

# Overview of 1 Corinthians 15

Resurrection Series (Part 10)

*By Ed Stevens -- Then and Now Podcast -- Oct 20, 2013*

## INTRODUCTION:

- A. Welcome to our ongoing study of the Resurrection from a full preterist perspective.
- B. Last time we looked at the expectations of the pre-70 saints, especially in regard to their hope of being transformed or changed to be like Christ when they saw Him appear at the Parousia. We discussed several of the biblical texts which indicate what the first century saints were expecting to see, hear, and experience at the Parousia, as well as what the transformation or bodily change was all about. The PDF lesson outline for that study was over 40 pages, including material from my magazine articles and seminar speeches. If you have not taken a look at it yet, you will certainly want to do so. It is the equivalent of a small book. It has lots of material that you will not find anywhere else.
- C. In this session, we will try to finish our study of Paul's resurrection teaching in both of his letters to the Corinthians. I want to tie up any loose ends that we may have left dangling in our previous studies, and give an overview (the big picture) of what Paul was teaching the Corinthians about the **resurrection** and **change** event at the Parousia.
- D. Let's ask our Heavenly Father for His blessing on our study together --
- Our physical creator and spiritual progenitor – the only Eternal, Self-Existing, Omniscient and Omnipotent One who sovereignly rules the whole universe in both its SEEN and UNSEEN realms: We exalt and adore your Infinitely High and Holy Name. We are here to study Your Inspired and Absolutely Authoritative Word. May Your Spirit in our hearts teach us Your Truth as we study it together. We ask for this in the Name of your only begotten Son Jesus. Amen.

## Overview of 1 Cor 15

### Here is a quick overview of what Paul talks about here in 1 Cor 15:

- The gospel had been preached to the Corinthians, and they had believed it.
- But now, some there in Corinth were denying that the dead would be raised out of Hades, and questioning the idea of a bodily afterlife.
- Paul argues that if the dead cannot be raised out of Hades, then neither was Christ raised out of Hades.
- The resurrection deniers raised two big questions for Paul to address (in verse 35):
  1. First Question: possible ways to translate it:
    - How *can* the dead *be raised*? -or- How do the dead rise? (*gnomic* question of principle) – this *gnomic* sense seems to work the best in connection with the second question. That means their two questions could be stated this way: "How in the world can the dead ones be raised back out of Hades? And if

they do rise out of Hades, what kind of body do they have when they come forth from Hades?

- How *are* the dead *to be raised*? (*futuristic* present tense)
- How *are* the dead *being raised*? (*iterative* series of individual resurrections)

2. Second Question: With what kind of body do they come?

- Paul answers both questions using a SEED ANALOGY.
- After proving that the dead will be raised (future tense), and that they will have a new kind of body that is suited to life in heaven, Paul then turns his attention to those living saints who would remain alive at the time of the Parousia when the dead would be raised.
- Paul reveals another mystery to the Corinthians about the bodily CHANGE that the living would experience at the Parousia. The dead would be RAISED, but the living saints would be CHANGED.

## Who Were These Resurrection Deniers?

The interpretation of 1 Cor 15 to a large degree depends on WHO these resurrection deniers were, and what kind of concept of resurrection they were coming from. If we can identify WHO they were, then we will know WHY Paul frames his arguments the way he does, and WHAT he is trying to prove with those arguments. In other words, interpreting Paul's statements here becomes a lot easier once we know WHO he is debating against.

WHO were those "some" there at Corinth who were denying the resurrection of the dead out of Hades? One listener posed the question this way: Did the "error" and "ignorance" of those resurrection deniers originate from **Greek thought** (which taught a bodiless existence after death) or from the **Sadducees** (who denied a resurrection and afterlife both)? In other words:

- (1) Were these resurrection deniers Jewish **Sadducees** who denied not only a resurrection, but a conscious afterlife as well?
- (2) Were they **Gnostics** who denied a resurrection, but believed in a conscious afterlife in a disembodied pure spirit state?
- (3) Or were they simple Jewish or Gentile Christians there in Corinth who had become confused in their thinking by listening too much to the **Greek philosophers** right there in Corinth who denied a resurrection, even though they believed in a conscious afterlife (disembodied pure spirit state), and accepted the possibility that some special "heroes" (such as Jesus) could have been raised out of Hades as an exception to the general rule that "the dead do not rise"?

