

Modern Millenarianism

W. Kelly.

B.T. Vol. 9, p. 107-111.)

My dear -,

You will be pleased to bear that I lately fell in with the *British Quarterly Review*, containing the article on *Modern Millenarianism*, which a good while ago you wanted me to read. Though particularly occupied just now with souls — a far better and more important object than books — I must try to find time for a few remarks on the paper, the tone of which greatly commends the writer to my heart, if I dissent from most of his conclusions on the subject.

One quite agrees with him that the Jews were wrong not intellectually merely but morally in excluding from their faith a rejected, suffering, crucified Messiah — in expecting His glory without His sufferings. We can now see, from Genesis to Malachi or at least Zechariah, plain intimations that He must needs first suffer. But even disciples were slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken. Alas! it is ever so. The present testimony of God, at any given epoch, is always the test truth, but strong and simple faith ever cleaves to it in spite of shame and disrepute. (Compare Heb. 11) So, while the Shekinah was present in the holy of holies, Israel was constantly tempted to lust after idols: when that was withdrawn, these ceased to be the special temptations, as is obvious in the later prophets. So, when a Christ in humiliation was presented to faith, Israel would none of Him.

But, again, the promise of a glorious returning Christ, we know from 2 Peter, was to fare no better with the last-day scoffers; and it is to be remembered that saints, if mingling much with the world, its literature, its philosophy and its politics, must inevitably be tintured more or less by the spirit of the age. Such seems to me the condition of the writers in this Review, if we take the article on Lord Macaulay and especially pages 26, 27 as a specimen of their sentiments on the momentous topic therein discussed. One can understand God overruling the existence of sects and employing their activity and even rivalry; but it argues a moral blindness to God's object and glory in His church on earth to treat sectarianism as not merely a peccadillo but the legitimate consequence of a right principle. "The very disunion he notices in our church arises from the strength and excellence of its principle." etc. "Sectarianism is, as we have said, the necessary consequence of the first principle of Protestantism." It may be "of Protestantism," but assuredly not of Christianity, whose inspired records and standards uniformly condemn it, root and branch, as a fleshly evil. (1 Cor. 1, 3; Gal. 5.) Need it surprise one to read in another paper, page 269, that Cromwell was the noblest product of Puritanism as it was of Protestantism, and this again of Christianity? For sad to say, pride is often in the ratio of degradation. Nor can we be astonished that both writers are warm admirers of Mr. Carlyle and his writings, and that the latter is so tender to sceptics of the class of John Sterling. The spirit of such scribes savour of the world, not of the Father, and can only corrupt the saints from the simplicity that is in Christ. I would not, I do not, till I know more, confound article 6 with articles 1 and 8: but beyond a doubt the connection is not the best. So that one should not look for any great light on prophetic or dispensational truths in a publication which endorses unsound doctrine on a question so distinctly answered in scripture, and so important in practice, as that of sectarianism — whether it be a good or bad thing. If wrong about the church's present responsibility, a writer, whom such a class of men would tolerate, could not be expected to be right about the future glory of Christ. Their principle is the exaltation of man in his present state, of Christians in their existing denominationalism; in a word, of Christendom as it is. As this principle naturally leads to the justification of sects, so it fears and dislikes

the coming of Christ in judgment of what they justify and of all other evil; it fosters the expectation, unauthorized by scripture, of a reign of the gospel, instead of submitting to the testimony of the gospel of the reign; at best, it seeks a present escape from tribulation, and a proximate triumph for the church (without Christ) on earth, instead of waiting for the appearing of both in a glory whereby the world shall know that the Father sent the Son and loved the church as He loved Him. It goes much farther, even to joining with papists and infidels to overthrow a rival religious body in the vain expectation of bettering society, without imputing more selfish motives. But I am writing an essay, instead of offering a few remarks on the paper.

