of these developments. (See N. Chomsky's lecture on "The Past" in Language and Mind for his view of the history of linguistics.)

This multi-discipline trend had its effect upon studies of the Biblical languages which attempted to classify and categorize various definitions of a word. Unfortunately, the method of elucidating categories created two related problems. For one, the unity among various uses was lost; for another, certain uses were forced into a category in which they did not accurately fit -- at least as far as the Hebrew was concerned. The way N is commonly defined today suffers from these problems. Its field of meaning has lost not only its original cohesive unity but its fluidity to encompass the multitude of ways N was originally used. This study assumes a rediscovery of the Hebrew view of N would restore its semantic unity and fluidity. Whereas several others have emphasized categories into which various uses for N can be catalogued, the emphasis of this study is upon developing the unity which overarches all OT instances of N, while at the same time demonstrating its fluid diversity.

The term 'synthetic thinking' as described in the English translation of Wolff's book needs to be developed further in order to obtain a more accurate understanding of this 'grasping of a totality'. Wolff was correct when he noted in his preliminary remarks that "different parts of the body enclose with their essential functions the man who is meant." (p. 8) The reference in Is. 52:7 to 'beautiful feet' does indicate that the runner is 'swift of movement' and therefore 'good with his feet'. In a poetic, artistic manner this reference to 'beautiful feet' created for the Hebrew the familiar image of a messenger -- the hot-line of 3,000 years ago. It captured a 'beautiful event' -- the receiving of good tidings through the communication network of that day. However, could not the telephone

of today be referred to in a way similar to the runner's feet? 'How beautiful is the phone of him who brings good tidings.' The feet and the phone are both vehicles of communication. One might not use modern English in quite this manner, but has not one had similar feelings about the phone after receiving a call from a close companion who is a great distance away? It is not a known English expression, but it is the same kind of poetical expression as is found in Is. 52:7. Moreover, the English word 'hand' can be used in the same fashion. 'How beautiful is the hand of the woman who gives herself in marriage.'

The ancient Hebrew viewed the 'essential functions' of a part of the body with imagery more expressive than Wolff has indicated. The functioning referred to actually opened up into basic statements about the Hebrew view of man and even his relation to God. In the words of J. Robinson, "...all words pertaining to the life and constitution of man are to be seen as designating or qualifying this fundamental relation of man to God." (p. 16) This characteristic of the Hebrew perspective for N is what distinguishes 'synthetic thinking' from the English use of hand. The 'essential functions' which were circumscribed by 'the naming of a body part' encompassed more than, for instance, activities of a 20th-Century Western hand; they could even be statements about how man 'functioned' in the world. This kind of 'grasping of a totality' by which reference to a body part was able to make a statement about man is the distinguishing characteristic of 'synthetic thinking'.

Anthropological words such as N were not limited semantically to body organs and a comment on how they functioned physically or for that matter just emotionally. The functions of N conveyed something about man himself, his nature, his life situation. N conveyed information about man just as a man's name communicated something about his nature. "For as his name is, so is he, Nabal is his name and folly [nabal] is with him." (I Sam. 25: 25b) Similarly, when children were born, they were given names that had certain significance for the Hebrew parents. "And as her N was departing (for she died), she called his name Benoni [son of my sorrow] but his father called his name Benjamin [son of the right hand or son of happy omen]." (Gen. 35: 18) Likewise, naming man N, as occurred in the writing of Genesis, communicated a certain significance to the 'whole man'. N, as linked to a 'body organ', gave certain significance to the whole. The 20th Century Western mind might want to here employ the word 'symbol' instead of 'significance'; however, today a symbol often suggests a lesser reality than the object it represents. From the perspective of synthetic thinking, equal reality existed between the part and the whole for which it stood. In the world of the Hebrews a symbol had as much concrete potency as the object it symbolized. The synthetic thinking of the Hebrews enabled an anthropological term, founded in a part of the 'body', to carry a certain significance which conveyed how the Hebrews perceived life, including life before God.

Using the above assumptions and information, the text, through use of an original-language concordance such as the Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament reveals what is here termed a 'theme'. It

is perhaps not the best term since modern use can imply something constructed and thereby secondary, whereas it is here used, in Hebrew fashion, to refer to imagery intrinsic to the meaning of N. An elaboration of the theme surrounding N will reveal the significance N had for the people of ancient Israel and will set the stage for a discovery of the fulfillment N received in the NT message.

Linguistic Data

Most books on Biblical studies of N begin with linguistic considerations which link N with the throat, neck or the breath. Johnson wrote, "...there is reason to believe that N...was used to denote the throat or neck, i.e. as the organ through which one breathed." (p. 4-5) He translated Jonah 2:6 to read, "water encompassed me up to the neck (N)" (p. 6) and Is. 5:14 to suggest enlarging of the throat. "Therefore sheol has enlarged its N." He concluded, "All in all, therefore, if the original meaning of N was throat or neck...it appears to have been so denoting that part of the body through which one breathes, i.e. the organ of expansion." (p. 7, n. 4) He obtained support from Accadian and Ugaritic cognates, napistu and nps respectively. He also called attention to the expression 'breathing out of N' and added, "a corresponding use of the term N to denote 'breath' may be readily understood even though there is no certain example of its use in this way." (p. 6)

Johnson is not the only one who has expressed the view that N was related to throat and breath; however, the others do not integrate the throat and breath relation as well as he. W. Eichrodt in volume two of his Theology of the Old Testament wrote, "It is possible in the case of this word, too, to establish the basic physical connotation, namely first of all the 'neck', 'throat' or 'gullet', and then by extension that which comes out of the throat, the 'breath' or 'breath of life'." (p. 134) Consistent with his preliminary remarks, Wolff expressed a rather 'organ-oriented' approach to N. He viewed N as "a term for the organ that takes in food". (p. 11) In addition, he noted, "But the N does not only count as the organ for taking in nourishment, it is also the organ of breathing." (p. 13) "The rarer use of N for the external neck could be secondary." (p. 14) Like other authors, Wolff noted a lingual connection with the Hebrew verb nph. "...the action of N is nph meaning to blow, breathe, or pant." (p. 13) Similarly, "It is only N as the organ of breathing that makes the verbal use of the root nps (niph.) comprehensible." (p. 13) He also cited cognates from other Semitic languages.

> In Accadian too napasu means to blow, to snort, to take breath, and napistu means in the first instance the throat, both of men and animals, and then life, the basis of life, and the living being; in Ugaritic nps also repeatedly means the jaws, the throat or the gullet, and then appetite, desire, the feelings and the living being. Arabic nafsun can mean both breath and

> appetite, and can then be the term for life, the feelings and the person. The semasiology of the Hebrew N shows over and above these indications side parallels in the related Semitic languages. (p. 13-14)

Though scholars hold that, etymologically, N resided in throat, neck, and breath, there are disagreements as to which was most basic. Wolff commented, "Becker (1942) has contested the basic meaning of throat, and took breath to be the earlier basic meaning. This controversy is probably to no purpose, since for Semitic peoples eating, drinking and breathing all took place in the throat; so it was the seat of the elemental vital needs in general." (p. 14)

A. Murtonen in Living Soul expressed a different opinion on the subject of N and its relation to throat and breath. After summarizing a variety of opinions that scholars of Semitic languages have exhibited on the issue of throat and breath in relation to N (p. 63-68), he concluded that the OT passages that Johnson believed were examples of the 'blowing (breathing) out of N' "in fact have no influence on the question and give no proof that N is equal to breath". (p. 67) He was also wary of the way scholars use general Semitic meanings to verify the meaning of a specific Hebrew word. (see p. 8)

Seemingly quite separate from N denoting throat, neck, or breath is the connection N had with the blood. Lev. 17:11 clearly reads, "For the N of the flesh is in the blood." Deut. 12:23b reads, "for the blood is the N." Eichrodt noted, "It is easily understandable that the blood should be pre-eminently the vehicle of the N, so that it can be stated quite categorically that the blood is the N." (p. 136) Wolff, however, considered it a secondary assignment. (see p. 19) The connection N had with blood linked it to the whole sacrificial system of the ancient Israelites. Lev. 17:11 continues, "For the N of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement by means of the N."

It is now established that during the OT period N was associated with not only throat, neck and breath, but also blood. Thus, N was somehow associated with many body parts. As mentioned earlier, there is disagreement among scholars surrounding the relation of these body parts to N. Did they relate to N in the same manner? Were some secondary while other primary as Wolff suggested? Was N equated with one or all of these 'body organs' which are today recognized from an anatomical perspective? If they were not each parts which were synonymous with N, then what was the actual nature of the association?

These questions cannot be answered in a way which does justice to the ancient Hebrew perspective unless there is first a documentation of the theme which unified and held in proper arrangement the various ways N was employed, including its use as body parts such as throat, neck, breath, and blood.

Nephesh in the Old Testament

A number of phrases frequently used by the writers of the OT pictured N in a dangerous situation of life and death proportions. The Hebrew found that others were "seeking his N" (Ex. 4:19, I Sam. 23:15) and thus "feared greatly for his N". (Jos. 9:24) People either had to "flee for their N" (II Kings 7:7) or "defend their N". (Es. 8:9) If they did not, then their N would be "utterly destroyed". (Jos. 10:28,30,32,35,37,39) The N that sinned could be "cut off from his people". (Num. 15:31) This was akin to death because his identity was so bound to his people. Indeed, a "N that sins dies". (Ez. 18:4,20) Other passages describe N needing or receiving deliverance from this danger. In the face of peril one wanted to "save his N". (Jer. 51:6) Rahab asked the two Israelite spies to save her family and "deliver their N from death". (Jos. 2:13) Lot and his family were told to "flee for their N". (Gen. 19:17) He then escaped to Zoar where "his N will be saved". (v. 20)

Since it was God who made man a 'N creature' (Gen. 2:7, Jer. 38:16), it was before God that N faced danger and needed deliverance from it. David once prayed, "Keep me...from the wicked who despoil me, my deadly enemies [of my N] who surround me." (Ps. 17:9) He then asked, "Deliver my N from the wicked by the sword." (v. 13) "For thy name's sake, O Lord, preserve my N." (Ps. 143:11) When presented with the head of Ishbosheth, David proclaimed, "As the Lord lives who has redeemed my N out of every adversity..." (II Sam. 4:9) The Lord deserved praise "For he has delivered the N of the needy from the hand of evil doers". (Jer. 20:13) From the viewpoint expressed in the OT, the N that does not sin but obeys the commandments "keeps his own N" (Prov. 24:12) since "all N are His". (Ez. 18:4)

The text presents N in the precarious position of being subject to harm and danger. Thus, N carried for the Hebrews a theme of danger and deliverance. The danger it faced and the deliverance it needed were not of ordinary dimensions; they were an intense life and death concern. A recognition of this theme of danger and deliverance allows one to see how N carried for the Hebrews a message about man, his nature and his life situation. What is here referred to as a theme captures how N opened into a belief about man's nature on earth. Through their synthetic outlook, the Hebrews gave to the term N that aspect of human living which is uncertain, insecure, threatened to the point of even death. Because this was the kind of status N had in this world, N of course sought deliverance.

Certain life experiences -- precisely those situations involving intense danger and deliverance -- reminded the Hebrews that they were N. Here the Hebrews spoke from within the intensity of the 'N experience' of facing danger and needing safety, or else! David cried to his Lord asking for deliverance from enemies. (Ps. 6:8-10) His N was sorely troubled (v. 3) and he asked his Lord to save his N. (v. 4) While Joseph's brothers were in Egypt to obtain grain, they thought back to the time when they put Joseph in the pit. "In truth we are guilty concerning our bro-

ther in distress of his N..." (Gen. 42:21) Jeremiah lamented that his N was "bereft of peace". (Lam. 3:17) Since N was brought into the picture, this verse communicates an extraordinary lack of peace of life and death proportions.

