

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

the grace of a morally beautiful character; and what Dionysius said of the oration against Leptines, that it was the most graceful of all orations, might be said of every sermon of Massillon, if one did not commonly, in the earnestness and power of the orator, forget the gracefulness of his style. Even those who place little value upon such qualities, will not perhaps be so unjust, as to blame it in him, who does not seek it from self-love, but possesses it as the necessary bloom of a beautiful nature. I certainly will not undervalue Bossuet and Bourdaloue, in comparison with Massillon, in respect to style; but I may be allowed perhaps to say, only to designate the peculiarities of these three men, that Bossuet speaks ever from the bishop's throne; that Bourdaloue appears surrounded with the scholastic atmosphere of a Jesuit college; that Massillon alone speaks with his audience the cultivated language of society. He has perhaps too many words, and dwells possibly too long on a thought, but this fault flows from the same source as the excellences of his style, from the warmth and fulness of his heart.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

Translated from De Wette's Commentary on the XV. Chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. 2d edition. 1845.\*

THE occasion of treating this subject was, that some in Corinth denied the truth of the resurrection of the dead (v. 12); but we do not certainly know, what was the character of these doubts and in what connection they stood. It appears, that these Corinthian Christians did not deny the fact of the resurrection of Christ, because the apostle, in his argument, lays this at the foundation, and indeed expressly certifies it, but does not seek to establish it against objections.<sup>1</sup> This conclusion however is not entirely certain, since the apostle writes for the majority of the Corinthian Christians, who had not yet been possessed by those doubts, although dangerously affected by them, rather than against the authors of those doubts (Flatt). In verse 85, it is

\* For some account of De Wette and of his merits as a commentator, see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, No. XVIII. p. 263.

<sup>1</sup> Ziegler, *Theologische Abhandlungen*, II. 93. Knapp, *scripta varii argumenti*, etc. p. 316. Meyer.

true, he seems to have regard to an objection from them; but this is of such a character, that it could be made from various quarters. Meyer concludes, from the anti-materialistic view of the resurrection, which the apostle maintains in verses 35 and following, that the principles of the opponents were *anti-materialistic*; but the opposite conclusion would rather be the true one. See the remarks upon these verses. Jesus, in refuting the Sadducees, Matt. 22: 30, views the subject in the same manner. Hence those in Corinth, who doubted the doctrine, might formerly have been Sadducees,<sup>1</sup> (for, that such persons must be answered with passages from the Pentateuch, rests upon an erroneous view of Matt. 22: 31, 32,) if every intermixture of Sadduceism with Christianity were not so improbable. Since also the derivation of those doubts from Essenism (Mosheim) has little or no probability, we are limited in our conjectures to the circle of Gentile Christians in Corinth. That the doctrine of the resurrection opposed the Grecian mode of thinking, we know from Acts 17: 32. The supposition of Epicurean principles (cf. Acts 17: 18) in those at Corinth, who denied the resurrection, is decidedly rejected by Neander (Apost. Gesch. I. 315), by Meyer and others, because such principles stand in too great opposition to Christianity, and because the apostle, in verse 32, adduces the Epicurean manner of life, not as the source, but as the consequence of the doubts, which he opposes, and indeed as an argument against them. But still he warns them, in verse 33, against "evil communications," which can be no other than the intercourse of those who doubted this doctrine. As sensuality could creep into the church, so also could Epicurean levity. That these were Gentile Christians of philosophic cultivation,<sup>2</sup> is not very probable, considering the small number of such Christians in Corinth (1 Cor. 1: 26) and the absence in this chapter of all polemic opposition to worldly wisdom. It is a false view to regard them, with Grotius, Usteri, Billroth, and Olshausen, as allegorists like Hymeneus and Philetus (2 Tim. 2: 17, 18), because in the argument of the apostle no trace of an opposition to such a tendency is to be discovered (Meyer).

Vs. 1—11. The apostle sets out from the fact of the resurrection of Christ as a main point of the gospel, and lays that at the foundation of his argument. Vs. 1, 2. *γνωρίζω*] *I make known*. Theophylact, Oecumenius: *τοῦτίστιν ἐπιναμυνήσω*, and so the most; Rückert: *I call attention to*, contrary to the literal sense of the word, cf. 12, 8. 2 Cor. 8: 1. Gal. 1: 11. The apostle begins, as it were, anew with the announcement of the gospel. *τὸ εὐαγγ.*] is not to be limited to the

<sup>1</sup> Heumann, Mosheim in part, Michaelis, Storr, Knapp and Flatt.

<sup>2</sup> Ziegler, Neander, Meyer and others.

proclamation of Christ's death and resurrection (contrary to Rck. and Mey.); these points are only rendered especially prominent by the *ἐν πρώτοις* in vs. 3 seq. *ὁ καὶ παρελάβετε κ. τ. λ.*] The *καὶ* three times used designates in each case something added to the preceding thought (Meyer); and indeed there is a climax in the repetition. *παρελάβετε* denotes the fact of perceiving (intellectually), historical faith, corresponding to the *παραδιδόναι* = *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, cf. v. 3. Gal. 1: 19. Phil. 4: 9, and often; according to the common explanation, it denotes the believing reception (Jno. 1: 11), *ἐστίματα* the faithful abiding therein (cf. Ro. 5: 2.), *σώζεσθε*, *ye are saved* (of the certain future), the salutary effect. *τινι—κατέχετε*] contains a condition of the latter, since *τινι λόγ. εὐγγ. ὑμῖν*, for the sake of emphasis, is placed first: *if ye hold fast the doctrine as I have announced it to you*. Contrary to Heidenreich, Billroth and others, who unite *τινι λόγ. εὐγγ. ὑμῖν* with *ὁ εὐγγ. ὑμῖν*, (see Rückert and Meyer). *λόγος* is here to be taken of the substance (Rückert, Meyer) and not the reason (Estius, Kyrke, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heidenreich), since *παρέδωκα* v. 3, and what actually follows, leads us only to the former, viz. the substance. *ἐκτός—ἐπιστεύσατε*] *unless* (14: 5) *ye have in vain* (Gal. 3: 4. 4: 11) *become believers*.

If now this clause, which forms an exception, is connected with *σώζεσθε*,<sup>1</sup> this does not suppose "the case (inconceivable to the Christian consciousness) that they, notwithstanding the *κατέχετε*, could still lose the fruit of faith" (Mey.); but it does suppose the truly conceivable case, that they had indeed received and held fast the gospel, but had not made a fruitful application of it to themselves; but with this connection, the more appropriate explanation would be, *without reason, temere*, as in Col. 2: 18.<sup>2</sup> Thphlet. Oec. Calv. Est. Billr. connect with *κατέχετε*, so that *εἰνῆ* denotes the *being in vain*, in reference to that; with this view we must indeed make an addition to the sentence: *κατέχετε δὲ πάντως* (Thphlet); and this on account of the position is the more suitable. Accordingly by the *εἰ κατέχ.* the danger is indicated, that they might not have firmly adhered to the Gospel, and this apprehension, by the *ἐκτός εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ.* is carried out, as it were with horror, to the worst, scarcely supposable case, that their reception of faith had been entirely in vain.

Vs. 3 and following. *Specification* (not proof, Mey.) *of the τινι λόγῳ, in the principal points.* γάρ] *namely* (Billr.). *ἐν πρώτοις*] *in*

<sup>1</sup> Beza, Flt. Olsh. Rck. Mey.; but which would not render necessary any insertion in brackets of the *τινι—κατέχετε*, as in Griesbach and Scholz.

<sup>2</sup> Rückert, but who with Theodoret supposes the reference to verse 14, which seems over-hasty.

