Matt. xix. 28), **and they sat upon them**(who? the Apostles, as in Matt. xix. 28:  
the Saints, as in 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; notice  
well, that there is nothing to hinder this  
in the souls of the saints not being seen  
till the next clause: for there is no mark  
of temporal sequence connecting the two  
verses: nay, such an idea is precluded by  
the specification at the end of ver. 4, that  
those very souls of the saints are they who  
reigned with Christ, and were His assessors  
in reigning and judging, during this time),  
**and judgment** (the act and decision of  
judgment) **was given to them** (so in  
Dan. vii. 22, “*Until the ancient of days  
came, and judgment was given to the  
saints of the Most High.*” That is, they  
were constituted judges). **And I saw the  
souls of them who had been beheaded**(literally, smitten with the axe) **on account of the testimony of Jesus and on  
account of the word of God** (see ch. i. 9),  
**and** (of those) **the which did not worship**(during life) **the beast nor yet his image,  
and did not receive the mark** (mentioned  
ch. xiii. 16) **on their forehead and upon  
their hand: and they lived** (i.e. “*lived  
again*;” and, as the act is presently described as the first *resurrection*, with their  
bodies, perfect and complete) **and reigned  
with Christ** (took part in His Kingdom:  
see ch.i, 6; 2 Tim. ii. 12: also 1 Cor. iv. 8  
and note) **a thousand years** (it would certainly appear that this reigning includes  
the office of judgment. Many interpreters  
suppose that these saints are the judged:  
but there is nothing in the context, nor  
in other parts of Scripture, to favour this idea, Nay, it is expressly negatived by  
our Lord’s saying in John v. 24: “*Verily,  
verily, I say unto you, That he who  
heareth my word, and believeth on Him  
that sent me, hath eternal life, and***cometh not into judgment***, but hath  
passed from death unto life*”). {5} T**he rest  
of the dead lived not** (*again*, as above)  
**until the thousand years be completed,  
This is the first resurrection** (remarks on  
the interpretation of this passage will be  
found in the Introduction, § v. par. 33.  
It will have been long ago anticipated  
by the readers of this Commentary, that  
I cannot consent to distort the words  
from their plain sense and chronological  
place in the prophecy, on account of any  
considerations of difficulty, or any risk of  
abuses which the doctrine of the millennium  
may bring with it. Those who lived next  
to the Apostles, and the whole Church for  
300 years, understood them in the plain  
literal sense: and it is a strange sight in  
these days to see expositors who are among  
the first in reverence of antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent  
stance of unanimity which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself,  
no legitimate treatment of it will extort  
what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where  
*two resurrections* are mentioned, where  
certain **souls lived** at the first, and the  
rest of the **dead lived** 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*