

ISSN2464-0344

Res novae



Revija za celovito znanost
Journal for Integrated Science

Bernard Goršak

THE SEPARATION OF BODY AND SOUL AFTER DEATH:
A PEDAGOGICAL INTERPRETATION

Ivo Kerže

MARITAINOVSKI FILOZOFSKI IZVORI
IZJAVE *DIGNITATIS HUMANAЕ*

Karmen Likeb

RAZVOJ MODELA ETIČNIH KONTROLNIH TOČK (EKT)
KOT REŠITEV PROBLEMA ZAVAJAJOČEGA OGLAŠEVANJA
PREHRANSKIH DOPOLNI

Simon Malmenvall

RAZUMEVANJE DEDIŠČINE CIRILA IN METODA
V LUČI SLOVENSKEGA KATOLIŠTVA IN NARODNE ZAVESTI

Marija Šimenc

NASTAJANJE VODITELJA SKOZI IZKUŠNJO V ČASU:
SV. CIRIL IN METOD V LUČI SODOBNIH SISTEMSKIH TEORIJ

Fakulteta za pravo in ekonomijo, Katoliški inštitut
Faculty of Law and Economics, Catholic Institute

LETNIK 10 • 2025 • ŠTEVILKA 2

Res novae

Res novae: revija za celovito znanost

Izdajatelj in založnik:

Fakulteta za pravo in ekonomijo, Katoliški inštitut

Naslov uredništva:

Res novae, Krekov trg 1, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

Odgovorni urednik:

Andrej Naglič

Glavni urednik:

Matic Batič

Spletni naslov:

<http://www.katoliski-institut.si/raziskovanje/res-novae>

E-pošta:

matic.batic@kat-inst.si

Uredniški odbor:

Philip Booth (St Mary's University, London, Velika Britanija), Mihai Dragnea (Universitetet i Sørøst-Norge, USN Handelshøgskolen, Vestfold, Norveška), Andres Fink (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Buenos Aires, Argentina), Aleksandra Kostić Tmušić (Univerzitet u Prištini, Filozofski fakultet, Kosovska Mitrovica, Srbija/Kosovo), Simon Malmenvall (Univerza v Ljubljani, Teološka fakulteta; Slovenski šolski muzej, Ljubljana, Slovenija), Aleksej Martinjuk (Respublikanski inštitut višje šole, Minsk, Belorusija), José Ignacio Murillo (Universidad de Navarra, Instituto Cultura y Sociedad, Pamplona, Španija), Mitja Steinbacher (Katoliški inštitut, Fakulteta za pravo in ekonomijo, Ljubljana, Slovenija), Dorina Dragnea (Institutul Național Al Patrimoniului, Bukarešta, Romunija), Anton Stres (Katoliški inštitut, Fakulteta za pravo in ekonomijo, Ljubljana, Slovenija), Sebastijan Valentan (Univerza v Ljubljani, Teološka fakulteta, Ljubljana, Slovenija).

Redakcija te številke je bila zaključena 21. 12. 2025.

Publikacija izhaja s finančno podporo Javne agencije za znanstveno-raziskovalno in inovacijsko dejavnost Republike Slovenije.

Tisk:

Itagraf d. o. o., Ljubljana

Oblikovanje in prelom:

Breda Sturm

Naklada:

100 izvodov

Letna naročnina:

28€ (Slovenija), 40€ (Evropa), 57\$ (ostalo navadno),

66\$ (ostalo prednostno)

ISSN (tiskana verzija): 2464-0344

ISSN (elektronska verzija): 2464-0352



Res novae

Revija za celovito znanost
Journal for Integrated Science



SPIRITUS
AUTEM
VIVIFICAT

LETNIK 10 • 2025 • ŠTEVILKA 2

Vsebina

Bernard Goršak

The Separation of Body and Soul After Death: A Pedagogical Interpretation

7

Ivo Kerže

Maritainovski filozofski izvori
izjave *Dignitatis humanae*

31

Karmen Likeb

Razvoj modela etičnih kontrolnih točk (EKT)
kot rešitev problema zavajajočega oglaševanja
prehranskih dopolni

67

Simon Malmenvall

Razumevanje dediščine Cirila in Metoda
v luči slovenskega katolištva
in narodne zavesti

127

Marija Šimenc

Nastajanje voditelja skozi izkušnjo
v času: sv. Ciril in Metod
v luči sodobnih sistemskih teorij

