*False Christ should rule two hundred and sixty years  
longer than the True Christ?*  
 5. “And the rest of the dead lived not1 until the thousand  
years were finished.”  
  
 If this be the revival of a party of holy men, it is  
not “the *first*,” or the twentieth. “But,” it is replied,  
“there was a resurrection also of dead persons before  
this, as Jairus’ daughter, Lazarus, and others” (Matt.  
xxvii. 52, 53). The Holy Spirit does not reckon those  
cases as the first resurrection. The resurrection is not  
the mere act of rising; it includes the glory then possessed. The time of enjoyment and reigning with  
Christ ensuing on the rising from the dead, is here taken  
into account. The raptures of the saints occur in different battalions. But all resurrections, beginning to  
be reckoned from the thousand years, and introducing  
their partakers into the kingdom of Christ, constitute  
together the first resurrection.  
 “This is the first resurrection.” Here is a word of  
explanation, resembling many like passages in the book.  
That must be taken literally, whatever be symbolic.  
Then resurrection is not figurative here, but literal.  
The sacred writer in saying, “the first resurrection,”  
implies that there is a second. He implies, too, that  
while the resurrections differ in regard of time or order,  
they are of the same description in regard of their  
essence as resurrections.  
 To the overcoming saint Jesus promises a place  
on *His* throne as distinct from His Father’s, a place on  
that which He now occupies. iii. 21. Where is Christ’s  
throne seen to be distinct from the Father’s? Not in  
chapters iv. and v. There Jesus is between the throne  
and the elders. Not in the final state of things in the  
  
1 So read the best MSS. and the Critical Editions.