

of our bodies to each other, or of our bodies to the external world. We regard, then, the law of variation as a means of preserving the species under certain circumstances, and as a means of better fitting created things for their various uses, and not as the creator of the thing, nor in any sense the originator of the species. Variation is the quality of a species, and not its producer. We see nothing yet to shake this belief; but if the lessons we have learned from geology and living forms are to be modified or proved to be mistakes, we will welcome the new light. It will not be hard to change opinion in such goodly company.

ARTICLE V.

EXAMINATION OF PHILIP. IIL 11 AND REV. XX. 4.

BY PROF. JOHN J. OWEN, D.D., FREE ACADEMY, NEW YORK CITY.

THE first of these passages, as found in our common version, reads thus: "If by any means, I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." That the general resurrection of mankind, both good and bad, is not here referred to, appears quite evident from the context, which represents it as an object of the apostle's greatest concern to secure personally for himself. To share in the general resurrection, he had only to live and die as a heathen man or an unbelieving Jew; but to attain to the resurrection here spoken of, he must "know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, and be made conformable unto his death." Even then, possessed of all these high spiritual attainments, there is an *εἴπως* (*if possibly, if by any means*), which, connected as here with the indicative mood, implies indeed no uncertainty of result, but nevertheless emphasizes most strongly the great difficulty of the achievement.

The resurrection here spoken of, must then be a resurrection of the righteous dead, who, as Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17 informs us, are to rise first — that is, before those living on the earth are changed — and be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so to be ever with the Lord. To this resurrection, as being distinct from, and antecedent to, that of the wicked dead, our Lord may have had reference in Luke xiv. 12–14, when he exhorted the chief Pharisee at whose table he was reclining, to bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind to his entertainments, adding for his encouragement, that he should be recompensed therefor at *the resurrection of the just*. A reference to the resurrection of the righteous dead, apart from that of the wicked, appears also clearly to be found in our Saviour's reply to the Sadducees (Luke xx. 35), "but they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry," etc.

It cannot be denied, that Paul may have had such a beatific vision of the glory of this resurrection of the just, that it seemed to him an object of attainment, in comparison with which everything else seemed insignificant and worthless. The marvellous disclosure of revelation, that from the loathsome grave the body so long held in its putrid embrace was to come forth, no more an object of aversion and horror, but one of resplendent beauty and loveliness, fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, to dwell forever with God and the holy angels, was enough, perhaps, of itself to fill the soul of the apostle with an intense longing to have a part in so wonderful a resurrection and transformation.

But, nevertheless, this is a resurrection to which all the righteous will attain. Although it is an inference from scripture, and from our reasonings of the future life from what we see around us, that saints in heaven will be possessed of different grades of glory and blessedness, according as may have been their spiritual attainment on earth, yet we are assured in the word of God, that all the dead in

Christ shall rise in his likeness, and be admitted into his glorious presence. Why then, it may be asked, was there such an intense desire on the part of Paul to attain to that which will be reached by all the pious dead? Why did he struggle for a blessing which belonged so clearly even to the humblest believer?

Interpreters have felt this difficulty, and have resorted to various methods to overcome it. It is the opinion of some, that the apostle simply expresses his desire to put himself under the transforming influence of this fact of the resurrection, and thus make it conducive to growth in grace and holiness. But such an exposition would do great violence both to the language and drift of the passage. The verb *καταντάω* is employed in the New Testament and elsewhere, signifying *to come to, arrive at*, and, metaphorically, *to attain to the possession of a thing*. It is never used to denote the passive reception of that which follows as the object, but the acquisition of it—as the end or goal of one's aim and desire. Very harsh also would be that metaphor which would refer the *resurrection of the dead* here spoken of, to the influence of that fact upon the soul of the believer. Not that we would deny the power of this great truth, when fully apprehended, to excite the highest aspirations after holiness; but the phrase, "resurrection of the dead," is too specifically used, here and elsewhere in the New Testament, to justify our interpreting it as an influence or motive excited by the fact, and not the very fact itself.