151

DOI: 10.62983/rn2865.25b.1
1.01 original scientific article

Bernard Goršak*

The Separation of Body and Soul After Death: A Pedagogical Interpretation

Abstract: One of the core mysteries of Christian theology concerns the separation of body and soul after death. According to the common understanding shared by the majority of Christian denominations, the soul departs from the physical body at the moment of death and enters a so-called intermediate state. The mystery lies in the nature of this postmortem existence of the soul, especially since a central Catholic dogma defines the human being not as a composition of two distinct yet connected entities (soul and body), but as a single, unified reality—a soul–body unity—arising from their synthesis. At the beginning of the Bible, an ontological definition of the human person is presented in the form of a categorical statement describing how man became a living soul: not only did he receive a soul from God as something added to him, but he himself became a soul. In this light, particularly when presenting this intriguing dilemma to a younger audience in the context of catechesis, it is exceedingly helpful to employ an appropriate analogy that, through comparison and parallelism, can render such a complex subject more intelligible. This article aims to present one such viable analogy.

* PhD, Assistant Professor, Alma Mater Europaea Maribor, Slovenska 17, SI–2000 Maribor, bernard.gorsak@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0599-6113.

Keywords: death, soul and body, intermediate state, Particular and Last Judgement

Izvleček: Ena osrednjih skrivnosti krščanske teologije je ločitev telesa in duše po smrti. Po splošnem razumevanju, kot ga deli večina krščanskih veroizpovedi, duša po smrti zapusti fizično telo in se znajde v tako imenovanem vmesnem stanju. Skrivnost tiči v naravi bivanja posmrtno duše, saj ena od poglobitvenih katoliških dogem pravi, da človek ni sestavljen iz dveh ločenih, a povezanih enot (duše in telesa), temveč iz ene enote (duša-telo), ki je rezultat spojitve obeh. Na začetku Svetega pisma lahko najdemo ontološko opredelitev človeka v obliki kategorične trditve oziroma opisa, kako je človek postal živa duša: človek ni zgolj dobil duše, ki bi mu jo dal Bog (kot nekaj dodatnega), ampak je sam postal duša. V tej luči je zlasti pri pojasnjevanju te zagonetne dileme mladim med njihovo katehezo nadvse koristno imeti na voljo primerno analogijo, s katero je preko primerjave in paralelizma moč zmanjšati nekatere nejasnosti, ki so povezane s to temo. Namen članka je predstaviti eno od možnih analogij.

Ključne besede: smrt, duša in telo, vmesno stanje, posebna in poslednja sodba

Introduction

For the religious life of the average adult Christian, the nature and quality of the catechesis received during the initial stages of religious formation play a crucial role. When such catechesis is superficial, individuals often encounter significant difficulties later in life in compensating for an inadequate understanding of fundamental dogmas and doctrines. This problem becomes particularly evident in questions concerning the unity and distinction of body and soul—how, on the one hand, they together constitute a single human reality, and yet, on the other, remain distinct upon bodily death—as articulated in paragraphs 365 and 997 of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*:

/.../ spirit and matter, in man, are not two natures united, but rather their union forms a single nature. /.../ In death, the separation of the soul from the body, the human body decays and the soul goes to meet God, while awaiting its reunion with its glorified body. (Catechism of the Catholic Church 2025)

Although this metaphysical and theological question seldom arises at the outset of a young believer's religious education, it becomes almost unavoidable in the later years of secondary schooling. The absence of open discussion or sufficiently clear explanation of this topic may give rise to doubt among young believers regarding the coherence and credibility of the Church's doctrinal teachings.

The present article seeks to assist catechists in communicating Christian teaching on this matter by offering a practical and pedagogically effective resource. The proposed

approach employs an analogy drawn from familiar natural phenomena—accessible even to primary school students—to illustrate the relationship between the soul and the body before and after death, as well as at the Last Judgment, when they are ultimately reunited.

What is *nephesh*?