While the Hebrew was waiting for his God to deliver, his N was losing vitality. Because the psalmists often wrote from within this experience, the Psalms include phrases such as "their N fainted in them" (Ps. 107:5), "my N melts for sorrow" (Ps. 119:28), "my N languishes for thy salvation" (Ps. 119:81), "my N longs, yea, faints for thy courts" (Ps. 84:2), and "their N melted away in their evil plight" (Ps. 107:26). Job asked, "How long will you torment my N!" (Job 19:2) It was also N that would wait for deliverance. "For God does my N wait in silence." (Ps. 62:11) "I wait for the Lord, my N waits and in his word I hope." (Ps. 130:5) Since the Hebrew knew all deliverance came from God, his N would "take refuge" in God (Ps. 57:1) and "thirst for him". (Ps. 42:32, 63:1) Once danger had passed and the intense, precarious nature of the situation was over, N would praise God for deliverance received. "My N makes its boast in the Lord, let the afflicted hear and be glad." (Ps. 34:2) "Then my N shall rejoice in the Lord, exalting in his deliverance." (Ps. 35:9)

Traditionally the theme of danger and deliverance has not been emphasized. Wolff is the one author who has made reference to it. The title for his section on N, "Needy Man", suggests some recognition on his part. He developed this in a few statements. "...N points preeminently to needy man, who aspires to life and is therefore living..." (p. 25) "When, therefore, the throat or neck are mentioned, there is frequently an echo of the view of man as needy and in danger, who therefore yearns with his N for food and the preservation of his life." (p. 15)

Phrases such as 'seeking his N' are usually seen to be referring to one's self, life, or person. H.W. Robinson would have put them in his category termed 'Personal'. The Hebrew perspective, however, was far too colourful in its 'concrete imagery' to refer to the self, life, or person without intentionally indicating something about that whole man. Likewise, the usual way to interpret phrases that portrayed the Hebrew within a N experience is to term N the 'seat of emotions'. As a correlate to the notion of soul as immaterial entity, the term 'seat of emotions' is associated with a metaphysical tradition that views the emotional as a non-physical entity attached to a physical body. N is <u>the</u> 'seat of emotions' no more than any other Hebrew anthropological term!

All such terms carried an emotional side, though usually not with the degree of intensity that typified N. From the Hebrew perspective, the feelings that N experienced occurred within the context of the danger faced and the deliverance needed. Designating N as the 'seat of emotions' misses this connection altogether. The tradition behind 'seat of emotions' leaves the emotions unrelated to the theme of man as a creature that faced danger and, therefore, needed deliverance. Then

N denoting 'seat of emotions' becomes one definition isolated from all the rest. This tradition contributes to the disunity and lack of fluidity that is typical of the popular understanding of N.

Wolff is also the author that best developed the relation between N as it explicitly revealed emotional content and N as it referred to the life, self, or person. With respect to Ps. 42:5,11, 43:5, Wolff commented, "Here N is the self of the needy man, thirsting with desire." (p. 25)

> Why are you cast down O my N,
> and why are you disquieted within me?
> Hope in God; for I shall again praise him.

Wolff was able to draw together the whole man who is in need and the emotions he experiences because he is needy. The self and the emotional were not viewed as two separate categories in to which various uses for N can fit. Like Wolff, Johnson was able to unite the self and the emotional through the 'grasping of a totality'; however, his understanding of this 'totality' did not reflect the theme of needy man seeking deliverance.

J. Pedersen in volume 1 of his classic Israel touched on the theme of danger and deleverance when he noted the soul of a stranger in Ex. 23:9 suggests a soul stamped by special conditions under which he lives. (see p. 100) "You shall not oppress a stranger, you know the N of a stranger for you were strangers in the land of Egypt." He continued, "...the word expresses his whole manner of being, his pursuit of security, his fear of arbitrariness, and the pain he feels under oppression." (p. 101) Pedersen sensed this trademark of N, but he did not see it in terms of a theme which was intrinsic to the meaning of N as expressed throughout the OT.

Each scholar made reference to Gen. 2:7 because the verse uses N to describe the creation of man. "And then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living N." In the past one may have read this verse to mean 'man obtained a living soul'. The King James' translation "and man became a living soul" remains ambiguous to the modern reader. Scholars sensitive to the confusion regarding differences between ancient Greek and Hebrew thought have been quick to stress that this verse is not to be read dualistically despite the fact that it has often been the classic proof text for dualistic interpretations using 'soul'.

Johnson wrote that N in Gen. 2:7 "...denotes one's 'self' or 'person' as a centre of consciousness and unit of vital power." (p. 19) He expressed the view that N here refers to the whole man -- with an emphasis on man's consciousness and vitality. But he made no mention of the

fact that this use for N is closely linked with other ways that N is used in the OT. On the creation of man, Pedersen stated, "The basis of its essence was the fragile corporeal substance, but by the breath of God it was transformed and became a N, a soul. It is not said that man was supplied with a N, and so the relation between body and soul is quite different from what it is to us. Such as he is, man in his total essence is a soul." (p. 99) As already noted H.W. Robinson stated that man was an animated body, and not an incarnated soul. Wolff wrote, "What does N mean here? Certainly not soul. N was designed to be seen together with the whole form of man, and especially with his breath; moreover man does not <u>have</u> N, he <u>is</u> N, he lives as N." (p. 10)

Wolff's question might best be answered in light of the theme of danger and deliverance. The man of Gen. 2:7 became a creature of flesh formed from dust, i.e., a being capable of perishing, and vivified and inspired through the breath of life. Breath animated flesh formed from dust. Due to this perishable nature and the perils the Hebrew indeed faced, he desired safety. The word N communicated, then, a certain <u>status</u> that man has in creation. It signified a precarious position in creation brought about by the possibility of harm. Any N thus needed help and was dependent upon others for safe keeping. This theme that overarched the OT use for N pointed to a status typifying man rather than a structural component. The people of the OT period had a less differentiated view of structure and function than is typical of modern Western society. Whereas 'soul' first denotes a structural entity and then certain moral and emotional functions, N emphasized the dynamic aspects of a functioning structure. Therefore, N did not refer to merely the 'whole man'; to the synthetic mind of the Hebrew, it communicated something about how man functioned in the world in light of his perishable status.

Johnson translated "N of a stranger" of Ex. 23:9 with "feelings of a stranger". (p. 10) "The grasping of a totality reveals itself in the fact that the term N may be used with more obvious reference to what is a comprehensive and unified manifestation of sentient life." (p. 9-10) It should be pointed out that these 'feelings' of the stranger could be termed N only because they were certain feelings that had their origin in the status of a stranger. The stranger had feelings of course, but more importantly his feelings came from the experience of being in a dependent, needy status that was peculiar to N. N did not ever denote isolated feelings and emotions; the only feelings of the stranger that could appropriately be termed N were those in association with the stranger's need for good will and hospitality from the Hebrews that paralleled the good will which the Hebrews needed from their God.

Johnson noted that N "as a substitute for the personal pronoun, often betrays a certain intensity of feeling...Thus, when it is used for the subject of the action in bestowing a blessing, it appears to spring from and certainly serves to accentuate the view that the speaker needs to put all his being into what he says if it is to make his words effec-

tive. Again, it is the same idiomatic use of N which springs to the lips in those times of crisis when one is brought face to face with the issues of life and death in their most urgent form..." (p. 18) Johnson, therefore, did notice that an intensity was associated with N as a personal pronoun. However, the intensity characteristic of N also colours other times N is used. For example, the stranger's status in Israel suggested a certain intensity to the ancient Hebrew. His basic need for food sustenance and safe keeping were not met until the Hebrews received him hospitably.

Pedersen commented on the 'feelings' of the stranger more accurately than Johnson, but he too did not make any reference to the fact that being in the position of vitally needing hospitality was peculiar to N. Pedersen began with primitive man's view of soul and understood the Hebrew view accordingly. The all-pervasive soul as totality governed his understanding of N, ruah (breath-wind-spirit), and leb (heart). The terms "suggested different nuances to soul but nonetheless have a greater likeness than difference". (p. 102) Though he did see differences between the terms (see p. 102-107, 145ff.) and did want "to examine what the psychic terms mean in their context" (p. 99), Pedersen's concept of soul, more primitive than Platonic, shaped his interpretation of N. Johnson, while appreciative of Pedersen's masterpiece, appears to have supported this criticism for he commented that Pedersen and those that followed him (Becker, Murtonen, Lys) had a questionable use of the word 'soul'. (p. 3, n. 4)

Wolff translated the passage in question with 'soul' of a stranger. "This is the place where we could translate N by 'soul' for the first time. For the writer is thinking not only of the stranger's needs and desires but of the whole range of his feelings, arising from the alien land and the danger of oppression in his state of dependence." (p. 17) Here Wolff further demonstrated his sense of the theme of danger and deliverance. However, assuming the original German edition uses seele in cases where the English translation has 'soul', Wolff also demonstrated that he used the term without being clear about the definition he employed for soul.

The stranger was not the only one whose status was peculiar to N. Prov. 12:10 reads, "A righteous man has regard for the N of his beast." The beast and the stranger were both viewed to be dependent upon care from another just as mankind, as N, was dependent upon the care that God expressed through His acts. Slaves were subject to their master for safe keeping and were thereby termed N as well. Lev. 22:11 reads, "if a priest buys a N as his property for money, the slave may eat of a holy thing." Jer. 34:16 records that slaves "set free according to their N desire" were again brought into subjection.

N was subject to more than just danger in the form of others seeking one's N. Being a creature made from dust, N was vitally dependent upon nourishment and sustenance in the form of basic provisions such as food,

water, and air. Not only did N face the threat of peril at the hand of another, N could go hungry and thirsty and even starve. Several OT passages picture N lacking or receiving daily sustenance. During Passover, the Hebrew could eat only according to his status as N. "No work shall be done on those days but what every N must eat, that only may be prepared by you." (Ex. 12:16) During this week the Hebrews were mindful about a basic fact of existence -- they were indeed N. Furthermore, to eat as N was to eat 'before God' knowing that He had concretely provided and thus sustained in a world where N needed to eat -- or else! A N that did not eat would perish since it was through bread though not bread alone that N was sustained.

Here too, an emotional aspect is connected to N, only this time it is feelings of hunger, thirst, and suffocation. As one might now expect of the synthetic thinking that typified the Hebrews, these feelings were applicable to N only if they participated in an experience that reflected the status of a N creature. Hunger, thirst, and suffocation could occur in the context of a yearning which N experienced while waiting for God's deliverance in the form of food, water, and air.

The righteous person was nourished through food that God provided, but the wicked remained unsatisfied. "The righteous has enough to satisfy his N, but the belly of the wicked suffers want." (Prov. 13:25) The Preacher warned, "Apart from God who can eat or who can have enjoyment. There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink and his N find enjoyment in them all." (Eccles. 2:24-25) "All the toil of man is for his mouth yet his N is not satisfied." (Eccles. 6:7) Jeremiah lamented the state of Jerusalem. "All her people groan as they search for bread; they trade their treasures for food to revive their N." (Lam. 1:11) The Israelites grumbled while in the wilderness because they no longer had meat as they had had in Egypt. "But now our N is dried up, and there is nothing at all but this manna to look at." (Num. 11:6) Therefore, "The anger of the Lord blazed hotly" (v. 10) because the people were not satisfied with His method of providing nourishment for N.

Fasting had implications for how the Hebrews were treating themselves as N creatures. To not eat was to purposefully cut off nourishment that N always needed. To 'afflict N' in this manner meant the Hebrews were abstaining from the very thing upon which N was critically dependent. For the day of atonement the Israelites were commanded to "afflict their N and do no work". (Lev. 16:29) They abstained from food to demonstrate that N was dependent upon their God for sustenance. Quite appropriately, they were asked to fast on the day of atonement because it was N that was atoned for through the shedding of blood and it was the providential God that sustained N despite the sin of N. Becoming clean despite sin through the ritual of atonement was of life and death importance to the Hebrews. "Whoever [N] is not afflicted on this same day shall be cut off from his peoples. And whoever [N] does any work on this same day, that N I will destroy from among his people." (Lev. 23:29-30) Perhaps the people were

so involved in the events of this day that they actually lost their appetite. A N that took the day of atonement seriously may not have felt like eating and may have experienced, consequently, a natural affliction of N. Unfortunately, only one verse in the Revised Standard Version connects afflicting and fasting. "I afflicted myself [N] with fasting." (Ps. 35:13) Even in this instance the English is unable to relate either afflicting or fasting to the significance that N had for the ancient Israelites.

The theme of danger and deliverance with respect to basic nourishment as well as life perils can now aid one toward grasping the relation that N had to the throat, neck, breath, and blood.

Throat, neck, and breath all participated in imagery regarding vital nourishment and sustenance that N needed. While it is true that 'throat' and 'neck' are probably the best English equivalents for N in some instances, N was not really synonymous with the throat or neck. For translation purposes N may denote the throat or neck on occasion, but this is not to suggest that today's understanding of throat or neck communicates the full meaning of N in these instances. Denoting N as throat without involving the need for vital nourishment fails to reveal the synthetic 'mind' of the Hebrews. The throat was only the organ that served as a vehicle for N sustenance. N and the organ <u>through</u> which it was nourished are not to be viewed as synonymous.