Similar to this interpretation is that which refers the words now under consideration to Christ's resurrection, spoken of in the preceding verse. But there is a wide difference in the relations which that resurrection and the one here spoken of sustain to the apostle's line of argument. The knowledge of Christ's resurrection is introduced as a means to an end, which end is made known in the following verse: *εἴπως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν*. The knowledge of that resurrection cannot be regarded logically as the means of attaining to its power or in-

fluence upon the soul of the apostle, for, as thus interpreted, the phrases would be essentially identical. Furthermore, if Christ's resurrection were the one referred to in the passage before us, there would be, most unquestionably, some word of limitation or adjunct which would remove all ambiguity. The usual form is, "the resurrection of Christ from the dead," or "his resurrection," when reference is had to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not the more general form, "resurrection of the dead." This interpretation is, therefore, too constrained and forced to be adopted as the true one. The same may be said also of every interpretation which regards it other than a veritable resurrection of the pious dead.

The difficulty, therefore, to which we have alluded still confronts us; and we reiterate the inquiry, why Paul was stirred up to such sublime efforts to reach that in which all his fellow Christians were sure to participate. Do we err in attaching to this resurrection of the dead, for the attainment of which he would make such intense and persistent effort, a more special significancy than that which refers it to the resurrection of all the pious dead?

Let us, then, in the spirit of candid and honest inquiry, see if we may not interpret the passage of a resurrection which shall embrace a portion only of those who have died in the Lord; and whether countenance is not given elsewhere in the New Testament to such a partial *ἀνάστασις* of the righteous. Let us see if there be not an order in the rising of the dead, so that every one shall rise "in his own order; Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming," and then, by implication, those who are to be delivered over to the power of the second death.

On the very threshold of our inquiry, we notice that the word rendered *resurrection* is not *ἀνάστασις*, the usual term, but *ἐξανάστασις*, a form found nowhere else in the New Testament, and only twice, if we mistake not, in the classic Greek authors. It must be admitted that *ἐκ* in composition may here have the sense *out of* or *from* the grave, and

that ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν may be translated, *resurrection of the dead from the grave*. But why did Paul lay such stress on the coming forth from the grave, as to adopt so unusual a form of the verb? It was an enlarged measure of personal holiness, a more entire conformity to his Divine Master, a resurrection to a life of happiness and glory, upon which his eye was fixed; and not upon the mere deliverance of his body from the corruption of the grave. It would degrade the sublime sentiment of the passage, to suppose that Paul adopted so unusual a form as ἐξανάστασις, merely to give prominence to the idea of a resurrection *out of or from* the grave. Such an ellipsis would also be harsh and obscure, especially as the preposition compounded with the verb, is here followed by the genitive τῶν νεκρῶν, to which it would be more naturally referred.

We would, then, translate the phrase ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, *resurrection out of or from the dead*, the usual form for *resurrection of the dead* being ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. The expression τῶν νεκρῶν is not abstractly put for *death*, or, metaphorically, for those exposures to death which characterized the missionary labors of all the apostles, and especially of Paul, but is used of the society or company of the dead. The ἀνάστασις in this passage is predicated, not of all this company of the dead, but of a definite number, who are to rise *out of or from among* others remaining yet in the grave.

It has been remarked that the form ἐξανάστασις is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. But we have its equivalent, ἀναστήσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν, in 1 Pet. i. 3, and in Acts iv. 2. In the former of these passages reference is had to the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the company of the dead, and in the second, while at first glance it would seem that the general resurrection was that which Peter and John preached, a closer inspection will show that it was the doctrine of the resurrection proved from that of Christ which was preached, and that the language was substan-

tially the same as that which Peter afterwards employed in his epistle, which we have just quoted. The phrase translated *through Jesus* is ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, *in Jesus*. Dr. Addison Alexander, in view of the phraseology of the Greek, gives as the meaning, that Peter and John taught the doctrine of the resurrection proved and exemplified in that of Christ, and that the words ἐκ νεκρῶν strictly mean "*from [among] the dead, from their society, from a share in their condition.*"

No one presumes to deny the pertinency and exactness of this phraseology when used of the resurrection of Christ, for he rose *from among* the dead and became the first-fruits of them that slept. Why then shall the same form of language, when employed by Paul to denote an ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν to which he is earnestly aspiring, be deprived of its obvious meaning, and made to refer to a general resurrection of the pious dead, if not of all mankind, both good and bad? This is not sound philology. The plain is ever to throw light upon the obscure. If ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν signifies that Christ rose *from among* the company of the dead, then the parallel phrase, ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, must be interpreted of Paul's desire to share in a resurrection *from among* the company of the dead. We see not how this philological necessity can be avoided.

