

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE BROTHERS OF THE LORD.

SECOND THOUGHTS.

As the discussion between "X" and myself has now been continued through four numbers of the *EXPOSITOR*, not to mention the original article in the *Church Quarterly*, outsiders will probably think that there has been enough of the *terce* and *quarte* of debate, and will not object to my turning aside to consider how the course of the argument affects my own statement of the matter in the first chapter of my *Introduction* to St. James, which I am now revising with a view to a new edition.

One feature of the discussion which impresses itself strongly on my mind is the frequent complaint made on either side that the opponent is beating the air, that he misses the point, that his arguments are all beside the mark. I am disposed to think that this arises from our starting with different canons of logic, and in a later page I have given an example of what I have called "X's" "transcendental logic," i.e., a logic passing my own understanding. It is evident that, where there is such a fundamental disagreement, no progress is possible. Each disputant must despair of convincing his opponent, and must leave his arguments to carry such weight as they may with those who accept his own methods of reasoning.

The points with which I deal in what follows are for the most part of a different character. I confine myself to the consideration of cases in which I can see real force in my opponent's arguments, and feel that the discussion has thrown real light on the subject.

The first case which I will consider is concerned with Lightfoot's statement as to the testimony of Hegesippus, which appears in p. 277 of his edition of the Epistle to

the Galatians. Lightfoot quotes from Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 20, where Hegesippus speaks of the grandsons of Jude, who was called the Lord's brother according to the flesh (*τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*), adding, "In this passage the word 'called' seems to me to point to the Epiphonian rather than to the Helvidian view, the brotherhood of these brethren, like the fatherhood of Joseph, being reputed, but not real." Again on p. 276 he says that the Clementine Homilies "speak of James as being called the brother of the Lord (*ὁ λεχθεὶς ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου*, xi. 35), an expression which has been variously interpreted as favouring all three hypotheses (Hieronymian, Epiphonian and Helvidian), and is indecisive in itself." To this he appends the following note: "The word *λεχθεὶς* is most naturally taken, I think, to refer to the reputed brotherhood of James as a consequence of the reputed fatherhood of Joseph, and thus to favour the Epiphonian view."

In p. 170 of the August EXPOSITOR I carelessly took these words of Lightfoot to imply that *κατὰ σάρκα* here had much the same meaning as in *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε* (John viii. 15), and that the whole phrase *κατὰ σάρκα ἐλέγετο* was to be regarded as equivalent to "wrongly reputed," a mistake to which "X" very properly called attention in the EXPOSITOR for November. My excuse is that I was suddenly called away from other work to reply to the article in the *Church Quarterly*, and took less trouble than I should have done to make sure that I was not attributing to Lightfoot an interpretation which had occurred to myself as not improbable. The phrase *ὁ κατὰ σάρκα λεγόμενος ἀδελφός* is, I think, unusual. If, with Lightfoot, we take *κατὰ σάρκα* as qualifying *ἀδελφός*, it implies that Jude had been described not simply as brother of Christ, but definitely as his brother according to the flesh, and it is interesting to find this statement referred to as an old tradition in the preceding sentence of

Eusebius : παλαιὸς κατέχει λόγος τῶν αἰρετικῶν τινὰς κατηγορησάσαι τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰούδα, (τοῦτου δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφὸν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτήρος) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυγχανόντων Δαβίδ καὶ ὡς αὐτοῦ συγγένειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόντων. ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὡδὲ πῶς λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος. Here it is asserted that "Jude was after the flesh brother of the Saviour," and it seems natural to explain the following τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου as referring to the παλαιὸς λόγος, which affirmed as a fact that Jude was κατὰ σάρκα a brother of the Lord. Can this phrase here mean anything else than it does in Romans ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, and in the other examples quoted in EXPOSITOR, p. 170? If Jude was ἀδελφὸς κατὰ σάρκα, he must have been son of Joseph and Mary, for if he were merely son of Joseph by a former wife he would have been in no real sense "brother of the Saviour according to the flesh."¹

I return now to Lightfoot's explanation of such words as λεγόμενος, φερόμενος, χρηματίζων (*Gal.* p. 283, n.) when standing alone with ἀδελφός. As is acknowledged by Lightfoot, these are not inconsistent with any of the three hypotheses which we are considering. They simply repudiate the Ebionite view that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. Christians who accepted the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in their entirety, and believed, in opposition to the Ebionite view, that Jesus had no earthly father, found a difficulty in