To return then, it is allowed that Mr. R. Herschell's thoughts and criticisms (given in pp. 153, 154) are incorrect, though there are in them elements of truth, is in those of his critic. Surely no serious person would contend that in Acts 7: 38 the word ἐκκλησία has the same force as in Acts 2 or Matthew 16, 18. The truth is, that the word in itself means "assembly," and is capable of application to a bad or good one, a civic or a religious one, the congregation of Israel in the Old Testament, or the church of God in the New Testament; that is, it proves nothing for the question at issue. Again, I grant and constantly teach, that the Abrahamic promises are quite distinct from God's grace to the church. They involve blessing for the Gentiles, but surely for "thy seed" in a larger measure and a higher mode; whereas the essential feature of "the mystery" is the abolition of any such distinctions between Jew and Gentile. This perfectly falls in with my view, but seems to be excluded by the system of the review, though the principle is surrendered in page 155. In the millennium the Abrahamic promises will be the governing idea; now it is "the mystery" (though it is also true that, in virtue of union with Him who is Abraham's Seed in the highest sense, we enjoy those promises in principle, as is taught in Gal. 3.) As to the second point neither Isaiah 65 nor Amos 9, cited in Acts 15, teach the long-continued rejection of Israel, much less do they reveal the calling of the church. They leave room for it and agree with it doubtless: but the calling of a body which knows neither Jew nor Gentile within itself, but of both makes one new man, was a mystery as yet hid in God, not disclosed in the prophecies though they might confirm it when it was disclosed. I agree that it was made known not to Paul only but to the New Testament apostles and prophets, and to Paul emphatically. So, too, it is agreed that Herschell's construction of Ephesians 3 is a total mistake. But it remains true, that while the church shares many blessings of which the Old Testament speaks, her own proper characteristics as Christ's body and bride were not predicted but hidden previously, save in types which gave no light till themselves received it through the revelation of the mystery in St. Paul's epistles.

We maintain then, not that Israel, and Judah, Jerusalem, and Sion, the priests and the Levites, may not be typical of God's people now in some of their manifold relations to God and man, but that the church as such, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all, is nowhere predicted in the Old Testament, though prophets may allude to and bring out particular features which are of course true of those who compose the church: as, for instance, God's visiting the Gentiles, etc. But surely this itself is not the church. And if any part of the Old Testament does, where and what is it? Indeed Ephesians 3 and Colossians 1 ought to be enough, I think, to set aside such a notion. The use of Isaiah 54 in Galatians 4 is in no way adverse, but just what we freely allow. If the critic will have it to mean more, as he appears to do in speaking of "its proper fulfilment," he must know that one can easily disprove so narrow a way of interpreting the prophecies; and this from the New Testament use of Old Testament prophecy. Galatians 4 says nothing of the sort, and the context of Isaiah 54 repudiates such exclusiveness and claims much more, without denying that this was an accomplishment of it. (Compare Matt. 2: 15, 17, 18, etc.) This, then, is the answer to what is urged in pages 159-163.

The "olive-tree" is a distinct idea, and not be confounded with the "one new man" of Ephesians 2.

The olive-tree was not a new thing, and goes up no higher than Abraham. Abel, Enoch, Noah have nothing to say to it. It is the tree of earthly testimony, the responsible separated witness of God, and extends into the millennium when all Israel shall be saved. It does not obliterate Jewish and Gentile distinction, but maintains the Jews to be the natural branches though Gentiles may be for a season grafted in. But the "one new man" is above such differences. Here both are brought in and reconciled in pure grace. Here there are no natural members. All is supernatural, and the idea of cutting off is unknown. Whereas, in Romans 11, the Jews were cut off in part that the Gentiles might be grafted in amongst them. This clearly then is a place which Christendom now holds in continuation of Israel, liable to be cut off if unfaithful, and in no way clashing with the truth in Ephesians that the church as such has her own peculiar privileges, which, so far from being enjoyed, were not even revealed before the descent of the Spirit, consequent on the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus and His ascension to heaven.

Nor is the new birth what makes the one body, but the baptism of the Spirit. Compare Acts 1: 4, 5 with 1 Corinthians 12: 13. All saints in all ages are necessarily born of the Spirit; but to be baptized of the Spirit was the new and distinctive blessing never realized before Pentecost. And this it is which forms the church, as we learn from 1 Corinthians, etc. Accordingly Hebrews 12 expressly distinguishes "the spirits of just men made perfect" (*i.e.*, the Old Testament saints) from "the church of the firstborn," etc.

