

Robert Pollack

Locating the Soul in an Age of Molecular Medicine⁴³³

I am a scientist who is about to address a purely religious subject. This is a slightly stressful situation, but one familiar to many Jews. My teacher Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz put it this way in a 1995 article:

Popular science has a huge impact on people because it simplifies things. For example, in Israel we translate ... the theory of Darwin as Torat Darwin....

In our time most Jews live an amphibian kind of existence, like frogs. The same people live consciously in two different realms, or worlds, that of the Western world, and that of Torah....

The problem is the reality of being a member of two contradictory cultures having contradictory claims and assumptions. The real problem is not a function of the truth of these claims, but rather the fact that people accept both of them. Frogs do very well with their amphibian life. But human beings are much less adapted to living in two worlds and belonging to both of them simultaneously."⁴³⁴

Where is the soul? Early theologian-scientists – the Aristotelian philosophers of a millennium ago – said that the soul was the “form” of the body, its Platonic ideal. As a student of Darwinian natural selection and an admirer of its way of choosing from among differences, the notion of Platonic ideal forms seems to me to be rather tattered. But, the idea intuitively remains, that the soul is somehow the essence of a person.

For example, in his 2003 book on eschatology – that is Greek for the study of the World to Come or, as we say in Hebrew, *Olam Haba* – the eminent Anglican theologian-scientist John Polkinghorne defines the soul as “the information-bearing pattern carried by the matter of the body.”⁴³⁵ This formulation invites a simple extrapolation: that the soul of a person is the information in that person’s DNA. Can this be? That is what I wish to discuss.

I wish, first, to lay out a more specifically Jewish notion of the soul. I could go to the Sages, but for a person like me – a scientist for fifty years and at seventy

433 This article is excerpted from a paper that was published in *Crosscurrents*, Summer 2003. Brief portions of that paper were taken from my books, *Signs of Life* (1994), Houghton Mifflin, Boston; *The Missing Moment* (1999), Houghton Mifflin, Boston; and *The Faith of Biology, the Biology of Faith* (2000), Columbia University, New York.

434 Steinsaltz, A., 1995. *Torah u Maddah Journal* 5: 156-167

435 Polkinghorne, J., 2003. *The God of Hope and the End of the World.* New Haven: Yale University Press, p. 36.

already in Biblical terms ten years an elder – it is easier instead to let the Sages come to me; that is, to turn to the *Siddur*, the Jewish book of daily prayers, codified in Hebrew for the most part a few hundred years ago but including some passages from the Hebrew bible's Torah, Prophets and Writings that are at least a few millennia old.

The *Siddur* opens with a set of blessings of Talmudic origin, meant to be said every morning as soon as one is awake, before the beginning of more formal and communal prayer. In the formative ancestral Vilna Siddur of 1615, these two blessings follow each other without interruption. Together they give us as good a Jewish notion of the soul as we need. In English they go something like this:

Blessed are you, Lord our G-d, King of the universe, who has formed people in wisdom, and created within them numerous orifices and cavities. It is revealed and known before the Throne of your Glory that if but one of them were to be blocked, or one of them were to be opened, it would be impossible to exist even for one hour. Blessed are you Lord, who heals all flesh and performs wonders.

My G-d, the soul which you have given within me is pure. You have created it, You have breathed it into me, and You preserve it within me. You will eventually take it from me, and restore it within me, in Time to Come. So long as the soul is within me, I offer thanks to You, Lord my G-d and G-d of my fathers, Master of all works, Lord of all souls. Blessed are You Lord, who restores souls to dead bodies.

It seems to me both modest and perfectly reasonable to begin each day with thanks for body, life and soul. But a closer look at the two blessings shows that the soul is not mentioned at all in the first blessing, which is so clear and specific about the body's anatomical vulnerability. This invites an interpretation of both blessings that makes the "soul" of the second blessing into something altogether non-anatomical, and therefore wholly mysterious. Is there nevertheless something to say about the soul in this world, other than eschatological guesses about the next? I think so.

