

# The Depth of the Human Person

*A Multidisciplinary Approach*

*Edited by*

Michael Welker

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY  
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN / CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

© 2014 Michael Welker  
All rights reserved

Published 2014 by  
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.  
2140 Oak Industrial Drive N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505 /  
P.O. Box 163, Cambridge CB3 9PU U.K.

Printed in the United States of America

20 19 18 17 16 15 14      7 6 5 4 3 2 1

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

The depth of the human person : a multidisciplinary approach /  
edited by Michael Welker.

pages      cm

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-8028-6979-1 (pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Theological anthropology — Christianity. 2. Philosophical anthropology.
3. Human beings. I. Welker, Michael, 1947- editor of compilation.

BT701.3.D47 2014  
233 .5 — dc23

2014005081

www.eerdmans.com

## Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	1
<i>Michael Welker</i>	
<b>I. Person and Personhood: Introductory Questions</b>	
Why Is Personhood Conceptually Difficult?	15
<i>Andreas Kemmerling</i>	
Flesh–Body–Heart–Soul–Spirit: Paul’s Anthropology as an Interdisciplinary Bridge-Theory	45
<i>Michael Welker</i>	
Emergence, the Quest for Unity, and God: Toward a Constructive Christian Theology of the Person	58
<i>Philip Clayton</i>	
<b>II. Scientific Perspectives in Interdisciplinary Dialogues</b>	
Towards an Integrated Anthropology	79
<i>John C. Polkinghorne</i>	

it. We cannot ask the natural scientist “What is a person?” in the same state of almost complete conceptual ignorance and with the same hope for conceptual elucidation, in which we may ask “What is a magnetic moment?”

Natural science can teach us what human beings (considered exclusively as members of a certain biological species) are; as for storks and computers — and, if there are or were any, extraterrestrials and replicants — science can inform us about their physical and functional similarities and differences. But we must not hope that among the distinctions drawable in naturalist terms, there is one — already drawn, as it were — between those human beings, storks, computers, extraterrestrials, and replicants which (or who) are persons and those which (or who) are not. This would be silly. The natural sciences, with good reason, attach importance to providing no methodological space for value-concepts. This, of course, is not a frivolous narrow-mindedness on their part but a well-considered delimitation of what does, and what does not, fall within their cognitive realm.<sup>31</sup>

31. Thanks to the members of the group, especially to Maria Antonaccio, Philip Clayton, Malcolm Jeeves, Eiichi Katayanagi, John Polkinghorne, William Schweiker, Günter Thomas, and Michael Welker. In developing my ideas about these issues, I have profited a lot from discussing and conversing with them. Many thanks also to my old friends Mark Helme, Rolf-Peter Horstmann, Rainer von Savigny, and Hans-Peter Schütt for support and encouragement. They were kind enough to read earlier versions and spotted several things they found flatly mistaken or just cranky, some of which I have tried to correct or tone down.

## Flesh–Body–Heart–Soul–Spirit: Paul’s Anthropology as an Interdisciplinary Bridge-Theory

*Michael Welker*

Several years ago we started our international and interdisciplinary research project titled: “Body–Soul–Spirit: Regaining a Complex Concept of the Human Personhood.” The title was — as we now see — a misleading formulation for a program that meant to pursue several goals and connect them.

- One goal was to answer the question: What speaks for and what speaks against the familiar dualizing anthropologies past and present, which invite us to observe the human being and to think about the human person in dual patterns such as “Mind and Body,” “Soul and Body,” “Spirit and Body,” “Self-Consciousness and Consciousness” or “Brain and Spirit”?
- Another goal was to test whether theological talk about “Soul” and “Spirit” was able to grasp phenomena and functions that could also be identified in nontheological, e.g., philosophical or scientific observations and reflections. Would anything be lost when modern philosophies and psychologies tried to replace soul and spirit, for instance by self-consciousness?
- A third goal was the attempt to include the bodily condition of the human being in the discourse between theology, philosophy, and natural sciences and to do so without introducing naturalistic reductionism or an aesthetic impressionism.

