

Our Contributors.

PROFESSOR SCRIPTUM HOLDS A WRITTEN EXAMINATION.

BY KNOXONIAN.

Gentlemen, I wish to know how the land lies. Take this paper and wrestle with it. Of course you can answer all the questions without any trouble, but I would like to see the answers in written form. There is always a terrible possibility that a man may think he has an idea in his head when he hasn't. One of the surest ways to find out whether one has an idea or not is to take a pen and try to put the idea on paper. About a thousand readers of THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN will smile at these questions and say, "anybody could answer them," but precious few of them will take a pen and try. Most of those who do try will be prudent enough to keep their answers in a safe place. Presbyterian people have always been noted for prudence. Now, gentlemen, get ready, do your best, don't copy or whisper, and if you make seventy-five per cent. on this paper I'll pass you without an oral.

TIME—TWO HOURS.

1. Explain the difference between *ability* and *capacity*; *convolve* and *convene*; *evidence* and *testimony*, *character* and *reputation*, *bravery* and *courage*, *apprehension* and *comprehension*; *answer* and *reply*.
2. Mr. Gould thinks that the following expressions in Dean Alford's "Queen's English" are not correct. If Mr. Gould agrees with you, point out the errors, and give your reasons. "It is said only to occur three times." "It is said that this can only be filled in thus." "I can only deal with the complaint in a general way." "This doubling only takes place in a syllable."
3. Write brief notes on the clerical phrase, "in our midst," and show wherein it differs from "in our middle."
4. Should the words *bring*, *fetch* and *carry* be used indiscriminately? If not, why not?
5. "In so far as the Presbytery did anything." What is the use of in? "I have got a book." Is got needed?
6. Is the use of the word *caption* for heading correct? If not, tell the newspaper men why not.
7. Would you say "a *grammatical error*," or "an *error in grammar*"? Explain how an error can be *grammatical*. Give the forms of expression by which you would describe a breach of the rules of grammar.
8. Mark the accented syllable in the following words. ally, allies, abdomen, adept, calliope, decorous, deficit, coronal, consignor, decade, extirpate, finance, financier, frankincense, remediless, quinine, quandy, ordeal, Newfoundland, naive, disputable, devastate.
9. Write short notes on "shall and will," and say what you think about the following rule, which is said to have been laid down by a learned professor: "If you feel reasonably confident that *shall* is the right word to use, blot it out and put down *will*, and if you are fairly certain that *will* is the correct word, draw your pen through it and write *shall*."
10. Explain the difference between *style* and *diction*. Define these qualities of style: *Precision*, *perspicuity*, *energy*, *elegance*.
11. What do you think of Sir John's style, of Laurier's, of Sir Richard Cartwright's, of the Hon. Mr. Fraser's or of George W. Koss'?
12. How many words were in the longest sentence ever uttered by the Hon. Edward Blake?

THE REV. DR. MACLAREN AND THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER OF REVELATION.

V.

To strengthen his position that the rising of the dead spoken of is revival, not a literal resurrection, other parts of the Word are turned to for proof. Isaiah xxvi. 19 is brought forward and reads thus: "Thy dead men shall live, together with My dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs and the earth shall cast out the dead." Here the question comes up, is this in keeping with the rule laid down some time? Is the Doctor here himself interpreting the obscure, by the clear? The canon laid down at the outset was good, but it should be recognized by post-millennial men as well as others. This is this same kind of a passage as Rev. xx., and more, it deals with the hope. The interpretation given of this passage is as objectionable as that of the other. There is more than revival in this passage. There is more than restoration to Palestine. Both these good things are in the words of the Lord to His people through Isaiah. There is literal resurrection from the dead, moreover, in these verses. "Together with My dead body shall they arise." Any other interpretation than that stops short of a part, a grand part too, of the truth. Never rob a verse of anything that is in it. McIntosh quotes this passage to show that the saints shall be in a secure place when the day of calamity comes. In so doing he is right. Christ is the speaker here. He says to Israel: "Thy dead men shall live, together with My dead body shall they arise." That He means primarily to tell the people that He will bring them back and restore to privilege, there is no doubt. But He means more than that. He means to tell them that He will bring all that are His out of the grave, and restore them as well. Any view of that passage that loses sight of the deeper deliverance is partial.