Olam Haba, The World to Come, in which the soul once again somehow rejoins some form of the body, must certainly be a World as free of any dependence on a vulnerable wet chemical like DNA, as it is free of death. But then what can one mean to say "You preserve it within me?" Is there a way in which to understand the soul's presence here and now, in this corporeal, mortal world? How can the soul of a living person, the soul I mean when I say these two blessings together, be localized? Is it in "the information bearing pattern carried by the matter of my body?" Perhaps. In DNA? Perhaps.

2010 marked the 57th anniversary of the discovery of the structure of DNA, the genetic material. There is something wonderfully mysterious about all DNA, but especially the DNA that sits inside the sperm and egg cells in each of our bodies. It may live on after we die.

We must die, but in our children, a version of that DNA will live on. What is so for each of us, is so for our species, all seven billion humans alive on this planet today. Our species will live only so long as the DNA in some of the egg and sperm cells of some of us combine to make the next generation of people. Beyond that promise, nature offers us no further hope of life, beyond the mortal span each of us has.

What is so for our species, is also so for all other tens of millions of different species alive on the planet today. In each case individuals within a species must die, but the DNA that begins a new individual by the combination of egg with pollen or sperm, will live on. The DNA that succeeds in traveling from the egg and sperm of one generation to the egg and sperm of the next is called the germ line of the species.

So if one wanted to seek souls in physical materials, then the germ line of our species – all the particular versions of DNA containing the instructions for the initial forms and behaviors of each of us and each of our children – would certainly be an interesting starting place. Not surprising that some people treat human DNA this way. But there is a problem from nature that needs resists this notion, the problem of the origin of all these tens of millions of species' germ-lines.

Darwin's explanation of evolution by natural selection answers the question of how we emerged in and from nature. It begins with the observation from nature that germ lines do not live forever. Unexpectedly, species are as mortal as the individuals that make them up. Both fossils and DNA analyses confirm that the germ lines of today's species come from the germ lines of previous, ancestral species, now dead. More, they also agree that any ancestral species emerged from accumulated changes in the DNA of the germ line of even older ancestral species.

The process is called speciation – Darwin presented his ideas about speciation in the 1859 book "The Origin of Species by means of natural selection;" – and he said it works in the following way. When inherited changes – we now know that these must be changes in germ-line DNA – leave some members of a species able to produce fertile offspring amongst themselves, but unable to produce fertile offspring with other members of the same species, then the germ-line DNAs of the smaller and larger subpopulations will begin to diverge from each other by random mutation. Once that happens, each subpopulation's germ-line is free to follow its own future of subsequent natural selection, and so we may say each has become the germ-line of a new species.

The subsequent survival, change, or death of one new species' germ-line need have no further effect for better or worse, on the survival, change, or death of the

other new species. Because of their common ancestry, the DNAs of the germ-lines of any two living species will share some stretches of DNA that were present in their last common ancestor species. The planet today is covered by individuals of species that may look as different as a person and a rose, yet the DNA of the germ line of a person and the germ line of a rose have an amazing amount of sequence similarity due to their ancient common ancestry.

Thus of all parts of the natural world, DNA itself, though invisible, is unsurpassed in its capacity for expressing novelty over time. Common ancestry means that DNA itself, the molecule, has persisted since the beginning of life some 4.5 billion years ago. The sprouting of new germ-lines from old from then until now, means that at the deepest chemical level of analysis, all life from its beginnings until now, has been DNA's way of making more DNA.

But does the capacity of DNA to express novelty through natural selection extend to encoding our souls, or is DNA perhaps nothing more than the Golden Calf of the day, an object worshipped precisely by those too impatient to consider their souls? The answer has only a little to do with today's DNA, and a lot to do with the ancient history of love.

Consider the germ-line DNA of our species and its most immediate ancestors. The first hallmarks of a future that would include us, were in ancestral mammals that lived at least two hundred million years ago. From that stock, mammals diversified – sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly, especially after the cataclysmic death of the dinosaurs sixty-five million years ago – into a set of about four thousand living species, different enough from each other to be placed in no fewer than fifteen different orders, including our own, the primates.

