

March 20, 2024
Homily Manuscript

Luke 16:19-31 (NIV)

¹⁹ (Jesus said,) “There was a rich man who was dressed in purple and fine linen and lived in luxury every day. ²⁰ At his gate was laid a beggar named Lazarus, covered with sores ²¹ and longing to eat what fell from the rich man’s table. Even the dogs came and licked his sores.

²² “The time came when the beggar died and the angels carried him to Abraham’s side. The rich man also died and was buried. ²³ In Hades, where he was in torment, he looked up and saw Abraham far away, with Lazarus by his side. ²⁴ So he called to him, ‘Father Abraham, have pity on me and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, because I am in agony in this fire.’

²⁵ “But Abraham replied, ‘Son, remember that in your lifetime you received your good things, while Lazarus received bad things, but now he is comforted here and you are in agony. ²⁶ And besides all this, between us and you a great chasm has been set in place, so that those who want to go from here to you cannot, nor can anyone cross over from there to us.’

²⁷ “He answered, ‘Then I beg you, father, send Lazarus to my family, ²⁸ for I have five brothers. Let him warn them, so that they will not also come to this place of torment.’

²⁹ “Abraham replied, ‘They have Moses and the Prophets; let them listen to them.’

³⁰ “‘No, father Abraham,’ he said, ‘but if someone from the dead goes to them, they will repent.’

³¹ “He said to him, ‘If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead.’”

Luke 23:32-46 (NIV)

³² Two other men, both criminals, were also led out with him to be executed. ³³ When they came to the place called the Skull, they crucified him there, along with the criminals—one on his right, the other on his left. ³⁴ Jesus said, “Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing.” And they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

³⁵ The people stood watching, and the rulers even sneered at him. They said, “He saved others; let him save himself if he is God’s Messiah, the Chosen One.”

³⁶ The soldiers also came up and mocked him. They offered him wine vinegar ³⁷ and said, “If you are the king of the Jews, save yourself.”

³⁸ There was a written notice above him, which read: this is the king of the jews.

³⁹ One of the criminals who hung there hurled insults at him: “Aren’t you the Messiah? Save yourself and us!”

⁴⁰ But the other criminal rebuked him. “Don’t you fear God,” he said, “since you are under the same sentence? ⁴¹ We are punished justly, for we are getting what our deeds deserve. But this man has done nothing wrong.”

⁴² Then he said, “Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.”

⁴³ Jesus answered him, “Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise.”

⁴⁴ It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon, ⁴⁵ for the sun stopped shining. And the curtain of the temple was torn in two. ⁴⁶ Jesus called out with a loud voice, “Father, into your hands I commit my spirit.” When he had said this, he breathed his last.

On Luke 23:43, the Disembodied Soul, & the Intermediate State

Tonight, we’ve come to the conclusion of our homily series on topics suggested by you, the parishioners of St Matthias. The final topic I chose was a request to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between Jesus’ words to the thief on the cross and the assertion of the Creeds about where Jesus was about to be for the next three days. In Luke 23:43, Jesus famously tells one of the criminals dying with him, “Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise.” However, the Apostles Creed, which we will recite after this Evening Prayer, says of Jesus that “He descended to the dead¹ (and) on the third day he rose again.” So the task I was given was to reconcile what seems to be in conflict. And it is appropriate that we saved this topic for last, with Holy Week being now just days away, but also because the subject of time is germane to this question, which we saw last week is much more complex than we might assume, and questions of translation absolutely loom large, which we learned about in week 3. However, tonight’s topic is even more of a can of worms, because it gets into two further subjects that you may not have anticipated getting into tonight. The first is the question of whether humans possess an immortal soul. In other words, does scripture indicate that humans consist of a material body, which is mortal, and

¹ Some know this line of the creed instead as “He descended into hell”. Without getting into the weeds too much, translating the Creed’s Latin to say “hell” was an innovation that didn’t emerge until the Reformation and originated with John Calvin. For the millennium or so prior to then, the Church took this line of the Creed to mean “descended to the dead”. (Matthew Emerson, “He Descended to the Dead”: An Evangelical Theology of Holy Saturday, IVP: 2019.)

a non-material soul, which is immortal, as many believe? And this leads to the second question of what happens to humans *between* their death and the “resurrection of the dead”, the latter which is anticipated by both of the creeds?² Is there a so-called intermediate state, where humans enjoy conscious awareness of God between death and the resurrection of the body?³

So, the first question is one of anthropology: asking what a human is. Well, the dominant view in the Western world for the past 2,500 years is called Body-Soul Dualism, which is the idea that humans are comprised of a material, mortal body and a non-material, immortal soul.

