

Chapter 1 : SparkNotes: Plato (c. 427–347 c. B.C.): Phaedo

*The Departing Soul's Address to the Body (Dodo Press) [Sir Thomas Phillipps, S. W. Singer] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Sir Thomas Phillipps, 1st Baronet () was an English antiquary and book collector who amassed the largest collection of manuscript material in the 19th century.*

Part 3 gives an idea about how Buddhists think of death and what lies beyond. Ascent of the Blessed from paradise and hell, Hieronymous Bosch 1 Death and the Entrance into the Spirit World based upon several sources When a person dies the silver cord, which is an energy cord that connects the soul with the physical body, ceases to exist. The physical body is now under the influence of its spirits and the four Elements which will decompose it and return it to the earth. From near-death experiences we know that when people die, some of them go through a dark tunnel towards a light at the end; others are immediately greeted by already deceased friends and relatives; or they are bathed in a brilliant light. The way of dying has a strong effect on the state of mind of the deceased immediately after passing over. When a person dies a sudden death, as with an accident, he often has no clue that he passed over. He thinks he is still alive and is puzzled why he cannot do the things he used to do, or why people do not respond to him. His consciousness is as clear as when he was in the physical body just before he died. His consciousness goes into a vegetative sleep which is more like being in an undifferentiated state of mind for a while. In this state of mind he can hang around in the neighborhood of the place where he passed over. His nebulous consciousness is able to perceive the physical world vaguely, and sometimes he will attach himself to objects, plants, animals or people. In the esoteric teachings this is called the great Sleep, caused by the Dark Angel, the Angel of Death. This initial vegetative state can last from a couple of hours to several days. When he leaves his place of passing over, he still thinks he is alive, and visits the living, and sometimes he lives with them for a while. He is still half or totally unconscious of his deceased state. Many souls have little interest in what happens to their physical bodies once they are dead. But they do like to hover around the place where they died for a few days. Some souls are still attached to the physical world. They try to communicate with the living. Some of the deceased are still so much attached to the physical that they attach themselves to a living person to enjoy, through that person, the earthly pleasures, like the taste of alcohol, cigarettes, food and so on. Those souls used to be habitual drinkers, smokers and even compulsive criminals. Such a situation is always to the detriment of the living person, as the deceased interferes with the energy body of that living person. Ailments and disease will follow, sometimes quickly, sometimes gradually. Some of the deceased have a grudge against a living person and will attach themselves to him in order to cause harm. Others had such a strong connection with for example a family member, that when they pass over they attach themselves to that family member, because they cannot give up the relationship they had with that person. This also causes harm to the living person, and the deceased often does not realize that. Such disturbed spirits are rare, and help is available from higher, caring entities, who can assist in the adjustment process from the other side. So, the deceased now knows that he has passed over. Some of the deceased now create themselves a dream world based on that what they had expected to find when they would die. Based on these expectations he creates himself a heaven, a hell or any other place he likes. Here he indulges himself in what he likes to do, like eating, feasting and so on, until, after a while, he gets bored with it and realizes that heaven or hell, as he imagined it, is a boring place, and that his expectations of these places were childish constructs of his mind. More developed souls will move much faster through this stage. Many spirits will hear relaxing music, allowing them to feel more "at home". Souls will find themselves in an environment of houses, rooms, parks, nature and so on. These are all places created by their mind that relate to the places they have lived in on Earth. This astral world is usually much nice, more beautiful, more colorful, and much more euphoric. Although the soul itself is androgynous, it will usually adapt an outer appearance of male or female in the spirit world. It is a question of what sex one wants to identify with. Once the deceased wakes up from his dreamy consciousness, and is clear and lucid, he is calm and feels free. In this of mind he can also contact the living. Souls arriving in this world are greeted by soul mates, friends, guides. Initially guides might be in the background when friends welcome the deceased soul. After the initial stages

souls will speed to their destination. They arrive at their own specific group of entities at their own maturity level. Group placement is determined by soul level. The souls represented in these cluster groups are intimate old friends who have about the same awareness level. It is usually a small primary unit of entities who have direct and frequent contact, such as we would see in a human family. Contact with souls from other groups is also possible. Members of the same cluster group are closely united for all eternity. They are often composed of like-minded souls with common objectives which they continually work out with each other. Usually they choose lives together as relatives and close friends during their incarnations on Earth. If necessary the deceased will undergo a healing process and a reorientation to its spiritual environment. The newly refreshed soul undergoes a debriefing of the life just ended. It is a self-evaluation process. It also provides emotional release and readjustment back into the spirit world. More advanced souls might skip the orientation process, although they will meet and talk to their guides. They are usually able to move on much quicker after their arrival in the spirit world. At a later time the soul will meet with a group of wise beings, usually called the Council masters or Elders. This board of review is generally composed of between three and seven members. Yes, there is no one else to judge you than yourself. You can also not deceive yourself in this regard, as your higher self is straightforward, knows the truth, and shows you incontrovertible where you failed. After the soul has spent time playing, studying, creating in the spiritual world in order to enhance its development, it will eventually feel the need again to reincarnate. This involves an orientation process too, during which a soul will be shown a series of possible lives on Earth. The physical body and soul the astral and mental body immediately separate. After the separation, the soul stays for a little while by the physical body. Now he is in the World of Spirits, which is an intermediate world between the heavens and hells. In the beginning he keeps the same appearance as he had when he was in the physical body, but this will slowly change, as his appearance will reflect exactly his inner state of being. By this other souls can see to which spiritual level one belongs. In contrast to life in the physical world, one cannot hide anything in the spiritual worlds. In general, the deceased does not know he has passed over when he arrives into the World of Spirits. He thinks he is still in the physical body. He still keeps his memory and continues to act as if he is still in the physical world. When more highly evolved beings interfere, the deceased is shown his past life in all the details. There are three states the deceased undergoes before he goes to heaven or hell. The first state of the exteriors: The deceased does not know that he has passed over and thinks he is still in the physical world. He meets old friends that have already passed over before him. They show him places, cities, people, and teach him about his new state of being, and the world he is now living in. Most deceased are so ignorant that they think they are already in heaven, because they think they have lived a moral and civil life. They never considered that both the bad and the good live a similar life outwardly, alike in doing good to others, attending public worship, hearing sermons and praying. They are ignorant not understanding that external deeds and external acts of worship are of no avail, only the internal state of being from which the external acts proceed is real. The second state of the interiors: In the previous state he still could pretend to be different than he actually is. Now he can only act according to his true intentions. He thinks from his own will, from his own affection, from his own love. His good and wicked characteristics come out unrestrained. The third state is of instruction: This state is only for those who go to the heavens. They get instructions by angels of different orders. After the instruction the deceased are clothed with angelic garments, which are mostly glowing white as if made of fine linen, and they are lead towards the heavens and introduced to societies. Those who are spiritually well evolved have clothes that sparkle like flames; less evolved ones have cloths that shine like light; and lesser evolved ones have glittering or just white cloths. The lowest have cloths of different colors. Swedenborg divides the spiritual world into three: The World of Spirits where the deceased arrives and stays at most thirty years. As we have seen in the above he receives help and teachings. There are three main sections of hells where the souls create themselves environments in which they continuously suffer, engage in heated discussions, act out their anger and so on. There are three main sections of heavens too. According to Buddhism, death is the separation of the mind and body. Each living being has a mind or consciousness which continues to exist after the death of the body, and takes a new rebirth.

