

Dr. Gary Meadors, 1 Corinthians, Lecture 32, 1 Corinthians 15, Paul's Response to Questions Concerning the Afterlife and Resurrection.

© 2024 Gary Meadors and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 32, 1 Corinthians 15, Paul's Response to Questions Concerning the Afterlife and Resurrection.

Well, today we continue in our lectures of 1 Corinthians and we're going to look at 1 Corinthians chapter 15.

And this involves your notepad number 16 that you should be retrieving from the Biblical e-learning site. It'll be page 221, is our start page. And we should cover the chapter today.

It's a long chapter, but it's a narrative sort of chapter again. And we'll make it our goal, at least in this lecture, to deal with 1 Corinthians 15. Obviously, as with all these chapters, there's so much that could be said, but we're trying to give a synthesis and can't do exactly what a commentary would do.

You wouldn't want to sit and listen to that. I don't think it would be too tedious. So, we'll leave that kind of work to you and we'll look at the large pieces of this chapter.

As we get ready to go into the chapter, just to say one thing about the close of chapter 14 that I wanted to kind of reemphasize. At the end of 14 was the issue of validation of the woman passage in 33b through 35, but I would want to reiterate verse 37 and 38. I don't know if I emphasized this enough.

This is a pretty strong statement from Paul concerning his authority. He's been challenged, we saw this all the way back in chapter 2, that the authority of Paul, the appropriateness and correctness of his teaching at various levels has been challenged. And he says in verse 37 of chapter 14, if any person thinks themselves or himself to be a prophet or spiritual, that's one of the four places where spiritual would refer to a person, view themselves as a spiritual person.

Let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord. But if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant. The point is several fold here.

First of all, that Paul is asserting in no uncertain terms that he is giving God's word. He has a self-consciousness of that, according to this passage. And furthermore, the

point of verse 38 in the more formal translations, but if anyone is ignorant, let them be ignorant.

That's smoothed out in the NIV and some other places. But I kind of like that old translation. The point of it is this, that if the audience can't come to accept Paul's teaching as authoritative and of divine importance and quality, then there is no basis for any further conversation.

That's a very important principle. If we cannot accept the scriptures as God's word and authoritative, where do we go to have a conversation? What epistemology would we appeal to if we don't have the epistemology of the authority of scripture? Well, in terms of Christian truth, there is no place to go. The Bible, at the end of the day, is our authority.

It's our only authority. And without it, we are adrift. We live in an age where everyone wants to bypass the Bible.

They don't even read it from the pulpit half the time anymore, as if the words of the sermonette that's given are more important than the words of scripture. The scriptures are the foundation for everything. And Paul makes that clear in no uncertain terms at the end of chapter 14.

And as he moves into chapter 15, he's dealing with a different sort of issue. He doesn't use the paradeph. He doesn't use a sort of a slogan to go off on.

He uses some statements that seem to be from the Corinthians. But he's dealing in chapter 15 actually with a theological deviation. Chapter 15 is about the resurrection of Christ, the resurrection of those who've believed in him, in the eschaton.

And that is a theological truth that's non-negotiable. He deals with it in very interesting ways. It doesn't seem to be what you overly caustic, but at the same time is absolutely authoritative.

And perhaps even the close out of chapters 12 through 14 at the end of chapter 14 is setting the stage for the authoritative teaching that Paul has concerning the fact of the resurrection. Which it seems that some in the Corinthian community were either denying or certainly having a problem with. So if you look at page 221 in the notes that you have, we have a section summary here.

And I've pointed out to you that chapter 15 verses 1 and 2 balance with chapter 15 verse 58. Yes, it is a very, very long chapter because of the nature of how Paul sets it forth in a narrative format. So I've given you a chart here of the text.

This I believe is the American Standard Version text. Where 15.1 says, I have made known unto you brethren. And then at the end of it, if you hold fast the word which I preached unto you, except you believed in vain.

And then at the close of chapter 15, which makes a natural boundary, he says, wherefore my beloved brethren. And of course, that's the brothers and sisters. Be you steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.

For as much as you know that your labor is not vain in the Lord. So we've got natural boundaries at the beginning and end of this chapter. Like bookends to make it very clear to us that we're dealing with a unit here.

Now in this chapter, Paul deals with three major aspects of the resurrection. Talbert's typical structural analysis brings this out as many others do as well. But in chapter 1 to 15, Paul discusses, excuse me, in chapter 15 verses 1 to 11, Paul discusses the resurrection of Christ.

Then in verses 12 through 34, he shifts to some questions that came from the Corinthians. And one of them had to do with the resurrection of the dead in response to two questions that they posed. Then in 35 through the end of the chapter in verse 58, the resurrection body in response to two other Corinthian questions.

And we'll look at these in that particular order. First is Paul's discussion of the resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ is the vital aspect of the gospel message.

Chapter 15 verses 1 and 2. Now I have made known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached unto you, which also you received, wherein also you stand, by which also you are saved. If you hold fast the word which I preached unto you, except you believed in vain. Once again, we've got boundary markers.

Verses 1 and 2, boundary with verse 11. Verse 11 says, Wherefore then, if it be I or they, so we preach, we proclaim. He starts with the proclamation, he ends with the proclamation in verse 11.

There's some major terms in these first two verses. The word preach or proclaim. I made known unto you the gospel which I proclaimed.

That's euangelizamai. We get the word euangelion. Euangelion is a Greek word for gospel.

Euangelizamai, which is built off of that, is a word for proclaiming the good news. And it becomes a term which has to do with the proclamation of the gospel. The word received.

We've talked about this term before. This word is virtually a technical term with the reception of tradition. The reception of authoritative teaching.

And which you stand. Stand is almost like a metaphor for which you're established. To stand your ground is to be established.

By which also you're saved. If, and that's a very interesting little rhetorical issue. The word if is very famous in rhetorical context.

Where writers know that their material is going to be read to the audience. And so as a result of that, we've got these rhetorical phrases. So that it stimulates the audience to think.

You know, if you stand, if you're strong. If you hold fast the word which I proclaim to you. That stimulates the audience to reflect.

Are they? Are they holding to that word? Or have they deviated from that word? Now remember when this was read to these groups of Corinthians. There would be those who perhaps had deviated on this issue. That's going to be discussed about the resurrection.

