

UNITED WISDOM

Immortality of the soul, resurrection and rebirth: different accounts of continuation

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-16-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Immortality of the soul, resurrection and rebirth: different accounts of continuation

Epigraph

> *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*

Paul, 1 Corinthians 15:26, King James Version.

What this article is about

Words about life continuing after death can sound similar while referring to different accounts. Immortality of the soul asks what should survive the death of the body. Resurrection speaks of life restored and transformed by God. Rebirth concerns a subsequent birth and connections between existences; that connection need not mean an unchanged soul moving between bodies. Distinguishing these answers can help before either accepting or challenging them. This essay compares a selected argument in Plato's Phaedo, Paul's discussion in First Corinthians and a passage from the Buddhist discourse MN38. These are particular presentations, rather than every version within their traditions, and they establish no empirical proof of an afterlife. An invented scene of planning a library discussion shows how to preserve what each statement means without making a conversation about death into compulsory consolation. A further question concerns living beside another person's certainty, one's own doubts and practical needs that philosophical classification cannot meet.

I. Three cards on the library table

Natalya is arranging a small library discussion about accounts of death. Three cards lie on her desk: soul, resurrection, another birth. Initially she wants to place them under a single heading stating that a person continues to live. A colleague asks what precisely continues, and what person means on each card. This sounds unnecessarily exacting until they try writing the same explanation for all three. Their sentence expresses something none of the selected texts must accept. It leaves unclear whether the previous identity survives, whether the body returns, who brings about the transition and whether another birth is a desirable outcome. Combining the cards has already altered their subject, before anyone arrives.

The scene is invented, yet its difficulty needs no specialist education to understand. When continuation appears in a conversation about someone who has died, it can mean memory,

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

religious hope, literal existence or the influence of a life already lived. These statements have different grounds. A family story about an inherited habit does not thereby become evidence about a soul. A prayer does not turn into a research report. Distinguishing their grounds also makes neither the story nor the prayer empty. It prevents asking them to perform someone else's task. Natalya can first ask what a word means, rather than making a speaker defend an entire worldview before people who were simply hearing about someone dear.

The first editorial decision therefore concerns no winner. It concerns identifying the claim being discussed. A meeting might explore the history of ideas, help people explain themselves or address a participant's personal question; these purposes differ. A source discussion can reasonably examine concepts and objections. At a farewell, the same argument may become an unwelcome intervention. Someone may decline to discuss existence after death even when others call it an important subject. Respect has a concrete form here: state the purpose beforehand, permit refusal and avoid presenting a chosen expression as the required way to experience death. Curiosity does not remove questions of place, timing or the agreement of those being addressed.

II. What a claim of continuation concerns

We can begin with several separate questions. What is said to exist after death: a soul, a transformed person, another life or memories among the living? What connects the earlier and subsequent states? On what grounds is the statement made: philosophical argument, religious revelation, an accepted account of causality or the observable consequences of actions? Finally, what is the proposed path intended to achieve: survival, resurrection, release from repeated births or a worthwhile present involvement? These questions are no examination everyone must pass. They help a reader notice distinctions hidden by an ordinary shared word. Answers should remain attached to particular texts, since a tradition's brief name can contain many interpretations that disagree with one another.

Continuation and identity particularly need distinguishing. In ordinary life we regard someone as the same person although knowledge, bodily conditions, relationships and memory change. This practice does not itself answer a question about death. Still less can one ordinary model be transferred into every teaching. Soul has a particular role in the selected philosophical argument; it does not simply mean a digital copy of personality or a collection of family photographs. A religious letter's transformed body also need not mean preserving today's condition forever. Modern analogies are best held back until we know which connection the source actually establishes and what its own language leaves unasserted. Familiar imagery can otherwise settle the question before we have understood it.

A fourth card appears on the desk: remembering a person. Natalya adds it to distinguish an available family action from claims about another existence, rather than to correct the first

three. A story can be preserved with belief in resurrection or without it; this compatibility proves no resurrection. Discarding an object similarly need not deny someone’s soul. An outward action rarely reveals a person’s entire conviction. A useful map of ideas should therefore never become a machine for sorting people into categories. A speaker may be invited to explain a thought, but a chosen word or silence cannot establish religious membership, a hidden fear or an alleged deficiency of faith. Interpretation has to leave the person room to answer.