Though Wolff was perhaps too concerned with finding the precise anatomical organ which N denoted in a given passage, his continued sensitivity to the theme of 'Needy Man' is evident in the following paragraph.

> In its very function as the organ that feels hunger and thirst N is also the seat of the sense of taste (Prov. 27:7):
>
> A sated N stamps on honey with his feet,
> but to a hungry N everything bitter is sweet.
>
> The hungry N (v. 7b) that tastes everything bitter as sweet is of course the throat, with which the root of the tongue and the palate are associated as organs of taste. But it is not the throat (v. 7a) that 'stamps'; it is the man whose behaviour is determined by the throat's satiety. The parallelism of the satisfied and the hungry N (which is made possible by synthetic thinking) must be differentiated in translation because of the differing statements: 'the sated man' must be set over against the 'hungry throat' (Prov. 16:24):
>
> Pleasant words are like a honeycomb,
> sweetness to the N and healing to the body.
>
> N side by side with the body and with the experience of sweetness is again designed to point clearly to the organ of taste, and yet in the simile for the 'pleasant words'

> the needy man as a whole is clearly envisaged, with the hint at his sensitivity and vulnerability. (p. 12)

Wolff appears to have thought more analytically than synthetically when he equated N with the throat. These two passages use body functions as imagery to convey life experiences typical to N. There is no justification for saying a man stamps with his feet but that a throat is hungry. Besides, the Hebrews would have been well aware that they felt hunger in the belly and not the throat. Wolff was correct when he said that N was the organ that felt hunger and thirst, but this should not have directed him first to the throat or tongue. In light of the imagery of a synthetic way of viewing the 'body', N was the organ(ism) that felt hunger and thirst if sustenance was not available, or 'hunger' and 'thirst' if the situation of the moment had awakened one to the fact that deliverance was needed. Therefore, it is more accurate to say that the Hebrews believed that N, having received breath and food through the throat, was the organism which tasted those bitter or sweet life experiences of seemingly life and death proportions right in the gut!

Is is not so much that N denoted the throat or neck as the organ through which one breathed, but that the throat is the organ through which N breathed. It is the vehicle through which N received breath as well as food. In order for the creature of Gen. 2:7 to become N, it received the 'breath of life' (nishmath hayyim) from God through the nostrils and it stands to reason the throat as well. E. Jacob in his article on N in Kittel's Theological Dictionary commented, "The deciding mark of a living creature is breathing, and its cessation means the end of life." He added that the phrase "'breathing out of N' of which there are no examples in the OT, alludes to the demise of N through the final exhalation of breath (p. 618) The Hebrews observed that the cessation of breathing and the end of N occurred together. They witnessed that one sustained the other, but that is no reason to conclude that the Hebrews believed that N denoted breath.

Similarly, Johnson made a slight error by equating expansion that occurs during breathing with expansion that was viewed to be occurring during the devouring of N by parasitic elements. It is more accurate to say that the expansion of breathing, or better yet eating, served as imagery for the behaviour of evil elements. This imagery was appropriate to N because of that theme that N would perish without sustenance.

The phrase "her N was departing" in Gen. 35:18 makes reference to the exhaling of neshamah. This phrase lends itself to the image of an immaterial entity leaving the body at death; yet as Wolff explained, "we must not fail to observe that the N is never given the meaning of an indestructible core of being, in contradistinction to the physical life, and even capable of living when cut off from that life. When there is a meaning of the 'departing' of the N from a man, or of its 'return' (Lam. 1:11), the basic idea is the concrete notion of the ceasing and restoration of the breathing." (p. 20) Jacob wrote, "The departure of N is a metaphor for death; a dead man is one who has ceased to breath." (p. 618) D. Lys in

his monograph, Nèphèsh, viewed the event as "the last sigh". (p. 133) Through the concrete image of the departure of breath, the text communicates that Rachel was in the process of dying while she named her newborn son. She was not yet dead in the modern sense of the word, but was ebbing closer to death by the moment. She was losing N vitality that ruah sustained to the degree that she would soon depart from N existence.

Since N was vitally sustained through the throat, N was most vulnerable at the neck. Therefore, it made most sense to the ancient Hebrews to include this neck in any imagery which portrayed N in danger. Jacob was correct when he commented that the water which encompassed Jonah "up to the N" (Jonah 2:6) is not really water rising to the neck, as Johnson would suggest, but rather the sea as a "chaotic element which threatens life". (p. 619) The chaotic and almost evil sea is devouring N in a manner similar to sheol. Similar to sheol enlarging its N in Is. 5:14, the water in Jonah 2:6 is something sinister which is devouring N.

N could best be attacked through attacking the throat via the neck. To slit the throat was to reach man as N. To strangle was to sever N from life-giving ruah. If an ancient Israelite was told his N was endangered, he might have instinctively tried to protect his throat. To repeat, this does not mean N denoted throat or neck or was equated by the Hebrew with either; instead, the throat and neck functioned (in more than the modern physiological sense) as the organ through which N was nourished and sustained.

The comment from a Hebrew that someone had bad breath (ruah) would have communicated a serious state of affairs. "I [ruah] am repulsive to my wife." (Job 19:17) Moreover, if a Hebrew had been asked how N was kept vital, he might have demonstrated his ability to pant. Likewise, if he had been asked to demonstrate dying, he might have exhaled as much breath as he could for as long as he could. But if he had been asked to actually locate N, he would not have been able to give what the modern person would consider a straight answer. The characteristics of N involved not only body parts such as the throat but was even able to "be present in such 'extensions' of the personality as the spoken and, no doubt, the written word, one's name, one's property, and (most important of all) one's offspring."(Johnson, p. 88) Yet, if he had been forced to locate N in terms of his 'body', the ancient Hebrew would have pointed to his blood as a last resort.

The relation between N and blood was of a different kind than N and throat, neck, or breath. The text appears to make more of an equation between blood and N in those passages that read that N is in the blood, e.g., Lev. 17:11 and that the blood is the N, e.g., Deut. 12:23b. N was considered to be synonymous with blood in the sense that N referred to a certain aspect of what is today considered blood. N was the blood seen from a particular perspective just as N was man in a certain light. N was the blood seen through the synthetic thinking of the ancient Hebrews. It was in the blood that N vitality resided. In the phrase "his N kindles

coals" (Job 41:21a) N is commonly translated 'breath'. Yet the relation between N and blood was more likely to suggest imagery in which Leviathan was 'hot-blooded'. "His N [hot blood] kindles coals, and a flame comes forth from his mouth." Here too breath participates in Hebrew imagery -- this time as a flame from the mouth of Leviathan -- but this is no reason for scholars to conclude today that N denoted the breath in this instance.

For sacrificial purposes blood could stand for N. "It is blood that makes atonement by reason of the N." (Lev. 17:11c) Blood atoned because of its association with N. Only N could atone for the sins of N. "...eye for eye, tooth for tooth, N for N." (Deut. 19:21) Blood was removed from the flesh and then used to make atonement for the sins of N. Blood was sprinkled before God or put on the horns of the altar in the tent of meeting or poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering at the door at the tent of meeting. (see Lev. 4:16-18) Sacrificially killing an animal meant N was destroyed and ritually given back to God. (see Pedersen p. 484)

The Hebrew relation between N and blood reveals that N conveyed a 'sacred' aspect to human living. N was a work of God (Gen. 2:7), was in God's care (Prov. 24:12), was in His hands (Job 12:10), and belonged to Him (Ez. 18:4,20). The Hebrews believed that they were forbidden to meddle or interfere with existence as N since it was a received existence 'beyond man'. For this reason the Hebrews did not eat flesh which still contained blood. Because of its association with N, the Hebrews bothered to pound out the blood during the preparation of any meat. "For the N of every creature is the blood; therefore, I have said to the people of Israel, 'You shall not eat the blood of any creature, for the N of every creature is its blood; whoever eats it shall be cut off.'" (Lev. 17:14) H.W. Robinson wrote, "The taboo on the consumption of blood is due to the peril attaching to its mysterious life-principle." (Hebrew Psychology, p. 381)

Once having trespassed this 'sacred core' of human life, the Hebrew became subject to the judgement of his God because he was taking N into his own hands and determining its fate. To trespass N was to assume the position of God. Killing or destroying was the most offensive form of tampering with N. A person committed this grave sin when he killed N wrongfully. Destroying human N particularly demanded an account since man was viewed as the likeness of God. God said to Noah and his sons, "Only you shall not eat flesh with its N, that is, its blood. For your lifeblood [N-blood] I will surely require a reckoning; of every beast I will require it and of man; of every man's brother I will require the N of man. Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for God made man in his own image." (Gen. 9:4-6) The Hebrews were forbidden to eat meat still containing the blood because the act meddled with N and therefore became offensive to God. The equation between blood and N meant consuming blood was a form of murder. One was sustaining one's own N with the sacred N of another.

N was the life-blood of man; it was considered the core of human existence. God allowed Satan to do anything he pleased with Job with one restriction. "Behold, he is in your power, only spare his N." (Job 2:6)

If Job's N had been 'taken', Job would have died. Today one might translate: "only spare the very life of Job". Job faced many afflictions and much suffering, yet he remained N. His blood retained the N vitality that ruah and food sustained; he continued to face harm and danger typical of that perishable, uncertain status which marked the human condition and, consequently, continued to seek deliverance.

N was also associated with another anthropological term, leb. However, the association was not like those with the throat or neck, the breath, or even the blood. Leb is usually translated 'heart' in English; however, "'heart' in the Bible does not, as in our Western tradition, mean the affections, sensibilities as opposed to reason. It is rather man's liberty, the centre in which are taken the fundamental decisions; in particular the choices between knowledge and ignorance, light and darkness, understanding and what the prophets call stupidity, foolishness." (Tresmontant, p. 119) Wolff wrote, "But it is feared that the usual translation 'heart' for leb leads our present day understanding astray." (p. 40) He cited the death of Nabal as an interesting example. "His leb died within him and he turned to stone. And about ten days later Yahweh smote Nabal; and he died." (I Sam. 25:37b-38) "In our text the body's turning to stone is associated with death of the leb; here, in view of the fact that Nabal lived for another ten days in this state, we can only think of paralysis. To a doctor that would suggest a stroke." (p. 41)

The ancient Hebrew perceived that God was especially concerned with a man's leb. "It is here that man's real character finds its most ready expression." (Johnson, p. 84) The obedient leb was, e.g., pure, faithful, stedfast, and contrite and the disobedient leb was stubborn, crooked, hard, and prone to deceit or swollen pride. (see Johnson, p. 85) The leb directed one's course of events. "...from every man whose leb makes him willing, you shall receive the offering for me." (Ex. 25:2) When the temple was rebuilt, the Israelites feasted because "the Lord had made them joyful and had turned the leb of the king of Assyria to them so that he aided them in the work of the house of God". (Ezra 6:22) Johnson put it this way: "Hence it is through the instrumentality of the heart that a man decides upon one particular course of action as against another and such choice of direction may be regarded as due either to this spontaneous action within the heart or to the influencing of the heart by external forces, human or divine." (p. 79)

The leb was considered to be that which directed the course of events for man as N. Likewise, the course of events in 'N experience' indicated the direction of the leb toward obedience or disobedience. Given these connections, it is not surprising to find several passages in the OT containing both N and leb . The commandment was to "love the Lord God and to serve him with all your leb and all your N" (Deut. 11:13, Jos. 22:5; see also I Kings 2:14, Jos. 23:14) and to follow his statutes "with all your leb and all your N". (Deut. 26:16) These phrases portray man as a

N creature whose leb could obey or disobey. Therefore, to love God with all the heart was to love knowing obedience brought blessing, but to love with all N was to be on the dependent side of a love-bond knowing God alone ultimately provided sustenance and safety.

Though the leb and N both desired, the desire of the leb and the desire of N were not the same and need not be confused by scholars of today. Whereas the leb desired obedience or disobedience, N desired according to its familiar theme. The leb desired what it intentionally wanted; N desired what it vitally needed. Returning to Judah was equated with deliverance by the Israelites in Egypt during the time of Jeremiah; given this association, "their N desired to return to dwell there". (Jer. 44:14) More common in the OT period, N desired food for sustenance and nourishment. "Because N craves flesh, you may eat as much flesh as N desires." (Deut. 12:20) N desired food because it was through food that N was sustained and nourished.

