



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF T. T. SHIELDS: THE IRONY OF
FUNDAMENTALISM

Mark Parent
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University

March, 1991

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Ph. D.

© Mark Parent, 1991



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-67477-6

Canada

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Douglas Hall for his invaluable support, and Dr. George Rawlyk for his guidance and encouragement.

I would also like to thank the members and adherents of the First Baptist Church of Kingston, Ontario who supported me in my studies.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my wife, Catherine (Nixon) Parent and my three children, Jeremy, Meaghan and Kaitlyn. They have had to put up with a husband and father engaged in a fulltime pastorate and in graduate studies. To them I owe my deepest expression of gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ABSTRACT (French)	v
ABSTRACT (English)	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE	6
THE LIFE AND INFLUENCE OF T. T. SHIELDS	6
CHAPTER TWO	56
The Oversight of Fundamentalist Studies	56
Scholarly Studies and T. T. Shields	70
The Creedalistic Nature of Fundamentalism	74
The Fundamentalist Attitude Towards Truth	78
The Creedalism of T. T. Shields	86
T. T. Shields' Attitude Towards Truth	93
CHAPTER THREE	112
SHIELDS' CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT	112
The Person of Christ	122
Christ as God	122
Christ as Man	132
The Work of Christ	140
The Way of Salvation	140

CHAPTER FOUR	183
SHIELDS' CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT AND THE BIBLE	183
The Early Shields and the Bible	186
The Later Shields and the Bible	193
Shields' Typological Interpretation	200
The Bible and Evolution	206
The Bible and Modernism	207
Conclusion	215
CHAPTER FIVE	232
THE CHRISTOLOGY OF T. T. SHIELDS' AND	
THE CHRISTIAN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY ..	232
Pre-1918 Years	
The Priority of Evangelistic Proclamation	232
The Return of Christ	240
The Condition of the World and the Church	242
Post-1918 Years	
The Priority of Evangelistic Proclamation	254
The Condition of the World and the Church	263
Christ and Culture	265
Conclusion	273
CONCLUSION	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY	302

RESUME

Dans cette disertation on se penchera sur la pensée christologique de Thomas Todhunter Shields entre 1894 et 1930, afin de pouvoir distinguer l'influence de cette pensée sur sa façon de concevoir la Bible et le rôle des Chrétiens à l'intérieur de leur culture.

T. T. Shields fut un des penseurs les plus importants du mouvement Fondamentaliste pendant les années 20. Plus vulgarisatrice qu'intellectuelle, son oeuvre mérite toutefois une étude approfondie à cause de son caractère réfléchi et de l'influence qu'elle exerça au sein du mouvement Fundamentalists.

La christologie de Shields fut monophysite et docète, ce qui mena avec le temps à un christo-monisme flagrant qui priva effectivement le Christ de son rôle médiateur. A la place du Christ, Shields substitua pratiquement la Bible; et les caractéristiques qu'il avait attribuées au Christ (c'est-à-dire son aspect sans fautes et dépourvu d'élément humain) il attribuait à l'Ecriture. La christologie de Shields resulta aussi en une conception tronquée de l'église, particulièrement en ce qui concerne la mission Chrétienne.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the christological thought of Thomas Todhunter Shields between the years 1894 to 1930, along with its influence on his view of the Bible and of the Christian's role within his/her culture.

T. T. Shields was one of the most prominent Fundamentalist leaders in the 1920's. While a popularizer rather than an academic his thought merits study due to his influence within Fundamentalism and his reputation for being one of the more "thoughtful" of Fundamentalists.

Shields' christology was monophysitic and docetic leading, in time, to a full blown christo-monism which effectively removed Christ from his mediatorial role. In place of Christ, Shields virtually substituted the Bible; and the characteristics that he had attributed to the Christ (viz., transcendence of error and 'the human element') he now attributed to the Scriptures. Shields' christology also resulted in a truncation of his conception the church, particularly with respect to the question of Christian mission.

INTRODUCTION

THE THEME STATED

"Christianity is Christ, and Christ is God, and God never fails."¹ With these words, Thomas Todhunter Shields, defended his faith in the providence of God in a sermon written and preached during the first half of World War One. From the foregoing quotation it is clear that Shields viewed the person of Christ Jesus as the central theme within his Christian faith. By 1916, when he preached his sermon on God's providential care, however, this centrality was becoming one in name alone. Soon Christ was to be displaced by the Scriptures as Shields moved from a conservative orthodox or proto-Fundamentalist² position to a Fundamentalism which propelled him into international leadership within the Protestant wing of the Christian Church, and into conflict, both within his home church of Jarvis Street Baptist and within his larger denominational grouping, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

This dissertation highlights the element of irony³ in Shields' defense of the person and work of Christ through an exploration and analysis of the thought of Shields between the years of 1894, when he preached his first sermon, and 1930 when his influence in the United States was curtailed due to the collapse of Des Moines University, a venture which Shields backed heavily and from which he suffered badly. The ironic element consists of the attempt which Shields made to preserve the centrality of Jesus Christ against the onslaught of new currents in theological thinking which, in time, crystallized into a set of beliefs and attitudes which Shields and his allies derisively called "Modernism."

In his attempt, however, to preserve the centrality of Christ T. T. Shields advocated a form of christomonism which failed to do justice to trinitarian orthodoxy. When even this christomonism failed to meet the challenge of Modernism Shields turned to the Scriptures as the bulwark against the "reductionism" of Modernism and, it may well be argued, ended up replacing Christ with the Bible. Moreover, because he could never really appreciate the fact of Christ's humanity and, thus, the implications of the incarnation, the Bible was conceived of as a divine book which was above critical investigation and, therefore, inaccessible to theological investigation. The

irony is that in attempting to defend orthodoxy, Shields ended up departing from orthodoxy.⁴

The organization of this dissertation is straightforward. The life and influence of T. T. Shields between the years of 1894 to 1930 will be presented in chapter one. In chapter two the centrality of Christ within his theological thinking will be considered. This will involve an examination of the importance of doctrine for T. T. Shields as well as his attitude towards truth, an attitude which he shared with other leading Fundamentalists. The argument will be advanced, in light of the history of Fundamentalist studies and the rationalistic emphasis of Fundamentalist thought, that more work needs to be done on Fundamentalist views of central theological issues. Chapter three will focus, then, on the key category of christology examining Shields' christology under the traditional headings of the person and work of Christ. Chapter four will attempt to show how his christology affected his view of the Bible and how the Bible displaced Christ as the authority within the Christian faith. Chapter five will take the implications of Shields' christology even further by delineating his view of the role of the Christian within Canadian culture. The dissertation will conclude with a closing chapter summarizing the main thesis and indicating areas for future study.

ENDNOTES

¹T. T. Shields, Revelations of the War Eight Sermons (Toronto: The Standard Publishing Company), p. 77. [Dates of publication are usually not given in Shields' published books. These sermons were preached on successive Sunday evenings from January 17 to March 7, 1916.]

²R. G. Sawatsky in his doctoral thesis on early Canadian Fundamentalism uses the word Proto-Fundamentalist to describe Conservative Protestantism prior to the Fundamentalist controversy of the 1920's. See R. G. Sawatsky, "'Looking For That Blessed Hope': The Roots of Fundamentalism in Canada, 1878-1914" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1986), p. 20. The use of such a term to distinguish between Christian orthodoxy and Fundamentalist is helpful. In the analysis which follows it becomes evident that up until the second half of World War One Shields cannot be called a Fundamentalist and must be placed within the conservative camp of evangelical Protestantism. It is only when the substitution of Christ with the Bible is made and a militant separatism appears, fostered in large part by the war, that Shields can be correctly termed as a Fundamentalist.

³The use of the term irony to characterize North American religious history, particularly in the 19th and 20th centuries is not unique to this dissertation. Reinhold Niebuhr used the concept of irony to analyze the position of the American nation, as viewed from the standpoint of Christian faith. In his work Niebuhr differentiated between pathos, comedy and irony noting, in regard to comedy, that: ". . . irony is something more than comedy. A comic situation is proved to be an ironic one if a hidden relation is discovered in the incongruity." In relationship to the tragic Niebuhr writes that irony: ". . . is differentiated from tragedy by that fact that the responsibility is related to an

unconscious weakness rather than a conscious resolution." See Reinhold Niebuhr, The Irony of American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. viii.

This use of irony to analyze the American situation, and particularly, the American **religious** experience has been, then, a common practice. Indeed, it may well be argued that the concept of irony in connection with North American religious history has been so overused that it has been rendered useless as a descriptive term. Martin Marty responds to such a criticism, asserting: "Misuse of the concept or weariness over the possible misuse of it [i.e. the concept of the ironic] will not make it go away or deprive it of value. As a teacher, through a long career, of the 'history of modern Christianity,' I am convinced that that adjective will survive and be as important and problematic an analytical tool for describing religion in the West as adjectives for periods like 'ancient' and 'medieval' now are." Martin Marty, Modern American Religion, vol. 2: The Irony of it All, 1893-1919 (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 11.

⁴In the Canadian context, Ramsay Cook has applied the concept of the ironic to describe the efforts of the forerunners of Modernism rather than the proto-Fundamentalists. Cook states, "and so my argument: the supreme irony of the regenerators was that the new birth to which they contributed was not, as they had hoped, the city of God on earth but rather the secular city." Ramsay Cook, The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 4.

CHAPTER ONE

THE LIFE AND INFLUENCE OF T. T. SHIELDS¹

Thomas Todhunter Shields was born in the city of Bristol, England² on November 1st, 1873 as the fifth in a family of eight children. Three of the children died in infancy but two girls, Margaret and Ethel, and three boys, Tod³, Irwin and Edgar survived the rigors of the English climate. Shields' father was a Yorkshireman by birth who, although raised within the Church of England, became a Primitive Methodist minister, serving in southern England and Wales.⁴

According to Leslie Tarr, it was prior to moving his family to Canada that the senior Shields became convinced of the Baptist position on baptism and was himself immersed.⁵ It is impossible, however, to confirm this, although it is clear from a diary/list of sermons which Shields Sr. kept that on December 30, 1888 he accepted a call to the Plattsville Baptist Church in Plattsville, Ontario, a small village located near the city of

Woodstock.

The Plattsville congregation was located within the Brant Association and was only one of two congregations within that association which received financial aid from the Home Mission Board. In the Home Mission Board report for 1890 the Plattsville congregation was described as "one of our most intelligent, liberal and progressive churches."⁶ It was a good church for Shields Sr. to begin his Canadian and Baptist work and he met early success as the congregation prospered under his leadership. In March of the 1989 he noted in his diary, "congregation at night are now half as many again as at the first."⁷

It was while his father was serving as the minister at Plattsville that a very significant event happened in T. T. Shields' life. A revival had begun in the Plattsville church spurred on by the preaching of two visiting ministers, Pastor McDonald and Pastor Sheldon. On February 18, 1891, along with his older brother Irwin, Tod made his profession of faith.⁸ This moment of decision-making was a rather unemotional event for Shields. Reflecting back on it he once commented:

It was a simple, matter-of-fact business transaction. I rested in the Word of the Lord, and I said, "If that is the Word of the Lord, either I am now a Christian or God is a liar -- one or the other." And seeing that He cannot lie, I believed all my sins were forgiven for His Name's sake.⁹

This lack of emotion contrasted with what would be a

typical Baptist response to the conversion experience. Shields' conversion and baptism may well have been an anti-climactic event for him, however, necessitated not by any awareness of the significance of God's gracious forgiveness but rather by the Baptist context in which his father now worked, a context which insisted on a regenerate membership and on a personalized conversion experience. From later reflections it is clear that Shields admired his father from his youngest days and wished to follow in his footsteps both as a Christian and as a minister of the gospel. In a lecture on the book of Acts, given late in his life, he confessed:

There was never a time in my life when I did not think I was going to be a preacher. I did not tell anybody, but when I was a little bit of a kiddie I was always going to be a preacher. My father's initials were the same as mine, and when I saw his name written, "Rev. T. T. Shields," I could not see any reason why I should not have it too, so I used to write my name just the same.¹⁰

For a young man who had always desired to follow in his father's footsteps and enter the Christian ministry it is odd that Shields made no formal academic preparations for such a ministry. This lack of theological education was to become a sore point later in life when opponents made the charge that Shields' hostility towards McMaster University was occasioned by academic envy. It was a charge which Shields hotly denied. In one rather turgid letter, which may never actually have been sent, Shields

responded to this criticism as put forward by a W. L. McKay, a former associate who had worked at the Parliament St. Mission, a mission sponsored by Jarvis St. Church:

Your posing as a man of education in your sermon, and your saying that the Pastor of Jarvis Street graduated from no college is very funny. Let me tell you, my dear fellow, that if I could not have left you miles behind, educationally, when I was fifteen years of age I should have expected nothing but a sound thrashing. It may not be known to you that I was brought up at the feet of Oxford and Cambridge teachers, and I think could have beaten any B.A. of McMaster University long before I reached the age of eighteen.¹¹

The comment concerning his Oxford and Cambridge teachers referred to the education which Shields received in England prior to his family's emigration to Canada in 1888. The more important allusion is to the "sound thrashing" which Shields would have expected to receive. This "thrashing" would likely have been administered by his father whom, on most occasions, Shields acknowledged as the real source of his pastoral education.¹²

It was his father who first provided T. T. Shields with the opportunity of preaching. In February 22, 1892, after a very happy and fruitful pastorate at Plattsville, Shields Sr. accepted the call of the Tiverton Baptist Church, a town near Kincardine, Ontario. Shields Sr. was reluctant to move to Tiverton for fear that the town would hold little attraction for Tod. He was also reluctant to go because of the difficulties which a previous pastor had experienced at the church.

T. T. Shields Sr.'s first hesitation, however, was put to rest in Tiverton when an illness forced him to absent himself from the Sunday sermon and to call on his son to preach in his stead. T. T. Shields reflected on that event:

I was living at home at a time when my father was taken ill. He called me into his room one day, and he said, "Would you like to try to preach for me on Sunday?" I said, "Do you mean it?" He said, "Yes." I said, "All right." "Do you think you can do it?" "Oh," I said, "I have several sermons written." I did not know which one I would take, but I had just written away. It was a church that was just full of theologians. There was more theology in one pew than you would find in any theological seminary, except ours [i.e. Toronto Baptist Seminary], in this country. Some of those Scotchmen could read their Greek Testament just as well as they could read their English one. And so they were all ready for the young man to break down. They had the hymns selected, and knew exactly what they were going to do. But frankly, I felt quite as much at home that first time I preached as I have ever felt since. I preached that Sunday, and I have been preaching ever since.¹³

This preaching event was the prompting and encouragement which T. T. Shields needed to enter the ministry. In his list of Sermons/Diary Shields Sr. appended to an earlier comment concerning his hesitation on accepting Tiverton's call because of his son these words: "how little we know how God will work. Tod got regular work with Clellan and besides our going to Tiverton was the means of him going into the ministry."¹⁴

The second hesitation which Shields Sr. had in accepting Tiverton's call was not so happily arranged by

the providence of God. Indeed, the conflict sharpened to such a degree that after only two years of ministry Shields Sr. accepted the call of the Vittoria Baptist church, a church in which he had first preached on February 4, 1894. The trouble in the Tiverton church spilled over, affecting family relationships. After he had left, the Tiverton church invited Shields Sr. back to participate in discussions concerning the church's problems. Shields Sr. refused to do so, feeling that the church there was not treating him with dignity (they did not offer to cover his travelling expenses) and he did not want to reopen old wounds. When T. T. Shields heard of his father's refusal he was upset. Never one to back away from conflict, even in his early years, he wrote his father a stern letter of rebuke which prompted a melancholy diary entry:

Tod was so vexed that I did not go that he wrote me a most cruel letter. Oh what I do suffer, I will not write it. God bless my poor inexperienced boy. He said he would not come home and not write to tell me anything about the council.¹⁵

The year 1894, besides being significant for his father was also important for T. T. Shields. Under the supervision of the Home Mission Board he accepted a call to serve the Florence Church and settled there in October of 1894. Florence is a small village located near Bothwell, Ontario. The Baptist Report Book for 1895-96 lists father and son together, the former serving the

Vittoria congregation, the latter serving in Florence.¹⁶

T. T. Shields stayed for only one year¹⁷ in Florence before moving again, this time to the Dutton Baptist Church, located in Dutton, Ontario near the community of St. Thomas. It was while he was serving the Dutton congregation that Shields was ordained into the Christian ministry. The Dutton church minutes state simply that "the matter of ordaining Brother Shields to the gospel ministry was discussed."¹⁸ In spite of the lack of formal theological education, Shields acquitted himself well and the service of ordination was held on September 23, 1897.¹⁹

The congregation at Dutton must have been puzzled as to the way events unfolded following the ordination, for almost immediately afterwards T. T. Shields moved to Delhi, beginning his pastorate there on October 17, 1897. Delhi was a larger church than either Florence or Dutton, and although from his sermons one gathers that he was not unhappy with Dutton, Shields evidently felt the need not to waste any time in climbing the ministerial ladder.

It was while Shields was serving the Delhi church that his father received the call to move to Leamington. Things had not gone smoothly at Vittoria for the elder Shields. He resigned once from the church but accepted a call to resume his ministry at Vittoria. Finally, on February 8,

1898 he terminated his work in that church, moved to Woodstock and resolved not to take a pastorate but to do interim ministry at various churches. One of the first churches he preached at was the Leamington church. Out of an initial contact in March of 1898 came a call to Leamington which Shields Sr. accepted on August 11, 1898.²⁰

The following year, 1899, while pastor of the Delhi church, T. T. Shields married Elizabeth Ann Kitchen on October 6, 1899.²¹ Approximately a year after his marriage Shields moved again, this time to a home mission supported church in the city of Hamilton. It was during his ministry at Wentworth Street that Shields began to develop a confidence and willingness to tackle political, economic and theological issues in an engaging and controversial style, which was to become his trademark.

His ministry met with numerical success at the Wentworth Baptist Church and Shields began to be recognized denominationally as having strong leadership gifts. Between 1900 when he arrived and 1903 when he left Wentworth the membership had more than doubled from 71 to 160, most of this through new baptisms.²² The pleasure in this growth was offset for Shields by the death of his father on October 1902. Early in January of 1902 Shields received word that his father had cancer, and would be forced to retire due to illness. According to Shields, his

father's

. . . last pastorate was here at Leamington. I had been home at Christmas time; and early in January received word that at the close of his morning service he had gone home with a doctor who was a member of the congregation, to consult him professionally. He had a little lump about the size of a pea under his tongue. He had it for some time; but had said nothing about it. The doctor at once diagnosed it as cancer. He had prepared his sermons for the day as was his custom. He therefore preached at night from the text he had expected to preach from: "Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck." At the close of the sermon he presented his resignation, saying that it marked the termination of a ministry of forty-three years.²³

Shields Sr. and his wife moved to Hamilton at the invitation of their son who procured appropriate accommodation. From January to October T. T. Shields prayed for and supported his father in his illness:

The x-ray was just beginning to be used; and my father went for daily treatments. I accompanied him most of the time - nearly every day he went. It succeeded only in driving the disease within; and about August of that year he went to bed and did not rise again. He was a great sufferer; and went home the first of October, 1902. He passed as he lived -- triumphant in the faith of Christ. He said to me not long before he died, "After all, the one and only truth that matters is that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."²⁴

The relationship with his father was a critical one for Shields, although not one without its moments of tension. The Tiverton incident evoked this expression of frustration and self-pity from the father:

I have a miserable life. How that boy [Tod] has made my heart ache and I loved him so dearly. May God bless him and may he never know in his after life

such pain and sorrow as he has caused me. I am not allowed, as a Father to say or do anything but as they think. And yet my life's struggle is for them to keep a home over their heads. Of course he did not mean to pain me he is a loving steady affectionate boy but apt to be impulsive.²⁵

Such sentiments appear nowhere in Shields' own writings. Always his father appears as his idol, his teacher, his mentor. His sermons were often patterned after his father's and at times it is difficult to tell their respective work apart, except that the son had a freshness and a vigor which was lacking in the father's preaching. Theologically, it was the father's influence which like a time-delayed bomb exploded later in his life and provided Shields with the confirmation that his journey from orthodoxy to Fundamentalism was divinely (or at least paternally) sanctioned. This journey from orthodoxy to Fundamentalism, along with the contours of Fundamentalist thought will be explored in subsequent chapters. Unfortunately, Shields' father died before the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy erupted, leaving unanswered question as to what his own position would have been in such a debate had he lived through the years leading up to the crucial decade of the 1920's.²⁶

This respect which T. T. Shields showed for his father was shared by others. And in the Baptist Year Book, while some of the factual information may have been incorrect, the respect which Shields Sr. commanded is certainly

evident:

In the loss of our esteemed brother, Rev. T. Shields, the Baptist ministry of this Province has lost one of its faithful members and the cause of the Lord one its outstanding defenders. . . . Our late brother was a man of sterling character. He stood supreme as a preacher of the gospel of Christ. In the pastorates of Plattsville, Wingham, Vittoria and Leamington, and also in the councils of our denomination, he proved himself a faithful minister of the gospel. Although he came to Canada only in the latter years of his life after a long and honorable ministry in another body from which he was forced, by the strength of his convictions; yet by the force, color and fidelity of his presentation of the claims of the gospel he came to be regarded as a preacher of no small merit. His was the preaching of Bunyan, with all the strength, flexible and sanctified imagination of that old Puritan.²⁷

The difference between father and son lay not in the field of theology, although in the early years Shields indicates that he did not see as clearly the dangers in new theological movements as his father did, but in the differences in their personalities. The father was "quiet, modest and somewhat retiring."²⁸ The son was loud, proud and forceful. Although theologically attuned to Fundamentalism it is doubtful that the father could ever have felt comfortable with the militancy demanded by the movement his son supported so faithfully. Had the father lived, the course of Shields' career and the the fortunes of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec might have been very different. Either that or, once again, the son might have broken his father's heart.

T. T. Shields mother continued to live with her son

in Hamilton, staying on there during his four months of evangelistic work which followed his call to Wentworth and his call to Adelaide Street Baptist Church in London, Ontario in 1904.²⁹ She exuded the same sort of quiet, supportive presence which Shields demanded of his two wives, but while she elicited admiration from her son, her influence on his life and thought was decidedly secondary to her husband's.

The call to Adelaide Street Church was, next to the call to Jarvis Street some six years later, the most momentous call of Shields' pastoral career. Finally, the uneducated son of an immigrant was to be given an opportunity to show what he was capable of doing.³⁰ Shields lost no time in meeting the challenge. C. J. Cameron, one time secretary of the Home Mission Board, at the close of Shields' ministry in Adelaide Church noted:

In September, 1904, Brother Shields became pastor of Adelaide Street Baptist Church, London. By his personal magnetism and through his judicious advertising the congregation soon overflowed the building. Scores of people every Sunday night were turned away from the church doors. A Building Committee, under the leadership of the pastor, was appointed, and the beautiful and capacious house of worship the church now occupies was undertaken and completed by February 1906. It had then a seating capacity for eight hundred people.³¹

It was during his Adelaide ministry that major characteristics and attitudes which had been nurtured in his previous pastorates, particularly in Wentworth, became noticeable. His enthusiasim for old-time religion hardened:

We are not of those very modern, so-called 'up-to-date' people who insist upon finding, or at least attempting to find any new road to heaven. 'The old time religion' is the only religion I ever expect to preach.³²

His militancy, his stress on individualism, and the important role of morality became even more evident:

O for the Daniel Spirit! That will do right whatever comes. May God help you young Christians to be brave. **There is nothing I despise so much as a moral coward.** [emphasis mine]³³

His impatience with ecclesiastical politeness and reticence which was first given scope in Hamilton was given even greater play at Adelaide. Sensationalism in the service of evangelism became an enduring trademark. Responding to criticism concerning this philosophy of ministry Shields declared:

At all events, as long as people come, and I have the opportunity of touching the hearts and consciences of men by the preaching of the Gospel I shall not care what people call me.³⁴

Most important of all was the way Shields' theology, and in particular, his christology grew and changed during his years in London. This theme will be developed later in the dissertation, but the point which needs to be highlighted is the fact that by the time Shields received the call to Jarvis Street Baptist Church he had already internalized key ideas and beliefs which would find prominence at a later date.

Historically, however, Shields' ministries in the Florence, Dutton, Delhi, Wentworth and Adelaide Street

churches served as a prelude to his call to serve the Jarvis Street Baptist Church.³⁵ Jarvis Street Church was the most prominent Baptist church in Canada at the time and one of the largest Protestant churches in Toronto, a city of churches.³⁶ D. E. Thomson, a lawyer and the chair of the pulpit committee, made contact with T. T. Shields early in 1910. The success at Adelaide Street was prominent in people's minds and Shields' pulpit abilities were well known, given wide publicity by visitors to Adelaide. Moreover, Shields's printed sermons which he circulated in a form modeled after those of Charles Haddon Spurgeon received wide distribution.³⁷ It caused little surprise, then, when the call from Jarvis Street Baptist Church finally came and on May 15, 1910 T. T. Shields began what would be a forty-five year ministry which would end only with his death on April 4, 1955.³⁸

T. T. Shields' pastorate began rather quietly with the church experiencing slow but steady numerical growth. In The Plot That Failed Shields reflected on the first four years of his stay at Jarvis Street:

No Pastor could possibly be more loyally supported than I was. The congregations increased until Sunday evenings the auditorium was invariably filled. The finances of the church showed a steady improvement. Nor were we without a measure of spiritual blessing.³⁹

In a lecture given to Toronto Baptist Seminary students Shields was much more succinct, commenting: "those

people [Jarvis Street members, particularly the wealthy and influential] in that day were not Modernists, unbelievers, they were believers."⁴⁰ It was not theological considerations which first brought T. T. Shields into conflict with his new church, then, but organizational frustrations. In 1914, after sitting more or less quietly, Shields began a campaign for better organization which would extend far beyond its immediate objective:

. . . I had never known any church to attend to its business in a more slipshod fashion than Jarvis Street did. . . . In the early part of 1914 I decided it was time to act; I therefore told the Deacons that until I became Pastor of Jarvis Street, I had never presided at the Annual meeting of any church of which I was Pastor, where a deficit had been reported, and that I had done so for the last time in Jarvis Street.⁴¹

Emboldened by his success in rectifying the church's financial situation Shields began to make organizational changes which would lead to more centralized control and, he hoped, to more responsible decision-making. While priding himself on being a committed Baptist, Shields was not particularly enchanted with the sloppy organization which often results from the Baptist emphasis on regenerate membership and democracy:

The average church organization is about as useful for affecting the purpose of its existence as would be the heaviest and most ancient ox-cart drawn by oxen with sore legs and shoulders, if entered in a race to compete with a modern motor-car.⁴²

In time, this frustration with the organizational framework of Jarvis Street Baptist Church took on theological overtones. Shields began to complain that the poor organization resulted from elected officers who were not spiritually committed, that often it was not spiritual depth which determined whether an individual sat on a given committee but social standing.⁴³

The outbreak of World War I in August of 1914 diverted attention from organizational changes at Jarvis Street to more global concerns. T. T. Shields was vacationing when the news of the declaration of war was made. Resting by the tranquil shores of an Ontario lake in the warmth on an Ontario summer, he was sufficiently troubled by the news to forsake his customary pattern of church attendance to go off by himself and read the book of Revelation in order to place the war within its proper context.⁴⁴ This rather sober reaction by Shields contrasted with the superficial enthusiasm which was evidenced by many in Canada. Indeed, Sam Hughes' (Canada's Minister of Militia) chief worry, upon being notified of the outbreak of war was that the war would be over before he could get his troops across the ocean to engage in battle.⁴⁵

In spite of Shields' initial reaction, however, the war years were for him a time of tremendous excitement and vitality. In part this was a result of several wartime

visits which he made to his beloved homeland of England. In a series of letters which form a diary of his visit in 1915 Shields described the atmosphere aboard the ship the Arabic as hostile waters were entered:

The ship is still cheerful, but tomorrow will be a serious day. Let me tell you what preparations I have made and shall still make. As there is plenty of room in the boat -- it will carry sixty-five persons and less than twenty are assigned to it, -- I have wrapped up my sermons -- don't laugh -- in my dressing case and then in brown paper. These with a few other things I shall put in my weekend bag and try to save them. This letter when it is finished I shall wrap up in my remaining oiled silk and put it in my belt. I have my cork life belt on a shelf at hand -- this I shall put on outside my pneumatic belt which I shall keep on under my vest. I shall have my overcoat, bath robe, and a couple of blankets where I can snatch them up in a minute. These I shall try to take for the children, for there are five and several women in our boat. Everybody on the ship is thoroughly prepared as though it were certain we should have to leave her. Tomorrow night very few will sleep, all the children will be put to bed ready dressed even to their shoes. I shall not undress at all tomorrow night.⁴⁶

The Arabic arrived safely in England and Shields had an exciting and inspiring visit there, seeing 'contacts,' preaching at Spurgeon's Tabernacle, and assessing the impact of the war. The highlight of his visit of 1915 was the contact which Shields made with Spurgeon's son as well as a service of memorial held on the first anniversary of the war in St. Paul's Cathedral. This service made such a profound impression on him that he drew a detailed map of the cathedral indicating where he and the various dignitaries sat. This was accompanied by a lengthy letter

outlining the events of the service and offering an appropriate commentary.

T. T. Shields' personal oratorical abilities, his position as a prominent minister, his strong sympathies for the Allied cause and his frequent trips to England during the war made it almost inevitable that Robert Borden, Canada's Primer Minister, would turn to him when public relations help was needed. In 1917, then, Shields eagerly accepted the proposal when he was approached to join a set of speakers whose task was to solicit support for Borden and Borden's call for conscription. Shields mainly used Baptist contacts for his speaking engagements but did not limit himself to such as he travelled far and wide drumming up the support which Canada would need in order to finish what had become a long and wearying war.

The war was an important turning point for T. T. Shields. It imparted to him a sense of uneasiness concerning the direction in which Canadian society was heading along with an attitude of militancy which gave expression to that concern.⁴⁷ After the war Shields was enlisted in a mission campaign known as the Baptist Forward Movement. In an address written for that campaign Shields gave graphic expression to this new militancy:

Much has been said in recent years about "union" and "cooperation; and Baptists are not indifferent to these discussions. When, in March, 1918, the Allied armies were being pushed back upon the Channel ports,

no one proposed that the British should become French, or the French British, or that either should become Americans. But the greatest military genius of all the Allied generals was appointed to the supreme command of the Allied forces; and when every individual soldier in all the armies of the Allies became subject to one supreme will, in that hour Germany's doom was sealed! And the forces of darkness will not be defeated by flags of truce; nor by the surrender of vital principles of revealed truth. The need of the hour is the recognition by every Christian of the Lord Jesus Christ as Generalissimo of all the armies of the Lord. And to that recognition our message clearly and uncompromisingly calls.⁴⁸

An initial theological skirmish had occurred when Shields first arrived at Jarvis Street Church in 1910. Elmore Harris, minister of the Walmer Road Baptist Church, challenged Professor I. G. Matthews of McMaster University, charging that he was disseminating Modernist teachings. T. T. Shields initially supported Harris in his concern but, in the end, lent his support to more moderate and conciliatory forces. Immediately following the war, however, such conciliatory approaches were not particularly attractive to Shields. When Matthews resigned in the Spring of 1919, Shields wrote an open letter to Chancellor A. L. McCrimmon urging McMaster University to hire an orthodox and conservative evangelical for the vacated post. When Rev. H. S. Curr, an avowed evangelical, was appointed to the chair, Shields felt a measure of satisfaction.⁴⁹ This was soon destroyed by an unsigned editorial in the Canadian Baptist on the subject of biblical inspiration, an editorial which, according to

Shields, strongly supported Modernist teachings.

The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec of 1919 provided the opportunity for Shields publicly to chastise the Canadian Baptist for allowing the publication of such an editorial. As well, it provided the forum in which he could seek the support of like-minded delegates in stopping the growth of liberalism within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. In this attempt Shields was successful.⁵⁰ In his own church, however, things did not go so easily for him. Shields attributed his problems to McMaster liberals who, after his Convention victory, were determined that he should be fired. His opponents claimed that it was his dictatorial style which created problems for him at the Jarvis Street Church.

After a series of meetings in which Shields barely survived two votes of dismissal, the church split with three-hundred-and-forty-two members leaving to form the Park Road Baptist Church. Shields, however, stayed, more convinced than ever that God had placed him in the Jarvis Street pulpit to withstand the forces of Modernism:

And when the Holy Spirit puts a man in a church, you cannot put him out, understand that! I never did want to come to this church. I am in my sixteenth year now, and I am perfectly sure that the Lord sent me - for several years I could not understand it, but I believed it when I came. I believe it now.⁵¹

Prominence in struggles within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec resulted in prominence on an

international scale as well. In 1922 he organized and began publication of the Gospel Witness, a weekly magazine which was originally composed almost entirely of his sermons but which became, in effect, a denominational magazine soon after its inauguration. The influence of the Gospel Witness must not be underestimated. At one time its subscription list topped the 30,000 mark as it was sent to various countries around the world. Many of those thirty-thousand were ministers who took what they received in the magazine and passed it on to their congregations. The Rev. Dr. Stuart MacLennan's letter to T. T. Shields was typical of the reception which was afforded the Gospel Witness:

Dear Doctor Shields: I notice that while I was away my subscription to the "Gospel Witness" expired and I want it to continue by all means. Please begin at the time my subscription ran out and renew it for another year. . . . By the way your sermon "The Religious Devil" gave me the framework for a most timely sermon on "McPhersonism". Thank you for it.⁵²

Such testimonials were extremely common. J. C. Crawford from Boone, Iowa touched on the same theme when he wrote in 1930:

Dear Brother in Christ: I admire your sermons because they are so full of the very essence of the gospel and you magnify Christ so wonderfully. I press your paper on to others⁵³. . . and they likewise appreciate your message.

It was Shield's running description of the battle he and others waged against Modernism, however, which likely attracted the majority of readers. Dr. Walter Ellis has

noted:

As a result of the Jarvis Street crisis Shields wrote the address The Inside of the Cup. This resulted in such popularity that Shields' newly established magazine The Gospel Witness became the leading fundamentalist journal in Canada.⁵⁴

Later in 1922, Shields participated in another venture which would gain him as much influence as did the inauguration of The Gospel Witness. Impatient with the "moderate" approach of previous theological protest groups, a small number of individuals gathered together to lay the framework for an organization called the Baptist Bible Union.⁵⁵ The first meeting of this new group was held in Kansas City in May, 1923 prior to the opening of the Southern Baptist Convention. At that meeting T. T. Shields was chosen as president with two other Fundamentalist giants chosen as vice-presidents, W. B. Riley of Minnesota and J. Frank Norris of Texas.

Perhaps nothing symbolizes the stature and respect which Shields enjoyed within the burgeoning Fundamentalist movement of North America as much as his election to the presidency of the B. B. U.. That Riley and Norris could play second-fiddle to Shields and insist upon his assuming the leadership is a strong testimonial in light of the rugged individualism which characterized Fundamentalist leaders.⁵⁶ In time this individualism would weaken and ultimately destroy any influence that the B. B. U. would have on the Southern and Northern Baptist Conventions of

the United States, and the two Canadian Baptist Conventions, but in 1923 the new movement was full of hope and eager for action.⁵⁷

Organized to fight Modernist influences within Baptist groups in Canada and the United States, the B. B. U. quickly gathered strength. Delnay has noted:

By the spring of 1924 the Baptist Bible Union was both an organization and a movement. The key issue in its protest against the Northern Baptist Convention was that of modernism in the foreign mission society. Its chief field of protest would continue to be the Northern Baptist Convention. . . . In the south the key issue would be evolution, in Canada it would be modernist control of McMaster.⁵⁸

T. T. Shields devoted an enormous amount of time and energy to expanding the base of the B. B. U. in Canada, travelling extensively within the country. The main focus of the B. B. U.'s energy, however, was to be directed against the Northern (American) Baptist Convention. Through Shields' influence the Baptist Bible Union's Confession of Faith⁵⁹ refrained from advocating separatism and dispensational premillennialism,⁶⁰ thereby ensuring the B. B. U. wider support within the Northern Baptist Convention.⁶¹

The anti-separatist stance which Shields advocated strongly in the first part of the 1920's disappeared as the conflict grew more intense. Within Shields' own Convention, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, his influence and support was reaffirmed by the

constituency as late as 1924. By 1926, however, a majority of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec had had enough of Shields and certain elements within the leadership were preparing to take the almost unheard-of step of excluding Jarvis Street Church from the Convention.

The growing militancy which the B. B. U. advocated through the policies of withholding or diverting funds as well as disrupting Convention meetings has caused scholars to be extremely negative in their assessment of its influence. Thus, H. Leon McBeth, contrasting Massee's Fundamentalist Fellowship with the Baptist Bible Union, asserts:

In general, they [i.e. B. B. U. supporters] represented a narrower educational and cultural base, a firmer commitment to premillennialism, a persistent nondenominational flavor, and above all a meaner spirit.⁶²

Norman Furniss is even more damning in his criticism of the B. B. U., placing the blame squarely on Shields for the Union's failure to achieve its goals:

Under the leadership of Shields, always an inflexible individual who followed the policy of rule or ruin, the group attracted to itself the reckless fundamentalist element among the Baptists, while more moderate clergymen resigned.⁶³

A kinder, and more accurate, assessment of Shields' leadership is provided by Delnay who has written:

Except for the first months of 1927, the Bible Union never had the benefit of a paid general secretary to promote it. It would seem to be indicative of the validity of the movement and of

Shields that it went as far as it did.⁶⁴

The influence of the Baptist Bible Union peaked in 1926,⁶⁵ the same year in which the majority of delegates at the annual meetings of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec voted to inform Jarvis Street Church that its pastor would no longer be acceptable as a delegate to future conventions unless he apologized for his actions against McMaster. After a stormy session which lasted well into the night, Rev. Dr. A. J. Vining, pastor of the College Street Baptist Church, put forward the resolution which requested an apology by Shields. The motion was duly seconded and, after more discussion, passed by a large majority. Vining apologized later in the meetings for his tone of speech during the debate but continued to support the call for an apology by Shields.⁶⁶

Such an apology would not be forthcoming. Instead, the stage was set for further confrontation. Already organized along paradenominational lines, Shields and his supporters moved to create a new denomination and on January 11 and 12, 1927 the Regular Baptist Missionary and Education Society of Canada was formed. The Convention's response was to push a bill through the Senate of Canada which would give them power to disbar Jarvis Street Baptist Church from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. In spite of vigorous protests by such well known citizens as C. J. Holman, as well as the public media, that power

was afforded to the Convention. On October 14, 1927 Jarvis Street Church was barred from sending any more delegates to Convention meetings. At that Shields and his supporters rose and marched out of the building singing "Onward Christian Soldiers," a fitting song for what had indeed been a war with all the damage and the bitterness and the legacy of hate which war leaves. It was not the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec's finest hour.⁶⁷

The Educational Society which had been formed earlier was, in October of 1927 at Jarvis Street Church, turned into a full fledged denomination when 768 delegates signed a statement of faith. Shields was elected President of this new group which immediately began to agitate amongst Convention churches for further numerical growth.⁶⁸

As a result of his leadership in the Baptist Bible Union and in other Fundamentalist organizations, Shields began to function as an unofficial 'Baptist Bishop' counselling, encouraging and helping to find churches for ministers who sympathized with his stance. Letters such as the one Shields sent to Alfred Davey in response to a request for a suitable candidate for Davey's church were common:

. . . you ask if I can recommend you a pastor. The only one of those whom you mention, known to me, is the Rev. J. Hind. Mr. Hind is one of our best men; he is a conservative of the conservatives. I do not know his qualities as a preacher, I mean his power. I have never heard him. But he has done such a work in

Guelph as it seemed a few years ago no man could do.⁶⁹

Invitations to speak were numerous coming from churches, Bible Union groups and, increasingly, Bible Institutes and other educational institutions like Wheaton and Gordon Colleges. A typical itinerary from the year 1928 has Shields scheduled to speak in Chicago, Des Moines, Denver, El Paso, Tucson, Los Angeles, Berkley, Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, Calgary, Moosejaw, Winnipeg, St. Paul; this trip lasted less than a month when travel was by rail rather than by air! Shields himself in his letter to Alfred Davey, in which he apologized for failing to respond promptly, stated:

I have no less than seven public engagements per week: three addresses every Sunday, two lectures per week, beside three prayer meetings; and the editing of a paper with out of town engagements involving often hundreds of miles of travel a week. Then when I get back, a mountain of work is waiting for me. Your letter is one of hundreds that I am trying to clear off, received since you came.⁷⁰

With such heavy demands on his time it was not surprising that the pastoral work at Jarvis Street had to be shared by others.⁷¹ What is surprising is that Shields managed to keep going, for very few were allowed the opportunity of confronting him as his brother Irwin did when he wrote:

As for you, -- if you don't stop rushing around the country the way you are doing, you will shatter your constitution beyond repair, and then the climax will come, -- the whole family will go down in ruin and will have to go to the poor-house, or to jail,

unless we resort to boot-legging, at which there is a great deal of money to be made; I know one chap who has made over two hundred thousand dollars at it.