Hosea vi. 3 is also quoted. Hosea vi. 2 is the verse intended, no doubt. It reads thus: "After two days He shall revive us; in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight." This verse is brought forward to prove that the resurrection foretold in Rev. xx. is a revival, and not a resurrection at all. The same difficulties meet us here as in Isa. xxvi. There is more than revival in this verse of Hosea. Here let me quote a single sentence from Dr. Pusey, in his comments on the verse: "The resurrection of Christ, and our resurrection in Him, and in His resurrection, could not have been more plainly foretold." Dr. Maclaren can see only revival in that utterance of the Lord. Dr. Pusey can see the resurrection of the Lord and of all believers in it. The latter Doctor is correct. Here let us note that the same arguments that are used to prove that "the first resurrection" is only revival, would have proved that the resurrection of our Lord from among the dead was only revival. The separate resurrection of believers from among the dead is as clearly a part of the New Testament revelation as the resurrection of our Lord was a part of the Old Testament revelation. Not many believers saw it then. The fault was not in the Old Testament. Not many as yet may see "the first resurrection" as presented in the New. It is there, however, whether many or few see it. In due time it shall take place.

Ezekiel xxxvii. 10-14 is quoted. The same line of reply comes in here. The prophet is made to see in vision a stretch of land covered with human bones, and the bones are very dry. The Lord speaks to the bones, and they live, and become a great army. The point here is what is meant by these bones coming together and being covered with flesh, and commencing to live? Is revival, quickening, all that is meant? Or is it that and more? It is the latter. The Lord said to Israel: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from Mine eyes." There is a parallel promise. Herein is a marvellous thing, that the resurrection of the believing dead should be overlooked and denied when these grand promises are before us. May it not be that the exigencies of a theory necessitate such harrowing processes.

We now come to the third subdivision under the figurative interpretation. It is designated "the sequence of thought." It is manifestly regarded as important, in as much as it is divided into five parts. But what may this phrase, "the sequence of thought," mean? Sequence comes from a Latin word signifying to follow. The idea manifestly is that the various thoughts in the passage hang together well; they are all of a piece. There is no incongruity between them. This is an argument that both sides claim. Post-millennial men read this Rev. xx., and say thought after thought there comes out in complete agreement with our views. Then pre-millennial men say the same. It is a matter of thankfulness that the belief is growing that "the sequence of thought" favours the latter interpretation.

But mark the stand that each side takes just here. All are agreed that Rev. xix. 11-21 describes a battle. Christ has His followers and the beast has his. It is between these two powers that the war rages. Victory is on the side of the Lord and His followers. The result is that the beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. So far both sides agree. A point over which they differ radically is this: is Christ the Lord personally present or is He not? Post-millennial men say the Lord is not present in person. He is in heaven while this battle rages. It is a conflict between principles say they. Light and darkness are here at war. The other side says: "In the battle described here the Lord is here in person. He has His army here." Here let me ask the writer what thought in the passage is it that compels the belief that the Lord is still in heaven? He has answered it. The beast, the false prophet and others slain by the sword of the mouth of the Lord. The sword of His mouth slaughters the wicked; therefore He is in heaven, and not here in person. That is what seems to be called "sequence of thought." When you really look at the case it is clear that the one thought has not much compelling power over the other. Christ slays with the breath of His mouth. That is a grand thought, but it does not compel us to deny that He is here on earth at the time of the battle. The fact is that that thought rather leads us to believe that He is here. He withered the barren fig-tree standing by its side. There was more power over men in His doing it there than if He had smitten it from His throne above. The sequence of thought is not very clear just here. Look for a moment at the followings of thought on the other side. Pre-millennial men believe that the Lord shall be on the earth in person during that battle, and for the following reasons: The Lord is on a horse; that looks as though He is travelling. He is followed by an army. That looks as if He is moving. He smites the nations. That looks as though He has come to earth. The beast, the kings of the earth and their armies make war upon Him that sat on the horse. It was not in heaven that the beast made war on Him that sat on the horse. The beast never got into heaven. Then it must have been on the earth the war was. That is when everything is done set forth in the Word, unless there be a statement to the contrary. The clear, strong, definite implications of the passage are that the Lord is here. The sequence of thought is on the other side. So we hold. There is a passage that we must not forget, 2 Thess. ii. 8: "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with

the brightness of His coming." It is by the brightness of His coming that the Lord is to destroy the beast and false prophet. These are one with the man of sin. The coming in this verse manifestly is the literal personal appearing of Christ. At that coming He destroys the wicked one, the beast and the prophet. Then we can bring forward more than "the sequence of thought" in support of our belief. We have the plain statement of the apostle.