The Departing Soul's Address to the Body A Fragment of a Semi-Saxon Poem, Discovered Among the Archives of Worcester Cathedral by Thomas Phillipps. Free audio book that you can download in mp3, iPod and iTunes format for your portable audio player.

Other religious beliefs and views[edit] Charon Greek who guides dead souls to the Underworld. In theological reference to the soul, the terms "life" and "death" are viewed as emphatically more definitive than the common concepts of " biological life " and "biological death". Because the soul is said to be transcendent of the material existence, and is said to have potentially eternal life , the death of the soul is likewise said to be an eternal death. Thus, in the concept of divine judgment , God is commonly said to have options with regard to the dispensation of souls, ranging from Heaven i. Typically both Heaven and hell are said to be eternal, or at least far beyond a typical human concept of lifespan and time. According to Louis Ginzberg , soul of Adam is the image of God. God is considered to be the Supreme Soul, with maximum degrees of spiritual qualities, such as peace, love and purity. However, the soul is not the highest, but a middle dimension of human beings. Higher than the soul is the spirit, which is considered to be the real self; the source of everything we call "good"â€”happiness, wisdom, love, compassion, harmony, peace, etc. While the spirit is eternal and incorruptible, the soul is not. The soul acts as a link between the material body and the spiritual self, and therefore shares some characteristics of both. The soul can be attracted either towards the spiritual or towards the material realm, being thus the "battlefield" of good and evil. It is only when the soul is attracted towards the spiritual and merges with the Self that it becomes eternal and divine. Anthroposophy[edit] Rudolf Steiner differentiated three stages of soul development, which interpenetrate one another in consciousness: Miscellaneous[edit] In Surat Shabda Yoga , the soul is considered to be an exact replica and spark of the Divine. Similarly, the spiritual teacher Meher Baba held that "Atma, or the soul, is in reality identical with Paramatma the Oversoul â€” which is one, infinite, and eternal Cornford quotes Pindar by saying that the soul sleeps while the limbs are active, but when one is sleeping, the soul is active and reveals "an award of joy or sorrow drawing near" in dreams. He considered this essence to be an incorporeal, eternal occupant of our being. Plato says that even after death, the soul exists and is able to think. He believed that as bodies die, the soul is continually reborn in subsequent bodies. However, Aristotle believed that only one part of the soul was immortal namely the intellect logos. The Platonic soul consists of three parts: Plato also compares the three parts of the soul or psyche to a societal caste system. Logos keeps the other functions of the soul regulated. For example, the full actualization of an eye, as an independent organism, is to see its purpose or final cause. This organization between form and matter is necessary for any activity, or functionality, to be possible in a natural being. Using an artifact non-natural being as an example, a house is a building for human habitation, but for a house to be actualized requires the material wood, nails, bricks, etc. However, this does not imply that a house has a soul. In regards to artifacts, the source of motion that is required for their full actualization is outside of themselves for example, a builder builds a house. In natural beings, this source of motion is contained within the being itself. The various faculties of the soul , such as nutrition, movement peculiar to animals , reason peculiar to humans , sensation special, common, and incidental and so forth, when exercised, constitute the "second" actuality, or fulfillment, of the capacity to be alive. For example, someone who falls asleep, as opposed to someone who falls dead, can wake up and live their life, while the latter can no longer do so. Aristotle identified three hierarchical levels of natural beings: For these groups, he identified three corresponding levels of soul, or biological activity: Although mostly seen as opposing Plato in regard to the immortality of the soul, a controversy can be found in relation to the fifth chapter of the third book. In this text both interpretations can be argued for, soul as a whole can be deemed mortal and a part called "active intellect" or "active mind" is immortal and eternal. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. December Learn how and when to remove this template message Following Aristotle, Avicenna Ibn Sina and Ibn al-Nafis , a Persian philosopher , further elaborated upon the Aristotelian understanding of the soul and developed their own theories on the

soul. They both made a distinction between the soul and the spirit, and the Avicennian doctrine on the nature of the soul was influential among the Scholastics. In his theory of "The Ten Intellects", he viewed the human soul as the tenth and final intellect. While he was imprisoned, Avicenna wrote his famous "Floating Man" thought experiment to demonstrate human self-awareness and the substantial nature of the soul. He argues that in this scenario one would still have self-consciousness. He thus concludes that the idea of the self is not logically dependent on any physical thing, and that the soul should not be seen in relative terms, but as a primary given, a substance. Consequent to this, he distinguished three orders of life: Concerning the human soul, his epistemological theory required that, since the knower becomes what he knows, the soul is definitely not corporeal—“if it is corporeal when it knows what some corporeal thing is, that thing would come to be within it. Furthermore, since the rational soul of human beings is a subsistent form and not something made of matter and form, it cannot be destroyed in any natural process. Immanuel Kant[edit] In his discussions of rational psychology, Immanuel Kant — identified the soul as the "I" in the strictest sense, and argued that the existence of inner experience can neither be proved nor disproved. We cannot prove a priori the immateriality of the soul, but rather only so much: It is from the "I", or soul, that Kant proposes transcendental rationalization, but cautions that such rationalization can only determine the limits of knowledge if it is to remain practical.

Chapter 3 : The Soul's Address to the Body : Douglas Moffat :

Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

The soul is, on the one hand, something that a human being risks in battle and loses in death. It has been suggested for instance, by Snell, 19 that what is referred to as soul in either case is in fact thought of as one and the same thing, something that a person can risk and lose and that, after death, endures as a shade in the underworld. The suggestion is plausible, but cannot be verified. The presence of soul therefore distinguishes a living human body from a corpse. Homer never says that anyone does anything in virtue of, or with, their soul, nor does he attribute any activity to the soul of a living person. Thus Achilles says that he is continuously risking his soul Iliad 9. It should also be pointed out that in the Homeric poems, only human beings are said to have and to lose souls. Correspondingly, Homer never envisages shades or images of non-human creatures in the underworld. These two facts taken together suggest that in whatever precise way the soul is conceived of as associated with life, it is in any case thought to be connected not with life in general, or life in all its forms, but rather, more specifically, with the life of a human being. Several significant developments occurred in the ways Greeks thought and spoke about the soul in the sixth and fifth centuries. The questions about the soul that are formulated and discussed in the writings of Plato and Aristotle to some extent arise from, and need to be interpreted against the background of, these sixth and fifth century developments. Thales of Miletus, who is credited with successfully predicting a solar eclipse occurring in , reportedly attributed soul to magnets, on the grounds that magnets are capable of moving iron Aristotle, *De Anima* 1. Thus, while Homer spoke of soul only in the case of human beings, in sixth and fifth century usage soul is attributed to every kind of living thing. What is in place, then, at this time is the notion that soul is what distinguishes that which is alive from that which is not. However, it is not just that soul is said to be present in every living thing. It is also the case that an increasingly broad range of ways of acting and being acted on is attributed to the soul. Thus it has come to be natural, by the end of the fifth century, to refer pleasure taken in food and drink, as well as sexual desire, to the soul. For detailed discussion, see Claus, . In contexts of intense emotion or crisis, feelings like love and hate, joy and grief, anger and shame are associated with the soul. Oedipus says that his soul laments the misery of his city and its inhabitants Oedipus Tyrannus. Moreover, the soul is also importantly connected with boldness and courage, especially in battle. Courageous people are said, for instance in Herodotus and Thucydides, to have enduring or strong souls cf. In the Hippocratic text *Airs, Waters, Places*, the soul is thought of as the place of courage or, as the case may be, its opposite: The connection between the soul and characteristics like boldness and courage in battle is plainly an aspect of the noteworthy fifth century development whereby the soul comes to be thought of as the source or bearer of moral qualities such as, for instance, temperance and justice. This text, and others like it cf. While the connection with courage is obvious in a number of texts, there are other texts in which the soul is the bearer of other admirable qualities, such as a Euripidean fragment that speaks of the desire characteristic of a soul that is just, temperate and good fr. The last two texts mentioned may well be influenced by Orphic and Pythagorean beliefs about the nature and immortality of the soul, to which we will turn in due course. But it would be a mistake to think that the moralization of the soul i. Pericles acts courageously, and Hippolytus temperately or chastely, because of the qualities of their souls from which such actions have a strong tendency to flow, and their actions express and make evident the courage, temperance and the like that characterize their souls. Once we are in a position properly to appreciate the connection between soul and moral character that must already have been felt to be natural at this stage, it should come as no surprise that the soul is also taken to be something that engages in activities like thinking and planning. If the soul is, in some sense, responsible for courageous acts, for instance, it is only to be expected that the soul also grasps what, in the circumstances, courage calls for, and how, at some suitable level of detail, the courageous act must be performed. Somewhat similarly, in a Sophoclean fragment fr. There is, after all, no clear-cut and manifest difference between, say, being in the emotional state of fear and having a terrifying thought or perception. Thus in non-philosophical Greek of the