Over against the concern to avoid dualistic reductionisms in the search for concepts that could harbor the complexity of the human person, Andreas Kemmerling issued a helpful warning: “What is so deeply confusing about the concept of ‘person’ is this: its inexhaustible wealth. Even the most basic and

meager 'ontological' concept of the person is inexhaustibly diverse. And it is completely unclear which of its characteristics are central — and which ones belong more at the conceptual boundary or perhaps should even be viewed only as derivatives of others."<sup>1</sup> The danger of contemplating human personality via dualistic reductionisms is that one produces a phenomenal blindness that structurally excludes important areas of knowledge. Over against this risk, Kemmerling points to another danger: to "fall into despair over the wealth" of the concept of person and to "sink into a bottomless pit." He suggests that we should lay bare the content-oriented and theoretical interests in our discussion of this concept so that we can attempt "to bring a bit of order into this conceptual muddle."<sup>2</sup>

It was the contribution of Gerd Theissen on the differentiation between *sarx* and *soma*, flesh and body, in Paul's letters, that drew my attention to this anthropology as a candidate to follow Kemmerling's proposal. With Paul's anthropology, however, we seem to have before us a contribution that, with its hard dualism of "flesh and spirit," essentially in the letters to the Galatians and to the Romans, has provided formative theological and theoretical impulses for past and present dualistic and reductionistic anthropologies. On the other hand, Paul's model suggests that we should consider a cohesion of very diverse themes (such as "heart," "soul," "spirit," "reason," "conscience"), all of which have been highly important for theories in which the concept of person has played a central role. Above all, Paul's anthropology is structurally open to topics and questions of both theology and the natural sciences. It does not ignore the complex corporeality of the human being or humanity's difficult relationship to "God's Spirit."

In the following, I should like, first, to illuminate the harsh dualism of "flesh and spirit" in Paul's thought, a dualism that could be regarded as the root of many reductionistic evils in anthropology. In the second part, I will address Paul's thoughts about the multidimensionality of the human body. A third part will deal with the various interrelations between spirit, body, soul, and spirit. In a final part, I will concentrate on Paul's use of the terms "heart" and "conscience" as ciphers for future anthropological research about the complex unity of the human person.

1. A. Kemmerling, "Was macht den Begriff der Person so besonders schwierig?," in *Gegenwart des lebendigen Christus*, ed. G. Thomas and A. Schüle (Leipzig: EVA, 2007), pp. 541-65, 544f.

2. Kemmerling, "Was macht den Begriff der Person so besonders schwierig?," pp. 564 and 563.

## 1. Flesh and Spirit

In Galatians, Paul speaks of the flesh and the spirit as "enemies," since each sparks off an opposing "desire." This hostile constellation leads to a loss of human freedom that can only be resolved if the spirit is allowed to lead: "Live by the Spirit, I say, and do not gratify the desires of the flesh. For what the flesh desires is opposed to the Spirit, and what the Spirit desires is opposed to the flesh; for these are opposed to each other, to prevent you from doing what you want" (Gal. 5:16-17). Those who are determined by the desires of the flesh are subject to finitude, transience, and decay; those who are determined by the Spirit "reap eternal life" (cf. Gal. 6:8).

We also find this conviction expressed in Romans: "To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace" (Rom. 8:6). Thus Paul's emphatic advice, that "if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live" (Rom. 8:13). However one is to understand these negatively connoted "actions of the flesh" and their death through the spirit, it is important first to note that Paul does not see the flesh simply as something that must be ignored at all costs.

Though Paul — with his strict differentiation of *sarx* and *soma* (flesh and body) — also repeatedly underlines the bond between the material dimension of the flesh and its transience,<sup>3</sup> the "materiality" of the flesh (over against stone and dust) is in fact an aspect to be valued: by drawing on associations with Exodus 24:12, Ezra 11:19; 36:26, and Jeremiah 31:33, 2 Corinthians stresses: "you show that you are a letter of Christ, prepared by us, written . . . with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts" (2 Cor. 3:3). The idea that this might be an accidental or even unfortunate play on words can be dismissed when one takes into account statements (such as 2 Cor. 4:11) regarding the revelatory role not only of the body but also of the flesh: "For while we live, we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be made visible in our mortal flesh."

