

A
L E T T E R
T O
Dr. *HOLDSWORTH*,
Occasioned by his
S E R M O N
Preached before the
Univerfity of *OXFORD*,
On EASTER-MONDAY,

Concerning the Refurrection of the Same Body.

IN WHICH

The passages, that concern Mr. *Locke*,
are chiefly confidered.

By the AUTHOR of *A Defence of Mr. Locke's
Essay of Human Understanding*; in answer to Some
Remarks on that Essay.

Printed first in the Year 1726.

VOL. I.

H

P R E F A C E.

I Think it proper to inform the Reader, that the following letter was written about three years ago, and sent in *May* 1724 to the author of the sermon, which occasioned it, with a design entirely to suppress it, if it should have the desired effect upon him. But after nine months the Doctor was pleased to let me know, that he had drawn up a large and particular answer to it, but was unwilling to trust me with his manuscript, till I should publish mine. However, after a long time, and with much difficulty, I at last obtained the favour of perusing it; but not meeting with that conviction in it, which would have made me give up my cause, I have been prevailed on to let the world judge between us; and the Reader may perhaps see an answer to this as soon as it appears. I could wish I had been provident enough to be as ready with my reply, that the whole state of the controversy might be considered as it were with one view; though that indeed was no easy matter, in the short time I was allowed the Doctor's papers. But as I find my endeavour to vindicate Mr. *Locke* has occasioned more particular and severe accusations against him, I think myself bound to do him all the justice I am able, with what expedition my health and leisure will permit.

If it is somewhat unusual to publish remarks upon a sermon so long after it has been preached,

the Reader will perceive some reasons of the delay by the account I have given here, and at the beginning of the letter itself: but however late, I believe it can never be thought unseasonable, to treat of a subject, which will never be out of date, or to vindicate a great and worthy man, whose works will always be known, and always esteemed by unprejudiced persons. The great zeal Mr. *Locke* shewed for the conversion of *Deists*, the serious veneration he expresses for the divine revelation, and (how little soever he was fond of particular systems) the care he took not to oppose any established articles of faith, make it a work worthy a sincere Christian to support his character against the injudicious of those, who have reproached him as a *Socinian* heretic, an enemy, an underminer of religion. That there are no plain proofs from his writings, to ground such a charge upon, is a sufficient foundation for this defence: but that he was certainly no *Socinian*, I am farther well assured by the authority of one, who was intimate to his most private thoughts, and who is as eminent for his probity, as for the high station he at present possesses. I offer not this as an argument to others; but I confess it adds much to my own satisfaction in pursuing this undertaking; though I would gladly resign it to some abler pen, and less obscure hand, that might do honour to so just a cause.

A LET-

A
L E T T E R
T O

Dr. Holdsworth, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

YOUR sermon, preached at *Oxford*, in defence of the resurrection of the *same body*, published 1720, did not fall into my hands till some years after. I was immediately inclined to make some animadversions upon it; but necessary affairs and ill health prevented me a considerable time: however I hope it is not yet too late to do an act of justice to one, whose name will never die; which is the intention of this letter.

I do assure you, Sir, it is not written upon any particular pique against you, or from a spirit of contention. My only motive to it is a love of truth, and a concern for the interests of religion; and if you please to receive it (as I beg you will) without prejudice, and in the same spirit, with which it is writ, whatever be the event, there will no enmity be raised between us. You may perhaps be convinced, that you was too severe in your censures of that great man, whom it is my purpose to defend; and then we shall be both pleased with the

H 3

success;

success; or if not, you will at least allow, that his advocate has treated you in such a manner, as can in no respect deserve your resentment.

I very much commend the zeal you express for defending the articles of our faith*, against any person of how great fame and abilities soever. Nay, the greater any man's fame and abilities are, who opposes our holy faith, the more earnestly, the more resolutely, and with the stronger force of argument, ought the pastors of the church to contend against him, that they may prevent the influence, which men of that character usually have over the judgments of others.

But then the same consideration should, on the other hand, make a prudent pastor very cautious of accusing any such eminent man, as an opposer of the articles of our faith. The matter of fact ought to be very plain, that he does openly and directly oppose some such article. On any weaker grounds a man of weight should not be given up to the adversaries; it is yielding them an advantage, which they will more triumph in, and perhaps do more execution with, than all the force of their arguments.

But if this is an offence against prudence, with respect to the interests of the church, it is yet more so against justice and charity, with respect to the man, to lay so heavy a charge as heresy against him, upon any less grounds than a direct opposition to the faith. If either the matter in question is not an acknowledged article of faith, or that he does not deny it, the man is certainly injured, upon whom such a censure is past.

These, Sir, are general propositions, which I believe you would readily assent to, if offered without any particular view in the application; and upon these principles I beg leave to examine, how far

* Page 6, 16.

your

your conduct towards the celebrated Mr. *Locke* has been agreeable to prudence, charity, or justice.

The main design of your sermon is to defend the resurrection of the *same body*, the denying of which you impute to Mr. *Locke* as an heresy, and give him many harsh words upon it. But besides this, you do in more places than one tax him with *Socinianism*; particularly p. 6. you call him, *a writer of the Socinian kind*, and p. 11. more expressly, *a late Socinian writer*. Why such a reflection was brought in, where it had nothing to do with the matter in hand, I cannot guess, unless it was to prejudice your audience against his opinion in the point you was then so zealously contending for, by insinuating, that he erred in the most fundamental articles. However that be, if there were any of your learned auditory, who had not read Mr. *Locke's* works (as no doubt many of your readers have not) they must certainly conclude, that he had writ something against the Trinity, or the divinity of our blessed Saviour, as the most notorious error of the *Socinians*. It is therefore chiefly to do him justice in this point, that I have engaged in the matter. But when I am entered, I shall consider your main subject likewise, and on both endeavour to shew, that Mr. *Locke* has not deserved the charge of heresy, which you have laid against him. Let us begin with the first, and examine, what grounds you had to accuse him of *Socinian* principles.

In order to this, it may be necessary to look back into that controversy, in which the learned Bishop *Stillingfleet* unluckily engaged, (as I have reason to believe himself thought) with that great man; for you have left us to guess at the grounds of your accusation, and this is the strongest, that I know of. From that alarm alone, which the Bishop had taken of something dangerous in his *Es-*

H 4

say

say to the article of the Trinity, could any jealousy of him be raised on that subject.

You know very well, Sir, no doubt, and I think it of importance to observe, that he had not in his *Essay*, or any where else, written one word directly or indirectly concerning the Trinity; nor does the Bishop accuse him of having an intention to oppose it, or express any suspicion of his being a *Socinian*, as you have since taken the liberty to call him. The only reason the Bishop had, for drawing Mr. *Locke* into this dispute, was, as he himself tells him, that some of his terms had been made use of by the enemies of our faith in opposing it, particularly that of *ideas*, and his definition of certainty to consist in the perception of the agreement or disagreement of our ideas. This the Bishop was afraid might be of dangerous consequence to the article of the Trinity. But the only reason he gives for his fearing so, is, That it had been made use of by ill men to do mischief, i. e. to oppose the article of the Trinity, without offering at any proof, that the definition was inconsistent with, or dangerous to that article. Now, Sir, let us consider Mr. *Locke's* behaviour upon this apprehension of the Bishop's. Does he join issue with those enemies of our faith? Does he oppose his definition to that article, which the Bishop was so apprehensive for? This would indeed have been a sufficient foundation for your reflections; but far from any thing like this, he expresses a great concern to vindicate his book from having any such danger in it; in order to which, he goes even farther than the laws of dispute require, and with great clearness of reasoning, in which he was so much a master, shews, that the objected definition can no ways affect any article of faith. To this purpose, give me leave here to set down some of his own words: "Your Lordship says, it may be of dangerous consequence to that article, which you have endeavoured to defend.