One particular phrase connecting N and desiring is found in the context of an act of deference, usually to a king. In Israel the king was the all-powerful head who represented the people before God and sometimes also mediated for them. The way in which he led the people could even determine whether of not the nation was judged to be right in the sight of their God. The king was in a position to "reign over all that his N desires". (I Kings 11:37) Others encouraged the king to act "according to all his N desire" (Sam. 23:20) and thus wished that all would go well for his N.

Still another use found mostly in the Psalms pictures the wicked enemy receiving the desire of his N against the righteous. David pleaded with the Lord, "Give me not up to the N of my adversaries." (Ps. 27:12a) He alluded to the wicked N that were consuming and thus could sustain themselves by devouring the righteous. A reading of Is. 57:20 indicates that the wicked were believed to be like the sea. "The wicked are like the tossing sea; for it cannot rest and its waters toss up mire and dirt." David asked that the wicked be unable to say that "they have had their N desire and swallowed him up". (Ps. 35:25) Not only the wicked devour; watchmen are pictured as "dogs that have a mighty N and never have enough". (Is. 56:11) The wicked, like sheol and the sea that engulfed Jonah, could acquire a misdirected kind of nourishing which maliciously sought sustenance through the consumption of N itself! The Hebrew might have imagined the wicked N as fat due to a consuming, greedy need; they ate everything in sight in an effort to be sustained. True to form, the images of nourishing and devouring were limited to the desires of N and were not directly related to the desires of leb at all.

Certain aspects of the relation between N and leb were typical of many Hebrew anthropological terms. Each had its own specific constellation or field of meaning which distinguished it from the others to the extent that a given contextual theme or image permitted one appropriate term or a limited selection of terms. Contemproary use of heart, soul, spirit, and mind have more overlap than ancient Hebrew anthropological

terms. Overlap perceived among Hebrew terms is largely due to a misunderstanding of their relationship. The desires of the leb and the desires of N participated in separate constellations of meaning. To cite another example, ruah and neshamah overlapped to the extent that they both could denote the breath, yet even here it can be argued that ruah always carried an opened up nuance of wind and spirit which was not characteristic of neshamah. The way ruah and neshamah operated linguistically is somewhat similar to the way N and dam both denoted the blood. Note, however, that the intention here is not to create neodualisms between basar (flesh) and ruah, dam, or N; it is to suggest their different linguistic fields of meaning.

It is worth mentioning that the Hebrew anthropology included terms which would not be included today. The term kavod (glory) often suggested a part of the body. "Therefore my leb is glad, and my kavod rejoices; my basar also dwells secure." (Ps. 16:9) "Let the enemy pursue me [N] and overtake me, and let him trample my life [hayyah] to the ground, and lay my soul [kavod] in the dust." (Ps. 7:5) The fact that kavod and a term for liver, kaved, agree in their consonantal root kvd and have only a vocalic difference suggests there may also be an etymological basis for viewing kavod as a body part which reflected a grasping of a totality. After the NT era, kavod took the form of a halo over the saints.

The manner in which one died was of particular importance to the Hebrew. Strangling was an evil fate because ruah was being choked. Job was at rock bottom when he uttered, "My N would choose strangling and death rather than these bones." (Job 7:15; 'bones' here refers to his lasting sufferings since bones are the most indestructible portion of the body.) It was a particularly offensive way to die because N was attacked right where its supply of ruah was most vulnerable -- the neck. One was not to tamper with ruah any more than N; of all things in creation it most suggested God. The drowning that Jonah anticipated was offensive on two counts: he would have died through the direct removal of his supply of ruah and also through the consuming throat of sheolish water. In this instance, water was in the process of sealing N from life-giving ruah.

There were others events surrounding death which were also particularly offensive to the Hebrew. Death by burning such as occurred during child sacrifice by neighboring peoples or burning of the corpse meant that that individual was utterly cut off, utterly annihilated. In these instances not even the bones remained. The form of death and the fate of the corpse indicated something about the one who had died. The desired fate was to be respectfully put to rest in the grave, but this could not be granted to those who, for instance, were left dead in the field where birds could gather.

"The ideas of the grave and of sheol cannot be separated. Every one

who dies goes to sheol, just as he, if everything happens in the normal way, is put into the grave. When the earth swallowed up Dathan and Abiram with all that belonged to them, they went straight down into sheol (Num. 16:29ff.), and Jacob now speaks of going into the grave (Gen. 47:30), now of going into sheol (Gen. 37:35). The dead are at the same time in the grave and in sheol, not in two different places." (Pedersen, p. 461) However, it was noteably those who suffered a shameful death, the slain or the wicked enemies of the godly, that were referred to as actually dwelling in sheol. Thus, Pedersen was perhaps not completely accurate when he wrote that all who died went to sheol. "The wicked shall depart to sheol, all the nations that forget God." (Ps. 9:17; see also Ps. 55:15; Prov. 5:6, 7:27, 9:18) Wicked scoffers could even make a covenant with death and sheol. (see Is. 28:15,18) To die a natural death full of years had its honour and satisfaction. One was "gathered to his people" (Gen. 25:8, 35:29, 49:33; Jud. 2:10) or "sleeps with his fathers" (I Kings 2:10, 11:43) in the family grave. Even in death, the godly participate in the family line. Pedersen was correct in holding the opinion that the grave and sheol cannot be viewed as separate; however, it is important to note a difference between his two examples regarding Jacob. In Gen. 37:35 Jacob refuses comfort after being told Joseph his son was killed, but in Gen. 47:30 Jacob's house is in order and he is therefore now ready to die. The word sheol is used, appropriately, only in the first example.

OT Biblical scholars agree that the ancient Hebrews believed N could die. N was subject to death and therefore was a perishable existence. Ruah-breath left flesh, and N thereby ceased to exist since the vitality of N-blood was no longer sustained. There was no idea of an immaterial entity that left the body at death. It was ruah as breath viewed through the synthetic mind of the Hebrews which concretely, visably left. Human wind departed, not an invisible non-physical entity of more value than a body from which it travelled. Breath and flesh returned to their former conditions and the person took on a new existence, a new status, as one of the rephaim. Pedersen tried to re-define soul when he wrote, "When death occurs, then it is the soul that is deprived of life. Death cannot strike the body or any other part of the soul without striking the entirety of the soul...There can be no doubt that it is the soul which dies, and all theories attempting to deny this fact are false." (p. 179)

Samson pleaded, "Let me [N] die with the Philistines." (Jud. 16:30) Balaam said, "Let me [N] die the death of the righteous." (Num. 23:10) According to John Robinson, "There is no suggestion that...the soul (N) is immortal, while the flesh (basar) is mortal. The soul does not survive man--it simply goes out, draining away with the blood." (p. 14)

Murtonen in Living Soul stated, "N is able to die, but the result is not a dead N but the N of a dead." (p. 29) Murtonen noted that a dead N was a contradiction in terms, and asserted that the corpse must have had some form of life or action since N always denoted these properties. Certainly, once N was dead, 'it' ceased existing. Nonetheless, it must be remembered that this 'it' was not an entity removed from the person. It

was a body part caught up in the earthly status of the person. With no blood-vitality, the person ceased to exist as N. "Apparently the dying was conceived as a more or less long process during which man was still called N on account of the 'life' or 'action' which took place in the corpse." (Murtonen, p. 29-30)

That N-blood lingered in a less vital state after one ceased breathing indicates why the Hebrews could extend the term N to a corpse. The lingering presence of sacred N reminded the Hebrews that they were not to tamper with the corpse. All instances of N denoting a corpse are in passages concerning the act of becoming unclean or defiled through touching a corpse. (see Lev. 19:28, 21:1, 22:4; Num. 5:2, 6:11, 9:6,7,10, 19:11,13; Hag. 2:13) One became unclean through such an act only because the corpse had N significance. When an OT passage mentions a corpse but not defilement through touching a corpse, then N is not found denoting a dead body!

Johnson held that this use for N is an example of semantic polarization (when a word has two opposite meanings) which was typical of near-Eastern culture at that time. He concluded that N had so much fluidity that "at one extreme it may denote that vital principle in man which animates the human body and reveals itself in the form of conscious life, and at the other extreme it may denote the corpse from which such conscious life has departed." (p. 22) The Hebrews did not perceive N to have two opposite meanings; it is only from a present day perspective that N appears to have such a field of meaning. Western thinking now emphasizes that a living body and a dead body are opposites. For the Hebrews, however, the sacred aspect of N applied to the corpse as well as a living person. The corpse was not a positivistically neutral entity or thing to which various meanings could be attached depending on the circumstances. The ancient Hebrews would not have perceived a 'corpse' any more than they would have perceived a 'body'. Only from the perspective of a living 'body' and a dead 'corpse' does N acquire <u>opposite</u> meanings. A view that resorts to semantic polarization in the case of N thereby overlooks the unity intrinsic to its field of meaning. Johnson's recognition of its fluidity was at the expense of the unity among uses of N.

An examination of further expressions using N can demonstrate that N was given the ability to take on a multitude of uses and, consequently, demonstrate the integrated relation between the various expressions and phrases containing N. They do not demonstrate additional, isolated definitions of N since it can be shown they too were originally connected to the theme of danger and deliverance which captured man's perishable status.

Is. 3:20 is the sole instance of a puzzling use for N. Found in a list of clothing and jewelry, N is translated 'perfume boxes' in the Revised Standard Version and 'scent bottles' in the Jerusalem Bible. E. Jacob provided a clue for re-interpretation when he realized "the content suggests magical devices to protect life from danger". (p. 618,

n. 52) The devices were probably similar to those used in the magic rites described in Ez. 13:18-20. The passage indicates that a prophetess of that time would use wristbands and veils to "hunt for N". E. Jacob's comment helps reclaim the original connection that this use for N had with the more common uses. Magical rituals that tampered with N in an attempt to deliver it from danger employed an object that was eventually termed N. A comment by Wolff is also helpful. "So we ought to think of a kind of necklet rather than amulets, which we would have to think of as hollow objects in the form of 'a little house on the neck'. The parts that are in danger are the parts adorned." (p. 14) It makes sense that these magical devices may very well have been worn on the neck -- right where N was most vulnerable. When understood correctly, Is. 3:20 is an excellent example of the semantic unity and diversity given to the term N.

The example from Prov. 12:10 of the good master having regard for the N of his beast indicates that N was not limited to just human creatures; animals were also perishable, flesh and blood creatures. Since N was the blood seen from the viewpoint of synthetic thinking, any blooded creature could potentially be termed N. The phrase most common in this instance is N hayyah which, like 'living water', is translated 'living N' since hayyah is the Hebrew version of the verb 'to be'. Infrahuman N both swarmed in the sea and lived on the land. Those that swarmed in the sea, i.e. fish, may have had particular significance with respect to N in that they dwelt in the sheolish sea. When in a fish, Jonah cried "out of the belly of sheol". (Jonah 2:2) Their natural habitat suggested a setting where N was removed from ruah. Wolff noted, "In the Yahwist's account of the creation (Gen. 2:7) we saw man expressly defined as N hayyah;...According to the tendency of the statements in Gen. 2:7, N hayyah introduces no differentia specifica for animal life; if this had been the case, then the subsequent definition in 2:19 of animal life as being N hayyah as well would hardly be possible." (p. 22) However, Johnson argued that N hayyah in Gen. 2:7 and N hayyah in reference to animals are distinct. (see p. 19, n. 2) He appears to have expressed the view that N hayyah in Gen. 9:16 did not refer to both man and animal. "When the bow is in the clouds, I will remember the everlasting covenant between me and every N hayyah of all flesh that is upon the earth." Gen. 1:20,21,24, 9:10,12,15,16 have the best examples of N hayyah though there are two other examples, Lev. 11:10,46a,46b and Ez. 47:9. Interestingly, the phrase occurs in the Bible primarily in the creation passages of Gen. 1 and 2, the post-flood 're-creation' passage of Gen. 9, and the destruction of this creation in Revelation.