And this has also been the dominant view in Christianity for much of Church history. Church Fathers like Tertullian (160-220 AD), Origen (185-254), and St Jerome (347-429) affirmed body-soul dualism, though they differed in some of the particulars.⁴ As did the enormously influential St Augustine (354-430 A.D.) and St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), whom we looked at last week. Then, in the Protestant Reformation the question of the intermediate state became a prominent issue due to the controversy over Purgatory. Purgatory had been part of the official Catholic teaching since 1274,⁵ and of course necessitates a person’s soul surviving after death. And though the Reformers took issue with Purgatory, both Luther and Calvin affirmed body-soul dualism, even if they disagreed on what the intermediate state was like. Luther believed that after death the soul sleeps prior to the resurrection and the Last Judgment. But Calvin disagreed and insisted that the soul enjoyed conscious rest with God during the intermediate state. So Calvin’s view became and continues to be dominant for many Protestants.

And with that view, contemporary Biblical Theologian Matthew Emerson’s explanation of the intermediate state and answer to the question of the thief being in “paradise” with Jesus is based primarily on the Parable of the Rich Man & Lazarus, which we read from Luke 16:19–31. From it, Emerson equates what the Bible refers to as Sheol in the Old Testament and Hades in the New Testament as being two names for the same spiritual place,⁶ which is the place of the dead. Emerson has further interpreted Sheol/Hades to be divided into multiple parts, including Gehenna, where the unrighteous dead end up, and “Abraham’s bosom”, which is where the righteous dead end up.⁷ And, as for tonight’s question: He says Jesus descended to the place for the righteous dead, and because Jesus was there, His presence *made it* “Paradise”. And the believing thief went there as well, so they were “together in paradise”, as Jesus had promised.⁸

² Apostles: “the resurrection of the body” and the Nicene: “We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come”

³ Nancey Murphy, *Bodies & Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, Cambridge, 2006, 15.

⁴ Tertullian followed the Stoics in believing the human soul is corporeal and generated with (at the same time as) the body. Origen followed Plator: soul is incorporeal and eternal, pre-existing the body. Jerome believed the soul was created at the time of conception. (Murphy, *Bodies* 14)

⁵ The Second Council of Lyon (1274) is when the Catholic Church first formally defined Purgatory as being where some souls are purified after death, such that souls benefit from the prayers and pious duties that the living do for them

⁶ In disagreement with Emerson, Joel Green comments on Sheol:

“It is important to note, then, that Sheol is only very rarely deployed in the Old Testament as the common location of the dead. Rather, in most instances the term is used with reference to that human fate to which the ungodly are consigned and to which the godly declare their aversion; it is the antithesis of heaven” ... “Even in those texts that speak of those who dwell in Sheol, we find no suggestion that some essential part of the human being (whether a soul or a spirit, or some other) has survived death.¹⁹ Rather, death is envisaged as ongoing persistence in a woeful, obscure state, cut off from one’s own people and from community with Yahweh. This isolated, shadowy state constitutes death. This is a reminder that the Hebrew Bible as a whole does not define the human person in essentialist terms” (Joel B. Green, “Eschatology and the Nature of Humans: A Reconsideration of Pertinent Biblical Evidence” <https://www.cis.org.uk/serve.php?filename=scb-14-1-green.pdf>)

⁷ Also, Tartarus: the place for the imprisoned, rebellious angels or spirits

⁸ Emerson’s book on this is titled *“He Descended to the Dead”*: *An Evangelical Theology of Holy Saturday* (IVP 2019), but he summarizes his view in brief at <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/essay/christs-descent-dead/>

So, there it is; problem solved! “In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Amen.”
Or...maybe not.

Now, perhaps Emerson *is* correct. However, scientific discovery, most recently in the field of neuroscience,⁹ has raised some significant questions about the necessity of body-soul dualism, which in turn has led scholars to re-examine whether the Bible really indicates that humans possess a non-material, immortal soul, and to reconsider scriptures long assumed to indicate an intermediate state between human death and resurrection. And one of the thinkers who has led this charge is Nancey Murphy, professor of Christian philosophy at Fuller Seminary; who is probably the most well-known professor I ever had, by the way.

