Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 1
Issue 1 *Januaru*

Article 34

4-1-1930

Concerning the Resurrection Body

J T. Mueller
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Concerning the Resurrection Body.

Notes on 1 Cor. 15, 35—49.

Modern unbelief, in its onslaught on our Christian faith, is in violent opposition also to the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection, one of the central teachings of the Gospel. With regard to this doctrine, Modernists are divided into two camps. Some, like Fosdick, are inclined to identify the resurrection of the body with the "immortality of the soul." (Cp. Fosdick, *Modern Use of the Bible.*) Others, again, deny even the doctrine of personal immortality, claiming that "the only valid immortality is of two kinds, influential and eugenic," or, that "the prolonged and rich life of posterity here is the only real fulfilment of the hope of immortality." (Cp. Horsch, *Modern Religious Liberalism,* p. 212 ff.)

However, the Modernists are not the only opponents of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. Mediating Fundamentalists, in increasing numbers, are now surrendering the traditional doctrine of the Christian Church and are going over into the modernistic camp. In his recent book *Basic Beliefs* Dr. H. M. Hughes, president of Wesley College, Cambridge, England, writes on the doctrine of the resurrection as follows: "It may be that there is a close connection between our natural and spiritual bodies (that the latter are the counterpart of the former) and that we are fashioning our spiritual bodies now according to the measure of the dominance of the Spirit of God in us. In that case the resurrection of the body takes place *at the moment of death,** when the spiritual body is liberated from 'the earthly house of this tabernacle.' There is also a passage in the record of our Lord's teaching which points in this direction: 'But as touching the dead that they are raised, have ye not read, . . . I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living,' Mark 12, 26. The implication is that the patriarchs *have already risen.**

According to this statement, Dr. Hughes holds the same doctrine which Paul condemns in those who "concerning faith have made shipwreck" and "concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection *is past already.*" (Cp. 1 Tim. 1, 19. 20; 2 Tim. 2, 17. 18.) Paul vigorously denounces this false teaching and earnestly warns against such false teachers when he writes: "Their word will eat as doth a canker . . . and [they] overthrow the faith of some," 2 Tim. 2, 17. 18.

Dr. Hughes, though still a Fundamentalist, inclines, according to his own confession, toward Liberalism. However, the *New International Standard Bible Encyclopedia,* in many respects an excellent work, professes to be conservative and antiliberal, and yet we read in

* Italics our own.

its column on the resurrection: "The points in the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous, then, seem to be these: The personality of the believer survives after death and is with Christ. But it is lacking in something that will be supplied at the consummation, *when a body will be given** in which there is nothing to hinder perfect intercourse with God. *The connection of this body with the present body is not discussed,** except for saying that some connection exists, with the necessity of a transformation for those alive at the end."

The statements of Dr. B. S. Easton, who is the writer of the article, are, as we see, very guarded. Yet if the resurrection body is *given* and "the connection of this body with the present body is not discussed," then the only implication which the reader may make is that the author means to suggest that not the same body which has been put in the grave will arise. In other words, Dr. Easton very cleverly avoids the main issue by refusing to state in clear words the very core of the doctrine of the resurrection, so offensive to all unbelievers, that *"in my flesh* I shall see God." If the present body and the resurrection body are not identical, then there is no resurrection of the body at all. The Christian doctrine of the resurrection is based on the very fact that the dead will rise with the bodies which they had during their lives on earth.

Gerhard states this fact very emphatically when he writes: *"(Diximus) formam resurrectionis consistere in duobus, in corporum, scil. ex terrae pulvere, reformatione et in eorundem animatione sive animarum cum corporibus suscitatis redunitione."* (*L. de Res. Mort.*, § 106.) Thus, according to Gerhard, the essence of the doctrine of the resurrection consists in the very fact that the bodies will be restored and reunited with the soul. Baier states the doctrine even more clearly when he says: *"Subjectum quo est corpus idem numero, quod quisque in hac vita habuit."* (Part. I, cap. IX, § 7.) He proves this statement from 2 Cor. 5, 10, where the identity of the present body and the resurrection body is expressly predicted ("that every one may receive the things done in his body"), and from Dan. 12, 2 and John 5, 28. 29, where it is said that the very ones that are in the graves shall come forth. This, however, applies not to the soul, but to the body. Baier clinches his argument with a reference to Job 19, 25, one of the best of all the Biblical proof-texts for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, or body.