The traits all primate species share define what we can be sure were traits of the first ancestral primate species. Do these traits include a soul? Here is how my colleague Monroe Strickberger puts it in his Textbook, *Evolution*.⁴³⁶

"Primates, the mammalian order that includes humans, are species that have a number of adaptations indicating an arboreal (tree-living) ancestry. ... These adaptations include:

- ability to move the four limbs in various directions.
- Grasping power of hands and feet.
- Slip-resistant cutaneous ridges in the ventral pads of these extremities [fingerprints].
- Retention of the collar bone to support the pectoral girdle in positioning the forelimb.

436 Strickberger, M., 2000. *Evolution*, third edition, Jones and Bartlett, San Francisco, chapter 20.

Flexibility of the spine to allow twisting and turning.

There's the first, oldest, DNA-based primate context for our own species. A tree-living ancestral primate's DNA survives in our germ line through these traits, which we share with all the other primate species that shared this ancestor: gibbons, orangutans, gorillas, and chimps. Not much there to on which to hang an ancestral origin of the Soul.

Anatomically modern *Homo sapiens* first appeared in eastern Africa about a hundred thousand to a hundred and twenty-five thousand years ago and began migrating soon thereafter. Europe, Asia, and Africa saw many millennia of joint habitation by archaic and modern humans, but the Neanderthal people of Europe died off about forty thousand years ago, and we have been the lone *Homo* species ever since. Alone, but not rootless. Each of us carries within, a deep history of specifically hominoid behaviors as well. Strickberger continues:

In addition to having their highly developed brain, anthropoid primates (monkeys, apes and humans) also undergo a relatively long postnatal growth period accompanied by considerable parental care for a relatively small number of offspring. The selective value of this trait probably arises from the limited number of offspring that can be successfully born and carried by highly mobile primates, along with the *long-dependent learning period* [my emphasis] needed to cope with many environmental and social variables.

Let me put that into my own words: the more recent ancestral germ line of last ancestor common to chimps, gorillas and humans disappeared only tens of millions of years ago. Since these three species are alive today and share a strategy of intensive nurturing of a small number of children, we may safely conclude that this trait on each of the three species, including our own, is the result of a very large set of DNA stretches within each species' germ line that have persisted from this ancestral anthropoid germ line. Put simply, our ancestral anthropoid DNA has given us our capacity for love.

This ancestral nurturing behavior, so critical for the strategy of survival used by all hominoid primates from then to now, is also prerequisite to our capacity for religious expression of that love. Our germ-line builds individuals capable of family, love, speech, language, abstraction, revelation, ritual and only then, finally, the specific expression of those capacities in a religion.

These and all other capabilities for expression of a religious life are all built upon this humbler but central, ancestral germ-line obligation that each generation must teach the next, for the species itself to survive. In this sense, the soul – wherever it may be localized – must be dependent for its existence in part on our DNA-based capacity for teaching and learning; that is, for love and for hope.

Scientists sometimes speak of inherited diseases as “experiments of nature.” Not a nice thought, but an accurate one. We can ask nature to help us take the next step in localizing the soul, carrying out our own “thought experiment,” of a sort. Consider five different kinds of person. In all five cases we will stipulate that the DNA of the person is OK.

First, the person who is healthy enough to say the two blessings I presented earlier (whether or not they choose to do so). The brain is OK, the mind is OK, and the body is OK.

Second, the person who is in a late stage of ALS, Lou Gehrig’s Disease. Portions of the brain have ceased to function properly and as a result there is no communication of brain with body. The mind, though, remains undiminished in its capacity for thought, though totally hampered in all its attempts to communicate through the body. Recent work has given such minds a way to communicate, by presenting patients – whose eyes may be kept open without discomfort – with a real-time video representation of their own electro-encephalogram waves.

In this situation, some ALS patients learn to modulate their EEG patterns, using a disembodied feedback loop that goes from screen to eye to brain to EEG machine to screen. In time they learn how to think in such a way as to make the waves rise above a line, or fall below it. And that control over a simple digital code of up-or-down is sufficient to enable them, slowly but surely, to remain in communication with any of the rest of us. So we have to say that in such a case, the brain is partially there, the mind is OK, but the body is gone.