*primis*, as the principal points: *οἰοναὶ γὰρ θεμελίως ἐστὶ πάσης τῆς πιστεως* (Thphlet), not: *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* (Chrys.); not: *among the first*, Masc. (Bek.). *ὃ καὶ παρελάβον*] *what I have also received in communication*. From whom? see on 11: 28. *ὑπὲρ τ. ἀμαρτ. ἡμῶν*] *on account of our sins* Gal. 1: 4, namely in order to atone for them, Ro. 3: 25, in other places simply *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* 1: 13. Ro. 5: 8 and often. *κατὰ τ. γραφ.*] cf. Lu. 22: 87. 24: 25 and following, Acts 8: 35. 26: 22, 28.—V. 4. *ἐγγεγραται*] The Perf., and not the Aorist as before and after, because it still continues in its consequences (Mey.). *κατὰ τ. γρ.*] refers as well to *ἐτάφη* (Isa. 58: 9), as to *ἐγγή.* (Isa. 58: 10. Ps. 16: 10. cf. Acts 2: 25. 13: 34, 35).

V. 5. *Κηφᾶ*] Lu. 24: 34, compare explanation of John, p. 212. *τοῖς δώδεκα*] Jno. 20: 19 and following, Lu. 24: 36 and following. *δῶδεκα* denotes the apostles as a whole, or as a body, a collegium (like Decemviri, etc.), not according to the exact number; for at that time there were only eleven. Chrys. Thphlet. Oec. include Matthew with those who saw the Lord (namely after the Ascension); but it is a previous appearance that is here spoken of.—V. 6. The specifications which now follow are not made dependent upon *παρελάβον* by *ὄτι*, but only indeed by a change of construction; for the apostle must also have received these facts. By *ἐπειτα, εἶτα* he unquestionably intends to designate the succession of time, cf. *ἑσχατον* v. 8. *ἐπάνω*] *over, more than*, out of the grammatical regimen, Win. § 38. 5. *πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς*] *five hundred brethren, believers*. A difficulty arises from the fact, that in Acts 1: 15, only one hundred and twenty disciples are mentioned; all however were not perhaps assembled there, or only so many were known to Luke. The testimony of the apostle decides for the correctness of the fact. *ἐφ' ἅπαξ*] *at once*, Theodoret: *ὁ καθ' ἑνα, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ πᾶσιν*, Vulgate, *simul*; so most; Bretschneider and Mey.: *once for all*, cf. Ro. 6: 10. Heb. 7: 27. 9: 2. 10: 10; yet, on account of the great number, the former signification is more full of meaning. *οἱ πλείους*] *the majority*. *μένουσιν*] *are living*. This appearance of Christ, which the evangelists do not mention, Osh. Platt and others connect with that in Matt. 28: 16 seq.; yet this evangelist speaks only of the Eleven.

V. 7. *Ἰακώβου*] probably the brother of the Lord, Gal. 1: 19. (Chrys. Thdrt. Thphlet. Oec. the common opinion.) Grotius compares the account from the Hebrew-Gospel in Jerome, de vir. ill. c. 2. (Einl. ins N. T. p. 71), but there it is the very first appearance of the risen Lord, that is spoken of. *τοῖς—πᾶσιν*] seems to include James, so that if the former supposition is correct, *ἀπόστολοι* is used

in a more extended sense (Chrya. Thdrt. Thphlct. Oec. Calv. Bengel, Mey. and others.)

V. 8. πάντων] this is commonly regarded as Masc., and Meyer limits it to the apostles, because Paul designates himself as the least of them. But must we not connect πάντων as Neut. with ἔσχ. meaning *last of all* (cf. Mark 12: 29. Grb. T.)? So πάντων μάλιστα Plat. Prot. p. 330. A. ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρούματι] *as it were a child prematurely born, the immature fruit*,<sup>1</sup> a designation (according to Bllr.) of his violent, as it were, not natural call, but according to that which follows, of his unworthiness, since those prematurely born are weakly. The article places the conception in a definite relation to the apostleship, as it were, *a premature birth as an apostle*. Knapp and Rink, following older writers in Wlf., erroneously read τῷ, equivalent to τινι, without any analogy in the N. T. (Mey.). The explanation of Spätling<sup>2</sup> is contrary to the use of language;<sup>3</sup> otherwise it would fitly correspond to the late call of the apostle and also to the predicate ὁ ἐλάχιστος τ. ἀπ. The appearance of Christ, of which the apostle speaks, is unquestionably that mentioned in Acts ix.

Vs. 9, 10. not precisely a parenthesis (Grb. Scho.), but a digression in explanation of the expression "premature birth." ὅς οὐκ εἶμι κ. τ. λ.] *as who, because, ἰκανός*] Matt. 8: 11. 2 Cor. 3: 5. καλεῖσθαι ἀπ.] *to bear the honorable name of apostle. χάριτι—θεοῦ*] *but through the grace of God*, notwithstanding my unworthiness. With the humiliating feeling of personal unworthiness is united the consciousness of the higher power active upon and in it, and this guides thus to the purified self-feeling of one's desert. οὐ κενή] *not in vain*, without result. περισσότερον] Acc. Neutr., governed by ἕκαστ. ἀπάντων πάντων] *"than they altogether, not: than each one of them, as commonly."* (Mey.) Although this explanation can be historically justified, still it is not certain and necessary. ἐκοπίασα] *labored* (Gal. 4: 11), not: *suffered* (Chrya. Thphlct.). οὐκ—ἐμοί] to prevent misunderstanding, as if he had said ἐκοπίασα in an egotistic, vain-glorious sense. By οὐκ ἐγὼ—ἀλλά (as in Matt. 10: 20. Mark 9: 37. Jno. 12: 44. Acts 5: 4. 1 Thess. 4: 8) merely the subordination of the human activity to the Divine is expressed, not the suspension of the former. *Augustin de grat. et lib. arb. c. 3.*: Non ego autem, i. e. non solus, sed gratia Dei mecum. *Ac per hoc nec gratia Dei sola, nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo.*

<sup>1</sup> Citations in verification in Wetst., attic ἀμβλωμα, Lobek ad Phryn. p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> ὕστερον γέννημα, τινις in Thphlct. Hdrch. Schulthess in Tzschirn. Anal. 1. 4. p. 212 seq.

<sup>3</sup> Fritzsche de nonn. post. P. ad Cor. ep. locis Diss. I. 60 sq.

(Hdrcb.). ἡ οὖν ἐπιπέ] here the human activity is united with the Divine.

V. 11. οὖν] by this the thread of verse 8 is again taken up, although the εἶπε—κηρύσσομεν presupposes the substance of the digression in vs. 9, 10; for only there is the calling and labor of the apostle spoken of. ἐκείνοι] does not refer back to vs. 7, 8 (Mey.), but to vs. 9, 10. οὖν] as vs. 8 seq., especially v. 4. The structure of the sentence is as in 13: 8. οὕτως] in the same manner, namely, by this, that ye have received this teaching. ἐπιστεύσατε] as v. 2.

Vs. 12—20. Upon the fact of the resurrection of Christ, the apostle now grounds the doctrine of the general resurrection. V. 12. δέ] places the denial of the resurrection of the dead in contradiction with this truth. πῶς] how is it possible that, etc. Ro. 6: 2, Gal. 4: 9. οὐκ ἔστιν] is a non-entity, a chimera, cf. 7: 9. Winer § 59. 5. b, p. 458.