fifth century the soul is treated as the bearer of moral qualities, and also as responsible for practical thought and cognition. For further discussion, see this supplement on the contrary claims of Burnet. As a result of these developments, the language made available something that Homeric Greek lacked, a distinction between body and soul. Antiphon says of a defendant who is sure of his innocence that though his body may surrender, his soul saves him by its willingness to struggle, through knowledge of its innocence. Homer, by contrast, knows and speaks of a whole lot of different sources and bearers of psychological predicates, but lacks a word to pick out the soul as a single item to which the predicates in question can, in some way or other, be referred and which can be distinguished from, and in suitable contexts contrasted with, the body cf. For instance, once it becomes natural to speak of soul as what distinguishes the animate from the inanimate, rather than as something that is restricted to humans, it becomes clear that the domain of ensouled things is not limited to animals, but includes plants as well. Empedocles and, apparently, Pythagoras cf. Bremmer, thought that plants have souls, and that human souls, for instance, can come to animate plants. Empedocles in fact claimed to have been a bush in a previous incarnation, as well as, among other things, a bird and a fish fr. As we have seen, at least some of the earliest extant texts that associate with the soul moral virtues other than courage suggest Pythagorean influence. Pythagoreanism was concerned with, among other things, the continued existence of the person or something suitably person-like after death. Barnes, ; Huffman forthcoming. This tendency is well illustrated by a story about Pythagoras, reported by Xenophanes fr. He may have been the first thinker to articulate a connection between soul and motor functions. Like many or indeed all sixth and fifth century thinkers who expressed views on the nature or constitution of the soul, Heraclitus thought that the soul was bodily, but composed of an unusually fine or rare kind of matter, e. Barnes, , and Huffman. The prevalence of the idea that the soul is bodily explains the absence of problems about the relation between soul and body. Soul and body were not thought to be radically different in kind; their difference seemed just to consist in a difference in degree of properties such as fineness and mobility. There is thus some reason to think that the philosophical theories in question are best interpreted as working with, and on, the relatively non-theoretical notion of the soul that by the end of the fifth century has come to be embedded in ordinary language. In what follows our main concern will be to characterize some of the theories in question. But we should also attend, wherever this seems appropriate and helpful, to ways in which familiarity with the ordinary notion of the soul might enable us better to understand why a theory or an argument proceeds the way it does. In addition, we should note ways in which philosophical theories might seem to clarify and further articulate the ordinary notion. In fact, in the Apology, 40c, Socrates himself is presented as being noncommittal about what happens to the soul at death, and even about whether it survives at all. They think that after it has left the body it no longer exists anywhere, but that it is destroyed and dissolved on the day the man dies. Are you really in a position to assert that? Answering both questions, Socrates says not only that the soul is immortal, but also that it contemplates truths after its separation from the body at the time of death. Needless to say, none of the four main lines of argument that Socrates avails himself of succeeds in establishing the immortality of the soul, or in demonstrating that disembodied souls enjoy lives of thought and intelligence. The arguments have been discussed in some detail, for instance in Bostock, and for our purposes there is no need to state and analyze them systematically. The argument that sheds most light on what Plato takes the nature of the soul to be is the affinity argument 78bb. This argument confronts head-on the widespread worry that the soul, at or soon after death, is destroyed by being dispersed. It begins by distinguishing between two kinds of things: These two categories are obviously mutually exclusive. It is not clear whether or not they are meant to be exhaustive. Moreover, the category of imperishable, intelligible being is exemplified, but not, it seems, exhausted, by Platonic forms such as equality, beauty and the like contra Bostock, Intelligible being evidently includes what Socrates calls the divine, whose nature it is to rule and to lead 80a, and there is no indication that the forms exhaust the divine, or even include the divine, so understood. Thus the argument leaves room for the idea that souls are not forms, but are nevertheless intelligible, partless and imperishable contra Robinson, In fact, in framing the argument in the way he does Plato furnishes the conceptual framework needed for saying that body and soul differ in kind, the one being perceptible and perishable, the other being intelligible and exempt from destruction. However, the argument does not support such a strong