I know what you will say, -- that you can't stop, -- but if you have a break-down you will be compelled to stop. How much better to slow down before you reach that point. A man who gets drunk is not damaging his constitution as much as you are with your feverish activity. Think it over.⁷²

In spite of his fondness for Irwin, Shields refused to listen to his advice. In 1925 he had begun a new project, agitating for the development of a Bible Institute which would function in cooperation with McMaster University. This was seen as a "Trojan Horse" by McMaster sympathizers and nothing came of Shields' suggestion until after his ouster from the Convention when he began his own Seminary in conjunction with the Jarvis Street Baptist Church.⁷³ January 4, 1927 was the date for the official opening of the new Toronto Baptist Seminary. Dr. W. B. Riley, with whom Shields would shortly have sharp differences, was the featured speaker at the opening exercises for the eighteen full time and twenty-eight part time students who enrolled for the inaugural year.⁷⁴

Shields took an active part in the new school, lecturing to the students in the areas of homiletics, pastoral theology and systematic theology. He also served as the President of the school and since the seminary was so closely tied to Jarvis Street he was the pastor for most of the students who attended the new seminary. While small in comparison with other well known Fundamentalist

and Evangelical schools in both the United States and Canada, nonetheless, students who graduated from the Toronto Baptist Seminary were stamped by Shields' theology and, often, were eager evangelists for his causes.⁷⁵

T. T. Shields, however, had bigger projects than a small seminary. In May 1927 he intended to resign from the presidency of the Baptist Bible Union in order to devote more time to the work at Jarvis Street. At the meetings of the B. B. U. executive, however, the physical assets and property of Des Moines University, Iowa were offered to the Baptist Bible Union. The offer carried a substantial price tag, for Des Moines had accumulated a \$750,000 deficit which needed to be paid off. Enchanted by this opportunity, Shields withdrew his resignation and, instead of lessening his commitments, added the Presidency of Des Moines University to his workload:

I left Toronto three weeks ago last Wednesday (this is Friday), hoping that I might obtain release from the Presidency of the Baptist Bible Union, in order to give more attention to my own work. Arriving Thursday morning, before I could get breakfast, the Des Moines University proposal was set before me. When the Executive meeting was held to consider it, they demanded first of all to know whether I would accept leadership for another year, for, they said, if I did not, they would not spend five minutes in a discussion of the project. The University proposal seemed to open up such a great opportunity for usefulness that I found it impossible to do other than put myself in the hands of the brethren. And here is the miracle: three weeks ago yesterday I heard of the University matter for the first time; two weeks ago yesterday . . . I spent the day in Des Moines, looking over the buildings, and examining the

situation generally; one week ago yesterday the old Trustee Board voted themselves out, and voted us in. They made me President of the Trustee Board and the entire University passed absolutely under the control of the Baptist Bible Union.⁷⁶

The hurried manner in which the Des Moines transaction was undertaken masked many of the problems which would bring about the end of the University. Delnay has observed:

A reading of such correspondence and minutes as remain suggests that there was time for only a cursory examination of the University accounts and engagements and that the Baptist Bible Union took the school virtually sight unseen.⁷⁷

The prospect, however, of establishing a first class Fundamentalist University so excited Shields that he took no notice of the possible problems which could be involved. Writing to his good friend E. M. Keirstead, a former McMaster professor who had retired to Wolfville, Nova Scotia, he exulted: "McMaster University is little more than a village high school in comparison with Des Moines."⁷⁸

Clearly, his defeat at the hands of Marshall and other McMaster loyalists resulting in his forced departure from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec in 1927 still rankled Shields, but the primary motivation for Des Moines was not personal aggrandizement but the opportunity of meeting and reversing the growth of liberalism. Committed, at least on an intellectual level, to the foundational nature of revelational truth for all arenas of human

knowledge,⁷⁹ Shields was entranced with the possibility of establishing a Baptist Fundamentalist University which would compete with Modernism not only theologically but in the sciences and liberal arts, as well. Writing to his friend Charles Fisher, Shields noted:

Take the matter to which you refer, Biological Evolution, or Evolution as it is taught in the Biological Sciences. If it be so that there are no universities in Europe or America in which this heresy is not taught, where are you to find your Christian biologists? We must get them from somewhere -- and they are obtainable; and invariably they are men whose knowledge of the Word of God, and whose spiritual perception has led them to a recognition of the fallacies involved in the conclusions of a science falsely so-called.⁸⁰

Sacrificing personal friendships⁸¹ and cancelling long-standing speaking engagements,⁸² Shields threw himself into ensuring the success of his vision. He crisscrossed the continent raising funds, finding competent staff, and encouraging new students to pursue their education at Des Moines. In these endeavors he was not successful. Staffing problems, financial constraints and poor enrollment coupled with American patriotism, and jealousy concerning the dominant role played by Edith Rebman, Shields' on-campus representative, all contributed to a student riot in which Shields and Rebman were forced to hide in an office bathroom to escape bodily harm.

The Des Moines incident dominated the front pages of

several newspapers. Shields was accused of having an affair with Edith Rebman although no proof was offered to substantiate this charge. Counting on Fundamentalist funding, such an accusation was extremely serious, not only would it mean the end of Des Moines, but (if taken seriously enough) the end of Shields' pastoral career. In an angry letter to Riley over Riley's lack of support Shields noted:

All that you say about Miss Rebman's desire to domination [sic] things may or may not be true. It may be that, as you say, "while she is extremely efficient, she is not tactful in dealing with men." But no such word of criticism and no complaint, was ever registered by yourself until Miss Rebman refused to accommodate you in consenting to having Mrs. Blake transferred to the office in Chicago. From that time you became her constant critic and apparently her implacable foe.⁸³

Shields continued, referring to Riley's insinuation that Shields' impassioned denial of being involved with Edith Rebman was extremely suspicious:

I care for nothing of what any man says of me so long as he does not touch my character, but when he does it will not drive me "to frenzy of thought and speech", but it will drive me to a determined defense. A Minister's reputation is all that he has. If that is taken from him, he might as well be murdered in cold blood.

Do you want me to say why for years I have had people express their fear for yourself, sir, on the very things concerning which I have exercised every possible precaution? Do you want me to tell of the Blakes and the Dibbles and some other things that are well known to me? If you do, proceed in your course.⁸⁴

Determined to save his reputation, Shields had no other recourse than to fight the charges of adultery made against

him by the Principal of Des Moines, H. C. Wayman. Wayman himself was fighting allegations made by Shields that his academic degrees were inauthentic and that he should be fired. The battle to fire Wayman was won by Shields but the ensuing riot, when all faculty positions were declared vacant by the Toronto pastor, meant that the war was lost. In the summer of 1929 Des Moines University closed its doors and Shields suffered the greatest and most painful set-back of his career. While he continued to champion various Canadian causes never again was he to provide strong leadership amongst American Fundamentalists.⁸⁵

Besides the various organizations and causes which Shields founded and supported, any assessment of his influence must take account of his preaching. Influenced by his father, Shields gave priority to the task of preaching, writing out his sermons in longhand in booklets which were carefully stitched together with text and dates preached on the front cover. In all Shields wrote over 1,400 sermons following this method until the pace of his ministry forced him to resort to stenographers.

It was not just in quantity, however, that Shields excelled but also in quality. In an article entitled "The Era of the 'Great Preacher' among Canadian Baptists," Gerald Harrop has argued that:

During the two decades that separated the World Wars, the homiletical Capital of the Protestant,

English-speaking world was probably Toronto
three of the brightest stars bore Baptist names: W.
A. (Bill) Cameron at Bloor Street (later
Yorkminster), John MacNeill at Walmer Road, and
Thomas Todhunter Shields at Jarvis Street.⁸⁶

Harrop continues, underemphasizing the pietistic element
within many of Shields' sermons:

. . . Shields was, in some respects, the most
intellectual and rationalist of our three preachers.
He stood firmly in the tradition of Calvinism and
Protestant scholasticism and his preaching ministry
in all its aspects -- expository, evangelistic,
polemical -- stemmed from a precisely defined
theology.⁸⁷

Shields' preaching ability is one quality which
scholars, both friend and foe, are agreed upon.⁸⁸ It was
his power in the pulpit which insured his call to Jarvis
Street and which, in spite of numerous splits and
controversies, kept him preaching right up to his death in
1955, giving him the base of operations from which his
political and ecclesiastical forays could be made. As
Shields himself noted:

Preaching is the biggest business I know. It is
a far bigger job than being Prime Minister. I don't
believe there is any occupation in the world that
makes a bigger demand upon all that a man has or may
become, than preaching.⁸⁹

Due to T. T. Shields' abilities and his involvements,
in any historical assessment of Canadian and American
Fundamentalism he is granted prominence. H. Leon McBeth in
his new history of Baptists asserts: "the leader of
Fundamentalism among Canadian Baptists was Thomas
Todhunter Shields."⁹⁰ In this assertion McBeth is not

alone. George Rawlyk notes:

It is sometimes forgotten that during the first three decades of the twentieth century T. T. Shields probably had a greater impact -- however, negative -- on McMaster than did any other person. A catalyst for denominational schism and theological warfare, Shields was either loved or hated, respected or detested. There was no middle ground for those who knew the extraordinarily gifted fundamentalist preacher and polemicist.⁹¹

Not only was Shields prominent within Canadian Baptist Fundamentalism, however, but also within the Baptist Conventions of the United States. Commenting on the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversies within North American Baptist life Stewart Cole has written:

During the decades of theological disturbance which were associated with the spread of popular science and secular culture, maladjusted individuals in these Conventions found it very difficult to tolerate the changing ideals of the corporate communions. There was one man in each area that stood out pre-eminently in such restlessness: In the South, J. Frank Norris; in the North, William B. Riley; and in Canada, T. T. Shields.⁹²

What is not always recognized, obscured both by Shields' Canadian citizenship and by his strong Baptist affiliation, is that Shields was also one of the leading Fundamentalists of his day, in both North America and, to a lesser degree, Britain. Fundamentalist scholar George Dollar mentions the triad of Riley, Norris and Shields but refuses to limit them to Baptist circles, citing them as giants of Fundamentalism at large:

It [1900 - 1930] saw the rise on the American scene of the prima donnas of the movement [i.e.

Fundamentalism] -- a tremendous trio without equal in their type of leadership and inspiration. These thrilling and yet disappointing men were J. Frank Norris, William B. Riley and Thomas T. Shields. **Fundamentalism had produced its giants; Kings they were of Fundamentalist Empires. . . .**⁹³ [emphasis mine]

Shields' influence within Fundamentalism at large, according to David Beale, lay in his militancy which drove him into a stance of separatism. Beale writes: "T. T. Shields was a major figure representing the transition from nonconformist to separatist Fundamentalism."⁹⁴ The advocacy of separatism, however, as Rawlyk has shown, came later in Shields' career.⁹⁵ Up until the mid 1920's, at least, Shields saw himself as orthodox and as part of the Canadian Baptist mainstream. It was only his excessive pride, his theological commitments and his unrelenting hostility to anything which smacked of theological Modernism which finally drove Shields into a separatistic stance. Even then, the interdenominationalism of an Oswald Smith was anathema to him.

While Shields' separatistic vision is of interest, the more important shift was a theological one which occurred much earlier than did his advocacy of separatism. It was his substitution of a verbally inerrant Bible for the centrality of the person of Christ which insured that Shields would depart from orthodox Christianity at the very time when he was trying to defend such against Modernist threats. The pressure of the 'war' against

Modernism, and his desire to please his father who had long since died, drove Shields to seek a concrete authority which could withstand the doubts and uncertainties which critical, biblical thought raised concerning commonly held assumptions. Lacking an ecstatic conversion experience, Shields could not appeal to an experientially based faith for authority. A more external authority was required. This he found in the Holy Scriptures.

ENDNOTES

¹The only biography of T. T. Shields is one written by the Baptist journalist, Leslie Tarr. See Leslie Tarr, Shields of Canada (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967). It is a hagiographical piece of literature marred by small but disconcerting errors in the opening chapters. These errors arose because Leslie Tarr likely did not have unrestricted access to the archival material located at the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, and because of the scarcity of material on Shields' early years and his family background.

²His British ancestry and birth were very important for T. T. Shields. In a sermon preached on August 18, 1895 he stated, "for my own part if it were ever mine to attract attention by any worthy deed which I could do as a man and a citizen, I would like it to be known that I was neither Canadian or American but an Englishman."

³Shields was referred to by family members by the nickname 'Tod' or 'Todda.' T. T. Shields to S. J. Eyre Hartley, November 29, 1924, T. T. Shields Papers, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

⁴The Primitive Methodists are Wesleyan in their theological emphasis stressing such "Wesleyan doctrines as redemption, repentance, justification, and sanctification." They began as the result of the evangelistic preaching of "Lorenzo Dow in 1807 at Mow Cop in Staffordshire, England." Arthur C. Piepkorn, Profiles in Belief the Religious Bodies of the United States and Canada, vol. 2: Protestant Denominations (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 610. This Wesleyan influence may have been influential in Shields' early years, counterbalancing T. T. Shields' fascination with Calvinist theology.

⁵Tarr, Shields, p. 18. Because of numerous errors in the early chapters of Tarr's biography I hesitate to

accept the factual information presented without outside confirmation. The question of the dating of Shields Sr.'s acceptance of the call to the Plattsville congregation serves as one example. Tarr dates the call as occurring on December 3, 1888. Shields Sr. in his diary/list of sermons places the date as December 30, 1888. T. T. Shields Sr. "List of Sermons," T. T. Shields Papers, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto. (To complicate matters the Baptist Year Book for 1890 contains the notation that Shields Sr. settled in Plattsville in August of 1889). A further problem with Tarr's bibliography is that it is popular in nature and footnotes are not included in the text. A phone conversation with the author was of little help and even the written manuscript by Tarr yielded few clues as to his sources.

⁶Report of the Home Missionary Society, Baptist Year Book, 1890 (Toronto: Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec), p. 70.

⁷T. T. Shields Sr. "List of Sermons."

⁸"Revival began. Pastor McDonald with us Thurs. Feb. 12 and Pastor Sheldon back after. Irwin and Todda professed a change of heart - Feb. 18, 1891. To God be all praise." T. T. Shields Sr. "List of Sermons."

⁹Tarr, Shields of Canada, p. 28.

¹⁰T. T. Shields, "Homiletics Lecture: the Acts of the Apostles," June 14, 1951, T. T. Shields Papers. Shields' relationship with his father will be referred to later in this chapter. See footnote number twenty-six for further comments on this issue.

¹¹T. T. Shields to W. L. McKay, 1926. [This letter was probably never sent but was substituted by a letter written by Shields' secretary with slightly less belligerent language.]

¹²See T. T. Shields, "Useful Suggestions for Young Preachers," The Gospel Witness, August 6, 1953, p. 15. T. T. Shields, Other Little Ships (Toronto: Hunter Rose Company), 1935, p. 79.

¹³Shields, "Homiletics Lecture: the Acts of the Apostles," June 14, 1951.

¹⁴Shields Sr. "List of Sermons."

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"Alphabetical List of Ministers," The Baptist Year Book, 1895-96, p. 169.

¹⁷I have been unable to find any information as to why Shields stayed such short periods of time in his first four pastorates. Perhaps it was the result of his father's example. A more probable reason was Shields' ambition which drove him in his early years, and some would add, latter years as well. Early in his life, according to Tarr, Shields wrote down two desires. The first was to preach at Spurgeon's Tabernacle in London, England. The second was to become the minister of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Both ambitions were amply fulfilled. Tarr, Shields of Canada, pp. 29 and 32.

¹⁸Dutton Ontario Church Minute Book, August 9, 1897, Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario.

¹⁹The Canadian Baptist reported on the event noting that, "the examination was very full and satisfactory, and Brother Shields gave evidence of having made the Word of God his special study." The Canadian Baptist, (September 30, 1897), p. 5.

²⁰Shields Sr., "List of Sermons."

²¹Shields Sr., "List of Sermons." T. T. Shields is very unreflective in regard to his marriages. In part this may have been due to preaching styles which censured any sort of personal sharing. Another factor was Shields' attitude towards women in general, an attitude which in today's terms would be labelled as extremely chauvinistic and patronizing. Russell notes, "throughout his ministry, Shields was . . . a pronounced male chauvinist." Quoted in C. A. Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," Ontario History 70 (December 1978): 266. Russell is too hard on Shields, often when Shields made comments on women he was simply reflecting the attitude of his day. Nonetheless, Shields was the dominant figure in both his marriages and his wives shared a common reticence and quietness which insured that they were no threat to their husband's popularity, although often, in very quiet ways, a great support: "I shall never forget Mrs. Shields. Although, at the time, I did not know her, Mrs. Shields was the first person to really welcome me to your church, and afterwards, always her smile of welcome, word of advice or sympathy, were bright spots in my life."

Bessie McKenzie to T. T. Shields, October 9, 1932.

²²John Dozois, "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields (1873-1955) In the Stream of Fundamentalism," (B. D. dissertation, McMaster University, 1963), p. 146.

²³T. T. Shields to S. J. Eyre Hartley, November 29, 1924.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵T. T. Shields Sr., "List of Sermons."

²⁶It is unfortunate that the documentation concerning the relationship between father and son is so scanty. A study on the psychological intricacies and ramifications of the relationship would give great insight into Shields and into the formation of his Fundamentalism. Carl Jung's insights both into the influence of actual fathers and the archetypal symbol of fatherhood would posit an intimate connection between Shields' childhood experience and his theology.

²⁷"Obituaries," Baptist Year Book, 1902 (Toronto: Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1902), pp. 19-20.

²⁸Obituary, Baptist Year Book, p. 20.

²⁹Tarr mentions that following his move to London, Shields' mother moved with him. This is contradicted by Shields' own reflections where he expressly notes that his mother stayed on in Hamilton for the rest of her life. T. T. Shields to S. J. Hartley, November 29, 1924.

³⁰Walter Ellis asserts that anti-British prejudice kept Shields Sr. from acquiring larger congregations than he did. T. T. Shields did not seem to suffer from such prejudice and throughout his life relished his British birth. "The elder Shields became a Baptist prior to immigration to Canada, where because of ill health and prejudice against the British, his remaining years were spent in small rural pastorates in Ontario." Walter Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in North America, 1895-1934" (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1974), p. 79.

³¹Quoted in Tarr, Shields of Canada, p. 43.

³²"Pilate's Question," Matthew 27:22, May 13, 1906.

³³"Daniel," Daniel 6:28, April 21, 1907. As mentioned, this characteristic was really cultivated at Wentworth: "I have been rather surprised to hear that we have been charged with being rather sensational. My only reply is this: that I would rather be a sensational preacher than a somnolent preacher." T. T. Shields, "How to Get Rich -- Chapter One," Psalm 78:2, July 6, 1902.

³⁴"Thaw Trial," Psalm 49:6. April 14, 1907.

³⁵Historically, it is clear, that Shields' first four churches form a prelude to his call to Jarvis. Sawatsky notes that when Shields supported Elmore Harris in his criticism of McMaster soon after arriving at Jarvis Shields was "young, and yet unknown." Sawatsky, "Looking for the Blessed Hope," p. 311. Most monographs on Shields dismiss his early pastorates with one or two sentences as being of little significance, only a prelude to his ministry at Jarvis Street Church. What may be true historically, however, is not true theologically.

³⁶For a brief history of Jarvis Street Church consult the first chapter of T. T. Shields, The Plot That Failed (Toronto: the Gospel Witness, 1937), pp. 1-8.

³⁷Russell notes that Shields' self-understanding could be characterized by an "Athanasius contra mundum" syndrome. See Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields: Canadian Fundamentalist", p. 277. In that Athanasius fought against Arian christology such a caricature is helpful, however, the real model for Shields' self-understanding was Charles Haddon Spurgeon and the DownGrade controversy of 1887-1889. See George Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, South Carolina: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), p. 107. Tarr, Shields of Canada, p. 159. In a letter written during his visit to England in 1915 Shields had the opportunity of visiting Spurgeon's son in their home. This made a profound impression on him. See T. T. Shields, "Letters/Diary" Thursday, July 22, 1915, T. T. Shields Papers.

³⁹In his book The Plot That Failed Shields infers that his call to Jarvis Street was somewhat surprising given the fact that he was not a McMaster graduate: "Certain officials of McMaster University, not of the governing bodies, but of the faculty, had come to regard the Baptist denomination as McMaster's special preserve. Non-McMaster men were tolerated for the doing of rough work, even as the Chinese coolies were used to do rough work on the Western front in the Great War. Trainloads of coolies passed through Canada. But no one ever supposed

one of them could by any possibility become colonel of a regiment, or commander of a brigade, or of an army, to say nothing of the possibility of one's carrying a field-marshal's baton in his knapsack." Shields, The Plot, p. 10. The evidence, however, shows that while there was some concern about Shields' strong conservatism it was J. H. Farmer, a McMaster professor, whose intercession sealed the invitation which Shields later received to come to Jarvis Street. Farmer later became one of Shields' special targets.

³⁹Shields, The Plot, p. 21.

⁴⁰T. T. Shields, "Homiletics Lecture," January 25, 1945, p. 5.

⁴¹Shields, The Plot, pp. 35-36. The control which, ultimately, T. T. Shields would exert over Jarvis Street is the stuff of legends. Stories abound about his "dictatorial" ways. In part these stories are apocryphal resulting from animosity rather than historical accuracy. It is, nonetheless, undeniable that Shields veered far from the Baptist emphasis of the priesthood of all believers. Perhaps the most damning example of this occurred near the end of his life when he summoned together a group of people to his bedside to instruct them: "I want to say this to-night. I may not be able to say it again. I don't need a successor in Jarvis Street. He is here. He sits beside me [indicating his associate minister, H. C. Slade]. . . . He is the only possible man to take hold of Jarvis Street, and I want to give Jarvis Street over to him, and I want Jarvis Street to take him." Needless to say, the church lost little time in acceding to Shields' instructions. Quoted in Tarr, Shields of Canada, p. 144. For a discussion of leadership in the Baptist context see John Richards, "Baptist Leadership: Autocratic or Democratic," in Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity, ed. J. K. Zeman (Burlington, Ontario: G. R. Welch Company, 1980. See also Walter Ellis, "Sects and Religious Factors" and James Barr, Fundamentalism, revised ed. (London: SCM Press, 1981), p. xix.

⁴²Shields, The Plot, p. 37.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴T. T. Shields, "Second Coming and the War," Psalm 103:19, February 20, 1916.

⁴⁵Desmond Morton, Years of Conflict: 1911-1921,

(Toronto: Grolier Limited, 1983), p. 28.

⁴⁶T. T. Shields, Letter to Family, June 30, 1915, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁴⁷For the influence of the war in militarizing Protestant conservatism see Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), pp. 23-26. Ernest R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800 - 1930 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), p. 237. One of the distinguishing marks of Fundamentalism is its penchant for military imagery. George Dollar, a Fundamentalist scholar typifies such an attitude when he writes: "The prophetic conference of 1886 was a Plymouth Rock in the history of Fundamentalism; a Magna Carta of its doctrinal insights; a Valley Forge in facing the onslaught of liberal theology; a Waterloo in the emergence of a victorious confidence in the rightness of interpretation; and a D-day for embattled pastors and professors who had been sickened and saddened by the liberal debacle." George Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, p. 43.

⁴⁸T. T. Shields, The Baptist Message: an Address (The Baptist Forward Movement, November 1919 to February 1920), p. 19.

⁴⁹Shields, The Plot, p. 121

⁵⁰Shields later marvelled over the victory he won at the 1919 convention, attributing it to the work of God's Spirit. Tarr compared it to the Battle of Britain in World War II (see Tarr, p. 71), while J. C. Watt in his history of the Fellowship Baptists is somewhat more restrained quoting a participant at that convention who reminisced: "Dr. Shields was masterful! With very incisive words and statements he cut those little modernistic-thinking men to pieces and he led multitudes to a stronger stand for truth." Quoted in J. H. Watt, The Fellowship Story: Our First 25 Years (Toronto: The Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches of Canada, 1978), p. 23.

⁵¹Sermon, April 27, 1924. For a fuller account of the Jarvis Street split see Shields, The Plot That Failed and Walter Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in North America, 1895-1934."

⁵²Stewart P. MacLennan to T. T. Shields, October 12, 1926, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁵³J. C. Crawford to T. T. Shields, January 13, 1930, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁵⁴Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors," p. 147. Tarr is even more emphatic in his assessment of the impact of The Gospel Witness: "It could probably be stated without exaggeration that this weekly magazine edited by a busy pastor was one of the most powerful organs of the fundamentalist movement of the 1920's and 1930's." Tarr, Shields, p. 110.

⁵⁵The Baptist Bible Union was seen by J. C. Massee as competition for his Fundamentalist Fellowship. In this Massee was correct. In the early years, however, Shields endeavored to minimize any differences between the two groups and pledged to work cooperatively: "My view of the case is this: That all those who contend for the faith should take special care not to contend against the faithful, and to reserve their fire for the foe. For this reason, I believe that all organizations, by whatever name they may be called, who exist to contend for the faith, should seek to co-operate with each other in their war upon a common enemy. And so far as I have any influence in the Executive of the Baptist Bible Union, I shall see to exercise it toward this end." T. T. Shields to J. C. Massee, June 2, 1923, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁵⁶"It was Dr. Riley and Dr. Norris who insisted upon my assuming the Presidency of the Baptist Bible Union. I threw myself into it, and have done so for years." T. T. Shields to Charles Fisher, April 4, 1928, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁵⁷For the history of the Baptist Bible Union see Robert Delnay "A History of the Baptist Bible Union" (Ph. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1963). Delnay's work has appeared (minus footnotes and bibliography) in published form in the Central Conservative Baptist Quarterly in the Fall, 1964, Spring, 1965 and Summer, 1965 issues.

⁵⁸Delnay, "A History of the Baptist Bible Union," p. 85.

⁵⁹Bush and Nettles state; "T. T. Shields was the most outstanding leader of the Baptist Bible Union and apparently he is responsible for writing its Articles of Faith." L. Russ Bush and Tom J. Nettles, Baptists and the Bible -- the Baptist Doctrines of Biblical Inspiration and Religious Authority in Historical Perspective

(Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), p. 385. My research affirms such a claim. See also Ellis, p. 186 and William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, revised ed. (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1969), p. 384.

⁶⁰Countless scholars have asserted that the Union's stance with regard to premillennialism was the result of Shields' influence within the new organization. In this they are accurate. However, it is inaccurate to claim, as some do, that Shields was amillennialist at this time. Until the 1930's, at least, Shields remained strongly premillennialist in his view, although he disagreed with dispensational premillennialism. This will be examined later in the dissertation.

⁶¹Shields was able to operate within the confines of the Northern Convention not only through pre-Convention meetings or special rallies but directly through sponsorship by the Cazenovia Baptist Church of Buffalo, New York who received him into membership and then elected him a Convention delegate. "Dear Dr. Shields, I have the honor to advise you that upon the recommendation of the Board of Deacons, you have been unanimously elected to membership in the Cazenovia Park Baptist Church of Buffalo, New York and that the Pastor has been instructed to give you the right hand of fellowship in the name of the church as soon as he meets you. You have also been elected a delegate from this church to the Northern Baptist convention meeting in Chicago, Illinois." J. Palmer Muntz to T. T. Shields, May 18, 1927, Jarvis Street Papers.

⁶²H. Leon McBeth, The Baptist Heritage: Four Centuries of Baptist Witness (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987), p. 578.

⁶³Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 103.

⁶⁴Delnay, "A History," p. 250.

⁶⁵"The annual Baptist Union conference of 1926 was held in Metropolitan Baptist Church, May 19 to 24. As a popular movement, it probably represented the high-water mark of the Bible Union." Delnay, p. 121.

⁶⁶See the Proceedings of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec (First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, October 19, 1926).

⁶⁷For a history of Shields' contentions with the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec see W. Gordon

Carder, "Controversy in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1908 - 1929" (B. D. dissertation McMaster University, 1950). Shields himself intended to write a book on this period, similar to The Plot that Failed, entitled The Great Contention. Much of the material for this book which was never published due to Shields' death in 1955 is contained in The Gospel Witness in the 1954-55 issues.

⁶⁸W. Gordon Carder "Controversy in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1908 - 1928," Foundations, p. 373.

⁶⁹T. T. Shields to Alfred E. Davey, December 2, 1924, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁷⁰Shields to Davey, December 2, 1924.

⁷¹"To the Hospital Authorities, City of Toronto, The bearer, Mr. J. Clarke Bradley, is a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, and is engaged in Christian work; and has kindly consented to represent me as a hospital visitor. As my hands are so full, it is impossible for me to do such work, and I hope Mr. Bradley may be received as though he were a minister, in my stead." T. T. Shields to Hospital Authorities, March 17, 1927, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁷²Irwin Shields to T. T. Shields, May 7, 1925, Jarvis Street Papers.

⁷³George Rawlyk, "A. L. McCrimmon, H. P. Whidden, T. T. Shields, Christian Higher Education, and McMaster University," in Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education ed. George Rawlyk (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988), p. 60.

⁷⁴Tarr, Shields, p. 118.

⁷⁵A popular history of the Toronto Baptist Seminary has recently been published. It is available from the Jarvis Street Church. Short biographies of several T. B. S. graduates are included. By His Grace to His Glory: 60 Years of Ministry (Toronto: Toronto Baptist Seminary, 1987).

⁷⁶T. T. Shields to E. M. Keirstead, June 17, 1927, Jarvis Street Papers.

⁷⁷Delnay, "A History," p. 227.

⁷⁸T. T. Shields to Keirstead, June 17, 1927.

⁷⁹"For example in the realm of sciences; it is my conviction that a man can no more understand the spiritual significance of natural phenomena without the illumination of the Holy Spirit, than he can understand the hidden thought of God in the Bible by a mere examination of the Greek text." T. T. Shields to Charles Fisher, April 4, 1928, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹Shields' friendship with Riley was ended over the Des Moines situation. His friendship with Norris was temporarily disrupted.

⁸²"I cannot tell you how sorry I am that I am compelled to miss the opportunity of having fellowship with you at your Conference. I am related to so many interests from which it seems impossible to escape that I feared at the beginning to accept your kind invitation; but when I did so, I had no idea that I should have Des Moines so largely on his hands at the time of the Conference meeting.

Dr. Torrey writes me that I am the first speaker advertised for the Montrose Conference who has failed in twenty years; and I have just replied that the Montrose engagement is the first, so far as I recall, that I have failed to keep -- yours is the second." T. T. Shields to Homer MacArthur, August 6, 1927, T. T. Shields Papers.

⁸³T. T. Shields to W. B. Riley, April or May, 1929. [This letter was likely never sent to Riley and is for that reason not accurately dated.]

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵On the subject of Shields' retreat to Canada see Delnay, A History, pp. 247-248; George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 191. David Beale, In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1950 (Greenville, South Carolina: Unusual Publications, 1986), p. 273. Jerry Falwell et al, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon: the Resurgence of Conservative Christianity 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986), p. 100.

⁸⁶G. Gerald Harrop, "The Era of the 'Great Preacher' Among Canadian Baptists," Foundations XXIII (January-March, 1980): 51.

⁸⁷Ibid, p. 58.

⁸⁸The historical booklet of the Queen Street Baptist Church published on their sesquicentennial, for example, has little good to say about Shields calling him "self-centered," "belligerent" a "perpetual dictator" and an "inflexible autocrat," but even amidst such condemnation the concession is made that Shields was "remarkably gifted as a preacher." A Century and a Half: 1833-1983 (The 150th Anniversary Committee of the Queen Street Baptist Church).

⁸⁹ Tarr, Shields, p. 151.

⁹⁰ Leon McBeth, The Baptist Heritage (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987), p. 557.

⁹¹ Rawlyk, Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education, p. 55.

⁹² Stewart Cole, The History of Fundamentalism (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931), p. 282. For similar, though less biased assessments see Marsden, Fundamentalism in Canadian Culture, pp. 179-182. Daniel Stevick, Beyond Fundamentalism (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 18-19. Martin Marty, Righteous Empire: the Protestant Experience America (New York: Dial Press, 1970), p. 218. Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists 3d ed. (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1963), p. 427. Robert Handy, A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 389. For Shields' prominence within Canada see John Webster Grant, The Church in the Canadian Era Updated and Expanded edition (Burlington, Ontario: Welch Publishing Company, 1988), p. 123. Hans Mol, Faith and Fragility: Religion and Identity in Canada (Burlington, Ontario: Trinity Press, 1985), p. 226. Douglas Wilson, The Church Grows in Canada (Toronto: Committee on Missionary Education of the Canadian Council of Churches, 1966), p. 117. A. C. Forrest, "The Present," in Religion in Canada: the Spiritual Development of a Nation, The Canadian Illustrated Library (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1968), p. 78. For a different assessment of Shields' place within Canadian Fundamentalism see John G. Stackhouse Jr. "Proclaiming the Word: Canadian Evangelicalism Since World War I," Ph. D. dissertation (University of Chicago, 1987). Stackhouse claims that Canadian Church history has operated with a church-sect model and, therefore, viewed William Aberhart and T. T. Shields as the main leaders of Canadian Evangelicalism. In Stackhouse's analysis Shields and Aberhart, while influential, are not central. In this assertion he is correct, but only to the degree that

Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism are closely related but, in key areas, distinct religious movements.

⁹³A History of Fundamentalism, p. 86.

⁹⁴Beale, In Pursuit of Purity, pp. 241-242.

⁹⁵Rawlyk, Canadian Baptists, pp. 55-60.

CHAPTER TWO

The Oversight of Fundamentalist Studies

"One wonders what a revisionist history, which took the conservatives seriously as thinkers as well as conservators, would look like."¹ Professor Mark Noll's criticism of a great deal of Fundamentalist and Evangelical² scholarship is one which has been shared by others as well. Morris Ashcraft, in a recent issue of the Review and Expositor, notes that this failure to take Fundamentalism seriously has been particularly acute in regard to theological issues:

If you will check the publications on Fundamentalism, you will find many discussions on the history of the movement but not so many dealing specifically with the theology.³

While William Abraham, in his book The Coming Great Revival: Recovering the Full Evangelical Tradition, echoes Noll's complaint, applying it to the Evangelical tradition which grew out of Fundamentalism in the late 1940's and early 1950's:

Non-evangelicals do not generally view the

evangelical tradition as either sound or sensible. They may admire its zeal, its interest in personal piety, its skill in evangelism, perhaps even its interest in scripture. Yet few contemporary theologians consider the evangelical tradition a genuine source of theological reflection or spiritual renewal.⁴

On the surface, at least, such criticisms are surprising, especially in light of recent studies on North American Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. Ever since Ernest Sandeen's ground-breaking book, The Roots of Fundamentalism, was published in 1970,⁵ a new critical appreciation of Fundamentalism, in particular, and Evangelicalism, in general, has been entertained by some scholars. Since the publication of Sandeen's book a growing number of scholars has been willing to concede that vital religious impulses did play an important part in the formation of North American Fundamentalism.

Nonetheless, in spite of the work of Sandeen, Marsden, Marty and others, Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism still need sustained scholarly analysis in order to delineate fully the contours and ramifications of these important religious movements. In particular, more work needs to be done in the area of Fundamentalist theology, specifically in regard to key theological categories, if Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism are to be properly understood. Fundamentalist teachings concerning dispensational premillennialism and the plenary inerrant view of biblical inspiration have been thoroughly examined

but theological categories such as christology have been, on the whole, neglected in most studies of North American Fundamentalism.

This neglect of substantive theological issues has had a long history. Because of various factors, some social, some theological, some personal, but largely because of the relentless pressure of modernity, Fundamentalism disappeared from public view by the late 1920's. With recent scholarship we now know that this "disintegration" was really only a redirection of Fundamentalist efforts inward towards the establishment of Bible Schools and Faith Missions rather than outward towards control of denominations and denominationally supported seminaries.⁶ What this redirection meant, however, was that scholarly assessment of Fundamentalism was left in the hands of scholars who were, by and large, not sympathetic towards Fundamentalist teachings.

During the heat of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, therefore, a more sympathetic analysis of Fundamentalism and Protestant conservatism was given than was to be the case afterwards. Harry Emerson Fosdick, for example, in his famous sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" gave this relatively balanced assessment of Protestant conservatism:

All Fundamentalists are conservatives, but not all conservatives are Fundamentalists. The best

conservatives can often give lessons to the liberals in true liberality of spirit, but the Fundamentalist program is essentially illiberal and intolerant.⁷

Fosdick's remarks were spoken in the midst of Fundamentalist attempts to gain control of denominational hierarchies, particularly in the Baptist and Presbyterian churches. Thus, his willingness to differentiate between conservatives and Fundamentalists may have been prompted, in part, by the need to garner the support of theological conservatives (such as a J. C. Masee) in order to insure that the Fundamentalist 'program' to capture control would fail. On the other hand, it may be argued that Fosdick was accurately reflecting the theological realities of the confrontation.

After the battle between Clarence Darrow and William Jennings Bryan over the teaching of evolution by John Scopes, a biology teacher in the town of Dayton, Tennessee in 1925, the shooting of D. E. Chipps by the Southern Fundamentalist leader, J. Frank Norris in 1926, and the Des Moines riot in 1929, however, Fundamentalism was seen to be discredited and on the wane and Fosdick's careful distinction was no longer felt to be necessary. Thus, Stewart Cole, building on caricatures created and popularized, in large part, by the journalist H. L. Mencken,⁸ asserted in 1931 that the reason there existed a large and receptive constituency towards Fundamentalist teachings among the Northern (American) Baptists was the

result of low ordination standards which had led to the influx of a large number of uneducated clergy, as well as the impact on the Northern Convention of Southern born and trained leaders who had moved North in order to work.⁹ Cole's work firmly established these two caricatures of Fundamentalists -- that of uneducated and therefore ignorant ministers, and Southern and therefore rural followers. More importantly, he found it possible, even as early as 1931, when his book The History of Fundamentalism was published, to use the past tense, as he defined Fundamentalism with these words:

Fundamentalism was the organized determination of conservative churchmen to continue the imperialistic, culture of historic Protestantism within an inhospitable civilization dominated by secular interests and a progressive Christian idealism.¹⁰ [emphasis mine]

Building on this analysis of Fundamentalists as a disgruntled and backward people who could not keep up with the culture of their time, Norman Furniss highlighted the militant spirit which characterized many key Fundamentalists:

Violence in thought and language was another outstanding feature of the Fundamentalist movement. The crusade, . . ., was one of intense emotion, with no room for the man who pondered, no tolerance for neutrals or opponents alike.¹¹

This crusade, however, according to Furniss at least, was doomed to failure because it was based on half truths and untruths:

Since the Fundamentalists were aligning themselves against ideas that had the weight of fact behind them, their best weapon could not be persuasive argument but rather coercion to still their opponents without granting opportunity for open exchange of dialogue.¹²

Richard Hofstadter's scholarly work, Anti-Intellectualism Within American Life, cemented the perception of Fundamentalists as ignorant and uneducated people. Tracing the change of emphasis within Protestantism from a Jonathan Edwards to a Dwight L. Moody, Hofstadter noted:

The Puritan ideal of the minister as an intellectual and educational leader was steadily weakened in the face of the evangelical ideal of the minister as a popular crusader and exhorter.¹³

Hofstadter also emphasized the political conservatism of most Fundamentalists, noting that "the fundamentalism of the cross was . . . supplanted by the fundamentalism of the flag."¹⁴ In his view this conservatism was based upon a "Manichean" mentality which was unable to tolerate ambiguities or complexity of thought. According to Hofstadter, everything was seen by the Fundamentalist as either black or white, "absolute good . . . [or] absolute evil."¹⁵

In 1963 with the publication of Louis Gaspar's book, The Fundamentalist Movement 1930 - 1956,¹⁶ a more sympathetic and balanced approach was taken to North American Fundamentalism. Gaspar defined the roots of

Fundamentalism as a combination of "apostolic doctrine, Medieval-Reformation theology, and American revivalism," which represented an "interaction against twentieth century liberalism and modernism."¹⁷

It was not until Sandeen's work appeared, however, first in an early essay on the origins of Fundamentalism and then, more importantly, in the book The Roots of Fundamentalism, that Fundamentalist studies began to discard, or at least revise, several former caricatures.¹⁸ In his earlier essay Sandeen noted that Fundamentalism had been discussed as a "political controversy . . . [and] as a psychological and sociological phenomenon."¹⁹ Sandeen sought to go beyond that to discuss Fundamentalism as a religious movement. In this essay on the origins of Fundamentalism he declared:

This study will attempt to prove that it was these neglected theological affirmations which give structure and identity to Fundamentalism and that only through the understanding of this aspect of American intellectual history can we lay the foundation for a satisfactory historical interpretation of Fundamentalism.²⁰

Sandeen singled out three areas of Fundamentalist studies which needed to be corrected. The first was that Fundamentalism needed to be examined in light of Fundamentalist theology as well as history. The second was that the Fundamentalist's claim to represent Protestant orthodoxy could and should not be accepted uncritically. The third was that scholars should stop referring "to

Fundamentalism as an agrarian protest movement centered in the South."²¹

Sandeen's book The Roots of Fundamentalism built upon his earlier work. In this book he was careful to differentiate Fundamentalism as a movement from the Fundamentalist controversies of the 1920's. Fundamentalism existed prior to the 1920's but, according to Sandeen, it existed under a different name. He noted:

As a result of the 1919 World Conference on Christian fundamentals, the millenarian movement had changed its name. "The millenarians had become Fundamentalists."²²

Along with Sandeen's work the writings of Martin Marty must be mentioned in the growth of a more objective and accurate treatment of North American Fundamentalism. Marty differentiated between two main parties within American Protestantism:

One party, which may be called "Private" Protestantism, seized the name "evangelical" which had characterized all Protestants early in the nineteenth century. It accentuated individual salvation out of the world, personal moral life congruent with the ideals of the saved, and fulfillment or its absence in the rewards or punishments in another world in a life to come. The second informal group, which can be called "Public" Protestantism, was public insofar as it was more exposed to the social order and the social destinies of men.²³

Marty outlined four key reasons why these two parties split apart. The four were closely connected. Darwinism and the mainly German-based critical approach to the Bible

were both seen as enemies of true faith by members of "private" Protestantism. While Social Darwinism and the transition of America from a mainly rural setting to an urban, industrialized one were also important in wedging apart what had been a previously homogeneous American Protestantism.²⁴

Reaction to this new thrust in Fundamentalist studies, and in particular, to Sandeen's thesis was not slow in coming, with most of it being positive. Leonard Sweet has summed up the attitude of scholars to Sandeen's thesis by noting, "in many ways Sandeen has not so much been proven wrong as not right enough."²⁵ It was George Marsden who in his definitive work Fundamentalism and American Culture showed that Sandeen was not "right enough" by expanding Sandeen's twin themes of pre-millenarianism and Princetonian Biblical interpretation. Reacting to Sandeen's earlier work Marsden stated:

This inquiry goes beyond both Sandeen and the older sociological interpretations. It views fundamentalism not as a temporary social aberration, but as a genuine religious movement or tendency with deep roots and intelligible beliefs. And it seeks to clarify the way in which this movement and these beliefs were conditioned by a unique and dramatic cultural experience.²⁶

Marsden's discussion of Fundamentalism was conditioned by the recognition of three paradoxical themes within Fundamentalism: the tendency of Fundamentalists to identify themselves at times as part of the establishment

and at other times as outsiders to the system; the tension between a pietism of the heart and a puritanism of the mind; and an ambivalent and often contradictory attitude towards the role of reason within the formation of Christian faith.²⁷ These paradoxical elements gave Fundamentalism a richness and a complexity which insured that any simple definition, even that propounded by Sandeen, would be inaccurate. It was to Marsden's credit that he realized that:

Fundamentalism was a mosaic of divergent and sometimes contradictory traditions and tendencies that could never be wholly integrated. Sometimes its advocates were backward looking and reactionary, at other times they were imaginative innovators. On some occasions they appeared militant and divisive; on others they were warm and irenic. At times they seemed ready to forsake the whole world over a point of doctrine; at other times they appeared heedless of their tradition in their zeal to win converts. Sometimes they were optimistic patriots, sometimes they were prophets shaking from their feet the dust of a doomed civilization.²⁸

Not only did Marsden contribute to a deeper and more accurate definition of Fundamentalism, he also helped to make Fundamentalist studies "one of the most important historiographical developments in the 1970's."²⁹ Marsden has set the context, then, in which Fundamentalism (particularly as it appeared in the United States) may be treated as a valid theological movement, which is what this dissertation seeks to do through the analysis of Fundamentalist christology as articulated by T. T. Shields. There are other valid methods of analysing

Fundamentalism such as sociological and historical ones, to mention only two, but this dissertation will be confined to a theological analysis.³⁰

Marsden himself has begun some of this theological analysis. In a small essay entitled "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Society" he contrasted two approaches to Fundamentalism, defining them as "Fundamentalism as a Cultural Phenomenon" and "Fundamentalism as a Belief system." In this essay Marsden highlighted five important theological themes within the Fundamentalist tradition: dualism, the importance of the substitutionary theory of the atonement, the approach of Fundamentalists to truth as a static, definable body of knowledge, the influence of a dispensational view of eschatology, and the impact of the Puritan tradition of covenantal theology.³¹ It is clear from Marsden's themes that more work is needed, however, in the analysis of Fundamentalist theology if Fundamentalism is to be fully understood. The historical context has been filled in, the theological beliefs of the Fundamentalists now need the same sort of careful study.