Though the flesh represents earthly, frail, and transient existence, it does not fail to receive dignity for having marked out the descent of a human life as well as the seriousness and drama of the divine will for revelation: In Romans, Paul proclaims the gospel of the Son of God "who was descended from David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3; cf. 8:3). And Israel is praised on his account,

3. See here the essay by Gerd Theissen in this volume; cf. also numerous Old Testament statements such as Isaiah 40:6: "All flesh is grass" and withers (cf. 40:7f.); Job 7:5: "My flesh is clothed with worms."

since “from them, according to the flesh, comes the Messiah, who is over all” (Rom. 9:5). If one takes seriously Paul’s often-stressed importance of the divine service — indeed, revelatory power — of the human body (see below, part 2), and if one sees that the earthly body cannot be separated from the flesh (a distinction that Paul clearly makes), then we must do away with all primitive “either/or” conceptions regarding “flesh and spirit.” The flesh inalienably belongs to the historical-material basis of the body, and thus (according to Paul) also to the higher level of human existence in heart and soul.

Yet as a notoriously finite and transient basis of existence, it becomes dangerous when its “lusts and desires” are self-directed. In his harsh statements about “the flesh,” Paul repeatedly alludes to the elementary fleshly-bodily functions of nutrition and reproduction. If an interest in these functions dominates human existence without placing them in the service of the spirit, then such an existence succumbs to “sin and death.” It is well-known that Paul does not hold back in his critique of gluttony, drunkenness, and forms of sexual contact incompatible with the possibility of reproduction (cf. Gal. 5:19ff.; 1 Cor. 5:1; 6:9f., 13ff.; 10:8; 11:21; 2 Cor. 12:21; Rom. 1:26f.; 13:13). If viewed superficially, one might attribute this to Paul’s “hostility against the body and desires,” to his personal neuroses, or to general canonical homophobias. In fact this harsh critique of the independent interests of “the flesh” grows out of a concern that those who have been won for God and for his gospel might once again be controlled by powers that would surrender them to the futility and transience of human life and block them from the prospects of God’s plan for them and from the perspectives of the spirit.

Just as an abstract and totalizing denial of the flesh fails to do justice to Paul’s anthropology, an enthusiasm for vague metaphysical and religious ideas such as “pure spirit” and “unmediated relationship with God in the Spirit” also fails to appreciate both the “depth” and the sharply observed and differentiated character of Paul’s thought. One can (and should) make this clear with the example of his dispute with the Corinthians regarding their speaking in tongues: “those who speak in a tongue do not speak to other people but to God; for nobody understands them, since they are speaking mysteries in the Spirit. On the other hand, those who prophesy speak to other people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation” (1 Cor. 14:2-3). Speaking in tongues obviously fails to impress Paul, even though he affirms that this is speaking directly in the Spirit, speaking even “to God.” This is not a singular derailment that could generously be dismissed by mystical enthusiasm for pure religious interiority and ultimate religious feeling. And it is not only public speech, but also prayer and doxologies “in tongues” that are expressly included by Paul in

his mild critique as direct contact with God, striven after and achieved in the human “spirit”: “For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind [*nous*] is unproductive. What should I do then? I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the mind also; I will sing praise with the spirit, but I will sing praise with the mind also” (1 Cor. 14:14-15).

These statements are revealing in many ways. Just as Paul does not condemn “the flesh” en bloc, neither does he present a scathing critique of glossolalic attempts to establish direct contact with God. In 1 Corinthians 14:18, he thanks God before the Corinthians that he speaks in tongues “more than you all” — whatever the measure of comparison may be. However, in this context Paul offers a strong plea for sensible speech in a sensible church service: “If you say a blessing with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the ‘Amen’ to your thanksgiving, since the outsider does not know what you are saying? For you may give thanks well enough, but the other person is not built up” (1 Cor. 14:16-17). Emphatically, he holds to his position that he “would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue” (14:19). And he explicitly warns against a community that loses itself “in the spirit”: “If, therefore, the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are out of your mind?” (14:23).

This clear, though not completely devastating, critique of glossolalia in direct contact with God “in the spirit” connects with a clearly sympathetic declaration of the use of rationality or reason (*nous*) even in spiritual contexts and in church services, and even in prayer and doxology — though this declaration is not directed abstractly against religious emotionalism. Here, rationality and reason are not highly complex entities attainable only through arduous transcendental philosophical training. They do not need to be won via post-pietistic processes of purification against “the naïve” and for “moral faith,” as was the case with Kant. Rather, *nous* signifies understandable statements connected with an interest in persuasion and conviction. Even outsiders should be taught and be able, once convinced, to agree (“to say amen”). Cognitive or moral attempts to overpower others — whether they succeed or whether they fail (over against the supposed “lost”) — are not a trademark of “the spirit.” The profile of the spirit is not recognized in an abstract opposition to “the flesh,” and in an essentially numinous or individualistic, “purely spiritual” relationship with God largely disconnected from outside contact. Rather one requires a carefully considered perception and appreciation of the body in order to understand the spirit and the places where it functions both in individual and communal human life.