conclusion, and Socrates is aware of this. What he does, in fact, conclude is that the soul is most like, and most akin to, intelligible being, and that the body is most like perceptible and perishable being. To say this is plainly neither to assert nor to imply as Robinson , 30, appears to think that soul in some way or other falls short of intelligible, imperishable being, any more than it is to assert or imply that body in some way or other falls short of, or rather rises above, perceptible, perishable being. The argument leaves it open whether soul is a perfectly respectable member of intelligible reality, the way human bodies are perfectly respectable members of perceptible reality, or whether, alternatively, soul has some intermediate status in between intelligible and perceptible being, rising above the latter, but merely approximating to the former. If this position can be established, Socrates is in a position to refute the popular view that the soul, being composed of ethereal stuff, is more liable to dispersion and destruction than the body. However, as Cebes points out 88b , unless Socrates can establish that the soul is altogether exempt from destruction, confidence of survival in the face of death is misplaced. For it might have experienced any number of incarnations already, and the current one might be its last. So Socrates launches his most elaborate and final argument for the immortality of the soul, which concludes that since life belongs to soul essentially, the soul must be deathless – that is, immortal. The affinity argument is supposed to show not only that the soul is most like intelligible, imperishable being, but also that it is most akin to it. Socrates argues that the soul is like intelligible being on the grounds that it is not visible and, in general, not perceptible anyhow to humans, as Cebes adds at 79b , and that it shares its natural function with the divine, namely to rule and lead the body in the one case, mortals in the other. There is a separate argument for the kinship of the soul with intelligible being. It is not just that the soul is in one state or another depending on which kind of object it is attending to, in such a way that its state somehow corresponds to the character of the object attended to. The claim that the soul is akin to intelligible reality thus rests, at least in part, on the view that intelligible reality is especially suited to the soul, as providing it with a domain of objects in relation to which, and only in relation to which, it can function without inhibition and interference and fully in accordance with its own nature, so as to achieve its most completely developed and optimal state, wisdom. It hardly needs pointing out, then, that the soul, as Plato conceives of it in the *Phaedo*, is crucially characterized by cognitive and intellectual features: However, it should be clear that the soul, as it is conceived of here, is not simply the mind, as we conceive of it. It is both broader and narrower than that. It is broader in that Plato evidently retains the traditional idea of soul as distinguishing the animate from the inanimate. Two of the four main lines of argument for the immortality of the soul rely not on cognitive or indeed specifically psychological features of the soul, but simply on the familiar connection between soul and life. According to the cyclical argument 70cd , being alive in general is preceded by, just as it precedes, being dead. According to the last line of argument that Socrates offers in the *Phaedo*, the soul is immortal because it has life essentially, the way fire has heat essentially. It is plain that both of these arguments apply to the souls of all living things, including plants cf. And in the final argument, Socrates explicitly appeals to the idea that it is the soul that animates the body of a living thing c: What is it that, when present in a body, makes it living? Now, as we have seen in some detail, the Greek notion of soul included the idea of soul as animating body probably as early as the sixth century, when Thales attributed soul to magnets. Connections between the soul and morally significant characteristics such as courage, temperance and justice, and with cognitive and intellectual functions, notably with planning and practical thought, are firmly established in fifth century Greek usage. But it is obviously far from clear whether the ordinary notion of soul, as it develops from the Homeric poems down to the end of the fifth century, is a well-formed, coherent notion, one that can suitably support the very prominent role that Plato assigns to the soul, in the *Phaedo* as well as in other dialogues. Perhaps most pressingly, it is far from clear whether what distinguishes the animate from the inanimate is the very thing that, in the case of some animate organisms, is responsible for cognitive functions such as sense-perception and thought, and that, specifically in the case of human beings, is the bearer of moral qualities such as justice, courage and the like. The question is neither explicitly raised nor, of course, resolved in the *Phaedo*; but a passage in the *Republic* da , with which we will be concerned in section 3. Given the idea that soul is the distinguishing mark of all living things, including plants, the Greek notion of soul is, as we have seen already, broader than our concept of mind.

Chapter 4 : What is the difference between the soul and spirit of man?

Soul and Body I differs from the Exeter version, in that, following the damned soul's address is a parallel address from a blessed soul to its body. Soul and Body II ends after The Damned Soul's address, which consists of lines of verse.

Within the middle dialogues, it is uncontroversial that the *Phaedo* was written before the *Republic*, and most scholars think it belongs before the *Symposium* as well. His most famous theory, the theory of Forms, is presented in four different places in the dialogue. Plato draws attention at 59b to the fact that he himself was not present during the events retold, suggesting that he wants the dialogue to be seen as work of fiction. Socrates himself challenges his listeners to provide such defense at 84c-d. How seriously does Plato take these arguments, and what does the surrounding context contribute to our understanding of them? While this article will concentrate on the philosophical aspects of the *Phaedo*, readers are advised to pay close attention to the interwoven dramatic features as well.

Outline of the Dialogue The dialogue revolves around the topic of death and immortality: The text can be divided, rather unevenly, into five sections: The former asks the latter, who was present on that day, to recount what took place. He agrees to tell the whole story from the beginning; within this story the main interlocutors are Socrates, Simmias, and Cebes. Some commentators on the dialogue have taken the latter two characters to be followers of the philosopher Pythagoras B. They go in to the prison to find Socrates with his wife Xanthippe and their baby, who are then sent away. Socrates, rubbing the place on his leg where his just removed bonds had been, remarks on how strange it is that a man cannot have both pleasure and pain at the same time, yet when he pursues and catches one, he is sure to meet with the other as well. Cebes asks Socrates about the poetry he is said to have begun writing, since Evenus a Sophist teacher, not present was wondering about this. He then asks Cebes to convey to Evenus his farewell, and to tell him that "even though it would be wrong to take his own life" he, like any philosopher, should be prepared to follow Socrates to his death. The discussion starts with the question of suicide. If philosophers are so willing to die, asks Cebes, why is it wrong for them to kill themselves? As Cebes and Simmias immediately point out, however, this appears to contradict his earlier claim that the philosopher should be willing to die: The thesis to be supported is a generalized version of his earlier advice to Evenus: Socrates begins his defense of this thesis, which takes up the remainder of the present section, by defining death as the separation of body and soul. This definition goes unchallenged by his interlocutors, as does its dualistic assumption that body and soul are two distinct entities. First, the true philosopher despises bodily pleasures such as food, drink, and sex, so he more than anyone else wants to free himself from his body 64da. They are best approached not by sense perception but by pure thought alone. These entities are granted again without argument by Simmias and Cebes, and are discussed in more detail later. All told, then, the body is a constant impediment to philosophers in their search for truth: To have pure knowledge, therefore, philosophers must escape from the influence of the body as much as is possible in this life. Thus, Socrates concludes, it would be unreasonable for a philosopher to fear death, since upon dying he is most likely to obtain the wisdom which he has been seeking his whole life. Ordinary people are only brave in regard to some things because they fear even worse things happening, and only moderate in relation to some pleasures because they want to be immoderate with respect to others. Thus ends his defense. To persuade them that it continues to exist on its own will require some compelling argument. Secondly, he identifies two things which need to be demonstrated in order to convince those who are skeptical: The first argument that Socrates deploys appears to be intended to respond to a , and the second to b. The Cyclical Argument 70ce Socrates mentions an ancient theory holding that just as the souls of the dead in the underworld come from those living in this world, the living souls come back from those of the dead 70c-d. He uses this theory as the inspiration for his first argument, which may be reconstructed as follows: All things come to be from their opposite states: Between every pair of opposite states there are two opposite processes: If the two opposite processes did not balance each other out, everything would eventually be in the same state: Therefore, everything that dies must come back to life again 72a. With this terminology in mind, some contemporary commentators have maintained that the argument relies on covertly shifting between these different kinds of opposites. Clever readers may notice other apparent difficulties as well. Does