The second division under this head has reference to the binding of Satan. The Doctor manifestly holds that the binding renders Satan powerless during the period specified. That is all that anybody need care about.

The third point under this head is this: "When Satan is bound, then the martyrs rise and reign." Here we have a former idea to the front. Rev. xx. 4 speaks of martyrs and others. Dr. Barnes admits that the verse deals with saints as well as martyrs, and so do many post-millennialists, but the Professor can see nobody there but martyrs. It is possible to become too closely wedded to a theory. The Jewish people must have had this question before them often. It was said by the prophet Isaiah: "Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened." The "then" pointed to the coming of the Lord. Two Jews discuss this promise. The one says that is a figure of speech, and means that Christ will give much light to men when He comes. The other says: "That is true, but there is more in the promise than you understand to be there. When Christ comes He will find people literally blind, and He will give them sight. He will bestow literal sight, and spiritual sight as well." The literal interpreter had the correct views of truth. Here we are, and have not yet learned to take the prophetic promises of the Word as they read. "The dead" do not mean the dead, but something else. There is a verse in one of the Psalms that reads: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption." Men looked at those words, and made an effort to discover their meaning. One man says that that verse teaches the literal resurrection of the Lord. The body of the Redeemer shall not be in the grave long enough to corrupt. The Saviour shall rise from the dead in a day or two. Another man says: "The verse does not mean that at all. The corruption spoken of is literal corruption. It is of a spiritual kind." Who was right, the literal interpreter or the figurative? An able man, a scholarly man, could have constructed arguments showing that that verse did not teach the literal rising of the Redeemer from among the dead. These arguments would have satisfied thousands of good men, and the reasoning would have been misleading in the extreme. Men may be doing the same thing when they teach that Isaiah xxvi. 19, and Hosea vi. 2 do not teach the literal resurrection of believers from among the dead. To have spiritualized away a promise like that of Psa. xvi. 10 would have been a serious matter. Dr. Andrew Bonar has an article somewhere to this effect, that all the utterances regarding the first coming of our Lord came true to the very letter. His conclusion is that the utterances concerning His second appearing shall be the same. "They that are Christ's at His coming." That shall be true and nothing more. Post-millennial men say all the dead shall rise at His coming. Paul said, "they that are Christ's." The theory compels men to read into that verse what is not there, and what never was intended to be there. The literal interpretation is the better.

The fourth argument under the "sequence of thought" head is an exposition of the meaning of the sentence, "The rest of the dead (*hoiλοιλοι*) live again at the end of the thousand years." Those spoken of in Rev. xx. 5, are the same as those in xix. 21. Any man who is poetic and accustomed to call up the departed would invoke the shades of Origen. We have here a reproduction of his methods of dealing with the Word. That marvellous man must have come to life during the last century and a half. A "remnant" is spoken of in xix. 20, and another is spoken of in xx. 5. The writer concludes that these are one and the same. It was no ordinary reader that ever made that discovery. That outdoes the discovery of the lost ten tribes. What is the connecting link between these two verses? It is *hoiλοιλοι*, the rest. The rest of a certain class is spoken of in xix. 21, and the rest of some other class is spoken of in xx. 5. Because the phrase "the rest" is used, therefore the persons are the same in both cases. That conclusion is clearly a *non sequitur*. "The rest" is not a decisive mark any place. The phrase may be applied to teamsters or soldiers or farmers, or to many classes. You may say "the rest" of sugar, or boots or anything. That identification is no better than "like" among flocks. "That sheep is mine; it is just like it," a man may say. But what is his mark good for? It is worth nothing. The identification here brought forward is *nil*. "The rest of the dead" of Rev. xx. 5 means all the wicked dead. They were left behind when Christ gathered out all that He counted worthy of the world to come (Luke xx. 35). They are a remnant, but they include all the wicked that are in their graves, and are different from the remnant of xix. 21.

X. Y. Z.

AN influential meeting has been held in Belfast to express sympathy with Rev. J. Bruce Wallace, M.A., whose efforts to stop the payment in public-houses of wages to dockers resulted in a libel action, in which the jury gave damages against Mr. Wallace. A committee was formed to raise a fund to indemnify Mr. Wallace for his loss.