Murphy provides the background that the notion of body-soul dualism originated from Greek Philosophy.¹⁰ Plato (427?-348 BC) famously believed the human person is an immortal soul *imprisoned* in a mortal body and that the rational part of the soul pre-exists the body.¹¹ Then, Aristotle (384-322 BC) was also a body-soul dualist, but viewed the soul as more of a life force, holding that plants and animals have souls, too.

So these ideas were in the air when the Church Fathers (the Church’s first theologians) came around in the early centuries after Christ. And they all used a Greek version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint, which had translated Hebrew terminology into Greek words. Well, like we learned in week 3, no translation is perfect, not even close. So, wherever there was the Hebrew word *nephesh*, meaning “spirit” (or breath), the Septuagint translated it into the Greek word *psyche* (pronounced soo-kay), which means “soul”. Well, the Church Fathers generally understood *psyche*/soul the way Plato and Aristotle had defined it, with a Body-Soul Dualistic understanding. So, as I said earlier, many of these Church fathers read a body-soul Dualism into the scripture that was very different from the what the Jewish writers intended. And this includes St. Augustine, who modified Plato’s view of the human person to possess an immortal (not eternal) soul that is using (not imprisoned in) a mortal body. And his view continues to be enormously influential in Christianity today.

So let’s look at a few examples of how translation led body-soul Dualism into scripture where it is clearly not what the writer meant. And we can also see how it continued to be influential for centuries, as evidenced by how the King James Version of the Bible translated, in particular, the text of Genesis 2:7.

Genesis 2:7

King James Version (in 1611): 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*.

NIV (in 2024): Then the Lord God formed a man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living^ being*.

^ Hebrew *chaiyah*, Greek (LXX) *zosan* – both words mean ‘living’

⁹ And, according to Nancey Murphy, Darwinian Evolution before that, and the Copernican Revolution before that.

¹⁰ Note: not all Greek thinkers were dualists and dualism had already arisen as one option within Jewish thought several centuries before Christ. (Murphy, *Bodies* 11)

¹¹ Plato saw the soul as having three parts, and that the rational part pre-existed bodily life in the transcendent realm of the “forms” and returned there upon death. (Murphy, *Bodies* 12).

* Hebrew *nephesh* means ‘spirit’ or ‘breath’ or paired with *chaiyah* can mean ‘creature’, Greek (LXX) *psyche* means ‘soul’.

You can see how the the King James makes it sound like God breathed a soul into humankind, where a modern version like the NIV translates it to sound like many this creature come alive, which is much closer to what was meant. And we know that’s what was meant because if we go back a chapter earlier, in Genesis 1:20-24 the writer uses the same exact language with respect to animals.

Genesis 1:20-24 (NIV)

And God said, “Let the water teem with living^ creatures*, and let birds fly above the earth across the vault of the sky.”²¹ So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living^ thing* with which the water teems and that moves about in it, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.²² God blessed them and said, “Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the water in the seas, and let the birds increase on the earth.”²³ And there was evening, and there was morning—the fifth day.²⁴ And God said, “Let the land produce living^ creatures* according to their kinds: the livestock, the creatures that move along the ground, and the wild animals, each according to its kind.” And it was so.

So in 2:7 is not describing God bestowing something on humans that distinguishes them from animals - like an immortal soul - but simply giving the human life: making the human a living creature.

And we can see other examples of where the writer of scripture is using the Hebrew word *nephesh* to mean something that clearly is not an immaterial, disembodied soul (all KJV).

Psalm 7:1-2 - O LORD my God, in thee do I put my trust: save me from all them that persecute me, and deliver me: ² Lest he tear my soul* like a lion, rending it in pieces, while there is none to deliver.

Psalm 22:20 - Deliver my soul* from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog.

Psalm 35:7 - For without cause have they hid for me their net in a pit, which without cause they have digged for my soul*.

*Hebrew *nephesh*

In these instances, the word translated soul is just a way to refer to the whole person.¹²

And, turning to the New Testament, but related to this, Murphy explains that many New Testament passage often have body-soul dualism read into them, when that wasn’t what the writer intended. For example, 1 Thessalonians 5:23 has notoriously been read as describing not a two-part human, but that we are diving into three parts: spirit, soul, and body.

