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INTRODUCTION
TO THE RESURRECTION,
AS TAUGHT BY EARLY FRIENDS.

By CYRUS W. HARVEY.

In bringing together, and republishing at this time, the following essays and writings concerning the resurrection, from the Works of early Friends, I have had the following object in view:

1 To let Friends again see how spiritual were the views of the early Friends on this doctrine.

2 To contrast the teaching of early Friends with the teaching of the modern claimants of the name of Friends, in order to show the falsehood of the claim that early Friends ever believed in the resurrection of our natural bodies.

When we view the tendency to outwardness and literalism, now so widely prevailing in the Society of Friends, and the readiness with which the most precious doctrines are put aside for popular theories, and modes, it is not a matter of surprise that materialistic views of the resurrection should be substituted for the spiritual teaching of the early Friends; but it is indeed surprising that such a revolution in a point of doctrine reaching to the very foundation of christian experience, should accomplish its work through a period of more than forty years, and no voice be raised as a protest against it.

The same spiritual insight into the nature of the Gospel of Christ, or the new Covenant dispensation, that led the early Friends to reject all outward Rites and Ceremonies as useless or hurtful, also led them beyond the gross and carnal views of the resurrection then prevailing, into those more in harmony with the spiritual nature of the gospel. Being made conformable to the death of Christ, through...
the fellowship of his sufferings, they knew the power of his resurrection, and in the language of George Fox, they “attained to the resurrection and had their vile bodies changed and made like unto his glorious body.”

The early Friends gave no place to what we would now term Systematic Theology: but in substituting the teaching of the Holy Spirit for the systems of men, they were led to embrace the Truth as a whole, with a clearness, that gave to their principles a unity as perfect as any other system of religious teaching ever known to man. For when we understand the relation of their fundamental doctrine of the “Gift of grace,” or “The light within,” to their other doctrines, we are constrained to approve the declaration of William Penn, wherein he said that “it was the root of the godly tree of doctrine that grew and branched out from it.” So perfect is the unity of their doctrines that it seems impossible to change any of them without so marring their unity, as to practically change the character of their system. It is this feature of the doctrines of Friends which has led the votaries and advocates of the modern movement to reject and modify so many of our Ancient principles. It is the effect resulting from the effort to harmonize that which is out of the unity of the Spirit; and from the very nature of things they can never succeed.

Recognizing God as a Spirit, and our souls as Spirits, they believed that sin was a spiritual malady, for which the Gospel provided a spiritual remedy; and standing on the ground of the Apostle, that there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body,” and with Christ Jesus that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that Christ Jesus is the first Adam, and the heavenly image, “I say this doth not concern the resurrection of carnal bodies, but the two states of men under the first and second Adam; men are sown into the world naturally, and so they are the sons of the first Adam; but they are raised spiritually through him, who is the resurrection and the life, and so they are the sons of the second Adam.—Penn’s Works, Vol. ii. page 439.

The sowing of the natural body spoken of by the Apostle, the early Friends did not understand to be the burial of dead bodies; for Penn, in his Works, Vol. ii. page 439, and George Whitehead in his Work on the resurrection in “The Christian Quaker,” Part ii. page 371,—the latter endorsed and recommended by Robert Barclay,—in harmony with the American rendering of the new Version, and with Conybeare and Howson, in their note to this place, in the Life and Epistles of St. Paul, have conclusively shown that the Greek word—“psychical” means “The living principle” or unspiritual, as distinguished from the spiritual principle.”—Note, Vol. ii. p. 37, Life and Epistles of Paul.

In the language of George Whitehead “It is sown—soma psychikon; an animal body, or as having life, a living body, which therefore CANNOT BE THE BODY AS DEAD AND LAID IN THE GRAVE.”—Christian Quaker, page 512.

William Penn, and George Whitehead endorsed by Robert Barclay, clearly lay down the doctrine that the change spoken of by the Apostle does not refer to any transsubstantiation of the carnal body of flesh and blood to a spiritual body; but that the carnal body is exchanged for a more glorious body, or that the glorious body is given of God in lieu of the vile body.—They lay down a natural body, they take up a spiritual body, or in lieu of a natural, receive a spiritual body, not that the natural body shall be transsubstantiated into a spiritual body.—That which is spiritual, remains spiritual, what is

Denying that flesh and blood shall inherit the kingdom of heaven, George Whitehead affirms that there is a “Spiritual birth or seed that doth inherit the kingdom of glory and peace.” Of this spiritual body he says “the soul spiritually hath its proper organ, vessel, or body wherein accordingly it retains either mercy or wrath, love or hatred, from God, when the earthly mansion or house is destroyed and turned to dust as it was, there being a house or clothing that cleaves more closely to the soul than dust can.” — Christian Quaker, page 532.

“The mere terrestrial body is neither the subject retaining perpetual love or enmity to God, nor is it the original cause of good or evil actions, therefore not the object of eternal love or wrath. But man in his spiritual existence, or being as spiritually and suitably organized as it pleaseth God, is to receive the things done in his body, according to what he hath done whether it be good or evil—proper and natural to the image he bears, which the soul carries along with it out of the earthly house that turns to dust.

For we have not, by distinguishing between the natural and spiritual bodies denied the saints their proper existences, spiritual body, or house eternal in the heavens, when the earthly tabernacle is dissolved.” — Christian Quaker, page 531.

The Apostle contrasts the spiritual and the natural conditions of man, as the “old man,” and the “new man;” the “old man,” “the old man which is corrupt,” “the old man with his deeds,” “the body of sin,” “the body of the sins of the flesh,” was to be put off; and the “new man” “created in righteousness and true holiness,” “after the image of him who created him,” was to be put on. In portraying the experience by which this was accomplished he represents the “old man,” as being crucified and slain, and an arising into “newness of spirit.” This experience the Apostle presents as the parallel or answer to the resurrection of Christ from the dead, “for in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive; [being resurrected] unto God,” Rom. vi. 10. 11. For he has already assured us with the grand and glorious words, “That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we also, (being raised) should walk in newness of life.” This “quickened” or “risen life,” the Apostle hast twice called the “inward man,” the “inner man,” the “new creature,” and twice the “new man.” The “old man which is corrupt,” bearing the image of the first Adam, “the body of the sins of the flesh” is put off, and the “new man” bearing the holy image of the second Adam is put on.

The successive steps by which this miraculous spiritual change is experienced, on the line of these illustrations is,

First, the crucifixion of the “old man,” wherein as our sins “work death in us” by the power of the law “that is spiritual,” we see “the exceeding sinfulness of sin,” and realize that we are “carnal sold under sin;” and out of the anguish and helplessness of this bondage, we cry in the despairing language of the Apostle, “Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death.” Rom. vii. 13. 14. 23.

Second, “the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ,” Col. ii. 11, wherein present guilt and uncleanness is removed, by having the “heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water, Heb. x. 22.

Third, is the progressive change and growth, by which this “new man, the resurrection life,” in which “Christ within, the hope of glory” abides; and obtains, and maintains the dominion, and reign, in the kingdom of God, that is within us, by changing us, by his Spirit, into the same image, from glory to glory, (2 Cor. iii. 18,) or our vile body like unto his glorious body,” by the working whereby it is subdued, and brought into subjection to the dominion of Christ, Phil. iii. 21: so that in the lofty and angelic strain of the Great Apostle, “we know that we are clothed upon with our house from heaven,—that mortality is swallowed up of life;” so that we are willing rather to be absent from “the home in the body,” the “earthly house,” that it may be dissolved and return to dust as it was, while the spirit returns to God who gave it, there to be present with the Lord, 2 Cor. v. 1-9.
We have seen that George Fox declares the two images were "two bodies," William Penn that the heavenly image was "a renewed state to God," and George Whitehead, that the spiritual body is a "spiritual birth," and that William Penn, and George Whitehead endorsed by Robert Barclay, declares that the sowing of the "natural body," "cannot be the body as dead and laid in the grave." Thus we behold them standing in position along side of the Apostle, holding those spiritual views of the resurrection, the Scripture ground of which, is briefly indicated above.

The second object of this Introduction was to contrast the teaching of early Friends with the teaching of the modern claimants of the name, in order to show the falsehood of the claim, that early Friends believed in what is now termed "the body resurrection."

For forty years past, declarations have been continually made, and repeated in the Journals, and in the ministry among Friends, by many whose standing and reputation for learning was such as to cause their unsupported declarations to be received by the great body of Society as true; that the early Friends believed and taught the resurrection of our bodies. We believe that Friends will find by the testimony of George Fox, William Penn, Robert Barclay and George Whitehead contained in this work, that all such assertions as have been so long made, have been made in ignorance or perfidy, and when we consider the fragments of evidence, picked out, so as to make an appearance of support for these assertions, while the great mass of evidence accessible, was passed by silence, it is barely possible that such men did not intend to deceive and mislead the Society of Friends.

Of this class of ministers and writers, Joseph John Gurney, in point of time, abilitv, learning, position and opportunity, stands at the head, as the chief advocate and originator of the modern body resurrection theories in the Society of Friends; while David Hunt and Barnabas C. Hobbs, as his disciples, head the list among modern Friends.

The following quotations are made from the published writings of these representative men, and contrasted with the teachings of early Friends, in parallel columns, that the reader may more easily compare them.

---

JOSEPH JOHN GURNERY

1 "As it relates to the faithful followers of Christ the resurrection of the body clearly forms a part of the scheme of redemption."—Portable Evidences, Phila. edition, 1856, page 179.

2 "There is no point on which revelation more emphatically dwells than on the certain approach of a day when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth, when the dead shall be raised, our mortal frame shall be proved to have been the seed of a spiritual body; when our soul shall be united to that body."—Portable Evidences, page 105.

GEORGE WHITEHEAD

1 "Such overthrow people from the faith, that stand in Christ who is the resurrection and the life, through which faith they attained to the resurrection and had their vile bodies changed, and made like unto his glorious body."—Resurrection of just and unjust.

2 "The seed or grain does not die before it is sown; but I pray, how does this dying after being sown hold with these men's opinion of the carnal body in the grave being the seed; for that being dead before, doth not die in the grave after it is buried, neither do these men intend to be buried alive."—Christian Quaker, p. 508.

GEORGE FOX

1 "As it relates to the faithful followers of Christ the resurrection of the body clearly forms a part of the scheme of redemption."—Portable Evidences, Phila. edition, 1856, page 179.

2 "There is no point on which revelation more emphatically dwells than on the certain approach of a day when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth, when the dead shall be raised, our mortal frame shall be proved to have been the seed of a spiritual body; when our soul shall be united to that body."—Portable Evidences, page 105.
5 “The last enemy which will be destroyed, is death, and death will be destroyed when all men shall be raised or changed, and shall become incorruptible.”—

Gurney's Essays, page 426.

6 “There will be a resurrection of the just and the unjust when, even our mortal part will be clothed with immortality.”—

Gurney's Essays, page 253.

DAVID HUNT.

In Religious Essays, page 120. D. Hunt intimates

1 That to disbelieve the body resurrection is “equivocating mysticism.”

2 “Before proceeding further we wish to state emphatically that if that which dies is not raised there cannot be a resurrection of the dead.”—Religious Essays, p. 114.

3 “Seeing therefore, that the soul does not die, it is self-evident that it is sheer inconsistency to speak of the resurrection of the dead, with reference to the soul.”


4 “And we pity those who are grieved as were the Priests and Sadducees when this doctrine is preached.”—Rel. Essays, p. 124.

THE RESURRECTION.

4 “I dare challenge him to produce any place of Scripture out of which he can make it appear that the mystery of the resurrection implies a resurrection of the same numerical body.”

Christian Quaker, page 555.

Quoted by George Whitehead from More's Glorified Body, and it is also quoted by William Penn in his second reply to John Faldo, Works, page 441.

WILLIAM PENN.

1 “John Faldo affirms that George Whitehead said, that he did not believe his body should rise again after its death. But what if he did say so, and I should second him? Would it follow that we deny the resurrection? I deny all such conclusions.”

—Penn's Works, page 298.

2 “Second reply to J. Faldo, his second testimony fell from George Whitehead in these words,—if we may believe him, I do not believe this body shall rise again after it is dead. I told him of this disingenuous catching and put him in mind of the Apostle’s own expression that justifies the saying — thou fool thou sowest not that body that shall be.”—Penn’s Works, Vol. ii. page 436.

THE RESURRECTION.

3 “It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. I do not deny that this text is concerned in the resurrection of man’s carnal body at all.—William Penn’s Works, Vol. ii. page 438.

4 “We come now to the second particular, propounded, the resurrection of the dead, which I dare say the Atheist will listen to with more than ordinary attention; and greedily suck in the doctrine, provided it be stated with the most curious circumstances, that the rigidest Theologians will describe it by, that we shall have the same numerical bodies in which we live here, and that those very bodies, the mold being turned aside shall start out of the grave.

I dare challenge him to produce any place of Scripture out of which he can make it appear that the mystery of the resurrection implies the raising up of the same numerical body. But the Atheist will still hang on and object that the term resurrection implies that the same body shall rise again, for that only which falls can be said to rise again.”

To this William Penn adds this comment—“Where let the reader take notice, D. More calls Faldo Atheist, for it is his objection against me.—Penn’s Works, Vol. ii. p. 337.”

B. C. HOBBS.

1 “I accept then that we must experience two resurrections, according to the teaching of the New Testament, before we can reach the full restoration from the effects of Adam’s fall. The first is the resurrection of the soul, as above stated; the second is the resurrection of our body.”—Essay, by B.C.Hobbs, Read and endorsed by 38 ministers of the ministerial Conference of Western Yearly Meeting, held at Bloomington, Indiana, 11th mo. 1880.


2 “I am unable to reach any other satisfactory conclusion than that the next Personal coming of the divine Son of man will be at the end of the world. When he shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body when the doors of the tomb shall open outward and he shall conquer death, hell and the grave.”—Same Report, page 75.
It is plainly evident from the above, that the early Friends not only did not believe the body resurrection doctrine, but that they argued against it as earnestly as its modern advocates contend for it.

We behold in what sense Joseph John Gurney uses the words “resurrection of the body;” for in the foregoing extracts, he has distinctly affirmed that our “mortal part,” “the man who sleeps in the dust of the earth,” “the part that moulders in the grave,” our “mortal frame,” (and the second time) our “mortal part,”—that this body, so denominated, “shall be raised,” “shall be clothed with immortality,” “shall be proved to be the seed of a spiritual body,” “shall be found the seed of a spiritual body,” “shall put on immortality” “shall be quickened,” “shall be raised.” These positions and declarations of a materialistic mysticism are utterly at variance with the great mass of testimony herewith republished from early Friends’ writings.

Yet, strange as it may seem, almost the last act of J. J. Gurney’s life, was the preparation of a declaration of faith, to which his affirmation was attached, wherein, without ever having retracted any of the foregoing, he stated, touching the resurrection of the body, “that it was fully received and admitted by early Friends.” And an extract from one of his letters is published by his Biographer, in his Life, in which he says of this Declaration:—“It has appeared a Providential opening for explaining myself, and for showing the utter groundlessness of the charges of my differing from the Society in its primitive sentiments and principles.”—Gurney’s Life, Vol. II. p. 507.

Although J.J. Gurney has thus affirmed his unity with early Friends, the writings on the doctrine of the resurrection, herewith published from early Friends, show that his sentiments are very far from being in harmony with them.

The only writer of any note among the disciples of J. J. Gurney, who has attempted to furnish evidence to substantiate their claim of unity with early Friends, is David Hunt of Iowa. In a chapter on the “Resurrection of the Dead,” in a work entitled “Religious Essays,” a limited attempt to show that these views are in harmony with early Friends is made by quoting some extracts of a general character, which he could safely apply to his purpose, as they did not really touch the matter sought to be proved. In his proof, he has referred to Robert Barclay four times, to William Penn twice, and to George Whitehead once. But he either did not know of their writings, on the doctrine of the resurrection, herewith published, or else, he designedly quoted such extracts as he thought would best serve his purpose.

In order to add weight to the vague and imperfect testimony he offers from early Friends, David Hunt says, “It must be interesting to all to examine the records and understand the views of those who were prominently instrumental, under divine authority in founding and building up the religious society, of which they are members, for by this means, learn whether we, as their successors, do fairly represent them, in holding and teaching the same doctrine.”—Ess. p. 134.

The assurance with which he insinuates and charges skepticism and infidelity, upon every one who declines or fails to agree with his carnal or materialistic theories of a body resurrection could hardly be shown more vividly than by placing them in parallel columns with a few extracts from George Whitehead and William Penn.

DAVID HUNT.

6 “With a desire to advocate 5 There are two things that sound doctrine, and to vindicate tend to Atheism, or to make men the society of Friends from calum- Atheists—
nious charges, and insidious insinu- Secondly. “Other mens’ self-
ationsof skepticism and infidelity on confidence in wresting things con-
these points, the following remarks try to reason and manifest ex-
fering that these self-same terres-
ience; and, in particular, in affirming that the same body shall rise again.

7 “Before proceeding further, trial bodies of flesh, blood and bones we wish to state emphatically, that shall be made spiritual, immortal if that which dies is not raised, and incorruptible.—Post-Script to there cannot be a resurrection of the dead. The soul does not die;”

WILLIAM PENN.

it is self-evident that it is sheer 5 But the Atheist will still inconsistency to speak of a resur- hang on and object further that-
rection, with reference to the the very term resurrection, implies soul.—Hunt’s Essays, p. 114–115. that the same body shall rise again,
8 For this purpose and for clearing our predecessors in the faith from imputations of skepticism on these points, we will give a few quotations. — *Hunt’s Essays*, p. 133.

— We come now to the second particular propounded: the resurrection of the dead, which I dare say the Atheist will listen to, with more than ordinary attention. — “That we shall have the same numerical bodies in which we live here, and that these very bodies, the mold being turned aside, shall start out of the grave.” I challenge him to produce any place of Scripture out of which he can make it appear that the mystery of the resurrection implies a resurrection or raising of the same numerical body. — *Penn’s Works*, Vol. II. page 440–441.

9 “When any members or non-members charge or insinuate that the society is skeptical on these points, let it be remembered that Robert Barclay hath said, the Lord knoweth that such charges are foulslanders cast upon the church.” — *Hunt’s Essays*, p. 141.