— V. 13. By the δέ a chain of inferences is attached and continued in the following verses. The first conclusion here made does not rest upon the principle: sublato genere tollitur et species (Grotius, Mey.; similar Knpp. p. 316. Rck.), nor upon the similarity of being in Christ and men (Thdrt. Bllr. cf. Ust. p. 364.)—to be sure a Pauline (v. 21. Heb. 2: 17), but here subordinate conception,—but, according to vs. 20 seq. upon this, that Christ by his resurrection had made a commencement in the resurrection of the dead, and that the latter is a necessary consequence of the former. So Chrys. Thphlet.; similar Calvin. Against the last mode of inference the objection may indeed be made, that from the ἀνάστ. νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν it does not follow, that Jesus is not risen, but simply that [under the supposition made] his resurrection has not fulfilled its end (Mey.); but this objection can be made only when one overlooks, that, according to the apostle, the connection of the resurrection of Christ with the general resurrection is founded in the Divine arrangement of the world, and for him has the validity of an axiom. On the other hand, the first mode of inference is merely logical, and the apt objection may be made to it, that Christ, as sinless, was not subject to death, and that consequently his resurrection could not be the condition of that of sinful men. V. 14. οὐκ ἐγγύστα] is to be taken in connection with the preceding, as in vs. 16, 17 cf. 7: 9. κενὸν ἄρα καὶ [according to A D E F G 17. all.] τ. κήρ. ἡμῶν] therefore! also our (entire apostolical) preaching is vain, empty, without foundation<sup>3</sup> [if Christ be not risen],

<sup>1</sup> It can hardly be said that ἄρα has in Paul anything surprising (Mey. after Hartung, Part. 1. 432. Kühn. § 757. b.), cf. Ro. 7: 3, 25. 10: 7. 2 Cor. 5: 15. Gal. 3: 29.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Eph. 5: 6. Col. 2: 8; according to Knpp. inutilis; opposed to this view, A. F. Müller, diss. exeg. de loco Paul. 1 Cor. 15: 12—19. Lips. 1839. p. 8.

and indeed because it is founded upon the resurrection and death of Christ. *κενή δὲ<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν*] *vain also your faith*; this is founded namely upon the *κῆρυγμα*.

V. 15. Lchm. Tschdf. Mey. connect this verse with the preceding by a comma, plainly contrary to the true relation of the chain of clauses and inferences; for *εὐρισκ.—θεοῦ* has its ground in that which follows, whilst the clauses *κενὸν—ὑμῶν* have their ground in that which precedes. *εὐρισκόμεθα*] *we are found, prove ourselves. ψευδομάρτυρες θεοῦ*] *as false witnesses concerning God* (Rck. Mey.) *not: of God, which God has* (Blr.). *False witnesses* according to what follows, because they would have declared that which was false; according to Knpp. *quia auctoritatem Dei ementiuntur*, and Müll. l. c. distinguishes strictly between *ψευθεῖς μάρτ.*, *qui falsum testimonium dicunt*, and *ψευδομάρτ.*, *qui mentiuntur se esse testes*, cf. *ψευδοσπογγῆται* and others; on the contrary, however, *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος, ψευδοκατήγορος. — κατὰ θεοῦ*] most interpret: *against God* (Matt. 26: 59), because against the truth; according to Meyer, "every consciously false declaration, that God has done anything, is against God." It is better to interpret it, with Raphel., according to Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 1. p. 6. Plutarch. *praedag.* c. 4. *Wk.*: *of God. εἴτερ ἄρα*] *if truly peradventure* (Mey.); but the two hardly go together in German [or in English—Tr.]; and *εἰ ἄρα, εἰ forte*, is different from *εἴτερ ἄρα, if truly therefore, siquidem, ut vos putatis* (Müll.). cf. the examples, where it is used elliptically, in Viger. ed. *Herm.* p. 514. *Passow* p. 640. a.

V. 16. Vindication of the *ὄν ὄν ἤγ. x. v. λ.* by an almost literal repetition of v. 18. — V. 17. Repetition of the inference for the Christian faith, drawn in v. 14, from the preceding proposition, with the modification that this faith is represented as fruitless (*ματαιά, vain, fruitless*, cf. 8: 20), and indeed in reference to redemption from sin. *ἔτι—ὑμῶν*] *ye are still in your sins*, in the condition of the misery of sin; similar *Ro.* 8: 9 *ὄν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶναι*. The inference rests upon the inseparability of the resurrection of Christ and his atoning death, and, in general, upon the inseparability of all the parts in the work of salvation.

V. 18. A new (*καί also*) inference from the *εἰ Χριστὸς ὄν ἤγ.*, and indeed such an one, as must give pain to many affectionate hearts in Corinth (11: 30). *οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ*] *those who have fallen asleep* (v. 6, and 11: 30) *in Christ* (in communion with him, in faith in him, not meaning: for the sake of Christ, i. e. as martyrs, Chrys.

<sup>1</sup> *δέ* is to be omitted, according to A B D \* F G 17. *all. Vulg. all. Patr. with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rck. Mey.*



Thdrt. Thphlet. Oec. Grt.), the departed Christians, at the same time not including the pious, who lived before Christ (Calov. Knpp.). ἀπώ-  
λοντο] *are lost*, i. e. Christians, if there be no resurrection, are sub-  
jected to destruction in Gehenna.

V. 19. A sad application of this inference to the living. The ab-  
sence of a Part. copul. may be explained by the emotion, cf. Ro. 7: 24,  
25. The correct position of the words, according to A B D \* E F G  
17. It. Patr. Lchm. Tschdf. is: *εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλπικότες ἐσμέν μόνον*]. Whether *μόνον* be connected with *ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τ.*  
(the common opinion, and for this transposition Ro. 5: 6 may be ad-  
duced) or with the whole clause (Mey. Müll.) is indifferent as regards  
the sense in the main point, if the emphasis be laid upon *ἐν τ. ζωῇ τ.*:  
"If we are only such, as have hope in Christ *in this life*" (Mey.).  
According to Mey. Müll. *ταύτῃ* has not the emphasis because it is  
placed after; but this reason is of no force, cf. Eph. 1: 21; nor is *τ.*  
*ζωῇ* to be placed in opposition to *κοιμηθέντες* (Mey.); *ἐν τ. ζ. τ.* is  
plainly contrasted with the destiny of the departed, indefinitely con-  
ceived, after death, if there be no resurrection. Yet I should rather  
divide the emphasis between *ἐν τ. ζ. τ.* and *ἠλπ. ἐσμέν*, and suppose a  
contrast between hope in this life and the fulfilment after death (cf. Ro.  
8: 24). Morus and Rck. connect *μόνον* with *ἐν Χριστῷ*; on the con-  
trary, Mey. *ἐλπίζειν ἐν Χρ.* to place one's hope in Christ, cf. Eph. 1:  
12; the Perf. as in Jno. 5: 45. 2 Cor. 1: 10, and the Partic. with *ἐσμέν*,  
in order to render more prominent the idea of hope. *ἐλεεινότεροι π.*  
*ἀσθρ.*] *more miserable than all men.*

V. 20. Conclusion of the argument, since the fact of the resurrec-  
tion of Jesus is taken as proved (*νυνὶ δέ, but now*, cf. vs. 4 seq.) and  
at the same time the axiom of belief connected with it (on which the  
argument has been hitherto conducted): *ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κοιμημένων*]  
*as first fruits of those who have fallen asleep* (is he awaked from the  
dead), so that he has made the commencement in the resurrection of  
the dead. cf. Col. 1: 18: *ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος ἐκ νεκρῶν.*

Vs. 21—28. Explanation of this axiom by showing its connection  
with other truths. 1) Vs. 21—24. *Christ, as contrast to Adam, is the  
author and effector of the resurrection.* Vs. 21, 22. The axiom of  
faith, that the resurrection of the dead has its ground in the resurrec-  
tion of Christ, is connected with what is laid down in Ro. 5: 12 seq.,  
that Christ, as contrast to Adam, is the second head of the human race,  
or the head of the human race restored, as Adam was the head of the  
fallen race of men. Whilst in Romans this parallelism is pointed out  
in the two points of sin and death on the one side, and righteousness  
and life on the other, here only one point is exhibited. (cf. remarks

after v. 50.) We have two corresponding propositions: in the one, v. 21, the parallelism is represented in general terms, under the conception *man*; in the second, v. 22, individually, in Adam and Christ; in the first, in the relation of antecedent and conclusion (*ἐπειδή, as once*); in the second, in the relation of similarity. *δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος*] sc. *ἔστι*, cf. Ro. 5: 12. *ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ, ἐν τ. Χρ.*) in connection with *Adam, with Christ*, in so far as the one and the other stands at the head. On account of this parallelism, and what follows, we must not give up the universality of the *πάντες*, maintained by the older writers (Bez. Aretius, Mor. Ram. Ust. Olsh. Mey.), and limit it to Christians (as Calov. Blondel, Wlf. Msh. Bgl. Lutheran-orthodox opinion, Est. Bllr. Bck.). But, since there is an *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς* and an *ἀνάστ. κρίσεως* (Jno. 5: 29), taking *ζωοποιηθ.* the same as *ἐγερθῆσονται*, and finding here both resurrections, shall we with the reformed churches, found also the resurrection of the unjust to judgment upon the merits of Christ, or say, with Olsh., that the wicked also, *as men*, are in Christ (but with this view the meaning of the *ἐν Χρ.* would be changed); — or shall we, with Grotius, contrary to the parallelism, take *ἐν* by means of; or, with Mey., understand it of the ground or reason: “in so far namely as Christ as Messiah must also be the general awakener of the dead, and would not be the former if he were not the latter, Acts 24: 15. Jno. 5: 28?” But with this latter view, the question would only be transferred back to a positive conception. Probably *ζωοποιηθ.* is to be taken in its appropriate signification, and understood simply of the resurrection to life; the universality of it, however, to be conceived of in the sense of the *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων* indicated in what follows. (cf. Weizel in Stud. u. Kr. 1836. 978.

