CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

The Hope of the Resurrection
(1 Corinthians 15:20-28)

LARGER CONTEXT

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul treats the question of the resurrection—Christ's and the believers'. Verses 1-11 are a reminder to the church of what they had received (vs. 1) and believed (vs. 11) when Paul first preached to them the gospel, namely that Christ "was raised on the third day" (vs. 4). This original conviction Paul now attempts to reinforce by giving a list of witnesses to Christ's resurrection, "most of whom are still alive" (vs. 6). The verses thus function to establish a common ground between Paul and the Corinthians: both believe Christ was raised from the dead.

In verses 12-19 Paul begins his main argument, building on that premise. He argues that it is inconsistent to believe in the resurrection of Christ and to say "there is no resurrection of the dead" (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν; vs. 12). Not only is it inconsistent, it also implies that Paul is a "false witness" (vs. 15), faith is futile (vs. 17), the dead in Christ are done for (vs. 18), and those alive in Christ are to be pitied (vs. 19). What was the nature of the Corinthians' denial of resurrection?

1. In contemporary New Testament studies it is often argued that the gnostic leaning of the Corinthian church manifests itself in a belief that the resurrection of Christians had already occurred (spiritually, since the body was of no concern to them) and that there was no future bodily resurrection (Barrett, pp. 347f.; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *An die Korinther* [1949], pp. 192f.; J. H. Wilson, "Corinthians Who Say There is no Resurrection of the Dead," *ZNTW,* 59 [1968], 90–107). Support for this "over-realized eschatology" (Bruce, p. 144) is sought in 1 Corinthians 4:8, where Paul intimates that the Corinthians think (wrongly) that "the age to come is already consummated," they are already kings and "there is no 'not yet' to qualify the 'already' of realized eschatology" (Barrett, p. 109). Additional support is found in 2 Timothy 2:18, where Hymenaeus and Philetus are reported to claim that the resurrection of believers has already occurred (cf. Polycarp, *Phil.* 7).

2. The older view of the Corinthian error is that it was the belief that "resurrection is impossible" (RP, p. 346). As Aeschylus says through Apollo's speech, "When the earth has drunk up a man's blood, once he is dead, there is no resurrection" (*Eumenides*, 647f.). They may have thought Christ's resurrection was an isolated exception (RP, p. 346; for the Greek background to this view see A. Oepke, in TDNT, 1,396), or they may have denied Christ's resurrection also (Hodge, p. 319). The immortality of the soul after death was sufficient hope for this group. R. McL. Wilson argues that the use of 2 Timothy 2:18 in the former interpretation: "may be no more than a reading back from the Pastorals into the situation at Corinth. The most natural rendering of 1 Cor. 15:12 is not that some say there will be no resurrection (because it is already past), but that in their view there is no such thing. The verb is in the present tense, not the future. In other words, Paul's opponents would be maintaining the 'Greek' view of the immortality of the soul over against a resurrection of the body, as indeed Paul's whole argument seems to imply, with its emphasis on the fact of the resurrection of Jesus" (*Gnosis and the New Testament* [1968], p. 53).

Whichever of these views is correct (see earlier, pp. 173, 323), Paul proceeds in 15:20–28 to show that believers *will* be raised in the future and that this "not yet" event is grounded in the "already" of Christ's resurrection. For Paul's overall view of the resurrection see G. E. Ladd, *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus* (1975), Chapter 9 and the literature cited in his footnotes. See E. Schweizer, "1 Corinthians 15:20–28 as Evidence of Pauline Eschatology and its Relation to the Preaching of Jesus," in *Saved by Hope. Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, ed. J. I. Cook (1978), ch. 8 (ET from *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift W. G. Kümmel*, edd. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer [1975]); also R. P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation* (1984), pp. 107–18 with bibliography.