Instead of teaching the body resurrection of David Hunt, they not only denied it but challenge their adversaries to prove it; and William Penn and George Whitehead, endorsed by Robert Barclay, affirm that the teaching of this doctrine makes Atheists, and they even go to the extent of approving More’s charge of Atheist against J. Faldo, for asserting almost in the exact words of David Hunt, that the "very term resurrection implies that the same body shall rise, for only that which falls can be said properly to rise.” — *Hunt’s Essays*, p. 136. Then presenting his testimonies made with “some research,” as he says, and evidently with great care and difficulty, lest he over-

— We might continue quotations but surely, those given, should suffice to satisfy every unprejudiced inquiring mind, that the society of Friends, relative to these doctrines, is based fully and steadfastly on the foundation of the Holy Scriptures, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, and that it does not presume to invest them with spiritual mysticism.” — *Hunt’s Essays*, page 141.

When we understand that all these assertions of what early Friends believed, are made to compel assent to the “body resurrection” doctrine as David Hunt was advocating it in the essay on “The resurrection of the Dead,” and then behold what a mass of testimony proving the contrary, that was accessible if he had made the “research” which he ought to have made,—a mass of testimony so great that it is hard to believe he did not know of its existence; changing only the sentences in brackets, we are constrained to turn his own closing paragraph back upon him, and all others who have so woefully deceived the society of Friends, as to the real position and views of the society of Friends, concerning the resurrection. “It is passing strange, and quite beyond our capacity to reconcile, how men of large experience, and admitted good judgment, could pretend to say that the society of Friends [did ever believe in the resurrection of these carnal bodies.] much less to affirm that the society has never given forth an expression of belief [in direct opposition to such a gross and carnal doctrine.] We think surely no considerate person, whether assenting or dissenting to the views presented and advocated [by early Friends, as given in this publication] after examining the evidence referred to, given forth from time to time, on behalf of the Society, by representative men, will repeat an error so palpable.” — *Hunt’s Essays*, page 142.

It was through the plausible presentation of this doctrine by Joseph John Gurney, and his reputation for great information, that the modern departures made their first inroads into the society of Friends; and no other influence has contributed more to revolutionize the Society, and fasten this doctrine of materialism on it than
David Hunt’s pretended proof from early Friends, together with his unblushing and iterated assertion of unity with early Friends; and his charges of unbelief skepticism, and unsoundness upon all who still hold to our ancient teaching on this doctrine. Because of the wide spread influence of these men, who “have taught Israel to err,” it was thought best to expose their teachings by contrast as above, that Friends might the more readily see how unfounded is their claim to represent early Friends; in the light of their spiritual teachings on the resurrection.

The views of ancient Friends have now been contrasted with the teachings of our modern claimants, but there is another view of this subject, that we believe should carry great weight, as showing the completeness of the modern apostasy from the teachings of early Friends. It is well known that early Friends met with great and vehement opposition from the enemies of their spiritual doctrines; an examination of the arguments of their bitter opposers, reveals the astonishing fact, that our modern body resurrection advocates have actually taken the position of the most bitter enemies of the Society, and are now using the same arguments to prove the body resurrection that were used against early Friends. The following arguments of each class, set over against each other fully sustains this assertion.

Ancient Opposers.

WILLIAM BURNETT.

1 William Burnett, whom George Whitehead calls one “chiefly concerned against us,” argues against George Whitehead, as follows:

“If Jesus Christ did rise again with that body that went to the grave, then there is a resurrection from the grave, of the same body.”

B. C. HOBBS.

3 “But this resurrection is the cause, pattern and argument of ours and Christ may be said not only to have raised His body from the grave, of the same flesh that goeth to the grave.”—W. R. in Christian Quaker, page 524.

DAVID HUNT.

1 “But not willing that it should be left as a question of doubt or controversy, he proceeds with direct reference to the resurrection of Christ as a prelude or assurance of that which awaits the children of men.—Hunt’s Essays, page 127.

THE RESURRECTION.

JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY.

7 Christ rose from the dead through the power of the Father and His resurrection is not only the prototype or pattern but the sure pledge of ours.—Essays, page 234.

To this argument of Burnett, Gurney, Hunt, Hobbs and their followers, George Whitehead answers, “This man’s work savors of flesh and not of Spirit—for the Apostle did not say that Christ’s flesh was raised up the third day, that they might believe that the same flesh that goes to the grave and turns to dust, shall be so raised as that man argues, for Christ’s resurrection was preached that their faith might be in God, who raised him up; that men might in this life, receive and feel the spiritual benefit thereof to their immortal souls, and so partake, in this life, of the power of His resurrection.—Christian Quaker, page 524.

Modern Friends.

WILLIAM KIFFIN.

1 William Kiffin said, “That the seed that is sown, is the same body of flesh which shall be raised.”—Christian Quaker, page 316.

THOMAS HICKS.

1 Thomas Hicks said, “That the body given to it, is the same for substance, the same that was sown, viz., the body of flesh and bones.”—Christian Quaker, page 375.

WILLIAM BURNETT.

2 “I would know what in Scripture is called a body but the which is destined to moulder in the flesh—it is sown a natural body, it grave, shall, in the end, be found is raised a spiritual body.”—Christian Quaker, page 529.

Endorsed by 38 ministers
THOMAS DANSON.

1 "If the bodies that have done good or evil must receive their reward accordingly, then the same bodies that die must rise again."—Christian Quaker, page 331.

JOHN FALDO.

1 "How unreasonable it is to call that a resurrection, which is not of the same body."— Chr. Quaker, page 536.

THOMAS VINCENT.

1 "The spirits of all just men them that slept. By this resurrection and women made perfect shall come down and enter again into all that are united to him, and will rise again, and because he lives, we the whole man, soul and body, shall live also."— Con. Essays, page 60.

The above was "endorsed and ordered published by 38 ministers, among whom were Elwood C.Siler, Nathan H. Clark, Amos Doan and Wm. G. Johnson, through the whole course of his argument on the resurrection of the dead, insults the intelligence and conscientious convictions of every sound and well informed Friend, by many charges and insinuations of infidelity, skepticism and un soundness; but he caps the climax of his imperious insolence, by saying, "And we pity those who are grieved, as were the Priests and Sadducees, when this doctrine is preached."—Hunt's Essays, page 124. But when we behold that Gurney, and Hobbs, and Hunt, have succeeded to the long vacant seats of Faldo and Danson, Hicks and Kiffin, Burnett and Vincent, in advocating a "physical," "mortal," "moulding" "body resurrection," in opposition to the spiritual doctrines of early Friends, and that David Hunt has actually succeeded them in the work and office of abuse and vilification of those who hold the ancient

11 "Let us remember that the body, brought forth by the seed, is as REAL A BODY AS THAT THEY PUT INTO THE GROUND. So, also, is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption. What is sown in corruption? The body, certainly, it is raised in incorruption. What is sown in corruption? The body, certainly, it is raised in incorruption."—Hunt's Essays, page 128.

B. C. HOBBS.

4 "The reference here is the spiritually dead."—Jno. v. 21-27. This is shown by the "now is," which cannot be applied to the physical resurrection complete." in verse 28.—Con. Essays, page 67.

5 "Christ as the first fruits of them that slept. By this resurrection, and women made perfect shall come down and enter again into all that are united to him, and will rise again, and because he lives, we the whole man, soul and body, shall live also."—Con. Essays, page 60.

The above was "endorsed and ordered published by 38 ministers, among whom were Elwood C.Siler, Nathan H. Clark, Amos Doan and Wm. G. Johnson, through the whole course of his argument on the resurrection of the dead, insults the intelligence and conscientious convictions of every sound and well informed Friend, by many charges and insinuations of infidelity, skepticism and un soundness; but he caps the climax of his imperious insolence, by saying, "And we pity those who are grieved, as were the Priests and Sadducees, when this doctrine is preached."—Hunt’s Essays, page 124. But when we behold that Gurney, and Hobbs, and Hunt, have succeeded to the long vacant seats of Faldo and Danson, Hicks and Kiffin, Burnett and Vincent, in advocating a “physical,” “mortal,” “moulding” “body resurrection,” in opposition to the spiritual doctrines of early Friends, and that David Hunt has actually succeeded them in the work and office of abuse and vilification of those who hold the ancient

From a careful examination of the writings of early Friends the following summary of their teachings has been deduced.

1 There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. 2 That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit. 3 As in the first Adam we are all born natural, so in Christ we are all born spiritual. 4 These two births are the two bodics. 5 The one is the earthly, the other the heavenly image. 6 That which is natural remains natural that which is spiritual, spiritual. 7 Only this spiritual birth inherits the kingdom of God. 8 This is the body the soul carries along with it out of the earthly house that turns to dust. 9 Nothing that turns to dust or corrupts, is ever raised. 10 There is a resurrection into Christ in this life, by which we receive the heavenly image or spiritual body. 11 There is a rising or ascending of this spiritual body into glory after death. 12 They deny the resurrection of the same natural or fleshly body that goes to the grave. 13 They call this doctrine a “gross belief,” an “absurdity,” a “carnal thought” and “gross conception.”
that such was the belief of early Friends, it is probable that they would not have embraced this doctrine. But as they have now embraced it, and strengthened their position by becoming familiar with the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, by which this doctrine is sustained, it is very likely that they will get behind these Scriptures, and justify their present position, though it is abundantly shown that original Quakerism rejected the body resurrection. Therefore the question, were the views of Scripture, upon which the early Friends grounded their rejection of the body resurrection doctrine, the correct teaching of Christ and the apostles, becomes of the utmost importance to every professed member of the society of Friends.

Not a little of that which is now presented, as a basis for the body resurrection is not Scripture, but mere human speculation. It is assumed that physical death is the consequence of sin, and that, consequently before salvation can be complete, the physical body must be raised. There is no Scripture upon which to base either the premises or conclusion of this argument, both are mere speculation; speculation opposed to facts, science, and the Scriptures. “In the day thou eatest, thou shalt die,” the pre-announced penalty for sin, did not apply to the physical body, for it did not die for hundreds of years afterward. Man was made with an organization, subject from the very laws of its action to waste and decay, as were other animals of the organic creation. Innumerable scientific facts attest the truth that the physical death of organized beings did not depend upon Adam’s sin. The Scriptures affirm that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” (1 Cor. xv. 50); and it will be answer sufficient to those who endeavor to break the force of this sweeping and invincible negative of the apostle, by saying that it “cannot inherit it, but will receive it as a gift” to remind them that if “inherit” means “to give,” in one place, it means it in all, and if it will answer to get flesh and blood into heaven, it will also put fornicators, idolaters, drunkards, thieves, revilers, (1 Cor. vi. 9–10.) into the kingdom of Heaven, for the same word and form of speech is used in all these Scriptures.

Another speculative assumption is, that, as the body of Christ was raised, therefore our bodies will be raised. There is no such Scripture declaration. It is expressly declared that the flesh of Christ saw no corruption.—Acts. ii. 31. Paul puts the difference between David and Christ thus, that David had “fallen on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption, but he whom God raised saw no corruption.”—Acts xiii. 36–37. The same apostle who drew this distinction, also affirmed that “corruption doth not inherit incorruption.”—1 Cor. xv. 50. It therefore seems utterly unscriptural to endeavor to parallel the resurrection of Christ’s body with corrupt and decayed human bodies of flesh and blood. No doctrine of the gospel is of more sweeping or universal application than that of a “new creation in Christ Jesus.” Salvation is not a repairing of old corruptions, either physically or spiritually, but a passing away of old things, and all becoming new by a new creation.—2 Cor. v. 17.

As there is no Scripture authority for teaching the resurrection of these physical bodies, because of the resurrection of the body of Christ; as it is unreasonable to assume the resurrection of our corruptible bodies, because His body, which saw no corruption, was raised; we would do well to inquire for the Scripture teaching concerning the meaning of His resurrection. The only place in Scripture where the relation of His resurrection to our salvation is shown by a parallel or comparison, is found in the sixth chapter of Romans. Here we find the Scripture key to the whole doctrine of the resurrection. The spiritual resurrection is here given as the one prefigured by the resurrection of Christ. By the use of like as, likewise, likeness, and even so, the apostle has clearly established the spiritual resurrection, as the answer or parallel of the resurrection of the body of Christ. The experience which precedes this resurrection is likened by the apostle to a burial with Christ. Out of this buried condition we come by the same power and glory that raised Christ from the dead. “Like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we also should walk in newness of life.” If we have been planted in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. The use of the word “crucified,” in this connection, shows that, not a physical death, but this spiritual death, or this baptism “into death,” by which spiritual death becomes an intense conscious experience, is the true parallel of Christ’s
death. But as the burial, and planting, and crucifixion is the parallel of Christ's death and burial, so the apostle in the clearest language, asserts that the resurrection from this death and burial is the parallel of the resurrection of Christ. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive [being resurrected] unto God."—Ver. 11-12.

The presumptive argument; that, because Christ was raised from the dead, our bodies will be raised, so far as Scripture teaching goes, is destroyed by the above parallel of the apostle.

And when we take this key to the resurrection, which the 6th chapter of Romans gives us, and follow it through the teachings of Christ and the apostles, we find that this spiritual resurrection, through which we are "quickened" from the "death in sin," (Eph. ii. 6), and "risen with Christ through the faith of the operation of God, who raised Him, [Christ,] from the dead," (Col. ii. 12, 13) which as we saw above, is so by the glory of the Father that raised Christ from the dead, that the apostle likens it to the resurrection of Christ, with the words, "even so we also should walk in newness of life"—we find this resurrection and the life received therein, occupying such a position, and so treated by the apostle, that in view of His own negatives, "That we sow not that body that shall be," that "flesh and blood CANNOT inherit the kingdom of God."—"Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption," (1 Cor. xv. 37, 50) that in order to be in harmony with the apostle, spiritual Christians will have to abandon the body resurrection doctrine.

Jesus taught that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," and "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."—John iii. 6. That is, the physical body is born of the flesh, but the spiritual body is born of the Spirit. "There is a natural body, and there is [not will be] a spiritual body," the one received by natural law, by descent from the first Adam, the other by spiritual law, by being begotten by the Spirit, or quickened by the second Adam, "who was made quickening [New Version, life giving] Spirit." This resurrection life is the life of the new birth. In it we bear the image of the second Adam. This is the body which the early Friends taught the soul carries along with it out of the body. It is the body of which the apostle speaks, in contrast with this outward body in 2 Cor. v. 1. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The New Version puts "bodily frame" instead of "tabernacle," in the first and fourth verses of this chapter. The contrast here is therefore, between this "bodily frame" and the "inward man," as it is only three verses above in the preceding chapter. Changing the figure the apostle represents this "building of God" as a "clothing" by which "mortality" is "swallowed up of life". (see 2 Cor. v. 4.)

This declaration of the apostle, that the spiritual clothing—the "house which is from Heaven" is that by which mortality is swallowed up of life, following the fifteenth of Corinthians, in point of time, and addressed to the same people, stands as an inspired interpretation of the apostles true meaning in that chapter so much used to prove the body resurrection. There is no ground in Scripture, of reason for applying such teaching, as "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory, it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power," (1 Cor. xv. 42. 45.) to those who die unregenerated.

The central doctrine, the fundamental, root doctrine, of the apostle's teaching in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, is that the "first man," (which is elsewhere described as the "old man which is corrupt," "the natural man,"') is of the earth earthy, and that the second man is the Lord from heaven; adding this universal declaration of the spiritual condition of those who are of these two natures; that "As is the earthy, such also are they that are earthy, and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly."—1 Cor. xv. 45. 48. By nature, by the first birth, every one born into the world bears the image of the first Adam. By regeneration, by renewal, by a new creation, by the spiritual resurrection, by transformation, by the new birth, all who are ever saved, bear the holy image and nature of the second Adam. The apostle says, "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."—1 Cor. xv. 49. The note to this text in the New Version changes "shall" to "let"; making it a command to all true believ-
There is no lesson recurring with more variation or vividness in the typical teaching of the Old Testament, than that the divine blessing rests not upon the first birth, but on the second. Not Cain, but Abel made his offering by faith; not Ishmael, but Isaac was born by promise; not Esau, but Jacob inherited the blessing; not in Saul, but in David was the succession established; not by the first covenant, but by the second was the “hope brought in, by which we draw nigh unto God.” The doctrinal teaching of the New Testament confirms the typical teaching of the Old. The loss is by the first Adam, the salvation by the second Adam; not the first birth, but the new birth “sees the kingdom of God;” not the “old man,” but the “new man” puts on Christ; not the first image, but the “renewed image,” is after or like Christ; not the earthly, carnal nature, but the heavenly, spiritual nature bears the image of the heavenly.

Jesus said of himself, “I am the resurrection and the life.” The apostle Paul commanded the Church at Ephesus to “put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”—Eph. iv. 23, 24. The same command is given in Col. iii. 10, except the new man is there, “after the image of him that created him.” Those who thus put off the corruption of the old man, and put on the righteousness, holiness, and image of the new man are “raised up,” “quickened together with Christ.”—Eph. ii. 5, 10. Paul commands us in Rom. xiii. 14, “to put on the Lord Jesus Christ.” They who have been cleansed by His baptism “have put on Christ.”—Gal. iii. 27. Christ is the resurrection and the life; and He says the true believer “passes from death,” “has everlasting life,” and “shall never see or taste death.”—Jno. xii. 51, 52; therefore those who are clothed with Christ, having put Him on as the apostle teaches, do indeed know, as they abide in Him in faithfulness, that “mortality is swallowed up of life.”—2 Cor. v. 4; for such never more see or taste death. When Christ is put on, we know the power of His resurrection. Robert

Barclay says “the knowledge of Him, and the power of His resurrection is a work of the Spirit of Christ in the Saints.”—Works, p. 25.

