

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions of life and breath and Spirit****Questions of life and breath and Spirit, on: 2005/7/6 15:02**

The thread in the Lounge on 'Abortion' has sparked these questions, because of the liberal use of the word 'murder', there.

What is the significance of 'breath' for humans?

What is the place of 'breath' in a scriptural definition of 'life'?

Or, is it possible to be 'alive' without 'breath' and if so, how is this justified from scripture?

Should your definitions line up with the parallel of being born of the Spirit (John 3)?

Jeremiah 1:5

Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.

All of us recognise that before we were born again, God was preparing us to receive His Spirit. After we received His Spirit, we became aware of eternity and the I AM, and understood that in the Father's heart, we had always existed. So, if we had not been born again, would we not exist in fact (spiritually alive), like we do now through Him who loved us and gave His life for us?

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - posted by My_Daughter, on: 2005/7/6 15:52

please no offense.

This is so good..

Or, is it possible to be 'alive' without 'breath' and if so, how is this justified from scripture?

I will study tonight, and come back if I may and answer this from scripture. (by the way I have a Scofield/NKjV)bible. I may at times make some errors but the Holy Spirit always takes me to crosswalk/lexington and teaches me. I find that it is a little difficult not to have anyone to talk to and to ask, so I will ask you if that's ok.

Everyone is so anointed on this site, and I feel left behind and must catch up.

Beware I drive a sports car, amen.

God Bless You, I will return with some answers from scripture.

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - posted by My_Daughter, on: 2005/7/12 12:10

Dorcas in response...

My interpretation as follows;

Oxygen_02

His Word

(John 3) flesh gives birth to flesh/Spirit to Spirit

Last Question:

~ No we would not if we were not born again: However, we would still be in his heart, but we would not have access to his kingdom (Give me the Kingdom). The Kingdom suffers violence and the violent take it by force.

In Conclusion: John 7-8 You must not be surprised at my saying. You must be born again -- The wind blows wherever it pleases. You hear its sound, but you cannot tell where it comes from or where it is going. So it is with everyone born of the spirit.

~Second to last question;

Or is it possible to be "alive" without "breath" and if so, how is this justified from scripture?, NO!, with justifications as follows;

A1 Gen 2:7 -- The Lord God formed the man/Adam from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the BREATH OF LIFE and the man became a living being.

A2 Eze 47:5 (37) -- This is what the Sovereign Lord says to these bones. I will make breath enter you, and you will come to life. I will attach tendons to you and make flesh come upon you and cover you with skin. I will put breath in you, and you will come to life, Then you will know that I am the Lord.

A3 Rev 11:11 -- But after the three and a half days a BREATH OF LIFE from God entered them, and they stood on their feet, and terror struck those who saw them.

My Song

Early in the morning will I seek your face
in prayer and in worship.

And early in the morning will I draw from your well, the well of living waters.

Breath in me Oh Heavens well the BREATH OF LIFE, for I shall live and not die.

Day after Day will I praise your Holy Name,

And Day after Day will I lift up my hands as an evening sacrifice.

Breath in me Oh, Heavens well the BREATH OF LIFE, for I shall live and not die.

Precept upon Precept and Line upon Line
shall your BREATH OF LIFE instruct me and
illuminate my path.

Breath in me, Breath in me, Breath in me
Oh Heavens well, the BREATH OF LIFE, for
I shall live and not die, Yes, I shall live
and not die.

Thanks Dorcas -- was waiting on the Lord to post.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/7/12 16:54

And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; which in that way entered into his body, and quickened it, which before was a lifeless lump of clay, though beautifully shaped: it is in the plural number, the "breath of lives" (l), including the vegetative, sensitive, and rational life of man. And this was produced not with his body, as the souls of brutes were, and was produced by the breath of God, as theirs were not; nor theirs out of the earth, as his body was: and these two different productions show the different nature of the soul and body of man, the one is material and mortal, the other immaterial and immortal: GILLS COMMENTARY ON GEN 2:7

Re: Traducianism, creationism and infusionism - you asked for it! - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/14 14:16

it seems this subject is either unwanted or dangerous ground. I suspect it is the latter. In the other thread on this topic I tried to identify what constitutes 'personhood'. I plumbed for genetic uniqueness and according to that criteria the fertilised ovum is a person. We are now moving onto the question of 'life' and its association with breath. On this basis some have concluded that an individual does not exist as a separate 'soul' until it takes its first breath.