I will argue for the third option here in this study. When we analyze Paul's use of terminology and the style of his argumentation, it appears that he is debating someone who was familiar with the teachings of the Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. Paul applies the label "foolish" (Gk "aphron") to those at Corinth who were denying the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:36). That was a label that Greek philosophers loved to slap on their opponents. Paul may have been "reversing the charges" on them.

Paul also uses a couple of quotes from Greek philosophers in his argumentation (see 1 Cor. 15:32-33). If his opponents there at Corinth were Sadducees, those quotes of heathen Greek philosophers would not have been authoritative to the Sadducees. But if the resurrection deniers were Gnostics or Greeks, those quotes would have had some leverage in the debate.

Thus it seems that the main problem here at Corinth seems to have been coming from a Greek philosophical perspective. The Greeks had real difficulty with any kind of "bodily" afterlife since they viewed the body as an evil prison which they wished to be rid of in the afterlife. They viewed the body as necessarily evil, therefore an afterlife would not be in a body. Paul agrees partially with them that the bodies we now have cannot be used in the afterlife ("flesh and blood cannot inherit the heavenly kingdom" and "corruption cannot inherit incorruption" 1 Cor 15:50). But he shows their fallacy when he states that there are different kinds of bodies, and that their afterlife would be in bodies that were made in the image of the Heavenly Man (Christ Jesus).

Not all bodies are subject to corruption. Jesus was the first to have an incorruptible body, and he gives all of His saints an incorruptible body just like His for their afterlife in heaven. This was a possibility the Greeks had not thought much about. They rejected any kind of body in the afterlife since they viewed all bodies as necessarily evil and corruptible. But Paul says there are different kinds of bodies (some corruptible and others incorruptible), and that their afterlife would be in an incorruptible and immortal body (not a corruptible or evil body). We certainly do not take our corrupted and corruptible bodies to heaven with us, but we do get a new uncorrupted and incorruptible body like Christ's to dwell in heaven with. This is Paul's whole point in 1 Cor. 15:37-41.

The opponents there at Corinth do not appear to be Gnostics, unless it was a very early, weak, and undeveloped form of Gnosticism whose afterlife views were virtually the same as the Greek Platonic afterlife views. Paul does not challenge any of the other beliefs of the Gnostics here, and the ideas he does challenge are common to both Greeks and Gnostics. So, there is nothing here in Paul's arguments that would necessitate the conclusion that his opponents were Gnostics, but there is a lot here in 1 Cor 15 to support the idea that his opponents were coming from a Greek philosophical view of the afterlife.

In his comments on Paul's afterlife teachings in 2 Cor 5:1-4, Walter Schmithals notes that Paul used terminology in his argumentation which was also used by Greek Platonic philosophers and Gnostics alike: "The figure of the tent as the dwelling place of the 'I' is widespread especially since Plato, and is typically dualistic." [**Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971**].

Thus, Paul's argumentation in 2 Cor 5:1-4 appears to be directed against Greek-oriented opponents, who were arguing against the concepts of a resurrection out of Hades and a bodily afterlife. The Greeks, if they believed in a conscious afterlife,

believed it would be forever in Hades in a disembodied state. Paul, in agreement with the Pharisees, believed that the righteous would be raised out of Hades and have a bodily afterlife. In view of this, it is quite surprising to most of us preterists when we find out that the Collective Body guys agree with the Greeks and the Gnostics that our afterlife is a disembodied pure spirit existence. Their claims to be in sync with the bodily afterlife taught by Paul and the Pharisees are simply not true. The only sense in which they believe in a "bodily" afterlife is in the Collective Body sense. They believe the individual disembodied soul/spirit is merged into the Collective Body. That is the only sense in which they believe our afterlife is "bodily." Does that sound more like Paul and the Pharisees, or like the Greeks and the Gnostics?

