

Does Dr. Ross Object to "labels"?

PAGE EIGHT

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c PER SINGLE COPY.

T. T. SHIELDS, *Editor.*

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1: 16.

Address correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 6. No. 10

TORONTO, JULY 14th, 1927.

Whole No. 272.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GLORY OF GOD.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, Dec. 3, 1922.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"When Jesus heard that, he said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby."—John 11:4.



We are all familiar with the picture of that Bethany home where Mary and Martha and their brother Lazarus lived. And you know how the days of sunshine were succeeded by days of gloom and grief,—how sickness came in at the door, and then death, and with death, the darkness of a great sorrow that was almost akin to despair. And you know, too, how that in the early gladness, in its gradual eclipse by the shadow of death, and in the subsequent sudden outshining of the glory of Lazarus' new life,—you remember how that Jesus was inseparably associated with it all. And as the door shuts, at last, upon that Bethany home, and we leave the loved ones there feasting in the fullest enjoyment of the favour and fellowship of the Son of God, we are compelled to admit that each of the colours of the picture, some of which, when viewed in a single relation, seem dark and forbidding, plays its own part in the harmony of the whole: the shadow is as necessary as the light, the clouds as essential to its beauty as the sun. The distance of the Master from the death-bed of Lazarus, which appears at close view to be the chief defect in the picture, when viewed perspectively, is seen to be its chief charm, and to furnish its supreme claim to immortality.

And our lives, even the most commonplace of them, are reproductions of this picture of Bethany, with all its mystery, with all its majesty of power and glory. We are all familiar with its pain and its parting, with its grave and its grief, and with its lonely path to the sepulchre watered with tears. Only we cannot view our own lives perspectively as yet; and therefore, we cannot understand why Jesus does not always come the moment we send for Him, why sometimes He tarries until we have dug a grave! I have thought, therefore, that if we can come to an understanding of these profound words of the Master, it will help us perhaps to understand Him better; and therefore also the better to understand ourselves.

I want to give you at the outset this morning an outline of my thought, in order that you may the more easily follow my argument.

First of all, this text suggests a divine prerogative: Jesus lays down the

principle that God has a moral right to glorify Himself, even at the expense of human pain; and secondly, He mentions a human occasion for the exercise of that prerogative: "This sickness," He declares, "is not unto death, but for the glory of God." He then teaches us that God is supremely glorified through Jesus Christ, and through Him in His human relationship, "that the Son of God might be glorified thereby."

I.

Here then, Jesus names A DIVINE PREROGATIVE. He has been told that Lazarus is sick. He answers as an authoritative interpreter of the problems of human life: He dares to go to the very root of things, and to give the "why" of human experience. He writes the history of the individual as He would write the history of the world, by saying, "In the beginning God." It is a bold answer; an answer perhaps, which some may find it difficult to receive; for immediately the question will arise in our minds, whether God has a right to glorify Himself at the expense of human suffering. Our Lord Jesus boldly asserts that He has that right; that it is His own peculiar prerogative to glorify Himself. And we shall never come to understand God until we, in our thought, and in our conduct, accord Him that supreme place. We are disposed to change the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man. There is a humanizing tendency in the religious thought of to-day—a disposition to summon God to the bar of human judgment, to measure His character, and to try His every action by human standards of equity. It is assumed that God may be interpreted by our own standards of what is right. Whittier has said—and I think, though written years ago, it still expresses very clearly the thought of the day: it involves a recognition of God's transcendent greatness; that He is above us; that He cannot always be understood,—

"Not mine to look where cherubim
And seraphs may not see:
But nothing can be good in Him
Which evil is in me";

but that is not wholly true. There are things which may be, and are, good in Him, which would be evil in us; for the simple reason that He is God and beside Him there is none else. Thus, for a man to work for his own glory can be only evil; while for God to make His own glory the end of all is pre-eminently right: again I say, for the simple and sufficient reason that He only is God.

This is a democratic age. The king must be surrounded by constitutional restrictions. We are proud of the parliament. We boast that we are our own masters. And this is well enough as a political principle. No man may safely be trusted with absolute power, just because he is a man. A human despot soon becomes a human devil. We recognize that, and glory in the constitutional principle. But the principle that "Jack is as good as his master," has invaded the religious realm; and the church barons are disposed to draw up a new Magna Charta, which they demand the King of kings shall sign. They would frame a constitution, and surround Him with a parliament. They would reverse the principle of election; for they prefer that the creature shall elect the Creator, rather than that the Creator should elect the creature. The only principle of election which they would favour would be one which would result in a responsible, representative government of things spiritual, in heaven. The only laws of God of which they approve are such as are enacted "by and with the consent of His counsellors." Thus they would strip the Absolute of His prerogatives, and reduce the Kingdom of God to a condition that would be little better than a state of anarchy. What would follow if this human desire, which is not new to this age by any means, could be realized?

I remember being entertained in the home of a certain gentleman some years ago. We were sitting talking on Saturday evening when our conversation turned upon the subject of divine sovereignty. He was a strong-minded, strong-willed man; and getting up from his chair, he walked up and down the floor of his library, and then pausing before me he said, "Look here, sir, if the Bible left no alternative but to believe in the doctrine of election, I should be an infidel!" What a terrible thing that would be—for him! As there was little likelihood of our reaching an agreement, I changed the subject.

Then he told me of a man who telephoned him one day, and said, "Can you find employment for a poor man who is at my door?" "Yes," he said, "I will telephone the factory, and tell the foreman to take him on." He was accustomed to go early to his office (he was an employer of labour) and about eight o'clock the next morning the foreman came into his office, and said, "I have trouble in the shop, sir." "Well, what is the matter?" "The men have taken off their aprons, and have put on their coats; and they are going to walk out." He said, "I will go down and see what is the matter." So they went to the factory, and he said, "Now men, what is the matter? Are you not getting wages enough?" "No complaint as to our wages, sir." "Are the hours too long?" "No complaint on that score." "Are the conditions surrounding your labour not satisfactory?" "No complaint there," they said. "Well, what is the matter?" And they replied: "You sent this man into the factory to work; he does not belong to the Union, and we simply will not work with him." "Oh," he said, "is that what is the matter? Now listen! If you have any complaint to register against me as your employer; if I do not pay you wages enough; if I do not treat you fairly in every respect, remember, I am always ready to sit down with you and talk the matter over; but," he said, "I want you to understand that I own this factory; I built it; it is mine; and I will run it as I like. Now, if you are not satisfied with that, there is the door—Walk! This place will stand here and rot if need be; but I will be master in my own house!" That was the man who a few minutes before insisted that he would not allow God to be sovereign. He would himself be master, and do as he liked with his own; but the creature must be permitted to dictate to God!