They have not held fast to the previous teaching of Paul, and so their ears are going to be perked up, as well as perhaps others in the congregation that might have called them on the mat for that particular issue. On page 222, the resurrection of Christ is affirmed from two historical perspectives. 15 verses 3 to 8 are interesting.

In Greek, there are one sentence that will get chopped up in things like the NIV, but they're actually one long sentence. Verse 3, For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received. There's another key term, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he's been hath been raised, has been, it's a passive verb, it's often referred to as the divine passive, God's action.

God raised Jesus from the dead; the Father raised the Son. He's been raised on the third day according to the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas. Now the sentence actually goes on through the end of verse 8, but we're going to stop with Cephas here in verse 5. So, I delivered, that's the proclamation, I delivered what I received.

Now the word received connects us once again with the tradition. This is confessional to a great extent. We'll talk a little more about the confessional nature, but if someone was being baptized, they might respond to these issues or reiterate these issues even in their baptism.

They believe that Christ died for their sins. They believe that he was buried, that he arose, and that he's coming back again. Those are early church confessional sorts of things.

So, you can see how I laid it out here for you, that Christ died for our sin according to the scriptures. Now, that's an interesting statement. He was buried and raised on the third day according to the scriptures, and he appeared to Cephas, and that goes on to his appearances to others.

A rather elaborate statement there in verses 5 through 8 of the eyewitnesses, the historical eyewitnesses to the resurrection of Christ in the first century. Now let's think a little more about this, according to the scriptures.

Now what does that refer to? Does it refer to the Old Testament? We are at a point where Paul and Peter are, and 2nd Peter brings us to the surface that they were actually seeing that what they were producing and providing to the community was scripture itself. Peter says that Paul writes in the scriptures in 2nd Peter chapter 3. So, there was a growing consciousness in the apostolic community that the writings that were being circulated were not just nice letters from the apostles, but they were actually scripture on a par of equality with the Old Testament. Paul could be referring to some of the gospel literature.

Perhaps not all of it was out in the mid-50s. Certainly, Mark was out. Matthew had been circulating, perhaps even in Aramaic or Hebrew, and the oral traditions of the gospels were well established by this time.

But I think Paul would be connecting it as well to the Old Testament, even though it wasn't as clear until the New Testament unpacked some of those messianic passages. What's scripture? Paul is referencing, more than likely, what is known as the servant of the Lord motif out of the Old Testament. Isaiah 53 verses 5 through 12 particularly.

1st Peter chapter 2 references the servant of the Lord motif in relation to Christ. The gospels portray Jesus' baptism in terms of the servant of the Lord. And Jesus applies that motif to himself in his sermon at Nazareth as well.

Edward Fudge wrote an article in which he points out that Paul, after Christ, picks up the gauntlet of the servant of the Lord idea and even applies it to himself in analogy to Christ as he continues to be an emissary of the message of Jesus. And so, Paul is

putting this idea of what he has received and the fact that Jesus has died, according to the scriptures, as a fulfillment of the servant's task. Now, this would have struck a lot of ears odd, particularly Jewish ears, because they understood the servant of the Lord to refer to the nation of Israel, that Israel as a nation was the servant of the Lord.

But Isaiah 52 and 53 had come to be seen by the early church as a messianic text and as fulfilled within Jesus himself as the servant of the Lord. So there was that transition from it being representative of the nation to it being representative of a person. And that would have been a challenge to some who understood the Old Testament and had come to know Christ, and now they're wrestling with the fact that they're going to have to change their minds about a few of these passages in scripture.

We shouldn't be surprised about that because in Luke 24, Jesus opened the Old Testament scriptures to the ears of the disciples on the road to Emmaus and unpacked himself from those scriptures. Would you just like to listen in to that particular lecture? Furthermore, not only did he die according to the scriptures and be buried, but he was raised on the third day. Now, in the Gospels, it refers to Jesus in the tomb from death to resurrection in two ways: three days and three nights, and on the third day.

In studies of the chronology of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, the third day becomes the most important phrase in that setting. Harold Hohner, who's deceased, formerly of Dallas Seminary, wrote a little book on the chronological aspects of the life of Christ. That would be a good one for you to read at this point in terms of the chapter on the resurrection of Christ and when he arose in the chronology of Passion Week.

The third day becomes the key term to describe the resurrection of Christ, particularly from the standpoint of a Friday crucifixion and a resurrection before Sunday morning or on Sunday morning. So, the third day is an important phrase. Christ's resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 is firmly founded in tradition received and also scientific history.

People saw him. Now, yes, it's a historical report, but it's a valid historical report that should not be put aside that there were actual eyewitnesses to the resurrected Jesus in the post-resurrection appearances and on the day when he ascended into heaven, which preceded Pentecost by about 10 days. First of all, tradition history, this issue of received 15:3-5 seems to be part of the early homilogia, the early confessions in the church.

These kinds of statements were used as catechism, particularly for those who were new converts and being baptized. A number of these appear in the New Testament. The confessional statements have survived.

There's some in Colossians. They're in a variety of places. There's a good book on this by Neufeld called *The Early Christian Confessions, the homology of the New Testament*.

Homologia is a Greek word that means to say the same thing, and it gets translated as the term confession. These are interesting to surface in the New Testament because it gives you sort of an insight into the development of the belief system of the early Christians and how they inculcated that into the new convert setting through baptism and through the confessions that took place in relation to those baptisms. Now, when you read commentaries, they'll also talk about the kerygma.

At the bottom of page 222, I mentioned this, the kerygma. Kerygma is a Greek word that means to proclaim. It's another term like euangelizami is to proclaim the gospel.

Well, the kerygma is the idea of the proclamation that was given by the early church. And so, when you read commentaries, and they talk about that, you'll know what it is. It's the preaching of the early church about Christ, particularly his death, burial, and resurrection.

It's the message of the gospel that they proclaimed. This scientific history, in verses five through eight, shows that the resurrection of Christ has an impact on Paul. And then he appeared to Cephas, which of course is Peter.

Now, sorry, I should have put in your notes. There are 11 post-resurrection appearances of Jesus between the time of his resurrection and the time of his ascension. And his ascension, of course, would be the last of those appearances.