V. 23. *ἕκαστος*] plainly refers to *πάντες*. — *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι*] in his own order. *τάγμα* properly *what is placed in order, a body of troops drawn up in military order*; so Mey.: *in his own division*; and such an one would *οἱ τοῦ Χρ.* form. But as a second *τάγμα* is not mentioned, and also Christ himself commences the series, the *succession* (*τάξις*) seems to be denoted by the word, as this idea lies in the words *ἀπαρχή, ἔπειτα, εἶτα*. For this use of the word, proof is not found in Clem. Rom. 1. Ep. ad Cor. c. 37. b. Bck., rather in c. 41; but as *τάξις* also like *τάγμα* designates a *division of an army*, so also the latter may have the former signification of *τάξις* [viz. *succession*]. *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*] those belonging to Christ, cf. 1 Thesa. 4: 16. Therefore the “*first resurrection*,” Rev. 20: 5. Bibl. Dogm. [of De Wette] § 203.

V. 24. *εἶτα τὸ εἶλ.*] sc. *ἔσται*. Then will the end be. Not: of the

resurrection;<sup>1</sup> for although with this view the development of the thought would be in strict progression, yet the expression τέλος, which we are scarcely led by the ἀπαρχή to refer to ἀνάστασις, is against it; not: of the world, or the present order of the world;<sup>2</sup> for although the objection, that "according to the uniform doctrine of the New Testament, with the second coming of Christ commences the finis hujus saeculi" (Mey.), is removed by Rev. 20: 7, 8 (where the Millennium is interposed); and if accordingly, with Olsh., we suppose the apostle to place this temporal kingdom of Christ between the first resurrection and the end, and the general resurrection at the same time with the end, a complete harmony arises between him and the Apocalypse, as also the expression τέλος can be justified by the clauses which follow in the context: ἔταν καταργήσῃ κ. τ. λ. V. 24, ἔσχατος ἔχθρὸς κ. τ. λ. V. 26; still the apostle, by the ὅταν παραδ. κ. τ. λ. (which clearly is to explain τὸ τέλος), has pointed out the way to another explanation, I mean not precisely this: the end of the kingdom of Christ (Grt. Bllr.), but of the events included in the "last things," the eschatological events (Ust. p. 378: the consummation). But the second, general resurrection is always to be connected with τὸ τέλος, and also between this and the first, a longer or shorter space of time is to be conceived of, which Rck. and Kl. wrongly deny. In this space of time now is to be placed the temporal kingdom of Christ, and at the same time with that, according to Weizel, as cited above, a process of sanctification or redemption, which extends also to the heathen and wicked persons, (analogous to the process of redemption, which took place from the resurrection of Christ to his reëappearance in the church) and the subjugation of all the enemies of Christ, together with the destruction of death, which takes place last (vs. 25, 26), and which is followed by the general resurrection. ἔταν παραδῶ<sup>3</sup> κ. τ. λ.] when he gives up the kingdom to God the Father (Ro. 15: 6). ὅταν with the Pres. Conj. expresses elsewhere (Jno. 8: 44. Win. § 43. 5) a recurring action, but also a future action (Matthiae Greek Gr. § 521. p. 1195). The Aor. is not appropriate, because this surrender is made dependent upon the following ὅταν καταργήσῃ. ἡ βασιλ. the kingdom of Christ can scarcely be regarded the same as that which is called the kingdom of Grace, i. e.

<sup>1</sup> As Thdr. Oec. Cajet. Bgl. Jehne interpr. c.15.ep. 1. ad Cor. in Velth. et Kuin. Commentt. Vol. II. Hdreh. (not Ust.) Mey.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Bez. Bld. Wif. Msh. Olsh. Kling. St. u. Kr. 1839. 504.

<sup>3</sup> More correctly Rck. Mey. after A D E all. Verss. Patr. παραδίδῶ (Lehm. Tschdf. after B F G παραδίδοι, which Opt. cannot be grammatically justified, cf. Kühn. II. 810. remark), because the following Aor. as well refutes the common reading as explains its origin.

the church (Bld. Calov. Est. Wlf. Msh. Rsm. Hdrch. Rck. ), since this is before the final advent of Christ (the *παρουσία*), but a kingdom (v. 25) between this and the consummation, similar to the Millennium of the Apocalypse, which indeed is far more perfect, spiritualized, and triumphant than the present earthly one (the church), but still belongs to a finite state, and is subjected to struggle. So Ust. p. 367. Note, Olsh. ; whilst Weizel rejects the idea of a Millennium, but assumes, however, an intermediate period. All other expositors hesitate to take up the thought of the apostle. Thphlet. : *τουτέστι κατορθοῦ, τελειοῦ* — τότε γὰρ τελείως ὁ Χρ. ἡμῶν βασιλεύσει; similar Thdrt. Ambros. Cajet. Storr Opusc. 1. 277. Flatt, so that a sense comes out entirely opposite to the Pauline. Est. : tradet regnum Deo et patri, i. e. cum subiectione et gratiarum actione gloriosum illud regnum suum Deo patri suo offeret, profitens universam regni sui gloriam illi auctori se acceptam referre. Hilar. Lib. XI. de trin., Aug. l. I. de trin. c. 8. Hugo Victor : cum perduxerit electos suos ad contemplationem Dei ; similar Hesshus. in Calov. ; Hdrch. : quando omnes regni messiani cives Deo exhibebit atque offeret vivos, dominio mortis ereptos, redintegratos, restitutos et immortales. — Parallel are Pirke Elies. 11. in Wst. Schttg. : Nonus rex est Messias, qui reget ab extremitate una mundi ad alteram. Decemus Deus S. B. Tunc redibit regnum ad auctorem suum S. D. ὅταν—δύναμις] when he shall have destroyed all dominion and all might and power. All hostile powers are meant, not merely the demons (Chrys. Thdrt. Hdrch. Bllr. Ust. p. 354), nor merely the earthly powers. Against the context, on account of the τοὺς ἐχθρούς in v. 25, is the explanation of Calvin (cf. Cajet.) : *potestates legitimas a Deo ordinatas*, and of Olsh. : *all dominion, good as well as evil, and also even that of the Son.* (cf. Mey.)

2) Vs. 25—28. The Apostle in the course of his remarks is led to the thought, not known probably to all, of *the surrender of the kingdom of Christ to God ; of this now, in a digression, he gives an explanation.*

V. 25. δεῖ—*βασιλεύει*] for he must (by virtue of the Divine order or arrangement of the world) reign. This necessarily presupposes a longer duration of the dominion, and indeed a different one from that in the church, during the continuance of which the destruction of the terrestrial powers indeed, but not of the super-terrestrial, takes place. ἄρχῃς οὐ κ. τ. λ.) Words adopted from Ps. 110: 1. The subject is not θεός (Bez. Grt. Est. Rsm. Fl. Hdrch. Bllr.), to which neither the connection (which was probably not taken into consideration by the apostle) of the passage in the Psalm, nor v. 27 compels us ; but the subject is Christ on account of the connection with v. 25

(Chrys. Rek. Mey.), although *αὐτῶν*, not *αὐτοῦ*, is to be written (Mey., cf. Win. p. 175-6.