There are several indicators within the chapter (1 Cor 15) which point toward the probability (if not the certainty) that Paul's opponents there at Corinth were coming from a Greek-oriented philosophical framework:

- 1 Cor 15:32 -- The Greek Epicurean philosophers were well-known to often say, "*Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.*" If Paul's opponents were Jewish, this quote of Greek philosophers would have made no impact upon their arguments. It would only be effective against Greek opponents. Quotes of Greek authors and philosophers like this would be totally out of place and meaningless in a debate about whether the Old Testament dead were going to be included in the Collective Body resurrection. According to the Collective Body theory, the resurrection deniers there at Corinth were not denying a resurrection and afterlife for everyone, but only for the OT dead. If those OT dead were not going to be raised, why would living saints abandon their afterlife hope to "eat and drink and be merry." This argument would be meaningless in a Collective Body debate context.
- 1 Cor 15:33 -- Paul appears to be quoting from or alluding to the teachings of the Greek philosophers Menander, Aeschylus, or Diodorus Siculus, when he says, "*Bad company corrupts good morals.*" Again, if Paul's opponents were Jewish, this quote of Greek authors would have had no effect against their arguments. Nor would it make any sense in the context of a Collective Body debate.
- 1 Cor 15:36-44 -- The seed analogy was used by Greeks and Jews alike, but the particular way he constructs his analogy looks more like he is using the Greek form of it as developed by Plato, and then turning it against his Greek opponents.
- 1 Cor 15:36 -- Paul calls his opponents "foolish" (Gk APHRON) which was one of the labels Greek philosophers loved to slap on their opponents.

Many of the Greeks in the first century held to the idea of "immortality of the soul" which advocated a conscious afterlife, but in a disembodied pure spirit state without a body. They saw no value in having a body in their afterlife. They viewed death as liberation from the evils of life in a body. Murdock Dahl thinks that the doubts about the resurrection that some there at Corinth had were exactly what "one would expect to find in a Greek or Hellenistic community conditioned to believe that all matter ... is either evil

or illusory, and who would tend to think of salvation in terms of the immortality of the soul.” [Dahl, Murdock E. *The Resurrection of the Body*. London: SCM, 1962. p. 12]

And Cullmann notes that “in Athens there was no laughter [by the Epicureans] until Paul spoke of the resurrection (Acts 17:32)” and that “for the Greeks who believed in the immortality of the soul it may have been harder to accept the Christian preaching of the resurrection than it was for others.” [Cullmann, Oscar. *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* New York: Macmillan, 1958. p. 59]

Corinth was only 40 miles away from Athens. Both cities were strong centers of Greek culture and philosophy. Whatever was believed in Athens was almost always found in Corinth as well. So, it would be no surprise to learn that the resurrection deniers in Corinth were coming from the same Greek philosophical perspective as Athens.

Murray Harris shows that there were several afterlife views among the Greeks, as witnessed by the Stoics, Epicureans, Pythagoreans (transmigration and reincarnation in another body), Platonists (immortality of the soul), and others:

But the evidence of Greek epitaphs suggests that most [Greek] people shared vague Homeric ideas of the hereafter rather than having a Platonic or Pythagorean outlook. That is, apart from heroes and notorious sinners who had particular destinies suited to their deeds, people survived death simply as **bodiless shades in Hades without any personal consciousness or identity**. Such shadowy relics or ‘doubles’ of former living persons had a **permanent changeless existence in Hades**, unaffected by transmigration. [Harris, Murray J. *From Grave to Glory: Resurrection in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, a division of Zondervan Publishing House, 1990. p. 40. boldface added]