Biblical term *nephesh* denotes a living being as a soul (Gen 2:7), which is a result of the unification of spirit (*ruah*) and the physical body (*adama*). Pleijel (2019, 205) admits that these passages in many ways enable a monistic interpretation although there are various alternative meanings of the word *nephesh* in the Hebrew Bible, and thus claiming a general *nephesh* concept would be wrong. *Nephesh* in a strict sense means exhalation, as it etymologically derives from the verb *naphash*, which can be translated as “to breathe”, “to expire”, or “to breathe out”; therefore *nephesh* can be ascribed to any living creature, even to fish and to forests and fields¹ (Moncrieff 1888, 3–4; Isaiah 10:18); or, as it is written in the Book of Job: “In whose hand is the soul of every living thing” (Job 12:10).²

- 1 Moncrieff places even lichen at one extreme and humans at the opposite extreme of the biblical spectrum of beings endowed with a “soul.” His citation of Isaiah 19:10, which he interprets as suggesting that even fish possess a soul, is problematic; in more recent translations, this verse is rendered quite differently.
- 2 The verse in question is rendered quite differently across Bible translations: the World English Bible, American Standard Version, and King James Version consistently mention both “soul” and “breath,” whereas the Good News Bible and Contemporary English Version are much less explicit in this regard.

For the purpose of this article, we will set aside the otherwise important distinction between human and non-human *nephesh* (animals and plants) and focus solely on the ontological questions related to the former. Our understanding of a person's final state in heaven, with a glorified body, has been discussed in a previous article (Goršak 2024, 7–46).

Aquinas (Akvinski 2012, 63) postulates that it is obvious that a human is not only a soul but rather a composite of soul and body. Furthermore, he refers to Plato, who believed that only the soul is capable of sensory perception and therefore that a human is a soul, which utilizes the body. This Platonic view is corrected by Aquinas, who avows that the essence of the soul is not separated from the essence of the body, and recognizes the unification of the soul with the body as its essential feature. The human body, according to Aquinas, is corruptible because it is not completely subdued to the soul. On the contrary, the immortality of the soul would make the body also immortal (Akvinski 2012, 63–65). Krista (2021, 11) acknowledges that Aquinas' view of the soul was non-Platonic or even anti-Platonic. For St. Augustine (1888) the soul of man is in all respects superior to the body. On the one hand, we see a clearly expressed theological doctrine of the union between the soul and the body; on the other hand, there is also a clear distinction between them in terms of immortality. From the Old Testament point of view, the first half of the Paragraph 47 of the Book of Ezekiel presents an astonishing prophetic story how once-dead bodies come back to life by God's breath/spirit; as delineated by Justin Martyr (Roberts and Donaldson 1909, 51).

Immortality of the soul

After death, the soul exists without a body until the Last Judgment, which will be followed by the resurrection of the glorified bodies that will finally unite with their respective souls for eternity. However, where exactly does the soul reside until then, and in what form does it exist? Such a soul is in a sense imperfect, says Aquinas, since it is now separated from its wholeness. The ultimate happiness is therefore not possible without a renewed union of the two; and the soul, united with a body, is more similar to God than a separated soul because it is more perfect by its nature. In the meantime, until the renewed unification at the Final Judgment, the soul has no will of its own (Akvincski 2012, 365, 65). One may argue that those souls exist as a kind of a “hologram”, in which there can be only a premonition of a body (as a template of a future glorified body), or as something purely ethereal – like the angels, who are spirits yet can also assume a body (Num 22:23; Gen 6; Gen 18:1–22; 19,1–3; 32:22; Hos 12:3–5; Heb 13:2; Dan 10:15–19; Acts 1:9–11; Luke 24:4; John 20:11–14). In this regard, Mühling’s statement is quite compelling: “/.../ bodiliness has to be conceived in relational and communicative terms: a body is not primarily something composed of molecules of matter, but a means of a person’s communicative abilities (perception and reaction) in relation” (Mühling 2023, 23). The human body as a means of inter-personal communication: a view that is rather interesting and in line with our “hologram” analogy. While the immortality of the soul is generally not questioned, the immortality of the body often is – even among Christians. Rahner (1967, 8) warns of the danger of losing hope in the resurrection of the body and clinging only to the immortality of the soul and the beatific vision.

The Protestants, according to Rahner, are even inclined to regard this “in-between-condition” that follows after death as something completely irrelevant (Rahner 1967, 11).

The proposed idea of the soul being in the intermediate state as a kind of hologram in relation to the body can potentially be seen as something close to the so-called “form”, through which Aquinas, according to Dobson (2005, 244), describes the capacity of the soul to maintain the life of a person after death – since the soul is the “form” of the body, which itself does not perish. Blackburn (1994, 22) confirms this by stating that while the body does not survive death, each person is resurrected because the same form is what animates the same body. Interestingly enough, Dobson further writes: “Aquinas taught that the soul without the body would not have personality, because individuality comes from matter, not spirit. For this reason, the resurrection of the body is crucial to the idea of personal immortality” (2005, 244). Averroes, who in many ways influenced Aquinas, claimed however that only the species survives death and not the individual, because people are combinations of soul and body. When the body is absent the very meaning of personhood disappears. Such teaching was strongly condemned by the Roman Catholic Church (Dobson 2005, 234–235). The flesh (our earthly body) must go through a radical transformation in order to become part of God’s kingdom; a transformation that would be equally radical even if we were still alive at the time of the Judgment (Rahner 1967, 28).