It was the experience of this glorious, spiritual change and victory over death, and not the resurrection of natural bodies, to which the great apostle refers when he says “O death where is thy sting! O grave where is thy victory?” for there is no victory for the grave, where there is no death; and no death, nor sting of death where there is no sin. On this point we will re-affirm the words of Robert Barclay “The outward death of those that are saved from eternal death is rather a sleep than a death, as Christ said concerning Lazarus, He sleepeth, and concerning the maid, she is not dead, but sleepeth. And therefore that Scripture Rom. vi. 23. [the wages of sin is death.] cannot be applied to them who die not, or perish not eternally: for though the Saints lay down the outward man, it is not as the punishment or reward of their sins which are forgiven, and from which they are delivered: and so the sting of death being taken in those who are saved, it is not that death which is the wages of sin. And seeing the apostle said to the Saints, that all things were theirs, even death, it cannot be that their death should be reckoned the wages of their sins.”—Truth cleared of calumnies. Works, p. 42.

Around the warrior, terms of victory and overcome, cluster some of the most exalted promises to be found in the whole range of revelation. They who overcome shall not be hurt of the second death; they receive a crown of life; have access to the tree of life in the Paradise of God; receive the morning star and the white stone; shall be clothed in white raiment, and inherit all things. They whom John saw standing on the sea of glass were those who had obtained the victory.

“But the victory and the overcoming are by faith, and the blood of the lamb.”—Rev. xii. 11; 1 Jno. v. 4. That this triumph is an experience, by which our salvation is realized now, is confirmed by the apostle, who says of those who thus overcome, “now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of God, and the power of His Christ.”—Rev. xii. 11. Sin and death, as cause and effect, are presented to us again and again by the apostle, as a malignant power, a fearful tyrant that reigns in fallen man, as an enemy of
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Rom. v. 14, 17, 21. Salvation as a "victory through Christ," is the overcoming and destruction of this malignant power, by grace so reigning in righteousness through Christ, that sin and death in us are overcome, and the power and dominion of Christ, established, in the kingdom of God that is within us. To such, "now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of God."—Heb. xii. 28; 2 Pet. i. 11; Cal. i. 13.

In the vivid delineation, of the contest and antagonism between sin and grace, given in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Romans; man is in bondage, and sin and death, personified as a tyrannical power, is reigning over him. We have already shown in the analysis of the sixth chapter of Romans, that man is freed from this bondage and dominion by the spiritual resurrection. There is a grandeur in the apostles presentation of the antagonism and struggle between life and death, wherein sin, as a mighty principle of death and grace as a mightier principle of life, contend for the victory, when we recognize ourselves in union with Christ, as actual participants in this warfare of the Lamb, which is totally lost, when we attempt to apply it to the revival of inert, decayed material bodies. We believe that it was to guard against such a disparaging materialism that the apostle prefaced the triumphant declarations of what constituted the victory, in the closing verses of the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians, with the negative declarations "That flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption,"—Ver. 50.

Having thus guarded against the materialistic application of what he was about to utter, he proclaims, that "when this corruptable shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality. Then shall be brought to pass the saying, that death is swallowed up in victory."—Ver. 54.

We appeal with earnestness to every unprejudiced reader to take notice of this all-important fact, that after the apostle had thus announced what would constitute the victory, his next utterance is one of triumphant thanksgiving, because he and others had received the victory, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and more than this, because of this victory, he makes a most earnest appeal to his beloved brethren to be "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; for as much as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." A similar thanksgiving crowns the struggle in Rom. vii. 23, by which he obtains the victory and is delivered from the "body of death." That the victory was a present experience and not a future act, is clearly shown from the fact that we only hope and pray for that which is in the future, or not yet obtained; and give thanks to God for His gifts and blessings already received.

Before turning our attention to the objections which the body resurrectionists raise against the foregoing views, we will remind them, that unless they are ready to affirm that the body of a wicked man dying without repentance, "is sown in corruption and raised in incorruption; sown in dishonor, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power," they cannot affirm, that the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians is a description of a general resurrection. Probably no one will be so foolish as to attempt such an application.

If therefore, this class of dead are not included, it will necessarily follow that even if there should be a resurrection of natural bodies, so far as the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians teaches, it would only apply to those who had already been "born again," or "risen with Christ," as is advocated in this Introduction.

The principle and most plausible objection rests upon the assumption, that the proper antecedent of the pronoun it, in verses 42, 43, and 44, is the dead natural body. David Hunt says, "Let us remember that the body, brought forth by the seed sown, is as real a body as that put into the ground, and the apostle says so is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption. What is sown in corruption? The body, certainly."—Hunt's Essays, 138. Between the apostle's reference to the seed sown, in verse 36, and the "so is the resurrection," which David Hunt brings together in the above is an omission of five whole verses. If he had inserted the first one instead of garbling the quotation, as he has done, he would not have made the assertion that this natural body is the same that is raised for this assertion is a positive contradiction of these words of the apostle omitted in his quotation, "Thou fool, that which thou sower,
D. Hunt says, “The seed brought forth is as real a body as that put into the ground.” To this we answer first, that if his seed, sown like the dead body he contends for, had no life-germ in it, he would get no new body. And second, we remind him and all his kind, that, that which springs up is the living germ which does not die; the living germ like the never-dying spirit, leaves the old dead body and ascends as a new plant, while the old dead grain remains in the ground, moulders away, and is never raised.

David Hunt further says, that “body means reality as opposed to representation.” If so, a material body is a real material body, and a spiritual body is a real spiritual body. Therefore when the apostle said “There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body,” he spoke of two present realities, one natural, the other spiritual, for both verbs are alike, in the present tense.

We believe this subject of the natural and spiritual body, is of sufficient importance to justify the quotation of the note to this part of the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians, in Conybeare and Howson’s Life and Epistles of Paul. We give it because of its prudent cautions, suggestive sentiments, and, (coming as it does, from another denomination,) well merited rebuke of the materialistic views of the modern resurrectionists in the society of Friends:

“The importance of the subject justifies our quoting at some length the admirable remarks of Dr. Burton (formerly Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford) on this passage, in the hope that his high reputation for learning and for unblemished orthodoxy may lead some persons to reconsider the loose and unscriptural language which they are in the habit of using.

“It is nowhere asserted in the New Testament that we shall rise again with our bodies. Unless a man will say that the stalk, the blade, and the ear of corn are actually the same thing with the single grain which is put into the ground he cannot quote St. Paul as saying that we shall rise again with the same bodies; or at least he must allow that the future body may only be like to the present one, inasmuch as both are under the same genus; i.e. we speak of human bodies, and we speak of heavenly bodies. But St. Paul’s words do not warrant us in saying that the resemblance between the present and future body will be greater than between a man and a star, or between a bird and a fish. Nothing can be plainer than the expression which he uses in the first of these two analogies, Thou sowest not that body that shall be.—(xxv. 37.) He says also with equal plainness, of the body, It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body: there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.—v. 44. These words require to be examined closely, and involve remotely a deep metaphysical question. In common language, the terms, body and spirit are accustomed to be opposite, and are used to represent two things which are totally distinct. But St. Paul here brings the two expressions together, and speaks of a spiritual body. St. Paul therefore did not oppose body to spirit; and though the looseness of modern language may allow us to do so, and yet to be correct in our ideas, it may save some confusion if we consider spirit as opposed to matter, and if we take body to be a generic term, which comprises both. A body, therefore, in the language of St. Paul, is something which has a distinct individual existence.

“St. Paul tells us that every individual, when he rises again, will have a spiritual body: but the remarks which I have made may show how different is the idea conveyed by these words from the notions which some persons entertain, that we shall rise again with the same identical body. St. Paul appears effectually to preclude this notion, when he says, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.”—(verse 50.)—Burton’s Lectures, p. 439-431.—Life and Epistles of Paul, Vol. II. p. 65.

In that part of The Christian Quaker entitled “Future Glory and Felicity of the soul,” republished in connection with this Introduction, George Whitehead and William Penn say, that “the soul spiritually hath its proper organ, vessel or body, wherein either the habit of good or evil, holiness or faithfulness cleaves to it, when the earthly mansion or house is destroyed and turned to dust as it was, there being a house or clothing that cleaves more closely to the soul than dust can.”—Christian Quaker, Edition 1674, Vol. II. p. 147.

When these two men published the above, and it was subsequently endorsed by Robert Barclay, it placed the early Friends far above
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The views of early Friends on the universal presence of God in the conscience, are being rapidly embraced by the greatest Christian Philosophers of this age, as well as ours. It placed them more than two centuries in advance of the most advanced religious thought of that age; and two-hundred and fifty years in advance of the scientific thinkers on the connection of mind and matter.

The most striking feature of the quotation from Dr. Burton is his conclusion, that body, as used by the apostle Paul, “is something which has a distinct individual existence.” Nearly all classes of those who believe in the resurrection of the body, admit that there is that in man that parts from the body at death, and continues to live as a “distinct individual existence,” but the capacity to do this, in the above view of the apostle’s meaning, necessitates the possession of a spiritual body.

God said to Satan in the beginning, “I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed.”—Gen. iv. 15. Jesus said the “good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares, [evil seed] are the children of the wicked one.”—Mat. xiii. 38. Like the grain in the analogy of the apostle, each of these seeds has a body of its own nature, but that somewhat, which has the capacity of a distinct existence, after death, which we call soul or spirit, and which takes on the good or evil nature, is that which is “sown in corruption,” “sown in weakness.” This and not the outward body, is the it of which the apostle speaks. We so believe and teach, because it is in harmony with the teaching of early Friends; and all who claim to be their successors, must so teach or lie open to be justly charged with hypocrisy and deception.

But on still higher grounds, we so believe and teach:—1 Because to teach that the it of the apostle’s was the outward material body, is to utterly nullify the negatives of the apostle, that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” “that corruption doth not inherit incorruption,” “thou sowest not that body that shall be.”

2 Because the words, “it is sown in weakness,” cannot properly be applied to a dead body, while it can with the greatest consistency be applied to that condition, in which the soul is by nature. For until purified by the atoning blood of Christ, even the child is in the “corruption” of the “natural” or fallen nature of the first Adam.

3 Because the Greek word “psychikon,” which is translated “natural,” means the “living principle, as distinguished from the spiritual principle.”—Life and Epistles of Paul, Vol. II. p.37. This was also the teaching of William Penn and George Whitehead;
and it is the explanation attached by note to this word, in the New Version of the Holy Scriptures.

4 Because to interpret the "natural body," of verse 44, to be the dead material body, or the "spiritual body" to be the resurrected, material body; renders meaningless the apostles illustration of this matter by reference to the creation of Adam. "The first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit." (ver. 45.) The last Adam gives to the soul the life the first Adam lost. The soul was deathless as to its individual being, and did not suffer dissolution: but the divine life, in which the image and nature of God inheres, was lost, leaving the "first man of the earth, earthly." The restoration of this life by the "quickening," or life giving power of the last Adam is the resurrection from the natural to the spiritual, from the corruptible to the incorruptible, from the earthly to the heavenly. The first Adam, as the Father of our race, stands as the federal head of the lost generation; and when the apostle, illustrating the nature of the natural and spiritual body, in this exalted contrast, applies the name Adam to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, he also, likewise recognizes Him, as the Head of the redeemed generation, who bear the image of the last Adam, because they are born from above. Gross and carnal were the terms applied by early Friends to their opposers, who not having spirituality enough to understand the mystery of the resurrection, contended more force to their pretended successors of our time, who occupy the ground of their opposers.

The only Scripture teaching on the resurrection which has been honored by a repetition in the "four Gospels" is the conversation of Jesus with the Sadducees. This is repeated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. This thrice repeated conversation, is from this fact, emphasized as of the utmost importance, as an interpretation of the resurrection as our Saviour taught it. The question propounded to Jesus, by the Sadducees, about the woman with the seven husbands, was but an extreme, statement, of the body resurrection doctrine. And the reply which Jesus made cannot without violence, be applied or reconciled with any phase of the body resurrection doctrine.

The Sadducees did not believe in either angels or spirits, Acts xxiii. 8. so that their question related solely to the resurrection of the natural body. Jesus first rebukes their unbelief by declaring that in the resurrection "they are as the Angels of God in heaven; that they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world are "the children of God being children of the resurrection." The interpretation which Jesus gives of the resurrection is based on the words of God to Moses "I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob." Quoting these words, Jesus answers and rebukes the Materialists of every age, who like the Sadducees vainly imagine that the resurrection relates to the natural bodies of men, by saying, "God is not the God of the dead but of the living."

Each of the following propositions are implied in this brief answer of Jesus to the Sadducees.

1. God was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but not of their dead bodies.

2. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had "attained that world and the resurrection from the dead."—Luke xx. 56.

3. They had become the children of God being the children of the resurrection.

4. They had a distinct spiritual existence and being, apart from their outward bodies, as the angels of God in heaven.

5. This distinct spiritual existence, with the foregoing glorious privileges, is what constitutes the resurrection as taught by Jesus Christ.

6. It was a great error, into which the Sadducees had fallen, because they lacked the knowledge of the true spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, when they supposed that resurrection meant, the raising of the natural body.

If we join this teaching of Christ, concerning Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with the teaching of the apostle Paul concerning the spiritual body; we believe that to the minds of many Friends, who have been perplexed about this doctrine of the resurrection, conviction will come, like rest to the weary and heavy laden; that the early Friends, that Dr. Burton, that Joseph Cook, were indeed in the truth, when they taught that the spiritual body of the resurrection, is that
house or clothing that cleaves more closely to the soul than dust can; that there is a glorious enswattement which will accompany it in the next world; in which the soul maintains a distinct individual existence.

If the advocates of the body resurrection were limited to a single text of Scripture as proof of their doctrine, they would probably select the 28th and 29th verses of the 5th chapter of John as the strongest text in the Holy Scriptures. David Hunt no doubt gave expression to the confidence of our opposers, when he assumes that all effort to understand this Scripture of the spiritual resurrection is “folly” and “subterfuge,” or “equivocating mysticism.” But those who believe the teaching of the early Friends, that God by His Spirit calls every man; that His voice, as the “word of faith, nigh in the heart,” is that to which the apostle refers, in Rom. x. 18, when he says, “I say, have they not heard? Yes verily; their sound went into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world,”—to those who thus believe, there is no difficulty in the interpretation of this Scripture. The difficulty of our opposers is one of their own construction, and has its origin in the effort to measure spiritual things by their carnal ideas of a material resurrection. We have already analyzed the answer that Jesus gave to the question that implied or supposed a material resurrection. We have seen that it is an absolute denial of any such doctrine, even to the saying that God was not the God of the dead [bodies in the Sadducee sense,] and it seems to us, in view of this reply, that the terms folly and subterfuge would better apply to those who in contradiction of Christ’s teaching endeavor to ingraft their materialistic ideas into this most spiritual discourse of Jesus; when he says nothing that makes it necessary. Jesus was teaching the Jews; and all classes admit that when Jesus said “The hour cometh and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live,” He spoke of a spiritual resurrection. This was a privilege then at that hour, enjoyed by the Jews only. It would be no marvel to the Jews to apply the next sentence of Jesus to the resurrection of the natural body, for it was the teaching of the Pharisees, and Jewish Rabbis, that Israel the chosen people, should rise from the dead. “They had been trained to believe that ALL ISRAEL would be gathered from the four quarters of the earth at the coming of the Messiah, and the dead would be raised immediately after.”—Geikie’s Life of Christ, p. 562.

The Jews were not only trained to believe that Israel would be raised from the dead, but Geikie says, “The Rabbis taught that all the heathen outside the Holy Land would be raised.”—Life of Christ, p. 561. If Jesus had changed the thought of this discourse from the spiritual resurrection, (ver. 25,) to a physical resurrection (in verse 28,) and included all, both Jews and Heathen, good and evil, it would have been only a repetition of their customary teaching, and so, no marvel to them. But if we receive this profound and spiritual discourse of Jesus, as a connected discourse on the judgment and the spiritual resurrection; instead of a change from the spiritual resurrection to a physical resurrection, we behold, (in ver. 28,) the glorious announcement that the hour should come when the whole world should enjoy the same privilege of salvation, the same privilege of hearing the voice of the Son of God, and “passing out of death into life,” that the Jews enjoyed at that hour. “Marvel not at this,”—that is, that the Jews should have life,—for the hour cometh in which ALL who are in the graves shall hear His voice and come forth;” that is the whole world, not Israel alone, the chosen people, as they thought; but ALL MANKIND in the coming hour, should “hear the voice of the Son of God, and live.”

The apostle teaches that as Christ died for all, then were all men dead. 2 Cor. v. 14. The grave is the receptacle of the dead; therefore when Jesus, using the word grave, in this wide sense, declared that the hour should come when ALL who were in their graves should hear the voice of the Son of God, He at once and fully recognized the true and universal condition of man in the fall, and announced the universal call and offer of salvation to ALL men.

No more marvelous announcement could have been made to the Jews, than that salvation should be for all men, while the body resurrection was no marvel at all, but a part of their customary teaching in which they were “trained.”

The chief objection urged against us, and in favor of a body resurrection, is that it is “folly” to suppose a condition, in which
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those in the grave, in this sense could do good. Much stress is placed on this objection; and the confidence with which it is repeated, indicates that our opposers consider it unanswerable: but unless they are prepared to affirm that an unsaved person cannot do good works, there is very little force in this objection. We ask our readers for the moment to wholly put away all idea of a material resurrection, and examine this subject in the light of Scripture teaching and example.

In the parable of the sower, the various conditions and attitudes of spirit in which men are found when the truth reaches them, is presented by our Saviour, under the figure of the wayside stony ground, thorns, and good ground hearers. Luke viii. 4 to 15. All these heard the voice of the Sower, but fruit was brought forth only by those represented by the good ground in this parable. In the interpretation given by Jesus, (ver. 15,) He says, the “good ground are they which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word keep it.” Again Jesus said, “every one that doeth evil, hateth the light; neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth, cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.” Jno. iii. 21. 22. In these teachings of our Saviour, we behold that He clearly recognizes a difference in the motives, conditions and acts which preceded their hearing of the truth, or coming of the light. The doing of truth which preceded the coming to the light, the good ground, representing the “honest and good heart which brought forth the fruit, indicate precisely the same motives, conditions and acts,indicated by the words “they that have done good,” in ver. 28. of Jno. v., which come forth to the resurrection of life.