Do not all history, observation, and experience prove that in the life of the individual, of the nation, and of the world, nothing but the sovereignly directed power of that God, Who "in the beginning" brought order out of chaos, can prevent a return to that chaotic condition? Men would fain tell God how to do them good. But they can know no real good unless "All things work together for good." If there be but a single exception to that universal "all," that one thing may neutralize all others; and as Naaman's leprosy threatened to bring his honour into the dust of death, as the sickness of Lazarus temporarily did, that one thing may convert all life's delicately woven purple and fine linen into a shroud to wrap a reeking corpse. There can be no good for any one of us, unless "all things, in all realms of life, in all ages, in all dispensations"—unless "all things work together for good to them that love God." And all things cannot work together for good to them that love God unless there be an intelligent, benevolent, directing Power, to Whom all things are subject,—unless it be true that is written, "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." So that we come to this by a process of purely philosophical reasoning; we are led to the conclusion that there can be no good to any one of us unless God's rule in all realms, over every atom and spirit, is ultimately, absolutely supreme.

You see, therefore, that in this matter, enlightened reason and revelation, from whatever standpoint you view it, are in perfect accord.

This then is the revelation of God in Christ Jesus. It is true that Jesus said, "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven." He is pleased to speak of God as our Heavenly Father, rather than as a King. But Christ's conception of fatherhood was far removed from the modern view. He came not to destroy the law, or the prophets, but to fulfil. And the teaching both of the law and of the prophets, and of the New Testament, is to the effect that the father should be supreme in his own household. I know that the modern family is a kind of republic in which everybody rules but father, in which the children and not the parents are the legislators, and in which no one is regarded as eligible for the presidency unless he has been born in the family! But the New Testament sums up the whole revelation of God in respect to this matter when it says, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord,"—for I will give you a penny if you do; for you shall have some sort of a treat if you are obedient?—No! "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right." That is all—it is right! "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven;" and, His children must obey Him, because it is right!

According to Christ's teaching, therefore, this world is subject to a benevo-

lent, paternal, Despot, Who makes His own glory the supreme end of every purpose, of every act; and because He can find in all the universe none greater nor worthier than Himself,—the motive which actuates the divine Ruler is a supreme, a sovereign determination to glorify Himself. If you say it is a selfish motive, my answer is, that the glory of God is the glory of a holy, everlasting love.

II.

Here is A HUMAN OCCASION FOR THE EXERCISE OF THAT PREROGATIVE. "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God."

And before we proceed further let me call your attention to *the importance of keeping our place as children in the Father's household*. We shall find some doors locked against us until we are older. We shall find there are some big words in our Father's speech which we must wait to understand. There are mysteries in the kingdom of God into which even the ancient and honoured servants of the household,—the angels—are forbidden to look. We shall be wise, in the presence of the problems of life, and the mysteries of the divine government, to humble ourselves, and sometimes to say, "I do not know; I cannot understand; even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight." Our entrance into the kingdom was conditioned upon our becoming as children: our enjoyment of the kingdom is dependent upon our remembering that the most mature Christian is never in God's sight a learned philosopher, but only a little child. We must therefore trust our Father's wisdom as well as His love though He make darkness His secret place; and His pavilion round about Him be dark waters and thick clouds of the skies.

You see then that here *Jesus asserts God's right to glorify Himself at the expense of human pain*. What a tale of physical and mental suffering, of heart-agony, of bitter tears, is told in these two words, "This sickness." They paint a familiar picture. There is not one of us who does not understand it. Two sisters have sent an urgent message to Jesus, saying, "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." The loved frame is become a playground for the furies; "every nerve is a road for the hot feet of pain to travel on; and every vein a canal of grief." A ministry of human love has exhausted itself, and discovers its impotence in the presence of death. There are broken hearts whose sorrow issues in scalding tears. Two sisters mourn in a house that feels empty, in a world that is cold and dark. And Jesus points to that scene, and says, "It is for the glory of God." And we may see that picture in real life, and learn its moral every day. But I want you to "dwell deep" this morning, to look beyond the bounds of the physical to spiritual things.

I cannot help seeing in that Bethany where Jesus was wont to visit and where death has now taken His place, a representation of another scene. Did not God walk in the garden in the cool of the day even as the God-man rested at Bethany? But a shadow falls across the path of the man that He has made in His own image and likeness; notwithstanding. He carries until this moral sickness issues at last in spiritual death: "So he drove out the man," even as the dead Lazarus was carried by loving hands away from Bethany's home and laid yonder in the sepulchre; and the garden is empty of its chief charm.

But is there any sense in which it may be said of the tragedy of Eden as of the empty chair at Bethany, "It is for the glory of God?" Is there any true analogy between physical and moral disease? Are the underlying principles in the two cases identical?

What was the cause of Lazarus' sickness? We do not know what his ailment was. Ignoring for the moment the moral or religious aspect of the question, it is indisputable that sickness results from transgression. Science will declare that some natural law has been broken; and whether ignorantly or presumptuously, the result is the same, inexorable law exacts the penalty. The organism has failed in some way to adapt itself to its environment—and that is another name for natural law—and disease, and perhaps death results.

The principle, therefore, underlying the text is this, *that even a broken law may be made to contribute to the glory of God*; and whether it be a physical or moral law, it is the same in principle, for law is universal, and God is one. I am not now dealing with the origin of evil; that must remain for the present a mystery; nor do I attempt to designate the first cause of "this sickness" of the text: I observe only that both are the result of a broken law;

and that as Bethany's grief has glorified God,—if God is to be God,—so Eden's sin and sorrow must!

I have read that science has discovered how to convert the sweepings of a city's streets into a distilled essence whose sweet odours perfume the apparel of fair ladies in brilliant drawing-rooms. I have read that filthy rags and even broken reeds of straw may be made into immaculate paper, upon which letters of love may be written. I was told by an expert that the finest quality broadcloth has in it always an admixture of "shoddy." I said to him, "You do not put 'shoddy' in the best broadcloth?" He said, "We could not make it without." And when he said that, I said, "Who knows? Perhaps it is made from some poor prodigal's ragged coat." And so above the clouds of mystery which impenetrably enwrap the origin and ultimate of things, my faith would enthrone an infinitely more perfect wisdom, and more consummate skill than can be found on earth. And if transforming grace can convert "the filth of the world and the off-scouring of all things" into golden vials full of incense; if these poor fallen natures can be made white by means of blood so that Love's name may be written thereon; and if with an admixture of the shoddy of human experience, sorrow of heart, and contrition of soul, if this may be interwoven with the infinite and absolutely perfect merit of Jesus, and cunningly wrought into a robe more durable than one of innocence, even a robe of righteousness, resplendent with the beauty of holiness; if sighs may be converted into songs, and tears may be crystallized into jewels, which sing the praises and reflect the glories of redeeming love; my heart shall cry, "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him (but) righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." True faith, which is the soul's apprehension of God as God—of God as absolutely sovereign,—will lead us to rest in the assurance that even the world's great sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God.

III.

And now, in conclusion, we are to see How GOD IS GLORIFIED IN CHRIST THROUGH HIS HUMAN RELATIONSHIP—"That the Son of God may be glorified thereby." What a wonderful saying that is! That this sickness, this physical malady which reduces the loved frame to a reeking corpse, until love itself is afraid to look upon it—that this sickness, in the purpose of God, may be used to glorify Him in the Person of His Son Jesus Christ.

It is necessary that we should have some intelligent idea of *what is meant by the glory of God*. When you speak about a man's being glorified, you mean that he is had in reputation, that he has established himself in the good opinion of his fellows: his glory is his fame. But God's glory is not His reputation among His creatures; His glory is infinitely more than what men think Him to be. An opal's glory is not its reputation among connoisseurs, nor its golden setting which holds it on the finger of a queen: it is its own inherent beauty which children's eyes may see. The diamond's glory is not the fair figure it adorns: it is its own independent, inseparable, unquenchable light. And the glory of God is not His reputation: it is His character, His nature; *God's glory is His own essential nature, what He only is*. The history of His dealings with the world is the history of His shining, of His making Himself known, of His self revelation. And in Jesus Christ, the Sun, which is the day-dawn of truth, bathed the dewy grass beneath the patriarchs' feet with beauty; whose later, higher, fuller ray, made the face of Moses radiant; and whose ascending brilliance encircled the prophets' brows with light—in Jesus Christ, the Sun of Truth shines from his zenith, full-orbed: "And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Thus it is through the Word made flesh, by His human relationship, God makes Himself most fully known. In the measure in which He is known as He really is, by men or angels, God is glorified.

As you read this narrative are you not impressed with *the disciples' ignorance of the Master's person, of His purpose and power?* He might have said then as later, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Phillip?"—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit Jesus spake of His death; but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." And he adds, "And I am glad

for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." What does He mean? He said to His disciples, "Let us go into Judea again"; and they said, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." They did not know Him! They did not see His glory. And when the word came, "He whom thou lovest is sick," He said in effect, "I am going to take you into a set of circumstances, into a certain situation, which will enable Me to show you Who I am. I am going to draw the veil and let a little of the glory shine; for otherwise you cannot know Me." So, too, man did not and could not know God fully in Eden. The prodigal, after his wanderings, knew the largeness of his father's heart, and the luxury of his enduring love, as even the brother at home did not know. He who is forgiven most will love the most; and redeemed souls will know God better than the angels, and therefore will glorify Him more.

"When he heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was." But they said, "Death is coming: death is in hot haste after one whom we love." But He answers, "I shall be there in time." At the grave of Lazarus, and by His own empty sepulchre, *Jesus reveals the glory of "the Living God, the King of eternity"*—"who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." Quite leisurely the Lord Jesus makes His way back to Bethany; and they meet Him on the way, and they say, "Lord, Thou art too late. If Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." "Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldst believe, thou shouldst see the glory of God?" "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day." But she did not know that He was "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last"; that He could anticipate the last day and by His almighty fiat banish death. Therefore He comes into the place of storm and tempest, where men and women are convulsed with grief; and His voice of power rises loud and clear above the tumult, "Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus said unto them, Loose him, and let him go." And, behold, the flesh-walls of human limitations drop away, the barriers of human temporality are dissolved; and we see God at work in the amplitude, the leisure, the unnumbered years; and Jesus of Nazareth grows upon our vision as "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity." Hallelujah!

Did He not know that death was coming to Eden? Did the serpent move so quietly, and speak so softly in Eden that God did not hear him? Did He not know that Death was on the track of the man He had made? Why did He not make haste? Why did He not prevent it? Had He not been so great in power and might; had He to measure His days by the rise and set of sun, He might have hastened in His walk to the garden; but He waited for centuries, for millenniums: "He abode two days still in the place where he was," until He was ready to "bring life and immortality to light in the gospel."

It was asked at Bethany, "Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?" Have you ever asked that question? Could He not have done otherwise? Why did He wait? Why was He so long in coming? Had they known it, *He was even then using this human clay which was called Lazarus to open the eyes of the blind.* "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe. I am glad that I was away that I might give Lazarus time to die." Think of it! "To the intent ye may believe." In principle He says, "The most important thing in the universe is that you should believe. The essential thing is that there should be some fixed centre; that there should be some One Who from everlasting to everlasting is the same. There can be no peace; there can be no rest; there can be no order; there can be no good; unless there be some One Who can be believed. And I am dealing with you, if you only knew it, so that you can believe. I am leading you on step by step, from one experience to another; until I bring you to the place where you can believe Me for everything." *And when you come to the place where you can believe God absolutely, you are in heaven!*

Well, I can partially understand that: can you? I have learned to be glad that He was not there. He promised Martha that if she would believe she should see the glory of God. But the sisters could not see His glory

till their eyes were washed with tears,—and since then tears have often proved lenses to bring God's stars, especially the Bright and Morning Star, nearer than the most powerful telescope could bring them. Had He prevented our tears He might have spared Himself the pain of weeping, but our eyes had never been opened then; we should never have seen the King in the beauty of His self-disclosure; deep had never called unto deep; but for the depth of human folly and ignorance—we had never known the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; and but for the depth of human guilt we had never known the depth of the riches of redeeming grace—deep had never called unto deep, and we had missed the sublimest harmonies, had not His waves and billows gone over the world!

An artist, who had made a reputation for himself as a man of skill, and who had painted many pictures, conceived a picture which he designed should be his masterpiece—his last work which was to establish his fame in the world of art. He laboured on his picture for many months. He had done much; but he could not find a background properly to set off the picture; notwithstanding, he had tried, as he thought, every possible combination of colours. One morning, after some hours of labour, he laid aside his brushes and his palette, and walked, almost in despair, out of his studio, to rest his mind; for again his utmost effort had resulted in failure. His little boy, three or four years of age, got out of the nursery away from his nurse, toddled along the hallway, and seeing the door of his father's studio open, as proprietor of the place, walked in. He went up to the easel, and looked at the great picture, and at the paints on the palette, and the brushes which he had seen his father use. He had seen his father put paint on the picture, and why should not he? So, dipping his brush into one colour after another, he mixed up the paint, and began putting it on. Presently his nurse missed him and looked all through the house, but could not find him. Seeing her master's studio door open, she came to the threshold, and, transfixed with horror at what she saw, cried, "Master, Master, baby's spoiled your picture!" The artist, hearing her, came running from another part of the house. When he came to the door he stood first of all in wonder; and then his look of amazement changed into one of pleasure and infinite satisfaction. He stood there with folded arms and let the boy go on painting. At last he said softly, "It is the thing I have long been looking for." Presently he stood beside the child, and putting the little fellow aside very tenderly, he took the brush from his hand, and with a few master strokes brought order out of confusion. Thus baby's blunder was used to establish the father's fame!

It is but a poor illustration; but I am sure of this, that against the background of the world's sin and sorrow, the divine Artist is to display His supreme glory. And I am glad for your sakes, and mine, that He was not there. I am glad of any opportunity for Him to display His faithfulness, His covenant-keeping grace.

What does it mean? What is the meaning of the two empty graves—the empty grave of Lazarus, and that of which it is but a type and symbol, the empty grave of Jesus? Does it mean that the rocky, empty sepulchre from which the Saviour rose, is a surer foundation for the feet of faith than the flowered paths of Eden could possibly have been? If it does, I say again, I am glad that He was not there. For even my little vision can see thus far, that there can be no heaven for anyone without faith in God. And if immortal faith could not bloom in Eden, it is well worth man's while to have taken a long and painful journey, if the unfading flower of a perfect trust may be gathered from the garden which stretches away from the open, empty sepulchre of Jesus.

I have done when I have told you this: you have read how the great tyrant Napoleon, the murderer of nations, laid Europe waste; how he returned a conqueror from every field of blood. And you remember that our own Wellington was given command of the allied British, Portuguese and Spanish armies? And you recall how many victories he won in the Peninsular War over the French armies, commanded by some of Napoleon's ablest marshals? for which he was accorded a high place of honour by the nations whom he served. And each victory served to establish Wellington in the confidence of the nations whose armies he commanded. But still they could not help

asking, "What if he should meet Napoleon himself? Would he prove the equal of that great conqueror?"

But the meeting came at last. On the eve of Waterloo, as Napoleon jumped into his carriage to go to the battle, he said, "I am going to measure myself with this Wellington." And he did measure himself with our great English Captain,—with the result that his empire was destroyed, and he was driven into exile never to return. And when the victory of Waterloo was won, Wellington is reported to have exclaimed with great emotion, "Thank God, I have met him at last."

At Bethany and at Calvary, Death, the world's great conqueror, came to measure himself with our Jesus—and Jesus won! Death was driven into exile, his empire destroyed: "Death hath no more dominion over him." His power is broken, and "the last enemy" shall one day be utterly destroyed. Do you not see the great truth,—that hell has done its utmost, and has failed; that Jesus has triumphed over the utmost power of evil? And I am glad that He had His opportunity to the intent we might believe. Christ's grave, the saved sinner's grave is empty. Go, my brother! go bury thy sins and thy doubts in the empty sepulchre! There is nothing left for us to do but to believe! The tyrant Death is exiled and soon shall be destroyed. Meanwhile, the monster by God's sovereign pleasure is harnessed to His golden chariot and made to drag His ransomed children up the shining pathway of the skies.

And from beyond the gates of pearl, from beyond the veil, we catch the echo of their music ringing down the skies as they sing, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father: to him—to Him—be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

Editorial

DR. J. J. ROSS ON BEING "LABELLED".

In an article entitled, "Among Southern Baptists", in *The Canadian Baptist* of July 7th, Dr. J. J. Ross, of Vancouver, writes in part as follows:

The Southern Baptist people are a great host. In Texas there is a population of five millions with one million Baptists. In Louisiana I was told that there were three million people with one million Baptists. All of these Baptists are fundamental in their experience and faith, but they are not "Fundamentalists". All of these Baptists are modern in their experience and faith, and in keeping step with the Saviour, but they are not "Modernists"; in other words they refuse to be labelled. They want to be known and are known, as Bible Baptists, no more and no less, for such they truly are.

We are all familiar with this talk about "refusing to be labelled". But in other than religious matters, comparatively few people refuse to be labelled. The people who call themselves "Brethren", say they refuse to be labelled. They will not, for instance, be called "Baptist", but "Baptist" is just as much a label as "Fundamentalist" or "Modernist". Dr. Ross tells us that the Southern Baptists want to be known "as Bible Baptists". What other sort of Baptists are there than Bible Baptists? We always supposed that men became Baptists when they believed and practised the Bible. "Christian" is a label: "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." The fact is, the majority of people are rather proud of their labels. They refuse only to be classified as "Fundamentalists" or "Modernists". The people who refuse to take sides on any great issue will usually be found on the side of the most aggressive party, but do not want it to be known.

Dr. Ross was once proud to be called a "Fundamentalist". Unless we are greatly mistaken, he was one of those who signed the first call for the Fundamentals Conference of the Northern Baptist Convention which met in Buffalo in 1920. But Dr. Ross appears to have forsaken his first love, and now refuses to be labelled theologically,—he is fundamental, but not a "Fundamentalist"; modern, but not a "Modernist"!

But has our friend from Vancouver always and invariably been opposed

to labels? If anyone will look at *Who's Who in America*, edition 1920-21, and turn up the name of John Jacob Ross, he will find the following:

ROSS, John Jacob, clergyman, author; b. at Lochaber, Quebec, Can., June 1871; s. Jacob and Julia (Pelette) R.; A.B., Woodstock (Ont.) Coll., 1894; B.Th., McMaster U., Toronto, 1898; (D.D., Northern Bapt. Theol. Sem., Chicago, 1918); m. Georgina May Graham (B.A., U. of Toronto), May 1902. Ordained Bapt. ministry, 1898; pastor successively, Chatham, St. Catharines, London, Dovercourt Ch., Toronto, 2d Ch., Chicago, since June 1918. Bible teacher; lecturer on Bible lands; was made defendant in notable libel case, at Hamilton, Ont., 1912, brought by late "Pastor" Charles T. Russell, resulting in Russell being found guilty of charges made against him. Author: *The Underworld of the Dead*, 1910; *The Sign of His Coming*, or *The Near Approach of the End*, 1912; *Some Facts and More Facts about the Self-Styled "Pastor" Charles T. Russell*, 1913. Traveled and studied in Bible lands 1 yr. Home: 3515 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.

In the edition of 1922-23 will be found the foregoing amended thus: after "1913" add:

;The Kingdom in Mystery, 1920; Thinking Through the New Testament, 1921. Traveled and Studied in Bible lands 1 yr. Home: 3515 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.

Again in the edition of 1924-25 is the following:

ROSS, John Jacob, clergyman, author. Home: Vancouver, B.C.; see Vol. 12 (1922-23).

From the foregoing it would appear that Dr. Ross boasts of at least three "labels" in the form of degrees: A.B. from Woodstock College in 1894; B.Th. from McMaster University, Toronto, 1898; and D.D. from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1918. We wonder how these labels became attached to Dr. Ross? We have seen bill-posters sticking their bills wherever fancy led them,—did someone come and plaster these labels on Dr. Ross without his knowledge or consent? Can it be possible that he "refused to be labelled", but that by some strong hand he was labelled notwithstanding? We shall proceed to answer these questions.

The following statement has been in our possession for some years. For the honour of the ministry in general we have refrained from publishing it; but in view of Dr. Ross' repudiation of labels in general, we think we ought to give him an opportunity, publicly, once more to "refuse to be labelled". Here is the statement:

Statements of Facts Relative to J. J. Ross, D.D.

Early in the year 1923 certain rumors which had been occasionally heard became more definite, namely that certain academic titles attributed to Dr. J. J. Ross in the two latest volumes of *Who's Who in America* did not belong to him. These volumes assigned to him the degrees of A.B. as a graduate of Woodstock College and B. Th. as a graduate of McMaster University, both institutions being in Canada. As Dr. Ross had been until recently a regular lecturer at the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary and was still a member of its board of trustees, the officers of the faculty and trustees, without giving publicity to the rumors even among the rest of the faculty and trustees, felt compelled to ascertain the truth or falsity of the rumors and, if they proved well-founded, to determine who was responsible for the false statements as to Dr. Ross' scholastic record.

Inquiry at the offices of McMaster University and Woodstock College elicited the official statement from both institutions that Dr. Ross had not received a degree or been graduated from either institution, though he had been a student at each of them. The general catalogue of McMaster University, issued at about the beginning of this year, did not contain the name of J. J. Ross. At about this time also, returns began to be received from a questionnaire sent out by the registrar and historian of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary to all present and former members of its faculty for biographical data to be preserved in the records of the Seminary. Among these returns was one from Dr. Ross in which he assigned to himself the degree of B.Th. from McMaster University, and referred to *Who's Who in America*, latest edition, as an authoritative record of his life.

Under these circumstances the president of the Seminary, Dr. G. W. Taft, still avoiding publicity in the matter, wrote to Dr. Ross in Boston a fraternal letter asking for a statement in explanation of the case. Dr. Ross in reply gave no direct or satisfactory explanation of the main question at issue, but called together such of the trustees of the Seminary as were present and two or three other Chicago brethren at the Northern Baptist Convention in Atlantic City, May, 1923, to whom he made statements; Dr. Taft being prevented by illness from attendance at the Convention.

June 13, 1923 there met in Chicago at the invitation of Dr. Ross the following brethren of his own selection: O. K. Mitchell; A. S. Carman; J. W. Hoyt; R. N. Van Doren; J. H. Byrne; Mrs. G. W. Taft; G. W. Taft; C. H. Parkes; T. J. Bolger; W. G. Brimson; J. J. Ross; Chas. Major; Benj. Otto; M. P. Boynton; W. J. Sparks; C. H. Snashall; A. G. Johnson, together with Dr. J. M. Dean of Pasadena who was passing through the city and was welcomed to the Conference.

Dr. Ross took charge of the Conference and made an extended statement dealing with many matters, replying also to questions from those present. On motion of Dr. Benj. Otto the informal gathering organized by electing Dr. M. P. Boynton, chairman, and Rev. Albert G. Johnson, Secretary. These officers, with Dr. J. J. Ross, Dr. J. W. Hoyt and the registrar of the Seminary, Dr. A. S. Carman, were appointed a special committee to visit the Chicago office of *Who's Who in America* and to examine certain documents and to make a report thereon to the whole committee.

After extended investigation lasting through the summer of 1923 in order to neglect no important point and after four meetings of the main committee or conference selected and invited by Dr. Ross, and four meetings of the sub-committee, we find ourselves substantially agreed as to the following points which we believe to be the main matters at issue:

1. *Who's who in America*, Ed. 1919-20, assigns to Dr. Ross the degree of A.B. from Woodstock College and the degree of B.Th. from McMaster University. The edition of 1921-22 repeats this statement. *Note:* The manager of *Who's Who* explains that A.B. was substituted in his office as a briefer equivalent of the statement in the blank returned by Dr. Ross that he was a graduate of Woodstock College. Proof with the change to A.B. was sent to Dr. Ross and returned with his signature of approval which he acknowledges.

2. That the edition of *Who's Who* for 1921-22, although two years had elapsed, no correction of the foregoing statements was made, although a copy of the record in the previous edition was sent to Dr. Ross and certain other corrections as to books published were made in the later record.

3. Dr. Ross has denied making out the original record for *Who's Who*, but the manager of that publication states that it is the regular method of the office to send the blank for biographical data directly to the subject of the sketch, to be returned by him, and a letter from the young woman who was at that time Dr. Ross' secretary states that she distinctly remembers filling out that blank at Dr. Ross' dictation. This letter is in evidence.

4. In filling out the questionnaire blank from the Seminary in the Spring of 1923, Dr. Ross assigns to himself the degree of B.Th. from McMaster University. This statement, made over his signature, which he does not deny, is in evidence.

5. Dr. Ross in answering the questionnaire refers to *Who's Who in America*, latest edition, for information as to his career; and when asked in a subsequent letter if the account in *Who's Who* can be relied upon, answers in the affirmative. This letter is in evidence.

6. We feel it necessary to point out that the question at issue is not whether Dr. Ross has received the degrees as stated, for the records of the institution and Dr. Ross' present admission prove that he never received them. Neither is it essential to discover as Dr. Ross appears to think, who first raised the question, and why, as to his scholastic standing. The sole question here at issue is as to the responsibility for the claim, three times repeated, to scholastic honors which did not belong to Dr. Ross. We submit the foregoing statements for which we hold the substantiating documents, as our findings on this question.

(All the evidence appears to us to indicate that Dr. Ross is himself responsible for the original statement in *Who's Who in America*, as well as

for its repetition in the questionnaire of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary.)

Sub Committee,

(Signed) M. P. Boynton, Chairman
A. S. Carman
A. G. Johnson, Secretary

Mrs. G. W. Taft and C. H. Parkes were invited to the conference by others.

Dr. Ross Not Always Opposed To Labels!

We have, indeed, been labelled by Dr. Ross ourselves. In 1921 it was our privilege to deliver an address at the Pre-Convention Conference of the Fundamentals Committee of the Northern Baptist Convention at Des Moines. At that time Dr. Ross proudly wore the name of "Fundamentalist", and was a member of the Committee. Some time during that summer, shortly after our address at Des Moines which was in June, 1921, we received the following letter from Dr. Ross. This letter will be read with interest as coming from a man who now lauds those who "refuse to be labelled".

Second Baptist Church
Chicago, Illinois.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ontario.

My dear Shields:

It was with real interest that I read the report of your sermon of last Sunday evening in the "*Toronto Globe*" of Monday. I like your statement very much, and the position and the spirit in that position which you have assumed. It looks as if the Devil was doing his utmost to hinder you in your work for the Lord in Toronto. I wish to assure you of my personal sympathy and prayer throughout this whole thing. You are doing the strong thing, the worthy thing, even the noble thing in standing for Christ and His truth, as you are doing.

I sent the "*Globe*" over to Dr. Hoyt. I have not heard from him since. I just phoned him but he is away on a picnic with his Sunday-school. I know that he will be very much interested in the report as it appears there.

I wish to say that your address at the convention on fundamentals was very much appreciated. You gave the critics a terrible drubbing and yet the spirit of it was of a character worthy of the great message. I have wondered if you ever see the "*Baptist*" published here in Chicago. It is under the control of the critics. Its report of the Fundamental Conference and the Convention is very undignified, unfair and in some part puerile. If you do not see it, I will be glad to send you a copy.

Please convey our kind regards to Mrs. Shields, and remember, always, that we pray for you. You did the fine thing in cancelling that engagement in Old London.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) J. J. ROSS

In October of the same year we delivered an address telling the inside story of the revolution in Jarvis Street. We entitled the address, "The Inside of the Cup". A copy of this reached Dr. Ross' hand, and he wrote us as follows:

Second Baptist Church,
Chicago, Ill., Nov. 1, 1921

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ontario.

My dear Shields:

I wish to thank you or some person else who sent me a copy of "The Inside of the Cup". I have read it over with great interest, and wish to congratulate you on the fair and splendid piece of work that you have done. At times I marvel at your spirit, as displayed in that address. You certainly were kept under restraint in many parts of it. I am under the impression that you have done a fine piece of work, not only for Jarvis Street Church, but for the whole Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

I think the case in Jarvis St. is surely a test case. There are two other churches in Ontario that need just such a shaking up as Jarvis St. has received: the First Church, Ottawa, and the James Church, Hamilton.

These two churches are so self-important that it seems impossible for them to get out of their own way. Again let me congratulate you on the work that you have done and are doing.

Hoyt is well. We had a talk about you yesterday, and wish that we had you here in Chicago with us.

With sincere kind regards, I am,

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) J. J. ROSS

It will be seen that in these letters Dr. Ross was prepared to label us as a "regular fellow"; and there was no disposition to dissent from our position.

There is much more we could write on this subject, but space forbids except to add this, that during the Convention of last October a telegram was read from Dr. Ross, or, from the Baptist Ministerial Brotherhood with which he was connected, congratulating the Convention. We have not the text of the telegram before us, but some such congratulatory message, we believe, was received. We wired Vancouver at the time enquiring what the Baptist Ministerial Brotherhood was, and we received the following reply:

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Toronto, Ont.

Vancouver, B. C.

October 26th, 1926

Numerical strength of Ministerial Association, Greater Vancouver, eighteen members; pastors, thirteen. Baptist Ministerial Brotherhood, Greater Vancouver, approximately eighteen; pastors, five. Brotherhood divisive organization formed by Ross and friends whilst they were still members of Association. Reason: Ross' persistent refusal to explain to Ministerial brethren validity of his degrees, resulting in fellowship being withdrawn from him. Their President, Rev. David Long; Secretary, Rev. Walter Daniels.

(Signed) C. E. WALSH

The day following we received this additional telegram:

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Toronto, Ont.

Vancouver, B. C.,

October 27th, 1926

Change brotherhood membership approximately nineteen of which six are pastors:

(Signed) C. E. WALSH

The other members of the Ministerial Brotherhood, we understand, are ministers, most of whom have left the ministry for secular occupation. This was the organization which congratulated the Convention!

There are labels people cannot well refuse to wear. Readers of the foregoing will be inclined to believe that Dr. Ross is not without a label. We leave it to others to decipher the wording of the label!

Will *The Canadian Baptist*, also *The Standard*, of Dallas, Texas, and all the other Southern papers, please copy.

A JOURNALISTIC ANANIAS.

There is a certain religious journal published in Toronto, at 223 Church Street, which includes in its Editorial Staff someone who bears all the marks of being a near relative of one called Ananias. We refer just now especially to an article entitled, "Neither Theology Nor Money". It is a short article, urging everybody to get ready for the Convention to be held less than four months hence. The article expresses its gratification that the Associations seem to say, "Time is precious. Let us drop the useless and fruitless controversy and go forward with the work of evangelization and education!" A week or so ago *The Canadian Baptist* said in an article, "Our people can be trusted"; but to ensure their trustworthiness no less than thirteen outside speakers went to the Western Association; to help to make the Northern Association trustworthy, according to the report of that Association, there were present: Dr. J. H. Farmer, Rev. Geo. T. Webb, D.D., Rev. J. H. Boyd, Rev. R. C. Bensen, Mr. W. C. Senior, and Rev. L. H. Kipp,—how many others, we do not know; while at the Collingwood Association, Dr. Bowley Green and

Rev. L. H. Marshall were present to ensure that Association's worthiness of trust.

But in the article especially under review, the writer says that it will be necessary to give a little time to what is known as the Baptist Bill, and continues: "The Convention will consider the Bill and will, without doubt, overwhelmingly endorse it, and put it into operation." It is, however, to this paragraph we especially direct attention:

"The Bill has nothing whatever to do with anybody's theological views. Nor has it primarily a bearing upon the money gifts of individuals or churches."

In that statement there is not an infinitesimal element of truth: it is a deliberate, wilful, black, unmitigated, falsehood—and the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* knows it. We have supported the Denomination with the utmost heartiness, in years past we have given as much time to denominational work as to our own church; and there was never a question of our loyalty until we opposed the heretical teaching of McMaster University. How dare a man who would retain a reputation for having at least a nodding acquaintance with the truth write such an utter misrepresentation of fact as that? All the world knows that the root-cause of this whole trouble is the determination of a company of men connected with McMaster University to permit the teaching of Modernism within its walls. Dr. Farmer has admitted it by advocating the "inclusive" policy; he has acknowledged it by admitting that he knew Professor Marshall's coming into the Convention would cause trouble; it has been proved up to the hilt by Professor Marshall's denial of the authority of the Scriptures, his attitude toward the miracles, his repudiation of the Blood Atonement, and his very doubtful view of the resurrection of Christ. But the Baptist Bill has nothing to do with theology or money! It has everything to do with both.

Personally, we are perfectly indifferent to the action of the Convention. If we had to stand absolutely alone, we should count it an honour to do so in this matter; and of all that we have said and done in this connection, we have nothing to retract.

Only in the issue of June 9th, *The Canadian Baptist* said:

"The Convention is a co-operative, missionary society. If they cannot join in its endeavours, if they definitely withdraw financial support, if they cannot accept the repeated verdict of their brethren, they should quit the camp and permit others to go on to the bigger, better things."

But now the Convention Bill has nothing to do with money!

Once again: the writer says,

"We have had a look at recent reports from our Home and Foreign Mission Boards and really we marvel at the way the money has come in, notwithstanding the campaign of abuse that has been waged against the noble and trusted leaders of these Boards."

But in the same issue of the paper, in the report of the meeting of the Home Mission Board, we are told, "The overdraft at the bank on regular account was \$9,000.00." We have had a long and very intimate acquaintance with the affairs of the Home Mission Board, and if the writer of the article referred to, "marvels at the way the money has come in", while the Home Mission Board reports a bank overdraft of \$9,000.00, we wonder what the dear writer actually expected!

The Canadian Baptist has closed its columns against everybody who will not accept the policy of McMaster. It is useless therefore for anyone to write to that paper. The Denomination is thus subjected to a campaign of misrepresentations. Let it be understood that when anybody is referred to in *The Gospel Witness*, or when any of these issues are discussed, our opponents will be permitted to answer anything we have to say. We have invited them repeatedly to come into the columns of *The Gospel Witness*, and to address its readers in any way they like. Of course, we reserve to ourselves the right to make any comments upon such communications, just as the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* reserves the right to make comments on letters sent to him.

We have said enough to justify our statement that a successor of Ananias has something to do with 223 Church Street.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY.

Every day the tremendous opportunity for service by Des Moines University grows upon us. We have been asked some questions which we should like to answer in a very few words.

First, the institution is a Baptist university, and so far as is practicable, all the professors and instructors will ultimately be Baptists. A few sound evangelicals on the Staff who will remain with us are not Baptists, but they are sound evangelicals in their convictions, and most of them are immersed believers.

We have been asked if any religious or denominational tests will apply to students. The answer is in the negative. All who can comply with the entrance requirements, and who are of sound moral character, will be welcome to the advantages of the Institution. Of course, the Institution will do the best it can to lead such as may be unconverted to Christ, and to lead those who are believers to clear views of truth. But we shall welcome students from all denominations, or from no denomination at all. Only the Trustees and the members of the Faculty will be required to subscribe to the Confession of Faith, for they are responsible for the teaching and governing of the University.

In this short article we venture to appeal to all Baptists everywhere to get in touch with all their young people who are attending high school and contemplating a college course, whether in the United States or Canada, and endeavour to influence them in favour of going to Des Moines. We need money, of course, and we appeal to all our friends to keep this constantly in mind; but we need students too.

We spent this last week critically examining the organization of the University, and discussing its affairs with some of the heads of departments. More than one hundred applications for positions on the Faculty were before the Faculty Committee, and it is abundantly evident that we shall have no difficulty in supplying all positions with men who are perfectly sound both in scholarship and in faith. But we were glad to find that our present Faculty can easily take care of one thousand students without overburdening any of the professors; indeed, if we could secure the attendance of one thousand students next fall, the University would be self-supporting. We therefore urge all our friends to exert every possible effort to send students to Des Moines.

We had an opportunity of examining the proofs of the new calendar, and of adding a few paragraphs here and there. The calendar will be ready for mailing within a week or ten days. We suggest that pastors and other friends, not only bring their personal influence to bear upon young people contemplating a college course, but that they send their names and addresses to the Registrar of Des Moines University. The Trustee Board of the University will meet in Des Moines, July 12th, when a number of appointments will be made to the Staff, and other details of University organization will be considered.

THE WORLD'S BAPTIST ALLIANCE.

Already *The Canadian Baptist* is talking about the Associations next year, suggesting that they all meet in Toronto, as the Northern Association has agreed to do, on the ground that it is improbable that persons will be able to attend both the Association and Alliance meeting in Toronto. Of course this will put the affairs of the Association into the hands, in each case, of a little group of men—but perhaps not much harm will be done.

But we wonder if our Baptist people realize the possibilities of this Alliance Meeting in Toronto? Between now and then the Executive of the Convention will endeavour to secure the passage of its iniquitous amending Bill, they will endeavour to secure the exclusion from the Convention of a fairly large number of churches; and if they succeed in that, they will inevitably force the withdrawal from other churches of all those who are in sympathy with the protest that has been made against McMaster's growing infidelity. Baptists from all parts of the world will come to Toronto, and Canadian Baptists will undoubtedly be labelled as supporting Modernism. The influence of Chicago University and its satellites in the Northern Convention, the influence of the educational leaders in the South who are holding out itching palms for Rockefeller's gold, will be most pronounced. Southern Baptists will have an opportunity of

fraternizing with such men as Shailer Mathews, Dr. Faunce, and Dr. Fosdick, with Dr. Glover and many others of the same school from England. This being so, it will be necessary to have a great Fundamentalist rally in Toronto also. We suggest that all editors who read these words, who are in sympathy with Fundamentalism, should immediately begin to call attention to the necessity for setting up a standard for Fundamentalism when the Baptists of the world assemble in Toronto. If there is to be a world alliance of so-called Baptists, let us have at least a great gathering of Fundamentalists who will not only protest against the ravages of Modernism, but will offer to our Baptist host some constructive evangelical programme. This is merely a suggestion; we shall have more to say on this subject at a later time.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor

No. 7

Lesson 6

Third Quarter

August 7, 1927

PAUL ARRIVES AT ROME.

LESSON TEXT: Acts, Chapter 28.

GOLDEN TEXT: (Acts 28:28).

"And so it came to pass that they escaped all safe to land." So chapter twenty-seven concludes. And the land was the Island of Malta.

I. PAUL AND THE VIPER.

The people of the Island were neither Greeks nor Romans, and so they are called barbarous people. They had a kind heart. They saw this company of shipwrecked, drenched to the skin, cold and shivering people, so they kindled a fire by which they could get a bit dry and warm. Paul did not crouch down to be waited upon; he also gathered a bundle of sticks. The great apostle was not afraid of soiling his hands. But as he was laying his bundle of sticks on the fire a viper came out and fastened on his hand. It was a deadly little creature whose bite was considered fatal. However, Paul calmly shook the creature off into the fire. "He must be a murderer," said the people to each other. But why should they leap to such a conclusion? And when no harm comes to Paul, they swing to the opposite extreme and say that "He is a god." Paul was not a god, but he was a man of God, and God was manifestly there. It is great to bring the presence of God with us wherever we come. This is what the world needs, and perhaps the "barbarous people" will be quickest to realize His presence. They often are. Do people feel that God is near when we approach?

II. PAUL'S HEALING MINISTRY AT MALTA.

Luke tells that the *primus*, the chief man of the Island, whose name was Publius, graciously opened his house to Paul and himself, and probably Aristarchus, and allowed them to stay there three days, and the father of Publius was ill with fever and dysentery. Luke the physician tells of this in medical terms, but, strange to say, it is not the physician who heals the sick man, but Paul the Christian preacher. Why is this? God wanted a witness there, and being healed by the preacher rather than by the doctor would make a deeper impression upon the people. The whole world needs the healing which the Christian preacher can bring. We who are Christians should carry healing everywhere. One being healed brought many others. It is always so. The story of a revival in one place will often lead to a revival in another. Where you see some conversions you are likely to see more. The healed soul naturally says, "Come and see what the Lord has done for my soul." And others come. So the three months in Malta passed by, and Paul and his friends left a beautiful influence behind them. This is the thing to do. Any place that we visit ought to be the better for our presence there. The people of Malta were so thankful they gave the travelers freely of what they had.

III. PAUL REACHES ROME AT LAST.

Resuming the voyage after three months in Malta they have fair weather and make good progress. Coming to Puteoli, not far from Naples, Paul is met by some "brethren," and he spent a week with them, then ten miles further

on he meets others, and his spirit is cheered, and so this prisoner, this great Christian, this mighty hero, this conquering Apostle, enters Rome. The dangers of the sea are past, but other dangers lie ahead. So long Paul had desired to visit Rome; now he has arrived.

Paul's trial does not come on for two years. The delays of law are proverbial, but Nero was such a trifier that anything, however foolish, would make him put off important business. So Paul remains in his own hired room, chained to a soldier guard all the time. Of course he would have a change of guard every few hours, so that he would have, perhaps, six different men in the twenty-four hours, and these men would be of the Imperial Guard, the flower of the Roman Army.

IV. PAUL'S MINISTRY IN ROME.

Paul could not go round to the Jewish synagogues in Rome, nor stand in the street and preach the gospel, but he was not inactive. He only waited three days before he called the chief of the Jews together, to whom he told his personal story, and to whom he preached the Gospel. There was a fine courtesy in his manner, and yet he was utterly faithful. And so day after day all sorts and conditions of people came to him and heard the Gospel. Many of the soldiers who were chained to him became Christians, and they told others, so that a gracious work of God spread throughout the barracks. This was fine. Do we touch people for God like that when we are in close contact with them? Jews and Gentiles came, and many were the trophies won for Christ in that "hired" room. One day a run-away slave came, and he was saved too, and afterwards went back to his master at Colosse, carrying the most charming and beautiful personal letter ever written.

Preaching and teaching occupied much of Paul's time during those two years; but he did more than that. The rich and ripened experience which his quiet years as a prisoner gave him prepared him for writing by the inspiration of the Spirit of God the most profound and wonderful letters ever penned. While he was in Rome he wrote the beautiful letter to the Philippians in response to a beautiful parcel of nice things which they sent him. Then at Rome he wrote that sublime letter to the Colossians in which Christ has in all things the pre-eminence. And during these two years at Rome the profoundest of his letters, the one to the Ephesians, was written. What should we have lost if these letters had not been written?

God knew how best to regulate the life of Paul so that he could be the greatest blessing to the greatest multitude. It is grand to hand our lives over to our Lord that He may do with us as He pleases.

The Book of the Acts breaks off suddenly. But it would appear that Paul was set free again for a little while, till the great fire in Rome took place, and Nero, accusing the Christians of it, set in motion a violent persecution which sent Paul again to Rome and to death.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

The Editor returned to Toronto at midnight Saturday. Having four heavy services on Sunday, and having to leave again Sunday night, midnight, to attend a Trustee Board Meeting at Des Moines, he had but an hour or two Sunday afternoon to give to *The Witness*. The articles printed in this issue are the result; but he has had no time to select and revise a sermon. We therefore reprint a sermon which was published in the first days of *The Witness*, and which proved a blessing to many. A very small number of our great *Witness* family were with us when this sermon appeared about five years ago.

SUMMER BIBLE CONFERENCE AT OAKLANDS PARK.

We have been asked to announce the Summer Bible Conference at Oaklands Park, (near Hamilton, Ont.) July 31st to August 14th, 1927. Special speakers will be: Pastor P. W. Philpott, D.D., Chicago, Ill.; Pastor H. W. Bieber, D.D., Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.; Pastor Alfred J. Lewis, B.A., Philadelphia, Pa.; Pastor W. S. Hottel, Hamilton, Ont.; with J. Raymond Hemminger as song leader. Good railroad, bus, and electric connections can be made to and from Hamilton in all directions. Those wishing hotel reservation should communicate with Pastor J. N. Millar, Philpott Tabernacle, Park and Merrick Sts., Hamilton, Ont.