¹ This interpretation is confirmed by the words of Epiphanius (*Haer.*, 78,7) ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ Ἰάκωβος καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ὁμότροφον, οὐχὶ κατὰ φύσιν . . . ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰωσήφ, μὴ σχῶν κοινωνίαν πρὸς τὴν γέννησιν τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτήρος, ἐν τάξει πατρὸς λογίζεται. The "transcendental logic" which I referred to above has to do with this use of κατὰ σάρκα. I had quoted Rom. i. 3, where Christ is said to be κατὰ σάρκα son of David, κατὰ πνεῦμα Son of God. So, I said, Jude, if he were son of Joseph and Mary, might be called κατὰ σάρκα, but not κατὰ πνεῦμα, brother of Jesus, seeing that it could not be said of him, τὸ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἅγιον. From which "X" infers that I am bound to regard "poor Jude" as being carnally, not spiritually-minded, "σαρκικός only, not πνευματικός."

using the simple language of the first generation of Christians, and speaking of Joseph as His father, or of the sons of Joseph and Mary as being His brothers.

Going back to the words of Eusebius, it is interesting to have his testimony to the fact that there was an old tradition (*παλαιὸς λόγος*) asserting that Jude was *κατὰ σάρκα* brother of the Saviour. To this same tradition Eusebius was indebted for the story of the charge brought against the grandsons of Jude as belonging to the royal line of Judah and kin to the Messiah (and therefore likely to take the lead in any insurrection against Rome). In the next sentence he tells us that this story was recorded by Hegesippus, whose testimony he quotes in a slightly altered form (*τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου ἀδελφοῦ*), mentioning Jude's brotherhood as asserted by another, not directly affirmed as a part of his own belief. The introductory words *ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδε πως λέγων Ἡγήσιππος* seem to involve an inconsistent, *κατὰ λέξιν* meaning "word for word," and *ὧδε πως* "somewhat as follows." At other times Eusebius uses stronger expressions to denote his own accuracy in quotation, such as *τούτοις αὐτοῖς ἐκτιθέμενος ῥήμασι*, of Africanus (*H.E.*, i. 7), *συλλαβαῖς αὐταῖς* of Josephus (*H.E.* i. 11). Possibly he may have thought the words of the old tradition (*κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι*) too strong, and modified it by the saving *λεγομένου*. That the addition was not due to Hegesippus is not only suggested by the form of the preceding sentence, but by another quotation from him contained in *H.E.*, iii. 23, *διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν . . . ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος*. At the beginning of the same chapter Eusebius uses the same language, "after their attack on Paul had failed through his appeal to Caesar, the Jews turned their attention to James, *τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου ἀδελφὸν*, who had been appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles."

A second point in which I should somewhat modify my

statement in consequence of "X's" criticism is in regard to my remark that the apocryphal Gospel of Peter is tinged with Docetic heresy. According to "X" the fact that the author of this Gospel held Docetic views only enhances his authority as a witness to the truth of the Perpetual Virginity; because, if the Divine Christ did not unite Himself to the man Jesus until the baptism by John, there was no reason for the miraculous birth. And so we are told that Cerinthus "rejected the doctrine of the miraculous conception and taught that Jesus was, according to the ordinary course of human birth, the son of Joseph and Mary; that He differed from other men only as being unusually righteous and wise; that, on his baptism, Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove, that He had been thereby enabled to preach the supreme God and to work miracles; that before his crucifixion Christ withdrew himself, leaving Jesus to suffer and to rise again, while Christ, as a spiritual being, remained impassible."¹

But this was not the only, nor indeed the most common form of Doceticism. Cerinthus was a Jew and an Ebionite. The Docetae were more commonly Gentiles and Gnostics.² Dr. Salmon gives an abstract of Hippolytus' account of this sect (*Hippol. Ref. Haer.*, viii. 10; *D. of Chr. Biogr.*, i. 866), the substance of which is that the "Aeons" begat of one virgin a joint offspring, the Saviour of all, co-equal with the primal Deity in every respect, except that He was begotten,

¹ See Salmon's article on Doceticism in *D. of Chr. Biogr.*, i. p. 868.

