

1918

# The Old Testament doctrine of man

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/46702>

*"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."*

THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF MAN

Earl F. Baumhofer

Graduation thesis submitted in the  
Department of Old Testament, Boston Uni-  
versity School of Theology, April 1918.

-- O U T L I N E --

THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF MAN

- I. INTRODUCTION: The Approach to the Theme
- II. A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PHYSIO-PSYCHICAL CONCEPTION OF MAN FOUND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
  1. A study of the life giving elements
  2. A study of physical terms and their psychical meanings.
  3. The creation of man and questions raised by it.
- III. A STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPTION OF PERSONALITY
  1. Corporate personality
  2. The development of individualism
- IV. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT MAN
  1. Old Testament view of future life primitive and uncertain as compared with ours
  2. Sheol and its relation to Old Testament eschatology
  3. Other factors in the development of the conception of the future life
  4. The Old Testament idea of the resurrection

Earl F. Baumhofer  
Boston University School of Theology  
April, 1918

## THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF MAN

### I. INTRODUCTION: THE APPROACH TO THE THEME

A correct physical and psychical analysis of man is a modern achievement. Albrecht von Haller, the "Father of modern physiology" was not born until 1708, and the great pioneer in modern medicine and surgery, John Hunter, lived from 1728-1793. Even so important a fact as the circulation of the blood was discovered by eighteenth century physicans. A correct conception of the nature of man has resulted from the investigations and discoveries of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It becomes clear, then, that we cannot expect to find the nature of man as held in Old Testament times, from 800 B.C. to 100B.C., corresponding to our conception of man. The views reflected in the Old Testament writings are primitive views; crude, fragmentary and fallacious as viewed thru the eyes of modern knowledge. It is necessary, therefore, in studying the Old Testament Doctrine of Man to put aside our modern conclusions, and former interpretations, and go back to the original primitive ideas as

held by the Hebrew people before Christ.

The Old Testament treatment is not scientific either in method or language. Neither is it philosophical except in its treatment of the problem of suffering. The language is the popular language of the people and conveys to us, essentially the views commonly held by the people. We must confine ourselves to their simple terminology and seek out the meanings they intended their words to convey at that time. We find in the Old Testament a "progressive development of anthropological conceptions" which must be recognized. This fact is found in the gradual evolution of some of the terms, as in the case of the Hebrew term RUCH, and especially development of Old Testament eschatology. However, there is no attempt on the part of the Old Testament writers to formulate a systematic doctrine of man and present it as such. They drew no distinctive lines between physiology, psychology, anthropology, theology or philosophy as we do, and it becomes necessary to observe the entire field to arrive at the nature of man as set forth in the Old Testament.

The psychology of the Old Testament is very different from our psychology. In fact there is no psychology corresponding to our meaning of the term. What we find is only a common-sense psychology familiar to the people. In this connection, H. Wheeler Robinson, in his book, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, observes three points where ancient man differs from

modern man in his conception of man. (1) "The idea of the soul is not that of a metaphysical entity, or even of an X in the equation of life; it is that of a quasi-physical something frequently identified (as by the Hebrews) with the breath." The ignorance of ancient man forced him to give a different interpretation to the physical body than ours. They generally thought of the various physical organs as "detached and self-contained." (2) Another point of difference is found in the conception that personality was accessible to various external influences not exercised thru the natural sense-organs. This gave rise to the "phenomena of fetishism", also totemism, demonology and witch-craft. Hence the ancient's interpretation of life was necessarily different from ours, because his world contained vital factors for him which are not found in our world. (3) In ancient thought we find the "defective sense of individuality, but what is better described as the idea of corporate personality." The individual was lost in the clan or family which became the unite around which ancient life centered.<sup>1</sup>