As to what is said on prophecy, it is clear to me that the reviewer does not see that, besides man's sin, and the new birth, and redemption, with their great issues, scripture treats largely of the government of the world whereof Israel was the earthly centre, as we are told in Deuteronomy 32, Now, just as clearly the close of this vast tragedy is placed at the end of the age. Thus, I believe that the predictions which speak of the Lord's glory, revealed in judgment and government of this world, await their grand fulfilment, though pledges may have been given. One cannot but be sorry to see him repent the objection of German sceptics and others founded on Edom, Moab, etc., having ceased to be. Even to the poor Jew they still exist, and God remembers them, howsoever they may be called now; and when the day of visitation arrives, He will judge them as such. At least, all he says here is assumption, and, so far from disproving anything, itself requires proof, and is against the evidence of such scriptures as Daniel 11: 41, etc. There is no more difficulty in their re-appearing than in that of the ten tribes; and those who believe in the future restoration of the one cannot well deny the future judgment of the other. The idea of germinant accomplishments of either we feel no disposition to reject; but they are rather an argument for than against the full manifestation; as the many antichrists in the apostle's time proved that it was the last time, at the close of which the Antichrist should come, they inchoate accomplishments, he the ultimate. Undoubtedly there is truth in applying prophecies; for they have their partial developments which the spiritual man may and ought to judge; but where scripture is to be interpreted, the grand matter is the full meaning, not what is true merely but what is adequate, and what exhausts the terms of the prediction. This is, I humbly judge, a sufficient reply to the use made of Deuteronomy 30; Isaiah 11, 43; Jeremiah 23, 30, 31, 33; Ezekiel 20, 37; Amos 9; Zechariah 8, 12.

On the "promises made to the fathers" we need not dwell as so much has been said by others. The subject of the resurrection and the judgment may claim more notice. Simultaneity of either is taught nowhere in scripture, so far as I know. What looks most like it is John 5: 28, 29. But the reviewer must be aware that ὥρα ("hour") is capable of meaning a long protracted period — nay, that it is so used, a few verses before, of the quickening-hour (*i.e.*, from the days of our Lord to the present moment). Why then may not the hour in which the resurrection occurs extend over a period of a thousand years or more, if so required by Revelation 20 or other scriptures? Matthew 25, so far from being a judgment of

all the dead, includes not one dead person (if so, where?) and, even of the quick, it is not universal. It is a judgment of "all the Gentiles," as distinguished from the Jews who are disposed of in Matthew 24. No doubt it is a final judgment, so far as regards those concerned. That it is universal, even to look at the living only — that it embraces the dead is to beg the question. Again, Acts 17: 31 is a judgment of the οἰκουμένη, the "habitable earth," and its inhabitants. No dead people are here referred to. That is, the proofs alleged are really no proofs at all.

The main objection to taking Revelation 20: 4-6 literally, as stated in page 183, seems to be that these verses do not include all the saints from the beginning. But do they not? The reviewer, like many others, restricts verse 4 to the martyrs and confessors, leaving out entirely those referred to in the first clause. Now the verse really speaks of three classes. "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them" — a purposely broad and vague category, so as to include the elders who obtained a good report by faith, and us for whom God provided some better thing, (that is, saints generally, whether martyred or not,) followed by the two special companies of sufferers whom the Apocalypse so largely describes. (Rev. 6, Rev. 13, Rev. 15.) The interpretation which loses sight of a clause whose terms are purposely so comprehensive as the first in this verse is quite unreliable, and the true force of "the first resurrection" comes out more plainly than ever. Compare with it Luke 20: 35, 36. Revelation 20: 4 is a description of all saints who reign with Christ, not of a part only, nor of mere representatives, but of the whole. "The souls τῶν πεπελεκισμένων," etc. are in addition to, not a specification of, those already seen enthroned. The impersonal use, as Stuart contends, of ἐκάθισαν falls in with this, and the αὐτοῖς would refer to the sitters on thrones, followed by the groups of persons first seen disembodied, and subsequently united to their bodies. This is the simple meaning of the verse, as all can see when it is suggested, and accordingly κρῖμα has its ordinary signification.