NOTES

verse 20

Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων—Νυνὶ δέ: "introducing the real situation after an unreal conditional clause or sentence; *but, as a matter of fact*, 1 Cor. 5:11; 12:18; 15:20; Hb. 8:6; 9:26" (AG, p. 548). Ἐγήγερται from ἐγείρω—note the unusual reduplication (HNTG §24.3148); perf. pass. does not have theme vowel. For the force of the perf. see HNTG §31.561. Ἀπαρχή = "first fruits" (AG, p. 80; G. Delling, in TDNT, 1,484ff.). Κεκοιμημένων from κοιμάομαι = "fall asleep," then figuratively "die" (AG, p. 438); note the reduplication and -μεν- participle infix.

The word ἀπαρχή is of fundamental importance here; see also its use

in Rom. 8:23 (with which ἀρραβών in 2 Cor. 1:22 is synonymous). "Paul (in dependence on the Old Testament) takes the word to mean the first instalment of the crop which foreshadows and pledges the ultimate offering of the whole" (Barrett, p. 350; cf. Alford, p. 608, who sees a more precise relation to Lev. 23:10ff.). So the main point of the verse is that just as surely as the first fruits guarantee the coming harvest, so surely does Christ's resurrection guarantee the believer's future resurrection (Bruce, p. 145). Conzelmann sees another nuance: "at the same time ἀπαρχή is used to ward off fanaticism: Christ is so far the only one" (p. 268). Conzelmann assumes that the Corinthians thought the resurrection of believers had already happened (2 Tim. 2:18).

verse 21

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν— 'Επειδὴ γάρ = "for since" (AG, p. 284); for a similar causal use of this pair see 1 Cor. 1:21. The γάρ relates vs. 21 with vs. 20; the ἐπειδή relates the two halves of vs. 21. What verbs will you supply in these clauses? Does the γάρ supply a justification (Parry, p. 223; Hodge, p. 324) or an explanation (Alford, p. 608) of vs. 20? For further notes see on vs. 22. "The two verses may be taken together, since the latter [vs. 22] serves to make the former more precise, though the former is also important as interpreting the latter" (Barrett, p. 351).

verse 22

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ 'Αδαμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται—"Ωσπερ ... οὕτως καί = "just as ... so also"; see the parallels in Rom. 5:19,21. 'Αποθνήσκω = "die" (AG, p. 90). What is the significance of the tense of this verb in this context? Ζωοποιέω = "make alive, give life to" (AG, p. 342); note the decisive -θησ- tense infix.

The effect of Adam's sin on the human race and the typology (τύπος; Rom. 5:14) between him and Christ is developed fully in Rom. 5:12–21. See also 1 Cor. 15:45–50, where Christ is pictured as the second Adam. On this motif in Paul see C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last* (1962). The pertinent question is why Paul introduces the Adam-Christ contrast in this specific context. Does he see a necessary logical connection between Adam/all die and Christ/all live, so that if the Corinthians accept the one they must accept the other (in which case Paul must assume they know and agree with his view of the solidarity between Adam and humanity)? Or, apart from logical connections, is Paul simply pointing out the humanity of Christ (ἄνθρωπος; vs. 21) and a parallel between Christ's work and Adam's sin, which may help the Corinthians understand the resurrection of believers in its relation to Christ? If we omit 21*a* and 22*a* (the Adam

halves), the argument of vv. 20–22 seems to be:

22*b*: in Christ will all be made alive;

21*b*: *therefore* resurrection is through a *man*;

20: *therefore* Christ is the first fruits of all (*men*) who sleep.

A tangential but important question raised by vs. 22 is whether Paul is here teaching universal salvation (cf. Rom. 5:18). Most of the commentators agree that "this can hardly be said to fit the context" (Barrett, p. 352; Conzelmann, p. 268n49), and "this interpretation utterly contradicts his eschatology" (Héring, p. 165). Two different approaches have been taken in order to harmonize this verse (vs. 22) with passages which speak of those who perish (1 Cor. 1:18; 3:17; 5:13; 6:9ff.; 9:27[?]) or of eternal destruction (2 Thess. 1:9):

1. The most common approach is to limit the πάντες in each clause of vs. 22 by ἐν τῷ ᾿Αδαμ and ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ respectively (Barrett, p. 352; Héring, p. 165; Parry, p. 222; Hodge, p. 325; Grosheide, p. 363). Hence we do not read simply, "All will be made alive in Christ," but rather, "All who are in Christ will be made alive." "Each of the two Adams acts as the head of a humanity—the old and the new" (Héring, p. 165). "All who are in Christ stand in solidarity with him as all men in Adam stand in solidarity with Adam. All in Adam share Adam's death, so all who are in Christ will share Christ's life" (Ladd, *Theology*, p. 326).