Physical death clearly separates soul from body, but when does soul 'arrive' in the body. We are moving into territory which has been fought over in the past; this is the battlezone of creationism (not the young earth variety) and traducianism. In Christian theology, traducianism is a doctrine about the origin of the soul, in one of the biblical uses of word to mean the immaterial aspect of man (Genesis 35:18, Matthew 10:28). Traducianism means that this immaterial aspect is transmitted through natural generation along with the body, the material aspect of man. I.e. an individual's soul is derived from the souls of the individual's parents. This implies that only the souls of Adam and Eve were created directly by God, in contrast with creationism, which holds that all souls were so created.

Traducianism was supported by Tertullian, the Eastern Orthodox Church, Gregory of Nyssa, many in the early Western church (but Roman Catholicism is creationist), the Lutheran Church, and some theologians such as Baptist Augustus H. Strong and theologian William G.T. Shedd. Most theologians, especially the reformed, are creationists.

There is another view known as Infusionism

n. 1.

The doctrine that the soul is preexistent to the body, and is infused into it at conception or birth; - opposed to traducianism and creationism.

Do you want to have a quick look at the Wikipedia article before we get deeper into this?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/15 13:33

Looks like a good opportunity to try and understand just what the soul is. I would like to begin my thoughts by first stripping away the material aspect of man. In other words try and discover what is left when man has laid aside, 'this', his tabernacle (the body).

Before we decide what is a soul and whether man is a 'bi' (soul and body) or tri-part (spirit/soul/body) being- lets at least build up some info on what we know.

Lets look at man "stripped" of the 'outward man'.

n Hades, he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and saw Abraham far off, and Lazarus at his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence

Based upon the story of the rich man and Lazarus we know that man does not need a body to:

- 1) He lifted up his eyes. This tells me he had conscious perception without having any physical components normally associated with these actions. I.e. he 'saw' with no eyes and 'heard' with no ears.
- 2) Though he had no brain he retained his memory and recognized Lazarus (whom he had seen) and Abraham (whom he had not seen). I deduce from this that man's brain is in no wise the location of the information required for man to have 'memory'.
- 3) He "cried with a loud voice". This is some type of 'audible' communication. Yet not a voice that could be heard in the natural as there are no vocal chords with which to form the necessary sound waves. The voice was still recognizable as being the rich man's. The identity of the speaker is not lost when man is stripped of his physical characteristics.
- 4) He was tormented by a 'flame'. He is said to have a 'tongue' and Lazarus a 'finger'. We know this could not be a material 'tongue' or 'finger'. This leaves either the option of an entire metaphorical story (which I cannot wholly accept) or there is a real sense in which the soul has parallel characteristics to the physical body. This would mean that the unseen portion

on of man would have to have some sort of 'extension' into the unseen world and can experience phenomena.

5) All individuals involved in this scenerio were able to communicate and 'reason' without a physical brain.

This brings us to Matthew 10:28

*And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both so

ul and body in hell.*

For the purpose of understanding what it means when we say a persons "soul may go to hell" we are referring to the term 'soul' as our Lord uses it in this passage. This same word interestingly enough is used in the Revelation to describe souls under the altar (6:9), creatures in the sea that had life, and in Revelation 18 describes them as being traded almost as a commodity (and we are not referring to 'slaves' here as slaves is the preceding word to "souls of men").

I'll stop for comments...

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit, on: 2005/7/16 21:59

Thanks for the direction towards reading up on traducianism. I checked out the article in Wikipedia and also, the puritansmind link from google, the latter covering many points I've thought of myself.

Quote:
-----In the other thread on this topic I tried to identify what constitutes 'personhood'. I plumbed for genetic uniqueness and according to that criteria the fertilised ovum is a person.

philologos,

The fertilised ovum also develops a significant number of other roles, such as the placenta (which becomes the afterbirth), the bag of waters in which the fetus (later, the baby) floats, the water itself is produced by those cells and, the umbilical cord, which still contains primitive cells at the end of the process. As with the baby, these functions evolve to keep pace with growth, finally accounting for a significant part of what is borne forth. Everything except the baby is thrown away after it is delivered.

These are reasons I would associate the soul with the baby only.

Quote:
-----This leaves either the option of an entire metaphorical story (which I cannot wholly accept) or **there is a real sense in which the soul has parallel characteristics to the physical body.**

I think so, also, Robert.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/17 4:13

Dorcas writes

Quote:
-----These are reasons I would associate the soul with the baby only

OK, I take your point. When do you see the fertilized ovum as 'the baby'?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/18 10:44

In attempting to discover what the soul 'is' we can conclude that the soul can function completely independent of the body- just not in the material universe. The unseen aspect of man contains parallel capabilities to the body. We also know that disembodied souls can communicate with other disembodied souls. We see in the story of Abraham's bosom that there is a "great gulf affixed" not just between the heirs of the righteousness of God by faith and the non-heirs, but between the 'quick' and the 'dead'.