"fend. Though the laws of disputing allow a bare denial, as a sufficient answer to sayings without any offer of a proof, yet, my Lord, to shew how willing I am to give your Lordship all satisfaction in what you apprehend may be of dangerous consequence in my book, as to that article, I shall not stand still sullenly, and put your Lordship upon the difficulty of shewing wherein that danger lies; but shall, on the other side, endeavour to shew your Lordship, that that definition of mine, whether true or false, right or wrong, can be of no dangerous consequence to that article of faith. The reason, which I shall offer for it, is this, because it can be of no consequence to it at all." He then proceeds to shew, that the grounds of faith, and of certainty or knowledge, are so entirely distinct, that into whatsoever the last is resolved, the foundation of the other will remain unshaken; that faith will still stand firm upon its own basis, let knowledge consist in whatever any one pleases. After which he concludes, "And thus much of my way of certainty by ideas, which I hope will satisfy your Lordship, how far it is from being dangerous to any article of the Christian faith whatsoever."

A great deal more passed between the Bishop and Mr. *Locke* on this subject, but all of it on his part had the same tendency, to justify his *Essay* from having any thing in it inconsistent with, or dangerous to, the article of the Trinity. And I believe every impartial reader must allow, that he had very much the advantage in the argument, which, as it was rashly begun, was weakly supported. But however that be, if this celebrated author was so concerned to satisfy the Bishop and the world, that he had writ nothing that could favour the *Socinian* principles; if he was so unwilling to be ranked among *Socinian* writers, as by the pains he took to clear himself we must believe him to be; why should

should we wantonly throw him up to them? Why should we labour to persuade them, that he is on their side? There are, I doubt not, many among them, that would be the more confirmed in their error by such a persuasion; and many others, perhaps, who have a high esteem of his judgment and penetration, may be biased that way by being told it was his opinion: for there is nothing more certain, than that a great part of mankind build their faith upon the authority of such persons judgments, whom they esteem, more than they do upon their own.

On this account then, Sir, there is certainly no prudence, nor can it be of any service to the Church, to rank Mr. *Locke*, as you do, with heretics, and even with the worst enemies of our religion: A treatment he never received from any other that I know of; a treatment, which one would think the serious veneration and awful submission he on all occasions expresses for the revealed truths of God, might well have exempted him from. The Bishop of *Worcester* does at no hand use him thus: he was indeed afraid where no fear was, and had unwarily drawn Mr. *Locke* into a dispute, before he had much considered his book; as he owned to a mutual friend of theirs, and that he was sorry he ever engaged in it. Mr. *Locke's* defence had, no doubt, convinced him, that his apprehensions were without grounds; and I think it should have had the same effect upon all that read it: at least, it should have prevented any farther accusation, without stronger evidence to support it. And this, not only in regard of the influence, which a man of his weight may have over others, as I have already observed; but in regard of justice to himself.

That he took pains to vindicate his book on the article of the Trinity, is sufficient reason to conclude, that he believed it; for what other motive

tive could he have for such a concern in that point? He lived in an age, when *Arianism*, *Socinianism*, and all manner of *free-thinking* was openly professed with impunity; nay in an age, when, as you too justly observe, *men are made teachers and governors in our church, who deny or betray all the great articles of the Christian religion*. It could not then be either from fear of suffering, or from any views of interest, that he was thus earnest to justify himself. What other motive then should we in justice suppose he had, but a sincere regard to the article of the Trinity.

But if you will needs have it, that he was a *Socinian*, notwithstanding his care to conceal it; what reason will you, what reason can you, assign for his conduct? For my part I can think of none upon that supposition, but that in modesty and humility he would not disturb the peace of the Church, by opposing her received doctrine. Now if this was his case (which is the very worst, that can be supposed) does such a temper and behaviour deserve a severe and publick censure? Of such a man we may say, as an eminent father did of himself, *He might err, but he would not be an heretic*. And therefore if you, Sir, had any private reasons to suspect him of *secret infidelity*, that charity, which is due to such a peaceable and unassuming temper, should certainly have obliged you to be as careful, as he was, to have kept it still a secret.

But I am fully persuaded there can be no sufficient reason to suspect him of such *secret infidelity*, or rather heresy, as you accuse him of; and dare venture to affirm, that he was no *Socinian*: for besides what I have urged from the concern he shewed to vindicate his book on the article of the Trinity, and that I am farther assured he solemnly declared his belief of it to a worthy friend of mine, who upon that dispute did, in the freedom of friendship, put the question to him (a matter of fact, which I think

think it incumbent upon me on this occasion to declare :) besides this, I say, there are many passages in his *Comment on St. Paul's Epistles*, which plainly assert or imply the direct contrary to several of the most considerable errors of the *Socinians*; as in all those places^b; where he treats of the inability of man to work out his own salvation, the necessity of grace, and the efficacy of the spirit of God dwelling in us as a new quickening principle; one of which places I shall here set down, because I think it likewise implies an acknowledgment of our Saviour's divinity. The *New Testament*, says he^c; "teaches, that those, who receive Christ by faith, "with him receive his spirit, and its assistance "against the flesh. And so spirit here may be "taken for the spirit of their minds renewed and "strengthened by the spirit of God." This is plainly asserting the spirit of God and the spirit of Christ to be the same. And as to the doctrine of our Saviour's satisfaction for sin, whatever fault may be found with his note on the word *Redemption*, Rom. iii. 24. the author of *Remarks on Mr. Locke's paraphrase*, &c.^d does himself own, in his censure on that note, that Mr. Locke in other places asserts the same thing, which he denies to be the sense of the word *Redemption* there; as on 1 Cor. vi. 20. vii. 23. *Ye are bought with a price, viz. the precious blood of Christ. Christ had paid a price for them, and they belong to him.* How, says he, could Mr. Locke so soon forget these words, being his own *Paraphrase* and *Notes* on the texts last mentioned? In his note on Rom. iv. 25. he asserts, that *our Saviour by his death atoned for our sins*; and on Eph. v. 2. that *Christ hath given himself for us, an offering and an acceptable sacrifice to God.* These are all assertions directly contrary to the *Socinian* errors.

^b Vide note on Rom. viii. 11. 2 Cor. viii. 1. Gal. v. 18.

^d Dr. Jenkins.

Now

Now if this be so; if Mr. Locke did really believe the sacred Trinity, the divinity of our blessed Saviour, or even if you have no clear proof to the contrary; and if on other important points he maintained such doctrines, as the *Socinians* will by no means allow; consider, I beseech you, Sir, how great is the injustice you have done him; and consider too, whether so public an injury does not require a public reparation. How good, how truly Christian would it be in you, Sir, to take some occasion of vindicating this *late celebrated author* as publicly as you have accused him; to declare yourself convinced upon farther thoughts, that your censure was on insufficient grounds! This is what you are the more obliged to, as he is now incapable of defending himself: and as such an unforced self-condemnation is what none but the most ingenious natures are capable of, it will gain you the love and value of all, who know how difficult it is to overcome that false shame, to which our natural pride subjects us; and which will strongly oppose so mortifying, but withal so generous, and so necessary a piece of justice.