Christ said of Himself, “I am the resurrection and the life.” Jno. vi. 25. He is also the “light that lighteth every man.” Jno. i. 9. They who come to Christ, “come forth to the resurrection of life,” for this is what Christ is. They that come to Christ, come to the light of life, for this also is Christ. But “he that doeth truth, cometh to the light,” so also he that hath done good cometh forth to the resurrection of life.

While it is no doubt true, that the experience, or preparation of heart which Jesus represents as the good ground, the honest and good heart, and the doing of truth, or doing good; which must actually precede and initiate every true conversion, is so unknown and inexplicable to the modern literalism of our day, that they denounced it as mysticism; yet it is no less true that such an experience and preparation of heart lies at the basis of all Christian experience as taught by our early Friends. It has been the teaching of the society of Friends from its origin that by a measure of the Spirit, given to every man as light, grace, seed, and Word of faith, God calls every man, and during a time of visitation, brings and offers salvation to every man. This measure of the Spirit, which wrought in the Gentiles, (Rom. ii. 14,) as the law written in the heart, prompts to the doing of good and restrains from evil, by leading the thoughts to “excuse or accuse” each other. This divine light, like the “voice of one crying in the wilderness,” has always led to the preparation for the coming of Christ in every heart where it has been honestly obeyed.

Those who thus know of this preparation through the tendering visitations of the Holy Spirit, experience that Christ is revealed in them, as their Saviour, and such “pass out of death into life,” out of death into Christ, who is the resurrection and the light of life. Those who do not know of this preparation during the day of visitation, who do not confess His name in the day of mercy, must bow in judgment, as the New Version renders the text, they “come forth to the resurrection of judgment.”

But aside from the doctrinal teaching of the New Testament, the example of Cornelius is sufficient to answer the objection of our opposers, and shows how those unsaved may do good. Cornelius was a devout man, one that feared God, gave much alms, and prayed daily; (Acts x. 1,) but he was commanded to send men to Joppa, “and call for one Simon, whose surname was Peter, who shall tell the words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved.” Here was a devout man, a Roman Centurion, giving alms, praying, indeed doing much good; but as no man can be saved by “works of righteousness,” he was unsaved until he believed, and received Christ Jesus as his Saviour. Cornelius was, no doubt, a typical man; he
represents that class of men in whom the good ground is prepared by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Such are prepared to receive the truth in an honest and good heart, and bring forth fruit to the honor and glory of God.

David Hunt ridicules the idea of men doing good in what he calls “the graves of sin,” but if this Roman Centurion who was unsaved, was not in the “grave of sin,” in the same sense as the dead of whom Jesus spake, in verse 25, we know of no Scripture that defines the difference.

We have limited the meaning of the words, “They that have done good, to such motives and acts as were represented by the sincere ‘devoteness’ of Cornelius, the “good ground,” or “honest and good heart,” in the parable of the sower; or the “doing of truth,” in the teaching of Christ; conditions and acts, which preceded the “coming to the light,” the receiving the word, and being saved, and consequently preceding the coming to Christ, the resurrection and the life, in the true gospel meaning of this precious experience. But to make an unlimited application of the words “they that have done good shall come forth to the resurrection of life,” to a final experience, is to teach the doctrine that all who have done good works are saved, and shall therefore enjoy the final reward of the righteous; which is contrary to the whole tenor of the gospel, which teaches that “not by works of righteousness, but through His mercy He saves us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

But against the views of our opposers, we enter the objection, that John v. 28, cannot be understood of a resurrection of the outward body, because it makes two resurrections instead of one, for each class referred to: for they “come forth” to a resurrection; one to “the resurrection of life,” the other to “the resurrection of damnation.” To come forth from an outward grave is to be resurrected; but according to our body resurrectionists’ idea, they are resurrected to a resurrection: What this resurrection is which they “come forth to,” from the outward grave, from the outward standpoint of our body resurrectionists, we are at a loss to determine. When the body resurrectionists endeavor to apply this text to an outward, literal resurrection as they do; as we all know that to come forth is a resurrection, if we confine them to the actual position in which they place themselves, they say to us, that they “that have done good,” have a resurrection to a life resurrection; as they protest against immortality being synonymous with resurrection; we put the question in all earnestness, what resurrection is it you come to, after your resurrection from the outward grave?

The views of early Friends on Christian experience and the resurrection escape the difficulty brought out in the above objection; for as seen in the foregoing teaching, we come forth out of the condition in which we are by nature, and come to Christ who is the “resurrection of life,” and so become the children of the resurrection.

David Hunt’s Essays characterize it as “folly” to speak of coming forth from the grave of spiritual death, to the resurrection of damnation; but as it is true that all who do not hear and obey the voice of God in the day of mercy and visitation will most certainly come to judgment; the “folly” seems more to exist in the unspiritual ideas of the author than in any great difficulty in this interpretation.

We object to the application of the words of John v. 28, to a general resurrection, in which all, both good and evil, shall come forth, at the same time, at the hearing of the voice of the Son of God; because if the resurrection is explained as an outward event, it is a positive contradiction of Revelations xx. 4-5, which places a thousand years between the resurrection of the good and the evil. This contradiction involves the body resurrection doctrine in a difficulty, out of which its advocates have not agreed as to how it shall be delivered.

In this Introduction, it has been shown that early Friends did not teach the resurrection of the natural body. It has been shown, by contrasting, in parallel columns, that there is a difference so sharp as to amount to actual contradiction between early Friends and the modern teachers of the body resurrection in the society of Friends. It has also been shown by a similar contrast, that the arguments of the modern resurrectionists among Friends, are exactly the arguments of the enemies who opposed early Friends.

It has been shown from Romans, sixth chapter, that the resurrection is spiritual.
From 2 Cor. v. it has been shown that if the "bodily frame" be destroyed, we have a building of God; and the resurrection is such that "mortality" is in this life, in the true Scripture sense, "swallowed up of life."

From the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians it has been shown negatively that we sow not that body that shall be; that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; and that corruption doth not inherit incorruption: and it has also been shown affirmatively that by the first Adam—through the first birth, we have the natural image and body, so also, by Christ, the second Adam—through the second birth, we have the heavenly image and spiritual body.

From the conversation of Jesus with the Sadducees, it was shown that, while God was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, he was not the God of their dead bodies; that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had attained the resurrection, and become as the Angels of God in heaven; that they were the children of the resurrection, having a distinct spiritual existence, apart from the natural bodies.

From John v. 28. 29, it has been shown that instead of teaching a body resurrection, Jesus was proclaiming the great doctrine of salvation, for all the world, as the marvellous intent of His mission; that as the Jews already believed in a resurrection of the bodies of men, it would have been no "marvel" to them if Jesus had taught it. It was also shown that to apply this Scripture to a general resurrection, would absolutely contradict Rev. xx. 4. 6; and that from the phraseology of this Scripture, to apply it to an outward, literal resurrection makes it teach two resurrections.

If the doctrine of the resurrection of the natural body is not taught in the passages above referred to, it is not found in the teachings of Christ and the apostles. There are other Scriptures used to strengthen the conclusions which the body resurrectionists draw from the foregoing; such as the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and the fourth of first Thessalonians; but whatever arguments in support of the body resurrection, may seem to be derived from these passages, they are so combined with another doctrine, which early Friends rejected, that they stand or fall with it. We refer to the doctrine of the Second personal Advent of Christ upon earth. There are evidently, three distinct things referred to by our Saviour in those passages, which speak of his coming. First is the coming at the time of death when one shall be taken and the other left. Second, the predictions which relate to the destruction of Jerusalem. Third, the coming to those who accept Him in order to save them, and dwell in them, which the apostle speaks of as "coming the second time, without sin unto salvation." Heb. ix. 28. Arranging the Scripture under these three heads, we find no Scripture left to support the doctrine of the Second Advent. The Second Advent teachers depend entirely upon a literal interpretation of the Scriptures, to sustain their doctrine: but Jesus says, (in Mat. xxiv. 34.) "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." These words of Jesus are of themselves a sufficient reply to all arguments the Second Advents can draw from the twenty-fourth of Matthew; for by their law of interpretation, they lie as in an impossible barrier, in the way of the literalism, that would use this chapter to prove the second personal coming of Christ.

That the glowing imagery of the twenty-fourth of Matthew, applies to the destruction of Jerusalem, is proved by the words of Luke, xxi. 20. 32, where the greater part of the same discourse of Jesus is repeated, ending as in Matthew with the words, "this generation shall not pass away until all be fulfilled." Though these were things to be witnessed in that generation, yet "they were to see the Son of man coming in a cloud." Luke xxi. 27. And God would "send His Angels with a great sound of a trumpet." Mat. xxiv. 31. It will be noticed that these two expressions are the ones relied on in Thessalonians, to prove the doctrine of the Second Advent of our Saviour, as preliminary to the general resurrection; but in view of their mysterious use by our Saviour, in connection, with His predictions of the overthrow of Jerusalem, we believe it might not be amiss to close this subject with the words of the apostle Peter, in his second general epistle when writing of the "day of the Lord," and the "new heavens, and a new earth," he speaks of what "our beloved brother Paul" had written of "things hard to be understood," which they that were "unlearned and unstable," wrested to their own destruction. If there is no deeper signification to these Scrip-
tures, than the literal construction put upon them by the body resurrectionists, there is nothing about them “hard to be understood.” Paul says, (evidently speaking of his own experience) I knew a man in Christ “caught up to the third heaven,” “caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words.” 2 Cor. xii. 2. 3. We have seen that the “sound of the trumpet” and the “Son of Man in the clouds,” were used with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; and Paul applies the words “caught up,” to an experience “in Christ;” and it is our sincere conviction, that there are experiences to which these words of Paul, in Thessalonians apply, which are so “hard to be understood,” that unless we learn their true significance, by passing through them, we will never understand them; and all attempts to apply them literally, is but the work of the unlearned in the spiritual school of Christ, and only tends to destruction instead of edification.

We trust that all who have had the patience to read this Introduction, may as patiently read the following writings of George Fox, William Penn, George Whitehead, and other early Friends, on the subject of the resurrection, and we are assured that it will be found that the positions taken in this Introduction, are the teachings of the founders of the society of Friends.
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CHAPTER 1.

CHRIST THE RESURRECTION.

Christ said to Martha, thy brother Lazarus shall rise again. Martha said unto Jesus, I know he shall rise in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto Martha, I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, Mark! though he were dead, yet shall he live that believeth in Christ, he shall live forever, he hath eternal life, as in John xi. 23, 24, 25, 26. And again, Jesus saith, whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die. Christ said, believest thou this, Martha? She said unto him, yea, Lord. Mark! who liveth and believeth in Christ, shall never die, but have eternal life, and are grafted into Christ, them that live and believe; and though he were dead, he that believeth in Christ, yet shall he live.

TRUE BELIEVERS ARE PASSED FROM THE DEATH IN ADAM TO THE LIFE IN CHRIST.

And Christ said, as I live by the Father; so he that eateth me shall live by me, John vi. 57. And Jesus said, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death unto life. Mark! such believers as these are passed from the death in Adam, to the life in Christ and have everlasting life in them. And again, Jesus saith, verily, verily, I say unto you,
namely the Jews—the hour is coming, and now is, Mark! and now
is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they
that hear shall live. Mark! they that hear shall live marvel not at
this, for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the grave shall
hear the voice—Mark! the voice—of the Son of God, and shall come
forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and
they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.

So here you may see, the resurrection of them that have done good,
to life, them that have done evil, to damnation. John, v. 25. 29, and
Mat. xxv. 46. The wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, but
the righteous into life eternal. Christ saith, the Father hath given
him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man:
the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, and all pow-
er in heaven and earth is given unto him, because he hath appointed
a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that
man whom he hath ordained—to wit, Christ Jesus—Acts xvii. 31,
Rev. xxii. 2, John v, Mat. xxviii. And here you may see, Christ saith,
He is the Resurrection and the life; for as the Father raiseth the
dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he
will, John v. 21. And Christ who is the image of the invisible God,
by him are all things created that are in heaven, and that are in the
earth, &c., all things were created by him, and for him, Col. i. 16.
17. He is before all things, and by him all things consist, and
having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to recon-
cile all things unto himself, whether they be things in heaven, or
things in the earth; for by Christ, God made the world, who is the
brightness of his glory, and the express image of his substance, and
upholdeth all things by the Word of his power, Heb. i. 2. 3, John i.
All things were made by Christ, the word, and without him was not
any thing made that was made. Christ Jesus, the first born of every
creature, the first-begotten from the dead by him were all things cre-
at ed that are in heaven and that are in earth. And the Apostle
saith, that the Gospel of Christ was preached to every creature under
heaven, Col. i. 15. 16. 18. 23. And that in the fullness of time,
Christ might gather in one all things to himself, both which are in
heaven, and which are on the earth, even in him, Ephes. i. 10. And
therefore the Apostle saith, he was to let all men see what is the fel-
lowship of the Mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath
been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, Ephes. iii. 9.

TRUE BELIEVERS HAVE EVERLASTING LIFE, AND SHALL NEVER
DIE, OR TASTE DEATH.

Here you may see, all things were made and created by Jesus
Christ; and man being fallen from God into sin and death, from
this life, Christ said, I am the resurrection and the life; and saith,
he that believeth on him shall not perish but have everlasting life:
and moreover—saith he,—he that believeth on me, though he were
dead, ye shall live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me
shall never die. And Christ saith to the Jews, if any man keep my
sayings, he shall never taste of death. And again, Christ saith unto
the Jews, verily, verily, I say unto you, if any man keep my sayings,
he shall never taste of death, John vii. 51. 52. The Father loveth
the Son, and hath given all things into his hand; and he that believ-
eth in the Son, hath everlasting life—Mark! hath it, and is not con-
demned—but he that believeth not the Son, is condemned, and shall
not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him, John iii. 18. 36.

AS THE ANGELS IN HEAVEN.

The Sadducees asked Christ, and said, there were seven brethren
took one woman to wife, one after another; and they asked Christ,
whose wife shall she be in the resurrection? And Christ said, unto
the Sadducees, that they did err, and knew not the Scriptures, neither
the power of God; for when they shall rise from the dead, they
neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels which
are in heaven; neither can they die any more, Luke xx. 36. And
as touching the resurrection of the dead, that they rise, have ye not
read it in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him,
saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the
God of Jacob, Luke xx. 38. He is not the God of the dead, but the
God of the living, for all live to him. And Christ said unto the Sad-
ducees, ye do greatly err, &c. Mark xii. 13. 20. 27, Mat. xxii. 23. 28.
30. 31. for he that believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting
life, John iii. 15. And you may see how the Apostles were witnesses
of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and that his soul was not
left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption, Acts ii. 30. 31, and
iv. 33. But the preaching the resurrection of Christ to the Philosophers,
Epicureans and Stoics, they called it babbling, and so mocked
ed at it, as in Acts xvi. 18. 22, and there see how they opposed the
Apostle, when he preached Christ the resurrection from the dead,
Acts xxiii. 6. And the Apostle said, that there shall be a resurrection
of the dead, both of the just and the unjust; and for preaching
the resurrection of the dead—namely Christ Jesus—he was called in
question, Acts xxiv. 15. 21. For all men being dead in Adam,
Christ by the Grace of God hath tasted death for every man, and is
risen for their justification; he is the quickening Spirit, and is the
resurrection and the life, and the first born from the dead, and is
become the first fruits of them that sleep.

THE NEW BIRTH THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST’S RESURRECTION.

Now concerning the Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, which was
made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and declared to be
the Son of God, with his power, according to the Spirit of holiness,
by the resurrection from the dead, Rom. i. 3. 4. And like as Christ
was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, &c. for if
we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall
be also planted together in the likeness of his resurrection, Rom.
vi. 5. And the Apostle said, that I may know Christ and the power of his
resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable
to his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection
of the dead—namely, the Lord Jesus Christ—who shall change
our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body,
according to the working, whereby he is able to subdue all things
unto himself, Phil. iii. 10. 11. to 21. Mark! change your vile body,
and fashion it like unto his glorious body, in the resurrection. So
the vile body must be changed, if it be made like unto his glorious
body in the resurrection, 2 Tim. ii. 17. 18. But Hymenæus and
Philetus concerning the truth err'd, who said that the resurrection
was past already. Such overthrew people from the faith, that
stand in Christ, who is the resurrection and the life, through which

faith they attained to the resurrection, and had their vile bodies
changed, and made like unto his glorious body. And the Apostle
said, blessed be God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who ac-
gording to his abundant mercies hath begotten us again to a lively
hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, 1 Pet. iii.
21. And through their faith in Christ Jesus, who is the resurrection
and the life, did many suffer, as in Heb. xi. 35. And John said,
blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on
such the second death shall have no power, but they shall be priests
of God and Christ, &c. Rev. xx. 6. Now these are the true believers
in Christ Jesus, that shall not perish but are passed from death
to life; and shall have life everlasting; and they that have done
evil, their resurrection is unto damnation; but the righteous, and
they that have done good, their resurrection is unto everlasting life,
John v. 29. Mat. xxv. 46. So, they that come to the resurrection
of condemnation, who have lived in the death of Adam, and would
not believe in Christ the life, they are cast into the lake of fire, with
hell and death, which is the second death; but they are blessed that
have part in the first resurrection—namely Christ—who is the resur-
rection and the life, on such the second death has no power, Rev. xx.
6. 14. 15. For Christ, who is the resurrection, and the life, destroy-
eth the devil and his works, who through death destroyeth death,
yea, the devil, the power of death, and bruiseth the serpent’s head,
and casts the devil, the old serpent, and the dragon, and the beast,
and the false prophet into the lake of fire, Rev. xix. 20. and xx. 10.