It is my understanding that the term 'death' in scripture denotes *separation* and not 'annihilation'. When the soul is separated from the body this is physical death. When the soul is separated from God this is spiritual death. When the soul is permanently separated from God this is the 'second death.'

On with our inquiry- "**What 'is' the soul?**"

If we say that the soul comes directly from God at birth we are left to make God the author of sin. We know God would not create something sinful. So it seems there has to have been a 'process' set into motion in the beginning that (like the body) would continue on in the creation of souls governed by some sort of laws similarly to those that govern natural reproduction.

A passage comes to mind to illustrate this:

"Everyone who quotes proverbs will quote this proverb about you: "Like mother, like daughter." You are a true daughter of your mother, who despised her husband and her children; and you are a true sister of your sisters, who despised their husbands and their children. Your mother was a Hittite and your father an Amorite. (Ezekiel 16)

This is not physical characteristics, this is personality traits. It is as if we are reading "your personality" 'looks' like your Hittite mother and Amorite father. This is behavior. Notice God did not say, "You were raised like the heathen"- He made an allusion to biological parenting. Obviously we are dealing with personality traits somehow being 'passed on' to the daughter from the parents (specifically the mother). How many times have we heard it, "You act just like you dad." It is as though peoples personalities reflect their families as much as physical biological characteristics. We are in deep water at this point- and I'm not a good swimmer, but I cannot deny some sort of connection here.

Now we have to make all this jibe with the incarnation. In both cases we must conclude that whether it be 'body' or 'soul' **the Sin** (original sin) cannot be transmitted through the mother. Yet we know that our Lord was preexistent. In this case we may lose some parallels between Christ and us. He was made *'like' unto His brethren* and again... *a body thou hast prepared me*. Notice that He did not say "a 'soul' thou hast prepared me." Yet Aaron was "... in the loins of his father...", not his mother when Melchizedek met Abram. This seems to indicate that the soul must somehow be derived from the fathers. They are "yet in the loins of their father..." In the case of THE Father- Mary was with child by the Holy Spirit. I don't take heed to generational curses and the like, but I recall the passage saying God would visit the iniquity of the fathers... , not the mothers. Yet in some sense the mother has a role to play in this also.

The mystery here is in the whole matter of cloning. Where does the 'soul' come from in that case? It seems to me that the whole process of reproduction must have laws set in motion by God that give an order to these things. You can change the 'inputs' (variables) but you cannot change the formula.

We will probably never know where the soul comes from. We can only say what we know can't be possible. We know God does not create sinners. So any 'fresh' new soul from God would have to be sinless and pure like Adam. This leaves two options as I see it:

- 1) souls are born into this world sinless and the problem of sin is somehow contracted in the process of generation (like a mother passing a venereal disease to the child)
- 2) The whole process was set into motion when God created Adam and within his loins were the souls of people for all generations and in Adam all fell into Sin.

Any other options not associated with the accepted norms that others came up with?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/18 16:36

Looking again at what constitutes the immaterial portion of man it may be wise to make a few more suggestions to aid our studies:

- 1) We know that a physical body is not necessary for a person to have self-consciousness and a conscious awareness of their immediate environment.
- 2) We know that a physical body is necessary for a person to experience phenomena in the material world.
- 3) We know that a material body is not necessary to experience consciousness in the unseen world.
- 4) The Hebrew word **nephesh** is used in a variety of different ways leaving it difficult to establish any sort of pattern of understanding. It can mean 'life' or it can mean 'will'. It is translated as: any, appetite, body, creature, dead, desire, heart, himself, life, man, mind, person, soul, themselves, will, yourselves.
- 5) We know that the 'life' of the flesh is in the blood. This is a hard saying. It seems refer to the blood as being vital to the vitality and animation of the body by the soul.
- 6) We know that breathing through the lungs is not essential for 'animation.' This is proven scripturally when John leaped in the womb of his mother before he had first drawn a breath in this life. From this we must conclude- that though "breathing creature" is the literal translation of "living soul" the breath must only reside in the blood and can be transmitted through the blood from mother to child through the placenta. one need not breath through the lungs to be a live soul.
- 7) We know that whatsoever 'nepesh' is- animals are said to have it as well as human beings (See Genesis 1:20, 21, 24, 30, etc.).
- 8) It seems reasonable that if the voluntary thinking faculties of a person are resident in their soul- than likewise the involuntary controls of the body are likewise resident in this soul. This would explain why it is essential for a body to have a 'soul'. This would cast to the wind the commonly held belief that men use 'X' percent of their brain in their short lifetimes as it relegates this aspect of memory to the soul and not the material brain. In this view the brain is merely the interface between the soul and the body.
- 9) If theory 8 holds true then we can further theorize that the soul contains the protocol for the 'operations' of the body. If the soul determines to move the hand it seems reasonable that from the same 'location' would originate the commands for the vital organs, etc.
- 10) It is also interesting that there is a direct correlation between blood pressure and consciousness. When the blood pressure drops to a certain level- consciousness is lost.
- 11) If so be that there is a connection between the body and the unseen element of man that controls the functions of the material element; it seems reasonable that this line of communication can be interrupted. Moreover, if there is communication- there must be a "line of communication."