I now come to consider the main subject of your sermon, so far as Mr. Locke is concerned in it. And here I must confess I was not a little surprised to find so much warmth, and such angry expressions (to say no worse) against one, who upon that *contentious* part of the subject, as you very justly call it^e, had given so little cause of offence. And I should have been willing to think, you had only heard in general, that Mr. Locke had writ against the resurrection of the *same body*, but had never read what passed betwixt him and Bishop *Stillingfleet* on that point, if you had not quoted some particular passages out of it; so little had he deserved that indignation, to which it seems your subject had raised you. "It was, you say^f, laid

^e Page 5, 26.

^f Page 26.

"upon

" upon you ; and to aim all your force against so
 " eminent a name might perhaps be necessary to
 " raise the weight and importance of a discourse ad-
 " dressed to such a learned assembly." But, now that
 the honour of the day is decided, I beg you will
 take a cooler review of Mr. *Locke's* part in that
 controversy ; and I am persuaded you will find
 reason to moderate your censure of him.

He did not, you know, Sir, intrude himself into
 this dispute, as I observed before on that of the
 Trinity ; nor did he give any other occasion to it,
 but that he had asserted *personal identity* to consist
 in self-consciousness ; a thing one would think fo-
 reign enough from the question of the resurrection
 of the same body. However the Bishop of *Wor-*
cester took a fancy, that his idea of personal iden-
 tity was inconsistent with that doctrine, because it
 made the same body *not to be necessary* for the raising
 the same person. To which Mr. *Locke* answers,
 that this was the first time he had heard, that *not*
necessary was the same with *inconsistent*. And that
 it is no good consequence, that one, who thinks the
 same particles of matter not necessary to the mak-
 ing the same person, cannot therefore believe, that
 the same person shall be raised with the very same
 particles of matter, if God should reveal, that it
 shall be so. He very frequently and earnestly ex-
 presses his belief of the last judgment, the resur-
 rection of the dead, and that the dead shall rise
 again with their bodies. This is surely all, that is
 important to the great ends of religion in the article
 of the resurrection ; and this certainly should se-
 cure a man from being taxed of infidelity or he-
 resy, with respect to that article, whatever he may
 think of the resurrection of the *same body* ; or, as
 Mr. *Locke* himself urges to the Bishop^a, " He that
 " believes this, and has said nothing inconsistent
 " herewith, I presume may, and must be acquitted

^a Page 178.

" from

" from being guilty of any thing inconsistent with
 " the article of the resurrection of the dead."

What particles of matter the resurrection-body
 shall be made up of, Mr. *Locke* thinks a question of
 curiosity, which the Scriptures having said nothing
 of, he modestly concludes, is not for him to deter-
 mine. And by the way, Sir, do not you mean
 much the same thing, when you call this the *conten-*
tious part of the subject, tho' you do not think fit
 to make the same conclusion ? For wherefore should
 this be more *contentious* than any other part of the
 subject, but because the Scriptures have not deter-
 mined the matter, and therefore men are left at liber-
 ty to dispute and exercise their wit about it ? How-
 ever, Mr. *Locke* does not *deny* even this contentious
 part, the *resurrection of the same body* ; which, me-
 thinks, might have prevailed for some abatement of
 your anger. " For tho', says he to the Bishop of *Wor-*
cester, I do by no means deny, that the same bodies
 " shall be raised at the last day, yet I see nothing
 " your Lordship has said to prove it to be an article
 " of faith^b." This indeed he does deny, not find-
 ing, as he says, any express words of Scripture for
 it ; and this is all, that he denies of it, not in the *im-*
udence of over-abounding reason (the words, with
 which you *not over-decently* treat him) for he has not
 so much as offered one argument from reason against
 the truth, or probability, or raised any difficulties
 about the thing itself ; though, to shew the incon-
 clusiveness of some of the Bishop's arguments, he
 has mentioned some odd consequences, that would
 follow from them. He makes no difficulty of be-
 lieving, that God may, if he thinks fit, give to every
 one, at the last day, a body consisting only of such par-
 ticles, as were before vitally united to his soul : the
 only question with him is, whether God has revealed,
 that he will do so. But all his modesty and professed
 submission to what the Scriptures have declared, con-

^b P. 195.

cerning

cerning the resurrection, could not, it seems, admit him to your good graces, unless he had allowed the resurrection of the same body to be an article of faith.

But I beseech you, Sir, what authority have you, or had the Bishop before you, to erect this into an article of faith, and to exclaim against a man as an infidel for not owning it to be so, as you have done, unless either of you had produced plain words of Scripture for it? The Bishop says the Christian church has always understood it so; and you tell us of the most ancient Christian writers, who have defended this doctrine, and supported themselves by it under their sufferings, and of the eastern and western creeds¹. But after all this ostentation, what do they assert more than that the dead shall rise again with *their bodies*, a term Mr. Locke would not have objected against, and which seems as sufficient to support the martyrs under their sufferings as that of the *same bodies*? It is plain, that the church has not thought fit to assume this term into any of her creeds, which are the only explanations of Scripture, that carry any authority with them. And though you may think Mr. Locke's rule too great a confinement, "That it is not only safest, but our duty, to keep close to the words of Scripture, so far as one delivers any thing for revelation;" yet you must certainly allow, that no private person ought to go farther in explaining it, (or at least that such a one has no right to impose his explanations on others farther) than the church has thought fit to do in her creeds. And therefore since the resurrection of the same body are neither the words of Scripture, nor of the church in her creeds: there can be no just support for that *scorn and contempt*, nor excuse for the hard words, with which you treat those, who deny it to be an article of faith^k.

But that we may consider with the more clearness the particulars, on which you are offended with Mr.

ⁱ P. 16.

^k P. 16.

Locke, we will begin with the first head of your discourse, where you begin with him, after you have told us your purpose to enquire, "what is usually meant by the sameness of human bodies¹. It is maintained, say you, by some, and particularly "by a late writer of the *Socinian* kind" (your subject it seems, had not warmed you enough yet, till p. 11. to call him, in absolute terms, a *Socinian*; but let us see what you say he maintains) "that, to defend the identity of the resurrection body with that which lived here, it is necessary to suppose, that the very same individual and numerical particles, which were at any time in life, but all of them at death united to the soul, must be raised again at the resurrection. This, you add, is by no means to be agreed to; and the reason you give for it, is, that considering the various ebbs and flows of matter, if the sameness of a natural body consists in the same precise number of particles, there is no one body in the universe, which can be imagined for any little time the same; and if there is no such thing as this abstracted identity in any other natural body, much less will it be found in the human body; and therefore it is not in the least necessary, nor in the least to be attended to." This is the sum of your argument, tho' you own that, "mathematically and precisely speaking, it is most true, that a body is not the same, if any one particle be lost from it." If so, then certainly what Mr. Locke says of the resurrection body, may by some means be agreed to. Mathematically and precisely speaking, it is most true by your own concession, that the body at the resurrection will not be the same with that which lived here, if it does not consist of the same numerical particles.

