# THE SLEEPING DEAD

The Bible's Real Answer About Death and the Afterlife

Eddie Lawrence

# The Sleeping Dead

# The Sleeping Dead

*The Bible's Real Answer About Death and the Afterlife*

by

**Eddie Lawrence**

*The Sleeping Dead: The Bible's Real Answer About Death and the Afterlife*
Eddie Lawrence
Richmond, Kentucky, United States of America
First Edition, 2026
ISBN: 9798199912525
LCCN: 2026914784



Free digital editions of this book are available at
ready4eternity.com/thesleepingdead/

*For Melinda, who has shown me a lifetime of patience and is the only person who can keep me humble while believing in me completely.*

# Table of Contents

# Preface

I have been to a lot of funerals for those who died in the faith. You probably have too. At nearly every one, the minister assures the gathered family and friends that their loved one is conscious and joyful in the presence of Jesus right now, already reunited with those who went before them. For a long time I never questioned that. It was simply what Christians believed. But the more I read my Bible, the harder that picture was to hold onto.

Across both the Old and New Testaments, dozens of passages describe death as sleep. Sleep. Unconsciousness. Unawareness. And yet several New Testament passages do seem to describe faithful followers of Jesus enjoying a conscious, thriving existence with Him between death and resurrection. That tension is what started this study.

A word of transparency before we begin. Some of what this book argues overlaps with positions held by Jehovah's Witnesses and Seventh-day Adventists. I want to be clear: I have never been associated with either group, and their literature did not shape my conclusions. I came to this the same way I come to most things: I was studying the text, it pulled somewhere unexpected, and I followed it. The fact that others arrived at similar conclusions by a different road does not make the conclusion wrong. It might just mean the Bible keeps saying the same thing to whoever takes the time to listen carefully.

This book represents my current understanding of what Scripture teaches on this topic, and I am confident in it. But every conclusion we hold must remain open to revision when faced with evidence we haven't yet considered. I have been wrong before. You may finish this book convinced I am wrong now. If you do, that is okay. My hope is not

merely that you agree with me, but that you learn to hear the Bible's voice clearly, even where it challenges the assumptions we inherited.

# A Word on Translations

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are from the Berean Standard Bible. I chose it because it is in the public domain, which means it can be quoted freely without restriction. Other translations are occasionally quoted when the wording of a particular translation is relevant to the discussion.

When Hebrew or Greek words come up, I will explain them in plain English. You do not need to know either language to follow the argument.

Chapter 1

# The Funeral

*The church building smelled like old wood and flower arrangements. Rows of padded pews held people in their Sunday best, most of them quietly studying their hands or staring at the casket up front. A slideshow cycled through photographs on a screen to the left of the pulpit: a young man in a uniform, a wedding portrait, a backyard barbecue, grandchildren piled onto a sofa.*

*His name was Robert. He was in his late seventies, a veteran, a longtime faithful member at this church, a man who had apparently never met a stranger. His wife of more than fifty years sat in the front row with her children on either side of her, holding herself together with the particular stillness of someone who has cried until crying stops working.*

*The minister read Psalm 23 first, then a passage from Romans 8. Then he turned to 1 Thessalonians 4 and read slowly:*

> *"Brothers, we do not want you to be uninformed about those who sleep in death, so that you will*

> *not grieve like the rest, who are without hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we also believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in Him."*
>
> *He kept reading through the trumpet and the clouds and the great reunion to the end of the chapter. When he finished he looked up and told the family that Robert was not gone. He was more alive right now than he had ever been. The moment he drew his last breath, he came face to face with his Savior. He was in the presence of the Lord, watching over them, waiting for the day they would all be together again.*
>
> *The family nodded. Some of them wept quietly. The words were like a hand on the shoulder.*
>
> *And then the minister prayed, and a soloist sang, and the service moved toward its close the way these services always do.*

---

Versions of that scene play out in funerals everywhere, week after week. The details change. The name on the program changes. The flowers are different colors. But the shape of it stays the same. And almost no one in those pews questions what they are hearing. It feels true. It feels kind. It feels like exactly what grieving people need. But there is something in that passage worth noticing.

The passage the minister read, the one from 1 Thessalonians 4, the one offered as comfort, uses a word that is easy to slide past. *Asleep.* Those who are *asleep.* Those who have *fallen asleep.* Paul uses it three

times in verses 13-15. And he is not the only one. Jesus uses it. The Old Testament uses it. Across both testaments, the Bible reaches for the word *sleep* dozens of times when it talks about death.

And yet the funeral described above did not talk about sleep. It talked about Robert being wide awake. Eyes open. Fully present with God. Watching. Aware. Those two pictures seem to point in different directions.

## The Pull of Scripture

I did not begin this study because I wanted to believe something different, or because I was bored with what I had always been taught. It came the same way most of my conclusions about Scripture come: studying a passage, and having the text start pulling somewhere unexpected. The more I resisted, the harder it pulled. So I followed it.

The question is this: when a Christian dies, what clues does the Bible offer about what comes next? The answer most of us grew up with goes something like this. The moment you die, your soul leaves your body and travels immediately to heaven, where you exist in full conscious awareness in the presence of God. You are awake, you are aware, and you are more alive than you have ever been. Your body stays in the ground until the resurrection, but the real you is already home.

That is the picture the minister painted at Robert's funeral. And for most of my life, I assumed it was simply what the Bible taught. But the more I studied it, the more I kept running into that word. *Sleep.* The Bible does not describe death the way the minister described it. It describes death the way you would describe someone who has closed their eyes and is resting quietly, waiting to wake up. That tension is what this book is about.

What I found when I followed that thread surprised me. It changed how I read passages I thought I already understood. And after years of

studying it, testing it, and reading the strongest arguments on the other side, I am convinced the sleep language is not just a polite metaphor. It reflects what the Bible really teaches about death.

Smart, faithful, Bible-loving people have disagreed about this question for a long time. If you land somewhere different than I do by the end of this book, that is okay. But I do think the question deserves a serious answer. And I think the answer most Christians have grown up with originates more from an ancient Greek philosopher named Plato than it does from the Bible.

That is a significant claim, and I intend to back it up. Before I do, though, I want to address the most common pushback this topic tends to get. Even from serious Bible students, the response is often some version of: *Does it really matter?*

## *The Cost of Getting This Wrong*

I understand why it feels like this is a question that doesn't make any difference in the end. If the destination of the dead in Christ is eventually the same, it's just a matter of timing. When we get to heaven, not if. Why spend time thinking about it? Here is why it matters.

First, ask yourself what the resurrection is actually for. If the soul goes immediately to heaven at death, then everything that matters has already happened. You die, you are with Jesus, you are home. The resurrection comes later and gives you your body back, but you were not suffering without it. The traditional view does not portray the dead as lacking anything that matters. So why do you need your body at all? Some will say the body is needed for the final judgment, but why? Does a soul that has been consciously present with Jesus for a thousand years really need a body to stand before God? Others will say the body completes us, but if you were at home with Jesus, in what sense were

you incomplete? The traditional view quietly treats the body as optional, which means it quietly makes the resurrection optional. But Paul never treats it that way. He says if there is no resurrection, we are the most pitiable people on earth and our faith is empty (1 Corinthians 15:17-19). Paul treats the resurrection as the most important event in human history and is central to our faith. The traditional view, whatever its intentions, quietly works against that claim.

Second, this question has real consequences for how we pray and what we believe about the dead. The Roman Catholic Church builds an entire structure on the assumption that the dead are conscious. They advocate praying to Mary and the saints, asking them to intercede. It teaches that some souls go to purgatory, a place of purifying suffering between death and heaven, and that unbaptized infants go to limbo, a state of natural happiness but permanent separation from God. Eastern Orthodox and other traditions build similar practices on similar assumptions. But if the dead are asleep, waiting for resurrection, that entire structure has no foundation. Praying to the dead is talking to someone who is not listening, and directing toward a creature the kind of communication the Bible reserves for the Creator alone. That is not a minor footnote. It is a serious problem, and it needs to be named as one.

Third, if the Bible consistently uses sleep as its primary picture of death, we should want to understand why. God does not choose words carelessly. If the writers of Scripture reach for the image of sleep again and again, that image means something. That choice of words was inspired by the Holy Spirit. It is shaping how we are supposed to think about death, how we face it, how we grieve it, and what we hope for on the other side of it.

Sleep is not a frightening word. Sleep is rest. Sleep is safe. Sleep is *temporary*. You close your eyes and you wake up. You do not experience time passing. You do not suffer through the night. You simply rest, and

then morning comes. What if that is precisely what God wants us to understand?

## Plato's Ghost

Before we open the Bible, though, we need to ask a question that most people never think to ask. Where did the traditional idea come from? How did Christians end up so firmly convinced that the soul leaves the body at death, travels immediately to heaven or hell, and lives there in full conscious awareness until the resurrection?

The answer is not as simple as "we read it in Scripture." The answer involves a Greek philosopher, and several centuries of Christians absorbing the assumptions of the surrounding culture and reading those assumptions back into the biblical text. That is where we are headed next.

---

***A note before you turn the page:*** If you are grieving right now, if you picked up this book because you recently lost someone, please understand that nothing in these pages is meant to take comfort away from you. The minister at Robert's funeral was not wrong about the things that matter most. The dead in Christ will rise. We will see them again. God holds them, and nothing can separate them from His love. The hope is real. I am only trying to sharpen our understanding of what that hope actually looks like and where it comes from. A hope built on what Scripture genuinely says is always stronger than one built on what we assumed it said.

One more note, this one for readers who hold a slightly different version of the traditional view. Not everyone believes we go straight to heaven when we die. Many careful Bible students believe the dead wait consciously in Hades, either in paradise or in a place of torment, until the

resurrection reunites body and soul. If that is your view, the argument in this book still applies to you. Both positions rest on the same foundation: a soul that can think, feel, and experience things while separated from the body. Whenever you read "going to heaven immediately" in these pages, feel free to substitute "waiting consciously in Hades." The conclusion is the same either way.

# Part One

*How Did We Get Here?*

Chapter 2

# The Greek Inheritance

Plato was a Greek philosopher who lived roughly 400 years before Jesus was born. He was brilliant, enormously influential, and wrong about some very important things. One of those things was the soul.

Plato taught that every human being is made up of two distinct parts: a physical body and an immortal soul. For Plato, these two parts are in constant tension. The body is material, temporary, and corrupt. The soul is immaterial, eternal, and pure. The goal of life, in Plato's thinking, is for the soul to free itself from the body so it can return to the higher realm where it truly belongs.

Death, in Plato's view, is not a tragedy. It is a release. The body finally drops away, and the immortal soul rises to its true home. If that sounds familiar, it should. It sounds a great deal like what gets said at most Christian funerals.

But here is what needs to be said clearly: Plato did not arrive at this idea by reading the Old Testament. He arrived at it through philosophy, the kind of reasoning and argument that was the stock in trade of Greek thinkers. The immortal soul was not a biblical discovery. It was a philosophical one. And *it was born in a culture that had no interest in Israel's God or Israel's Scriptures*.

## How the Idea Spread to Jewish Thinking

Long before the church picked up Plato's ideas, Jewish thinkers were already absorbing them. From roughly 300 BC onward, the Greek language and Greek culture spread across the ancient world following the conquests of Alexander the Great. Jewish communities throughout the Mediterranean found themselves swimming in a sea of Greek ideas. Some resisted. Many did not.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, a reference work on Jewish history and belief, is worth quoting here, not as a biblical authority, but as a witness to how Jewish scholars understand their own interpretive history. Nobody is better positioned to tell us whether the immortal soul was native to Hebrew thinking than the people who have read and debated those Hebrew scriptures for thousands of years. And their conclusion is striking. The encyclopedia states that "the belief that the soul continues its existence after the dissolution of the body is a matter of philosophical or theological speculation rather than of simple faith, and is accordingly nowhere expressly taught in Holy Scripture." And further: "The belief in the immortality of the soul came to the Jews from contact with Greek thought and chiefly through the philosophy of Plato."

This is a striking statement. The immortal soul was not native to Hebrew thought. It was imported. In fact, even within Judaism itself, a broad consensus that the body and soul are distinct and separable did not emerge among Jewish teachers until the third century AD, long after Jesus walked the earth.

This matters because it points to something the Old Testament itself never actually teaches. Nowhere in the Hebrew Scriptures does God tell His people that the soul is immortal. Nowhere does the Old Testament picture the soul as a separate, independent thing that floats free from the body at death and continues on without it. That idea simply is not there.

What the Old Testament does teach about human beings, about what we are and what happens when we die, looks quite different from Plato's picture. We will work through that carefully in the following chapters. For now, the point is this: the immortal soul did not come from Abraham, Moses, or David. It came through the back door of Greek philosophy, and it carried none of the authority of Scripture with it.

Now, showing that an idea came from Plato does not automatically prove it is wrong. The Bible could independently teach the same thing Plato taught, and if it does, the pagan origin of the idea is irrelevant. That is a legitimate point, and I want to be clear: the historical argument in this chapter does not settle the question. It sets the stage. It explains why we need to go back to the Bible and ask whether Scripture actually teaches the immortal soul, rather than just assuming it does because we have always believed it. The biblical case is what Chapters 3 and 4 are for. History raises the question. Scripture answers it.

## How the Idea Entered the Church

Here is where the history gets uncomfortable. The earliest Christians lived in the same Greek-speaking, Plato-saturated world. And as the faith spread and grew, Christian teachers faced a real challenge. The people they were trying to reach, educated Romans and Greeks, thought that Christianity was foolish; the religion of slaves, the poor, and the uneducated. Christians believed in a bodily resurrection. They believed in a God who had entered history as a human being. Their God died on a Roman cross! To a person of that time who had been educated in Greek philosophy, these ideas sounded absurd, crude, and primitive.

So some early educated Christian teachers made a choice. They started using Platonic language and Platonic ideas to explain the Christian faith in terms their neighbors could respect. Their intentions were

good. They wanted to show that Christianity was reasonable and worthy of serious thought. But the approach had a serious cost.

Justo González, a church historian, describes it this way in his book *The Story of Christianity*: "Although at first these philosophical traditions were used for interpreting the faith to outsiders, soon they began influencing the manner in which Christians understood their own faith." In other words, what started as a communication strategy ended up reshaping what the church actually believed.

Edward Fudge, in his book *The Fire That Consumes*, traces how this played out in detail. Early Christian defenders of the faith "freely borrowed the Platonic conception of the soul, the chief characteristic being its separability from the body." When they argued for the resurrection and the final judgment, they often leaned on the pagan idea of the soul's immortality to make those doctrines seem more logical to their neighbors.

The result was a slow blending of biblical teaching with Greek philosophy. The two traditions got mixed together, and over time, the mixture started to look like pure Scripture to those who inherited it.

Tertullian, a Christian writer from around 200 AD, shows us just how comfortable early Christian thinkers had become with Plato's ideas. Writing to defend the resurrection of the body, he appeals to Plato almost without hesitation: "I may use, therefore, the opinion of Plato, when he declares, 'Every soul is immortal.' " Tertullian was not simply parroting Plato. He believed he was using a pagan witness to confirm a Christian truth. But notice what that assumes: that Plato and the Bible are teaching the same thing about the soul. That assumption, borrowed and rarely examined, is exactly the problem.

None of this means the early church teachers were villains. They were not. They were people doing their best to explain a faith they loved to a world that did not share their assumptions. The problem was not

their sincerity. The problem was their method. When you try to explain the Bible using the vocabulary of a different worldview, you risk letting that worldview quietly reshape what you believe the Bible says.

## What the Bible Says About Immortality

Before we go further, it is worth stopping to let the Bible speak directly on this question. Because what it says may surprise you. Paul, writing near the end of his first letter to Timothy, describes God this way: "He alone is immortal and dwells in unapproachable light" (1 Timothy 6:16). Notice what Paul does not say. He does not say God alone is the only immortal being in existence. He says God alone possesses immortality by His own nature. Immortality belongs to God the way sight belongs to eyes. It is not something He acquired. It is what He is.

For human beings, immortality is a different story entirely. Consider what these passages say:

> "To those who by perseverance in doing good seek glory, honor, and immortality, He will give eternal life" (Romans 2:7).
>
> **Implication:** People seek what they do not yet have. If we already possessed immortal souls, there would be nothing to seek.
>
> "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 6:23).
>
> **Implication:** Eternal life is a gift. God does not give us what we already possess.
>
> "For the perishable must be clothed with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality" (1 Corinthians 15:53).

**Implication:** At the resurrection, immortality is something God puts on us. If we already had it, this language would make no sense.

"[He] has abolished death and illuminated the way to life and immortality through the gospel" (2 Timothy 1:10).

**Implication:** Jesus reveals the path to immortality through the good news. If immortality were already built into every human soul, why would it need to be revealed?

And then there is the Garden of Eden. After Adam and Eve disobeyed God, the Lord said: "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil. And now, lest he reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever… Therefore the LORD God banished him from the Garden of Eden" (Genesis 3:22-23).

Stop and think about that. If Adam and Eve were already immortal, why would God be concerned about them eating from the tree of life and living forever? Now, someone might say the tree was only about the body. The soul, they would argue, was already immortal on its own. But notice what that argument requires: you are assuming what you need to prove. You bring a distinction into the text that Genesis never makes. The text does not say "lest his body live forever." It says "lest he live forever." The whole person is in view. And the whole person needed the tree. *Why would immortal people need a tree of life*? The tree existed precisely because they were not inherently immortal. Eating it would grant something they did not already possess.

N.T. Wright, one of the most widely read New Testament scholars of our time, puts it plainly in his book *Surprised by Hope*: "Platonists believe that all humans have an immortal element within them, normally referred to as 'soul.' In the New Testament, however, immortality is something that only God possesses by nature and that He then shares,

as a gift of grace rather than an innate possession, with His people." The Bible's picture and Plato's picture are not the same picture.

## What Does "Death" Actually Mean?

A careful reader holding the traditional view may object saying, "These verses are not contrasting immortality with physical death. They are contrasting it with spiritual death. It is not that some people live forever and the rest simply die. It is that those outside of Christ spend eternity separated from God. That is what spiritual death means." And the proof, they would argue, is right there in Genesis. God told Adam and Eve they would die the very day they ate from the forbidden tree. They ate, and they did not drop dead. So the death God threatened must have been spiritual. It was a break in their relationship with God resulting in a separation from Him, not physical death.

If this is true and "death" carries that meaning throughout Scripture, the immortality argument loses most of its force. So before we go further, we need to ask a direct question: does the Bible actually teach the concept of "spiritual death"?

### *Does "Spiritual Death" Appear in the Bible?*

The Bible uses the word "spiritual" quite a lot. Paul writes about spiritual gifts, spiritual worship, spiritual blessings, spiritual truths, spiritual wisdom, spiritual bodies, and a number of other spiritual things. But for all the things the Bible calls spiritual, it never once uses the phrase "spiritual death." Not once. Now, the absence of an exact phrase does not always settle a question. A concept can be present even if the precise wording is not. So the real question is whether the idea appears anywhere in Scripture.

The passage most often enlisted in support of it is Ephesians 2:1-2: "And you were dead in your trespasses and sins, in which you pre-

viously walked." People who are clearly alive and walking around are called "dead." Doesn't that prove that death can describe a non-physical, spiritual condition?

Not quite. What Paul is getting at is that these people are on a trajectory leading to death, not that they are dead already. Ernest Best, writing in the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, describes this as Paul presenting their future judgment as if it were already present. Their path leads to death, so Paul speaks of them as already dead. We use the same kind of language today when we say someone is a "dead man walking." We do not mean his relationship with God has been severed. We mean his destination is settled unless something about his condition changes. That is Paul's point. He is not describing a hidden spiritual condition. He is describing people on a path toward judgment. That is a very different thing from saying a distinct category of death called "spiritual death" exists as its own biblical reality.

### *Back to the Garden*

So what about Adam and Eve? The traditional reading needs Genesis 2:17 to describe spiritual death, because if it describes physical death, God said something that did not happen.

The Hebrew phrase behind "you will certainly die," literally translated, is "dying you shall die." Hebrew uses this kind of doubling to express absolute certainty. This doubling language appears throughout the Old Testament, always in the same context: physical death as the penalty for a violation. God tells Abimelech he will certainly die if he does not return Abraham's wife (Genesis 20:7). God tells Solomon he will certainly die if he crosses the Kidron Valley (1 Kings 2:37). God tells King Ahaziah through Elijah that he will certainly die from his ill-

ness (2 Kings 1:4). In every case the phrase means exactly what it looks like it means. Physical death. No spiritual redefinition required.

There is no reason to read Genesis 2:17 differently. God threatened Adam and Eve with the same kind of death the phrase always describes. The traditional reading does not rescue the text from a problem. It imports a solution the text never asked for.

### *Then Why Didn't They Die That Day?*

This is the right question, and the Bible actually answers it without inventing a new category of death. The answer is grace. God had threatened death, and death is what the violation deserved. But God, in an act of undeserved mercy, relented. Ezekiel 33:14-16 describes exactly this pattern.

> *"But if I tell the wicked man, 'You will surely die,' and he turns from his sin and does what is just and right—if he restores a pledge, makes restitution for what he has stolen, and walks in the statutes of life without practicing iniquity—then he will surely live; he will not die. None of the sins he has committed will be held against him. He has done what is just and right; he will surely live."*

God can pronounce a death sentence and relent when a person turns from their sin. It isn't any more complicated than that. What is often treated as a theological puzzle requiring an entirely new category of death is better understood as the first recorded act of divine grace in human history.

Does this mean Adam and Eve repented? The text doesn't tell us. But the inference is drawn from what Scripture itself says about how God operates. Ezekiel 33 gives us God's own words about how He handles a death sentence when a person turns from their sin. Applying that

principle to Genesis 3 is letting Scripture interpret Scripture. That is a very different thing from conjuring an entirely new category of death that appears nowhere in the Bible in order to explain why they didn't die physically.

And Genesis itself confirms that Adam and Eve were mortal all along. God drove them from the garden specifically to cut off their access to the tree of life, "lest he reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever" (Genesis 3:22). If they were already immortal, that concern makes no sense. The tree was not decorative. It supplied something they did not naturally possess. Once they lost access to it, aging and death followed, not as the arrival of some new spiritual condition, but as the natural result of being mortal creatures cut off from the one thing that could physically sustain them.

### *What This Means for the Rest of Scripture*

If "spiritual death" is not a biblical category, the traditional move of redefining death throughout Scripture loses its foundation. When Romans 6:23 says the wages of sin is death, it means death. When Ezekiel says the soul that sins will die, he means the soul dies. The word does not need to be rescued from its plain meaning. It needs to be taken at face value. And if death means cessation rather than separation from God, the immortality passages snap into focus. You cannot seek something you already have. You cannot receive as a gift something that is already yours. The contrast in those passages is not between a good eternity and a bad one. It is between eternal life and the second death.

## The Reformation

The Protestant Reformation of the 1500s challenged many things the Roman Catholic Church had taught. The Reformers pushed hard to bring Scripture back to the center of Christian belief and practice. They ques-

tioned the authority of church tradition. They challenged practices they believed had no biblical foundation. But they did not clean house on the question of the soul.

Luther, interestingly, showed openness to the idea that the dead rest unconsciously, awaiting the resurrection. He mentioned it in several of his sermons and commentaries. But that view did not win the day in Protestant thinking. Calvin addressed it directly in a book titled *Psychopannychia*, written to argue against soul sleep and defend the conscious existence of the soul between death and resurrection.

The result was that the Reformation, for all its willingness to challenge tradition, carried Plato's basic assumption right along with it. The idea of the naturally immortal soul, the soul that continues in full conscious awareness after death, survived the Reformation largely intact. Protestants and Catholics disagreed about many things. On this point, they broadly agreed.

Which means that what most of us inherited from our churches, whether we grew up Catholic, Baptist, Methodist, or anything else, was not a carefully examined biblical conclusion. It was a very old assumption that had never been seriously questioned. An assumption that, if we trace it back far enough, leads not to the Old Testament, not to Jesus, not to Paul, but to Plato.

## The Weight of This

Edward Fudge observes that, while the immortal soul remains the majority view in most churches today, it is "increasingly regarded as a post-apostolic innovation," meaning an idea that came after the New Testament era, not from it. He adds that it is "positively harmful to proper biblical interpretation and understanding."

That is a strong statement. But it is a fair one. When we assume that humans naturally possess immortal souls, we bring that assumption to

every passage we read about death and the afterlife. And that assumption does real damage to our understanding of what the Bible is actually trying to tell us.

The ancient Hebrews did not build their faith on an immortal soul. And while a handful of New Testament passages have been read that way, as we will see in Part Two of this book, none of them actually teach what Plato taught. The idea that the soul is naturally immortal and inherently indestructible is an idea with pagan fingerprints all over it, not biblical ones. But to understand why, we first need to understand what the Bible says about the soul itself. What is a soul, exactly? Is it a separate part of you that can exist on its own? Or is it something closer to the whole of who you are? That is the question waiting in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

# What Is a Soul?

*Dave flipped his Bible open to Genesis 2 and read aloud. "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."*

*Carol looked up from her own Bible. "Wait. Mine says 'living being,' not 'living soul.' "*

*Dave shrugged. "Different translations, I guess. Probably means the same thing."*

*Carol wasn't so sure. She turned back a page. "Look at this, though. When God creates the animals in chapter one, my Bible calls them 'living creatures.' You think that's the same word underneath?" She pulled her laptop over, opened her Bible software, and clicked on the word "being" in Genesis 2:7. "It's the Hebrew word 'nephesh,' " she said. She scrolled back to Genesis 1:24. "And right here — 'living creature.' Also nephesh."*

*Dave leaned over to look at the screen. Neither of them said anything for a moment.*

*"So the same word they use for Adam," Dave said, "is the same word used for the animals?"*

*They both sat there, not quite sure what to do with that.*

---

Dave and Carol did not have an answer. But they had stumbled onto exactly the right question. That question is what this chapter is about. Before we can talk about what happens when we die, we need to understand what we really are. And that means we need to take a careful look at the word "soul."

Most of us carry around a picture of the soul that feels perfectly natural. The body is the physical part of us, the part you can see and touch. The soul is the invisible part, the real you, the part that holds your thoughts, your feelings, your personality. The body is like a car, and the soul is the driver. When the car breaks down, the driver climbs out and keeps going. It is a tidy picture. It is also not what the Bible teaches.

## A Word That Gets Mistranslated

The Hebrew word translated "soul" in the Old Testament is *nephesh* (pronounced "NEH-fesh"). It shows up for the first time *not* in Genesis 2, but in Genesis 1, and it shows up describing the animals. The word "creatures" in both of these verses is *nephesh*:

> "And God said, 'Let the waters teem with living creatures' " (Genesis 1:20).
>
> "And God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds' " (Genesis 1:24).

Then we get to Genesis 2:7, where the King James Bible says Adam became a "living soul." Many newer translations say "living being."

Both of those English phrases, living soul and living being, are translating the exact same Hebrew phrase that Genesis 1 uses for the fish, the birds, and the land animals.

Edward Fudge, in his book *The Fire That Consumes*, points out that the King James translators called Adam a "living soul" in Genesis 2:7 but then turned around and called the animals "living creatures" even though it was the same Hebrew phrase. He quotes scholar Norman Snaith, who called this "most reprehensible." Speaking of a later English translation Snaith added, "it is a grave reflection on the Revisers that they retained this misleading difference in translation … The Hebrew phrase should be translated exactly the same way in both cases. To do otherwise is to mislead all those who do not read Hebrew. There is no excuse and no proper defense."

Why does that matter? Because the translation difference has quietly taught us something the text never said. It led us to assume that Adam had something the animals did not. A soul. A special invisible essence. But Genesis never says that. It says Adam became a *nephesh*, just as the animals are *nephesh*.

A natural question follows from that: if humans and animals share the same word, does that mean there is no difference between us? Not at all. Genesis 1:26-27 is clear that humans alone are made in the image of God, a distinction that sets us apart from every other creature in a profound and irreversible way. What *nephesh* establishes is not that humans and animals are the same, but that both are whole, embodied, living beings. The image of God is about who we are in relation to God and what we are called to do in His world. It is not about having a different kind of soul than the animals. Humans are uniquely image-bearers. But both humans and animals are *nephesh*, and that matters for understanding what happens when we die. So what does *nephesh* mean?

## What Nephesh Really Means

At its most basic level, *nephesh* refers to a living being, a creature animated by the breath of life. It is what makes a creature alive. When God breathed into Adam's nostrils, the dust became animated. It became a living, breathing being. That living being is what the Bible calls a soul, or *nephesh*.

Notice something important in that description. God did not put a soul into Adam. Adam did not receive a soul like a gift placed inside a box. The text says Adam *became* a living being. The soul is not something you have. It is something you are.

Think about that for a moment. We have always said, "I have a body and a soul." But the Bible's picture is closer to saying, "I *am* a soul" — a whole person, not a container with invisible contents that can be taken out and moved around. You cannot separate a soul from a body any more than you can separate wetness from water.

The evidence for this shows up across the whole Old Testament. In the passages below, *nephesh* in square brackets shows you the Hebrew word behind the English translation. Look at how *nephesh* gets used:

> **Souls touch things:** "Or if a person [*nephesh*] touches anything unclean — whether the carcass of any unclean wild animal or livestock or crawling creature — even if he is unaware of it, he is unclean and guilty" (Leviticus 5:2).
>
> **Implication:** An invisible spirit cannot touch a physical object and become ceremonially unclean. But a whole person can.
>
> **Souls eat:** "But if anyone [*nephesh*] who is unclean eats meat from the peace offering that belongs to the LORD, that person [*nephesh*] must be cut off from his people" (Leviticus 7:20).

**Implication:** The soul is eating; it can be cut off from other people. These are not things associated with a disembodied spirit.

**Souls are connected to physical life itself:** "But you must not eat meat with its lifeblood [*nephesh*] still in it" (Genesis 9:4).

**Implication:** The *nephesh* is bound up with the physical body so completely that it flows through the veins.

**Souls can shed tears:** "But if you do not listen, I [*nephesh*] will weep in secret because of your pride. My eyes will overflow with tears, because the LORD's flock has been taken captive" (Jeremiah 13:17).

**Implication:** The soul weeps, has eyes, has a face for tears to run down. Grief is pictured as a whole-person experience, body and inner life together.

**Souls can die:** *This one is worth slowing down for.* Leviticus 21:11 says a priest "must not go near any dead body [*nephesh*]."

**Read that again.** The word translated dead "body" is *nephesh*. The Bible calls a corpse a dead soul. Not a body that a soul used to live in. Not an empty shell left behind after the soul vacated. A dead *nephesh*. If the soul were an immortal, indestructible thing that lives on after the body gives out, that phrase would make no sense at all. But it makes perfect sense if the soul is the whole person.