There are only 11, and that's a 40-day period because Pentecost follows the Passover by 50 days. So, we've got 40 days and only 11 appearances. Furthermore, in the first week of Jesus' resurrection, there are seven of those appearances.

And we've got some big gaps. Some of them are private to the women at the tomb and to Peter. And it's a very interesting thing to work out those post-resurrection appearances.

But I think it impresses me that there are so few for over a month. You would think that when Jesus had resurrected, he'd become an evangelist, and he'd go out there and show himself to big crowds of people like he did when he was teaching on earth. But he didn't.

He has now passed the baton to his followers. First of all, he appears to the 11 in the upper room that week. And you know some of the stories, like with Thomas.

He appears to them after they have fished while they are fishing, and they are unsuccessful. And then he tells them to cast on the other side of the boat. Peter jumps in the water, and even though he might not have been able to see back to the shore, he knows it is the Lord just by command and by success.

They sat around the fire, and they had a good old fried fish meal if you please. And so, not a lot of appearances. He was there, and he was gone.

The road to Emmaus was another one. And he's passed the baton and now the apostles have to pick it up. And they're responsible for the proclamation of the message.

The largest appearance was, of course, at the Ascension where there may have been as many as 500, as it tells us here in the account in 1 Corinthians 15. And so, we've got this validation to the group. But then we've got a validation in terms of Paul in verses 9 and 10.

For I am least of the apostles, Paul says. I'm the least of the apostles that am not met to be called an apostle because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God, I am what I am.

And his grace, which was bestowed upon me, was not found vain. But I labored more abundantly than all of them, yet not I, but the grace of God that was within me. So, we see the appearance of Cephas, James, and other private appearances, by the way, and the appearance of the ones who were gathered for his Ascension.

But Paul wasn't there because Paul saw the resurrected Lord on the road to Damascus. He refers to this in some of his self-authenticating testimonies about the fact that he had seen the risen Lord, which was a validation of his apostleship. I saw him.

I saw him. And then he moves on in verse 11, whether then it be I or they, the others who proclaim, so we preach, and so you believe. I think that's a reference probably to that apostolic community, to the witnesses of Jesus.

So, we've got this received tradition of teaching. We've received this testimony from those who had seen the resurrected Lord. And this is all a package of evidence to the fact that Jesus is no longer in the tomb, but he's gone back to the Father and he's now an intercessor for us.

And Paul will go on to teach more about the risen Lord and what that means for the Christian community. And so, we've got that first testimony about resurrection. It's the resurrection of Christ.

But now we go on to another aspect of resurrection. It's the resurrection of those who have died on earth. This is an interesting one in verses 12 to 24.

It seems that there were some who were denying it. Look at verse 12. Now, if Christ is preached, I'm reading from the American Standard Version today, if Christ is preached that he hath been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? This time, instead of using a quotation per se, it's sort of an indirect quotation.

Paul credits them by saying there is no resurrection of the dead. But he puts it into a little bit different form. The question, why would anybody say there's no resurrection of the dead? Christ rose.

Why would you say that? So, Paul responds to the denials of the resurrection in verses 12 through 19. And that first Corinthian assertion has to do with there's no resurrection of the dead. What is Paul's response? Well, look at verses 13 through 18.

Because of the nature of this narrative, I just want to point it out and do a sort of running comment on it. But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised. So, if you say there's no resurrection, you have, by implication, denied that Christ arose.

Now, of course, in a Greco-Roman setting, the concept of a bodily resurrection was something strange to them. And so, you would have to accept Christian teaching here. The Old Testament is not that much of a forerunner on this idea of resurrection because it was not a concept that was emphasized there.

There are some implicational passages, but it is with the resurrection of Christ that we get the full barrel presentation of the fact of resurrection. But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, then is our preaching vain?

Because the whole foundational plank of the validity of the Christian message is the resurrection of Christ, if Christ didn't come out of the tomb, as has been testified by the apostles, then Christianity has no foundation at all. And our faith would be in vain.

Paul is just very straightforward with this. The preaching, the proclamation, is in vain. That means your faith is in vain.

This whole project has been undermined. Yet, yea, and we are found false witnesses of God. We're liars.

We witnessed God raising Christ, whom if he raised not, if so be that the dead are not raised, for if the dead are not raised, neither has Christ been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain. That's repetitious.

He's making his point in a broad narrative sort of way. You are yet in your sins. Because if there's no resurrection, there's no efficacy of the death of Christ.

If there's no efficacy of the death, there is no salvation as we have proclaimed it. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ, they've perished too. They have no hope.

If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most to be pitied. Everything hinges on the resurrection of Jesus. Now, there are a lot of publications about this that you can easily surface and can expand upon the significance of the resurrection.

There have been lots of interesting apologetic writings, even going back into England in the 1800s, where some individuals who were basically atheists took it upon themselves to evaluate the Gospels and write a book in regard to the fact that Christ did not rise. In the process of their research, they became Christians because they accepted the testimony, legitimacy, and cogency of the argument of the canonical Gospels to the resurrection of Christ.

Either those people were crazy, or they were telling the truth. They came to the conclusion that they were telling the truth. The resurrection is the message.

You cannot deny that. And so, Paul responds, first of all, no resurrection, no Christianity. If there's no resurrection of the dead, the whole project is tanked.

Furthermore, Paul responds to some shortsightedness of these Corinthians in verse 19. Notice this verse. If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we have all men to be most pitied.

If this life is all there is, that means there's no afterlife. There's no future life. The Bible has been clear, and Paul was clear in the epistles that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord.

The second Corinthian assertion seems to have been that if we only have hope now and not in the future, we're most to be pitied. They do not have a future. There is no eschaton.

There's only now. Paul's response to that in verses 20 to 34 is another lengthy response, but it's lengthy in the sense of its narrative style. But now that Christ has been raised from the dead, Paul asserts, the first fruits of those that are asleep.

He's the first of the resurrection. Now, there were some interesting resurrections before that. All the way back in the Old Testament, remember, they threw Elijah, get my facts here, into the tomb of a dead Syrian, I think it was, and he came back from the dead.