## 2. The Multidimensionality of the Body

If one only considers Paul's statements about the decaying, earthly body (1 Corinthians 15) — which leaves us in a life far removed from God (2 Corinthians 5), which is controlled by sin (Romans 6), and which hopes for redemption and salvation from this present forlornness and mortality (Romans 8) — then one might easily be tempted to equate *sarx* and *soma*, flesh and body. Yet although the earthly body is made of flesh and thus shares in the frailties and endangerments of the flesh, they must be clearly distinguished. The body is not only shaped and characterized by flesh but also by a multitude of spiritual forces, and it points to a completely different set of dynamics than the flesh, which aims in a finally futile way at self-preservation.

Paul does not perceive the body merely as a "material entity," the simple bearer of "faculties" of higher value. Rather, the body is a complex organism with many parts, and it connects very different services and functions. As such, it is an area, a sphere in which God "lives" and through which God seeks to be glorified: "Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own? For you were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body" (1 Cor. 6:19-20).

Paul presents the body even like a place of revelation, as a place where one can perceive the life and death of Jesus (2 Cor. 4:10; Gal. 6:17): "It is my eager expectation and hope that . . . Christ will be exalted publicly now as always in my body, whether by life or by death" (Phil. 1:20). In light of an understanding of the body as an organism composed of many parts, Paul provides a detailed illustration of the existence of the post-Easter, resurrected Christ and the state of his church (cf. especially 1 Cor. 12:12ff.): "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body — Jews or Greeks, slaves or free — and we are all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:12-13). Paul repeatedly demands of the Christians to whom he writes that they understand themselves as the combined and cooperative members of the body of Christ: "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (1 Cor. 12:27; see also Rom. 12:4f.).

Paul attempts to clarify the activity of the divine Spirit and the great importance of the sacraments of baptism and holy communion in light of the "constitution" and liveliness of this many-membered body. That love which has been "poured out" through the Spirit into the hearts of believers (Rom.

5:5) unites these believers together in the body of Christ.<sup>4</sup> In this way, God is able through the Spirit to work upon each individual. The Spirit "allots to each one individually [his or her particular gift] just as the Spirit chooses" (1 Cor. 12:11). "But as it is, God arranged the members in the body, each one of them, as he chose" (1 Cor. 12:18). The miracle of this organic interplay of individual members in a single body is the achievement of the Spirit.<sup>5</sup> Yet the collective charisma and purposefully directed activity of the members of this body is also an achievement of the Spirit. Paul's stress on this interplay between Spirit and body once again emphasizes Paul's critique of efforts to establish "purely spiritual" contact with God by speaking in tongues.

Finally, the great importance of the body (also in its specific materiality) is stressed in the institution of the holy communion. That bread which is shared, and which symbolically nourishes and "builds up" the congregation is the "body of Christ." The bread that we eat is not identified as the "flesh of Christ" which must pass away. Mediated through gifts of creation — through bread and wine — the resurrected Christ enters into his members not only "in the Spirit" but also manifestly, "in the body," making those members into the carriers of his post-Easter existence.<sup>6</sup> This (difficult to understand) interplay between Spirit and body in the autonomy and cooperation of the body's members, and in that service of the individual members and of the entire body which extends beyond the simple self-maintenance of the organism, represents a sign of hope that points to the eschatological destiny of believers' corporeal existence.

That wonderfully enlivening interplay of the Spirit with the many-membered body is a sign that the body is not finally or completely defined by its corporeality and that it need not be identified with its corporeal frailty and finality. But above all, this wonderful "building up," even of the material, organic community of the "body of Christ," points to the power of the Spirit to create a new reality that awakens in the bodily existence shaped by the Spirit a hope for a life that extends beyond this "fleshly" finitude.<sup>7</sup> In Philippians,

4. On the relevance of the event and the image of the "pouring out of the Spirit," see M. Welker, *God the Spirit* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1994).