And the Bible does not stop there. In Ezekiel 18:4, God speaks in His own words: "Behold, every soul belongs to Me; both father and son are Mine. The soul who sins is the one who will die." He repeats

the point just sixteen verses later: "The soul who sins is the one who will die" (Ezekiel 18:20). God does not say the body dies while the soul survives. He says the *soul* dies. This is not a theologian drawing a careful conclusion from difficult evidence. This is God making a plain statement. He says it twice in the same chapter so there is no missing it.

The soul is mortal. The Bible says so. That matters enormously, because if the soul can die, then the traditional picture of death collapses at its foundation. A soul that God says can die cannot slip free from the body and travel consciously to heaven. A soul that dies cannot exist consciously in heaven. It has to wait for something. We will see what that something is in the next chapter.

Now step back and look at everything in this list. If the soul is an invisible spiritual essence living inside the body the way a driver rides inside a car, how do you explain any of it? How does a spiritual essence touch a dead animal and become unclean? How does it eat? How does it end up as a corpse?

Those passages fit much more naturally with a whole-person understanding of the soul. The Bible is not being careless with its language. It is being precise. The definition that struggles here is the one we brought to the text, not the one the text actually uses.

### *What about the spirit?*

At this point, a fair question comes up: "What about the spirit? Doesn't the Bible say God breathed a spirit into us? Isn't that the part that lives on?" The Hebrew word for spirit is *ruach* (pronounced "ROO-akh"). It refers to breath, wind, or the animating principle of life that God contributes to a living creature. When God breathed into Adam, He supplied the *ruach*, the spark of life that turned dust into a living *nephesh*.

Think of it this way: the body is like a light bulb, the *ruach* is the electricity that powers it, and the light the bulb produces represents the inner life, the thoughts, emotions, will, and personality of a living person. The bulb and the electricity together produce the light. If you like math, the Bible's equation is simple:

**body + breath of life = a living soul**

When the power goes out, the light does not go somewhere else. It simply stops. The whole system stops together. That is the Bible's picture of death. When a person dies, Ecclesiastes 12:7 says the *ruach* "returns to God who gave it." That verse is sometimes read as proof that a conscious soul flies back to God at death. But what it actually describes is the creation of man in reverse. God supplied the breath of life, the animating principle. Death results when that animating principle returns to its source, the way a bulb goes dark when the power is cut. What returns to God is not a conscious disembodied entity. It is the breath He lent. The person, the *nephesh*, the whole being, is the one who sleeps, resting in death and waiting for resurrection, as we will see in the next chapter.

There is one more thing worth noticing before we move to the New Testament. In the Old Testament, the way you say "let me live" is "let my soul live." Look at how two different translations handle Psalm 119:175:

> "Let me [*nephesh*] live to praise You; may Your judgments sustain me." (BSB)
>
> "Let my soul [*nephesh*] live, and it shall praise thee; and let thy judgements help me." (KJV)

Same Hebrew word, same verse, two different English renderings. One says "me." The other says "my soul." They mean exactly the same

thing, because in biblical thinking, you and your soul are not two different things. You are your soul.

A few more examples make the same point from different angles:

> "Please say you are my sister, so that I will be treated well for your sake, and on account of you my life [*nephesh*] will be spared" (Genesis 12:13). Abraham is not asking his wife to help spare his invisible soul. He is asking her to help spare his life, his whole self.
>
> "Then prepare a tasty dish that I love and bring it to me to eat, so that I [*nephesh*] may bless you before I die" (Genesis 27:4). Isaac's soul is hungry. He wants stew.
>
> "If a man is found kidnapping a person [*nephesh*] from among his fellow Israelites, and regards him as mere property and sells him, that kidnapper must die" (Deuteronomy 24:7). You cannot kidnap a spirit. You kidnap a whole person.

The Old Testament paints a consistent picture. But the New Testament was written in a different language, with a different word for soul. Does that word tell the same story?

## The New Testament Word

The New Testament was written in Greek, not Hebrew. But when the writers of the New Testament want to talk about the soul, they use a Greek word, *psuche* (pronounced "psoo-KAY"), that carries the same meaning as *nephesh*. In fact, when Jewish scholars translated the Old Testament into Greek several centuries before Jesus, they used *psuche* to translate *nephesh* most of the time. The two words are essentially the same idea in two different languages.

Paul makes this connection clear in 1 Corinthians 15:45 when he alludes to Genesis 2:7: "The first man Adam became a living being (*psuche*)." Same verse, same meaning, different language. And just like *nephesh* in the Old Testament, *psuche* in the New Testament refers to the whole person, not just a spiritual component. Notice the same pattern:

"For what does it benefit someone to gain the whole world and yet lose his life [*psuche*]?" (Mark 8:36 CSB). Compare that with another translation of the same verse: "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world, yet forfeit his soul [*psuche*]?" (Mark 8:36 BSB). One says "life." The other says "soul." Same word, same verse. Because in the Bible, your life and your soul are the same thing.

> **Souls can be immersed in water:** "So those who accepted his message were baptized, and that day about three thousand people [*psuche*] were added to them." (Acts 2:41) You baptize a whole person, not just a spiritual essence.
>
> **Souls can die:** "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down His life [*psuche*] for the sheep." (John 10:11) Jesus laid down His soul. He died. The Son of God did not lay down only His body while His soul kept going. He gave everything.
>
> **Souls face judgment:** "There will be trouble and distress for every human being [*psuche*] who does evil, first for the Jew, then for the Greek." (Romans 2:9) God judges the whole person.
>
> **Souls can be threatened:** " 'Get up!' he said. 'Take the Child and His mother and go to the land of Israel, for those seeking the Child's life [*psuche*] are now dead.' " (Matthew 2:20) Herod was not trying to destroy Jesus' invisible soul. He was trying to kill Jesus, the person.

The pattern holds from Genesis to Revelation. **Soul means the whole person. It is not a piece of you. It is all of you.**

## Soul and Spirit: Are They Different Things?

Now that we have both *nephesh* and *psuche* on the table, a question worth addressing directly: are the soul and the spirit two separate things? Some Christian traditions teach that humans are made of three distinct parts (body, soul, and spirit) and that each is a separate ingredient in the recipe for a human being. This view is called *trichotomy* (tri meaning three, *chotomy* meaning division).

Scholar Daniel Akin points out a problem with that view that is hard to get around. If every word in a biblical list names a separate part of a human being, then trichotomy does not go nearly far enough. Mark 12:30 tells us to love God with our heart, soul, mind, and strength (four elements). First Thessalonians 5:23 lists spirit, soul, and body (three elements). Put those two lists together and you end up with six distinct parts: body, soul, spirit, mind, heart, and strength. Nobody believes those passages amount to anatomy lessons which teach we are made up of six different things. They are different ways of saying the same thing: love God with your whole being.

The simpler and more biblical answer is that soul and spirit are two different words for the same reality, looked at from different angles. Akin, in *A Theology for the Church*, notes that "many recognize that soul and spirit are often used interchangeably in Scripture." Scripture itself bears this out.

The Greek word for spirit is *pneuma* (pronounced "NYOO-mah"), the New Testament equivalent of the Hebrew *ruach*. Both words carry the same range of meaning: breath, wind, and the animating life-force God gives to living creatures. And just as *nephesh* and *ruach* overlap in the Old Testament, *psuche* and *pneuma* overlap in the New.

In Luke 1, Mary says, "My soul [*psuche*] exalts the Lord," and then in the very next breath, "my spirit [*pneuma*] has rejoiced in God my Savior" (Luke 1:46-47). The same experience, the same moment, described with both words back to back. In John 12:27, Jesus says "my soul [*psuche*] is troubled," and in John 13:21 He is "troubled in spirit [*pneuma*]" in the same Gospel, describing the same kind of deep inner distress with both words. The words overlap because they describe the same inner life of a person from slightly different angles, not two separate compartments inside the body.

Hebrews 4:12, a verse sometimes cited to prove that soul and spirit are distinct things, says the word of God divides "soul and spirit, joints and marrow." But New Testament scholar F. F. Bruce cautions that it would be "precarious to draw any conclusions from these words about our author's psychology." The point of the verse is the penetrating power of Scripture, not a diagram of human anatomy. Soul, spirit, joints, and marrow all point to the same thing: the whole person, inside and out, laid bare before God.

## Why Does This Matter for Death?

Here is where this is more than just a word study. If a soul is the whole person, body and inner life together, then what happens to the soul when the body dies? The Bible gives a consistent and clear answer, and we will look at it carefully in the next chapter. But the groundwork here matters.

The traditional picture, the one most of us grew up with, says that when you die, your soul slips free from your body and travels to heaven, where you live in full conscious awareness until the resurrection. Your body goes into the ground, but the real you is already home. That picture depends entirely on the soul being a separate thing that can exist on its own. A driver who can climb out of the car.

But the Bible's picture is different. If the soul is the whole person and cannot exist apart from the body, then that traditional picture has a serious problem. It is built on a foundation the Bible never actually laid. A "soul" that can separate from the body is a contradiction of terms. The biblical view is that the soul is the entirety of a person. It is our whole being; we cannot be broken down into our constituent parts (body and breath) and still exist as a living creature. As was said earlier, it would be like trying to separate wetness from water.

### *Death Is Not The End*

Now, this does not mean death is the end. Not at all. The children of God have a magnificent hope waiting for them. Paul describes it this way in 1 Corinthians 15:51-53:

> "Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed — in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. For the perishable must be clothed with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality."

Notice what Paul says. The mortal must be *clothed* with immortality. Not: the immortal soul must be reunited with its body. The mortal person, the whole *nephesh* or *psuche*, must be transformed. Immortality is something God grants the faithful at the resurrection. It is not something we already have tucked away inside us. God does not give us what we already possess. The gift is real precisely because we do not have it yet.

Some passages may seem at first glance to cut against this pattern, and we will examine those carefully in later chapters. For now, the foundation is in place: the soul is the whole person, the soul is mortal, and

the consistent testimony of Scripture from the opening pages of Genesis through the letters of Paul, points in the same direction.

## What We Actually Are

So here is the Bible's picture of what a human being is, put as simply as possible. When God formed Adam from the dust and breathed life into him, something new came into existence. Not a body plus a soul. Not a car and a driver. A whole, living, breathing person. A *nephesh*. Body and inner life, inseparable, together making one whole being.

That is what you are. Not a soul inside a body, waiting for the day when death finally sets you free. You are a complete person, created in God's image, made to live and breathe and love and worship and one day, because of Jesus, to be raised from the dead and clothed with immortality.

Dave and Carol didn't find a tidy answer that afternoon. But they found something better: a question worth following all the way to the end. The answer, it turns out, is bigger and more hopeful than the one they started with. When immortality is something God grants rather than something we already possess, the resurrection becomes everything, not an afterthought to a soul that already made it home. And that hope is the one the Bible actually teaches.

Chapter 4

# The Sleeping Dead

Think about the last time you had a really good night's sleep. Not just a decent night's rest, but the kind where you close your eyes and the next thing you know, morning is already there. No awareness of time passing. No experience of the dark hours between. You were simply gone, and then you were back.

Now think about what it would mean if that is exactly what death is like. Not gone forever. Not suffering. Not wandering. Just resting, with morning guaranteed. That is the picture the Bible paints, and it paints it over and over again. Chapter 3 established what a soul really is: not a separate invisible piece of you that slips free of your body at death and keeps going on its own, but the whole person, body and inner life bound together. By inner life I mean your thoughts, emotions, will, and everything else that makes you who you are. The soul is not something you have. It is something you are. And when the whole person dies, the whole person rests. The Bible even has a word for that rest. The word is *sleep*.

This is not a minor theme tucked away in a few obscure verses. It runs from one end of the Bible to the other, through the Old Testament and the New, through poetry and history and prophecy and the letters of the apostles. Dozens of times, the biblical writers reach for the image

of sleep when they want to describe what death looks like. God does not choose words carelessly. When He returns to the same image again and again across centuries of writing, we should take note because that image is important. It is shaping how we should think about death, how we face it, how we grieve it, and what we hope for on the other side of it. So let's look at what the Bible actually says.

## The Old Testament Portrait

The sleep language for death did not start with the New Testament. It did not begin with Paul or with Jesus. It began long before either of their ministries, woven into the oldest books of Scripture. Job is one of the oldest books in the Bible, a vivid account of a man wrestling with suffering and loss. And when Job contemplates death, this is what he says:

> "For now I would be lying down in peace; I would be asleep and at rest." (Job 3:13)

> "So a man lies down and does not rise. Until the heavens are no more, he will not be awakened or roused from sleep." (Job 14:12)

Job does not picture the dead as wide awake somewhere. He pictures them lying down. Sleeping. Resting. Waiting to rise. The waking up, in Job's description, is tied to a future moment: the end of time when "the heavens are no more." He didn't describe it as something that happens only to his body.

Job says these words from the pit of his suffering, not as part of a careful theological argument. Yet the picture he reaches for instinctively, rest followed by rising at the end of time, matches exactly what the angel later told Daniel in the Old Testament, a passage we will look at shortly.

The anguished man and the heavenly messenger end up in the same place.

The Psalms return to this picture repeatedly. Psalm 13:3 is a prayer: "Consider me and respond, O LORD my God. Give light to my eyes, lest I sleep in death." Sleep, for David, is what death looks like, and it is something he hopes to delay rather than rush toward.

Psalm 6:5 asks a pointed question: "For there is no mention of You in death; who can praise You from Sheol?" *Sheol* is the Hebrew word for the place of the dead, the grave, the realm where the dead go. David's question affirms that the dead are not actively praising God. There is no ongoing worship, no continued activity. The dead are at rest.

Daniel closes his book with a remarkable promise from the angel who had been speaking with him: "But as for you, go your way until the end. You will rest, and then at the end of the days, you will rise to receive your allotted inheritance." (Daniel 12:13) Rest, and then rise. The sequence matters. Daniel does not go immediately to his reward. He rests first, and the rising comes at the end of time.

Ecclesiastes is probably the most direct of all. The Preacher does not soften the picture:

> "For the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing. They have no further reward, because the memory of them is forgotten." (Ecclesiastes 9:5)

> "Whatever you find to do with your hands, do it with all your might, for in Sheol, where you are going, there is no work or planning or knowledge or wisdom." (Ecclesiastes 9:10)

These are plain words. No knowledge. No work. No wisdom. No planning. The dead in *Sheol* are simply not active.

Some readers push back on these verses by pointing out that Ecclesiastes frequently describes life "under the sun," meaning the world of the living. On that reading, "the dead know nothing" is not a statement about the afterlife, but simply an observation that from where the deceased exist, they are unaware of events on earth. It is a fair objection, but verse 6 doesn't permit that view. Look at what it says: "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun" (KJV).

A few modern Bible translations say "vanished" instead of "perished," and that translation has some scholarly support. Two respected Hebrew dictionaries used by scholars (HALOT and Brown-Driver-Briggs ) disagree slightly on the nuance. One places this use of the word under the category "to become lost." The other places it under "perish, die," with an emphasis on mortality. But notice what neither option allows: if the emotions of the dead have perished, they are gone; if they have become lost, they are also gone. In neither case are they pictured as alive and active in a conscious soul somewhere. The traditional view requires them to still exist. The text says they do not.

Love, hate, and envy are not things the body experiences. They belong to the inner person. And the only way those inner things can be gone, whether perished or lost, is if the person is no longer awake, aware, and functioning.

And then there is Daniel 12:2, one of the clearest resurrection texts in the entire Old Testament: "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Notice where the dead are. They sleep in the dust of the earth. They are not in heaven, awaiting reunification with their body. They are in the ground, awaiting resurrection.

Beyond these individual texts, the Old Testament has a phrase it uses so regularly that it becomes almost a formula. When a king or leader dies, the writer says he "slept with his fathers." This language appears dozens of times across the historical books. Here is a small sample:

> "Then David slept with his fathers and was buried in the city of David" (1 Kings 2:10).
>
> "And Solomon slept with his fathers and was buried in the city of David his father. And Rehoboam his son reigned in his place" (1 Kings 11:43).
>
> "And the time that Jeroboam reigned was twenty-two years. And he slept with his fathers, and Nadab his son reigned in his place" (1 Kings 14:20).
>
> "And Rehoboam slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the city of David" (1 Kings 14:31).

This is not poetic accident. This is the Bible's standard way of recording a death. Generation after generation, king after king, the same words. Sleep. Not ascended to glory. Slept with his fathers. In the ground. The Old Testament authors used that word deliberately, because it captured something true about what death actually is: rest, with the hope of resurrection waiting at the other end.

## What the Dead Know and Don't Know

One objection comes up so often that it is worth addressing here before we move into the New Testament. It goes like this: "Sleep is just how death looks from our side. The body is lying there motionless, so the biblical authors call it sleep. But the soul has already departed to be with God. The real person is wide awake in heaven. Only the body sleeps."

The problem with that reading is Daniel 12:2: "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Daniel does not say the bodies sleep in the dust while the souls wait somewhere else. The sleepers are in the dust. And that connection goes all the way back to God's words to Adam after the fall: "For you are dust, and to dust you shall return." (Genesis 3:19) God was not talking about Adam's body while Adam's soul made other arrangements. He was talking about Adam. The whole person came from dust, and the whole person returns to it.

So consider what that does to the objection. If the "soul" is already conscious in heaven while the body sleeps in the dust, then who, or what, exactly is waking up in Daniel 12:2? The soul is supposedly already awake. The resurrection, on that reading, would not be a waking at all. It would be a reunion, a soul descending from heaven to reclaim a body it left behind. But that is not what Daniel describes. He describes a waking. And you cannot wake up what is already conscious.

From the perspective of the person who dies, there is no long waiting period. No experience of centuries passing. No lingering in some middle place, watching time roll by. The moment a believer dies is, from their perspective, immediately followed by the resurrection. They close their eyes, and the next thing they experience is the morning of the new creation, the voice of the archangel, the trumpet of God, and the face of Jesus. The Bible calls it sleep because it is temporary, a condition God will revive us from.

That is not a less comforting picture than the traditional one. If you think about it carefully, it is actually more comforting. There is no impatience through the wait. There is no longing due to the absence of loved ones who still live. There is no long period of separation from the body that the Bible itself never pictures as a possible state of human existence. There is simply rest, and then glory.

## Jesus and the Language of Sleep

By the time we reach the New Testament, the sleep language does not disappear. Jesus Himself uses it, and He uses it in a way that makes the meaning impossible to miss.

In John 11, Jesus receives word that His friend Lazarus is sick. He waits two days before traveling to Bethany, and by the time He arrives, Lazarus has been in the tomb for four days. Here is what Jesus says to His disciples before they make the journey:

> "Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep, but I am going there to wake him up." (John 11:11)

The disciples misunderstand. They think Jesus means Lazarus is getting some rest and will recover on his own. So John explains what Jesus actually meant: "Jesus had been speaking about his death, but his disciples thought he meant normal sleep." (John 11:13)

When Jesus arrives at the tomb and calls Lazarus out, He is doing exactly what He described: waking someone up. Lazarus was not conscious in some middle state, aware of everything happening around him, watching from a spiritual vantage point while his grieving sisters waited outside. He was asleep. And Jesus woke him up.

## The Apostles and the Language of Sleep

The sleep language continues throughout the rest of the New Testament. The apostles did not invent a new vocabulary for death. They kept using the same word Jesus used and the same word the Old Testament used.

Stephen, the first martyr of the church, dies with a prayer on his lips and a vision of Jesus before his eyes. Luke describes his death this way in Acts 7:60: "And when he had said this, he fell asleep." Not "his soul went to heaven." He fell asleep. Luke, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, used the same image the whole Bible uses.

Paul uses it in Acts 13:36 when he describes the end of David's life: "For when David had served God's purpose in his own generation, he fell asleep." David's body was buried with his ancestors and decayed in the ground, Paul says. David was not immediately ushered into conscious glory. He fell asleep, and the resurrection was still to come.

First Corinthians 15 is the New Testament's longest and most detailed treatment of the resurrection. If the soul goes immediately to heaven at death and lives there in full conscious awareness, the resurrection seems like an afterthought, a nice add-on to a soul that is already home. But Paul does not treat it that way. He treats the resurrection as the main event, the thing on which everything else depends. And listen to how he talks about the dead throughout the chapter:

> "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep." (1 Corinthians 15:20)

> "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive." (1 Corinthians 15:22)

Paul says that in Adam, all die. He did not say all experience a temporary physical interruption while the real them keeps living in the spiritual realm. All die. And in Christ, all will be made alive again. That language only makes sense if the dead are actually dead. You cannot be made alive again if you never stopped living. Paul's entire argument depends on it.

> "Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed." (1 Corinthians 15:51)

The dead are those who have "fallen asleep." The resurrection is the moment they will be changed, clothed with imperishability, made

immortal. Paul never says they were born immortal, or received immortality the moment they died. He says they will receive it when the trumpet sounds.

But it is verse 18 where Paul's logic comes into sharpest focus:

> "Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." (1 Corinthians 15:18)

Paul is making a hypothetical argument. He is saying: if there is no resurrection, here is what you are stuck with. And what he says you are stuck with is not loved ones who are alive somewhere else, conscious and waiting, simply unable to return. He says you are stuck with loved ones who have perished. Not displaced. Not relocated. Not lounging in a comfortable middle place between death and glory. Gone.

Some will push back here. They will say Paul is only describing a hypothetical that doesn't apply because the resurrection is real. Fair enough. Paul agrees, and so do I. But that response misses the point the verse actually makes. For Paul's hypothetical to work, the dead, without resurrection, must simply be gone with nothing left of them to recover. If he believed the dead were already consciously present with the Lord in some in between state, his hypothetical should have a different conclusion. He might have said they are stuck without their bodies, or stranded in an intermediate existence with no way forward. That would still be a grim conclusion. But it is not what he says. He says *perished*.

And here is the thing about hypotheticals: they have to be grounded in something real to make any point at all. Paul is not making up a fantasy scenario with no connection to reality. He is saying, look at what the resurrection actually does. It reverses something. It undoes something. If it were not real, the undoing would not happen, and the dead would simply stay in the condition death left them in. That condition,

the one the resurrection reverses, is what Paul describes as "perished." If the dead are already with Christ, what exactly does "perished" mean? The hypothetical works precisely because it describes a real state that the resurrection overcomes. Paul is not inventing a horror story. He is pointing at the actual condition of the dead and saying: the resurrection is what changes this.

"Perished" only makes sense if Paul understood the dead to be genuinely gone, and the resurrection to be the only thing that reverses it. And that is precisely why the Bible calls it *sleep*. The word sleep does not just soften the reality of death. It announces that the condition is temporary. God intends to wake them. That one word, perished, pulls the rug out from under the idea that the dead are awake and aware somewhere. A person who is consciously present with Christ has not perished. Paul's own logic will not allow it.

The passage from 1 Thessalonians 4 that the minister read at Robert's funeral deserves a slower look now that we have more context:

> "Brothers, we do not want you to be uninformed about those who sleep in death, so that you will not grieve like the rest, who are without hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we also believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in Him. By the word of the Lord, we declare to you that we who are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord will by no means precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a loud command, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ will be the first to rise." (1 Thessalonians 4:13-16)

Paul calls the dead those who are asleep, using the word three times in three verses. And notice where he places his comfort. He does not say,

"Your loved ones are already in heaven, fully alive and aware, waiting for you." His comfort is the resurrection. The reunion he describes is future, physical, and communal. The dead in Christ rise first, then the living are caught up together with them, at the same moment, after the trumpet sounds.

The Thessalonians feared their dead loved ones would be left behind when Jesus returned. Here was a perfect opportunity, if the traditional view is right, to simply reassure them: "Do not worry. Your loved ones are already in heaven with Jesus. They will not miss a thing." Some will say Paul simply was not addressing the intermediate state in this passage, that he was answering a specific pastoral question and nothing more. That is true as far as it goes. But notice what it misses. The information that the dead are already home with Christ would have been directly relevant to the Thessalonians' concern. Their grief was about separation and missing out. Telling them their loved ones were already safe with Jesus would have answered that grief immediately and completely. Paul had the perfect answer available, if that answer were true, and he did not use it. Instead he pointed them to the resurrection.

## The Consistent Biblical Portrait

Step back and take in the full sweep of what we have covered in these first four chapters.

Chapter 2 showed us that the idea of the naturally immortal soul, the soul that leaves the body at death and lives on in full conscious awareness, did not come from the Bible. It came from Plato and entered Christian thinking through centuries of philosophical borrowing.

Chapter 3 showed us what the Bible actually says about the soul. It is not a separate component that can detach from the body and keep going. It is the whole person, body and inner life inseparably bound together. When the Bible says Adam became a living soul, it means he

became a living being, just as the animals are living beings. The soul is not something you have. It is something you are.

And now Chapter 4 has shown us what happens to that whole person when death comes. The whole person rests. The whole person sleeps. From Job to the Psalms to Daniel to Jesus to Stephen to Paul, the image never changes. Death is sleep. The resurrection is waking up. And the hope that carries God's people through grief is not that their loved ones are already fully home, watching from above. The hope is that they are resting safely in the hands of God, and morning is coming.

The three conclusions build on each other. You cannot separate them. If the soul is not naturally immortal, and if the soul is the whole person rather than a detachable spirit, then of course the Bible describes death as sleep. Of course the dead rest and wait. Of course the resurrection is the main event and not a footnote. Everything fits together, and it all fits together around the Bible's own words rather than the borrowed vocabulary of a pagan philosopher.

The consistent, repeated, inspired language of the Bible describes death as sleep and resurrection as waking. That pattern spans both testaments, multiple authors, centuries of writing spanning from Moses to John, and every literary genre Scripture contains. If we allow that pattern to set the terms, the passages in Part 2 look very different than they do when we read them through Plato.

Sound interpretive method says that when the Bible establishes a consistent pattern, we read the ambiguous passages in light of that pattern, not the other way around. If a jury hears dozens of consistent witnesses and then one ambiguous one, they do not throw out the majority. They ask what the ambiguous witness most likely means given everything else the court has established. That is exactly what Part 2 will do, one passage at a time.

Sleep is not frightening. Sleep is safe. Sleep is temporary. And the morning God has promised is permanent. Think back to the fictional funeral in Chapter 1. The minister stood before a grieving family and told them that Robert was not gone, that the moment he drew his last breath he came face to face with his Savior, that he was more alive right now than he had ever been. Those words were kind, and the minister who said them genuinely loved the people he was speaking to. But as we have now seen, those words did not come from the Bible. They came from Plato, filtered through centuries of church tradition that never stopped to ask where the idea originated. The Bible's comfort to that family is bigger and richer than what they heard that day. It is not that Robert is already home and the body just needs to catch up. It is that Robert rests safely in the hands of God, that death has not had the last word, that morning is coming, and that when the trumpet sounds, the family sitting in those pews will rise together with him. That is the hope the minister read from 1 Thessalonians 4. It is just not the hope he preached.

## A Word About the Other Outcome

There is one more thing the picture of sleep requires us to say, and we should not shy away from it. Sleep ends in waking, but not everyone wakes to the same morning. Jesus said it plainly in John 5:28-29: "Do not be amazed at this, for the hour is coming when all who are in their graves will hear His voice and come out—those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment." Daniel 12:2 says the same: "And many who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake, some to everlasting life, but others to shame and everlasting contempt." Two outcomes. One resurrection.

This book focuses on what happens to those who die in Christ, but that focus is not permission to ignore the second outcome. The sleeping

dead will all wake, and what they wake to depends entirely on their relationship to Jesus Christ. Some of you have people in your life who have not yet trusted Him. Some of you may still be working through that decision yourselves. The same event that raises the faithful to glory raises everyone else to face judgment. If you want to see your loved ones who died in Christ again, you need to be ready to die the way they did. There is only one way to be ready, and that is as a faithful disciple of Jesus.

---

That is the foundation. Now comes the harder work. The chapters in Part 2 will look, one by one, at the passages most often brought forward to argue that the dead are already awake and aware. These passages appear to plainly teach conscious existence after death, but only because our thinking has been so thoroughly dominated by Plato's view of the soul that we cannot read them any other way. Plato's view must be replaced with Scripture's view, because without a biblical understanding of the soul firmly in place, we are not equipped to interpret those passages at all. Our minds will simply default back to Plato because that is the framework most of us have lived inside our entire lives.

That is exactly why Chapters 2, 3, and 4 had to come first. We needed a biblical view of the soul before we could read those passages on Scripture's own terms. Now we have one.

Before you turn the page, **the appendix at the back of this book lists sleep references from both testaments**. Consider spending time with it before you move into Part 2. The pattern this chapter has traced through selected passages becomes something harder to dismiss when you see all of it at once.

One more thing. The paradigm shift I am asking your brain to make is not a small one. Most of us have believed the traditional view since

childhood and never once had reason to question it. I want to be transparent with you: when I worked through all of this myself, it was not a single moment of clarity. I could see the evidence and follow where it led, but the traditional picture had been part of my thinking for so long that it felt true even when the biblical evidence pointed somewhere else. It was like trying to see something through fog. The facts were there, but the familiar picture kept reasserting itself. It was a long process, and not a particularly conscious one. I was not sitting down each day with a determined effort to change my mind. It was more that I kept coming back to these ideas over time, kept seeing the evidence hold up from different angles, and the biblical picture gradually became more natural than the inherited one. If that is where you find yourself right now, that is not unexpected. You may find yourself reading a passage in Part 2 and feeling absolutely certain it means what you have always thought it meant. When that happens, stop. Ask yourself whether the text itself is taking you there, or whether centuries of inherited assumptions are filling in details the passage never actually states. Give it time. Keep studying. The fog does thin.

# Part Two

*What About These Passages?*

Chapter 5

# "The Spirit Returns to God" — Ecclesiastes 12:7

*Dave and Carol had been at it for days. They had worked their way through what the Bible actually means by the word "soul." They had followed the sleep language all the way from Job to Paul. They had looked at scores of passages. And somewhere in the middle of all of it, Dave had started to feel the ground shifting a little under his feet.*

*But there was one verse he kept coming back to. One verse he felt sure still said what he had always been told it said.*

*He flipped his Bible open and read it aloud.*

*" 'The dust returns to the ground from which it came and the spirit returns to God who gave it,' Ecclesiastes 12:7." He looked up. "That's it, right there. Whatever we say about sleep and the soul, this verse is pretty clear. When you die, your spirit goes back to God. It returns. It arrives somewhere. You don't arrive somewhere unless you're conscious enough to make the trip."*

*Carol nodded slowly. She had heard the verse her whole life too. It had always meant the same thing to her that it meant to Dave.*

*"Read it to me one more time," she said.*

*" 'The spirit returns to God who gave it.' "*

*Carol was quiet for a moment. Then she asked a question. Just one.*

*"What word is that - 'spirit' - in Hebrew?"*

*Dave already knew the answer. They had spent days on it. "Ruach," he said.*

*"And what does ruach mean?"*

*"Breath. Wind. The animating principle of life." He said it almost automatically. Then he stopped.*

*Carol opened her Bible to Psalm 104 and read verse 29 aloud. "When You take away their breath" - she paused and looked at him - "that word is ruach. Same word. God takes away their ruach, and they die and return to dust."*

*Dave stared at the page.*

*"Now read Ecclesiastes 12:7 again," Carol said. "But this time, put the actual meaning of the word in."*

*Dave read it slowly. " 'The dust returns to the ground from which it came and the breath returns to God who gave it' "*

*He sat very still.*

*"That's not a soul arriving home," Carol said quietly. "That's a light bulb going dark."*

*Dave didn't say anything for a long moment. The verse had not changed. Not a single word of it. But everything he*

*thought it meant had just reorganized itself in front of his eyes. What he had read his entire life as proof that something conscious departs at death and journeys back to God was actually describing the reversal of creation. God lent the breath. God takes the breath back. The lamp goes out.*

*It was the same verse. He would never read it the same way again.*

---

What just happened to Dave has a name. It is called a paradigm shift. A paradigm is the invisible set of assumptions you use to make sense of what you see. It feels less like a theory and more like common sense. You do not think you are interpreting the world. You think you are just seeing it. A paradigm shift is what happens when that framework suddenly gets replaced. The data does not change. The words on the page do not change. But everything reorganizes, and you cannot go back.

Dave's problem was not that he had read Ecclesiastes 12:7 carelessly. He had read it many times. He had taken comfort from it. He had probably heard ministers quote it at funerals. The problem was that he had always read it through assumptions he had inherited from centuries of church tradition. Assumptions that, as we traced in the early chapters of this book, did not come from the Bible. They were invisible to him, so they felt like common sense. The spirit returns to God obviously means something conscious goes back to God. What else could it mean? But when Carol asked what the word actually meant, the lens cracked.

This is exactly the kind of shift this entire section of the book is going to ask you to make. Before we are done, we will walk through several passages that people regularly quote as proof that the dead are already wide awake in God's presence. And in every single case, we are going

to do what Carol did. We are going to ask what the words actually mean. We are going to read them the way their original audience would have read them, without centuries of accumulated assumptions rearranging the room first.

That is harder than it sounds. Deeply held beliefs do not give up without a fight. You may find yourself reading one of these passages and feeling absolutely certain it means what you have always thought it meant. When that happens, do what Dave did. Slow down. Ask what the words actually say. And give the Bible room to speak for itself.

It will help to have your Bible open as we go. This section is going to get into the text, and you will want to follow along. Let's start where Dave and Carol started. With Ecclesiastes 12:7.

## The Book of Ecclesiastes

Before we look at the verse itself, we need to spend a moment on the book it comes from. The author of Ecclesiastes calls himself "the Preacher" or "the Teacher." Most readers have understood this to be Solomon, or at least a writer reflecting on wisdom from Solomon's perspective. Whoever he was, he was remarkably candid about the limits of human understanding.

A large part of Ecclesiastes is written from what the Preacher calls the perspective of life "under the sun." That phrase shows up again and again throughout the book. It means the view from down here, from the ground level of human experience, unassisted by divine revelation. From that vantage point, the Preacher observes things that seem meaningless, unfair, and impossible to untangle. He asks hard questions. He sits with uncertainty. He looks at what human wisdom can and cannot see.

This is important because there is a verse near the beginning of his reflections that people sometimes pull out and hold up as proof that the soul survives death:

> "Who knows if the spirit of man rises upward and the spirit of the animal descends into the earth?" (Ecclesiastes 3:21)

But notice the setup. "Who knows?" That is not a declaration. It is a question, an honest admission that, from a purely human vantage point, no one can see past death. The Preacher is not teaching theology here. He is describing the limits of what we can observe on our own, without God telling us.

By the time the Preacher reaches chapter 12, the tone changes. He is no longer asking questions. He makes a plain declaration: the breath returns to God who gave it. That is not observation. That is revelation. He knows this not because he can see it from under the sun, but because God revealed it to him.

The shift matters. Ecclesiastes 3:21 is honest uncertainty. Ecclesiastes 12:7 is confident declaration. And what it declares is specific: the breath returns to God who gave it.

## What Does "Spirit" Mean Here?

Now we are at the heart of the matter. The Hebrew word translated "spirit" in Ecclesiastes 12:7 is *ruach*. We met this word back in Chapter 3. If you need a refresher: *ruach* is one of those Hebrew words that carries a wide range of meaning, and English translators have to make a judgment call each time they render it. Depending on the context, *ruach* can mean wind, breath, air in motion, or the animating principle of life that God gives to a living creature.

The scholars who produced the New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis describe the most basic meaning of

*ruach* as "blowing," "air in motion," and "wind." It is the same word used in Ezekiel 37, the famous vision of the valley of dry bones, where God tells the prophet to call the wind [*ruach*] to breathe [*ruach*] into the slain so that they come to life. Wind and breath and the life-force are all wrapped up in the same word.

Some translations render *ruach* here as "breath" rather than "spirit," and that is actually the more precise choice in this context. Both readings are legitimate. *Ruach* genuinely carries both meanings, and translators have to make a judgment call. But you might wonder: if it just means breath, why does the text say it *returns* to God? Doesn't returning somewhere imply a conscious journey? Not necessarily. The word translated "returns" is the Hebrew verb *shuv* (pronounced "shoov"), meaning to go back to where something came from. Genesis 8:3 uses the same word to describe the floodwaters receding after the flood. The water returned. No one imagines the water was conscious. The verb simply describes something going back to its source. Genesis 2:7 established that God is the source of the breath of life. When that breath returns to Him at death, the text is describing the same kind of thing: something borrowed going back to where it came from.

## The Reversal of Creation

Here is where the verse comes fully into focus. Go back to Genesis 2:7 for a moment. There, God forms Adam from the dust of the ground and breathes the breath of life into him. The Hebrew word for "breath" there is actually *neshamah* (pronounced 'neh-shah-MAH'), a closely related word that, like *ruach*, refers to the breath God contributes to living beings. The result of that divine breath is that Adam becomes a living *nephesh*, a living person. Dust plus breath equals a living soul.

The NET Bible, a translation known for its extensive translator's notes, renders *ruach* (in Ecclesiastes 12:7) as "the life's breath" and adds

a note explaining that "the likely referent is the life's breath that originates with God," pointing the reader back to Genesis 2:7 and several other texts where *ruach* refers to the breath God gives to living creatures.

That origin is exactly what makes the reversal so precise. Now read Ecclesiastes 12:7 as the exact reversal of that picture. The dust returns to the ground it came from. The breath returns to God who gave it.

The living soul comes apart. The body goes back to the earth. The breath goes back to God. What God assembled in creation, death disassembles. Old Testament scholar Roland Murphy, writing in the Word Biblical Commentary series, puts it this way:

> "The process described here is the reversal of Gen 2:7. The end of life is the dissolution (not annihilation; the Israelites never speculated how the 'I' was in Sheol; cf Eccl 9:10). Humans return to the dust (Gen 3:19) whence they came, while the life-breath given by God returns to its original possessor. This is a picture of dissolution, not of immortality, as if there were a *reditus animae ad Deum*, 'the return of the soul to God.' There is no question of the 'soul' here, but of the life-breath, a totally different category of thought."

Let's unpack that. Murphy is saying that Ecclesiastes 12:7 describes the taking apart of a living person, the exact opposite of what God did in Genesis 2:7 when He assembled one. The body returns to dust. The breath returns to God. That is dissolution, the coming undone of what creation put together. Murphy is also careful to say this is not annihilation because the biblical hope rests on God's power to remember, preserve, and restore the dead through resurrection. But neither is this verse picturing a conscious soul making a triumphant journey home to

its Creator. That idea, which Murphy names with the Latin phrase *reditus animae ad Deum*, meaning "the return of the soul to God," is simply not what the text is describing. What returns to God is the breath, and that, Murphy says, is "a totally different category of thought."

Murphy's aside about Sheol is worth noting. The Old Testament does speak of the dead existing in *Sheol*, a shadowy realm of the departed. That is a real biblical concept, and we are not dismissing it. But existing in Sheol in some diminished, unconscious state is a very different claim than the one most people bring to Ecclesiastes 12:7, namely that a conscious soul departs at death and immediately enters God's glorious presence. Ecclesiastes itself draws that line plainly. In chapter 9, the Preacher writes that "the dead know nothing" (9:5) and that "there is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol" (9:10). The Preacher is not describing a bustling afterlife. He is describing the silence of death. That is fully consistent with what 12:7 says: the breath returns to God, and the person waits.

In other words, this verse is not describing a conscious soul making a journey. It is describing the unmaking of a living person. The breath God lent goes back to its source, the way borrowed money returns to its owner.

## Animals Have Ruach Too

There is something else in Ecclesiastes that makes this point impossible to miss. Go back to chapter 3 and read these two verses carefully:

> "For the fates of both men and beasts are the same: As one dies, so dies the other — they all have the same breath [*ruach*]. Man has no advantage over the animals, since everything is futile." (Ecclesiastes 3:19)

> "Who knows if the spirit [*ruach*] of man rises upward and the spirit [*ruach*] of the animal descends into the earth?" (Ecclesiastes 3:21)

Notice something important here. The Preacher says plainly that humans and animals share the same *ruach*. The same word. The same breath. The same life-force.

Now notice something the translators did. In verse 19, they render *ruach* as "breath." In verse 21, which is the very next verse in the same passage discussing the exact same thing, they switch to "spirit." Same Hebrew word, same context, two different English words. That inconsistency is not neutral. It quietly creates the impression that verse 21 is talking about something elevated and uniquely human, when the Preacher's whole point is the opposite. From a purely human vantage point, people and animals die the same way.

If *ruach* in Ecclesiastes refers to an immortal, conscious entity that survives the death of the body and returns to God, then animals have one too. And if you follow that conclusion all the way, you end up with a very strange theology. Most Christians who appeal to Ecclesiastes 12:7 are not prepared to argue that animals possess immortal, conscious souls.

The much simpler and more consistent reading is the one the text actually supports. *Ruach* is the breath of life. It belongs to God. God lends it to every living creature. When the creature dies, it returns to the One who gave it.

## What the Verse Establishes — and What It Does Not

Ecclesiastes 12:7 tells us two things with confidence. First, the body returns to the earth. We all know this to be true. It is visible, undeniable, and universal.

Second, the breath returns to God who gave it. The life-force God contributed does not simply vanish. It returns to its source. God, the giver and owner of life, reclaims what He lent.

What the verse does not tell us is that a conscious, disembodied soul flies back to God and begins a new phase of aware, active existence. That idea is not in the text. It gets imported into the text by readers who already believe it, readers wearing Platonic lenses so familiar they have forgotten the lenses are there.

N.T. Wright, one of the most respected New Testament scholars of our time, has made this observation in his book *Surprised by Hope*. He notes that Christians have been buying their mental furniture from Plato's workshop for so long that they have come to assume what Plato taught is what the Bible teaches. It is not. The two pictures are genuinely different, and the difference matters.

So does Ecclesiastes 12:7 teach the immortality of the soul? No. It teaches something more precise and more honest. It teaches that the breath of life comes from God, belongs to God, and returns to God at death. The "light bulb" goes dark until God gives life again. And it leaves the question of what happens next, the resurrection, to be answered by other passages that speak to exactly that hope. Ecclesiastes 12:7 is not the end of the story. But it is an honest description of what death actually is.

---

*Dave closed his Bible and leaned back in his chair.*

*"I've heard that verse read at funerals," Dave said quietly. "The Bible was right there the whole time. I just couldn't hear it over Plato."*

*Carol didn't say anything right away. She knew how that felt. She had been right there with him, until she asked the question.*

*"Not on purpose," she said finally. "Nobody handed us Plato and told us to believe him. They handed us the Bible and told us to believe it. It's just that somewhere along the way, the two got mixed together, and nobody stopped to sort them out."*

*Dave nodded. "Okay," he said. "What's next?"*

*Carol turned the page. "There's a story about a rich man and a poor man," she said. "And it's going to feel like it proves everything we just said is wrong."*

*Dave picked up his Bible.*

*"Then let's look at it."*

Chapter 6

# The Rich Man and Lazarus — Luke 16:19–31

*Dave set his Bible down on the table and stared at the ceiling.*

*"Okay," he said. "That one I know. The rich man dies and ends up in Hades. He's in torment. He can see Lazarus in Abraham's bosom across the gulf. He asks Abraham to let Lazarus dip his finger in water to cool his tongue. If that's not a conscious soul in the afterlife, what is it?"*

*Carol had been waiting for this one. She had been waiting for it the whole week.*

*"What kind of story is it?" she asked.*

*Dave frowned. "What do you mean?"*

*"I mean, what kind of writing is it? Is it a news report? A parable? A letter? A prophecy?"*

*"It's…" Dave stopped. He had always just assumed he knew. "Jesus tells it. So it's — it's one of His teachings."*

*"Right. But what kind? Because the kind of story it is tells you everything about how to read it. But before we even get*

*there — do you know why Jesus told it? Like, what set it off? Who was in the room?"*

*Dave opened his Bible back to Luke 16. He read for a moment. Then he stopped.*

*"The Pharisees," he said slowly. "They were right there."*

*"And what does Luke say about them?"*

*Dave found verse 14 and read it aloud. " 'The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things and ridiculed Him.' " He looked up. "Huh."*

*"Yeah," Carol said. "Huh."*

---

Few passages in the Bible carry as much weight in conversations about death and the afterlife as this one. Ministers preach it as a tour of the afterlife. Bible teachers hold it up as proof that the dead are conscious, aware, and experiencing either comfort or torment right now. The story feels so vivid and so specific that it seems almost impossible that it could mean anything other than exactly what it appears to say on the surface.

The reason people feel that way is understandable. The image is powerful. A rich man suffers in flames. A poor beggar rests at Abraham's side. A great uncrossable gulf separates them. The rich man calls out across the divide. He is thirsty. He recognizes Lazarus. He remembers his five living brothers. He begs for mercy and receives none.

If you have heard this story your whole life as a window into the afterlife, what we are about to say will take some work to hear fairly. I ask you to do that work. Not because I need you to agree with me, but because the Bible's own consistency is at stake in how we read this

passage. I am going to show you that the traditional interpretation does not just strain the evidence, it breaks it. It sets this one passage against the entire witness of Scripture regarding the state of the dead. And when one passage contradicts dozens of others, something has gone wrong with the interpretation of that one passage. But we are getting ahead of ourselves. Let's start where the story actually starts: with the people Jesus was talking to, and why He was talking to them.

## You Have to Know Who Was in the Room

One of the most common mistakes in reading the Bible is jumping straight to a passage without asking the most basic question: what is the context, who is speaking, and to whom? In Luke 16, Jesus tells the story of the rich man and Lazarus to a specific audience, and Luke does not let us miss it. Verse 14 tells us plainly: "The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all of this and were scoffing at Jesus." There they are. The Pharisees. And Luke specifically identifies them as lovers of money. This is not a small detail. It is the key that unlocks the whole chapter.

To fully grasp why the Pharisees matter so much here, you need to understand something about the world they lived in. The ancient Mediterranean world operated on what scholars call an honor-shame culture, a world where your public reputation was your most valuable possession. In that kind of society, a person's worth was not measured the way Western culture tends to measure by guilt or innocence. It was measured by the amount of public honor the community gave them. Honor was the currency that mattered most, and people competed for it openly.

One of the primary ways to accumulate honor was to accumulate wealth. A rich man was not just comfortable, he was respected. He was someone the community looked up to. And in the religious world of first-century Judaism, that assumption went even deeper. Many people

believed that wealth was a sign of God's approval. If God blessed you with riches, it meant you were righteous. If you were poor, sick, and covered in sores, lying at someone's gate, well, that told its own story.

The Pharisees had swallowed this assumption completely. Their love of money was not simply greed. It was, in their minds, a form of spiritual evidence. They were wealthy. Therefore God favored them. Therefore they were righteous. So when Jesus talked about money and faithfulness and the danger of serving wealth instead of God, they did not take notes. They ridiculed Him. That ridicule is what triggered the story of the rich man and Lazarus.

## The Whole Chapter Is About Money

Before Jesus tells the story of the rich man and Lazarus, He has already been teaching for two full chapters on the same theme. Luke 15 and 16 form a sustained section of teaching built around one question: how do people use and misuse what God has given them?

Look at the lineup. The parable of the lost sheep (Luke 15:3–7): a shepherd risks everything to recover what was lost. The lost coin (Luke 15:8–10): a woman searches her whole house for one coin. The prodigal son (Luke 15:11–32): a young man demands his inheritance, squanders every penny of it, and ends up feeding pigs. The dishonest manager (Luke 16:1–8): a steward wastes his master's resources and scrambles to save himself when his mismanagement comes to light. Then a cluster of sharp sayings about money, faithfulness, and the impossibility of serving both God and wealth (Luke 16:9–13).

Every single one of these stories touches material possessions. This is not random. Luke organized this material deliberately. The thread running through all of it is stewardship: what faithfulness with money looks like, and what unfaithfulness looks like.

So Jesus tells one more story. A rich man who had everything ends up in torment. A poor beggar ends up in the place of honor. The reversal is total and deliberate. It is designed to land on the Pharisees like a hammer, right on their assumption that their wealth was God's endorsement of their righteousness.

Jesus was not teaching about the geography of the afterlife. He was dismantling a specific, dangerous, and very popular theological error. Keep that in front of you as we work through the rest of this chapter. Because everything else we are going to say flows from it.

## A Third Option

Most of us have been taught that this story is one of two things. Either it is a real, historical event involving a real rich man and a real beggar named Lazarus, or it is a parable. A fictional parable, but with accurate afterlife details baked into its framework. In both cases, the conclusion is the same: Jesus is pulling back the curtain on what death is actually like. But both of those options have serious problems, and it is worth slowing down to see why before we introduce a third possibility.

If this is a real, historical event, then we have to accept that Jesus was reporting on an actual person's conscious experience in the afterlife as a matter of fact. That would make this the only time in all four Gospels that Jesus described a specific person's literal experience after death. That is an extraordinary claim. And, as we'll see, it is not just unsupported by the text. It would flatly contradict what both testaments consistently say about the dead. We have noted that dozens of passages describe the dead as being asleep (see the appendix for a list). In addition, the entirety of scripture defines a soul as the whole being; body plus the breath of life. A "soul" does not exist apart from the body. A real event would have to be true. And if it is true, the sleep passages are false and how the rest of the Bible defines the word soul is in error. That

is not a tension we can smooth over. It is a contradiction that breaks the Bible.

So perhaps it is a parable. But here is the problem with that. Jesus used parables to compare something unfamiliar to something familiar. He would say "the kingdom of heaven is like…" and then describe an earthly scene that illuminated a heavenly truth. The earthly picture was the means. The heavenly truth was the point. But in the traditional reading of the rich man and Lazarus, what is the earthly picture and what is the heavenly truth? If the afterlife is the setting of the story, then there is no comparison happening. There is just a description. At that point, the story begins functioning less like a parable and more like a report. If Jesus is simply telling us what the afterlife literally looks like, He is making a factual claim about a real place. That puts us right back where we started: treating this as a historical report.

Some would argue the comparison is between the Pharisees' values and God's values, wealth honored among men versus what God actually honors. And that is exactly right. That is the point Jesus is making. But that point does not require the afterlife details to be literally true. A story can teach a true lesson using a borrowed or fictional setting. Jesus did not need to give us a glimpse of the literal afterlife to say "God sees things differently than you do." The reversal of fortunes is the lesson.

Which means neither category quite fits. The story cannot be a straightforward historical report without contradicting numerous other passages. And it is not quite a parable in the way Jesus's other parables work. Which opens the door to a third possibility that almost no one considers. An analogy from our own culture might make this third option easier to see.

Think about a story that nearly every person in Western culture knows: Saint Peter standing at the pearly gates with a clipboard, deciding who gets into heaven and who doesn't. You have seen it in cartoons.

You have read it in joke books. Everyone knows it is not real. Nobody thinks Peter is actually the gatekeeper at heaven's entrance.

Now imagine that Jesus were beginning His ministry today, in our modern world. Can you picture Him saying, "You know, it's like when a man dies and walks up to the pearly gates and Peter says to him…"? The story would connect instantly. Everyone would recognize it. Jesus could use it to make a powerful point about judgment, or humility, or the gap between how we live and what we think we deserve, without anyone walking away thinking He had just given a theology lecture on Peter's actual job description in eternity or the real floor plan of heaven. That, it seems, is what happened in Luke 16.

## The Story Behind the Story

Jesus probably did not invent the story of the rich man and Lazarus from scratch. He most likely borrowed it. That's quite a claim, so let me offer some evidence. Ancient Jewish culture had a well-known folk story, a morality tale, about a poor Torah scholar and a wealthy tax collector named Bar Maayan. Both men die. The poor scholar was barely mourned at his funeral while the wealthy man received a grand send-off. The poor Torah scholar ends up in a lush garden paradise with fountains of water. The rich tax collector ends up in torment, dying of thirst, next to a river he cannot reach. The full text of this story is in the appendix for those who want to read it. The parallels to Luke 16 are obvious.

New Testament scholar Richard Bauckham, writing in the peer reviewed journal *New Testament Studies*, concluded that there are several Jewish versions of this story and they likely trace back to an even older Egyptian tale about Setme and Si-Osiris. The older Egyptian story also features a rich man and a poor man who experience a complete reversal of fortunes after death. Bauckham says the story appears to predate the

first century. By the time Jesus spoke with the Pharisees in Luke 16, the basic plot was possibly a familiar story.

It is worth knowing that adapting and retelling existing stories was a well-recognized method in the Jewish teaching tradition, one that shows up repeatedly in literature that shares deep roots with the world Jesus inhabited. Menahem Kister, a professor of Talmud at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, documents this practice in the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*. He shows that both the Gospels and rabbinic literature draw on shared, fluid storytelling traditions, and that details in a given story often reflect earlier versions of that tradition. Rabbis regularly reshaped familiar stories to drive home a new point, and the same phenomenon appears throughout Jesus's teaching. This was not considered dishonest or unusual. It was simply how teachers in that tradition worked.

Jesus's audience may well have recognized the story when He started telling it. It resembled the kind of reversal narrative that circulated in their culture. And if they did recognize it, Jesus could use it without endorsing every detail as literal fact, just as we could use the Peter-at-the-gates story today without claiming Peter is there with a clipboard.

But even if the specific folk tale was not universally known, the broader point stands. Jesus regularly used familiar cultural material to make His point. He drew on farming, fishing, weddings, and everyday life. Using a well-known story form to teach a lesson was entirely consistent with how He taught. And as we will see, He did not need to endorse the afterlife details of the borrowed story any more than He endorsed the ethics of the dishonest manager in the parable just before it. The story was a vehicle. The point was what mattered.

Some will object that Jesus would never build a story on a false picture of reality, because He is the Truth and would not let bad theology stand unchallenged. But look at the parable right before this one. Jesus

held up a dishonest manager as an example worth learning from without endorsing his fraud. The story's framework served the lesson. Jesus expected His audience to hear the point, not audit the scaffolding. And the Pharisees standing in that room would not have heard this as a theology lecture about the afterlife to begin with. As the Jewish Encyclopedia notes, they had no developed concept of a disembodied immortal soul. For them, according to the encyclopedia, "man was made for two worlds, the world that now is, and the world to come, where life does not end in death." Their hope was resurrection, not a soul consciously adrift between death and a future body. They would have recognized the folk tale for what it was, and felt the indictment land exactly where Jesus aimed it.

## Was This a Real Event?

Some people feel strongly that the rich man and Lazarus were real, historical people. They point to two features of the text. First, Jesus says "a certain rich man." They consider this phrasing as evidence that Jesus had a specific, real person in mind. Second, He gives the poor man a name, Lazarus, something He does not do in any other parable. Both points deserve a fair hearing, but neither holds up well under scrutiny.

Regarding the phrase "a certain rich man," the examples below come from the King James Version, which means it might read a little differently than your translation. Regardless, the pattern is the same across translations. Luke uses this construction throughout his Gospel to introduce stories that are clearly parables. In Luke 10:30, the Good Samaritan begins: "A *certain man* went down from Jerusalem to Jericho." In Luke 12:16, Luke explicitly tells us Jesus "spake a parable" and then begins it with "the ground of a *certain rich man*." In Luke 13:6, Luke again says Jesus "spake also this parable" and begins it with "a *certain man* had a fig tree." In Luke 14:16, Jesus opens the parable of the great

banquet with "a *certain man* made a great supper." In Luke 15:11, the prodigal son begins with "a *certain man* had two sons." In Luke 20:9, Luke again tells us Jesus "began to speak to the people this parable," and it opens with "a *certain man* planted a vineyard."

That is six parables in Luke alone, all using this exact phrasing. Nobody argues the Good Samaritan was a real traveler, or that the prodigal son was a real person, or that the great banquet was a real dinner party. The phrase is a storytelling device, not a historical marker. It is the ancient equivalent of "once upon a time."

### *What the Name "Lazarus" Tells Us*

Could there be a reason Jesus named a person in His story that does not force us to conclude the person was real? Indeed there is, and the name does double duty.

First, naming the poor man underscores the selfishness of the rich man. The rich man was acquainted with Lazarus *well enough to know his name*. This naming contributes to the story. Despite the fact that the rich man knew Lazarus by name, he did not help him, even though he lay right outside his estate. The rich man's name, on the other hand, is never given. The rich man's name would contribute nothing to Jesus's point. The beggar's name, however, hints at everything that is wrong with the rich man. He knew who was suffering at his gate; *he even knew his name*! He just didn't care enough to help him.

Second, the name "Lazarus" itself may say something about the poor man's condition. Lazarus is the Greek form of the Hebrew name *Eliezer*, meaning "my God helps." Scholar Duane Warden, writing in the *Stone-Campbell Journal*, observes that while many readers take the name as a sign of the poor man's piety, it might just as easily be a statement of his destitution, something on the order of "may God help him." Either

way, the name is not there to identify a real person. It is there to tell us something about both characters in a single word.

So the naming of the poor man is not a sign that he was a real person. It is a storytelling device that does two jobs at once: it hints at the self-centeredness of the rich man, and it tells us something about the poor man's condition. The rich man gets no name because a name would contribute nothing to Jesus's point.

## Pausing to Take Stock

Before we go further, it is worth pausing to gather what we have seen so far, because the argument builds from here and we want to make sure the foundation is clear.

First, Luke 16 is about money and the Pharisees. The entire chapter, indeed two full chapters leading up to this story, is built around the theme of material possessions and what they reveal about us. The Pharisees who loved money ridiculed Jesus, and this story was His response. That context is not background noise. It is the key to everything.

Second, the story bears a strong resemblance to reversal narratives that already existed in Jewish and Egyptian culture before Jesus told His version. That resemblance suggests Jesus most likely adapted a familiar story form rather than inventing the plot from scratch, and that He used it the way teachers in His tradition regularly used such stories: as a vehicle for a point, not as a window into literal reality.

Third, if we read this story as a genuine description of the afterlife, whether as a real event or as a parable with accurate details, it creates contradictions with what the rest of Scripture consistently teaches about the dead and about the nature of the soul. Those three things together are what motivate the question we now need to press: can the traditional reading actually hold together on its own terms?

## The Contradiction the Traditional Reading Cannot Survive

Now we come to the most important argument in this chapter, and I want to be direct about it, because it changes everything. If Jesus was using this story to reveal what actually happens to people after they die, whether as a real historical event or as a parable with accurate theological details woven in, then He was directly contradicting the rest of what the Bible teaches about the dead. This is not a difficult wrinkle that a little careful scholarship can smooth out. This is a head-on collision between one passage and the entire consistent pattern of Scripture.

Go back to what we established in the previous chapters. The Bible describes death as sleep, consistently, repeatedly, across both testaments. Remember, dozens of Old and New Testament passages use sleep language to describe death (see appendix). The dead are presented as people who are not aware of anything.

Ecclesiastes 9:5 says it plainly: "For the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing." Psalm 146:4 says that when a person's spirit departs, "his plans perish," not just his body, but his plans, his thoughts, his ongoing activity. Psalm 115:17 states: "The dead do not praise the LORD, nor do any who go down into silence." The Psalms elsewhere give us the anguished prayers of people who cry out to God while they are still alive, because once they go down to the grave they will no longer be able to declare His works or give Him thanks. Jesus Himself called Lazarus, a different Lazarus, the one He raised from the dead in John 11, "asleep." Paul told the grieving Thessalonians that their loved ones who had died were "asleep," and used the promise of resurrection as his comfort. A strange thing to do if the dead were already consciously at home with the Lord and aware of everything.

This is not a fringe reading of isolated verses. This is the overwhelming, consistent testimony of Scripture from Job to the Epistles. But there is something else the traditional reading contradicts that is just as important. Remember what we established in Chapter 3 about what the Bible actually means by "soul." The Hebrew word is *nephesh*, and it does not refer to a spiritual component that lives inside a person and can detach from the body at death. A *nephesh* is the whole living being. Body and breath together make a soul. Separate them and the soul does not go somewhere else. The body goes back to the dust from which it came, and the breath returns to God who gave it. This is the "unmaking" of a soul.

Remember the light bulb from Chapter 3. The bulb and its filament correspond to the body. The electricity corresponds to the breath of life God supplies. The light they produce together corresponds to the soul, the whole living person. You cannot pull those three things apart and expect the light to keep burning somewhere else. When the power goes out, the light simply stops. It does not travel to another room. The soul works exactly the same way.

Jesus knew this. The Pharisees knew this. Luke knew this. Every one of them had grown up with Hebrew scriptures that defined the human person in those terms. A disembodied soul existing in a conscious afterlife was not the view of the Hebrew Scriptures. And the Pharisees standing in that room were not thinking in those terms either. The Jewish Encyclopedia notes that the Pharisaic belief in resurrection "had not even a name for the immortality of the soul." Their afterlife hope was resurrection, not a soul floating free of the body.

This matters for how we read Luke 16. When Jesus told this story to Pharisees who were steeped in the Hebrew scriptures, they would not have heard it as a description of what the traditional view calls "disembodied souls" having experiences in an intermediate state. That frame-

work was not native to their thinking. What they would have heard was a familiar folk tale being aimed at them with sharp precision. And that is almost certainly what Jesus intended.

Now read Luke 16:19–31 as a literal description of the afterlife. The rich man is wide awake. He is in agony. He is holding a conversation. He has a specific request. He remembers his five brothers by name. He pushes back when Abraham explains why relief cannot come. He is more alert and more verbally capable than most people manage on a good morning.

