they aim at exclusion, it insists on comprehension. Where they pile up definitions and descriptions, it points only to the Father and the Son. Where they combat errors, it states truths. I do not wish to persuade myself that the longer symbols of later times, Athanasian Creed, or Westminster Confession, or Thirty-nine Articles, may not be necessary, true, and useful. As errors cropped up, it was sometimes run the risk of fancying that it is an intellectual thing to be believed, rather than a life through them to be lived.—W. M. Sinclair.

I was led in my correspondence with the Principal of King's College to dwell, perhaps too much, on the words, 'This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, Lord, and love Thee more.'—Rev. xx. 6.

Knowledge and Love.
I know Thee!—from my infancy Thy light Hath been the air in which my spirit moved; I love Thee!—for the lifelong pure delight Of feeling that I am by Thee beloved.

And yet my heart how languid! and how slow Beat its dull pulses from its inmost core! How poor my knowledge! and my love how low! I want to know Thee, and to love Thee more.

How shall I stir the longings of my soul Into the passion of a holy love, Till its great wave of worship upward roll And break in praises at Thy feet above?

O could I only see Thee as Thou art Where angels wait, archangels veiled adoring, Thy glory! it might pierce my veiled heart, Seeing Thee clearer, I might love Thee more.

Ah! vain conceit! That glory with its light Could do the work of sorrow with its shade, That Faith's high triumphs could be won by sight, Or man without the Cross be God-like made.

Deep in the shadow of the Cross there lies A glory hidden from our grayer view, Such revelation as self-sacrifice Gives to the heart that can to truth be true.

Our Lord without its passion could not win For us the broken heart and binding vow, Nor from our souls lift off the load of sin Save with His torn hands, and bleeding brow, So must we follow—surely not unmeet With the great Master sorrowing on before, In duty's path rough hands and wounded feet Will make us know Thee, Lord, and love Thee more. John Monsell.

The First Resurrection.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.'—Rev. xx. 6.

There are probably few, even of those who from time to time meditate on the deeper disclosures which Holy Scripture makes to us of those whom our blessed Lord speaks of as 'sons of the resurrection,' who ever dwell upon the holy mystery which the text presents to us in those solemn and emphatic words.

The words, taken by themselves, seem plainly to place before us two deep truths, first, that however we may subsequently explain it, there is a first resurrection—a resurrection which will be succeeded by another resurrection, different it may be in nature and character, but indisputably later in point of time and manifestation.

The second truth is of no less importance, namely, that this first resurrection will be of such a
nature, so transcendent and so divine, that he who
shall be accounted worthy of it is declared by
the inspired writer to be emphatically blessed and
holy. I say emphatically blessed and holy; for
the careful reader cannot fail to observe that there
is a kind of break in the sequence of the foregoing
words, after the mention of the circumstances
which justify the title given to them—a pause that
is designedly made by the holy writer to impress
on the reader the exceeding blessedness and
holiness of him who is a partaker in, or, again
to use our blessed Lord's words, 'a son' of the
first resurrection.

But all this will be made still clearer if I set
before you in their connexion the words which
immediately precede and follow the passage on
which we are preparing to meditate.

After a description of the binding of Satan for
a period indicated by the apostle as a thousand
years, an expression chosen, it may be, to mark a
period, long as it might seem to man, yet as one
day in the unfolding counsels of Omnipotence—
after a description of this binding, the apostle
passes onward to specify the circumstances of
a solemn judgment—thrones set and judgment
given to those who sat thereon—judgment,
perhaps (but the connexion is not clear), in
reference to those next mentioned, holy martyrs
and saintly men who had remained faithful to
their Lord even unto the end. Of them it is said
that 'they lived and reigned with Christ a
thousand years'—the thousand years during which
the power of the Evil One is declared to be
restrained, a period now commonly and probably
rightly explained to mean the final flowering time
of the visible Church.

The apostle then passes onward expressly to
declare in language which, as it seems to me,
cannot possibly be explained away, that 'the rest
of the dead lived not till the thousand years'—this
blessed period of holy development—should be
finished, and (after one last struggle) the end,
or in other words, the advent of the Lord, the
final judgment, and the closing scenes of this
world's history, be fully and finally come.