V. 26. *As the last enemy death is destroyed*, not Satan (Ust. p. 373); still death is conceived as a personal, diabolical power, Rev. 20: 14—

V. 27. Proof, that Christ will destroy all hostile powers, also death, from Ps. 8: 6, which passage according to the grammatico-historical sense, is to be understood of the dominion of man over the earth, but by an ideal explanation is applied by Paul to the Messiah: *for he* (God, according to the connection of the Psalm) *hath put all things under his feet*, namely, by his decree, which the Messiah in reality (vs. 24—26) fulfils. The apostle at the same time also, by an analysis of the passage in the Psalm, confirms the above conception of the surrender of the kingdom of Christ to God, and defines it more accurately as a subjection of the Son to the Father. *ὅταν δὲ εἶπῃ*] sc. ἡ *γραφή* (6: 16); according to Mey. *ὁ θεός*, but contrary to the connection here and in the Psalm. *ὅταν quandoquidem*, Jno. 9: 5 (Bllr.); better: *quum dicat* (Bez. Mey.), but this is uncommon, since after *ὅταν* the Aor. has the signification of the Fut. exact, cf. Remarks on Heb. 1: 6. *διὸν ὅτι*] sc. *πάντα ὑποτ.*, cf. *Matthiae*, § 624, p. 1494.

V. 28. *τότε—ὑποτ.*] *then will also the Son subject himself*, etc., in a different sense from that in which everything (hostile) will be subjected to him, in this sense namely, that he will no longer reign in God's stead, or God through him mediately, but God will rule without mediation. The explanation, that the subjection is only a hyperbolical expression for the complete harmony of Christ with the Father (Chrys. Thphlet. Oec.); the limitation to the human nature (Thdrt. Aug. Jerom. in Calov., Bld. Est. and others) together with the declarative explanation: "it will be very clear, that Christ also in respect to his dominion, considered according to his humanity, is dependent upon God the Father" (Fl.), together with the addition: "Christ will then according to his divine nature rule with the Father" (Calv.); and furthermore to explain it by the Corpus Christi mysticum, i. e. of the church (Thdrt.),—these all are unmeaning evasions. The limitation to the mediatorial office of Christ (Bld.) is better. *ἵνα ἡ π. ε. λ.*] *in order that* (not: *so that*, Hdrch.) *God may be all* (as we say: *be everything, in authority, etc.*) *in all* (Masc.), cf. Col. 8: 11; differently Eph. 1: 23, and also here *ἐν νῦναις* can be taken as neuter *in all modes* (of existence).

Vs. 29—34. *Further arguments for the resurrection.* V. 29. *First argument.* *ἐνεῖ*] *for*, does not introduce a reason for v. 28 (Mey.), but an argument for the resurrection (Oec.). The preceding stands

indeed only in distant connection with it; but since vs. 25—28 are to be considered as a digression (Olsh.), it is not at all unnatural thus to refer back. *τί ποιήσουσιν*] the Fut. refers to the supposition: if there be (were) no resurrection; *what will (would) then . . . do*; not: quid eos facere apparebit (Blr.). But in this question lies the foolishness of this doing. Cf. Acts 14, 15: *τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε*; 21, 13: *τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες*; Grt. Fl. Mey.: *what will they effect? οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*] *who are baptized for (instead of) the dead*. This only possible sense of the words leads to the explanation, that the apostle supposes the practice afterwards in use among the Cerinthians (Epiph. Haer. XXVIII, 7) and Marcionites (Tert. de Resurr. 48, adv. Marc. V, 10. Chrys. ad h. l.), according to which Christians were baptized for those who had died unbaptized (the article denotes those who thus died), in order thereby to make them partakers of the resurrection and eternal life.<sup>1</sup> It is an argumentum ad hominem, an appeal to the prevailing belief; in which view there is only this difficulty, that the apostle seems to have sanctioned this senseless practice (Mey. and others do not indeed allow this), or at least does not blame it. Luther and others in Calov. translate: *over the dead*, i. e. over their graves; but *ἐπὶ* does not appear in the New Testament in the signification of *place*; the custom is not proved, and the argument taken from thence would be weak. Chrys. Thphlet. Oec. Corn. a Lap. Er. Schmid and others, entirely contrary to the use of language, translate: *in faith in the resurrection of the dead*. Epiph. Calv. Est. Flac. and others explain it of the baptism of the catechumens on the death bed, likewise contrary to the sense of the words. Cleric. ad Hamm., *Deyling*. Observ. S. II. 44, *Döderlein* Institut. II. 409, and *Olsh.* translate: *in the place of the dead*, i. e. who are baptized, although their predecessors are dead,—who take the place of the dead. *Pelag. Olear. Paul.* Memor. II. 153 seq. *Schr.* interpret: with regard to the departed Christ (Plur. of the Category); *Strr.* Opusc. 1. 281. *Fl.* interpret: *on account of Christ and those who have died in him*; *Fl.* proposes also to take *βαπτίζ.* in the metaphorical sense of the baptism of blood: *to endure sufferings* in respect to the departed Christ and his departed worshippers. *Morus* interprets: why do they incur misery on account of the dead, i. e. on account of those who have been dead a longer or shorter time? (Similar Lghtf.) Many other explanations still, see in Calov. Wlf. Hdrch. *εἰ—ἐγγίγονται* is joined to the preceding by Luther, Grb. Scho. better (cf. Ro. 3: 6, 7) by Bez. Bgl. Lchm.

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. Anselm. Scalig. Grt. Calixt. and others of the older writers in Calov. Blr. Rck. Mey.

Billr. Rck. Mey. to that which follows, so that it forms the parallel of the conditional clause to be supposed with ἐπει. τί καί] but why (Ro. 8: 24). Instead of τῶν νεκρ. read αὐτῶν.

Vs. 30—32. *Second argument: I should act foolishly to expose myself to death.* This is an argument for immortality, but for such an one as is an object of hope. Cic. Tusc. 1, 15.: Nescio quomodo inhaeret in mentibus quasi saeculorum quoddam augurium futurorum — quo quidem demto, quis tam esset amens, qui semper in laboribus et periculis viveret? V. 30. καὶ ἡμεῖς] *we also*, the apostles, not till in the following passage does Paul speak of himself alone. V. 31. ἀποθνήσκω] a strong expression for encountering dangers of death, cf. Wtst. Kpk. πῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν] *per gloriam* (mean) *de vobis*. σὴ a well known Greek particle of affirmation, used only here in the N. T. ὑμετ. is to be taken objectively, as sometimes the Gen., and as ἡ ἀγάπη ἡ ἐμὴ Jno. 15: 9, ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ Jno. 15: 11. according to the explanation of some, ὑμετέρω ἐλπίει Ro. 11: 31, φόβω τῶ ὑμετέρω Thucyd. 1. 33, cf. Matthiae § 466. 2. Rückert, but he reads ἡμετέραν according to A 2 \* \* 4. all. Or. Thdr. ἐν Χριστῷ κ. τ. λ.] *in the communion* (as it were in goods) *with Christ*, i. e. as apostles.

V. 32. κατὰ ἀνθρώπων] *after the manner of men*, Bez.: *humano impulsu*, Mey.: *in the interest of ordinary men*; more definitely indeed: *without hope of the resurrection* (Ambros. Oec. Schott). The explanation: *ut hominum more loquar* (Est.), or *exempli causa* (Hdreh. and others) is entirely untenable, since λαλῶ or λέγω is not in the clause. ἐθνησιμαχίᾳ] is with Tert.<sup>1</sup> Thphlet. Oec. Pelag. Bez. Grt. Est. Calov. Rsm. Schr. Rck. Olsh. Mey. to be taken in a figurative sense of any great danger encountered. Cf. Ignat. ep. ad Rom. c. 5, ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ—ἐνδεδμεμένος δὲνα λεοπαράδαι, ὃ ἐστὶ στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα. Other examples in Wtst. 2 Tim. 4: 17. For against the literal interpretation<sup>2</sup> may be adduced: 1) the silence of the Acts and of Paul himself, 2 Cor. 11: 23; 2) that Paul as a Roman citizen was not exposed to such a punishment; 3) the improbability of deliverance. But what that danger was we do not know. Thphlet. Pelag. and others refer it perhaps to the commotion excited by Demetrius (Acts 19: 28 seq.), but on the one hand Paul, according to Luke, did not come immediately into danger; again, this event seems to be later than the composition of this Epistle (cf. Acts 20: 1). τί—ὄφ.] *what advantage do I have from it?* The aim and fruit of all

<sup>1</sup> De resurr. c. 48: depugnavit ad bestias Ephesi, illas sc. bestias Asiaticae pressurae, 2 Cor. 1: 8.