You cannot have it both ways. Either the dead are sleeping, unaware, and silent, which is what every other passage of Scripture consistently teaches, or this one story is a literal window into conscious, active existence after death that contradicts all of that. And either the soul is the whole living person, which is what the Bible consistently teaches, or this one story requires us to believe in a soul that can detach from the body and go on living independently, which is what Plato taught.

Something has to give. And when one passage is interpreted to contradict dozens of others, the right question to ask is not, "How do we fit all those other passages around this one?" The right question is, "Are we reading this one passage correctly?" The burden of proof falls on the apparent exception, not on the pattern.

## He Has a Tongue

There is still another problem with the traditional reading, and almost nobody mentions it in sermons on this passage. Read Luke 16:24 again carefully. The rich man in torment cries out: "Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am in agony in this fire." He has a tongue. He is thirsty. He wants water. He feels fire. He experiences what the text calls agony.

Now think carefully about what the traditional interpretation requires. The traditional view holds that at death, what it calls the "soul" separates from the body and exists consciously in an intermediate state until the resurrection, at which point soul and body are reunited. If that is true, then at the point in the story where the rich man is speaking, he has no body. His body is in the grave. His brothers are still alive on earth. The resurrection has not happened. He should be, on the traditional view's own terms, entirely without physical form.

So what in this story has a tongue? What feels thirst? What suffers from fire? Tongues are flesh. They belong to bodies. Thirst is a physical experience driven by the body's need for water, felt in the throat, registered by nerve signals, processed by the brain. Fire burns skin and tissue. None of these things have any meaning apart from a physical body. And the traditional view says the body is still in the ground.

Some will respond that Jesus is simply using physical language to describe a spiritual experience we would otherwise have no words for. That is worth acknowledging. But we have already seen why that response does not work. The biblical soul is not a separable component that floats free of the body. There is no disembodied "soul" to have an experience in the first place. The metaphor defense assumes the very thing the Bible denies. It builds on a Greek foundation, not a Hebrew one.

They might also argue that the soul has a spiritual body, pointing to Paul's discussion in 1 Corinthians 15. But Paul is not describing what happens between death and resurrection. He is describing the resurrection body itself, the transformation that takes place when the dead are raised at the last trumpet. That is a different subject entirely, and it does not rescue the traditional reading of this passage.

Folk tales use physical imagery because that is how folk tales work. The Jewish story of Bar Maayan uses the same kind of imagery: thirst,

water, gardens, physical comfort and physical torment. These are narrative conventions that belong to the genre, not theological claims about the mechanics of the afterlife. Jesus borrowed the story and its imagery to make His point. The story was a tool. The Pharisees' love of money and their false assumption that wealth meant righteousness was the point. And a tool does not have to be a window into the afterlife to do its job.

## The Story Is the Tool, The Pharisees Are the Point

Before we sum up, there is one more thing worth naming, because it gets to the heart of why this passage has caused so much confusion. Most readers approach this story and immediately fix their attention on the afterlife details. The flames. The gulf. Abraham's bosom. The conversation across the divide. These are vivid and dramatic, and we are naturally drawn to them. Without realizing it, we treat the afterlife setting as the main event and the actual lesson about wealth as a footnote. We walk away thinking we have learned something about what happens after we die, and we barely register what Jesus was communicating to the people standing in front of Him.

But look at what Jesus emphasizes in the story. The rich man begs Abraham to send Lazarus back from the dead to warn his five brothers. And Abraham's response is the climax of the whole thing: "They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them." And if that were not sharp enough, he adds: "If they do not hear Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone rises from the dead."

That final line is where Jesus puts all His weight. He is not ending on "and this is what the afterlife looks like." He finishes with "you already have Scripture, and you are ignoring it." It is a direct indictment of the Pharisees who are standing right there, claiming to honor the Law while using their wealth as proof of their righteousness. The story ends

not with a revelation about the geography of Hades, but with a charge against people who refuse to hear what God has already said.

If Jesus intended the afterlife details as even a secondary point, you would expect Him to do something with it at the end. He does not. He drops it entirely and drives straight to the indictment. The afterlife setting was never the destination. It was the road that got the Pharisees to see their condition. We are so fascinated by what we think is a glimpse behind the curtain that we miss Jesus's real point.

## The Verdict

Let me put this together as plainly as I can. The traditional interpretation of the rich man and Lazarus requires us to believe that this one story, told in a chapter specifically addressed to money-loving Pharisees, in the middle of a sustained section of teaching entirely about material possessions and stewardship, overrules all the passages that consistently describe the dead as unconscious and unaware. It requires us to ignore what the Bible itself teaches about the soul as a whole person rather than a detachable component. And it requires what it calls a separated "soul" to have a tongue, feel thirst, and suffer from fire, which directly contradicts the traditional view's own claim that the body remains in the grave until the resurrection.

That is not a reading that holds together. And when an interpretation of one passage cannot survive its own internal logic and contradicts the consistent testimony of the rest of Scripture, the right response is not to cling to it because it is familiar. The right response is to ask whether there is a better way to read it.

This story is not a real, historical event. The evidence against that reading is clear. This story is not a parable with accurate afterlife details, either. Because if Jesus intended the afterlife details to be taken as gen-

uine revelation about the state of the dead, He contradicted everything else the Bible says about death.

This story is best explained as an adapted cultural narrative, the first-century equivalent of the pearly-gates imagery, that Jesus repurposed with precision to confront Pharisees who had convinced themselves that their wealth was God's approval of their righteousness. He took a story they probably recognized, set a rich man in torment and shame and a poor beggar in luxury and honor, and turned their entire worldview upside down.

Jesus did not endorse the afterlife framework of the folktale any more than He endorsed the fraudulent business practices of the dishonest manager in the parable just before it. The story was a tool. And the point the tool was making is this: what people exalt, God may consider an abomination (Luke 16:15). Wealth does not mean righteousness. The beggar at your gate has a name, and God knows it. The day of reversal is coming.

That message required no conscious dead to make its point. It did not require a soul capable of existing apart from its body. It required a borrowed story, a room full of money-loving Pharisees, and a Teacher who knew exactly what He was doing. Bauckham himself concluded that the story is not an eyewitness account of what happens after death. It was told to make a point, nothing more.

## Still Relevant

The message Jesus fired at the Pharisees has lost none of its relevance. The prosperity gospel still teaches that wealth is evidence of faith. Churches still fill front rows with donors. The poor are still overlooked and the comfortable still assume God is comfortable with them too. We still justify ourselves before other people rather than before God. Moses

and the Prophets are still speaking. The question is whether anyone is listening.

---

*Dave sat quietly for a long moment.*

*"I've heard that story preached maybe a dozen times," he said finally. "I don't think I ever once heard a single word about the Pharisees being there. Or the money theme running through the whole chapter. It was always just — rich man, poor man, Hades, Abraham's bosom, big lesson about the afterlife."*

*"I know," Carol said.*

*"And the tongue thing." Dave shook his head slowly. "Nobody ever mentions the tongue thing. If this is a disembodied soul, why does it need water on its tongue? A tongue is a body part. And thirst — thirst is physical. You can't be thirsty without a body."*

*"Right. And the metaphor defense doesn't help either. A separable soul that can feel things without a body isn't a biblical idea to begin with. That's Plato, not Moses."*

*"Either way, the traditional reading doesn't hold together." Dave said it flatly. Not angrily. Just the way you say something when you have finished thinking it through.*

*"And then there are all those Bible passages," Carol said. "The dead know nothing. They sleep. Their thoughts perish. One story, told to a room full of money-loving Pharisees, in a chapter entirely about money, is supposed to cancel all of that."*

*"It can't," Dave said. "Whatever this story is doing, it cannot be a literal description of the afterlife. Because if it is, the Bible contradicts itself. And I don't believe the Bible contradicts itself."*

*Carol smiled. "Neither do I."*

*Dave picked up his Bible. "Okay. What's next?"*

*"The thief on the cross," Carol said. "Jesus tells him, 'Today you will be with Me in Paradise.' "*

Chapter 7

# The Thief on the Cross — Luke 23:42–43

*"Jesus is dying on a cross," Dave said. "A man next to Him is dying on a cross. And Jesus looks at this man and says, 'Today you will be with Me in Paradise.' I mean — that's pretty clear, isn't it? Today. This day. Not someday. Today."*

*"Read the whole exchange," Carol said.*

*Dave found the passage and read it aloud. " 'Then he said, "Jesus, remember me when You come into Your kingdom!" And Jesus said to him, "Truly I tell you, today you will be with Me in Paradise." ' "*

*He looked up. "I'm not sure what there is to argue with."*

*Carol was quiet for a moment. "Ask one question," she said. "Before we talk about the thief at all. Ask where Jesus went that day."*

*Dave started to answer. Then he stopped.*

---

The thief on the cross is one of the most beloved scenes in all of Scripture. A dying man, probably a violent criminal, turns to Jesus in his final moments and asks for mercy. And Jesus gives it to him, freely and immediately. It is a picture of grace at its purest. No one wants to argue with that scene.

The grace Jesus extended to that man is real. But the question of what Jesus's exact words meant, and specifically what the word "today" referred to, is a fair one. And it turns out there is more going on in those few words than most people realize.

Let's look at the passage.

> Then he said, "Jesus, remember me when You come into Your kingdom!" And Jesus said to him, "Truly I tell you, today you will be with Me in Paradise." (Luke 23:42–43)

The traditional reading takes this at face value: Jesus promised the thief that on that very day, they would both be together in paradise. The thief would not have to wait for the resurrection. He would enter paradise immediately upon death.

That reading is so familiar that it feels obvious. But before we examine it closely, there is a biblical fact we need to think about. And, it is a fact we have been building toward for the last six chapters.

## What We Already Know

Before we examine this passage closely, we need to bring everything we have already established with us. Whatever Jesus meant by these words, the meaning has to be consistent with what the Bible has already told us. The soul is not a separable entity that can float free of the body at death. It is the whole person. The Bible's consistent message is that death is sleep, not conscious activity. And the rich man and Lazarus, as we saw in the last chapter, is not a window into the afterlife. Those things are

settled. Any reading of Luke 23:43 that requires us to abandon them is not a better reading. It is just a more familiar one. With that foundation in place, let us look at what Jesus actually said.

## Where Did Jesus Go That Day?

F. LaGard Smith, in his book *Afterlife: A Glimpse of Eternity Beyond Death's Door*, puts his finger on the most important question in this whole discussion: the crucial issue is not whether the thief went to paradise that day, but whether Jesus did.

Think about that for a moment. If we accept the traditional reading, then wherever Jesus went, the thief went too. They were going together. So the question becomes: did Jesus go to paradise, meaning heaven, on the day He died?

Jesus Himself answered that question three days later. After the resurrection, when Mary Magdalene found Him outside the empty tomb and reached out to grab hold of Him, Jesus said this:

> "Do not cling to Me," Jesus said, "for I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go and tell My brothers, 'I am ascending to My Father and your Father, to My God and your God.' " (John 20:17)

Read that carefully. On Sunday morning, three days after He died, Jesus told Mary that He had not yet ascended to the Father. He had not yet gone back to heaven. If Jesus had not ascended to the Father by Sunday morning, He certainly had not done so on the day He died. And if Jesus did not go to paradise that day, then the traditional reading of Luke 23:43 has a problem it cannot get around. It requires us to believe that Jesus promised the thief something that Jesus Himself later said had not happened.

John 20:17 does not bend. Jesus's own words establish the boundary. Whatever He meant when He spoke to the thief on the cross, He did not mean that they would both be in heaven before sunset that day. This is not an argument from an obscure corner of Scripture. It is Jesus speaking in plain language, and we either take Him at His word or we do not.

Philosopher Peter van Inwagen posed a question worth thinking about: "If, between one's death and one's resurrection, one exists as a disembodied Platonic soul, why does Paul repeatedly refer to death as a sleep?" It is a fair question. And now we can add another: if Jesus went directly to paradise the moment He died, why did He tell Mary three days later that He had not yet gone to the Father?

## Is Paradise and Heaven the Same Place?

Before we go further, we need to answer a question some readers will already be asking: is paradise the same thing as heaven? Maybe Jesus went somewhere other than the Father's presence, and that is where the thief went too. It is a fair question, and the Bible answers it clearly.

The Greek word for paradise, *paradeisos* (pronounced "par-AH-day-sos"), appears only three times in the entire New Testament: here in Luke 23:43, in 2 Corinthians 12:4, and in Revelation 2:7. The same word appears in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, in Genesis 2:8 for the Garden of Eden, a place defined by the direct presence and fellowship of God.

In 2 Corinthians 12, Paul describes being "caught up to the third heaven" and then immediately calls that same place "paradise." The two terms point to the same location: the dwelling place of God. Revelation 2:7 confirms this when Jesus promises the faithful that they will eat from "the tree of life, which is in the paradise of God," an image rooted in God's direct presence. So, the evidence leads us to conclude that

paradise is indeed heaven. They are two different words for the same place.

Paradise is not a waiting room. Paradise is not a middle stop in Hades on the way to something else. Paradise is where God is. It is heaven. And John 20:17 tells us, from Jesus's own mouth, that He had not yet arrived there three days after He died. So if paradise is heaven, and Jesus had not yet gone to heaven, something about the traditional reading does not add up. That is exactly what the next two arguments help us work through.

## The Comma Problem

Now we come to something that might genuinely surprise you: the comma in Luke 23:43 was not in the original text. There were no commas anywhere in the original New Testament. Biblical scholar William Mounce explains in his widely used textbook *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar* that the original Greek New Testament was written in all capital letters with no punctuation, no spaces between words, and no accent marks. Every comma, period, and question mark you see in your Bible was placed there by translators. Punctuation is not inspired. It is an interpretation.

This matters enormously in Luke 23:43, because one small comma changes the entire meaning of what Jesus said. The traditional translation reads: "Truly I tell you, today you will be with Me in Paradise." But there is another grammatically valid way to read the same Greek sentence: "Truly I tell you today, you will be with Me in Paradise."

Notice the difference. Move the comma from before "today" to after it, and "today" no longer tells us when they would arrive in paradise. Instead, it emphasizes the moment Jesus makes the promise. He is saying, *right now, on this day, I make you this guarantee.*

Think about how people talk when they are making a forceful point. An angry parent might say to a teenager, "I'm telling you right now, you are going to regret that decision." Nobody hears that sentence and thinks the regret will arrive at exactly that moment. "Right now" is not telling you when the regret comes. It is stamping the moment of speaking. It is saying, *in this moment, I am making you this promise.* Move the comma in Luke 23:43, and "today" works exactly the same way. Jesus is not telling the thief when paradise will arrive. He is saying, *here and now, on this day, I make you this promise.*

That same emphasis shows up in the Old Testament. In Deuteronomy, Moses says 'I am commanding you today' repeatedly (Deuteronomy 6:6, 27:4, 30:16), not because the commands would expire at midnight, but because he is emphasizing the weight and immediacy of the moment.

Scholars disagree on which reading is correct. E.W. Bullinger, in his thorough reference work *A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament*, argued that the grammar of the Greek text supports moving the comma. Dr. Joseph Hong, who studied this passage specifically in an article published in *The Bible Translator*, concluded that the traditional placement is probably correct, while conceding he could not be certain. Thomas Farrar conducted a detailed statistical analysis of similar sentence patterns throughout Luke and Acts. His analysis favored the traditional placement, but he also acknowledged the same uncertainty as Hong.

Here is what matters most: both Hong and Farrar openly admitted they could not settle the question with certainty. And Farrar specifically wrote that Bible translations should footnote the alternate reading, and that scholars should treat it as a defensible position and not dismiss it.

The majority of English translations go with the traditional comma placement. But the majority is not always right. The comma is not

original. It was placed there by translators doing their best. And when respected scholars who favor the traditional reading still acknowledge the question is genuinely open, that should give us pause before we use this verse to overturn everything else the Bible consistently says about death.

## A Word from the Cross

Here is what is easy to miss when we get absorbed in commas and definitions: two men are dying. Picture the scene again, but slowly this time. Two men are dying. Both are nailed to crosses. Both are in the kind of pain that makes it hard to form a coherent thought. The hours are grinding by. The crowd below is not kind.

In the middle of all of that, the thief turns his head toward Jesus and makes what is, given the circumstances, a humble request. He does not ask to be rescued. He does not ask to be taken down from the cross. He does not even ask to go to heaven. He asks this: "Jesus, remember me when You come into Your kingdom." Someday. Whenever that is. Just remember me. He was asking for a future mercy. And Jesus gave him something far better. "Truly I tell you today, you will be with Me in Paradise."

He was a man in agony, speaking to a man in agony, and He was doing what Jesus always did: meeting the person exactly where they were. What that dying man needed was not a precise theological lecture about the nature and timing of the afterlife. He needed someone to tell him that everything was going to be all right. And Jesus did. Jesus offered assurance, not a theology lesson.

This is not a weak argument. It does not require any grammatical gymnastics. It simply takes seriously the human reality of what was happening on that cross and recognizes that the most comforting and honest thing Jesus could say was exactly what He said.

## The Stool Still Stands

Let's put all three legs of this stool together. First, Jesus's own words in John 20:17 establish plainly that He had not ascended to the Father three days after He died. If Jesus did not go to paradise that day, neither did the thief. Whatever He promised the thief, it was not fulfilled before sunset on the day He died. This is the strongest piece of evidence we have, and it comes directly from Jesus.

Second, the comma in Luke 23:43 is not original. Respected scholars who favor the traditional placement still acknowledge they cannot be certain. Moving the comma to after "today" produces a reading that is grammatically sound, consistent with how the word is used elsewhere in Scripture, and should not be dismissed.

Third, in that terrible moment on the cross, Jesus offered a dying man comfort and assurance. The promise was real and it was good, better than anything the thief had asked for. But Jesus was speaking pastorally, not analytically. From the thief's perspective, the fulfillment would feel immediate. Death is sleep, and those who sleep do not perceive the passage of time. He would simply wake to what Jesus had promised him.

These arguments are not mutually exclusive. In fact, I affirm that that all three are simultaneously true. All three of these readings are consistent with everything the Bible teaches about the nature of the soul, the reality of death as sleep, and the resurrection as the great waking.

The traditional reading cannot say the same. It requires Jesus to contradict Himself. On the cross He said the thief would be with Him in paradise that very day. Three days later He told Mary He had not yet gone there. Those two statements, under the traditional reading, cannot both be true. And we do not get to decide which one to believe. We have to find a reading that honors both.

The thief's story is not diminished by any of this. The grace Jesus showed him is no less extraordinary. The promise is no less certain. He asked to be remembered in a distant kingdom, and Jesus gave him paradise. That is still one of the most beautiful exchanges in all of Scripture. We are just reading it the way the whole Bible asks us to.

---

*Dave sat with his Bible open in his lap for a long time.*

*"John 20:17," he said finally.*

*"Yeah," Carol said.*

*"That's not ambiguous. Jesus is talking. He's telling Mary He hasn't gone to the Father yet. And this is Sunday morning." He shook his head slowly. "If that verse is in the Bible, then Luke 23:43 cannot mean what I always thought it meant. It just can't."*

*"Not unless Jesus contradicted Himself," Carol said. "And I don't believe that."*

*"Neither do I." Dave exhaled. "This doesn't make the moment on the cross less meaningful. The thief asked to be remembered, and Jesus gave him heaven. That's still extraordinary."*

*"It is," Carol said. "We're not taking anything away from the thief. We're just reading the whole Bible."*

*Dave nodded. He picked up his coffee, which had long since gone cold.*

Chapter 8

# Fear Him — Matthew 10:28

*Dave set his coffee down.*

*"Okay," he said. "I'll grant you John 20:17. I'll grant you the comma. But this one I cannot get around. Matthew 10:28. Jesus literally says 'body' and He literally says 'soul.' Two different words. Two different things. That's not the church fathers. That's Jesus."*

*Carol nodded. "Read it to me."*

*Dave found it. " 'Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Instead, fear the One who can destroy both soul and body in hell.' "*

*Carol leaned back. "What is Jesus contrasting in that verse?"*

*Dave thought for a moment. "What men can do versus what God can do."*

*"Right. So what is Jesus actually doing here?"*

*"He's telling them where to direct their fear."*

*"Exactly," Carol said. "He's not giving a lecture on how human beings are put together. He's telling twelve men who*

*are about to walk into serious danger that human power has limits and God's doesn't. That's not an anthropology lesson. That's a caring word to people risking execution." She paused. "So why do we keep reading it as a statement about the immortal soul?"*

*Dave looked back down at the verse.*

---

Matthew 10:28 might be the verse people reach for most quickly in these conversations. That is because, on the surface, the verse seems to vindicate the traditional interpretation. Carol's question to Dave wasn't a trick. It was an invitation to read carefully. And what careful reading reveals is that the traditional view asks more of this verse than the verse actually delivers.

The traditional interpretation of this verse requires almost nothing of the Bible student. Jesus says "body" and He says "soul," so body and soul must be two different things. Done. No cross-referencing required, no asking what the words meant to a first century Jewish audience, no examining the grammar. Just read the English and let familiar categories do the rest. That kind of reading feels natural because those categories have been sitting in our minds our entire lives, courtesy of a tradition that absorbed more from Greek culture than it realized. Reading the verse carefully, on the other hand, requires something more: looking at what *psuche* actually means, noticing what the grammar does and does not signal, and letting the Bible define its own terms rather than importing definitions from outside. That is a higher standard of reading and it is the standard the text deserves.

We have really only two choices when we come to Matthew 10:28. We can let Scripture interpret Scripture, or we can continue to march with the church fathers on this topic. The latter is what most people do,

but to paraphrase Edward Fudge, they do not realize that it is Plato who is leading the parade. To understand what Jesus said, we have to set aside the categories Greek culture handed us and approach the passage with only the Bible as our guide.

## The Setting: A Dangerous Assignment

Matthew 10 opens with Jesus sending His twelve disciples out to preach the good news. It was not going to be a safe assignment. Jesus was honest with them about that. He told them they would face opposition and persecution. He warned them that people would hand them over to councils, have them flogged, drag them before governors and kings. Families would be divided. They might be killed.

And then, right in the middle of this difficult charge, Jesus paused to encourage them. Starting in verse 26, He told them not to be afraid. He gave them several reasons. One of those reasons is our verse:

> Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Instead, fear the One who can destroy both soul and body in hell. (Matthew 10:28)

He was drawing a contrast between two kinds of power: human power and divine power. The worst a human persecutor could do was kill the disciples' bodies. That was a temporary harm. God, on the other hand, has the authority and power to carry out a final, irreversible judgment. The disciples should fear God's judgment far more than any human threat. Human death is not the end of the story. But divine judgment is.

## What You Bring to the Verse

Of all the verses in the Bible, this one is the most likely to look like a proof text for the traditional view, but only if you approach it through

the lens of Greek philosophy. Bring Plato's definition of the soul to the text and the verse will seem to confirm the traditional interpretation. Set that definition aside and let Scripture define its own terms, and the verse tells a very different story.

The Bible consistently teaches that *psuche* never means an immortal spirit separate from the body. Across the New Testament it is translated as living being, creature, person, human being, and above all, life. In fact, a survey of the Greek New Testament shows that translators render *psuche* as "life" in almost forty percent of its occurrences. That is not a minor translation choice. Your *psuche* is not something hidden inside you. It is you. It is the life God gave you and sustains.

You cannot build a doctrine of the immortal separable soul on one verse and ignore everything else the Bible says. Scripture has to interpret Scripture. One passage cannot be read in a way that contradicts all the rest, and all the rest points in one direction. So as we work through what Jesus said here, we will let the rest of Scripture set the boundaries for what it can mean. And as we do, we will find that the verse actually says something quite different from what the traditional view needs it to say. To put it plainly, we cannot correctly understand what Jesus said in Matthew 10:28 without a scriptural definition of the word "soul."

## What Jesus Did Not Say

Before we look at what Jesus did say, it is worth pausing over what He did *not* say. The traditional view points to this verse specifically as proof of these claims. But Jesus did not say the soul is immortal. He did not say it is indestructible. He did not say it survives the destruction of the body. In fact, He said exactly the opposite: God can destroy it. That is not a small detail to brush past. It cuts straight to the heart of the question this chapter is asking.

## What Jesus Was Really Saying

We have established that *psuche* means life. Now let's see what the most authoritative scholarship says about this specific verse. The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament addresses *psuche* in Matthew 10:28 directly, and its conclusion is striking. The dictionary describes *psuche* here as "the true life of man as it is lived before God and in fellowship with God." The dictionary is affirming that in this verse, the emphasis is upon "life," while also noting that the term carries the idea of relationship with God. In addition, it also states that "the reference to God's power to destroy the *psuche* and *soma* [body] in Hades is opposed to the idea of the immortality of the soul." This is not a fringe opinion. It comes from one of the most authoritative reference works in all of biblical scholarship.

That reading is not unusual. As noted above, many modern translations render *psuche* as "life" rather than "soul" in passages like Matthew 16:25 and John 12:25, because the context demands it. If *psuche* means "life" here rather than "immortal soul," the whole traditional reading of this verse rests on a foundation the text itself does not provide. With that in mind, read the verse again with the word "life" in place of "soul":

> Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot end your life. Instead, fear the One who can destroy both your life and body in hell.

That is not a linguistic trick. It is simply what the Greek word means in context, and several modern translations make exactly that word choice in other New Testament passages.

With that understanding, the verse becomes straightforward. Men can kill the body but cannot *permanently* take the life God gives, because God will raise the dead. God, on the other hand, can destroy both

the body and that life completely and finally. Jesus is not contrasting two separate parts of a person. He is contrasting two different outcomes: temporary death at human hands versus permanent and complete destruction at God's hand. The first sentence is not a statement about the soul's nature. It is a statement about the limits of human power over the life God controls.

## What About Destruction?

The word Jesus chose when He described what God can do is worth examining carefully. Jesus emphasizes that men can kill the body, but that death is only temporary, because God will raise the dead. They cannot kill the *psuche*, the life God gives. That contrast between temporary and permanent is what the first sentence is built on.

Jesus then carried that same contrast into the second sentence with the word "destroy." The Greek word is *apollumi* (ah-POL-oo-mee), and its meaning ranges from "lost" or "ruined" to complete annihilation. In Luke 15, the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son are all described with this same word. But in every one of those cases, the lostness is temporary and reversible. The whole point of each parable is that what was *apollumi* gets found and restored. As always, context determines which sense of the word applies in any given passage.

At the other end of the range, consider Matthew 2:13, where the angel warns Joseph to flee to Egypt because Herod is about to search for the child "to destroy Him." The word is *apollumi*. Herod's intent was not to ruin Jesus or render Him miserable. He wanted to eliminate Him entirely. That is *apollumi* at its strongest and most unambiguous. And that stronger sense is exactly what the context of Matthew 10:28 calls for, because Jesus is not describing a temporary condition. He is describing a final and irreversible judgment from which nothing returns.

In this context, *apollumi* clearly points toward complete and permanent destruction of the whole person.

If God can *apollumi* the soul, the soul is not indestructible by nature. That is the point. A soul that can be permanently destroyed is not an immortal soul. The verse that the traditional view most often cites to prove the soul's immortality explicitly states that God can destroy it.

This means the verse cannot communicate what the traditional view requires of it. It does not teach that the soul and body are two separate, independently existing things. The verse draws a contrast between what men can do and what God can do, between a death that is temporary and a death that is permanent and final. Matthew 10:28 points us toward the seriousness of God's judgment and our complete dependence on Him for life itself.

But a careful reader might still wonder: if "soul" doesn't refer to a separate immortal substance, why did Jesus separate it from "body" in the first sentence and then rejoin them in the second? Think about a doctor whom a vindictive hospital administrator wants to fire. The hospital administrator can terminate her employment, but he cannot take away her medical license. He can take away her job at that hospital, but her career as a doctor remains intact. The licensing board, however, has the authority to do both. It can strip her of her medical license and end everything she has worked for, permanently and with no appeal.

In that scenario, people understand immediately that the point is about power and reach. Who can touch what, and how far does their authority extend? That is exactly what Jesus is doing in Matthew 10:28. He is emphasizing the contrast between limited human authority and complete divine authority. The hospital administrator has partial reach. The licensing board has total reach. Men have partial reach over a person's existence. God has total reach. Jesus was making a point about authority, and that is the point the analogy illustrates.

## Only God Gives Immortality

Human beings are not naturally immortal. We are mortal. We die. We are entirely dependent on God for continued existence. The Bible never says we are born with immortal souls. It says the opposite. Only God possesses immortality as His own nature (1 Timothy 6:16). For us, immortality is a gift, something God grants, not something we automatically have. And according to the biblical testimony, that gift belongs to those who are in Christ. At the resurrection, the faithful will receive imperishable bodies and the gift of eternal life. Those outside of Christ will not receive that gift.

## The Bigger Picture

Step back and look at the whole verse one more time in the light of everything the Bible has shown us. The biblical narrative describes death as sleep. It describes the resurrection as the great waking. The soul, biblically understood, is the whole person. The dead are not conscious and active somewhere else. They are waiting, like someone asleep, for the morning of the resurrection.

Matthew 10:28 fits perfectly into that picture. Men can kill the body. But the *psuche*, the life God intends to restore in the resurrection, is beyond their reach. They can end your life. They cannot prevent your resurrection. They cannot touch your eternal destiny.

God, on the other hand, holds all of that in His hands. That is what makes His judgment final in a way that human violence simply is not. Men kill the body and it is a temporary death. God's final judgment, for those who face it apart from Christ, is a permanent and irreversible destruction of the whole person.

Edward Fudge, in *The Fire That Consumes*, summarizes Matthew 10:28 as well as anyone has:

> "Man's power to kill stops with the body and the horizons of the present age. The death that humans inflict is not final, for God will call forth the dead from the earth and give the righteous immortality. By contrast, God's ability to kill and destroy is limitless. It reaches deeper than the physical and extends beyond the present. God can kill both soul and body, both now and hereafter."

That is the verse. Not a proof of an immortal, separable soul. A contrast between human limits and divine authority. A call to put your ultimate fear in the right place. And underneath it all, a quiet but powerful reminder that the life we have is not ours by nature, that immortality belongs to God and is offered through Christ, and that God's judgment is more final and more serious than anything human beings can do to one another.