We read in Genesis 2:7,

And Jehovah God formeth the man -- dust from the ground, and breatheth into his nostrils breath of life, and the man becometh a living creature (YLT)

Some translations say "living being." Are there any clues in this passage of man's creation that we can understand man's composition?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/18 18:22

Quote:
-----Now we have to make all this jibe with the incarnation. In both cases we must conclude that whether it be 'body' or 'soul' the Sin (original sin) cannot be transmitted through the mother. Yet we know that our Lord was preexistent. In this case we may lose some parallels between Christ and us. He was made 'like' unto His brethren and again... a body thou hast prepared me. Notice that He did not say "a 'soul' thou hast prepared me." Yet Aaron was "... in the loins of his father...", not his mother when Melchizedek met Abram. This seems to indicate that the soul must somehow be derived from the fathers. They are "yet in the loins of their father..." In the case of THE Father- Mary was with child by the Holy Spirit. I don't take heed to generational curses and the like, but I recall the passage saying God would visit the iniquity of the fathers..., not the mothers. Yet in some sense the mother has a role to play in this also.

hi Robert

I think this is going too far with evidence we have at hand. What would you make of the Ezekiel 19 passages of the lioness who passed her nature on to her two sons, and the powerful statement Ezek. 19:10 Thy mother is like a vine in thy blood, planted by the waters: she was fruitful and full of branches by reason of many waters.

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - the baby, on: 2005/7/18 20:14

Quote:
-----When do you see the fertilized ovum as 'the baby'?

After 13 weeks, when it appears to be perfectly formed outwardly, it is no longer referred to as the fetus. From the 14th week quickening (movement) may be detected by the mother.

The earliest I have heard of a baby surviving outside the womb, is 22 weeks of gestation. At this stage though, the eyelids are not yet separated and *many* practical hurdles lie ahead.

It used to be from 28 weeks that a baby was considered potentially viable, but this may have been reduced to 24 or 26 weeks in some countries. (If a baby dies in the womb before this stage, it is a type of spontaneous abortion (of which there are several). If it dies afterwards, it is an intrauterine death, or, if after a live birth - a neonatal death.)

Bearing in mind that pregnancy should last 40 - 41 weeks, even as late as 38 weeks, a baby can have difficulty with sucking. The ideal window to be born is roughly 10 days either side of the due date, when everything should work spontaneously and the contents of the skull are protected by adequate but not too much ossification of the bones. (Abnormal aspects of pregnancy or labour, always add postnatal problems.)

Because of the multitude of difficulties in attendance, any baby born before 37 weeks is considered *premature*. It is prone to birth injury, difficulties with breathing and temperature regulation, feeding and blood sugar control, resisting infection, poor physical tone and low birth weight. The possibility of a lingering heart murmur is increased.

Occasionally, a very small and premature baby seems to undergo a unique combination of stresses which have assisted in maturing the lungs prematurely, and it survives with only tube feeding of mother's milk, but this is *rare*. Neonatology as a recognised science is now, only about a 100 years old.

Without good prenatal care and the option of surgery, babies die. And mothers die. The saving of a mother's life, so she may care for her other children, is the reason instruments were ever developed to remove the contents of the womb, if this becomes the last resort in labour, (which of course it still does in many countries).

I have given this small amount of detail, to emphasise the value of 'fulness of time' in bringing a baby to birth successfully.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 9:10

Hi Ron,

Quote:
-----What would you make of the Ezekiel 19 passages of the lioness who passed her nature on to her two sons, and the powerful statement
Ezek. 19:10 Thy mother is like a vine in thy blood, planted by the waters: she was fruitful and full of branches by reason of many waters.

I was thinking about this also. I think we see it clearly in the passage I quoted, "...Like mother like daughter..." Personally I am undecided and am glad you rang in with some input. This is a terrible conversation to try to conduct alone.

It seems that the traducian view makes the most sense until we have to grapple with its ramifications on the incarnation. My point being, (and this is one of my other views) that God selected Mary as a holy woman of God who had a heart to serve God as the female contribution to the soul. The problem with this view is its ramifications on preexistence.