Now Christ, is the beginning and the ending, the first and the
last; all that believe in him, and are grafted into him, and put him
on, and walk in him, who is the resurrection and the life, over such
neither the first death nor the second death hath power but they live
and walk in Christ who hath power over death, and destroyeth death
and the devil, the power of it, who is the resurrection and the life,
who brings people out of the first death in Adam, and gives them
power over the second death and hell, which is cast into the lake of
fire, with all them that are not written in the Lamb’s book of life,
from the foundation of the world. So in Christ the resurrection and
the life all are blessed and happy eternally. And the Apostle Paul
explains very fully the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. and saith, now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some amongst you—namely, the Corinthians—that there is no resurrection from the dead? And if Christ be not risen, then our preaching is vain, and we are false witnesses, because we have testified of God, that he raised up Christ from the dead: and if Christ be not raised up from the dead, then is your faith vain, and you are yet in your sins; for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. So here you may see, here were some amongst the Corinthians, that said, there was no resurrection of the dead, 1st Cor. xv. 12. And therefore the Apostle thus reasoned with them, if Christ was not risen, then there was no resurrection of the dead, then their preaching was vain, and they were get in their sins; and if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable; but now Christ is risen from the dead, Col. i. 18. and Rev. i. 5. The first begotten from the dead, and the Prince of the Kings of the earth. And Christ saith, I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I live, forever more, Rev. i. 18. For by man—namely Adam—came death; and by a man — namely Christ — came also the resurrection from the dead; for as in Adam all died, even so in Christ, all be made alive.

NOT THE BODY THAT SHALL BE.

But some will say, how are the dead raised? and with what bodies do they come? But the Apostle answereth, and saith to such, thou fool, that which thou sowest, is not quickened, except it die, and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be but bare grain; it may chance of wheat, or some other grain, but God giveth it a body as it pleaseth him, and to every seed its own body. In the marginal note it is said, that Paul sendeth such fools as seem to be witty and wise, to be instructed of the poor rude husbandman, 1st Cor. xv. 35.

THE FIRST BIRTH NATURAL, THE SECOND BIRTH SPIRITUAL.

As in the fist Adam we are all born natural, so in Christ, the second Adam, we are all born spiritual. Here you may see how the Apostle teacheth these fools by the seeds-man that soweth his wheat, or some other grain, and the natural seed that is sown in the creation, preacheth the resurrection of the dead, and may teach such fools the resurrection of the dead, that say, with what body do they come, when the dead are raised up? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die, and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but God giveth it a body as it pleaseth him, &c. for the husbandman that soweth his wheat or barley, doth he sow that body that shall be?

FIRST THE NATURAL BODY, AFTERWARD THE SPIRITUAL BODY.

And Christ saith, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit, John xii. 24. So, what the husbandman soweth, whether wheat or other seed, he soweth, Mark! he soweth not that body that shall be, but God giveth it a body that pleaseth him, and to every seed its own body; and there are heavenly bodies, and there are earthly bodies; the glory of the heavenly is one, and the glory of the earthly is another. So here is a distinction of glories to each body, so also is the resurrection from the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; and it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual, Mark! raised a spiritual body; there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body; and so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, the second man Adam was made a quickening spirit; how be it, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual; the first man is of the earth earthly, the second man is the Lord from heaven: and as is the earthly, such are they also that are earthly; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly; THE EARTHLY AND THE HEAVENLY IMAGE. And as we have born the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; Mark! as we have born the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the earthly, in the resurrection, as the Apostle saith, now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption:—Mark! corruption doth not inherit incorruption—wherefore, I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, Mark! all.
THE RESURRECTION.

CHANGED AT THE SOUNDING OF THE HEAVENLY TRUMPET.

So, here is a changing from corruption to incorruption, and from mortality to immortality, and from an earthly image to a heavenly, and from a vile body unto Christ's glorious body in the resurrection, whose flesh saw no corruption, and to be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. And further, the Apostle saith, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; Mark! the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and Mark! we shall be changed and is not this a heavenly trumpet? for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortality must put on immortality, 1 Cor. xv. 1 Thes. iv. 16. So when the corruptible hath put on incorruption, and this mortality shall have put on immortality, Mark! put on immortality and incorruption, then shall be brought to pass this saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory; O Death! where is thy sting! O Grave! where is thy victory! the sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, which giveth us, Mark, us! the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. xv. Isa. xxv. 8. Hos. xiii. 14.

THE NATURAL AND THE SPIRITUAL BODIES.

By George Fox.

CHAPTER II.

And ye make a great deal ado concerning with what bodies people shall be raised? and about the body of Christ; therefore be satisfied with the Apostle's doctrine: for the Apostle saith, some men will say how are the dead raised, and with what bodies shall they come forth? and therefore he saith, awake and live righteously, and sin not, for some have not the knowledge of God, I speak this to your shame. Therefore see, is not this your condition, that make such a work about the body of Christ, and with what bodies people shall be raised up; and the Apostle saith to such, "thou fool, that which thou sest is not quickened except it die, and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be." So he tells here plainly it is not the same, and calls thee a fool that questionest if thou sowest wheat or other corn, let the husbandman answer thee in this.

Further the Apostle tells thee, "God giveth it a body as pleaseth him, and to every seed its own body." And therefore people are to wait upon and trust in God to give it a body as pleaseth him; and the Apostle tells thee, there are also Heavenly bodies, and there are Earthly bodies, but the glory of the Heavenly is one, and the glory of the Earthly is another, so also, is the resurrection of the body. (Mark! people, can ye read here?) He further tells you, it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. And of the Heavenly bodies and Earthly bodies, this Heavenly is not Earthly, Is it? It is
sown a Natural body, and raised a Spiritual body, and there is a Natural body, and there is a Spiritual body. So, is natural spiritual? As it is also written, the first man was made a living soul, and the last a Quickening Spirit, to wit, Christ. Mark! made a quickening Spirit. How-be-it that was not first made, which is Spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is Spiritual. Can not ye read this? Are not ye awake? Doth not the Apostle bid you awake, that ye may read and see? The first man is of the earth, earthly; (Mark! the first man,) the second man is the Lord from Heaven. Mark! the second man, to wit, Christ.

And is the first man human, and the second man the Lord from Heaven human also? Will ye give them both the name human? Where had ye such words to call the second man withal? Not from the Scriptures, for they give him no such by-names.

And the apostle further tells you, as is the earthly, so such are the earthly,—like itself, and will call other things like itself,—and as is the heavenly, such are also they that are heavenly, like itself again: and as we have borne the image of the earthly, Mark! so shall we bear the image of the heavenly. And can the Apostle express himself in more plain words.

So here is an image of the earthly, and an image of the heavenly; these are two bodies, and two images, earthly and heavenly: so well might the Apostle say, Thou fool; for an Heavenly image is not an earthly, a Spiritual body is not a natural, nor an Heavenly body an earthly. So thou fool, that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be. Mark! that shall be.—Doctrinal Works, page 466.

Peter saith to the Church I will not be negligent to put you always in mind, namely, of the things that he had declared unto them, though they knew them, and were established in the truth; as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me, 1 Pet. i. 12. 13. 14. And the apostle Paul saith, for we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in

the heavens; for in this, namely, earthly house we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house that is from heaven.

So God’s people have an house and a clothing from Heaven, when they put off the earthly tabernacle; for we that are in this earthly tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be un-clothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up in life, 2 Cor. v. 1. 3. 4.

Here you may see what the spiritual groaning was for, for an house and clothing from heaven, and that mortality might be swallowed up of life, and so to be ever with the Lord. And here you may see how Christ is the Resurrection and the Life; and in the resurrection the vile body is changed like unto his glorious body; and in the resurrection they are Spiritual, and Mortal puts on immortality, and corruptible puts on incorruption; and so as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; as the Apostle saith, there are earthly bodies, and there are heavenly bodies—

the glory of the earthly is one, and the glory of the heavenly is another; there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body, the natural body may be seen with the natural eye, but the Spiritual body must be seen with the Spiritual eye.—Doctrinal Works, page 947.
CHAPTER III.

John Faldo affirms, that George Whitehead should say, being pressed in the matter, that he did not believe his body should rise again after its death which he can prove by many witnesses.

William Penn’s reply.—I know not if George Whitehead did so express himself; but I see, every expression must be considered up to defend a decrepit cause: truth stands in no need of such watchings, that would make a man an offender for a word. But what if he did say so, and I should second him, would it follow that we deny a resurrection? I am sure I will deny all such consequences. Doth not the Apostle say expressly, 1 Cor. xv. 36. 37. Thou fool—thou sowest not that body that shall be. Is Scripture grown into such mean requisition with J. Faldo; or doth his rage against the Quakers so transport him, that he knows not Scripture, when he meets it from a Quaker?

But says our adversary, upon a like place, and to this purpose, (p. 139.) viz. “We shall all be changed: I would ask, if they would be content to be refused their debts, if contracted before Quakers, and demanded when Quakers; I suppose they would believe that the change in a person is not the change of a person, and that they are the same still to whom the money was and is due.” But how clever soever any may think this Simile, we will prove it lame and defective; for the change was not of the body any further, than as the soul

governed it after a new way of living. I cannot think that J. Faldo will dare to say, that a man’s body is rendered ever the less corruptible by any the best change the soul can make in this world. The question is about what that change must be which makes a corruptible an incorruptible body? I mean not by corrupt, sinful, but that gross elementary matter which is subject to those impressions, influences, mutations, and passions which we see all sublunary bodies are subject to. Either the resurrection of the body must be without that matter, or it must not? If it must, then is it not that same numerical body; and so, their proper and strict taking of the word resurrection, they must let go. If it must not be without that same gross matter it died with, then I affirm, it cannot be incorruptible, because it will carry with it that which will render it corruptible ad infinitum.

And what can be more unreasonable, than that bodies compounded of this elementary world, which, says our Adversary shall and must by nature have an end, should out-live their own matter, and which is more, never end; I say, we cannot see how that which is of dust should be eternal, whilst that from whence it came, is by nature but temporal. And that which is yet most of all irreconcilable with Scripture and right reason, is, that the loss and change of nature from corruptible to incorruptible, natural to spiritual, should not make in another body. In vain do such dispute against the popish transubstantiation as an absurd and impossible thing, who themselves are guilty in a case of the like nature. The Romanists affirm a change in the sacrament, though our senses tell us it is the same thing that ever it was.

Our Adversaries in the point of the resurrection boldly affirm, that it is the same body, and yet transubstantiated from natural to spiritual, or changed from what it was, to something it never was. For my part, I think the last and not less impertinent, and the former more expressly spiritual.—William Penn’s Work, Vol. ii. p. 298.

(Second reply of John Faldo.)

Argument of John Faldo.—If God be Omnipotent, which he is, or he is not God, he is able as the Apostle speaks to subdue all things,
to himself, with which he answers all cavils from impossibility in nature.

William Penn's reply.—The question was not about God's Power; nor was it so much as any part of the question; but whether matter is not by nature corruptible, and how that which is corruptible by nature may be by nature incorruptible. This Scripture he urges to prove his carnal resurrection, will as well prove the popish transubstantiation, or any the most unreasonable conceit in the world; for it is but saying, all things are possible with God, and God is able to subdue all things unto himself; and the business is done at J. Faldo's rate of arguing. But the question is not about what God can do, but what he hath done, and has declared he will do.

I know there are impossibilities in nature, which God's Omnipotency makes possible; but if J. Faldo doth not know that there is a difference between impossibility in nature, and contrariety to nature, I now tell him, there is one, and that so wide, as though Almighty God frequently supplies nature's want of power, yet he rarely, if ever, acts contrary to and inconsistent with the natures of his own creatures; what is Spiritual, remains Spiritual; what is material, material; and what is corruptible, corruptible. But let us see how much better he acquits himself of another passage, which he ventures to cite, and in my opinion doth no more.

John Faldo.—W. P. proceeds further in this vain reasoning, and wicked too, (p. 202.) “I say we cannot see how that which is of the dust, should be eternal, whilst that from whence it came, is by nature but temporal, and that which is yet most of all irreconcilable with Scripture and right reason, is that the loss and change of nature from corruptible to incorruptible, natural to Spiritual, should not make it another body.” That is according to Scripture I have given large proofs in my book, to no one of which he replieth, as also how unreasonable it is to call that a resurrection, which is not of the same natural body.

W. P.—We may guess how well he proved it in his first book by the strength he hath employed to maintain it in the second. But let all sober men judge if this reply be pertinent to this part of my answer; yet he promised he would answer my arguments. For the

Scripture, it is clear, that “corruption shall not inherit incorruption; neither can flesh and blood inherit the kingdom of God,” 1 Cor. xv. 50. Thus Annota cert. Div. Anno 1745, upon the place; and if lie will know the true resurrection let him learn to understand this weighty passage: “for we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,” 2 Cor. v. 1. And I cannot but wonder; my Adversary's understanding should be so benighted, as that contrary to express Scripture, he should assert a resurrection of the same body that is buried, properly and strictly so; the Apostle teaches us to believe that it is not that same body that is sown that shall be; for though we shall be changed from mortality to immortality, corruption to incorruption, 2 Cor. v. 1, and 1 Cor. xv. 37. 50, yet men's bodies of flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, for the word resurrection doth not strictly imply a taking up of the same numerical body, as he would have us believe from his new found relative IT, (first book, 2d part, p. 103.) for which Beza shall give him a release both from the Latin and the original Greek there being no word in either for his relative IT, on which he and his factious Brother Hicks have so relatively insisted; indeed as their last and best refuge. The text lyeth thus:

Speiratai soma psuchikon egeiratai soma pneumatikon. Seritur corpus animale, resuscitatur corpus spirituale, i.e. A natural body is sown, a spiritual body is raised; that is, They lay down a natural, and take up a Spiritual body, or in lieu of a natural, receive a Spiritual body, or that admitting of such an exchange, that the Spiritual is the same numerical body, that was the natural; for so the natural and Spiritual body would be one and the same; but suppose J. Faldo's relative IT to hold, I do utterly deny that this text is concerned in the resurrection of man's carnal body at all. I will recite it with the five following verses as they lie in our English Translation.

“It is sown a natural body, it is raised a Spiritual body; there is a natural body, and there is a Spiritual body; and so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living Soul, the last man Adam a quickening Spirit; how-be-it, that was not first which is Spiritual,
but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is Spiritual; the first man is of the earth, earthly, the second Adam is the Lord from Heaven; as is the earthly, so are they that are earthly; and as is the Heavenly, so are they also which are Heavenly; and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly,” 1 Cor. xv. 44 to 49. I say this doth not concern the resurrection of carnal bodies but the two states of men under the first and second Adam, men are sown into the world naturally, and so they are the sons of the first Adam; but they are raised spiritually, through him who is the resurrection and the life, and so they are the sons of the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, the quickening Spirit. The very words of the Apostle undeniably prove this to be the scope; how else could the first Adam’s being made a living soul, and the second Adam a quickening Spirit, be a pertinent instance to prove natural and spiritual bodies; upon which follows, that the natural was the first, that is, the first Adam, and then that which is Spiritual which is the second Adam, the quickening spirit, the Lord from Heaven, who came to raise up the sons of the first Adam, from their dead to his living, their natural to his spiritual estate.

But perhaps it will be objected, that the 47th verse, the first man is of the earth earthly, and part of the 9th verse, we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly, seem to imply a bodily resurrection; but let the whole verse be considered, and we shall find no such thing.

The first man is of the earthly, the second man is the Lord from heaven; who sees not that this is rather spoken of the earthly-mindedness, than of the earthly body of Adam? It was mentioned to show the great disparity that is between the nature and qualification of the first and second Adam; the following verse puts this interpretation out of doubt, as is the earthly, such are they that are earthly; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.

For those words, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. I cannot see how they should relate to the resurrection of the carnal bodies of men; for the image of the heavenly is a renewed state to God, through the operation of the Spirit and Power of Christ, the first part of the verse clears it; and as we have borne the image of the heavenly, as Ambrose and Theophylact read it, and six or seven copies besides have it which is as much as to say, that as we have borne the image of the God of this world, by becoming his children, so may we bear the image of the true and living God, by being redeemed from a vain conversation, having our consciences sprinkled from dead works, and being born again of the incorruptible seed, by the word of God, which lives and abides for ever. If it be objected, that Adam is not mentioned as degenerated, but as created, and therefore this interpretation will not do. I answer; it is true, he is said to be made a living Soul; but first this makes not for the resurrection of dead bodies, and so far our adversary gets no strength. Secondly; though the Apostle begins with the first Adam’s creation yet he orderly comes to the earthly image, that the living Soul put on by disobedience, which introduceth the necessity of the coming of the second Adam, and his quickening Spirit to create anew, and bring into the image of God. So there is Adam, as sown, and his posterity representatively in him, and his and their lapse, and then the restoration by him that is the resurrection and the life, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven however. Had this concerned the resurrection in our adversary’s sense, the image would be changed wholly, accidents would not serve his turn, therefore not the same image, unless the earthly could be the heavenly image, which were impossible; for we should lose our earthly bodies, at what time we become the image of the heavenly, in this world, if this conceit had any truth in it, and if of the other, they to be sure must never enter; for another takes place: but as it was never understood so by any that I know of, but evermore of that earthly image, which came by transgression, and the heavenly image that comes in obeying the truth by the Spirit, according to what the Apostle saith, Col. iii. 8. 9. 10. “But now you also put off all these; anger, wrath, blasphemy, filthy communication, out of your mouths, lie not one to another; seeing you have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.” so until the natural man that is sown, comes to die to his own image, will and affections, he can never be quickened into this glorious image of the second Adam, the quickening Spirit, who
THE RESURRECTION.

is the Lord from heaven. But suppose it were to be understood rather of bodies than souls, the text may be as well translated a living as a natural body is sown; yea rather so, for the word is not—psusikon but—psuchikon, or animale, that imports as much as a Soul's Body, and such an one, I dare say, J. Faldo would not be willing to sow, except he had a mind to be buried alive, so Clarinus both translates it, and interprets it, Corpus animale accipendum est, cui anima vitam prestat ne interest, i.e. A souly or living body is that, to whom the soul gives life that it doth not die.

But to go further; suppose the Apostle treated of a natural change, and not of the spiritual state of the soul in this life, yet can it be extended no farther than this; when good men lay down this earthly house, or tabernacle of clay, the image that came to us from Adam's loins, we shall be clothed upon of immortality, received into the building that is eternal, in the heavens, and be made like unto his glorious body, 2 Cor. v. 1, Phillip. ii. 21. We sow a natural, we reap a spiritual, and we sow not that body which shall be; but, God giveth it a body as pleaseth him, 1 Cor. xv. 37. 38.