St. Augustine (1888) is also quite explicit about the immortality of the soul: “The life of your flesh is your soul: the life of your soul is your God. As the flesh dies in losing the soul,

which is its life, so the soul dies in losing God, who is its life.”³ He cites 1 Tim 5:6 in order to clarify the paradox that the soul lives (is manifestly immortal) even when dead (e.g. in hell) because if the soul loses God, it is dead while still existing. Merricks (2009), on the other hand, focuses on the question of a so-called time gap between death and resurrection; and what could be the basis for the resurrected body. He cites some traditions and teachings on how remaining atoms of a dead body or even some bones in the lower spine could be such basis. However, with time, each atom of our body changes, and also after cremation, no bones are remained. Therefore, for Merricks these explanations cannot be valid. The resurrection implies bodily identity across a temporal gap, and Merricks believes that a human person is one and the same thing as his or her body. He further develops this belief with the claim that there may not even be any time gap, and that we jump ahead in time from our death to the Day of Resurrection. According to Špelič (2024), one may even speculate that there is a kind of continuation between the earthly and the resurrected body. Although this is not completely implausible, we instead believe that there may be a temporal intermediate existence, because with God all things are possible (Matt 19:26); and that the resurrection can be similar to the act by which the body was first created: “Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee” (Jer 1:5; Eph 1:4).⁴

In this regard, the biblical passage in Luke (23:42–43) is particularly relevant, and the question of what happened to the repentant thief after the crucifixion warrants a far deeper analysis than can be offered here. Nevertheless, it must be

3 The citation in question is from the Paragraph 8.

4 The template of a single body was hence always there with God.

addressed at least briefly. Does the “tomorrow” mentioned in this passage refer literally to the next day, or does it support Merricks’s idea that time after death somehow skips directly to the bodily resurrection of an individual, implying that the flow of time in the afterlife is entirely relative? We maintain that Dismas was indeed with Jesus within the next 24 hours. The crucial distinction, however, is that being in Paradise does not equate to being in Heaven. Paradise and Heaven represent distinct “locations,” or more precisely, distinct states of being. In previous work, we described Paradise as an imperfect and transitional⁵ state (Goršak 2024, 9). Some early Church Fathers taught that the Pre-Fall Paradise continued to exist—neither on earth nor in the heavens, but above and beyond the world. In Scripture, the Greek term *ouranos*, meaning Heaven, is more commonly used, whereas the term for Paradise is *paradeisos* (Blue Letter Bible 2025). Some translations and interpretations conflate the two, giving rise to confusion. According to this understanding, Dismas’ soul entered Paradise after death—a state roughly analogous to a higher level of purgatory—rather than Heaven proper. He still awaited the Last Judgment and the resurrection of his body.

The two judgments

The post-mortem separation of body and soul, followed by their eventual reunification, is chronologically inseparable

- 5 In Paradise, even before the Fall, a man could be married to a woman, there was propagation of the species, physical labor was required, protection was necessary, free will allowed the possibility of sin, forbidden trees existed, evil appeared in the form of a serpent, and the ordinary soil (*adama*) was present—all of which are absent in Heaven.

from both judgments: the Particular Judgment and the Last Judgment, also referred to as the General Judgment. As Kreeft (2000, 11) aptly observes, what occurs at death is neither extinction, nor reincarnation, nor a transformation into an angel, nor a change into a ghost.

It is recommended that every Catholic catechist have at least a basic understanding of the Church's teachings regarding the sequence of events in the afterlife. Only with this foundation can the catechist present the proposed analogy effectively and help prevent common theological misconceptions, which remain prevalent even today among many believers. For example, some who identify as Christians still deny the resurrection of the body or the conscious existence of the soul after death.⁶ Rahner (1967, 10) on the other hand, presupposes that the beatific vision is every just man's due right after death and before the Last Judgment.⁷ In addition, there exist some non-canonical interpretations regarding what occurs after death. According to these accounts, some souls are subject to only one judgment, while others undergo two; at the moment of death, the Archangel Raphael is said to serve as judge; and it remains possible for souls to repent for their sins on the "Mountain of the Dead," as described in the Book of Watchers (Koplitz 2018, 58).

