

It is a prominent part of the theory, that when the Saviour comes the righteous dead will be raised and the righteous living changed, the wicked destroyed, and all the *raised* and *changed* shall live and reign with Christ 1000 years. To this I shall attend as briefly as possible.

The point long in dispute, whether Christ shall reign personally, is not of much moment here. The passage upon which the idea just alluded to rests, is Rev. xx. 4, 5. The passage is highly figurative, and too obscure to be made the foundation of a positive opinion. "No wise man would oppose a vision in which the description is professedly figurative to the plain declaration of Scripture, that the resurrection will take place at the *second coming* of Christ." But supposing Miller's view correct respecting the *first* resurrection, unfortunately for the theory, it is a resurrection of *souls*, not of bodies. The term *first* is probably used here, as it often is, for the *best*, or that which is excellent; "bring forth the best (literally the first) robe, Luke xv. 22. The *literal* resurrection is of *bodies*, this of *spirits*. If a "living dog" be more excellent than a "dead lion," because it is animated, how great is that excellency which is communicated to the soul when it is made spiritually alive, and has the divine image impressed upon it. What can it then mean but a figurative or spiritual resurrection? A resurrection of the "cause" for which the martyrs died, and included with them of course are all the righteous dead. They shall live in their successors, as Elijah did in John; which is quite a common figure in the Bible. Now, Miller and his followers just flatly deny that there is any such thing as a "figurative resurrection" in Scripture. Does not Paul, as we have already seen, describe the restoration of his kinsmen to the Church, by this figure? Isaiah makes use of the same figure, ch. xxvi. 19; and Ezekiel describes in the same way the remarkable reviving which was to take place in the Church upon her return from Babylon, ch. xxxix. 11, 12. And as to these "souls" reigning with Christ, it is supposed that he is to dwell "bodily" with them during 1000 years. Did not Enoch walk "with" God? But who ever supposed that Enoch was either then in heaven, or God "with him" on earth, otherwise than by his gracious presence? But the idea is groundless: 1st. Because there are only *two* appearances of Christ on earth mentioned, and they are always spoken of so as to exclude a *third*. The second is always connected with the final judgment. 2nd. Such a reign is incompatible with the glory into which he has now entered. The personal reign is also supposed; however, from ch. xxi. 8, "the tabernacle of God is with men." Yet the words seem employed as if on purpose to remind us of an ancient promise thus fulfilled, Ez. ch xxxvii. 27, "My tabernacle also shall be with them." And it has been the privilege of genuine believers, in all ages, to have Him, "who dwells in the high and holy place," with them. The saints then, in the times spoken of, shall reign "with Christ," in their government of themselves by his spirit and laws, and shall have