Any thoughts?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 9:14

Hi dorcas,

Quote:
-----After 13 weeks, when it appears to be perfectly formed outwardly, it is no longer referred to as the fetus. From the 14th week quickening (movement) may be detected by the mother.

I don't know if you read my theory on the role of the soul in involuntary bodily functions? Would you concur that if the mind is essentially resident in the soul and that voluntary bodily functions (actions) originate in the soul that the involuntary functions (that which controls heartbeat, breathing, etc) are also resident in the soul?

Thanks,

-Robert

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit, on: 2005/7/19 11:46

Quote:
-----It seems that the traducian view makes the most sense until we have to grapple with its ramifications on the incarnation. My point being, (and this is one of my other views) that God selected Mary as a holy woman of God who had a heart to serve God as the female contribution to the soul. The problem with this view is its **ramifications on preexistence**.

Robert,

I suggest there is a strong connection between the body of a person and the 'immaterial' existence of its functions from life through to after death, which may be termed 'soul'.

As *sin* is a spiritual condition which is clearly a function of flesh before it is put to death in Christ, and there is 'spirit' which gives life to flesh in a physical sense, (which is not put to death in Christ) I associate the sinfulness of a *soul* with the spiritual condition of the flesh (body, in which it co-exists with physical life).

This can be put to death in Christ *by choice* and (the soul) brought to LIFE by the Holy Spirit (who fellowships with the sp

irit which gives living existence to the physical body and therefore, the soul).

That a body may sin, may give a home to other spirits, and even may be seriously influenced by souls with whom it spends time, influence a 'soul' in ways which are able to be *undone* by the work of Christ.

In considering 'the Word became Flesh', if Paul could say

1 Cor 7:14

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: **else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.**

how much more would being 'overshadowed' by 'the Almighty' be able to make HOLY the 'seed of the woman' (Mary)?

'The life is in the blood', I understand as having to do with the spiritual state of the body. That is, there was LIFE in the blood of Jesus both when He walked the earth and when He died, but, sinful man does not have LIFE in his blood. By faith, LIFE through the Spirit IS REAL to us and *definitely* affects our bodies if we allow it to affect our choices of thought and action. It gives LIFE to the soul. But, it cannot make our flesh bodies live forever as they are, something which we come to *appreciate*. :-P

EDIT: On pre-existence, therefore, until the Word became Flesh - Man - He did not have 'soul'.

I may have to come back to this statement but, any pre-existence we have is as spirit not *soul*, and how we deal with our sin-producing flesh, determines the eternal future of our souls.

Do this and my next post deal completely enough with your question about voluntary and involuntary processes?

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - on sex and gender, on: 2005/7/19 12:08

Quote:

-----the female contribution to the soul.

For those reading who may be unsure.... One of the last processes undergone by the single cells which are called 'sperm' and 'ovum' (egg) (before they can combine with each other successfully) happens before they get a chance to meet. (This process is called *maturation*.)

The 46 chromosomes (- complete genetic blueprint in every cell in us all -) contained in each would-be reproductive cell, **halve in number**, so there are now only 23 chromosomes in each (sperm and egg (ovum)).

(This is traditionally described in a picture as 'like dividing a ladder along its length'. It is at this stage, extra fragments of chromosome - sometimes a whole chromosome - can be retained by one or the other, (which it should not), which, when combined with the other 23 of the opposite reproductive cell, now add up to more than 46 (in the fertilised ovum). Not all of these abnormal combinations are incompatible with life.)

Of the 23 from the mother, the chromosome defining sex in the ovum will *always* be an X. A sperm, though, may carry an X (thus the fertilised ovum will now carry XX for a female child) - or a Y (thus the fertilised ovum will carry XY for a male child). Therefore, it is the father's contribution to the 46 in the fertilised ovum, which determines the sex of the child.

Therefore also, the mother of a child brings a female influence from both her father and her mother and there is no way of knowing except by facial appearance or chromosomal analysis, whether the X she supplied to a girl child (or a boy child), was from her mother or her father. However, her *soul* while she is carrying a baby, may bear an influence on her offspring, I think.

I would carefully divide 'female' 'male' (sex) and 'feminine' 'masculine' (gender), too, as while no-one can affect physical femaleness or maleness, masculinity and femininity can be engendered by conscious (and unconscious) influences from within and without the child.

The latter (masculinity and femininity), influenced by hormones and spirit, also may affect the function of the physical body. (This may be simplistically expressed here, but are key thoughts, as ideally, the balance of 'masculinity' and 'feminin

ity' in a man or a woman, is not at variance with the maleness or femaleness of their body.)