² That it was easier for Greeks than for Jews to accept the doctrine of the miraculous birth appears from Justin, *Apol.*, i. 20, where the stories of Hercules and the Dioscuri are cited as parallels, while the Jew Trypho, on the contrary, says that the Christians ought to be ashamed to support their cause by the ridiculous fables of the heathen (*Dial.*, 67). In the edition of the Gospel according to Peter by Robinson and James, attention is called to the writer's dislike of the Jews (p. 27), and to the two marks of Doceticism noticed in the Gospel: (1) that Jesus felt no pain when crucified (p. 18), (2) the cry uttered on the cross, "My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me" (p. 20), which they compare with what we read of Valentinus in *Iren.* i. 8. 2.

while the latter was unbegotten (p. 867). The Saviour passed into this lower world, unseen, unknown, not believed in. An angel who accompanied him from above, made the annunciation to Mary, as it is written in the Gospels. At His baptism He received in the water a form and impress of the body conceived of the Virgin. [I suppose this new body was imagined to be a spiritual body inclosed in the outer fleshly body.] The Saviour received this body in order that, when the " archon " had condemned to death the flesh that was his own creation, the Saviour's soul, having stripped off the fleshly body, and left it nailed to the cross, might yet not be found naked, being arrayed in the body received at baptism. Here the Docetic principle seems to apply only to our Lord's resurrection-body.

To much the same effect Irenaeus (i. 30, 12) says of the Ophites, "*Jesum quippe ex virgine per operationem Dei generatum, sapientiorem et mundiorem et justiore[m] hominibus omnibus fuisse . . . (Ibid. 13). Descendente autem Christo in Jesum, tunc coincide[n]te virtutes perficere et annuntiare incognitum Patrem (Ibid. 14). Confirmare autem volunt descensionem Christi et ascensionem ex eo quod neque ante baptismum neque post resurrectionem aliquid magni fecisse Jesum dicunt discipuli.*" Salmon remarks (p. 868) that with two exceptions, or perhaps only one, all the sects known as Gnostic ascribed to the Saviour a superhuman nature, their main assaults being made on the doctrine of His perfect humanity. Thus Valentinus held that the body of our Lord came from heaven and was not formed from the substance of the virgin; she was but the channel through which it was conveyed into the world (p. 869).

It appears then that Doceticism formed no obstacle to the acceptance of the miraculous conception. If it might be understood, as by Cerinthus, to render this unnecessary, it might also be used, as by Valentinus, to

explain it; while it further accounted for the absence of miracles before the baptism; gave full meaning to the words reported to have been heard at the baptism, "This day have I begotten thee"; agreed with the appearances after the resurrection, the power of passing through closed doors, etc.; and seemed to afford an explanation of the resurrection, if the fleshly body remained on the cross, and the spiritual body supplied its place.¹

The reference to the Docetic Gospel of Peter is introduced by Origen with the words *τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ φασί τινες εἶναι (ἐκ παραδόσεως ὀρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου) υἱοὺς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικός*. I had cited this as showing that Origen believed this account to have been derived from the Gospel of Peter or the Protevangelium. "X" considers that this is an incorrect rendering, and that Origen here expressly speaks of the "elder brother theory" as a tradition recorded in the Protevangelium and corroborated by its occurrence in the Gospel of Peter. I do not think this is the necessary interpretation of these words. Literally translated they mean, "Starting from tradition (viz., the so-styled Gospel of Peter or the Protevangelium." Origen knows of the story as contained in these two books and does not care to discuss which is the older of the two. Even if the Greek had been *ἐκ τῆς παραδόσεως ὀρμώμενοι τῆς τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Π. Ε.* it would not require us to believe that the story, which had come down to Origen's time from the Gospel of Peter, was already a tradition to the author of that Gospel. When Clement speaks of *ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσις* (*Str.*, vii. 108),

¹ Thilo, in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, p. 378, goes so far as to say that the doctrine of the perpetual virginity, as stated in the Protevangelium, and generally accepted and defended in the Roman and Anglican Churches, is due to the Docetic fancies of the Gnostics: "dubitari vix potest, quin Gnostici primi illo commento usi sint, ut suae de putativo vel aethero Christi corpore sententiae fidem facerent."

he does not refer to tradition as coming to the Apostles but as coming down from them to later generations of Christians.