1. H.W. Robinson-The Christian Doctrine of Man- p6f

## II. A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PHYSIO-PSYCHIAL CONCEPTION OF MAN FOUND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Before we can understand the nature of man set forth by the ancient Hebrews, we must be initiated into the Hebrew way of thinking of man. There are two fundamental differences from our way of thinking about man. The first difference is a crude psychology based on the functions of the physical organs. They had no conception of nerves or the brain or the way men think. As Robinson puts it, "The body not the soul, is the characteristic element of Hebrew personality; and Hebrew thought working by an instinctive and primitive logic, has developed from the functions of the physical organs a somewhat complex psychical usage." Hence we can only approach the psychology of the Hebrews thru their physiology, which in itself is incomplete. The second difference is found in their failure to distinguish between science and metaphor. We made this distinction very clearly in our own thinking and in studying the Hebrew conception of man may be in danger of believing he too, made the distinction. Thus we often use the word "heart" in the same way the Hebrew did, a popular psychical sense, but we are well aware that we are using the term metaphorically, whereas the Old Testament uses the term and others of the physical, not metaphoricall, but psychically. Thus the Hebrew says that the intellectual and spiritual

activities are due to the working of a physical organ while such facts as hunger and sexual passion is assigned to the soul. We must think then with the ancient Hebrews not of a dualism of soul and body, but a theory of consciousness based upon primitive ideas of the physical. The terms used to express this theory of consciousness are not to be taken metaphorically. Heart is the only physical term in Hebrew usage that comes any where near our usage of a physical term in a psychical sense.

#### 1. A Study of the Life Giving Elements

In the creation story we read that Jehovah "formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here we have the secret of the source of life as held by the Hebrews. The body received its life energy from the breath or wind blown into it. Ezekiel in his vision of the dry bones sees the same thing come to pass and the bones come to life. Just how this theory arose among the ancient people's we do not know. However it is a common-sense theory. Breath was in life but not in death, hence it came to be looked upon as a life giving element. Breath or spirit was life both in the physical and psychical sense. Blood also was looked upon in the same way. All knew that when blood was shed strength departed and when too much blood was shed life departed.

Now the Hebrews had three important terms which mean the source of life, or life itself. Robin-

son says they denote "breath-soul". The terms are NESHĀMĀH, NEPHESH, and RUACH. It appears that the first and third terms are used more exclusively for breath or spirit, while the second term is used more commonly to designate soul. However we find that RUACH is sometimes used in the same sense as NEPHESH, in the J and E documents and in the post-exilic literature. A study of the terms separately will throw some light upon their usage. The material given here is based largely upon Robinson's work.

NESHĀMĀH is used very little in comparison with the other terms. It seems to denote more the common breath of man and animal. It occurs twenty-four times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Nine times it is used as the principle of physical life or the real breath. An example of this is found in 1 Kings 17:17 where the widows son fell sick; "and his sickness was so sore, that there was no breath left in him." See Job 27:3 also. Again in three cases the term denotes the principle of the moral and spiritual life. See Job 32:8, 28:4, Prov. 20:27. There are other uses of the term meaning the wind, which is the breath of God as in 2 Sam. 22:16, "The foundations of the world were laid bare, By the rebuke of Jehovah, At the blast of the breath of his nostrils."

A more important term is RUACH (spirit) which occurs 378 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. It has a variety of senses in which it is used, as (1) for wind, natural or figurative, (2) meaning supernatural

influences working on man, (3) as the principle of life (like NEPHESH) 39 times, and (4) as the resultant of physical life:

The interesting thing about this term is its evolution from a lower to a higher meaning. We find in RAUCH more than a synonym of NEPHESH. In the pre-exilic period RAUCH is not used as the soul of man, altho it does sometimes denote life+energy in some of the J and E passages, as Gen. 45:27, Judges 15:19 and 1 Sam. 30:12, neither is the term used with psychical predicates until after the exile when this usage becomes more less common. It is also used to mean strong passion (Judges 8:3), grief (Gen. 26:35), zeal (Hag.) 1:14, in the sense of breath it is often connected with the nostrils as in 2 Sam. 22:16 etc.