We also have the widow of Nain's son. We have Lazarus who came back from the dead. We've got some interesting pre-Christ resurrections, but theological, theologically, and this is a theological construct, anyone resurrected prior to the resurrection of Christ was resurrected in their mortal body and they would have to have died again.

If you think about this in terms of Lazarus, it's a very interesting thought to pursue in theological thinking out loud. But Christ is the first to be resurrected, not to go back, but to be in a resurrected body. Lazarus didn't come back in a resurrected body.

He came back to a normal body. Jesus was the first to be in a resurrected body that is adapted to a new domain, goes through walls, transcends time and space, and so forth and so on. There's a lot of interesting little details there.

He ate fish, and yet, in a resurrected body, we wouldn't think of that sort of thing. How do you describe all that? Well, that's an interesting project, isn't it? But the fact is that Christ was in the resurrected body. Verse 21, for since by man came death, by man, that is Jesus, came also the resurrection of the dead.

So, Paul's response is threefold to this denial of the resurrection. First of all, Paul affirms that the resurrection of the dead affirms the resurrection of the dead, and he explains its significance in verses 20 to 28. Then comes the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom of God.

He talks about these orders of resurrection in verse 23. 25, for he must reign till he has put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death.

Death came in the Garden of Eden, and the end of Earth's history is the abolishment of death, for he put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he said all things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is accepted who did subject all things unto him.

And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected. So, everything's delivered up to the Father in this scenario. Verse 29 is the second point, which is an odd point here.

Else, if the resurrection is not true, if the conclusion of the eschaton is not true, verse 29, else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them? Why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour? In other words, our sacrifice for the gospel. Now, we all have to admit that verse 29 seems odd in the flow of this, and we do not know what we would like to know in terms of why it was so important for Paul to bring that up. What was the scenario in that original community of being baptized for the dead that brings it to the surface here to be so important to be mentioned? All commentaries talk about this.

It's notoriously difficult, as they say. He states that every view must be held as tentative. Godet, an older commentator, counted 30 interpretations of this phrase.

Thistleton lays out 13 valid proposals for this phrase in detail. Just some of the most prominent ones, as I've noted at the bottom of page 223, the phrase can mean in place of the dead. It's called a proxy baptism by Fitzmeyer, being baptized for friends or relatives who had been believers but died before they were baptized.

So, it's sort of a substitutionary baptism. Why? We have no explanation, but that's one view, a major view, the proxy baptism. This view is also called vicarious baptism by some.

If you read Thistleton's major presentations, you'll see that some of the views have a lot of subsets. It's probably the majority opinion, this idea of proxy or vicarious baptism, but we don't know. Another one, which is very common but probably a little too surface, is that people are baptized because of the testimony of their friends or relatives who died, who told them about Christ, but they're gone now.

And these people get convicted, and they believe because Aunt Sarah testified to them, but now she's dead, and I'm being baptized in honor of her as I've come to know Christ. As one writer puts it, living people turn to Christ and are baptized because of the testimony of believing loved ones who have died in Christ, and so we now have the hope of meeting them in the final resurrection. That's a popularistic sort of presentation of the answer to this passage, but it is one of the views.

Thistleton opts for baptism for the sake of the preposition in Greek, for the sake of the dead, meaning a testimony of the living in the hope of being united with the dead in the resurrection. That's a variation on the proxy vicarious baptism. Thistleton's category has variations that capture the proxy baptism idea.

So, at the end of the day, it just kind of floats in here in verse 29 and shocks us as it were, but it meant something serious to the first century Roman Corinth community as to what was going on in that regard. If it were a theological problem, I think Paul would have expanded upon it. It was probably more pragmatic, more functional, that **people were, because baptism** and believing in Jesus were pretty much linked.

Not that baptism regenerated them, but that baptism was such a linked testimony to their belief in Christ that it links to those who have passed on before them in some way, and probably in some sort of a testimonial fashion. Furthermore, the resurrection in the future motivates suffering now. Verse 30, why do we stand in jeopardy every hour if the resurrection is not true? Why would people allow themselves to be martyred, to be persecuted? Through the history of the church, the resurrection of Christ from the dead that seals the validity of his death and provides for us a salvation by the testimony of the apostles, why would this long history of martyrs exist if it wasn't for the reality of the resurrection? I protest by that glorying in you, brethren, which I have in Christ, Jesus our Lord, I die daily.

I'm getting a little tongue-tied on that literal translation there. It reads a little in a staccato fashion. The NIV, verse 31, I face death every day, yes, just as surely as I boast about you in Christ Jesus our Lord.

If I fought wild beasts in Ephesus with no more than human hope, what have I gained if the dead are not raised? And it's as if you could throw up your hands and own the proverbial statement, let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die. In many cultures, eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you die. If this life is all that we have hope, why in the world would we sacrifice like we sacrifice if it were not true that Christ rose and that we have the promise of resurrection, and that on the basis of Christ's resurrection we have a salvation that brings with it an ethic that we must maintain.

Not to keep our salvation, not to gain our salvation, but to honor the God who has provided that salvation. For by grace we are saved through faith, not by any works. It's grace alone.

But we will work. We are his workmanship in Christ Jesus. Everybody quotes Ephesians 2, 8, and 9, but they never go to verse 10.

We're his workmanship. We will work like any slave for the salvation that God has given us. And Paul is saying, that'd be crazy if there was no validity to the resurrection of Christ and therefore to the validity of salvation.

Verses 33 and following. It's a parting comment. It's sort of a wake-up call.

It's a, please wise up. Be not deceived. Evil companionships corrupt good morals.

That's a proverbial statement. It's sort of like my dad used to say, birds of a feather flock together. You ever heard that one? Some of our parents probably drilled that into us pretty heavily because they didn't like the people that we were associating with.

But evil companionships corrupt good morals. Awake to soberness righteously and sin not, for some have no knowledge of God. I speak this to move you to shame.

Let me read a little smoother translation. That's what these new translations do for us. Verse 32 or verse 33.

Do not be misled. Bad company corrects good character. Now that in a sense is a statement against those who are denying the resurrection.

Don't hang out with those individuals. Come back to your senses as you ought and stop sinning. A deviation from good theology is a sin.