---

*They sat quietly for a moment, letting it settle.*

*Dave picked up his Bible again and reread the opening of Matthew 10. "I keep thinking about those twelve men," he said. "Jesus was literally sending them out knowing some of them would eventually be handed over, beaten, killed. James was beheaded. Peter was crucified upside down. And this is what He said to comfort them."*

*"Don't be afraid of that," Carol said quietly.*

*"Right. Which is an extraordinary thing to say to someone walking toward their own death." Dave set the Bible down. "And here is what strikes me. If the traditional view is right, the comfort Jesus was offering is basically: don't worry,*

*your soul is immortal. Men can only get to your body. Your soul just keeps going automatically, no matter what they do to you."*

*Carol thought for a moment. "Now, to be fair, the traditional view would say God is still in the picture. He's the one who created the soul that way."*

*"True," Dave said. "But notice what the comfort then rests on. It rests on a property the soul possesses, something built into it at its creation. It's indestructible by nature. It doesn't need God to preserve it or restore it. From that point on it survives with no help from anyone."*

*Carol nodded slowly. "Jesus wasn't saying don't be afraid because you're indestructible. He was saying don't be afraid because God doesn't lose people."*

*Dave looked at her. "That's personal. That's relational. That's not a soul that survives by default due to its own immortality. That's a God who holds onto the people who are His."*

*"And that's still true," Carol said. "For anyone who has ever paid a real price for following Jesus. Anywhere in the world. Right now."*

*Dave was quiet for a moment. "Don't fear what men can do to your body. Fear God, who holds your life. All of it. Permanently." He closed his Bible. "That's not just a warning. That's a promise."*

Chapter 9

# Tents and Buildings — 2 Corinthians 5:1-8

*They had been at it for two hours. The coffee was cold, the table was covered in sticky notes, and neither of them showed any sign of stopping.*

*Carol opened her Bible to 2 Corinthians 5 and slid it toward Dave. "Okay. This is the one the minister loves. He preached a whole sermon on it last spring. Tent equals your body. You die, your soul leaves the tent. Then at the resurrection you get a permanent home instead of a temporary one. Building from God."*

*Dave read the passage slowly. "That's how I've always understood it too. It seemed so obvious."*

*"It did," Carol said. "Until I started paying attention to how Paul talks about death everywhere else he writes. He always comes back to resurrection. Always. So why would he suddenly switch here and start talking about a soul going up to heaven the moment you die?"*

*Dave set his pen down. "What if he isn't switching?"*

*Carol tapped the page. "That's exactly what I want to find out."*

---

Read through a traditional lens, 2 Corinthians 5:1-8 seems to say the body is a temporary tent, death is the moment your soul steps out of it, and the Lord is waiting on the other side. That reading feels so natural it barely needs defending. But we have been asking the same question throughout this book: does the text actually say that, or have we been reading our assumptions in without realizing it? When we slow down and let Paul say what he actually says, a very different picture comes into focus.

Here is my argument in brief, before we dig into the details. The traditional reading of this passage requires three things Paul never says: that "naked" means dead and disembodied, that "at home in the body" describes a soul living inside a body, and that there is an intermediate state between death and resurrection. Every one of those ideas gets imported into the text from outside. Paul himself supplies none of them. In fact, as we will see, Paul's own words rule them out one by one.

## What Does "Naked" Mean?

Let's start with the passage itself.

> Now we know that if the earthly tent we live in is dismantled, we have a building from God, an eternal house in heaven, not built by human hands. For in this tent we groan, longing to be clothed with our heavenly dwelling, because when we are clothed, we will not be found naked. So while we are in this tent, we groan under our burdens, because we do not wish to be unclothed but clothed, so that our mortality may be swallowed up by life. (2 Corinthians 5:1-4)

Two things are clear right away. The "earthly tent" is our current physical body. The "building from God" is the glorified resurrection body we will one day receive. On those two points, almost everyone agrees. The disagreement starts with the word "naked" in verse 3. And everything hinges on what Paul means by it.

### *The Traditional Reading Gets Ahead of Paul*

The traditional reading assumes that "naked" means dead. In that picture, you are a soul living inside a body like a person inside a tent. When you die, your soul steps out of the tent and exists in a bare, unclothed state until the resurrection gives it a permanent home. The nakedness describes your soul between death and resurrection, floating free of its body and waiting.

Notice, though, what Paul does not say. He does not use the word "death" anywhere in verses 1-4. He does not use the word "soul." He says nothing about any state between death and resurrection. We project all of those ideas *into* text. Paul does not supply them. So if "naked" does not mean "dead and without a body," what does it mean? The best place to look is Paul's own writing.

### *Let Paul Explain Paul*

In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul writes about the resurrection using a seed as a metaphor for how our bodies will be transformed.

> And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. (1 Corinthians 15:37 KJV)

The Greek word Paul uses for "bare" here is *gumnos* (pronounced "GOOM-nos"), the ordinary Greek word for naked or bare. Now look at 2 Corinthians 5:3:

> because when we are clothed, we will not be found naked [*gumnos*].

It is the same word. Paul connects these two passages himself, whether we notice the connection or not. Both passages are describing the same event.

In 1 Corinthians 15, the seed is "naked" (bare) before it becomes what it is meant to be. The seed goes into the ground in its incomplete, unfinished form. What comes out is something glorious by comparison. Crucially, the seed is not naked because it has shed something. It is naked because it has not yet become what it will be. The nakedness describes the seed's current state of incompleteness.

That is exactly how Paul uses "naked" in 2 Corinthians 5. We are the bare seed. We are not naked because we have lost something at death. We are naked because we have not yet received what is coming. Paul is describing our present existence on this earth, in this tent, not some stripped-down state after we die.

Read verse 3 again with that in mind: "when we are clothed, we will not be found naked." Paul is saying that when we receive our resurrection bodies, the incompleteness of our current life will finally be over. Right now, we are the bare kernel. The glory is still coming.

Some readers will push back here. They will say the bare kernel represents the soul, and the outer shell is the body that gets left behind at death. The soul survives and eventually receives its new resurrection body the way a seed becomes a plant.

But there is a practical problem with that picture before we even reach the theology. Farmers do not peel husks or separate inner kernels

before planting. The seed goes into the ground whole. Nothing gets separated out first. Paul says nothing about one part of the seed surviving while another part dies. He simply says the seed dies, and God gives it a new body. If Paul intended the kernel to represent a surviving soul, he picked a remarkably poor illustration. Nothing in farming works that way. The transformation is entirely God's work, not the natural continuation of some immortal inner core.

This also runs against everything the Bible teaches about the soul. As we established in Chapter 3, Scripture does not present the soul and body as two separate things that can be peeled apart. You are not a soul trapped inside a body. You are a soul, a whole living person. The idea of a soul waiting to be re-clothed assumes the very body-soul split that the Bible consistently refuses to make.

### *We Groan Because We Are Incomplete*

This reframes what Paul says in verse 4 as well.

> For while we are in this tent, we groan and are burdened, because we do not wish to be unclothed but clothed, so that our mortality may be swallowed up by life. (2 Corinthians 5:4)

When Paul says "we do not wish to be unclothed," he is not describing a dread of death. He is describing something all of us feel right now, while we are alive. We groan. We are burdened. This life, as good as it can be, is incomplete. Our bodies age. They get sick. They wear out. We live in a shabby temporary tent, not a glorious permanent building. We feel the distance between what we are and what we are meant to become. Paul is describing that ache.

New Testament scholar Larry J. Waters puts it plainly in a 2012 peer reviewed journal article: "This present life is compared to nakedness,

humiliation, and weakness." Not because we are souls trapped in bodies, but because our current physical existence is incomplete compared to what is coming.

We do not want to stay in this bare-seed existence. We want to be clothed with what God has prepared. We want our mortality swallowed up by life. That is not a description of someone who has died and is waiting for a new body. That is a description of us, right now, groaning and hoping.

## The Greek Word That Seals It

One more detail from Paul's Greek clinches this reading. In verse 2, Paul says we are "longing to be clothed with our heavenly dwelling." The Greek word he uses for "clothed" is *ependuomai* (pronounced "ep-en-DOO-oh-my". This is not the ordinary word for putting on a garment. It specifically means to put one garment on over another that is already there, like pulling a coat on over your clothes. BDAG, the standard Greek-English lexicon scholars use for the New Testament, defines *ependuomai* exactly that way: putting something on over something already there.

That definition creates an insurmountable problem for the traditional reading. If the soul is naked, stripped bare of its body at death, there is nothing for the resurrection body to go over. A completely naked "soul" has no underlayer. But *ependuomai* requires one. By definition, it means layering one garment on top of another. The word Paul chose rules out the picture the traditional reading requires.

That single word rules out the idea of a soul escaping a body and becoming something completely different. Paul is describing transformation, not escape. God wraps what we are now in what we will become. Ralph P. Martin, writing in the Word Biblical Commentary, notes that Paul pictures the heavenly garment going on over the earthly one rather

than replacing it. John Gillman, in a *Journal of Biblical Literature* article, connects this directly to 1 Corinthians 15:53, where Paul says mortality will put on immortality. Both passages point the same direction. The resurrection is not an escape from the body. It is the body's completion.

## What Paul Has Not Said

Before we move to verses 6-8, it is worth being clear about what Paul has not said in verses 1-4. He has not said that death releases the soul from the body. He has not described any three-stage journey from earthly body to naked soul to resurrection body. None of those ideas appear in the text. We project these ideas onto the text because of the Greek philosophical framework that sees the body as a container for the real self, a soul better off without it.

Paul's actual argument is simpler and more hopeful than that. We are presently the bare seed, naked and groaning in a shabby tent, waiting for the resurrection that will clothe us with everything God has prepared. The nakedness is ours right now. The clothing is coming.

---

*Dave leaned back and stared at the ceiling for a moment.*

*"Okay," he said finally. "That actually makes sense. The seed thing especially. I've read 1 Corinthians 15 a hundred times and never connected it to this passage. Same word, same idea."*

*"Neither did I," Carol said. "Not until I started digging." She paused. "But here's the problem."*

*Dave looked at her.*

*"Verses six through eight." Carol found the place and read aloud. " 'While we are at home in the body, we are away from the Lord… We are confident, then, and would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord.' " She set the Bible down. "Away from the body. At home with the Lord. That sounds pretty clear."*

*"It does," Dave said slowly. "It sounds like the moment you leave your body, you are with the Lord. Which is exactly what the traditional view teaches."*

*"I know." Carol chewed her lip. "So either everything we just figured out about verses one through four is wrong, or this phrase means something different from what it sounds like."*

*Dave picked up his pen. "Let's find out."*

---

## At Home, Away, and What Paul Actually Means

When people quote 2 Corinthians 5 in a discussion about death, this is usually the part they have in mind:

> And God has prepared us for this very purpose and has given us the Spirit as a pledge of what is to come. Therefore we are always confident, although we know that while we are at home in the body, we are away from the Lord. For we walk by faith, not by sight. We are confident, then, and would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord. (2 Corinthians 5:5-8)

Read quickly, this passage seems to settle the question. You are at home in your body. The Lord is somewhere else. When you die and

leave your body, you arrive with the Lord. The transition is immediate. Death is the door and the Lord is on the other side.

That reading is so ingrained in Christian culture that it shows up on sympathy cards, funeral programs, and church marquee signs. "Absent from the body, present with the Lord." We say it at gravesides. We find it comforting. But the question, as always, is whether that is actually what Paul is saying, or whether we are supplying a meaning the text does not require. Two things bring the whole passage into sharp focus: an idiom, and a missing third state.

## "At Home in the Body" Is an Idiom

The NET Bible, known for its detailed translation notes, renders verse 6 this way:

> Therefore we are always full of courage, and we know that as long as we are alive here on earth we are absent from the Lord. (2 Corinthians 5:6 NET)

Notice that phrase: "as long as we are alive here on earth." The NET translators did not add those words to pad the verse. Their own note explains the decision: "at home in the body" is an idiom. An idiom is a common expression whose meaning differs from what its words literally say, the way "kick the bucket" does not actually involve a bucket. The NET translators recognized that the Greek expression meant being alive and translated it that way. Their footnote cites Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida, two of the twentieth century's most respected scholars of New Testament Greek. Louw and Nida's observation is that "at home in the body" meant "to be alive," with particular emphasis on physical existence on earth. It did not describe a soul living inside a physical body. It was simply how a Greek speaker expressed being "alive."

If "at home in the body" simply means being alive, its opposite is unavoidable. "Away from the body" does not mean a soul has floated free of its shell. It means the person is dead. The idiom defines both sides of the contrast at once. Paul is not describing a soul in transit between body and heaven. He is describing a living person and a dead person. The bottom line is that Paul's words are not expressing the notion that we are a soul living inside a body. This is just a way he talks about being alive.

## Paul Only Gives Two States, Not Three

The traditional reading of this passage requires three states: you are alive in your body, then you die and your soul exists consciously without a body in God's presence, and finally at the resurrection you receive your glorified body.

But Paul only describes two states across the entire passage, from verse 1 through verse 8. In the first half, he contrasts our current earthly body with the glorified resurrection body to come. In the second half, he contrasts being alive on earth with being at home with the Lord. Two states. That is it. Paul never describes a conscious, bodiless intermediate state.

### *What Paul Is Actually Contrasting*

With the idiom in view and the absence of any intermediate state noted, the passage reads differently. Paul is not laying out a sequence of events that happens after you die. *He is contrasting two modes of existence*: our current incomplete earthly life and our future life with the Lord in glorified resurrection bodies. The first mode is temporary and groaning. The second is the goal.

This is the same longing he described in the first half of the chapter. We groan in this tent. We long to be clothed. We ache for what is com-

ing. From verse 1 all the way through verse 8, Paul is talking about one thing: bodily resurrection. Paul makes the same point himself in Philippians 3:21, where he says Jesus will transform our lowly bodies into the likeness of His glorious body. That is the consistent hope Paul sets before his readers: not a soul floating free of the body, not a dead body reanimated as a container for an escaped soul, but bodily transformation. The same thread runs through 2 Corinthians 5:1-8 from beginning to end.

### *But Doesn't Verse 8 Say He'd Rather Be Dead?*

Someone will ask, "If 'away from the body' simply means dead, doesn't verse 8 still say Paul would rather be dead and with the Lord? Doesn't that prove the traditional view, that the moment you die, you are with the Lord?" It would, if that is what Paul actually wrote. But it isn't.

Read verse 8 carefully: "We are confident, then, and would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord." You have probably heard this verse quoted a different way. The King James Version renders it this way:

> We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. (2 Corinthians 5:8 KJV)

That translation has shaped how Christians have heard this verse for four centuries. But notice how people actually quote it: "Absent from the body, present with the Lord." They drop the "and." That small omission changes everything.

With the "and" in place, which is how Paul wrote it and how the KJV translates it, the two phrases sit side by side as a statement of preference, not as a cause-and-effect sequence. Without the "and," the verse reads

like a sequence: leave the body, arrive with the Lord, instantly, automatically, one producing the other. But Paul does not write it that way, and neither does any other major English Bible. He joins the two phrases with "and," not with "therefore" or "which means." So everything depends on what that "and" is doing.

That single word is worth a closer look. The Greek word translated "and" is *kai* (pronounced "kye"), the most common conjunction in the New Testament. It works pretty much like the English word "and." Three standard Greek lexicons scholars use for New Testament study, BDAG, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, and the Louw-Nida lexicon, all agree that *kai* can carry a stronger sense. Something like "and then" or "and so." But that stronger reading depends on context. Here, Paul is expressing a preference, not issuing a command or describing a cause-and-effect sequence. Nothing in verse 8 calls for the stronger reading. The plain "and" is all that is there.

E. W. Bullinger, a nineteenth-century Bible scholar whose meticulous work on the Greek New Testament remains valuable today, identified this in his book *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. He calls the construction an *Anacoluthon*, which he defines as "non-sequence" where the latter part of the sentence does not follow from or connect with the former part. In plain terms, Paul's second phrase does not flow out of the first as a result or consequence. He is not saying that leaving the body produces arrival with the Lord. He is stating two things he longs for, and the "and" between them is just "and."

Here is a simple way to see what that means. If someone says "I'd rather leave this cold city and be sitting on a beach," they are not describing their travel plans. They are not telling you about the flight, the layover, or when they will arrive. They are telling you where they want to end up. Paul is doing the same thing. He wants out of this groaning,

incomplete, bare-seed, tent dwelling existence. He wants to be with Christ. He says nothing about what happens in between.

Bullinger goes further and makes a sweeping claim about the whole passage: "There is no thought (here or elsewhere) of our being at home, or 'with the Lord,' apart from resurrection and our resurrection bodies." That is not a minor grammatical footnote. That is a statement about what Paul means across his entire body of writing. The home Paul longs for in verse 8 is the same home he described in verse 1: the building from God, the resurrection body. He is not longing to drift up to heaven as a disembodied soul. He is longing for the resurrection that will finally clothe him.

The second thing that confirms this is that Paul says almost exactly the same thing in Philippians 1:21-23, a passage we examine more closely in Chapter 11:

> For me, to live is Christ and to die is gain… I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better indeed. (Philippians 1:21, 23)

That sounds just as immediate as 2 Corinthians 5:8. But a few chapters later, in the same letter, Paul tells us exactly what his hope looks like:

> We eagerly await a Savior from there, the Lord Jesus Christ, who, by the power that enables Him to subject all things to Himself, will transform our lowly bodies to be like His glorious body. (Philippians 3:20-21)

Paul's longing to depart and be with Christ in Philippians 1 is resurrection hope, not a theology of souls flying to heaven at death. The two passages in that letter interpret each other. And the same is true

here. When Paul says he would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord, he is expressing the same resurrection longing he has been describing since verse 1. He is not changing the subject. He is restating his deepest hope in personal terms.

So why does it feel so immediate? Because for Paul, it will be. This is not a creative theological move requiring separate defense. It is a necessary consequence of what we established in Chapter 4. If the dead are unconscious, they do not experience the passage of time. A sleeping person has no experience of the hours passing, and the dead are no different. From the dead person's perspective, the next conscious moment will be resurrection. You close your eyes in this shabby tent and open them in the glorious building God has prepared. Paul can describe it as going directly from one to the other because, from where he stands, that is exactly what it will feel like.

## What This Passage Teaches and What It Does Not

Let's be clear about both. It teaches that our bodies are temporary and incomplete. It teaches that we groan for something better and that God has prepared a glorified resurrection body for us. It teaches that Paul's deepest longing is to leave this incomplete, groaning, bare-seed existence behind and enter the presence of the Lord in his glorified body.

What it does not teach is that death immediately releases a conscious soul into God's presence. That idea requires reading "naked" as meaning dead, reading "at home in the body" as a soul inside a shell rather than as an idiom for being alive, and inserting a three-stage journey Paul himself never describes. Every one of those moves imports something from outside the text.

When we read Paul on his own terms and let the Bible's own framework shape our understanding, a different and more consistent picture

emerges. The hope is resurrection. The groaning is now. The clothing is coming.

---

*Dave was quiet for a long moment, tapping his pen against the table.*

*"He only gives two options," he finally said. "Alive here, or with the Lord. You'd think if there were a third thing, some in-between state, he would at least wave at it. Especially if he's trying to comfort people who just lost someone."*

*Carol flipped back a few pages. "And then there's the word he uses for 'clothed.' Ependuomai. You put it on over something that's already there."*

*"Like a coat," Dave said.*

*"Like an overcoat. So if the soul is floating around completely naked between death and resurrection, what exactly is the resurrection body going over?"*

*Dave stared at her. "There's nothing there."*

*"There's nothing there," Carol agreed. "Paul's own word choice rules it out."*

*Dave thought about that. "We've been reading Plato into Paul for so long that we forgot they're two completely different people with two completely different ideas about what a human being even is."*

*"That's it exactly." Carol picked up her coffee. "Paul isn't trying to tell us that death is a door to heaven. He's telling us that we are unfinished people living in an unfinished world, and that God is going to finish what He started."*

*She paused. "That's not a smaller comfort. That's a bigger one."*

*Dave nodded slowly. "Incomplete people waiting for completion. Not souls without bodies, which would only make them more incomplete. Just people. Groaning and hoping. And resurrection on the other side of it all."*

*"And resurrection on the other side of it all," Carol said.*

Chapter 10

# Out of the Body? — 2 Corinthians 12:2-3

*Dave was still thinking about the previous week's conversation when he arrived. He set his Bible and his notebook on the table, poured himself a cup of coffee, and sat down.*

*Carol was already there, looking at something she had written on a notepad.*

*"Still in 2 Corinthians," Dave said.*

*"Still in 2 Corinthians," she confirmed. "Chapter twelve this time." She slid the notepad across to him. She had written out two verses.*

*Dave read them. "Okay. I've read this before. Paul says he doesn't know whether this experience happened in the body or out of the body." He looked up. "That sounds like Paul is describing a soul leaving a body. Which is exactly what we've been examining."*

*"That's how most people read it," Carol said. "But notice something. He says it twice. Both times he says, 'I do not know.' And both times he adds, 'God knows.' "*

*Dave read it again. "He doesn't claim his soul left his body. He says he doesn't know whether it did."*

*"Right," Carol said. "So the question is: why would a man who supposedly experienced his soul departing his body have absolutely no idea whether that happened?"*

*Dave was quiet for a moment. "That is a strange thing to say."*

*"Very strange," Carol agreed. "Unless the whole point is something completely different from what we think."*

---

We have spent the last several chapters working through the passages people most often cite as evidence that the dead are consciously present with God between death and resurrection. We have looked at Paul's description of the tent and the building in 2 Corinthians 5. We have looked at Jesus and the thief on the cross. We have looked at the rich man and Lazarus. And in every case, we have found that the text, read carefully on its own terms, does not actually say what the traditional view needs it to say.

Now we come to 2 Corinthians 12:2-3, a passage that does not come up in these conversations quite as often as the ones we have already covered, but which deserves careful attention. Here is what it says:

> I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven. Whether it was in the body or out of it I do not know, but God knows. And I know that this man—whether in the body or out of it I do not know, but God knows— was caught up to Paradise. The things he heard were too sacred for words, things that man is not permitted to tell. (2 Corinthians 12:2-4)

People read those words "out of the body" and immediately think: there it is. Paul is describing a soul leaving a body and traveling to heaven. Proof that the soul can exist apart from the body. But that reading runs into some serious problems the moment you look at the passage closely. Let's start at the beginning.

## Who Is Paul Talking About?

Most Bible scholars agree that Paul is talking about himself. Writing in the third person - "I know a man" - was Paul's way of describing his own experience while distancing himself from what he was about to say. He did not want to appear to be bragging about himself, so he framed the story as if it happened to someone else. Ralph P. Martin, writing in the Word Biblical Commentary on 2 Corinthians, notes this is the standard reading of the passage.

So Paul is describing something that happened to him personally. Fourteen years before he wrote this letter, he had an extraordinary experience. He was "caught up" to the third heaven, which he also calls Paradise. Something incredible happened. And he does not know, not even about his own experience, whether it happened "in the body or out of the body."

## Before We Read Anything Into This Passage, Ask a Simple Question

Here is something the traditional reading tends to gloss right past, but it matters enormously. The traditional view of death defines it as the separation of the soul from the body. When you die, your soul departs your body and goes to be with God. That is the traditional definition. If that definition is correct, then "out of the body" in this passage means that Paul's soul left his body. And if Paul's soul left his body, Paul died.

No one believes that. No interpreter that I am aware of has ever argued that Paul literally died during this experience, visited heaven as a disembodied soul, and then returned to his body. That is not what anyone thinks happened. And yet, if the traditional definition of death is correct, the soul departing the body, then "out of the body" can only mean one thing. Paul died.

The traditional view cannot have it both ways. Either "out of the body" means the soul leaves the body (which means Paul died), or it means something else. If it means something else, then this passage is not proof that the soul can travel to heaven independently of the body. The traditional reading uses "out of the body" to support soul-body separation when talking about death, but quietly steps back from that meaning when applying it to this passage. That inconsistency is worth noting.

## Why Is This Passage in the Letter at All?

Before we examine what "out of the body" means, we need to understand why Paul even brings up this experience. As always, context is everything. Paul did not write 2 Corinthians 12 to teach his readers anything about the soul. If you read this passage in isolation, you might think he is making a theological point about the nature of human beings. But zoom out and look at what is happening in the letter, and a completely different picture emerges.

Beginning back in chapter 10, Paul launches into a passionate, extended defense of his own authority as an apostle. Something had gone badly wrong in the church at Corinth. A group of traveling teachers had arrived and were tearing down Paul's credibility with the believers there. Paul calls them sarcastically the "super-apostles" (2 Corinthians 11:5; 12:11). These opponents boasted about their impressive credentials, their polished speaking skills, and their spiritual experiences. They used visions and supernatural encounters as proof that they were

superior ministers. They presented formal letters of recommendation (2 Corinthians 3:1; 10:12), criticized Paul for being unimpressive in person (2 Corinthians 10:10), and argued that his refusal to accept money from the Corinthians proved his ministry was second-rate (2 Corinthians 11:7-9).

Paul spends four chapters firing back. But his strategy is a clever one. He plays along with his opponents' game just enough to beat them at it, then turns the whole competition on its head. If they want to compare family backgrounds, Paul has a better one. If they want to compare suffering for the faith, Paul's list makes theirs look small. And if they want to compare extraordinary spiritual experiences, Paul has one that none of them could touch.

That is the only reason this passage appears in the letter. Paul is not offering theological instruction about the soul. He is wielding this experience as a reluctant argument in a debate he never wanted to have. He even says so. He calls what he is doing "foolish boasting" (2 Corinthians 11:1, 16-17) and makes clear that the whole exercise is beneath him. The moment he finishes describing his experience, he immediately backs away from it:

> "I will boast about a man like that, but I will not boast about myself, except in my weaknesses." (2 Corinthians 12:5)

And then he pivots immediately to his thorn in the flesh: a painful, humbling limitation given to him specifically to prevent him from becoming proud about "the surpassing greatness of the revelations" (2 Corinthians 12:7). Weakness, Paul says, is the true credential of genuine ministry. Not spectacular visions.

This tells us something important: Paul himself considered the exact nature of this experience to be beside the point. He was not interested in using it to make a theological argument. He brought it up reluctantly,

used it briefly, then walked away from it. As Ralph P. Martin observes in his commentary, Paul "will soon depreciate the value of this experience." That is not the behavior of someone who considers this passage a key piece of evidence for anything. Any theological conclusion we try to build on this passage is reading something into it that Paul never put there.

## The Double Disclaimer

Now we get to the heart of it. Paul says twice, once in verse 2 and again in verse 3, that he does not know whether his experience happened "in the body or out of the body." Both times he adds "God knows." He repeats himself. He emphasizes his own uncertainty. Why would he do that?

Margaret Thrall, a scholar who studied this passage closely, suggests that Paul "may be emphasizing his total lack of comprehension about how the event occurred. It was a wonderful happening whose mode of operation was known only to God." Angel Manuel Rodríguez of the Biblical Research Institute puts it plainly: "Paul is simply stating that he does not have a clear understanding of the nature of his supernatural experience." New Testament scholar Victor Paul Furnish, writing in the Anchor Bible commentary on 2 Corinthians, observes that Paul "not only acknowledges but actually emphasizes his own complete ignorance" about the nature of what happened. And Furnish adds something remarkable: based on Paul's Jewish background and his understanding of the Old Testament, "a bodiless journey would have been inconceivable to Paul."

This should not surprise us. Paul was not just any Jewish thinker. He was a Pharisee, trained in that tradition from his youth (Philippians 3:5). And as we saw when we examined Luke 16, the Jewish Encyclopedia notes that Pharisees had no developed concept of a disembodied

immortal soul. Their vision of human destiny was not a soul floating free of the body in some conscious intermediate existence. It was resurrection. As the encyclopedia puts it, they believed "man was made for two worlds, the world that now is, and the world to come, where life does not end in death." That is the theological air Paul breathed. A soul detaching from a body and traveling independently to heaven was not a Hebrew idea. It was a Greek one.

Read that again. For Paul, the idea that a person's soul could detach from their body and travel somewhere on its own was not just theologically unlikely, it was literally inconceivable. It was not a category available to him. The Old Testament, which Paul knew inside and out, never describes the human person as a soul temporarily housed in a body. It describes a human being as a whole, unified person: body and inner life together as one.

This is why Paul says he does not know. He had no framework for describing what happened to him. Was he physically transported to the third heaven? Was it an overwhelming vision? He could not tell. The experience was so far outside normal categories that he could not categorize it. And crucially, Furnish notes, Paul "seems to be saying that he does not really care" and suggests this implies there were people in Corinth who did care about the question, probably the same opponents who prized spiritual experiences as proof of spiritual superiority. He will not say whether it was in the body or out of the body and that deliberate refusal undercuts the very argument his opponents were making.

## Paul's Own Use of the Same Phrase

Now we come to the most decisive argument of all. What did Paul mean by "out of the body"? The Greek phrase translated "out of the body" in 2 Corinthians 12:2-3 is *ektos tou somatos* (pronounced "EK-tos too SO-

mah-tos"). In Greek, *ektos* means "outside" and *somatos* means "body." So the phrase means literally "outside the body."

Here is what makes this so significant. This exact phrase, *ektos tou somatos*, appears in only one other place in all of Paul's letters. It appears in 1 Corinthians 6:18:

> Flee sexual immorality. Every sin a person commits is outside the body, but the sexually immoral person sins against his own body. (1 Corinthians 6:18)

Same phrase. Same author. Same audience. Paul wrote 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians to the same church in the same city. These letters are part of the same ongoing conversation with the same community of believers.

In 1 Corinthians 6:18, does "outside the body" mean that a soul departs the body? Obviously not. No one has ever read that verse and concluded that committing ordinary sins requires the soul to temporarily vacate the body. That reading would be absurd, and no interpreter has ever suggested it.

So here is the test: if *ektos tou somatos* means "the soul departing the body" in 2 Corinthians 12, then it has to mean the same thing in 1 Corinthians 6:18. And if it means that in 1 Corinthians 6:18, then Paul is saying that every sin involves the soul leaving the body. That is nonsense, and everyone knows it.

But what does 1 Corinthians 6:18 actually mean? It takes a moment to explain, but it is worth following carefully because it also tells us something important about the people Paul was writing to.

## A Borrowed Argument That Paul Quotes to Refute

Ancient writers, including Paul, sometimes used a rhetorical technique where they quoted their opponent's position before knocking it down.

They would put the other person's words on the page and then immediately argue against them. The problem for modern readers is that ancient manuscripts had no quotation marks. In Paul's day, punctuation marks like those simply did not exist. Readers were expected to recognize from the flow and content of the argument when the writer was quoting someone else versus making their own point.

Paul does this repeatedly throughout 1 Corinthians. He quotes short, catchy sayings that the Corinthian believers had apparently adopted to justify their behavior and then he corrects them. For example:

> "All things are lawful" (1 Corinthians 6:12; 10:23): Paul quotes it, then immediately qualifies it.
>
> "Food for the stomach and the stomach for food" (1 Corinthians 6:13): Paul quotes it, then counters it.