In the later post-exilic period it came to mean the inner life in general, altho it was still used to express strong passion, anger, zeal etc. This last meaning, the seat of man's higher life, his spiritual self is the significant use for us. Again Rauch was associated with God, as his spirit, and this association plus the higher meaning it held for man made it the term that expresses or denotes the higher aspects of man's psychical nature, in contrast with NEPHESH which came to mean the lower aspects of man's psychical nature. It is opposed to flesh.

The third term, NEPHESH (soul) occurs 754 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Robinson classifies

the use of the term into three main groups. (1) It is used as the principle of life 282 times as in 1 Kings 19:10, (2) in a psychical sense 249 times covering all kinds of states of consciousness as, volitional Gen. 23:8, intellectual Proverbs 2:10, emotional Gen. 42:21, as appetite Num. 21:5, as desire Deut. 21:4, (3) used in a personal sense 223 times.

NEPHEESH is the individualization of RAUCH, the spirit of life. It has a narrower and more concrete meaning and is thought of as the seat of the feelings. It is the soul of man. The spirit returns to God, that is RAUCH, while the NEPHEESH (soul) goes to Sheol. This soul of man is thought of as having its seat in the blood, the life giving source, or even in the breath, also the life giving source. Hence the term is sometimes used for blood. Peters gives the following explanation, "The blood as vital principle was identified with the NEPHEESH, as the soul or self of the man. The nefesh is some times said to be the blood, sometimes to be in the blood, and vice versa. (see Deut. 12:23, Lev. 17:11) Apparently also nefesh was in some way connected with breath. So man became a live person by the breath which Yahaweh-Elolhim breathed into his nostrils. (see Gen. 2:7, Job 27:3, 34:14, Isa 42:5, 57:16) Nefesh, or 'person' may be used of the whole man, but more especially it is used like 'blood', of the living or vital element in contrast to the flesh of both man and beast."<sup>1</sup> Prov. 12:10.

1. Peters- The Religion of the Hebrews- p448

## 2. A Study of Physical terms and their Psychological meanings.

We have observed that Hebrew psychology was based upon functions of physical organs to which they ascribe psychological activities. Flesh (BASAR) is a prominent term in the Old Testament. It is used for flesh of the human and animal body as distinguished from blood, skin etc. Job.10:11; Ezek. 37:6, Gen. 2:23. Again the term is used for the entire body as in Lev. 15:13-16, 22:6, Ps. 16:9. A third use is the designation of sensual creatures generally as in Gen. 6:17-19, 7:21, 9:11, Job 34:18.

Of the 266 times BASAR is used 45 cases have a psychological shade of meaning. "Flesh is contrasted with stone and bronze as being sensitive, Job 2:6, and warm with life, 2Kings 4:34. It suffers, Eccles. 11:10, like the heart that shudders in fear, Ps. 119-120, is weary Eccles. 12:12, ibides in confidence, Ps. 16:9, longs, Ps 63:2, enjoys wine Eccles. 2:3, rejoices Ps. 84:3, sins Eccles. 5:5, is influenced by mental states Prov. 14:30, and retains a certain sensitiveness even after death Job 14:22."

When the term designates all flesh as opposed to Divine, it sets forth the weakness of flesh, and man's frailty and dependence upon God. See Isa. 31:3, 40:6, Ps. 56:5, 78:39, Job 10:4, 34:15 etc. This idea does not appear in early Hebrew thought until Isaiah 31:3. Its use in this sense does not imply anything

1. Material taken from Robinson's book, Davidson's O.T.Theology and Knudson's lecture notes,

sinful as Paul uses the term. Flesh was used for food and was not unclean, Ex. 16:3. In Ezekiel we read "I will take the stony heart out of ~~their~~ flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh." Here the term is used figuratively to denote tenderness and sensitiveness toward God's commands and will. NATURAL frailty or sin may grow out of sensuous weakness but it is not the same with it.