Harris then explains the attitude that almost all Greeks had about the possibility of a resurrection back out of Hades:

There are probably no lines anywhere in Greek literature that more aptly epitomize the **prevailing Greek attitude toward resurrection** than those found in the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus (lines 647-648). On the occasion of the founding of the court of the Areopagus in Athens, the god Apollo observes, “Once a man is slain by death and the dust has drunk up his blood, **there is no coming back to life [anastasis]**.” [Harris, Murray J. *From Grave to Glory: Resurrection in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, a division of Zondervan Publishing House, 1990. p. 43. boldface added]

And finally Harris notes that there was “considerable variety among the Greeks” in their afterlife views, but almost all of them rejected the idea of a resurrection, regardless of how it was defined. He mentions a couple of writers (Euripedes and Plato) who:

. . . acknowledge the possibility that **the gods could raise the dead**, but even in these **exceptional cases** resurrection merely means reanimation of the physical

body through the **return of the soul from Hades** (e.g., Plato, *Symposium* 179 C). Many educated Greeks, however, aspired to immortality [of the soul only], convinced by the persuasive reasoning of that unrepeatable succession of philosophers – Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. [Harris, Murray J. *From Grave to Glory: Resurrection in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, a division of Zondervan Publishing House, 1990. p. 283-284. boldface added]

## Explanation of 1 Cor 15

With all that in mind about who Paul's opponents were there in Corinth, and who it was that was confusing the saints there to think that the dead were not going to be raised, let us take a quick journey through the whole chapter of 1 Cor 15 to see if it will make better sense for us now. Also keep in mind that I am interpreting this text from an *Individual Body perspective* (NOT the Collective Body View). As we go through the chapter we will point out some of the clues within the context that confirm Paul is arguing his case against those Greek-influenced resurrection deniers there at Corinth from an Individual Body perspective.

**15:1-11** – Notice the four occurrences of the phrase “*He was seen*” (vv. 5-8). These are eyewitness confirmations of the reappearance of Jesus in His self-same crucified body. These reappearances were not a ghost out of Hades, or just a docetic (seeming) resurrection of Jesus for evidentiary purposes. Nor were they merely metaphorical references to His collective body (the Church) being raised out of covenantal sin-death into the life of the kingdom. Instead, Paul said that Christ *was raised* (out of Hades) and reappeared in His self-same individual “flesh and bones” body that had *died*. Notice verse 11b: “. . . so we preach and so you *believed*.” This is the gospel that Paul had preached to the Corinthians—the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus—which they *received*, *stood* in (v. 1), and *believed* (v. 11). Paul hoped that they had not “*believed in vain*” (v. 2).

**15:12-19** – There were some at Corinth who were saying that “*there is no resurrection of the dead*” (v. 12). But Paul reminded them that they already *believed* that Jesus had been raised from the dead, so why did they now doubt that others could be raised? If Jesus was raised, as they supposedly *believed*, then others also could be raised. Conversely, if the “dead ones” in Hades could not be raised out of there, then neither was Jesus raised out of Hades. Yet, they *believed* that Jesus had been raised. Paul said their *faith* in the resurrection of Christ was “in vain” (v. 2), “empty” (v. 14), and “futile” (v. 17) if there was no resurrection of the dead. This would also mean that the dead saints had simply “perished” (v. 18), that all saints were “still in their sins” (v. 17), and that their Christian lifestyle was “the most pitiable” (v. 19). This is why he later says: “. . . If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die” (v. 32b).