¹² “It is widely agreed now that the Hebrew word translated “soul” in all these cases - *nephesh* - did not mean what later Christians have meant by “soul.” (Murphy, Bodies 17-18)

1 Thessalonians 5:23 - May God himself, the God of peace, sanctify you through and through. May your whole spirit, soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But New Testament scholar James Dunn argues compellingly that Jews did not think of human beings *partitively* - as divided into parts - like the Greeks, but *aspectively*: that all of the words are ways of describing the whole person from different aspects. So for example, a writer might refer to a person as a body or soul in how they relate to the world or others, but as a “spirit” in how they relate to God. But these are not divisible parts, just describing different aspects of the whole person.

However, we have all been so steeped in body-soul dualism, that there remain some New Testament scriptures that require some nuance and imagination to *not* read that way. I’ve listed a few (Revelation 6:9¹³ & 1 Peter 3:18-20a¹⁴) but the most challenging might be Matthew 10:28 is a tough one, where Jesus himself says, “Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Rather, be afraid of the One who can destroy both soul and body in hell.”¹⁵ But don’t forget that Jesus didn’t speak Greek; He spoke Aramaic. So St Matthew’s challenge here was similar to the Septuagint translating the Old Testament into Greek. By choosing to use the Greek word *psyche*, this doesn’t mean Matthew necessarily understood Jesus to be referring to a disembodied soul like the Greek philosophers used the word.¹⁶

Nancy Murphy’s conclusion is that the Bible has no clear view on the makeup of the human person, that it was concerned with other things. So, in her mind, Christians are free to adopt dualism (or, in most cases, continue to hold this view), but the alternative to Body-Soul Dualism that she proposes is called nonreductive physicalism. We’ll get into the nonreductive part in a few minutes, but physicalism holds that humans do not possess a disembodied, immaterial (or immortal) soul. Rather, we are composed of only one “part”: a physical body. And she supports this view not only on biblical grounds, but on scientific and philosophical grounds as well.

So let’s talk about some science for a moment, shall we? It is Murphy’s contention that “all of the human capacities once attributed to the mind or soul are now being fruitfully studied as brain processes.”¹⁷ To demonstrate this, Murphy takes all of the capacities that were ascribed in the past to the soul, and shows

¹³ Revelation 6:9 - “When he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls[^] of those who had been slain because of the word of God and the testimony they had maintained.”
[^]Greek *psyche*
 Fr John: Souls can be interpreted aspectively, to refer to these martyrs’ whole persons and the passage as a whole to be a vision rather than a picture of reality.

¹⁴ 1 Peter 3:19-20a - “For Christ also suffered once for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God. He was put to death in the body but made alive in the Spirit. 19 After being made alive, he went and made proclamation to the imprisoned spirits— 20 to those who were disobedient long ago when God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built.”
 Joel Green interprets this eschatologically rather than anthropologically. This would interpret easily with the immediate resurrection view (see below) or perhaps other ways. (Joel B. Green, *Body, Soul, And Human Life: The Nature of Humanity in the Bible*, Baker: 2008.)

¹⁵ Fascinatingly, Luke’s version of this saying of Jesus does not involve soul language at all: “I tell you, my friends, do not be afraid of those who kill the body and after that can do no more. But I will show you whom you should fear: Fear him who, after your body has been killed, has authority to throw you into hell. Yes, I tell you, fear him.” (Luke 12:4-5)

¹⁶ Joel Green notes that the Greek word *psyche* can have a range of meanings, including “inner self,” “life,” and “person” (Green, *Body, Soul* 55). Elsewhere, in regard to Matthew 10:28 in particular, Green says, “Though it could be possible that Jesus is simply saying that those who are persecuted should be comforted that martyrdom is only the end of earthly life, not the end of one’s human existence. Thus *psyche* would refer not to ‘soul’ but to ‘vitality’.” (Joseph Lee, “Brain, Mind and Soul: Towards a Contemporary Catholic Understanding of the Human Soul,” Flinders University, School of Humanities and Creative Arts, 2015 <https://theses.flinders.edu.au/view/334c8e6b-e372-4e77-9ab5-8f8b44a0ea26/1> , 254)

¹⁷ Murphy: “...or more accurately processes involving the brain, the rest of the nervous system, and other bodily systems, all interacting with the socio-cultural world.” (Murphy, *Bodies* 56)

how science has come to explain them as neurological processes, where discovery has been made primarily through the study of brain scans when during certain activities and by studying victims of traumatic brain injuries, where certain cognitive capacities are consistently shown to be lost when a particular area of the brain is damaged. Now, to do this, Murphy uses the work of St. Thomas Aquinas, who was the most precise in how he talked about the soul's capacities. And where Augustine had modified Plato, Thomas Aquinas had modified Aristotle, so Aquinas actually believed that plants and animals had souls, too, just not with the same capacities as humans. And the primary ways

