

*Thou shalt not eat it*, thou shalt pour it upon the earth as water. *Thou shalt not eat it*, that it may go well with thee and with thy children after thee, when thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the Lord." The most emphatic form of expression, it will be perceived, is here used with reference to the prohibition; the reason of it again assigned, being because of its vitality.

The foregoing reasons assigned for the prohibition of blood-eating may be considered as the *moral*. But it has ever been traditionally held

a living soul, נשמת חיים (nishmat chayim) in regimen, literally, a soul of life, just as the law is elsewhere said to be a עץ חיים (a tree of life, gets chayim.) or living tree. Observe the word employed in this passage, which in common with most Jewish and Christian commentators, we understand as teaching the infusion by God in man, not only of his life, animal life, but his spiritual life, too, indicated by the word "neshamah." We particularly observe that "nefesh" is not here used, but "neshamah." The text concludes, "and Man became לנפש חיה (lenefesh chaya,) a living being; i. e., the dust shaped by the hand of Omnipotence, became by the divine agency, a man, a living being; a rational one, too, the text teaches us, since we find the just-shaped earthly mass receive a "neshamah" or soul. We presume none will venture to deny that "nefesh" does not very frequently signify in the Scriptures, a person, an individual. If there should be any, notwithstanding that every Hebrew lexicon of any character would prove their error, we will refer them to a dozen passages occurring in Leviticus alone, where it can mean nothing else, to wit, ch., 4, v., 2; 4, 27; 5, 2; 5, 4; 5, 15; 5, 17; 5, 21; 7, 27; 17, 12; 17, 15; 22, 6; 22, 11. Nevertheless upon the strength of the passage from Genesis just quoted, the assertion is made that "nefesh" does not signify life, and is not therefore identical with the blood. We never said, as our critic appears to have understood us, that "nefesh" life is identical with "dam" blood. We think, on the contrary, the words convey two very distinct ideas, notwithstanding our belief, that life has connection with the blood; therefore, he has formed his conclusion rather hastily and unwarrantably. We concur with the following passage from the writer, except in one small, but important, particular, upon which we shall remark within brackets. "Until the breath of life was breathed into man's face, the "nefesh" was dead. [We would rather say it was *the body* that was dead especially since the writer joins with us in the belief that the animating principle was directly bestowed by God, and that then man became a living being; he adds] the soul wanted animation. [To say the least of it, we think that this expression of our author involves some little self-contradiction. We again repeat it was *the body* that wanted animation, not the soul, and the contradictoriness of our critic's assertion is shown in this; he first asserts that "nefesh" means soul, and then that the *soul wanted animation*! Now to find such an assertion as the latter made by a religionist, a reverent Scripture reader, and a scholar, all which our critic evidently is, we think an amazing thing. Surely he shares the belief that man's soul is an emanation from God, is immortal, and consequently, that it never was dead in Adam, but that from the moment it was breathed in him, from that moment it lived—ay—and lives even now, while we write, and while he reads. The writer continues, "True, Mr. De Sola may allege that this breathing into the face or nostrils has reference to the first circulating of the blood, and suggested the practice adopted in cases of suspended animation from drowning or other mode of suffocation. [We have