**15:20-23** – Since Christ was the firstfruit of the Resurrection harvest, His resurrection guaranteed that the rest of the dead would be raised. When Christ ascended, the firstfruit was presented to God, making it possible for the rest of the dead to be raised. Notice what Paul wrote in verses 22-23 regarding *when* the resurrection

would occur. The dead saints had not yet been raised when Paul wrote (AD 57), but they “*shall be made alive* (future tense) ... *at the Parousia*.” This proves that the Resurrection was not an ongoing *process* at the time Paul wrote, but rather a future *event* that would occur *at the Parousia*. This future tense “shall be made alive” does not work in the *Collective Body View* (CBV) of the Resurrection, but it fits perfectly with the *Individual Body View* (IBV).

**15:24-28** – Paul says that Christ was already reigning in some sense at the time he wrote (AD 57), and “must continue to reign until all His enemies were put under His feet” (v. 25). What reign is this? It certainly is not His *eternal reign* which did not begin until the Parousia. So unless we want to posit two different reigns of Christ before His eternal reign, it means that this reign must be His *millennial reign*, during which He put down all His enemies (like David had done, cf. 1 Kings 5:3), took the kingdom away from the Jews (Lk. 20:16; cf. Matt. 21:43), gave it back to the Father to whom it belongs (1 Sam. 8:7; 12:12), and then sat down with the Father to co-reign with Him eternally (cf. Rev. 21-22). When the Israelites rejected God as their king and demanded a king like all the other nations, God allowed them to set up *Saul* as their king (1 Sam. 8:7). But soon afterwards God sent Samuel to anoint *David* as the successor (1 Sam. 13:14), from whose descendants a king (Jesus) would arise to take the kingdom away from the Jews and give it back to God (Acts 13:22-23; Lk. 20:16; cf. Matt. 21:43 and Luke 19:12-27).

But there is something even more interesting here in these verses which directly relates to the whole question of what kind of resurrection is under discussion here in 1 Cor 15. Notice the reference to the putting down of all enemies by Christ, the last of which was Death itself. The commentaries connect this defeat of Death with the casting of Death and Hades into the Lake of Fire mentioned in Revelation 20. When we compare Paul's words here with John's words in Rev 20, the similarity between them is significant and clear. It appears that both texts are talking about the same defeat of Death at the Parousia when the dead were raised. This means that we can use the information in Rev 20 to help us understand 1 Cor 15. Rev 20 mentions the raising of the dead ones out of Hades, and the emptying of Hades before it was cast into the Lake of Fire. So the resurrection that occurred at the end of the millennium, was a resurrection of the dead ones out of Hades. It was that resurrection of the dead saints out of Hades which fully and finally defeated Death and Hades once for all. Unless we want to posit a different final defeat of Death in Rev 20 than the final defeat mentioned in 1 Cor 15, it means that Rev 20 is talking about the same final defeat of Death that 1 Cor 15 is. And notice that the resurrection in Rev 20 was the emptying of Hades. There is not the slightest hint in Rev 20 that it is talking about a collective body being raised out of dead Judaism. Instead, it is easily and clearly talking about the resurrection of the dead out of Hades. And if 1 Cor 15 is talking about the same final defeat of Death in connection with the Parousia and the Resurrection that Rev 20 is, then it means that 1 Cor 15 is ALSO talking about the resurrection of the dead ones out of Hades, just like Rev 20 is. *Do you catch the power of that?*

**15:29** – What was this baptism for the dead? Several commentaries suggest that it refers to the Jewish burial custom of washing (purifying) a dead body before burial to insure that this individual would be resurrected. In the case of dead relatives whose bodies were lost at sea, consumed by fire, or eaten by wild animals, a very close blood relative was allowed to be washed (baptized) “on behalf of” that dead relative to ensure his/her resurrection. Paul is neither approving nor condemning this burial custom, but rather wondering why the Corinthians practiced it if they did not believe their dead relatives were going to be raised.

**15:30-32** – Furthermore, if the dead are not going to be raised, and there was not going to be any conscious afterlife, why suffer persecution and deprive oneself of this life’s benefits? Why not rather indulge in all life’s pleasures to the maximum?