It is admitted by the reviewer that, if John had said anywhere "This is the second resurrection," the explanation would have been authoritative. Now it is not duly observed, that "this is the first resurrection" is the divine explanation of the first vision, not the symbol but the authoritative solution of it; just as much as, in an earlier scene, "the seven heads are seven mountains" and "the ten horns are ten kings." Here, as in so many other scenes, you have first the hieroglyphic and then the key. I admit that the expression as to the post-millennial judgment scene is "This is the second death," not the second resurrection, because the point is not merely their reappearing but their awful and endless doom, the lake of fire. No resurrection can be inferred from verses 7-9: but there is a life-resurrection in verses 4-6, and in verses 11-15 a judgment-resurrection; the one comprehending those who have done good, the other, those who have done evil, as in John 5, and the word "hour" in verse 28, as we have seen from the analogy of verse 25, leaving ample space for the intervening period.

As to the objections in page 186, etc. 1, I deny that the life and reign, etc. is the judgment. It is a connected but distinct thing. 2. I have already denied that there is the smallest intimation of a resurrection in Matthew 25: 30, 31. 2 Corinthians 5: 10 speaks only of the saints, as the reviewer seems to admit in page 183. Acts 17: 31 is equally irrelevant. It is not necessary that the two resurrections should be parallel: they are really contrasted in character. 3. The limit of a thousand years is with the reign, not with the life, though in another sense they reign everlastingly. The comparison of verse 6 with 4 is decisive as to this. Why then should not the resurrection in verses 12, 13 be a sequel to 4 and 5? 4. Our view preserves the antithesis much more than the ordinary one, and is unobjectionable on that score. I do not admit the correspondence between 2 Corinthians 5 and Revelation 20 if only because the former must take in "us all," *i.e.* is universal, while I believe that of Revelation 20 is of the unjust only. There are alas! bad works in God's servants, and the Lord is not indifferent to building up such materials as wood, hay, and stubble upon Christ, but there are no good works in the unjust. Hence, in

the account of this last judgment, there is no hint of any good things, inure than of good men; while in 2 Corinthians 5 you have both, though the good be not unmixed in the saints. This, in Revelation 20: 11-15, is the κρίσις, and no man living shall be justified there — no, not if God entered into it with His servants; but they have everlasting life and shall not come into κρίσις. They are passed from death unto life, though the Lord Jesus will beyond doubt examine their ways, and then shall every man have praise to God. Not a word in the closing scene of Revelation 20 implies the presence of a saved soul: all is consistent with the idea that the judgment is of the wicked only, the book of life being brought forward on God's part, so to speak, is the books were on man's; and both appearing in their terrible sentence. Even the reviewer is obliged to allow that the expression, "till the thousand years," etc. does not necessarily restrict the resurrection of the rest of the dead to that moment, but simply that it cannot be before. Besides, there is a difference in the way in which Satan's release is spoken of, μετὰ ταῦτα δ. ἄ. λ. μ χ. This formula does tie the loosing of Satan to the close of the thousand years, but is nowhere used about the resurrection of the rest of the dead. So that the argument tells exactly against the point desired. 5. It is astonishing how sensible Christians like the reviewer, Dr. David Brown, etc., overlook the fact that "the dead" is a phrase which, at the epoch in question, coincides is a fact with "the rest of the dead." In Revelation 20: 12 either phrase might have been used, on our theory; in Revelation 11: 18 only τ. v. the dead, and not "the rest of the dead." In the passage before, οὐς v. means all the dead (that is, of course, excepting those raised more than a thousand years before); in the other passage it means all the dead too (that is, just as simply good and bad, because it is before all resurrections, as the other is after one of them). These objections, suggested by the context, are really null, and verses 7-9 are the antithesis to verses 1-3, and not to 4-6 which finds its contrast in 11-15; the loosing of Satan, etc., to his being bound, and the second death to the first resurrection.

I must beg the reviewer's pardon for thinking his view of the whole scene, etc., both careless and beyond reasonable belief. The triumphs of the principles of martyrs cannot be called God's judgment and vengeance for their blood on those that dwell on the earth. Besides, what was celebrated in heaven (Rev. 5: 10) was that they should reign on (or over) the earth — not their cause merely, but themselves. One can understand principles reigning or perhaps by a harsh figure being "kings;" still it would be hard, as some have said, to make "priests" of them, while it perfectly suits the person; and lastly, while it is quite intelligible for an affectionate labourer, rejoicing over his tried brethren, to say, "now we live, if ye stand fast in the Lord," it is not so to speak of the souls of beheaded ones living, save in the sense of being united to their bodies. In other words, there is no analogy whatever between the context of 1 Thess. 3, and of Revelation 20. As to 1 Corinthians 4: 8, one cannot, for a moment, accept an interpretation so vague. They were anticipating the time of the kingdom, having tired of the place of tribulation and patience. Would to God, says Paul, that the time for reigning had really come, that we, poor, despised, buffeted, hungry, devoted to death, might reign with you!