2. The other approach is to qualify the meaning of ζῳοποιέω while letting πάντες refer to all men without qualification (RP, p. 353; Alford, p. 608). Ζῳοποιέω is then taken to refer to a general resurrection of all men, which does not imply their salvation.

verse 23

ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι—Τάγμα: of a number of persons who belong together and are therefore arranged together in a "division, group, class"; a technical military term for bodies of troops in various numbers (AG, p. 810); see G. Delling, in TDNT, 8,31f., which renders the clause "in his 'position' or 'rank'" (so also Barrett, p. 355). What verb should be supplied here? Barrett suggests "will be brought to life" from the preceding clause (p. 354). See below for further notes on the meaning of this clause.

ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ—᾿Επειτα = "then, thereupon" (AG, p. 284). The definite article οἱ should be translated "the ones" or "those." ᾿Εν has a temporal sense and should be rendered "at" (AG, p. 259, II, 2). For the religious and secular background of παρουσία see Conzelmann, p. 270n69&70 and A. Oepke, in TDNT, 5,858ff. Three types of interpretations may be considered:

1. Parry (p. 224) construes ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι as "in his own appointed place" (cf. 1 Clement 37:3). "As each member has now his

place and function in the Body, so, when the whole Body is quickened and raised, each will still have his place and function." Thus τάγμα = "the place in the Body, already assigned, and to be preserved in the resurrection."

2. With nuances of difference Barrett (p. 355), Héring (p. 167), Conzelmann (p. 27), and Bruce (p. 146) construe τάγμα as a reference to stages of resurrection, of which two are mentioned in this passage: Christ's and then at his *parousia* the resurrection of believers. Thus Paul stresses the reality and futurity of the believer's resurrection. Note how this guards his readers against misunderstanding teaching like Rom. 6:4 and Col. 2:12 ("you were raised with Christ") and Col. 3:3 ("your life is hid with Christ in God"). Conzelmann calls this Paul's "eschatological reservation" (p. 268n44). We have been *already* raised with Christ to "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4) but *not yet* to full resurrection life. That happens later (ἔπειτα) "at his coming."

3. The third view includes vs. 24; see on the next phrase.

verse 24

εἶτα τὸ τέλος—Εἶτα = "then, next" (AG, p. 233). Τέλος = "end, goal, rest, remainder" (AG, pp. 818f.). What verb should we supply? The third interpretation of the τάγματα (vs. 23) mentioned above views τὸ τέλος as a *third* τάγμα. For example, Alford (p. 609) sees three classes: Christ (ἀπαρχή), Christians (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ); and "the rest of the dead, here veiled over by the general term τὸ τέλος." (Similarly H. Lietzmann-W. G. Kümmel, *An die Korinther,* p. 80.) See Rev. 20:5. Against this view are the criticisms of Barrett (p. 356) and Bruce (p. 147).

Some ask whether εἶτα signifies a lapse of time between the *parousia* and the end when Christ hands the kingdom over to God. Bruce (p. 147) argues that "the temporal adverb *eita* implies an interval of indeterminate duration between the parousia and the *end,* when Christ hands his dominion back to God" (similarly Ladd, p. 558). In this "final phase of Christ's kingship his people will share it with him (4.8) and judge the world (6.2)" (Bruce, *ibid.*). Alford (p. 609) locates the millennium in this period (between vs. 23 and vs. 24). Davies (pp. 293-95), however, and Barrett (p. 357) see no significant interval between the *parousia* and the end. Davies cites John 13:4f.; 19:26f.; 1 Cor. 15:5-7 to show that εἶτα need not imply an interval. On the theological significance of a millennial kingdom see Ladd, pp. 557f., 628-30; M. Rist, "Millennium," *IDB,* 3, 381f.; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (ET 1955), pp. 218f. (bibliography).