III. Plato’s argument and its grounds

In the selected final argument of Phaedo, Socrates connects soul with life: soul brings life to what it animates and will not admit life’s opposite. Immortality and imperishability are then separately considered. The conclusion requires agreement that what is immortal does not perish. The sequence matters. This is an argument with particular premises concerning soul, life and opposites, rather than a measured description of a dead person’s transition. After Cebes agrees, Simmias still retains uncertainty; Socrates advises reconsidering the first principles. These details belong to the dialogue actually read. Its confident conclusion should therefore not be reported as if the text prohibited questions altogether or presented an experimental fact accessible to everyone.

A contemporary reader has several substantial ways of approaching this material. One can examine the argument’s internal coherence: does its conclusion follow from the premises accepted? One can ask whether those premises are persuasive. One can consider how speaking of soul changes an account of responsibility. These are different activities, and none should be represented as the others. A participant who finds soul meaningful has not thereby accepted the complete argument. Someone challenging a metaphysical premise need not deny the moral significance of human life. Conversation becomes more exact when an objection has an address. People can then discuss a specific premise or inference, rather than the worth of whoever has chosen belief or doubt.

A further detail prevents an overly convenient classification. Just after discussing the ethical consequence, Socrates narrates the souls’ journey, judgement and return after long periods. Within the selected passage, immortality and return are not sealed opposites. The three words in this essay’s title consequently identify distinguishable questions rather than three boxes permanently assigning every source. An account may combine the persistence of a soul with subsequent existence; another may define the connection and purpose differently. This observation preserves a real distinction while removing false tidiness. A library card needs to state which aspect it addresses, and allow its text to be more complicated than the classroom definition chosen for an introduction. Clarity requires an honest boundary around the simplified account.

IV. Paul: resurrection and transformation

In the passages of First Corinthians actually read, Paul’s resurrection hope concerns Christ and God’s action. The question of a future body is addressed through sowing and transformation; spiritual body retains bodily language. These passages do not simply state that an independent part of a person persists indefinitely. Death is called an enemy, and transformation belongs to a religious account of fulfilment. This particular Christian reasoning cannot be replaced by a promise to extend today’s biological life forever. Nor does it settle every theological disagreement: the selected verses are no complete survey of Christian teachings concerning soul, body and the state after death. Their context remains essential to what they claim.

The acting agent should not disappear from the library discussion. When a promised action belongs to God, it cannot be retold as a person’s ability to arrange the transition through the right attitude. Such a retelling changes religious grounds into a contemporary achievement technique. The alteration becomes especially apparent when a listener is urged to eliminate doubt for a supposedly guaranteed outcome. This essay makes no such guarantee. It can explain the direction of hope in the selected letter, without requiring someone to experience that hope or confirming it through a family memory. A believer’s confidence remains a conviction; a reader’s caution remains a way of studying the text. Distinguishing them need not diminish either person’s human standing.

Religious hope also differs from the living person’s immediate schedule. Someone may need documents, accompaniment, quiet, a clear account of what is happening or conversation with a person they have chosen. Agreement with a teaching makes none of these needs unnecessary. Disagreement removes no possibility of helping. Natalya therefore decides against ending the meeting by urging everyone to accept one answer. Questions concerning resurrection may continue through discussion of the selected text, while practical farewell arrangements are addressed separately. This approach does not dismiss religion’s seriousness. It recognises that a statement concerning the last enemy and someone’s immediate request belong to different levels, and neither replaces the other.

V. MN38: continuity without an unchanged carrier

In the selected MN38 passage, the Buddha rejects Sāti’s view that the very same consciousness travels between births. Consciousness depends on conditions; becoming, birth and suffering, and their cessation, are considered. This neither denies rebirth nor renames an immortal soul. The translator also cautions against overextending the passage to consciousness beyond the six sense media. The comparison here is narrow: continuity cannot automatically mean an unchanged entity.

Contemporary conversation can notice its own tendency to look for a carrier whenever anything continues. Another existence is easily imagined as a suitcase containing character, memories and the previous name. Yet that picture already includes an answer a source might challenge. Abandoning the picture supplies no simple knowledge of another world. It merely makes room to ask how the text actually connects events. Natalya need not draw either a new owner of the previous body or the previous owner of a new body. She can say that the selected passage requires attention to conditions, and let readers examine it for themselves. An honest stopping point is more useful than a vivid analogy quietly importing someone else’s metaphysics.