the principle about balance in 3 , for instance, necessarily apply to living things? Moreover, how does Plato account for adding new living souls to the human population? While these questions are perhaps not unanswerable from the point of view of the present argument, we should keep in mind that Socrates has several arguments remaining, and he later suggests that this first one should be seen as complementing the second 77c-d. This is likely a reference to the Meno 82b ff. The argument may be reconstructed as follows: Things in the world which appear to be equal in measurement are in fact deficient in the equality they possess 74b, d-e. In order to do this, we must have had some prior knowledge of the Equal itself 74d-e. Since this knowledge does not come from sense-perception, we must have acquired it before we acquired sense-perception, that is, before we were born 75b ff. Therefore, our souls must have existed before we were born. He could mean that the sticks may appear as equal or unequal to different observers, or perhaps they appear as equal when measured against one thing but not another. The process of recollection is initiated not just when we see imperfectly equal things, then, but when we see things that appear to be beautiful or good as well; experience of all such things inspires us to recollect the relevant Forms. Moreover, if these Forms are never available to us in our sensory experience, we must have learned them even before we were capable of having such experience. Simmias agrees with the argument so far, but says that this still does not prove that our souls exist after death, but only before birth. This difficulty, Socrates suggests, can be resolved by combining the present argument with the one from opposites: He does not elaborate on this suggestion, however, and instead proceeds to offer a third argument. There are two kinds of existences: The soul is more like world b , whereas the body is more like world a 79b-e. Therefore, supposing it has been freed of bodily influence through philosophical training, the soul is most likely to make its way to world b when the body dies 80da. If, however, the soul is polluted by bodily influence, it likely will stay bound to world a upon death 81bb. Of the impure souls, those who have been immoderate will later become donkeys or similar animals, the unjust will become wolves or hawks, those with only ordinary non-philosophical virtue will become social creatures such as bees or ants. The philosopher, on the other hand, will join the company of the gods. Hence, after death, his soul will join with that to which it is akin, namely, the divine. For he, like the swan that sings beautifully before it dies, is dedicated to the service of Apollo, and thus filled with a gift of prophecy that makes him hopeful for what death will bring. The Objections 85cc Simmias prefaces his objection by making a remark about methodology. If at the end of this investigation one fails to find the truth, one should adopt the best theory and cling to it like a raft, either until one dies or comes upon something sturdier. For one might put forth a similar argument which claims that the soul is like a harmony and the body is like a lyre and its strings. But even though a musical harmony is invisible and akin to the divine, it will cease to exist when the lyre is destroyed. Following the soul-as-harmony thesis, the same would be true of the soul when the body dies. Next Socrates asks if Cebes has any objections. In support of his doubt, he invokes a metaphor of his own. Suppose someone were to say that since a man lasts longer than his cloak, it follows that if the cloak is still there the man must be there too. We would certainly think this statement was nonsense. Just as a man might wear out many cloaks before he dies, the soul might use up many bodies before it dies. In light of this uncertainty, one should always face death with fear. Misology, he says, arises in much the same way that misanthropy does: If he had more knowledge and experience, however, he would not be so quick to make this leap, for he would realize that most people fall somewhere in between the extremes of good and bad, and he merely happened to encounter someone at one end of the spectrum. A similar caution applies to arguments. If someone thinks a particular argument is sound, but later finds out that it is not, his first inclination will be to think that all arguments are unsound; yet instead of blaming arguments in general and coming to hate reasonable discussion, we should blame our own lack of skill and experience. To begin, he gets both Simmias and Cebes to agree that the theory of recollection is true. Simmias admits this inconsistency, and says that he in fact prefers the theory of recollection to the other view. Nonetheless, Socrates proceeds to make two additional points. First, if the soul is a harmony, he contends, it can have no share in the disharmony of wickedness. But this implies that all souls are equally good. Second, if the soul is never out of tune with its component parts as shown at 93a , then it seems like it could never oppose these parts. A passage in Homer, wherein Odysseus beats his breast and orders his heart to endure, strengthens this picture of the opposition between soul and

bodily emotions. Given these counter-arguments, Simmias agrees that the soul-as-harmony thesis cannot be correct. Response to Cebes 95ab 1. He now proceeds to relate his own examinations into this subject, recalling in turn his youthful puzzlement about the topic, his initial attraction to a solution given by the philosopher Anaxagoras B. When Socrates was young, he says, he was excited by natural science, and wanted to know the explanation of everything from how living things are nourished to how things occur in the heavens and on earth. But then he realized that he had no ability for such investigations, since they caused him to unlearn many of the things he thought he had previously known. He used to think, for instance, that people grew larger by various kinds of external nourishment combining with the appropriate parts of our bodies, for example, by food adding flesh to flesh. But what is it which makes one person larger than another? Or for that matter, which makes one and one add up to two? Because of puzzles like these, Socrates is now forced to admit his ignorance: This method came about as follows. He took this to mean that everything was arranged for the best. Therefore, if one wanted to know the explanation of something, one only had to know what was best for that thing. Suppose, for instance, that Socrates wanted to know why the heavenly bodies move the way they do. Anaxagoras would show him how this was the best possible way for each of them to be.

Chapter 5 : The Human Soul - by Father Paul A. Duffner, O.P.

Get Textbooks on Google Play. Rent and save from the world's largest eBookstore. Read, highlight, and take notes, across web, tablet, and phone.

Man A Trinity Spirit, Soul, Body The Christian doctrine of immortality cannot be understood apart from the right conception of the tripartite nature of men. Many think that man is a physical being only. There is a great danger of any man thinking thus of himself. There have been persons who have lived all of their lives either in ignorance or willful neglect of a life after death, but upon their death-bed they suddenly realized that they were more than physical beings. There is an idea also that prevails largely today that man consists of only two component parts: In the thinking of the writer this view appears to be one that might create confusion in the minds of any Christians. While soul and spirit are so closely related that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish accurately between them, there seems to be only one logical conclusion: The Bible does make a distinction. Man is a triune being because he is created in the image of God. We know that God is a Trinity. Created in the image of God, man is likewise a trinity. He has a spiritual nature that is separate and distinct from the body in which it dwells. The two following passages from the Bible clearly establish the fact that man is a triune being composed of spirit, soul, and body: I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ 1 Thessalonians 5: For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow body , and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart Hebrews 4: The trinity of man is an essential part of the image relationship between him and God. Life is not ultimately physical and the body is not the whole man. In this opening chapter we shall confine our material to the spirit and the soul inasmuch as the body will be considered in succeeding chapters on the resurrection. It can have direct reference to the spirit of man which is as much a part of the tripartite nature of man as the Spirit of the living God is a Person of the Holy Trinity. Or it can indicate an evil spirit such as any agent of the Devil. We will confine ourselves here to the Biblical usage of the word only as it relates to the spirit of man, one of the three constituent parts of his being. The threefold nature of man might be illustrated in several ways. The outer circle stands for the body of man, the middle circle for the soul, and the inner for the spirit. At this point it will be well to quote a portion from Dr. It develops then that the spirit of man, being the sphere of God-consciousness, is the inner or private office of man where the work of regeneration takes place. The Apostle Paul gives us the Word of God on this, a passage that is sadly neglected. Quoting from the sixty-fourth chapter of the book of the Prophet Isaiah, Paul wrote: But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. A great many people stop here, content to remain in ignorance. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God 1 Corinthians 2: If I have a will to know certain scientific facts, by my human spirit I am enabled to investigate, think, and weigh evidence. If I set myself to the task, I may become a scientist of world-renown and of great accomplishments. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned 1 Corinthians 2: When the will is surrendered, the Holy Spirit takes up His abode in the spirit of man. And when that transaction takes place we will know it, for, says Paul: Many people confess that they get nothing out of the Bible even though they attend church and read their Bibles regularly. Perhaps they do not know that they are not regenerated and that they need to yield their will to the Spirit of God so that He can renew their human spirits. The deep things of God never will be understood by the world outside of Jesus Christ. Our Lord warned His disciples, Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine Matthew 7: The spirit of the unregenerate man has no more capacity to appreciate the things of God than a dog has to appreciate holy things, or a hog a genuine pearl necklace. This they did because the dog was a dog and the sow was a sow. No amount of religion or church activity can change the spirit of the unregenerate man. We gave holy things to dogs. We cast the pearls of the Kingdom