The Bible speaks about this subject in various passages, one of which is 1 Corinthians 15, where it is stated that the natural body is what is sown through death, and that it is the spiri-

6 This is the so-called "soul sleep," a belief characteristic especially of the Seventh-day Adventists.

7 This was accepted as the dogma by Pope Benedict XII in the fourteenth century.

tual body⁸ that is raised. Clement (2 Clem. 20:25, 7)⁹ is also clear on this when he asserts: “And let not any one of you say that this flesh is not judged neither riseth again.” The Second Council of Lyon, held in 1274, confirms the official teaching of the Catholic Church in the following words: “We believe in the true resurrection of this flesh that we now possess.” The same definition became an integral part of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Paragraph 1017) and the Nicene Creed (Catechism of the Catholic Church 2025). It is noteworthy to add that according to the Catholic understanding, the end result of the bodily resurrection at the General Judgment will also depend on works (Barber 2013, 166–169; Rev 20:11–15).

Why are two judgments needed instead of just one? Aquinas explains:

Each man is both an individual person and a part of the whole human race: wherefore a twofold judgment is due to him. One, the particular judgment, is that to which he will be subjected after death, when he will receive according as he hath done in the body [2 Cor. 5:10], not indeed entirely but only in part since he will receive not in the body but only in the soul. The other judgment will be passed on him as a part of the human race: thus a man is said to be judged according to human justice, even when judgment is pronounced on the community of which he is a part. Hence at the general judgment of the whole human race by the general separation of the good from the wicked, it follows that each one will be judged. And yet God will not judge “the same thing a second time,” since He will not inflict two punishments for one sin, and the punishment which

8 In Greek: σῶμα πνευματικόν (*sōma pneumatikón*).

9 In the primary source, this appears in paragraph 9, verse 1.

before the judgment was not inflicted completely will be completed at the last judgment, after which the wicked will be tormented at the same time in body and soul (Aquinas 2025, 9233).

Aquinas continues to clarify that in the beginning God acted in two parts: the first part was the creation of the creatures themselves, and the second part was the determination of the way of being/acting of the creatures. Therefore, when the end comes, the judgment must also be twofold, but in reverse order: first, the individual is judged according to how he acted in life; and only subsequently humanity as a whole is judged, that is, the community of which an individual was a member. With the Last Judgment we have a judgment of the entire story of all creation. The Last Judgment is the separation of the good from the wicked, which therefore will not occur beforehand. As for the individual condemnation of each individual after death,¹⁰ this judgment does not immediately take full effect (it is delayed), but it will only take full effect at the Last Judgment, since only then the blessed ones will receive their full reward due to the added glory of the body, which will be resurrected and glorified (Aquinas 2025, 9232–9234; John 5:29). Therefore, the resurrection is more than just immortality (Kreeft 2000, 13).

One could say that the Particular Judgment is finally “ratified” only at the Second Coming. What the soul comes to know at the Particular Judgment immediately after death—though still not in its fullness—becomes definitively manifest only

¹⁰ Aquinas describes separately where are the souls after death under the Question 69 of the Supplement.

at the General Judgment. We may hold that the Particular Judgment pertains primarily to faith and to the works that flow directly from it, whereas the General Judgment also encompasses the evaluation of human actions in their full relational and communal context, that is, in relation to the entirety of our interpersonal relationships.

The analogy

After briefly outlining some of the principal theological concerns regarding the sequence and nature of the events that occur after death, it is now time to present the proposed analogy. We suggest that, with the aid of some basic knowledge of chemistry, the uncertainty surrounding the relationship between the soul and the body after death can be rendered somewhat more intelligible—especially when this topic is addressed with younger students. The first step is to recognize that both elements and compounds are examples of pure substances. A pure substance is one that contains no admixture of other substances; mixtures or composites, by definition, do not qualify. Compounds consist of molecules formed from more than one type of atom. For example, pure sugar (such as glucose) consists exclusively of sugar molecules and therefore qualifies as a pure substance; yet each sugar molecule itself is a unified structure composed of hydrogen, carbon, and oxygen atoms.