This distinction also prevents a hurried moral inference. An unfamiliar teaching gives no automatic grounds for deciding why a particular person died, what they deserved or which hidden task their death fulfilled. No authority to assign meaning to another person’s loss follows here. Describing historical accounts and judging a specific life are different actions. The latter can intrude upon someone under the guise of explanation. A library card therefore reports a source rather than secret causes of a family event. Readers may relate what they read to their own convictions, but the essay does not do this on their behalf. Facts, interpretation and responsibility for words spoken before living people remain separate.

VI. Distinguishing explanation from confirmation

Understanding a claim does not yet confirm its truth. We can explain an idea we reject with care, and explain one we accept poorly. The difference particularly matters when hope is involved. Persuasive speech can resemble evidence simply because it supplies a desired sense of order. Clarity of presentation and grounds for confidence should nonetheless be considered separately. At the library meeting, it helps first to ask whether speakers recognise their thought in the paraphrase. Only then can its grounds be discussed. Reversing that order often creates unnecessary conflict: someone defends against a statement they never made, while their interlocutor treats the defence as refusal to address a serious question.

The selected texts use different kinds of justification. Philosophical reasoning invites examination of premises and inferences. A religious letter addresses its own grounds of faith. A discourse situates a statement within a teaching and its account of conditions. A shared table can display the differences without converting them into identical outcomes of one experiment. Asked whether an afterlife has been demonstrated, the librarian should not answer by counting similar images. Shared interest in a question is no independent confirmation of an answer. The character of the evidence, the limits of the material read and the presence of disagreement can all be stated honestly. Cultural comparison need not pretend to be an investigation nobody conducted.

Accuracy does not oblige a person to reconsider an entire life immediately. One conversation can end with a clearer question while leaving a prior conviction, or lack of conviction, intact. An open question is no debt requiring urgent settlement. When a family uses religious language, someone can ask what is expected: respectful presence, participation in a particular action or personal agreement with a teaching. These are different requests. Declining the last need not mean refusing the first. Conversation benefits from distinguishing an invitation from a demand before disagreement is called betrayal. Theoretical precision then acquires a practical use: it resolves no final mystery, but makes the immediate human request more honest.

VII. Difference without a contest of worth

Comparison can quietly become a contest between consolations. One account is called warmer, another stricter, a third more modern. Such judgements may express personal preference without explaining the accounts. A reader concerned with embodiment may value one expression; someone with another question will notice a different aspect. This establishes neither the best tradition for everyone nor who understands death most deeply. The criterion of comparison should be named. Examining persistence of soul does not warrant replacing that criterion with an image’s emotional appeal. Trying to support a relative is a different question, and classroom classification supplies no automatic answer. A question’s significance to someone does not make it a universal measure of every account.

A second risk is smoothing disagreement away for a friendly ending. Saying that everyone means the same thing may remove precisely what a participant regards as important. Where God’s action is decisive, replacing it with impersonal continuity changes the conviction. Where an unchanged carrier of consciousness is challenged, declaring a shared soul is likewise not neutral. Respect requires no such merger. Sources can be recognised as answering differently while people continue reading or caring together. Unanimity is no compulsory payment for remaining in the same room. A difference can be named honestly without using it to compel someone into another person’s language, ritual or profession of belief. A workable conversation may retain real disagreement at its end.

Natalya changes the meeting’s arrangement. Three source-specific explanations will replace three answers on one poster. Each leaves room for a question. Participants may discuss one card without having to speak about the other two. This arrangement does not make study superficial; it states the organiser’s promise accurately. The meeting offers an initial map and an opportunity to read a selected text more carefully, rather than a common verdict on the fate of the dead. A concrete promised result reduces the temptation to fill gaps with a beautiful sentence. Limits can make a conversation usable: people know what is offered and can decide whether it fits their interests, convictions and present ability to remain near a difficult subject.

VIII. Doubt does not disclose an entire person

A person is easily characterised through one remark. Belief is taken to mean fear of disappearance; doubt to mean inability to hope; silence to conceal agreement or rejection. All three conclusions may be someone else’s guesses. The same expression can convey an idea, familiar family language, respect for a setting or a wish to say no more. Questions about grounds should therefore be invitations rather than discoveries of hidden motives. Someone may answer only about the text, or say that they do not wish to discuss a personal matter now. An intellectual conversation gains no special access to a person merely because its subject concerns ultimate things and the organiser regards it as exceptionally important.

This boundary is especially visible around certainty. Philosophical distinctions need not destroy something a person regards as support. They also need not shield every claim from examination. A voluntary discussion can challenge an inference, identify a contradiction and ask for a more accurate paraphrase. The boundary separates examining a statement from claiming authority over another person. Someone need not agree to preserve a relationship, and an interlocutor should not turn disagreement into a diagnosis. Clear boundaries permit serious discussion: an opponent receives an answer about the subject, rather than becoming an illustration for someone else’s theory of human weakness or ability to tolerate uncertainty. Critical attention and respect can remain together without either being reduced to politeness alone.