Re:, on: 2005/7/19 12:24

Quote:
-----We know that the 'life' of the flesh is in the blood. This is a hard saying. It seems refer to the blood as being vital to the vitality and a nimation of the body by the soul.

6) We know that breathing through the lungs is not essential for 'animation.' This is proven scripturally when John leaped in the womb of his mother before he had first drawn a breath in this life. From this we must conclude- that though "breathing creature" is the literal translation of "living soul" the breath must only reside in the blood and can be transmitted through the blood from mother to child through the placenta. one need not breath through the lungs to be a live soul.

Luke 1:41

And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost:

Luke 1:44

For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy.

Apparently, the ear is the organ functioning most completely (I do not say perfectly.) from earliest in pregnancy - before 6 weeks. I don't know how this has been ascertained, but, it is an explanation for the babe leaping at the **sound** of Mary's voice.

It could also be a natural response to the joy in Elisabeth's soul, that the babe leaped.

'and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost' might also be a reason for the baby to leap. I believe it was around 26 weeks gestation by now, so, quite a head-butt!

I am suggesting though, that these may be reflex, rather than by *choice*. I am also suggesting that the 'life' of the mother - of her spirit in her body - is *extended* to support the 'life' in the flesh of the baby in the womb.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 13:18

Hi dorcas,

Quote:
------(This is traditionally described in a picture as 'like dividing a ladder along its length'. It is at this stage, extra fragments of chromosome - sometimes a whole chromosome - can be retained by one or the other, (which it should not), which, when combined with the other 23 of the opposite reproductive cell, now add up to more than 46 (in the fertilised ovum). Not all of these abnormal combinations are incompatible with life.)

So the traducian version of this would be some sort of 'soul DNA' being split from each parent to join into one again- independent of the two from which this new soul has sprung? It would seem that this process would have to take place at the exact same time as the two combining strands of physical DNA combine? If that were so then it seems logical that the soul must be present in order for any physical functions beyond that initial transfer to have function. In other words if there is a heart beat of any kind- there has to be an underlying soul controlling the rhythm.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - the soul and its sin, on: 2005/7/19 13:19

RobertW said

Quote:
----- Would you concur that if the mind is essentially resident in the soul and that voluntary bodily functions (actions) originate in the soul that the involuntary functions (that which controls heartbeat, breathing, etc) are also resident in the soul?

I would put this a different way: that the brain is a function of the body *all of which impress* the soul with its mind and memory.

Quote:
-----If we say that the soul comes directly from God at birth we are left to make God the author of sin. We know God would not create something sinful.

Can you see that if the soul is somehow derived from the body (flesh), God Himself is not implicated in its sinfulness?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 13:26

Quote:
-----I am suggesting though, that these may be reflex, rather than by choice. I am also suggesting that the 'life' of the mother - of her spirit in her body - is extended to support the 'life' in the flesh of the baby in the womb.

So are you suggesting here that the baby is functioning off of the mother's soul? It seems likely that the babies soul would be fully developed into its functionality before the body as it would be foundational to the body. I am suggesting here that the baby must be built upon the foundation of his/her own soul and that that soul must be complete before the body can rest upon it (so to speak). In other words without a fully developed soul- the body cannot survive. And though I would concur that the reactions of the child may have been a reflex- I think it only strengthens the view that a soul is present to process the stimuli and then *react* to it. One need not be conscious to react to stimuli- only alive. Fire on the foot of a sleeping man will wake him to consciousness. The whole process will not be of choice- but a natural reflex.

Any thoughts?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 13:31

Quote:
-----Can you see that if the soul is somehow derived from the body (flesh), God Himself is not implicated in its sinfulness?

Yes. Though I don't think we can too soon rule out the possibility of God creating souls individually at conception simply to keep from implicating Him. I think there are ways around that such as I suggested the child somehow was infected with Sin as would a child be infected by a contagious disease of the mother. The child could have been defiled by Sin at some stage in development.

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - soul or spirit first?, on: 2005/7/19 13:32

Robert,

Quote:
-----If that were so then it seems logical that the soul must be present in order for any physical functions beyond that initial transfer to have function.

I don't know if you've had time to process my hypotheses but I'm picking up that it is fixed in your thinking that aspects of soul from the parents are inherited as 'pure' soul, rather than purely as genetic material capable of *generating* soul which is uniquely individual to the child, in accordance with the unique combination of genetic material inherited from its parents.

Thinking this through, would explain how Jesus said 'a body you have prepared me'.

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit - the paternity of sin, on: 2005/7/19 14:02

Robert, previously you said 'sin' had to be transmitted through the father (Adam). Every parent has a father, who had a father. Every mother also had a father who had a father. It is necessary to see this is what influences the immediate parents of the child, through which the child also, as his or her mother and father, is subject to the principle of sin by a spiritual effect on *flesh*. If it were possible to be born with the principle of sin installed, and somehow not commit a sin, it would still be the principle of sin which would make it impossible to please God.