The Lutheran *Confessions* teach the same doctrine. In his *Large Catechism,* Luther writes: "Meanwhile . . . we expect that our flesh will be destroyed and buried with all its uncleanness and will come forth gloriously and arise to entire and perfect holiness in a new,

* Italics our own.

eternal life." (Creed, Art. III, 57.) The *Formula of Concord*, with even greater emphasis, declares: "In the article of the Resurrection, Scripture testifies that precisely the *substance* of this our flesh *(huius nostrae carnis, quam circumferimus, substantia)*, but without sin, will rise again, and that in eternal life we shall have and retain precisely this soul *(eam ipsam animam)*, but without sin." (I. Orig. Sin, § 46.) The Lutheran doctrine thus claims identity between the present body and the resurrection body, though the latter differs from the former *per accidens* in form and appearance. *"Subjectum quo est corpus* IDEM NUMERO."

The question now is: Is this the doctrine which Paul teaches in 1 Cor. 15, 35—49? Both the Modernists and the mediating Fundamentalists deny this, for modernistic agnosticism has no place for a resurrection. In view of this fact an investigation of the passage is certainly in place.

The entire fifteenth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians was written in proof of the doctrine of the resurrection. It may be roughly divided into two parts: vv. 1—34, where the apostle, with consummate skill, proves the certainty of Christ's resurrection and its consequences, and vv. 35—58, where he enlarges upon the nature of the resurrection body. Vv. 35—49 constitute the backbone of the second part.

In the Corinthian church some members (τινες) denied the doctrine of the resurrection *in toto*. This absolute denial of the doctrine was evidently based upon the supposed impossibility of such an event. They argued that, since the bodies had disappeared, there could be no form in which the dead might appear. Essentially their chief argument was the same as that of our present-day unbelievers: There is no resurrection because in our opinion there can be no resurrection. "Who can recall by charms a man's dark blood shed in death?" (*Agamemnon*, 987—992.)

Paul meets this argument in v. 35, where he puts two distinct questions, around which he intends to build up his discussion. The first is: "How are the dead raised up?" The second: "With what manner of body do they come?" It is quite evident that the two queries are not identical. The first manifestly inquires into the possibility of the resurrection. It is similar to such questions as: "How shall we escape?" Heb. 2, 3, or: "How dwelleth the love of God in him?" 1 John 3, 17. The particle *how* (πῶς) in these questions does not express mode, but possibility. The question was, no doubt, taken over from those who stood aghast at the thought that the body which has utterly perished should be restored. It is the eternal question of doubting reason. While reason may conceive of an immortal soul, it regards as the acme of folly the doctrine that the dead will be raised. Even the Egyptians, who believed in a possible resuscitation

of the body, provided it were preserved from decay, did not teach anything like the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection. The verdict of human reason has ever been: There is no resurrection of the dead. This denial Paul therefore had to meet first, and he introduced his argument with the very question with which he was confronted by unbelief: "How are the dead raised?" or, "How can they be raised?"

The second question refers to the result of the resurrection. If there is a resurrection, the dead must come forth with a body. But if that is the case, what, then, is the nature of the resurrection body? With what kind of body will they come? Will the resurrection body be the same as the present body, or will it be a different body? Evidently, in the opinion of the doubters of the resurrection at Corinth, to put this question was to confront Paul with an unsolvable problem. Their contention was that there could be no resurrection body — the body has perished to remain perished. It may be noted in passing that the Sadducees put practically the same question to our Lord and received the same reply which Paul gives in the passage before us. (Cp. Matt. 22, 23—30.) They argued exactly as did the Corinthians and as do our Modernists to-day.

Paul was not at all perturbed by the query put to him. He answers it in v. 36 with a stinging comment: "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." The epithet "fool" (*ἄφρων*) is an exclamation of strong disapprobation. (Cp. Luke 24, 25; 12, 20; Rom. 1, 22; Eph. 5, 15.) The apostle was angered by the senselessness of the argument that "the body cannot live again simply because it dies." To him it appeared foolish, irrational, and contrary to all experience, since miracles similar to the resurrection miracle occur in nature every day. The seed is put into the ground, and from it the plant rises. Indeed, vegetation cannot spring into existence in any other way. If there is to be a plant, the seed must be sown into the ground and perish in its present form. So, Paul argues, it is with the body. The present body is placed in the ground, and from it springs the resurrection body. Thus the apostle, in order to convince his opponents, confronts reason with reason and argues with incontestable logic from common experience. If from the perished seed life can come, why should it be impossible for the dead to rise?