I also paralleled my adversary's change yet sameness, of bodies with the popish transubstantiation, showing that the absurdity Protestants charge upon this, is equally chargeable upon that; only with this distinction, that the Papists deny it to continue a wafer after consecration; but John Faldo asserts, the spiritual body to be the same carnal body after mutation, which is a kind of a consubstantiation, and far more ridiculous: but of this he took no notice, and his silence is prudent: things unanswerable are better unmeddled with than cited and not confuted; he knows who passed for wise men by holding their tongues; I wish that were his greatest fault.

I will conclude this head with a few testimonies of defense of what we have said of J. Faldo's carnal resurrection, referring my reader to my chapters of the resurrection both against him in my Answer and my book against T. Hicks, entitled Reason against Railing, and particularly the second part of a discourse that we hope will suddenly be published called The Christian Quaker, for his fuller satisfaction of our Spiritual Judgment, and our adversary's fleshly apprehension concerning the resurrection.

H. MORE, Mystery of God, page 221, 224, 225.

Dr. H. More, the Cantabrigian Philosopher, begins his discourse of the resurrection with this censure of J. Faldo's. "We come now to the second particular propounded, The Resurrection of the Dead, which I dare say the Atheist will listen to, with more than ordinary attention, and greedily suck in the doctrine, provided it be stated with the most curious circumstances that the Rigdest of theologers will describe it by, that we shall have the same numerical bodies, in which we lived here on earth, and that those very bodies, (the would being turned aside,) shall start out of the grave. This doctrine the atheist very dearly hugs, as a pledge in his bold conceit of the falsehood and vanity of all the other articles of religion; whereof he fancying the upshot of Christianity to be so groundless and incredible, he fairly quits himself of the trouble of all, and yields himself up wholly to the pleasures of the world."

To the objection of Atheists, who play hard upon J. Faldo's carnal resurrection.

"First, In that canibals proper bodies are made up of the flesh of other men, so as if every one had his own, he would have never a body in the resurrection."

"Secondly, That it implies that all men are buried, when as myriads are drowned in the sea, and eaten by fishes."

"Thirdly, That men's bodies are passing like rivers, consequently no more the same numerical bodies, than the water that runs away is the same river; and upon this score the body of an old man must pay for the sins of a young man, whose youthful body felt the pleasure, and is gone."

"He thus answers out of the best sort of Philosophers, that the soul of every man is his individual person, and that she alone it is that sees, hears, enjoys pleasures, and undergoes pain, and that the body is not sensible of any thing, no more than a man's doublet, when he is well bastinod'd; and this answer, (says he,) takes away all the first and last cavil (he goes on) and why do men plead for the consociation of the soul's numerical body in reward or punishment, but that they fancy the body capable of pleasure or pain; but they err,
not knowing the nature of things; the body being utterly incapable of all sense and cogitation, as not only the best Platonists, but also that excellent philosopher Des-Cartes hath determined, and is abundantly demonstrated in my treatise on the immortality of the soul, see book 2. Chap. ii. 4. 5. 6. To the second cavil I answer, that the universal expression of men’s rising out of the grave, is but a prophetic scheme of speech the more strongly to strike our senses, as I have already intimated in my expression on 1 Cor. xv. against the Psychopannachites. See book 1. c. 6. § 3. This succor, saith he we have against the Atheists out of philosophy; but I answer farther as concerning the Scripture itself, that I dare challenge him to produce any place of Scripture, out of which he can make it appear that the mystery of the resurrection implies the resuscitation or raising up of the same numerical body: the most pregnant of all is Job xix. which late interpreters are now so wise, as not to understand at all of the resurrection; and for 1 Cor. xv. that chapter is so far from asserting this curiosity, that it plainly says it is not the same body. But the Atheist will still hang on, and object farther, that the very term resurrection implies that the same body shall rise again; for that only that falls can be said properly to rise again. Where let the reader take notice, that D. More calls John Fallo, Atheist, for it his objections against me, Rep. p. 89.—William Penn’s Work, Vol ii. p. 437.

OF—

Resurrection and Rewards.

By William Penn.

Reply to Thomas Hicks.

CHAPTER IV.

The last doctrine he insinuates our denial of, is that of the resurrection from the dead. That which he brings under the Quaker name, as a sufficient proof for that suggestion, I shall relate, that every impartial reader may be satisfied of the man’s inconsistency with sound doctrine, as well as the common justice of doing as he would be done by.

In answer to his questions about the resurrection of the same carnal body that dies, he brings in G. Whitehead thus:

Q. Is it not written, thou fool, that which thou sowest is not the body which shall be, but God gives a body as pleaseth him?

Thus (saith Thomas Hicks) Whitehead replied; and G. Fox the younger speaks to the same purpose. To fools that say this body of natural flesh and bones shall rise; I say, the body which is sown, is not the body which shall be. I query, saith he, whether both these persons do not tacitly deny the resurrection of the body?

Now that T. H. has shown himself at once dishonest and erroneous too; let it be observed that from our denial of the resurrection of the same natural fleshly body, he absolutely infers and concludes, our denial of the resurrection of the body, in any sense; which is great injustice to any adversary. Let it be well observed, that he makes the Scripture itself to deny the resurrection, and so heterodox, by
accounting G. Whitehead and G. Fox their answers in Scripture language, to be a denial of the resurrection: for if T. Hicks does not intend by his arguing, that the same body that died, without a mutation, shall rise again, what makes him to quarrel with the apostle Paul’s saying, thou fool, that which thou sowest, is not the body which shall be; and repute us heretics for believing him?

Certainly his gross belief of the resurrection is inconsistent with Scripture, reason, and the belief of all men right in their minds in the point. How can he have the confidence to call the Scripture his rule, and yet contradict it so egregiously, as when the apostle tells us, it is not the same body that is sown, that shall be, to assert that it is the same body, and that who say the contrary, denies the resurrection of the dead and eternal recompense? In short, we do acknowledge a resurrection in order to eternal recompense, and that every seed shall have its own body; and rest contented with what body it shall please God to give us. But as we are not such fools as to curiously enquire What? so we forever deny the gross conceits of T. H. and his adherents concerning the resurrection.

But T. Hicks would have us believe, that the apostle said, thou fool to him that denied, and not to him that owned the resurrection; but he must excuse us if we refuse to credit him; for it was not whether every seed should rise with its own body, or that bodies should rise, but, as taking that for granted, the question was, what bodies they should be. So that thou fool is most due to T. Hicks and his associates, who are not, with us, satisfied to leave all with the Lord, but intrude, and query, what bodies shall rise? Wherefore no answer can be more proper to him than, thou fool, (Thomas Hicks) that which thou sowest is not the body that shall be.

But he thinks he is not without reason; for, says he, if the text be not the same body, how can that be called a resurrection; for that supposeth the same?

A. If a thing can yet be the same, and notwithstanding changed, for shame let us never make so much stir against the doctrine of transubstantiation, for the absurdity of that is rather out-done than equalled, by this carnal resurrection.

The papists say, that the bread and wine after consecration are very Christ, though the accidents remain. Thomas Hicks, and abundance of that sort of men, hold that man’s body in the resurrection is the same with that carnal body buried, and yet that it is changed to a spiritual body. How is it possible that it should be the same, and not the same? How that body, and yet, as the apostle says, thou sowest not that body that shall be, is very hard to reconcile.

And truly that which is yet very strange, those three Scriptures peculiarly cited in defense of his gross conceit of the resurrection, are either relative of another matter, or directly opposite to and inconsistent with his assertion.

CARNAL BODIES NOT RAISED.

And this mortal shall put on immortality, this corruptible shall put on incorruption.—1 Cor. xv. 53.

I grant that this implies a change; but I deny, that it so much as intimates, that men shall rise with those very carnal bodies that were buried. No, the apostle not only tells us, that the body sown is not the body that shall be, but that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, ver. 50. If the flesh and blood be transmuted, or changed into no flesh and blood, I query, (and I think I may do it safely too) whether it be the same flesh and blood that is changed into no flesh and blood, that is the body raised? O absurd, dark and carnal man.

Nor am I afraid to tell him, that the Scripture cannot rationally be taken strictly as translated (neither ought many more) for there are certain figures, modes, and ways proper to that language, in which this epistle was written, which are to be understood with allowances, for how can the mortal (taken for mortality, and not him who in part is mortal) put on immortality; can mortality be clothed with immortality? Then it seems that mortality is the person, and immortality the garment. If T. Hicks should tell me, no, it is meant that the mortal body should be changed into an immortal body, it follows that he is gone from the letter of the text into an interpretation, as well as that it contradicts his absurd identity or sameness of body. If so, it is as lawful for me (and more, if in the right) to construe it thus, that we who are mortals, respecting our
bodies, put off the mortal part, and put on instead thereof immortality; suitable to that weighty passage of the apostle Paul.—2 Cor. v. 1. For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, which as directly concludes the change, not of accidents, but bodies, from an earthly house or tabernacle, to an heavenly house or building as ever any thing can be spoken of by men or angels.

To conclude: since mortality cannot properly put on immortality, but man that is clothed with mortality may put off, or exchange mortality for immortality, for otherwise, mortality would have immortality for its garment; a thing impossible and absurd: I do infer that this place yields no strength at all to T. Hicks's gross apprehension of the resurrection.

His next Scripture is that in the Romans, 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 by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.

But this is nothing to T. H's purpose in the least; for the apostle treats not here of the resurrection of dead carnal bodies in our adversaries sense, as the whole chapter seriously proves; but of the inward work of the Spirit, in order to the making man's body a fit temple for the Holy Ghost to dwell in, as he wrote to the Corinthians.

The third place he brings, is out of the epistle of Paul, written to the Philippians: he shall change our vile bodies: upon which he says, this cannot be meant of a new created body, because such a body cannot be said to be either vile or changed.

But what makes this for his conceit? Surely nothing: for if the vile body be changed, then it is not that vile body; therefore not the same body. Again, to say that Scripture cannot be meant of a new created body, because such an one cannot be said to be either vile or changed, makes much against him; for it is to say, that the body that shall be, is vile, else what means his saying, because such a body cannot be said to be (not to have been) either vile or changed. Though the body that shall be, may not be said to be either vile or changed, yet it may be given of God in lieu of a vile body, and so

the vile body changed for one that is glorious. It was either ignorantly or sophistically done in T. Hicks, to imply, that body that shall be, could not be said to be changed, since the change lies on the side of the vile body, that is exchanged for a more glorious body: therefore all along we must conclude, it is not the same, but another body. But how disingenuous is T. Hicks, to repute G. W's answer in the apostle's words, a pressing the metaphor too far, and yet by so doing, runs himself into this dark imagination of a fleshly resurrection.

But T. Hicks thinks, the joys of heaven imperfect? else?

Is the joy of the ancients now in glory, imperfect? Or are they in heaven but by halves? If it be so unequal that the body which hath suffered should not partake of the joys celestial; is it not in measure unequal, that the soul should be rewarded so long before the body?

This principle brings to the mortality of the soul, held by many Baptists, or I am mistaken: But why must the felicity of the soul depend upon that of the body? Is it not to make the soul a kind of widow, and so in a state of mourning and disconsolation, to be without its beloved body? Which state is but a sort of purgatory.

What made the apostle willing to be absent from the body, that he might be present with the Lord, 2 Cor. v. 8, 9. if such a dissolution brought sadness instead of joy, as our adversaries in the point of the resurrection suggest, if not boldly affirm? In short, if the complete happiness of the soul rests in a re-union to a carnal body, for such it is sown, then never cry out upon the Turks Alcoran; for such an heaven, and the joys of it, suit admirably well with such a resurrection. The reasons I have to give against this barbarous conceit, I thus contract:

Because that the scripture speaks of a dissolution, and no resurrection of that which is dissolved, being earthly, and unfit for a celestial paradise; and therefore holds forth a building of God, an house eternal in the heavens.

If the body be the same, it must have the same nature, otherwise not the same body: but if it have the same nature, it will be corruptible still: mortal souls bring forth mortal natures; not immortal; neither can mortal be immortal, and yet the same nature as before, for
that change made, tell me, what remains of the old earthly body?

It makes the soul incapable of complete happiness without a *fleshy body*, as if heaven were an earthly place to see, walk in, and for all our outward senses to be enjoyed and exercised, as in this world, though in an higher degree; which I call *Mahometism*: For what spiritual happiness the body now can have, respecting God, is derived through the soul to the body, and not through the body to the soul. Besides, if so great a change or alteration pass upon the body, how is it that carnal and sensible body that suffered? And how can that same body be equally sensible of celestial delights? For the flesh and blood that suffered, is not to enter God's kingdom; and if that very same carnal body enter not, which sustained any part of the tribulations, the great knot is broken, and our adversary's strongest, if not only plea, is rendered invalid; for if the same natural body, parts and senses, consisting of living flesh, blood and bones, that suffered and died, rise not, another is given in which the children of the resurrection, who suffered in the flesh, have their recompense: and if they do so strictly rise as they died, then every man is to rise *married, love, high, fat, lean, young, old, homely, handsome, and according to former complexion and sex;* and which is yet more unreasonable, this body is to be incorruptible, immortal, spiritual, fashioned like Christ's glorious body, and as the angels of God. May our adversary blush at these dark imaginations but here touched upon, because more largely handled elsewhere, only I can but signify, that this sort of resurrection pleaded for, is renounced by some Baptists, and several other more clear-sighted professors.

For our parts, a resurrection we believe, and of bodies too, unto eternal life. What they shall not be, I have briefly said and proved; what they shall be we leave with God, who will give every one a body as pleaseth him, and thou fool belongs to the unnecessary mediter.—*William Penn's Works*, Vol. II. page 543.

(Reply to the Bishop of Cork.)

I shall now attend his only necessary point of sight, that he thought fit to mention, which, he says, we either suppress, or wave, viz. the resurrection of the dead; I confess I did not think that any body would have been so uncharitable to us, after our acknowledging the future state of the just and unjust, since that implies it, and every medium to it. However I will attend what the bishop urges for proof of what we don't deny, but always must the slander of doing so, I will, says he, only mind you of two passages out of the Scripture of truth, 1 Cor. xv. 16, 17. If the dead rise not, your faith is vain, you are yet in your sins. Hence it appears, says the Bishop, all other points of faith are in vain, if this be not true. And so say I, as well as the Bishop, and shall always say as he says, while he says no more than the text says; for who can think, that allows himself to think, that we should not believe an immortality, who have exposed ourselves, and suffered so much, that we may obtain an happy one. But the question is not whether the dead rise, but with what bodies? For if the dead rise not, then may we say with the apostle, verse 19. In the same chapter, we are of all men most miserable. So that the resurrection of the dead is out of all dispute with us; but with what body, will, I believe, be one, till the dead rise.

Here it is we are cautious, and tread softly; remembering what the apostle says to the curious and inquisitive upon this head, ver. 35. 36. 37. 38. But some man will say, how are the dead raised up, and with what bodies do they come? Thou fool, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. Here is the ground of our caution, which the Bishop is pleased to call suppressing, and others denying of the resurrection. We have indeed been negative to the gross conceit of people concerning the rising of this carnal body we carry about us, which better agrees with the Alcoran of Mahomet, than the gospel of Christ. But that there is a resurrection of the just and unjust to rewards and punishments, we have ever believed. And indeed we cannot but wonder that any should be displeased with us, for being pleased with that which God is pleased to give us. Bodies we shall have, but not the same says the apostle, and so believes the Quaker; but God giveth every one a body as pleaseth him, and that pleaseth us, whoever it pleaseth; for we had rather be called fools ten times by the Bishop, than once by the apostle, which we think we should deserve, if we should dare to stretch the text, or presume to define the secret.—*Penn's Works*, page 896.
THE
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His Absurdity, Confusion and Carnal Conceits about it Discovered. The Resurrection owned by us, and Spirituality Asserted; with the future and distinct existences of men and angels; and the eternal advantage of the Righteous after Dissolution.

By GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

Joh. xi. 25. Jesus said, I am the Resurrection and the Life, &c.
1 Cor. xv. 38. God giveth a body at his pleasure.
Ver. 44. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.
2 Tim. ii. 23. But put away foolish and unlearned questions.
The following essays on the resurrection are taken from an ancient work, published jointly by William Penn and George Whitehead, entitled "The Christian Quaker, and his divine Testimony Vindicated." This Work was issued from the press, with preface dated, Rickmersworth, the 16th of 10th month, 1674, and signed by William Penn and George Whitehead.

The circumstances under which these essays were first published; the well-known reputation and standing of William Penn and George Whitehead as representative early Friends; the fact that they are the most extensive publication of early Friends on the subject of the resurrection, added to the following endorsements, give these essays an authority as a statement of the original views of Friends on the subject of the resurrection, which attaches to no other publication of the early Friends.

In the chapter on the Resurrection of Dead Bodies, by William Penn, on page 18, after referring the reader for further information to his chapters on the resurrection, in his other essays, William Penn says, "and particularly the second part of a discourse that we hope will suddenly be published, called The Christian Quaker, for his fuller satisfaction of our spiritual judgment and our adversary's fleshly apprehension concerning the resurrection."

But the most conclusive evidence that they were regarded as sound and reliable statements of the spiritual views of Friends on this doctrine, is furnished by the following extracts from Robert Barclay's Works, page 879.

In his Apology, Vindicated against the attack of John Brown, Barclay thus refers to, and recommends The Christian Quaker as a statement of the "full belief" of Friends on this doctrine. "And lastly of our full belief of future states, and of the resurrection, he may find a large account in a book, called The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony Vindicated, by William Penn and George Whitehead, printed in the year 1674, from page 146 of the second part to the end."

(30)

PREFACE.

Serious Reader:

Our opposer appearing altogether utterly void of any spiritual sense or divine understanding in this great and sublime mystery of the resurrection, his work is the less to be regarded; and we having very little of so much as seeming argumentation from him, I need say the less to his Work; only take notice of a few of his absurdities and abuses. What further, as is opened in the discourse following, is chiefly for the sake of others more honest and free from prejudice, and in order to incline them from gross conceptions, unto a spiritual apprehension of this mystery, and that they may be mindful of their present concernment, of acceptance with God in his own life and righteousness, and not be diverted from obtaining the end and future felicity of the righteous, by uncertain, vain and gross thoughts and notions of carnal minds, which are but depending upon their own imaginations of a future state, and not upon a divine principle, or spiritual understanding thereof.