Aquinas perceived that plants had the ability to grow, to absorb nutrition, and to reproduce.¹⁸ And scientists essentially agree.¹⁹ But Aquinas ascribed to animals a more advanced soul, which he called the "sensitive soul" with capacities that set them and humans apart from plants. These included the capacities for locomotion, appetite, and sensation. *{see full chart on the final page}*

- Locomotion is just the ability to move from one place to another. Well, neuroscience has shown that in humans these processes are controlled primarily by a strip of cortex across the top of the brain that has come to be called the "motor cortex".
- Going down to "emotion", this is the ability to recognize the intentions of others. Well, neuroscience has shown that the amygdala is necessary for interpreting facial expressions, direction of gaze, & tone of voice, and is also indispensable for fear conditioning.

But then, Aquinas said what distinguishes the human soul from the animal soul are rational capacities including abstract reasoning, which depends upon language, and the will. What Aquinas called the will was the power to desire "the good", which includes the desire for moral good as well as the desire for God. Not only is a capacity for language necessary, but it's been demonstrated that such desires depend on brain functions particularly in the pre-frontal cortex. Furthermore, the brain's temporal lobes are in various ways related to interest in religion²⁰ and to religious experiences. So, according to Murphy, neuroscience has shown that from a this-life perspective the concept of a soul is completely unnecessary, as everything a soul was thought to *do* can now be explained physically, including what was said to make us distinctive from all other creatures: "that we are able to be addressed by God and heed God's calling and commands." But this is where the term "nonreductive" is important, because all atheists would be some sort of physicalists, saying humans are nothing *but* bodies and chemical processes. But a nonreductive physicalist says these capacities humans have that animals do not are explainable *in part* as brain functions, "but their full explanation requires attention to human social relations, to cultural factors, and, most importantly, to our relationship with God."²¹

In addition to the suspect *history* of how Body-Soul Dualism came to be dominant in Western Christianity, it faces two other challenges that are worth mentioning. One is, if the soul - or mind - is non-physical - if it comes from something other than brain processes, it remains a mystery how it would possibly communicate with a physical body.²² This is called the problem of mind-body or soul-body interaction.

¹⁸ Aquinas called this the "vegetative soul"

¹⁹ Although scientists would add a fourth feature that Aquinas failed to note: self-repair (Murphy *Bodies* 57).

²⁰ "For example, patients with temporal lobe epilepsy often develop strong interests in religion" (Murphy *Bodies* 67)

²¹ So their full explanation is tied to a combination of biology, language, community, and from a Christian perspective from God taking the initiative to address and encounter us. Murphy: "The nonreductive physicalist says that the difference between humans and (other) animals is not found in a special immortal part, but rather in special capabilities, enabled by our more complex neural systems, language, and culture" (Murphy, *Bodies* 111, 116).

²² "In a world composed of atoms, sensation must result from the impinging of atoms on the sensory membranes, and then from coded information conveyed to the brain and thence to the mind...It's a problem of engineering." (Murphy, *Bodies* 47)

And a second is related to when the soul gets added? The Church ruled in 553 AD²³ that any notion that one's soul pre-exists their human life is heretical. Therefore, Body-Soul Dualism for Evangelical Protestants to Roman Catholics holds that God specially creates the soul within every human.²⁴ So, if that's the case, when does that happen? Is it some miracle God does at conception? And for those who affirm human evolution, this raises the even bigger question of when did God start bestowing the soul? Did God wait til the emergence of language around 100,000 years ago? Did neanderthals get a soul, too? Or just modern humans?

So Body-Soul Dualism may be the majority view for now, and it does have two millennia of Church tradition backing it up. I myself am not ready to completely turn my back on it, but I have big questions and it may become more and more difficult to maintain in the generations to come.

Now, holding to nonreductive physicalism is not without its challenges either. But Murphy suggests that what it basically requires is giving up a belief in the intermediate state and emphasizing resurrection as a whole person being raised to new life, not a soul getting a new body. Although, I do *not* think it means we'd need to be uncomfortable using the word "soul", just use it aspectively rather than partitively.