Luther remarks on this verse: *"Solches siehest du taeglich vor Augen, und ist so gemein, dass wohl Schande ist, solch Gleichnis zu geben, und willst noch viel fragen und disputieren, wie es zugehen werde in der Auferstehung? Merkst du nicht, dass dir da ein Spiegel und Bild vor die Nase gestellt ist, das du greifen kannst? Denn weil er solches macht aus einem kleinen Korn, sollte er nicht mit uns, denen er Himmel und Erde geschaffen hat und gibt, viel ein ander, besser und herrlicher Wesen machen? Darum musst du ja ein toller Narr sein, weil dir solches vor die Augen gemalt und in alle fuenf*

Sinne dringt, wie ein jeglich Koernlein seine Gestalt und ganzen Leib verliert, und doch nicht verliert, sondern schiesst wieder viel schoener heraus mit Blaettern und Staenglein und kriegt einen schoenen, neuen Leib, dass du muesstest dich zu Tode wundern, wenn du es zuvor nicht gesehen haettest; und willst nicht glauben, dass Gott werde uns tun, wie er verheissen hat, dass er uns wolle auferwecken und verklaeren, viel heller und schoener, denn jetzt keine Kreatur auf Erden ist?" (VIII, 1225 ff.)

After having established the possibility of the resurrection Paul next considers the question to which the remainder of the passage is devoted: "With what manner of body do they come?" In discussing this point, the apostle argues on the basis of the same illustration which he used to establish the first truth. But first he employs an analogy to show the difference between the present body and the resurrection body. "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other kind." (Brit. R. V.) The point of comparison here is simply the difference in appearance between what is sown and what comes forth. What is sown is a seed; what springs forth is a plant; but essentially they are the same. If the grain is of wheat, then also the blade is a blade of wheat and not of barley or oats. This fact we must not overlook. If some exegetes maintain that Paul here teaches that the resurrection body will be *essentially* different from the present body, they are straining the *tertium comparationis*. Also, they overlook the subsequent context. That the apostle does not assert that the resurrection body will be a new creation, entirely distinct from the present body, is clear from his arguments that follow. V. 37 is only the beginning of the disputation. In its very nature it is transitional, leading up to the climax of the discussion, the very purpose of which is to establish the identity of the present body and the resurrection body. What v. 37 shows is that the resurrection is not merely resuscitation. As the plant is more glorious than the seed, so the resurrection body will be more glorious than the present body, although its component elements will be the same, Job 19, 25—27. More than this the illustration does not teach and should not teach. This is apparent from v. 38, where the apostle says: "But God giveth it a body even as it pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own." The *Expositor's New Testament* remarks on this verse: "This added clause meets the finer point of the second question of v. 35: God will find a fit body for man's redeemed (glorified) nature, as He does for each of the numberless seeds vivified in the soil." Luther writes: *"Und ist das die Meinung und Beschluss davon, dass des Menschen Leib muss veraendert werden und die Gestalt nicht behalten, so er jetzt hat, ohne was gehoert zu seinem Wesen, also dass nichts bleiben soll, was dieses vergaenglichen Lebens ist, und doch derselbige Leib*

und Seele sei und bleibe, so ein jeglicher gehabt hat, mit allen Gliedmassen." (VIII, 1235.)

The particular force of the passage is, of course, the evident fact that God gives to each kind of seed its peculiar body, so that each grain preserves its identity, wheat producing wheat; barley, barley; spelt, spelt, etc. Hence, while the new plant with its seed is not the grain itself that was sown, yet it is the same in kind and preserves its identity, each seed actually reproducing its own body. So, Paul argues, the heavenly body that shall spring from the death of this earthly body, though it is not the body of sinful flesh and blood as it was sown in the grave, will be nevertheless the same body. In other words, at the resurrection every one will receive his own body, the body which he had while he lived on earth.