It may be claimed, however, that τῶν νεκρῶν here refers to the wicked dead, and that this ἐξανάστασις is to be predicated thereof of the whole, and not of a portion of the pious dead. But this, as has been remarked, would convict Paul of a groundless anxiety to attain to a resurrection which will be shared by all the pious dead, and thus deprive his language of all force and pertinency. Furthermore, it would appear somewhat strange, that the apostle should employ, in this connection, τῶν νεκρῶν of the wicked dead, when he elsewhere makes no mention of them, except in Acts xxiv. 15, where he speaks of the resurrection both of the just and unjust. A resurrection from among the wicked dead! Does Paul mean to imply that he and his fellow saints are to repose in the grave with the wicked dead, and

to arise from among them, and that he is to put forth the most intense and persistent efforts to attain unto this *ἀνάστασις* from among the enemies of his Lord? He speaks of departed saints as sleeping in Jesus, but never as making their grave with the wicked dead. How surpassingly strange that he should refer here so specifically and emphatically to that class, as though the pious dead were left wholly out of sight, and the unrighteous dead were of such relative importance, that even the article in *τῶν νεκρῶν* was required to give them due prominence.

It is not a sufficient reply to this, that Paul in no other way could have given precision to this language, for he might have written *ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων*, *the resurrection of the just*, or *ἀνάστασις τῶν ἀγίων* or *τῶν πιστῶν*, *the resurrection of the saints or the faithful*, and thus have avoided, according to his custom elsewhere, any mention or reference to the wicked dead. Indeed, the ellipsis needs only to be filled out, to put this interpretation of *τῶν νεκρῶν* out of the question: "If in any way I may attain to the resurrection of the righteous from among the company of the wicked dead."

There can be no doubt, then, that *τῶν νεκρῶν* refers here to the pious dead. If so, the passage incontrovertibly teaches that, antecedent to the resurrection of the whole company of the righteous dead, there will be a resurrection of the most eminent saints, and that this *ἀνάστασις* is to be one of such transcendent glory and blessedness, and requires in those who are to be its subjects such high attainments in holiness, that Paul made it an object of intense and continuous effort to be included in the number of those who were thus to rise.

But is this resurrection of a part of the pious dead antecedent to that of the rest, taught elsewhere in the New Testament? In 1 Thess. iv. 16, Paul says: "the dead in Christ shall rise first"; but this *πρῶτον* finds its correlate in *ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*, which introduces the change that shall pass upon living believers immediately upon the *ἀνάστασις*

of the pious dead. One thing, however, is clearly taught in this passage, namely, that the order of the resurrection shall be such, that the living and the risen saints will ascend in one company to meet and welcome their coming Lord and Judge. It may be inferred also from this, that the wicked dead will be raised last of all, and that their eyes will open upon him whom they have rejected, "coming, with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment" upon them for their ungodliness and unbelief. An order, therefore, in the resurrection of the good and the bad would seem in this passage to be very clearly established.

In 1 Cor. xv. 23, to which reference has already been made, Paul speaks also of an order in the resurrection of the good, Christ being the first-fruits, and then they also which are Christ's at his coming. The words *ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι*, every man in his own order, rank, or band, would seem to indicate, that as Christ rose first of all from the dead, so in the *ἀνάστασις* of his followers there would be an order, a series, succession, like the advance of the divisions of a great army. Every believer will rise and ascend in the band or division (*τάγμα*) for which he has been qualified during his probationary state. If no other passage than this bore upon the subject of our discussion, it might be deemed as furnishing quite satisfactory proof that the resurrection of the righteous will not be simultaneous and *en masse*, but progressive, serial, and in divinely constituted order.

It may be proper to remark in this connection, that the phrases, "end of the world," "day of judgment," "day of the Lord," and the like, are not to be compressed to an inconsiderable period of time, like our day of twenty-four hours, but in the very nature of things must be referred to an indefinitely prolonged period, the length of which is known only to God. It is called the *day* of the Lord, because it refers to a period definitely fixed in the councils of eternity, and not because it is embraced within the limits of a common day. Thus in Gen. ii. 4, the work of creation

is referred to as performed in a single day, whereas we are told in the foregoing chapter that God was employed six days in the creation of the heavens and the earth. These days were probably great time-periods, and yet we are not misunderstood, nor do we use language improperly, when we speak of the *day* of creation. In like manner, the process of the resurrection and final judgment may embrace long extended periods of time, and yet be properly referred to as *the day of the Lord, the day of judgment*, or still more concisely, the *hour* when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and come forth (John v. 28, 29).