<sup>2</sup> Adopted by Ambros. Cajet. Erasm. Lth. Calv. Corn. a Lap. Lghtf. Wlf. Msh. Fl. B'lr.

higher effort Paul found in blessedness with Christ, which he thought of as beyond the grave. *εὐ—ἡγείρ.*] is best connected with what follows (Chrysa. Thphlet. Bez. Bgl. Grh. d. N.), because if connected with what precedes (Thdet. Bld. Grt. Est. Lth.—but he makes two questions), the *φάγ. κ. π.* seems too much isolated, and the conditional clause *εἰ νεκρ. κ. τ. λ.* is contained already in the correctly explained *κατ. ἀνθρ. φάγ. κ. τ. λ.*] words borrowed from Isa. 22: 13, LXX, concisely denoting the Epicurean, pleasure-loving levity, which results from unbelief in a higher life after death. Cf. Book of Wisdom 2: 1 seq. and classical parallel passages in Wtst.

Vs. 33, 34. *Moral Warning.* *μὴ πλασ.*] 6: 9. *φθορῶ—κακαί*] an Iambic verse (yet, instead of *χρησθ'* which is conformable to the metre, *χρησά*, with Grb. and others, is to be read) taken indirectly as a proverb, or directly from the Thais of Menander, as Tert. Jerome and others observe. See Menand. fragm. ed. Meinecke, p. 75. *ὀμιλίαι κακαί*] *evil conversations, intercourse of pernicious society*; reference to the deniers of the resurrection, who then notwithstanding must have been frivolous people, whilst Paul, according to vs. 32, may give to the greatest part of his hearers credit for a still serious disposition. Differently Bllr. Olsh., but Mey. thinks otherwise. — V. 34. *ἐκνήψατε δεκαίως*] *be sober in the right way.* They were already therefore, as it were, beclouded with that levity. Odys. XIV, 90: *δικαίως μῦσθαι* (Mey.) *κ. μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε*] *be not hurried on to sin.* On the difference between the Aor. and Pres. in these imperatives, see Win. § 44. 5. *ἀγνοῶς. κ. τ. λ.*] *for some have ignorance of God*, those designated in v. 12; Bllr. erroneously makes a distinction. Their doubts sprang from or were connected with a want of true knowledge of God, cf. v. 39. Matth. 22: 29 *πρὸς ἐντρ. κ. τ. λ.*] 6: 5.

Vs. 35—50. After the apostle has shown that there is a resurrection of the dead, he enters upon the manner. V. 35. Propounding of the question in the form of an objection. *πῶς*] *How?* refers to the manner of the process of resurrection. *ποιῶ σώματι*] *with what sort of, how constituted, body* (cf. 11: 5), refers to the result of the process. Cf. Kling as cited above, p. 507. These are always the questions which the doctrine of the resurrection suggests, and indeed so much the rather, the more grossly it is apprehended; for so much the rather can one raise difficulties against it from the *naturalistic* point of view. Such an one the apostle seems to presuppose in his opponents, since he begins with natural analogies and then points to higher possibilities. *ἔρχονται*] *they come, appear.* The Present represents the object as present in thought, cf. v. 42. Win. p. 308.

Vs. 36—41. *Analogies for the resurrection.* 1) Vs. 36—38. *Anal-*



ogy of sowing and germinating with reference to the πῶς, whereby particular reference was had to the difficulty of the new life proceeding from death. ἀφρον] A B D G 47. all. Lehm. Tschdf. Rck. Mey. read: ἀφρων (Nom. instead of Voc. Win. p. 209), and Meyer connects σύ with it "because with the common connection an emphasis must be placed upon σύ, which however the context does not furnish." ζωοποιεῖσθαι, to be quickened, awakened, used instead of: germinating, ἀποθνήσκειν, to come into a state of dissolution (Jno. 12: 24), and in v. 37 σῶμα body, instead of plant—general expressions and conceptions, in order to bring the figure and what is denoted by it nearer together. The reverse in v. 42.

V. 37. The construction, elucidated by no one but Mey., but not correctly by reference to Matthiæ II. § 478, is occasioned by that in the preceding verse, and becomes clear if we substitute αἱ τι for ὁ, or if we suppose, in the clause succeeding, οὐκ ἐστὶ instead of οὐ σπείρεις. From the resemblance of the verb and the object arises the advantage, that the subsequent or defining clause is more closely united with the preceding clause. εἰ τύχοι, σίτου] perhaps (14: 10) of wheat. τῶν λοιπῶν] sc. σπυριμάτων, which the connection shows. — V. 38. ὁ δὲ θεός] Paul regards this process of nature in the development of the plant so much the rather as an act of God, as he must attribute the resurrection to Divine omnipotence; but he considers it to be such an action as takes place by necessary laws, through the act of creation, to which ἡθελήσας refers. καὶ] and indeed. τὸ ἴδιον σ.] its own (peculiar, different from others) body.

2) Vs. 39—41. Analogy of the manifold diversity of organic structures (to which the ἴδιον σῶμα, v. 38, forms the transition), by which the objection ποίῳ σώματι, v. 35, is met. Those who doubted in Corinth, like the Sadducees, had narrow conceptions of the creative omnipotence of God and the richness of creation. V. 39. σάρξ] animal organism. κτηνῶν] of the four-footed animals, properly, jumenta. — V. 40. καὶ σώμ. ἐπουρ.] sc. ἔστιν, and there are heavenly bodies, by which the ancient writers conceived of the blessed; the moderns, according to modern conceptions, and according to v. 41 (but there another analogy comes in), the heavenly bodies; Meyer, correctly, the bodies of the angels. σώμ. ἐπίγ.] Bodies of men and animals. δόξα] glory, is to be regarded, in reference to heavenly bodies, as brightness of light (cf. Matt. 28: 3. Acts 12: 7); in reference to earthly bodies, as beauty. — V. 41. The idea of δόξα leads the apostle to the analogy of the heavenly lights, whereby he would point, not to the diversity of the bodies of those who are raised, but to the possibility of new and unknown forms. ἄλλα δόξ. ἀστέρων] another (in com-

parison with the sun and moon) is the *splendor of the stars*; at the same time also, by the plural *ἀστέρων*, the diversity is indicated in the splendor of the stars as compared with each other, as is shown by the explanatory clause: *ἀστὴρ γὰρ κ. τ. λ.*

Vs. 42—44 a. Application of the foregoing to the resurrection: the body of those who are raised will, notwithstanding death and corruption, be a much higher, a spiritual body. Vs. 42, 43. *σπείρειν*] an expression for *being buried*, taken from the comparison in vs. 36, 37. The subject, *σῶμα*, naturally supplies itself. *ἐν φθορᾷ*] in the state of corruption, (v. 50). Parallel: *ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ*] in the condition of dishonor, contrast of *δόξα*, cf. 12: 23. *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ*] in the condition of weakness, in so far as the power of the human body is relatively small. After Chrys. Thdr. Oec. Bez. Grt. and Hdrch. Meyer refers all these conditions to the *dead* corpse, which indeed is sown, i. e. buried. (Others, as Msh., erroneously assume a reference to different states, cf. Bllr.); but as *σῶμα ψυχικόν* does not denote the quality of the dead body as such, but of the living body, according to its organization, it seems better to refer the preceding qualities also to the latter (Calv. Est. Bgl. Ram. Fl. Rck.), so much the more, as the *ἀσθενεῖα* would be an idle predicate of the former. — V. 44. *σῶμα ψυχικόν*] a *psychical* body, in which the *ψυχή*, i. e. the sensuous part of the inner life, predominates, and which is organized accordingly, cf. 2: 14. *πνευματικόν*] which is organized for the predominancy of the spirit.