And in this strict mathematical sense it is, that Mr. Locke must always be understood, when he denies or affirms any thing of the *same body*. He had in

¹ P. 6.

a chapter on the subject of identity told us, in what he took the identity of several things to consist, as that of the same plant, the same man, and among others that of the same body, the identity of which he places in the same numerical particles; and having thus fixed the signification of the term *same body*, he steadily and constantly uses it in the same sense: A rule, which as he much recommends to others, to prevent confusion, so he always strictly observes it himself; and therefore he can by no means allow any body to be the same, longer than it consists of the same numerical particles. For what he says on this matter is not particular to the resurrection-body, as by your way of arguing one would be apt to think: it is very plain, that he does not allow the human body, whilst *living here*, to be for any considerable time the same, because compounded of continually fleeting particles. So that he would hardly take your argument from the perpetual variation of bodies here to be any answer to him, or any proof, that there is no necessity of the same particles to make the *same body* at the resurrection: Tho', when you say afterwards, p. 8. "That those parts of the old matter, which belonged to the human body before death, be they more or less, which it pleases God to restore to life at the resurrection, will be sufficient, whatever new particles may be added, to make it as much the same with that which died, as that which died was with that which lived before, or that which lived was for any little time the same with itself." In this I believe Mr. Locke would have perfectly agreed with you, tho' I fear he would still have stubbornly maintained, that not one of these was the same body with either of the other.

But there is an identity, you say, p. 7. by which even a river is the same. Same what, Sir? The same river indeed Mr. Locke would own, but not the same body, which is the subject in question: But you go on, And all the sameness we are obliged to allow to any
fleeting

fleeting varying body. I crave leave by the way to ask, who has obliged us to allow any sameness at all to such a body? But to proceed, "All the sameness, we are obliged to allow to any fleeting body, is only that, which preserves it distinct from all others of the same, or of a different species." And in what, I pray you, Sir, does this sameness consist? That you "do not say the schools have very properly assigned, but you think it needs not be farther enquired after." Here, methinks, you seem fairly to drop the very thing you was in quest of, viz. *What is meant by the sameness of human bodies?* But your reason for so doing is, I confess, beyond my depth: "What that sameness is, you say, needs not be farther enquired after, because the principle of individuation is undoubtedly secured by that sameness, which preserves any body distinct from all others." If you had said by that *something*, your meaning would have been every whit as clear, and your principle of individuation as undoubtedly secured; for I think it is plain you use the word *sameness* in a confused undetermined sense, for *something* you know not what, and will not trouble yourself to enquire about, since you are sure it does the business of *preserving any body distinct from all others*: tho' one would think, if it does such mighty feats, it is the more worth enquiring after.

But whatever your meaning be, I believe, Sir, you do not suppose, that Mr. Locke denied the distinction of bodies, or in the least doubted, that every human body is preserved distinct from all others; tho' he would not allow, that it is a *sameness*, by which they are so preserved. Every human body, from the first moment of its vital union with the soul, is by its existence in that union and organization of life, distinguished from all others; and by a participation of the same continued life, tho' in a succession of constantly fleeting particles of matter, is preserved so distinct. In which consists according to

Mr. Locke, the identity of the *same man*, tho' not of the *same body*.

But what if all this weighty contest should appear at last to be only about *words*, as I shrewdly suspect it is; for, as to the reality of things, you seem to me perfectly to agree with Mr. Locke? You say "That the human body is compounded of fleeting particles continually exhaling and flowing from it, so that it cannot be imagined for any little time to consist of the same numerical particles." Which is all that Mr. Locke means, when he says, "That the body, which a man has at fifty, is not the same with that which he had at five or at fifteen, *i. e.* as he explains himself, it does not consist of the same individual particles of matter." You say, "That those parts of the old matter, which belonged to the human body before death, be they more or less, which it pleases God to restore to life at the resurrection, will be sufficient, whatever new particles may be added, to make it as much the same with that which died, as that which died was with that which lived before," &c. as above. Mr. Locke, in answer to the Bishop, who from St. Paul's words, "That every one must receive according to the things done in his body, contends, that every man's body at the resurrection must consist of the same particles of matter, which were once united to his soul, and no other:" on this occasion Mr. Locke says, "Why with the remaining particles of a man's body, long since dissolved and mouldered into atoms, other new particles of matter mixed with them, may not serve to make *his* body again, as well as the mixture of new and different particles of matter with the old did in the compass of his life make *his* body, I think no reason can be given. Since whatever matter is vitally united to his soul, is *his* body, as much as is that, which was united to it, when he was born, or in any other part of his life." This is so perfectly the same sense with your

your words last quoted, that, methinks, this single paragraph should have been sufficient to have prevented all your heavy accusations, and helped you to see, that there was no material difference between you; but that, notwithstanding his opposition to your darling *sameness*, he had just the same thoughts about the resurrection-body that you have. You both assert, that it may consist of part of the old materials, with some new particles added to them. You say this will make it as much *the same*, &c. He says it will be as much *his* body, as that which he had in any part of his life: and what real difference can there be in your meaning, since the materials of your *same* body, and Mr. Locke's *his* body, are exactly the same? The only dispute then, that can be between you, is, whether a body, compounded of new and different particles, mixed with some of the old matter, may properly be called the same body with what is was before these new particles were added. Now whether such a dispute is a sufficient ground to exclaim against a man, as denying an article of faith, I appeal even to yourself: Nay whether you do not as much deny the resurrection of the *same body*, in Mr. Locke's sense of the same body, to be an article of faith, even as he does? For what are you here contending for? but that it is not necessary to believe, that the body at the resurrection, shall consist of the same numerical particles with that, which was formerly united to the soul? And what does Mr. Locke mean by denying the resurrection of the same body, to be an article of faith, but that it is not necessary to believe (because the Scriptures have not declared) that the body shall be raised with the same numerical particles? For that is always his sense of same body.

But if he would have receded from this strict way of speaking, and owned the faith of the resurrection of the same body, in *your sense* of *same body*, though this might have secured him from your censure, yet

he could not have passed for *orthodox* with the Bishop of *Worcester*, who insisted, that the body, at the resurrection, must consist of the same particles, which had been formerly united to the soul, and *no other*. Much less would his faith have stood approved to some of those *well-meaning men*, whose impertinent learning, you say, hath raised so much dust about the resurrection-body: A dust raised by endeavouring to bring together all the scattered particles, which had ever in the whole compass of a man's life been united to his soul; they fancying, good men! that they were obliged to believe the resurrection of the same body, in the downright real meaning of the words. And, in which of all these three senses, Sir, is the resurrection of the same body an article of faith? Or, is there such a charm in the words *sameness*, that, if a man will put it into his *creed*, he may take it in any sense he pleases, or in no determinate sense at all? This seems, indeed, to be the case; and if we are at liberty to understand the word in any of the forementioned senses, as you have taken the liberty to enlarge the meaning of the word, beyond the Bishop, and many other assertors of this doctrine, I do not see but that if another should go a little farther, and maintain, that it is not necessary to the sameness of the resurrection-body, that it should consist of any of the same particles, that belonged to the old body; but that, whatever particles shall then be vitally united to the soul, will make the *same body*; I do not see, I say, but that such a one must be allowed a very good believer of your article of faith; since it is plainly the *word*, and not the *thing*, on which the stress is laid. But is not this making an article of faith of a mere sound?