Third, the person who is in a late stage of Alzheimer’s Disease. Other portions of the brain have ceased to function properly, and as a result there is no memory, no recognition, no communication. My father lived in this state for years. First, I did not recognize him in a “home” when he still knew me, which was bad enough; but then he did not know me when I did know him, and that was much worse. Today there are no tools to penetrate this loss of mind. We have to say that in such a case, the brain is partially gone, the body is OK, but the mind is gone.

Fourth, the newborn infant who emerges breathing, but with such severe brain damage that there is no cortical function, that is, no chance for thought or action later in life. Jewish law is quite clear that a person who is breathing on his or her own is alive. In this case we can be sure that though the body is there – as it is in Alzheimer’s Disease – there is neither mind, nor much brain either.

Fifth, the person who has just suffered a massive cerebral stroke, or a severe accident to the head. Lacking signals from the brain to the diaphragm such a person would be dead, but because of the technology of artificial-breathing, he or she may be maintained for some time in a state which can only be described as well as one in which the body is OK, but both the mind and the brain are gone.

Now the thought-experiment: is there a part of the anatomical DNA-based person in which the soul of a living person may be said to reside, based on these five situations? Not really.

In the first case, of a healthy person, it could be in the brain, the body or the mind, or in all three. In the second case, of ALS, it could be in the mind, or in the remaining functional brain, or both. In the third case, of Alzheimer's Disease, it could be in the body or the remaining functional brain, or both.

In the fourth case, of the newborn baby who lacks a cortical brain, the soul can be only in the body. In the fifth case, of the person with a flat EEG maintained on an artificial breathing machine, though the machine is on, only the body is functional. The soul is in question in the fifth case, with some Rabbinic authorities agreeing that it has already been taken, and others seeing no difference between the fourth and fifth examples.

Adding up these five cases, there is no single place left for the soul to reside. A slightly modified conclusion would be, that there is no anatomical localization of a person's soul within that person that meets the test of all five of these cases.

Now let's go back to the lessons of evolution, and look again.

Emotionally rich interaction with a loving adult is as important to an infant as food or water. This need is very old, much older than the hominoid ancestors of our species, older even than the ancestor of the mammals, as many hundreds of millions of years old as the time when the last common ancestor of mammals and birds walked the earth. As my colleague Ursula Goodenough put it in her wonderful book, *The Sacred Depths of Nature*,

We nurture our children selflessly. But we also recognize them as our most tangible sources of renewal – for a child, the world is always new.⁴³⁷ ... The instinct to engage a mate to help with child-rearing is accompanied by the instinct in children (and in all young mammals and birds) to form strong relationships with their all-important parents.... [I]t seems probable that our affection for our parents flows through emotional networks that establish parent-offspring bonds in other mammals."⁴³⁸

Nor is the bond between a child and its parent the only universal human emotion of this sort. As Goodenough later writes,

Our sorrow at the death of others is a universal human emotion that

437 Goodenough, U., *The Sacred Depths of Nature*, 2000. Oxford, New York., p. 129

438 Ibid, p. 134.

transcends cultures. Indeed ape mothers have been observed carrying their dead babies around for several days, suggesting that this form of grieving far antedates our humanness.⁴³⁹

This is to say that the germ line of our species carries, and gives to each of us, an inherited, wholly naturalistic, DNA-encoded set of behaviors that include an absolute dependence on other members of our species for emotional and physical support at the beginning and end of life. That dependence must persist as well throughout one's life, and therefore we are a species of intrinsically loving, and beloved, individuals.

Let us suppose that every one of us does have a soul, and that while we are alive it has a natural location somewhere in this mortal world. We've already established that the soul of any of us is hard to find in any part of our DNA-encoded, experience-modulated minds, bodies or brains. Yet we know that somehow, as Polkinghorne puts it, "whatever the human soul may be, it is surely what expresses and carries the continuity of living personhood."⁴⁴⁰

If we simply connect these ideas an unexpected answer emerges, one based on the history of our species. The location of the soul of any one of us need not necessarily be entirely in our minds or bodies or brains. Instead, it could be – in part, or altogether – in the minds, bodies and brains of each of the people whom we have nurtured, and the minds, bodies and brains of those who have nurtured us.

