*on the Father,*—and the addition, *that  
Christ will then in his divine nature reign  
with the Father* (so Calvin): the interpretation   
(of the words **the Son Himself**!), as  
referring to Christ’s *mystical Body*, i.e.  
*the Church* (Theodoret),—are idle subterfuges.”   
De Wette. The refutation of  
these and all other attempts to explain  
away the doctrine here plainly asserted, of  
the *ultimate subordination of the Son, is*  
contained in the three precise and unambiguous   
words, **the Son Himself.**

**that God** (alone) **may be all [things] in  
all**,—i.e. recognized as sole Lord and  
King: “all things will be subordinated to  
the Son,—the Son to the Father.” Bengel.

**29–34.**] ARGUMENTS FOR THE REALITY   
OF THE RESURRECTION, *from the  
practice* (1) *of those who were baptized for  
the dead,* (2) *of the Apostles, &c., who submitted   
to daily peril of death.*

**29.**] **Else** resumes the main argument, which  
has been interrupted by the explanation  
since ver. 23 of “*each in his own order.*”  
After it is an ellipsis of ‘if it be as the   
adversaries suppose.’

**what shall they  
do**] There is in these words a tacit reprehension   
of the practice about to be mentioned,   
which it is hardly possible altogether   
to miss. Both by the third person  
aud by the words they which are, he  
indirectly separates himself and those to  
whom he is writing from participation in  
or approval of the practice:—the meaning  
being, **what will become of**—‘what account  
can they give of their practice?’

The participle is *present*, **those who are**  
[**in the habit of being**] **baptized**—not  
past, “*those who have been baptized.*”  
The distinction is important as affecting  
the interpretation. See below.

**on behalf of the dead**] viz. *the same* **dead**  
who are spoken of in the next clause and  
throughout the chapter as the subjects of  
*the resurrection*—not *dead* in any figurative   
sense.

**the** *dead*, the article marking  
the particular dead persons on behalf of  
whom the act took place. Before we pass  
to the explanation, it will be well to go  
through the next question: **If dead men  
are not raised at all, why do they trouble  
themselves to be baptized for them** (so,  
and not as in A.V., is the sentence to  
be arranged)? Thus much being said as  
to the plain meaning of the words used,  
there can be no doubt as to their interpretation.   
The only *legitimate reference* is,  
to a practice, not otherwise known to us,  
not mentioned here with any approval by  
the Apostle, not generally prevalent, but  
in use by some, of *survivors allowing themselves   
to be baptized on behalf of* (believing?)   
*friends who had died without  
baptism.* With the subsequent similar  
practices of the Cerinthians and Marcionites  
this may or may not have been connected.  
All we clearly see from the text, is that  
it unquestionably *did exist*. The other  
principal interpretations are discussed in  
my Greek Test. Bengel well says that  
“even to catalogue all of them would require   
a dissertation.” I may briefly say  
here that all labour under one of the following   
fatal faults, either: (1) they make  
the word **dead** figurative in meaning;  
(2) they give an unnatural sense to **for**,  
or **in behalf of;** or (3) they make the  
appeal to refer to some feature common to  
the baptism of all Christians. The only  
justifiable rendering, as given above, is  
adopted by Ambrose, and by Anselm, Erasmus,   
Grotius, &c., and recently by some of the  
principal modern expositors. The ordinary  
objection to it is, that thus the Apostle  
would be giving his sanction to a superstitious   
usage, or at all events mentioning  
it without reprobation. But this is easily  
answered, by remembering that if the  
above view is correct, he does *not* mention  
it without a slur on it;—and more completely   
still, by observing that he thus  
uses a custom which otherwise would displease   
him, to shew the untenableness of  
the error which he is combating: reserving,   
perhaps, the reprehension of the practice   
for its proper season. Stanley’s concluding   
remarks are worth quoting: “On  
the whole, therefore, this explanation of  
the passage (*that given above*) may be  
safely accepted, (1) as exhibiting a curious  
relic of primitive superstition, which, after  
having, as the words imply (?), prevailed  
generally in the apostolic church, gradually  
dwindled away till it was only to be found  
in some obscure sects, where it lost its original   
significance: (2) as containing an  
example of the Apostle’s mode of dealing  
with a practice, with which he could have