The texts which we have thus far considered lead us to the belief that the resurrection of a part of the pious dead will antedate that of the rest. We now proceed to the examination of a passage which, when fairly interpreted, seems to place the doctrine of a *first* resurrection, or a resurrection embracing a portion only of the pious dead, beyond a reasonable doubt. We refer to Rev. xx. 4, 5: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

It may be premised here, that whatever theory may be adopted in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, all expositors of any note are agreed that the twentieth chapter embraces a series of events, beginning with the confinement of Satan in the abyss, and running on to the end of time. But there is a difference of opinion, whether a single thread of prophetic events runs through the whole chapter, or whether events are referred to which are cotemporaneous, and therefore mutually dependent and correlate. Thus many, if not the majority of evangelical commentators, find a synchronism in the thousand years of Satan's confinement

in the bottomless pit and the thousand years of what is termed the martyr-reign. But this has proved the starting point whence many have wandered far away from the principles of sound hermeneutics, and in the end have fallen into great errors. The Millenarians, assuming that these epochs are one and the same, hold the opinion that Christ, in bodily form, is to descend to this earth, and having established his seat of empire at Jerusalem, is to reign in great pomp and splendor, the most eminent of the pious dead reappearing in risen, glorified bodies with him, and forming the nobility and court of his kingdom.

To avoid this unscriptural theory of the Millennium, the sounder class of expositors fall into the opposite error, and deny that any reference is had in vs. 4 to a physical resurrection of the martyrs and other eminent saints, the language being purely symbolical. They synchronize the two epochs of a thousand years, but seek to escape the millenarian heresy to which such an interpretation exposes them, by reducing the sublime truth revealed in vs. 4 to a metaphor. Prof. Moses Stuart refers the two chiliads to one and the same period of time, but nevertheless interprets vs. 4 of a physical resurrection of the martyrs, who live and reign with Christ in heaven during the confinement of Satan in the bottomless abyss. He was too able and honest an interpreter to evade the obvious sense of vs. 4, although his exegesis is cramped and distorted by erroneously synchronizing the two epochs of a thousand years. But we know of no other interpreter of note, especially among those of a past generation, who does not refer the second chiliad of years to a metaphorical representation of great events which are to take place contemporaneously with the first chiliad. It is quite evident that they do this to relieve themselves from the consequences which would inevitably follow, were they to give vs. 4 a literal sense, and at the same time synchronize it with the time of the binding and confinement of Satan. Can any one believe that Doddridge would have so paraphrased this verse: "I saw the souls of

them who had been beheaded, and they *appeared* to rise in triumph, and they lived and reigned with Christ," and in his note on the passage, express his doubt that a *proper* resurrection is referred to, thus making the whole scene a mere phantasm passing before the eye of the seer, unless through fear of being entangled in the meshes of Millenarianism, if he held to a veritable resurrection of the martyrs? Or that Thomas Scott, an expositor of such sturdy common sense, would have interpreted the martyr-resurrection as a reappearance of the *martyr-spirit* on earth during the millenium, had he not feared that a literal interpretation would expose him to the charge of being a Millenarian, or at least of favoring their views? The clouds and mists which have obscured this passage, and concealed in a great measure its sublime truth from the apprehension of the readers of God's word, are in the main to be referred to the unwarrantable blending together of these two epochs, and compelling, by a sort of Procrustean torture, a harmony which has no substantial basis on which to rest.

We have so recently, in another connection,¹ presented the readers of this Review with what we deem satisfactory proof, that two distinct epochs are referred to in the thousand years of Satan's confinement in the bottomless pit, and the thousand years of the martyr-reign, that we deem it unnecessary to repeat in the present Article what has there been written. Suffice it here to say, that the train of thought is greatly interrupted by the theory of two concurrent and contemporaneous series of events, and that the two epochs have no characteristics in common, the one being a period of rest from the active opposition of the adversary, the other, of jubilant triumph and glory; the one being followed by a wide spread and awful apostasy, and another desperate encounter with the enemies of truth; the other, by the general resurrection and the final judgment. The absence of the article in *χίλια ἔτη* of vs. 4, also proves very clearly that a new and distinct epoch is there introduced;

¹ See Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. XVIII. 363.

for had it been identical with the *χίλια ἔτη* of vs. 2, the article, according to Greek usage, would have been prefixed, as it is in vs. 3 and 7, where reference is had to the thousand years of Satan's confinement, and vs. 5, where reference is had to the thousand years of the martyr-reign.