The most important term from the standpoint of psychical usage is heart (LEB). It occurs 851 times in the Old Testament and its uses may be grouped into five classes. (1) Physical or figurative use; (2) personal inner life or character in general as in Ex. 9:14, 1 Sam. 16:7, Gen. 20:5, (3) Emotional states of consciousness found in wide range as intoxication 1 Sam 25:36, joy or sorrow Judges 18:20, 1 Sam 1:8, anxiety 1 Sam. 4:13, courage and fear Gen. 42:28, love 2 Sam 14:1, (4) Intellectual activities as attention Ex. 7:23, reflection Deut. 7:17, memory Deut. 4:9, understanding 1 Kings 3:9, technical skill Ex. 28:3. (5) In the sense of volition or purpose as in 1 Sam. 2:25, this being one of the most common and characteristic uses for the term.

Heart also is used in the same sense as soul and means the entire inner life. It is especially connected with the mental life and serves the function of the brain in Old Testament thought. "Without heart" in the Old Testament means without understanding.

A few other terms of minor importance occur. Liver (KĀBĒB) is used twice in a psychical sense; as a general life center of consciousness. See Lam. 2:11, and Wrov. 7:23. The kidneys are used a few times as emotional centers. The bowels (MĒ'IM) are referred to nine times in a psychical meaning as, sexual love. Song of Sol. v.4, religious affection Ps. 40:9, compassion and pity Isa. 16:11, 63:15, distress Lam. 1:20, Jer. 4:19. In the peripheral organs we observe that the Hebrews gave them a localization of function. They looked upon the eye as an element of personality with psychical and moral life of its own. They speak of the eye as unsatisfied Prov. 27:20, expectant psp 145:15, proud Ps. 131:1, evil Prov. 23:6 etc.

### 3. The Creation of Man

In briefly summarizing the Old Testament conception of man, so far as his human nature is concerned, we have an idea of the Hebrews conception of creation of man. We find two principle elements interang in, dust, and breath or spirit (neshamah or rauch). The combination fo these two elements completed the process of the creation of man. The union of dust with spirit gave flesh (basar), while the union of spirit with dust became NEPHESH or soul<sup>1</sup>.

Several problems regarding creation arise and it is necessary to find out the Old Testament attitude toward them. Does the Old Testament favor traducianism, the belief that both the body and the soul

are the offspring of the parents, or creationism, the belief that God is responsible for the creation of the soul separate from the body, the creation of the parents? It appears that the question was not raised by the Hebrew mind, yet there are facts to substantiate both views to a certain degree. Favoring traducianism we have in Ps. 51 the statement that in sin did my mother conceive me; also the fact of the creation of woman in Gen. 2. Creation here seems to have had absolute end in man. On the other hand for creationism we have the vivid sense of God as creator of all things as in Ps. 33:15, 95:6, 119:73, 139:13, Job 10:8, Jer. 38:16. We do not find in the Old Testament a scholastic type of creation where each soul is separate from God, but rather a religious creationism in which each individual soul is the expression of the will of God.

Another question that arises is, did the soul have a preexistence? There is no direct evidence or even clear indication that the ancient Jews believed in the preexistence of the soul. Some sight a number of passages as teaching such a belief, as 1 Sam. 2:6, Job 1:21 and Ps. 89:15, but they do not contain any clear doctrine of preexistence of the soul. In the two accounts of creation found in the J and E documents Gen. 2:3 and 3:1 we find a view opposing preexistence. Hence the evidence seems to be against, rather than for a belief in the preexistence of the soul.