However, this very statement would give rise to another objection in the minds of Paul's doubting readers. Paul was aware, while writing the truths contained in v. 38, that the doubters might ask: "But *can* God really change the present body into a form suitable to the resurrection life?" This objection the apostle meets in vv. 39—41, where he calls attention to the almost infinite variety of bodies which God has already created. And, first, there is a great variety of bodies in this present animal life. Men, animals, fishes, and birds have all their distinctive forms. The diversity in animal organizations is practically endless; not two of them are alike, just as no two plants are alike. From this Paul draws the argument that, if God is able to create so endless a variety of bodies, He is able also to adapt the present body of man to the resurrection life. Paul's appeal here is to both the omniscience and the omnipotence of God, "with whom nothing shall be impossible," Luke 1, 37.

But the wisdom of God, in creating different forms, is still more remarkable. As there is endless variety in animal life, so there is also endless variety with regard to the celestial bodies. The celestial bodies differ from the terrestrial; each class of bodies God wisely adapted to its own existence. But the marvel is still greater. Even the celestial bodies differ from one another in glory. "There is one glory of the sun, another of the moon, and another glory of the stars." Indeed, even "one star differeth from another star in glory." But if that is true, then how easily may God cause the bodies which He raises from the grave to differ from those that, after death, had been consigned to it! If even the present bodies differ so greatly from one another, cannot God fashion a resurrection body which is adapted to the heavenly life in glory? The overwhelming force of this apologetic argument is apparent. It destroys the very foundation on which the Corinthian doubters built their agnostic claim.

Luther writes on this passage: "*Da sind nun so viel irdische oder himmlische Kreaturen und dennoch ein jegliches in seiner Art von*

andern unterschieden und immer eines herrlicher und edler denn das andere. . . . Nun reimt St. Paulus dieses Gleichnis auf seinen Artikel und spricht: 'Also auch die Auferstehung von den Toten.' Will sagen: Alle werden wir auferstehen mit Leib und Seele, aber in einem neuen Wesen oder Gestalt des Leibes und seiner Glieder. Darum soll sich niemand irren an keinen heidnischen Reden und Gedanken, wie sich's reimen und zugehen werde." (VIII, 1236 ff.)

In vv. 42—44 Paul directly applies the lessons which his illustrations suggest. The introductory statement: "So also is the resurrection of the dead" points back to v. 40 and suggests the thought that, as the celestial bodies differ in glory from the terrestrial, so also will our resurrection bodies differ from our present bodies. This is his principal argument throughout this passage. That also among the raised believers there will be differences in glory is a truth clearly taught in v. 41. But this truth is only incidental. The far more important truth which Paul wishes to demonstrate is that the resurrection body will be so much more glorious than the present body. Three times the apostle repeats with emphasis the statement: "It is sown, . . . it is raised." The body that is raised is the body that is sown. The two are identical. The resurrection body will not be a new body or a new creation, but the earthly body glorified, strengthened, and rendered incorruptible. The corruption (*φθορά*), the disgrace (*ἀτιμία*), and the weakness (*ἀσθένεια*) will be totally removed, so that the resurrection body will appear in incorruption (*ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ*), in glory (*ἐν δόξῃ*), and in power (*ἐν δυνάμει*). The resurrection body will therefore be the same as the present body; but its form or appearance will be different. It will be a body free from the corruption, dishonor, and weakness of sin.

In v. 44 Paul shows the difference between the present body and the resurrection body by making a new statement, in which he summarizes what he had just said about the resurrection body. He says: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." The context clearly shows what Paul means by these terms, though their etymology hardly helps us in understanding them. When the apostle wrote the words, they were no doubt readily understood by his hearers or readers. If any doubt was entertained, it was quickly removed by vv. 47 and 48, where the writer interprets the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* as the earthly body (*ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός*) and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* as the heavenly body (*ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐπουράνιον*). Evidently the natural body is a body suited to this natural, earthly life. (Cp. Jas. 3, 15 f.; Jude 19; also 1 Cor. 2, 14.) The spiritual body is the body fitted for the spirit life in eternity, where the believers in Christ commune with God, who is a spirit, in a body adapted to such spiritual communion. The spiritual body, then, is a body adapted to the higher state of existence in heaven. (Hodge.) With this statement, Paul closes the discussion of the

question, "With what manner of body do they come?" His line of argument has been in brief: As God creates infinite varieties of bodies in this present life, so He will surely fashion out of the corruptible present body a spirit-body corresponding to the spiritual resurrection life and adapted to its higher needs. In this way he has in a most satisfactory manner answered both questions put by the Corinthian doubters. His logic is unassailable and perfectly convincing.