Richard B. Hays, a respected New Testament scholar, argues in his commentary on 1 Corinthians that "every sin a person commits is outside the body" is not Paul's own statement. It is a slogan that the Corinthians had adopted, and Paul quotes it in order to refute it. Hays lays out the back-and-forth like this:

> **Paul:** Flee sexual immorality!
>
> **Corinthians (objecting):** But why? Every sin a person commits is outside the body.
>
> **Paul:** But the sexually immoral person sins against his own body.

You may notice that some Bible translations add the word 'other' to this verse, reading 'every other sin a person commits is outside the body.' But that word does not appear in the original Greek. Translators added it to try to make the sentence clearer. The problem is that it actually

creates a bigger problem than it solves. If Paul is saying that every sin except sexual immorality has nothing to do with the body, what do we do with drunkenness? Gluttony? Those clearly involve the body too. A reading that creates that many contradictions is probably not the right one. And since Paul did not write the word 'other,' we should not let it shape our understanding of what he meant. This is why the "slogan" interpretation makes more sense. To understand what the Corinthians meant by that slogan, we need to understand how they thought about the body.

This was not a random idea the Corinthians invented. It had deep roots in their culture. Herm J. G. Zandman, writing in the journal *Die Skriflig*, notes that Plato's view of the human person, the idea that the soul is the true self and the body is an inferior prison, had become broadly influential throughout the Greek-speaking world by the first century. Corinth was a thoroughly Greek city, and these assumptions were part of the air its residents breathed.

Hays describes exactly where that thinking led. The *sophoi*, a Greek word meaning "wise ones," were the self-appointed intellectuals of the community. According to Hays, they saw the body as transient and trivial and concluded that it makes no difference what a person does with their body. If they were hungry, they should eat. If they wanted sexual gratification, they should seek it. None of it matters, they reasoned, because it only concerns external physical things that carry no lasting significance.

So when they said "every sin a person commits is outside the body," they meant the body has nothing to do with sin. In other words, because the body was excluded as a source of sin altogether, sin became something that exists exclusively in the realm of the mind and "soul," making it, by definition, a thing "outside of the body." Turn that around and you see the other side of the same coin: on the Corinthian view, the only sins

that truly count are sins of the mind and spirit. Lust in the heart is a real sin. Acting on it with the body is not.

The results were exactly what you would expect. Paul confronts believers who were visiting prostitutes (1 Corinthians 6:15-16), getting drunk at the Lord's Supper (1 Corinthians 11:21), and arguing that bodily resurrection was unnecessary (1 Corinthians 15:12). Their theology produced their behavior.

Paul's response is a direct demolition of this whole framework. The body is not a shell. It is not beneath God's concern. It belongs to the Lord (1 Corinthians 6:13). It is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19). It will be raised from the dead (1 Corinthians 15:42-44). The Corinthians had it exactly backwards. Far from being irrelevant, the body is the very place where God's Spirit dwells and where resurrection glory will one day be displayed.

So "outside the body" in the 1 Corinthians 6:18 slogan meant something that belongs entirely to the heart and mind rather than the physical body. This is the error Paul is correcting.

## Putting the Two Passages Together

So let's bring this back to 2 Corinthians 12. Paul used the phrase *ektos tou somatos*, "outside the body," in 1 Corinthians 6:18 as part of a Corinthian slogan to address the error which claimed the body has nothing to do with sin. Sin, as the slogan asserts, belongs to the realm of the mind and soul. "Outside the body" in that context has nothing to do with a soul departing a body.

When that same phrase appears in 2 Corinthians 12:2-3, the burden of proof falls on anyone who wants to claim Paul suddenly means something completely different by the same words, in the same correspondence, to the same people, with no signal that anything has changed.

Rodríguez states it directly: "the phrase 'outside the body' is employed only once more by Paul, in 1 Corinthians 6:18. Certainly Paul is not saying that sins are committed by a bodiless entity who resides inside the body." The meaning Paul already established in his own writing cannot suddenly become evidence for the soul leaving the body simply because the traditional view needs it to mean that. An author's own previous use of a phrase is the most reliable guide to what he means by it.

## Paul Puts This in the Vision Category

There is one more thing worth noting. Before Paul describes this experience at all, he introduces it with these words:

> I must go on boasting. Although there is nothing to be gained, I will move on to visions and revelations from the Lord. (2 Corinthians 12:1)

Visions and revelations. That is the category Paul places this experience in before he describes it. A vision is not an out-of-body experience in the Platonic sense. A vision is a revelatory experience in which God shows something real to a person without necessarily moving that person's body anywhere. God communicates through the vision. The person sees something true and extraordinary. And the person's soul does not have to detach from their body for any of this to happen.

The Bible is full of these kinds of experiences, and in every case the person involved remains a whole, unified person. Isaiah saw the Lord "high and exalted" (Isaiah 6:1) without dying. Ezekiel was taken to Jerusalem "in visions of God" (Ezekiel 8:3) and likewise to Chaldea (Ezekiel 11:24). John received the book of Revelation while "in the Spirit" (Revelation 1:10) without leaving his body. These were real en-

counters with real divine truth. None of them required the soul to go anywhere without the body.

Paul's uncertainty about whether he was "in the body or outside the body" fits this visionary framework perfectly. Was he physically transported to paradise? Or did he experience it as an overwhelming vision so vivid that he could not tell the difference? He genuinely does not know. And critically, neither option requires his soul to have separated from his body. Furnish notes that for Paul, given his Jewish background and his deep knowledge of the Old Testament, a disembodied journey was inconceivable. What Paul experienced was real. It was extraordinary. It was, by his own description, so surpassingly great that God gave him a painful limitation to keep him from becoming proud about it (2 Corinthians 12:7). But it was also beyond any category Paul had available to describe it.

Based on what 'outside the body' means in 1 Corinthians 6:18, and Paul's own categorization of this as a vision in verse 1, his experience was either a physical journey to heaven or a revelatory vision that took place entirely in his mind. Either way, his "soul" did not leave his body.

## What This Passage Does Not Teach

Read on its own terms, with Paul's own context and his own use of the identical phrase firmly in view, 2 Corinthians 12:2-3 does not teach that the soul can depart the body and travel to heaven. It does not teach anything about the intermediate state. Paul himself says twice that he does not know what mode this experience took.

What the passage does teach is that Paul had a genuine, extraordinary, and deeply humbling encounter with God that he could not fully explain. He was caught up to the third heaven, which he calls Paradise. He heard things "not permitted for a man to tell" (2 Corinthians 12:4). Whatever happened was so real, so vivid, and so beyond ordinary expe-

rience that he could not say whether it was physical or visionary. And then he went straight back to talking about his weaknesses. Because that is what Paul considered the real credential.

---

*Dave sat back and ran his hand through his hair. "So every time somebody quotes this passage as proof of soul-body separation, they're asking it to carry a meaning Paul himself refused to apply."*

*"Twice," Carol said. "He said he didn't know, twice. That's not ambiguity. That's a deliberate refusal to make the claim."*

*"And even if his soul had left his body," Dave said slowly, thinking it through, "that would mean Paul died. Which nobody believes happened. So either way, the traditional reading doesn't work."*

*"Right," Carol said. "If 'out of the body' means the soul departs, Paul died. If it doesn't mean that, then it doesn't prove what we thought."*

*Dave looked at the passage again. "He just wanted people to know that God had given him an experience more remarkable than anything his opponents could claim. And the very next thing he talks about is how weak he is." He shook his head. "That is a strange way to make an argument."*

*"Unless the argument is that weakness is the point," Carol said. "Not the vision. The thorn. The vulnerability. That's what made his ministry real."*

*Dave was quiet for a moment. Then: "We've now been through how many of these passages?"*

*"I've lost count," Carol said.*

*"And every single one of them, when you read it carefully in context, turns out not to say what people think it says." He looked at her. "That's not a coincidence."*

*"No," Carol said. "It isn't." She turned a page. "There are still a few more. Are you ready?"*

*Dave picked up his pen. "I'm ready."*

Chapter 11

# Gone to Be with Christ — Philippians 1:21-24

*Carol was already there when Dave arrived, her Bible open to Philippians.*

*"Paul again," Dave said, pulling out his chair.*

*"Paul again," she said. "This one has always bothered me, honestly. More than most of the others."*

*Dave sat down and read where her finger rested on the page. "For to me, to live is Christ and to die is gain." He looked up. "That sounds like death is immediately good. Like he's about to be somewhere wonderful."*

*"That's always been how I read it," Carol said. "But we've learned to slow down before we decide what a passage means."*

*Dave nodded. "So what does it actually say?"*

---

Philippians 1:21-24, on the surface, sounds exactly like a man who expects to be immediately and consciously present with Christ the moment he dies. Let's read it.

> For me, to live is Christ and to die is gain. But if I go on living in the body, this will mean fruitful labor for me. Yet what shall I choose? I do not know. I am torn between the two. I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better indeed. But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body. (Philippians 1:21-24)

Paul is writing from prison. He knows he might be executed. He is weighing two possibilities: staying alive to continue his ministry, or dying and being with Christ. He calls the second option "far better." That sure sounds like he expects death to usher him directly into the Lord's presence. So what is the problem? The problem is everything else the Bible says about death, and everything else Paul himself says about it.

## The Foundation Holds

We have already established in earlier chapters that the Bible consistently describes death as a state of unconscious rest. The dead are compared to people in a deep sleep. They have no thoughts, no awareness of time, no active existence while they wait for the resurrection. That is not one passage. That is dozens of them, running from Job and the Psalms through Ecclesiastes and the prophets and right into the letters of Paul.

That foundation matters here, because we cannot build an interpretation of Philippians 1 that contradicts the rest of what Scripture plainly teaches. If Paul believed everywhere else that the dead sleep, we should be very slow to conclude that this one passage means something completely different. And here is the thing: we do not have to.

Some interpreters press further into the Greek text here. The word Paul uses for "depart" is *analusai* (pronounced *ah-nah-LOO-sigh*), and it has been claimed it carries nautical associations: a ship loosing from

its moorings. They conjecture that Paul is picturing the soul setting sail from the body. It is a creative image, but the word itself does not require that picture. Luke 12:36 uses the same Greek word for a master simply returning home from a wedding: "Then you will be like servants waiting for their master to return [*analusai*] from the wedding banquet." The word there has nothing to do with a soul leaving a body. It just means to go. The nautical image is reading into the word in this context, not a meaning drawn out of it.

## What Death Looks Like from the Inside

Think for a moment about what it is like to be unconscious. The first time I went under anesthesia for a medical procedure, I found it to be a strange experience. One moment I was staring at the ceiling of an operating room. The next moment I was staring at a different ceiling in the recovery room. No gap. No awareness of time passing. No sense that anything had happened in between. The surgery had taken over an hour, but from my point of view, it was instant. Unlike ordinary sleep, there was no sense that time had elapsed at all.

I am not suggesting the dead are under anesthesia. I am only pointing to something we have all experienced: a deep state of unconsciousness carries no sense of time. That is the point, and nothing more.

If the dead are truly unconscious with no awareness of the passage of time, then from their perspective, death and resurrection will feel instantaneous. A person who died in biblical times and is raised at the last trumpet will have no memory of the thousands of years in between. Their last conscious moment will be followed immediately, from their point of view, by their first conscious moment in the presence of Christ.

The scholar Larry Kreitzer, writing on the intermediate state in the *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, quotes biblical scholar F. F. Bruce on exactly this point. Bruce says that "in the consciousness of the de-

parted believers, there is no interval between dissolution [death] and investiture [resurrection], however long the interval might be measured by the calendar of earth-bound human history."

That is the key. Paul is not wrong to say that departing means being with Christ. For Paul, subjectively, it will be exactly that. He will close his eyes in death and open them in the presence of his Lord. The calendar will say centuries have passed. Paul will have experienced none of it.

## Paul Is Not Contradicting Himself

Paul cannot contradict himself here, and not merely because he was a careful writer. The same Holy Spirit who moved Paul to write about the sleeping dead in his other letters moved him to write the letter to the Philippians. Inspiration rules out the possibility that Paul accidentally taught two incompatible things. So when this passage seems at odds with everything else Paul writes about death, the right response is not to pit the passages against each other. The harmony is not hard to find.

Paul is the one who, writing to the Thessalonians, calls the dead "those who have fallen asleep" (1 Thessalonians 4:13). He is the one who tells them that the dead in Christ will rise at the last trumpet, when the Lord himself descends from heaven (1 Thessalonians 4:16). That is resurrection language, not the language of souls immediately going to heaven.

Paul consistently describes the dead as asleep and awaiting resurrection. So when he says he desires to "depart and be with Christ," he is not contradicting that teaching. He is describing his own death and resurrection from the only point of view available to him: his own subjective experience. From where Paul stands, to depart is to be with Christ, because nothing will happen in between that he will be aware of. He is not describing a soul going to heaven at the moment of death. He is expressing resurrection hope.

## What the Same Letter Says

We do not even have to look outside Philippians to confirm this. Notice what Paul does not do in chapter 1. He does not linger over what death will feel like, or describe a conscious journey his soul will take, or picture himself in some intermediate state between death and resurrection. He moves almost immediately from the thought of dying to the thought of being with Christ, because for Paul those two things are the same event, separated only by a sleep he will not remember. He has no category for a disembodied conscious existence in between, because that idea comes from Greek philosophy, not from the Hebrew Scriptures he was trained in as a former Pharisee and not from the gospel he preached.

A few chapters later, still in the same letter, Paul makes his meaning explicit:

> But our citizenship is in heaven, and we eagerly await a Savior from there, the Lord Jesus Christ, who, by the power that enables Him to subject all things to Himself, will transform our lowly bodies to be like His glorious body. (Philippians 3:20-21)

Two things jump out here. First, Paul's hope in this very letter is the transformation of his body. Not the release of his soul from his body. Not escape from physical existence into a disembodied spiritual realm. Transformation. His lowly body becoming like Christ's glorious body. That is resurrection language. That is the hope Paul is living for.

Second, notice the direction of movement. The Savior comes from heaven to transform bodies on earth. The movement is downward, not upward. Paul is not picturing himself ascending to heaven as a freed soul. He is picturing Christ descending to raise and transform his body.

These two passages are not in tension. They are the same hope described from two angles. In chapter 1, Paul describes it from the inside:

what it will feel like to him personally. In chapter 3, he describes it from the outside: what it will actually look like when Christ returns. Read together, they tell a single story. Paul desires to depart and be with Christ because his next conscious moment after death will be the resurrection. And the resurrection, he tells us plainly, is Christ coming down to transform the body.

## What This Passage Is and Is Not

Philippians 1:21-24 does not teach that the soul departs the body at death and immediately enters conscious fellowship with Christ. It teaches that Paul so deeply identifies with Christ that death itself cannot separate him from that relationship. It expresses his confidence that the next conscious experience after death will be the presence of his Lord. And it does all of that in perfect harmony with everything else the Bible says about the sleep of the dead and the hope of the resurrection.

This passage is not a window into the mechanics of what happens between death and resurrection. It is a statement of personal faith from a man who is not afraid to die because he knows who holds him. Paul is not describing the soul's itinerary. He is declaring where his hope is anchored. And his hope, like ours, is in the resurrection.

---

*Dave closed his Bible slowly. "So Paul isn't saying death sends him straight to heaven. He's saying death leads to Christ, because from his own perspective it will be immediate."*

*"Right," Carol said. "There's no experience of waiting. No awareness of time passing. He closes his eyes here and opens them there."*

*"And the same letter," Dave said, "tells us that the direction of travel is Christ coming down to transform the body. Not Paul's soul going up."*

*Carol nodded. "He's not looking forward to escaping his body. He's looking forward to Christ redeeming it."*

*Dave sat with that for a moment. "That's actually more hopeful," he said finally. "Nothing is wasted. Not even the body."*

*"Nothing is wasted," Carol agreed.*

*She turned a page. "One more letter of Paul's. And this one, I think, may be the most important one of all."*

Chapter 12

# Back to the Beginning — 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18

*It had been Carol's idea to read through 1 Thessalonians 4 again.*

*They were nearly done. They had spent weeks on this, passage by passage, question by question, and she felt like something had come full circle. The passage that had started all of this, the one that had been read at Robert's funeral, the one that had made her sit back in the pew and feel that strange tension she could not quite name, deserved a second look now that they had done so much of the work.*

*Robert had been their Bible class teacher for almost twenty years. He knew every person in that room by name. He knew which ones were struggling, which ones needed encouragement, which ones asked good questions just to get other people talking. When he died, the whole class felt it.*

*The minister had read from 1 Thessalonians 4, and he had said what ministers always say. Robert was more alive right now than he had ever been. He was in the presence of the Lord. He was watching over them.*

*And Carol had sat in that pew and felt the tension again. The minister said Robert was wide awake. Paul said he was asleep. Both of them were reading from the same page.*

*She had brought it up with Dave afterward. And this whole study had begun.*

*Now, weeks later, she read the passage aloud.*

*" 'Brothers, we do not want you to be uninformed about those who sleep in death, so that you will not grieve like the rest, who are without hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we also believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in Him. By the word of the Lord, we declare to you that we who are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord will by no means precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a loud command, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ will be the first to rise.' " She set her Bible down. "First Thessalonians 4, verses 13 through 16."*

*Dave was quiet for a moment.*

*"Verse 14," he said. "That's the one people always point to. 'God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep.' They say that means the souls of the dead are already up in heaven, and God brings them back down when Jesus returns."*

*"I know," Carol said. "I used to think that too."*

*"But now I want to actually read it," Dave said. "The whole thing. Like we've been doing."*

*Carol nodded. "Then let's start where Paul starts. Not with what God will bring. With why Paul is writing the letter in the first place."*

---

You can learn a lot from a letter by asking a simple question: what problem was the writer trying to solve? Paul did not write to the Thessalonians to deliver a lecture on the afterlife. He wrote because they were worried. Verse 13 tells us exactly what that worry looked like. He did not want them grieving like people who had no hope. Something about the death of their fellow believers had shaken them, and Paul wanted to address it directly.

What were they afraid of? Verse 15 tells us. Paul writes that those who are alive at the Lord's return "will by no means precede those who have fallen asleep." That word "precede" means to go ahead of, to get there first. The Thessalonians were afraid that their deceased brothers and sisters who had already died would be at a disadvantage when Jesus returned. They would somehow miss out, be left behind, arrive late to the reunion.

That fear tells us something critical about what the Thessalonians actually believed about death. Think about it carefully for a moment. If they believed the dead were already consciously present with God in heaven, why on earth would they worry that the dead were at a disadvantage? If anything, they would assume the opposite. The ones who had already died had a head start. They were already there. The living would be the ones scrambling to catch up.

The only way the Thessalonians' worry makes sense is if they believed the dead were not already with God. And they were afraid that being asleep in death when Jesus returned meant missing out on some-

thing. Paul's job was to correct that fear. And the way he corrects it tells us just as much as the fear itself.

Now look at how Paul responds. He does not say, "Your loved ones are already in heaven, fully alive and aware, so do not worry about them." That would have been the simplest possible answer if the traditional view were true. He could have put the whole thing to rest in one sentence. Instead, he talks about a trumpet, a shout, an archangel, and the dead rising from the earth. His entire answer is about the resurrection. His comfort is not "they are already there." His comfort is "they will rise first."

The dead in Christ rise first. Then the living are caught up together with them. Together. At the same moment. After the trumpet sounds. If the dead were already conscious and present with the Lord, Paul's comfort here would be strange and unnecessarily complicated. Why bring up the resurrection as the great hope if people are already experiencing something better? Why does the reunion happen at the trumpet if the dead are already home?

Paul's answer only makes sense if the dead are, in fact, asleep. They are waiting. They have not yet arrived at the final destination. The resurrection is not a formality after the real event. It is *the* event.

## The Language Paul Keeps Choosing

Notice what Paul calls the dead throughout this passage. In verse 13, they are "those who sleep in death." In verse 14, they are "those who have fallen asleep in Him." In verse 15, they are "those who have fallen asleep" again. Three verses. Three times. Paul had plenty of room to say something like "those who have left to be with Christ" or "those whose souls are now with God." He does not. He reaches for sleep every single time. Some people argue that sleep here refers only to the

body. The body sleeps, they say, but the soul is awake. It is a body-only metaphor.

But look at the grammar. Paul does not say that the bodies of believers have fallen asleep. He says that *people* have fallen asleep. In verse 13, it is "those who sleep." In verse 14, it is "those who have fallen asleep in Him." In verse 15, it is "those who have fallen asleep." The subject in every case is a whole person, not a part of a person.

Paul had every opportunity to clarify this if he meant only the body. He never does. And given everything we have seen in this study about how the Bible understands the human person, that is exactly what we would expect.

The ancient Hebrews did not think of a human being as a soul driving around inside a body. They thought of a person as a unified whole. Scholar James Heller, writing in the journal *Theology Today*, summarized this view of humanity well. He noted that God breathed into man the breath of life and "man became a living soul," and that the soul describes the whole person, not merely the spiritual dimension. His conclusion cuts to the heart of the matter: "to the Hebrews it was so obvious that a man and his body were one and the same that they neither needed, nor had, a special word to designate the body." They had words for arms, legs, and internal organs. But they had no single word for the sum of all those parts, because the sum of all those parts was simply a person. A human being.

Whatever assumptions existed among the believers in Thessalonica, Paul himself writes from a deeply Jewish understanding of the human person. When he said "those who have fallen asleep," he meant the whole person. Not just the shell they left behind.

Paul never suggests the sleep metaphor refers only to the body. It gets imported into the text from Greek philosophy, which divided the human being into two separate parts: the body, which was temporary and

physical, and the soul, which was the real, immortal self. That framework was foreign to Paul's world, and it does not belong in this passage.

## What Does "Bring with Him" Actually Mean?

Here is the phrase that drives the traditional interpretation of this passage: "God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in Him." The reasoning goes like this: if God is bringing them with Jesus, they must already be wherever Jesus is. They are accompanying Him on the return trip down from heaven. Which means they were already in heaven to begin with.

It sounds logical. But the Greek word behind "bring" does not require that reading. The word Paul uses is *agō* (pronounced "AH-go"). It means to lead, to bring, to guide, to accompany. Respected reference works including the Greek-English Lexicon compiled by Louw and Nida note that *agō* focuses on the act of leading, not on where the journey begins. The word says nothing about a point of departure. It does not tell us where the people being led were coming from.

So what is God actually doing? He is raising the dead and leading them into the presence of the returning Christ. The dead are not descending from heaven to be reunited with their bodies in the ground below. They are whole persons, asleep in their graves, whom God calls forth at the resurrection and brings immediately into the company of their Lord.

This is exactly what the order of events in verses 15 and 16 describes. Christ descends. The dead rise. The living are caught up. The movement of people is from the ground upward, not from heaven downward. There is no moment in Paul's description where souls come down from heaven, find their old bodies, and climb back in. That picture does not appear anywhere in this passage. It is not in the Bible at all. It is what

happens when you read this text through a Greek philosophical lens that Paul was not using.

The Complete Jewish Bible, which translates the New Testament with particular sensitivity to its Jewish background, renders verse 14 this way: "we also believe that in the same way God, through Yeshua [Jesus], will take with him those who have died." That phrasing captures what the Greek actually emphasizes: God takes up the dead and brings them with Christ. The movement is from the grave upward, not from heaven downward. The translation does not read a prior heavenly location into the text, because the Greek does not put one there.

Christ descends. The dead rise. The living are caught up. Every person in Paul's picture moves upward toward the returning Lord, not downward from heaven to a waiting body. The picture is simple and consistent. It only gets complicated when you bring assumptions to the text that Paul never shared.

---

*Dave had been reading back through the passage while Carol walked through the argument. He set his Bible down.*

*"So 'bring with him' doesn't mean they were already there," he said. "It just means God leads them out of the grave."*

*"Right," Carol said. "The word doesn't tell us where they were coming from. It just tells us that God does the leading."*

*"And the order of events confirms it," Dave said. He was looking at verses 15 and 16 again. "Christ comes first. Then the dead rise. Then the living are caught up. The movement of people, both the living and dead, is up to Jesus, not down from heaven."*

*"If the traditional view is right," Carol said, "you have to imagine Christ returning from heaven leading a procession of souls, then stopping at every cemetery on earth so each soul can find its body, and then the whole group continues on from there."*

*Dave stared at her. "The Bible never describes anything like that."*

*"Not once," she said. "And the only reason to picture it that way is if you've already decided the souls were in heaven to begin with. The passage itself never puts them there."*

*Dave was quiet for a moment. "Paul's picture is actually simpler," he said. "The dead are in the grave. God raises them. They are immediately with Christ because the resurrection and His return happen at the same moment."*

*"In the twinkling of an eye," Carol said. "That's how Paul describes it in 1 Corinthians 15:52. It's not a sequence with gaps between the steps. It all happens at once."*

*Dave nodded slowly. He picked up his Bible again and read verse 14 one more time to himself. Then he looked up. "You know what the other question is, right?"*

*Carol waited.*

*"If the traditional view is correct, what does the resurrection actually add? What does it accomplish that hasn't already happened?"*

*Carol looked at him. "That's the right question."*

*"Because if people are already fully alive and fully conscious and fully present with God the moment they die, the resurrection starts to look like a technicality. A formality."*

*"But Paul never treats it that way," Carol said. "In every letter he writes, the resurrection is the center of everything. Not a footnote. The whole point."*

*"Which makes a lot more sense," Dave said, "if the dead are actually sleeping. Because then the resurrection is the moment everything changes. That is when they wake up. That is when God brings them. That is when the reunion happens."*

*Carol nodded. "The trumpet is not an announcement that something already happened. It is the moment it happens."*

*Dave set his Bible down. For a moment he just looked at it.*

*"Robert taught this class for almost twenty years," he said. "And I sat there for most of them."*

*"So did I," Carol said.*

*"He knew this passage. He taught it. He just never asked why Paul answered the Thessalonians the way he did. Why his comfort was the resurrection and not heaven."*

*Carol smiled a little. "Maybe that's why we're asking now."*

*Dave nodded. He gathered his notes and tapped them into a neat stack. Then he paused. "I looked something up this week. Did you know the word 'cemetery' comes from a Latin word, which was in turn derived from Greek, that means a sleeping-place?"*

*Carol looked at him. "Seriously?"*

*"Seriously. Doesn't prove anything theologically. But somebody, somewhere, was thinking along the same lines as Paul when they named it."*

*Carol smiled. "The sleeping-place. And one day, a trumpet."*

*"One day, a trumpet," Dave said.*

---

This is the passage that was read at Robert's funeral, the one that placed two pictures side by side and asked which one was true: the minister's picture of someone already wide awake in God's presence, or Paul's picture of someone asleep, waiting for the trumpet.

We have now read enough of the Bible to hear Paul's answer on Paul's own terms. The dead are not halfway through a journey. They are not conscious souls waiting for their bodies to catch up. They are resting in the sleep of death until God acts. And when God acts, He does not send souls down from heaven to be rejoined to bodies waiting in the grave below. He raises the dead. He leads them out of the grave. He brings them with the returning Christ in the same moment, in the twinkling of an eye, transformed and clothed with the immortality that the Bible never says they possessed by nature.

That is the resurrection. And it is not a formality. The dead do not rise to reclaim something they already had. They rise to receive something they never possessed: a glorified immortal body. That is Paul's comfort to the Thessalonians. That is the hope Robert was waiting for, whether he had ever worked through the passage quite this carefully or not.

It is a better hope than the one the minister described at his funeral. Not because the minister meant any harm. He said what ministers have said for centuries, in words that have comforted grieving people for a very long time. But comfort that rests on a misreading is not as solid as comfort that rests on what the text actually says.

Paul's comfort is stronger. God has not forgotten the dead. He has not left them behind. He has not lost them. He knows where every one of them is. And when Christ returns, He will bring them. Every last one. First. That is worth waiting for. That is worth the trumpet.

Chapter 13

# Souls Under the Altar — Revelation 6:9-11

*Dave had been quiet for a while, turning pages.*

*"We've been through a lot of passages," he said. "Ecclesiastes, the thief on the cross, the rich man and Lazarus, Paul's letters, all of them. And every time, the text turns out to say something different from what I thought."*

*"Different from what we were taught," Carol said.*

*"Right." He found the page he was looking for. "But this one." He turned the Bible so she could see it. "This one still bothers me. Souls under an altar, crying out. That sounds pretty conscious."*

*Carol leaned over and read it. Then she sat back.*

*"Before we look at the verse," she said, "we need to talk about the book it comes from."*

*Dave raised an eyebrow. "Revelation?"*

*"Revelation," she said. "Because the kind of book something is matters a great deal for how you read it."*

---

There is one more passage that people regularly bring up in this conversation, and it comes from the last book in the Bible. In Revelation 6, the apostle John describes a vision of souls crying out from beneath an altar in heaven. To many readers, this sounds like exactly what they have always believed: the dead are conscious, they are somewhere, and they are very much awake.

It is a fair reaction. On the surface, the image is striking. But before we read any verse in Revelation, we need to spend a moment on the book itself, because Revelation is unlike any other book in the New Testament.

## A Book Full of Symbols

Revelation belongs to a specific genre that Bible scholars call *apocalyptic* literature. The word *apocalyptic* comes from a Greek word meaning "unveiling" or "revelation." Apocalyptic writing was a recognized style in the ancient Jewish and early Christian world. It communicated God's message through vivid, layered symbols: creatures with many eyes, beasts rising from the sea, stars falling from the sky, a dragon, a lamb, a harlot riding a scarlet monster. Even interpreters who disagree about Revelation's meaning recognize that the book communicates through vivid symbols and images. Revelation works through images the way a political cartoon works through images. The picture communicates something real, but the picture itself is not the point.

Revelation also regularly turns abstract realities into living characters. Death is not just a concept in this book; it rides a horse. Hades does not just describe a place; it follows Death like a companion. Stars do not just fall; a dragon sweeps them from the sky with its tail. This is what the book does on nearly every page. It takes invisible, abstract realities and gives them flesh, movement, and voice so that readers can

feel their weight. Keeping that habit in mind as we read is not optional. It is the only honest way to read Revelation.

The very first verse of the book signals this. Revelation 1:1 says God "sent and signified" the message to John. That word "signified" is important. It literally means God conveyed this message through signs and symbols. The book announces its own symbolic nature right at the beginning.

Arthur Ogden, in his detailed commentary on Revelation called *The Avenging of the Apostles and Prophets*, makes this observation: "The language used by John in this book is unlike any other used in the New Testament. The message was signified unto John, indicating the abundant use of signs and symbols in its presentation. Words and phrases are often used to signify, symbolize and reveal what is otherwise hidden truth. This identifies the book more specifically in nature with the prophetic books of the Old Testament."

That is the interpretive foundation we need to carry into every passage in Revelation, including this one. When we read a verse in this book, the first question we have to ask is not "what does this picture look like?" but "what does this picture mean?"