Does the Old Testament view of man teach a dichotomy or trichotomy theory? There is very little

evidence in favor of the three fold theory of human nature; yet as eminent a scholar as Charles holds this to be the correct theory of the Old Testament. This theory is based on Gen. 2:7 "God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Charles holds the three fold nature is seen in the "dust", in the "breath of God" and in the "living soul." This however does not correspond to the teachings of the Old Testament on creation of man, as we pointed out above. There are really only two elements that enter into the nature of man, those are dust plus the higher nature from God which makes the man or living soul.

### III. A STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPTION OF PERSONALITY.

#### 1. "Corporate Personality"

One of the outstanding differences of ancient man from modern man is his apparent lack of ability to think and live in terms of individualism. He is prone to look upon himself as a part of a nation, clan or tribe, and is bound to this corporate body which becomes a unite of life and action. This fact we term "corporate personality". Many scholars hold this to be a fundamental fact in the Old Testament conception of man. He is not an individual, but rather a part of a nation. There is considerable proof in the Old Testament to show that for a great many years this was the prevailing conception of personality. Some students hold that pre-exilic Israel was wholly a corporate personality and that individuality did not come into being, as a unite of society, until after the exile. However it is folly to make any arbitrary line of division between the two since they are more or less blended together. There is however a period in the early history of the Hebrew people when the idea of a corporate personality stands well in the fore front. And this idea "forced individualistic values to be modified by unquestioned acceptance of certain social customs and religious ideas which to us are immoral,

because based upon the discredited idea of corporate personality."

The custom of blood-revenge is made possible only thru holding the idea of a corporate personality, as in 2 Sam. 14:7, 21:1-14. In 1 Sam. 15:3 we have the remarkable plan placed Amaalct with the injunction to slay all they possess, women, children and even all cattle and sheep. We see this idea of personality reflected in the punishments of later generations for what the fathers have done, as in Dan. 9:16, Lev. 28:42-46. The Levitical marriage Deut. 25:5 and the absolute disposal of the child by the father Ex. 20:5, 2 Kings 9:26 are based on the same idea. This conception of life is reflected in the famous code of Hammurabi, and is more or less common to all of Semitic peoples. Corporate responsibility is seen in Josh. 7:24-26 where Joshua has Achan, son of Zerah, and all his household stoned for the trouble he caused. Perhaps the best expression of the corporate personality is found in the relation of the nation to Yahweh. The Hebrews looked upon their relation to Yahweh as depending upon their relation to the nation. Yahweh was a national God and he is not interested in the individual. In Amos 3:2, 9:7 we find the nation as a unity chosen by the favor of God. It appears from the words of David to Saul in 1 Sam. 26:19, that to leave Israel's land is to leave Yahweh's protection.

## 2. The Development of Individualism

We have asserted that it was not justifiable to draw a line of demarkation between corporate and individual personality at any particular time. We find it is true that The Hebrews believed in a corporate personality, but it is also true that from the earliest of Hebrew history we have somewhat of the individualism of the post-exilic period present. This is seen in the fact that a distinct law of retribution was applied to the individual at a very early period. In the J document, Gen. 18:5 this fact is made plain, also in 1 Sam. 2:25. Other passages might be sighted. In the Jeramaic period we witness the care for the individual as is proven by the meaning of the names given to the children. Again the individual seeks the Divine in prayer, 1 Sam. 1. The stories of the patriots reflect an emphasis on the individual more than on the nation. They were stories of individual men rather than of a nation.<sup>1</sup>

The new emphasis upon the individual person which we find in the Old Testament, reaching its full force in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, is the result of the development of Israel's morality and religion, which in turn was due largely to the Prophetic Reformation. This had its beginning with the prophet Elijah when he protested against Ahab. The ideas of the Reformation were set forth by the 8th century literary prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah. It

is true their messages were addressed primarily to the nation but they lead to the development of the individualistic principles. The encroachment of external foes hastened the idea of individual values and marked the beginning of Yahweh's punishment of his people, which resulted in the doctrine of the "Righteous remnant" of Isa. 1:24-31, of 10:20, 28:5. This doctrine overthrew the national solidarity in a sense and placed the emphasis upon the righteous portion of the nation, which was of necessity made up of individuals who were true to Yahweh as individuals, rather than as a nation.

