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 it were I or they, so we preaeh, and were Tor they, so preach,   
 12 But if Christ is and so ye believed. 1\* Now   
 preached believed. he is risen from the if Christ be preached that   
 dead, how say some among you he rose from the dead, how   
 that there is no resurrection of the say some among you that   
 13 But if there is no resur- there is no resurrection of   
 the dead? 33 But if there   
 dead ?   
   
 of the Sadducees ever found its way into   
 will with divine Grace, but in subordina- the church. (2) Were they Epicureans?   
 tion, see Matt. x. 20; 2 Cor. y. 20; vi. 1, Probably not, for two reasons: (@) the   
 and ch. iii. note. 11.) He resumes Epicurean maxim, “ Let us eat and drink,”   
 the subject after the digression respecting &e., is represented as a legitimate conse-   
 himself:—it matters not whether it were quence of adopting their denial of the re-   
 I or they (the other Apostles)—svucH surrection, not as an accompaniment of,   
 is the purport of our preaching—svucit much less as the of it: and (6) had   
 was your belief:—so, after this manner, the Epicurean element entered to any extent   
 viz., that died, was buried, and rose into the Corinthian church, we certainly   
 again, as verses 3, 4. should have had notice of its exceed-   
 12~19.] On the fact of Christ's Resur- ingly antich: mn tenets. It is possible   
 rection, announced in his preaching, and that the deniers may have been, or been in   
 confessed in their belief, grounds (nega- danger of being, corrupted by mixture with   
 tively) the truth of the general Resurrec- Epicureans without, trom the warning of   
 tion:—If the latter be not to nei- ver. 33. (3) Were they Jews? If not Sad-   
 ther has the former happened :—and he ducees, hardly Jews at all, or a   
 urges the results of such a disproof of strong tenet of Pharisaism was this one   
 Christ's Resurrection. 12.] intro- of the Resurrection, see Acts xxiii. and   
 duces the argument for the resurrection, we know of no tendency of Essenism which   
 by referring to its among a portion should produce such a denial. (4) They   
 ot the Corinthian church. But belongs must then have been Gentile believers,   
 to the whole question, and is opposed to heriting the unwillingnessof Greek mind   
 “if we preach” and “so ye believed” of to receive that which a full account could   
 the foregoing verse.—The word Christ has not be given, see vv. 35, and probably   
 the leading emphasis, as an example of of a philosophical cavilling turn. Meyer   
 that which is denied by some among you: argues, from the antimaterialisticturn the   
 But if Curist is (not subjunctive, be Apostle’s counter-arguments, vv. 35 ft,—   
 preached: he is arguing from a matter of that the objections were antimaterialistie   
 fact, not from a mere hypothesis) preached also: De Wette infers the very opposite,   
 that He is risen from the dead (if an which certainly seems to me more pro-   
 instance of such resurreetion is a fact an- bable.—No trace whatever is found in the   
 nounced in our preaching), how say some argument of an allegorizing character in   
 among you (how comes it to pass that the opponents, as was that of Hymenzus   
 say) that a resurrection of the dead and Philetus, who maintained that the   
 does not exist (stress on és, in reading yesurrection was past already, 2 Tim. ii.   
 the English text)? If the species be 17, 18, as some suppose—Whether the   
 conceded, how is it that some among you Apostle regarded the resurrection of the   
 deny the genus? some among you} body as inseparably bound up with a future   
 It is an interesting question, wo these existence of the soul does not very clearly   
 some were: and one which ean only be pear in this chapter. From the use of   
 answered by the indications which the argu- the word “perished,” ver. 18, which must   
 ment in this chapter furnishes. (1) Were refer, not to annihilation, but to perdé-   
 they Sadducees? If so, Apostle would tion, it would seem that he admitted an   
 hardly have begun his argument with the independent existence of the soul; as also   
 fact of the Resurrection of Jesus. And yet from Phil. i. But from ver. 32, it   
 we must remember that he is arguing not seem that the Apostle regarded the denial   
 with the deniers, bat with those who being of the resnrrection as involving that of   
 as yet sound, were liable to be misled by future state and jndgment.—On the ques-   
 them. But the opposition between Saddu- tion to which of the (supposed) Corinthian   
 ceism and Christianity was so complete, parties the opponents belonged, I have   
 wehave little to think that le: