

Our Contributors.

PROFESSOR SCRIPTUM AGAIN AT WORK.

BY KNOXIAN.

In our last talk, gentlemen, I urged you to be careful how you use pronouns. A pronoun is a small word, but that is no reason why it should not have British fair-play. Pronouns are badly used in two ways. Sometimes you cannot tell what antecedent to connect them with, and sometimes they have no antecedent at all. Gentlemen, I urge you to watch your pronouns as closely as a dude watches the growth of his incipient moustache or a politician watches a close constituency. In order to convince you of the absolute necessity of being careful, I ask you to examine the following sentence, and to point out the antecedent of each italicized *he*.

"He told his friend that if *he* did not feel better in half an hour *he* thought *he* had better return."

In spoken language something may be done by pitch, or pause, or emphasis to show the antecedent that a pronoun ought to be connected with, but on the written page the little word has no such help. Just look, gentlemen, at the condition of the pronoun in the following sentence taken by Professor Bain from a standard writer:

"The pedant assured *his* patron that although *he* could not divest the boy of the knowledge *he* had already imbibed, unless *he* would empower *him* to disable *his* fingers, *he* should endeavour, with God's help, to prevent *his* future improvement."

What a laugh that sentence would raise if found in the report of a rustic committee or the verdict of a coroner's jury. Professor Bain took it from the writings of Smollet.

Did you ever hear anybody use a pronoun in this way. "Smith lent Jones a large sum of money; *he* was well off." Does that mean that Smith could lend the money because he had plenty of it, or that Jones could borrow because his credit was good?

The foregoing examples should be sufficient to make you careful in handling that pronoun. Never say or write *he* unless the antecedent is conspicuous by proximity or prominence. Nothing irritates a reader more than to have to run back from every pronoun and hunt for its antecedent with a lantern. Sometimes you find two or three antecedents with any one of which you might connect the pronoun, and sometimes you could not find an antecedent with a search-warrant. Like the detectives, you think you "have a clue," but the clue often amounts to nothing.

But let no gentleman suppose that the pronoun *he* is the only one that needs careful handling. You may easily use *who* in such a way as to make your meaning clear as a London fog. Did you ever hear anybody use a sentence like this: "John Smith, the son of Thomas Smith, *who* gave me the book." Did Smith senior or Smith junior give the book?

Genung gives the following examples of the wrong use of *who*: "It is requested that all members of Council, *who* are also members of the Lands Committee, will assemble in the council-room." What does this sentence mean? Is it meant that all members of Council are *also* members of the Lands Committee, or is the intimation intended for members of the Council who happen to be members of the Lands Committee?

But to hasten to a conclusion, gentlemen, look at this sentence: "His conduct surprised his English friends, *who* had known him long." Who were surprised—all his English friends or merely those among them that had known him long?

Finally, gentlemen, examine this simple utterance: "I met the boatman *who* took me across the river." Does this mean I met the boatman, *and he* took me across, or does it mean that among a crowd of boatmen I met the one who had on some former occasion rowed me over?

Once more, gentlemen, look at this use of the word: "The youngest boy *who* has learned to dance is James." Does this mean that James is the youngest boy *and he* has learned to dance, or of all the boys, the youngest that has learned to dance is James?

Once more, gentlemen, Alfred Ayres, from whom these illustrations are taken, is a good writer on such points.

Finally, gentlemen, the word *that* is often a difficult one to manage, and we may discuss it at some future time.

One word more. Be careful about pronouns.

Finally, be careful about *only*—*it he, who, which that*, etc. (Chorus of students—The professor wound up just like a preacher).

A SERIOUS DANGER.

MR. EDITOR,—A serious danger seems to menace our missions in China through the action of the United States House of Representatives in having passed an exclusion bill, providing for the arrest and deportation or imprisonment of any Chinaman found in the country after September 1, 1890, unless he produces, when the census is taken, a certificate of legal residence, which the bill requires every Chinaman to procure. Such legislation is anti-Christian and brutal, and is a concession to the hoodlums and demagogues of the Republic unworthy of a nation claiming such a high character for civilization and philanthropy. It may be wise, in view of the alleged immorality of the Chinese, to restrict immigra-

tion to some extent, but such extreme measures as those proposed in this bill are quite unjustifiable. The Chinese Government would be wanting in self-respect did it not retaliate, and Canada is sure to suffer, as distinctions will not be drawn between the missionaries sent out by Canada and the United States, all being classed together as "Melicans." It is to be hoped the Senate will show more discretion than the House of Representatives, and refuse to pass the measure in its present shape. If the exclusiveness of eastern nations was so objectionable that their ports had to be forced open by the war ships of the western nations, how can the proposed course be justified? Can it be right for Christian America to do what was wrong for heathen China? Already the missionaries in China have taken alarm, and if public opinion does not prevent Congress perpetrating the outrage, farewell to missions in China. The situation is one to cause grave apprehension.

Brockville.

J. J. BELL.

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

IV.

In support of the belief in a simultaneous resurrection Rev. i. 6, or as it should be i. 7, is quoted, "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him." This verse by no means bears the kind of testimony that it is brought forward to do. It is just like John v. 28, 29. It states a fact, every eye shall see Him. But it does not say that every eye shall see Him at the same moment. Believers shall see Him when He comes at first, but unbelievers may not see Him for some time, and that time may be a thousand years. When Christ rose from among the dead no one but believers saw Him. That is fact. It was only to his followers that He showed Himself alive. We read Acts x. 40, 41, "Him God raised up the third day and showed Him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen of God, even to us who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead." How does the Professor know but that God in His wisdom may follow the same plan, when Christ first comes to earth again? The wicked may not see Him when He first appears, as they did not when He rose from the dead. They shall see Him and hear Him and feel His power. That shall be true to the very letter. The mouth of the Lord hath said it. The manifestation of the Son of God may not be on the exact plan that the Professor has marked out. The modern notion that every eye shall see Jesus when He first comes owes its existence to tradition, not to the plain teaching of the Book.

2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at His appearing and His kingdom;" is quoted as proof of the simultaneous resurrection of the dead. The revisers have settled the point raised by the writer very effectually. "By His appearing and His kingdom," He judges the quick and the dead. Christ judges by His kingdom as well as by His appearing. How does His kingdom judge men? When it comes in its glory it will be seen that unbelieving men are unfit for it. The quick and the dead mean the living and the dead. Who ever thought of denying that Christ is the Judge of both these classes? Between that verse and Premillennial doctrine there is no note of discord.

It is easy to talk about putting passages on the rack and to cry out torture! torture! Here are three passages that manifestly have been so dealt with. Have we not all need to pray that "some friendly power the gift would give us to see ourselves as others see us." Other passages are brought forward, with which we have not time and space to deal.

Before leaving this point, the simultaneous resurrection of all classes, let us look at another proof passage presented by the writer. It is Matt. x. 32, 33, "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess Me before men, him will I also confess before My Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." What our Lord says is that He will acknowledge every man before His Father in heaven that confesses Him on earth. If a man deny Christ, Christ will deny Him. Is there anything said about time in those precious verses? Nothing. May not Christ confess his people at one point of time, and deny His enemies at another? There is nothing that implies the contrary in this passage, or anywhere else in the Bible. Why does a writer of such known power in preaching and teaching bring forward these passages for such a purpose? He must do it because there are no other passages that serve his purpose any better. If any clearer ones were to be had, he would bring them. The strongest men in our Church used to argue against the use of an organ in the services of the Lord's house. The objections they raised were futile, harmless things. The trouble with them lay in the cause they had to advocate. They had to take such arguments as they could get. The Doctor had to take such passages as he could get. His work is still before him. He has yet to prove that the resurrection of all the dead shall be simultaneous.

It is a little surprising that Daniel xii. 2 has not been quoted in this connection. However it has not, and we pass by it.