This *easy* way of explaining the *sameness* of human bodies does, I confess, deliver us, as you say, out of all that dust, which has been raised about the resurrection-body: But how it performs the other part, which

you ascribe to it, I am at a loss to find out. *It clears off*, as you express yourself, *on the other side*, all the open scepticism, and secret infidelity of the writer above-mentioned, his confounding identity and personality, and his unknown resurrection of persons. Mr. Locke's scepticism, or in plainer words, his not pretending to determine of what particles the body shall be made up at the resurrection, is grounded on the silence of the Scriptures, which your *easy account* does no way clear off: And therefore I am afraid it would leave him, and all who think as he did, in the same scepticism it found them. For this very reason likewise it is, that he denies the resurrection of the same body to be an article of faith, *viz.* because the Scriptures have not declared, whether we shall be raised with the same bodies, or not; the Spirit of God, as he observes to the Bishop, *having not thought fit to gratify any one's curiosity therein*. This is all the infidelity, that I know of any ground to tax him with, and this is not secret, but as open as his scepticism.

On all that is important in the great article of the resurrection, he has declared his faith so fully, and spoke with so Christian and awful a sense of it, that there can be no pretence to doubt his sincerely believing that article of faith; and therefore, what injurious insinuation you intended in those words, his secret infidelity, I must leave to your own conscience.

As for his confounding identity and personality, I find nothing like it in all his controversy with the Bishop; and since you do not refer us to any place, nor tell us in what respect he is guilty of this fault, no particular answer can be given to it: But this I will venture to say, that no man was ever less apt to confound one idea with another than he; and that if all writers had been as careful as he was to distinguish their ideas, and to use the terms, which stood for them, always in one determinate sense, we should have had less confusion, and less contest, than has been in the learned world.

As to his *unknown resurrection of persons*, which your *easy account* seems likewise intended to *clear off*; I do not remember, that he has used that expression. The *resurrection of the dead*, as being the language of the Scriptures, are the words he commonly chuses to express himself by; but if he has used that expression, or any other of the same importance, I hope, Sir, your zeal for the resurrection of the same body will not carry you so far as to deny, or to endeavour to *clear off*, the resurrection of the same persons; though what else you can mean, by mentioning it in the manner you do, I must own, I cannot understand.

We are now come to your second inquiry, *viz.* "How far the Scriptures declare to us, that the *rising* bodies of men shall be the *same* with those that died." The different sense, in which, as I have shewn, the assertors of this doctrine, as an article of faith, have understood the words, is, I think, a sufficient indication, that the Scriptures have declared nothing particular about it: and the little real difference, which, as I have likewise shewn, there is in Mr. *Locke's* meaning and yours, makes this contest appear to be of so very little importance, that I should not think it necessary to go along with you any farther, if I did not find in what follows, as hard and injurious a treatment of the person, whose defence I have undertaken, as any I have yet complained of.

° You begin with telling us, that where the doctrine is entirely matter of faith and revelation, there the words and expressions of Scripture are principally to direct us. And it were to be wished, you had kept close to that excellent rule. But you go on; Now, that the Scriptures do directly lead us into this belief, (they do not then, it seems, expressly affirm it) will appear from those expressions and passages, (you should have added, with my interpretation of

° Page 10.

them)

them) in which the doctrine of the resurrection is delivered. And upon this occasion, say you, we are told, that the Scriptures are so far from owning the resurrection of the same body, that even the resurrection of the body is not so much as mentioned in them. But how consistently with any show of truth, or modesty, is evident to any man, who reads these words of St. Paul, Rom. viii. 11. It should have been, *He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in you.*

The Bishop of Worcester having undertaken to shew, that Mr. *Locke's* notion of ideas was inconsistent with an article of faith; he answers, that what his Lordship instances in, is not, that he yet knows of, an article of the Christian faith. And afterwards adds, "In the *New Testament* (wherein I think are contained all the articles of the Christian faith) I find our Saviour and the Apostles to preach the resurrection of the dead in many places. But I do not remember any place, where the resurrection of the same body is so much as mentioned. Nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember in any place (where the general resurrection at the last day is spoken of) any such expression, as the resurrection of the body, much less of the same body." These are Mr. *Locke's* words, which I have set down, that it may be the more evident, where the want of truth and modesty lies. Such an imputation of gross and barefaced falsehood one would expect to have been followed by some plain text of Scripture, where this very expression, *the resurrection of the body*, is used, and where the general resurrection, at the last day, is undeniably spoken of; for nothing less will make his assertion inconsistent with any show of truth or modesty. But, instead of this, you produce a text, in which not only the expression he mentions is not used, but which

which is understood by many commentators and able divines, who had no view to this controversy, in a quite different signification from the resurrection at the last day; and that not by violently throwing the words into a figurative meaning, when the first and simplest will stand good (as you very unjustly accuse Mr. Locke of doing in this place) but for reasons taken from the sense, the scope, and tendency of the Apostle's discourse. A rule for interpreting Scripture, which you afterwards lay down^p, but I think have very ill observed here. The words of St. Paul Rom. viii. 11. *He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in you,* taken alone as they stand quoted by you, introduced with such a preface, and followed by a positive assertion, that "there is no reason, why the "Apostle's words should not be taken in the "sense he uses them wherever he treats of the resurrection; that it is manifest he is here speaking of Christ's and our own resurrection; and "that it is certain his discourse in this place is not "in the least foreign to such a mention of the resurrection." The words, I say, thus represented, may strike your hearers or readers with some appearance of a contradiction to what Mr. Locke had said. But how fairly it was done in you to quote them thus, and to talk in this absolute manner, without taking the least notice of the several reasons Mr. Locke gives in a very large Comment upon the place, for understanding them in another sense, I leave to your cooler consideration. You do indeed in your margin refer us to his Comment; but, besides that your audience had already taken the impression, I have much ado to persuade myself, that you did not trust to the laziness or negligence of most readers, who seldom are at the pains to consult the books referred to in margins:

otherwise I cannot think but you must have some apprehension, that the plain and judicious arguments he brings, for understanding the quickening our mortal bodies to signify a quickening to newness of life or to a life of righteousness, might be thought by the readers strong enough to shake the certainty of your bare assertions, and at least sufficient to support his modesty in denying your sense of the words, even though he should have mistaken the Apostle's meaning. But that the lazy readers may be enabled in some measure to judge between you, without the trouble of having recourse to the Comment; and the more curious be incited to a thorough examination of it, I shall set down, as briefly as I can, some of the reasons he there alleges for the sense, in which he understands the words, and why they cannot be meant of raising our dead bodies out of the grave.