However, there remained a last question, and one which is of considerable importance: "*Why* is it that God will change our present bodies into spiritual bodies?" This thought underlies the last part of the passage, vv. 42b—49; and unless we bear it in mind, we shall not be able to understand the conclusion of Paul's argument. That God should raise our present bodies, corrupted by sin, and transform them into heavenly bodies, suited to eternal communion with Him in bliss, is certainly a high dignity conferred upon the believer and so great an act of divine grace that in some way it must be accounted for. Paul, in simple and clear words, accounts for this divine act of grace by referring his readers to Christ's redemptive work, which is the core and climax of this final discussion.

The introduction to the theme is simple and natural. Paul says: "If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body." The evident meaning of the statement is: "If the one exists, then also the other exists, or: As certainly as we have a body adapted to this present life, so also shall we have a body adapted to the heavenly life. This truth inevitably follows from the certainty of the resurrection, which Paul has already proved in the preceding verses. If there is a resurrection, there must also be a resurrection body. God's loving design, involving our future life, must certainly be carried into effect, just as His loving design was executed at the creation. When God originally created man, the first man, Adam, as it is written Gen. 2, 17, was made (lit., became) a living soul, or a creature adapted to this present life. Adam was not made, as were the angels, for an existence outside this earth, but directly for this earth. And as Adam was created for this earthly existence, so all children of Adam are adapted to this earthly life. Like their ancestor, they are suited to a life on earth. This explains why all men have a *σῶμα ψυχικόν*. God wished them to be creatures of this earth. But that does not explain all. Adam accounts only for our present existence, not for our existence in the future world. This blessed existence the believers owe to the second Adam. Foreseeing the Fall, God decreed for the perishing world a second Adam and made Him a life-giving spirit (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*), which phrase evidently refers to the glorified body of Christ. What Adam could not give us Christ can and does give us. Adam could give us only a natural body, but Christ, as the

life-giving Spirit, can give us a spiritual body; in other words, He can raise us from earth to heaven. Hence we receive from Christ both the resurrection life and the resurrection body suited to that life. Adam was the head of the human race in its sinful state; Christ is the Head of the human race in its deliverance from sin. Adam was the source of our disgrace; Christ is the Source of our final and permanent glory. For He has life in Himself and He graciously bestows it upon all who believe in Him as their divine Redeemer. John 5, 26. As Christ was raised from the dead in glory, so will He raise up in glory all who have died in Him. John 5, 21. This thought Paul states very clearly in Rom. 6, 4, where he writes: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the *likeness of His resurrection.*" In Phil. 3, 21 he writes still more clearly: "Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself." Thus Christ, the second Adam, by His vicarious death and His justifying resurrection, has been made unto us a life-giving Spirit, who in the resurrection will give us the spiritual body needed for the life in glory. This is Paul's reply to the question, Why is it that we shall be given a spiritual body? The answer is clear and convincing and leaves no doubt whatever with regard to the certainty of the resurrection body. Christ's resurrection is the greater miracle; if that has been accomplished, then also the lesser miracle, our resurrection and glorification, will be accomplished, for this rests upon the undeniable fact of His own glorious resurrection.

Incidentally, however, also this discussion throws light upon the previous question, "In what manner of body do they come?" The answer which this last argument suggests, is: In the likeness of Christ's resurrection body. We shall be fashioned like unto His glorious body. Paul thus presents to the believer a way in which he can picture to himself the resurrection body. Let the believer look upon the risen Savior, and then he can visualize his own resurrection glory. Paul's explanation is also that of John, who writes: "We know that, when He shall appear, we shall be *like Him,*" 1 John 3, 2. Could anything sweeter be written than this consoling message of the glory that will be ours?

The very consideration of this glorious state of the believer, however, prompts other questions: Why must we first pass through this present life if God has intended us for a life so much more perfect and glorious? and: Why should we first receive this poor earthly, Adamitic body if Christ in the end will give us a glorious, spiritual body like unto His? Paul answers these questions by simply pointing his readers to God's sovereign and gracious will. God's design is that "that is not first which is spiritual, but that which

is natural; then that which is spiritual." According to God's inscrutable, but good will, the lower is to precede the higher; the earthly, the heavenly. First God willed the seed-time, after that the harvest. In accordance with His divine plan, God made the first man, from whom we have our earthly existence, of the earth, earthy (ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός). Then, in view of our Fall and sin, He provided for us a second Man from heaven, from whom we shall have our heavenly existence. And "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." As Adam was, so are we; his earthly body has become ours. "And as is the Heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." As is Christ, the risen and glorified Savior, so also shall all believers be who will enter heaven with Him. For this is God's divine rule: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly." As we in this life have lived after the image of Adam, so in heaven we shall be after the image of the Lord of heaven, our adorable Savior Jesus Christ. As from Adam we have bodies suited to the life on earth, so from Christ we shall receive bodies suited to the life in heaven; for He "shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body."