Vs. 44 b.—50. Exposition and confirmation of the assertion, that those who are raised will receive a spiritual body. *ἔστι—πνευμα.*] there is a natural (psychical) body, and there is a spiritual body—Justification of the paradoxical conception of a *σῶμα πνευμ.* by the express assertion, that there is just as well such a body as a common natural one. A B C D \* F G 6. 10. all. Verss. Patr. *Lohm. Tischdf. Rck.* read: *εἰ ἔστι σ. ψυχ., ἔστιν καὶ κ. τ. λ.*, and after these Luther. But it is plainly a pretended emendation, because the thought is brought into the form of an inference.

V. 45. Scriptural proof, which leads back to the above (vs. 21, 22) parallelism between Adam and Christ. *οὗτος*] in harmony with *this*. The passage is Gen. 2: 7 according to the LXX (*καὶ ἐγ. ὁ ἄνθρ. εἰς ψ. ζ.*) with the insertion of *ὁ πρῶτος* and *Ἀδάμ*. But the proof does not lie in the proper passage itself, (for from the *εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*, to a *living soul* [a psychical being] follows merely the existence of a *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, readily acknowledged without that) but in the addition of a Midrash (comment): *ὁ ἔσχατος κ. τ. λ.*, which rests upon the antitypical parallelism of Adam and Christ, having with the apostle the power of an axiom. *ὁ ἔσχ. Ἀδάμ*] is Christ, cf. Ro. 5: 14, not the risen

man (Hardin, Teller W B., Jehæ). *eis n. ζωοποιῶν*] to a life-giving (others, resuscitating, cf. Jno. 5: 21 seq.) spirit (spiritual being). The question is, how far? According to Bez., in his Divine nature; according to Calov. and Fl., in his human nature, by virtue of the communicatio hypostatica; according to Grt. (cf. Calv. ad v. 47) in consequence of his resurrection and ascension; according to Est. in consequence of his resurrection; according to the Socinians and Mey., in consequence of the ascension, because (according to the gospel accounts) his body during his earthly life, and even after the resurrection, was psychical ['natural']. Whether Paul acknowledged the latter, is the question, because he places the appearances of Christ, soon after the resurrection, in the same series with those of the heavenly Christ, which were made to him. With him also the resurrection of Jesus is too much the principal point in the whole subject, for him not to have perceived in that the sufficient cause. Jno. 5: 26, 27 appears to attribute to Jesus the resuscitative power, even in his earthly life, cf. Jno. 10: 18.

Vs. 46, 47. But that the *spiritual* (σῶμα is not to be supplied to πνευματικόν, as has been common since Thphlct.) is not earlier than the *psychical*, is shown in the form (ἀλλά) of meeting an objection (Thphlct. Bek.) and is developed by analysis from v. 45. ὁ πρῶτος, ὁ δεύτερος] emphatic. ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός] formed from earth, and consisting of dust, cf. Gen. 2: 7. This predicate is used instead of the above ψυχὴ ζ., in order to make clearer the quality of the σῶμα ψυχ. ὁ ἄριστος] is wanting in B C D \* E F G 17. all. Verss. Patr. in *Lchm. Tschdf.*, and is probably a gloss. If it is read, it must be understood as in opposition to ὁ δειν. ἀνθρ. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ] of heavenly origin, takes the place of πνεῦμ. ζ. That it refers to the corporeal nature of Jesus, cannot be maintained; it denotes, like πνεῦμα ζ., the entire personality of Jesus, which, through its predominant spirituality, has also a spiritual body.

V. 48. Hence as there are two heads, so also there are two series or masses of mankind. ὁ χοϊκός] Adam. οἱ χοϊκοί] the descendants of Adam, i. e. all men, in so far as they stand in connection with him and partake of his nature, Christians also not excluded in their nature as mortal. ὁ ἐπουράνιος] Christ. οἱ ἐπουράνιοι] the Christians who have risen and are partakers of the kingdom of God. — V. 49. Application of what has been said to the reader. καὶ χοϊκοῦ] and as we have borne the image (form, organization) of the earthly (during our mortal life). φορέσομεν κ. τ. λ.] we shall also bear the image of the heavenly, attain the same nature as Christ. The reading φορέσωμεν, for which there is, to be sure, preponderating evidence in A C D E

F G 28. all. Vulg. all. Patrr., and which is adopted by Lchm. Tschdf. and Mey., makes the clause a warning. But 1) this has here no appropriate place, since v. 50 (to be sure, not according to Mey., see below) concludes the argument, consequently also v. 49 must accord with the form of this argument; 2) the clause would then take its point of view in the present time, whilst *ἐφορῶσάμεν* κ. τ. λ. transfers the entire life to the past. Meyer gives an interpretation not contained in the previous train of thought: "as we were similar to Adam by sin (which however has not been spoken of hitherto, see below) before receiving Christ." And thus, after all, the genuine reading in the common text seems to remain, according to B 17. all. Syr. Arr. Aeth. Arm. Orig. ed. Thdrt. How the other reading originated, is not indeed so easy to explain, as it has not at all the character of correction or facilitation.

V. 50. Conclusion of the preceding, by the express (*τοῦτο δὲ φημι*, cf. 7: 29) *negative* assertion, *that* (whatever one may think positively concerning the resurrection-body) *flesh and blood* (Thdrt. : *τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν καλεῖ*) and *that which is perishable* (*ἡ φθαρὰ* instead of *τὸ φθαρτόν*) cannot (namely, not immediately, without change, v. 53) be partakers of the kingdom of God and of incorruption. According to Ust. p. 364. Bllr. and Olsh., Paul here makes an admission to his *spiritualizing* opponents: "but that I allow" (?). Meyer joins v. 50, as introduction or transition, to v. 51 seq. But besides that the principle here laid down is far too general, to form a transition to the particular communication, which follows in verse 51, it is also more appropriate, according to the manner in which, in Ro. 11: 25, a similar *μυστήριον* is announced, to suppose something new to commence with verse 51. Not until the exhibition of the result, in v. 50, does it come to the mind of Paul to explain himself concerning those still living at the second coming of Christ. *κληρονομεῖ*] does not stand for the future, which is the reading in C D F G Vulg. al., but denotes the nature of the case, cf. v. 35. The Christological expression *inherit* (6: 9, 10), is transferred, also, by means of the parallelism, to *ἀφθαρσ.* (state of imperishableness) as in Matt. 19: 29 to *ζωὴ αἰών.* In the contrast carried out, in vs. 21, 22, 45 seq., between Adam, mortal and communicating immortality, and Christ, risen and communicating the resurrection, the element of sin, by which death has come into the world, is passed over in silence and not considered until verse 56.