He begins his Comment on this 11th verse, with a review of the scope and tendency of all the former chapters of the Epistle, too long to be here inserted. He then shews the connection, which this viiith chapter has with the preceding, where St. Paul had been discoursing of the weakness of the law to deliver from the dominion of sin; and goes on here to shew, by whom we are enabled to keep sin from reigning in our mortal bodies; that Christians are delivered from the dominion of their carnal lusts by the spirit of God, that is given to them, and dwells in them. As v 10. "If Christ be in you, the body "is dead because of sin, or as to sin, but the spirit "is life because of righteousness." After which the 11th verse, taken entire, seems to follow very coherently in Mr. Locke's sense, "But if the spirit of "him, that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in "you, he, that raised up Christ from the dead, "shall also quicken your mortal bodies." But to return to the Comment; after Mr. Locke has explained these words mortal bodies thus, "i. e. bodies, "dies,

"dies, which, as the seat and harbour of sinful
 "lusts, are indisposed and dead to the actions of
 "a spiritual life;" in the same *sense, continues he,*
 "and upon the same account, *St. Paul* calls the
 "bodies of the Gentiles their mortal bodies ch.
 "vi. 12. where his subject is, as here, freedom
 "from the reign of sin, upon which account they
 "are there stiled, *y. 13. Alive from the dead.*
 "To make it yet clearer, that it is deliverance
 "from the reign of sin in our bodies, that *St. Paul*
 "speaks of here, I desire any one to read what he
 "says, ch. vi. 1. 14. to the Gentiles on the same
 "subject, and compare it with the thirteen first
 "verses of this chapter, and then tell me, whether
 "they have not a mutual correspondence, and do not
 "give a great light to one another? If this be too
 "much pains, let him at least read the two next
 "verses, and see how they could possibly be, as
 "they are an inference from this 11th verse, if the
 "quickening of your mortal bodies in it mean
 "any thing, but a quickening to newness of life,
 "or to a life of righteousness." I have been thus
 "particular, that the reader may judge, whether this
 "way of reasoning, and comparing one place with
 "another, can be called *violently to throw the words*
into a figurative meaning. I shall next set down the
 "reasons he offers, why the sense, which you call *the*
first and simplest, will not stand good. These seem
 "so clear to him, that he begins this part with won-
 "dering to see a late *commentator and paraphrast po-*
sitive that the words we are upon, *do here signify,*
shall raise your dead bodies out of the graves. To his
 "argument (which is likewise yours) that the word
quicken, when spoken of the resurrection, is of the
 "same import with *raise;* he answers, "But what if
 "*St. Paul,* which is the question, be not here
 "speaking of the resurrection? Why then, accord-
 "ing to our author's own confession, *quicken* does
 "not necessarily import the same with *raise?* And
 "he

"he can never prove, that *St. Paul* is here speak-
 "ing of the resurrection, till he can prove, that
 "mortal here signifies the same with *dead:* and I
 "demand of him to shew mortal any where in the
 "*New Testament* attributed to any thing void of
 "life. Mortal always signifies the thing it is
 "joined to, to be living, so that *St. Paul's* words,
 "in that learned author's interpretation of them,
 "do here signify, God shall raise to life your
 "living dead bodies; which no one can think, in
 "the softest terms can be given to it, a very pro-
 "per way of speaking." A little after he says:
 "I next desire to know of this learned writer, how
 "he will bring the resurrection of the dead into
 "this place, and to shew what coherence it has
 "with *St. Paul's* discourse here; and how he can
 "join this verse with the immediately preceding
 "and following, when the words under considera-
 "tion are rendered, *shall raise your dead bodies*
out of their graves at the last day, which must
 "make *St. Paul* in the midst of a very strong and
 "coherent discourse, concerning walking not after
 "the flesh, but after the spirit, skip of a sudden
 "into the mention of the resurrection of the dead,
 "and having just mentioned it, skip back again
 "into his former argument: but I take the liberty
 "to assure him, that *St. Paul* has no such starts
 "from the matter he has in hand, to what gives
 "no light or strength to his present argument. I
 "think there is not any where to be found a more
 "pertinent close arguer, who has his eye always
 "on the mark he drives at. This men would
 "find, if they studied him as they ought, with
 "more regard to divine authority than to hypo-
 "theses of their own," &c. A little after he says,
 "One thing more the text suggests concerning
 "this matter, and that is, if by quickening your
 "mortal bodies, &c. he means here the raising
 "them into life after death, how can this be men-
 "tioned

"tioned as a peculiar favour to those who have the spirit of God? For God will also raise the bodies of the wicked, and as certainly as those of believers; but that, which is promised here, is promised to those only, who have the spirit of God: and therefore it must be something peculiar to them, *viz.* that God shall so enliven their mortal bodies by his spirit, which is the principle and pledge of immortal life, that they may be able to yield up themselves to God, as those that are alive from the dead, and their members servants to righteousness unto holiness, as he expresses himself, ch. vi. 13. 19." If any one can yet doubt, whether this be St. Paul's meaning here, he refers them for farther satisfaction to St. Paul himself in several other places, which he quotes at the end of this note.

I believe, Sir, you may by this time perceive, that you unluckily hit on a text, which Mr. Locke had so largely explained in a different sense from that, for which you alledge it; and that all, who see his reasons for it, must allow, that, notwithstanding those words of St. Paul, he might both with *truth and modesty* affirm, that, where the resurrection of the last day is spoken of in Scripture, he found no such expression as the resurrection of the body.

But let us see, whether your next text will more closely affect him; for *this*, you say, *is not the only place of Scripture, where express mention is made of raising, or quickning the mortal bodies.* The place you instance in for this *express* mention seems indeed somewhat oddly chosen for your purpose. "The same Apostle, you observe, Phil. iii. 21. tells us, that the Lord Jesus shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." If punning on so serious a subject were as allowable, as it was fashionable in the last age, I shall be tempted to say you had put the *change* upon us. Where is

the express mention in this text of quickning or raising the body? "*But you tell us*, that tho' the word here used is of a different signification, no question can be made, but that it imports the change to be made at the resurrection of the dead." None indeed; but what is that to the question in hand, or to Mr. Locke? Did he ever deny, that our bodies should be changed at the resurrection? Or does this prove (which was the thing to be proved) that there is such an expression in Scripture as the resurrection of the body? Nay, does this change relate at all to the bodies of those, who are to be raised from the dead? For of that a question may be made, since this very expression is used of those, who are not to die, and consequently cannot be raised from the dead. *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed*^a. And whether the changing our vile bodies mentioned here may not concern the same persons, I leave to be considered. However that be, it is plain this text does no way contradict what Mr. Locke had asserted: But I should have been more surprized to find it brought as a proof of the resurrection of *the same body*, if you had not told us before, that the greater change a body undergoes, it is the more proved to be still *the same*; which, you will give me leave to observe, is at least using the word in a very large sense. "These, you say, are very express texts: and yet there is another, where the words are rather more undeniably direct to this sense than either of these two, it is 1 Cor. xv. 53. *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.*" How express the two former are to this sense, has been already considered. On this last you refer us as before to Mr. Locke's comment upon this chapter, and to his Reply to the Bishop of Worcester's answer, &c. but take no notice of the reasons he gives in both places for the sense, in which he understands that whole dis-

^a 1 Cor. xv. 51.

course of St. Paul, and for applying the words you have quoted, not to the bodies, but to the persons dead; as if it had been said, mortal corruptible *man* must put on immortality and incorruption. But to prove, that this text is express for the resurrection of the *same body*, you argue, "That it is by their bodies alone that men die; that the soul must be allowed to live after the death of the body; and if the body alone die, it must be by the raising of that body alone to life again, by which the dead, or dead person, or man, can in any sense or construction of words be said to be revived, or raised, since the joining of a living soul to a new body can never be called a resurrection or reviviscence." To this I answer, that it is not by the body alone, but by a separation of the soul from the body, that a *man* dies; and by a reunion of that soul with a body, the *man* may in a very proper sense be said to be raised from the dead, whether the body, to which it is united, be new or old. Or, as Mr. Locke had before answered to this very objection proposed by the Bishop of Worcester, "As to the propriety of the name, I think it will not be much questioned, that if the same man rise, who was dead, it may very properly be called a resurrection of the dead, which is the language of the Scripture."