Marsden's work was begun in the peaceful atmosphere of academic inquiry.³² The renewed impact of Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism in the 1970's and the 1980's, particularly in the United States, however,

resulted in the proliferation of many of the earlier definitions of Fundamentalism, sparking off another round of debate over the exact definition of Fundamentalism. Previous characterizations of Fundamentalism which viewed Fundamentalism consistently in negative terms have surfaced as a result of this renewed debate. J. Philip Wogaman, for example, in his book Faith and Fragmentation: Christianity for a New Age retreated to earlier definitions of Fundamentalism when he asserted:

The resurgence of fundamentalism within Christianity and some other religions is often mistakenly understood as a great new wave of religious revival when in fact it may be nothing more than a fragmented response of religious despair.³³

This more negative assessment of Fundamentalism (prompted once again by its growing strength) also undergirded the rather acerbic comments of James Barr in his two books entitled Fundamentalism and Beyond Fundamentalism.³⁴ Barr avoided the earlier errors of depicting the Fundamentalists as ignorant and rural³⁵ but he failed to distinguish clearly enough between Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. In Barr's analysis the more inclusive and socially concerned stance of those who call themselves Evangelicals was deemed to be unimportant. In this he departed from a strong current within Fundamentalist studies which has always seen the separatism of Fundamentalism as an important defining feature which differentiates Evangelicalism from

Fundamentalism. Instead, Barr concentrated on the issue of Biblical interpretation and inspiration as being the key issue which divided Fundamentalists from other Christian groupings. His assessment of Fundamentalism was a strongly negative one:

. . . after the very thorough review of fundamentalist literature, mainly in its doctrinal aspects and its interpretation of scripture, which I have carried out, I do not find many of its intellectual arguments to have any validity except in very minor respects.³⁶

It is balanced and objective views of Sandeen, Marty and Marsden, however, and not those of Barr which have carried the day, thus paving the way for other scholars such as Joel Carpenter and Mark Noll who have also contributed to a fuller and deeper analysis of Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism within the North American setting.³⁷ As Leonard Sweet has summarized the situation, however:

There are three indisputable facts about the evangelical tradition in America. First, it is important. **Second, it is understudied.** Third it is diverse.³⁸ [emphasis mine]

Sweet continues, noting:

. . . Evangelicalism will continue to afford rich scope for unanswered ambiguities and fuzziness of thought. In spite of all the emerging literature, we have only just begun.³⁹

Sweet's comments concerning the need for further study in regard to the Fundamentalist-Evangelical tradition in the United States are even more pertinent when applied to

the Canadian situation. In a recent book on revivalism in Canada, one of the foremost Canadian scholars on the subject of the Evangelical tradition within Canada, has given graphic testimony to the lack of recognition given not only to Canadian Fundamentalism, in particular, but to the role of religion within Canadian society, in general. George Rawlyk, professor of history at Queen's University, writes:

I felt a deep inner need in 1982 and 1983, in particular, to re-examine the Nova Scotia revivalist tradition in general and Henry Alline in particular. But I did not want to jettison whatever academic reputation I had by being too closely associated with revivals and revivalists -- even in the distant Canadian past. From my vantage point at Queen's University, I understood only too well the secular bias of so much Canadian historical writing, and I did not want to be pushed even further to the outer margins of the profession.⁴⁰

The little work which has been done on Canadian Fundamentalism has operated, according to John Stackhouse, within the confines of a church-sect model which has discriminated in favour of the Canadian mainline church traditions and against those who operate outside of that tradition.⁴¹ Sawatsky has summed up the situation, noting:

There have been no major studies of the Canadian [Fundamentalist] experience other than several monographs on the extraordinary events connected with the Rev. T. T. Shields and the split of Canadian Baptists in the 1920's.⁴²

Within both American and Canadian studies of

Fundamentalism key theological themes warrant further study, then, particularly the theme of christology which is central to any expression of the Christian faith. This absence of any in-depth study of Fundamentalist thought on the person and work of Christ is a serious omission. Thus, in reference to Noll's well written and important book, Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in North America,⁴³ Leonard Sweet makes the telling criticism:

Noll ducks all discussion of Christological issues as they relate to biblical criticism, and thereby neglects to scrutinize the evangelical elevation to absolute of Scripture rather than Christ.⁴⁴

An analysis of the Fundamentalist christology of T. T. Shields is, therefore, amply warranted.⁴⁵ Before such a study may be attempted, however, a brief overview of material on T. T. Shields is needed. This will be followed by a clarification and analysis of the Fundamentalist view of truth as a static, definable body of knowledge. To complete the chapter an examination of Shields' views in regard to truth will be undertaken in order to determine whether Shields was representative of Fundamentalism in this important regard.

Scholarly Studies and T. T. Shields

The paucity of scholarly material on North American Fundamentalist studies, in general, and Fundamentalist

theological thought, in particular, has already been noted. Studies on T. T. Shields have not been an exception to the rule. Indeed, Shields has suffered from a double neglect. He been overlooked in the regard to his theological thought. Moreover, because of his Canadian field of ministry he also has not been given the prominence which he deserves within Fundamentalist studies in general.⁴⁶

A scholarly but fairly short work has been written by C. Allyn Russell as part of a series of biographical studies of prominent North American Fundamentalist leaders. Chapters on J. Frank Norris, John Roach Stratton, William Riley, J. C. Massee, J. Gresham Machen, William Jennings Bryan, and Clarence McCartney appear in the book entitled Voices of American Fundamentalism.⁴⁷ The "chapter" of Shields, however, was relegated to an article published in the Ontario History Review.⁴⁸

The only book-length study on Shields is the biography written by the Baptist journalist, Leslie Tarr.⁴⁹ Although useful and quite readable, it suffers from the lack of a critical perspective on Shields, his thought, and his place within Fundamentalism in North America. Commissioned by Shields' former church, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, it is basically hagiographical in nature and tone. Tarr has also published a short article on Shields in the Fundamentalist Journal.⁵⁰

The preaching style and content of T. T. Shields has been examined in a short article written by G. Gerald Harrop, a former professor at the McMaster Divinity College. In his article Harrop examined and contrasted three prominent Toronto Baptist preachers: W. A. Cameron of Bloor St. Baptist and, later, Yorkminster Baptist, John MacNeill of Walmer Road Baptist, and T. T. Shields of Jarvis Street Baptist.⁵¹

The only thesis written on Shields was a B. D. thesis by John Dozois based on archival material held by the Canadian Baptist Archives located at the McMaster Divinity College.⁵² John Stackhouse's doctoral thesis devoted a substantial chapter to Shields, but because he did not have access to the Jarvis Street material on Shields, few new insights are advanced.⁵³ Dozois' thesis has served as the basis for a lecture on Modernism at McMaster which the well known Evangelical theologian, Clark Pinnock, delivered as part of the 1979 Baptist Heritage Conference at Acadia University.⁵⁴

Several unpublished theses are available on the Fundamentalist-Modernist struggles which troubled the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. The most important of these predates the Convention's split in 1927. In his Ph. D. thesis, Walter Ellis gives a thorough analysis of the Jarvis Street split in the early 1920's

along with important reflections on the underlying social criteria which lay behind the split within Jarvis Street Church.⁵⁵ Of further interest is William Gordon Carter's B. D. dissertation which covered the tensions within the Baptist Convention during the early decades of the 1900's.⁵⁶ Leslie Tarr provided a different perspective on the Baptist split in an article originally delivered as part of the Acadia Divinity College's Hayward Lecture's Series.⁵⁷ George Rawlyk's essay on Shields' influence over McMaster University has been another study which has come out of the Hayward Lecture Series, this time in 1987.⁵⁸

More general works which briefly touch upon Shields are S. D. Clark's Church and Sect in the Canadian Era⁵⁹ and W. E. Mann's Sect, Cult and Church.⁶⁰ Most of the books on Canadian church history give only passing mention to Shields.

T. T. Shields' involvement within the Baptist Bible Union has been thoroughly covered in Robert G. Delnay's Th. D. dissertation. Although Delnay prefaced his dissertation with a statement of allegiance to Fundamentalism as preserving the essential truth of the Christian faith, nonetheless, he managed to maintain an objective and scholarly stance towards Shields and the Baptist Bible Union. Delnay's work is invaluable in that he was given access to the Baptist Bible Union material contained within the Jarvis Street archival material.⁶¹

The various histories of the Baptist denomination in Canada and the United States also contain references to Shields. Most helpful are Robert G. Torbet's A History of the Baptists⁶² and the more recent history by Leon McBeth entitled The Baptist Heritage.⁶³ Recently a popularly written history of the Baptist movement in Canada has been published which contains a chapter on the influence of T. T. Shields with regard to the 1927 split within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.⁶⁴ References in these various books to Shields are few and based mainly on Tarr's biography.

The Creedalistic Nature of Fundamentalism

The paucity of material examining major theological themes within Fundamentalism, referred to in the opening section of this chapter and highlighted by the lack of material on T. T. Shields, is somewhat surprising in light of the creedalism⁶⁵ and enchantment with rationalism which undergirded most Fundamentalist thinking. This rationalistic understanding of the Christian faith was a certainly a central element within the thinking of T. T. Shields. It was Stewart Cole who first popularized the five points of Fundamentalist doctrine. These five points were picked up by Furniss and repeated in his study of Fundamentalism. Describing the impact of the twelve volume series on The Fundamentals Furniss has stated:

In addition to several articles on regeneration, sin, and other tenets, the series [The Fundamentals] explicated on the "Five Points" that were to become the sine qua non of fundamentalism: the infallibility of the Bible, Christ's virgin birth, his substitutionary Atonement, Ressurrection, and Second Coming.⁶⁶

Sandeen found an historical flaw in Cole's work on the "Five Points," in that the 1895 Niagara Conference which, according to Cole, gave shape to the famous "Five Points" did no such thing:

Cole was mistaken in stating that Niagara adopted a five point creed in 1895. From that error has stemmed much of the confusion over the identification of Fundamentalism with a five point creed.⁶⁷

While Sandeen's research cleared up this historical inaccuracy, it in no way undercut a creedalistic definition of Fundamentalism. Indeed, Marsden's more recent study has shown that the doctrinal preoccupation of much of North American Fundamentalism has deep roots with key doctrinal concerns being articulated as early as 1886 when A. J. Frost "in his litany of the ills of the church" stated:

A thousand pulpits are drifting from the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, the vicarious atonement, the resurrection of the body, and eternal retribution.⁶⁸

This creedalistic emphasis within Fundamentalism is hinted at within the term "Fundamentalist." Coined by the Northern Baptist leader Curtis Lee Law, editor of the Watchman Examiner, the word itself revealed that "Law's

primary concern . . . was doctrinal."⁶⁹ Intense preoccupation with doctrinal truths along with the attempt to formulate various Fundamentalist creeds (called statements of faith in order to differentiate them from the great Ecumenical creeds) is one of the critical ways in which Fundamentalism departed from the earlier Evangelical tradition in which it had been nurtured. Until Sandeen's work, it was assumed that the Fundamentalists were the conservators and the Modernists were the innovators in theological matters. Since Sandeen it is now accepted by most that the innovations which Fundamentalism produced were as significant as the orthodoxy which they sought to preserve. Walter Ellis has stated: "in the process of making sense of their situations both the modernists and the fundamentalists produced new theological syntheses."⁷⁰

The new theological sythesis which the Fundamentalists formed neglected much of what had been a part of North American Protestantism. Through the elevation of key doctrines to the position of creeds, the emphasis on a relational faith with Jesus the Christ was downplayed in favour of a rationalistic allegiance to these central doctrines. The living Christ who could never be confined within a creed was displaced as the ultimate authority by a plenary, inerrant Bible which could be so manipulated. With the loss of its christological heart,

Fundamentalism often became merely an allegiance to a set of doctrines, which were sometimes contradictory and unrelated to each other or to the wider Christian faith. It had become what may be called a creedalistic faith. Thus, Bernard Ramm, a theologian who writes out of a neo-evangelical perspective, made the following interesting confession in a book published in 1983:

I had just finished a lecture on my version of American evangelical theology. When I was asked by a shrewd listener to define American evangelical theology more precisely, I experienced inward panic. Like a drowning man who sees parts of his life pass before him at great speed . . . , so my theology passed before my eyes. I saw my theology as a series of doctrines picked up here and there, like a rag-bag collection. To stutter out a reply to that question was one of the most difficult things I have ever had to do on a public platform.

The experience set me to reflection. Why was my theology in the shape it was? The answer that kept coming back again and again was that theologically I was the product of the orthodox-liberal debate that has gone on for a century. It is a debate that has warped evangelical theology. The controversial doctrines have been given far more importance than they deserve in a good theological system. Other important doctrines have been neglected. The result of that debate has been to shape evangelical theology into the form of haphazardly related doctrines.⁷¹

From his position as an outsider to the Fundamentalist-Evangelical movement James Barr expands on Ramm's comment, stating that the problem with Fundamentalism is not simply the result of an imbalance of doctrines but the result of an undue emphasis on the power of reason. Barr concludes:

. . . the fundamentalist position has not been a non-philosophical or anti-philosophical one, but one built upon a strong and clear philosophical position, in which a very powerful, indeed practically unlimited, role was accorded to reason in the vital matter of biblical interpretation. It is also an indication, if yet another were needed, that the basic fundamentalist orientation is not an emotional one, as is so often thought, but a strongly rationalistic and intellectualistic one.⁷²

The Fundamentalist's Attitude Towards Truth

This creedalistic emphasis within Fundamentalism existed in symbiotic relationship with Fundamentalist attitudes towards the nature of truth. Marsden notes:

There is, . . . , a common underlying assumption that explains the unanimous opposition to liberalism of these conservative Protestants of differing theological emphasis. Despite their differences, they agreed that knowledge of truth was of overriding and eternal significance, that truth was unchanging, and that it could be known by true science and common sense.⁷³

The importance of truth, doctrinally defined, has already been noted, what is here emphasized is that this centrality of truth was supported and shaped by a view of truth as a static and unchanging deposit of knowledge.⁷⁴

As a group of religious thinkers, North American Fundamentalists were both unaware of and uninterested in the contextual shaping of Christian faith. They were keenly aware of societal changes but almost completely blind as to how the context of their society had shaped and conditioned their own expression of the Christian faith. Instead, they were confident that if true faith

could be once again affirmed then the ills and problems of modern society would be rectified quite easily.

The approach to truth taken by most Fundamentalists is that expressed by the theologian Charles Hodge, a member of the Princeton School, who defined systematic theology as:

. . . the exhibition of the facts of Scripture in their proper order and relation, with the principle of general truths involved in the facts themselves, and which prevade and harmonize the whole. For the sake of convenience this view might be characterized as a "concordance" model of systematic theology.⁷⁵

Hodge's approach to truth was one which marked the Princetonians as a group and which, through their influence, pervaded Fundamentalist thought. Mark Noll in his selections from the writings of the Princetonians has noted that the tendency of the Princeton School as a whole, "was to regard theological truth in static categories which were not influenced by historical development."⁷⁶

In his analysis of the development of Fundamentalist-Evangelical thought from 1880 to 1974, Noll elaborated further on such an attitude towards truth, noting:

Evangelicals are "realists" in the sense that they believe that the world enjoys an independent existence apart from its perception by humans, that essence precedes existence, and that the mind is capable of perceiving existence beyond itself with at least some degree of accuracy.⁷⁷

Noll's use of the term "realist" to describe Evangelical

attitudes towards truth is also an appropriate description of the Fundamentalists. The roots of this term reflect the conflicts between "realist" and "idealist" approaches to faith which arose during the Medieval debates between "nominalism" and "realism".⁷⁸ The critical historical period with regard to Fundamentalist attitudes towards truth, however, is not the medieval period with its intellectual debates but the work of Immanuel Kant and the changing attitude towards truth and faith brought on by the Enlightenment. In many senses, and particularly with regard to its attitude towards truth, Fundamentalism may be characterized as a pre-Enlightenment theology. The Fundamentalists failed to grasp adequately and respond to the Kantian paradigm as it found expression in leading theological thinkers such as Schleiermacher. As a result of Kant's philosophical system the demonstrative metaphysical approach to theology which had prevailed in the past was gradually abandoned in favour of a system which emphasized man's transcendent status and unique inner awareness. Schleiermacher used Kantian ideas in order to base Christian belief upon the universal, subjective awareness of God which was seen to be rooted in each person's inner aesthetic and religious response to reality as a whole.

Fundamentalist thinkers refused to accept this Kantian revolution choosing to continue in an approach

to truth which had more in common with pre-Enlightenment attitudes. Bernard Ramm in his book After Fundamentalism makes this point when he defends Barthian thought against, "the fundamentalists [who] accepted Van Til's thesis that Barth's theology, for all its historical theological vocabulary, is nothing more than neomodernism."⁷⁹ In Ramm's analysis Barth is the only major theologian who dealt seriously with the Enlightenment, which gave rise to the theological changes initiated by Kant and focussed by Schleiermacher into liberal Protestantism, without forsaking the great truths of the Christian faith.⁸⁰

It is this failure to address the philosophical insights of Kant and the Enlightenment period which helps to explain why Fundamentalist theology has not been treated by the majority of modern scholars as a legitimate theology, worthy of academic attention. Sympathetic scholars, on the other hand, argue that in spite of this serious weakness, Fundamentalism has preserved an important element within Christian faith through its refusal to let go of an objective, "realist" attitude towards truth. Thus, Donald Bloesch in his systematic theology has noted:

Kierkegaard's challenge to liberalism was therefore more radical and far-reaching than that of Abraham Kuyper, Charles Hodge, and J. Gresham Machen in that he demonstrated the fallacy of viewing Christianity as a static deposit of truth, as a doctrine amenable to rational appropriation. Yet

Christianity certainly includes doctrine, and perhaps his existentialism did not do justice to the intellectual dimension of faith.⁸¹[emphasis mine]

The Fundamentalist approach to truth is one in which dynamic, historical views of theological truth are subjugated to static, suprahistorical views. B. B. Warfield in his comments on systematic theology once stated, "that to say Systematic Theology is a science is to deny that it is a historical discipline."⁸² Thus, Grant Wacker has correctly concluded that:

Liberals made their peace with the modern world in various ways, but in the end they all insisted that God's self-revelation is mediated through the flow of history. Protestant conservatives, on the other hand, invariably claimed that part of God's self-revelation escapes the grip of historical conditioning For the conservatives this meant that revelation is subject to clarification but not development.⁸³

This suprahistorical understanding of truth was often in tension with the pietistic element within Fundamentalism. Using orthodoxy to fight orthodoxy, Pietism held that Christian theology was basically inaccessible to the unregenerate. Fundamentalism wished to hold on to this Pietistic criticism, directing it against Modernist thinkers who, Fundamentalists claimed, inevitably fell into error because they did not have a "right relationship" with Jesus. One fails to see, however, how a Pietistic emphasis may be coupled with a static, suprahistorical attitude towards truth. When the two clash, as is inevitable, it is Pietism which gives way as is

evidenced by J. I. Packer's criticism of Liberal Protestantism where he states; "Liberalism is subjectivism trying to be Christianity, and, as we saw, subjectivism in any form is incompatible with Christianity."⁸⁴

This caricature of Liberalism as "subjectivism" versus the "objective" truth adhered to by the Fundamentalists provides yet further insight into Fundamentalist attitudes towards truth. Not only is truth seen to be an objective reality, it is seen to be an objective reality which does not need to be mediated through the psyche of the human being. Helmut Thielecke levelled an important criticism against such thinking when he wrote:

We want to have our own history with Jesus, history with his benefits. We do not want to be cheated out of this history by receiving the decisive thing in the form of a dogmatic premise, as though this would be "receiving" in any true or meaningful sense.⁸⁵

To support their understanding of truth the Fundamentalists depended on the Common Sense Philosophy which pervaded the Princetonian School in the late nineteenth century and into the first two decades of the twentieth century. Based as it was on Baconian inductivism, Common Sense philosophy buttressed Fundamentalism's assertion "that basic truths are much the same for all persons in all times and places."⁸⁶

This Common Sense philosophy supported the view

[of truth as something which was static and quantitative. In addition, such a view gave intellectual approval to the belief that such truth was easily accessible to the common person, and that the motive for differing opinions concerning theological truths [i.e. doctrines] was not the mystery of eternal truths but the sinfulness of the human being in actually interpreting those truths. Truth, according to the correspondence theory to which the Fundamentalists adhered, was synonymous with perceived reality and this fit in well with the philosophy of Common Sense. Douglas Frank writes:

Common Sense philosophy, of course, fits into the same pattern of attention to appearances, providing a scholarly foundation for the extraordinary importance of the visible realm. Its naive Baconian empiricism promised people that what they saw before their eyes was truth, simple and unvarnished.⁸⁷

It is inaccurate, then, to depict Fundamentalism as being in contradiction to scientific thought. Fundamentalism was not anti-scientific but tied to a view of science which by the 1930's was rejected by many as being outmoded. George Marsden has observed:

. . . fundamentalists had resisted Darwin and knew little of Einstein, but they were not opposed to science as such. Rather, they were judging the standards of the later scientific revolution on the first -- the revolution of Bacon and Newton. In their view, science depended on fact and observation.⁸⁸

This infatuation with science defined in Baconian and Newtonian terms undergirded the Fundamentalist approach

towards Scriptural interpretation. The doubt cast by biblical criticism on the factual nature of many of the biblical narratives may have forced Fundamentalist interpreters to be more creative in their harmonization of science and Scripture but it did little to alter their view that truth in science and Scripture were both supportive and mutually compatible. Indeed, the Fundamentalist view of science helped to confirm a cognitive, propositional interpretation of the Bible which further undergirded Fundamentalism's approach towards truth as being that which corresponded with the eternal verities. Operating within the confines of Fundamentalist attitudes towards truth this complementarity of the biblical text with "true" science was taken to be irrefutable evidence that truth was indeed static and suprahistorical. As Sandeen has noted:

. . . the Warfield-Hodge doctrine of biblical authority provided American Protestantism with one way to perpetuate the ideology of parties of fact -- history perceived as roadmap linearity or as a Logos Express which runs down the tracks of rational progress to the station called "Eternity."⁸⁹

This creedalistic emphasis within Fundamentalism, based as it was on a pre-Enlightenment attitude towards metaphysical truth, suggests that if Fundamentalist thought is to be understood from within, then the ideal starting point is through key theological categories such as christology. This dissertation attempts to examine the

christology of T. T. Shields and to describe its impact on his view of biblical authority as well as on his vision of the ideal relationship between the Christian and his/her culture. Before such an examination is undertaken, however, it must be ascertained whether Shields was part of the Fundamentalist movement in regard to a creedalistic understanding of faith.

The Creedalism of T. T. Shields

While differences between Shields and American Fundamentalists existed, the similarities certainly outweighed the differences.⁹⁰ This was especially evident in the creedalistic attitude which Shields took towards the Christian faith. In this he was typical of North American Fundamentalism as a whole. In an early sermon written in 1895 during the second year of his ministry Shields warned about the tendency he was seeing in the Canadian church and society of his day:

. . . to exalt as one of the chiefest riches, that which is in reality the grossest sin; which is, in fact, the only sin which can condemn a man to death: I mean the **sin of unbelief**. [emphasis mine]⁹¹

The question which must be asked is, 'What did Shields mean by "belief" and "unbelief"?' In conventional Roman Catholic theology faith or belief means, by and large, mental assent to divinely revealed truth. In classical Protestant theology, however, faith or belief

is defined in terms of trustful obedience. The object of belief is not a set of doctrinal propositions but the personal reality of God in Christ.

Shields was not immune to the classical Protestant definition of faith but he fused with it a strong emphasis on the importance of mental assent to revealed truth in a manner reminiscent of traditional Roman Catholicism. An important definition of faith or belief for Shields, then, even in his early years, was assent to divinely inspired truth. This emphasis, however, did not have the same dominance in the early years of his ministry as it did in the later years. Thus, in a sermon preached in 1902 during his Hamilton pastorate, Shields noted in classical Protestant terms that:

. . . faith is more than a logical conclusion, more than the assent of the intellect to a certain proposition. Faith, with some people is believing a piece of paper, or believing what is printed on it. Nay! Faith is believing a Person -- it is believing God.⁹²

Increasingly, though, what Shields came to believe about God, was a set of intellectual beliefs. On the basis of these beliefs and infused by the Holy Ghost one acted in a different manner than the non-Christian, certainly, but the obedience was built upon belief, not belief upon obedience:

. . . belief of the truth, and obedience to the truth are essential to salvation. I desire to show that having regard to the human constitution and to the natural and moral laws under which men live

salvation could not be offered to men on any other terms than belief in and obedience to the truth. . . . [Furthermore] belief and action, or conduct, . . . are related to each other as cause and effect.⁹³

With such a perspective, the primary sin according to Shields, as has already been stated, came to be the sin of unbelief. In seriousness this was closely followed by the sin of intellectual doubt concerning key Christian doctrines. In spite of a stronger emphasis on the relational and experiential aspects of the Christian faith in his pre-1904 ministry, this concern about the debilitating effects of intellectual doubt was clearly in evidence by as early as 1895 when Shields noted:

. . . I regret to say that there are professing Christians who are unwilling to accept God's Word in its entirety; and who seem to believe, as one has said, that it is an evidence of a sound logical mind to doubt everything and to be sure of nothing.⁹⁴

With his growing stress on faith as intellectual assent, a stress which began to dominate his classical Protestant stress on faith as faithful obedience, it may be said of T. T. Shields what was earlier noted about Fundamentalism as a whole. To re-iterate, Fundamentalism, in general, and Shields, in particular, were not anti-rationalistic at all. In some senses, the Fundamentalists were supreme rationalists in that they were convinced of the power of human reason to grasp and understand the mysteries of God's mind. For example, in a 1906 sermon Shields stated; "Faith is not reason in its infancy, but

reason grown to be a man. Faith is reason in its highest exercise."⁹⁵

At the inaugural meeting of the Baptist Union in 1908, as Shields began to stress his definition of faith as reason grown to maturity, he spelled out what the essential beliefs were upon which this house of faith was to be constructed:

Indeed we believe everyone who really knows Jesus Christ will desire to cooperate with all by whatever name they may be called, who believe in an inspired Book, in an atoning sacrifice offered by a divine Redeemer, a risen Intercessor, and whether He come before or after the millennium, a coming, conquering Lord.⁹⁶

Some fifteen years later the listing of foundational beliefs had remained the same but the language had become more precise:

It is true that Fundamentalists are contending for the very things -- the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement, the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God, the promise of His second advent with all its implications -- the Fundamentalists believe these things and do not hesitate to proclaim it.⁹⁷

Increasingly it was these doctrines which became the basis for Christian unity rather than denominational allegiance or Christian behavior:

. . . I don't care whether you are Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or what you are. These various sections of the Christian Church may have their differences on minor points -- I believe they are minor points, although very important; there is nothing unimportant of what is revealed in God's Word -- but upon these great fundamentals of the faith, Evangelical churches have stood together.⁹⁸

Along with fostering cross-denominational fellowship, Shields' creedalism also gave legitimization to a growing separatism which began to define his life and thought in the 1920's. Speaking about Paul's confrontation with Peter he stated:

Of course it was bad manners on the part of the Apostle Paul. He exposed himself to the danger of being called a contentious man. But he thought more of the truth, and of the conservation of the truth, and of loyalty to the Word of God and to the revelation of the gospel, than he did of his friendship with Peter, or Barnabas or anybody else.⁹⁹

Shields' willingness to put truth above friendship is yet another indication of the dominance of faith defined as intellectual assent rather than as trustful obedience. Shields could not understand those conservatives who were willing to fellowship with the so-called Modernists. In his view they were selling out the essence of the Gospel through their actions. Thus, by 1931 when his description of Paul as the first separatist was made, the emphasis upon the relational held little attraction for Shields. Little wonder, then, that with the minimization of faith defined in relational terms as trustful obedience separation became not only an unfortunate by-product of theological differences but a key definition in the process of determining who was, in fact, to be considered a 'true' Christian.

T. T. Shields' stress upon the importance of intellectual assent to divine revelation also

differentiated him from a charismatically shaped Fundamentalism. In his book The Doctrines of Grace he warned against a variation of conservative religion which elevated the emotions over the intellect:

A cheap type of evangelism, "Come to Jesus! Come to Jesus," with no exposition of the Word, with no appeal to the understanding, but to the emotions only, has done inestimable damage to the cause of Christ.¹⁰⁰

In another sermon he picked up the same theme, this time naming the object of his criticism:

What is the explanation of so-called Pentecostalism? It is nothing but an orgy of emotionalism. It is the Herod spirit: "let me see a miracle" -- but not the miracle of a reformed life.¹⁰¹

T. T. Shields' stress on regeneration, coupled with a continuing pietistic streak which would often make his sermons warm and tender, insured, however, that creedalism was never enough. Although Shields moved away from a definition of faith as trust (fiducia) and towards a definition of faith as assent (assensus), nonetheless, he continued to realize that unless creedal beliefs resulted in changed lives then, while sufficient for salvation, they were incomplete. In a Sunday sermon Shields stated:

You who come here regularly know that I should be the last to underestimate the value of right thinking or of correct opinion; but there is a type of orthodoxy that is as unattractive as any heterodoxy in the world. There is an orthodoxy that is self-centered, that considers its own interest, and is indifferent to the world about.¹⁰²

Thus, in spite of an important change within his theological outlook, his creedalism never stood on its own. In this Shields avoided, in the pre-1930 years of his ministry, the barrenness of a faith defined totally by intellectual agreement, and thereby differed from some of his Fundamentalist contemporaries. Moreover, Shields' refusal to make premillennialism a part of his creedal definition of faith also differentiated him from other Fundamentalist leaders. In his Doctrines of Grace he emphasized the view that in connection with eschatological issues there had to be room for disagreement:

These things which relate to the future have their value, but when they are emphasized at the expense of the great doctrines of grace they are indispensable, first, to our salvation, and then to our growth in grace, to the formation of Christian character, and to our effective witness for Christ -- I say, when people are led into the habit of skygazing and speculative Bible study, it is neither good for their minds or for their spirits.¹⁰³

While Shields allowed for disagreement on eschatological questions, however, and while he never succumbed totally to creedalism, it is clear that, by as early as 1904 when he started his ministry at the Adelaide Street Baptist Church, Shields' primary definition of faith was intellectual assent to divine revealed truth. In this emphasis he stood squarely within the parameters of a North American Fundamentalism which had modified its Evangelistic heritage under the constraint of having to attack the theological changes brought on by Modernism. In

this war of theology, faith defined as assent was emphasized to such an extent that it became one of the primary features of Fundamentalism. In part, this was so because it became next to impossible for Fundamentalist leaders to cling to a definition of faith as trust without playing into the hands of the Modernists who could expand the traditional Protestant definition to include their teachings as well as the more orthodox doctrines which the Fundamentalists prized. In part, it may also have been due to the suspicions of Fundamentalists such as Shields of emotionalism in both its conservative and liberal forms. In this regard it is important to remember that Shields' own conversion experience was an unemotional experience, in spite of the revivalist trappings in which it was expressed.

T. T. Shields' Attitude Towards Truth

T. T. Shields' attitude towards truth, in keeping with his creedalistic definition of faith, was also typically fundamentalistic. Shields defined the human being according to a traditional tripartite formula of body, mind and soul.¹⁰⁴ These three aspects of the human being were paralleled by three aspects of a unified truth -- natural, moral and spiritual -- where natural truth was defined as "the real nature of things; and moral truth as the true representation of things."¹⁰⁵ According to

Shields this unified Truth was easily understandable. In a sermon preached in 1896 Shields stated, "we shall say to our souls. 'If Christ is God, then His word must be true; and if His Word is true, why should I not believe it?'"¹⁰⁶

Charles Hodge's correspondence definition of truth, then, was one which Shields taught and in which he believed. Even in his early years of ministry he had little patience with approaches to truth which allowed for a difference between the significance of truth and the expression of such truth, stating:

Jesus Christ did not play with words as some men do today. He never used a word without knowing just what it meant nor did He use a word without it meaning just what he expressed.¹⁰⁷

It was Shields' attitude towards truth which prompted his outbursts against modern thought. In such criticisms Shields was at his caustic best:

When the Marthas of today get dinner for the Master all the pieces of their 150 piece dinner sets are requisitioned to serve the "many things" and what the [utensils] are for, much less the dishes it would puzzle anyone to tell. There is a pig roast of politics, a supply of philosophical soup, a shallow dish of science, and some stuff that is neither wine nor milk called modern thought.¹⁰⁸

Imitating his father's style, Shields parodied this "sop" of modern thought:

Mr. Philosopher's helpers were Mr. Don't Know, Mr. Can't Know, Mr. Guess-So, Mr. Hope-So, Mr. Possibility and Mr. Probability; Mr. Positive had been dismissed as incompetent.¹⁰⁹

T. T. Shields' outbursts against what he called

"rationalism" should not be interpreted to mean that he adopted a more experientially-defined attitude towards truth. His attacks against the scholarship, philosophy and rationalism of his day were attacks directed against scholarship, philosophy and rationalism **falsely defined**. Modernism could claim to speak the language of reason but that language had no connection with the language of Fundamentalism:

The Modernist's Christ is not our Christ; the Modernist's Bible is not our Bible; the Modernist's Gospel is not our gospel; the Modernist's experience is not our experience! Christianity and Modernism are as contrary to each other as Christ and Belial.¹¹⁰

Thus, while Shields would often label Modernism as rationalistic (in the false sense) and, therefore, un-Christian, he would also take, what was on the surface, a different line of attack, and criticize Modernism for being "subjective." The seeming paradox of dismissing Modernism for its rationalism, on the one hand, and criticizing Modernism for its subjectivism, on the other, was dissolved by the Fundamentalist accusation that modernistic rationalism was false rationalism, a rationalism which was separated from divine truth and which, therefore, led inevitably to the curse of subjectivism:

Modernism, in its ultimate expression, is always subjective; authority resides within man's own consciousness -- in short, he becomes a law unto himself, and thus becomes utterly lawless.¹¹¹

It was this spirit of subjectivism which, according to Shields, lay at the base of the various heresies which had plagued the Christian Church over the years:

Religious subjectivism uncontrolled, unregulated by objective standards, has been the cause, the base, of nearly all the soul destroying heresies of history.¹¹²

Opposed to the subjectivism of Modernism was the objective truth of the Evangelical faith which Shields professed. Such truth was extremely powerful, lying at the base of all action. When World War I erupted Shields pointed out the direct link between the philosophy (i.e. truth) which undergirded the German state and the outbreak of war:

. . . few learned to hate the Nietzschean philosophy. It was only a philosophy, an idea, a thought, a doctrine, an abstraction: why trouble about it? Hold that fast in your mind, for I shall return to it.¹¹³

This objective truth of Fundamentalism was not to be put in contrast with truth in other realms of thought. All truth cohered, scientific as well as spiritual:

The pulpit must concern itself with spiritual matters: its special science is theology, which is a word about God. But it is impossible that this chief of all sciences should be unaffected by the general progress of human knowledge; for truth never contradicts itself, but is in perfect agreement in all realms.¹¹⁴

In his belief in the seamless robe of truth, Shields used a common sense approach towards truth which was similar to the Scottish Realism or Common Sense philosophy

of the Princetonians. As early as 1906 he stated in a Sunday sermon, "don't be frightened at the word philosophy. There is a philosophy which is as simple as the multiplication table."¹¹⁵ This coherence of truth and the ease of understanding truth depended upon an empiricism of the senses which was typical of Fundamentalists. A favourite sermon illustration revolved around two tires which were supposed to be different from each other. The one lawyer (the Modernistic one) tried through speculative and complex reasoning to show a difference between the tires while the other lawyer simply had the two tires displayed to the jury and then said, "there they are jury, look at them."¹¹⁶

In his view of truth, and this point has been emphasized in this chapter, Shields was very much a North American Fundamentalist. In fact, many of his Fundamentalist supporters considered him to be an intellectual within the movement.¹¹⁷ Shields is often linked with Machen as a "defender of the faith."¹¹⁸ Clearly even the most charitable evaluation of Shields could not support such a contention. Machen was a scholar, Shields a popularizer. Nonetheless, Shields' reputation within Fundamentalist circles as a preacher of academic substance must be taken seriously.

The reputation and influence of Shields as well as

his creedalistic approach towards truth underscore the importance of analyzing his theological thought if Shields, in particular, and North American Fundamentalism, in general, are to be better understood. The starting point for such a study may be found in Shields' view of the person and work of Christ. This is due, in part, to the centrality of christology within Christian theology. It is also due, however, to the centrality of Christ within Shields' early years of ministry. For the early Shields the norm of truth in Christian faith was, "but One: Christ is all in all; truth is in Him, and can only be identified as truth in relation to Him."¹¹⁹

ENDNOTES

¹Mark A. Noll, review of Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century: Vol. I, 1799-1870 and Vol. II, 1870-1914, by Claude Welch, in Fides et Historia (January 1988), p. 95.

²The term 'Evangelical' is a rich term with a variety of historical connections. The most inclusive use arises out of the application of this term to the Protestant movement as a whole by reason of the Reformation emphasis on faith, grace and the Scriptures. A narrower but still important use of the term arose out of the Wesley's influence on the Anglican Church in the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century the word 'Evangelical' was applied to those churches in North America who used the techniques of revivalism. In the twentieth century the word has been captured by the more progressive wing of the Fundamentalist movement beginning in the 1940's under the leadership of Harold Ockenga, Carl Henry and Billy Graham, to mention just a few names. It is the twentieth century usage to which the scholars of religious conservatism refer. It is important, however, to recognize that although this current Evangelical movement grew out of the Fundamentalism of the 1920's, they are not identical movements. Evangelicalism repudiated the separatistic stance of Fundamentalism in regard to social issues and ecclesiastical affiliations. This repudiation of separatism opened the door for doctrinal changes as well, although these did not become obvious until the Evangelical movement was more firmly established. Thus, while broad generalizations may be applicable to both Fundamentalism and to Evangelicalism it is important not to confuse these two movements with each other.

The question as to why the original meaning of the word "Evangelical" becomes superseded by other, more rationalistic meanings is a complex one. For some interesting insights into this question see W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern England (London: Unwin-Hyman Books, 1989).

³Morris Ashcraft, "The Theology of Fundamentalism," Review and Expositor LXXIX (Winter 1982): 31.

⁴William J. Abraham, The Coming Great Revival: Recovering the Full Evangelical Tradition (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984), p. 6.

⁵Ernest R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930 (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1970; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978).

⁶For some good descriptive material on this withdrawal and redirection see Joel A. Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945" (Ph. D. dissertation, John Hopkins University, 1984).

⁷Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" in American Protestant Thought in the Liberal Era, ed. William R. Hutchinson (New York: University Press of America, 1968), p. 172.

⁸"[Fundamentalists] are thick in the mean streets behind the gas works. They are everywhere where learning is too heavy a burden for mortal minds to carry, even the vague, pathetic learning on tap in the little red school-houses. They march with the Klan, with the Christian Endeavor Society, with the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, with the Epworth League, with all the Rococo bands that poor and unhappy people organize to bring some new light of purpose into their lives. They have had a thrill and they are ready for more." Quoted in Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 188.

⁹Stewart Cole, the History of Fundamentalism (New York: Smith Publishers, 1931), p. 82.

¹⁰Ibid, p. 53.

¹¹Norman Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954; reprint ed. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1963), p. 36.

¹²Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 57.

¹³Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1963), p. 86.

¹⁴Ibid, p. 131

¹⁵Ibid, p. 155. See also Daniel B. Stevick Beyond Fundamentalism (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 18. "They [the Fundamentalists] attempted to preserve the familiar orthodoxies on every point. All of the old was right all of the new was wrong."

¹⁶Louis Gaspar, The Fundamentalist Movement 1930-1956 (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1963; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981).

¹⁷Ibid, p. v.

¹⁸"Although revisionist scholarship actually began during the 1960's it was the publication in 1970 of Ernest Sandeen's The Roots of Fundamentalism that inaugurated a new era in fundamentalist studies." Leonard I. Sweet, "The Evangelical Tradition in America" in The Evangelical Tradition in America edited by Leonard I. Sweet (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1984), p. 75.

¹⁹Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism: Toward a Historical Interpretation, Facet Books Historical Series, no. 10, American Church, edited by Richard Wolf (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 2.

²⁰Sandeen, The Origin of Fundamentalism, p. 3.

²¹Ibid, p. 25.

²²Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 246.

²³Martin Marty, Righteous Empire the Protestant Experience in America (New York: the Dial Press, 1970), p. 179

²⁴Martin Marty, Pilgrims in Their Own Land: 500 Years of Religion in America (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), pp. 297-298.

²⁵Sweet, The Evangelical Tradition p. 78.

²⁶Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 5-6.

²⁷Ibid, pp. 6-7.

²⁸Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 43.

²⁹Sweet, The Evangelical Tradition, p. 75.

³⁰George Marsden has insisted that, "Fundamentalism will be misunderstood if it is reduced to a cultural phenomenon. Fundamentalism involves commitment to a certain set of views and unless the essential coherence of this world-view is seriously considered, fundamentalism cannot be understood or appreciated." George Marsden, "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Society" in Reformed Faith and Politics, edited by Ronald Stone (Washington, D. C.: the University Press of America, 1983), p. 67. Nonetheless, while Fundamentalism should not be reduced to a cultural phenomenon, of interest only to the sociologist of religion, it is a cultural phenomenon which finds its most sympathetic audience in the United States, and particularly, in the northern United States. John Wilson asserts that this was due to the "decline of white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant power which began in the 1890's and which [was] exacerbated by an influx of Catholic immigrants." John Wilson, Religion in American Society: the Effective Presence (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978), p. 62. While according to Bebbington, the more accomodating spirit of British conservatism is the reason why Fundamentalism never gained a large following in England. See W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern England (London: Unwin-Hyman Books, 1989). Hans Mol, however, universalizes the "Fundamentalist" spirit noting that it is an attempt in both Protestant and Catholic faiths to maintain an "otherness" in regard to its society as opposed to seeking to interact with its society. Mol continues, making no differentiation between the United States and Europe, and noting, "in other religions, the two facets are often inseparable. But in the differentiated societies of the West, the deepest division within the ecclesiastical bodies run exactly between these two diverging conceptions of their function." Hans Mol, Identity and the Sacred: a Sketch for a New Social-Scientific Theory of Religion (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p. 75. The impact of modernity on the consertive element within American religiosity has been most recently examined in J. D. Hunter, American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandry of Modernity (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983). More work, however, is needed on this issue, particularly in the Canadian context where little has been attempted.

³¹Marsden, "Fundamentalist Views of Society," pp. 68-72.

³²"In the early 1980's, as the author of a book on early twentieth-century fundamentalism, I suddenly found

myself involved in current events. Until then I had usually followed the conventions of the historical profession and worked on topics that only other historians were likely to learn about. Indeed, when I began working on fundamentalism in the early 1970's, most Americans were only dimly aware even of what that term might mean. By 1980, though, when my history appeared, Ronald Reagan had just been elected, and fundamentalists seemed everywhere. Once again H. L. Mencken's quip seemed apt: 'Heave an egg out of a Pullman window, and you will hit a Fundamentalist almost anywhere in the United States today.'" George Marsden Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), p. vii.