Luther remarks on the last passage: *"Denn das heisst 'das Bild des irdischen Menschen,' das ist, dass wir allzumal dahergehen in derselbigen Gestalt und Wesen und allerdings leben und tun, wie Adam und Eva gelebt und getan haben. Denn sie haben eben dasselbige Wesen gefuehrt, also gegessen, getrunken, gedaeuet, ausgeworfen, gefroren, Kleider getragen usw., dass gar kein Unterschied ist gewesen zwischen ihnen und uns, anzusehen* [*nach dem aeusserlichen Ansehen*]. *Hernach aber werden wir solch Bild und Wesen ablegen und ein anderes annehmen, naemlich des himmlischen Christi, und auch dieselbe Gestalt und dasselbe Wesen fuehren, so er jetzt nach seiner Auferstehung hat, dass wir nicht mehr duerfen so essen, trinken, schlafen, gehen, stehen usw., sondern ohne alle Notdurft der Kreaturen leben und der ganze Leib so rein und hell wird werden wie die Sonne und so leicht wie die Luft und endlich so gesund, selig und voll himmlischer, ewiger Freude in Gott, dass ihn nimmermehr hungern, duersten noch muede werden oder abnehmen wird."* (VIII, 1251 f.)

From the discussion it is clear that Paul's doctrine concerning the resurrection body in 1 Cor. 15, 35—49 is in full agreement with that of Christ and the whole Bible. (Cp. Dan. 12, 2; John 5, 28. 29; Job 19, 25.) He teaches in clear and unmistakable words the resurrection of the body, not merely the "immortality of the soul." His doctrine is, not that Christ will create for the believer a new body, which has no connection with the present body, but that at the resurrection the same body that was buried in the grave will come forth, transformed and glorified, fashioned like unto the glorious body of the risen Savior. The apostle is, therefore, in opposition both to the

Modernists, who identify the resurrection with the immortality of the soul, and to the mediating Fundamentalists, who claim that there is no connection between the present body and the resurrection body. The connection, according to Paul, certainly exists. The resurrection body will be the present body, only changed and glorified. As Christ's humiliated body was essentially the same as His glorified body, so from the humiliation of this present life the believer will pass into the glory of the perfect, heavenly life, with a body free from the pollution of sin and perfectly adapted to the glorious life of holiness. As he has borne the image of the earthy, so shall he then in supreme perfection bear the image of the Heavenly. J. T. MUELLER.

Luther's Academic Relations to Erfurt and Wittenberg.

The word *academic* is here used in the special sense of something agreeing with scholastic rules, customs, and usages; for the age in which Luther lived was very particular in its observance of such relations. And although Luther, in his personal opinions and judgments, made use of great freedom in analyzing such customs, yet his abhorrence of any form of radicalism kept him from actions which might have been regarded as iconoclastic, also in the field of academic courtesies. In other words, while he was not excessively conscientious and punctilious about these customs, he took part in their observance with a manifest absence of self-consciousness. It was in agreement with a principle which he copied from the great apostle, a maxim that caused him to become all things to all men if he could do so without denying the truth in any manner.

Luther had such academic relations with both Erfurt and Wittenberg, and this involved not only the university in either city, but to some extent also the Augustinian convent. The latter is true partly because the members of the theological faculty in either university were in part members of the Augustinian Order, partly because members of the congregation or convent were usually enrolled in some course in the university. In a measure, at least, we may here think of affiliations such as those of certain seminaries located in university centers of our country to the respective institutions.

Until recent years there has been much haziness and uncertainty concerning the academic relations of Luther. In some quarters it was apparently not known that he was affiliated with the University of Erfurt for a second time, after he had once been sent to Wittenberg. In other quarters, where there was some knowledge of this fact, it has been concluded that his first attempt in the rôle of teacher was