But you tell us, That "there is no distinction in Scripture between the dead and the bodies of the dead; and that it is a strong delusion, to affirm, as the writer often mentioned does, that there is any other distinction between the dead and the bodies of the dead, besides that of the words in Scripture." You seem however aware, that St. Paul's question 1 Cor. xv. 35. stands in your way to support this delusion, when in the name of some *inconsidering* man (as you will have it) he asks, *How are the dead raised? And with what*

body do they come? Hard shift you make here to drop the distinction of the *dead*, from the *bodies* of the dead, in a place where it is so undeniably plain, for whether the question relate to the sameness of the resurrection-body or not, turn the words how you will, to *what sort of body*, or *with a body how qualified*, still it will be with what body do *they*, i. e. the dead, come? And your paraphrase in these words, "The dead bodies of men, when raised to life again, what qualities shall they be endued with?" is too manifestly strained from those of the Apostle, to recover us from this *strong delusion*. But it is not my purpose to examine your *more exact inquiry into the sense of Scripture upon this point*; nor to take the pains I did on the first text you instanced in, of going through the place you refer to in Mr. Locke's *Comment*, or his *Reply* to the Bishop of Worcester. I thought it necessary to be so particular there, to shew how injuriously he had been treated on that occasion; but the contest itself seems to me of so little importance, that it matters not much which way it is determined. I shall therefore only set down some of Mr. Locke's words in the *Reply*, which you refer us to, relating to St. Paul's discourse of the resurrection, in 1 Cor. xv. on which you have likewise made your remarks, and shall leave it to any one, who will be at the pains to consult his *Comment*, and to compare what both of you have said, to judge between you, according to the bias of his own mind (for that is most people's way of judging) which of you has made the best observations, and most just inference, from that discourse of St. Paul. Mr. Locke's words, with which I shall conclude what I had to say on your second Inquiry, are these:

"This therefore being so; that the spirit of God keeps so expressly to this form of speaking

"Mr. Locke's Reply to the Bishop of Worcester's second Answer.

“ in the *New Testament*, of *raising, quickening, rising, resurrection of the dead*, where the resurrection at the last day is spoken of; and that the body is not mentioned, but in answer to this question, with what bodies shall those dead, who are raised, come? so that, by the dead, cannot precisely be meant the dead bodies: I do not see but a good Christian, who reads the Scripture, with an intention to believe all that is there revealed to him, concerning the resurrection, may acquit himself of his duty therein, without entering into the enquiry, whether the dead shall have the very same bodies, or no? Nor, if he shall think himself bound to determine concerning the identity of the bodies of the dead, raised at the last day, will he, by *St. Paul's* answer, find the determination of the Apostle to be much in favour of the very same body; unless the being told, that the body sown, is not that body that shall be; that the body raised is as different from that which was laid down, as the flesh of man is from the flesh of beasts, fishes, and birds; or as the sun, moon, and stars are different one from another; or as different as a corruptible, weak, natural, mortal body, is from an incorruptible, powerful, spiritual, immortal body; and lastly, as different a body as that which is flesh and blood, is from a body that is not flesh and blood: *For flesh and blood cannot*, says *St. Paul*, in this very place, *inherit the kingdom of God*. Unless, I say, all this, which is contained in *St. Paul's* words, can be supposed to be the way to deliver this as an article of faith, which is required to be believed by every one, *viz.* That the dead should be raised with the very same bodies, that they had before in this life; which article proposed, in these, or the like plain words, could have left no room

Ver. 50.

for

“ for doubt in the meanest capacities, nor for contest in the most perverse minds.”

On your third enquiry, “ What congruities there may be in the nature of God, or man, to confirm our belief, that the dying and raised bodies of men shall be the same;” *Mr. Locke* is not much concerned, and therefore I shall say but little upon it. You tell us, “ That it seems highly congruous to the justice of God, that those very bodies, which were partners with, and instruments to the souls of men, in the good or evil actions they did in this life, should in the other be partners with, and instruments to the happiness or misery due to their sins or virtues.” I shall only observe on this argument, that it seems not very well suited to your notion of the sameness of the resurrection-body, whatever force it might have from those, who maintain, that every individual particle of matter, which was at any time in life, or all that were at death, at least, united to the soul, must be reunited to it at the resurrection. For what reason can be assigned, why the justice of God should not require, that all the particles of matter, as well as any part of them, which were instruments to the souls of men in their good or evil actions, should be instruments to the happiness or misery due to them? If your argument is good, we shall be in danger of raising all that *dust* again, which your *easy account* had delivered us from. For though you may satisfy yourself with calling that, in some respects, the same body, which consists of some of the same, mixed with different particles of matter; yet, if the justice of God is concerned in the case, it will be equally concerned, that all, as well as that any part of the unconscious matter, which was joined with the soul in the whole course of its actions, good or bad, should be joined with it in

Page 17.

K 2

reward

reward or punishment. You say indeed afterwards, in softer terms, that by the rules of divine justice, the unconscious matter *may* be joined with the soul in reward or punishment. That it *may*, I believe no body will deny; and you, it seems, are not assured enough to say it *must*, notwithstanding the *congruities* you talk of. But you proceed: "And there seems to be the same sort of congruity in the soul of man, to receive eternal happiness or misery in its own proper, and the same body. For there seems to be a certain congruity of the soul with matter." Here you quote Mr. Locke in your margin, for saying the contrary, *after his manner*: an expression you use more than once, though what you intend by it, I cannot guess. As to the soul's having a congruity with matter in general, to which your margin seems to relate, Mr. Locke says nothing contrary to it in *any manner*. All that he says on the point in hand, in his *Reply* to the Bishop, who contends, that the resurrection-body must consist of the same particles, which were once united to the soul, and *no other*; after having asked, what an *embryo*, who should die soon after it had life, must do for a body of the size his Lordship seems to require? and urged, that according to this doctrine, it must remain a man not an inch long to eternity: he adds, "Though what greater congruity the soul hath with any particles of matter, which were once vitally united to it, but are now so no longer, than it hath with particles of matter, which it was never united to, would be hard to determine, if that should be demanded." If you, Sir, can determine this, give me leave to ask, much to the same purpose of what I offered on your former congruity, by what reasons you can do it, which will not equally conclude, that the soul has a congruity with *all* the particles of matter, which were ever united to it, as with *any part* of them,

v. g.