³³J. Philip Wogaman, Faith and Fragmentation: Christianity for a New Age (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 19

³⁴James Barr, Fundamentalism (London: SCM Press, 1981). James Barr, Beyond Fundamentalism (London: SCM Press, 1984).

³⁵"No gross differentiation of social and educational background can be used to provide a rationale for the phenomenon of fundamentalism." Barr, Fundamentalism, p. 90.

³⁶Barr, Fundamentalism, p. 9

³⁷For a good analysis of the contribution of self declared evangelical scholars to Fundamentalist studies see Leonard Sweet, "Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: the New Evangelical Historiography," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 56:3 (Fall 1988).

³⁸Sweet, The Evangelical Tradition, p. 1.

³⁹Ibid, p. 86.

⁴⁰George Rawlyk, Wrapped Up in God: A Study of Several Canadian Revivals and Revivalists (Burlington, Ontario: Welch Publishing Company, 1988), p. 149 In an article on Maritime Fundamentalism, Rawlyk made a similar criticism of the bias of Canadian historiography, "Many English Canadian historians find it embarrassingly difficult to take religion seriously. As they comb the past for relevance they are keen to avoid any confrontation with spiritual and religious realities." George Rawlyk, "Fundamentalism, Modernism and the Maritime Baptists in the 1920's and 1930's," Acadiensis (Autumn

1987): 3.

⁴¹See Stackhouse, "Proclaiming the Word."

⁴²Sawatsky, "Looking For the Blessed Hope," p. 7.

⁴³Mark A. Noll, Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship and the Bible in America (San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1986).

⁴⁴Sweet, "Wise as Serpents: Innocent as Doves," p. 399.

⁴⁵Scholars who are not sympathetic to Fundamentalism have no problem with this lack of a theological appreciation and analysis of Fundamentalist theology. This is not because they are biased against such studies, but because, in their analysis, Fundamentalism lacks coherent theological beliefs to analyze! Barr asserts, "in a certain sense fundamentalism could be characterized as a theology-less movement." He continues, noting, that if fundamentalists can be said to have a theology, three qualifications must be made concerning such a claim; "[i] if it is a theology it is a fossilized theology [ii] it is a fragmented theology and [iii] the theology of fundamentalism is inactive." Barr, Fundamentalism, pp. 160-162.

⁴⁶One example of the oversight which Canadian Fundamentalism suffers from is typified by the reprint of prominent Fundamentalist writings by the Garland Press. The series is edited by Joel Carpenter, a respected scholar of Fundamentalism and, at the time of the inauguration of the series, Director of the Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals. When I wrote, pointing out that Shields should have been included in such a series, Joel Carpenter replied, "You are of course entirely correct to chide me for not including any of the work of T. T. Shields in my reprint series on fundamentalism. Shields was important to the movement, and he should have been represented. I considered him at one point, but got distracted with other issues of inclusion and never got back to him. The same is true, I'm afraid, for William ("Bible Bill") Aberhart. Looking back now, I regret that R. V. Bingham is the only Canadian author or personage (other than the Canadian-born men, Harry Ironside and William Ward Ayer) in the series." Joel A. Carpenter to Mark A. Parent, May 16, 1988.

⁴⁷C. Allyn Russell, Voices of American Fundamentalism Seven Biographical Studies (Philadelphia: the

Westminster Press, 1976).

⁴⁸Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist."

⁴⁹Tarr, Shields of Canada.

⁵⁰Leslie Tarr, "T. T. Shields: a Soldier in the Field," Fundamentalist Journal 2 (June 1983): 42-44.

⁵¹Harrop, "The Era of the 'Great Preacher'."

⁵²Dozois, "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields."

⁵³Stackhouse, "Proclaiming the Word."

⁵⁴Clark Pinnock, "The Modernist Impulse at McMaster University, 1887-1927," Baptists in Canada Search for Identity Amidst Diversity, ed. J. K. Zeman (Burlington, Ontario: G. R. Welch Company, 1980).

⁵⁵Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors."

⁵⁶William Gordon Carter, "Controversy in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1908-1929" (B. D. dissertation, McMaster University, 1950).

⁵⁷Leslie Tarr, "Another Perspective on T. T. Shields and Fundamentalism," in Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity, ed. J. K. Zeman (Burlington, Ontario: G. R. Welch, 1980).

⁵⁸Rawlyk, "McCrimmon, Whidden and Shields."

⁵⁹S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1945).

⁶⁰W. E. Mann, Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955).

⁶¹Delnay, "A History of the Baptist Bible Union."

⁶²Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists, 3rd ed. (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1963).

⁶³H. Leon McBeth, The Baptist Heritage: Four Centuries of Baptist Witness (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987).

⁶⁴Harry A. Renfree, Heritage and Horizon the Baptist Story in Canada (Mississauga, Ontario: the

Canadian Baptist Federation, 1988).

⁶⁵By creedalism I mean an attitude towards Christian faith which stresses orthodoxy (right thinking or doctrine) as being the key element within a healthy Christianity. In a suggestive essay, Bruce Shelley has pointed out that what I call creedalism (and what he calls rationalism) forms only one of three strains within Fundamentalism. Shelley writes, "a full treatment of Fundamentalist lifestyles would recognize at least three types of Fundamentalists: the rationalistic, the militant, and the pietistic." Bruce Shelley, "Sources of Pietistic Fundamentalism," Fides et Historia 5 (Spring 1973): 68-69. In my study of Shields, however, while Shelley's typology is helpful in differentiating between various strains of thought and attitude within Shields, Shields cannot be confined within any of the three types and is able to combine all three in a rich, somewhat confusing, and always complex mixture.

⁶⁶Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 13

⁶⁷The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 141n.

⁶⁸Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 71.

⁶⁹Ibid, p. 159.

⁷⁰Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors," p. 285. J. D. Hunter describes the common theological perspective out of which both Fundamentalism and Modernism emerged, noting, "the nineteenth century Evangelical held to be normative the core religious beliefs of reformational orthodoxy: an individuated conception of personal salvation mediated by Jesus Christ, the role of the Bible as the sole authority on religious and spiritual matters, the need for obedience to the sovereign will God in his vocation and in his personal and family life." J. D. Hunter, American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandry of Modernity (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983), p. 24.

⁷¹Bernard Ramm, After Fundamentalism: the Future of Evangelical Theology (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983), p. 1.

⁷²Barr, Fundamentalism, p. 275. This centrality of doctrine within Fundamentalism has also been noted by Abraham who warns, "It is extremely important to see fundamentalism as a genuine doctrinal tradition. It

embodies a particular reading of such central Christian themes as creation, the fall, salvation, church, consummation, and so forth. I am not claiming that it amounts to a serious theological tradition. The latter I would reserve for a genuinely critical, self-searching account of Christian doctrine. 'Theological tradition' can only be applied to fundamentalism as a courtesy title . . . Yet its doctrinal character clearly needs to be acknowledged." Abraham p. 15.

⁷³Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 216.

⁷⁴In spite of the extensive historical research which has uncovered Fundamentalism's historical conditioning, a modern Fundamentalist can still claim (echoing the position of the Princetonians), "true Fundamentalists hold strongly to the same basic tenets that they were debating seventy-five years ago." Jerry Falwell et al, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon, p. 2.

⁷⁵Quoted in John Jefferson Davis, Foundations of Evangelical Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 66.

⁷⁶Mark Noll ed., The Princeton Theology 1812-1921: Scripture, Science and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Warfield (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), p. 30.

⁷⁷Mark Noll, Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), p. 156.

⁷⁸In Paul Tillich's analysis, the modern equivalent of the nominalist-realist debates (particularly in connection with the writings of William of Ockham) would be the controversy between individualism and collectivism, with nominalist thought supporting individualism and realist thought supporting a collectivistic approach. See Paul Tillich, A History of Christian Thought From its Judaic and Hellenistic Origins to Existentialism, ed. Carl E. Braaten, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), pp. 198-201. If Tillich is correct in his analysis, the analogy between Fundamentalist views of truth and realist views would be incomplete. Fundamentalism's advocacy of individualism and realism at the same time would be yet another paradox within Fundamentalist thought.

⁷⁹Ramm, After Fundamentalism, p. 21

⁸⁰For the failure of Fundamentalism to come to terms with Kant and the Enlightenment see also Mark Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, pp. 142-161.

⁸¹Donald Bloesch, Essentials of Evangelical Theology, vol. I, God, Authority and Salvation (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 122. The use of Kierkegaard in regard to criticisms of a depiction of truth as a static deposit of knowledge is somewhat misleading. What Kierkegaard reacted to was the Hegelian thought which pervaded the theological thinking at the time. Since Hegel was responding to Kant's thought, however, the genesis of a new approach to truth, theological truth included, lies in the Enlightenment period. More accurate, then, is Bernard Ramm's comment in the introduction to his book After Fundamentalism where he writes, "the Enlightenment sent shock waves through Christian theology as nothing did before or after. And therefore each and every theology, evangelical included, must assess its relationship to the Enlightenment." Ramm, After Fundamentalism, p. 4. Of interest in this connection is the work of Harvey Cox who in his book Religion in the Secular City examines Fundamentalism as a legitimate source for new theological formulations within a post-modern society. After an interesting analysis of Fundamentalism a la Jerry Falwell, however, Cox claims that it is the thought of Liberation Theology rather than Fundamentalism which will provide the most help in moving into a new future. See Harvey Cox, Religion in the Secular City Towards a Postmodern Theology (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984).

⁸²Noll, The Princeton Theology, p. 30.

⁸³Grant Wacker, "The Dilemmas of Historical Consciousness: the Case of Augustus Strong," in In the Great Tradition: In Honor of Winthrop Hudson Essays on Pluralism, Voluntarism, and Revivalism, eds. Joseph D. Ban and Paul R. Dekar (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1982), p. 224.

⁸⁴J. I. Packer, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, reprint ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), p. 153. Packer defines Fundamentalism as yet another chapter in a debate between "Subjectivism" and the objective truth of the Christian faith. He writes; [Fundamentalism] is, in fact, an episode in the continuing debate between Evangelicalism and what we shall call Subjectivism of which Liberalism is a modern example." Ibid, pp. 45-46.

⁸⁵Helmut Thielicke, The Evangelical Faith, vol. II, The Doctrine of God and of Christ, trans. and ed. Geoffrey

W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1977), p. 271. Interestingly, the Dutch theologian, C. G. Berkouwer, accuses liberal Protestantism of holding to the view of truth which I argue was that supported by North American Fundamentalism. Berkouwer writes, "timeless idealism (a la liberalism and Jurgen Moltmann), which is uninterested in important historical progress and decision, will never be able to understand that significance of Christ's resurrection and ascension, nor of Christ's promise concerning the coming of another Comforter." C. G. Berkouwer, Studies in Dogmatics: the Work of Christ (Grand Rapids: William Eerdmans, 1965), p. 209. Berkouwer's criticism of liberal Protestantism is directed mainly against Bultmann's demythologizing of the Bible text which stands in direct opposition to the Fundamentalist tendency to sacralize the Biblical text -- but which may well end up having the same effect.

⁸⁶Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 111. The impact of Scottish Realist philosophy has been emphasized by numerous scholars recently, beginning with George Marsden's seminal work. Leonard Sweet makes the observation that such an emphasis has been "both overdue and overdone." Leonard Sweet, "The Evangelical Tradition," p. 28.

⁸⁷Douglas Frank, Less Than Conquerors How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century (Grand Rapids: William Eerdmans Company, 1986), p. 63

⁸⁸Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 214.

⁸⁹Ernest Sandeen, Review, p. 217.

⁹⁰For a brief analysis of whether or not Shields was a "typical" Fundamentalist see Tarr, "Another Perspective on T. T. Shields," in Baptists in Canada. Tarr's hesitancy to attach the Fundamentalist label to Shields is, in light on new research unveiling the rich diversity within Fundamentalist, remarkable.

⁹¹"Cutting Roll," Jeremiah 36:22-24, July 28, 1895.

⁹²"The Gospel of Power," Ephesians 1:19-20, October 26, 1902.

⁹³"Belief and Conduct," Mark 16:16, November 18, 1906.

⁹⁴"Cutting Roll," Jeremiah 36:22-24, July 28, 1895.

⁹⁵"Belief and Conduct," Mark 16:16, November 18, 1906.

⁹⁶"Our Future as Baptists," [no text] , November 4, 1908.

⁹⁷"Does it Matter Whether Jesus is God?" The Gospel Witness August 5, 1923.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹T. T. Shields, The Doctrines of Grace (Toronto: the Gospel Witness, n.d.) p. 79. Separatism within the Christian Church has not been a new phenomenon. The Donatist movement in North Africa is one classical example of separatism. In the case of the Donatist movement, however, the legitimization for a separatistic stance was to preserve the ethical 'holiness' of the church. In the case of North American Fundamentalism the desire was to protect the intellectual 'holiness.' Shields' separatistic stance says much about his personality. More importantly, it confirms that his attitude towards faith was best defined by creedalist assent rather than by personal relationship.

¹⁰⁰Shields, Doctrine, p. 161.

¹⁰¹T. T. Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History or the Trial of Jesus, p. 101. [This book is a collection of sermons preached from December 9, 1928 to February 10, 1929] Shields' aversion to the emotionalism of Pentecostalism (based on a strong concern for the primacy of intellectual assent to the key doctrines of the faith) was typical of Fundamentalism. George Marsden states, "the strong concern for the exact meaning of the printed word, . . . , is one of the principal things that distinguishes fundamentalism from other less intellectual forms of American revivalism or from the more experientially oriented holiness tradition or -- most populist, sectarian, and vocally oriented of all -- Pentecostalism." Marsden Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 61.

¹⁰²T. T. Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother or the Adventures of a Modern Young Man (Toronto: the Gospel Witness), p. 112.

¹⁰³Shields, Doctrines, p. 91.

¹⁰⁴"Words and Wagons," Genesis 45:27-28, August 18, 1895.

- 105 "The Faith," John 8:32, February 14, 1897.
- 106 "Different Kinds of Faith," John 2:23-25. December 6, 1896.
- 107 "The Faith," John 8:32, February 14, 1897.
- 108 "Bethany Revisited," Luke 10:41-42, November 10, 1901.
- 109 "No Man Hath Ascended Up to Heaven," John 3:13, August 23, 1901.
- 110 "The Supernatural the Storm Centre of Christianity," The Gospel Witness, March 13, 1924, p. 1.
- 111 T. T. Shields, Other Little Ships (Toronto: the Hunter Rose Company, 1935), p. 225.
- 112 T. T. Shields, The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed (Toronto: the Gospel Witness, 1933), p. 28
- 113 T. T. Shields, Revelations of the War: Eight Sermons (Toronto: the Standard Publishing Company, 1915), p. 36.
- 114 Ibid, p. 19.
- 115 "Belief and Conduct," Mark 16:16, November 18, 1906.
- 116 "The Gospel," Acts 4:14, August 11, 1901.
- 117 Commenting on one of his many lecture series, Shields noted; "Someone wrote to me to-day saying that he liked the 'sincere milk of the word,' but that he was old enough to take a little strong meat, and that he found in these Thursday evening discussion some 'strong meat'." Shields, Doctrines of Grace, p. 90.
- 118 See Rawlyk, Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education, p. ix. Tarr, "Another Perspective on T. T. Shields," pp. 218-223. G. Gerald Harrop, "The Era of the 'Great Preacher'", p. 58.
- 119 Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 225.

CHAPTER THREE

T. T. SHIELD'S CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT

Introduction

Christology is the touchstone of all knowledge of God in the Christian sense, the touchstone of all theology. "Tell me how it stands with your Christology and I shall tell you who you are."¹

Karl Barth's insistence upon the central nature of christology may seem like a redundant statement. Clearly, Jesus Christ is central to Christian thought. That is given in the very name "Christian" which originally was used in Antioch by non-Christians to define the early followers of the Jewish teacher named Jesus, sometime in the years 40 to 44 A.D. (Acts 11:26). In spite of any possible redundancy, however, the centrality of Jesus Christ for Christian faith must, it may be argued, be stated and re-stated on a continual basis. It is only by means of such a statement and re-statement that the Christian Church can be rescued from taking for granted that which gives it life and purpose. As Jurgen Moltmann has noted, it is only when and where this centrality of the person and work of Jesus the Christ is acknowledged

[that Christian faith is to be found:

In spite of all the cultural, philosophical and spiritual riches of historic Christianity, Christian faith basically lives only as a profession of faith in Jesus Wherever Jesus Christ is acknowledged as the Christ of God, Christian faith is to be found. Wherever this is doubted, obscured, or denied, there is no longer Christian faith, and the riches of historic Christianity disappear with it. Christianity is alive as long as there are people who, as the disciples once did, profess their faith in him, and following him, spread his liberating rule in words, deeds and new fellowship.²

This quintessential role of Jesus Christ is evident from even the most cursory reading of Church history. The manifold treatments of Jesus Christ have varied according to the context and culture out of which these treatments have happened to surface,³ but the centrality of Christ for Christian faith has been clearly discernible throughout the centuries. Thus, G. C. Berkouwer, has insisted (in my opinion, accurately) that theological issues over the centuries have revolved around the "one central question: 'What think ye of the Christ?'. " According to Berkhouwer, "names and dates change but the conflict remains the same."⁴ From the christological debates of the early Church, to the theology of the cross of Martin Luther, to the Christ who has a preferential option for the poor, the debate has changed and matured. Always, however, like a multi-faceted jewel, Jesus has remained central to any true expression of the Christian faith.

To claim that Christ is central to Christian faith is to claim that the heart of Christian theology is christology.⁵ This, of course, has been the impact of Karl Barth's theological system whatever one may think of the contours of his thought. It is christologically centered, through and through.⁶ This centrality of christology within the formation of Christian theology has been affirmed and re-affirmed since the First World War, then, mainly as a result of Barth's writings. George Craig Stewart in the Christian Century series "How My Mind Has Changed" gave this testimony in 1939:

If I dare not say my mind has become more Christianized, I can say that it has become more and more Christ centered and, I think, Christ controlled. In the field of theology, Christology has become increasingly a paramount interest. In the field of social adjustment I have seen Christ as the only guide. In evangelism I have come to know more and more nothing and to preach nothing but Christ crucified.

The ironic aspect of Stewart's comments is that the Fundamentalists, whom Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the Christian Century, so soundly condemned, sought to emphasize this christological center of the Christian faith.⁸ Commenting of the twelve volume series The Fundamentals, Stewart Cole has noted:

The central figure in the writings of the twelve volumes was the person of Christ. With rare exceptions He occupied the preeminent place in every article contributed regardless of the subject of the nature treated.⁹

It must be acknowledged that Cole's assertion seems to run counter to the claim by George Marsden that the crucial issue in The Fundamentals:

. . . seems rather to have been perceived as that of the authority of God in Scripture in relation to the authority of modern science, particularly science in the form of higher criticism of the Scriptures themselves.¹⁰

Moreover, Cole's comment appears to contrast with Sawatsky's conclusion that:

. . . there is no doubt that the main issue which occupied the attention of the proto-fundamentalists in the two decades before WWI was the presentation and defense of the Bible as the authoritative and plenary inspired Word of God.¹¹

The apparent discrepancy between Cole's comments and those of Marsden and Sawatsky, among others, is resolved, however, by a realization of the unbreakable unity which the Fundamentalists (past and present) claimed in connection with Christ and the Scriptures. J. I. Packer, a modern Conservative, but one who, in this regard, has faithfully preserved former Fundamentalist arguments has written:

"What think ye of the Old Testament?" resolves itself into the question, "What think ye of Christ?" And our answer to the first proclaims our answer to the second.¹²

This perceived connection between Jesus Christ and the scriptures will be examined later. What must be emphasized in the context of this present discussion is that differences of opinion concerning the thematic unity of

The Fundamentals, as to whether scriptural authority was the chief concern of the authors or whether the person and work of Christ was the main concern, are a natural result of the inseparable connection between the two in Fundamentalist thought. What is important to state at this point, however, is that in his early years of ministry Shields gave priority to Christ over the scriptures. Consequently, he approached the scriptures in a far different manner in the early years of his ministry than he did in his ministry during the critical decade of the 1920's.

For the early Shields the central question was not Packer's question "What think ye of the Old Testament?" but the foundational question "What think ye of Christ?" In this approach, Shields echoed the sentiments of such influential leaders as the American Baptist theologian Augustus Strong who, early in the twentieth century, wrote:

. . . Christ is not only the central point of Christianity, but he is Christianity itself -- the embodied reconciliation and union between God and Man.¹³

Thus, in a sermon which Shields used to introduce himself to the pastorates of both Dutton in 1895 and, later, Delhi in 1897 he had this to say concerning the thrust of his ministry:

And so, dear friends, I wish this morning, having accepted your invitation to become your

pastor, to let you know, that I have come among you to divide the word of truth. . . . Or in the words of Paul, "I [have] determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."¹⁴

This centrality of Christ is well illustrated by a 1895 sermon where Shields adopted a four point outline; "in Revelation Christ is all, in Justification Christ is all, in Sanctification Christ is all, in Glorification Christ is all."¹⁵ Little wonder that in a note which his father had written concerning a 1899 sermon on the "Dreyfus Case" this comment appeared:

I think this sermon is well conceived, well worked out, and beautifully adapted to exalt Jesus; and with his blessing must have done good.¹⁶

This focus on the person and work of Christ meant that during the pre-Jarvis St. period, although an intimate connection between the Bible and Christ was always adhered to by Shields and no conflict was seen to exist between the two, they were not to be conflated. In a 1903 sermon, for example, although closely connected, Christ was still treated as pre-eminent over the scriptures:

Christianity is king among religions: the Bible is king among books; Jesus is King among men! But you must do better than that. Christianity has no place among religions it is **the** religion. The Bible is not be classified with other books. It is **the** book. And you have not read the writing on the cross until you have learned that Jesus of Nazareth is **the** King.¹⁷

Another testimony to the pre-eminence of Christ (although it is worth noting that as in Shields' 1903 sermon

the Bible is mentioned in first place instead of Christ) is found in the first sermon which Shields preached, in the new church building which was constructed at Adelaide Street some two years after he began his ministry there. Using this occasion to preach on the "things most surely believed" Shields concluded:

I therefore point you to this word as our authority -- to the cross -- the sinners' only hope -- to the empty grave whence our great conqueror rose -- I point you to the opened heavens -- the gates of pearl thrown wide for you and bid you look to Jesus. This is all my message -- Jesus! Jesus! Jesus!¹⁸

In a sermon on Thomas' confession of Christ preached in 1912 during the early years of his Jarvis Street ministry, however, subtle but important changes began to occur in Shields' christology. A symptom of this change was a stress on the person and work of Christ using creedalistic rather than experiential terms:

Look at his [i.e. Thomas's] confession as embodying the essentials of a Christian **creed**. A man may have and hold many peculiar views, but he must have Christ, who or what He is, or he is not a Christian.¹⁹ [emphasis mine]

Christ was still central within Shields' theology but the centrality, increasingly, was a creedalistic one in which all truth, theological and scientific, was seen by Shields to be dependent upon one's christological perspective. In another sermon preached in 1912, Shields noted; "our attitude toward human thought in all realms whether of religion or science will be determined by our attitude

toward Christ."²⁰ Increasingly, then, Shields' focus was on doctrinal concerns as he lashed out at any talk of a Christianity in which there was seen to be a separation between the person and the **teachings** of Christ:

Christianity is inseparable from the person of Christ. You cannot have Christianity without the teachings of Christ; nor can you separate the teachings of Christ from the Person of Christ, because the teachings of Christ gathered about His own person.²¹

Thus, as Shields grew more conservative and militant in his theological perspective his perspective on Christ began to change. His early emphasis on the pietistic Christ, the Christ who tugged at the heartstrings and who could never be confined within finite human doctrine received less and less prominence while the emphasis on a dogmatic christology became more prominent. As Shields' theological conservatism grew even more pronounced, then, the importance of safeguarding the centrality of the person of Christ increasingly was based upon Christ's role in the authentication and preservation of doctrinal truth. In an address delivered at a pre-Convention Conference in 1921 in Des Moines this emphasis was clearly discernible as Shields, speaking to an American audience, noted:

If Christ be fallible and the Scriptures untrustworthy who shall tell us of our state? Or who shall show us the path of life? The doctrines of the fall of man; of sin and its punishment; of the new birth; of justification by faith; of the ministry of the Holy Spirit; of the resurrection of the dead; of the second advent; of the judgement to come all these

doctrines fail, and the whole historic evangelical position crumbles with the surrender of the infallibility and eternal sonship of Jesus Christ.²²

With Christ having been reduced to the guarantor of the veracity of key conservative doctrines, however, it was almost inevitable that an emphasis on Christ, who could never be confined to doctrinal truth,²³ would be replaced by an emphasis on the scriptures. This conflation of Christ and the Bible, followed by the subsequent substitution of the Bible as the mediator between God and humanity will be examined in a subsequent chapter. It must be noted, however, in this introduction to the centrality of Christ within the theology of T. T. Shields, that by the early 1920s, if not as early as the start of the First World War, this centrality had already become one which tended to exist in name only. An important change had taken place as an emphasis on Christ, even defined in creedalistic terms, gave way to an emphasis on the centrality of the scriptures.²⁴ In the end, the centrality of Christ which Shields exemplified in his early years of ministry and which he sought to protect became a victim of the growing theological tensions which would erupt in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy of the 1920's.

In spite of this marked change in his thinking, though, Shields continued to display, from time to time, a pietistic edge which surfaced within his pulpit ministry. Moreover, in spite of later changes in theological

emphasis Shields' **original** theological vision was clearly a christological one. Thus, the oversight of Fundamentalist studies has been particularly noteworthy in this regard. Discussions and analysis of pre-millennial thought or of a plenary inerrant view of the scriptures are important, but the Fundamentalism of T. T. Shields was not so impoverished that more substantive theological issues, and particularly his christological thought, can be ignored. Indeed, it is debatable whether Fundamentalism as a whole should be treated in such a cavalier way. Jerry Falwell, a modern Fundamentalist leader, has noted:

The deity of Christ is really the most essential fundamental of all. Attention has shifted in the past decade to the issue of the inspiration of Scripture, since it is from Scripture that Evangelicals derive their basic doctrinal beliefs. Nevertheless, the basic issue that was strongly defended by the early Fundamentalists was the person of Christ.²⁵

This centrality of Christ for all theological thinking, coupled with the strong emphasis which Shields placed upon the person and work of Christ in his pre-war ministries, means that Shields' christological thought is an excellent avenue for an understanding of his theology. Moreover, because of his stature within North American Fundamentalism such an approach also results in fruitful insights into Fundamentalist theology as a whole within the critical years of 1894 to 1930.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST²⁶

Christ as God

To understand fully Shields' depiction of the person of Christ it is important to note that Shields moved very quickly in his theological thinking from a trinitarian to a christomonistic emphasis. This came about mainly as a result of his desire to safeguard the divinity of Christ from "modernistic" reductions. Moreover, it is fair to claim that this change paralleled his movement from an experiential to a creedalistic understanding of the place of Christ within the formulation of Christian faith. In his earlier years of ministry Shields managed to avoid conflating the person of God the Father with that of God the Son. He strongly protested against any reductionism of Jesus, but he did so within the boundaries of a trinitarian view of God which he defined by means of four assertions:

This is the standard definition of the Trinity:
(1) The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God. (2) Each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the others. (3) Neither is God without the others. (4) Each with the others is God.²⁷

Although, in accuracy of fact, it must be admitted that Shields' trinitarianism was one in which the role of the Spirit was hardly ever mentioned, nonetheless, it was an important feature of his early view of the person of Christ. Indeed, as a result of this strong trinitarian view of God, Shields was concerned about the impact of

alternative views of Christ which so elevated him in regard to the person of God the Father that a tritheistic rather than a trinitarian view resulted. In an August 1896 sermon he warned:

I suppose there is not a person here this morning who does not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity or Triunity: the doctrine that there are three persons in one God. And yet there are many persons who profess to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity who, through lack of teaching from others, or failure in examination for themselves, do really believe in a doctrine of Tritheism.²⁸

By the start of his ministry in the Jarvis Street Church, however, concerns about the debilitating effects of a tritheistic interpretation of the trinity had been long since replaced by concerns about unitarian beliefs which he saw as being rampant, even within supposedly conservative churches. In a 1912 sermon Shields noted:

There is a view of Christ and the New Testament which, while not called by the name is closely akin to Unitarianism. I venture to think that Unitarianism is doing its most blighting, deadliest work in nominally evangelical pulpits.²⁹

While Shields' concerns about tritheism were prompted by his worry that the persons of the trinity might be separated from each other, his attack on unitarianism was prompted by concerns about a conflation of the persons of the trinity. Such a conflation ended up in Shields' view undermining the "essential deity" of Christ which became such an important category within his christology. Indeed, it was this emphasis on the "essential deity" of Jesus

which by the start of Shields' ministry at Jarvis Street in 1910 had become his chief definition of the person of Christ. Shields always believed in the deity of Christ as the predominant theme which had to be emphasized in any discussion of the person of Christ. Allusions to Christ's essential deity occur as early as 1905 when Shields noted that Christ's "Deity is essential"³⁰ to any true understanding of the atonement. Widespread use of the phrase, however, did not occur until after Shields move to Toronto. An example of this is found in a March 30, 1912 sermon where he notes:

I say then that Jesus entered upon his ministry in full consciousness of his **essential Deity**, with full knowledge of every word which God had spoken to men, both in nature and in providence, and in the inspired record of revelation contained in the Old Testament.³¹ [emphasis mine]

His use of this phrase was compatible with a move away, not only from a trinitarian coloration of the Godhead, but even from a Christo-monistic expression towards a full-blown modalistic emphasis. Such an emphasis can be traced to as early as 1903 when, in a sermon on Christ Jesus, Shields explained

Jesus, and He is God, most emphatically, He is God -- **God never said**, He never did a mightier thing than this, "I lay down my life, that I may take it up again."³² [emphasis mine]

It is of interest, then, that what became the chief characteristic of T. T. Shields' view of the person of Christ was not one which surfaced strongly in his early

pastorates. In the three pastorates which he served before moving to Hamilton in 1900 the chief theological issues which preoccupied him were concerns over adult versus pedobaptism as well as a growing frustration that many churches had downplayed the reality and existence of hell. The reason for this early silence on what was to become a predominant concern may have been due to the fact that in his pre-1900 years the "essential deity" of Christ was something which was taken for granted by him and his parishioners. Shields did not see the need for the strong defense which he provided for this belief later in his ministry.

Nonetheless, in sermon preached in 1896 it is clear that Shields believed in the deity of Christ and that such a view was part of his theology from the start of his pastoral ministry:

. . . we must believe in the Deity of Christ. I affirm that until a man believes that Jesus is the Son of God. He cannot be saved.³³

What this emphasis on the deity of Christ meant for Shields was that Christ was God. Commenting on the intellectual superiority of Jesus, Shields observed:

Men have spent their lives in universities, and their pens have written wonderful words, but since the world was no words have equalled in power or influence the works of this one who never learned. What is the reason. Christ is God.³⁴

In the early years of his ministry, however, Shields

did not depict this divinity of Jesus in ways which would leave him open to charges of modalism. His trinitarian definition which has already been referred to safeguarded him from such a view. By the time Shields had accepted the call of the Adelaide Street Baptist Church to serve as their pastor, however, the connection between this deity of Christ and one of the trademarks of Fundamentalism had been made. It was the combination of a stress on the supernaturalism of Christ coupled with a stress on the deity of Christ which pushed Shields in the direction of a modalistic expression of the Godhead. According to Shields, it was the deity of Christ which served as the foundation and principal element within a Christianity which was **supernaturally** conceived:

. . . this supernatural Book which speaks of a supernatural Person, who died, if I may so say, a supernatural death, who rose again by a supernatural life, all promise the perpetual promise of a supernatural power.³⁵

Shields' emphasis upon the supernatural nature of Christ flowed from his belief in the essential deity of Christ and was an emphasis which he held in common with many other conservative church leaders of his day. For example, B. B. Warfield of the Princeton School wrote that the significance of the Gospel portrayals of Jesus consisted of this stress on the supernaturalism of Jesus:

. . . the portrait of Jesus as the supernatural son of God who came into the world as the Messiah on a mission of mercy to sinful men . . . is as old as

Christianity itself and comes straight from the representations of Christ's first followers.³⁶

That the supernaturalism of Shields was common to many Fundamentalists is also supported by Russell's conclusion concerning such Fundamentalist leaders as J. Frank Norris, William B. Riley, and John Roach Stratton:

Theologically, they were united in a belief in the supernatural. Religion for them was an objective, divine "given" from a transcendent God, rooted not in human aspiration, exhortation, or meditation, but in the historical facts of the birth, life, death and resurrection of Jesus.³⁷

It was this conflict between naturalism and supernaturalism which the Fundamentalists (Shields included) saw as the primary issue of contention between Fundamentalism and Modernism. Russell notes:

There were many differences between the liberals and the fundamentalists, but as the latter saw it, the crucial issue was naturalism versus supernaturalism.³⁸

What this supernaturalism of Jesus meant for Shields was that:

. . . He [i.e. Jesus] was not born from below but from above. By the law of divine intervention, He entered into human history. No mechanical theory of the universe can account for Him. No such character as Jesus could ever have entered into human history but by the principle He Himself enunciated, "I came down from heaven."³⁹

This supernaturalistic depiction of Jesus and, by extension that of the Christian faith, provided a strong negation to modernistic attempts to explain the scriptural miracles through natural phenomena. For Shields, this

attempt by the Modernists was a crass and destructive form of reductionism. Defending the supernatural nature of Christianity he counselled his readers:

. . . to be on guard against . . . the attitude of the Modernism. It denies that God has spoken in any supernatural way or that He has ever wrought in any supernatural way, but rather that He has shut himself up within the law He has made, that he cannot, or, at all events, does not suspend them, and that He works only by natural laws.⁴⁰

It is interesting to note in light of Shields' movement away from an experiential to a creedalistic appropriation of Christ that Shields' supernaturalistic emphasis had more affinity with Thomistic thought than it did with Martin Luther's theological system which was centered in the relationship and difference between Law and Grace. The roots of this emphasis on supernaturalism extend back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries when supernaturalism arose as a reaction to "the intellectual abandonment of the unity of the medieval order."⁴¹ While Roman Catholic supernaturalism resulted in the movements known as Fideism and Traditionalism, both of which were rejected by the Church, Fundamentalist supernaturalism did not become anti-rationalistic but held firmly to two levels of knowledge both of which were perceived to be in harmony with each other. This was clear in Shield's emphasis upon the twin realities of moral and natural law. In his thinking moral law was founded upon special revelation and natural law upon reason, but they

were not to be set in contradiction to each other for together they formed a unified structure of truth in which revelation provided knowledge about God and God's will for humanity, while reason provided knowledge about the sensory world.⁴²

It was this stress that Shields placed upon the supernaturalism of Christ which paved the way for, and, indeed, made inevitable the substitution of Christ by the Bible. Once Jesus was conceived as essential deity, and as the Supernatural One, he became so removed from the life of humanity that his mediatorial role almost vanished. This, of course, was not Shields' intention, but as a subsequent chapter will show, it was certainly the result of his stress on the supernaturalism of Christ. By 1923, for example, emphasis upon Christ had been so eclipsed by an emphasis on the Bible that Shields had to state this correction:

The resurrection was the complement of a supernatural birth. The supernaturalism of the Bible is nowadays very generally rejected; but this is all focused, at last, not upon the inspiration of Scripture -- that is only incidental, that is only part of the road that leads to the main citadel of truth: the supreme thing is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.⁴³

The "supreme thing" about the person of Jesus Christ which had to be believed and defended was his essential deity, which was; "essential to the integrity of revelation . . . essential to atonement . . . essential to

complete redemption.⁴⁴ It was, however, this insistence that Christ was essential deity which was the most important factor in removing Christ from his mediatorial position as the God-Man. Indeed, so important was the essential deity of Christ for Shields that he could state categorically concerning the early Church community:

. . . there was not one man, there was not one woman, who found a place in the fellowship of those early believers who had the shadow of a ghost of a doubt as to the essential Deity of Jesus Christ. **If anyone doubts that he has no place in a Christian church.**⁴⁵ [emphasis mine]

Shields' stress upon the essential deity of Christ, couched in supernatural terms and overlaid with modalistic hues, was one which was common to other Fundamentalists. From his study on Fundamentalism James Barr provides this summary of the typical Fundamentalist answer to the question -- "Who is Jesus?":

The basic answer furnished within fundamentalism is: Jesus is God. He is the Son of God, supernatural in essence, miraculously manifested within the world in human form.⁴⁶

That such a stress came dangerously close to a docetic and monophysitic view of Christ has not escaped scholarly censure. Barr has noted:

In terms of traditional orthodoxy, there is at least one major point at which fundamentalist faith could probably be considered heretical or unorthodox, and that is the view of the person of Christ⁴⁷

Stevick is even more pointed when he writes:

Of several incipient heresies in Fundamentalism,

the most noticeable is Docetism -- the turning of Jesus' humanity into a mere appearance. Fundamentalist piety and preaching insist so vehemently on the deity of Jesus Christ that his manhood is made unreal. The incarnation becomes like one of the appearances of the gods in Greek mythology -- the god masquerades as a man.⁴⁸

To accuse Fundamentalism of holding views of the person of Christ that were docetic is understandable. More accurate, however, at least in regard to Shields, would be the charge of monophysitism rather than that of docetism, although the two are theologically related to each other. Shields' primary definition of Christ as essential deity coupled with his emphasis upon the omniscience of Christ as well as his contention that Christ's death on the cross was not caused by the physical act of crucifixion point in the direction of monophysitism. These will be discussed later, but it is important to underscore the fact that for Shields the essential deity of Christ meant that the divine had so fused with the human that, in effect, the divine predominated. Thus, Shields counselled his parishoners:

You must not say that the death of Christ was caused by the cross of wood, by those who drove the nails and platted the thorns and pierced Him with a spear. These instruments could never terminate the life of the Son of God, an indissoluble life.⁴⁹

This same monophysitic perspective undergirded Shields' confidence in Christ's journey through life:

He [i.e. Jesus] never changed His plan; he never turned from His predetermined course by a hair's breath. He never turned a single step from the path

appointed. He went sovereignly to His goal -- and nobody could stop Him for Jesus was God.⁵⁰

Moreover, it was the essential deity of Christ which lent a modalistic hue to Shields' treatment of Christ, for such a stress meant that God and Christ were viewed as almost indetical and, at the very least, indivisible beings:

What is Jesus Christ to you? To me, He is the Son of God, who was begotten of the Holy Spirit. To me, He is the only God, I know. I do not know of any other God than Jesus Christ.⁵¹

Christ as Man

Shields' stress on the essential deity of Jesus so thoroughly dominated his analysis and treatment of the person of Christ that even when he did discuss the humanity of Jesus it was a humanity which was depicted in god-like terms. As early as 1900 when he discussed the physical appearance of Jesus, Shields stated:

I have no doubt that physically Jesus was "altogether lovely." This fine portraiture is without doubt literally descriptive of the physical beauty of our Beloved. Never was a more kingly head, and not even Samson or Absoloam's locks, methinks, were worthy to be compared with his.⁵²

This tendency to minimize the humanity of Christ increased markedly in the 1920's. Thus, in a 1923 sermon this emphasis on the physical perfection of Jesus as a result of his deity and consequent sinlessness was elaborated on as Shields advanced the claim that Jesus was

physically stronger and healthier than other human beings:

I think I may state very positively, that by virtue of the fact that His body was without taint of sin, His body must have been the more invulnerable and less susceptible to the attacks of disease, better fortified against the approach of death . . .
53

In light of his emphasis on the physical strength of Jesus, Shields was faced with the question as to why Jesus died quite quickly when crucified on the cross in comparison to the thieves who were crucified with him. Shields answered by noting that the punishment which Jesus received prior to his crucifixion would have been more than enough to kill an "ordinary" man:

Have you ever wondered that Jesus did not die in Gethsemane? others have sweat drops of blood in hours of extreme anguish, but invariably they died. Jesus alone survived such grief as that. Had he been a man only, your forty-nine lashes would have killed him . . .
54

Shields' attitude towards the humanity of Jesus was that it was clearly secondary to the deity of Jesus. How much this was dependent upon the polarization of the Fundamentalist-Modernistic controversy and how much was integral to Shields' christology and would naturally have developed in spite of theological controversy is difficult to say. Certainly the "humanistic" Christ of the Modernists held no appeal for Shields at all. In fact, so intense was his desire to avoid what he took to be reductionism concerning Christ's deity that in a 1917 sermon he spoke of the relativism of truth, an

uncharacteristic turn of phrase in one who depicted truth as absolute and unchanging:

Any affirmation concerning Christ can only be conditionally and relatively true. For instance: He was a good man -- it is not true unless you can add, "Yea, rather, He is the God-Man" The first cannot be true without the last. Claiming to be God, He must have been what He said He was, or He could not have been even good. Thus the perfection of His humanity depends upon the reality of Deity.⁵⁵

Logically, then, Shields could not allow for any "kenotic" element within his depiction of the humanity of Jesus:

I say then that Jesus entered upon his ministry in full consciousness of His essential Deity, with full knowledge of every word which God had spoken to men, both in nature and in providence, and the inspired record of revelation contained in the Old Testament.⁵⁶

Such a position concerning Christ, however, destroys his humanity. Unless our christology is informed by the kenotic dimension in some way, the humanity of Jesus is so overshadowed by the deity of Jesus that it virtually disappears as a significant element within the person of Christ. Quite rightly Helmut Thielicke warned against such a treatment of Christ:

A christology which fails to check the natural thrust of the concept of nature towards absorption of the human nature into the divine nature comes suspiciously close to mythology.⁵⁷

This "mythological" thrust of Shields' christology would have very serious implications for his treatment of the scriptures and his view of the Christian's mission

within the world. As a result of such a thrust the Bible came almost to be treated as a paper deity which, like Joseph Smith's golden plates, fell from heaven -- ready-made and without error. Moreover, the witness of Christians as individuals became something which was confined to evangelism alone, in spite of the fact that Shields' Fundamentalist beliefs gave him a perspective on life which would have been useful in tempering the captivity of the Canadian Church by the forces of secular modernity.

Interestingly, in only one aspect of his treatment of the humanity of Christ did Shields acknowledge Christ's humanity as an important consideration. That was in Shields' stress upon Christ's hard work, manliness and courage. This theme surfaced very early in his ministry. In an evening sermon preached in 1897 he declared:

It will be our endeavour this evening to show you that Christ was not the inculcator of a long-faced, broken hearted, tear-stained religion, but the very opposite of that. Jesus was a Conqueror. . . .⁵⁸

One reason why Jesus was a conqueror was a result of Jesus' willingness to work hard:

. . . when Pilate pointed to Jesus and cried, "Behold the Man," he pointed to **the World's Highest Example of Industry**. It has been supposed by some lazy people that work is part of the punishment of sin; and they have imagined that if sin had not cursed the earth every life had been lived idleness. Nothing could be farther from the truth.⁵⁹

The manliness and willingness to work hard which

Jesus displayed was important for Shields because of Shields' individualistic view of the Christian life.⁶⁰ Indeed, one of Shields' greatest concerns in connection with Modernism was its stress on social evil and social salvation. In Shields' view such an emphasis tended to undermine the importance of individual sin, and by doing so, thereby robbed the individual of responsibility and of dignity.