Natalya notices a participant returning repeatedly to soul. She could immediately decide why the word is needed and suggest replacing it. Instead she asks whether the person wants to explain the concept or retain it as a personal expression. If the answer concerns a source, the discussion continues with that text. If it concerns someone dear, conversation may become a story requiring no demonstration. The transition should not be imposed: someone may have come specifically to dispute an argument, with no wish to discuss family. Attention is useful when an initial understanding of the request can be corrected. It does not make one guess the final truth about a speaker, or use every subject as an occasion for disclosure.

IX. Living relationships beside an open question

Disagreement concerning existence after death need not be settled before every shared action. Relatives may arrange who communicates the news, who accompanies someone needing company and which words belong in a common announcement. These arrangements establish no single metaphysics. They identify a particular matter on which agreement is possible. Limited agreement should never be represented as complete acceptance of someone else’s worldview. Preparing a farewell space does not necessarily affirm every teaching voiced there. Declining a religious formula need not mean refusing care. For the distinction to work, requests must be sufficiently specific, and another form of involvement must remain discussable without assigning guilt in advance. Shared practical work can have a narrower basis than shared belief.

Remembering likewise requires no proof of eternity. A story can be accurate and meaningful even when its teller does not know what exists after death. Memory has limits too: nobody must become the sole keeper of every object, date and family version. Only one inference matters here: the actions of living people should not become a test of a teaching’s truth. A photograph proves no immortal soul; its absence disproves no resurrection; continuation of a family habit describes no mechanism of rebirth. Once these levels are distinguished, a particular object may remain a particular object. Its value can be discussed within a family’s circumstances rather than as compulsory evidence about someone’s fate beyond this life.

The essay itself also has a straightforward limit. Explaining concepts replaces no practical help, and need not become a conversation someone can presently undertake. When presence is needed, presence can be offered. A relevant professional or clarification of an official procedure addresses its own subject. No medical recommendation or assessment of the reader is derived from these philosophical sources. It may be more useful to acknowledge the limit of one’s role than to keep speaking about souls merely to fill silence. An unread question can wait; someone needing assistance should not have to wait until others reach agreement on ultimate matters. This editorial distinction concerns the living person’s responsibility for how they address another, rather than the organisation of an imagined other world.

X. Keeping the question precise and the answer free

By the end of preparation, Natalya has found no single expression that places the selected accounts inside one formula. This no longer seems a failure. Their grounds, the subject said to continue and the meaning of transition differ. Plato’s discussion can be read as a philosophical argument with premises. Paul’s resurrection retains religious grounds and transformed bodily language. MN38 does not permit an unchanged carrier of consciousness to be quietly imported into its selected account. A short explanation leaves many questions open while ceasing to answer them in someone else’s terms. The meeting promises neither that reading three texts will make death comprehensible nor that it will remove unease. It offers a more precise beginning and access to selected sources.

Different continuations may follow. One reader may investigate the history of soul; another return to a religious text. A third may recognise that today’s question concerns conversation with relatives rather than existence after death. A fourth may not continue reading. None of these outcomes alone determines a person’s maturity. Ideas are useful in relation to the actual question someone brought, rather than a compulsory movement towards one shared answer. Freedom also includes remaining unready. People may name convictions, express doubt or limit a discussion without making that choice a final description of their identity. No task of growing through someone else’s explanation is imposed upon them simply because the subject is considered profound.

Distinguishing immortality, resurrection and rebirth means handling statements, and the people making them, with greater care. Agreement need not follow, but there may be fewer disputes about what nobody asserted. The ultimate question remains ultimate; the immediate action acquires its own object. We can lack an answer to the first while still hearing a request, declining to impose a formula, acknowledging the limits of our reading and naming a source accurately. Careful speech promises no victory over death. Its possibility is narrower: no unverified claim needs to be purchased at the expense of human dignity, and care need never become a reward for the correct worldview. Reading continues where there is actually room for it.

What this means in practice

If it fits your question, choose one statement about continuation after death and note a few distinctions beside it: who or what is said to continue, what connects the earlier and later states, and on what grounds the claim is made. Add the text’s name, or acknowledge that its source has not yet been identified. There is no need to map every religion immediately. Simply check whether a familiar image absent from the text has replaced the statement you meant to understand.