N was also used with respect to God. At first impression one wonders how this could have been since the ancient Hebrews believed that their God was not perishable nor dependent upon deliverance like human and animal N. However, N was not the only Hebrew term referring to man that was also used in reference to God. He was also portrayed as having hands, a mouth, eyes, leb, and above all ruah; basar (flesh) was the noticeable exception. In these instances common expressions primarily used to say something about man communicated the way God related with His people. Expressions referring to a king whose N desires lent themselves to use with respect to God, the Lord of creation. "What his N desires, that he does." (Job 23:13) "I will

raise up for my self a faithful priest who shall do according to what is in my leb and my N." (I Sam. 2:35) His N hates (Ps. 11:5) and abhors (Lev. 26:30), delights (Is. 42:1) and loves (Jer. 12:7); God swears by his N (Jer. 51:14; Amos 6:8) and avenges his N (Jer. 5:9,29, 9:9) on a godless nation for what it has done. These examples record that N carried the intensity typical of a life and death matter during those times when God was so distraught over the activity of His people that He would have almost lost His N vitality and perished had not events taken a turn for the better. Similarly, He was delivered from His anguish when His people did change their ways.

There are several instances where a specific number of people are designated N. "The N were 16,000 of which the Lord's tribute was 32 N." (Num. 31:40) Why should one assume that N in such an enumeration originally referred to a mere 'head count' without communicating something of particular importance about these people? The N in Num. 31: 35,40,46 are Midianite captives remaining after Israel executed their Lord's vengeance. The captives were in a situation similar to the stranger, beast, and slave. They were referred to as N because they were at the mercy of the Israelites for their very lives and were kept from execution as the Lord commanded. (see also I Chron. 5:21; Jer. 52:29,30) If an enumeration alluded to that status which created the potential for danger and need for deliverance, then the term N was used.

Jacob, renamed Israel, and his offspring are enumerated in Gen. 46:15,18,22,25,26a,26b,27a,27b and Ex. 1:5a,5b. His clan was here termed N only because its status in Egypt typified N. This N went to Egypt, multiplied, and ended in bondage to Pharaoh. The nation, Israel, was then in bondage in Egypt like fish that were engulfed in sheolish waters. Israel, as N, went to Egypt with the promise that it would one day return to Canaan. "I am God, the God of your father; do not be afraid to go down to Egypt; for I will there make of you a great nation. I will go down with you to Egypt, and I will also bring you up again..." (Gen. 46:3) That Israel was later delivered from the bondage of Egypt became the Hebrew's most recollected sign that the Lord did in fact take care of His people. N in bondage to Pharaoh (who the writer of Ez. 29:3, 32:2f. compared to a sea monster reminiscent of Leviathan) was promised deliverance. Furthermore, the deliverance of N occurred through the parting of the sheolish sea. N was a flesh creature capable of perishing; however, N was also given the promise of deliverance. N not only sought deliverance and even longed and waited for it; N was promised deliverance to those who obeyed the commandments of the Lord God. For Wolff's final remark to his chapter on N, he wrote, "Thus, before Yahweh, man in the OT does not only recognize himself as N in his neediness; he also leads his self on to hope and to praise." (p. 25) The promise was given and godly N hoped for its fulfillment.

Transition to psuchē in the New Testament

Could the meaning of N have gone through any evolution during the many centuries of the OT period? There is evidence that one important change occurred about the time of the Exile. Originally the singular form for N applied to either an individual or a group, but after the Exile there appeared a plural form as well. Murtonen considered this change to be an expression of the growing sense of individuality among the Israelites. (p. 58ff., 70-75) He stated that in the OT N appears in the plural form only 50 times with the oldest examples in Jeremiah and Ezekial. Psalms 122:13 and 97:10 are the only examples found in the psalms. H.W. Robinson wrote of the sense of 'corporate personality' common among the Israelites. (see Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 27ff.) In the context of that status which typified N this term meant individuals were mutually bound together in the same 'N experience'. Such a group could even cover more than a generation. "All the N belonging to Jacob who came into Egypt who were his own offspring not including Jacob's sons' wives were 66 N in all." (Gen. 46:26) In such a 'head count' the emphasis is more a 'N of 66' than '66 N'. The singular form applied to the group was not abandoned after the Exile, but it no longer had a monopoly. Nonetheless, this later use of the plural form was not specifically a change in the meaning of N; it was a change that represented the growing sense of individuality in Israel.

Johnson noticed possible changes in ruah that "come from the exilic and post-exilic age" (p. 31), yet warned against over-emphasizing the point. He mentioned no changes in N during the OT period. Though he thought that N had its origin in throat, he claimed that any developments which began to emphasize vitality occurred before any of the OT was written. "These earlier meanings of the term N, however, have become obscured through its use to denote the more obviously animate forms of life." (p. 7)

There is really no significant change in the meaning of N during the period of time in which the OT was written. Some expressions using N are found in specific books from a certain time period, but this fact cannot be used to support the idea that a change in meaning actually occurred. All instances of N in the OT demonstrate a field of meaning held together by the theme of danger and deliverance and, therefore, do not remain apart from the unity and fluidity characteristic of N.

The question of a change in meaning from the OT period to the NT period is more complicated because the NT was written in Greek. Many authors have investigated whether the Greek word psuchē (hereafter referred to as 'P') maintained the Hebrew meaning for N or if the Greek language became a vehicle to introduce Greek concepts into the Hebrew world. Though some scholars think this influence began at the time of the Exile, J. Robinson has given some excellent examples of how the Apostle Paul used the Greek language to convey Hebrew beliefs and has thereby demonstrated that the assimilation of the Greek anthropology

into the Hebrew tradition occurred after the NT was written. He stated that the "mind of the flesh" from Col. 2:18 is an example of a combination of words that was impossible for the Greek mind to fabricate. He added, "Though the actual word nous [mind] may be taken from Hellenistic terminology, we have here a good example of how, like every other term, it is drawn by Paul into his typically Hebraic usage." (p. 25) Furthermore, spiritual body in several verses in I Cor. 15 and the defilement of flesh and spirit in II Cor. 7:1 were also contradictions to the Greek mind. Lastly, psuchikos (from psuchē) was contrasted to pneumatikos (from pneuma or in Hebrew ruah) and identified with choikos (earthy). "Both the contrast and still more the identification would have been an absurdity to the Greeks." (p. 23) It appears that the anthropological viewpoint of the NT Hebrew, the Jew, was contrary to a Greek way of thinking during most of the 1st Century A.D.

The letter that the apostles and elders sent with Paul and his associates to settle the circumcision issue is an interesting example of how Hebrew anthropological terms maintained their heritage despite the presence of the Greco-Roman world. "For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these four necessary things: that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity." (Acts 15:28-29) It is of particular interest to this present study that the Gentile Christians were asked to abstain from blood and that which was strangled. The drinking of blood was forbidden because it still signified the consuming of N. Strangulation was still offensive to the Hebrews because it destroyed N via the direct choking of ruah. To tamper with N or ruah was still viewed as being offensive to God. This request in Acts 15 demonstrates that these particular Hebrew beliefs were still in vogue during NT times.

The continuity of the tradition regarding N from the OT to the NT is not the only evidence of a continuity in meaning from N to P. Five NT passages contain OT quotes in which P was used to translate N. (Mat. 12:18, Acts 2:27, Acts 3:23, Rom. 11:3, and Heb. 10:38) This fact does not necessarily prove that P was synonymous with N, but it does indicate that the use of the Greek language by the NT writers was imbedded in their own Hebrew tradition. Beginning with the Septuagint, the Greek version of the OT, P was used to translate N. There is, however, some disagreement among scholars as to how often. (see Murtonen, p. 10 and Wolff, p. 10)

The NT writers also replaced N with P in various expressions common to the OT. Rom. 11:3 reaffirms the theme of danger and deliverance. "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, they have demolished thy altars and I alone am left, and they seek my P." P also faced the danger of excommunication. "And it shall be that every P that does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed from the people." (Acts 3:23) P could receive deliverance too. "...whomever brings back a sinner from the error of his way will save his P from death." (James 5:20) P also de-

noted living creatures that swarm in the sea (Rev. 8:9) and slaves in a situation like those of the OT. (Rev. 18:13) Furthermore, P reflected the more experiential side of being N. Rev. 18:14 records that P could experience its life-sustaining provisions removed. "The fruit for which thy P longed has gone from thee." The Apostle John here prophesied that this P would be lacking nourishing food. The Matthew and Mark accounts of Christ in the garden at Gethsemane record that his "P was distressed". (Mat. 26:38 and Mk. 14:34) His P was so sorrowful that he was to the point of perishing while his P-blood was dripping. The significance that N held for the Hebrew people was at least intended to be communicated in these passages. When viewed properly, these NT passages reveal a semantic continuity from N of the OT to P of the NT.

However, P was not limited to N; it also carried N into the NT setting. P was not simply synonymous with N nor was it only replacing it. P was given a new aspect, but this addition was not a transition into Greek thought; it was a development into the Good News of the NT. To begin to understand this development of the theme peculiar to N, one must first discover how Christ influenced P in light of the Hebrew meaning for N.

Psuchē in the New Testament

Christ's use of the common language of the Jews, Aramaic, germinated a richer understanding of life a N and challenged the old Hebrew perspective for N. Since N was in an insecure position and faced the possibility of harm and even utter destruction, the ancient Israelites focused upon saving N, delivering N from danger, restoring N to safety, and sustaining N through provisions, especially food. It is recorded in Greek that Christ said into this OT context, "He who tries to save his P will lose P, but he who is willing to lose his P for my sake will save it." (Mk. 8:35, Mat. 16:25, 10:39, Lk. 9:24, 17:33, and Jn. 12:25) Whether said in Aramaic or recorded in Greek, its impact upon the Jews would have been dramatic because it posed a threat which carried the intensity of N. Many Jews became befuddled and thought they had plenty of reason to dismiss, reject, or rationalize his claim. He had the audacity to proclaim that N could be saved only through doing the apparent opposite. How exasperating to be told the fulfillment of the promise came only through giving up the very thing for which they were hoping! And how 'teeth gnashing' to be told that this saving of P could occur only if the losing of P was done for "his sake".

Nonetheless Christ demonstrated his teaching by acting toward men and women in a manner that culminated in his own crucifixion. Christ came "to give his P as a ransom for many" (Mat. 20:28) and came as the good shepherd who "laid down his P for the sheep". (John 10:11) This was a new commandment for the Jews and yet it was the old one given since the beginning. (see I John 2:7-8) With respect to the Hebrew view of N, it

was a new commandment because losing P, giving up P, and laying down P were all new ways of viewing N, yet old because N was still saved through an obedient leb. Christ therefore expanded the semantic field for N of his day and consequently influenced the style in which the Gospel writers employed the Greek word 'P'.

Besides initiating a life style of sacrificing P, Christ radically altered the old view of N when he instituted Communion at the Last Supper. The drinking of his blood represented through the drinking of wine (which was considered the blood of the grape, see Deut. 32:14) could only dumbfound the Jews raised in their Hebrew tradition that drinking blood was akin to murder because sacred N was being consumed. Yet, Christ said, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood you have no life in you." (Jn. 6:53) The Jews were revolted and murmured because of this claim. (see vs. 60-61) "After this, many of his disciples drew back and no longer went about with him." (v. 66) Later the disciples consumed his P and therefore participated in his murder, but in drinking his blood they were also nourished by that life which defeated the grave.

There is no evidence in the canonical books of the Bible which indicates that this notion of saving P through losing it was familiar to the Jews. Since the OT was written within a culture emphasizing the preservation of N, the canonical books of the OT contain only two instances of people risking N for the sake of another. Both Jud. 9:17 and I Chron. 11:19 record an act of wartime bravery. The Jews did not have in their Hebrew tradition an explicit statement of the concept of "laying down their P for the brethren". (I John 3:16, Jn. 5:13) It is fascinating to discover that the NT church began to grasp this new perspective for N that Christ gave to P. Barnabas and Silas became men who "had risked their P" for the sake of Christ. (Acts 15:26) Epaphroditus also "risked his P for the work of Christ". (Phil. 2:30) The Apostle Paul himself wrote, "I do not account my P of any value nor as precious to myself..." (Acts 20:24) He was willing to lose P just as Christ had commanded. "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own P, he cannot be my disciple." (Lk. 14:26)

Christ added a sense of resurrection to the Hebrew view of N. Throughout OT times people were afraid of those that sought N in order to destroy. Christ, however, taught: "... do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill P; rather fear him who can destroy both P and body in gehenna." (Mat. 10:28) The Hebrews believed man could kill N; but Christ instead taught that man could not kill P. Even though the Jews might try to tamper with P, ultimately they could not. When teaching his disciples to expect persecution, Christ said, "You will be delivered up even by parents and brothers and kinsmen and friends, and some of you they will put to death; you will be hated by all for my name's sake. But not a hair of your head will perish. By your endurance you will gain your P." (Lk. 21:19) The Jews were challenged to see that P could be saved if P would be sacrificed. Christ's disciples learned that God still would

keep P safe despite even death. "But we are not of those who shrink and are destroyed, but of those who have faith and keep their P." (Heb. 10:39) The P that was sacrificed would receive a full existence and not the shadowy existence of the rephaim.