In his perspective on the "manliness" of Christ Shields once again revealed his affinity with other Fundamentalists who stressed similar themes. Douglas Frank has noted this theme of manliness within Billy Sunday's sermons:

Some of Billy Sunday's most popular and widely quoted sermons were those he delivered to men only, which he did several times during each major campaign. These sermons, of course, were laden with references to manhood, its necessity and its character.⁶¹

The individualistic vision which supported and necessitated a manly spirit has been underscored by several scholars of North American Fundamentalism. Martin Marty has noted that:

Almost all observers have agreed with participants that Fundamentalism is in many respects a highly individualized version of Christian faith. The fundamentalists for the most part are church members, but they are not "churchly" in a sacramental sense.⁶²

Louis Gaspar has stated that this stress on the individual has been "one of the main characteristics of fundamentalism."⁶³ According to Robert Handy, Fundamentalism's

stress on individualism was the legacy of the nineteenth century. He summarizes the point in these words:

. . . orthodox Protestantism had grown up with the individualism that characterized nineteenth-century America, had contributed to its rise and found it thoroughly congenial.⁶⁴

In both Christ's essential deity and his humanity, then, Shields saw a superiority and beauty which ensured that of the three persons of the Trinity, Christ was always pre-eminent. Indeed, so pre-eminent was the person of Christ that the charge of modalism is one which applies to Shields' christological thought between the years 1900 and the First World War, after which the scriptures began to predominate. Even then, Shields maintained a modalistic perspective on the Godhead which minimized the role of God the Father and God the Spirit. Of course, if questioned on this Shields would have responded, it seems clear, with a trinitarian declaration of belief; but Modernism's attempt, as he saw it, to disparage this centrality of Christ so troubled Shields that concerns about too heavy a stress on the person of Christ did not enter his thinking. His concern, after his very early years of ministry when the spectre of tritheism did bother him, was directed solely against any reduction of the status of Christ:

"The old religion is passing," they say. On every hand you hear it. The logic of majorities is urged against orthodoxy. The majority take a new view of Christ and the Gospel. He is no longer the mighty, miracle-working, life-giving Son of God -- but

something less than that.⁶⁵

To make Christ less than the mighty, miracle-working, life-giving Son of God, however, was to let go of what defined Christianity. As Shields thundered in 1906; "let no man talk of faith who gives Jesus any subordinate place."⁶⁶ In his depiction of the person of Christ, Shields, in the pre-war years at least, maintained this centrality of Christ for faith. In a 1904 sermon he declared movingly:

Jesus Christ is at once the archetype and the antitype of everything that is beautiful, blessed and true. He is the original and the ultimate of absolute perfection, the Alpha and the Omega of righteousness and love.⁶⁷

It is clear, then, that in reference to the two great divergent approaches typified by an Alexandrian christology versus an Antiochene christology Shields sided firmly with the former over the latter.⁶⁸ Because of this "Alexandrian perspective" Shields was never able to do justice to the incarnation of Christ. Here his docetic tendencies received clear expression, even in his early years of ministry, as when in an 1897 sermon he described the "incarnate Son of God" as "the immortal Spirit clothed with a material body."⁶⁹

Of course, Shields also had trouble with the implications of the incarnation because he adopted the typically Protestant view which treated the cross and the resurrection experiences as the foundational elements

within Christ's life, minimizing the importance of the incarnation:

Until the day break and the shadows fly away the Incarnation must remain a problem and a paradox But the incomparable wonder of infinite magnitude is the cross of Christ. Is it an exhibition of mercy and grace? Is it a mistake, a miscarriage of Justice? Or is it, in any case, a suspension of power? Look at it! God stabbed to the heart by a human hand.⁷⁰

In regard to the question of the pre-existence of Christ Shields, as may be anticipated, was firmly in support of Christ's pre-existence. Indeed, Shields even went so far as to assert that the pre-existent state of Christ was one in which already the uniting of the deity and humanity of Christ was, at least academically, a reality:

I remind you, first of all, that the Incarnation is a perpetual fact, an abiding reality I fear that sometimes believers think of the Incarnation as a mere parenthesis in the life of our Lord, as something which began at Jerusalem, and which terminated at the ascension.⁷¹

Shields adopted, then, a Calvinistic interpretation versus a Lutheran interpretation of the bodily presence of Christ in the "heavens." According to Shields:

Jesus Christ, in his own person, has united Deity and humanity, and he has carried a redeemed, a glorified body with Him to the throne of heaven and there appears in the divine presence for us.⁷²

Surprisingly, in light of Shields' stress on the essential deity of Christ, his treatment of the virgin birth was remarkably muted, especially in comparison with the prominence which it received within Fundamentalist-

Modernist controversy. He did, however, use the virgin birth as a counterpart to the resurrection:

These two truths are complementary to each other -- the virgin birth, and the physical resurrection of our Lord; for if it be true that He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, and that He was begotten again from the dead by divine power, that His is the one authoritative voice in all the universe which should command the attention of men everywhere.⁷³

Besides helping to delineate one stage in the existence of Jesus the Christ, Shields' other use of the virgin birth was to undergird the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ. In response to a rhetorical question as to why Jesus did not need to be "born again" Shields replied, "He was begotten of the Holy Ghost. He was human, but He was divine."⁷⁴ Once again, then, it was the divinity of Christ which Shields was anxious to assert and to support.

THE WORK OF CHRIST

The Way of Salvation

If the "essential deity" became the fundamental category in which Shields conceived of the person of Christ, it is the "way of salvation" which was his fundamental construct in his analysis of the work of Christ. In notes for a sermon delivered in 1897 he wrote about four ways in which human beings have tried to obtain salvation; "the legal way . . . the 'do the best you can way' . . . the 'doing no harm' way . . . and the way of

faith.⁷⁵

In his analysis and depiction of the work of Christ Shields, therefore, displayed a much greater consistency between early and later views than was the case with his thought on the person of Christ. In part this may have been due to the fact that the theological tensions between the conservatives and the Modernists revolved around the person of Christ rather than the work of Christ. It may also have been a result of the rationalistic emphasis of Fundamentalists such as Shields, an emphasis which was more at home in speculations concerning Christ's person than in discussions concerning Christ's work. The Fundamentalists would not have disagreed with the celebrated statement, originally attributed to Melanchthon, that to know Christ was to know his benefits. They were, however, clearly more attuned to the doctrinal rather than the experiential.

Differences of perspective, nevertheless, also existed between the conservatives and the Modernists in regard to their understanding of the work of Christ. Wolfhart Pannenberg, writing about the liberal tradition with which the Modernists were more comfortable, has noted:

If one compares neo-Protestant Christology -- whether in its religious form, as in Schleiermacher, or in the religious-ethical form of Ritschl -- . . . , one notices the modesty of its soteriological interests. The neo-Protestant theologians are

concerned only with making possible the humanness of life on earth Precisely because overcoming death through a transcendent being is not an issue here at all, one also cannot speak of a vicarious penal suffering of Jesus through which sin is overcome at a level which is inaccessible to us. . . . The soteriological interest is limited here to the life on earth.⁷⁶

Nonetheless, in spite of such differences concerning the work of Christ the main point of contention centered in the issues of Christ's humanity and Christ's deity.

Another factor in support of this great measure of consistency with regard to the work of Christ may well have been the strong Reformational slogan of salvation by grace to which Shields subscribed. While this slogan has often been misinterpreted in the form of "salvation by faith" rather than "salvation by grace through faith," its very existence and use was a stabilizing influence upon Shields in his approach to the work of Christ.

The differences which occur, then, are more subtle and are differences of tone more than of content. In Shields' earliest years of ministry a much greater emphasis was placed, as might be expected, on the love of God. Several times Shields quoted F. W. Faber's hymn:

There's a wideness in God's mercy,
Like the wideness of the sea;
There's a kindness in His justice,
That is more than liberty.
For the love of God is broader
Than the measure of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal,
Is most wonderfully kind.⁷⁷

Indeed, in one of the first sermons that Shields preached

he advanced the claim that, "the law glorified only the justice of God, while the Gospel glorifies His justice and mercy, and proves that 'God is Love.'"⁷⁸ Thus, while the twin themes of God's justice and God's mercy were always a part of Shields' theological perspective it was the theme of God's love which predominated in his earliest pastorates.

The way of salvation became much narrower and stricter, taking on strong creedalistic hues, in Shields' later years of ministry than was the case in his first three pastorates. An exclusivistic elaboration, however, was evident from the very beginning of his preaching as Shields thought that this "way of salvation" was the only way in which salvation could be obtained. Prompted by a desire to see people "won to Christ" he cried out in 1897:

O brethren! To see the work of God not prospering -- to see souls on every hand without Christ, without hope, without God! and at the same time to see that there are but a few who seem to care for the souls of men -- that is enough to try an angel's courage.⁷⁹

This pathway of salvation centred in the person of Jesus Christ rather than in ecclesiastical obedience. Moreover, in 1899, at least, Shields was able to differentiate between faith about the person and work of Christ and faith in Christ:

You are not called to a church but to Christ, you are not asked to believe a creed but Christ, not human opinion but Christ, Christianity is not a set

of principles but principles incarnate in a person --
in Christ.⁸⁰

This salvation incarnated in Christ was conceived of, not in social but in individualistic terms. The transformation of society was secondary. The primary need was for individual conversion through Christ:

And so I say, more than a teacher, more than a scientist, more than a poet or a philosopher, more even than a perfect example men need a Savior. Therefore we must preach it again and again, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."⁸¹

The salvation won for the individual by Christ was pictured by Shields in various ways. Pre-eminently it meant assurance of heaven in the life to come. This stress on the future life underscored the truth that Jesus alone could be spoken of as a "savior." As Shields noted: "our Lord Jesus alone established communication between this life and the next, and declared himself to be the Way, the truth and the life."⁸²

As might be expected in light of its historic linkages with an Alexandrian interpretation of christology, the theme of the divinization of the human being was another way in which Shields depicted the salvific process. In a concluding prayer he said:

We thank Thee, O Lord, for thine abounding grace. We thank Thee for Him who understands us so well, who, by His Deity is linked with God, is God and by His humanity lays hold of us, and lifts us up even now into the heavenly places, and presently into Heaven itself, to stand at last clothed in his perfect righteousness in all the blazing light and glory of that Celestial City, without fault before

the Throne of God. Amen.⁸³

More typically, however, Shields used the language of regeneration to describe what this way of salvation in Christ involved. In his book of sermons entitled Revelations of the War he wrote:

All this I have said for the sole purpose of proving that there can be no heaven for unchanged human nature; and that not one can be a citizen of the New Jerusalem who is only civilized, and educated, and religious. Salvation consists in a personal experience of the regenerating grace of the Spirit of God: "Ye must be born again."⁸⁴

As the way of salvation, Jesus became in Shields' understanding the yardstick by which all of life had to be measured, and to whom all of life had to be subjugated:

If we become rightly adjusted to Him we shall be rightly adjusted to life itself; and until we have reached our decision in respect to Jesus Christ, the lesser issues of life are not settled, and our course cannot be determined.⁸⁵

Often Shields would use a little poem which he likely wrote himself to express this fundamental principle; "What think ye of Christ is the test, To try both your plan and your scheme; You cannot be right in the rest, Unless you think rightly of him."⁸⁶

Although centered on future redemption, it would not be fair to depict this way of salvation as having efficacy only for the future. Once one has been rightly oriented to God and life through Christ, an inner peace and joy is his/her reward:

It is a happy, a joyous thing, to be a

Christian; to be at peace with God; to choose the Prince of Peace and the Author of life; to be at one with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; to be at peace with the law of our own nature, and with the laws of the universe about us and with God above us.⁸⁷

Christ's claim to be the way of salvation for the individual was a result of Christ's obedience to the moral law and his substitutionary death on the cross. Of these two, although it is arguable, the cross predominated. In a sermon on Baptist missionary work given in 1899 he stated; " . . . if you want money for missions preach the cross."⁸⁸ Shields was deeply convinced that the loss of influence of the Christian Church was a direct result of a denial or at least denigration of the message of salvation through the blood of the cross. In a characteristic comment he noted in 1899:

Men are trying to reduce the blessed Gospel with its glorious cross to a bloodless religion, and then they wonder that men are not ready for sacrifice, willing for service."⁸⁹

Jesus could not be treated then as a social reformer but only as a sacrificial lamb:

Jesus did not come into the world to lift industrial burdens and remove social inequalities: He came not to be a Judge or divider: He did not come to set an example to a world dead in trespasses and sins. He came as the Lamb of Sacrifice to give his life a ransom for many. There is no salvation without sacrifice, no Gospel without a cross.⁹⁰

According to Shields, the cross was Jesus's future from the very start of his life. There was no room in Shields' christology for contingent events within Christ's

life. There was no sense that Christ forced the issue of the cross only when he saw that his teachings were not bringing the results which he anticipated. Instead, from Christ's birth his destiny was already decided. As Shields put it:

It was fitting and I say it reverently that Jesus should have been born in a stable and cradled in a manger, for he was from the beginning a Lamb of sacrifice. He was born to die.⁹¹

In his insistence upon the substitutionary theory of atonement, T. T. Shields was not unaware of or totally unappreciative of other theories. Increasingly, however, he viewed them as inferior, lacking the passion and the raw power which the substitutionary theory safeguarded. In a sermon on Jesus Christ preached in 1918 he noted that there were indeed, "other theories of the atonement," but they paled when viewed in the light of Jesus's "tears . . . bloody sweat . . . and stripes."⁹²

Theories of the atonement which stressed the example of Christ, or Christ as ransom from sin, or even Christ as the confirmation of God's governance were inadequate in Shields' opinion. He rejected the Abelardian, Grotian, and Classical theories of the atonement as being misleading. Increasingly, the only satisfactory view of the atonement was the explicitly substitutionary one, a theme which became more predominant in his preaching during his ministry in the Adelaide and Jarvis Street churches:

Will you bear in mind that **the ground of our salvation** and our entrance to heaven, that is to say, that which makes salvation possible, is the blood of Jesus, for that satisfies the law of God. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission."⁹³

It was only through this substitutionary work of Christ on the cross that God was able to reunite humanity with God as well as to effect an inner reconciliation within God. In this stress on God's self-reconciliation Shields reveals a key difference between his view of the atonement and that of Anselm (and to a lesser degree Calvin) who first proposed the substitutionary theory of the atonement. Anselm's stress on Christ as Man was far different than Shields' stress on Christ as God. As Shields noted:

I say, therefore, an atonement is necessary that God and man may be at one with other, and (I say it with the profoundest reverence) that God may be at one with Himself.⁹⁴

The cross of Christ and the substitutionary atonement were seen by Shields as central to any expression of the gospel⁹⁵ and key to the message of the scriptures:

There is no passage in the Word of God which does not bear a definite relation to the death of Christ, and to all that is involved in that tremendous, historic event. Therefore, all sermons, all preaching, ought to be directly related to the cross.⁹⁶

Indeed, for Shields, the cross of Christ was the lens through which all of life had to be viewed, if it was to be seen properly:

There is no interest of human life, nor paradox, nor problem, no mystery, which is not understandable at the cross. It is perfectly true that the cross is the ground of the individual sinner's hope, and the crucified is the individual believer's savior; but the cross and the resurrection together, "the Lamb as it has been slain," is the divine answer to universal human need.⁹⁷

This emphasis upon the one theory of the atonement to the virtual exclusion of other interpretations was not unique to Shields. Augustus Strong, in the early twentieth century, described in his Systematic Theology what the atonement meant for humanity, and described it in substitutionary terms:

The Atonement, then, on the part of God, has its ground (1) in the holiness of God, which must visit sin with condemnation, even though this condemnation brings death to his Son; and (2) in the love of God, which itself provides the sacrifice, by suffering in and with his Son for the sins of men, but through that suffering opening a way and means of salvation.⁹⁸

It is to be expected that Shields would have an affinity on this point with Strong since Shields saw himself as a part of the Reformed tradition. His agreement with that tradition, however, was not as complete as he himself would have claimed. Shields differed from the Reformed tradition in that he rejected Theodore Beza's theory of limited atonement (a theory which Calvin never expressly stated). Moreover, Shields differed from Calvin in that Calvin stressed the role of the Holy Spirit and the two natures of Christ to a much greater degree than Shields himself did. Another key difference is that in

regard to Calvin's discussion of the work of Christ in terms of the **triplex munus** Shields was strangely silent.

In connection with one important strand of Luther's christology Shields expressly disassociated himself from a Classical interpretation of the atonement. Moreover, his rationalistic stress and view of faith was not one which was guaranteed to make him appreciative of Luther or even of Lutheran orthodoxy. Indeed, from my study of Shields he did not seem to have availed himself of direct access to the writings of Calvin or of Luther. His Calvinism was filtered through later Calvinists. Of course, Shields did not write for an academic but rather a popular audience and with the dispersal of his library it is difficult to determine who the key academic figures were in the formation of his theological thinking.

In regard to Christ's fulfilment of the moral law, however, Shields was faithful to Reformed orthodoxy. Christ's sacrifice on the cross was depicted by Shields as the fitting complement and the highest expression of the perfect obedience which Jesus exemplified during his life and his death. In Shields' understanding of life there were two laws which governed all existence: the natural law, and the moral law which governed ethical and religious matters. These two legal systems were related to each other in a hierarchical fashion with the moral law

taking precedence over the natural law.

In a manner similar to the natural law, the moral law did not vary from country to country, culture to culture. As Shields put it:

. . . there is one God over all the earth and His law is one. For the ruling of individual and national life there is one moral law, one law for Britain and America, for Germany and Italy, for Austria and Russia, and Japan and Spain, for China, for Turkey and for France.⁹⁹

As a result of his strong stress on law, one of Shields' prime targets of attack and censure was anarchy. In a sermon on the subject of anarchism he noted that: "law is universal, and law is in force at the gates of hell if not hell itself. Not one of God's creatures animate or inanimate is without law"100

Along with this emphasis on the universality of law as something that remained constant throughout differing cultures, Shields also stressed the absolute consistency of the moral law. He noted: "the Ruler of the Universe does not like some human legislators contradict in one province of his wide domain that which He has written in another."¹⁰¹

In light of such an emphasis on the universality and unity of the moral law it is not surprising that Shields depicted the breach of any aspect of the moral law as being extremely serious. In graphic language he once stated:

A moral act is not ephemeral in its reach and influence, but eternal. It reaches forth into the future; either upward into heaven, or downward into hell.¹⁰²

It was this moral law which, for Shields, was the key definition of what it meant to be made in the image of God. Consequently, Christ's work consisted of obeying the moral law during his life and in paying the penalty for humanity's breach of the law by dying on the cross:

It was in this respect chiefly that man was made in the image of God, that the law of His nature was made the law of ours And just as the moral nature of God, demands satisfaction for sin, so does our own moral nature require to be appeased; and the moral faculty, conscience, defiled as it is, will never be wholly at rest, and never one with God until the penalty of sin is paid.¹⁰³

The essence of sin, therefore, was seen by Shields as something which broke this moral law. To sin was not to break relationship with God, except perhaps in a secondary sense; to sin was to break some aspect of the moral law. Shields put it this way:

I use the term "moral" in contra-distinction to that which is non-moral. The Christian revelation being an unfolding of truth concerning the laws of the moral realm, having to do with principles governing the oughtness of things, or of right conduct. Our attitude towards the revelation is an indication of our attitude towards the moral principles revealed, and therefore is chiefly determined by purely moral considerations.¹⁰⁴

Indeed, Shields became so emphatic about the moral law that not only did it serve to define the essential nature of the human being, it also was seen by him to be an essential aspect of God. It was for this reason that

Shields could not subscribe to the governmental theory as originally proposed by Hugo Grotius. In Shields' view God was so closely connected with the moral law: it formed such an integral part of his character, that only the substitutionary theory did justice to humanity's breach of the law:

. . . God is so identified with His law, -- or His law with Him, that the necessity for atonement lies, not in any system of law, not in any governmental form, but . . . is deeply based in the moral nature of God Himself; . . . sin is not an offense merely against man . . . sin always, as the cross reveals, at last wounds God, stabs Him to the heart, pierces the hand of omnipotence, and snatches the crown from the brow of Deity, to replace it with thorns.¹⁰⁵

This stress on the moral law was not unique to Shields. Grant Wacker, in his analysis of Fundamentalist definitions of a Christian society (as opposed to a secular society) has highlighted this concept of the moral law as an important window on Fundamentalism. In his opinion, American Fundamentalists shared three convictions:

Fundamental and buttressing all else, is the conviction that there are numerous moral absolutes human beings do not create but discover. In this case, the problem is, of course, that modern culture is deceived by the opposite notion: that moral standards are forged within specific historical settings and thus wobble from one context to another The second cornerstone of Christian civilization is the conviction that moral absolutes ought to form the visible portion of the laws that govern society The third cornerstone of Christian civilization is the conviction that the moral absolutes that undergird -- or ought to

undergird -- society's laws are commonly revealed in the Bible.¹⁰⁶

George Marsden also has emphasized the importance of the moral law for American Fundamentalists, and, like Wacker, analyzed it within the context of a Fundamentalist vision for society:

The relationship of God's law to the nation was thus the key factor in shaping American evangelical social, political, and economic views. The success of the nation depended directly on her virtue. God would bless or curse nations that kept or broke his laws. He would administer these blessings or curses in two basic ways. One way was through special providences. . . . The second way of administering justice, however, was built into the nature of things. God had structured the moral law into the universe with many inbuilt rewards or punishments.¹⁰⁷

In Shields' thought the operation of the moral law within society was important, vitally important; but even more important was the interplay between the demands of the moral law and the personhood of God. It was this interplay which meant that the sacrificial, substitutionary death of Jesus on the cross was a necessary prerequisite to any individual and societal transformation.

The implementation of the atonement made possible by Christ's substitutionary death was pictured by Shields in Calvinistic terms. Shields boasted of his Calvinism (because of his ignorance of Calvin's own writings) and in regard to the work of Christ sought to place Christ's death squarely within the overarching framework of God's

election. As Shields put it:

. . . you will find through the Bible a principle of development. Some people call that Evolution, but in a strict sense, it is not Evolution: it is simply the gradual deliberate, and predetermined disclosure of the which was formed in the Eternal Mind before the world began¹⁰⁸

This electing work of God, as Shields described it, could easily have pushed Shields in the direction of a First Mover who set things in motion and then left them to proceed on their own, -- in short a sort of Calvinistically coloured deism. Shields never denied the possibility that God, at any time, could be involved within the world, but with regard to God's electing work the "formula" had been made and the only thing God had to do was to sit back and watch it work:

He was like an expert chemist. He has worked out his formula. He is convinced that certain compounds will produce certain results. He goes into his laboratory to demonstrate his theory and marvels as he observes the confirmation of his predictions. So Jesus was compounding the formula foreordained -- the revelation of God which was to beget faith in men and bring them back to God.¹⁰⁹

As Shields clarified his thought, however, he became more and more Arminian in his view of election. As Russell has noted:

To save man from innate sinfulness, Shields looked not to human efforts as characterized, in his judgement, by Arminianism, nor, as he said sarcastically, "to theological professors, bishops or scientists," but rather to the sovereign God who elects some to salvation through the radical experience of new birth. In endeavoring to clarify his position, Shields declared that God chooses for such salvation those who have repented and believed

in Christ. Ironically, this latter position was closer to original Arminianism than to the high Calvinism, in which Shields professed to believe.¹¹⁰

Russell's conclusion accurately summarizes Shields' position. It was not, however, a position which he grew into, but one which was always a part of his theological outlook and, in fact, was present to a greater degree in Shields' early years of ministry than was the case in his ministry in Jarvis Street Church. Thus, in a sermon preached in 1896 he stated:

We believe in the election of grace, and undoubtedly declare that to God all power belongs, yet we are sure that God has conditioned our salvation upon our being willing to receive Jesus Christ.¹¹¹

Whether this election was for all or only for the few is not always clear in Shields' earlier sermons. In a comment on Paul's mission to Corinth, Shields noted; "there were people in Corinth: . . . People upon whose salvation God had already determined and who therefore must be saved."¹¹² In a sermon within his book The Most Famous Trial in History, however, it is clear that if Shields ever did hold to a limited atonement (a view more in keeping with the Calvinists rather than John Calvin) he abandoned it for a belief in a universal atonement:

Every man and woman here has the choice always, of opening his heart to Christ, or to the devil; of being flooded with all the joy of heaven, or being made to taste all the bitterness of hell. It is an inevitable choice you cannot escape it.¹¹³

It was Shields' belief in the electing work of God

through Christ which confirmed him in his stance that the work of salvation was all of grace. Shields emphasized; "salvation is of grace through faith, which means that salvation is altogether the work of God from beginning to end."¹¹⁴ This emphasis upon God's electing work in Christ also served to ensure the believer's salvation, as Shields supported the view of "eternal security":

Perhaps there is no more "damnable heresy" in the church today, than that doctrine which teaches men that they have no right to feel themselves saved until they are actually within the pearly gates surrounded by the Jasper walls. In other words that doctrine which would make me trust in my own righteousness rather than that of Christ.¹¹⁵

Shields' disgust with any theory of Christ's atoning work which would deny eternal security was present during his Adelaide Street ministry. In a 1906 sermon he burst out against the teaching that a believer could lose her/his salvation:

I freely and frankly acknowledge that there is no doctrine I more cordially disapprove of -- I may use a stronger term -- there is no teaching I hate more intensely unless it is its opposite, namely that men being saved may continue in sin that grace may abound.¹¹⁶

Christ's work of election as actualized in his substitutionary death and life was of fundamental importance for Shields as a result of his strong emphasis upon sin and upon damnation. Early in his ministry he expressed great disapproval of those preachers and teachers who misled people concerning the reality of Satan

and of hell. As Shields put it: "this common cry of no devil and no hell, is hell's nineteenth century lie, spoken by the devil's lips."¹¹⁷ Sin was in Shields' view endemic to humanity. He noted; "sin is constitutional, it is hereditary, it is in the blood."¹¹⁸ Thus, any unbiased and honest observer would "most readily believe that the average man is the most selfish creature in the world."¹¹⁹

Shields' concern with modernistic theology was that it tended to trivialize the seriousness of sin and thus the importance of Christ's substitutionary work. He commented: "a book that ignores the great fact of sin . . . that makes men out to be anything less than sinners, cannot bring to you the voice of Jesus."¹²⁰ Such teaching was fatally dangerous, eternally dangerous:

I affirm that from the first word of Genesis to the last word of Revelation there is nothing but promise of judgement, of wrath -- wrath to come -- for every man who does not acknowledge his sin and plead guilty to the fact that he is related to him who brought death into the world and all our woe.¹²¹

Fortunately for humanity, God's wrath was not the final word for the believer. Christ offered himself as the sinner's substitute and bore the penalty of wrath that the sinner should have borne. Shields used the concept of Christ as the "Federal Head" of humanity to try to make clear his teaching about Christ's substitutionary role. Speaking about the resurrection of Christ he noted:

. . . the resurrection of Jesus Christ may be

everybody's victory; it may be everybody's joy; for he was the Representative Man, our Federal Head, the Second Adam, the Lord for Heaven, who came to be a quickening spirit. . . .¹²²

As the sinner's substitute and the Federal Head of a saved humanity Christ also served as the sanctifier of the saved. Shields stated; [Jesus] finds His reward in a sanctified people."¹²³ Again Shields was inconsistent with respect to the question whether the believer sanctified him/herself or was sanctified by the indwelling work of Christ. In his book of sermons, Other Little Ships, he wrote; "the Lord Jesus never dwells alone. He makes the spiritually barren life fruitful; He fills the life with joy and gladness, and He does for us beyond all imagining."¹²⁴

In the last analysis, however, Shields attributed most of the work of sanctification to the individual, noting that the way of salvation found in Christ imparted eternal life but that there was a difference between this eternal life and a sanctified life:

When He [i.e. God] saves a man He saves Him altogether and gives him eternal life. And yet it is possible to be saved in that sense, and yet not live in a continuous experience of the delivering grace of God.¹²⁵

It was his emphasis upon the life of surrender to Christ which caused Shields to set aside his Calvinistic emphasis on perseverance as he pleaded with his listeners saying:

You have been putting it off my brother. A Christian truly, and yet a Christian that will have his own way, **who has not yet made full surrender of his will to Christ.**¹²⁶ [emphasis mine]

With an almost Barthian flavour to his words, Shields amplified on what was involved in this process of surrender. In his book The Doctrines of Grace he noted:

We are not heard for our much speaking; we are not heard for long prayers -- or for short ones: we are heard in the measure in which we feel our own nothingness and depend on the fullness of grace that is in Christ.¹²⁷

In his book, More Than Conquerors, Douglas Frank has argued that this theme of surrender was a dominant theme within North American Fundamentalism. In his view it represented an attempt by those who saw their social power slipping away to experience a sense of victory, a new inner triumphalism in compensation for a changed social status.¹²⁸ Frank writes:

The movement that encouraged a posture of humble surrender was in fact a manifestation of autonomy -- of the demand for a kind of visible perfection that God did not even embody in Jesus Christ. The Victorious Life movement, with its pat answers and confident guarantees, gave new life to the lost triumphalism of a former day by shifting it to the subjective realm and cloaking it in the language of Christian devotion.¹²⁹

It is worth noting, however, that in spite of his willingness to use the language of surrender, Shields avoided the excesses of the Victorious Life Movement. He realized that even the most perfected surrender to the will of God did not, in this life at least, bring absolute

victory over sin. He affirmed: "there is the 'old man' and the 'new.' The unregenerated man is all 'old man:' the regenerated man is both 'new man' and 'old man.'"¹³⁰ In Shields' understanding, the complete emancipation of the new man would have to wait until the final resurrection. After this final resurrection and judgement, Christ's redemptive work was over for the individual believer or non-believer. Beyond the reaches of this judgement Christ's substitutionary sacrifice had no efficacy:

I do not know when the Lord will come -- "In such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh" -- but this I know, that when he shall come the opportunity will be at an end, the gospel of redemption of forgiveness of sins, is to be preached "til He come."¹³¹

In his writing and preaching on the theme of the work of Christ, Shields did not dwell on the subject of the resurrection. His attention was riveted mainly on the cross. This is not to claim that the resurrection was unimportant for him. In a 1922 sermon he was emphatic about the value of the resurrection for Christian faith:

Nothing remains if the resurrection is surrendered. The Deity of Christ, His atonement, His trustworthiness even as a moral teacher -- all go by the board, if his body did not rise from the dead.¹³²

Shields' support for the concept of the immortality of the soul, however, tended to undercut his emphasis on the importance of Christ's resurrection. In his book, Christ in the Old Testament, he stated:

The hope of immortality runs through every part

of Scripture. The Bible assumes it from beginning to end. The truth of the immortality of the soul is implied in the story of creation.¹³³

This concept of the immortality of the soul, as John Macquarrie points out, is not in the New Testament writings at all.¹³⁴ Moreover, as Otto Weber notes, it is the antithesis of the Christian view of death and, thus, of the importance of Christ's resurrection:

Belief in immortality is, of course, an extreme misunderstanding of death, and as such, experienced as the echo of Plato's Phaedo, it is the extreme opponent of the Christian view of death . . . to take death seriously means to understand it as the death which Jesus Christ took upon himself. . . . But as the curse which holds sway over man, its power is not unlimited. God himself has taken this curse upon himself in the person of Jesus. Just as he opposed the power of sin with his faithfulness, he has counter-attacked the power of death with the power of his life victoriously.¹³⁵

While, due to his emphasis on the immortality of the soul, Shields may have undercut, in this instance, the importance of the resurrection of Christ, it is clear that, on the whole, Shields elevated the person of Christ and made Christ the central focus of his theology and the central figure of the trinity. In the earliest years of his ministry this Christomonism was tempered by an appreciation for the person of God, the Father/Creator; but as Shields moved into a more modalistic view of the person of God this tempering almost disappeared. Ironically, however, as Christ was treated as the fullest expression of the Godhead the consequence of such a heavy

stress on Christ (as essential deity supernaturally conceived) was a minimization of the mediatorial function of Christ as the God-Man. Thus, as his attacks on Modernism grew more intense, particularly during the critical period of the twenties, the centrality of Christ was subsumed under the centrality of the Bible. In turn, the Bible inherited the mediatorial function which in orthodoxy theology belonged only to Christ. T. T. Shields, however, never entirely lost in his preaching that which he lost in his doctrine. When he was at his best his sermons were compelling, urgent and Christ-centered:

And from above the clouds, from beyond the chambers of the sun, we catch the echo of their music [i.e. the saints in heaven] ringing ringing down the skies, "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."¹³⁶

T. T. Shields' christology was obviously fundamental to his intellectual thought and, therefore, central for any accurate understanding of his attitude towards the Bible, as well as for an understanding of his view of the role of the Christian and the Church within Canadian culture. He conceived of the person of Christ as a supernatural being who was essentially divine rather than human. This, in time led to the supplanting of the centrality of Christ by that of the Bible. Moreover, the result of Shield's docetic and monophysitic christology was a Bible conceived of as verbally inspired and without

error.¹³⁷

Similarly his christological thought formed a decisive influence within his understanding of the Christian mission. Indeed, Shields' depiction of the work of Christ as redemption from individualistic acts of transgression against the moral law severely circumscribed his view of the mission of individual and Church. The dynamic concept of the Kingdom of God as inaugurated in Christ is absent in Shields' christology. What this means is that the missionary task of the Christian and the Christian Church was, in Shields' view, a task primarily of evangelism rather than social reform. The converted individual was primary, thus, Shields had few positive answers to the great social problems which were besetting Canadian society. What answers he did give were conceived of in moralistic terms which guaranteed that they would not be heeded by a society which had begun to turn its back on the morality of the past.

It is to this debilitating substitution of the centrality of Christ by the centrality of the Bible that this dissertation now turns. Why and how did this substitution take place and what were the ramifications of such a substitution? These are important questions for a study of T. T. Shields and for a proper understanding of North American Fundamentalism. The centrality of the

Bible, interpreted in literalistic terms, has been treated as the chief defining characteristic of Fundamentalism by both friend and foe alike. This chapter has demonstrated that this was not true in Shields' early ministry, yet it became true, in his ministry at Adelaide Street and, particularly, at Jarvis Street Church. It is now necessary to trace this evolution and examine what the impact of Shields supernaturalistic and monophystic depiction of Christ meant when applied to the scriptures.

ENDNOTES

¹Karl Barth, Dogmatics in Outline trans. G. T. Thompson (London: S.C.M. Press, 1949; reprint ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959), p. 66.

²Jurgen Moltmann, The Crucified God: the Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology trans. John Bowden and R. A. Wilson (London: S.C.M. Press, 1974), p. 112.

³Jaroslav Pelikan extends the influence of Christ even further than the boundaries of Christian faith stating: "Regardless of what anyone may personally think or believe about him, Jesus of Nazareth has been the most dominant figure in the history of Western culture for almost twenty centuries. If it were possible, with some sort of super magnet, to pull up out of history every scrap of metal bearing at least a trace of his name, how much would be left? It is from his birth that most of the human race dates its calendars, it is by his name that millions curse and in his name that millions pray." Jaroslav Pelikan, Jesus Through the Centuries: His Place in the History of Culture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), p. 1.

⁴G. C. Berkouwer, Studies in Dogmatics: the Person of Christ, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), p. 12.

⁵Paul Tillich's comments about Jesus as the Christ being the "heart of the divine life," are suggestive in this regard. See Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology vol. 1 (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 158.

⁶For a discussion of the Christocentricity of Barth's theology see John Thompson, Christ in Perspective - Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978).

⁷George Craig Stewart, "A Bend in the River," Christian Century LVI (May 10, 1939), p. 608.

⁸Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the Christian Century, had this to say concerning the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy: "Two worlds have clashed, the world of tradition and the world of modernism. One is scholastic, static, authoritarian, individualistic; the other is vital, dynamic, free and social." Quoted in George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 175.

⁹Cole, The History of Fundamentalism, p. 59.

¹⁰Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 120.

¹¹Sawatsky, "Looking for the Blessed Hope," p. 317.

¹²Packer, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, p. 59.

¹³Augustus H. Strong, Systematic Theology vols. 1-3 (Philadelphia: the Judson Press, 1907), p. 691.

¹⁴Shields, "Strong Determination," I Kings 22:14, November 10, 1895.

¹⁵Shields, "Sufficiency of Christ," Colossians 3:11, January 20, 1895.

¹⁶Shields, "The Dreyfus Case," Luke 23:14, September 17, 1889.

¹⁷Shields, "Kingship of Jesus," John 19:22, May 31, 1903.

¹⁸Shields, "According to Scripture," I Corinthians 15:3-4, February 11, 1906.

¹⁹Shields, "My Lord and My God," John 20:28, October 29, 1905.

²⁰Shields, "The Deity of Jesus," John 1:18 and Galatians 4:4-5, March 31, 1912.

²¹Shields, "The Supernatural, the Storm Centre of Christianity," The Gospel Witness (March 13, 1924). It is clear that the teachings of Christ were a secondary and not a primary concern for Shields. His primary concern was always fixated on the person of Christ.

²²Shields, "The Cross and its Critics" in Baptist Doctrines: Addresses Delivered at the North American Pre-Convention Conference (Des Moines, Iowa, June 21, 1921), p. 80.

²³The importance of doctrinal truth for Christian faith is not negated by such an affirmation. Concerning the "five points" of Fundamentalism, Franklin H. Littell has written this reminder: "Although Christianity is not propositional, and intellectual assent to a form of dehydrated orthodoxy is not the soundest proof of live faith, these propositions are indeed worthy of attention and reverent discussion. They come closer to Christian doctrine than many of the opinions of modern gnostic cults." Franklin H. Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: a Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History, revised ed. (New York: the MacMillan Company, 1971), p. 145. Moreover, while Otto Webber has underscored the secondary nature of doctrine, he does not eradicate its importance within Christian faith. He merely places under the authority of the person and work of Christ: "faith, as faith in Jesus Christ, is never directly oriented towards propositions, however true, or views, however, correct It is therefore not faith 'in Christianity' or 'in' dogma. It deals continually with propositions and views because it has to do with Jesus Christ as person." Otto Weber, Foundations of Dogmatics trans. Darrell I. Guder, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981), p. 7.

²⁴The point of transition when the centrality of Christ was replaced by the centrality of the Bible is extremely difficult to determine. My perspective on this issue depends, in part, on my contention that it was the experience of the First World War which transformed Shields from orthodox to Fundamentalist. In this contention, Sandeen's comments on the need to differentiate between the Fundamentalist controversy of the 1920's and the Fundamentalist movement which predated that controversy become problematic. Sandeen has written that the Fundamentalism of the 1920's was the continuation of an earlier movement known as pre-millenarianism (see Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism). Certainly, it must be conceded that Fundamentalist roots precede even the war years. Nonetheless, Fundamentalism proper, it seems to me, must be dated from 1918, when, as a result of the war, Protestant conservatism was militarized. George Rawlyk, in an article on Shields' Nova Scotia Lieutenant, John James Sidey, confirms such an interpretation when he writes: "Sidey had, in a sense, become a Conservative

Evangelical; he was not yet, the evidence suggests, a Fundamentalist. What seemed to separate these two positions was a certain degree of 'violence in thought and language' which characterized the Fundamentalist mind but not the Conservative-Evangelical." George Rawlyk, "Fundamentalism, Modernism and the Maritime Baptists in the 1920s and the 1930s," Acadiensis (Autumn 1987) p. 9. In a paper delivered at the May, 1989 meetings of the Evangelical Theological Society Meetings (Canada Region), I have illustrated the changes which the war produced in Shields. As a result of these changes I argue that Shields saw the need for a new war, a theological one, and by 1918 was committed to such a course of action. This commitment, coupled with a substitution of the centrality of Christ by the scriptures, are the twin factors which moved Shields from a Conservative-Evangelical to a Fundamentalism position. See Mark Parent, "The Fundamentalist of T. T. Shields and World War One," Meetings of the Evangelical Theological Society (Canada Region), May 8, 1989.

²⁵Falwell et al, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon, p. 8.

²⁶To separate the person and work of Christ in a discussion of christology is not considered warranted by many present-day theologians. Melanchthon's well known thesis in the 1521 Loci -- to know Christ is to know his benefits -- is often used to point out the inadvisability of separating the person from the work. By extension, Melanchthon's comment also underscores the aridity of intellectual knowledge of Christ apart from saving faith in Christ. In regard to this later point, however, D. M. Baillie was certainly correct in his warning that those who took Melanchthon's view too far and wanted to have Christ without christology, had really adopted an attitude which was "based on a conception of history which is humanistic and evolutionary rather than Christian." D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1956), p. 77. With regard to the contention that the separation of the person from the work of Christ is an artificial separation, the answer must be that such a criticism is true. Nonetheless, the conservative nature of Shields' christology is best approached through the traditional categories of the person of Christ and the work of Christ. As with other theological issues, Fundamentalists such as Shields believed that they were conserving the orthodoxy of the past. An example of such a self-perception is provided by Bernard Ramm who in a recent book on "Evangelical" christology writes: "Evangelical Christology is a continuation of historic Christology. It is Christology stated in the Apostle's Creed, refined in the

Nicean-Constantinople Creed, elaborated on in the Chalcedon Creed, and finally summed up on the Creed of Athanasius." Bernard Ramm, An Evangelical Christology Ecumenic and Historic (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1985), p. 2. That this preservation of orthodoxy is true, is debatable. The point that is being made, in this dissertation, is that the easiest and best framework for studying Shields' christology is by means of the categories of: the person of Christ and the work of Christ.

²⁷Shields, "God is One," Galatians 3:20, August 2, 1896.

²⁸Shields, "God is One," 3:20, August 2, 1896.

²⁹Shields, "The Cross in the Old Testament," I Peter 1:18-20, March 17, 1912.

³⁰Shields, "My Lord and My God," John 20:28, October 29, 1905.

³¹Shields, "The Deity of Jesus," John 1:18 and Galatians 4:4-5, March 31, 1912.

³²Shields, "He Shall Not Strive," Matthew 12:19-20, April 26, 1903.

³³Shields, "Different Kinds of Faith," John 2:23-25, December 6, 1896.

³⁴Shields, "Christ's Wisdom," John 7:15, March 22, 1896.

³⁵Shields, "Fire on the Altar," Leviticus 6:13, April 30, 1905.

³⁶B. B. Warfield, The Person and Work of Christ ed. G. C. Craig (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1950), p. 12.

³⁷Russell, Voices of Fundamentalism, p. 213.

³⁸Ibid, p. 16. This characteristic stress of Fundamentalist thought has been noted by many scholars of Fundamentalism. See N. H. Hart, "The True and the False," p. ii; C. Norman Kraus "Introduction: What is Evangelicalism," in Evangelicalism and Anabaptism, ed. C. Norman Kraus (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1979), p. 10. George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 108. Carl F. Henry, Evangelical

Responsibility in Contemporary Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B Eerdmans, 1957), p. 32. J. I. Packer, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, p. 162. That this claim to adhere to a supernaturalistic definition of the Christian faith is still a feature of contemporary Fundamentalism, is evidenced by Robert Delnay's introduction to his dissertation: "While the writer has attempted to record impartially and objectively the history of the Baptist Bible Union, he frankly acknowledges that his sympathies are with the supernaturalist against the naturalist, with biblicism against rationalism, with fundamentalism against modernism. He regards these as opposites and confesses his inability to conceive of any real common ground between them." Delnay, A History of the Bible Baptist Union, p. vi.