Why? Because it's a transgression of the revealed will of God. Sin is not some cutesy little word. Sin is just a theological term that captures a violation, a transgression of the revealed will of God.

For there are some who are ignorant of God. I say this to your shame. Remember it's an honor and shame culture.

And Paul is calling them to shame and the denial of the resurrection. Even if they say, well I don't deny the resurrection of Jesus. That's special.

But I am denying the resurrection of human beings and some eschaton. That won't work. Christ arose is the promise of our resurrection and seals that scenario in the history of redemption.

He arose we will arise as well. Well that's the assertion of the fact of the resurrection. But that doesn't satisfy this bunch.

We have to go on. There is also the question of the resurrection body in 35 to 58. You have to admit if you stand back for a moment.

This is all very logical from an unbelieving perspective. Jesus rising from the dead has been battled against by unbelieving people forever. Even in the first century they would not accept it.

They said that the guards fell asleep and Jesus' body was stolen from the grave. Go back and read the gospels. From the very beginning excuses were being made to deny the fact of a real resurrection, of a miracle.

And consequently the issue of a future resurrection. There are even internal to certain segments of Christianity the idea of an eternal sleep instead of a future world, a future resurrection, a heaven as the term has been used to describe. The fact of resurrection is an essential plank in Christian truth.

If you cannot accept that you cannot accept the preaching of the gospel because it is an essential plank therein. But does it not strike us as curious? So we say well how can it be? How can you, how can Whitcliffe who was burned and his ashes thrown into the Thames River, how can those who have been believers and are cremated come back? Their bodies are gone. God's got to have something to work with.

Well that's all quite interesting and quite challenging to human thinking and human constructs. But that's not a problem for God because what is true about us yes we have a physical body but in the resurrection you have a new body. And that old body is irrelevant whether it's eaten by worms or whether it's burned up is irrelevant because the real you as attached to these human bodies as we are is that enduring essence.

But in the resurrection. You have a new body and that old body is irrelevant Whether it's eaten by worms or whether it's burned up is irrelevant because the real you. As attached to these human bodies as we are is that enduring essence. We call it the soul--body, soul, and spirit. But soul and spirit are the same immaterial part. That's the thing that perseveres throughout eternity. It goes through changing forms and Paul is going to come to that in just a second.

To argue against the next problem. And that is okay. You can have your resurrection. Now explain to me. What it's going to be like the resurrection body. Verse 35. Notice this. But someone will say. Here is the rhetorical nature of the narrative. The interlocutor, the person that's arguing with Paul that's actually in the community.

But Paul is now setting it up. But someone will say. How are the dead raised? How and with what manner of body do they come? Now they think they have Paul.

On the horns of a dilemma. How and what are the two issues? In this section, Paul seems to be responding to an unbelieving question. How can man possibly rise when their bodies have disintegrated? It's a legitimate question.

But when it's asked by a believer in unbelief from the preaching of the gospel. It's a different matter. Paul considers such unbelief to be foolish.

And unbelief is the operative term. You see, at the end of the day, my friends. We are committed to the propositions that the Bible has given us.

About ultimate reality. We can't put it back into a test tube. We are removed from it historically.

And God can come back and communicate with us in miraculous ways. Do you think that would make you believe? Well, it really wouldn't. In fact, the book of Revelation becomes a testimony to that because it seems that Elijah and Elisha perhaps are raised from the dead and become the two witnesses.

And maybe Moses is involved in this. The three witnesses isn't it? Yeah. And they preach, and they proclaim, and they perform miracles.

Or someone in their spirit and power. And people still don't believe it. You see, people don't believe on the basis of miracles.

People believe because they acquiesce to the presentation of the message of the cross and the resurrection and of God's sovereign orchestration of the world. So, you can't twist someone's arm into belief. They've got to do that internal to themselves.

Now we have a secret tool and that is the conviction of the Holy Spirit of God. We've all come to Christ because of being convicted that the gospel is true. And that the assertions of scripture are true.

And that they apply to us. And there is never any substitute for that. You cannot reason with people.

Now, you can reason with people so that in their own internal processes, they will come to see the truth of that reasoning. But some will not. And if they will not, you cannot argue them into heaven.

They've got to believe, and believing is a movement of the Spirit of God. Two questions. How and with what form? Talbert makes a comment on page 224 in the middle.

Verses 35 to 58, 33 actually, to 58, consist of two Corinthian questions followed by the Pauline answers but in reverse order. We'll get the second question answered first, and the first question answered last. The first question, how are the dead raised, is answered in the latter part of the chapter.

The second question, about what kind of body they come from, is answered first. So we're going to look first at what kind of body someone would come back in if they're

disintegrated, if they're gone, if we have a resurrection of the body. And here comes wisdom that if you, we should say only God could give.

Paul comes back with an argument from nature that should just blow our minds here. In chapter 15, verses 36 to 49. Interestingly, in Mediterranean antiquity, when you study the Bible, you are studying Mediterranean history, at least in the first century.

In Mediterranean antiquity as now, this is a standard, objective question about resurrection. It wasn't just Christians who asked this, but whenever the question of a resurrected issue comes up in antiquity, this is how and what is presented. So these Roman believers, these Roman Corinth believers, are doing what was natural to them, which had gotten them into trouble in other ways as well.

In verses 36 to 44, we get continuity and discontinuity. It's the same but it's different. Look at verse 36.

I'm going to read the NIV so that it doesn't sound so awkward here. Verse 36. How foolish what you sow does not come to life unless it dies.

So, Paul's appeal to nature. The principle of death. Have you ever raised a garden? I like gardening, and I've raised some gardens.

If you take a seed out into the garden of corn, one seed of corn is put in the ground. It disintegrates, but from that one seed comes a stalk, and on the stalk, there will be at least two ears of corn that have on them hundreds of seeds of corn. It died, it disintegrated, it gave new life.

It's the same. You don't get green beans from a corn seed. You don't get peas from a corn seed.

You get corn. It's the same, but it's different. That's the principle of death.

If you put it in the ground in terms of the natural life of agriculture, you're going to get back the same thing, but it's going to be different. Same but different. The principle of death in the resurrected body.

You can do whatever you want to that physical body once the person is dead. But they will come back because disintegration is irrelevant because the seed continues on, and that's part of the fact that a soul is a substance. Philosophically, a soul is substance and continues through eternity.