Quote:
-----I think there are ways around that such as I suggested the child somehow was infected with Sin as would a child be infected by a contagious disease of the mother.

The spirit which gives life to the flesh, also activates thereby, the *sin principle* in the flesh. This is how God is implicated - by giving each child a spirit, which is not intrinsically sinful.

If there is Hebrew text which undoes my thesis, I'm all ears. ;-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/19 14:22

Quote:
-----If we say that the soul comes directly from God at birth we are left to make God the author of sin. We know God would not create something sinful.

Hi robert

Good to talk, sorry to have left you to it.

Let's probe this a little. The "creationist" (wish we had another name for this group; creationist is bound to cause problems!) view may not necessarily mean that God creates a sinful soul. In all my thinking on this topic I have a verse of scripture that I keep at the forefront on my mind. Heb. 4:12 For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. This passage juxtaposes three groups and indicates that the word of God 'logos' is able, uniquely?, to pierce and divide between the categories within these three groups; soul/spirit, joints/marrow, thought/intents of the heart. The subtleties required in distinguishing 'thoughts' from 'intents' are a warning here. How could I reliably distinguish between the two? Only I think by revelation, hence the need for the 'logos'. Human perception and even theological knowledge are utterly unreliable here; we need to know what God thinks to separate between thoughts and intents.

The other couplet that is obviously in my mind is 'soul/spirit'. Apparently these two can be so closely associated that only 'revelation' can separate them out. You may have noticed that whenever we get into soul and spirit stuff here on SI, I always bring in my cautions. It is so easy to say that man's action is 'soulish' and mine 'spiritual'. That's just a preamble; a disclaimer! ...we know in part...

The word 'soul' is first found in most versions in Gen. 2:7 And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. but before we look at that verse we ought to be aware that this word 'nephesh' is used earlier in Genesis; Gen. 1:20 And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

Gen. 1:21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

Gen. 1:24 And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

Gen. 1:30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so. These are KJV quotations; this is Green's Literal translation; Gen 1:21 LITV. And God created the great sea animals, and all that creeps, having a living soul, which swarmed the waters, according to its kind; and every bird with wing according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:24 LITV And God said, Let the earth bring forth the soul of life according to its kind: cattle, and creepers, and its beasts of the earth, according to its kind. And it was so.

Gen 1:30 LITV 30 And to every beast of the earth, and to all birds of the heavens, and to every creeper on the earth which has in it a living soul, every green plant is for food. And it was so. So right at the beginning we have a sense that sentient creatures have something which the Bible refers to as 'soul'. The word almost seems synonymous with 'life' and that is the way most versions have translated it. If 'nephesh' derives from 'breath' then the phrase or concept that we are touching in each of these verses is 'life-chay' and 'soul/breath-nephesh'; the breath of life. These creatures, and I am groping for words here, have life-force, soul-life, they are instinct with a characteristic life; soul.

The next time 'soul-nephesh' is used is in the creation of Adam, but there it is said to be the 'consequence' of God 'breathing' (nshamah - a puff of wind) lives into his nostrils. God formed (potted) Adam of the dust of the ground, puffed lives into his nostrils and Adam became a living soul (chay nephesh). Although the whole of the animal creation was also formed of the dust of the earth, Adam received this special attention from God and, apparently, as a consequence 'became' a living soul. The other sentient animals were already 'living souls' but Adam is different because of this extra 'puff'. I am not being frivolous.

Some Bible students have deduced that 'soul' is the consequence effect of indwelling spirit upon body which produces 'soul', but the remainder of the animal creation also has 'soul' but without this unique experience of being 'God-breathed'. Where did they get their 'soul' from? What is soul? It becomes more obscure as we go on. In the account of the flood we have the verse: Gen. 6:17 And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die. and we might have guessed that this would be 'nephesh' of life, but it isn't; it is 'ruwach'! Gen. 7:15,22 make it clear that we are not just talking about 'human' flesh here because the animal creation which went 'two by two' into the Ark also had 'ruwach'.

The word 'soul' is later used as an apparent synonym for 'life'. "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six; And the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten."

(Gen. 46:26-27, KJVS) Here 'souls' come from Jacob's loins; is that traducianism?