³⁹Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 28.

⁴⁰Shields, Christ in the Old Testament How to Find Christ in Bible Study (Toronto: the Gospel Witness, 1972), p. 6. [The sermons in this book were originally given in 1923].

⁴¹Karl Rahner, ed. Encyclopedia of Theology the Concise Sacramentum Mundi, "Supernaturalism" by Ernest Niermann (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982), p. 1650

⁴²On key issues it seems to me that Fundamentalism had more in common with pre-Vatican Roman Catholic thought than has been commonly assumed. Certainly in the 1920 period, Shields viewed Catholic doctrine as being essentially correct on the matters such as the deity of Christ. Of interest is the fact that a modern fundamentalist theologian, Norman Gieseler, prides himself on being a Thomist. See Arvin Vos, Aquinas, Calvin and Contemporary Protestant Thought: a Critique of Protestant Views on the Thought of Thomas Aquinas (Washington, D. C.: Christian University Press, 1985), p. xii, n. 1. The difference between Shields' supernaturalism and Thomistic thinking (besides a qualitative difference) is the result of the differing historical contexts. Shields was not faced with the problem of trying to find room for the natural world, but due to the deist revolt, he was left with the problem of trying to find room for the supernatural world. Thus, in his theology he begins with the knowledge of God provided by revelation. Nonetheless, when he is consistent, his supernaturalism does not swallow up the natural world but rather fulfills it and brings it to completion. In this regard his position on special versus general revelation is important. In an sermon preached in

1895 he stated: "no man can know anything of God except through His son Jesus Christ." Shields, "Christ's glory, Hebrews 1:2-3, September 22, 1895. By 1923, however, he had modified this earlier position to allow room for general revelation: "I believe the content of the word 'believe,' in respect to faith in Jesus Christ, is much wider and fuller than some of us generally suppose The light of nature, though it shines less brightly, is the same light as shines in the face of Jesus Christ." Shields Christ in the Old Testament, pp. 59-60.

⁴³Shields, "The Lord Has Risen -- and Hath Appeared," The Gospel Witness (May 17, 1923), p. 4. This subtle but effective tendency to take the spotlight off of Christ and place it on the scriptures instead, is evident in the comment of a German representative to an Evangelical Alliance meeting in the 1870's who likened: ". . . the doctrine of the supernatural redemption and atonement by Christ to a 'fortress' or citadel' surrounded by its moat . . . the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures." Quoted in George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 18.

⁴⁴Shields, "Is Jesus of the Manger God Upon the Throne," Isaiah 9:6-7 and Luke 1:32-33, December 24, 1922.

⁴⁵Shields, "Church Union, Ephesians 1:22-23, The Gospel Witness (January 29, 1925), p. 4.

⁴⁶Barr, Beyond Fundamentalism, p. 56.

⁴⁷Barr, Fundamentalism, p. 169.

⁴⁸Daniel Stevick, Beyond Fundamentalism (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 63. Of interest is the fact that Dietrich Bonhoeffer made the charge of docetism against Liberal, rather than Fundamentalist theology. Bonhoeffer wrote: ". . . the whole of liberal theology must be seen in the light of docetic christology. It understands Jesus as the support for or the embodiment of particular values and doctrines. As a result, the manhood of Jesus Christ is in the very last resort not taken seriously, although it is this very theology which speaks so often of the man." Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Christology, with an introduction by E. H. Robertson, trans. John Bowen (London: Collins, 1966), pp. 83-84. The cultural bondage of Fundamentalism means that Bonhoeffer's comments could apply equally well to Fundamentalism.

⁴⁹Shields, "The Power of an Indissoluble Life," Hebrews 7:15-16, The Gospel Witness (January 2, 1930), p.

⁵⁰Shields, Doctrines of Grace, p. 26.

⁵¹Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History or the Trial of Jesus, p. 30. [A collection of sermons preached between December 9, 1928 to February 10, 1929].

⁵²Shields, "Altogether Lovely," Canticles 5:8, June 10, 1900.

⁵³Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 157.

⁵⁴Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 67. B. B. Warfield wrestled with the same problem but came up with another solution. According to Warfield, it was not the physical suffering which caused Christ's death, but the mental suffering he endured: "in the presence of this mental anguish the physical tortures of the crucifixion retire into the background, and we may well believe that our Lord, though he died on the cross, yet died not of the cross, but as we commonly say, of a broken heart, that is, to say, of the strain of his mental suffering." Warfield, The Person and Work of Christ, p. 133. Warfield's christology matched Shields in its monophysitic and docetic tendencies: "the Jesus of the New Testament is not fundamentally man, however, divinely gifted: he is God tabernacling for awhile among men, with heaven lying about Him not merely in his infancy, but throughout all the days of his flesh." Warfield, p. 19.

⁵⁵Shields, "Attitudes Towards Christ," Mark 5:17-19, December 30, 1917. This absorption of the human by the divine grew even stronger as Shields grew older. In an address given near the end of his life he stated; "But how were the divine and human elements blended in Him [i.e. Christ]? Which of the two natures predominated? Did His human nature render Him subject to Human limitations? Or the rather was not His humanity, while making Him our true Kinsman, by union with His divinity, sublimed to the quality of divine perfection?" Shields, The Finality of Christ (Toronto: the Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate) p. 6. [Keynote address at the July 25, 1952 meeting of the British Isles Regional Conference of the International Council of Christian Churches].

⁵⁶Shields, "The Deity of Jesus," John 1:18 and Galatians 4:4-5, March 31, 1912.

⁵⁷Thielicke, The Evangelical Faith, vol. 2, p. 321. Berkouwer makes a similar criticism when he states; "Every

effort to disparage the humanity of Christ means a disqualification of the scriptural picture. Scripture never permits the divine to threaten or relativize the human nature." Berkouwer, The Person of Christ, p. 21.

⁵⁸Shields, "They Began to be Merry," Luke 15:24, November 14, 1897.

⁵⁹Shields, "Behold the Man," John 19:5, April 30, 1899.

⁶⁰Shields, "Buried With Christ," Romans 6:3-5, April 25, 1915.

⁶¹Douglas Frank, More Than Conquerors, p. 189. This emphasis on the "manliness" of Christ in Shields' thought warrants further study particularly in light of contemporary feminist christologies.

⁶²Martin Marty, "Fundamentalism as a Social Phenomenon," Review and Expositor (Winter 1982), p. 19.

⁶³Louis Gaspar, The Fundamentalist Movement, p. 126.

⁶⁴Robert T. Handy, The Protestant Quest for a Christian America 1830 - 1930 Historical Series (American Church) no. 5 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 10.

⁶⁵Shields, "A Prince and a Savior," Acts 5:30-31, March 29, 1914.

⁶⁶Shields, "Faith," John 4:50, November 18, 1906.

⁶⁷"Christ Loved the Church," Ephesians 5:25, March 28, 1904. Shields' christology had a mystical side to it -- a "Jesus" mysticism which is somewhat similar to "Christ" mysticism. For an introduction to Christ mysticism see Pelikan, Jesus Through the Centuries, p. 122-132. This mysticism existed in contrast to the "objectivistic" stance of Shields, which would seem to disallow any authentic mystical experience. As William Johnston points out, however, there is an "objective" aspect to Christian mysticism. See William Johnston, Christian Mysticism Today (San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1984), pp. 12-14. It was to this objective interpretation of mysticism which Shields subscribed. Thus, Shields' mysticism was very different from the mysticism of the Canadian revivalist Henry Alline. For Alline's mystical experience see George Rawlyk ed, Henry Alline Selected Writings in Sources of American Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1987).

⁶⁸For a readable summary of the Alexandrian and Antiochene positions see Paul Tillich, A History of Christian Thought, pp. 79-86. On this issue, Helmut Thielicke writes these words: "part of the tragedy of the history of christology is that we seem to be forced to choose between an Alexandrian type and an Antiochene type. In brief the Alexandrian type proceeds deductively from the supernatural sonship of Jesus whereas the Antiochene type proceeds inductively from the man Jesus of Nazareth." Thielicke, The Evangelical Faith vol. 2, p. 266. Pannenberg notes that the vast majority of contemporary christologies proceed from "below" rather than from "above" and that even when one holds strongly to the divinity of Jesus the only possible approach which makes sense in our day and age is one from "below" [i.e. an Antiochene starting point]. See Wolfhart Pannenberg, Jesus -- God and Man trans. Lewis Wilkins and Duane Friebe, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1977), pp. 34-35. Shields' approach to christology is from "above" and provides further confirmation that his christology was conceived of in Alexandrian terms.

⁶⁹Shields, "I Will come Again," John 14:3, May 2, 1897.

⁷⁰Shields, "He Shall Not Strive," Matthew 12:19-20, April 26, 1903.

⁷¹Shields, Doctrines of Grace, p. 125.

⁷²Ibid, p. 127. For Calvin's position on this question see John Calvin, The Institutes of Christian Religion, vol. 2, ed. John T. MacNeill (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 1359-1404. For a summary of the issues involved see Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition A History of the Development of Doctrine, vol. 4, Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700) (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 159-161 and 352-359.

⁷³Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 92.

⁷⁴Shields, "The Virgin Birth," Luke 1:35, The Gospel Witness (December 27, 1923), p. 5.

⁷⁵Shields, "Four Ways to Heaven," Titus 2:11, February 28, 1897.

⁷⁶Pannenberg, Jesus -- God and Man, p. 45.

⁷⁷Shields, "Love of Christ," Ephesians 3:19, February 7, 1897.

⁷⁸Shields, "Christ's Mission, Luke 2:14, December 23, 1894.

⁷⁹Shields, "Look, Wait, Believe," Micah 7:7, January 31, 1897.

⁸⁰Shields, "No Fault," John 19:4, October 29, 1899.

⁸¹Shields, "A Faithful Saying," I Timothy 1:15, August 25, 1901.

⁸²Shields, "Communicate With the Dead?" John 14:6, March 23, 1919.

⁸³Shields, How to Receive Eternal Life, p. 30. This prayer was written late in Shields' life but the theme of divinization appears early, in brief and tantalizing glimpses. See also Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 33. This emphasis accords well with the Alexandrian elements within Shields' christology.

⁸⁴Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 16. This theme of the impotence of religion is fleshed out further in this sermon on "The War and Human Nature." Shields argued; "surely religion can change human nature? No, even religion may fail. When religion degenerates into mere philosophy, when it rejects a divine revelation, and substitutes the pride of the intellect for the humble and contrite heart, it loses the power to make men new." Ibid, p. 15. Shields' comments on the impotence of religion and the strong place which he gave for the reality of sin raise the question of whether or not he could be said to have adhered to an early, "lay" version of what would later be called neo-orthodoxy. Joel Carpenter writes; "fundamentalists also saw some of the failings of modernity and of the shallowness of the American way of life. In this sense their perspective at times became a plain person's parallel to the "realism" of the neo-orthodox movement. Fundamentalists believed with Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr that the liberal faith in progress was naive and unfounded." Joel Carpenter, The Renewal of American Fundamentalism 1930-1945 (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1984), p. 128. If Shields had pursued further the insights which are found in his book Revelations of the War it might be possible to make a connection between his theological system and that of the neo-orthodox

theologians. Shields, however, never turned the radical searchlight of his critique of Modernism on his own religious system and assumptions. In part this was due to the hectic pace of his schedule, as well as to his lack of formal education, and his popular versus academic ministry. Moreover, the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy ended up trivializing many of the potential theological contributions of Fundamentalism. Paul Tillich, rather harshly, but with much truth, contrasts Protestant Orthodoxy with North American Fundamentalism: "We must be sure to distinguish between orthodoxy and fundamentalism. The orthodox period of Protestantism has very little to do with what is called fundamentalism in America. Rather it has special reference to the scholastic period of Protestant History Protestant Orthodoxy was constructive. It did not have anything like the pietistic or revivalistic background of American Fundamentalism It was not determined by a kind of lay biblicism which rejects any theological penetration into the biblical writings and makes itself dependent on traditional interpretations of the Word of God." Paul Tillich, A History of Christian Thought, p. 306. Alongside Tillich's comments about the lay biblicism of Fundamentalism, previous comments about Fundamentalism as a pre-Enlightenment movement, must be considered. Thus, when neo-orthodox thought began to make an impression on the theological world, Conservative scholars viewed it as simply a new form of Modernism. See Cornelius Van Til, Karl Barth and Evangelicalism (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1964).

⁸⁵Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History, p. 131.

⁸⁶Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 23.

⁸⁷Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History, p. 121.

⁸⁸Shields, "Baptist Missions," John 20:25, August 17, 1899. There was a strong pragmatic rationale behind Shields emphasis on "preaching the cross" which fit well with his Common Sense philosophy of truth.

⁸⁹Shields, "The Second Mile," Matthew 5:41; 27:32 and Acts 21:13, August 6, 1899. This theme of the passion of the Gospel was one which meant much to Shields and arose out of his portrayal of Jesus Christ as someone who was -- courageous, manly and bold. In a fascinating letter on a service he attended at St. Paul's Cathedral, he had very critical words to write about the Archbishop's sermon. Curiously it was not the Archbishop's theology which most concerned him: "what I most complain of is that there

was no unction, no passion, no glow. How any man could look down upon that great throng; hundreds and hundreds of wounded -- Red Cross nurses standing everywhere, men without arms, some having lost a leg, some blind . . . And there were the representatives of the Allied Nations, the statesmen and the soldiers and sailors of the Empire, the King and all the Royal family, and thousands of the most representative people in business, in the professions, in every walk of life it was most inexcusable to serve up such a dish of platitudes as the archbishop gave us -- especially when served cold." Shields, "Letters/ Dairy," August 4, 1915. Obviously, Shields would have liked to have traded places with the Archbishop. Even more certainly Shields liked his religion to be "full of passion," full of the "blood stained cross of Calvary."

⁹⁰Shields, "Lamb of God," John 1:29, May 23, 1902.

⁹¹Shields, "An Endless Life," Hebrews 7:16, December 25, 1904.

⁹²Shields, "Jesus Only," Matthew 17:8, January 20, 1918.

⁹³Shields, "Sanctification of the Spirit," I Peter 1:2 March 11, 1906.

⁹⁴Shields, "Altar Cubits," Ezekiel 43:13, June 28, 1908. Emil Brunner also stressed this self-justification of God by means of Christ's sacrifice on the cross. In Brunner's work, however, it is the love of God that is justified rather than the holiness of God. See Emil Brunner, The Mediator: a Study of the Central of the Christian Faith trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1934), p. 520.

⁹⁵Shields, "How to Get Ready for the Lord's Return," The Gospel Witness (October 9, 1930), p. 9.

⁹⁶Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 155.

⁹⁷Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 76.

⁹⁸Augustus Strong, Systematic Theology, p. 761. The substitutionary theory of the atonement continues to be the theory accepted by Fundamentalists and Evangelicals. For example, see Donald Bloesch, The Evangelical Renaissance (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1973), p. 60.

⁹⁹Shields, "The Dreyfus Case," Luke 23:14, September

17, 1899.

¹⁰⁰Shields, "Anarchy," Romans 8:7, September 15, 1901. Shields viewed Modernist theology as, at heart, an expression of anarchy because, in his thinking, it downplayed the seriousness of the consequences which resulted from the rupture of the moral law.

¹⁰¹Shields, "Baptists and Missions," [no text], June 16, 1911.

¹⁰²Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 59.

¹⁰³Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 183.

¹⁰⁴Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 194.

¹⁰⁵Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 102.

¹⁰⁶Wacker, "Searching for Norman Rockwell: Popular Evangelicalism in Contemporary America," in The Evangelical Tradition in America, ed. Leonard Sweet, pp. 297-299.

¹⁰⁷George Marsden, "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Society," in Reformed Faith and Politics, ed. Ronald Stone, p. 71.

¹⁰⁸Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 53.

¹⁰⁹Shields, "Great Faith," Matthew 8:10, April 26, 1914.

¹¹⁰Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," p. 265.

¹¹¹Shields, "Wilt Thou Be Made Whole?" John 5:6, November 8, 1896.

¹¹²Shields, "Paul at Corinth," Acts 18:9-10, July 10, 1899.

¹¹³Shields, The Most Famous Trial of History, p. 72. Of interest is Donald Bloesch's assertion that neo-Evangelicalism holds to the view of a universal atonement. Bloesch writes; "the new evangelical movement insists on the need for personal faith in Jesus Christ for salvation. It declares itself against the doctrine of a final universal salvation, though it does not necessarily oppose the concept of a universal atonement, as did the older Calvinism. Christ died for all men, but His death is

beneficial only for those who believe." Bloesch,
The Evangelical Renaissance, pp. 35-36.

¹¹⁴Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother or the Adventures of a Modern Young Man (Toronto: the Gospel Witness), p. 77. [these sermons were preached between November 23, 1924 to January 11, 1925].

¹¹⁵Shields, "Saul Built the House," I Kings 6:14, July 14, 1895.

¹¹⁶Shields, "Did Jesus Die in Vain?" II Timothy 2:10, January 13, 1907. For Calvin's teaching on the "perseverance of the saints," see John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, vol. 2, ed. John MacNeill, p. 1035. Berkhof also felt, like Shields, that, if this doctrine was denied, salvation became an act of human works rather than divine grace: "the denial of the doctrine of perseverance virtually makes the salvation of man dependent on the human will rather than on the grace of God." L Berkhof, Systematic Theology rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953), p. 549.

¹¹⁷Shields, "Joab and Amasa," II Samuel 20:8-10, July 30, 1899.

¹¹⁸Shields, "Place Called Calvary," Luke 23:33, December 7, 1902.

¹¹⁹Shields, "The Price of Coal," Romans 12:20, October 12, 1902.

¹²⁰Shields, "The Voice of Jesus," John 10:27, June 13, 1909.

¹²¹Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 148.

¹²²Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 87. E. J. Carnell, one of the key theologians in the rise of neo-Evangelicalism, tied this concept of Christ as Federal Head to Paul's writings about Christ as Second Adam. Carnell noted; "Paul says that a sinner's relation to God is decided by his relation to a federal head. A federal head is an official representative; he acts in the stead of another." E. J. Carnell, The Case for Orthodoxy (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1959), p. 71 The historical antecedents of the depiction of Christ as Federal Head, however, are to be found in the Protestant orthodoxy of the seventeenth century and, in particular, the writings of Johannes Cocceius, who served as a professor of theology at Leyden. See R. Buick Knox, "The

History of Doctrine in the Seventeenth Century," in A History of Christian Doctrine, ed. Hubert Cunliffe-Jones (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 437.

¹²³Shields, "Christ Loved the Church," Ephesians 5:25, March 28, 1904.

¹²⁴Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 151.

¹²⁵Shields, "What is Sanctification?", The Gospel Witness (April 27, 1924), p. 8.

¹²⁶Shields, "Jacob," Genesis 13:24, July 16, 1899.

¹²⁷Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 135.

¹²⁸The charge of triumphalism is one of which Shields was guilty. In this respect, it is clear that Shields was, as he claimed, in the Calvinist rather than Lutheran tradition. He did refer to Lutheran themes as when he noted in a sermon "Justice is His [i.e. God's] 'strange work.' When you look upon a drowning world remember it is His strange work -- you will see God in the ark not in the flood." Shields, "God Loved the World," John 3:16, February 3, 1902. In regard to Luther's theology of the cross, however, with its profound concept of God hidden in weakness, Shields was unappreciative or unaware. For an introduction and current application of Luther's theology of the cross see Douglas Hall, Lighten Our Darkness Towards an Indigenous Theology of the Cross (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press), 1976.

¹²⁹Douglas Frank, More Than Conquerors, p. 116. Frank dates the Victorious Life movement from 1910 when Charles Turnbull attended a Keswick youth conference in New Wilmington, Pennsylvania. In Frank's analysis, Darbyite premillennialism and Keswick higher life teaching, as mediated through Turnbull, "became the backbone of the fundamentalist movement in American evangelicalism after the turn of the century." Ibid, p. 114. See also George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 72-101.

¹³⁰Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 183.

¹³¹Shields, "The Second Coming of Christ," The Gospel Witness (January 13, 1927), p. 12.

¹³²Shields, "The Second Coming of Christ," The Gospel Witness (January 13, 1927), p. 12. R. A. Torrey made a similar claim when we wrote: "The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the cornerstone of Christian

doctrine." R. A. Torrey "The Certainty and Importance of the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ From the Dead," The Fundamentals vol. 5 (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company), p. 81.

¹³³Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 41.

¹³⁴John Macquarrie, Principles of Christian Theology (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 324.

¹³⁵Otto Weber, Foundations of Dogmatics, pp. 625-627.

¹³⁶Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 261.

¹³⁷This will be examined in the next chapter. An example of Shields' monophysitic treatment of the scriptures is contained within a 1907 sermon where he claims; "I do not wonder that men quarrel with this book of Genesis. It is so absolutely unique -- as much as though it had dropped from the skies." Shields, "Excellent Knowledge," Philippians 3:7-8, February 10, 1907.

CHAPTER FOUR

SHIELDS' CHRISTOLOGICAL THOUGHT AND THE BIBLE

Introduction

Professor Clark Pinnock, in an article on the issue of differing views of biblical authority within the Believer's Church tradition, rather grudgingly confesses:

There have been disturbing shifts on the conservative side too which must not go unnoticed lest we leave a badly distorted impression. Undoubtedly, the most serious weakness here is the significant shift in the list of preferred texts of orthodoxy from, what do you think of Jesus? to what do you think of the Bible?¹

To write about North American Fundamentalism is to write about a movement which most scholars feel is primarily defined by its attitude towards, and interpretation of, the Bible. In a short article on the theology of Fundamentalism Morris Ashcraft, a professor of theology at the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, summarizes this common scholarly interpretation of Fundamentalism, asserting:

It seems to me that fundamentalist theology is a

theology of one major doctrine -- the inerrancy of the biblical autographs. Whether we encounter it during the period of 1880-1925 among the older fundamentalists or in 1980 among the Neo-Evangelicals, the first point on which all others depend is the inerrant Bible in its original manuscripts.²

In this study of Shields I have attempted to show that Ashcraft's opinion is incorrect with regard to the **early** Shields. More accurate, in this respect, would be Carl Henry's observation that:

The older apologetic was less hesitant to begin with Christ -- not because it sought to detach Christology from bibliology, but because it sensed the danger that biblicism might seem to ascribe superiority to some principle other than the Christological.³

Nonetheless, while Ashcraft's dates might be misleading his contention that one of the central, defining features of North American Fundamentalism was its "elevation" of the Bible by means of an inerrantist interpretation is certainly correct for the post-1920 period. Indeed, in Martin Marty's research it is this inerrantist interpretation which he claims is the common thread which tied the various strands of Fundamentalism together. He writes: "not all fundamentalists were to be pretribulationist or dispensationalist or premillennialist, but all were inerrantist."⁴

Early scholars of the Fundamentalist movement set the stage for this interpretation of Fundamentalism as a movement which was based on an "inerrantistic" approach

towards the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. Norman Furniss, for example, underscored the foundational nature of the Bible within Fundamentalism when he noted:

To the Fundamentalists, religious beliefs formed a pyramid, each tenet resting on the one below, with the infallible Bible as the broad foundation; to reshape one block, to remove another, would send the whole structure crashing to the ground.⁵

Even when Ernest Sandeen published his revisionist history of Fundamentalism in 1970, while he corrected many of the caricatures of the early scholars such as Furniss and Cole, he retained this emphasis upon the centrality of the Bible within Fundamentalist thought as he noted that:

What made the fundamentalist theology of biblical authority so critical in the development of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was the fundamentalist insistence upon this doctrine as the foundation of all Christian faith.⁶

Indeed, so crucial was this emphasis on the centrality of an inerrantist Bible for Fundamentalists that, along with a pre-millennialist interpretation of eschatology, it formed, in Sandeen's view, the definition of Fundamentalism:

A firm trust and belief in every word of the Bible in an age when skepticism was the rule and not the exception -- this has been both the pride and the scandal of fundamentalism. Faith in an inerrant Bible as much as an expectation of the second advent of Christ has been the hallmark of the fundamentalist.⁷

While these two fundamental characteristics of pre-millennialism and inerrantism existed in symbiotic relationship, in the last analysis it was, in Sandeen's

view, the inerrantism of Fundamentalism which formed "the central question of Fundamentalist historiography."⁸

Fundamentalist and Evangelical scholars of the present have also depicted biblical inerrantism as one, if not **the**, primary definition of Fundamentalism. Thus, J. I. Packer has commented that "Jesus Christ constituted Christianity a religion of biblical authority,"⁹ while Jerry Falwell has noted that The Fundamentals had "twenty-seven articles [dealing] with the Bible, nine with apologetics, eight with the person of Christ and only three with the Second Coming of Christ."¹⁰ James Barr summarizes what scholars, both those critical to Fundamentalism and those supportive of Fundamentalism, feel was (and is) the central issue within Fundamentalist thought:

For fundamentalists the Bible is more than the source of veracity for their religion, more than the essential source or textbook. It is part of the religion itself, indeed it is practically the center of the religion, the essential nuclear point from which lines of light radiate into every practical aspect.¹¹

The Early Shields and the Bible

A careful reading of the extant Shields' material makes it clear that the person and work of Christ dominate his theology in the early years of his ministry until, at least, the start of his Jarvis Street ministry in 1910. This early christological stress means that the common

Fundamentalist assumption concerning the stability of the doctrine which leading Fundamentalists such as Shields expounded can, in this one case at least, no longer be supported. This transition from a christocentric to a bibliocentric approach is an important transition which merits academic attention. If the person of Christ, rather than an inerrant Bible, formed the core of Shields' faith in his early years as was shown in the previous chapter, when did inerrantism become central in his thinking, and what shape did it take?

To deny an inerrantist approach to the Bible within his pre-Jarvis Street years of ministry is not, of course, to claim that Shields ever held to any other theory of inspiration other than a conservative one. Shields himself, during the war years when his theology hardened and a form of "puritanism"¹² began to dominate, confessed in a rare personal comment, "once a pauper -- [I] was liberal enough, now a child of God I find myself getting more conservative all the time."¹³ There is, however, no evidence of such liberalism and certainly no evidence of it with regard to his view of scriptural authority and interpretation. An 1898 sermon serves as an example of his conservatism. After noting that the Bible was written by human beings, Shields continued:

But God told these men just exactly what words to write. . . . Do you think God would ever tell a lie? No, the Bible says He "cannot lie." Then if God

cannot lie and the Bible be His word, every word in the Bible must be true.¹⁴

This conservative approach, while containing the seeds of a full blown inerrantism was, in his early ministry, however, held in check by the centrality of the person of Christ. In further comments concerning the Bible's relationship to modern scientific discoveries, made in 1899, Shields asserted:

The Bible is God's word concerning sin and salvation. It is not so much His word concerning the sun and the moon and the stars, and this earth of ours, in their relation to each. This Book will ever be found to be in harmony with the true philosophy of things, and will never be at variance with science save that which is "falsely so-called," **but, notwithstanding, it is not to be regarded as a text book on these things; but solely as a text book treating of sin and salvation.** [emphasis mine]¹⁵

The Bible, according to Shields, was God's only "infallible revelation of His will,"¹⁶ but God's will was not that the Bible be the focal point of Christian faith and all human knowledge but, rather, that the person of Jesus the Christ form the focus of Christian faith.

In spite of his conservative interpretation of biblical inspiration, then, biblical revelation was secondary to the person and work of Christ in the pre-Jarvis Street years. The fact that the Bible should only be treated as a textbook on sin and salvation was one indication of the limits with which Shields approached the scriptures. The other more important limit was that the Bible merely witnessed to the salvation which could only

be found in the person and work of Jesus the Christ:

Now my friends I cannot see what possible help the Bible can afford if you are "without Christ." Indeed if I were this moment without Christ, and if I had no hope that he could ever be mine, I think I should wish with all my heart that there be no Bible without Christ the Bible is the most terrible book in the world.¹⁷

Two other factors which were influential in tempering the "bibliolatry" of which Fundamentalism is often accused should also be noted. The two are closely connected. Shields distinguished between the literal meaning of a given text and its spiritual significance. Such an approach could have resulted in extravagant allegorizations except for the fact that, according to Shields, the literal meaning and its spiritual significance were not opposed to each other:

While it is a fact that the narratives of the Old and New Testaments are literally true, they also have a spiritual signification; and that while one may profit by the application of its literal meaning, the deeper and more lasting benefits are ours when its meaning is spiritually applied.¹⁸

This distinction between the literal meaning and the spiritual significance was in harmony with the typological¹⁹ approach which Shields used in his interpretation of the Old Testament. Shields' typological interpretation appeared early in his preaching, although in the very early years it tended to have an allegorical emphasis rather than a strictly typological one. In an 1897 sermon on Canticles, a book of which he was

particularly fond, he wrote:

In the text under the figure of a shepherd girl seeking her beloved, who also is a shepherd, there is most beautifully set for the mutual attraction of Christ and His Church, that is to say the mutual love of Christ and the believer.²⁰

Shields' typological interpretation of the biblical text will be examined more fully later in this chapter. The important point which must be stressed is that such an approach, coupled with a willingness to differentiate between the literal meaning and the spiritual significance, helped (in spite of Shields' adherence to a conservative interpretation of the inspiration of scripture) to maintain a christological centrality rather than a biblical centrality within Shields' early theology.

In the 1920's, however, as Shields was drawn deeper and deeper into theological controversy, the role of the Bible began to dominate over that of the person of Christ. Two reasons prompted this change. The first was the "attack" which Modernists made against the scriptures. The second was the inner thrust of Shields' christological thought which, with its monophysitic and christomonistic characters, so removed Christ from his mediatorial role that a vacuum was created into which the scriptures were placed. Shields' Christ was too inaccessible for the believer. He was God rather than the God-Man. Increasingly, then, and ironically in spite of Shields'

intentions or even, it seems, his awareness of what was the result of his christological thought, the scriptures preformed the mediatorial task which in orthodoxy belongs to Christ and Christ alone.

The first step in this displacement of Christ by the scriptures was an emphasis upon the "deity" of the scriptures through an affirmation of its supernaturalism. In a 1905 sermon he acknowledged that the Bible was a "natural" book but insisted that its essential nature was not a naturalistic but a supernaturalistic one:

And so this Book is very natural. It was written by men of flesh and blood as we are, by men who were born as we are, who lived and died as we shall die, **And yet this book glows with a supernatural fire.**²¹
[emphasis mine]

This emphasis on the supernatural was never absent from Shields' outlook on Christian faith. During his years at Adelaide Street Baptist Church in London, however, it began to be a key factor within his preaching and teaching as Shields moved steadily and surely in a more reactionary theological direction.

Nonetheless, it was not his experience at Adelaide Street but the impact of the First World War which confirmed Shields in his conservatism and propelled him in the direction of a full-blown inerrantism. With respect to German biblical criticism, the war provided Shields with a ready made opportunity to link German biblical scholarship with German militarism:

. . . I am bound to confess that I have long believed that German critics of the Bible were not intellectually honest, that their antagonism towards the written word was dictated by motives similar to those which inspired the Pharisees to conspire to crucify the Word Incarnate; they were moved by a natural bias against the principles which Christ exemplified, and which the Bible proclaims.²²

It was this revelation of the true motives behind German biblical criticism which, it may be argued, caused Shields to adopt a very positive stance towards the lessons which he hoped that the war would teach the Canadian people. One of those lessons, and increasingly the most important, was the supposed effect that the war would have in stemming what Shields saw to be a growing loss of confidence in the biblical text.²³ It was Shields' firm belief during the early part of the war that the war experience would not only put a halt to this disillusionment in the Bible but would also undergird the importance of the Bible as a universal text which transcended and judged all races and all nationalities. In a 1915 sermon he affirmed (in terms which would also serve as his self-perception when he waged his own war against Modernism in the 1920's) his confidence in the triumph of the Bible:

And in the sphere of human activity, this Book will be restored to its place. And men will return from their speculations to the life of faith, and from their philosophical vagaries to the verities of revelation. And the army of the Lord will go forth to battle armed with the weapon tried and true; and where human pride would fain have ruled, this Sceptre

of Truth shall prevail.²⁴

In spite of this concentration on the Bible as "**the weapon**" for use against the enemies of spiritual truth Shields still spoke in 1915 in terms which, on the surface, managed to keep the Bible in a secondary and supportive role with centrality continuing to be accorded to the person of Christ:

After all that men have said and written against it [i.e. the Bible] it is still the one Book which is worth reading at such a time as this. **And it is all because it enshrines the Person of the Universal Man, who is also the Universal King.**²⁵ [emphasis mine]

The Later Shields and the Bible

The new prominence which the Bible received within Shields' theology following the First World War was clearly evident in the sermons which he preached and in the addresses which he delivered. In an address entitled, "What Some Baptists Are Determined to Stand For," delivered in October of 1922, Shields outlined some fundamental principles on which Baptist believers had to take their stand. Significantly, the first principle was the inspiration and authority of the scriptures and it was only in the second instance that there appeared an insistence upon the essential deity of Jesus.²⁶ This secondary role of Christ, as compared to the primary role of the scriptures, was accompanied by a growing tendency to speak about the Bible as if it were a living thing:

This Book clearly makes a distinction between those who believe and those who do not believe. This Book clearly tells us that there is salvation in Christ; and that apart from Christ there is no salvation.²⁷

It was, apparently, the Bible rather than the risen Christ that was seen by Shields as the living word of God. In a personal declaration of war against the "enemies of orthodox faith" Shields cried out in February 1922:

To me this Bible is the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. I have ceased to be diplomatic with those who endeavour to undermine men's faith in the book. I count them the enemies of the souls of men.²⁸

In a related affirmation Shields noted in December, 1925:

... if it were possible to gather every single copy of this Book and make one great bonfire of it so that there should not be left anywhere upon earth a solitary copy of the Word of God, God could produce it again the next morning without one jot or tittle omitted, for He has a copy which He keeps Himself; "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."²⁹

His spirited testimony concerning the centrality of the scriptures continued to coexist with language which affirmed the centrality of Christ. The latter was, however, a centrality which functioned, increasingly, on a theoretical and abstract level only. The war with Modernism was waged around the issue of biblical interpretation and this meant that while the centrality of Christ was still affirmed, this affirmation was so clearly secondary to the focus on the scriptures that as early as March, 1923, while speaking to the student body of Gordon College in Boston, Shields had to remind them of the

supposed priority of the person of Christ:

Where then is our spiritual morn -- our magnetic pole -- our pole star, our morning sun? The Bible? Primarily, No! Are you surprised! Our standard is the God-Man Jesus Christ. **What I know of Him I know through the Bible.**³⁰

This insistence that what is known about Christ is known only through the scriptures tended to distance Christ from his people. As Shields asked, rhetorically:

What do you know about Christ? Nothing apart from the Book. What do you know about the will of God? Nothing apart from the Book. What do you know about the divine pattern, what God wants you to be? Nothing apart from the Book.³¹

Shields' inconsistency with respect to natural revelation which at times he affirmed and which at other times he seemed to deny may be explained by this elevation of the Bible as the pre-eminent medium of revelation. Christ became more and more hidden behind the written word, more and more distanced from humanity, and so the voice of the risen Christ who testifies to the heart of believer and non-believer alike was largely muzzled. Christ was, in effect, imprisoned within the scriptures.

Shields, of course, would not have explained it in this fashion. To him there was a dynamic complementarity between Christ and the scriptures. Christ was the theme of the scriptures from beginning to end:

This book from Genesis to Revelation has but one theme -- properly understood, the Bible speaks only of Jesus Christ Every matter of which the Bible treats is related to the Person and Work of our

Lord Jesus Christ Every word spoken before the advent of our Lord was a preparation for His coming, and everything recorded in this Book subsequent to His appearance amongst men is an explanation of that appearance.³²

Thus, the circular justification of authority to which Shields adhered was that the Bible testified to and thereby authenticated Christ who, in turn, testified to and authenticated the Bible:

Thus, as to motive, it comes to this: that our relationship to the Author of the Book will determine our relationship to the Book itself. It is inevitable: if we are rightly related to the author we shall be rightly related to the Book; if we love the Author we shall love the Book; if we understand the Author in some measure we shall understand the Book; and understanding the Book we shall understand Him better.³³

This circular argumentation concerning Christ and the Bible, it should be emphasized, occurred often within Shields' post-1918 sermons. Another instance of it was contained within his book of sermons on the trial of Jesus:

You cannot consider the questions relating to the Person of Christ, -- whence He came, who He is, whither He has gone, whether He is coming again, without, at the same time, being forced to consider the bearing of their answer upon the Bible. All these questions are directly related to the Bible. On the other hand, you cannot consider any question in respect to the trustworthiness of the Scriptures, or in respect to anything of which it speaks, you cannot consider the Bible from any aspect without, by that consideration, being at last driven to ponder this question, Is Jesus the Christ?³⁴

Closely related to this circular argument was the accompanying insistence that if one aspect of the biblical witness were shown to be untrue, then the whole edifice of

biblical inspiration and, therefore, of Christian faith would crumble:

Well then, if it be true, it [i.e. the Bible] is a Book of divine origin, for it claims that for itself. It is either all that it claims to be, or else it is utterly valueless; and if it be divinely inspired, then this Bible is in a class by itself.³⁵

In light of the intimate connection between Christ and the scriptures, as well as the assertion that if even one "error" were detected in the biblical text then the text was utterly valueless, it is little wonder that Shields fought with such vigour against Modernist teachings. In his analysis Modernism undermined Christ indirectly by undermining the scriptures directly:

The cardinal principle of Modernism is that it denies the divine inspiration and authority of the Word of God, the Bible. You may seek to evade it as much as you will, but that is the foundation of the whole matter: Modernism denies that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, that they are the Word of God.³⁶

Shields' description of the "Bible" (always capitalized) as the Word of God (also always capitalized) is curious in light of the Bible's own testimony to Christ as the Word of God and in light of Luther's distinction between the living Word contained within the written word. This is a distinction that Karl Barth has popularized in contemporary theology by his differentiation between the living Word, the written Word and the preached Word. Unlike some modern Conservative-

Evangelical scholars who recognize Christ as the Word but who refuse to allow any cognitive dissonance between the Living Word and the written word,³⁷ Shields always spoke in his post-1918 sermons of the Bible as the Word of God. As God's Word to humanity it was completely true in all aspects:

This is my confession of faith: I believe the Bible to be the Word of God; I believe it to be so completely God's Word, that it is not only without error in respect to its spiritual message but that in matters of science and history, and of everything of which it treats, it is the truth.³⁸

At least following World War I, the Bible as God's Word was so closely identified with Christ in Shields' theology that the two could be spoken of as if they were one and the same:

My brethren, let us take courage! As there was no sepulchre which could hold the Incarnate Word, so there are no means by which this Bible can be destroyed. The original is kept where the alleged "assured results" of the critics have no weight: forever God's Word is settled in heaven! And when heaven shall be opened, and the Rider of the White Horse shall come down [from] the skies, He shall be clothed in a vesture dipped in blood: and His name is called the Word of God.³⁹

This imprisonment and displacement of the Living Word by the written word meant that the Bible rather than Christ became the mediator between God and humanity in Shields' theology. As Shields put it in January, 1933:

Fundamental to everything is this principle: I approach the discussion as one who believes, without any reservations, in the divine inspiration, infallibility and supreme authority, of the Bible as being the very Word of the living God. To me, this

Book is the supreme authority.⁴⁰ [Shield's emphasis]

In its displacement of Christ as the supreme authority within Christian faith, the Bible also was treated in a "docetic" fashion in much the same way as the person of Christ had been previously depicted.⁴¹ Shields' tendency to approach the Bible with docetic presumptions was directly based, then, on Shields' treatment of the person of Christ. In his view any kenotic element within Christ led inevitably to "open unitarianism."⁴² With all talk of kenosis concerning Christ being declared heretical, however, it was unavoidable that Christ's humanity would be viewed as a mere cloak which the essential Deity only assumed in a functionalistic manner. Similarly, in writing about the supernaturalism of the scriptures Shields fell into the same trap. He sought to defend the human element within scriptures when he stated:

Now, divine inspiration does not destroy the peculiar characteristics of the personality through whom it speaks. As for instance, let us suppose there are different colours in these windows; there may be blue and purple and violet and yellow and red; and the morning sun streams through these coloured glasses. It is all sunlight, but it is coloured by the medium through which it shines.⁴³

But this emphasis on the biblical authors, like the humanity of Christ, was overwhelmed by Shields' stress on the supernaturalism of the Bible. In spite of the example of the coloured glass which presumably could not only change the colours of the sun but also, through defects in

the glass, block the sunlight, in the last analysis, the Bible was seen by Shields as "supernatural Book from beginning to end."⁴⁴ Indeed, the Bible was so absolutely unique that it "could not be more utterly unlike every other book had it **literally dropped from the skies.**"⁴⁵[emphasis mine]

Shields' Typological Interpretation

Alan Richardson has treated the current renewal of the typological interpretation of the Bible as a movement complementary to the modern, historical critical approach to the scriptures. Richardson writes:

Before the rise of critical scholarship in the nineteenth century the richly typological interpretation of the ancient Fathers had been somewhat neglected in favour of a mechanistic conception of the predictive element in the Old Testament, which goes hand in hand with the notion that revelation is written down in the propositional statements of Scripture. . . . The rise of modern historical methods destroyed the argument from prophecy in its traditional form. During the twentieth century, however, it has been increasingly realized that a powerful apologetic may nevertheless be based upon the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. This fulfilment is one of types or images rather than a literalistic coming to pass of verbal predictions.⁴⁶

While Shields' use of typology in his interpretation, particularly of the Old Testament, could have allowed him to move towards a more liberal and less literal interpretation of the biblical text, it definitely did not influence his thinking in such a manner. In part this was due to the fact that, unlike the modern biblical scholars

in Richardson's description who had abandoned a direct correlation between prophecy and prediction, Shields continued to support a direct linkage between the two. As he phrased it, "every prophecy which was made concerning Him [i.e. Christ] was most literally fulfilled."⁴⁷

Nonetheless, in spite of Shields' use of this more traditional notion of prophecy where the prediction caused the historical event, he also used a more dynamic typological approach as well, particularly in his early years of ministry. Indeed, the old predictive notion of biblical prophecy was coupled with a typological interpretation. In a sermon on the book of Ruth he once stated: "the Book of Ruth, like every other Book of Scripture, is full of the Lord Jesus. Indeed, **it was written for the purpose of introducing us to Him.**"⁴⁸[emphasis mine]

Usually, though not always, Shields' typology was limited to types of the Christ. In an 1899 sermon, for example, he wrote; "leprosy is a type of sin; Naaman the Syrian a type of many sinners."⁴⁹ On the whole, however, Shields' typological thrust was centered in Christ. As he noted:

The Old and New Testament are one. "Christ and him crucified" is on every page. The promise of His cleansing blood like a scarlet thread binds all the books from Genesis to Revelation fast together, and makes this Bible the loving, life-giving, Word of God.⁵⁰

In an 1917 sermon he summarized the matter thus: "I have tried to show you that every true prophet of the Old Testament, every 'man of God' was a type and prophecy of the God-Man of the New."⁵¹ This typological structure of the Bible was even further evidence that in Shields' thinking the Bible was supernaturalistic and, thus, an essential part of the sovereign plan of God:

Now for us clearly to apprehend that and to see that God is little by little making His plan and purpose known, in type and in symbol, writing His purposes into the history of His people -- to understand that will save us from this modern notion that the Bible happened.⁵²

While Shields' typological approach to the interpretation of the Old Testament text did not stop him from advocating an allegiance to a plenary, verbal, inerrant view of biblical inspiration, it might have done so if followed to its logical end. Nonetheless, it did give his biblical hermeneutics a solid base which would enable him, even during the controversial years of the 1920's, to avoid the speculative extremes to which some elements within conservative Protestantism were driven. Shields' typological interpretations may have been rather unconvincing at times,⁵³ but the very fact that by this approach he was allowed to see Christ on every page of the Bible meant that he was unsympathetic to extremes of allegorization. For him the main point was singular; it was Christ. In a sermon on the prodigal son he warned:

I am aware that a parable in the hands of an extreme literalist is likely to be about as useful for purposes of illumination as a box of matches in the hands of a baby: there is likely to be rather too much light for safety. It is possible, by emphasizing the details of a parable, to rob the Word of God of its authority; and make it, I fear, almost absurd.⁵⁴

Shields was not opposed to any allegorization of the biblical text. In his book Christ in the Old Testament he gave the advice: "read the story of the Babel tower. You ask, 'do you mean to say that that it is literal history?' Yes, I think it is historical; but I think it is allegorical too."⁵⁵ Nonetheless, allegorization had to be governed by christology within Shields' framework. Again the circular argument for inerrancy played a part in this insistence. If the entire Old Testament pointed to Christ, as in Shields' typological framework it clearly did, then it was only logical and fitting that Christ would authenticate such a revelation. Writing about Jesus' comments within John chapter five where Jesus referred to Moses' writings (John 5:47) Shields used a typical Fundamentalist argument: "Jesus in those verses put His seal upon the traditional view that the Pentateuch was of Mosaic authorship."⁵⁶ That Jesus may simply have been echoing popular sentiment concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Torah did not trouble Shields. In this, Shields differed from fellow Baptist, Augustus Strong, who wrote:

... we must distinguish between what he [i.e. Jesus] **intended** to teach and what was merely

incidental to his teaching. When he said: Moses "wrote of me" (John 5:46) and "David in the Spirit called him Lord." (Matthew 22:43), if his purpose was to teach the authorship of the Pentateuch and of the 110 Psalm, we should regard his words as absolutely authoritative. But it is possible that he intended only to **locate** the passages referred to, and if so, his words cannot be used to exclude critical conclusions as to their authorship.⁵⁷

While Strong's comments also tended to leave little room for either the humanity of Christ or the scriptures they are preferable to the circularity displayed within Shields' biblical exegesis, or the either/or mentality of Fundamentalists such as Robert Anderson. Anderson in his article on biblical criticism within volume two of The Fundamentals insisted:

. . . that the Lord Jesus Christ identified Himself with the Hebrew Scriptures, and in a very special way with the book of Moses, no one disputes. And this being so, we must make choice between Christ and Criticism.⁵⁸

Shields' typological approach centered as it was in the person of Christ also played an important role within his hermeneutics. Shields recognized that a plenary, verbal view of inspiration was not, in and of itself, a guarantee of a united exegetical view. He confessed that:

Roman Catholicism, Darwinism, Christian Science, Millennial Darwinism and many, many other extravagant and irrational sins have the common characteristic that they do not deny the Voice of God or the Word of God, but only misinterpret it.⁵⁹

In a 1900 sermon he set out the hermeneutical principles which he hoped would safeguard against the misuse of the biblical text:

The best expositor of Scripture is the Holy Spirit; the best commentary on the Bible is the Bible itself, for one part explains another. Its many books are so many stories in the arch of the bridge of communication between earth and heaven, of which Christ is the key-stone binding all together.⁶⁰

In a 1916 sermon (by this firmly entrenched in his christomonistic viewpoint) he further defined these hermeneutical principles, noting:

No interpretation can be true which conflicts with the truth of the essential Deity, and absolute infallibility of our Lord Jesus Christ. If I can find a clear statement of His on any subject, that is absolutely final with me.