Verse 37: When you sow, you do not plant a body that will be but just a seed, perhaps of wheat or of something else. That's the principle of change as I've already

described. Verse 38 But God gives it a body as He has determined, and to each kind of seed, He gives its own body.

You get what you plant even though it gets disintegrated. The principle of God's sovereignty. The principle of continuity in verse 38b To each kind of seed He gives its own body.

There is continuity. It's the same, but it's different--the principle of adaptability.

Verses 39-41: Not all flesh is the same. People have one kind of flesh. Animals have another.

Birds another. Fish another. There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies.

But the splendor of the heavenly bodies is one kind, and the splendor of the earthly bodies is another. The sun has one kind of splendor. The moon and the stars are another, and the star differs from the star in splendor.

Every star is different. Every snowflake is different. That's something that just amazes me.

How do you do research on all that? But evidently, that's the case. They're all different. Every fingerprint of a human being is different.

Can you imagine? How can that be? So much so that we now have a massive fingerprint database. If you commit a crime and you've ever been fingerprinted and it's in the database, they'll find you. Isn't that amazing? Creation is an amazing thing.

You've got the principle of death, of change, of God's sovereignty of continuity, and of adaptability of created kinds. Then you've got the perspective of form. So not only do you have the issue of how it is explained from nature.

Let's think about form in verses 42 to 45. So, will it be with the resurrection of the dead? Here's the analogy.

It is building from the bridge of nature to the human. So will it be with the resurrection of the body? The body that is sewn is perishable.

It's going to rot. Embalming may preserve something but you can't have that throughout history. You've got battlefield deaths where people are disintegrated by a shell or a grenade.

You've got famous people who are burned at the stake and disintegrated. And you've got all kinds of ways in which the body goes away. It's perishable.

But it's raised imperishable. It has a new body. There's continuity, but there's difference. There's continuity, and there's diversity. It is sewn in dishonor. Death is not a beautiful thing.

It is raised in glory. It is sewn in weakness. It is raised in power.

It is sewn in the natural body. It is raised a spiritual body. So what do we have here?
Page 225.

A new life principle. Corruptible to incorruptible. A new value.

Dishonor to glory. Dishonor is the absence of glory. What good is a dead body? It's an ugly thing.

It's a sad thing. I used to work in an emergency room on the weekend in a large hospital in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. We saw three to five hundred people a day.

And on the weekends that I worked, on the midnight shift, we had major traumas. I still remember it as if it were yesterday. There was a wreck on a road not far from the hospital.

A tanker was run off the road and exploded, and a car was involved in the accident. And there was a couple, an engaged couple. The man survived, but the woman didn't.

We got the call from the EMS and the ambulance that was bringing them in. But they warned us. They were bringing in the girl, but they said she would not be covered because the boy was hysterical behind them.

They brought her in, and when I looked at the gurney and this uncurved face, I knew immediately she was gone. The young man came in hysterical, and the nurses took care of him. The girl had died.

Well, we explained this to the young man, and he was devastated. And his family lived in Roanoke, Virginia, and he called them, and when he called them and they asked about her, you could tell from that one-way telephone conversation, when they asked about her all he could say was she didn't make it. He could not bring himself to say she was dead.

I came to learn the story and back in the 60's when this story took place, people didn't live together like they do now. At least not very often. And they had been

planning their wedding for years and they were only a few weeks away from that wedding.

And it was pretty clear that they were trying to honor God and waiting. And all he could tell his parents was she didn't make it. He said it several times as if they didn't believe him.

She didn't make it. She was dead. It was a body, but the person was gone.

That body will disintegrate. We honor that body in our culture in many ways, but they're gone. It's a new life principle.

The glory of the human that was incarcerated in a way by that body. But the body is a real integral part of being human. There's no dichotomy here.

But when we leave, that eternal substance of our soul goes, and the body is left behind to deteriorate. And in the resurrection, a new body. A new strength from weakness to power in verse 43.

It is raised in glory and sown in weakness and raised in power. It is sown a natural body. It is raised as a spiritual body.

Natural to spiritual. A natural body is adapted to the domain in which we live. We breathe air.

We feel wet when we get wet. We eat to survive. But a spiritual body doesn't mean it's a ghost and ethereal.

Let me ask you this. Does an angel take up a place in space? The answer is absolutely. And in our resurrected body, we will take up a place in space.

And even between our death and our resurrection, we take up a place in space. We are created human beings. And in that regard, spiritual doesn't mean ethereal.

Spiritual is an adjective. It's an adjective to describe a new kind of body that's adapted to a new domain. Jesus had the resurrected body.

He had a spiritual body if you please. He could appear through locked doors. And yet, Thomas could touch him physically and feel him.

He could eat fish. And he wasn't the invisible man. It's a new body adapted to a new realm and a new domain.

There's continuity, yet there is discontinuity. It's a different body. But the substance is the same.

The perspective of form. How else and how more brilliant could you say this sort of thing? This is beyond our realm of experience. We haven't seen resurrected people walking around.

We have never met anyone with a glorified body. So how in the world could you explain something that humanity, other than those who saw Jesus, have ever witnessed? You can't. It has to be a theological construct.

How brilliant to bring nature and the characteristics of nature to bear as an analogy to this resurrected body. Paul has set it out in ways that a child could understand and yet there is obviously an element of belief. There's a contrast between Adam and Christ in 44 to 49.

If there is a natural body, there's also a spiritual body. 45, so it is written the first man, Adam, became a living being. God breathed into a clay bottle the breath of life in the book of Genesis.

The last Adam is a life-giving spirit. The spiritual did not come first, but the natural and, after that, the spiritual. We have to be what we are before we can be something else.

We have to have a natural body before we can have a resurrected body. The first man was of the dust of the earth. The second refers to Christ as being of heaven.

As was the earthly man, so are those who are on the earth. And as the heavenly man, so are those who are of heaven. So, you've got Adam and you've got Christ compared.

Adam had the earthly body, Christ the resurrected body, and those who die will have a resurrected body as he. And just as we have borne the image of the earthly, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly man. We will have a resurrected body like Christ.