God is my record, that it is a spiritual eye, and divine understanding, that I desire may be opened in these weighty matters treated on; for which end in the sight of God, I am open and free in my spirit in what I write on this occasion; which I desire to improve only for the glory of God and good of souls.
Thomas Hicks accuses us from what one Turner should say; but answers not what he said, or his argument. He accuseth us in general words, which manifest denial of the resurrection of the body. For which his instance is our saying, that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Observe hence, that 'tis no marvel that he reviles and slanders us, and thinks we have some reserved meaning, like the Jesuitical equivocation; p. 56. when he hath accused us for making use of the apostles plain words, which he hath not answered; would it be well taken if he should positively say, that the apostle denied the resurrection, when he saith, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, 1 Cor. xv. 50. Its one thing to deny men's carnal gross thought, about the seed, resurrection and body; and it is another thing wholly to deny the resurrection of the body in those general expressions, he pretends to desire information what the body is we believe shall arise again; when before he positively accused us with manifest denial of the resurrection of the body, that is, of any body, if he meant as his words import.

And here again he is obtruding upon us that fools question, which the apostle reproved, when in answer thereto he said, thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and thou sowest not that body which shall be; but God gives it a body as it pleaseth him. 1 Cor. xv. 35. 36. 37. 38.

For which again he queries, whether we do not tacitly deny the resurrection of the body? for all this man’s pretense of Scripture being his rule, he is not content with the Scripture language, not yet willing to resign up himself to the pleasure of God, in giving to every seed its own body, as it pleaseth him.

But such busy intruders will be inquisitive concerning the manner of God’s executing His pleasure in this thing; whereas men’s present concern should be rather to wait, to know, and submit to the good pleasure of God in this life, and to find a part in Christ Jesus, who is the resurrection and the life, that they might be assured of the good effect and fruits of God’s good pleasure hereafter.

For it is a design of satan to busy and puzzle men’s thoughts about their existences in heaven, while he keeps them in sin and darkness, in the way to hell; whereas if they would faithfully serve God in the way of His grace here on earth, they would freely trust Him with the manner how He will glorify them hereafter.

And my saying, we ought not to be curious in these matters, to inquire into God’s secret pleasure in things beyond our capacity; neither do I desire to make myself wiser than I am; nor to appear wise above, or besides, what is written, in this case.

Doth this argue that the divine light within is not the rule above the Scripture, as is implied in his 57th page; when I confess it to be that, that gives the true understanding of them; and to be wise according to what is written, and not to pretend the Scriptures for proof of what they prove not.

As for instance; when I am called to answer an unscriptural question, by such as profess Scripture to be their rule; I think it most meet to answer them in the Scripture language, which while they are not satisfied with, they inquire but to cavil, and for advantage, as my opposer and some others of his abettors did. As for a more particular instance, when they query about the resurrection of the body, as desiring I would inform them, what body that is, that shall arise again, which being the same with that which the apostle reproves for, 1 Cor. xv. 35. it deserves the same reproof for answer. verse 36. 37.

Again, though I really confess the universal resurrection of the body of mankind, or of the whole Adam; which implieth:
A general fall and death; and that they shall come forth, some to the resurrection of life, and others to the resurrection of damnation; yet for the very phrase, namely, the resurrection of the body of flesh, I find not in Scripture; but the resurrection of the dead, the raising and arising of the dead.

Upon my answer in the apostle's very words, 1 Cor. xv. 35, the feigned Christian saith, this answer Whitehead said, is sufficient for such busy intruding fools, p. 57. By which he hath contradicted what he said, before Whitehead answered in p. 54. But then he adds, the apostle calls fools, not they that believed; but they that deny the resurrection of the body, persons of the same persuasion with the Quakers in this point, p. 57.

That the Corinthians did positively deny the resurrection, he hath not proved; but that some questioned, like him, how, and with what body are the dead raised, whose folly the apostle reproved; and this is not Quakers persuasion thus to question, much less to deny the resurrection in the true sense and real mystery of it; for so to question, with what body are the dead raised, is not a question necessary to salvation, nor yet essential to the being of a Christian, who knows a part in Christ, who is the resurrection and the life.

Now come we to examine T. H.'s meaning upon the text, 1 Cor. xv. 37. 38. wherein he proceeds thus; concerning this mortal, viz. That the body given it, is the same for substance, the same that was sown, only called a body given to it, because it is so changed from its accidents of corruption and mortality. Thus far T. H.

What reasonable man can make sense of this piece of oratory, as to say that the body given to it, is the same for substance; like as if he had said, this same mortal body is the same it which is given it, or it is the same it that is sown, that is given itself; or the same body for substance is given to the mortal body. What rare Rhetoric is this?

And to his brother Kiffin saith, that the seed that is sown, is the same body of flesh, which shall arise, though otherwise qualified; if so what is the body that God giveth to it, as it pleaseth Him, for if it be looked upon in the nature of a seed, it must be supposed that it is another body, that is given unto it, as is to every seed sown, according to its kind; for it is a plain nonsense to say, that that which is sown, is the same body that is given to it.

Besides, that which is not quickened except it die, which may be spoken of every kind of seed, that hath life in it first, doth not die before it is sown, but after it is sown, as Christ saith, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit; now the fruit or ear brought forth, is the proper body given to it, which is not the very same which was sown in the earth. But I pray, how holds this dying after sown, with these men's fleshly opinion of the carnal body in the grave being the seed, for that being dead before, doth not die after it is buried; neither do these men intend to be buried alive.

And seeing every seed hath its own proper body, what body can be proper to the terrestrial bodies, which if every one of them must be looked upon as the seed, to have each a proper body given, what a plurality of bodies must there be besides what are, and will it not amount to this, that every man shall not only have these terrestrial bodies, but each a body besides, and so every man two bodies, and those of the same substance that these are now, terrestrial or carnal?

He cites, Phil. iii. 21. thus, he shall change our vile bodies. Herein he mis-cites and perverts the phrase; for it is not bodies in the plural, but body in the singular; and it is to be read thus from the Greek, He shall change the body of our lowness, that it may be fashioned or transfigured like unto His glorious body.

But doth not this evidently make against him; considering that Christ's glorious body is not a carnal, terrestrial or earthly body, but a spiritual, transcharacter, glorious body. And the changing of our low body, in fashion to be like His, implieth not the same terrestrial or carnal bodies, or to be of this fashion and substance, as now they are; for celestial, spiritual and glorious bodies are much different from terrestrial, carnal and mean corruptible bodies.

Again T. Hicks addeth from Phil. iii. 21. This cannot be meant of a new created body; because such a body cannot be said to be either vile or changed. If then this be not the body which died, but another, how can that be called a resurrection; for that suppose the same? If another, then it is more properly a creation of a new body, then the resurrection of the body. - p. 58.
Mark here. He is for a resurrection of the very same terrestrial bodies of men, but no new creation; for that opposeth his thoughts of the resurrection.

What a strange inconsistency is it, that the self-same earthly or carnal bodies of all should arise again after they are turned to dust without any new creation, and yet rise complete, the same they were for substance? What sense or congruity can be made of this? Many thousands being dissolved, and turned to as real dust of the earth, as man was at first formed of, should living and complete bodies be raised out of that dust, without creating anew first? But if it cannot be a new created body, it is not the same natural, carnal, or terrestrial body, for substance after dissolved: it is not this very same corruptible flesh, blood and bones, that is given to every seed as it pleaseth God, or that shall inherit God’s kingdom.

Howbeit, as to be quickened, implyeth a death first; and resurrection, a fall before; and to be changed, that there was either a vile, corruptible suffering, or low estate before: so all that come to know Christ in them, and the body dead because of sin, know the Spirit to be life because of righteousness: and if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you. Rom. viii. 10. 11. 12. 13. And this plainly is a quickening unto righteousness, by the Spirit dwelling within, which is far from being a proof of T. H’s opinion, though cited by him.

And as in the first Adam is both the fall and death come over all men; so in the second Adam, who is the resurrection and the life, all are made alive, and that unto righteousness, who first come to see the body dead because of sin, and the deeds of the body mortified, Rom. iii. 13. or who come to know Christ, and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death; these attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Phil. iii. 10. 11. Such do not strive for a notion thereof, but to attain it.

As to the manner of existences or beings of all men in the world to come, there is no necessity for any to be taking thought or busying their minds about them; it being in the pleasure and wisdom of God, to reserve all to their due and deserved ends in an immortal capacity.

Our present concernment is, so to know and esteem of Christ, as that we may be found in Him, not only mortified to the corruptions of this world, through the fellowship of His sufferings and conformity to His death; but also interested in that blessed resurrection, which is only attained to in Christ, who is the resurrection and the life; that He may be magnified in our body, whether by life or death.

To what he saith in his fifty-ninth page about the body that was dead; about that it which is raised; about the soul and the seed of God; the matter is answered elsewhere; yet, all that know the body dead because of sin, having mortified the deeds of the flesh and being conformable to the death of Christ, as dead with Him, shall also be quickened and raised up by His Spirit that dwells in them, which is life, because of righteousness; and such only can speak experimentally of the seed of God, and the soul.

There is a seed of God, and a seed of the serpent in mankind, according to George Fox Jr’s relation; he further tells you, that they who discern the body of each seed, are not the fools which are questioning, how the dead should be raised, and with what body; for they know that all mankind will be found in one of these two seeds. By which it is plain, he doth not exclude men from a future being or immortality, nor confound them with the very being of God; though it is by His invisible Power that all are upheld in their respective existences, in immortality, whether they be found in the nature and image of the good seed, or the evil.

T. H. And since he calls them fools, that is, the Apostles, and all true Christians that say, this body of flesh and bones shall rise. Page 59.

Reply. He should have produced his plain Scripture for the Apostles so saying. Where are these words to be found in all the Scriptures of the New Testament, that this body of flesh and bones shall rise again? Doth not the Apostle say the contrary, thou sowest not that body that shall be? And, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God?
But must we then suppose, as some professors do, that those bodies of flesh and bones, shall inherit the kingdom of God, without any blood in them? Or, that after they are returned to dust, they shall arise again, the self-same as they are, without any new creation? I confess, this is such kind of new Philosophy as I have not read of before.

The man has run himself into such strange confusion, and wholly misses the sense of the resurrection and the life; and overlooks the true seed and root of the matter, while in his vain mind he is imagining, muddling, and devil-like disputing about the body, which in comparison of the immortal existence and being of man, is but an outside case, earthly shell or husk that dissolveth.

Again he saith, if this seed of the serpent be only sin, and the seed of Christ only grace, it is only sin and grace which shall rise again.

Oh the gross darkness and ignorance of this man! He knows not the seed of the serpent, from whence sin springs; nor the seed of God, from whence grace and life flows: but falsely supposes, that our principle extinguishes the future distinct beings of men, though it hath been plainly told him that all mankind will be found in one of these two seeds.

As also we testify, from that sense of life and immortality, that is to say; all men, and spiritual body, shall exist in immortality; yea, though our inward man is renewed day by day inward man is neither extinguished by the perishing of the outward weight of glory. (2 Cor. iv.) this man; nor thereby deprived of that advantage, which is an eternal seed of the righteous, and the seed of the wicked; of the seed of God, and the seed of the serpent; and so comprehends and takes in the whole Body of mankind under those two relations and natures; not to dissolve or extinguish their rational, intelligible beings, with the perishing and dissolvable, earthly, outside or case, but that all shall be reserved for their due and proper ends, according to the seed, nature and image, which their soul carries with it when it parts with the earthly clothing.

And whereas it is said, that it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; the great stress is laid on the particle it, which may as well be applied to wheat or other grain; it is sown, and it is raised, when the body or outside of that very corn that is sown, is dead, though the innate virtue or life doth not in itself die, nor fruitlessly expire; thou sowest not that body that shall be, yet in these two relations, it, is used as relative both to that which is sown, and to that body that shall be, while in the very next words to those before cited, it is said, there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body, (1 Cor. xv. 44.) and these can no more be the self-same, than celestial and terrestrial bodies can; or than the first Adam and the last Adam, or the earthly and the heavenly, which the apostle plainly distinguisheth between, as he doth betwixt the natural and the spiritual.

But whereas T. H. and his brethren so much argue from the word it, as it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual, they take this it, as it is sown a natural body, and it is raised; as if the apostle, when he saith, there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body, (1 Cor. xv. 44.) and these can no more be the self-same, than celestial and terrestrial bodies can; or than the first Adam and the last Adam, or the earthly and the heavenly, which the apostle plainly distinguisheth between, as he doth betwixt the natural and the spiritual.

This admits of no such transubstantiation as that the self-same natural body should become spiritual, or be the subject of such an accident.

And it is sown soma psuchikon, an animal body; or as having
life, a living body, which therefore, cannot be the body as dead
and laid in the grave; for in that condition they are not corpus
animalis; for that relates to the earthly Adam, or body of mankind,
as having a natural life. And must not even the animal or natural
man die before the spiritual man be risen, or immortality in Christ
be put on? And is not the natural or animal man opposed to the
renewed man? 1 Cor. ii. 14.

And the seed which is sown in weakness must needs have some degree
of life in it, when sown, whether natural or spiritual; and the weakness
and corruption doth relate to the subject in which it is sown, if
the seed itself be incorruptible.

And as the first man is of the earth, earthly, the second man is
the Lord from heaven; and as is the earthly, such are they also that
are earthly; and as is the heavenly, such are they that are heavenly,
( ver. 47. 48.) which if this be owned, it must be granted, that they
that are heavenly must have bodies suitable—either heavenly or
spiritual bodies. This heavenly being, the second man, the Lord
from heaven. (ver. 47.) And mark! As is the heavenly, such are
they that are heavenly; which cannot be the same with earthly any
more than the image of the heavenly can be the image of the earthly.

And as to our being asked, what this mortal is that must put on
immortality? Though mortal, in this place, implies a dying condition
of man, as the effect of sin, as, in Adam all die; yet it cannot—
as having put on immortality—be relative to flesh and blood, but
admitted in a heavenly and spiritual sense; for the apostle plainly
tells us but a little before, now this I say, brethren, that flesh and
blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption
inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery! We shall not
all sleep, but we shall all be changed. Ver. 50. 51. And so by that
life and immortality which is brought to light, we see beyond death
and mortality; and we, though as in a dying state yet, behold
immortality, being quickened by the second Adam, and renewed again
into the image of the heavenly; being made alive in Christ, who
redeems man from death, and ransoms the soul from the power of
the grave, who swallows up mortality and death in life and victory,
and saith, O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy de-

struation, (Hos. xiii. 14. Isa. xxv. 8.) by whom also death being
so swallowed up into victory, and the sting of it, which is sin, taken
away. They who thus have their part in Christ, who is the resurrection
and life, can truly say, thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory,
through our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. xv. 57. And to take
off further surmisings against us, I tell my opposer, that this resurrec-
tion, or change, extends not only to a raising of man up from sin
to righteousness, but also to an eternal glory. And it is not only the
raising up of the seed or grace in man, as he supposes; but the rais-
ing up of man from sin, death, hell and the grave, even in the seed
and life, which is the ransom; and this answers his cavils in his
sixtieth and sixty-first pages only, where he fictitiously makes us
speak thus, viz.——

Qu. We believe the resurrection of the body, though we know
not what that body is which shall rise. And then he absurdly makes
a Christian to answer thus: — Thou said before, the light within was
the divine essence: either then thy light within thee is not God, or
God knows not all things.

Reply. First he feigneth the Quaker, though we will never own
him to be our mouth; for the words were not so spoken by me, or
us; but that we ought not to be too curious or inquisitive in things
beyond our capacities, as to the manner of the existences hereafter;
or how men shall be reserved unto their several ends and rewards;
for God knows how to do it; but we being sensible of the different
seeds, we cannot be altogether ignorant of the nature of each body
being proper to the seed it belongs to: yet if with John, we say, it
doeth not yet appear what we shall be; it is satisfaction that we know
what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we
should be called the Sons of God; for such are Sons of the resurrec-
tion.

Secondly, T. H. abuses the Christian by making him speak ab-
surdly that which implies, that if man have a divine light in him,
he must needs know all that the light knows, or else, either conclude
that the light is not divine, or else, God is not Omniscient; and
then it follows from hence, that none have either a divine light, or
God dwelling in them, unless they know as much as God, which was
a temptation to man at first, and by this he hath shut out all, not only the fallen world, but God's people also from having any divine light or power of God in them.

He scoffs at some of our Friends, saying, we own the resurrection; that is, we witness it; and then adds, but what is it you witness? The resurrection of the seed? 'Tis Christ in you.

Ans. Is this a matter to be taunted or scoffed at? Hath he truly acted the part of a Christian thus to slight the arising of the righteous seed in any; or Christ's arising, who doth appear, reveal himself, and arise in the souls that believe in him, to raise them also up with him; yea, and that which the Father hath given him he will loose nothing of it, but raise it up at the last day? And if you do not come to know a righteous seed raised up in you, and truth to spring up out of the earth and to witness Christ to be your resurrection and life, you remain dead in your sins, and short of the glory of this resurrection. But in witnessing Christ to be the resurrection and life unto us, we do not assert that it is only the seed or Christ in us that doth arise, as is vainly imagined; but we are revived, and do arise in and with him, as those that have believed in His name, as He said, I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and, he that liveth and believeth in me, shall never die: wherein he doth not take notice of the putting off of the earthly body or clothing, as his dying or death. And, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming: and this is not to exempt man from the benefit of the resurrection; nor to say, that Christ and the light within is sown natural, mortal and corruptible, as T. H. most maliciously and falsely accuseth us by way of question, as asserting blasphemy: to which he further adds, that we intend the resurrection of something past, and witnessed in ourselves. What is falsehood and deceit if this be not? Page 61. And further saith, thus do you undermine the very foundation of faith, hope and holiness of life, like Hymeneus and Philetus, (2 Tim. ii. 17.) who said the resurrection is past already.

To which I answer, first what we witness in ourselves of the resur-

The resurrection, it is this man's horrible blasphemy, to call it falsehood and deceit, for that we do witness to Christ as being the resurrection and the life revealed in us, so far as we have a living knowledge of Him, and experience of being by Him raised up from sin and death that came by it, in order to attain to a future glory.