My second principle is this: my attitude toward the Old Testament is determined by what I conceive His attitude to be.

My next working principle is this: the Old Testament is to be interpreted in the light of the new; and not the new by the old.

Another principle is: Passages as obscure or highly figurative as to be susceptible of many interpretations must be interpreted in the light of the explicit statements of Scripture and not the reverse.⁶¹

Shields' fourth principle was directed mainly against extremes of millennialism which he felt treated the text in a highly interpretative fashion which was unwarranted by the context in which the text was situated. His insistence upon the importance of the text's context was a natural consequence of his typological interpretation in which the figure of Christ was dominant. There was the immediate context and the larger, christological context. This larger context was ample proof, if such were needed, of the unique inspiration of the Bible:

For us to see, I say, that the Lord Jesus is in the book of Genesis as well as in the Book of Revelation, and that all these Books are bound together by the same character, though differently named, will serve to confirm our faith that this Bible is "the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever."⁶²

The Bible and Evolution

Another important element within Shields' use of the Bible was his attitude towards evolution. While his view of the centrality of the scriptures changed over the years to the place where Christ was largely displaced, or at least, imprisoned by the Bible, he showed remarkable consistency in his opposition to evolutionary teaching. In an 1895 sermon, for example, he simply took for granted Bishop Ussher's chronology of creation and noted concerning Christ's birth that: "four thousand years have passed away when the event for which the world from the beginning has been waiting takes place."⁶³

For Shields, the challenge of the evolutionary hypothesis was a direct challenge to the veracity of the claim that God was real and involved in the world. As Shields put it: "no one can accept the Bible's account of creation, and its interpretation of all the phenomena of human life, who cannot accept the first word -- "In the beginning God."⁶⁴ Any doubts which Shields may have privately entertained in light of Darwin's theory of evolution were put to rest by the outbreak of World War I

which confirmed, for Shields, the erroneous path of modernistic accommodation to Darwin's evolutionary hypothesis. In a sermon preached in 1915 he declared:

It is now perfectly clear to me that the Bible and the evolutionary hypothesis cannot both be true . . . All attempts at harmonization have resulted only in the emasculation of Scripture in general; the rejection of much of Genesis; the torturing of the whole Pentateuch; the weakening of the Bible's authority; and the dishonouring of its subject, the glorious Son of God.⁶⁵

The Bible and Modernism

The chief weapon which Shields and most other Fundamentalists used against modernistic teachings was the "infallible" Bible. The defense of the Bible rather than the defense of the person of Christ became the chief preoccupation of Fundamentalists such as Shields. Whether this shift in focus would have happened regardless of the theological war with Modernism is difficult to determine.

Was the displacement of the person and work of Christ by the Bible the inevitable result of a christology conceived of in christomonistic and monophysitic terms, or was it the result of the presumed tactics of the Modernists? According to Shields, the Modernists -- Harry Emerson Fosdick (amongst others) -- did not attack the person of Christ directly but indirectly. Shields could find very few critics who dismissed the deity of Christ in an outright fashion. What he thought he found were many who by questioning the biblical account of the virgin

birth, for example, subtly undermined the deity of Christ.

Whether it was what he took to be Modernist strategy or whether it was the inevitable outcome of his christological thought which resulted in the pre-eminence of the Bible is, for all intents and purposes, a 'chicken-and-egg' question. Certainly it may be claimed with confidence that Shields' christology was conceived in such a manner as to make possible the substitution of the Bible for Christ, but whether this would have happened without modernistic questions concerning the biblical text is impossible to determine.

Once Shields had 'divinized' the scriptures, however, they became a potent weapon against Modernism. Treated as absolute and inerrant truth, the scriptures were no longer subject to critical discussion and exegesis; biblical interpretation as such became suspect in the eyes of Shields and his followers. Conversely, a mere appeal to "the Bible says" was enough to restore confidence in the text and to put an end to all critical discussion. In a sermon preached in September of 1925 Shields responded to the question of the influence of other religions on the formation of the Judaic faith by using this tactic:

Some of the critics have a theory that the religion of the Hebrews, the religion of the Old Testament was an imitation -- an improvement let it be admitted -- but an imitation of the religions of the heathen; that they are all of common origin, and have

been evolving out of the religious consciousness of men. **That is not what the Bible says.**⁶⁶

That many did not adhere to an inerrant Bible and would remain unconvinced by the circular arguments which Shields and his fellow Fundamentalists found so appealing, did not seem to trouble Shields. He was deeply concerned about the loss of faith which he saw all around him but was unable to see or to respond to this questioning in creative ways which would make sense in a world where authority was rejected and where truth was relativized.

Instead, he continued to offer his circular argument with various twists and turns until, in time, no circular argument was needed; the Bible had displaced Christ and any critical exposition of the scriptures was an attack on the divine. Thus, in speaking about Julius Wellhausen's theory of the composite authorship of the Torah, Shields asserted: "more than thirty years ago the theory was said by a distinguished scholar to be 'too monstrous to be seriously entertained.' And so it will be regarded by those who ascribe infallibility to Christ."⁶⁷ In a sermon directed towards the children of the church he hammered home this point even further as he instructed them:

And hear me, you boys and girls in high school, I do not care who your teacher is, man or woman, I do not care what his training is, if ever you hear your teacher anywhere suggest that there is anything in this Holy Book that is not true, that the Bible is not reliable, whenever your teacher substitutes human wisdom for the wisdom of God as revealed in Christ, you say in your heart, "That is one thing I will not

believe."⁶⁸

That such an attitude towards the Bible and towards Christian faith could result in a form of blind faith which would further marginalize the conservative Christian faith in which Shields so strongly believed did not seem to bother him. As he almost naively stated:

I venture the affirmation that there is not a biblical problem, whether in respect to the Bible, the miracles of the Bible, or in the supernatural manifestation of which is the record -- considered as itself the supernatural product, and as being the record of the supernatural, -- there is no problem involved that is not solved the moment you accept Jesus Christ as God.⁶⁹

The stumbling block, however, is that the Bible is such a rich and complex book that the tight and tidy but, unfortunately, simplistic arguments which Shields used could not hold. Even within Fundamentalist circles there were strong differences of opinion on hermeneutical questions. Once critical scholarship had been discredited as an important avenue of arriving at truth,⁷⁰ what was to be the standard by which the singularity of the biblical witness could be guaranteed? The answer came early in Shields' career. In a sermon preached during the second year of his pastoral ministry he announced that: "the pastor is the Lord's mouthpiece, and I believe the Lord speaks through Him to his people."⁷¹

In his insistence upon the divine authority conferred upon the pastor by God, Shields would only grow more and

more adamant as the years passed. Many have criticized this element within his personality as a psychological aberration which was particular to him. J. C. Watt, a Fellowship Baptist minister (the Fellowship Church formed in October, 1953 out of the ministers and churches who had withdrawn from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec in 1927) in his history of the Fellowship Baptist Church attributes Shields' authoritarianism to physical illnesses which weighed him down near the end of his life.⁷² While not discounting psychological proclivities, or health and emotional strains, it is important to acknowledge that an hierarchically structured faith based on a complex 'book' such as the Bible will have enormous problems with authority. In the end, then, authority will fall upon the one who 'correctly' interprets the Bible.

This ladder of authority was evidenced by Shields' life and thought. Christ was the essential deity, who was to be approached through the Bible conceived of as supernaturally inspired book, which was to be interpreted by the pastor to the people, who would take the truth revealed through this chain of authority and act upon it. In a tradition where the ecclesiastical structure of the Roman Church was seen to be an expression of the anti-Christ, the question of which pastor was the correct interpreter was a vexing question indeed. In the end, this

issue turned prominent Fundamentalist leaders against each other and significantly weakened the attack which Shields and others sought to mount against Modernism.⁷³

With his particular view of biblical inspiration and interpretation, and his subsequent use of the Bible as the chief weapon against Modernism, it was not surprising that Shields moved towards separatism in the middle nineteen-twenties. As he forecast in 1921 in Christ in the Old Testament:

The time is coming, and it is not far distant it seems to me, when those who believe in the supernatural in this Book, and in the supernatural in the life of the believer, and in a supernatural power as the energy by which the work of the church is to be accomplished -- the time is coming when people of all denominations who believe that will have to raise their protest of this denial of everything that is revealed in the Word of God.⁷⁴

In an article on Fundamentalism K. E. Christopherson, while zealously overstating the unity of mainline churches in comparison with the Fundamentalist situation, nevertheless makes a telling point when he writes:

[Fundamentalist] sectarian divisiveness is perhaps the inevitable result of making the central keystone of Christian faith an inerrant Bible which in fact humans will interpret variously, in contrast with the uniting tendency of a gospel which Paul insisted makes us all **one in Christ**.⁷⁵

Shields' separatism was an inevitable result of his "elevation" of the Bible, but his allegiance to separatism varied in its intensity. In an April 12, 1923 address entitled "The Necessity of Declaring War on Modernism," he

explicitly denounced denominational separatism as he counselled:

I do not mean to advocate withdrawal from the denomination, nor do I suggest any sort of separatist movement. We should, in this matter, proceed on the principle of "what we have we'll hold."⁷⁶

Just a few years later, however, in a private letter to the Director of the China Inland Mission, he had changed his mind as his own denomination censured him in 1926, and in 1927 moved to obtain the Constitutional power to expel him:

On this continent the battle for the Book is being lost -- where it is being lost -- not by the attacks of the modernists nor yet by the rout or retreat of the fundamentalist; but by the course and conduct of men who are personally sound in their views, but who allow their friendships and fellowships to regulate their alignment in conflict, **rather than permitting their doctrinal convictions to determine their fellowships.**⁷⁷ [emphasis mine]

Shields' leadership in the separatist thrust within Fundamentalism was crucial and the results of this leadership in this area have been longlasting. Indeed, the Fundamentalist scholar David Beale has stated that: "pre-1930 Fundamentalism was **non-conformist**, while post-1930 Fundamentalism has been **separatist.**"⁷⁸ In time, the very definition of a Fundamentalist, as Jerry Falwell summarizes, became one who "was a true separatist."⁷⁹

Until 1925 Shields did not favour separatism, even if he intimated that such a stance might well be inevitable.

His latter commitment to an inerrant Bible, however, made such separatism inevitable. Shields had demolished the avenues for conversation with Modernist and moderate alike through his theological views. Instead of abandoning or revising these views, he held to them with greater tenacity. To a growing part of Canadian church society this tenacity made little sense. To one who accepted Shields' theological position, no other logic was wanted or needed. In his sermon entitled, "Is There Any Modernism in Heaven?", even without his magnificent oratorical powers to drive the point home, the print fairly leaps off the page in its compelling power:

I have said it to you so often: I am sure of the Old Testament because the Lord Jesus has told me it is all true. Did you know that? Study your gospels and you will find that he has put his imprimatur upon every part of the Old Testament; to Him it was the very Word of God. What shall we say of Him? Did He know? Was He subject to human limitations? Did he play upon the ignorance of His contemporaries in the days of His flesh, when He talked about Jonah's being in the belly of the whale, when he predicted real Ninevites' standing up in the judgement? Did He really believe in the historical accuracy of that scripture, or was He merely taking the prevailing view? He could not be my Saviour if He did not know; and if He knew it was not true and did not tell me, how can I trust Him? Oh, no, my friends, He knew. He is God! What do they say in heaven? "Unto the Son" -- what do you say about Christ? What do you say about Him? Whose Son is He? What is your answer? I can tell you what heaven's answer is -- "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever. That is what they say about Christ in heaven. They do not say it in some of the colleges. But I do not care what all the theological seminaries in the world say, if I can get Heaven's judgement on this question; and Heaven says of Him, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever."⁸⁰

Conclusion

The Irony of It All is how Martin Marty entitles the first volume of his series on "Modern American Religion," explaining that "irony . . . characterizes the quality of situations and outcomes in modern American religion."⁸¹ Basing his analysis on Reinhold Niebuhr's influential use of irony in his description of American history, Marty depicts the events between 1893-1919 in the religious history of America as fitting the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of irony "as 'a condition of affairs or events as if in mockery of the promise or fitness of things.'"⁸²

The concept of irony is particularly applicable when considering Shields' christology and its impact upon his view of the Bible. It is supremely ironic that Shields, motivated by a strong desire to uphold the centrality of Christ against Modernist reductions, ended up displacing Christ by the Bible. Shields himself would certainly not agree with such an assertion. This, however, is simply further indication of the element of irony which characterized Fundamentalist efforts to protect the primacy of Christ.

This displacement of Christ was not unique to Shields, although he certainly was a leader in this movement and, as such, responsible for lending some

credence to the charge of 'bibliolatry' with which Fundamentalism has been so often accused. John Dozois in his B. D. Thesis on T. T. Shields attempts to refute this charge of bibliolatry, noting:

One thing is certain. He possessed deep affection for the Bible, and believed its teachings were meant to be taken seriously. This accounts, to a great extent, for his militant opposition to those he felt were undermining its message and authority. But to charge him with Bibliolatry is to misunderstand the nature of the love he had for "the Book". What concerned him was that the Modernists seemed to be reducing "the Book" to the level of all other books. Today we can see that his fears were not without foundation.⁸³

John Dozois has understated the high place of the Bible within Shields' theology in the years following the First World War. Nonetheless, he is correct in rejecting the charge of bibliolatry. Bibliolatry has been a charge attached to various Protestants from the Reformation onward. The slogan "the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants"⁸⁴ has led many to conclude that certain elements within Protestantism, if not all of Protestantism, fell into an unhealthy veneration and worship of the scriptures. It is an accusation which has been levelled at various times against the Fundamentalists. With its pejorative usage over the years bibliolatry is not a particularly helpful term in trying to understand and evaluate Shields' attitude towards the Bible.

That is not to say that Shields did not, at times, seem to end up treating the Bible as a sort of paper god. It has been shown how, following the First World War, the Bible began to displace Christ as the primary authority within Shields' theology. Moreover, the fact that Shields treated Christ's humanity in monophysitic and docetic terms meant that when the Bible supplanted Christ it too took on a supernaturalistic character which, in effect, negated any human element within the authorship of the Bible. This, of course, did not bother Shields and was, in fact, what attracted him to the Bible as the weapon of warfare against what he took to be modernistic reductionism and denial of the essential deity of Christ.

Shields' treatment of the Bible should, however, be of great concern, for it is essentially a mistreatment of the scriptures. Otto Weber delineates what happens to the Bible within Fundamentalism when he notes:

Just as in the Roman Church and theology the Word as event is subsumed into the Word of the Church, this happens in the Protestant realm with the Bible. The result is that the Bible is made the object of a similar apotheosis as that of the Church in the Roman world. This tendency can be seen anew and in a more extreme form in modern Fundamentalism; faith in-God in Christ becomes faith in the infallibility of the Bible (naturally, the two are identified but the later absorbs the former in practice).⁸⁵

T. F. Torrance has addressed this absorption of Christ by the scriptures in his 1981 Payton Lectures delivered at the Fuller Theological Seminary. In

Torrance's analysis:


Fundamentalism stumbles, not so much at the consubstantial relation between Jesus Christ and God the Father, at least so far as his person is concerned, but at the consubstantial relation between the free continuous act of God's self-communication and the living content of what he communicates, especially when this is applied to divine revelation in and through the Holy Scriptures.⁸⁶

According to Torrance, then, Fundamentalism operates within a dualistic and static framework which:

. . . cuts off the revelation of God in the Bible from God himself and his continuous self-giving through Christ and in the Spirit, so that the Bible is treated as a self-contained corpus of divine truths in propositional form endowed with an infallibility of statement which produces the justification felt to be needed for the rigid framework of belief within which fundamentalism barricades itself.⁸⁷

What this means in terms of God's self-revelation in Christ Jesus is that "the living reality of God's self-revelation through Jesus Christ and in the Spirit is in point of fact made secondary to the Scriptures."⁸⁸

Torrance's critique is confirmed by the movement of Shields' thought from a stress on the person of Christ to a stress on the Bible. What has clearly been shown, however, is that simply to emphasize the person and work of Christ is not to solve the conundrum which Fundamentalism creates. That is to say, not only must the displacement of Christ by the Bible be corrected, but the Fundamentalist tendency towards docetism and monophysitism must also be changed since it was this monophysitic-docetic view



of the person of Christ which, in Shields' theology at least, was the key element within his interpretation of the scriptures.

An analysis of the thought of T. T. Shields leads to the important insight that, although Fundamentalists and Evangelicals must re-evaluate their static, propositional view of divine revelation, they must also, and perhaps more importantly, re-evaluate what it means to claim that Jesus Christ was both Divine and Human at the same time if the centrality of the living Christ is to be restored to conservative Christianity.

It is, of course, unnecessary to acknowledge that this mystery can never be fully understood. Nevertheless, it is possible to correct misunderstandings of the orthodox christology of Chalcedon and to affirm the centrality of the person of Christ within all valid expressions of Christian faith. As Torrance phrases it, all evangelical beliefs should "point away from themselves to Jesus Christ alone as their truth and thereby acknowledge their own inadequacy and deficiency before him."⁸⁹

Shields' evangelical beliefs failed to point away from themselves to the person of Jesus Christ because he moved from a trinitarian to a christomonistic position where Christ was defined in monophysitic and docetic terms.

This depiction of Christ ended up distancing him from humanity. Thus, Christ's mediatorial role, (which is one of the essential truths preserved by the stress on Christ as very God and very Man) was lost and a vacuum was left into which Shields placed the scriptures. Not surprisingly the scriptures were viewed in the same manner as Shields viewed the person of Christ. It seems inevitable, then, that when Christ is torn apart and treated as either God alone (Shields' essential deity) or as the supreme example of "man" (the pitfall of much of liberal christology) that theological tensions will arise. For a healthy theology the strange but compelling figure of the Christ must always be the central truth of faith beyond which, as Ellul put it, "there is nothing -- nothing but lies."⁹⁰

This is not to claim that a correct doctrinal formulation of "the two natures" of Christ will free Christ from the imprisonment of the scriptures or of contemporary culture -- far from it. But the christological formulations of the early Church, it may be argued, were not made in order to substitute philosophy for faith as many have alleged⁹¹ but to preserve the mystery of God's self-revelation in the person of Jesus the Christ without resorting to irrationality.

In his stress upon the complementary nature of reason and faith it may be argued that Shields was correct. Rationality, as such, is not the enemy of faith.

Rationalism, falsely defined (to use a typical Shields' expression), may well be such an enemy. When our human reason becomes the measure of all things then man/woman has, in fact, displaced God.⁹² Nevertheless, the use of reason to preserve the mystery of faith is not only legitimate but necessary.

Moreover, to insist upon a christological priority is not to drive a wedge between "the Spirit and the Bible, the Bible and Christ, and Christ and the Spirit" as Bernard Ramm has phrased his caution in the book, The Pathway of Religious Authority.⁹³ Certainly the danger of separating Christ from the scriptural testimony, so that Christ becomes a rather vacuous ideal which can be filled with the language of contemporary culture, is a very real danger. However, such a distortion should not silence the attempt to demonstrate how Christ was displaced within Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. Without an understanding of why and how this displacement happened, appropriate theological corrections cannot be made in order to safeguard Christ's centrality within conservative thought. Ironically (as has already been noted) such a concern was what motivated Shields, in the first instance, and so a further warning is needed. And that is that the very act of seeking to safeguard the centrality of the person of Christ is a dangerous act, for the moment this

task has been embarked upon, one has interposed something between Christ and the believer. The final conclusion which arises out of Shields' displacement of the person of Christ by the Bible is that one must recognize this irony and so echo a paraphrase of a celebrated comment by Shields' hero, C. H. Spurgeon, "defend [Christ], I would as soon defend a lion!"⁹⁴

ENDNOTES

¹C. H. Pinnock, "Biblical Authority, Past and Present, in the Believer's Church Tradition," in The Believers' Church in Canada, eds. J. K. Zeman and Walter Klassen (Brantford and Winnipeg: The Baptist Federation of Canada and The Mennonite Central Committee, 1979), p. 84.

²Morris Ashcraft, "The Theology of Fundamentalism," Review and Expositor LXXIX (Winter 1982), p. 39.

³Carl Henry, Evangelical Responsibility p. 39.

⁴Martin E. Marty, Modern American Religion, vol. 1, The Irony of it all 1893-1919 (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 237.

⁵Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 15.

⁶Ernest Sandeen, "The Problem of Authority in American Fundamentalism," The Review and Expositor LXXV (Spring 1978), p. 211.

⁷Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 103.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Packer, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, p. 21.

¹⁰Falwell et al, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon, p. 3.

¹¹Barr, Fundamentalism, p. 36.

¹²"Puritanism can mean many things: the doctrine of thrift and hard work which accompanied the rapid rise of early capitalism in modern western civilization; or the concern for the individual conscience and personal liberty which so transformed 17th century England and confirmed Britain's role as cradled of freedom . . . [or] an attitude to life and the world, and to man's sensual enjoyment of them, which looks upon these things as the

devil's instrument for snaring souls." William Kilbourn, "The Past" in Religion in Canada, ed. William Kilbourn (Toronto: The Canadian Illustrated Library, 1968), p. 46. On a theological level, Puritanism expressed itself in a strong emphasis on biblical theology as a way to halt the advance of the Roman Catholic Church. It is in this theological sense that the word is used to describe the theology of T. T. Shields as he also emphasized "biblical theology" as a way of halting the advance of modernism. Puritanism has never had a single definition. In this fluidity of definition, it is similar to the word Pietism which has been employed in order to contrast Shields' revivalistic [i.e. pietistic] emphasis with his doctrinal [i.e. puritanistic] emphasis. For a good analysis of revivalism within the North American situation see Jerald Brauer, "Revivalism and Millenarianism in America," in The Great Tradition in Honour of Winthrop S. Hudson Essays on Pluralism Voluntarism and Revivalism, eds. Joseph D. Ban and Paul R. Dekar (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1982), pp. 147-159. J. J. Davis has criticized the revivalistic strain within the American tradition for bringing about the downfall of evangelicalism in the 1920 because it "tended to emphasize personal religious experience rather than rigorous theological reflection." John Jefferson Davis, Foundations of Evangelical Theology, p. 34. In my analysis the "downfall" of T. T. Shields came about because, instead of exploring the richness of a personal relationship with Christ, he resorted to doctrine in the form of biblical inerrancy as his tool for combating Modernism.

¹³Shields, "No Temple Therein, Revelation 21:22, October 29, 1916.

¹⁴Shields, "Jesus Called a Child," Matthew 18:2, January 13, 1898.

¹⁵Shields, "Goodness of God," Romans 2:4, August 27, 1899.

¹⁶Shields, "Jesus's Stripes," Isaiah 53:5, June 4, 1899. Although the Bible was treated by Shields as God's infallible witness it was, in Shields' early thinking, not God's only witness. In Shields' understanding God had "written three books" that is; nature, providence, and the Bible. Of these three the Bible "is the best book of the three; it is the best because it is the plainest and because it is the completest." Shields, "Christ's Sovereignty," I Corinthians 15:25, March 4, 1900.

¹⁷Shields, "Without Christ," Ephesians 2:12, June 15,

1902.

¹⁸Shields, "Take Ye Away the Stone," John 11:39, March 17, 1895.

¹⁹Typological interpretations of the biblical text were used extensively in the writings of the early church fathers. See "Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church," in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, From the Beginnings to Jerome, eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 412-453. Luther's revolt against the allegorization of the biblical text in favour of the literal meaning, renewed interest in a typological interpretation of the Old Testament, since typology was tied to historical events and personages and did not lead to the fanciful interpretations which an allegorical approach tended to do. Interestingly enough Alan Richardson ties together a typological approach with the rise of modern, critical biblical scholarship. See Alan Richardson, "The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship and Recent Discussion of the Authority of the Bible," in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 3, The West from the Reformation to the Present Day, ed. S. L. Greenslade (London: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 335. Comparing typology with allegory Richardson writes: "In contrast to the Hellenistic or Alexandrian variety of allegorical exegesis, biblical typology seeks to disclose genuinely historical patterns within the scriptural framework; there must be a real and intelligible correspondence between type and antitype." Ibid, p. 337.

²⁰"Christ Our Beloved, Canticles 1:7, August 15, 1897.

²¹Shields, "Fire on the Altar," Leviticus 6:13, April 30, 1905. I have argued in the previous chapter, that the constant and growing emphasis on the supernaturalism of Christ so removed Christ from his mediatorial role that it paved the way for the substitution of Christ by the Bible. In light of Shields' insistence on the supernaturalism of the Bible why did not a similar transposition happen with the scriptures? The answer lies in the concrete nature of the biblical text which could be handled and seen and "possessed" versus the risen Christ who could not be treated in such a manner.

²²Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 82.

²³Ibid, p. 96.

²⁴Ibid, p. 100.

²⁵Ibid, p. 99.

²⁶Shields, "What Some Baptists Are Determined to Stand For," Jude 1:3, October 22, 1922.

²⁷Shields, "Wilt Thou Be Made Whole?" John 5:6, October 1, 1922.

²⁸Shields, "The Second Coming of Christ," [no text], February 13, 1922.

²⁹Shields, "The Virgin Birth," The Gospel Witness (December 27, 1923), p. 3.

³⁰Shields, Address delivered at Gordon College in Boston, March 29, 1923. While Shields recognized that, in the opinion of many conservatives, the scriptures had displaced Christ; he failed to analyze his own thinking in this regard. He did not ask the question why most students would give priority to the scriptures, nor examine his own culpability in such an important (and destructive) shift.

³¹Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 193.

³²Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, pp. 13-14.

³³Ibid, pp. 11-12.

³⁴Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History, p. 52.

³⁵Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 4.

³⁶Shields, "Is There Any Modernism in Heaven?" The Gospel Witness (September 17, 1925), p. 3.

³⁷See, for instance, the text of the 1978 Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy contained in J. I. Packer, God Has Spoken, rev. ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979), pp. 139-155. For Barth's distinction see Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics The Doctrine of the Word of God, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1956), pp. 742 ff.

³⁸Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History, p. 50.

³⁹Shields, "The Cross and Its Critics," pp. 83-84.

⁴⁰Shields, The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed. This stress on the need for authority within religion was a constant one with Shields. It too helped in the

displacement of Christ in favour of the Bible. Near the end of his life Shields noted in an address on the "Finality of Christ" that: "authority must reside in some one. In whom? To whom does this Council [i.e. the International Council of Christian Churches] look for direction? We refuse to allow any person or collection of persons to exercise spiritual leadership over us. And yet someone must command and direct. Who shall it be? There can be but one answer: "One is your Master, even Christ, and ye are brethren." But who is to be the Master's mouthpiece? The International Council of Christian Churches declares its belief that the Head of the church has revealed His will in the Holy Scriptures." Shields The Finality of Christ, pp. 5-6.

⁴¹Mark Noll makes this same point in his review of conservative biblical scholarship when he notes: "In the past, however, evangelical scholars have not entirely broken free from a docetic approach to Scripture, which treats the Bible as a magical book largely unrelated to the normal workings of the natural world" Mark Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, p. 165.

⁴²Shields, The Necessity of Declaring War on Modernism [An address delivered at the Mass Meeting of the Baptist Fundamental League of Greater New York, at Calvary Baptist Church, April 12, 1923], p. 2.

⁴³Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, pp. 18-19.

⁴⁴Shields, "Abraham Believed God," Romans 4:3, August 13, 1922.

⁴⁵Shields, "The Most Excellent Knowledge," The Gospel Witness (September 10, 1927), p. 9. [This sermon was originally delivered on September 18, 1930].

⁴⁶Alan Richardson, "The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship," in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 3, p. 335.

⁴⁷Shields, "Where Are the Nine?" Luke 17:17, August 29, 1897.

⁴⁸Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 94.

⁴⁹Shields, "Namaan," II Kings 5:2, July 16, 1899.

⁵⁰Shields, "Well of Bethlehem," II Samuel 23:14-16, July 28, 1899.

⁵¹Shields, "More About Elisha," II Kings 8:4, October 18, 1914.

⁵²Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 69.

⁵³Shields' sermons within the book Christ in the Old Testament contain some very powerful, as well as some very trivial, examples of typological interpretation.

⁵⁴Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 109.

⁵⁵Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 62.

⁵⁶Ibid, p. 69.

⁵⁷Augustus Strong, Systematic Theology, p. 314.

⁵⁸Robert Anderson, "Christ and Criticism," The Fundamentals, vol. 2, p. 79.

⁵⁹Shields, "Revelation and Reason," Matthew 4:7, January 14, 1912.

⁶⁰Shields, "A Good Land," Numbers 14:7-9, January 14, 1900.

⁶¹Shields, "Will He Be Welcome?" Revelation 1:7, February 13, 1916.

⁶²Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 108. In the early years of his ministry, Shields understood the importance of treating a text within its immediate context. In a 1896 sermon he noted, "we have not right to wrench a passage of Scripture out of its context." Shields, "Risen With Christ," Colossians 3:1, April 5, 1896.

⁶³Shields, "In Remembrance of Me," Luke 22:19, June 2, 1895.

⁶⁴Shields, "Outside the Gate," Genesis 3:22-24, February 25, 1912. In a slightly earlier sermon he made a similar point when he stated, "if the story of Eden be only a myth, then the cross is without meaning. But it is no myth but solemn and historic fact. Shields "The Cross," John 12:32, March 7, 1909.

⁶⁵Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 21.

⁶⁶Shields, "Is There Any Modernism in Heaven?" The Gospel Witness (September 17, 1925), p. 2

⁶⁷Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 71.

⁶⁸Shields, "The Writing on the Cross," The Gospel Witness (December 16, 1926), p. 3.

⁶⁹Shields, The Most Famous Trial of History, p. 54.

⁷⁰This is not say that critical biblical scholarship should be the means at arriving at biblical truth. This unfortunately has been the verdict in many theological circles, with the concomitant undermining of the role of the laity in the arena of biblical interpretation. Mark Noll discusses this problem in Between Faith and Criticism, pp. 150-154.

⁷¹Shields, "Strong Determination," I Kings 22:14, November 10, 1895.

⁷²J. H. Watt, The Fellowship Story (Toronto: the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches, 1978), p. 41.

⁷³The wonder is that the Fundamentalist coalition which showed such power in the first third of the twentieth century was able to work in such a relatively united fashion, in light of this issue of authority. The answer is to be found in the creedalism of Fundamentalism. Statements of faith served to ameliorate many potential differences of opinion which could have torn the movement apart. Still today the Associated Gospel Church in Canada, a group of churches whose roots are to be found in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy of the 1920's maintains organizational unity through having each 'ordained' minister reaffirm his allegiance to the A.G.C. statement of faith, on an annual basis.

⁷⁴Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 88.

⁷⁵K. E. Christopherson, "Fundamentalism: What Led Up To It, How It Go Among Us, And What We In Academe Do About It," Dialog, 19 (Summer 1980), p. 213.

⁷⁶Shields, The Necessity of Declaring War on Modernism, p. 12.

⁷⁷T. T. Shields to D. E. Hoste, February 19, 1927.

⁷⁸David Beale, In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850 (Greenville, South Carolina: Unusual Publications, 1986), p. 5.

⁷⁹Jerry Falwell et al, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon, p. 145.

⁸⁰Shields, "Is There Any Modernism in Heaven," p. 4.

⁸¹Martin Marty, Modern American Religion, vol. 1 The Irony of It All, p. 3.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³John Dozois, "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields (1873-1955) In the Stream of Fundamentalism," p. 128.

⁸⁴William Chillingsworth (1602-1644) coined this expression but did not mean it as a blind obedience to the Bible, but as a defense of the rights of reason in the investigation of doctrinal matters, in opposition to a Roman Catholic ecclesiasticism.

⁸⁵Otto Weber, Foundations of Dogmatics, vol. 1, p. 183.

⁸⁶T. F. Torrance, Reality and Evangelical Theology (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1982), p. 16.

⁸⁷Ibid, p. 17.

⁸⁸Ibid, p. 18.

⁸⁹Ibid, p. 19.

⁹⁰Jacques Ellul, The Meaning of the City (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 130.

⁹¹See, for example, Jacques Ellul, The Subversion of Christianity, trans Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 23

⁹²One of the benefits of being a Canadian Christian according to Douglas Hall is that our geography helps to mitigate against the hubris which prompts humanity to think that God can be displaced by man/woman. As Hall puts it, "it is hard to stand out on the prairie, or by the sea, or in the midst of northern Ontario's myriad Christmas trees and think to oneself: 'Man is the measure of all things.'" Douglas Hall, The Canada Crisis A Christian Perspective (Toronto: the Anglican Book Center, 1980), p. 78.

⁹³Bernard Ramm, The Pathway of Religious Authority (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), p. 46.

⁹⁴Quoted in J. I. Packer, "Fundamentalist" and the Word of God, Forward.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF T. T. SHIELDS AND THE CHRISTIAN'S
ROLE IN SOCIETY

The Pre-1918 Years

The Priority of Evangelistic Proclamation

Besides shaping his view of the Bible, Shields' evolving christology also had important ramifications for what he saw to be the cultural and political task of the Christian individual and the Christian Church. His lack of emphasis on the incarnation of Christ, and what Christ's incarnation meant for the redemption of the social order, coupled with his insistence that the penal substitutionary theory of the atonement was **the** correct interpretation of Christ's task during his earthly ministry, formed a potent theological mix. Such a mix served to establish his understanding of the role of the Christian individual and of the Christian Church as being one of a passionate dedication to the task of evangelism. This evangelistic task was depicted by Shields, even during his early years of ministry, almost exclusively in terms of the conversion

of the individual. From the very beginning of his ministry, then, the evangelistic impulse was viewed by him as the pre-eminent manner in which the Christian showed his/her love towards God and towards others. Speaking in 1894 on the text where Jesus counselled his disciples, "If you love me you will keep my commandments," (John 15:12)

Shields noted:

. . . the best way in which one can reveal his love for another; the strongest proof that such a love exists is by an ardent desire to see that person led in the full knowledge of Christ as revealed in the gospel.¹

This evangelistic task was seen by Shields to be the raison d'etre of the Christian. It was his or her God-given duty which gave meaning to all of life. In a November, 1894 sermon Shields asserted:

I believe that every one of us, it matters not who or what we are, if we are the Lord's children, we are each of us responsible for the salvation of some soul. If it were not so we should not be in the world."²

Shields' stress on this evangelistic priority meant that he had little sympathy with social service schemes which bypassed what he saw to be the foundational step of the conversion of the individual. In an 1896 sermon on the missionary task, he declared:

They are hundreds of plans in operation throughout the world today, which have for their object the uplifting of humanity, and the benefit of the world at large, but there is only one which has or ever will be successful, and that is the lifting up of the crucified Christ. . . . From the heart to the home; from the home to the business; and from the

business to the uttermost parts of the earth.³
[emphasis mine]

Shields depicted the evangelistic task at home and the missionary task abroad in similar terms. Both evangelism and missions were conceived of, by him, in terms of individual conversion which, through ever-widening circles of influence, would finally touch and influence the societal realities of a people and a country. He protested strongly when he thought that churches had removed the evangelistic focus from overseas mission work and placed it elsewhere:

. . . the mission of the church is considered by some, to be to entertain, or at most to educate. But the real mission of the church is to satisfy the world's need; and the need of the world is Jesus.⁴

This need for Jesus, which Shields saw as the epitome of all the world's deepest needs, would, in his analysis, be fulfilled only by the evangelistic task which, through the winning of men and women to Christ, would "prepare the world for the coming of Jesus Christ."⁵

It would be unfair, however, to confine Shields' concern to the eschatological dimension. Shields felt strongly that if the individual were changed through conversion, then inevitably and naturally changed individuals would change society:

. . . if the truth of the Gospel is rooted in the heart of the individual, it will purify politics, it will remedy all social ills; it will bless whoever believes in it body, soul, and spirit. Therefore the minister should preach to the people the Word of the

Lord, he should have for his object the salvation of souls.⁶

Conversely, individual effort apart from the regenerating power which was available only through the conversion of the individual by Jesus, would lead nowhere. In a comment levelled against McMaster University (long before the battles of the 1920's) Shields noted, in a 1901 sermon, that education could do nothing to change the individual in terms of making him/her into the type of individual whom Christ could use:

But alas! The old man [Shields' term for the unconverted person] is too old to learn. Though he were to pursue a ten year's course in McMaster University, notwithstanding the indisputably incomparably excellent pedagogical abilities of its professors, in all that time they could not teach him how to spell missionary. They might make him a B.A. or a B. Th., but they could never make him a missionary.⁷

This evangelistic/missionary task was seen by Shields to be so all-consuming that material wealth not only could but should be sacrificed for its success. Elaborating on the figure of the "old man" as the example of the unregenerated individual Shields commented:

It is the old man who, because it is muddy, or because his costly patent leather shoes are pinching must needs ride in a street car, and pay for his ticket with money that belongs to missions; and it is the same old gentleman who buys a new coat because he is tired of the old one although it is not torn.⁸

The "old man's" destructive ways were extremely loathsome to Shields since, in his view, they hampered the evangelistic-missionary task of winning people to Christ

and, thereby, of transforming society. In lyrical prose Shields spoke about what the power of conversion made possible through the death of Christ and the financial gifts of his parishoners meant to a needy world:

What the Nile is to Egypt the Gospel is to the world. Rising in the unseen mountain-ocean of the love of God, it flows from its mysterious source in an ever widening, deepening channel over the arid wastes of the world, until by its kindly influence, the wilderness and the solitary places are made glad, and the desert rejoices and blossoms as the rose.⁹

His advocacy of the evangelistic and missionary task as being one of converting individuals to an acceptance of the penal substitutionary work of Christ on the cross was evident from the very beginning of his preaching ministry. Likewise, his frustration with missionary and evangelistic schemes which did not start with the conversion of the individual was also a constant feature. In the early 1900's, however (and this point needs to be stressed), the intensity of Shields' attacks against what he now named as "ethical gospels," that is gospels which instead of proclaiming the need for repentance and conversion saw, as their mandate, the betterment of humanity, began to increase. In a 1905 sermon, preached during his tenure at the Adelaide Street Baptist Church in the city of London, he asserted: "I have more hope of turning the world upside down with the doctrines of grace than with . . . ethical gospels."¹⁰ What is interesting about the contrast which

Shields drew in this sermon is that grace is described by him in rationalistic terms as a doctrine to be believed. This speaks volumes about his view of conversion as adherence to key doctrines, such as the "essential deity" of Christ and the penal, substitutionary theory of the atonement, rather than as an experiential acceptance of the prior work of God in Jesus the Christ. In a January 1906 sermon this stress on doctrine was underscored as he further elaborated on the superiority of "the gospel" to the "ethical gospels":

The Gospel is by many looked upon as being out of date as David's sling and stone, the doctrine of atonement, the punishment of the wicked, and back of it all the infallibility of the Bible -- these are obsolete weapons we are told. But they are wonderfully effective in bringing down the giants of sin. Show me your modern David armed with his boasted "ethical gospel" who comes back with the head of Goliath in his hand, while all the hosts of Philistia are running for their lives! Until then we may well keep to our sling and stone. Our stone of truth from the brook of the Kedron swollen by a Savior's tears and crimsoned by His blood is more fatal to sin than the whole panoply of your "ethical" bloodless gospels.¹¹

The reason why the "ethical gospels" which Shields attacked were inferior to his "doctrines of grace" and why they were, in Shields' view, ineffective in the transformation of the individual and of society was because of their emphasis on the material rather than the spiritual, and the now rather than the future. In a November 1908 sermon Shields highlighted these two themes:

And only as we remember that we are servants of

the King whose kingdom is not of this world and thus recognize the spiritual character of our work shall we possess the spiritual qualifications which are absolutely essential to its accomplishment The Church's mission is to prepare men not for the Now but for the Bye and Bye: for to be prepared for the Bye and Bye, is the best possible preparation for Now; to make men good citizens of the New Jerusalem is to make men good Canadians.¹²

Shields' emphasis on the task of the conversion of the individual and his growing antipathy to what he labelled in the early 1900's as the "ethical gospels" with their thrust on social reform and betterment rather than conversion through Christ (understood, in large part, in terms of adherence to correct doctrine) meant that while in 1894 he could speak about love for men and women as "an evidence of our love for God,"¹³ in 1913, on the eve of the First World War, he was careful to distinguish between the two. Moreover, he gave love for God, by which he meant commitment to conversion, primary importance:

Let no one substitute the second summary of the law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour," for the first, "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God." That would be to turn the Tree of Life upside down, and put the branches where the roots should be.¹⁴

This change in emphasis went hand in hand with Shields' growing, if unexamined tendency to displace the person of Christ with a plenary inerrant Bible. Such a shift was prompted, in part, by his fear that modernistic thought was undermining the Christianity which meant so much to him. The Biblical testimony neither prioritizes

nor separates love of God and love of neighbour, but Shields' concern that Modernism was separating the two caused him to move in the direction of prioritizing love for God which, in itself, would lead to its own form of separation. Increasingly, the warm-hearted evangelistic thrust of his very earliest years of ministry would give way to an evangelistic proclamation based on correct doctrine. Using George Marsden's penetrating analysis of four typical Fundamentalist reactions to the interplay between Christian faith and contemporary culture, it is clear that while the transformation of society which Shields believed would be the result of a vigorous evangelistic proclamation remained constant, his definition of evangelism did not. Quite quickly a more doctrinally defined evangelistic proclamation based on right doctrine eclipsed a more experientially-based definition, yet without totally doing away with an experiential emphasis. The two views of evangelistic proclamation coexisted, then, and while different from each other, (in regard to the interplay between faith and culture), they both lent support to a vision of society transformed by the word. In the first instance there was the warm-hearted word of piety, and in the second, the clear-headed word of true doctrine.¹⁵

The Return of Christ

Shields' overwhelming emphasis on the transformation of society by the Word meant that the return of Christ was not, in the very first few years of his ministry, a dominant concern. Indeed, in one of the first sermons which he preached on this subject in July 1896 he warned:

There has been a great deal of idle speculation as to the exact time of Christ's second coming. Some have gone so far as to predict the very day and hour. But this is folly. . . . **Christ will come when the world is not expecting him. . . .**¹⁶

By November 1896, however, two years after he had started preaching, Shields began to realize the importance of the doctrine of the return of Christ, as he noted:

Next to the doctrine of the first advent, there is perhaps no doctrine so important as that of the second advent. And yet perhaps there is no scriptural truth more neglected than the doctrine that Christ shall come again."¹⁷

In a series of sermons in the spring of 1897 he elaborated on the second coming of Christ, revealing his pre-millennial sympathies which had a distinctly dispensationalist bias.¹⁸ Quite quickly, then, the return of Christ became increasingly important to Shields, a return which he thought was very imminent indeed. In a May of 1897 sermon he rhapsodized:

As for myself, my heart is filled with an immeasurable joy when I think of His [i.e. Christ's] imminent return; and my soul is ravished with not less than an angel's delight, as I remember that these mine eyes shall behold the King in His beauty when He cometh in the clouds of Heaven.¹⁹

The reason for this growing emphasis on the imminent return of Christ was the rising pre-millennialist thrust of the proto-fundamentalists who put to the fore what had previously been "kept in the background by the majority of Christians."²⁰ Looking back, likely on his 1897 rediscovery of the importance of the imminent return of Christ, Shields commented in a 1916 sermon on the same theme:

Well, many years ago I had very pronounced views on the second coming of Christ. It was a truth which appeared to me as a new star in the firmament of revelation. Of course it wasn't new. It was only new to me.²¹

While in this particular sermon Shields confessed that he had grown less dogmatic in his view of the imminent return of Christ, this confession must be correctly interpreted. What Shields grew less dogmatic about were the dispensational details of his eschatological position. At least in the 1894 to 1918 period, which this section analyzes, he did not depart from his premillennial views, though, and, in point of fact, his pre-millennialism grew stronger and became a more integral part of his theological position as he became more and more explicitly conservative in his theology. He began to see the strong connections between a pre-millennial stance and an emphasis on the conversion of the individual, versus the "ethical gospels" which centered in the reformation of society which, in his view,

arose out of a post-millennially inspired reductionism of the importance of the sacrifice of Christ in the salvific process.