5. John Polkinghorne has suggested that we recognize the personality of the Spirit in its context sensitivity: J. Polkinghorne and M. Welker, *Faith in the Living God: A Dialogue* (London: SPCK, 2001); "The Hidden Spirit and the Cosmos," in *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*, ed. M. Welker (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), pp. 169ff.

6. Cf. M. Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, second printing 2004).

7. Cf. here J. Polkinghorne and M. Welker, eds., *The End of the World and the Ends of God:*

Paul sums this up with the hope that Christ “will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself” (Phil. 3:21). In other texts, he sees this new creative power flowing from the creator, but primarily from the Spirit of God (cf. Rom. 5:5ff.; 8:21ff.; 1 Cor. 15:34ff.; 2 Cor. 3:18). Paul does not simply base his comments here on religious wishes or fantasies. His observations dealing with the inner constitution of the human spirit and other “mental” powers are reinforced in his eschatological views.

### 3. Spirit–Body–Soul–Reason

Paul closes the first of his letters to the Thessalonians with the wish that “the God of peace himself [may] sanctify you entirely; and may your spirit (*pneuma*) and soul (*psyche*) and body (*soma*) be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess. 5:23). For a way of thinking that has become accustomed to omnipresent dualistic anthropologies (from “body and soul,” “body and spirit,” “mind and material,” to that fashionable dichotomy of the late twentieth century: “brain and mind”), this “trichotomous sounding expression” raises a “particular problem of Pauline Anthropology.”<sup>8</sup> Normally, New Testament exegesis attempts to “solve” this “problem” by assuring us that Paul is “simply trying to emphasize that God’s salvific work touches the whole human being.”<sup>9</sup> The claim here, that this is “a plerophoric way . . . of expressing the totality of the human being,”<sup>10</sup> seeks support in part by claiming that *pneuma* “in 1 Thessalonians is for Paul not a component of the human being, but is rather the expression and characteristic of God’s new creative action in human beings.”<sup>11</sup>

Yet these propositions fail to convince for a range of reasons. Not only does Paul expressly speak in 1 Thessalonians 5:23 of “your spirit,” but in other letters as well he clearly distinguishes God’s Spirit from the spirit of human beings: according to Romans 8:16, “it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with

*Science and Theology on Eschatology* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000); H.-J. Eckstein and M. Welker, eds., *Die Wirklichkeit der Auferstehung* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007), esp. pp. 311ff.

8. U. Schnelle, *Paulus. Leben und Denken* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), p. 615.

9. Schnelle, *Paulus*, p. 615; T. Holz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, in *EKK XIII*, p. 265; G. Friedrich, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, in *NTD 8*, p. 250.

10. Friedrich, *NTD 8*, p. 250.

11. Schnelle, *Paulus*, p. 615.

our spirit that we are children of God.” In almost all letters we find talk of the human spirit or the spirit of particular persons (e.g., 1 Cor. 2:11; 5:5; 2 Cor. 7:13; 12:18; Philem. 1:25). The wish that the community might “be holy in body and spirit” (1 Cor. 7:34), the warnings against “defilement . . . of the spirit” (2 Cor. 7:1) and receiving “a different spirit” (2 Cor. 11:4) as well as the gift of “discerning between spirits” (1 Cor. 12:10) would all be senseless if *pneuma* were “not a component of the human being.”

There are certainly statements (primarily in Philippians) that leave it unclear whether Paul — with his encouragements to “stand firm in one spirit” (Phil. 1:27; cf. 2:1) — is referring to the Holy Spirit or is only expressing the equivalent of his wish that the community strive “side by side with one mind (psyche) for the faith of the gospel” (Phil. 1:27; cf. also the statements about “praying in the spirit,” 1 Cor. 14:14ff.). References to the “spirit of the world” (1 Cor. 2:12) and the warnings against a “sluggish spirit” (Rom. 11:8, following Isa. 29:10) make it unavoidably clear that one can in no way simply attribute references to *pneuma* in Paul’s work only to his doctrine of God.