But we'll never be like Christ in the sense of God. We will forever be redeemed, resurrected human beings. Just as angels will forever be what they are.

We will never link to the divine being. We are not going to be divine beings in eternity. We will be human beings, and we will function, and we will go on.

Have you ever asked yourself what it's going to be like in eternity? Have you ever asked yourself that? What are you going to do in eternity? Well, I'm from the south,

you know, so in eternity, am I going to sit outside of a little country store and have an RC Cola and a moon pie? You'll only understand that if you're from southern America and pick the banjo. Is that what I'm going to do throughout eternity? Or maybe you're a golfer. Are you going to golf throughout eternity? What are you going to do throughout eternity? What are you going to do? I mean, how long is eternity? I mean, we use that word because we can't really describe it.

I mean, it's forever. Do you know what you, as a human being in a glorified body, are going to do throughout eternity? You are going to go to school throughout eternity. Now, some of you, remember you cannot give up your salvation.

So, you just can't give it up right now based on what I'm saying. What are you going to do throughout eternity? Eternity is an eternal learning process for glorified human beings—an eternal learning process about God.

You will never exhaust or become equal with the knowledge of God. Every day, you'll learn something new, as it were, about the divine being. Eternity is an eternal learning project of us about God.

I am getting questions answered. I'm going to spend the first thousand years watching videos of Jesus' life. Just kidding.

But I would love to do that and hear it in Greek and Aramaic. Might as well go the whole nine yards. Alright, so you see what fills the vacuum of what is the resurrected body? The answer is biblical theology.

And the apostles are those who are developing this biblical theology. The most exhaustive explanation we have of this issue is in 1 Corinthians 15, which is stated in simple terms. Now, there's lots of ink spelled to unpack all the words in this chapter.

But this chapter is a narrative that can be read and can be understood. Always make a distinction between what you can understand and what you can comprehend. I can understand the Trinity.

Because I can understand the assertion, I can't comprehend the Trinity. I can understand the resurrection body.

But I can't comprehend what that means. It's not part of my learning and experience. Understanding and comprehending are two completely different things.

And the Bible expects us to understand the assertions. But our comprehension of those assertions will have to wait until the eschaton. So, the creative and historical pattern demands future hope.

It's not just now. But it's the future. All of Christian living is conditioned by the fact that there's a future.

Teleology is a word that we often use. There's a purpose. There is a day in which we will answer to God.

There is an eternity in which we will live out our redemption in the presence of God. For those who do not know God, there's an eternity as well. And that is another issue that you will have to answer.

You can read about it in the last half of these particular notes, which we won't even talk about because the last half of these notes have to do with the final judgment, which is an aspect of biblical theology. It's addressed, and we won't talk a lot about it, in the last part of 1 Corinthians 15 where Jesus takes his kingdom and delivers it to the Father. And at that, earth's history is concluded, and God ushers in eternity, and there are constructs about what that means.

I personally think we will see a rejuvenated earth by fire or whatever and that the eternal state of human beings is connected to this earth that God created. But that's all creative constructs. You should understand what that means by now because we only have a few snippets that tell us about this.

The earth is not destroyed in the sense of being done away with, but it is refurbished by fire and becomes the eternal habitation of the redeemed. Well, that's theology. I'm just dealing with the Bible, right? Okay.

Now, notice the first question is answered, and the answer is rather brief. Verses 50 to 58. The first question was how.

We've talked about what kind of body. Now let's answer the question of how the dead are raised. Look at verse 50. I declare to you, brothers and sisters, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

Notice it's called flesh and blood. You see, what makes us mortal is our heart, which pumps blood through our body and causes tissue to live. The heart stops.

The blood stops. The tissue dies. We die.

But this body is not all who we are. We have an eternal soul that's corporal substance. That's a philosophical assertion.

That will live throughout eternity in the new body, which is never described other than by analogy, as we've seen. I declare to you that flesh and blood don't inherit the

kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Listen, I tell you a mystery a musterion in verse 51.

I just wanted to do my double take here to the Greek text. A musterion this mystery the sacred secret heretofore concealed but now revealed. A catchy little phrase that's easy to remember and is a definition.

A sacred secret heretofore concealed but now revealed. I tell you a mystery. Now go back to the end of chapter 14.

If you don't believe that the words of the apostle are the words of God, there's no foundation for any kind of conversation. That's the authority of scripture. We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed.

You see, we come from the resurrection, and that resurrection changes us. There's another whole conversation that we won't get into of what we call the intermediate state between death and the final resurrection. You can read the book of Revelation and see some of that.

There are people gathered around the throne, the believers. And they're corporal substances that must take up a place in space because they're mentioned. They're not asleep in their graves, although their body is there and has not yet taken on the form of the future resurrected body.

You'll have to study the intermediate state if you want to follow up on that. But we shall all be changed. People use this verse and hang it on the walls of nurseries.

We shall not all sleep, but we will all be changed. That's cute, but it certainly is an abuse of this context, to say the least. In a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet, for the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed.

That's the last final resurrection of the second coming of Christ. For the perishable must clothe itself with the imperishable, the mortal with immortality. When the perishable has been clothed with the imperishable and the mortal with immortality, then the saying that is written will come true.

Death has been swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your sting? Excuse me. Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting? The sting of death is sin.

Now get that. The sting of death is sin. You see, in Romans, I believe it's chapter 5, Paul's argument that sin reigned from the time of Adam to Moses. His whole argument is based on the fact that people died.

Death is a result of Adam's sin, of being kicked out of the garden. Here, we come back to that meta-narrative of scriptural that calls for us to bring forth the whole idea of the Garden of Eden and the early chapters of Genesis. Where, O death, is your sting? Where is your victory? Death, where is your sting? The sting of death is sin and the power of sin is the law, but thanks be to God he gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Death is evidence of the truth of the Biblical narrative. But it's not the end. We die, we will be resurrected.

Let nothing move you, my brothers and sisters. Stand firm. Always give yourselves fully to the work of the Lord because you know that your labor in the Lord is not in vain.

We know that because we have committed ourselves to the assertion of a future resurrection of the, we call it the eschaton, the very end. Eschatology is the study of end things, last times, and end times. The Bible is teleology.