Vs. 51—53. Communication concerning the destiny of those, who will be still living at the second coming of Christ. Vs. 51, 52. *μυστήριον*] cf. Ro. 11: 25. *πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγώμεθα*] This common reading is found in B (without *μὲν*) D \* \* E all.

codd. gr. ap. Hier. all., in Versa. Chrya. Theot. all., and is rightly preferred to the various others, which are to be regarded as introduced on dogmatic grounds. The more precise meaning would be: *we shall all indeed not die* (i. e. we shall be living till the second coming of Christ) *but shall all be changed*, so that the subject of both verbs would be Paul, and all those, who should live until the second coming, and *ἀλλὰ*, as v. 52, would refer only to those then living (Mey.). But it would have been an absurd prediction, if he had promised, that in the time before the second coming, no one of the Christians would die, cf. 11: 30. 6: 14. Moreover, in a grammatical point of view, it is opposed to this explanation, that *ἡμεῖς* is not used instead of *πάντας*, as in v. 52. 1 Thess. 4: 15, 17. Hence it may be regarded as certain, that *πάντας* denotes *all Christians*, and *ἀλλαγῶς*, is to be referred, not, as in v. 52, to the living, but also at the same time to the dead, and in reference to the latter, is to be taken figuratively in the sense of *ἐξαρθ. ἀφθαρτοι*, v. 52. Meaning: *we shall not all die, but all (some by the process of resurrection, others by another) be changed*. In order not to be obliged, with Chrya. and most interpreters, to assume a transposition of the negation,<sup>1</sup> it is best, with Bllr., to refer even the first *πάντας* to *ἀλλὰ*. and regard the *μὲν οὐ κοιμηθ.* only as inserted: *we shall all—not die indeed—but all be changed*. After an opinion in Oec., Estius explains *οὐ κοιμηθ.*, pressing the meaning of the word, thus, that all *die* indeed, but do not *sleep* in death, i. e. would pass quickly from death to life. *ἐν ἀτόμῳ* x. τ. λ.] belongs to *ἀλλὰ*: *in a twinkling* (*ἄτομον*, *individuum*, *small point of time*), *in a moment*. *ἐν τ. ἐσχ. σάλπ.*] at (Win. p. 461) *the last trumpet* (at the last sound of the trumpet), *not that of the last day* (Pelag. Est. Fl. Hdrch. Bllr. Rck. Mey.), but at the last of the signals which will then be given. But the apostle does not mean thereby the last trumpet, Rev. 11: 15 (*τινὲς*, Thphact. Wlf. Olsh. cf. Fl.), which does not by any means constitute the last decisive moment; and also not the last of the seven sounds of the trumpet, during which the resurrection shall take place by degrees, according to R. Akiba in his Othioth. f. 17. 3. in *Häsenan*. II. 939. Wtst. (the *ἐν ἀτόμῳ* is, however, against this); but he means the last of the signals, during which, according to some primitive (not so much Matt. 24: 31 as his own, resting upon an *ἀποκάλυψις* made to him) apocalyptic representation, the events included in the 'last things' were to take place. (In 1 Thess. 4: 16, several sounds of the trumpet are not indeed expressly mentioned, but *ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ* re-

<sup>1</sup> Which, however, could find an explanation and apology in this, that Paul places the emphasis on *πάντας*, as in the case in Num. 23: 13: *πάντας μὲν οὐ μὴ ἴδῃ*.

fers either merely to the second coming, as the first act, and a second and several signals are presupposed, or it is to be taken collectively). The conception of the signals of the trumpet rests ultimately upon the use of the holy trumpets in the festivals of Divine worship among the Jews, and is the figure of the entrance of solemn catastrophes, produced from above. *The last signal of all* cannot be meant, if here only the *first* resurrection be spoken of, which, according to vs. 23, 24, is not to be doubted. *σαλπίσσει—άλλαγ.*] is a confirmatory clause, which is not, with Grb. and Scho., to be inserted in brackets, since the construction is not thereby interrupted; but rather, on the contrary, the following second confirmatory clause, v. 53, refers to *άλλαγ. σαλπίσσει*] Impers. cf. Win. § 39. 1. *καί*] and then, in consequence of that. *ἡμεῖς άλλαγ.*] Calov. Est. Strr. (Opusc. 1. 76) Fl. and others, after Chrys. Thdrt. Thphlct. and Oec., are of opinion, that Paul does not speak of himself, but of those who should then be living. V. 53. *δει*] according to the principle, v. 50. *ἐνδύσασθαι*] put on, image of close union, Lu. 24: 49. Ro. 13: 14. Eph. 4: 24. Col. 3: 10, especially also of the resurrection-body, 2 Cor. 5: 3.

Vs. 54—57. *The apostle dwells in triumphant hope upon this conception*; it is, as it were, a lyrical conclusion to the whole section, like Ro. 8: 31 seq. V. 54. *γενήσεται*] will take place, "be fulfilled," *κατεπόθη κ. τ. λ.*] Is. 25: 8, not after the LXX. (*κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας*), but after the original text, and indeed with this deviation, that *יְהוָה*, Jehovah *destroys*, is translated passively, and *עַד עַד* for ever, by *εἰς νίκος* (as LXX. 2 Sam. 2: 26 and elsewhere) *to victory* (so that victory is the result). Schemoth R. XXX. f. 131. 4. XV. f. 101. 8: in — — diebus ejus (Messiae) Deus S. B. deglutiet mortem s. d. Es. XXV, 8 (Wtst.).

Vs. 55, 56. Thdrt. Thphlct. and Oec. seem to take these words of Hos. 13: 14, not as a quotation, but as borrowed, and as an expression of the triumphant feeling of the apostle, as also Meyer adopts this view. But as in v. 56 a Midrasch (commentary) follows, and as the apostle elsewhere (Ro. 11: 8) unites various passages, it seems better to regard them as a quotation. Hosea says: *אֲנִי הִבְרִיתָ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכֶסֶדְךָ וְשָׂאֵל*; LXX. : *ποῦ* (= *אֲנִי* cf. v. 10; others, *I will be*) *ἢ δίκην σου* (instead of *thy plagues*), *θάνατε, ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου* (instead of *thy diseases*), *ἄδη*. B C 17. all. Verss. Patr. *Lachm. Tschdf. and Rck.* have here *νίκος* first and *κέντρον* last, contrary to the order of words in the common text, but it is plainly through accommodation to the LXX. Again, B D E F G. 39. all. Verss. Patr. *Lchm. Tschdf. Rck.* have *θάνατε* instead of *ἄδη*, which, as a deviation from the LXX, is to be regarded as original (Mey.). By *κέντρον* Paul conceived of the sting

of a scorpion (Thphlct. Grt. Mey.), i. e. a destructive weapon, not a goad (Schltz. Bllr.); it is not parallel with *δύναμις* "as that which calls forth the expression of power: sin wakes the slumbering power of death, and again the law that of sin" (Olsh.), for *κέρατ. τ. θαν.* is the sting with which death kills, not by which its power is awakened. According to the familiar expression that death is the wages of sin (Ro. 6: 23), the latter is here represented as the destructive weapon, which death employs; and, that the strength of sin lies in the law, which awakens and strengthens it, is clear from Ro. 7: 7 seq.—V. 57. cf. Ro. 7: 25. *τῷ διδόντι*] the Present denoting the certain Future. *τὸ τίχος*] as v. 54.

V. 58. *Final warning*, in the form of an inference (*ὡστε*, cf. 11: 38. 14: 39), not from *τῷ διδόντι κ. τ. λ.* (Mey.) but from the whole previous instruction. *ἑδραῖοι—ἀμετ.*] *firm, immovable*, namely in faith, cf. Col. 1: 23, and indeed here in reference to the doubts which have been considered. Bez. and Mey.: the readers are conceived of as ethical *athletes*; but there is no mention of combat. But as faith must be active, and moral action suffers by doubts, it is added: *περισσ. κ. τ. λ.*] *distinguishing yourselves in the work of the Lord*. This is not: the work which Christ has performed; the Christian plan of salvation, cf. 16: 10. Phil. 2: 30 (Mey.), or the spread of Christianity (Olsh.), but practical Christianity, cf. Jno. 6: 28, 29. *τὰ ἔργα, τὸ ἔργον τ. Θεοῦ*. The work belonging to Christ or that commanded by him (cf. Matth. 6: 33) is indeed for the apostle, the furtherance of the plan of salvation and the spread of the gospel (16: 10), but for *all* Christians the work of love (*κόπος*). *εἰδότες*] introduces the motive, not for following the whole warning (Mey.), but for the *περισσύνειν κ. τ. λ.* and this *εἰδέσθαι* is the conviction of the resurrection, fortified again by the defence of the apostle, in which there lies a reward (v. 32), of which *κερὸς, without fruit*, forms the contrast. *ἐν κυρίῳ*] belongs, to be sure, not to *ὁ κόπ. ἡμ.* (Thphlct. 1 Oec. 1. Hdrch.), but also not to *ὄν-κερὸς* alone (Thphlct. 2. Oec. 2. Mey.), but to the whole clause, cf. 9, 1.—Also in the character of this warning lies an argument against the reading v. 49, and the turn of warning thereby introduced.