before swine. Here we are told that it is the spirit of man that is given understanding. Such is not the case. The spirit of man is his personality and it is that which differentiates him from the lower animal creation. It is by his spirit that the Christian both serves and worships God. The Soul Man not only has a living soul but he is a living soul. We must be careful not to confound that which is truly spiritual and that which is merely soulish or psychical. We have seen that the spirit of man is the sphere of activity where the Holy Spirit operates in regeneration. Just so is the soul the sphere of activity where Satan operates making his appeal to the affections and emotions of man. Satan knows full well that he dominates the psychical or the soulish man. Therefore he does not care if a man goes to a church where the Spirit of God is not in evidence. Personally, I believe that Satan would rather have man go to a modernistic church where there is false worship than he would have him go to a house of prostitution. The soul is the seat of the passions, the feelings, and the desires of man; and Satan is satisfied if he can master these. Grant has said that the soul is the seat of the affections, right or wrong, of love, hate, lusts, and even the appetites of the body. Of David and Jonathan it is written: These passages show the soul to be the seat of the affections. But as the soul loves, so it also hates. It is in the soul where fleshly lusts, desires, and appetites arise: Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul Peter 2: As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country Proverbs It shall be even as when a hungry man dreameth, and behold, he eateth; but he awaketh, and his soul is empty; or as when a thirsty man dreameth, and behold, he drinketh; but he awaketh, and behold, he is faint, and his soul hath appetite Isaiah The soul of man, that is, his affections and desires, are never directed Godward until after the spirit has become regenerated. Man can never love God nor the things of God until he is born from above. He may have a troubled conscience or be so stirred emotionally that he may weep bitterly, and still remain dead in trespasses and in sins. We do not feel that we are guilty of judging men when we state that some who have answered an altar call and shed tears never were born again. When the Spirit of God illuminates the spirit of a man with divine light and life, that man begins to yield his affections and faculties to God. She could not extol the Lord in her soul until she had recognized God in her spirit as her Saviour. The initial triumph is in the spirit when Jesus Christ is acknowledged as personal Saviour. In that immortal classic of the Psalms, David says:

The Soul's Address to the Body by Douglas Moffat, , available at Book Depository with free delivery worldwide.

The manuscript[edit] The two versions of Soul and Body are found in two separate poetry collections. The first is found in the Vercelli manuscript, and is entitled, by modern scholars, Soul and Body I. The other is found in the Exeter manuscript, and is entitled, also by modern scholars, Soul and Body II. While the Vercelli version is incomplete, it has been suggested that not much of the poem has been lost Smetana However, this is not unusual: Based on these facts, scholars can reasonably assume that the poem is nearly complete. Orton points to lapses in metrical structure and inconsistencies in spelling and punctuation to support this argument. In addition, Douglas Moffat notes that it seems strange that the poet brought the first half of a two-part poem to a fitting conclusion before moving on to the next part, instead of "saving summary comments for the conclusion of the whole" Nevertheless, there is not enough evidence to prove whether The Blessed Soul is a later addition. The first is from "The Old Irish Table of Penitential Commutations," which states the requirements for rescuing a soul from hell: Although Hill admits the passage is problematic, it does seem to support the idea that the torment awaiting the damned body will be proportional to its joints. The second is from the medieval Irish version of the Fifteen Tokens of Doomsday, which lists various torments of Hell. The ninth torment states that "locks and fiery bonds" will blaze on "every member and on every separate joint of the sinners" because "in life they did not control those members by penance and by the cross of repentance Furthermore, the language of the poem is West Saxon in nature, and lends itself to an "Irish-influenced Mercian literary school" of thought, or the common thought found in the kingdom of Mercia, one of the ancient, Anglo-Saxon kingdoms found in what is now Great Britain Lapidge It is clear, as Moffat notes, that there is an identifiable first-person speaker throughout the entire poem; the speaker is the damned soul or the saved soul who is addressing his respective earthly body. The body-and-soul theme, which dates back to the early Christian era, is meant to remind readers what will happen to their soul should they choose to neglect their obligations to God. The soul demands an answer from its body, because as the soul believes, the body is largely, if not completely, responsible for their shared, horrific fate Ferguson Despite the body being "dumb and deaf" line 60 , the soul reminds its body to plead its case before God at the Last Judgment. Not once, but twice does the soul chastise its body for its "firelustas" lines 31 and 41 , or literally its "appetite for sin," specifically material wealth and earthly possessions As one can see at the end of the poem, the Christian message of unity and judgment comes full circle, with the modern English translation stating "to every man among the wise this may serve as a reminder. Religious overtones and their significance[edit] Critical assessors of Soul and Body agree that the religious theme of the poem is quite obvious; the soul addresses its body in relation to the Final Judgment of both the soul and its body on the last day. While a body must decay, the body of the saved soul already did his penance. Penance in this poem is defined by the practice of fasting. Both the damned soul and the blessed soul imply that the body either did or did not fast. In the former, the soul accuses: You, who were proud of dining and sated with wine, you boasted majestically, and I thirsted for the body of God, for the drink of the spirit. Smetana and other scholars have questioned the unorthodoxy of the theology used in the poem, with some charging the poem with dualism i. However, Frantzen reassesses this apparent inversion of the soul and body hierarchy, arguing that the poem does, in fact, follow normative Christian beliefs because its focus is not on theology, but penitential practice. Additionally, Frantzen points to the homilies of Aelfric and handbooks of penance to illustrate that Soul and Body has much in common with the pastoral teachings of the late Anglo-Saxon period As such, early Christian audiences were very familiar with these themes; the imagery would have had strong implications for them Ferguson