The argument here is not against Heaven. Those two prayers speak about those of us alive today, and the souls "within" us now. And I am arguing, simply, that these souls within us need not be individually ours alone. I hold in me a set of emotional and narrative memories of a number of people. Some people have impressed themselves deeply on me, and I know I will never forget them. Others once made me laugh or cry, but I can hardly remember why. Above and beyond any other people, my wife, my daughter and her family live inside of me with sharpness and intensity unrivalled by the memories of anyone else.

From what I have said about our natural origins, it should be clear that the special intensity of these memories is not an accident, but rather that it is the predictable outcome of a strategy for the survival of our species, that has worked for it and for its ancestors as well, for hundreds of millions of years. All that I am saying that might be new, is that this special set of memories and feelings I hold for these people represents an aspect – maybe no more than a reflection, but maybe no less than a portion of the entirety – of each of their souls.

Now let me make that symmetric. I will assume – it is no great immodesty – that a sense and a memory of me is as strong in each of them. In that sense each of

439 Ibid, p. 150.

440 Polkinghorne, J., 2003. *Op. Cit.*, p.105

them hold an aspect, or a portion, of my soul. And in each case, with full symmetry, it is that portion or aspect of our souls that can, without mystery or miracle, and while restricted entirely to this mortal world, survive death.

In terms of the five persons we've already discussed, this notion clears away all awkward anatomical paradoxes, and restates the problem in a simple and telling way. Each of these people has a soul, but we cannot tell much about that soul until we know more about the people closest to each of them. If they are loved and cared for, then of course their soul is well no matter how ragged their mind, or brain, or body. And if they are abandoned, mocked, written off as if already dead, then their soul must be in the Other World already, even though their body, or their brain, or their mind may still be present.

The idea of a distributed, socialized, delocalized, mortal soul does, of course, raise certain questions. Let's consider the four that have come up most frequently:

Doesn't this idea just beg the question? If our soul is distributed among others, then where is it in them: body, brain, mind, etc? Yes, of course it does; that's the point. The notion restates the question so as to avoid localization in any one part of even any one person, and to substitute for that expectation, a fuller recognition of the essentially distributed nature of one's humanity.

For persons lucky enough to share the fate of my first example, the symmetry of relationships assures that the distributed soul is not only in others, but in oneself. But surely for the infant born without a cerebral cortex, the soul has little apparent place to be, except in those who love it. In terms of eschatology, *Olam Haba* is then the time out of time and the place that is no place we can experience in this world, that will return to us both our embodied individualities, and our collective relationships.

What about the soul of an orphan?

Nothing in what I have said links the essential requirements for loving and caring, to any other aspect of DNA-based behavioral biology, except the impulses to love and to care. Parents should love and care for their children, and children for their parents, but the soul of a child neglected by living parents is far more at risk than the soul of an orphan adopted by loving strangers.

What happens to the idea of a specifically Jewish soul, a Yiddishe Neshomeh, as my grandmother would have put it?

Any notion that mixes DNA and Jews in the same discussion runs the risk of appearing to be an endorsement of the idea that in some way, Jews are a genetically distinct subpopulation of our own, and that therefore we have the capacity to carry

each other's souls because we are expressing the DNA-based inheritance of a Jewish variant of a species-wide aspect of human behavior.⁴⁴¹

By proposing a definition of the soul grounded in an aspect of our species' shared inheritance, I have indeed argued that nature is not consistent with the existence of an inherited, specifically Jewish soul, a *Yiddische Neshomeh*. It exists but it must be acquired, and not by DNA-based, genetic inheritance: otherwise, how and when could her mother-in-law have given Ruth the Moabite, the ancestor of King David and therefore the progenitor of the Messiah, her *Yiddische Neshomeh*?