Jeremiah made a large and permanent contribution to the rise of individualism.. It was the outgrowth of his own personal experience in relation to Yahweh. See Jer. 15:7, 1:4-10, 15:20, 31:31f. He emphasised personal piety and made religion a personal matter. He taught that an individual might have access to God.

The deepest expression of the doctrine of individualism is found in Ezekiel 9:4, 20:38. Ezekiel's contribution was intellectual rather than personal. He announced a principle; see 18j 33:10f, 14:12-20. He teaches that every individual stands in an independent relation to Yahweh, and that each individual destiny is determined by one's self. He laid a great deal of emphasis upon individual retribution, as in Chapter 18, 33:12. This doctrine dominates most of the religious thought of the rest of the Old Testament period. It had its basis in Proverbs and psalms.

The development of the morality and religion of the Hebrews under the leadership of the prophets, lead to the liberating of individualism and making the individual the unite of life. Thus in the latter part of the Old Testament history we find individual personality given a much more prominent place than in the early history. But the idea of nationalism still continued and did not pass away as some scholars would lead one to believe. Haggai, Zechariah and and others did not follow the lead of Ezekiel and still held to the old idea of nationalism. Malachi, Deutro-Isaiah and Joel treat more of individualism, but also are interested in the nation and its future.

The culmination of the doctrine of the individual personality is found in the after life and believe in the resurrection from the dead. The individual was to live after death and was to receive justice at the hand of God. This the nation could not do. Thus we find in the study of the Old Testament conception of personality, that their were the two ideas, the corporate and the individual. They were not separated by any definite mark of time, but existed and developed together.

#### IV. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT MAN

##### 1. Old Testament View of the Future Life Primitive and Uncertain as Compared with Our View.

To us eschatology is a simple matter, we believe in a future life where we shall receive punishment or reward. Our believe is well founded. With the ancient Hebrews this was not the case. We find no clear conception in the Old Testament, which falls far below that of the New Testament. The Hebrews were rather skeptical of the future. Their ideas were vague on this subject and a difference of opinion existed. The view held by the Hebrews of the future life "was less tolerable than the Greek, less ethical than the Egyptian, and less certain than the Persian view."

The reasons given that caused this negative attitude are (1) that the sense of solidarity was so strong among the Hebrew people that they were satisfied with the future if only the nation was immortal. (2) Another reason is found the lack of imagination of the ancient Hebrew, and (3) the very nearness of the approaching kingdom and the realization of the Messianic hope, did away with a need of a future life. While the Hebrew religion, which at this point appeared to be cruder than the heathen religions, it never the less emphasised the social aspect of life and enabled the

Hebrew religion to finally move on a higher plan and give birth to the true faith in immortality.

## 2. Sheol and its Relation to the Old Testament Eschatology.

Sheol is derived from the root "to be hollow". The English word "hell" comes from the same root and means hollow. In the Old Testament Sheol was thought of as a great subterranean pit-cave where the dead went. At first the dead were thought of as going to the grave, then arose the idea of a clan grave, Ezek. 32:22. Finally it became a world grave. This conception of a grave where the dead went was closely connected with ancestor worship of the Hebrews, as is seen in many instances in their care of the welfare of the dead. Graves are found in Palestine with arms, food, drink etc in for the dead, an offering to the dead. The cult of the dead was in the hand of a son and if he failed to use it the dead would lose their happiness and peace, hence when a husband died and left no offspring his brother was to marry the widow that seed might be raised up to him, to care for this feature of their belief in the existence of the dead after death.

The dead retain a familiar appearance, 1 Sam. 28:14, but they have neither body or soul, see Isa. 14:10, this however may not be the right interpretation. The dead in Sheol possessed a certain degree of life, and consciousness, they moved about, Isa. 14:9.