Let us now take water as an example of a pure substance. Water consists exclusively of water molecules and is therefore itself a pure substance; yet each water molecule is composed of hydrogen and oxygen atoms (H_2O). These at-

oms, belonging to two different elements—each of which is itself a pure substance—combine to form a new entity, namely water, which is again a pure substance. In this process, the characteristic properties of hydrogen and oxygen as elements are transformed and no longer manifest themselves in their original form; nevertheless, they remain present, though concealed, within a different mode of being. Under certain conditions—specifically through a chemical process of separation or analysis—these elemental properties can be recovered, and thus they are not permanently lost. At the same time, water molecules do not outwardly exhibit the distinctive characteristics of the elements from which they are composed. Hydrogen, when isolated as an element, possesses its own unique properties, as does oxygen; yet when they are combined through synthesis, they give rise to water, which, as a compound and a pure substance, possesses its own complete and distinctive set of properties.

Here, we can already anticipate the analogy: hydrogen, the primordial substance of the universe, will serve as an analogy for the earthly, physical body. The oxygen, under standard conditions, is a gas that enables breathing. Often, it is symbolized as a wind or breath and is thus closely associated with God's *ruah* or soul.¹¹ "It is the oxygen in the atmosphere that renders it vital, or life-supporting" (Moncrieff 1888, 4). Both, hydrogen and oxygen can therefore exist as elements; still, under certain conditions they are inclined to be merged (synthesized) and to build something even more valuable: water. Water is life itself; the only proven habitable part of the universe was formed with water, and

¹¹ It can be understood also as *nephesh*.

life emerged from it. Water will be part of the new Heaven and Earth as “the river of the water of life” (Rev 22:1). Therefore, water in accordance to our analogy, is a complete human being, with body and soul as one. After death, the process of “water splitting” occurs, separating hydrogen (body) and oxygen (soul); after the Second Coming, they undergo the process of “synthesis” once again – the same process that first took place at conception in the mother’s womb.

Now, with this we could close our analogy as it satisfies for our main purpose: to explain how something ontologically merged can ontologically exist even after it was completely separated – and to be in both cases a self-standing (self-sufficient) unit. For lower-level students, this explanation may suffice. However, for more advanced classes, the analogy can be extended further, distinguishing between glorified and damned bodies.

Hydrogen can combine with oxygen in various ways, providing a useful analogy for the distinction between the saved and the damned. To illustrate the state of the damned, we can compare their condition to the formation of a water molecule that includes deuterium (D_2O), a hydrogen isotope with an additional neutron in its atomic nucleus, making it heavier. This form of water is known as “heavy water” – a fitting metaphor for the weight of damnation. An even heavier variant is water composed of tritium (T_2O), a hydrogen isotope with two extra neutrons.¹² Thus, with this analogy one can even

12 This is the reason for the term “heavy water” or D_2O , respectively T_2O (tritiated water).

distinct different levels of Hell: the “ T_2O damned” sink lower than the “ D_2O damned” due to their greater weight.

In contrast, the glorified souls will synthesize with only one atom of the hydrogen and not with the two (as normally anticipated). Under the standard conditions the oxygen is in a molecular state (O_2) and it will synthesize with the hydrogen, which is also in a molecular state (H_2). However, under certain circumstances, oxygen interacts with hydrogen in a way that produces not a complete water molecule but a hydroxyl group (OH^-) (Helmenstine, 2019). This group is “lighter” by one oxygen atom, making it a suitable analogy for the “higher” celestial state (i.e. glorification). However, unlike a water molecule, the hydroxyl group lacks self-sufficiency; it is highly reactive due to its negative charge and seeks to bond with a positively charged particle. What could this “positive particle” represent? Our answer is God. The ultimate purpose of this “chemical reaction,” following the Last Judgment, is an eternal union with God, represented as $G-OH$, where every saint is no longer self-sufficient but instead bonded to Him for eternity.

Thus, with this final description of the union between the glorified soul and body (OH^-) and God (G^+) in heavenly eternity, our analogy is complete. Hopefully, it will serve as a valuable teaching tool in the catechesis of young Christians.

References

Aquinas, Thomas. 2023. *The Summa Theologica*. https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1225-1274,_Thomas_Aquinas,_Summa_Theologiae_%5B1%5D,_EN.pdf (accessed 1 March 2025).

Akvinski, Tomaž. 2012. *Razum in vera*. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba.

Barber, Michael P. 2013. A Catholic Perspective: Our Works are Meritorious at the Final Judgment because of our Union with Christ by Grace. In: *Four Views on the Role of Works at the Final Judgment*, 161–184. Ed. Alan P. Stanley. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic.

Bible. 2025. <https://www.biblija.net/biblija.cgi?l=en> (accessed 4 March 2025).