Nor are reservations about that “trichotomous sounding expression” in 1 Thessalonians 5:23 well grounded exegetically; on the contrary, they must be attributed to anthropological “mental blocks.” This becomes apparent when we note that the same interpreters who understand Paul here to be speaking “in a plerophoric way” about the “entire human being” stress that *pneuma*,<sup>12</sup> or (“in the Old Testament tradition”) *psyche*,<sup>13</sup> is also used by Paul to signify “the whole person.” If one does not wish to distort the epistemological potential of the Pauline anthropology within a cheap, amalgamated rhetoric, then one must take Paul’s differentiation between spirit, body, and psyche seriously.

From both theological as well as anthropological perspectives, the Spirit enables a co-presence and contact with those who are absent. Through his Spirit, the invisible God communicates with the human spirit and imparts to it creative impulses. According to Paul, even those who are absent can have authentic contact with others “in the spirit,” despite differences in space and time. By remembering his own visits, his teaching and preaching, and through his petitions before God, but also through the letters and messages of others, Paul is present to the community “in the spirit.” This presence is not merely a figment of his imagination. Paul himself can also become “spiritually” present in the community. In 1 Corinthians 5, he describes this process of spiritual communication and co-action: “For though absent in body, I am present in

12. Holz, *EKK XIII*, p. 265.

13. Schnelle, *Paulus*, p. 615.

spirit; and as if present I have already pronounced judgment in the name of the Lord Jesus. . . . When you are assembled, and my spirit is present with the power of our Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5:3-4). "The name" and "the power of our Lord," and certainly the Spirit of God (though not expressly mentioned in this passage) play an important connective role here in the connection of the community — even in a very general way, that is, with and without bodily co-presence. However, one certainly does not need to make reference to the Holy Spirit in order to understand the spiritual process of communication between Paul and the Corinthians.

More difficult to understand is the concept of *psyche* in Paul's work. We encounter the term only eleven times in the Pauline corpus, and it has been variously translated, either as "soul," "life," or even "person." Paul takes up the Old Testament expression *nefesh*, which can be translated as "throat, neck, desire, soul, life, person," as well as being used as a pronoun.<sup>14</sup>

It is worth noting that according to 1 Corinthians 2:14 the "person described by the psyche" "is unable to perceive the work of the spirit."<sup>15</sup> The expression, *psyche*, encompasses an individual, earthly life — an earthly, bodily, and spiritual individuality that, while created by God, has not (yet) been filled by God's Spirit. Paul sees the "first Adam" as a "living psyche" and thus as a transitory creature, while Jesus Christ as the "last Adam" is a "life-giving Spirit" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45). Paul shares not only his preaching with the Thessalonians but also his own bodily-spiritual "psyche," for they have become dear to him (1 Thess. 2:8). He swears to the Corinthians before God upon his own psyche and assures them of his desire to exhaust himself for their psyches (2 Cor. 1:23 and 12:15) — though in these two cases the expression should probably be translated more clearly as "life" (so too in Phil. 2:30 and Rom. 2:9; 11:3).

Furthermore, as for the psyche, only hesitantly would one use the expression "whole" human being — especially if one does not want to overlook the spiritual and theological dimensions. According to Romans 13:1, "each psyche [should] be subject to the governing authorities; for . . . those authorities . . . have been instituted by God." Paul could hardly have said: each person should serve the state "with all your heart and with all the powers of your spirit." In contrast to that assumed set of associations so common in modern Euro-American contexts, Paul's usage of psyche in the sense of "soul, person, and life" is very clearly understood in a secular way. On the other hand, rationality

14. H. W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, 5th ed. (München: Kaiser, 1990), pp. 25ff.

15. Schnelle, *Paulus*, p. 615.

and reason (*nous*) is closely connected with prayer and doxology (1 Corinthians 14; see above, part 1). In Romans, the "law of sin," under which the fleshly members of the body stand, is thoroughly opposed by the "law of my mind," which is determined by the spirit (Rom. 7:23ff.). Paul can even speak of God's *nous* (Rom. 11:34) and of a human *nous* that can be renewed by discerning the will of God (Rom. 12:2). At this point, we have now dealt with all the most important instances of this term in Paul's letters. However, before any undue religious-philosophical aspirations arise, it should be noted that Paul also uses a contextually relative *nous* (Rom. 14:5) and considers the possibility that God surrenders some to a "debased *nous*" (Rom. 1:28). How little we should desire prayer, doxology, and the recognition of God's will without rational consistency, and how great should be our wariness of a rational consistency that leads us astray.