The explanation offered of "the rest of the dead" is, if I remember rightly, what Dr. Wardlaw offered long ago. It is only conceivable, in those who have studied very superficially, and who wish not to reduce their ideas to the vision, but to accommodate the vision to their ideas. Look at other passages of the book, where οἱ λοιποὶ occurs; and is it not a phrase immediately related to the context wherein it occurs? See in Rev. 2: 14, "you, the rest in Thyatira who have not this doctrine," etc., antithetical to those described in the same scene, or epistle, who had. Again, in Rev. 9: 20 the non-repentant remnant is in contrast with the killed third part of men, as in Rev. 11: 11 the affrighted remnant after the slain seven chiliads. Again, in Rev. 12: 13-17 you have the dragon persecuting the woman who brought forth the manchild: he is caught up out of the way, she flees, the earth helps, and the furious dragon goes away to make war with the remnant of her seed, i.e., evidently in contrast With τὸν ἄρρῶνα — " just named. So again in Rev. 19 by οἱ λοιποί, the remnant, is meant that part of the Lord's enemies which

remained for the sword that proceeded out of His mouth, after the beast and false prophet were cast alive in the lake of fire — a living remnant who are to be thus judged, and there the scene closes. Then, after the intervention of quite a different vision wherein an angel is seen securing the serpent for a long but limited space, there comes before the prophet the vision of thrones filled already with sitters upon them, beside two other classes of holy and blessed sufferers who are subsequently said to be clothed with their bodies (*i.e.* "they lived") and reigned, as well as the precious enthroned ones. In contrast with those who lived, the rest (οἱ λοιποὶ) of the dead are clearly another remnant, not a living but a dead remnant who do not receive life till the millennium closes. That this is spoken of natural death, and of life after that, is manifest from the fact that both they, and the first resurrection class, who together form "the dead," are here regarded as having been "dead" in the same sense. The death, therefore, common to both can only be natural death, and hence also the resurrection is a real literal resurrection of the saints before the millennium, and of "the rest of the dead" after it. The distinction is certainly as plain is possible between the remnant in Revelation 19 and that in Revelation 20.

Further, one must repeat that the whole is not merely symbolical. Doubtless the thrones are symbols here, as are the white horses in the preceding chapter. But then we have, besides, the revealed explanation — "this is the first resurrection." It is not then a resurrection, as in Ezekiel 37, used to symbolize some other action of divine power and grace but a vision is seen, and the Holy Ghost explains it as the first resurrection, shared by those who are priests of God and of Christ, and who reign with Him a thousand years. Then, upon the loosing of Satan, we have the last rebellion of mankind — the nations from the four quarters of the earth, who are devoured by fire from God out of heaven, and of course added to the rest of the dead whom "the first resurrection" had left undisturbed in their graves. Subsequently appears a great white throne, and One sat upon it from whose face the earth and heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And the dead are seen standing before the throne, and the final assize ensues. This is no coming of Christ. in judgment of the earth, and of course all mention of living saints caught up to Him is absent. It is a judgment of the dead before the throne, not an advent of Christ to the earth, for earth and heaven are fled before His face. Not a word is hinted about His coming to the living, but the dead stand before Him — where is not said, but it is clearly neither the heaven nor the earth that now are, but both will have disappeared. This then is not at all the time nor the circumstances described in Matthew 25; for there you have all the nations, as such, gathered and separated before Him after He has come (to earth) and taken His seat (not on the great white throne for judging the dead but) upon the throne of His glory when He shall judge the Gentiles, when the apostles shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. That is, the popular scheme is confusion, a vain attempt at harmonizing a scene of judgment of nations (on the earth of course, for there are none in heaven, nor in eternity), with one so different in nearly every respect as the judgment of the dead: here no living are in question, there no dead. It seems therefore the extreme of hardihood, in the way of interpretation, both to expunge the personal coming of the Lord in judgment of the quick from Revelation 19: 11-21 where it is more fully described than in any part of scripture, and to insert it in Revelation 20: 11-13 where it unquestionably is not depicted, and could not be; for at that time there are no quick to judge and no earth to come to — a double failure, in the latter adding to, and in the former taking from, the plain force of the words of this prophecy. Possibly Acts 17: 31 may coincide with Matthew 25, but not 2 Corinthians 5: 10 for reasons already given, all being distinct in character from Revelation 20: 11-13 as shown above. The reviewer's reason for denying that Revelation 19: 11-21 describes a personal coming appears to be akin to those who object, because it dwells so elaborately upon the person of the Word of God who comes to make war! whereas in Revelation 20 we are to suppose His personal coming must be, because it is not described it all!! Is this "God's pure daylight, the true analogy of scripture," beaming upon the apocalyptic symbols?