The dead, 1 Sam. 21:8, could forecast the future. This is a peculiar view held by the people. Sheol was a place the people did not want to go to. It was thought of as a bad place; but there was one thing worse and that was to die and be unburied, for they then did not even go to Sheol. The distinction in Sheol did not rest upon ethical grounds, but rather social, if any, Ps. 28:19, Job. 3:19. The prophetic view of Sheol was that it was a land of forgetfulness, Ps. 88:11, Job 22:2, a place of silence, Psa. 115:17. There was no return, no work, no knowledge, no wisdom, Job. 7:9, 14:12, Eccles. 9:5f. Because this belief grew out of fear and superstitions the Hebrews naturally turned away from it, and the prophets used it to set off by contrast the richness and fullness of God himself. The prophets were so convinced of Yahweh's presence that they let belief in a future life go. A belief in Sheol was not the starting point for belief in immortality. It enabled the Hebrews to accustom themselves to a belief in a life after death, which paved the way for the higher belief in immortality which had its source in Yahweh himself.

### 3. Other Factors in the Development of the conception of the Future Life:

Other factors enter into the idea of the future life. We shall mention them briefly. There was the growing conception of Yahweh in his relation

to the individual, in his ethical demands, and in the deepening sense of fellowship with God. The Hebrew dreaded the existence in Sheol without the presence of God, and came to hold the view that he was created in the image of God and that he should share eternal life with God; therefore death was unnatural.

Again we find the rise of individualism a potent factor in the future life. Ezekiel laid emphasis upon the individual responsibility and fact that righteousness would be meted out to all according to their deserts. This prepared way for belief in immortality.

The idea of retribution had a direct bearing on the belief in the future life. We find this problem considered in Job. He was afflicted and looked upon as a sinner because of his afflictions. However Job continued to declare his innocence, and turning from the God of experience he prayed to the God of ideal, believing in a vindication of himself after death of which he would be conscious. Job is driven by the idea of retribution to a belief in the future life as the only solution of his problem.

In the Psalms we find also the growing conception of the future life, especially in Psalms 16, 17, 49, and 73. It is the opinion of many scholars that the text of these first two psalms is untrustworthy. Some hold they teach the need of escaping immature death, others, they teach national immortality. In the 49 Psalm, verse 15, we read the righteous are to live

in heaven, a direct reference to the life hereafter. The psalm speaks of Sheol as the future home of the wicked. Psalm 73:25 teaches the righteous are taken to heaven the home of God, while the wicked are sent to Sheol, which now takes on a moral character, for punishment.

#### 4. The Old Testament Idea of the Resurrection

The idea of the resurrection is seen in Isa. 26, and Dan. 12. In Isa. 26:19 we read, "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise." Here we have a belief in the resurrection expressed but it does not teach the resurrection of the wicked. In Dan. 12:2 we have another clear statement of belief in the resurrection. This is the resurrection of Israel, however, and not a general resurrection. It teaches the resurrection of the just for communion with God and the resurrection of the wicked for punishment, that is to be punished.

There are two reasons why the ancient Hebrews believed in the resurrection of the body. (1) They could not conceive of the soul apart from the body. (2) Older than the belief in immortality was the Messianic Hope which was to be fulfilled upon the earth in the bodily form. To make immortality effective it had to be linked with the old Messianic hope, which naturally gave rise to doctrine of resurrection of the body.<sup>1</sup>

1. Material taken largely from Knudson' lecture notes, Davidson and Schultz.

-- BIBLIOGRAPHY --

1. H. Wheeler Robinson - "The Christian Doctrine of Man"
2. Laidlaw - "The Bible Doctrine of Man"
3. Davidson - Old Testament Theology
4. Schultzy - Old Testament Theology
5. Peters - The Religion of the Hebrews
6. Knudson - Lecture Notes on Old Testament Theology
7. Hastings Bible Dictionary