**15:33-34** – Paul rebuked the Corinthians for hanging around with “*evil company*” who were corrupting them, and for listening to “*some who do not have the knowledge of God.*” The Greek philosophers in Corinth and nearby Athens would certainly fit that description. When Paul visited Athens, he noted how the city was full of idols, one of which was dedicated to the “*unknown god.*” The Greeks did not have a correct understanding of God, so it is not surprising that the Greek philosophers in Athens scoffed at Paul when he taught the resurrection of the dead. Therefore, it seems likely that it was Greek philosophers there in Corinth who were confusing the Corinthian saints by denying that the dead will be raised.

**15:35-38** – “Some” there at Corinth, who had been influenced by Greek philosophy to deny the resurrection, were asking these two questions: 1) *How are the dead raised up?* and 2) *With what body do they come?* Both questions suggest a strong Platonic influence. Paul answers both questions by using several analogies. He begins by comparing the Resurrection to the sprouting of seed: “*What you sow is not made alive unless it dies.*” In essence, Paul was saying that a seed does not receive its new plant body until after the old seed body breaks open and is laid aside (dies). It is the same for the saint. We cannot get our new immortal bodies until after our mortal bodies have died. That is true, except for those saints who happened to still be alive at the time of the Parousia, at which time the living were CHANGED without having to experience death first.

Some commentators are puzzled by Paul’s statement that the seed does not die until *after* it is sown. Since they think the sowing of the seed is the *burial* of the body, the implication is that people were being buried alive! However, other commentators remind us that the *sowing* is referring to the *birth* of the person into the world. Thus, Paul is saying that humans are sown into the world at their birth, and their physical bodies have to die before they can receive their new immortal bodies. In verses 37-38, Paul clearly says that the body in which we are sown is *not the same body* that we will have after the Resurrection. Instead, “God gives it a body just as He wished, and to each of the seeds a body of its own.” In other words, we are born, live, and die in one kind of body, and come to life in a different kind of body, just like seeds do. Futurists who take the “bodies-out-of-the-graves” (BOG) view of resurrection, have



difficulty explaining these two verses. Paul, at the least, is teaching two different *kinds* of bodies, if not two different *bodies* altogether. The latter concept is clinched in verse 38 where Paul says that God gives a *new body* to “each of the seeds.” Thus, when the seed sprouts, the old seed body dies and returns to dust, while the new plant body rises up from the inner germ of the seed. Note also that *each of the seeds* (individuals) *receives its own body*. This does not work in the Collective Body View, but it perfectly fits the Individual Body View.

**15:39-41** – These three verses further illustrate the point about the differences between *seed* bodies and *plant* bodies. There are different kinds of flesh, and different levels of glory between terrestrial and celestial bodies, as well as between the sun, moon, and stars.

**15:42-44** – Verse 42 picks up once again on the concept expressed in verses 37-38. Just as seeds are not sown in their *final* plant body that they will have after they sprout, so it is with human resurrection. God gives “it” (each individual “seed” or person) a new body at the Resurrection. The seed is sown into the world in a body that is subject to corruption, dishonor, and weakness. But it is raised in a body that is incorruptible, glorious, and powerful. The seed (individual person) is sown in a *natural* body, but raised in a *spiritual* body. Notice again that Paul is speaking of individual seeds here, not about a collective body.

**15:45-49** – Paul again emphasizes the fact that there are two different kinds of bodies, and that the *natural* body precedes the *spiritual*. The First Adam was earthy and made of dust, just like we are in our natural bodies. The Last Adam is from heaven and has a heavenly spiritual body, which is the bodily image the saints “*shall bear*” (future tense) after they are raised at the Parousia. Note the future tense here: those saints were not already bearing the image of the heavenly Man while they were still in their earthy (natural) bodies of dust. They did not have two bodies at the same time. They would not *put on and bear* their new heavenly spiritual bodies *until the Resurrection*. Clearly this heavenly image is referring to a new kind of body that they each would receive at the Parousia, one that would enable them to live in heaven with the heavenly Man Christ Jesus. It is interesting here in verse 49 that Paul does not distinguish between the living and the dead in bearing the image of the heavenly Man. *The implication is that both the dead and the living would put on their new heavenly spiritual bodies at the Resurrection event*. This implication becomes explicit in the next five verses.