I know not who over drew so crude an inference from 1 Thessalonians 4: 16 as that which the reviewer calls "the argument," unless it were some ill-taught Bloomsbury lecturer. Every one else holding the pre-millennial advent known to me interprets both clauses in this and the following verse as he does; so that the argument does not lie there, but in the fact of the resurrection here noticed being exclusively that of the righteous at Christ's coming; whereas that of the unrighteous, as we have just seen from Revelation 20, is when heaven and earth have fled away and His coming is out of the question. It may be, of course, that some ignorant person has so argued; but we are no more responsible for such mistakes than is the reviewer for the crudities of many of his friends. A similar remark applies to the alleged millenarian use, of 1 Corinthians 15: 23, 24.* I can only say that such egregious misinterpretations are new to me. All well-instructed students of prophecy that I am acquainted with admit and contend that τὸ τέλος means the end (not of the dead but) of Christ's kingdom which he takes as the exalted man; that the only resurrection here treated of, besides Christ's, is of those who are His. On the other hand, there is not the least foundation for the reviewer's statement that "when they were gathered in, the end of His temporary mediatorial dispensation would have arrived." There are three epochs referred to: first, the resurrection of Christ; next, that of His people (in order to reign with Him); then, the end of this kingdom when He delivers it up to God even the Father, death itself having died. Now this is manifestly confirmed by 2 Timothy 4, where the judgment of quick and dead is connected with "His appearing and His kingdom" — not as if His kingdom closed with His appearing, but rather that His appearing ushers in His kingdom; and, before that kingdom terminates, the resurrection of the wicked and in judgment are necessarily over. So also Revelation 20, where we have the resurrection of the holy severed by more than a thousand years from that of the rest of the dead, and it is with their judgment (and not the first resurrection) we find the annihilation of death connected in this chapter. Here again the same remark applies as has been said of 1 Thessalonians 4 — they that are Christ's rise at His coming; and of these only and separately does 1 Corinthians 15 speak; whereas "the dead" which remain, after the millennium is closed, are not raised till His coming is an impossibility, for the earth is fled away. I should say therefore, that the separate and subsequent resurrection of the wicked conclusively follows from a comparison of 1 Corinthians 15 with 2 Timothy 4 and Revelation 20, as well as the truth that the kingdom in question fills the interval between the ἔπειτα and the εἶτα (i.e., the "afterward" and the "then" of these verses).

* Mr. Birks used to say wild things even before he avowed his heterodoxy as to eternal punishment.

I am glad the reviewer gives up, as not sufficiently explicit, the usual way of neutralizing the force of the expression "resurrection from the (lead," as distinct from "resurrection of the dead." Others too, I remember, have been either ignorant or unfair on this head. for though "the resurrection from the dead" is of course *à fortiori* "of the dead," never does the converse hold; and this establishes their distinctive character. The natural meaning of the terms is selection, and therefore priority in rising of those selected. To say "not priority," after admitting that it implies selection, is to my mind unintelligible; and it must be repeated that Matthew 25: 32 does not state or imply but exclude resurrection from that scene. Again, one cannot understand the note which says that "we lay no stress on the difference between ἐξανάστασιν τῶν v. (as Rec. and Griesbach have it) and τὴν ἕκ v. (as Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, and Tregelles read)." Why, the difference is that the former is wrong and the latter right, the former is a contradiction in terms, while the latter is established by external evidence and harmonizes the internal. Thus the argument in favour of a separate precious resurrection of the righteous appears sound and decisive, and the popular notion of one common resurrection of all the dead is contrary to the plainest scriptures. Yours affectionately,

W. K.