ὅταν παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν—Ὅταν is a compound of ὅτε and the indefinite particle ἄν: with the pres. subj. it means that the

action of the subordinate clause is contemporaneous with the action of the main clause (AG, p. 592, 1a). Παραδίδωμι = "hand over, deliver, commit" (AG, pp. 619f.). Καταργέω = "make ineffective, wipe out, abolish" (AG, p. 418). Note the shift from pres. tense (παραδιδῷ) to aor. (καταργήσῃ). This shows that the action of the second ὅταν clause (the abolishing of the evil powers) must precede the action of the first ὅταν clause (the handing over of the kingdom to God). The trilogy of evil powers (ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις) occurs again in Eph. 1:21; see also Rom. 8:38; Eph. 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10,15. Note 1 Cor. 2:6, which speaks of earthly or spiritual ἄρχοντες being "abolished" (καταργουμένων). Barrett (p. 357) says "it is idle to attempt to distinguish between these nouns; they represent the evil powers ... under whose control the world has come." On ἀρχή see G. Delling, in TDNT, 1,482-84; on ἐξουσία W. Foerster, in TDNT, 2,571-73; on δύναμις W. Grundmann, in TDNT, 2,295f., 307f. See, for general orientation, G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers* (1956); C. H. Powell, *The Biblical Concept of Power* (1963).

"In some way (never specified by Paul) authority has come into the hands of evil powers, whom God has to dispossess in order to reassert his own sovereignty. . . . Christ appears to reign during the period in which this dispossessing takes place, one enemy after another being overpowered. When the kingdom has been fully re-established, the Son hands it over to the Father, and the kingdom of Christ gives place to the kingdom of God" (Barrett, p. 357). But note well the eschatological tension: in Col. 2:15 the ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι have *already* been disarmed at the cross! See Heb. 2:14, according to which Jesus by his death secured the abolition (καταργήσῃ) of "the devil."

RP (p. 355) says, "What exactly is meant by παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν is beyond our comprehension." But Hodge gives four pages (pp. 330ff.) to this verse in search of its meaning. For the significance of 1 Cor. 15:23f. (with its emphasis on temporal sequence) in O. Cullmann's salvation-history scheme see *Christ and Time* (ET 1964), pp. 67, 151ff. and later discussion of this book (pp. 426f.).

verse 25
δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῇ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ—Δεῖ = "it is necessary," denoting compulsion of any kind (AG, p. 171); cf. W. Grundmann, in TDNT, 2, 21–25. Γάρ should alert you to think through how vs. 25 grounds vs. 24 (see Hodge, p. 331; Conzelmann, p. 272). Βασιλεύω = "be king, rule" (AG, p. 136). Note the pres. tense of the infin., whose significance Barrett (p. 358) tries to bring out with the translation "continue to reign." (When did Christ begin to reign? Ladd, p. 558; cf. Matt. 28:18; Col. 1:13, 18; 2:10.) Ἄχρι οὗ = ἄχρι χρόνου οὗ = "until the time when" (AG, p. 128,2). Θῇ, from τίθημι: the "τι" at the beginning of τίθημι is a reduplication (HNTG,

§ 13.24) which appears only in the pres. and imperf.; we can also rule out perf., pluperf., and fut. because there is no reduplication and no "κ" or "σ" tense sign. So θῇ is aor. The absence of an augment alerts us to the subj. mood. Thus tense and mood are the same as καταργήσῃ (vs. 24) and both have the same thrust.