**15:50-54** – Some commentators believe verses 50-53 are talking about the effect of the Resurrection event upon both groups, the living and the dead. Others think it is mainly a discussion about the *bodily change* of the living that occurs “*in the blink of an eye*” immediately after the dead are raised. It really does not make much difference. Both views have the living and the dead “put on” their new immortal bodies at the resurrection/change event. However, the key points that we must not overlook are the *bodily change of the living*, and *when it occurred*. Note verses 51-52 in particular. Not all of those saints who were alive at the time Paul wrote (ca. AD 57)

would die. Some of them would remain alive until the Last Trump when the dead “**will be raised**” (future tense) and those living saints “**shall be changed**” (future tense). Notice the future tense here for both the resurrection of the dead and the change of the living. They would occur “*in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet*” at the Parousia. This was not an already ongoing process of resurrection and change, but rather a *future* resurrection and change that would occur “*at the last trump*” in concert with the Parousia. This does not fit the Collective Body View at all, but it perfectly fits the Individual Body View of resurrection and change. We know what the Resurrection did for the dead saints: It raised them out of Hades and put them in heaven with their new immortal bodies. But what about the living saints? What was the bodily “*change*” that the living were going to experience at the Parousia? Whatever it was, it was supposed to occur “*at the last trump*” right after the dead were raised (v. 52). Unless we want to stretch out the sounding of the last trump for millennia or eternity, then it means that the *bodily change* of the living took place in connection with the resurrection of the dead at the Parousia, and is not ongoing after AD 70. But what was this change of the living? Verses 53-54 explain what it was: It was the “*putting on*” of incorruption and immortality. For the dead, whose bodies were already consumed in corruption, it meant “*putting on*” new bodies of incorruption. For the living who were still wearing their “*flesh and blood*” mortal bodies, it meant “*putting on*” immortality which swallowed up (or *changed*) their mortality into immortality. Paul clarifies this further in his second epistle to the Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor. 5:1-4), which we looked at in the last session.

That pretty much wraps up our study of Paul's resurrection teaching in his two epistles to the Corinthians. If any of this was unclear or confusing to you, don't hesitate to send me an email asking for more information about it.

Some of our regular listeners in the past few months have asked me to do a series of studies on Paul's eschatological teaching in the book of Romans. I have wanted to teach a series on Romans for several years now, so this seems to be the right time and place to do it! Therefore, Lord willing, next time we will begin that series on Paul's eschatological teaching in his epistle to the church at Rome.

I would encourage all of us to start preparing for that series by reading the book of Romans in several different translations. Become as familiar with the flow of Paul's thinking in Romans as you can, before we study it together. That will make our studies here on the podcast much more meaningful and productive for you.

If you know of any commentaries on Romans that I might not be aware of, please send me an email about them. I want to cover all the bases in my study preparation.

That will do it for this session. Thanks so much for listening.

**We urgently need your support!**

If you are being edified by these podcasts, please prayerfully consider supporting IPA with a donation of any amount. We cannot do this without you, and we need your help

right now more than ever. The summer slump hit us hard, and expenses for our annual exhibit booth at the *Evangelical Theological Society* are taking a big bite. Plus, we are rebuilding our website from scratch to add a shopping cart, which is putting a crimp in our budget as well. So, your help is greatly needed. To make a donation or support monthly, [click here](#). Thanks for being partners with us.

**Additional Resources Available:** If you wish more details on the Resurrection of the dead and the change of the living, simply email me (preterist1@preterist.org) and request the .pdf files on “Resurrection and Change.”