Separately, note a present practical request: information, an arrangement for company, a story about someone or no discussion of the subject now. This can coexist with an unresolved worldview question. When someone else is involved, first ask whether they want the conversation and what the chosen word means to them. Their answer need not match yours.

This small exercise is voluntary. It proves no afterlife, removes no fear by guarantee and assesses nobody’s condition. It may be stopped, its question left open or another reading preferred. When concrete help is required, conceptual distinctions cannot replace a suitable request for it. The result may be no more than a more exact question and a clearer boundary around one’s speech. No special experience or changed conviction is promised.

Key quotation

> *Apart from a requisite condition, there is no coming-into-play of consciousness.*

MN38, dialogue with Sāti, Thanissaro Bhikkhu translation. The sentence concerns dependently arisen consciousness in the selected discussion.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Two textual grounds and locators	Mechanism and limit
What continues	Phaedo, selected final argument, Jowett, carrier 1294–1376: soul brings life and is considered immortal and imperishable. First Corinthians 15:35–54, KJV: the future body concerns God's action and transformation.	The comparison distinguishes a philosophical life-bearing principle from resurrection's religious agency. Neither becomes a promise to preserve today's biological condition indefinitely. It does not show that every Christian account rejects soul, or that one argument establishes the fate of every dead person.
Connection and identity	Phaedo, carrier 1350–1378: imperishability is separately argued, and judgement includes a subsequent return. MN38, Sāti dialogue 115–147, Thanissaro: an unchanged carrier of consciousness is rejected.	Persistence of an entity differs from connections between existences. The comparison prevents three sealed categories. It declares conditioned consciousness no disguised Platonic soul and transfers no complete Platonic narrative into every rebirth teaching.
Body and condition	Paul, First Corinthians 15:42–54, KJV: transformation is expressed through a future body. MN38, consciousness classification 142–147: its designation concerns its condition.	Each passage requires attention to its subject before importing a bodiless duplicate. This can correct a modern paraphrase without proving a common account of embodiment, reducing spiritual body to ordinary resuscitation or providing a medical account of consciousness.
A person's relation to a statement	Phaedo, carrier 1370–1372: Simmias retains uncertainty, and Socrates proposes examining first principles. MN38, raft image 206–211: a view is not held as a possession.	One passage concerns examination of premises, the other holding a view within its religious path. The contemporary comparison does not identify philosophical examination with Buddhist release. Neither grants an organiser authority to demand disclosure, agreement or abandonment of every conviction.

Comparison	Two textual grounds and locators	Mechanism and limit
Why present life matters	Phaedo, carrier 1375–1378: nurture and education concern the soul's subsequent journey and judgement. Paul, First Corinthians 15:20–28: hope concerns Christ, fulfilment and God.	Both passages place present existence within a wider horizon, whose grounds and organisation differ. A shared theme establishes no single system of recompense. It assigns no guilt to a dead person, explains no particular loss as deserved punishment and makes no living person's worth depend on agreement with our account.
The direction of hope	First Corinthians 15:26 and 51–54, KJV: death is an enemy and the expected event a transformation. MN38, arising and cessation 244–290: cessation of conditions of suffering is considered.	The promised event and the goal of the selected path differ. Continuation is therefore not automatically desirable repetition forever. No identical salvation, ranking by consolatory appeal or guarantee of freedom from fear follows from the table.

Primary sources

1. Plato, Phaedo, Jowett: selected final argument and immediate aftermath, carrier 1238–1378; immortality/imperishability, Simmias' uncertainty, examination of premises, ethical consequence and narrated return.

2. Paul, First Corinthians 15:12–28, KJV and 15:35–54: both selected complete passages; epigraph 15:26.

3. MN38, Thanissaro Bhikkhu: selected continuous 115–290, separately note 2 conclusion 457–462 and translator/licence footer 494–497; key quotation from the Sāti dialogue.

Both Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English carriers. English literals were checked against KJV and Thanissaro's translation. Plato is paraphrased without direct quotation. No entire works or Greek/Pali collation claimed. Worldwide rights UNKNOWN; the modern translator's licence is not declared blanket commercial permission.

Tags

death, soul, immortality, resurrection, rebirth, Plato, Phaedo, Socrates, Paul, Corinthians, Buddhism, MN38, consciousness, conditions, body, transformation, memory, hope, doubt, faith, worldview, religion, philosophy, sources, distinctions, comparison, consent, care, finitude, reading

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.