Who is the subject of θῇ? In favor of Christ as the subject (Hodge, p. 331; Alford, p. 610; RP, p. 356; Parry, p. 226; Conzelmann, p. 273) it may be argued that θῇ is parallel to καταργήσῃ (vs. 24), the subject of which is Christ. In favor of God as the subject (Barrett, p. 358; Bruce, p. 147) is the loose quotation from Ps. 110:1—"The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand until I set thy enemies as the footstool of thy feet." The importance of this Psalm to the early church is seen by the number of times Christ is spoken of in terms of Ps. 110:1: Rom. 8:34; Col. 3:1; Eph. 1:20; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 1 Pet. 3:22; Acts 2:34; 5:31; 7:55; Rev. 3:21; Matt. 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; [16:19]; Luke 20:42; 22:69; 1 Clem. 36:5; Barn. 12:10. See D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand* (1973).

On the christological significance of the present reign of Christ see Ladd, p. 410; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (1963), pp. 221ff. For those who read German an excellent article relating Christ's present rule to the Christian life is L. Goppelt, "Die Herrschaft Christi über die Welt," in *Christologie und Ethik* (1968), pp. 102-36.

verse 26

ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος—"As the last enemy, Death is brought to nought" (RP, p. 356). Is Parry (p. 226) pressing the tense when he says, "The present tense [is used] because the destruction of death has already begun with the Lord's resurrection"? Compare Heb. 2:14; 2 Tim. 1:10 (καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον) and Rev. 20:14 (death and Hades thrown into the lake of fire in the last battle). Héring (p. 168) thinks this verse "precludes the possibility of something like 'everlasting torment'." Barrett (p. 358) and RP (p. 356) oppose this argument.

Paul's singling out of "death" here reminds us that his theme is resurrection. On the theological significance of death *still* being an enemy of God see especially O. Cullmann, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?" in *Immortality and Resurrection*, ed. Krister Stendahl (1965), pp. 9-53. Cullmann opposes a common sentimental view of death as a sweet doorway to heaven, insisting on its enemy-like character. For the way death has been personified in the history of religions see Conzelmann, p. 273n98; see above, pp. 46-48.

verse 27

πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ—Ὑποτάσσω = "subject, subordinate" (AG, p. 855). On the morphology of "σσ" verbs see HNTG,

Paradigm V-4b and §24.252. The "σσ" is there only in the pres. and imperf. The basic stem ends in "γ" which combines with the aor. tense sign "σ" to form "ξ" here. Where is the augment? Always remember to account for the γάρ: how does vs. 27 support vs. 26? What is the subject of ὑπέταξεν? See arguments for Christ and God the Father in Conzelmann, p. 274n108.

This is a quotation from Psalm 8:6, except that Paul has changed the second person (in MT and LXX) to the third person, as he did in vs. 25 when he partially quoted Psalm 110:1. In Psalm 8 the αὐτοῦ is man, but the early church saw in it a messianic significance and applied it to *the* Son of man (Heb. 2:6–9). In Ephesians 1:20–22, Psalms 110:1 and 8:6 are again brought together, so it is possible that these two were closely connected in early Christian apologetics (Conzelmann, p. 274n103). Since the same Hebrew word lies behind θῇ (vs. 25) and ὑπέταξεν (vs. 27), Barrett (p. 358) thinks that Paul's citation of Ps. 110:1 led him to cite 8:6 as an illumination of the former. He sees rabbinic methodology at work here. For this "argument by analogy" see earlier, p. 256.

ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα—Εἴπῃ from εἶπον, "I said." The theme vowel tells us that it is subjunctive. Ὑποτέτακται is from ὑποτάσσω; note the reduplication "τε"; there is no theme vowel in perf. pass.; the voiced velar "γ" (in the stem "ταγ") assimilates to the voiceless velar "κ" before "τ." Δῆλον is from δῆλος = "clear, plain, evident" (AG, p. 177). Ἐκτός = "outside, except" (AG, p. 245). Ὑποτάξαντος: where is the "σ" tense sign for the aorist? What does the "ντ" tell us? The form is gen., after ἐκτός. Several things must be added in translation: before δῆλον we add "it is" and between ὅτι and ἐκτός we may add "they have been subjected" (Alford, p. 611).

