will with divine Grace, but in subordination,   
see Matt. x. 20; 2 Cor. v. 20; vi. 1,  
and ch. iii. 9, note.

**11.**] He resumes  
the subject after the digression respecting  
himself:—**it matters not whether it were  
I or they** (the other Apostles)—SUCH  
**is the purport of our preaching**—SUCH  
**was your belief:—so, after this manner,**  
viz., *that Christ died, was buried, and rose  
again*, as verses 3, 4.

**12–19.**] *On the fact of Christ's Resurrection,   
announced in his preaching, and  
confessed in their belief, he grounds (negatively)   
the truth of the general Resurrection:  
—If the latter be not to happen, neither   
has the former happened:—and he  
urges the results of such a disproof of  
Christ's Resurrection.*

**12.**] introduces the argument for the resurrection,  
by referring to its denial among a portion  
ot the Corinthian church.

**But** belongs  
to the whole question, and is opposed to  
“*if we preach*” and “*so ye believed*” of  
the foregoing verse.—The word Christ has  
the leading emphasis, as an example of  
that which is denied by some among you:  
**But if** CHRIST **is** (not subjunctive, **be  
preached:** he is arguing from a matter of  
fact, not from a mere hypothesis) **preached  
that He is risen from the dead** (if an  
instance of such resurrection is a fact announced   
in our preaching), **how say some  
among you** (how comes it to pass that some  
say) **that a resurrection of the dead  
does not exist** (stress on *is*, in reading  
the English text)**?** If the *species* be  
*conceded*, how is it that some among you  
*deny* the *genus?*

**some among you**]  
It is an interesting question, WHO *these  
some were:* and one which can only be  
answered by the indications which the argument   
in this chapter furnishes. (1) *Were  
they Sadducees?* If so, the Apostle would  
hardly have begun his argument with the  
fact of the Resurrection of Jesus. And yet  
we must remember that he is arguing not  
*with the deniers*, but with those who being  
as yet sound, were liable to be misled by  
them. But the opposition between Sadduceism   
and Christianity was so complete, that  
we have little reason to think that any leaven  
of the Sadducees ever found its way into  
the church. (2) *Were they Epicureans?*  
Probably not, for two reasons: (*a*) the  
Epicurean maxim, “ Let us eat and drink,”  
&c., is represented as a legitimate *consequence*   
of adopting their denial of the resurrection,   
not as an accompaniment of,  
much less as the ground of it: and (*b*) had  
the Epicurean element entered to any extent  
into the Corinthian church, we certainly  
should have had more notice of its exceedingly   
antichristian tenets. It is possible  
that the deniers may have been, or been in  
danger of being, *corrupted by mixture* with  
Epicureans *without*, from the warning of  
ver. 33. (3) *Were they Jews?* If not Sadducees,   
hardly Jews at all, or Judaizers: a  
strong tenet of Pharisaism was *this very one*  
of the Resurrection, see Acts xxiii. 6: and  
we know of no tendency of Essenism which  
should produce such a denial. (4) They  
must then have been *Gentile believers*, inheriting   
the unwillingness of the Greek mind  
to receive that of which a full account could  
not be given, see vv. 35, 36: and probably  
of a philosophical and cavilling turn. Meyer  
argues, from the antimaterialistic turn of the  
Apostle’s counter-arguments, vv. 35 ff.,—  
that the objections were antimaterialistic  
also: De Wette infers the very opposite,  
which certainly seems to me more probable.—No   
trace whatever is found in the  
argument of an *allegorizing* character in  
the opponents, as was that of Hymenzus  
and Philetus, who maintained that the  
resurrection was past already, 2 Tim. ii.  
17, 18, as some suppose.—Whether the  
Apostle regarded the resurrection of the  
body as inseparably bound up with a future  
existence of the soul does not very clearly  
appear in this chapter. From the use of  
the word “*perished,*” ver. 18, which must  
refer, not to annihilation, but to *perdition*,   
it would seem that he admitted an  
independent existence of the soul; as also  
from Phil. i. 23. But from ver. 32, it would  
seem that the Apostle regarded the denial  
of the resurrection as involving that of the  
future state and judgment.—On the question   
to which of the (supposed) Corinthian  
parties the opponents belonged, I have