"This passage, construed literally, does not teach a resurrection of all the saints who have died prior to the time indicated. It is clearly a martyr scene" pages 10, 11. Is this

exclusively a martyr scene? This is the question before us for a little. It is a martyr scene, but it is more. Let me quote the language. "I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." There are more than martyrs in that passage. "And which had not worshipped the beast"—these are saints but not necessarily martyrs. All that refused to worship the beast were not slain in every age. Many believers refused to submit to Rome and were not slain. Many of such were slain, but many were not. There are saints in that verse as well as martyrs. Here let me make an affirmation, not because I have pleasure in so doing but because the interests of truth demand it. The writer of the pamphlet is manifestly biased in favour of this modern Post-millennial theory. It is clear to all unprejudiced interpreters that the saints are spoken of in that fourth verse, and rise along with the martyrs to reign with Christ. Albert Barnes admits in his comments on "The First Resurrection," that saints and martyrs are spoken of in the fourth verse. So in substance does Matthew Henry. It is easy to speak of putting verses on the rack. Men who teach that that verse speaks only of martyrs, put it on the rack. Light on this subject may be had by turning to Rev. vii. 14. There the saints are described as those that "came out of great tribulation." That phrase designates all the saints. In like manner this phrase in Rev. xx. 4, "Which had not worshipped the beast," designates all saints. In that verse we have all saints rising to reign with the Lord. All this is in beautiful agreement with what Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. 23, "They that are Christs at His coming," and with 1 Thess. iv. 13-18. Premillennial men do not need to "transform the martyrs into all the dead in Christ." All that sleep in Christ shall rise when He comes. So the Word time and again declares. The Holy Ghost has taught us to believe that all saints are potentially martyrs.

On page 11, under head No. 3, the writer says, "There is nothing said here of the reign of the risen saints or martyrs with Christ on earth. That it is to be on the earth is filled in from the imagination." Before answering the point made let me point out that the Professor can draw on his imagination, whether others do it or not. In expounding Matt. xxv. 31-46, he makes the passage mean the general judgment. But now there is nothing said about resurrection in that passage. Yet he has got all the dead there. Who says that he cannot fill in from the imagination? Before leaving that passage let me raise a point. Does the Greek phrase *hanti ta ethna* ever include the dead? That generally, if not always, refers to the living. Yet the Doctor has no trouble in making it mean the dead here. Premillennialists profess to find the doctrine of this grand reign on the earth in the Bible. They do not draw on imagination, but turn to such passages as 2 Peter iii. 13, "Nevertheless, we according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." If righteousness dwells on this earth there must be righteous people. Trees and plants, etc., are never said to be righteous. It is said "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." In Daniel ii. 44 we have proof that Christ shall reign on this earth. "In these days shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Any one of these promises is worth ten thousand efforts of the imagination. All flesh is grass but the word of the Lord endureth forever.

Now we come to what the Doctor really believes this part of the Word to teach. Hitherto he has been pulling down, which is generally the easiest thing to do. Now he comes to build up. He understands the passage to be figurative. The binding of Satan is not literal. The abyss is not literal. The key is not literal. We need not wait to debate these points. God in the exercise of His power separates Satan from among the saints, and keeps him away a thousand years. Peter speaks about spirits in prison. God can imprison spirits. He has done it and is doing it. In like manner He can imprison the dragon, the old serpent. That prison is a real one. Into that God puts him for a time. In time Satan shall be loosed from his confinement. In our anxiety to show that this passage is a figure we should be careful not to eliminate the truth. The binding of Satan is fact. The chain may not be heard on the pavement, but there is a chain, or there are walls of some kind or other, by which the destroyer is so kept that he cannot go about to devour any more. It is likely the Doctor will go as far as this. There are one or two words, or more, here that the Doctor will have trouble in spiritualizing. He has spiritualized the chains, and the key, and the abyss. He has not spiritualized the old serpent. He has not turned Satan into a symbol of anybody or anything. We are glad that there is some reality in this passage. The late Dr. Stuart Robinson was dealing with the position of the Rationalists in the matter of the fall. They say it is an allegory. The Doctor asked, "Is Eve an allegory? Is Adam an allegory?" We must not make everything we can get our hands on allegory or figure of speech either. There is a Greek word here, *κεφαλαιωσαν*, beheaded. Was the beheading a literal terrible fact, or was it a figure of speech? Nearly all interpreters look at that word and say that was fact. Heads were severed from the bodies of those godly people, by the hand