Till that hour the rest of the dead lived not,
or in other words the general resurrection is stated
not to have taken place. There are thus plainly
two resurrections mentioned in this passage, the
general resurrection after the thousand years, and,
as it would seem, synchronous with the advent;
and prior to it, and separated from it by an inter-
space of time, a first resurrection—a resurrection
of martyrs and saints, who had braved every
assault and every temptation, and had remained
faithful unto death. It is in reference to this
most blessed and chosen company that the in-
spired writer says definitely, 'This is the first
resurrection'; and he enhances it with the words
of our text, and with the further declaration that
these first-fruits of them that slept will be with
Christ, will be His ministers and priests, yea, and
bear rule with Him during the blessed flowering
time of His Church. Such is the substance of
this momentous prophecy.

Thus far we see distinctly that the passage
we have been considering does reveal to us that
there will be a first resurrection—a resurrection
anterior to that general resurrection, when, as the
holy writer tells us, 'the dead, the great and the
small,' will stand before the throne of their
Redeemer and be judged every man according
to his works. We also see equally clearly that
this first resurrection holds a defined place in what
would appear to be the ordered sequences of the
closing scenes of this world's history. Now comes
the plain question. Is this first resurrection a
definite reality—a reality on which we can base
exhortation, and towards which we may direct
spiritual effort? Is it a solitary expression, in a
passage of deep apocalyptic mystery, from which
no practical teaching could safely be deduced,
or, on the contrary, does it verily indicate, as the
text seems to imply, something very real and very
blessed, something that we ought to strive to
attain unto, even as St. Paul, in one uniquely
expressed passage, does verily seem to have
striven, when he closes a noble utterance of all
he did to become more closely united with Christ
with those words of humble, yet really lofty hope
—'if by any means I may attain unto the resur-
rection from the dead'—the resurrection (it must
be from the tenor of the words) of the saints and
the elect, the resurrection on which we are now
meditating.

What answer then have we to return to the
serious question? Can we rightly regard this
first resurrection as a plainly revealed doctrinal
truth? Can we profitably use it in our deeper
thoughts, and may we pray in our higher moments
for a place in that blessed resurrection? What is
our answer? Well, certainly first this, that it is
only in the Book of the Revelation, and in one of the most mysterious parts of that mysterious book, that we find the teaching of a first resurrection set forth in definite words, and especial blessedness attributed to those who will have part in it. We may indeed accept the language of one of the deepest writers of our own times on the doctrine of the Last Things, and acknowledge that it is especially difficult 'to distinguish between the symbolical and the literal in apostolic prophecy,' and 'to decide what must be looked upon as having to do only with time, and what must be viewed as referring to essential reality.' Nay more, we may further admit that from the days of Augustine this holy declaration of a first resurrection has been considered to refer to a spiritual resurrection from sins, and the thousand years to the time since the Christian Church has been founded, and the power of Satan restrained and limited by the preaching of the gospel. But such an interpretation even the great name of Augustine can never predispose us to accept. It is enough to say that all the religious instincts of the soul are opposed to such allegory and idealism in a passage where the whole context seems convincingly to show that this precarious mode of scriptural interpretation is inappropriate and inapplicable. Details may be set forth in symbols, but the broad tenor of the revelation—that the elect after they have left this poor earth will enjoy the fullest and most complete reunion with their Lord, and that His Church will become more holy, and more glorified as the presentiments of His return become stronger and more defined,—these, verily, are arguments for the prophetic truth of the plain meaning of the words that are in my mind irresistible.

We hold then firmly to the plain historical tenor of the words of our text; and (as we may truly say) in company with the best and deepest writers and expositors of our own times, maintain the belief in a first resurrection, a resurrection prior to the general resurrection, a resurrection of the holy and the elect, who henceforward will follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, will be ever with Him, will perform all His blessed behests, will judge the very angels, and will be around Him when He will return on descending clouds to be the Judge of the quick and the dead.