## The Passage

With that in mind, here is the text:

> "And when the Lamb opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the testimony they had upheld. And they cried out in a loud voice, 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, until You avenge our blood and judge those who dwell upon the earth?' Then each of them was given a white robe and told to rest a little while longer, until the full number of their

> fellow servants, their brothers, were killed, just as they had been killed." (Revelation 6:9-11)

Notice a few things right away, just from the imagery in the passage itself. A lamb opens a seal. Is that literal? Of course not. The Lamb represents Jesus, and this image conveys something about His authority and His identity as the sacrificial lamb of God. No one should read that verse and picture an actual sheep breaking a wax seal on a scroll. We understand immediately that it is symbolic.

So why would we suddenly shift gears and read the souls under the altar as a photograph of conscious, disembodied people beneath a sacred object that belongs not in heaven, but in the Jewish temple?

The symbol of souls being "under the altar" comes directly from the Old Testament practice of sacrifice. When a priest offered an animal at the altar, he poured the blood out at the base of it (Leviticus 4:7). The blood pooled beneath the altar. That image is what John is drawing on. The martyrs' lives, poured out for God, are pictured the way sacrificial blood was poured out at the base of the altar in the courtyard of the Jewish temple. As Ogden writes, "under the altar" symbolized "the sacrifice of their lives for the word of God and the testimony which they held."

Think carefully about what that means. John is not telling us where these martyrs are located in heaven. He is telling us something about what their deaths meant. They gave their lives for God's word. That sacrifice was as real and as costly as any animal laid on the temple altar. The image of blood poured out beneath the altar captures that truth in a way that a plain statement never could. These souls are under the altar. John does not intend to communicate the literal position of these martyrs in heaven. He is painting a picture of faithful martyrs who died a sacrificial death. The picture is drawn from the sacrificial language

every Jewish reader would have recognized immediately. The martyrs' deaths were their offering. That is the image. It is a deeply moving picture of faithfulness, but it is still a picture.

## The Company This Verse Keeps

Before we go any further, it is worth stepping back and looking at the neighborhood Revelation 6:9-11 lives in. Because this passage does not stand alone. It sits right in the middle of one of the most famous sequences of symbols in the entire Bible: the opening of the seven seals. And the seals that come just before the fifth one give us a clear picture of how John expects his readers to handle his imagery. The first four seals release what history has come to call the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

The first horseman rides a white horse, carries a bow, and goes out "conquering and to conquer" (Revelation 6:2). Most readers understand this as a symbol of military conquest or political power sweeping across the earth. No one believes a literal man on a literal white horse is galloping through history.

The second horseman rides a red horse and takes peace from the earth. He carries a great sword, and people begin slaughtering one another (Revelation 6:3-4). Again, this is a symbol of war and bloodshed, not a report about an actual mounted soldier.

The third horseman rides a black horse and carries a pair of scales. A voice announces the prices of wheat and barley, and instructs that oil and wine not be harmed (Revelation 6:5-6). This is a well-recognized symbol of famine, where food is rationed and the poor suffer while the wealthy are spared. Not a literal horseman. Not a literal scale.

The fourth horseman rides a pale horse. His name is Death, and Hades follows close behind him. He receives authority over a quarter of the earth to kill by sword, famine, plague, and wild beasts (Revelation

6:7-8). A horseman named Death, followed by Hades as a companion. Plainly symbolic.

Four seals. Four horsemen. Four vivid, unmistakably symbolic pictures of forces that devastate human history. And then comes the fifth seal.

Suddenly, according to the traditional reading, John stops writing in symbols and starts writing a literal, factual report about the conscious location of the dead in heaven. The highly symbolic language of the first four seals gives way, without any signal or transition, to a straightforward description of disembodied souls having conversations beneath a sacred altar.

That is not how consistent reading works. A reader is not free to apply symbolic interpretation to four consecutive passages and then suddenly switch to a literal reading for the fifth, with no signal from the text that anything has changed. If the horsemen are symbols, the souls under the altar are symbols. John did not change his method between verse 8 and verse 9. His readers would not have expected him to. Applying a literal reading to verse 9 while reading the surrounding verses as symbols is not a careful interpretive choice. It is a conclusion driven by what someone already believes about the afterlife, not by what the text actually does.

## Abel's Blood

To see how this kind of figurative language works in the Bible, we need to go all the way back to Genesis 4. Cain has just killed his brother Abel. God confronts him:

> " 'What have you done?' replied the LORD. 'The voice of your brother's blood cries out to Me from the ground.' " (Genesis 4:10)

Abel's blood cries out. It has a voice. It speaks. Did Abel's literal blood make audible sounds from the dirt? No. That is not what Genesis is claiming. This is powerful figurative language that expresses two things at once: the gravity of the crime and the fact that God is fully aware of it. Abel is dead. But his death does not escape God's notice. The blood speaks, not because blood has vocal cords, but because God "hears" and requires justice.

Now here is the question that decides everything about how we read Revelation 6. If the souls crying out beneath the altar in Revelation are literally conscious, disembodied people speaking in heaven, then by the same logic, Abel's blood is literally, audibly crying out from the soil of the earth. You would have to believe both things or neither. No one believes Abel's blood is literally speaking. The language in Genesis 4 is obviously figurative. And the figurative language in Revelation 6 works exactly the same way.

The imagery functions the same way Abel's blood did in Genesis 4. Their deaths cry out for justice before God. And notice what is not underneath that figurative language in Genesis. There is no conscious Abel. There is a corpse and a crime. The figure carries God's awareness of the injustice, not Abel's ongoing experience of anything. The same vehicle carries the same cargo in Revelation 6.

## What the Symbolism Is Doing

Once we understand that this is symbolic, the picture becomes richer rather than poorer. The imagery in these three verses is doing several things at once, and none of them require conscious souls in an intermediate state.

First, the image declares that God sees. The martyrs died for their faith. In many cases, the world did not care. Governments executed them. Crowds applauded their deaths. Their names were forgotten. But

John's vision says God has not forgotten. He sees every sacrifice. The blood cries out and He hears it.

Second, the image echoes the Psalms. The cry "How long, O Lord?" appears throughout the Psalms when God's people suffer and wonder when He will act (Psalm 13:1-2, Psalm 35:17, Psalm 79:5). This is the language of lament, one of the most important forms of prayer in the Bible. John's vision places the martyrs inside that ancient conversation. Their deaths join the long cry of God's suffering people through all of history. The image reaches back through centuries of faithful people asking the same question.

Third, the white robes point to resurrection, not an intermediate state. Each soul in the vision receives a white robe. In Revelation, white robes consistently symbolize victory, purity, and the vindication that comes from God (Revelation 3:4-5, 7:9). These robes represent what God promises to those who died for His name. They are not a literal wardrobe, and the text does not say the souls put them on. The robes are given and then the souls are told to rest. That sequence matters: the gift points forward to what is coming, not to what is already present. A robe is worn by a body, and the promise of a robe is the promise of a body to wear it at the resurrection. Just as the Lamb does not literally open a physical seal, the robes do not literally clothe bodiless spirits. They are a symbol of future vindication. And the timing of that vindication matters: the souls are told to "rest a little longer." Rest. Not talk, not worship, not wait consciously. Rest. That word choice fits exactly with what the rest of the Bible says about death throughout both testaments.

Fourth, the command to rest "until the full number" is complete points forward to the resurrection. The vindication these martyrs cry out for will not come until a future event, when God's purposes in history reach their appointed conclusion. At some point in the distant future, when the last martyr gives his or her life, then will come the reckoning.

That is not a picture of people enjoying a conscious intermediate state. It is a picture of people who have been promised that God will act, and that His timing is His own.

## What This Passage Is Not Doing

Revelation 6:9-11 is a vision. John did not visit heaven and file a report. He received symbols from God to communicate truth about God's awareness, God's justice, and the certainty of future vindication.

If the souls under the altar are literally conscious, then Abel's blood is literally crying out from the ground. If Abel's blood is figurative, the souls under the altar are figurative too. You cannot apply the rule differently to two passages that use the exact same kind of language.

What Revelation 6:9-11 establishes is meaningful and important. God notices the deaths of His faithful people. He hears their cry for justice. He has promised to act. Their sacrifice matters eternally.

What it does not establish is that the dead are already conscious in heaven right now. That conclusion requires reading a visionary, highly symbolic book through a lens of literal interpretation, and it requires ignoring the same kind of figurative language when it shows up in Genesis. Consistent interpretation has to go both ways.

The rest of the Bible remains exactly where we left it. The dead rest. They sleep. They wait, without awareness of the passage of time, for the resurrection morning when everything changes. Revelation 6 does not contradict that picture. Placed in its own literary context, and read alongside Genesis 4, it confirms it. The martyrs' blood speaks from the ground, just as Abel's did. And God, who heard Abel, hears them too.

---

*Dave read through the passage in Revelation one more time, slowly.*

*"So Abel's blood," he said, "that's the key."*

*"That's the key," Carol said. "Once you see that one, you can't unsee it. The language works exactly the same way."*

*"If the souls are literally conscious," Dave said, working through it out loud, "then Abel's blood has literally been making noise in the dirt for thousands of years."*

*"And nobody believes that."*

*"Nobody believes that." He set the Bible down. "So the question isn't whether this is figurative. It's just what the figure means." He was quiet a moment. "And it means God sees. God remembers. He will act."*

*"Which is actually more comforting," Carol said, "than a story about conscious souls waiting around in heaven."*

*Dave looked at her. "Because it's about God's character. Not about human nature."*

*"Right. The comfort isn't 'you'll still be awake somewhere.' The comfort is 'God does not forget. He will not let injustice stand. His timing is perfect.' That's a much bigger promise."*

*Dave nodded slowly. He picked up his pen.*

*"Okay," he said. "What's next?"*

Chapter 14

# The Corner We Painted Ourselves Into

*They had been sitting at the kitchen table for a long time. The pages spread out in front of them were covered in notes, cross-references, and questions they had written down weeks ago and only now felt equipped to answer.*

*Carol set her pen down. "We've been through a lot of passages now. The thief on the cross. The rich man and Lazarus. Paul wanting to depart and be with Christ. The souls under the altar. And in every single one of them, once we stopped reading it through the traditional lens, it stopped saying what we thought it said."*

*"I know," Dave said. "But there's something that still bothers me. These are smart people. Serious Bible scholars. People who have spent their whole lives studying this. How did they end up here too?"*

*Carol looked at him. "That's actually the thing I want to talk about tonight."*

*Dave leaned back in his chair. "Then talk."*

---

We have spent the last several chapters working through the passages in the New Testament that the traditional view depends on most heavily. At every turn, when we read them carefully and in context, they said something different than we expected. But there is a question that deserves an honest answer before we go further: if the traditional view has these problems, why do so many serious scholars still hold it? The answer is not that they are careless readers. The answer is something more interesting than that.

There is a moment in certain theological debates when a scholar, after years of careful study, essentially throws up his hands and admits that the problem cannot be solved. That kind of honesty is rare and worth paying attention to.

Gerald Hawthorne and Ralph Martin no doubt spent decades studying Paul's letter to the Philippians. Their contribution to the *Word Biblical Commentary* series on Philippians is among the most respected in the field. And when they arrived at Philippians 1:23, the verse where Paul writes about his desire to depart and be with Christ, they found themselves in a place that honest scholars sometimes end up: stuck.

On one side of the problem, they recognized that Paul consistently teaches that Christians who die are "asleep," waiting for Christ's return. Death is not a graduation to heaven. It is a rest before resurrection. Paul makes this point repeatedly across his letters. Hawthorne and Martin knew that.

On the other side, they looked at Philippians 1:23 and heard Paul saying something that seemed to contradict everything else he wrote, that the moment he died he would step directly into the presence of Christ.

They could not reconcile these two things. And in a commentary read by ministers and seminaries around the world, they said so plainly. Their conclusion was that "no completely satisfactory resolution to the problem posed by these seemingly contradictory views has as yet been given, and perhaps none can be given."

Two of the leading scholars in New Testament studies, writing about one of the most beloved passages in Paul's letters, looked at the traditional Christian understanding of what happens when we die and said: we cannot make this work. The pieces do not fit together. They are to be admired for their transparency and honesty. Lesser men would try to bluff their way through it, or just ignore the verse entirely.

To be fair, Hawthorne and Martin did not abandon the traditional view. They held it while admitting they could not defend it on this point. But that is precisely what makes their testimony useful. They are not witnesses against their own position. They are witnesses that the position has a problem it cannot solve from the inside. Their impasse is only a problem if you begin with a particular assumption. And it is the same assumption we have been tracing throughout this entire book.

## The Assumption That Breaks Everything

Their problem was not intelligence or effort. It was the framework they brought to Paul's writings, one that Paul himself did not share. That framework is Greek dualism. As we traced in the early chapters of this book, the idea of an immortal soul that survives the body's death as a conscious, separable entity did not come from the Hebrew scriptures. It came from Plato. It entered Christian thinking through the early church fathers, many of whom were educated in Greek philosophy before they were converted. The ink was hardly dry on the New Testament Scriptures before the error started taking hold. Within a few hundred years

the Greek framework was already so deeply embedded that most people never thought to question it.

The result was two pictures that could not be made to fit. Paul the sleep-of-death teacher. Paul the go-immediately-to-heaven teacher. And since both pictures seemed to come from the same letters, the only honest conclusion was that Paul seems to have contradicted himself, and that no one had yet figured out how to reconcile his statements.

But Paul does not contradict himself. When you read him through a biblical understanding of the soul, rather than a Greek one, every passage lines up. The apparent contradiction disappears entirely. The problem was never in Paul's writing. The problem is in the lens we read through.

That is what happens when you paint yourself into a theological corner. The paint is the unexamined assumption. The corner is the place you end up when that assumption forces conclusions that do not fit together. And once you are in the corner, you cannot move without stepping on something you were not willing to step on. The way out of the corner is not to be smarter. It is to recognize that the assumption itself is the problem.

## The Surprise That Changes Everything

There is another way the traditional view paints itself into a corner, and this one comes not from a scholar's commentary but from the pages of the New Testament itself. Consider what the Bible says about the final judgment. Several passages in the Gospels describe people standing before God to receive their verdict, and what is striking about those scenes is that the people in them are genuinely surprised.

In Matthew 25:37-39, the righteous are shocked by the positive verdict they receive. They cannot believe they deserve it. They ask Jesus, "Lord, when did we see You hungry and feed You, or thirsty and give

You something to drink? When did we see You a stranger and take You in, or naked and clothe You? When did we see You sick or in prison and visit You?" They are not nodding along because they already knew the outcome. The verdict catches them completely off guard.

In Matthew 25:44, the unrighteous express the same kind of surprise, but from the other side. When their condemnation comes, they protest: "Lord, when did we see You hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not minister to You?" Again, the moment catches them off guard. They were not expecting it.

In Matthew 7:22-23, Jesus describes a group of people who appeal to their own record of ministry, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Your name, and in Your name drive out demons and perform many miracles?" and receive a response they clearly did not see coming: "I never knew you; depart from Me, you workers of lawlessness."

Now ask a simple question. If the traditional view is correct, and the dead are already consciously experiencing their reward or punishment the moment they die, how is any of this a surprise?

Think it through. If a believer dies and her soul goes immediately to heaven, she is already there. She already knows the verdict. She has been living in it, consciously, for however many years or decades or centuries passed between her death and the final judgment. When she stands before God at the end of all things, the judgment scene is not revealing anything new. It is simply making official what she has already been experiencing.

And if that is true for the righteous, it is equally true for the unrighteous. If unbelievers face conscious punishment from the moment of death onward, then by the time the final judgment arrives they have already been punished. The verdict at the end is just a formality. A stamp on a document they already read.

But the New Testament does not treat it as a formality. It treats the judgment as the moment of revelation, the moment when accounts are finally settled. The righteous are surprised by their reward. The unrighteous are surprised by their condemnation. The entire scene depends on the idea that the people standing before God do not already know what is coming.

Ralph Cunnington, an evangelical scholar writing in The Evangelical Quarterly, put the problem plainly. The final judgment, he observed, will surprise unbelievers. They will not be ready for it. But this surprise makes no sense if they were already consciously experiencing punishment from the moment they died. If they had been in torment for years or centuries, the judgment verdict would not be a surprise. It would be a confirmation of what they already knew. The surprise requires that whatever their condition between death and judgment was, it was not one of conscious awareness of their final standing before God.

This is not a minor point. The surprise factor runs through multiple passages and multiple types of people: the righteous who did not expect to be rewarded, the unrighteous who did not expect to be condemned, and those who assumed their religious activity would speak for them but discovered it did not. In every case, the judgment scene lands as a revelation, not a formality.

That is exactly what you would expect if the dead are sleeping, unaware of the passing of time, waiting for the moment when God wakes them and the books are opened. It is very difficult to explain if they have been consciously present in heaven or torment all along.

## The Way Out of the Corner

The past eighteen-hundred years of tradition weigh heavily on these questions. It is not easy to step back from conclusions that feel woven into the fabric of the Christian faith. When a view has been re-

peated from enough pulpits and printed in enough hymnals and spoken at enough gravesides, it begins to feel less like a position someone once argued for and more like a thing everyone has simply always known.

The dominant framework through which many Christians came to read these passages did not come from the Bible. It came from a culture that was heavily shaped by Greek philosophical assumptions. It was absorbed into Christian thinking so early and so quietly that most people never noticed. The result is exactly what Hawthorne and Martin described: contradictions that no one can explain away, because a real explanation would require giving up the very assumption that created the problem in the first place.

The Bible does not contradict itself on this, or any, question. Paul does not contradict himself. The picture of sleeping dead waiting for the trumpet of God fits every passage we have examined. The surprise at the judgment fits. The resurrection as the great moment of transformation and reunion fits. What does not fit is the Greek idea of a naturally immortal soul that departs the body at death and remains fully conscious throughout an intermediate period before a resurrection that, at that point, barely matters.

The corner we painted ourselves into is real, and it took centuries to paint. Getting out of it means setting down the brush, recognizing where the paint came from, and reading the Bible on its own terms.

That is what we have spent this entire book trying to do. And it works. Every passage lines up. The picture holds together. The only thing left is to deal honestly with the objections, and that is exactly where we are headed.

---

*Dave picked up his pen and turned to a fresh page in his notebook.*

*"So the scholars who can't figure it out," he said, "they're not stuck because the Bible is confusing. They're stuck because they brought the wrong map."*

*"That's exactly it," Carol said. "You can have the most detailed map in the world, and it won't help you if it's a map of the wrong city."*

*Dave wrote something down and then looked at it.*

*"The surprise thing gets me," he said. "I've read Matthew 25 a hundred times. I never once thought about why they were surprised. I just thought that was how Jesus told the story." He shook his head. "But if they're already in heaven or already in torment, there's no reason to be surprised. The judgment wouldn't be news to them. It would be old news."*

*"And the text treats it like the biggest news of their existence," Carol said.*

*"Yeah." Dave set his pen down and looked at the stack of notes in front of him. "You know what's strange? I've been reading some of these passages my whole life. I never noticed any of this." He paused. "Not because it isn't there. Because I wasn't looking for it."*

*Carol nodded. "Nobody looks for what they already think they have."*

*Dave picked his pen back up. "Okay. What are the objections?"*

*Carol turned a page. "Samuel at Endor. Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration. A few others."*

*"Alright." He almost smiled. "Let's see what they actually say."*

Chapter 15

# Answering Common Objections

By now you have probably thought of a few objections yourself. Maybe someone you respect has already raised one. These are the ones that come up most often, and they deserve the same honest treatment we have given everything else.

---

**Objection: The witch of Endor summoned Samuel from the dead (1 Samuel 28). Doesn't that prove the dead are conscious and can communicate?**

This is one of the strangest stories in the Old Testament, and good Bible students have wrestled with it for centuries. There are really two ways to read it. The first possibility is that something really did appear, but it was not actually Samuel. The Hebrew word used to describe what came up is *elohim* (pronounced eh-loh-HEEM). Biblical scholar Michael Heiser, in *The Unseen Realm*, explains that *elohim* is essentially a 'place of residence' term describing beings that inhabit the spiritual realm rather than the physical world. In other words, *elohim* describes the category of being, a spiritual inhabitant of the unseen realm, rather than identifying the specific individual who appeared. If what appeared

was an *elohim* in that sense, the woman may have conjured a deceiving spirit that mimicked Samuel's appearance, in which case the passage tells us nothing reliable about the actual condition of the dead. The second possibility is that God, as a rare exception, awoke Samuel himself and permitted him to appear. If so, the text gives us absolutely no window into what Samuel had been experiencing before or after this moment. He appears, delivers a message, and that is all. The story sheds no light about the ordinary state of the dead. Either a deceiving spirit appeared and the passage proves nothing, or Samuel appeared under extraordinary divine circumstances and still says nothing about what the dead ordinarily experience. Either way, this passage is not the strong evidence it appears to be at first glance.

---

**Objection: Moses and Elijah appeared at the Transfiguration (Matthew 17:1-8). Doesn't that show the dead are alive and present with God?**

Matthew, quoting Jesus, describes what happened on that mountain as a *vision*: "Tell no one about the vision until the Son of Man has risen from the dead" (Matthew 17:9). A vision is a revelatory experience in which God imparts information. The Bible is full of visionary experiences. Isaiah saw God on His throne (Isaiah 6:1). Ezekiel was taken to Jerusalem "in visions of God" (Ezekiel 8:3). John received the entire book of Revelation "in the Spirit" (Revelation 1:10). In each case, the vision communicated real divine truth without being a literal snapshot of the physical universe. The Transfiguration was about Jesus, confirming His identity and His mission. It was not a doctrinal lesson on the intermediate state. But even if we set the visionary language aside and treat the appearance as literal, the narrative still tells us nothing about what Moses or Elijah were experiencing before that moment or after it.

All we know is that for a brief moment, they were awake and conversing with Jesus. Just like the story at Endor, the appearance happens, a point is made, and the text moves on. The silence of the narrative is not evidence of conscious existence between death and resurrection. It is just silence.

---

**Objection: Isaiah 14:9-10 describes the dead stirring and speaking in Sheol. Doesn't that mean they are conscious?**

Isaiah 14:9-10 is poetry. Specifically, it is a taunt song, a mocking poem written against the king of Babylon. Here is what it says:

> "Sheol below is eager to greet you at your coming; it stirs up the spirits of the dead to meet you, all the rulers of the earth; it makes all the kings of the nations rise from their thrones." (Isaiah 14:9)

Before we build a theology of conscious afterlife on this passage, we need to notice what surrounds it. Just a few verses earlier, in Isaiah 14:8, the cedar trees of Lebanon are described as rejoicing over the king's downfall and speaking to him: "Since you have laid low, no woodsman has come against us." Do the trees literally rejoice? Do they speak? Of course not. That is the power of poetry. It uses vivid, imaginative pictures to make a point. The entire passage is built on this kind of dramatic, personified imagery, and everyone recognizes it as such when they read about the talking trees. The same literary tools are at work just two verses later when the shades of the dead stir and rise. If we press the tree verse literally, we get talking cedar trees. If we press the Sheol verses literally, we get a doctrine that flatly contradicts everything else the Bible says about the state of the dead. Good interpretation means

reading poetry as poetry. Isaiah is making one devastating point: the mighty king of Babylon, who made the whole earth tremble, ends up in the grave like everyone else. The passage is not a doctrinal statement about consciousness after death. It is a piece of devastating poetic irony.

---

**Objection: Hebrews 12:23 refers to "the spirits of righteous men made perfect." Doesn't that describe the dead as conscious and already in God's presence?**

Hebrews 12:22-24 is one of the most beautiful passages in the New Testament. It describes the new covenant community gathered around God, and verse 23 includes this phrase: "the spirits of righteous men made perfect." To understand what this means, we need to recognize two things. First, "the spirits of righteous persons" was a familiar Jewish idiom, a set phrase that simply meant the godly dead. Writers of the period, including those who composed books like 1 Enoch and 2 Baruch that circulated in the Jewish world, used this exact expression as a standard way of referring to people who had died in faith. The writer of Hebrews was using language his audience already understood. Second, as New Testament scholar William Lane notes in his Word Biblical Commentary on Hebrews, the phrase appears in Hebrews 12:23 alongside a reference to God as Judge, and together they point to "God's powerful intervention in His fallen creation." The passage is describing the full heavenly assembly, the complete community of the redeemed, as the goal toward which God's people are headed. The phrase "made perfect" is a word Hebrews uses throughout the letter to describe people whose relationship with God has been completed and fulfilled through Christ's work, not necessarily a statement that they are consciously present and active right now. Hebrews does not tell us what the godly dead are presently experiencing. It tells us that God's saving purpose for them

is complete, and that they belong to the same assembly we belong to as we walk by faith. That is a glorious truth. It just does not require them to be consciously awake and waiting in a heavenly waiting room.

---

**Objection: Maybe the New Testament introduces the concept of the soul surviving the body. Isn't that just progressive revelation: God revealing a truth He hadn't fully disclosed before?**

It is true that God gradually revealed His truths, not all at once, but bit by bit. However, the progressive revelation argument actually works against the traditional view, not for it. The whole idea behind progressive revelation is that later revelation builds on and completes earlier revelation. It does not contradict it. If the New Testament introduced the idea that the soul is immortal and separable from the body, that would not be a development of Old Testament teaching. It would be a flat contradiction of it, because the Old Testament knows nothing of a soul that survives the death of the body as a conscious, independent entity. The Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Job, Daniel, all of them describe the dead as sleeping, silent, knowing nothing. A "new revelation" that directly contradicts the consistent witness of the entire Old Testament is not progressive revelation. It is a discontinuity the Bible never allows. Jesus himself said He did not come to abolish the Law and the Prophets (Matthew 5:17). And the problem does not stop there. If the New Testament introduced soul immortality as a new truth, we would expect the writers who came after Jesus to develop and build on it. But Paul, writing decades after the events of the Gospels, describes death as sleep, tells the Thessalonians that the dead remain in their graves until the resurrection, and places the great moment of transformation at the trumpet call, not at the moment of death. Progressive revelation moves forward consistently. It does not introduce a doctrine in the Gospels that

the epistles then quietly contradict. The words of the New Testament fit within what the Old Testament already taught about the power of God over human life and death, and they fit equally well with everything Paul wrote afterward.

---

**Objection: The church has taught the immortal soul for the last eighteen-hundred years. Are you saying that for all those centuries the church has gotten this wrong?**

The history is real: the idea of a naturally immortal soul has been the dominant view for most of Christian history. But the history is also real that this view came directly from Greek philosophy. Many early church fathers were deeply influenced by Plato and other Greek philosophers, and in some cases acknowledged that influence openly. Those borrowings hardened into doctrine before most believers had any reason to question them. The Protestant Reformation recovered some biblical truths from beneath layers of tradition, but this was one area where it largely left the Greek assumption in place. The fact that a view has been held for a long time does not make it correct. What makes a view correct is whether it is actually what the Bible teaches. And as we have seen throughout this book, the sleep of death, the resurrection as the great transforming event, the gift of immortality as something received rather than something already possessed, these are the things the Bible consistently teaches, from Genesis to Revelation. Longevity of a doctrine is not necessarily an indicator of correct biblical interpretation.

---

**Objection: This view seems new and unfamiliar. Doesn't that make it suspect?**

Actually, it is not new at all. This view was held by those in the early church who resisted the Greek philosophical influence. It was held by Martin Luther, who wrote plainly that the dead sleep until the resurrection. William Tyndale, who gave his life to put the Bible into English, defended it strongly. More recently, Oscar Cullmann made one of the most compelling cases against the traditional view in his 1955 essay "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?" He argued on careful biblical grounds that resurrection, not an immortal soul, is the heart of the Christian hope. Conditional immortality, as this view is sometimes called, has a long and respectable history. What is actually newer is the degree to which pagan ideas about the soul came to dominate Christian thinking. That dominance has been so complete, for so long, that a careful return to the Bible can feel unfamiliar. But unfamiliar is not the same thing as wrong.

---

**Objection: OK, maybe the dead aren't in heaven yet. But aren't they conscious in Hades, waiting for the resurrection in compartments of paradise and torment?**

This objection assumes that Hades is a divided realm where the dead wait consciously in either comfort or torment until the final judgment. But that picture requires more than the Bible actually gives us. The Greek word *Hades* is simply the New Testament equivalent of the Hebrew word *Sheol*. When Jewish scholars translated the Old Testament into Greek several centuries before Jesus, they used *Hades* to translate *Sheol* consistently. The two words point to the same reality: the grave, the place of the dead, the destination of everyone who dies. Neither word carries a built-in description of what the dead experience there. The elaborate compartment map, with its paradise side and torment side connected by an uncrossable gulf, draws most of its detail from one

source: the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus in Luke 16, which we examined in Chapter 6. As we saw there, that story is not a glimpse into the afterlife. It is a story aimed at money-loving Pharisees. For the purposes of this book's central question, the answer is the same either way. The biblical hope remains resurrection, not a disembodied existence that bypasses it.

---

These objections are real, and they come from people who love the Bible and take it seriously. They deserve careful answers, not dismissal. The goal throughout this book has not been to be contrarian or to tear down what is precious to people. The goal has been to sit with the Bible open and let it say what it actually says.

Every one of these passages, read carefully in context, turns out to be consistent with the picture the Bible paints from beginning to end. The dead sleep. The resurrection is the great event. Immortality is a gift. And the God who created us in the first place is fully capable of raising us from the dust and making us whole.

That is not a diminished hope. That is the hope the Bible actually offers. That hope belongs to everyone who trusts in the God who raises the dead. Not because we are indestructible by nature, but because He is faithful.