It is a gross slander, that we either intend or say, like Hymeneus and Philetus, that the resurrection is past already; for that it is not yet, as to man, completely; we are not yet raised to what we shall be, as namely, to that fullness of glory and absolute joy and triumph which shall be incessantly possessed after our labors and sufferings are ended, and our earthly house dissolved; for the more we are drawn up into absolute spirituality, the more capable we are of that full fruition of an eternal weight of glory in the heavens; in order to which let us be spiritually minded, and walk in holiness of life while here in our earthly house. As also we cannot hold that the resurrection is past already, while we, or any of us, are suffering with Christ, and travelling in order to attain unto the resurrection of the dead, that is, perfectly to be raised up with Christ, who is the resurrection and life, in some degree at least, of all that truly believe in His name and power: neither is this to undermine the foundation of true faith, hope, or holiness of life, while we confess Christ to be that foundation. But to argue for sin and imperfection term of life, and so to put off being perfect until in heaven, as this opposer has done, this is repugnant to the foundation of living and purifying faith and hope; and so excludes holiness of life: howbeit he thinks to arrive at heaven with the same carnal carcass or corruptible cask he now bears about with him; only he thinks, it will be newly dressed up and polished after it is turned to dust. But the greatest miracle is, that it must not be created anew, nor a new created body; and unless we grant him this, he reckons our religion a mere cheat, calculated only to the service of the devil and our own lusts, and that it denies any eternal advantage; and therefore he opposeth the Christian to the Quaker, page 62. And what is the marrow of his matter for this severe conclusion upon us?

But he accuseth us of a palpable denial of all future and distinct beings and existences after death, (page 62.) which is a palpable and
notorious untruth: for as we confess to the distinct beings of angels in heaven; so we confess the future distinct beings and existences of saints and children of the resurrection, that in the world to come they shall be as the angels of God; yea they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection. They shall be equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Luke xx. 36. And what bodies have these angels of God? Terrestrial, or celestial; carnal, or spiritual? Let that be considered.

The man’s other pretense is, if the soul be a part of God, Divine, Infinite (as before) and returns into God, being God, it cannot miscarry, he saith. His abuse concerning this hath been answered before, both in this treatise and in my book on the Nature of Christianity.

And it was never asserted by us either of the soul of man, or of the Spirit or existence of man, or the creature which may vary in its affections to good or evil, according to the power that acts man. Neither can it be conceived in reason (but envy) that any of us should look upon the Infinite God, to be divisible into so many parts or particles as there are entities or experiences of men; yet that there is an infinite Life, principle or seed in the soul of every man, this we confess, as that by which the soul immortally subsists in its being; and therefore this may be counted the soul, or light of the soul; for without this the soul of man could not subsist in an immortal capacity. And this I and divers others can testify, that G. F. did not intend to ascribe either immutability, infiniteness or divinity to the mere formed or created Spirit, soul, or being of man, but to the divine, immediate inspiration or breath of life, flowing from God himself, who inspired unto him an active soul, and breath ed in a living Spirit, whereby man became both a living and reasonable soul, endowed with rational, intellectual and spiritual parts.

I know no other reason he can pretend for his charge against us and our religion, as a cheat, and as denying our eternal advantage, but that we do not own his gross and carnal sense of the resurrection, though it be none of our phrase, to say in these general words, that the body perisheth forever; but hereby he plainly implies man’s in-

1. We testify that the resurrection is not past.
2. That the soul of man is not God, nor Christ; but God is the Saviour of it; and so we, always since we knew our own souls, have distinguished between the soul and the Saviour of it.
3. That we confess future and distinct beings after death, as well as of men and of angels; and that the children of God and of the
resurrection, shall in the world come, be as the angels, yea, equal to them.

4. Though it be said, thou sowerst not that body that shall be; and, flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. xv. It doth not therefore follow, that our religion denies any eternal advantage that is to be reaped; much less that it is a cheat, or calculated to the service of the devil, as most wickedly and maliciously T. H. hath reviled and blasphemed that religion and testimony which we know is given us of God; for we have not by distinguishing between the natural and spiritual bodies, denied the saints, their proper existences, spiritual body, or house eternal in the heavens, when the earthly tabernacle is dissolved; and unless the man holds the mortality of the soul, that it dies with the body, or the extinguishing of the spiritual being of man, I do not see how he can suppose a denying of any eternal advantage on our parts; unless he place it all upon the earthly body. It is true that some of his brethren do hold that the soul dies with the body, and sleeps in the dust until both be raised; and this also depriveth all the saints deceased from having any eternal advantage, in the mean-time at least. But we are not of that faith, hope or religion that will expire or perish with the carnal body, as our opposers will, who in his fruitless, carnal work and discourse, consists more of and for the gross body than Spirit; he is too gross and carnal in his apprehensions, to discern so much as a vision of the future beings and states of saints: but both they that think they shall reap no eternal advantage without their terrestrial bodies of flesh and blood, as T. H.; (page 75.) and they who hold the mortality of the soul, are not of the apostle’s mind and Spirit, who said, we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. 2 Cor. v. 1. We are confident, I say, and willing, rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord, for to me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain; but if I live in the flesh this is the fruit of my labor: yet, what I shall choose, I wot not; for I am in a straight betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better. Phil. i. 21. 22. 23.

Mark here! 1. He expected a far better and more excellent house than the earthly house after dissolution.

2. If to die was gain to him, and to depart from the flesh, desirable; and so out of it, to be with Christ, far better, he did not place his felicity upon the flesh or carnal body, as T. H. doth: neither did the apostle so endeavor to magnify that fleshly outside clothing, which is perishing and dissolvable; but his earnest expectation and hope was on the behalf of Christ, and his future gain in Him, saying, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death. Phil. i. 20. But T. H. his carnal contest is for magnifying his earthly, carnal body, and not for magnifying Christ therein; for he scornfully slighteth our witnessing Christ, and His being risen in us; though it is evident the apostle did not place his eternal felicity and advantage upon the earthly house, flesh or carnal body that perishes and turns to dust; for if he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his Spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust. Job xxxiv. 14. 15. But T. H. sees no eternal advantage to be reaped by persons after death, unless they confess the resurrection of the very self-same flesh, blood and bones that dies, corrupts and turns to dust, if he intends any blood in it, he will admit of no new creation of it; and by this, his religion and hope do expire and perish with his corrupt body, and must only be renewed when the dust of that body shall be raised without creating a new body. And if there be no eternal advantage without this kind of resurrection, as described by him, this doth either wholly deny the original or spiritual being of man, and comprehends the whole man, only as consisting of a mortal and perishing body; or else admits not of a reasonable soul really to enjoy itself in any condition out of the outside, perishing vesture or decayed clothing, which for man to be divested of, can be no more loss to him, as to his immortal being, then it is to the wheat to die and bring forth much fruit, unto which, resurrection is applicable as well as to man, though not to the sameness of body. And as it cannot unman a man to put off his old clothing, that he may put on new; no more can it annihilate our spiritual existences to have the earthly clothing put off and dissolved, but be to our far greater advantage and glory, to be invest-
ed with that spiritual, transcendent clothing, and most excellent house, eternal in the heavens; which state they only attain to who become sons of God and of the resurrection, and desire Christ may be magnified in their bodies here. And furthermore from that belief and discovery I have received in the true light, of the resurrection and future rewards, according to the holy Scriptures; I desire it may be minded, that God commandeth all men everywhere, in their day and time, to repent, because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man, whom He hath ordained. So that there will be a day of judgment, wrath and perdition of the ungodly; unto which day, the Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust to be punished; and this will be a terrible day to all that make lies their refuge, and reject the universal call of God to repentance: and seeing that in the great day of the Lord a final dissolution may be expected of all those things that are perishing and dissolvable, even of the heavens and the earth, and that they shall be changed. What manner of persons ought we to be here in all holy conversation and Godliness!
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CHAPTER VI.

W. B's First argument. If Jesus Christ did rise again with that body that went to the grave, then there is a resurrection from the grave of the same body. But Christ did leave the grave empty.

Second argument. If Jesus Christ rose from the dead with flesh and bones, you with the same flesh as was nailed to the cross, then there is a resurrection from the grave of the same flesh that goes to

An. But Christ did rise in the same, Ergo.

This man's work savors of flesh and not Spirit. The consequence of both his propositions is inconsistent, and so his argument is fallacious; for Christ's flesh saw no corruption, being raised the third day, it did not corrupt in the sepulcher, much less turn to dust or earth as others do; therefore the instance and comparison is un-
equal in this case, though it holds for a more spiritual end and advantage than this drives at, for which the apostle did instance the resurrection of Christ by the glory or power of the Father, that men might believe in that power. He did not say that Christ’s flesh was raised up the third day, that you might believe that the same flesh of yours that goeth to the grave and turns to dust shall be so raised, as this man argues; for Christ’s resurrection was preached, that their faith might be in God who raised Him up; that men might in this life receive and feel the spiritual benefit thereof to their immortal souls, and so partake in this life of the power of His resurrection, to be raised up with Christ, in order to reign with Him in glory hereafter: as for instance: Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized in Christ Jesus, were baptized into His death, therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. And buried with Him by baptism, wherein also you are risen with Him through the faith of the operations of God who hath raised him from the dead. Col. ii. 12. 13. As also to the same purpose and end, read Rom. viii. 11. and x. 9; Eph. ii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 15. 18. 19. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 45; Phil. iii. 10. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14; John vi. 39. 40; Col. ii. 20. and iii. 3. 4; Eph. i. 20. and ii. 6; Col. ii. 12; 1 Pet. i. 3. 21; Heb. xi. 35; 1 Thes. v. 10. 11.

By all which it is evident, that Christ’s death and resurrection was not preached for a carnal end, but for a spiritual benefit here, and an eternal advantage hereafter.

But whereas our opposer carnally infers from Christ’s arising, a resurrection of the same flesh that goes to the grave: his shortness in this, and the shallowness of his fleshly apprehension, comes under this further consideration, viz:

1. That all flesh and earthly bodies of men do not go to the grave, in his sense. It is said, the dead bodies of thy servants have they given to be meat unto the fowls of heaven; the flesh of thy saints unto the beasts of the earth. Their blood have they shed like water round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them. Psalms lxxix. 2. 3. Therefore these were not laid in graves of the earth.

The Resurrection.

As also it is apparent, that the flesh of many is wasted away with sickness before they die, or their bones be laid in the grave. And likewise many undergo such great sickness and calamities in their life-time, as so often doth, both corrupt and waste their flesh and blood, that so often as they are restored to health again, they have new flesh, or renewed bodies thereof; and then, what a vast bigness would their bodies amount to, if raised with all the same flesh that they had in their life-time! Moreover through great judgment and sore exercise David said, my bones cleave to my skin. Psalms cii. 5. And my knees are weak through fasting, and my flesh faileth of fatness. Psalms cix. 24. And as Elisha signified, when man is chastened with pain, upon his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain, so that his life abhorreth bread; his flesh is consumed away that it cannot be seen; and his bones, that were not seen, stick out. His soul draweth near unto the grave. Job xxxiii. 19. 20. 21. 22. Through such judgment, and chastisement, they who have known the polluted flesh consumed away, are not so much concerned for the same flesh, as these our fleshly opposers are, whereby they show they never experienced such chastisements, nor underwent such judgments, that God might hide pride from them, and keep back their soul from the pit. Their proud flesh would always live, and be reserved to eternal glory; whereas he whose flesh is consumed away, through the chastisements of the Lord, and who comes to see that God is gracious therein unto him, to deliver him from going down to the pit, who saith, I have found a ransom. It is said of such an one, his flesh shall be fresher than a child’s; his shall return to the days of his youth. Job xxxiii. This is not the old flesh which was consumed away through chastisements. And as all flesh is not the same flesh, so all bodies are not of the same kind, as hath been fully shown. It were more meet, for Baptists and others, to wait to see judgment and chastisement from God upon them, to the consuming and wasting away of their corrupt flesh, than to quarrel for it, and cry, this body, and this very flesh, shall arise again out of the grave, even as Christ’s did, and with these very eyes I shall see God, (pointing at their present flesh and carnal eyes) when as they do not know but that their flesh may be divers times consumed and wasted through
THE RESURRECTION.

judgment or sickness before they die: and so often in the mean-time new flesh, or bodies thereof restored them, as was hinted; which if truly obtained as a token of their inward renewing unto God, were much better and of more concernment, than thus carnally to quarrel for their old corrupt flesh.

W. B.'s Third argument. If Job had that faith, that with his flesh he should see God, then it was not in other flesh; nor yet another eye but it was both with his flesh, and with his eye, that after this life he should see God; therefore do I conclude, that the fleshly body of man shall be raised out of the dust, to see God.

Ans. By all which assertion and conclusion, we may see and still conclude, how gross and carnal these Anabaptists are in their apprehensions and thoughts concerning God; thus to render Him visible to their flesh and fleshly eye, supposing that Job in his belief herein, and God in His being, were like themselves; whereas God is invisible and an Infinite Spirit, not made up of flesh and bones to be seen of flesh and carnal eyes. As also the man has perverted Job's words which are, as translated, Though after my skin worms destroy this body; yet in my flesh shall I see God, (Job xix. 26.) who before said my flesh is clothed with worms. Job. vii. 5. It is not, that, with my flesh, or fleshly body, I shall see God, after worms have destroyed it; but, in my flesh I shall see God. Neither did Job quiet himself in his perplexity with the belief that his flesh should see God, as is imagined, but that he should see God, as afterward he did, when he said, I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee; wherefore I abhorre myself. Job xlii. 5.

Now that wherein Job was quieted, was, that he knew that his Redeemer lived, who should redeem him out of all his troubles that he had in the flesh; and that after his outward body was destroyed, out of his perplexed flesh, he should see God in an immortal state. He had no reason to quiet himself upon any confidence in, or concerning that flesh, when he was so disquieted and perplexed in it; for those words, (Chap. xix. ver. 26.) are differently rendered in the margins thus. After I shall awake, though this body be destroyed, yet out of my flesh shall I see God; see the margined Bibles of the last translation, with Hebrew notes and various translation. Now there is a great difference between seeing God with my flesh, and seeing God out of my flesh after it is destroyed.

But to these men who believe that with their flesh or fleshly bodies they shall see God, He may say, as He said to the wicked, thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself; but I will reprove thee, and set them (to wit, thy iniquities) in order before thine eyes, (Psalms 1. 21) yea, thou thoughtest that I was so like thyself, that thou mightest see me with thy flesh and fleshly eyes: but thy thoughts in this were very carnal, and thy apprehensions very gross; thou shalt find thou art mistaken, I am an invisible, all-seeing Spirit that searches hearts and penetrates through the dark spirits and cogitations of men, to bring their secret thoughts to judgment, and set their evil actions in order before them.

And there were those who saw Christ's outward or bodily appearance, who had neither heard the voice of God, nor seen His shape. Job v. 37. And Philip said to Christ, show us the Father and it sufficeth us. It was not enough for them, nor yet a seeing the Father, to see Christ's body or person; both Father and Son being truly and savingly to be seen in Spirit: and said Christ, A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. The Anthropomorphites, who were monks, inhabiting the deserts of Egypt, held that God was a person in the bigness and stature of a man, mistaking that saying, Let us make man in our own image, applying it to the man's outward similitude (and so do the blasphemous Muggletonians) and therefore, that God is visible to the carnal eye and fleshly body, from which these Baptists' doctrine, of seeing God with their flesh and fleshly bodies, is little different.

W. B.'s Fourth argument. The fourth witness to this truth is Martha. John xi. 24. Her brother Lazarus being dead, that she believed that he should rise again at the last day in the resurrection. If the resurrection of dead Lazarus, or that of Lazarus laid in the grave, was believed and assented to by Martha.

Ans. That Martha had such a belief from the Jews' opinion of the resurrection, as she intimated of Lazarus his body, which Christ did then raise, is not the matter in question; but that they and she had it from Christ, or the true and spiritual understanding thereof,
doth not therefore follow; but rather the contrary from Christ's own following reprehensive diversion, after Martha said, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day; Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die, (John xi. 24. 25.) but our opposer was not pleased to take notice of this answer of Christ's, but only of Martha's words and belief, and to argue from hence after this manner.

W. B's Fifth argument. The word resurrection implieth to rise again.

Ans. And can this be applied to nothing, nor any other wise, than to that very flesh or gross body, that returns to dust? Is not Christ the resurrection and the life? And doth not to rise again, imply, that man was fallen before? And that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive? And is not resurrection applicable to that which is quickened? And must this be understood only of the dust of dissolved bodies without any creation? For he saith, If God give another body, and raise not again that body that before was in being, then it is a creation, and no resurrection. So that from hence it is a resurrection of the same dust of the gross bodies dissolved, that seems to be expected by these men, and not any creation; and therein is their great mercy and comfort, though they do not acquiesce herein from contention and quarrelling; but in that resurrection, quickening, reviving, changing, translation, do not signify creation; therefore they are not applicable to the dust of bodies after dissolution, though both resurrection and new creation be to renewed man. Behold I make all things new; new man, new creation, new heaven, and new earth; but this is a mystery hid from corrupt flesh, so much contended for by our present opposers.

The rest of his arguments and doctrines are mostly very weak and ignorant about this point, yet comprehensively answered in this book.

Here follow some passages out of a Manuscript by William Burnett, against me, with a Reply detecting his ignorance in confounding the carnal body and the spiritual.

W. B. Indeed, if George Whitehead hath found out a body for Christ that is not a carnal body, which implies only a fleshly, it is such a body that I have never read of in the Scriptures. I would know what in Scripture is called the body, but the flesh? Now take but away the flesh, and where is the body? Aye but, saith G. W. it is a spiritual body; as if a body of flesh, and a spiritual could not it is a spiritual body; as if a body of flesh, and a spiritual could not stand together: this is his great mistake. The apostle could have stand together: this is his great mistake. The apostle could have born his testimony to this truth, that it is the body of flesh that shall be raised spiritual. 1 Cor. xv. 43. It is sown a natural body, it is raised spiritual, here the apostle still keeps to the word it. The rest of his arguments and doctrines are mostly very weak and ignorant about this point, yet comprehensively answered in this book.