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Silence is the pre-requisite for any effort to meditate. No TV or radio in the background. No extraneous noises from your surroundings. Find a place that you can count on for silence, a sacred place that you can return to anytime to meditate. It could be in a corner of your bedroom, in the back yard, in a park or even in church! Sit on the floor, legs folded in a meditation position, or sit in a comfortable chair. Be comfortable but not so that you fall asleep! Meditation is an active mental activity and nothing can be accomplished if you fall asleep. Try to schedule a time each day to sit and meditate. Analyze your own thinking about two weeks: Sit quietly and close your eyes. Almost immediately your mind will wander and thoughts will enter into your mind. Just pull back and like a stranger sitting on the sidelines, watch these thoughts stream through your mind. Take note about these thoughts. Being very detached, just watch these thoughts stream by. Do this each session for a few minutes to begin with, then build up to 10 minutes. Watch your thinking for about two weeks in daily sessions of 10 minutes. You will note that as time goes by, there will be fewer and fewer thoughts streaming through your mind and you will be at the threshold of gaining control of your thinking. Concentrate on an object one week: Pick an object wherever you are meditating to concentrate on. It could be anything: Draw all your energy together and concentrate on the object for as long as you can. Other thoughts may stream into your mind. Keep doing this method until you can hold your concentration for about 5 to 10 minutes. You are on the road to controlling your mind and not your mind controlling you. Vacate the mind the whole time: Let us call this The Seven Breath Method. The objective is to take seven deep inhalations and exhalations during which time no extraneous thoughts will stream into your mind. However, if extraneous thoughts creep in during your breathing, you must start all over again. In the beginning, it is very common for thoughts to invade your breathing around the third inhalation. Start over again until you have inhaled and exhaled seven times without any interfering thoughts. Admittedly, this may be the most difficult because it opens the door to all the riches and advantages of soul contact. Sit in a comfortable posture with your spine straight and erect. Begin to breathe deeply. Honor the breath that is yours to draw in and to exhale. And with each breath, one should realize that one is drawing in pure life and light. As you breathe deeply, initially focus your attention in the head area, the top of the head in particular. Become aware of your own aura. Then, become aware of your spine, the central beam of the temple of the body, the spinal column, that lovely dimensional doorway into inner space. Focus on the spine as you get used to the rhythm of the breath, as it goes in, as it goes out, and eventually release your attention on the breathing as it continues at the proper pace by itself. Focus all attention on the spinal column itself, holding the attention there. Seek to visualize it as a tube of pure white light. This is your dimensional opening in the physical body to the other dimensions. You must have the desire to go in it, the will to go into the dimensional portal. Will yourself to go in. Use your will to go in, in, in. In each session of meditation, at some point you may hit an inner foothold or landmark. Even if you think you cannot go any deeper, keep trying nonetheless until you cannot go any further. At this point, stop and simply enjoy the inner surroundings. Become aware of the inner atmosphere as the breath continues to inhale and exhale at its own steady pace. Know yourself as you are, beyond thoughts, feelings, sensations and certainly your physical bodies. Every session will be a new adventure. Come to know that part of you, the soul, that has never changed and shall never change, the part of you that is eternal. Seek to feel your own endlessness. You should begin to see a slight glow in your head, even in a dark room; that will get brighter and brighter over time. This is an indication that you are approaching the soul, the God within, which is lodged in your pineal gland. Please refer to the following sections of this website for more information:

This is a reproduction of a book published before This book may have occasional imperfections such as missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. that were either part of the original artifact, or were introduced by the scanning process.

Human beings seem always to have had some notion of a shadowy double that survives the death of the body. But the idea of the soul as a mental entity, with intellectual and moral qualities, interacting with a physical organism but capable of continuing— Many cultures have recognized some incorporeal principle of human life or existence corresponding to the soul, and many have attributed souls to all living things. There is evidence even among prehistoric peoples of a belief in an aspect distinct from the body and residing in it. Despite widespread and longstanding belief in the existence of a soul, however, different religions and philosophers have developed a variety of theories as to its nature, its relationship to the body, and its origin and mortality. Among ancient peoples, both the Egyptians and the Chinese conceived of a dual soul. The Egyptian ka breath survived death but remained near the body, while the spiritual ba proceeded to the region of the dead. The Chinese distinguished between a lower, sensitive soul, which disappears with death, and a rational principle, the hun, which survives the grave and is the object of ancestor worship. The early Hebrews apparently had a concept of the soul but did not separate it from the body, although later Jewish writers developed the idea of the soul further. Biblical references to the soul are related to the concept of breath and establish no distinction between the ethereal soul and the corporeal body. Christian concepts of a body-soul dichotomy originated with the ancient Greeks and were introduced into Christian theology at an early date by St. Gregory of Nyssa and by St. Ancient Greek concepts of the soul varied considerably according to the particular era and philosophical school. The Epicureans considered the soul to be made up of atoms like the rest of the body. For the Platonists, the soul was an immaterial and incorporeal substance, akin to the gods yet part of the world of change and becoming. In Christian theology St. However, although body and soul were separate, it was not possible to conceive of a soul without its body. In the Middle Ages, St. From the Middle Ages onward, the existence and nature of the soul and its relationship to the body continued to be disputed in Western philosophy. To Benedict de Spinoza, body and soul formed two aspects of a single reality. Immanuel Kant concluded that the soul was not demonstrable through reason, although the mind inevitably must reach the conclusion that the soul exists because such a conclusion was necessary for the development of ethics and religion. To William James at the beginning of the 20th century, the soul as such did not exist at all but was merely a collection of psychic phenomena. Just as there have been different concepts of the relation of the soul to the body, there have been numerous ideas about when the soul comes into existence and when and if it dies. Ancient Greek beliefs were varied and evolved over time. Pythagoras held that the soul was of divine origin and existed before and after death. Epicurus believed that both body and soul ended at death. The jiva-atman is also eternal but is imprisoned in an earthly body at birth. At death the jiva-atman passes into a new existence determined by karma, or the cumulative consequences of actions. The cycle of death and rebirth samsara is eternal according to some Hindus, but others say it persists only until the soul has attained karmic perfection, thus merging with the Absolute brahman. Buddhism negates the concept not only of the individual self but of the atman as well, asserting that any sense of having an individual eternal soul or of partaking in a persistent universal self is illusory. The Muslim concept, like the Christian, holds that the soul comes into existence at the same time as the body; thereafter, it has a life of its own, its union with the body being a temporary condition. Learn More in these related Britannica articles:

Chapter 9 : Soul and Body - Wikipedia

Do souls maintain contact with their loved ones after departing the body? beings peace to their souls, me how i can contact their souls and know what they.

Greek psyche; Latin anima; French ame; German Seele. The question of the reality of the soul and its distinction from the body is among the most important problems of philosophy, for with it is bound up the doctrine of a future life. Various theories as to the nature of the soul have claimed to be reconcilable with the tenet of immortality, but it is a sure instinct that leads us to suspect every attack on the substantiality or spirituality of the soul as an assault on the belief in existence after death. The soul may be defined as the ultimate internal principle by which we think, feel, and will, and by which our bodies are animated. The term "mind" usually denotes this principle as the subject of our conscious states, while "soul" denotes the source of our vegetative activities as well. That our vital activities proceed from a principle capable of subsisting in itself, is the thesis of the substantiality of the soul: If there be a life after death, clearly the agent or subject of our vital activities must be capable of an existence separate from the body. The belief in an animating principle in some sense distinct from the body is an almost inevitable inference from the observed facts of life. Even uncivilized peoples arrive at the concept of the soul almost without reflection, certainly without any severe mental effort. The mysteries of birth and death, the lapse of conscious life during sleep and in swooning, even the commonest operations of imagination and memory, which abstract a man from his bodily presence even while awake—all such facts invincibly suggest the existence of something besides the visible organism, internal to it, but to a large extent independent of it, and leading a life of its own. In the rude psychology of the primitive nations, the soul is often represented as actually migrating to and fro during dreams and trances, and after death haunting the neighbourhood of its body. Nearly always it is figured as something extremely volatile, a perfume or a breath. Often, as among the Fijians, it is represented as a miniature replica of the body, so small as to be invisible. The Samoans have a name for the soul which means "that which comes and goes". Many peoples, such as the Dyaks and Sumatrans, bind various parts of the body with cords during sickness to prevent the escape of the soul. The soul in ancient philosophy bears the same stamp of Dualism. In the "Rig-Veda" and other liturgical books of India, we find frequent references to the coming and going of manas mind or soul. Indian philosophy, whether Brahminic or Buddhistic, with its various systems of metempsychosis, accentuated the distinction of soul and body, making the bodily life a mere transitory episode in the existence of the soul. They all taught the doctrine of limited immortality, ending either with the periodic world-destruction Brahminism or with attainment of Nirvana Buddhism. The doctrine of a world-soul in a highly abstract form is met with as early as the eighth century before Christ, when we find it described as "the unseen seer, the unheard hearer, the unthought thinker, the unknown knower, the Eternal in which space is woven and which is woven in it. In Homer, while the distinction of soul and body is recognized, the soul is hardly conceived as possessing a substantial existence of its own. Severed from the body, it is a mere shadow, incapable of energetic life. The philosophers did something to correct such views. The earliest school was that of the Hylozoists; these conceived the soul as a kind of cosmic force, and attributed animation to the whole of nature. Any natural force might be designated psyche: With this we may compare the "mind-stuff" theory and Pan-psychism of certain modern scientists. Anaximander gives it an aeriform constitution, Heraclitus describes it as a fire. The fundamental thought is the same. The cosmic ether or fire is the subtlest of the elements, the nourishing flame which imparts heat, life, sense, and intelligence to all things in their several degrees and kinds. The Pythagoreans taught that the soul is a harmony, its essence consisting in those perfect mathematical ratios which are the law of the universe and the music of the heavenly spheres. With this doctrine was combined, according to Cicero, the belief in a universal world-spirit, from which all particular souls are derived. All these early theories were cosmological rather than psychological in character. Theology, physics, and mental science were not as yet distinguished. It is only with the rise of dialectic and the growing recognition of the problem of knowledge that a genuinely psychological theory became possible. In Plato the two standpoints, the cosmological and the