Blackburn, Simon. 1994. *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blue Letter Bible. 2005. <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lexicon/g3857/kjv/tr/o-1/> (accessed 1 March 2025)

Bynum, Caroline Walker. 1995. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. 2025. https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENGO015/_INDEX.HTM (accessed 24 October 2025).

Dobson, Geoffrey P. 2005. *A Chaos of Delight: Science, Religion and Myth, and the Shaping of Western Thought*. London: Equinox Publishing.

Goršak, Bernard. 2024. Immanent Transcendence and the Christian Understanding of the Emergence of the New Heaven and Earth. *Res novae* 9, no. 1: 7–46. DOI: 10.62983/rn2865.24a.1.

Helmenstine, Anne Marie. 2019. What Is the OH Functional Group Called? *ThoughtCo*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/oh-functional-group-name-608776> (accessed 27 February 2025).

John Paul II. 2005. *The Redemption of the Body and Sacramentality of Marriage*. https://stmarys-waco.org/documents/2016/9/theology_of_the_body.pdf (accessed 27 February 2025).

Koplitz, Michael Harvey. 2018. *Can There be Two Judgments after death? The Mountain of the Dead from 1 Enoch, Hebrews and Revelation*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380396568_Can_There_be_Two_Judgments_after_death_-_The_Mountain_of_the_Dead_from_1_Enoch_Hebrews_and_Revelation (accessed 27 February 2025)

Kreeft, Peter. 2000. *The Resurrection of the Body*. New Haven, CT: Knights of Columbus Supreme Council.

Krista, Hyde Dawn. 2012. "Thomas Aquinas: Soul-Body Connection and the Afterlife." MA thesis, University of Missouri, St. Louis. <https://irl.umsl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1261&context=thesis> (accessed 27 February 2025).

Mavrodes, George I. 1977. The Life Everlasting and the Bodily Criterion of Identity. *Noûs* 11, no. 1: 27–39.

Merricks, Trenton. 2009. The Resurrection of the Body. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophical Theology*. Eds. Thomas

P. Flint and Michael C. Rea. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://andrewmbailey.com/papers/Trenton%20Merricks/Oxford-Handbk-Resurrection.pdf> (accessed 28 February 2025).

Moncrieff, William Glen. 1888. *Soul, or, The Hebrew word nephesh, and the Greek word psuche*. London, ON: J. I. Anderson.

Mühling, Markus. 2023. The Last Judgment. In: *St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology*. Ed. Brendan N. Wolfe et al. <https://www.saet.ac.uk/Christianity/TheLastJudgment> (accessed 27 February 2025).

Pleijel, Richard. 2019. To Be or to Have a nephesh? Gen 2:7 and the Irresistible Tide of Monism. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 131, no. 2: 194–206. DOI: 10.1515/zaw-2019-2007.

Rahner, Karl. 1967. *The Resurrection of the body*. Derby, New York: St. Paul Publications.

Roberts, Alexander C.; Donaldson, James. 1909. *Justin Martyr and Athenagoras*. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Augustine. 1888. Tractate 47. In: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. First Series, Volume VII. Ed. Philip Schaff. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company. <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1701047.htm> (accessed 4 March 2025).

Steiner, Richard C. 2015. *Disembodied Souls. The Nefesh in Israel and Kindred Spirits in the Ancient Near East, with an Appendix on the Katumuwa Inscription*. Atlanta: SBL Press. https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/9781628370775_OA.pdf (accessed 4 March 2025).

Špelič, Miran. 2024. Dal genoma allo pneumatoma – l'impatto delle scoperte moderne sul pensiero teologico. In: *Theologia Slovenica coæva : contributi ispirati dalla romanità*. Ed. Jan Dominik Bogataj OFM, 195–204. Ljubljana: Teološka fakulteta.

2 Clem. 2025. Ep. Clementis ad Corinthios. https://scriptural-truth.com/PDF_Apocrypha/Second%20Epistle%20of%20Clement%20to%20the%20Corinthians.pdf (accessed 16 February 2025).