#### 4. Heart and Conscience as Ciphers for Areas of Future Anthropological Research

Although the psyche, according to Paul, signifies the earthly, corporeal-mental unity of a person, it is not a soteriological entity. Here Paul is in agreement with the rest of the biblical traditions (except for Tobit), in claiming that "the soul" in and of itself does not receive immortality and other eschatological privileges. The activity of God's Spirit does not penetrate directly into the psyche. Rather its effects flow via the heart in the human body and then indirectly upon the soul. The heart is an exceptionally important entity in Paul's anthropology. As in the Old Testament (861 references for *leb* or *lebab*), it connects "vegetative, emotional, noetic and voluntary functions."<sup>16</sup> If psyche signifies the earthly, corporeal-mental unity of the human person, then the heart, *kardia*, stands for the emotional-voluntary depths. It is via the heart that the divine Spirit reaches the human body and its mental capacities (2 Cor. 1:22; 3:3; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 3:29; 5:5). Yes, God himself can "shine" in the hearts of human beings (2 Cor. 4:6). And it is in the heart that the divine Word arouses faith (Rom. 10:8ff.).

As with the spirit, the heart can also be directed to those who are absent and make them imaginatively present, even in longing: "we were . . . separated

16. Bernd Janowski has presented an impressive examination of these functions and their interdependencies: B. Janowski, *Konfliktgespräche mit Gott. Eine Anthropologie der Psalmen*, 2nd ed. (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006), pp. 166-70.



from you — in person, not in heart — we longed with great eagerness to see you” (1 Thess. 2:17). To those who are absent, the heart can “give room” within a person (2 Cor. 3:2; 6:11; Rom. 7:2f.). However, it is so bound to the body and the “inner” person, that one cannot say: my heart is present with you! Yet it is also the place of hidden intentions and thoughts that can only be revealed with the help of the spirit (1 Cor. 14:25), including also God’s Spirit at the eschatological judgment (1 Cor. 4:5; Rom. 8:27). The heart gathers together emotional and moral energies, it bestows “firmness” of character, receives comfort and direction (1 Thess. 3:13; 1 Cor. 7:37; 2 Thess. 2:17; 3:5); it is the location of zeal, firm resolution, and spiritual obedience (Rom. 6:17; 8:16; 9:7). Yet as a human capacity, it can also be foolish, serving the desires of the flesh, fighting against repentance and, in “the simple-minded,” allowing itself to be deceived (Rom. 1:21; 1:24; 2:5; 16:18).

Despite all its possibilities for firmness and energy, as an organ bound to an earthly body the heart is still troubled by the melancholy of finitude: “but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption as sons [of God], the redemption of our bodies. . . . Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words. And God, who searches the heart, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God” (Rom. 8:23, 26-27).

The revelatory power of the Spirit, which is aimed at recognizing both the divine and the truth, also manifests itself in the human conscience (*syneidesis*). We are dealing here with a dynamic, restless, and sensitive “power of self-judgment,”<sup>17</sup> a consciousness of norms, which also questions itself in light of its fellow human beings and their needs, in which a person’s “conflicting thoughts will accuse or perhaps excuse them” (Rom. 2:15). Those persons seized and filled by the Spirit of God, who develop a differentiated capacity for judgment, can on the one hand “commend [them]selves to the conscience of everyone” through the connection of subtle empathy and a steadfastness of their own convictions (2 Cor. 4:2). On the other hand, they are called upon to deal tactfully with others, especially those who cannot mediate the freedom of faith and their tradition-based normative consciousness in their “weak conscience” (cf. Romans 14).<sup>18</sup> In one’s conscience, we have a concentration within

17. Schnelle, *Paulus*, pp. 606-9; H.-J. Eckstein, *Syneidesis bei Paulus*, WUNT 2.10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), pp. 242f.

18. On the corresponding processes of moral communication, see M. Welker, *Kirche ohne Kurs?* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987), pp. 55-62.

the individual of the cognitive and normative processes of mediation between multipartite social and moral complexity and the search for illumination and cognitive coherence. Paul envisions this balancing between inspired faith and disciplining reason with regard to the flesh-centered body and the heart-centered human spirit. The human spirit is to be connected with and filled by the Spirit of Christ, and is to be clarified by the *nous*, by reason, a twofold edification that should not become trapped by an anthropological dualism.