And while abandoning belief in the intermediate state does not call into question the ultimate destiny of those who die in the Lord, it could seem to call into question whether our loved ones who have died are "looking down on us now". Then again, maybe not, as that could all depend on the relationship between time and eternity!

Some alternatives to the intermediate state include the belief in immediate resurrection. This option is attractive for those who maintain God is completely outside of time,²⁵ because they hold that those who have died in the Lord are not disembodied souls but were immediately resurrected with new bodies outside of space-time.

Alternatively, those like Antje Jackelen, whom we looked at next week, affirm what is called the total death theory, which holds that when we die, every part of us dies, until Jesus returns and we are raised from the dead. So for her, Jesus' words to the thief are fulfilled because after the moment of death, the thief's next conscious moment

But finally, what would it matter whether Body-Soul Dualism or nonreductive Physicalism or something else²⁶ is true? Well, Murphy does make a strong case that the acceptance of Body-Soul Dualism in Church history contributed a lot to a degrading the outward and embodied elements of life for

²³ At the Second Council of Constantinople

²⁴ This is known as "soul creationism", not to be confused with cosmological creationism.

²⁵ "One solution is a resurrection at death. Opposing this is the idea of continued life and of retribution directly after death and before the Resurrection. Texts for example Luke 16:19-31; 23:42f, are quoted which apparently use body-soul scheme of later Judaism such as Matthew 10:28. Such thinkers also include Paul, Church Fathers like St. Irenaeus, and authors who, while not sympathetic to concede a separated soul due to their philosophical ideas, however did affirm it because it was contained in the words of the Lord.106 There is the continuation of consciousness and the continuity of the bodily element, connected with the idea of transformation." (Lee 258-9)

²⁶ Another, weaker option is Emergent Dualism, explained here by Lee:

"A second kind of "physicalism" is, notwithstanding its title, is W.Hasker's emergent dualism. 22 Emergence occurs when elements are organised into complex wholes, and something authentically new enters the picture, something that is not reducible to or explainable by the elements.23 Hasker agrees with Murphy's ontological reductionism, that as one ascends the hierarchy of levels, there are no new metaphysical additives to generate higher-level entities from lower ones. Hasker points out that Murphy assumes the standard particle-interaction laws of physics or what he terms microdeterminism. Murphy asks if ontological reductionism can be accepted without causal reductionism, as in arguments about free will being an illusion. Hasker finds it hard to see how causal reduction can be avoided. If the higher-level organisation is to make a difference, "it can only do this by affecting the interactions of the constituents at the base level – but this is forbidden to do by the 18 thesis of microdeterminism. Causal reduction has in no way been avoided."24 Hasker says microdeterminism has to be abandoned. These are grounds for his emergent dualism. In emergent dualism the mental individual emerges from the organism and is sustained by it; not added separately from outside by the divine." (Lee 244-5)

Thomas Aquinas' capacities of the soul	(note)	Brain Process
The "sensitive" soul of animals		
Locomotion	This is the ability to move from one place to another	The "motor" cortex + subcortical regions
Appetite	The drive to seek toward what is pleasurable and avoid what hurts	Food appetite: mediated by pleasure-centers of brain and dependent upon a balance of neurotransmitters Sexual desire: highly dependent on hormones (e.g. oxytocin) secreted by the brain's pituitary gland
Sensation	Lower animals respond to stimuli without knowing what they're doing, while higher functioning animals have consciousness. The ability to retain sense impressions <i>in the absence of the stimulus</i> is basically the role of imagination.	Higher animals and humans: signals are transmitted through two difference kinds of light-sensitive cells in the retina, through a series of processors, to the visual cortex
Emotion	The ability to recognize the intentions of others	The amygdala has been shown to be necessary for interpreting facial expressions, direction of gaze, & tone of voice; also fear conditioning.
The "rational" soul of humans		
Active intellect	Abstraction, judgment, & reasoning	All of these capacities depend on language, which requires the cognitive capacities for comprehending language and has long been known to involved the Wernicke's area & Broca's area of the brain.
Passive intellect	A memory of facts & ideas	Approximately a dozen memory systems have been distinguished by neuroscientists. Long-term memory depends on the hippocampus.
The Will	A power to have wants that only a language-use can have, including a desire for moral good and for God)	Thomas's "appetite for the good" appears to depend directly on localized brain functions, particularly in prefrontal cortex. The temporal lobes have been shown to activate during a variety of religious experiences.