This it would really seem impossible to deny as the plain teaching of the passage now under our consideration. But this passage, remember, only places before us in a more precise form a truth that we may justly say is centred in the teaching of our Lord and Master whenever He vouchsafes to speak of the last things of this world's history. The conception of a first resurrection is an absolute necessity for every devout reader who would understand the fulness of the Divine words, when the share which the Lord's chosen ones will have in the unfolding mysteries of the future forms the subject of His heavenly teaching. When He vouchsafes to answer the question of St. Peter as to the reward which they who had given up all might hope for hereafter, what a flash of light is cast upon our present subject by the declaration that they will be with Him when He comes to renew all things, and will have a part in the very judgment of the last day. When Sadducees put to the dear Lord their pitiful question about the women and the seven brethren, what a clear view is vouchsafed to us of a first resurrection, when a resurrection, not of the dead, but (as the original plainly specifies) from out of the dead, is attributed by our Lord to those holy and chosen ones whom He speaks of as the sons of the resurrection. Or again, in the great prophecy on Olivet, when the Lord expressly revealed that at His second coming on the clouds of heaven His angels will gather around Him His elect 'from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other,' what can we possibly understand by the elect save those who have been accounted worthy of the first resurrection?

Still more distinctly may we trace these references to a first resurrection in the Epistles of St. Paul; but enough, perhaps, has been said to show that the declaration of the Apocalypse is no isolated statement in a mysterious book that ought not to be pressed as setting forth a definite doctrine, but really and truly is a statement, clear in itself, of a fundamental truth which is not only in harmony with our Lord's own words and those of His apostles, but invests them with a fuller significance.

We need not hesitate, then, in avowing our belief in a first resurrection of the pre-eminently holy and faithful, or in other words, of the elect, to which—as it has been supposed by a serious writer of our own times—each passing generation may be sending up its saintly contingent. Such a
belief seems to quicken and elevate. The whole doctrine of the resurrection seems brought home to us with a more vivid reality. If there is a first resurrection, if holy companies of saintly believers are now clustering round the risen Lord, if each revolving Easter Day the mystic number of the elect is approaching nearer and nearer to its accomplishment, what hope and what refreshment seems ministered to the soul when we try, however feebly, to realize the holy mysteries of Easter-tide and all that flows forth from the resurrection of the Lord.

Only too often, when we try to meditate on such subjects, the cold feeling enters the soul that all is so far off, so undefined, that it must be practically better for us to turn our thoughts to our own daily needs and duties, and leave unnoticed subjects which he may think can never exercise any influence on Christian life or the homely details of Christian duty.

But when we so think and act we spiritually suffer in two ways. In the first place we never obtain any true perspective of the life after death, or of the true meaning of union with Christ not only here but hereafter. Every Easter brings home to us that if we have in any sense died with Christ, as regards the world and its ways, we must rise with Him; and that if we be risen with Him we must seek those things that are above, and strive more and more to realize not His resurrection only, but all its consequences. Amid those consequences what the Apostle Paul speaks of as ‘our gathering together unto Him’ must certainly hold a place, and further, the daily increasing belief that the blessed flowering time of the Church may be nearer to us than we may think,—far nearer, nay, may have actually begun.

But we spiritually suffer also when we put such subjects out of our thoughts, in another and perhaps a more serious manner. We lose the lifting power on the soul which these higher thoughts never fail to supply. Does not the thought of a first resurrection awaken some spark of hope on our part that, this life ended, we may be among those who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth? At first it may be felt to be a hope that in the circumstances of the mass of us never, never can be realized. And yet when that hope enters into the higher prayers of the soul, and those prayers bring about the mystic changes which from time to time show themselves in the whole inner life, who shall dare to say that the love of Christ may not, in this one and in that one, have transmuted the whole being, and changed the humble, hoping worshipper into a son of the first resurrection.

Our thoughts have led us far upwards. Let us now close them with that glorious petition of our Burial Service—that it may please Thee, our Saviour and our God, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom.

---

**Recent Foreign Theology.**

Saul—Paul.

(Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895.)

In Ac 13:9 the Apostle who has hitherto been called Saul (Σαυλος) is suddenly called Paul (Παύλος ὁ καὶ Παύλος), a name which he ever afterwards keeps. The passage has given rise to the most diverse conjectures. It has even been supposed that the change of name had some sort of connexion with the conversion of the proconsul Sergius Paulus. It should be noted that the Apostle did not change the name; only the historian does so; by the δ καὶ he makes the transition from the use of the one name to the use of the other.

This elliptic καὶ in the case of double names is a very common usage in the times of the New Testament. In his *Studies on Atticism*, W. Schmid has shown from the papyri and inscriptions how widespread this usage was, giving as a first proof an inscription of Antiochus Epiphanes. ‘As Latin in the same way in the case of familiar designations uses qui et, we might suspect a Latinism, if the Antiochus-inscription had not made it more probable that the Latin usage is a Græcism.’ W. Schmid seems to think