The second *χίλια ἔτη* must, then, be regarded as a distinct period from that which precedes. It commences when the enemies of truth have been utterly destroyed, and extends onward into the future, until lost in the effulgence of Christ's second and final coming to judge mankind and close up his mediatorial reign.

We are now prepared to inquire who are the persons, in this second thousand years, said to live and reign with Christ. In the commencement of the verse they are called *αἱ ψυχαι*, "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands." Two classes of persons seem here to be referred to, they who had suffered martyrdom, and they who had been steadfast in times of great spiritual declension. It is quite clear that these classes are put generically for the most eminent of the pious dead. They are called *souls* (*ψυχαι*), in reference to their mode of existence antecedent to their reunion with the body,—which body is represented as *living*, that is, rising from the grave,—and not in reference to their mode of existence during the thousand years of their triumphal reign with Jesus Christ. It is mainly because they overlooked this use of *ψυχαι*, and erroneously referred it to the condition or state of these persons during their reign with Christ, that most of the earlier English commentators explain this beatific vision of the martyr-resurrection as symbolical of a moral renovation of mankind, and not as an actual resurrection of the bodies of the persons spoken of.

But is this *living again*, this *ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη*, nothing more than a revival of the martyr spirit, a metaphorical re-

appearance of this class of the pious dead in Christians of the same spirit? Wherein consists the antithesis, then, between those persons who lived and reigned with Christ, and the rest of the dead (*οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*), who were to live not again (i. e. whose resurrection was not to take place) until the martyr-reign had come to a close? Are the resurrections, one or more, which are to follow, and to which this martyr-resurrection stands correlated as the *first* in order, to be expounded as mere metaphorical representations of the prevalence of a spirit on earth which has found its prototype in the good and bad men of a former period? To such a result are we brought by the exegesis which we are attempting to refute. If we affix a symbolical sense to the first resurrection, the laws of interpretation require us to regard all which follows as symbolical. Where is the line to be drawn, on the one side of which is metaphor and symbol, and on the other a narrative of what is actually to take place? There can be no such line of demarcation. Either the resurrections spoken of, the great white throne and him who sat thereon, the dead small and great who stood before it, the books of judgment which were opened, and the final award to each man according to his works, are mere symbolical representations of great moral changes which are to take place in the latter days, or they are all to be regarded as events which are actually to take place in the order and manner here revealed to the eye of John. So Alford well remarks: "if in a passage where *two resurrections* are mentioned, when certain *ψυχὰι ἔζησαν* at the first, and the rest of the *νεκροὶ ἔζησαν* only at the end of a specified period after that first, — if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean *spiritual* rising with Christ, while the second means *literal* rising from the grave, — then there is an end of all significance in language, and scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain; but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which,

in common with the whole primitive church, and many of the best modern interpreters, I do maintain.”

For a similar reason, we must reject that interpretation of the passage which refers the martyr-resurrection and reign to an increase of happiness and joy to which, during the millennium, the more eminent of departed saints shall attain in view of the extension of Christ's kingdom on the earth. Such an exposition would make the subsequent resurrection, to which this stands related as the first, a mere increase of happiness, and not a veritable resurrection of the body. The expression *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέζησαν ἕως τελευσθῆναι τὰ χίλια ἔτη*, *but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished*, would then be nothing more nor less than that they experienced no additional joy or happiness at the universal spread and triumph of the gospel until the martyr-reign was brought to a close, at which time they would *live again*, that is, be permitted to share in the blessedness which their martyr companions had enjoyed during the preceding thousand years. There is an absurdity on the very face of such an interpretation of the passage, which should insure its rejection without a moment's hesitation. It is also opposed to a well-established fact of revelation, that all the souls of the righteous dead are with Christ, and that no blessedness resulting from the universal spread of the gospel on earth is shared by a portion to the exclusion of the rest. “There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.” The triumphs of Christianity will not awaken joy in a portion only of the blessed; but all, according to their spiritual capacity, will be supremely happy at the renovation of the earth under the prevalent sway of the gospel.