In p. 171 I spoke of the attempt made to interpret the ambiguous language of Hegesippus by the unhesitating assertions of Eusebius. I referred there to Zahn's *Brüder u. Vettern Jesu*, as throwing a new light on the subject, and in my present paper I have brought forward other considerations which seem to show that Hegesippus himself held what we know as the Helvidian view. Of the Eusebian passages quoted on the other side, I said that, with the exception of one taken from a disputed treatise, they did not seem to me decisive. One passage is, however, cited by Professor McGiffert as conclusive against the Helvidian view. It is the awkward sentence in *H.E.*, ii 1, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὠνόμαστο παῖς, τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατήρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα ἡ παρθένος πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου—τοῦτον δὴ οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰάκωβον . . . πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον (we are told that the bishopric of Jerusalem was first held by James, the reputed brother of the Lord, because He too was called son of Joseph, and Joseph father of Christ). The pronoun οὗτος might be understood, as Lightfoot says, of Joseph, but I agree with him that it is more natural to take it of Christ, in which case it certainly appears to be opposed to the Helvidian view. It seems to me, however, that Eusebius is unsettled in his own opinion: he never pronounces decidedly for the Epiphonian view, which must, undoubtedly, have been known to him, and of which he would naturally have given an account if he thought it worthy of trust, as he does of the relationship of Symeon to our Lord. Of the Hieronymian view he could have known nothing. It is noticeable also that he sometimes inserts, sometimes omits the λεγόμενος before ἀδελφός.

Another passage which calls for further consideration is the narrative of the attempt of the mother and brothers of Jesus to interfere with His ministerial work, contained in Mark iii. 20-35. The immediate occasion of this attempt was the pressure of the multitude, which made it impossible for Jesus and His disciples even to eat bread. His family thought that His mind was overstrained,¹ that He must be compelled to take rest. This idea was encouraged, perhaps originated, by the scribes, who had come from Jerusalem to prejudice His followers against Him, as they had already tried to prejudice His disciples by the question, "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" and the disciples of John by Christ's apparent neglect of fasting. So here they try to prejudice His own family by the suggestion that His mind was disordered, or, as they would phrase it, "that he hath a devil," which we know from St. John's Gospel to have been a common allegation on the part of the Jews.

Thus in vii. 20, when our Lord asks, "Why seek ye to kill me?" the multitude answer, "Thou hast a devil. Who goeth about to kill thee?" Again in viii. 48, "Say we not well, Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" and in verse 52, after Christ's words, "If a man keep my word, he shall never taste of death," the Jews said, "Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my word, he shall never taste of death." So in x. 20, after Christ had said, "I lay down my life that I may take it up again," many Jews said, "He hath a devil and is mad; why hear ye him?" Others said, "These are not the sayings of one possessed with a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?" Westcott's note on vii. 20 is as follows: "Compare Matt. xi. 18, Luke vii. 33, where the same phrase is used of John the Baptist, as one who sternly and, in men's judgment, gloomily and

¹ Compare 2 Cor. v. 13, *εἰτε ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ· εἰτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν.*

morosely withdrew himself from the cheerfulness of social life. So here perhaps the words mean no more than 'thou art possessed with strange and melancholy fancies; thou yieldest to idle fears.' In a different context they assume a more sinister force, viii. 48, 52; x. 20. Yet even in these cases the sense does not go beyond that of irrationality."

In the EXPOSITOR for July (p. 33) I said that the narrative of St. Mark seemed to me best explained by the supposition that the relations of our Lord all shared a common anxiety when they heard that the Son and the Brother was so absorbed in His work of teaching and healing that He took no thought of the necessaries of life; and that Mary herself was the one who would feel most eager to suggest some way of inducing Him to take rest. This does not please "X." He doubts whether "to accuse another of having an unclean spirit can by any manipulation be made to express solicitude for his welfare" (EXPOSITOR for November, p. 475). But where does he find the remotest hint that Mary and the Brethren accused Jesus of having an unclean spirit? The phrase is used in Mark iii. 30 of the scribes from Jerusalem, to whom our Lord, in the absence of His relations (for they were still vainly endeavouring to find entrance from the outside) addressed the stern warning against blaspheming the Holy Spirit. It is even a question whether this discourse is rightly placed here by St. Mark. Dr. Edersheim (*Life of Jesus*, i: 573) thinks that St. Mark is here combining two events, one recorded in Matthew ix. 34, the other in Matthew xiii. 20-32; and he believes that the greater part of our Lord's answer to the blasphemous accusations of the scribes, as given in St. Mark's Gospel, was spoken at a later period, when the opposition of the Pharisaic party assumed much larger proportions. His comments on the latter are contained in vol. ii. 197 foll., where he describes the ministry in Peraea. "X" writes (in p. 470) as if he thought the Brethren were