Three differing interpretations of εἴπῃ are advocated:

1. The subject of εἴπῃ is Ps. 8:6, just cited (Barrett, p. 359). Against this is the fact that ὅταν + aor. subj. in vs. 24 and vs. 28 refers to future action. Moreover the force of the perfect ὑποτέτακται (HNTG §31.56) suggests that the subjecting is completed.

2. The subject of εἴπῃ is God (RP, p. 357; Alford, p. 611; Hodge, p. 332).

3. The subject of εἴπῃ is Christ and refers to a future declaration to the Father (Parry, p. 227).

It is so "clear" that when God subjected all things to Christ, he did not subject himself to Christ, one wonders why Paul even bothered to say this. Barrett (p. 360) proposes that it may be an attempt to counter a belief at Corinth (of which there is no other evidence, except perhaps 3:23) that at his exaltation Christ became one supreme God. Most commentators do not even raise the question. Paul's safeguard of a

distinction within the Godhead may be seen in Phil. 2:11 (as noted earlier, pp. 265ff.).

verse 28

ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα—Ὑποταγῇ: this is a 2nd aor. pass. subj. What is the subject? Recall that neut. pl. subjects regularly have sing. verbs. This action is yet future. When αὐτός is used in the predicate position with another noun it means himself or itself (DM, p. 129). Ὑποταγήσεται: if the "θ" were present (-θησεται), the future passive would be plain.

This verse obviously supports a kind of subordination of the Son to the Father. See the helpful discussion of the christological problem in Hodge, pp. 333-36. Calvin raises the question here, which relates also to vs. 24 (Christ's handing over the kingdom to God). Do not these verses contradict the Scriptures which teach the eternity of *Christ's* kingdom (e.g. 2 Pet. 1:11)? For his answer see his commentary on 1 Corinthians, p. 327. Bruce (p. 148) also addresses the problem: "When this subjection is completed and the last enemy destroyed, Christ has fully accomplished his mediatorial ministry. He has brought the whole estranged creation back into harmony with God; now he 'delivers the kingdom to God the Father.'"

ἵνα ᾖ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν—Ἦ: pres. subj. of εἰμί. Ἵνα denotes that this is the purpose and goal of all Christ's kingly activity and his final subjection to the Father. The common translation is "that God may be all in all."

Barrett (p. 361) comments, "This is to be understood in terms of Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 15:54-57; 'soteriologically, not metaphysically.' ... It is not the absorption of Christ and mankind, with consequent loss of distinct being, into God; but rather the unchallenged reign of God alone, in his pure goodness." Also compare Eph. 1:23; Phil. 2:11 (cf. R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi* [1967, ²1983] pp. 271-83), Héring (pp. 168f.) rejects the translation, "God is all in all," because it would teach a pantheism unknown in the Bible and because ἐν πᾶσιν would then be a "stupid pleonasm." Omitting the article τά before πάντα, he construes πάντα as a single accusative used adverbially, "completely, in every respect" (as in 1 Cor. 13:7). Thus he renders the phrase, "in the whole universe and completely." RP (p. 358) suggest another slant: "The meaning seems to be that there will no longer be need of a Mediator: all relations between creator and creatures, between Father and offspring, will be direct."

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARGUMENT

Paul wants to demonstrate in this paragraph that the past resurrection of Christ guarantees the *future* resurrection of believers at Christ's

parousia. His argument is grounded ultimately in the revelation of God's goal in history to be all in all. We may trace the argument backwards to see how it fits together.

God is destined to be all in all. Therefore even the Son must be subject to him. But God has placed everything, including his enemies, under the jurisdiction of the Son. Therefore, before the Son is subject to the Father, the Son must bring all his enemies into subjection to himself so that when he subjects himself to the Father there will be no alien powers unsubdued. Now death is one of the enemies which must be abolished. In the context this would mean that Christ has done and will do all that is necessary to deliver his people from the shackles of death—he will raise them just as he, the first fruits, was raised. Of this the Corinthians may be sure, for God's goal is to be all in all.