There is no interpretation which fully answers the conditions of the passage, except that which refers it to a resurrection of the bodies of these martyrs and eminent saints. Observe how direct and sharply marked is the antithesis: “they lived (*ἔζησαν*) and reigned with Christ a thousand years — the rest of the dead lived not again (*οὐκ ἀνέζησαν*)

until the thousand years were finished." If *ἀνέζησαν*, in the second member, signifies not mere continuance of existence, but a resumption of the former condition of the dead, when soul and body were united, then *ἔζησαν*, in the first member, must have the same signification. But such, most unquestionably, must be the meaning of *ἀνέζησαν*. It is employed in Rom. xiv. 9 of Christ's resurrection: "for to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived (*ἀνέζησαν*, *lived again*), that he might be Lord both of the dead and living (*ζώντων*)."
 Here *ἀνέζησαν* refers to the reviving or returning to life of Christ's body; and this is rendered still more emphatic by the antithetic *νεκρῶν* and *ζώντων* (*dead* and *living*) with which the verse closes. When it is, then, said *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέζησαν*, *the rest of the dead lived not again*, in the passage before us, we ought without hesitation to give *ἀνέζησαν* the same sense which it has in the passage just cited.

The verb *ἀναζάω* is elsewhere found in only two places in the New Testament, namely in Luke xv. 24 (repeated in vs. 32): "this my son was dead, and is alive again (*ἀνέζησε*)"; and in Rom. vii. 9: "but when the commandment came, sin revived (*ἀνέζησεν*) and I died." In both these instances the word is used metaphorically; but the metaphor is based on the prevalent signification of the word *to rise to life* from a state or condition of death. The restoration of the prodigal son to his father was, as it were, a resurrection from the dead, or the entering upon a new existence. Sin, by the presence and power of the commandment, was quickened from its death-like stupor to life and activity; or, in other words, the sinner was made to feel that he was under the fell influence of sin, of which he had been previously as insensible as though it had no living hold upon him. But in the passage before us, a metaphorical use of *ἀνέζησαν* would be inadmissible, viewed not only in relation to the passage itself, but its context, both preceding and following; for it would compel us to affix a metaphorical sense to the whole passage, if not to the whole chapter,

unless we mix the plain and figurative, the literal and metaphorical, in defiance of all hermeneutical laws.

We see, then, that ἀνέζησαν in the second member, employed as it is in Rom. xiv. 9, of Christ's resurrection from the dead, leaves us no room to doubt what sense shall be given to ἐζήσαν in the first member, with which it stands in such marked antithesis. It must relate to a physical resurrection, a reunion of soul and body, not in the gross material sense in which the union takes place on earth, but in accordance with the laws of that higher existence to which the blessed will attain after the resurrection.

But not only is ἐζήσαν to be interpreted of a physical resurrection, from its antithesis with ἀνέζησαν in the second member, but from the *usus loquendi* of the word as found elsewhere in the New Testament. It is employed in several instances of persons restored to life or raised from the dead. "My daughter is now dead, but come and she *shall live* (ζήσεται)." Matt. ix. 18. "And they, when they had heard that he [the Lord Jesus] was *alive* (ζῆ), believed not." Mark xvi. 11. "And when they found not his body, they came saying that they had seen a vision of angels, which said that he was *alive*" (ζῆν). Luke xxiv. 23. "To whom also he showed himself *alive* (ζῶντα) after his passion." Acts i. 3. "And he gave her his hand and lifted her up, and when he had called the saints and widows, presented her *alive* (ζῶσαν)." Acts ix. 41. See also Acts xx. 12. These citations will suffice to show that ἐζήσαν, in the cognate passage before us, is not to be taken in a metaphorical sense, nor as denoting mere continuance of existence, but a veritable restoration from death to life. As this could not be predicated of the souls of these martyrs, which, from the time when they had sealed with their blood their testimony for the truth, had always been with Christ, it must be referred to their bodies, that had lain so many centuries in the grave, but were now raised to a life of incorruptible glory.

With every philological argument, then, in its favor, why should we hesitate to refer the vision in Rev. xx. 4 to an

actual resurrection of the martyrs and other eminent saints? Is there any violation of scripture analogy in such a view? Will there not be grades of glory and happiness throughout eternity, as the firmament reveals to us stars of various magnitude and brightness? This seems to be clearly implied in Dan. xii. 3; nor can we question it, unless we place all the blessed on the same level of enjoyment, without respect to their comparative eminence in piety on earth, or their self-denial and labors in their Master's service. There are some historical facts in the Bible which bear directly upon the subject of this discussion. Enoch and Elijah were exempted from the power and dominion of the grave, and translated immediately from earth to heaven. After the resurrection of our Lord, "the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53). It is strange that any should be in doubt as to whether these bodies were received up into heaven, or returned again to the grave, there to sleep until the general resurrection. Had the latter been true, the Jewish priests could have disputed with some show of reason the reality of their appearance, finding their bodies, as they would have done, in the grave. This leads us to believe, with much assurance, that they were taken up into heaven at the time of our Lord's ascension. He was the first-fruits of them that slept; they, the precursors of a glorious harvest yet to be gathered in.