---

*Carol closed her notebook.*

*Dave leaned back in his chair and was quiet for a moment. Then he said, "You know what's funny? I feel like I understand the resurrection better now than I ever did before."*

*"How so?" Carol asked.*

*"Because it actually means something now." He gestured toward the notes spread across the table. "If everybody goes straight to heaven when they die, the resurrection is just… a formality. A ceremony. But if the dead are sleeping, waiting, then the day the trumpet sounds and the dead rise — that's the moment. That's when everything changes. That's the payoff."*

*Carol smiled. "Paul writes about it like it's the most important event in human history."*

*"Because it is," Dave said. "I just never quite saw it that way before."*

*He gathered his notes into a rough stack and looked at them. "I'll be honest with you, though. We are going to be out of step with a lot of people we respect. A lot of people we love. I say something about this at church and somebody's going to look at me like I have two heads."*

*"Probably," Carol said, without any apology in her voice. "But would you rather be in step with the crowd, or in step with the text?"*

*Dave thought about that for a second. "The text," he said. "Every time."*

*"Then we're in good company," Carol said. "The church has had faithful voices on this for centuries. And they were willing to say so, even when it cost them."*

*"It cost them a little more than a few awkward conversations," Dave said, and laughed.*

*"Fair point." Carol picked up her pen one more time and wrote something at the top of a fresh page.*

*Dave leaned over to look. She had written: The resurrection is everything.*

*"Yeah," he said quietly. "That's it. That's exactly it."*

*He reached over and tapped the page. "Leave room under that. I think there's more to say."*

*Carol looked at him. "There's always more to say."*

# Part Three

*A Better Hope*

Chapter 16

# Waking Up

*The church building smelled like old wood and flower arrangements.*

*Robert's wife sat in the front row, holding herself together with the particular stillness of someone who has cried until crying stops working. The minister read from 1 Thessalonians 4. He said Robert was more alive right now than he had ever been. He said Robert was in the presence of the Lord, watching over his family, waiting for the day they would all be together again.*

*The family nodded. Some of them wept quietly. The words were like a hand on the shoulder.*

---

That was the beginning of this book. We started there because that scene is where most of us live. It is the picture of death we absorbed at funerals and gravesides and in the quiet moments when we wondered what waits on the other side. The minister meant every word. He loved that family. And what he said was not entirely wrong.

But we have spent a lot of time learning that the picture he painted was not quite the one the Bible paints. We picked up Plato's brushes without knowing it, and we have been painting with them ever since. So let's go back to Robert's funeral. Not to pick apart what the minister said. But to see it differently than we did on page one.

## What We Actually Have

The minister told the family that Robert was already home. Eyes open. Fully present with God. Watching over them. The Bible tells us something richer. Robert rests. He is safe. He is held by the God who made him and redeemed him. Death has not swallowed him up. It has not ended him. He simply sleeps, and he will not experience even a moment of the time between now and the trumpet. From Robert's perspective, the next thing he will know is the voice of the Son of God. He will wake to the resurrection, transformed, clothed in the immortality that God alone possesses by nature and that God freely gives to His own.

That is not a smaller hope than what the minister described. It is a bigger one. The minister's picture is a quiet, private reunion. A soul slipping away to heaven, waiting for something. Watching from a distance.

The Bible's picture is a cosmic event. A trumpet. A shout. The dead in Christ rising first. Then those still alive caught up together with them. An entire people, across every generation, raised at the same moment, together. Not one ahead of the others. Not one left behind. Robert does not get his reunion while his family grieves below. They get it together. All of them. At once. On that day.

## The Communal Dimension

The fact that everyone will experience that day together is one of the most underappreciated gifts in the biblical picture of death. The tra-

ditional view is, at its heart, an individual story. You die. Your soul departs. You go to be with Jesus. That is a beautiful thought, but notice how private it is. You get your reward the moment you die. Everyone else gets theirs when they die. As a result, the resurrection becomes a formality, a technical reunion of body and soul for people who were already, in the most meaningful sense, where they were going to end up.

Paul does not describe the resurrection that way. Not once. When he writes about the hope of the dead in Christ, he writes about a community. "The dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are alive and remain will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17). Together.

The resurrection is not a series of individual transactions happening across thousands of years. It is the one great gathering of the entire people of God. The generation that conquered the Promised Land rises with the generation that watched Jerusalem fall. The Christians who died in Roman arenas rise with the Christians who died in hospital beds. Robert rises with his family. They do not get their reunion in pieces. They get it together, at the sound of the same trumpet, transformed in the same twinkling of an eye.

The sleep of death is not a waiting room where disembodied spirits pass the time until resurrection. It is the night before the greatest morning in human history. And everyone wakes up at the same time.

## Why Sleep Is Not a Threat

Someone will always ask the question. It comes up in Bible classes. It shows up in comments on blog posts. It gets whispered at funerals. If the dead are simply unconscious, how is that any comfort? How is sleep better than being already present with God?

The assumption is that conscious experience is what makes something good. That if you are not aware of something, it is not happening

for you. And therefore unconscious rest must be inferior to conscious presence with God.

But think about what the Bible promises the sleeping dead. They are in God's hands. Nothing can separate them from His love. Not death, not time, not the grave. Paul said that in Romans 8, and he did not put a footnote on it saying "unless you happen to die before the resurrection, in which case you are going to be waiting for a while." The dead in Christ rest securely, held by the same God who holds the living. They are asleep in Jesus.

And from their own perspective, they experience no time passing at all. The sleep of death is not experienced as a long wait. It is not experienced as anything. The moment death closes their eyes, the next conscious moment is the resurrection. There is no gap. There is no loneliness. There is no period of incomplete, disembodied existence. There is simply rest, and then the morning of all mornings.

What exactly is the threat in that? A child who falls asleep in the back seat of the car on a long trip does not experience the miles. He does not feel the dark or the cold outside the windows. He simply closes his eyes at one point in the journey and opens them at the destination. The sleep was not a deprivation. It was a mercy.

God has given His people the same mercy. The distance between now and resurrection morning will cost the sleeping dead nothing, because they will not experience it. They will open their eyes at the sound of the trumpet. That is not a consolation prize. That is grace.

## The Surprise That the Alternative Can't Explain

We covered this in Chapter 14, but it deserves one more mention here because its force is so difficult to escape. If the righteous have already been consciously enjoying God's presence for decades, centuries, or longer, and the unrighteous have already been consciously suffering, then the

genuine surprise of the judgment scenes in Matthew 7 and 25 becomes very hard to explain. The verdict would not reveal anything new. It would simply confirm what everyone already knew. What point does the judgement serve? But Scripture consistently presents judgment as revelation, not confirmation. People are shocked by what they hear. That fits naturally with the biblical picture of the dead: asleep, unaware, waiting for the morning when the books open and the trumpet sounds. That surprise is incompatible with the traditional view. However, it is exactly what you would expect if the dead are sleeping.

## Why We Can Rest Here

Some readers will finish this book and feel uneasy. They will agree with the careful analysis. They will see the weight of the evidence. And they will still feel a quiet pull toward the familiar comfort of immediate heaven, because that is what they were told at every funeral they ever attended, and changing a picture that deep takes time.

That is completely understandable. A few chapters of careful Bible study cannot instantly undo a lifetime of assumption. The discomfort is not a sign that you are rejecting the evidence. It is a sign that you are honestly wrestling with it. But here is what you can rest in, right now, without waiting for the discomfort to fully resolve.

The Bible is not hiding the truth about death to make you anxious. It is revealing the truth to make you unafraid. Sleep is not a frightening word. It is a word of safety. It is a word of rest. It is a word that comes with a guaranteed morning on the other side.

The dead in Christ are not forgotten. They are not suffering. They are not floating in some uncertain middle space. They rest in the hands of a God who does not lose things. And when He speaks on that great morning, every one of them will hear His voice and rise.

You do not have to choose between the comfort of the traditional view and the truth of the biblical one. The biblical view offers all the comfort the traditional view offers, and more. Robert is safe. The separation is not permanent. The reunion is coming. You do not have to grieve like people without hope. You just have to know what the hope is made of.

## The Question Revisited

At some point in this conversation, usually when someone is grieving, the question comes out directly: "But isn't it more comforting to think your loved one is already in heaven, wide awake and with Jesus, than to think they are just asleep?" It sounds like a pastoral question asked at bedsides and funerals, but it is really a theological one wearing pastoral clothes. And it deserves an honest answer.

The traditional view offers immediate reunion for the person who died. The biblical view offers something different: a guaranteed awakening with no subjective experience of waiting, followed by a communal resurrection that gathers the entire people of God together at once.

Which of those is more comforting depends on what you find comforting. If the idea of your loved one being conscious and present with God right now gives you peace, that feeling is real and it is not wrong to feel it. But feelings do not determine what the Bible says. And when we build our comfort on a picture the Bible does not paint, we build it on a fragile foundation that a careful question can knock over. Comfort that survives scrutiny is stronger than comfort that cannot.

The biblical picture can withstand every question you bring to it. Robert rests safely. He does not experience the time of separation. He will rise. You will rise. The reunion will happen, and it will happen together, and it will be permanent. For those who are in Christ, no more

death after that. No more separation. No more grief. That is not a compromise. That is the hope.

## One More Time at the Funeral

---

*The church building smelled like old wood and flower arrangements.*

*Robert's wife sat in the front row. The minister stood at the pulpit with his Bible open to 1 Thessalonians 4. He read slowly, all the way through, the trumpet and the shout and the dead rising and the great gathering together. Then he looked up at the family.*

*"Robert rests," he said. "He is safe. He is held in the hands of the God who made him and saved him, and nothing in heaven or earth can take him from those hands. He does not suffer. He does not wait in anxiety. He simply sleeps, the way Scripture says the faithful dead have always slept, at peace, beyond the reach of pain and grief and time. Robert is now asleep in the arms of Jesus.*

*"But I want you to hear what Paul is really saying in this passage, because it is bigger than Robert going to a better place. Paul says God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in Him. He says the dead in Christ will rise first. He says we who are alive will be caught up together with them.*

*"Together. That is the word. Not Robert getting his reunion while you stay behind and grieve. All of you. Together. At the sound of the same trumpet. In the twinkling of an eye.*

*Robert does not cross the finish line alone and wait for everyone else to catch up. You cross it together, on that day, transformed and whole and finally, permanently home.*

*"So yes, grieve. The separation is real and it is painful and God does not ask you to pretend otherwise. Death is the last enemy that will be defeated. But do not grieve as people without hope. The hope is not that Robert made it and that you might also. The hope is that the same God who raised Jesus from the dead has His hand on every believer in every grave, and He will not forget a single one of them when the morning comes.*

*"Robert now sleeps, waiting for that morning. And if you belong to Christ, so will you be. And when it comes, you will all wake up together."*

*The family wept. But the words did not drift away like smoke. They held like an anchor.*

---

That is the hope the Bible really offers. It was there in 1 Thessalonians 4 all along. We just had to set Plato's brushes down and hear God on His own terms.

# Epilogue

This book covers a lot of ground, but it does not cover all of it. Every passage we examined could fill a book of its own. Every chapter we spent a few pages on has generated decades of scholarly debate. This book gave you the headlines, but there is more to the story.

If you want to keep studying, the afterlife category at `https://ready4eternity.com/blog/afterlife` is the place to go. Every passage covered in this book has a corresponding series of posts that walk through the evidence in more detail, interact with the scholarship, and include the footnotes that a popular-level book like this one intentionally left out. That is also where new material will appear first. If something in these pages raised a question this book did not answer, the blog might already have it. One more thing before you go.

Hold your convictions with open hands, not with a white knuckled grip. I am confident in these conclusions. I have staked my reputation as a Bible teacher on them, and I have not yet seen an argument that changed my mind. But I have been wrong before, and you may finish this book and find something I missed. If you do, I genuinely want to know. We must all be willing to change our minds about our current conclusions when presented with compelling information. Good Bible study is not a monologue.

What I hope you take away is not simply a new answer to the question of what happens when we die. I hope you take away a new habit: the habit of letting the Bible set the terms. Not Plato. Not tradition. Not the minister at the last funeral you attended, however sincere he was. The Bible, read carefully, in context, with a willingness to be surprised.

The dead in Christ rest safely. The morning is coming. And when it does, we will all wake up together. That is worth studying.

# Appendix A: Sleep Passages

---

## Section 1: Passages That Explicitly Use Sleep Language

For now I would be lying down in peace; I would be **asleep** and at rest. (Job 3:13 BSB)

so a man lies down and does not rise. **Until the heavens are no more, he will not be awakened or roused from sleep**. (Job 14:12 BSB)

Consider me and respond, O LORD my God. Give light to my eyes, lest I **sleep** in death, (Psa. 13:3 BSB)

So David **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David. (1 Kings 2:10 KJV)

And Solomon **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David his father: and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 11:43 KJV)

And the days which Jeroboam reigned were two and twenty years: and he **slept** with his fathers, and Nadab his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 14:20 KJV)

And Rehoboam **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David. And his mother's name was Naamah an Ammonitess. And Abijam his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 14:31 KJV)

And Abijam **slept** with his fathers; and they buried him in the city of David: and Asa his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 15:8 KJV)

And Asa **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David his father: and Jehoshaphat his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 15:24 KJV)

So Baasha **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in Tirzah: and Elah his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 16:6 KJV)

So Omri **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in Samaria: and Ahab his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 16:28 KJV)

So Ahab **slept** with his fathers; and Ahaziah his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 22:40 KJV)

And Jehoshaphat **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David his father: and Jehoram his son reigned in his stead. (1 Kings 22:50 KJV)

And Joram **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David: and Ahaziah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 8:24 KJV)

And Jehu **slept** with his fathers: and they buried him in Samaria. And Jehoahaz his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 10:35 KJV)

And Jehoahaz **slept** with his fathers; and they buried him in Samaria: and Joash his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 13:9 KJV)

And Joash **slept** with his fathers; and Jeroboam sat upon his throne: and Joash was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel. (2 Kings 13:13 KJV)

And Jehoash **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel; and Jeroboam his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 14:16 KJV)

He built Elath, and restored it to Judah, after that the king **slept** with his fathers. (2 Kings 14:22 KJV)

And Jeroboam **slept** with his fathers, even with the kings of Israel; and Zachariah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 14:29 KJV)

So Azariah **slept** with his fathers; and they buried him with his fathers in the city of David: and Jotham his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 15:7 KJV)

And Menahem **slept** with his fathers; and Pekahiah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 15:22 KJV)

And Jotham **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David his father: and Ahaz his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 15:38 KJV)

And Ahaz **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David: and Hezekiah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 16:20 KJV)

And Hezekiah **slept** with his fathers: and Manasseh his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 20:21 KJV)

And Manasseh **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza: and Amon his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 21:18 KJV)

So Jehoiakim **slept** with his fathers: and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his stead. (2 Kings 24:6 KJV)

And Solomon **slept** with his fathers, and he was buried in the city of David his father: and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 9:31 KJV)

And Rehoboam **slept** with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David: and Abijah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 12:16 KJV)

So Abijah **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him in the city of David: and Asa his son reigned in his stead. In his days the land was quiet ten years. (2 Chr. 14:1 KJV)

And Asa **slept** with his fathers, and died in the one and fortieth year of his reign. (2 Chr. 16:13 KJV)

Now Jehoshaphat **slept** with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David. And Jehoram his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 21:1 KJV)

He built Eloth, and restored it to Judah, after that the king **slept** with his fathers. (2 Chr. 26:2 KJV)

So Uzziah **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings; for they said, He is a leper: and Jotham his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 26:23 KJV)

And Jotham **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him in the city of David: and Ahaz his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 27:9 KJV)

And Ahaz **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him in the city, even in Jerusalem: but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel: and Hezekiah his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 28:27 KJV)

And Hezekiah **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him in the chiefest of the sepulchres of the sons of David: and all Judah and the inhabitants

of Jerusalem did him honour at his death. And Manasseh his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 32:33 KJV)

So Manasseh **slept** with his fathers, and they buried him in his own house: and Amon his son reigned in his stead. (2 Chr. 33:20 KJV)

Your dead will live; their bodies will rise. **Awake** and sing, you who dwell in the dust! For your dew is like the dew of the morning, and the earth will bring forth her dead. (Isa. 26:19 BSB)

And many who **sleep in the dust of the earth will awake**, some to everlasting life, but others to shame and everlasting contempt. (Dan. 12:2 BSB)

"Go away," He told them. "The girl is not dead, but **asleep**." And they laughed at Him. (Matt. 9:24 BSB)

The tombs broke open, and the bodies of many saints who had **fallen asleep** were raised. (Matt. 27:52 BSB)

He went inside and asked, "Why all this commotion and weeping? The child is not dead, but **asleep**." (Mark 5:39 BSB)

Meanwhile, everyone was weeping and mourning for her. But Jesus said, "Stop weeping; she is not dead but **asleep**." (Luke 8:52 BSB)

After He had said this, He told them, "Our friend Lazarus has **fallen asleep**, but I am going there to wake him up." His disciples replied, "Lord, if he is **sleeping**, he will get better." They thought that Jesus was talking about actual **sleep**, but He was speaking about the death of Lazarus. So Jesus told them plainly, "Lazarus is dead." (John 11:11-14 BSB)

Falling on his knees, he cried out in a loud voice, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them." And when he had said this, he **fell asleep**. (Acts 7:60 BSB)

For when David had served God's purpose in his own generation, he **fell asleep** and was buried with his fathers and saw decay. (Acts 13:36 BSB)

After that, He appeared to more than five hundred brothers at once, most of whom are still living, though some have **fallen asleep**. (1 Cor. 15:6 BSB)

Then those also who have **fallen asleep** in Christ have perished. (1 Cor. 15:18 BSB)

But Christ has indeed been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have **fallen asleep**. (1 Cor. 15:20 BSB)

Listen, I tell you a mystery: **We will not all sleep**, but we will all be changed— (1 Cor. 15:51 BSB)

Brothers, we do not want you to be uninformed about **those who sleep in death**, so that you will not grieve like the rest, who are without hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we also believe that God will bring with Jesus **those who have fallen asleep in Him**. By the word of the Lord, we declare to you that we who are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord **will by no means precede those who have fallen asleep**. For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a loud command, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trumpet of God, and **the dead in Christ will be the first to rise**. (1 Thess. 4:13-16 BSB)

Ever since our fathers **fell asleep**, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. (2 Pet. 3:4 BSB)

---

## Section 2: Passages That Imply Sleep

For **there is no mention of You in death**; who can praise You from Sheol? (Psa. 6:5 BSB)

What gain is there in my bloodshed, in my descent to the Pit? **Will the dust praise You? Will it proclaim Your faithfulness?** (Psa. 30:9 BSB)

**Do You work wonders for the dead? Do departed spirits rise up to praise You?** … Will Your wonders be known in the darkness, or Your righteousness in **the land of oblivion**? (Psa. 88:10-12 BSB)

**It is not the dead who praise the LORD**, nor any who descend into silence. (Psa. 115:17 BSB)

His breath goes forth, he returns to his earth; in that very day **his thoughts perish**. (Psa. 146:4 KJV)

For the living know that they will die, but **the dead know nothing**, and they have no further reward, because the memory of them is forgotten. (Ecc. 9:5 BSB)

Whatever you find to do with your hands, do it with all your might, for **there is no work or planning or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol**, where you are going. (Ecc. 9:10 BSB)

For **Sheol cannot thank You; Death cannot praise You**; those who descend to the Pit cannot hope for Your faithfulness. The living, only the living, can thank You, as I do today. (Isa. 38:18-19 BSB)

Do not be amazed at this, for the hour is coming when **all who are in their graves will hear His voice and come out**. (John 5:28-29 BSB) *[Jesus describes the dead as being in the graves awaiting His voice at the resurrection. The framing assumes they are simply there until called forth.]*

Brothers, I may tell you freely of the patriarch David, that **he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day** … For David **did not ascend into heaven**. (Acts 2:29, 34 BSB) *[Peter's argument depends on David remaining in the grave. David died, was buried, and has not ascended to heaven, so Psalm 16 must refer to someone else.]*

# Appendix B: Jerusalem Talmud Sanhedrin 6:6

What happened in Ascalon supports him who said, Simeon ben Sheṭaḥ was president. Two students were in Ascalon. They ate together, drank together, and studied Torah together. One of them died, and nobody attended his funeral. The son of Maᶜyan the publican died; the entire city stopped working to attend his funeral. The other student started crying and said woe, do the haters of Israel have no hope? It was shown to him in his dream and said, do not denigrate your Master's children. This one did one good deed and died with it, the other one committed one sin and died with it. What sin did he commit? Far be it that he committed a sin, but once he put on his head phylacteries before his arm phylacteries. What good deed did the son of publican Maᶜyan do? Far be it that he committed a good deed, but once he prepared a breakfast for the city council but they did not show up. He said, let the poor come and eat it, so it should not go to waste. Some say, he was walking in the street, having a loaf under his shoulder. It fell down and a poor person picked it up. He did not say anything in order not to embarrass him. This student saw gardens and water sources. He saw the son of Maᶜyan the publican standing on the river bank trying in vain to reach the water. He also saw Miriam, Onion-leaf's daughter, hanging on her breast nipples; but some say, the door of Hell was fixed in her ear. He asked, [why? They told him, because she fasted and made herself famous among her neighbors. Some say, she fasted one day and was dissolute two days. He asked them] for how long? They told him, when Simeon ben Sheṭaḥ comes, we shall remove it from her ear and put is in his ear. He asked

them, what is his misdeed? They told him, because he made a personal vow that if he were elected president, he would kill all sorcerers. But now he was made president and he did not kill them. In fact, there are eighty women in the cave of Ascalon who hurt the world; go and tell him! He told them, he is an important personality, he will not believe me. They told him, he is very meek and will believe you. In case that he will not believe you, take out one of your eyes and put it in your hand. He took out one of his eyes and put it in his hand. They said, return it; it was even with the other. He went and told him. He wanted to perform his miracle before him, but he told him, you do not need to. I know that you are a pious person. Even though I intended so in my thoughts, I never spoke it with my mouth. It was a day of rainstorms. He took eighty select men in clean garments and took with them eighty amphoras. He told them, when I whistle once, put on your garments. When I whistle for the second time, come. When he came to the cave of Ascalon, he said, open for me, I am one of yours. When he entered, one said what she said and produced bread. One said what she said and produced a dish. One said what she said and produced wine. They asked him, what can you do? He told them, when I whistle twice, I shall bring here eighty select men in dry garments for your pleasure and entertainment. They told him, we desire them. When he whistled, they put on their garments; when he whistled for the second time, they all entered together. He made them a sign for each one to grab one of them and lift her from the earth. Then they did not succeed in what they were trying to do. He told the one who brought bread, bring bread! She did not succeed. He said, take her to be crucified. Bring a dish! She did not succeed. He said, take her to be crucified. Bring wine! She did not succeed. He said, take her to be crucified. This he did to all of them. That is what we have stated: "Simeon ben Shetaḥ hanged eighty women in Ascalon, but one does not try two on the same day." But the hour needed it.

---

*Jerusalem Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin*, translated and edited by Heinrich W. Guggenheimer (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999–2015). Text and translation digitized by Sefaria from the National Library of Israel. Used under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license.

# Works Consulted

Akin, Daniel L., Bruce Riley Ashford, and Kenneth Keathley. *A Theology for the Church*. Revised ed. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2014.

Arnold, Clinton E., ed. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*. Volume 3: Romans to Philemon. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.

Atkinson, Basil. *Life and Immortality: An Examination of the Nature and Meaning of Life and Death as They Are Revealed in the Scriptures*. Taunton: E. Goodman & Son, The Phoenix Press, n.d.

Baird, Cliff. *Understanding the Afterlife: A Scriptural Analysis of the Hadean World*. WestBow Press, 2012.

Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels." *New Testament Studies* 37, no. 2 (April 1991): 225–46.

Best, Ernest. "Dead in Trespasses and Sins (Eph 2:1)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 4, no. 13 (1981): 16–17.

Bos, A. P. " 'Aristotelian' and 'Platonic' Dualism in Hellenistic and Early Christian Philosophy and in Gnosticism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 56, no. 3 (December 2002): 273–91.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic; Coded with the Numbering System from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Reprinted from the 1906 ed. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.

Bruehler, Bart B. "Reweaving the Texture of Luke 16:14–18." *Journal of Biblical and Pneumatological Research* 5 (2013): 49–67.

Bullinger, E. W. *A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Bullinger, E. W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated*. 16th print. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? The Witness of the New Testament*. Reprint ed. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2000.

Cunnington, Ralph. "A Re-Examination of the Intermediate State of Unbelievers." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 82, no. 3 (July 2010): 215–37.

Dailey, Thomas F. "To Live or Die: Paul's Eschatological Dilemma in Philippians 1:19–26." *Interpretation* 44, no. 1 (January 1990): 18–28.

Elwell, Walter A. Entry for 'Soul.' *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. StudyLight.org, 1996. `https://www.studylight.org/dictionaries/eng/bed/s/soul.html`.

Farrar, Thomas J. "Today in Paradise?: Ambiguous Adverb Attachment and the Meaning of Luke 23:43." *Neotestamentica* 51, no. 2 (2017): 185–207.

Fudge, Edward William. *The Fire That Consumes: A Biblical and Historical Study of the Doctrine of Final Punishment*. 3rd ed. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2011.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 32A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.

Garland, David E. *2 Corinthians*. Vol. 29 of The New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1999.

Gillman, John. "A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15:50–57 and 2 Cor 5:1–5." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107, no. 3 (September 1988): 439–54.

González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity*. Vol. 1, *The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. New York: HarperCollins, 2010.

Green, Joel B. "Eschatology and the Nature of Humans: A Reconsideration of Pertinent Biblical Evidence." *Science & Christian Belief* 14, no. 1 (2002): 33–50.

Green, Joel B. "Three Exegetical Forays into the Body-Soul Discussion." *Criswell Theological Review* 7, no. 2 (2010): 3–18.

Guggenheimer, Heinrich W., trans. and ed. *The Jerusalem Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999–2015.

Harris, M. J. "Immortal." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Revised), edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 2:811. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Harris, Murray J. "Resurrection and Immortality: Eight Theses." *Themelios* 1, no. 2 (1976): 50–55.

Harris, W. Hall, ed. *NET Bible Full Notes Edition*. 2nd ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2019.

Hawthorne, Gerald F., and Ralph P. Martin. *Philippians*. Vol. 43 of Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.

Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Heiser, Michael S. *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015.

Heller, James J. "The Resurrection of Man." *Theology Today* 15, no. 2 (July 1958): 217–29.

Hentschel, Jason. "Thomas Aquinas, 2 Corinthians 5, and the Christian Hope for Life After Death." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 8, no. 1 (2014): 63–80.

Hoekema, Anthony A. *The Bible and the Future*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Hong, J. "Understanding and Translating 'Today' in Luke 23.43." *The Bible Translator* 46, no. 4 (October 1995): 408–17.

Inwagen, Peter van. "Dualism and Materialism: Athens and Jerusalem?" *Faith and Philosophy: Journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers* 12, no. 4 (October 1995): 475–88.

Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*. 1871. Accordance electronic ed. Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software, 1996.

Kaiser, Walter C., Peter H. Davids, F. F. Bruce, and Manfred T. Brauch. *Hard Sayings of the Bible*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2010.

Kister, Menahem. "Parables and Proverbs in the Jesus-Tradition and Rabbinic Literature." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41, no. 1 (December 2018): 5–28.

Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and M. E. J. Richardson, eds. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Kreitzer, Larry J. "Intermediate State." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1–8*. Vol. 47A of Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.

Lane, William L. *Hebrews 9–13*. Vol. 47B of Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.

Louw, J. P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Vol. 40 of Word Biblical Commentary. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Mitchell, T. C. "The Old Testament Usage of Nešāma." *Vetus Testamentum* 11, no. 1 (January 1961): 177–87.

Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*. Zondervan Language Basics Series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2019.

Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. Vol. 46 of Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Murphy, Roland E. *Ecclesiastes*. Vol. 23A of Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1992.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Newman, Lester I. *The Concept of the Soul in Plato and in Early Judeo-Christian Thought*. Boston University, 1958.

O'Kane, Martin. " 'The Bosom of Abraham' (Luke 16:22): Father Abraham in the Visual Imagination." *Biblical Interpretation* 15, nos. 4–5 (2007): 485–518.

Ogden, Arthur M. *The Avenging of the Apostles and Prophets: Commentary on Revelation*. 3rd ed. Ogden Publications, 2016.

Pearson, Birger A. "Gnosticism as Platonism: With Special Reference to Marsanes (NHC 10,1)." *Harvard Theological Review* 77, no. 1 (December 1984): 55–72.

Rickabaugh, Brandon L. "Responding to N. T. Wright's Rejection of the Soul." *Heythrop Journal* 59, no. 2 (March 2018): 201–20.

Robbins, Vernon K., Robert H. von Thaden Jr., and Bart B. Bruehler. *Foundations for Sociorhetorical Exploration: A Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity Reader*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Robeck, C. M., Jr. "Soul." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Revised), edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Rodríguez, Angel Manuel. "2 Corinthians 12:2, 3." Biblical Research Institute, Seventh-day Adventist Church. https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/articles/2-corinthians-12-2-3.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Soul." In *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Silva, Moisés, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 2nd ed. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Smith, F. LaGard. *Afterlife: A Glimpse of Eternity Beyond Death's Door*. Nashville: Cotswold Publishing, 2003.

Smith, Morton, and R. Joseph Hoffmann, eds. *What the Bible Really Says*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1989.

Spitz, Elie K. "Immortality of the Soul." *My Jewish Learning*. Last modified May 24, 2021. https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/immortality-belief-in-a-bodiless-existence/.

Strahan, Joshua Marshall. "How in Hades Do We Teach Genesis 1–3?" *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith* 71, no. 2 (June 2019): 119–22.

Taylor, Ben. "A Comparative Study of the Conservative Evangelical View and the Seventh-Day Adventist View of the Doctrine of an

Intermediate State." Western Evangelical Seminary Theses, May 1, 1963.

Tertullian. *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. `https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0316.htm`.

Turner, James T., Jr. "On the Horns of a Dilemma: Bodily Resurrection or Disembodied Paradise?" *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology* 75, no. 5 (December 2014): 406–21.

Turner, James T., Jr. "On Two Reasons Christian Theologians Should Reject the Intermediate State." *Journal of Reformed Theology* 11, nos. 1–2 (2017): 121–39.

VanGemeren, Willem, ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

Warden, Duane. "The Rich Man and Lazarus: Poverty, Wealth and Human Worth." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 6, no. 1 (2003): 81–93.

Waters, Larry J. "The Believer's Intermediate State After Death." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 169, no. 675 (July 2012): 283–303.

Wright, N. T. *Surprised by Hope: Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church*. New York: HarperCollins, 2008.

Yap, Marlene Yu. "Three Parables of Jesus Through the Shame-Honor Lens." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 19, no. 2 (2016): 207–23.

Zandman, Herm J. G. "Historical Tension Between the Holistic and Dualistic View of Man in the Church." *In die Skriflig* 46, no. 1 (December 2012): 1–8.

# About the Author

Eddie Lawrence lives in central Kentucky with his wife, Melinda. With the exception of four years in the US Army, he has lived in that area his whole life. He and Melinda have two married children and one grandson.

Eddie holds a B.A. in Biblical Studies and has taught the Bible in church settings for several decades. His approach to Scripture is shaped by a simple conviction: we cannot know what the Bible means to us until we understand what it meant to its original authors and readers, and the best interpreter of Scripture is Scripture itself. That conviction drives everything he writes.

He runs a Bible study blog called Ready4Eternity, where he documents his own ongoing study of Scripture and engages in depth with the passages and questions that most interest him. Readers who want to dig deeper into any topic covered in this book will find additional material at ready4eternity.com.