Both James and Peter grasped this new way of viewing N. James wrote, "...receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your P." (James 1:21) He also claimed that bringing back "a sinner from the error of his way will save his P from death". (James 5:20) Peter agreed with the idea that enduring persecution gains P (Lk. 2:19) and that those with faith keep P (Heb. 10:39) when he wrote, "As the outcome of your faith, you obtain the salvation of your P." (I Peter 1:9)

The more common interpretation found today of P in the above passages is actually a combination of a misunderstanding of N in the OT and popular views of soul stemming from the Greek tradition. A contradictory conglomeration of the Hebrew tradition for N and the usual view of soul underlies the way the word 'P' is often understood today. The 'opening up' of N into the NT use of P has lent itself to the tradition of 'saving souls'. The concept of soul as immaterial entity is easily read into the saving of P found in the NT. The P kept safe despite death becomes understood to be that supposed entity which survives death. One must view P in the context of its Hebrew tradition and not a Greek tradition of soul articulated by Plato. The deliverance, keeping, and saving of P must be understood to be a development of the deliverance, keeping and saving of N.

There is evidence that Paul was aware of the possibility of this very distortion during his time. He knew the presence of a Platonic tradition would be particularly confusing to the Gentile converts. E. Schweizer, in his article in Kittel's Theological Dictionary, pointed out that Paul never used P for a life which survives death. Schweizer maintained that Paul, when struggling for greater theological clarity, used pneuma (usually translated 'spirit' like the Hebrew word 'ruah') in reference to life after death and not P. Paul certainly acknowledged a continuity between earthly life and resurrection, but since he saw it as a gift of God and not man's doing, pneuma was used instead. (see p. 650) The passage on resurrection in I Cor. 15 shows how Paul kept P within the Hebrew tradition. The first man, Adam, was "living P" (the N hayyah of Gen. 2:7); the last man a "life-giving pneuma". (v. 45) Psuchikon was the earthly seed sown perishable, corruptible, dishonourable and weak. Pneumatikon was raised imperishable, incorruptible, glorified and powerful. (v. 42-44) In Paul's view, flesh and blood could not inherit the Kingdom of God. (v. 50) The OT relation between blood and N lead to the conclusion that P could not inherit the Kingdom of God either. Unlike his friends James and Peter, the Apostle Paul did not use expressions such as 'saving P'. He expanded the Hebrew tradition for N only through the new notions of spending, risking, and sacrificing P. That Paul refrained from the expression 'saving P' does not mean that he believed that P was not saved through its sacrifice. Rather, P could be saved through becoming pneuma.

The P referred to by the first disciples of Christ was not a rational soul that could comprehend the 'world of Ideas' nor a soul that was a microcosm of the divine. If Christians today are to be consistent with their original heritage, then they must use an expression such as 'immortality of the soul' in a manner different from the ancient Greeks. Paul realized the importance of this fact for his audience and therefore gave P no immortality. The preservation of the Biblical P was not considered to be an automatic process nor something ultimately within the power and control of P. It was understood to be a gift from the Giver received under the condition that P itself was sacrificed.

Now that evidence demonstrates how P was rooted in N and yet expanded its theme with NT meaning, one can look at verses that are especially susceptible to mis-interpretation.

During a meeting where Paul was speaking at length, a Eutychus sank into a deep sleep, fell from the third story, and was subsequently found dead. In Hebrew terms this meant he was no longer breathing. Acts 20:10 reads, "But Paul went down and bent over him and embracing him said, 'Do not be alarmed for his P is in him.'" The event is parallel to the times Elijah and later Elisha laid upon a child whose N then came to him again. (I Kings 17:17; II Kings 4:32-36) One traditionally pictures a N entity that returns after first leaving the body. But if it was not some immaterial entity that left and returned to each child and Eutychus, then what did happen? Clarity comes when one realizes the Hebrew tradition viewed death as the event of creation in reverse. Out of dust man became N hayyah. Man breathed his last ruah when he died; he returned to dust and, therefore, was no longer N. In these passages the children and Eutychus revived as they began to breathe again. Ruah-breath returned and thus they were still N hayyah. The return of N or P was understood to be an event that could follow a 'departure of N' such as the one described in Gen. 35:18.

The division of P and pneuma in Hebrews 4:12 is also subject to various interpretations today. "For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of P and pneuma, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart." Schweizer said that no theological trichotomy could have been in view since bones and marrow do not part. Thus P and pneuma were not distinguished, but rather the word penetrated both together. (see p. 651) However, though no trichotomy was in view here and the word did penetrate each, in this instance the NT writer did believe that P and pneuma were distinguishable just as clearly as a bone (joint?) and its life-giving marrow were known to be distinct. The division noted in Heb. 4:12 is no different than Paul's distinction in I Cor. 15. To divide P and pneuma was to divide the corruptible and the incorruptible. The word could discern the thoughts and intentions of the heart and thereby separate the obedient from the disobedient. Those whose hearts were disobedient

perished as P, but those whose hearts were obedient became pneuma. P had the connotation of a needy N that died without receiving deliverance, whereas pneuma suggested a P lost through sacrifice which therefore became safe and secure.

Because the Apostle Peter contrasted P to the passions of the flesh in I Peter 2:11, the verse often falls prey to the traditional view of soul. "Beloved, I beseech you as aliens and exiles to abstain from the passions of the flesh that wage war against your P." Schweizer stated that this is the most Hellenistic use in the NT since the plain antithesis between P and sarx (flesh) gives a sense of two parts of man. (see p. 653) However, this instance of P is not an example of Greek influence; here too Peter wrote from within the Hebrew tradition for N. P was assailed and threatened in the same fashion as N. The difference in this instance is that Peter was referring to a more 'inward' foe than one which attacked N at the neck. The sarx was understood to be weak and, consequently, referred to those inward things which drew man into a constant struggle in his life with other humans before God. Man as a 'P creature' lived in the flesh, yet as Schweizer himself pointed out "P is not identical to purely physical life, but P is natural life given to God and received by Him". (p. 656) The 'inward' struggle for man as P was "to not restrict life to the purely physical" (p. 654), though the passions of sarx could facilitate such a restriction. The Jew could easily forget Christ's statement: "Do not be anxious about your P, what you shall eat or what you shall drink..." (Mat. 6:25a) Here the Jew was taught that the sustenance that N needed was really through more than food. "Is not P more than food, and the soma [body] more than clothing?" (Mat. 6:25b)

The idea that P was more than food and more than the 'purely' physical was behind the implication found in III John 2 that P could be sound even if one was in poor health. "Beloved, I pray that all may go well with you and that you may be in health; I know that it is well with your P." A sound P was not considered to be opposed to one's health; afterall, the very contrast had its origin in the Hebrew view that the sound condition of N was dependent upon food that nourished healthfully, or else! (see Lam. 1:11; Hos. 9:4) Though the Hebrews of the OT knew that man as N could not live by food alone, they thought that N could not live soundly if such bread was in short supply since N living was so bound to that bread which God provided. Similarly, any form of sickness meant N was in a weak and less vital state and was far from sound. By the time the NT was written a shift had occurred. The emphasis became that, before God, P could be sound despite hunger, thirst, and poor health since actually living as P involved more than food and more than the body. (see Mat. 6: 25a, 10:28)

I Thessalonians 5:23 is often used to document the view that man is a trichotomy of body, soul, spirit. "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your pneuma [spirit] and P and soma [body] be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The debate over dichotomy and trichotomy has occurred throughout the history of the

Church; however, this issue would have never even entered the thinking of an ancient Hebrew. Given his familiarity with Greek thinking, Paul may have been aware of the dilemma, but he nonetheless used the Greek language to express his own tradition. Hebrew anthropological terms were not distinguished in a structural or spatial manner. Similarly, Paul was not listing three components, parts, or entities of man's nature; he was not, as the New Bible Dictionary has supposed, "merely describing the same immaterial part of man in its lower and higher aspects". (p. 1208; P and pneuma respectively) As shown in the discussion on I Cor. 15, Paul limited P to the Hebrew tradition. When Paul asked the Thessalonians to keep P sound and blameless for when Christ would come, he was exhorting with reference to living as a perishable creature that needed sustenance and also deliverance through God's providence. A sound and blameless P was not anxious about P (Mat. 6:25a) and accounted P as nothing precious (Acts 20:24) since actually God sustained despite hunger and delivered despite death. A sound and blameless body, on the other hand, was not anxious about finding clothing or shelter in order to obtain protection from the elements. "Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about your P, what you shall eat or what you shall drink, nor about your soma [body], what you shall put on. Is not P more than food, and the soma more than clothing?" (Mat. 6:25) Nor did this sound and blameless bodily frame need to hide behind fig leaves "at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ". Paul believed that this frame requiring protection from the elements was itself the shelter, the tabernacle, inspired with the Holy Spirit (pneumatikos agion). Finally, a sound and blameless pneuma was life-giving; it was inspiring and refreshing. Paul was not listing structural components but was alluding to three distinct constellations or fields of meaning which captured different aspects of sound and blameless Christian living.

When the fifth seal was opened during the revelation that came to the Apostle John, he "saw under the altar the P of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the witness they had born". (Rev. 6:9) It is very easy to picture that supposed immaterial aspect of a slain saint waiting during an intermediate state for the time it might again be housed in a material substance--the body. Nevertheless, this verse also has its heritage in N of the OT. The P to which John referred alluded to N-blood that was poured out at the base of the altar. (see Lev. 4:7,18) The P under the altar were saints who had been slain. That the saints were referred to as P communicates something about their death. They had risked their P for Christ to the point of death. The imagery of John's revelation connected the sacrificial blood of these saints who had followed Christ's example with the blood of the bull which was poured out before God at the base of the altar.

Revelation 20:4 records that John "saw the P of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus". Their sacrifice at the neck necessitated that John use P as the most apporpriate term for denoting these Christians. In this instance, as well as Rev. 6:9, he employed

P in order to link their deathes to the sacrifice of P that Christ initiated when he laid down his P. John saw saints that had achieved what Christ had asked. John was not intending to make a statement on the eternal condition of a certain group of P. His vision focussed on the sacrifices made. To say that P here stands for eternal life is to miss the dramatic imagery associated with the sacrifice of P. Certainly John saw these saints from the viewpoint that their beheading was already in the past, but this does not mean he used P to refer to an eternal state after their beheading. He termed these saints P only because he was looking back to their deathes right at the neck. Here John was consistent with Paul. He knew P gained eternal life through its sacrifice. The saved P received consummation in eternal life, but that does not mean John or Paul held the view that followers of Christ existed eternally as P.

At first glance the NT appears to exhibit contradictory meanings for P; it can suggest a perishable, needy status like N and yet the emphasis is often that P can be safe and secure. The apparent contradiction occurs because P was often limited to the OT scope for N while on other occasions P was employed to indicate an 'opening up' of N that developed it into the message of the NT.

E. Schweizer referred to these two different uses when he commented on the losing and saving of P in Mark 8:35. "Both the reference to preserving the P and also the positively assessed losing of the P shows that primarily the reference is to what is commonly called life, i.e., physical life on earth. The promise that life will be saved, however, shows that what is in view is true and full life as God the Creator made and fashioned it." (p. 650) He accurately noted that P could refer to the 'true life' as distinct from the 'purely physical life'. The 'true life' is life as supreme good, lived before God rather than life as a "natural phenomenon". (p. 645) The 'true life' is kept by God for eternity only in the lasting sacrifice of life and permanently lived by the gift of God. (see p. 643) As physical life, P is just natural life (Schweizer cited Acts 20:10, 27:22; Mat. 6:25b), that is, the life given as a ransom for many (see Mark 10:45) and this life that is limited and threatened by death. (see p. 635)

However, in this article Schweizer was unable to draw this distinction into a unified perspective which is able to explain how the NT writers could use P to refer to both the 'true life', as he terms it, and the 'purely physical life'. One can only understand this way of using P once one comprehends the development of N into P. Instances where Schweizer maintained that P stands for the 'purely physical life' are cases where P is but a translation of N and instances where he maintained that P stands for the 'true life' are cases where P is but N 'opened up' into the NT message. Because he did not realize that both ways of using P were brought into one constellation of meaning through the synthetic imagery of man as perishable N facing the threat of enemies

or lack of food and drink, his distinction fosters the view that P had two separate meanings. P never stood for the 'purely physical life' apart from this theme nor did P refer to the 'true life' without a qualifying context. Therefore, when P was employed by the NT writers, what Schweizer referred to as the 'true life' was but that 'purely physical life' which received deliverance only through its sacrifice.