If, then, the bodies of Enoch and Elijah, and those saints that came forth from the grave after Christ's resurrection, were raised to heaven, and are now there, while the bodies of Abraham, David, Isaiah, Daniel, and other patriarchs and prophets, are yet mouldering in the grave, shall we regard it strange if these worthies of the Old Testament, together with the eminent saints and martyrs of the new dispensation, are to be honored by a resurrection which shall antedate that of the rest of the pious dead, who, in accordance with God's sovereign pleasure, are to remain in the grave until this thousand years of the martyr-reig

But our examination of this passage would be incomplete if we did not inquire to what class of persons *οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν* in vs. 5 refers. It seems to be the general opinion of expositors that reference is had in these words to the whole company of the dead, both good and bad. But is not this an erroneous view? Has not the apocalypt in his eye the righteous dead, and these only? Do not the persons in vs. 5, designated by *οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*, revive and live again in precisely the same sense as the martyrs, who have been raised to thrones of glory during the preceding chiliad of years? Very reluctantly ought we to employ a word of such high import as *ἀνέζησαν*, which, as we have seen, is found elsewhere in its literal sense only in one passage in the New Testament, where it refers to the reanimation of Christ's body; we say, very reluctantly ought we to employ this great word of the wicked, who are to rise to shame and everlasting contempt (Dan. xii. 2), and whose resurrection is one of damnation instead of life and happiness (John v. 29).

But the words *οἱ λοιποὶ* place this reference of the passage to the pious dead beyond a reasonable doubt. *Λοιποὶ* is derived from *λείπω*, and signifies *those who are left* of a number from which some have previously been taken. The same class of persons must be referred to in the correlates *some, others*, unless they are accompanied by adjuncts which characterize them as belonging to different classes. We will not deny that the language might have been so shaped, that *οἱ λοιποὶ* would have referred naturally and properly to the whole congregation of the dead; yet as the words here stand, we cannot, without great violence, make *οἱ λοιποὶ* embrace any other than the class of the pious dead, from which the martyr-saints have previously been taken to participate in the first resurrection.

The exegesis which we have adopted receives further confirmation from the declaration in vs. 5, *αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη, this is the first resurrection.* There can be no doubt whatever that this refers to the thousand years of the martyr-reign; for in the following verse it is declared that he who

has part in the first resurrection is blessed and holy, and that upon such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. What then is the *second* resurrection, to which this stands related as the *first* resurrection? It is manifestly found in the words, "but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." The second resurrection follows immediately upon the close of the first, which embraces in its whole sweep of events one thousand years. We do not turn aside here to inquire into the length of these prophetic years, since our argument is wholly apart from the discussion of that point. But here are evidently two resurrections, the one following the other; and our assumption is, that if one is literal the other is literal, and if one is metaphorical the other is metaphorical. Every principle of interpretation demands this. Now the declaration, "blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection," does not imply that they who share in the second or following resurrection, are not also blessed and holy; but the sentiment is, that the persons embraced in the first *ἀνάστασις* are pre-eminently blessed and holy, and exempt from the power of the second death. This idea is rendered still more emphatic by the clause which follows: "they shall be priests of God and of Christ," and the repetition from vs. 4: "and shall reign with him a thousand years." What conceivable meaning can be attached to this verse, if the resurrection in vs. 4 is to be interpreted as metaphorical or symbolical of some great moral change which is to take place in the latter day upon the earth? The passage is deprived of all sense, if the resurrection in vs. 4 be regarded as other than what is actual and real. Are we not justified, then, in claiming from this passage the most abundant and conclusive evidence that there are to be two distinct and successive resurrections of the pious dead? Have we perverted the laws of grammar or the meaning of words in reaching this conclusion? Have we turned aside from the sacred text to follow the wild speculations and vagaries of

human reasoning? We are not ignorant of the objections which may be advanced against this view, nor would we undervalue them. We may not be able to give a satisfactory answer to them; the subject lying, as it does, so far in the distant future, and relating to that which so far transcends the unaided power of the human intellect to compass. But formidable as these objections may be, they are powerless when confronted with the great utterance of the passage, that there is to be a resurrection of the martyrs and a portion of the righteous dead, which shall antedate by a chiliad of prophetic years that of the rest of the dead, and which is therefore called *ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη*, the first resurrection, or more literally, the resurrection (viz.) the first. It may not be unprofitable, however, to notice several of the more common objections to the doctrine of a first and second resurrection of the pious dead.