It is always looking to the future. I don't care where you are in the Bible, it's looking off to the future. And the future becomes a motivation for the present.

We tremble because we know that we have to answer to God. Even as believers, we will answer to God. We're not told all of what that means.

Someone has said that everyone who knows Jesus Christ as Savior will get into heaven. Some will have a teacup, and some will have a gallon bucket to be filled. We'll all have our cups filled, teacups, and gallon buckets.

It's just an effort to try to describe what the Bible never bothers describing. The Bible never addresses our curiosity about that eternal state. The closest you're ever going to get is what we've just read in this chapter about the resurrection body.

That's as close as you're ever going to get. You need to own it. And you can't dissect it.

It's like a beautiful flower, the description of Paul here. It's like a beautiful flower. If you pick it, it's going to start to die.

You start picking the petals off of it, and then it's certainly going to die. You've destroyed it. We can exegete, and you can read hundreds of pages of commentaries unpacking the things that are here, and there are certainly some other phrases that we could go into, but at the end of the day, the careful and close reading of this text is telling us by analogy what the future is going to be.

It's not answering all your questions. We don't know whether your pets are going to be in heaven. There will be banjos.

I'll guarantee you that. There will be banjos. In fact, one of my good friends, Michael Whitmer, who is a professor of theology, is going to be sitting at my feet in the Eternal State taking banjo lessons.

John Lauer, one of my Old Testament colleagues, is going to be there as well. And some of my students made fun of me because of my banjo. They're going to be right there taking Banjo Seminar 101 in Eternity.

I'm just teasing you. We have all kinds of imaginations about this, but isn't it not interesting, my friends? The Bible does not address your curiosities about this. It affirms it.

It asserts it. It uses it as a motivating force. But what the Bible really is concerned about is your understanding of the cross, and your preaching of the gospel, and your living out the ethics that the Bible teaches.

That's what the Bible is after. You're after a lot of other things. Sure, human beings are curious.

We want our curiosities addressed, but that's not what God is concerned about. He's told you just enough to motivate you, and that's the end of it. Suck it up, and get busy with the gospel.

Now, by the way, I can't go into this now, but the gospel, my friends, is everything from the promise that Jesus is coming to the day he comes back the second time. All of that is described as the gospel. Read the book of Romans.

Paul said, I long to preach the gospel to you. And the book of Romans has about everything there is about that. That's the gospel.

It's not just the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. That's part of the gospel. But the gospel is a big story about everything that's messianic. Get busy with that, and unpack it. Well, it's a mystery. It's an act of God.

It's a logical necessity to the resurrection. There's another text I've cited here that you can read. Well, I want to just give you some more notes, though, that I'm not going to go through.

A good friend of mine, David Turner, who is the author of the Matthew Commentary and the Baker Exegetical Commentary Series, and some other books as well, and lots

of articles. David is a fine New Testament scholar. In teaching, one of his classes may have been on Matthew, but I'm not sure; he and the class did a project on the question of the final judgment.

He shared the results of that with me, and I've given that to you here at length for your own study. And you have a series of all the texts that they could surface in a New Testament focus about the final judgment, just the texts themselves. Turner then added statements from all the major confessions.

I'm not sure that they're certainly not all of them, but it's the major confessions that were in his context when he did this, which was in a Baptist institution. It's a very interesting study that answers the issue of the final judgment. And then on page, I think it's I forget, it's about 229 No, go on beyond that.

I had it written down on my other notes, and then I added some things and changed the pagination. It goes all the way almost back to the very last here. It is 237.

On page 237, we have a series of reflections on the implications of the Biblical doctrine of the final judgment. Let me just highlight them. I'm not going to read them to you.

First of all, when you study all those texts and the history of the church and its doctrinal statements, you come to the conclusion that hell is a real and everlasting experience for those who have rejected God's gracious offer. That's a hard truth, but believing the Bible requires it. The next one, on page 238, Scripture does not teach that heaven and hell are experienced during our present lives on earth.

They are a part of eschatology. The third thing is that God is love in its fullest and most profound sense. God is many other things as well.

In fact, in class, when you understand what God's love means, you understand that that's not a statement of God's feeling. It's a statement of God's covenant loyalty, and in that sense, God is love. The next bullet, Our sin and sinful ways have deeply offended God, and yet He's merciful in spite of it.

God's reconciliation through Christ is effective only when it is appropriated by individuals. You must believe it. You must receive Christ.

Next, there is no evidence in Scripture for the idea that hell has a pruning or correcting influence. There's no purgatory. There's no eternal sleep.

There's no annihilationism, according to the evidence in the church's belief. This has been highly debated, even in evangelicalism, in recent years. However, the text and the doctrinal statements certainly up in modern times have held that view.

Furthermore, human beings will be held accountable for the revelation they've received, whatever that happens to be for them. Furthermore, the goal of the Christian mission is not to make God's wise plan of salvation through Christ palatable. It is to proclaim it.

At the bottom of 238, the reality of final judgment and our accountability to God convinces us that we should more faithfully attend to the means of grace that He's provided for our growth and the message of proclamation. So, this thing of final judgment is not to be sneezed at. We hear very little preaching in our current palatable culture about judgment, the final judgment.

But it's coming. Either in terms of our death or in terms of the ushering in of the eschaton at the end of the age, whichever of those comes first for any of us. So, we need to take inventory and answer the question, what will you do with Jesus? Neutral, you cannot be.

For someday, you'll be asking, what will He do with me? This life is the opportunity for you to answer that question. As someone said, as death finds you, eternity binds you. You have this life to make your decision for or against Christ, His death, burial, resurrection, and the promise of His coming again.

And the resurrection of all human beings, some to life and some to an eternal death. That's your choice. And it's a serious choice.

Yes, it is a Christian choice. It's a Judeo-Christian choice, really, because of the Old Testament. And you may say, I don't believe the Bible, which, as an autonomous human being, you have the opportunity to say.

But I would just encourage you to take stock of the Scriptures and the life of Christ and Paul and many others before you seal your decision. Because until you die, you have every opportunity to turn to the only living God and His Son, Jesus Christ. And I pray that you have done that or that you will. In Jesus' name, Amen.

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture number 32, 1 Corinthians 15, Paul's response to questions concerning the afterlife and resurrection.