Schweizer also exaggerated the difference between Paul and other NT writers with respect to the way they used P. He was correct when he commented that in the few cases that Paul did use P, he never used it to denote a life which survives death. When Paul incorporated the NT notion of sacrificing P, he employed P in a manner that remained close to the OT use for N. Unlike the other NT writers, he did not use expressions such as 'saving P'. This difference permitted Schweizer to conclude that the other authors used P to stand for life after death. On the gaining of P through enduring persecution in Luke 21:19, he wrote, "P is plainly understood as eternal life." (p. 647) On the passions of the flesh warring against P in I Peter 2:11, he stated that P "takes the place that is occupied by pneuma in Paul" (p. 653) and noted the opposition of the desires of the flesh and desires of the spirit in Gal. 5:17. Though Peter and Paul were probably referring to the same struggle as now experienced in the Christian life; that does not mean that Peter used P to denote the same thing which Paul termed pneuma. For both authors the words had distinct imagery. None of those who wrote the NT used P to stand for life after death per se.

Schweizer also posed numerous questions which suggest he was mistaken on how P was used to bear on the 'religious life' and the 'natural life' as they are termed in the English translation of his article. For instance, he wrote, "Is the praise of God an emotional movement on the same level as pleasure in eating and drinking?" (p. 642) He was inclined to ask this question only because he was not familiar with the link attributed to P between praising God and pleasure in eating. Like N, P praised God when He provided nourishing food and took intense pleasure in eating such nourishment because it was a sign that God had indeed sustained. The praising P did and the accompanying pleasure experienced were two aspects of one event. As far as the Hebrew tradition was concerned, the constellation of meaning for P was not divided into a 'religious life' and a 'natural life'.

With another question he wondered if physical life was separated from this 'religious life'. "Here, however, is the problem, for if the physical life is seen as God's gift, can it still be separated from the life with God that takes shape in, e.g., prayer, praise, and obedience, and which fashions a union with God that does not come to an end with physical life?" (p. 640) Schweizer posed this as a problem and not just as a rhetorical question. Any praise, prayer, or obedience that P did, that is, that man did in light of being P, was from the context of the theme that has its heritage in N. The praise, prayer, or obedience that P offered to God arose from those experiences involving danger and deliverance that its perishable existence, i.e., its 'physical life' presented.

"But each time the question arises whether the P is equally the locus of faith as it is of confusion or stimulation, of joy or sorrow. In other words, is faith to be viewed simply as a psychological matter like joy, sorrow, or perplexity?" (p. 640) Here, too, Schweizer made an unnecessary contrast. P was not so much the locus of faith; rather, a P whose heart was obedient was kept safe (saved) through faith. (see Heb. 10:39) "As the outcome of your faith, you obtain the salvation of your P." (I Peter 1:9) Emotional states such as joy, sorrow, or perplexity in conjunction with P occurred in the context of the theme that typified N.

Perhaps Schweizer tried to answer his own questions about the true life and religious life and their relation to natural life when he wrote, "...the religious life does not differ from natural life, but it is this life as it is experienced by the man who is freed from trying to preserve it. It is thus a released and liberated and open life which God and neighbor can penetrate and yet not disrupt it but instead fulfill it." (p. 642) He here gave a worthy answer that may meet the need of a 20th Century person caught with a schism between his 'religious life' and his 'natural life'. However, the point of the present study is that the Hebrew would not have posed these questions in the first place. Even for the disobedient, the 'religious life' was not something different from 'natural life'. Nor was there a possible difference in stress between the whole man and his life before God. (see p. 650) P was never framed in such a dilemma; it was never linked to one and thereby dissociated from the other. Even I Peter 2:11 was meant to contrast this physical living from two vantage points--that of P and that of sarx (flesh).

Unfortunately, Schweizer, like many scholars, organized his discussion in terms of contemporary Western categories of thought. Subheadings such as physical life, whole man, place of feeling, true life in contrast to physical life, life as supreme good, and resurrection life suggest a more analytical method of approach than would have typified the synthetic mentality of the Hebrew tradition. During NT times the Jew may have been more able to abstract from concrete experience and conceive of himself as an individual 'apart from' the group than his ancestors; yet, he still demonstrated that 'grasping of a totality' when it came to his view of P. The theme of danger and deliverance, though developed into the NT message, still overarched the different ways the NT writers used P. The word was addressed to the subheadings Schweizer presented, but his categories do not demonstrate the unity and fluid diversity that was intrinsic to P in Israel just under 2000 years ago. Schweizer's list suggests a distinction between the mundane and the spiritual which was not characteristic of Hebrew nor earliest Christian thought. The Hebrew did make distinctions, but not along these lines. He instead held the view that the flesh was 'mundane' and N was 'sacred' in that it was the product of flesh having been inspired with ruah--that which is now termed 'spiritual'.

Nonetheless, Schweizer did say that P referred to the whole man and, furthermore, understood that P presented something about man's living situation before God. He commented that "rest for your P" in Mat. 11:29 was an expression taken from the OT and added that P probably meant the self that

lived before God and would one day give account rather than some being that rested when liberated from the body. (see p. 639-40) While discussing the phrase "anchor for the P" in Heb. 6:19, Schweizer wrote, "P is assailed and threatened and needs an anchor." (p. 651) He noticed that P, like N, was also subject to harm; it could be sought and killed. Furthermore, the phrase "well with your P" in III John 2 referred to not merely the whole self or life or man, but to the life which was ultimately important. (see p. 651-52) Perhaps best of all, he stated that James used P to refer to the earthly life of man before God which would find its consummation in resurrection. (see p. 652)

Understanding the fulfillment

Every person witnesses someone's death at one time or other. The observation that what remains at death, the corpse, is the person yet is not the person (or is it?) has lead to a confusion that has resulted in two traditional stances. One maintains the unity of man when positing that the corpse is all that is of the person--he or she no longer exists. Such a view, often considered monistic, would claim that the individual as one entity or substance, is totally destroyed by death. Nothing remains of the person; after all, the corpse lingers only briefly. Yet the centuries of man show that his innermost hopes and desires are never quite able to accept this view. Throughout history most people have believed that a person is somehow more than the corpse which remains.

This latter belief is found in most religious systems in some form or other; the existence of the individual continues despite death. But one is then faced with a contradiction that the corpse is, yet really is not, the person. This contradiction usually forces one to the dualistic position that man is two entities--one of less value since it actually is not the person and is but the corpse, and one of more value since it is actually the person whose existence continues. The contradiction that death presents is one possible origin of the body/soul dualism. It is the reality of death that has lead many to conceive themselves to be two-part creatures. The 'religious' have perceived their nature to be split in an attempt to be consistent with their innermost longings.

The ancient Hebrews were not caught in the dilemma between contemporary monistic and dualistic hypotheses. According to their belief system, mankind was originally created as an entirely whole, unified creature who was embedded in the activity of the Garden. The entrance of sin into the Garden brought death to its caretaker. The Israelite knew that death did destroy the 'whole man', but he did not believe death revealed two entities--one perishable and the other imperishable. What was destroyed was the person's status as a N creature. As noted earlier, death was seen as the reverse of that creation of man recorded in Genesis 2:7. Both breath and flesh returned to their place of origin--breath to the wind and flesh to the dust. The person then acquired a new status as

one of the rephaim. It was a dark, silent, weak and certainly unappealing existence as a shade or shadow in sheol. Or, however, the godly person--dying a natural, honourable death full of years--acquired a restful status with his ancestors. Such people could be disturbed from their rest, nonetheless, in order to visit N existence, e.g., Samuel by the medium of Endor. (see I Sam. 28:8-15)

The OT Hebrews did not have to be in a frame of thought that was confused by the monistic/dualistic dilemma that the corpse presents since their Torah had recorded that God had given the promise that N would be saved. N would not always be in bondage and threatened with danger and death. The Hebrew that was obedient before God did not have to reduce himself to the misconceived hope of 'religious' man that an immaterial entity would survive death nor to the pessimism of the monist that death is existential annihilation. The devout knew the fulfillment of the promise lay in the offspring of Abraham (Israel), the line of David, the root of Jesse, the Branch, the coming of the Messiah. Here lay his hope in the deliverance of the N from bondage, destruction, and inevitable death.

However, diversity of thought increased in the ancient Hebrew world as it approached the NT era. This development is particularly evident from the later books among the Apocrypha and Pseudoepigraphy. A more dualistic anthropological perspective found in, for instance, Esdras, Ecclesiasticus, and the Book of Wisdom suggests Hellenistic influence. Into the NT period there was not one sole viewpoint which could be labelled as the Jewish point of view. This is evident from the controversy regarding resurrection that occurred between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. By this time the Jewish leaders, at least, held views that had evolved from the views of their ancestors. Further evidence of Hellenization is perhaps evident in the writings of Philo and Josephus and the Rabbinical Literature such as the Mishnah, though here the body was not degraded as occurred in Platonic belief.

In the NT era there was differences in belief regarding basic anthropology, and consequently death, but the present author has traced only that development found among those who wrote the NT. The argument has been that the NT writers maintained the ancient Hebrew tradition which viewed N in terms of its status and accompanying imagery, despite the fact that they used the Greek language to convey their Hebrew perspective.

Luke's choice of words for recording Stephen's speech to the Sanhedrin demonstrates that mostly likely he and Stephen were conscious of the promise that God had given to the offspring of Abraham, They also understood that it was N or P who was given this promise. When Stephen gave his defense before the council, he reviewed the history of God relating with Israel. It is recorded that he said while speaking about Abraham:

> And after his father died, God removed him from there into

> a land in which you are now living; yet he gave him no inheritance but promised to give it to him in possession and to his posterity after him, though he had no child. And God spoke to this effect, that his posterity would be aliens in a land belonging to others, who would enslave them and ill-treat them 400 years. 'But I will judge the nation which they serve,' said God, 'and after that they shall come out and worship me in this place.' (Acts 7:5-7)

Stephen, like the author of Genesis 49, said that it was N that went to Egypt and became enslaved. "And Joseph sent and called to him Jacob his father and all his kindred, 75 P." (v. 14) Israel was in N bondage to Pharoah, but God delivered them as promised. Note that their deliverance was accomplished only after the sheolish sea parted.

Interestingly, the three other instances in the NT where P denotes a specific number of people, emphasize deliverance rather than bondage and enslavement. Enumerations of N in the OT suggested bondage and captivity; in the NT the enumerated are not N in bondage but P saved. On the day of Pentecost Peter addressed those bewildered about the event, and, subsequently, "...those who received his word were baptized, and there were added that day about 3,000 P." (Acts 2:41) Peter also wrote in his epistle about the Flood when "a few, that is, 8 P, were saved through water." (I Peter 3:20) While Paul was being taken to Rome as a prisoner, the ship sailed into a storm. They became lost at sea, but Paul assured them, "...there will be no loss of P..." (Acts 27:22) Paul gave thanks and broke bread, and the crew ate some food themselves. The author, probably Luke, added that there were "in all 276 P in the ship". (v. 37)

Each of the three instances has a reference to water that was not typical of N during OT times--the water for baptism in Acts 2:41, the Flood in I Peter 3:20, and the stormy sea in Acts 27. Each event was like the time when the sheolish sea parted and allowed the Israelites to flee Egypt. P was saved from possible destruction by water--during their baptism the converts arose from water, during the Flood the Ark stayed afloat, and during the shipwreck all made it to shore safely. Water, in connection with N, was always the sheolish water of the sea that threatened to destroy and engulf N in a consuming manner. In the OT N were like those N hayyim that swarm in the sea; they were like fish in bondage to the sheolish sea. At that time the natural habitat of fish was viewed as a chaotic, evil, uncontrollable element that kept N in bondage. In the NT period, P acquired the sign of Jonah, that is, it had been engulfed in water but through a great fish had risen from the grasp of death threatening water. P were therefore no longer like fish in bondage in sheolish water, but were like fish that were delivered. Perhaps this NT link between fish and P was a factor that lead to the use of the fish as a Christian symbol. "Fishers of men" rescue P from the dangers of consuming sheol. (Mat. 4:18-22)

For the NT Church this new relation between water and P had baptism imagery. In rising from the water P was found to be cleansed wholly.