Ločitev telesa in duše po smrti: pedagoška razlaga

Povzetek

Ena najpomembnejših ločnic, ki ločuje krščanstvo od ostalih religij, je teologija telesa. Enost telesa in duše je kot dogma, ki je v samem jedru krščanstva, radikalno drugačna ne samo od zgodnjega platonizma in ostalih antičnih politeističnih verovanj, ampak tudi od večine poznejših religij – zlasti še tistih, ki poudarjajo dvojnost človeške narave oziroma ločenost duha in telesa. Med temi so najbolj znani zlasti manihejci, katari in albižani, čeprav v to skupino nenazadnje sodijo tudi vse ostale antropologije, ki telo razumejo zgolj kot nujno vmesno stopnjo do popolne osvoboditve duha, ki sledi po smrti oziroma po dokončanem krogu inkarnacij (npr. budizem, hinduizem, bramanizem, šintoizem, taoizem). Božji Logos, Odrešenik, je vstopil v naš svet v telesu in po smrti na križu je vstal prav tako s telesom ter s tem dokazal, da bo tudi naše vstajenje ne samo vstajenje duše, ampak tudi vstajenje (poveličanega) telesa, ki bo z njo ponovno združeno.

Vendar, če je omenjena dogma tako zelo pomembna za celotno teologijo in tako zelo zacementirana v krščanski doktrini, kako potem, da se duša in telo vendarle ločita, ko nastopi telesna smrt? Nenazadnje je ločitev duše od telesa po smrti prav tako del krščanske dogmatike. Ali to ne pomeni, da si je krščanstvo samo sebi v nasprotju in to celo pri tako temeljnih vprašanjih, kot je vprašanje odnosa med telesom in dušo? Ter, kar je še bolj problematično, če to dilemo nekako še uspemo razjasniti s pomočjo zapletenih teoloških izvajanj, kako o tej temi nagovoriti ostale vernike, zlasti mlade pri urah kateheze, da ne bodo zaradi omenjene kontradiktornosti začeli dvomiti v samo veljavnost in trdnost krščanskega

nauka? Je morda s pomočjo česa znanega, oziroma nečesa, kar pozna praktično vsak, ki je končal osnovno šolo, moč vsaj približno ponazoriti slutnjo tega fenomena, ki bo na koncu vendarle morala ostati skrivnost – ter tako ohraniti notranjo koherentnost celotnega krščanskega učenja?

V prispevku ponujamo sestavo vode, njen razpad na osnovne elemente ter njeno ponovno sintezo, kot model, s pomočjo katerega bo katehet (in končno vsak, ki bo to želel) lahko ponudil preprostejšo in nazornejšo razlago omenjenega problema. Spojina, kot je voda, je čista snov, vsi njeni osnovni gradniki (molekule) so isti po sestavi in lastnostih (H_2O). To torej ni zmes, kjer imamo različne (heterogene) delce, z različnimi lastnostmi. Vodik (H_2) in kisik (O_2), ki po spajanju dajeta molekule vode, sta sama zase prav tako čisti snovi. Torej so vse tri snovi čiste (homogene, enotne, ene narave), tako kot sta duša in telo sami zase, a vendar tudi, ko sta spojeni v eno enoto. Ob spajanju se vodik in kisik »odpovesta« nekaterim svojim lastnostim, ki sta jih imela, ko sta bila vsak sam zase (avtonomna) – hkrati pa sta prav zaradi svojih tipičnih lastnosti nagnjena k temu, da se spojita in ob tem tvorita novo avtonomno in homogeno kakovost oziroma enoto.

Pojmi, kot so kisik, vodik in voda, so vsem dobro znani, saj so vsakdanji in povsem življenjski. Interakcije med kisikom in vodikom torej po našem mnenju lahko služijo kot analogija za ponazoritev interakcij med telesom in dušo. S spojitvijo dveh avtonomnih enot, ki sta obe notranje homogeni (čisti, ene narave), dobimo eno avtonomno enoto, ki je prav tako notranje homogena (čista, ene narave). Oboje je lahko njuno naravno stanje: da sta samostojni in da sta spojeni, pri čemer pa njuna spojenost vendarle daje še neko dodatno, višjo

kakovost. Struktura vode je tako primerna analogija za telo spojeno z dušo, oziroma ker je, kot pravi Psalm 24, Bog svet utemeljil na vodi, omenjena analogija prerašča v metaforo za življenje samo.

To ne more biti edina primerna analogija za učinkovito pedagoško razlago ločenosti telesa in duše po smrti in verjetno tudi ni najboljša možna. Vendar pa do tega trenutka predstavlja edinstven poskus, kako neko zelo zapleteno teološko temo preko analogije, ki uporablja povsem domače pojme, približati mlademu verniku ter mu tako že v zgodnjih fazah njegove verske formacije ponuditi zadovoljivo razlago in s tem tudi prepričati, da bi to zanj postala prevelika ovira, ki bi ga morda lahko celo vodila v stran od vere.