epistemological , are found combined. Thus in the "Timaeus" p. First the world-soul is created according to the laws of mathematical symmetry and musical concord. It is composed of two elements, one an element of "sameness" *tauton* , corresponding to the universal and intelligible order of truth , and the other an element of distinction or "otherness" *thateron* , corresponding to the world of sensible and particular existences. The individual human soul is constructed on the same plan. Sometimes, as in the "Phaedrus", Plato teaches the doctrine of plurality of souls cf. The rational soul was located in the head, the passionate or spirited soul in the breast, the appetitive soul in the abdomen. In the "Republic", instead of the triple soul, we find the doctrine of three elements within the complex unity of the single soul. His account of the origin of the soul in the "Timaeus" leads him to deny the intrinsic immortality even of the world-soul, and to admit only an immortality conditional on the good pleasure of God. In the "Phaedo" the chief argument for the immortality of the soul is based on the nature of intellectual knowledge interpreted on the theory of reminiscence; this of course implies the pre-existence of the soul, and perhaps in strict logic its eternal pre-existence. The Platonic doctrine tended to an extreme Transcendentalism. Soul and body are distinct orders of reality, and bodily existence involves a kind of violence to the higher part of our composite nature. The body is the "prison", the "tomb", or even, as some later Platonists expressed it, the "hell" of the soul. In Aristotle this error is avoided. His definition of the soul as "the first entelechy of a physical organized body potentially possessing life" emphasizes the closeness of the union of soul and body. The difficulty in his theory is to determine what degree of distinctness or separateness from the matter of the body is to be conceded to the human soul. The Stoics taught that all existence is material, and described the soul as a breath pervading the body. Eight distinct parts of the soul were recognized by them: Absolute immortality they denied; relative immortality , terminating with the universal conflagration and destruction of all things, some of them e. Cleanthes and Chrysippus admitted in the case of the wise man; others, such as Panaetius and Posidonius, denied even this, arguing that, as the soul began with the body, so it must end with it. Epicureanism accepted the Atomist theory of Leucippus and Democritus. Soul consists of the finest grained atoms in the universe , finer even than those of wind and heat which they resemble: The soul-atoms themselves, however, could not exercise their functions if they were not kept together by the body. It is this which gives shape and consistency to the group. If this is destroyed, the atoms escape and life is dissolved; if it is injured, part of the soul is lost, but enough may be left to maintain life. The Lucretian version of Epicureanism distinguishes between *animus* and *anima*: The soul in Christian thought Graeco-Roman philosophy made no further progress in the doctrine of the soul in the age immediately preceding the Christian era. None of the existing theories had found general acceptance, and in the literature of the period an eclectic spirit nearly akin to Scepticism predominated. Of the strife and fusion of systems at this time the works of Cicero are the best example. On the question of the soul he is by turns Platonic and Pythagorean, while he confesses that the Stoic and Epicurean systems have each an attraction for him. Such was the state of the question in the West at the dawn of Christianity. In Jewish circles a like uncertainty prevailed. The Sadducees were Materialists , denying immortality and all spiritual existence. The Pharisees maintained these doctrines, adding belief in pre-existence and transmigration. The psychology of the Rabbins is founded on the Sacred Books, particularly the account of the creation of man in Genesis. Three terms are used for the soul: At all events, it is evident that the Old Testament throughout either asserts or implies the distinct reality of the soul. An important contribution to later Jewish thought was the infusion of Platonism into it by Philo of Alexandria. He taught the immediately Divine origin of the soul, its pre-existence and transmigration; he contrasts the *pneuma*, or spiritual essence, with the soul proper, the source of vital phenomena, whose seat is the blood; finally he revived the old Platonic Dualism , attributing the origin of sin and evil to the union of spirit with matter. It was Christianity that, after many centuries of struggle, applied the final criticisms to the various psychologies of antiquity, and brought their scattered elements of truth to full focus. The Gospel language is popular, not technical. *Psyche* and *pneuma* are used indifferently either for the principle of natural life or for spirit in the strict sense. Body and soul are recognized as a dualism and their values contrasted: Paul we find a more technical phraseology employed with great consistency. *Psyche* is now appropriated to the purely natural life; *pneuma* to the life of supernatural religion, the principle of which is the Holy Spirit, dwelling and operating in the heart. The opposition of flesh and spirit is accentuated afresh

Romans 1: According to this, man, perfect man teleios consists of three parts: Body and soul come by natural generation; spirit is given to the regenerate Christian alone. Thus, the "newness of life", of which St. Paul speaks, was conceived by some as a superadded entity, a kind of oversoul sublimating the "natural man" into a higher species. This doctrine was variously distorted in the different Gnostic systems. The Gnostics divided man into three classes: To each class they ascribed a different origin and destiny. Even in this life they are exempted from the possibility of a fall from their high calling; they therefore stand in no need of good works, and have nothing to fear from the contaminations of the world and the flesh. This class consists of course of the Gnostics themselves. The psychici are in a lower position: They stand in a middle place, and may either rise to the spiritual or sink to the hylic level. In this category stands the Christian Church at large. Lastly, the earthy souls are a mere material emanation, destined to perish: This class contains the multitudes of the merely natural man. Two features claim attention in this the earliest essay towards a complete anthropology within the Christian Church: It is probable that originally the terms pneumatici, psychici, and choici denoted at first elements which were observed to exist in all souls, and that it was only by an afterthought that they were employed, according to the respective predominance of these elements in different cases, to represent supposed real classes of men. The doctrine of the four temperaments and the Stoic ideal of the Wise Man afford a parallel for the personification of abstract qualities. The true genius of Christianity, expressed by the Fathers of the early centuries, rejected Gnosticism. The ascription to a creature of an absolutely spiritual nature, and the claim to endless existence asserted as a strictly de jure privilege in the case of the "perfect", seemed to them an encroachment on the incommunicable attributes of God.