I begin to wonder whether 'soul' is the same kind of word as 'flesh' in that we have to interpret it from its context; it is a multi-purpose word. Consequently, I am not sure that your comment quoted above can stand. If 'soul' is context sensitive then God could give an 'innocent' soul which would immediately find itself in the context of a fallen humanity and necessarily partake of that humanity. It would find itself within a trichotomy (I prefer trichotomy to tripartite) sharing with body and spirit, but with the spirit already 'dead' as regards its relationship with God. It must inevitably sink towards domination by the 'life forces' which affect it; a fallen physicality and a the law of sin and death in the spirit. This would make 'creationism' possible without charging God with the folly of creating a sinful soul.

what do you think?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/7/19 16:06

I think you make a good case here. I have a hard time coming to terms with a soul being anything other than 'blank' in the sense that it is predisposed to anything or is comprised of the parents. I'm not saying it's not possible and it does answer some other questions, but I have a hard time with it. Yet do you think we could safely take this position and not have to forsake original sin? My immediate thoughts was one in which I heard or read once where someone believed that a person did not fall and become victim of Original Sin until they actually performed the act. Actually I'm not so sure Paris Reidhead did not believe in Original Sin as we come to know it. I keep that in mind as I hear him teach on appetites, etc. and how they are good. I still believe he has some very good points though.

You mention "trichotomy". Have you heard the saying?:

- 1) Plants are a 'body'.
- 2) Animals are a 'soul' and 'body'
- 3) Man is 'spirit' 'soul' and 'body'.

Apart from the requirement of obedience, I have viewed this as a partial portion of the reason as to why God rejected

Cain's offering. The herbs were given to the animals for food. How valuable were the herbs in comparison to the animal? How much more the human than the animal. You are worth more than many sparrows, etc. What is man that thou are mindful of him? Yet we see that in some way we were created in the image and likeness of God. Could it be that when God got ready to make man in His likeness- He made him in the form of a trinity also? And if so be that the mystery of the Holy Spirit carries over into our conversation we can conclude:

"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." (John 8)

Am I giving in too quickly?

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit, on: 2005/7/23 19:32

philologos,

Thank you for this detailed exposition.

Quote:

-----The word 'soul' is later used as an apparent synonym for 'life'.

Â“All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six; And the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten.”(Gen. 46:26-27, KJVS)

Here 'souls' come from Jacob's loins; is that traducianism?

I begin to wonder whether 'soul' is the same kind of word as 'flesh' in that we have to interpret it from its context; it is a multi-purpose word.

Is this the same Hebrew word as in Genesis 14:21

'And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself'? {persons: Heb. souls}

Have I understood correctly that physical breath is implicit in both 'nephesh' and 'ruwach'?

And, in the light of Genesis 6:17, is it possible to say there an inextricable link between 'nephesh' and 'ruwach'?

Re: Questions of life and breath and Spirit, on: 2005/7/23 19:51

Robert,

Quote:

-----we see that in some way we were created in the image and likeness of God. Could it be that when God got ready to make man in His likeness- He made him in the form of a trinity also? And if so be that the mystery of the Holy Spirit carries over into our conversation we can conclude:

"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." (John 8)

Am I giving in too quickly?

The parallels between the natural and the spiritual extend to the life of the unbeliever, who nevertheless is aware of a growing awareness of spiritual truth, but has no power until he is born again of the Spirit.

Quote:

-----Apart from the requirement of obedience, I have viewed this as a partial portion of the reason as to why God rejected Cain's offering

It occurred to me that God had cursed the ground and that whatever it had brought forth, may not have satisfied the criteria of which, if Abel was aware, one feels sure Cain would also be.

Possibly, because Cain was elder, he had been working with Adam on the cultivation of food - the tougher job - of necessity. Little Abel comes along and has an easier job, looking after the sheep.

Nevertheless, one sees the same attitude in Cain, as in the Prodigal's elder brother. Whether it was favour with God or favour with man, neither *understood* something about the fairness and generosity of the Father, or, about the love which sought to please Him by doing the right thing, especially outside Eden, because *all* were in sin.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/7/24 0:37

Ron:

God 'breathing' (nshamah - a puff of wind) lives into his nostrils

Do you have anything that will help clear up this for me?

I've read "lives" (plural) before. But when adam sinned he lost both eventually, one immediately, right? And his seed passed down the sin principle to all, so wouldn't the soul be the area in the life of man that contained that principle of sin?

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/7/24 1:02

Have you ever read the Genesis acct as found in the book of Jaser ? Interesting read, but the dialogue between Able and Cain in that book is pretty extensive in comparison to our KJV bible. I'm sure there's a lot more to that whole thing. Maybe when God placed coats of skins on Adam and Eve He instituted a system of sacrifice that He would accept and Cain and Abel both knew of it? But Cain was self-willed and refused to bend to God's will and out of envy killed Abel thinking that now God would have to come to him on his terms and receive him. They both seem to have been having fellowship with God up to that point, face to face.