somehow implicated in the blasphemy of the scribes ; but the feeling expressed by the word ἐξέστυη is entirely alien to it. Is it conceivable that those who, even if they had not themselves been present at the Baptism, the voice from heaven, the testimony of John, must at least have known of them from others ; those who had heard His teaching and witnessed His miracles ; who had lived in His company and felt for themselves the perfect beauty of His character—that such men could have listened to the charges brought by the scribes without an outburst of flaming wrath, such as stirred the sons of Zebedee on much smaller provocation ? James and Jude, we know from their Epistles, were not at all the men to bear with meekness insult and injustice done to a brother. If they could have listened in silence to such a charge, they would have been worse than the scribes ; for to whom much is given, from them much is required. What they could not help hearing was the common talk of the Jews, of which St. John tells us, and which was really suggestive of their ἐξέστυη. “ X’s ” attempt to screen the Virgin from blame is scarcely less unsatisfactory than his condemnation of the Brethren. He thinks she was led to join in their interference owing to her jealousy of the “ many women, some probably nobly born and certainly wealthy, who ministered to Him of their substance.” “ It was hard for her to see others allowed to be taking that care of Him, which for so long had been her sole privilege.”

This passage of St. Mark is used by the Epiphanians to prove that the Brethren were older than our Lord and therefore felt themselves entitled to press their own plans upon Him. “ X ” endeavours to support this by referring to the profound respect felt by younger brothers for their eldest brother in an Indian family. I see no signs of this in the relations between Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Aaron, David and Eliab, Solomon and Adonijah ; or

between Judah, Joseph and Benjamin, as contrasted with Reuben and Simeon. If it be said that in these cases there was a special divine intimation, setting aside the prerogatives of seniority, how much more in the case of our Lord !

In my edition of St. James (p. xxv.) I had referred to Dr. Edersheim's remark that, if the Epiphanian theory were true, our Lord would not have been the heir to David's throne according to the Genealogies, as an elder brother would have ranked before Him. This is denied by "X" in p. 476: "That He should be the firstborn is no part of the divine revelation." I have not myself given any special study to this point, but I observe that, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Lord A. Hervey, who is, I suppose, the chief authority on the subject, writes as follows under the head "Genealogy": "The genealogy of St. Matthew is, as Grotius most truly and unhesitatingly asserted, Joseph's genealogy, as legal successor to the throne of David, i.e., it exhibits the successive heirs of the kingdom ending with Christ as Joseph's reputed son. St. Luke's is Joseph's private genealogy, exhibiting his real birth, as David's son, and thus showing why he was heir to Solomon's crown"; and the same view is taken by the writer in Hastings' *Dictionary*. I think, too, that this is the natural inference from the allusions to the Messiah in the Old Testament.

PS.—I should like to add, in reference to my note on p. 288 of the EXPOSITOR for September, that I have since heard from Mrs. Gibson, to the effect that Professor Kautsch, of Halle, agrees with her view, that there is no reason why a prefixed *ἰδοὺ* should forbid us to interpret the present participle in the Hebrew of Genesis xvi. 11, as referring to present time. The Palestinian Syriac has the present participle in Luke i. 31, where the Greek has the future. It appears to me, therefore, that the angelic speaker may well have used the prophetic present, "Thou conceivest, thou bearest,"

the first appearing in the foreground, the second in the background of the vision ; while Mary, taking the present in its usual sense, may have hastily denied that such was, or could be at present, the case with her.

J. B. MAYOR.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

(1) PAUL'S knowledge of Jesus began with the sight of the Risen Lord on the way to Damascus. This appearance he regards as of the same kind as those to the other witnesses of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 8). One of his claims to apostleship is that he has seen Jesus (ix. 1). The attempt to treat this appearance as of the same kind as "the visions and revelations of the Lord" in an ecstatic state, of which Paul elsewhere speaks, is futile (2 Cor. xii. 1). The conditions for a subjective vision were absent in Saul the persecutor; the striking and sudden change wrought in him by the sight of Jesus is a proof of its objectivity. The emphasis Paul lays on the burial of Jesus indicates that for him the body of Jesus was included in the resurrection. A continuance of the spirit after death would not have been described in the words, "He hath been raised on the third day." The description Paul gives of the general resurrection is evidently applicable to Christ as "the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20). If the body buried was *natural*, the body raised was *spiritual* (ver. 44). The possibility of the transformation of the one into the other is assumed regarding those who may survive until the general resurrection: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (verses 51 and 52). It is probable that Paul considered