v. g. with those parts of the old matter, which you think sufficient to make up your same body? I am afraid, Sir, you must either take into your account of the *same body* what Mr. Locke requires to the sameness of the resurrection-body, which at the beginning you tell us must by no means be agreed to; or relinquish your argument from any congruities in the nature of God and man. This I suppose you will make no great difficulty of doing, notwithstanding the flourish you have made with it; since towards the conclusion of this head you seem to own, that there is nothing^w, but imagination in it, and return to the Scriptures for the support of the doctrine. How well the Scriptures you have produced serve to support it, let every unprejudiced person judge. But you have so warmed yourself with the heat of argument, that, rather than part with the identity of the rising body, you will part with the resurrection itself. "If we are still confidently opposed in it, say you^x, with this fallacy, that the resurrection of the dead is the only language of Scripture, and that this implies no more than that persons once dead shall live again; we may and must give up this article of the resurrection, so far as much as they, who deny any resurrection, do yet believe, that persons, dying in this world, may or do still live in another." What you call a fallacy, Mr. Locke hath, both in his *Comment* on 1 Cor. xv. and his *Reply* to the Bishop of Worcester, sufficiently shewn to be a certain and plain truth, viz. that the resurrection of the dead is the only language of Scripture, and that St. Paul plainly distinguishes between the dead that shall be raised, and *the bodies of the dead*: but that this implies no more than that persons *once dead shall live again*, Mr. Locke has no where said. This is an inference of your own, and not of his. And therefore how

^w Page 18.^x Ibid.

you can justify yourself in setting this down as his words, by putting in your margin with a reference to them, *so Mr. Locke*; it may be proper for you to consider. In the mean while I would beg you not to be too hasty in giving up this article of the resurrection; for though it may be true, that some, who *deny* any resurrection, do yet believe, that persons dying in this world may still live in another; it will by no means follow that those, who *own* the resurrection of the dead, must mean no more by it, than that persons dying in this world do still live in another. Being raised from the dead has manifestly a quite different signification, and those, who believe this article, must believe something more, than that an unimbodyed spirit, such as is the soul when separated from the body, continues to live elsewhere; for that can, by no construction of words, be called a resurrection of the dead. The raising must be understood of that which died, the same species, a creature consisting of soul and body: the same man must be raised at the last day; otherwise there is no resurrection of the dead. That this was Mr. *Locke's* faith in this great article, is evident from many passages in the above cited places; and I doubt not, that, from a just zeal for what the Scriptures have plainly revealed on this point, he would, instead of *giving up*, have as earnestly contended against you for the resurrection of the *dead*, as you have done against him for that of the *same body*. And which of you has the most express texts, the strongest supports for your doctrine in the Scriptures, I believe by this time may be plain enough to every unbiaised reader.

As to your fourth enquiry, "What is the true foundation of a Christian's belief of this truth, against the difficulties objected to it?" Mr. *Locke* is not at all concerned in it. He has not, as I observed before, made any objection against the possibility,

bility, or so much as denied the truth of it; tho' not being plainly revealed in Scripture, he is cautious of allowing it for an article of faith. And as your reasoning on this subject, if the supposition you go upon is true, *viz.* that God has declared he will raise the same body; as your reasoning, I say, upon that supposition is just and good, I have nothing to remark on this head, having already considered the two texts, with which you triumph at the end, as undeniable proofs of your assertion; texts, in which tho' God does indeed, as you say, *expressly tell us, that he will quicken our mortal, and change our vile bodies*, I believe enough has been said on them, to make it a question, whether *we must be satisfied*, as you add, *that he there means, that the same body, which dies, shall rise again.*

Your fifth and last enquiry, *viz.* "By what fault of men or times, the doctrine, you have been contending for, is disputed or denied?" I take Mr. *Locke* to be as little concerned in as the former. But your Sermon having been all along chiefly aimed against him, no other person being named or quoted, those, who are unacquainted with the writings and character of that truly valuable man, may imagine those reflections are applicable to him, which you throw about on the two faults you mention, as causes of this dispute, *a false value set upon human reason*; and *a false method of interpreting Scripture*. To remove the prejudices therefore of such as are strangers to him, (for to those, that know him, it is wholly needless) I shall observe, that as the subject of Mr. *Locke's* celebrated *Essay* was the *human understanding*, he has taken great pains and care to fix the bounds of it; to shew how far reason may pretend to determine, and where it has nothing to do, but to be contented in its ignorance, where revelation has not interposed; or to submit to the divine authority, where it has. And I think his *Essay* on no account more valuable, than the check it has given to that vanity and presumption,

sumption, by which many, otherwise truly great men, have in most sciences pretended to explain and determine things, not discoverable by our natural faculties; for I know no book that affords us better helps to perceive what is, and what is not so, than that admirable *Essay*.

And as Mr. *Locke* was careful to observe the bounds of human reason, I may add, that few men were ever less guilty than he of transgressing those bounds; of pretending to examine and explain by reason and philosophy things out of their sphere, whether natural or divine. In matters of revelation, he used his reason indeed to discover *what* the Holy Spirit has declared (and that certainly is the province of reason) which is all that he has done in this dispute of the resurrection of the same body. For he is none of those, that have, as you say, *artfully entangled it in wonderful difficulties*¹. If the spirit of God had revealed it, he has nothing to say against it.

Nor has he given the least cause to suspect him of any sinister design in his interpretations of Scripture. What *security* you would have a man of skill and abilities give for his integrity, I know not; but all the security the case can admit of, I think, Mr. *Locke* has given, that he was nothing of all, that against which you want a security. That he was neither *Atheist, Deist, nor Free-thinker*², in the ill acceptance of that word, his writings do sufficiently evince; nor do they give us any ground of suspicion, that his "mind was tinctured with depraved opinions." He is none of those you complain of, who have "denied, "blasphemed, or ridiculed those great articles of "faith, the blessed Trinity, the divinity of our "Saviour, the satisfaction he has paid for our sins, "the unity and communion of the church:" Articles truly great and important, and which I confess I cannot without indignation see ranked with *the resurrection of the same body*; a doctrine so doubtful in

¹ P. 22. ² P. 23. ³ P. 26.

its

its meaning, so variously understood, of which the Scriptures have determined nothing clearly, and which is of so little importance to be determined, that all, that is of consequence to the great ends of religion in the article of the resurrection, is sufficiently secured without it. And I must own I do not see what service it can be of to the Christian religion, to equal a question of curiosity with the most necessary articles of our faith; or to arraign an eminent and worthy man, one, who on all occasions seems to have his *heart filled with sacred awe and sincere veneration for the holy Scriptures*, as an heretic and an infidel, for doubting about so useless and undetermined a question. That every *man* shall be raised again at the last day in *his own proper body*, to be punished or rewarded according to what he had done in this life; and that those, who have pleased God, shall with *their own eyes, and not another's, see God*, are truths, in which Mr. *Locke* and you agree: and what particles of matter their bodies shall be made up of, would not have been worth the least dispute, if it had no way been imposed as an article of faith.

I leave you now, Sir, to consider, whether you have made good the charge of your title-page against Mr. *Locke* of cavils, false reasoning, and false interpretation of Scripture; and if I have said any thing, which may help to convince you, that you have borne too hard upon him, and which may incline you to make him some publick reparation, or at least to repent betwixt God and your own conscience of the wrong you have done him, I shall not think my pains ill bestowed; and the least intimation of any such effect would engage me to be, with the greatest esteem and respect,

S I R,

Your most humble servant: