

one general rising from the grave. Paul, who wrote most particularly of the resurrection, affirms, 1 Cor. xv. 52, that we shall "*all be changed,*" not by a sliding scale system, but "*in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump.*"

This theory of a preferential rising of the more eminent saints, has recently received new interest by its maintainance in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. See Vols. xviii., p. 358, and xxi., p. 362. But with all due deference to so great authority, do we demur to the soundness of the reasoning employed. Not to dwell on the doubtful propriety of resting a matter so weighty mainly on verbal criticism, rather than on the analogy of faith, the conclusion so arrived at, does not seem sufficiently clear for general adoption. Granting, as claimed by this authority, a probable omission of the Greek article in Rev. xx., 4, before the chiliaid of years, arguing, according to Greek usage a different thousand years to that of v. 2, in regard to the confinement of Satan, yet it seems somewhat dogmatical to urge, a separate enunciation for v. 6, where the article is actually omitted in the original, though referring to the thousand years of v. 4. Moreover, it proves too much for the critic's position, since the insertion of the article in v. 7, before the term of Satan's confinement, makes it synchronise with the thousand years' reign of the saints, unless a separate enunciation be also claimed for v. 7, which really would be a begging of the question, rather than proving it.

But why, it will be asked, this labored criticism on the Greek text? Just to sustain a theory. On the ground, that the mingling of the literal and the spiritual is opposed to all sound exegesis, the review writer first strives to sift out the reference, so inconvenient for him, to the binding of Satan, a purely spiritual transaction, and then, on the principle of exegesis claimed, exultingly infers that if the last resurrection described in the close of the chapter, be literal, then so is the first.

To disprove this reasoning, we have just to note that the boundary between the literal and spiritual, is not determinable by the arbitrary limitation of chapter and verse, a modern work of an uninspired hand, but by the scope of the passage in the inspired writing. Hence, as the first resurrection is placed by the revelator between the spiritual processes of the binding and loosing of Satan, on the principle of exegesis claimed, the first resurrection must also be spiritual. But, that this may more plainly be seen, it will now be best to consider :

3.—*The Evangelic View.* According to this, the first or millennial resurrection, is a revival of earnest christianity, a *living again* of the spirit that animated the martyrs and other eminent saints, freed from the deadening admixture of worldliness at present so prevalent among the churches. In the same sense that Abel, though dead yet speaketh; as we understand Elijah the prophet to have come, when the Baptist heralded Christ "*in the spirit and power of Elias,*" it is maintained the blessed and holy of the first resurrection, will reappear in the faith and fervor of the millennial times. The binding of Satan, it is urged, involves the death of worldliness maintained by his agency as "*the god of this world.*" As the spirit of sin, under the evil one, now reigns unto death, so superabounding grace, is to reign unto life eternal, righteousness becoming prevalent in all places over iniquity, until the loosing of Satan at the close of the millennium. That some such spiritual meaning is to be attached to the phrase "*lived again,*" may be argued from the fact that the Greek word is so used in at least two other passages; one Luke xv. 24, 32, of the prodigal son, and the other Rom. vii. 7, 9, "*but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.*" Thus, though the word usually