Nevertheless, until recently many reasonable people could still make the argument, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that since Jews accept the covenants made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the genomes of Jews must somehow be different from the genomes of all other people, containing unique versions of many genes – that is, that Jews are a biological family. After all, common laws, habits, language, texts and historical memories are consistent with – and easily confused with – common ancestry.

But genes of Jews are interesting to medical science, because Jews from Central and Eastern Europe – Ashkenaz – descend from a rather small number of families who survived the pogroms of the mid 1600s. Rather than asking “Are Jews a family?”, geneticists seeking to advise Ashkenazic families are also, in passing, asking, “Do Jews all share the same versions of one or more genes?” – a question with a testable, precise answer. As no two people except pairs of identical twins have exactly the same version of the human genomic text, this claim could be confirmed or rejected by a search for versions of the human genome shared by all Jews and no other people.

Jewish curiosity has provided sufficient genetic material to give a perfectly clear negative answer: there is no support in the genomes of today's Jews for the calumnious and calamitous model of biological Judaism. Though there are many deleterious versions of genes shared within the Ashkenazic community, there are no DNA sequences common to all Jews and absent from all non-Jews. There is nothing in the human genome that makes or diagnoses a person as a Jew.

This is fine with me. In fact, it makes the notion of a “Jewish soul” easier to understand. At least to some extent a Jewish soul is a soul caring for, and cared for by, Jews. No particular version of any gene is involved in the religious choice to accept the unique Revelation given to the Jews at Sinai. That gift to Jews shows us how to make proper use of our innate human capacity for mutual caring and love. Learning the skills required to make the most of these capacities is necessarily a matter of learning *Torah*, as much as it is necessarily not a matter of ones' parents' DNA.

⁴⁴¹ Pollack, R., 2006 “Genetics and Morality,” The Orthodox Forum, Fourteenth Conference, New York City, March 17-18, 2002. *Judaism, Science and Moral Responsibility*. Ed. David Schatz and Yitzhak Berger. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2006. 45-53.

Conclusions

By accepting Jewish law, *Halakhah*, as the product of revelation at Sinai, I happily and wholeheartedly give the Jewish way of caring a unique status. American Jews who do not deny they have Jewish ancestors but who wish themselves otherwise to be exactly like everyone else in America, find this difficult, because the proposal that one Jew's Neshamah may be located in the feelings other Jews have toward that Jew, is finally not a scientific argument, but a purely religious notion. It makes the commitment to serve others an absolute requirement of a full life as a Jew, not a choice one may take up or not, as if it were a hobby or a career.

Commitment is another word for love. Neither word is often heard in the rhetoric or the mission of a secular research university. About eight years ago Columbia University – surely one of the world's most secular places – gave me the funds to start up the Center for the Study of Science and Religion. In 2003 I brought the CSSR into Columbia's Earth Institute, where it serves in support of the large agenda of global sustainable development. These career choices of mine have been taken because of – not in spite of – the religious considerations I have just discussed.

I do this work because I choose to push this way of seeing our Jewish obligation to each other as a sharing of souls, to its universal limit. There is an idea of universal utility in what I have come to understand out of my own religious experience. It is this: without the capacity to both give and take love, no aspect of your soul can find a proper home in someone else.

King Solomon best summarizes the eschatological implications of this idea:
For love is fierce as death,
Passion as mighty as Sheol;
It's darts are darts of fire,
A blazing flame.
Vast floods cannot quench love,
Nor rivers drown it. ...⁴⁴²

I am a scientist; no poet, and surely no King. This is how I now understand these lines from *Song of Songs*:

When the fact of love is elevated to the status of a religious obligation, it becomes a statement about the World to Come. Even then, it need not, nor should not, lose any of its biological, evolutionary, DNA-based specificity. Without the capacity to give love, you cannot leave with anyone the best aspect of your own soul and so it is likely to wither within you; and without the capacity to receive love, you

⁴⁴² *JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh*, 1999. *Song of Songs*, Ch 8, lines 6-7. p. 1743. Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia.

cannot properly remember anyone else's soul either, and so you deprive them of some hope for the future, as well.