Understanding this connection enables one to see why Peter, after writing that 8 P were saved through water, next wrote, "Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a clear conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (I Peter 3:21) Unless P was baptized, it could not be saved; in other words, unless P arose from the sheolish water, P remained in its bondage. Fresh, running water was clear and cleansing in the OT viewpoint, but it was not until the writing of the NT that this aspect to water was associated with N to the point that water cleansed, delivered, and even saved P.

Now the shift that occurred from N of the OT to P of the NT is hopefully more clear to the modern reader. The wicked could seek N and destroy it. People could also seek P, but they were not really able to destroy one. (see Mat. 10:28) N was easily threatened and often quite insecure; however, P was secure through faith and kept through endurance. N needed food for sustenance, or else!, but P was more than food. (see Mat. 6:25a) In sickness N was weak, but P could be sound despite poor health. N made its appeal for atonement through the sacrificial pouring out of blood, but P made its appeal through baptism which cleansed, atoned, and removed blame. N feared for its well-being, but P did not need to be anxious nor accounted as precious. The OT Hebrew feared losing his N, but Christ's followers willingly gave up their P and thus really saved it. N was the perishable seed which continued, through the offspring, the godly line leading to the Messiah; P was the perishable seed which, once buried, grew into pneuma.

This development of the theme from N to P occurred because the promise given to N had been fulfilled. The Messiah had come! Prior to Christ there was a growing sense of resurrection, but it was only on an anticipatory level. Once the death and resurrection of Christ had satisfied the hope that the Hebrews had as N creatures. This shift in emphasis from N to P became most complete. From the viewpoint of those who wrote the NT, the life of Christ meant P could receive what N was once promised. Those P who made their appeal to Christ and were cleansed were considered to be people that were no longer in bondage to nor subject to death. Obedient P were not like the beast, the stranger, the slave nor the captive in the OT. They had emulated Christ through sacrificing their P and had thereby saved it. The term P was thus given by the NT writers an OT sense in some instances because N still anticipated the fulfillment of the promise, whereas in other instances P was given a NT sense because P had received what N had been promised. When P was used to translate an OT quote or expression originally containing N, P remained limited to N. When it was meant to convey notions found only in the NT such as sacrificing P or saving P despite death, then P was employed in light of the fact that the OT promise had been fulfilled.

Therefore, the Christ-follower also did not have to succumb to the dilemma that the corpse presents. His hope for the deliverance of the N had foundation. The deliverance from Pharaoh promised in Genesis 49

expanded to include, once and for all, death itself. Those baptized P did not have to conceptually split themselves into body entities and soul entities in order to satisfy their deepest hopes.

It is difficult for the 20th-Century monist or dualist to conceive of death as an event which initiates a metamorphosis. In Cartesian fashion there still has to be some substance, some structure, which carries over as the building block for the new existence. For the Christians of the NT period, however, there was no immaterial soul entity which acted as some blueprint or immaterial personality skeleton and later became 'fleshed out' in the next life. Two passages, John 12:24-25 and I Corinthians 15: 35-50, indicate that both Christ and the Apostle Paul used an analogy from nature to convey the view that death is a transformation. Paul argued that this perishable N existence and not some immaterial aspect of it was analogous to a perishable seed:

> You Foolish Man! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies. And what you sow is not the body which is to be, but a bare kernel, perhaps of wheat or of some other grain. But God gives it a body as he has chosen and to each kind of seed its own body. For not all flesh is alike, but there is one kind for men, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish. There are celestial bodies and there are terrestrial bodies; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for star differs from star in glory. So is it with the resurrection of the dead. (I Cor. 15:35-42)

Paul asserted that God could give each P (seed) a body (plant) according to its flesh. The bare kernel of flesh (basar, sarx) could become a glorious body (soma). Note that human seed is not considered to be the only kind of seed which could receive a body. Since all P were kernels of flesh, all could receive one--people, animals, birds, and fish for instance. The seed (P) that could be sown was perishable, but what could be raised was imperishable. (see v. 42b) Paul concluded, "I tell you this, brethen: flesh and blood [thus implicating N and P] cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable." (I Cor. 15:50) What is perishable is just that--perishable, and it does not automatically become imperishable. It must first be willingly sacrificed and buried and baptized with water before it can grow into that imperishable plant.

The P of the believer was this perishable existence which could be transformed into pneuma. The seed sown as a soma psuchikon was raised as a soma pneumatikon (see I Cor. 15:44) In this NT passage the godly clearly do not become shades among the refaim. In the sense that the believer had already participated in the death and resurrection of Christ, the person

was already pneuma. This transformation, this metamorphosis, began when he or she became committed to Christ through the willing sacrifice of P. From the viewpoint of those who wrote the NT, N and P (when understood as a seed) were still destroyed when breath (ruah and neshamah) departed; however, they believed this destruction was also a necessary stage which enabled the P seed to transform into a glorious body of the kind that Christ revealed between his resurrection and ascension.

Bibliography

Research on nephesh and psuchē involved seven major sources. They are here listed chronologically since the sequence reflects a development in the views of Biblical scholars.

Robinson, Henry Wheeler; The Christian Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
"Hebrew Psychology". In Peake, Arthur S.,(ed.); People and the Book, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
Robinson's investigation of the OT view of man has had more lasting impact than any other study before Pedersen. His use of the work done in cultural anthropology of his day helped develop a new approach to OT studies.

Pedersen, Johannes; Israel, (two vols.), London: Oxford University Press, 1926. (Danish original, 1920)
This book represents the first comprehensive work on the culture of the ancient Hebrews and is considered a decisive turning point in the modern understanding of the OT view of man. It is a classic still useful today despite its over dependence upon studies of primitive culture of this century and, specific to this study, its questionable use of the word 'soul'.

Johnson, Aubrey R.; The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, (2nd edition), Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964. (first published 1949)
Johnson has done an extensive study of Hebrew anthropological terms which has only recently been approached by Jacob's article and perhaps surpassed by Wolff's chapter on nephesh. The second edition includes ample footnotes as well as an elaborate bibliography and index.

Murtonen, A.; The Living Soul: A Study of the Meaning of the Word Nephesh in the Old Testament Hebrew Language, Helsinski: 1958.
This study is especially interesting to the present author because Murtonen used a similar methodological approach yet arrived at entirely different conclusions. He seems to have missed the validity of Johnson's point that interchanging nephesh and soul is questionable and, furthermore, to have established categories for different uses of nephesh based on a material/formal criterion. In addition, the reading is difficult due to awkward sentence structure.

Jacob, Edmund; "Nephesh". In Kittel, Gerhard, (ed.); Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 9, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. (German original 1953-55)
In this article Jacob made some good points on specific passages containing nephesh yet failed to make a comprehensive re-formation.

Schweizer, Edward; "Psuchē". In Kittel, Gerhard, (ed.); Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 9, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. (German original 1953-55)
Schweizer, as did Jacob on nephesh, made good comments regarding psuchē in specific passages. His view on Paul's use of psuchē awakened the present author to the fact that the NT writers did not use psuchē in quite the same way.

Wolff, Hans Walter; Anthropology of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974. (German original 1973)
More than any other author studied, Wolff has demonstrated a sense of the thematic imagery intrinsic to nephesh which is emphasized in the present study. It might have been more enlightening if he had made reference to the views of previous authors while elaborating his own.

The following are recommended for further reading on the subject of nephesh and the Old Testament view of man.

Becker, Johannes H.; Het Begrip Nefesj in het Oude Testament, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitg., 1942.

Briggs, C.A.; "The Use of Nephesh in the Old Testament", Journal of Biblical Literature, 16:17-30, 1897.

Dhorme, Edouard Paul; "L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et accadien", Paris: Revue Biblique, 1923.

Eichrodt, Walther; Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 2, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967. (German original 1935)

Janse, Antheunis; De Mensch als Levende Ziel, Culmenborg: Uitg. De Pauw, 1933. (chapters 1 and 2 in English manuscript as "Man as a Living Soul")

Lys, Daniel; "Nèphèsh: Histoire de l'âme dans la révélation d'Israël au sein des religions proche-orientales", Etudes d'histoire et philosophie religieuses, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959.

Snaith, Norman H.; The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946. (Fernley-Hartley lecture, 1944)

The following are books of a more philosophical nature which discuss the issue of soul/body and mind/body and for the most part contrast the Greek and Hebrew perspectives.

Berkouwer, Gerrit C.; Man: the Image of God, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962. (Dutch original 1957)
In his chapter, "The Whole Man", Berkouwer discussed the issue of sub-

stantial dichotomy, that is, the soul/body dualism. This is not an exegetical study; it is an involved look at the issue in the history of the Church and surveys contemporary attempts to establish the unity of man.

Cullmann, Oscar; "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead: The Witness of the New Testament", New York: MacMillan, 1958. (Ingersoll lecture, 1955)
Cullmann here argued for the view that both the body and soul can be in the power of either the flesh or spirit.

Owen, D.R.G.; Body and Soul: A Study on the Christian View of Man, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.
Owen traced the influence of Greek thought on modern science and contrasted it to the Biblical view as he saw it.

Robinson, John A.T.; The Body: A Study of Pauline Theology, London: SCM Press, 1966. (first published 1952)
Robinson summarized his view of the Hebrew anthropological perspective and then refuted the belief that Greek thought influenced Paul's anthropology.

Schilder, Klaas; Heaven, What Is It?, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950. (Dutch original 1935)
Though he concentrated on another subject, Schilder did spend a few pages distinguishing soul and spirit along the lines that Paul made in I Corinthians 15.

Shestov, Lev; Athens and Jerusalem, Athens: Ohio University Press, 1960. (Russian original 1938)
Shestov's command of the history of Western thought in contrast to Christian thought is quite evident in this book, his last major work.

Tresmontant, Claude; A Study in Hebrew Thought, New York: Desclee Co., 1960. (French original 1953)
This is a highly recommended book on the difference between Greek and Hebrew thought that is partial to, though critical of, Bergson.

van Peursen, Cornelius A.; Body, Soul, Spirit: A Survey of the Body-Mind Problem, London: Oxford University Press, 1966. (Dutch original 1956)
As the title indicates, van Peursen surveyed the mind-body problem from the ancients to the 20th Century, and ended with his phenomenological position on the unity of mental and physical being.

On language and thought:

Chomsky, Noam; Language and Mind, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, 1972. (first published 1968)
The lecture "The Past" summarized ideas found in his book Cartesian

Linguistics (1966) which gives a stimulating, noticeably Chomskian, defense of Descartes' rationalism and its influence upon the study of language in especially the 17th Century.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee; Language, Thought, and Reality, Cambridge: Technology Press of MIT, 1956.
This is a thought-provoking book containing a collection of papers written by this free-lance linguist of the 1930's who not only argued that language reflects a world view, but, unfortunately, that language structures and even determines that world view.

Toward a philosophy of science:

Kuhn, Thomas; The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970. (first published 1962)
Kuhn asserted that the scientific community exhibits a definite psychosocial behaviour which operates under the rubric of a 'paradigm'.

Polanyi, Michael; Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy, New York: Harper and Row, 1964. (first published 1958)
This is a highly recommended critique of the development of positivism and objectivism in the sciences. One main point made is that the characteristics of the knower, the subject, influence his knowledge of the known, the object.

Reference material:

Brown, F.; Driver, S.R.; Briggs, C.A.; A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. (first published 1891)

Cameron, W.J.; "Soul". In New Bible Dictionary, London: Intervarsity Fellowship, 1962.

Dictionary. English. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1965.

Wigram, George; Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, (6th edition), London: Bagster & Sons, 1963. (first published 1843)

Wigram, George; Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, (2nd edition), New York: Harper, 1855.

Berry, George Ricker: The Interlinear Literal Translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, Genesis and Exodus, Chicago: Follett Pub. Co., 1959. (first published 1897)

Bible. English. The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1962.

Bible. N.T. Greek. The R.S.V. Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: The Nestle Greek Text with a Literal English Translation by Alfred Marshall, London: Samuel Bagster & Sons Ltd., 1972.

Kittel, Rudolph, (ed.); Biblia Hebraica, Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1973. (first published 1937)