It is alleged as adverse to this view, that it is taught nowhere else in the word of God. What if this were so? It would not invalidate the testimony of the passage before us. Some of the sublimest truths of revelation are unfolded in single passages. The fact that Christ's mediatorial kingdom is to be given up to the Father, when he shall have put all enemies under his feet, is revealed only in 1 Cor. xv. 24-28. The nature of the resurrection-body is discussed only in this same chapter. The marvellous declaration that saints shall judge angels is made only once, and that too in the form of an interrogation. The allegation, then, that this doctrine of a first and second resurrection is found only in the passage now under consideration, if it were so, would not invalidate its truth. But, as we have shown in the former portion of this Article, it seems clearly referred to by Paul, in his *ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*, and in the order (*ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι*) in which the dead are to arise; so that were this text in Rev. xx. 4 blotted out, the hiatus might be quite readily filled from the teachings of Paul.

It may also be objected, that the exegesis of these passages which we have adopted, would raise to heaven a portion of

the pious dead without the preliminary process of the judgment; or, in other words, that it is opposed to the great fact of revelation, that the righteous are to be first judged, and then enter into life eternal. But may not a virtual judgment be passed upon the pious, in whole or in part, so that they may have a foretaste of the blessedness which shall be confirmed to them in the solemn award of the final judgment? Is not a preliminary judgment of this sort passed upon all who die in the Lord and are admitted into the presence of Christ? It does not preclude their standing with the rest of the human family before the judgment seat of Christ, that Enoch and Elijah were translated bodily to heaven. The resurrection of those who came forth from their graves after the resurrection of Christ will not stand in the way of their appearance at his bar, in whose triumphal train they ascended to heaven, and whose bodies, fashioned after the image of his glorified body, are the pledge of his redemptive grace that all, in due time, shall be raised from the grave and transformed into his glorious likeness. Nor can it be reasonably charged upon the doctrine of the resurrection of the martyr-saints, to live and reign with Christ antecedent to the resurrection of the rest of the righteous dead and the final judgment, that this class will be exempted thereby from standing before the bar of God, to be judged like all the rest of mankind. As Professor Stuart well remarks: "The decisions of conscience need no protracted time for examination. Each spirit takes, of course, the place to which its character necessarily assigns it, and all this, as we may suppose, without any general or even any particular and formal judgment after the manner of human tribunals."

We believe fully in the doctrine of a general judgment; but this is not inconsistent with the belief of an order in the resurrection of the pious, nor of the admission to blessedness of those who attain unto the first resurrection, long anterior to the Parousia of the Son of man to sit upon the throne of judgment. Preliminary to the final act in the drama of time, the most stupendous scenes will be enacted, which, as

precursors of scenes of greater glory and blessedness yet to come, will fill all holy beings with admiration and rapture. The glory of the first millennium will be far transcended by that of the second, when the devil having been cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where have already been consigned the beast and the false prophet (Rev. xx. 10), the whole earth shall be at rest and be quiet (Isa. xiv. 17), and heaven above shall resound with new hallelujahs as the martyr-saints enter upon the glory and blessedness of the first resurrection. Then shall be realized the predictions of the latter-day glory, made by Isaiah, Zechariah, and other prophets of the Old Testament. Then, in view of the vast multitudes who in successive generations shall throng the ways of Zion, and come up to her solemn feasts, the blessed Redeemer "shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied," and it shall be rapturously exclaimed: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?"

To the first resurrection (*ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη*), which shall be the crowning event of this glorious epoch, we believe that Paul had reference in the passage under consideration. It was to be attained only by the most intense and persevering efforts after holiness. With all his devotion to the cause of his Master, with all his self-denying labors, with all his high spiritual attainments and gifts, even though he had been caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for man to utter, with all these gifts and graces and abundance of revelations, he was not certain of having fully attained to this *ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*, but he avowed it as his fixed and unalterable determination, "to press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." "Let our conversation be in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, 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 even all things unto himself."