The Condition of the World and the Church

Shields' "oversight" of the critical importance of the doctrine of the return of Christ in the first two years of his ministry stemmed from two different opinions which he held as to the condition of the world. In a November 1894 sermon, speaking on the text Mark 6:36-37 Shields remarked: "nothing could be more expressive of the spiritual condition of the world today than these words -- 'For they have nothing to eat.'"²² This conviction that the condition of the world was one of spiritual famine, however, was absent from a September 1895 sermon where he asserted: "... we have no reason, my friends, to be tired of the world, though we sometimes give the world much reason to be tired of us. This world is not so bad after all."²³ While Shields would retain, from time to time, this positive attitude about the progress of the world, by and large, and certainly on a theological level, his anticipation of the future of the world and his characterization of the present condition of the world grew more and more pessimistic. This was in keeping with his rediscovery of the importance of the imminent return of Christ. As Sandeen noted in his analysis of the

significance of premillennialism:

. . . belief in the pre- rather than the postmillennial return of Christ involved much more than a question of the timing of the second advent. Converts to premillennialism abandoned confidence in man's ability to bring about significant and lasting progress and in the church's ability to stem the tide of evil, convert mankind to Christianity, or even to prevent its own corruption.²⁴

In a February 1897 sermon Shields underscored the doctrine of total depravity, exemplifying the larger pattern to which Sandeen referred. According to Shields:

Some men tell us that the world is growing out of sin, and all that is needed is something to keep men from falling. That is not true. The world has already fallen, and what is wanted is something or someone to lift it up.²⁵

Four years later his comments on the condition of the world were even more negative. He concluded:

All the plain precepts of Scripture, all Biblical metaphors, all parables, all church history -- indeed all history, our own observation and experience unite in declaring that "This vile world," is not "a friend of grace to help us on to God."²⁶

Increasingly, any sense of postmillennial optimism was obviously not an option for Shields:

You may talk of dark ages gone by when might was recognized as right, and declare that we have fallen upon better days, that the world is getting better, more generous, more unselfish every day -- but no sane man will believe you.²⁷

In this October 1901 sermon Shields used the example of a rather vicious strike which had hit the city of Hamilton and which in his analysis was caused by, "a few men of wealth having oppressed a multitude of laborers."²⁸

Along with this oppression of the many by the wealthy few, Shields also used the example of increased technology as an indicator of the dehumanizing direction in which the world was heading:

We live by machinery. We eat machine made foods, and in some cases with machine made teeth, we wear machine made clothes, read machine made letters, and books, listen to machine made music -- we are in danger of forgetting how to walk -- we move about in machines -- the world is full of the noise of the whirring of wheels and the flapping of belts -- the business of the world appears to be to make machines, but above the noise and clatter of it all, God is calling again, "Let us make Men."²⁹

Shields contrasted his depiction of the world and his vision for the future with the thrust of evolution which he thought undermined the elective powers of God who knew "the end from the beginning," and declared "the record of the race to be one of descent rather than ascent."³⁰ The partnership which seemed to exist between evolutionary thought and the "ethical gospels", which Shields decried, was one reason why Shields felt more comfortable with a premillennial view of history. While certainly not as pessimistic as Moody, who depicted his task as that of filling lifeboats from the sinking ship of the world, Shields was not happy with any view of inevitable progress. In this, however, he displayed contradictory tendencies as the moral perfectionism which has tended to characterize so much of Baptist thinking was also a part of Shields' thought.

Conceivably, with aggressive evangelistic efforts, enough individuals could be changed that the society and, in turn, the nation would also be changed. Such progress would not be socially but individually generated, yet it would still lead to an evolutionary betterment of the world.³¹ This optimistic view, however, was not adhered to by Shields [because of his disenchantment with the spiritual health and vitality of the Canadian Church]. As early as 1897 he lamented: "... you take what are called the churches of Jesus Christ. How few comparatively are faithful to the One in whose name they exist."³² The weakness of the church, in Shields' understanding, was the result of a neglect of the spiritual elements. Using familiar military terminology he noted in 1899:

A Church is a body of the King's army. And I make bold to say that in our day in nine cases out of ten in estimating the strength of a church its spiritual condition is not for a moment taken into consideration, ministers and wealth are the main considerations.³³

In a July 1902 sermon he adopted his father's penchant for Bunyanesque allegorizations and spoke about the church as a company called, "Morality, Church and Company Limited". Among the various departments in this Corporation was the "charity department". Shields described it in the following manner:

Another department was the Charity department. Mr. Liberal was in charge. There was one thing they could not sell in the department, that was a creed. They sold things which looked very much like creeds

-- but of course different from a Christian creed. One was a belief called no-hell, another a book entitled no Christ -- in short you could get all you wanted to feed your fancy in this so-called Department of Charity.³⁴

It is noteworthy, however, that before the advent of World War I Shields was supportive of the movements towards Church union amongst the Methodist and Presbyterian denominations, an indication that he was not as negative about the Canadian Church scene as might be thought. In a sermon on Church union delivered in June 1906 he commented:

Whether a union of all the denominations be consummated or not, the negotiations looking in that direction cannot but be productive of good. However sure of our positions we may feel ourselves to be, no harm can come from their re-examination.³⁵

This relatively supportive view of the possibilities of Church Union, changed quickly, however, as he began to see the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in a decidedly negative light as churches who had adopted "ethical gospels" and given up on the true power of **the gospel**.

His premillennial perspective on the condition of the world, then, coupled with his conviction that the majority of Canadian Churches had forsaken the true proclamation of the gospel, merged with his docetic and monophysitic depiction of the Jesus Christ, and seemed to push Shields strongly in the direction of what H. Richard Niebuhr termed a "Christ Against Culture" approach. In contrast to this culture-denying tendency, however,

Shields' Calvinism tended to smooth out the dualism inherent within such a view, making it very difficult to determine whether Shields should be labelled as the supporter of a "Christ Against Culture" position or an adherent of the "Christ Transforming Culture" stance.³⁶

From the start of his ministry Shields emphasized the fact of the pre-eminence of Christ and the all inclusive nature of the call of Christ. As Shields put it:

. . . let no man talk of loyalty to Christ who tramples underfoot the blood of the covenant as an unholy thing. Remember loyalty to Him in **one thing** is not sufficient, loyalty in **all things** is demanded.³⁷

On the theme of loyalty to Christ in all things, Shields was insistent in this pre-1918 period. In an important and revealing sermon entitled, "Christian Business Men," Shields amplified what this loyalty in "all things" meant to the person who worked in business:

. . . men say business is business, as though religion had nothing to do with it. To the true Christian his religion is his life's business, and his business is an expression of his religious life.³⁸

In the same sermon he gave it as his opinion that, "the possession of capital is a sacred trust which a Christian must administer in the interest of others."³⁹ In spite of his premillennialism, then, Shields' transformist vision continued to hold him. Indeed, when he was at his lyrical best, Shields' depicted the inter-relationship between the Christian Church and Canadian culture by using

a transformist rather than a culture-denying vision:

Can you imagine a piece of land of perhaps a few thousand acres' extent? Through it there winds about a pure river. On either side there stretch away rich undulating lands, where cattle graze in green and luscious pastures, or reapers work amid the golden grain. In one direction there is a building of chaste but simple design, -- a college, rich in its traditions of unselfish devotion to the cause of learning, and hallowed by its association with illustrious alumni who have brought blessing to the world. Hard by, are gardens laid out in perfect taste, abloom with rarest blossoms, enriching with their beauty and their fragrance all who dwell about them. And over there, a modest dwelling stands with grass and flowers around it. Before the door a mother sits and sews and sings; while little children romp about and fill the air with merry laughter. Yonder on the highest point of land, there stands a church, the symbol of the life it represents; the architectural embodiment of physical strength, of intellectual achievement, of moral symmetry, and spiritual beauty: and over all, the mantle of a living vine which drinks in rain and dew of heaven, and lives by heaven's sunshine. Can you hold that picture in your mind? That is "Culture."⁴⁰

Because of his transformist rather than separatist⁴¹ view of the Christian's involvement within society, Shields was appreciative of Canada as a British nation. In a Thanksgiving Day sermon delivered in November 1894, he stated: ". . . we have reason to thank God for His mindfulness of the country in which we live. I do not think there is a country of the world today that has more reason to thank God than we have."⁴² During the Boer War Shields warned; ". . . if ever the Imperial Government pursues a course which is manifestly wrong, it will be as much Canada's duty to protest against it, as now it is her

duty to draw the sword in support of it."⁴³ And in a comment on civilization (exemplified best, according to Shields, by the country of Britain) he asserted:

Ignoring Jesus, too many boast of the sum of the world's light which they call civilization What is called civilization is the moon in the moral firmament . . . her beneficent rays are the borrowed rays of the Sun of righteousness, the reflected light of the gospel of Christ.⁴⁴

Besides Shields' premillennialism, his growing despair over the lack of spiritual fidelity in the Canadian churches and the ramifications of his christological views, another factor which insured that Christ was distinct from and, in Shields' thought, pre-eminent over culture was his Baptist tradition of the separation of Church and State. This emphasis grew mainly out of his concern over the Separate School issue. In 1896 he addressed this question in connection with developments in Manitoba and stated:

Manitoba, my friends, is but a child. It is but sparsely settled It is for this very reason that Rome is so anxious to establish a system of separate schools. Verily the children of this world are wiser than the children of light.⁴⁵

When this particular issue re-surfaced in 1905 and the Federal Conservatives put forward a proposal to allow for support of Separate Schools in the Northwest, Shields' stance was consistent with his 1896 views as he declared; "I shall oppose the imposition of this Education clause simply and solely because it is wrong. It is as wrong

today as in 1896."⁴⁶ In a separate sermon on the same theme he elaborated his reasons for opposing the Roman Catholic Separate School system:

Baptists have always been among the most uncompromising advocates of the principle of the separation of Church and State. We have no desire to keep other men's consciences, we absolutely refuse to allow other men to keep ours. And, consonant with that principle, we are opposed to the use of public money or of public lands for the teaching of religion in any form.⁴⁷

Shields' adherence to the Baptist tradition of separation of Church and State and his opposition to the approaches of those who supported "ethical gospels" meant that the majority of the social sins which he inveighed against in the pre-1918 period of his ministry were individual rather than social wrongdoings. The use of make-up was one of his early targets. In an 1895 sermon he commented:

I need hardly say, perhaps, in such an audience as this, that such practices as the eating of cloves or the using of paint and powder for the purposes of beautifying the complexion instead of observing the God given laws of health, savor very strongly of disloyalty to Christ.⁴⁸

The riding of a bicycle in an 'improper manner' was, curiously, another concern of his: "... he who rides a bicycle in such a position that the head and chest are at right angles to the rest of the body is neither being good to himself nor loyal to Christ."⁴⁹ Dancing and card playing also made Shields' list of vices as he declared, "... we want no dancers as members of this church; we

have not room on our church roll for the names of card players."⁵⁰ To the objection that these vices were rather trivial and secondary Shields made the response:

Anything which keeps you out of the kingdom of God, be it a pack of cards, a glass of whiskey, a violin or a bicycle, anything; no matter whether it is great or small which keeps you out of the kingdom of God is too costly for you or for me.⁵¹

Of course a glass of whiskey was not seen to be a trivial matter within Canadian society in the late 19th century. In 1896 Shields urged complete avoidance of anything to do with the liquor business as he pointed out:

A loyal Christian cannot have a great deal of property in a distant city, and conveniently forget that a certain house of which he holds the deed, and of which he is sole possessor, is used as a saloon, and is hastening men down to hell.⁵²

According to Shields, a domino theory of progressive degeneration applied to the one who harmed the temple of his or her body through the consumption of alcohol: " . . . the first step is departure from total abstinence, or the first glass, the second is acquired appetite; the third, the loss of self-control."⁵³

Shields did not let his disgust with the sale and consumption of alcohol, however, cause him to lose sight of overriding evangelistic priorities. In a 1902 sermon he stated:

I am a **prohibitionist** out and out. And yet I do not believe that prohibition would make a man sober . . . It would make me a thousand times happier and would make me a thousand times safer to have Christ on the throne of my heart than to have a prohibition-

ary law on the statute books.⁵⁴

Shields' concern with individual vices was matched by his advocacy of individual virtues. Christ as the rugged, hard-working, 'manly' individual was the pattern for all Christians. As Shields puts it in a May 1896 sermon, ". . . both in the Church and State, as Christians and citizens, we need men that are men."⁵⁵ Part of what made a man a man was a willingness to work hard. Idleness was one of the worst sins, according to Shields. He stated: "I don't believe all men are equal. I have seen some men who were lazy -- and, well I decline to be reckoned equal with a lazy man or have [him] classed as equal to me."⁵⁶ Thrift, hard work, true economy were the virtues which gave one "progress in the Christian life."⁵⁷ They were also the virtues which supported prosperity within society at large. Preaching in 1907, Shields claimed:

. . . whatever be the real cause of the present distress; whether it be the destruction of capital in the recent wars, and by the convulsions of natural phenomenon as at San Francisco and Valpariso; or a low standard of business and of business morals, or extravagant living; or the over expansion of industrial concerns; whatever the underlying cause or causes, there is, undoubtedly this lesson coming out of it all: that truth and honesty in the merchant, intrinsic values in the merchandise, are as essential to abiding commercial prosperity as is good weather to the harvests of life.⁵⁸

The values of hard-work, thrift, honesty were founded on Shields' view of Christ as the pre-eminent individual to whom other individuals responded. As North

American society began to change profoundly, Shields cried out against this attack on the dignity of the individual as he noted, "there was a day when a workman sold his labour at his own figure. Now he is in danger of becoming part of a huge machine controlled in the main by a few master spirits."⁵⁹ This "huge machine" would be rectified, however, not by the strikes of labour unions, but by the influence of Christian individuals in key positions:

When a factory pours forth its army of labourers at the close of the day, too often, the man with sooty hands and face must go back to some wretched hovel, the only home he can afford to pay for while the head of the concerns returns from his office to a palatial mansion I venture to say that that condition of things will never be where the management is in really Christian hands.⁶⁰

His insight into the dehumanizing aspects of modern technological society, coupled with an "old-fashioned" emphasis on honesty and hard work, might well have led Shields to be more sympathetic to "ethical gospels" which were concerned with similar abuses. It was, in part, this overwhelming emphasis on the individual as opposed to the collective which kept Shields from expressing such sympathies. In this sense, Shields lends support to Gaspar's strong claim that, ". . . the kind of individualism which the Reformation encouraged, and revivalism solidified, is one of the main characteristics of fundamentalism."⁶¹

Prior to the end of the First World War, then,

Shields' discovery of premillennialism did not disillusion him about the possibility of societal transformation. It did, however, bring in a new emphasis, one which the war also called forth, and that was the desire to preserve the values of the civilization into which Shields had been born during the second half of the 19th century, the values of hard work, of thrift, and of individualism. The changing patterns of society, the advent of the machine dominated age, which Shields so disliked, and a move by Canadian society away from the rural values upon which Shields had been reared moved Shields towards a preservationist viewpoint. While this tended to put Shields in opposition to Canadian culture, he was certain that the effect of World War I would be to spark a return to the values of the past. Disappointed, then, by the effects of the war which served to pull people away from the church rather than towards it, Shields entered the tumultuous decade of the 1920's with a perspective which was much more militant and hard edged than had been the case previously.

The Post-1918 Years

The Priority of Evangelistic Proclamation

Shields' support for evangelism and his definition of the evangelistic/missionary task as one of individual conversion to Christ grew even more pronounced during the

decade of the twenties. In a 1922 sermon he asserted that:

The hunger of the soul cannot be satisfied with business, nor with wealth, nor with pleasure, nor with fame, nor even with wife and family. They are all mortal and must leave you. And when the soul wakes it will be to the realization that you are poor indeed, unless you have that one all-comprehensive blessing of the Father, even "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever."⁶²

He grew more vocal (and sarcastic) in his insistence that churches which did not adopt this evangelistic, soul-winning priority were making a grave mistake:

But the Christian Church, instead of seeking to instruct people in the things of God, have given themselves over to the making of playgrounds and gymnasiums, and of bowling alleys, to providing entertainment -- anything, everything, but telling people the Word of the Lord.⁶³

His famous 1921 sermon, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements," which Shields, in a handscribbled note, indicated he felt was the cause of the Jarvis Street split in 1921, rather than any "dictatorial" methods which he may have employed in his ministry, was entirely in keeping with his commitment to the priority of evangelism. In that sermon Shields stated:

If there be a deacon of this church who thinks more of an evening at the theatre, or the diversion of a game of cards, or the pleasure of the dance than the interests of a soul for whom Christ died, he is unworthy of his office. And the same may be said of Sunday School teachers and officers, and also of every member of the church.⁶⁴

He went on to elaborate:

Does this question of amusements affect the business of soul-saving? Yes it does. Most emphatically it does! The passion for pleasure for

world amusement has made barren churches as it has made childless homes! And we shall never accomplish our God-given task nor glorify Him in the salvation of men, until by the power of the Holy Spirit we learn to relate ourselves to men everywhere as to souls for whom Christ died.⁶⁵

The timing of the sermon may have been dictated by power-struggles within Jarvis Street Baptist Church, but the essential thrust of the sermon was an elaboration of what Shields had preached in the 1890's.

The conversion of the individual for future salvation was his pre-eminent concern, then, and nothing, according to Shields, should be allowed to divert the Christian from such a task. At home the culprit was social service schemes, the fruit of the "ethical gospels" which he attacked in the early years of the twentieth century:

Now they have substituted what they call "social service" for evangelism, the uplifting of the masses for the salvation of the individual The primary thing is to bring the individual soul to Christ than other things will all be settled . . . when the churches reverses that program it reverses God's program, and the blessing of the Lord is bound to depart.⁶⁶

Overseas it was educational and health ministries which drew his ire:

Half your missionary societies, instead of sending flaming evangelists to bring men to Christ, are building schools yonder in India and China and often filling them with Modernist teachers, spending their strength in education. It is all good in its place, providing it is the right sort of education. But what is the use of building a school for a lot of dead people.⁶⁷

Social service schemes, educational programs, health

clinics were good and proper in their own place, but when they became a priority in the mission of the Christian Church then, in Shields' view, the second commandment had been placed before the first. This was a mistake, in Shields' thinking, because, according to his theological perspective, the thrust of the first commandment to "Love the Lord your God" was clearly an evangelistic thrust.⁶⁸

As premillennialism took on a larger and more important role in defining and shaping Shields' attitude toward the place of the Christian in relationship with contemporary culture, however, Shields became much more condemnatory of society and of the church. A series of pamphlets on eschatology issued by the Methodist Church was responsible for re-igniting his passion for this issue, causing him to prepare and deliver a series of lectures on this theme, which he presented in 1922. In the first lecture Shields set out his own position:

I frankly declare that I believe in the premillennial coming of Christ. And I believe it is of importance to know whether he will come before or after the millennium. But I do not regard the premill[ennial] view as fundamental to the gospel.⁶⁹

What was fundamental to the gospel, according to Shields, was a belief in the personal, visible return of Christ to the earth. Shields himself adopted a premillennial position but in this sermon he allowed for a postmillennial stance as long as this personal, visible return of Christ to the earth was part of that postmillennial viewpoint. On

the whole, however, he continued to identify post-millennialism with a belief in an evolutionary perspective which saw the world progressively evolving from lower to higher. With this view he wanted nothing to do. He did not, though, wish to be seen as saying that social reform had no place within the Christian message. In his view social reform had a place if it could be instituted and realized by individuals who had been converted to the "doctrines of grace." Shields attacked the view that one's eschatological position determined one's attitude towards social reform:

I do not agree with the Methodist pamphlets that questions of pre or post must determine our attitude toward social reform. In either case, the believer in the Bible will see that individual regeneration is the essential thing and social⁷⁰ reform and service will be the inevitable result.

Instead of being an indication of one's stance on the question of social reform, Shields felt that the question of premillennialism versus postmillennialism was an indication of one's "interpretation of history."⁷¹ Shields believed in the premillennial position because he was certain that the scriptures taught such a truth. He was concerned that a denial of premillennialism would undercut the elective power of God within history and thus undermine the authority of the Bible.

While Shields believed in a form of social reform and protested against the argument of the Methodist

pamphlets that a premillennial perspective would undercut efforts for social reform, it is clear that a growing lack of social consciousness was increasingly evident within Shields' own ministry in the 1918 to 1953 period. In his own survey of human history and in keeping with his premillennial perspective, he saw things getting progressively worse rather than better. He noted in 1924:

I never quarrel with people because they are pre or post, if they believe in the coming of the Lord, -- that is the essential thing, **although I feel a profound sorrow in my heart for post-millennarians; they must be troubled every time they read the newspapers**⁷² [emphasis mine]

Shields' desire to avoid arguments over the details of Christ's return in spite of his avowed premillennial position has caused those who have studied his thought to claim that Shields adopted an amillennial rather than a premillennial position.⁷³ In a 1923 lecture he appeared to be moving away from a premillennialist position when he declared:

Somebody here says, "I am surprised to hear you say that, sir [ie. that David would grow stronger and Saul weaker]. I thought you believed that there would not be any gradual inauguration of a reign of righteousness. I thought you did not believe that the Millennium, whatever it may be, was to come gradually, but on the contrary this spiritual Saul was to get stronger and stronger." Oh no I do not think that at all.⁷⁴

Shields' point was a fine one. He did not want to give in to a despair which would depict Satan growing stronger and stronger while Christ became weaker and weaker. In his

opinion Satan was in his death-throes and the last ages had been instituted by the first advent of Christ, a distinct change from the more dispensationally oriented eschatology of his pre-1918 ministry. However, the death-throes of Satan would be intense and horrific as Satan expended all his efforts in an attempt to vanquish Christ and Christ's own. Shields could not be accused of any optimism in regard to the betterment of the world. While pessimistic concerning the benefits of social service schemes, however, Shields was optimistic in his belief that evangelistic efforts could help hasten the inevitable return of Christ and, thus, the rule of Christ's kingdom on earth:

. . . the great contribution that any man or woman, however great he or she may be, can possibly make to this world's welfare, is to facilitate, to hasten the return of our Lord, and the establishment of Jesus upon His throne.⁷⁵

A further indication that Shields forsook a dispensationalist premillennialism for a historic premillennialist position was his disavowal of a secret "rapture." In a 1897 sermon he had observed that, "the Rapture may be unobserved to all but the saints,"⁷⁶ but in 1930 he stated:

The Scriptures teach us that His coming will be a visible coming. I fear I shall not agree with some of you . . . when I say that after years of diligent search I have been unable to discover any scriptural warrant for the view that Jesus will come secretly.⁷⁷

His premillennialism continued unabated, however, and in a 1931 sermon (a year beyond the confines of this study) he underscored his commitment to premillennialist thought as he asserted: "I confess myself a premillennialist. I can see, from the teaching of Scripture, no hope whatever of the cleansing of this earth, and the establishment of righteousness, this side of the coming of Christ."⁷⁸

While Leslie Tarr notes that Shields tended towards an "amillennialist viewpoint," C. Allyn Russell feels that:

Shields was a premillennialist in the sense that he believed that the world would grow progressively worse rather than better before the return of Christ. He was an amillennialist, however, in the sense that he did not believe in the establishment upon earth of a tangible physical kingdom of God.⁷⁹

Russell's conclusion concerning Shields' disavowal of an earthly kingdom is directly contradicted by Shields' own writing, particularly his comments in the last chapter of his book, The Doctrines of Grace.⁸⁰ It seems clear, moreover, that Shields' premillennialist position is best understood, not within the context of theology proper but within the context of his view of the Christian's responsibility for society. Shields was a premillennialist because he believed that the world was getting progressively worse and that the only hope for betterment was not through social reform but through evangelism. The theological rationale which lay behind his exaltation of

evangelism was a christological one, a docetically-viewed Saviour whose chief point of ministry during his life was his death on the cross. This was certainly his inspiration for an evangelism whose chief reward was other worldly. This is not to claim that Shields had no appreciation for the concept of the Kingdom of God. What he did with this concept, however, was to turn it inward and to individualize it. The Kingdom of God was "now" for Shields, not in the sense of justice breaking into the world in Christ and out of the Christian Church through the Spirit, but only in the sense of individual conversion and an inward purity from the "amusements" of this world which would, fittingly enough, provide more time for the task of evangelism.

It was in this way that Shields was able to reconcile the contradictory tendencies which he had inherited from American revivalism, which Marsden claims "always involved an ambivalent attitude toward American culture."⁸¹ This ambivalence was a strong part of Shields' attitude as pietistic leanings battled with puritan leanings — the salvation of souls versus the salvation of society. In Shields' view the salvation of souls was the first and foundational step for the salvation of society. Thus, while his evangelistic fervor arose out of a "Christ against Culture" perspective, its fruits were seen by Shields as supporting a "Christ transforming Culture"

attitude. It was in this sense that Shields could support so many of the values of Canadian society while at the same time holding firmly to a premillennialist rejection of such a society. This tension could not be held in balance indefinitely, however, and as Shields grew more and more alienated even from his own Baptist Convention the tension gave way to condemnation.

The Condition of the Church and the World

During his ministry in the 1920's Shields used the spiritual condition of the church along with the spiritual condition of the world as support for his premillennially shaped view of history. Indeed, as he moved further and further into a separatist stance it could be said that, in his view, the prime example of a degenerating world became a spiritually apostate Christian church. Writing in 1923 about the influence of the University of Chicago in the training of ministers, Shields noted:

There are a few men who have passed through that University without being contaminated; but the majority of them become apostles of Modernism. And this accursed thing, for it is from hell, beyond any doubt has managed to secure a place in the official life of the Denomination. And there is growing up an ecclesiasticism which threatens to put an end to the independence of the local church.⁸²

Increasingly, he hammered home his opinion that the role of the Church in Canadian society was to be a spiritual one. Thus, in a 1925 sermon he asserted:

. . . . the function of the church is spiritual

and only spiritual; to be the channel of God's redeeming grace, the instruments of the ascended Lord to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth, to affect the salvation of the souls of men.⁸³

It was with regard to church union that Shields made the most dramatic reversal of his previous opinions. Where earlier he had welcomed talks on the theme of union and even attended some meetings of other denominations where this theme was discussed, in the 1920's he turned completely against church union, depicting it as the great example of spiritual apostasy and of ecclesiasticism:

And the Devil wants a great big organization over which there can be a central authority that will dominate the whole church. And in a short time you will see who will be in authority over that body of people called United church. I believe the whole movement is part of the general apostasy.⁸⁴

Declining attendance and the discontinuance of the Wednesday evening prayer meeting were also seen by Shields as tragic reasons for the evangelistic ineffectiveness of the Christian churches in Canada:

A church that does not pray! Think of it! Oh, the tragedy of it! No wonder souls are not saved. What are we doing? Shall we resolve that we will talk with Him day by day about the absent one, and be much in prayer for the salvation of the lost.⁸⁵

In another comment on this lack of prayer Shields was at his caustic best when he stated:

It is strange that some churches have no prayer meeting; that churches should be content to say, "I dwell among mine own people. Come and visit us We are the happiest little social club you ever knew. We come together to admire each other, and to tell each other what a lot of nice people we are. We are a lovely little family circle." Of course no one

speaks this is so many words but it is their inarticulate confession.⁸⁶

The discontinuance of prayer meetings, the emphasis on the "now," the move towards church union, and the growing ecclesiastical bureaucratization which afflicted his own Baptist denomination put to flight any thoughts of a postmillennialistic optimism. Shields summarized what he took to be the church situation as he commented:

There was a time when the Church of Christ was prosperous and when we read those passages in the Psalms about Zion and Jerusalem as though they were even now finding their ultimate fulfilment. And we began to believe, at least some people did, that gradually Zion would spread her wings over the world and that little by little evil would be dispossessed and that the Kingdom of God would thus gradually come, and we should wake up some fine morning to discover that at last the millennium had dawned. And then, all at once, there seems to be a reversal of everything; every fundamental of the faith is denied, everywhere the Book itself is thrown on the scrap-heap, the Deity of Christ is repudiated everywhere, and the . . . very men who were ordained to preach the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, everywhere turning their backs upon our David [i.e. upon Christ, of whom David was a type], until they say, "The hearts of the men of Israel are after Absalom."⁸⁷

The only hope for such apostasy was the premillennial return of Christ, and to this hope for the righting of the Christian Church Shields directed his hearers:

. . . remember then, the day is coming, Oh the day is surely coming, when the King will come back -- there is no doubt about that: "And they shall then see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory."⁸⁸

Christ and Culture

In 1915 in the most fascinating and richest

theological book Shields wrote, The Revelations of the War, he made this declaration:

You must not think of God as a Sunday God, or as being interested solely in what we regard as "religious" matters. Nor must we in our own thoughts limit the operations of the Spirit of God to the purely religious realm. God is in everything, and His hand controls everything; and the "wise man" and "scribes" who really see and write the truth are His providential witnesses.⁸⁹

Unlike Liberal theology, which made peace with the world through the separation of faith from science so that faith became a matter of the heart alone beyond or above the claims of science, Fundamentalists such as Shields sought to group faith (defined as doctrinal assent) with science, to couple it with the empirical rationality employed by the natural sciences. This resulted in the contradiction of Shields' advocating separatism on one occasion and on another underscoring the activity of God in all the affairs of the world, those labelled "religious" and those labelled "secular." In the final analysis, though, because of his cultural vision which failed to come to grips with, both the significance of the incarnation of Christ and the activity of the resurrected Christ through the workings of the Holy Spirit, Shields made a clear distinction between the children of the light and the children of darkness. In his understanding the children of the light were those who made explicit conservative doctrinal commitments and used

those commitments to determine their social activities. In this sense he too made the mistake of severing the religious from the secular, rather than seeing everything as both secular and religious at one and the same time.

This division between the sacred and the secular, with the sacred being infinitely superior to the secular, resulted in a compartmentalized attitude, which meant that unless there was an explicit conservative religious overtone to culture Shields could find little that was good in it. To illustrate this point, he commented concerning the painting of a modern artist that her painting was simply "a vulgar mass of colour."⁹⁰ Unless art, music, literature were explicitly connected with Christ they were useless at best and dangerous at worst. Everything in the field of culture had to be related to Christ for it to be worthwhile.

This attitude pushed Shields in the direction of a "Christ against Culture" position in the 1920's and tended to move him away from the transformist position which had been a part of his thinking in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth. As he put it:

The truth is, you cannot be a friend of Jesus Christ and the friend of Caesar at the same time. "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is an enemy of God." You must choose between Caesar and Christ."⁹¹

Nonetheless, even during the 1920's when he felt that the Canadian society and the Canadian Church were moving

further away from the claims of the gospel, Shields never completely abandoned the position of Christ transforming culture, a position in keeping with Shields' Calvinistic orientation. In spite of the fact that he felt one had to choose between Christ and Caesar, one still chose for Christ in order to convert Caesar to the true way. This combination of a "Christ Against Culture" theology expressed in a "Christ as the Transformer of Culture" mentality meant that Shields was often able to avoid the captivity by culture which many of the mainline churches were not able to withstand.⁹²

With biting comments about the millionaire, John Rockefeller, Shields took a strong stance against the philosophy of Social Darwinism.⁹³ His advocacy of individualism and his upbringing made him a conservative politically and the only time he threatened, during his years of ministry from 1894-1930, to vote in any but a conservative manner was a result of differences with the Ontario government over the issue of the Roman Catholic Separate School system. He did not, however, feel that business should be left to conduct its affairs apart from the claims of Christian faith. In this he agreed with the adherents of the Social Gospel. With Shields, however, the problem was not the result of social and systematic evil which had to be dealt with by strikes and collective

action, but the fact that individual regeneration had not gone far enough. All aspects of an individual's life had to be seen as being under the control of religious faith. Once this was accomplished then business would be purified:

I know men in this city, business men -- I could call the roll of a long list of prominent business men of this city who in their heart believe the book and to-morrow morning they will have to sit around a board with a number of men who are not Christians, and with a host of other men who are nominal Christians and who never allow their religion to interfere with their business.⁹⁴

Shields was not anti-business; he never displayed any socialistic vision whatsoever. His transformist tendencies were directed, not towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, but towards the establishment of the 'Christianized' individual. Thus, in spite of his antagonism towards modern culture, his desire to transform society meant that Shields never advocated complete separation as an end in itself but rather as a means by which to gather strength and power so that the armies of God could sally forth and conquer the heathen.⁹⁵ Increasingly, in the decade of the twenties, the primary arena for this struggle was the Christian Church, but Shields never lost sight of a wider vision, that of a society composed of converted individuals, a society with a suspiciously Victorian edge to it.

Shields' stress on the rugged, 'manly' individualism

of Jesus and his concomitant attack on individual vices continued unabated in the decade of the twenties. Indeed, one of his chief concerns about church union besides the explicitly theological ones, was the concern that individuals were being lost in the move towards larger social groupings. Speaking about union he noted:

Now, my friend, that is the tendency of time -- the making of institutions instead of the making of men. And this is subversive of the faith, and it is absolutely contrary to the teaching of the Word of God. God's plan is not the making of institutions; God's plan is the making of men.⁹⁶

It was as a result of his strong stress on the conversion of the individual that the Prohibition movement did not receive unqualified support from Shields. To him, Prohibition sometimes seemed like another form of "making institutions" rather than "making men" and it no doubt caused him anxiety that the very church groups which he most opposed were the strongest in their support of the Prohibition movement. In a 1920 sermon he issued this warning, "... prohibition is not a new way of spelling the Millennium. We still need measures to restrain evil human nature."⁹⁷ Indeed, in spite of his vehement opposition to the use of alcohol, Shields eventually would claim that adherents of the Temperance Movement fell into the trap of trying to make, "machinery to make the world better, instead of using God's means to make the individual better."⁹⁸

Another concern which arose out of his emphasis on the individual was Shields' frustration with the sin of idleness. In one sermon he burst out: "... how we fritter away time as though there were no end to it! People talk about "pastimes." Why should any sane man or woman want to "pass" his or her time? We have little enough of it."⁹⁹ The shortness of time about which Shields was concerned was not only a reference to the Psalmist's threescore-and-ten but a reference to the imminent return of Christ. In light of such a return every effort and every minute had to be used wisely. Thus, taking time to bob one's hair or to engage in dancing received strong condemnation from Shields, not only because he saw them as wrong in and of themselves, but because they diverted the Christian individual from his or her primary task of evangelistic outreach.¹⁰⁰

It must be emphasized, however, that this individualistic stress existed in tension with a populist vision. In contradiction to his stress on the individual, and in spite of his personal proclivity for a comfortable lifestyle, Shields clung to a populist outlook which was revealed by his strong antagonism towards monied interests within the church:

... I declare to you that if a man were to come into this church with all the millions of the richest man on earth -- if he were not walking with the Lord, a spiritual man, abiding in Christ -- so far as I am concerned he should have not office in

this church.¹⁰¹

It was his populism which caused him to censure the Oxford Group Movement. He observed: " . . . the appeal of the Oxford Group to the more comfortably circumstanced people of the community, or the recognition of any sort of class, is surely contrary to the Spirit of the Gospel."¹⁰² The contradiction between his individualistic emphasis and a populist appeal against the wealthy is explained by his own situation at the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, where many of the wealthy acted in opposition to him until their withdrawal in 1921, as well as by the influence on Fundamentalism of William Jennings Bryan, the great populist and friend of North American Fundamentalism.

This populist emphasis was always a minor element in Shields' thought and did not threaten the powerful individualism which typified his thinking. Moreover, any populist tendencies which he may have adhered to were the fruit not of a growing engagement with the world but a growing disenchantment. At the core of Shields' populism was a strong antagonism to those elements within Canadian society which were leading people away from the true faith. It was this militaristic note of societal condemnation which to most people was what characterized the Rev. Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields. And while this may be a slightly one-sided depiction of T. T. Shields, it is fair to say that such a stance was his primary perspective

and motivation, particularly in the last half of the 1920's. For the second half of the decade of the twenties was a time for battle between the sons of light and the children of darkness. As Shields once phrased it:

It is a day when the army of God needs soldiers, when it requires real courage to be a Christian. But it is a glorious fight! It is a glorious war! I would rather be without camp with Him [i.e. Christ] than in the king's palace with Him. I would rather preach the gospel in a barn, or under the open skies, or in any place of assembly at all, with the assurance that God the Holy Ghost is with me, that preach the gospel in the greatest cathedral on earth and be forsaken of the Lord. Let us keep close to Him, Cleave unto the Lord with full purpose of heart.¹⁰³

Conclusion

In regard to his view of the Christian's involvement within culture, Shields was much more consistent than he was in his view of the Bible. In part this was because his christological position had direct and negative effects on his treatment of the scriptures. When Christ was viewed as essential deity his mediatorship with humanity was broken. Into the vacuum the Bible was thrust by Shields, and with unfortunate consequences. Certain elements within his attitude towards the biblical text, such as his typological interpretation of the Bible, served to modify a misuse of the Bible as a sledge hammer which he could use to attack favorite sins. In this regard Shields avoided some of the "eisegetical" pitfalls into which other Fundamentalists fell. Nonetheless, the very

substitution of the sacred scriptures for Christ insured a skewed theological construct which, in its own way, could be said to depart from orthodox Christianity to almost as great a degree as the Modernistic theology which Shields so vigorously attacked.

While not as easy to outline as in his treatment of the Bible, Shields' christology, nonetheless, also influenced his vision of societal involvement. It did so, however, primarily not through direct negative repercussions but as a result of christological beliefs which were unexplored and unappreciated. The incarnation of Christ was one important area where, it may be argued, Shields did not go far enough in his analysis of the person and work of Christ. Another area was his depiction of the atoning work of Christ by means of the penal, substitutionary theory alone. This juridical model is certainly one of the important insights into the work of Christ. When left to stand on its own, however, it can become very one-dimensional and individualized. This is what happened in Shields' theology: individual conversion was everything, while societal reform was always secondary and, indeed, inevitable once enough individuals had been converted. That this reform was not happening was, according to Shields, evidence of a profound dislocation, within the world, (in Shields' pre-1918 years of

ministry), and within the church (in his ministry during the 1920's). To preserve a spirit of inevitable triumph, Shields adopted a premillennial eschatological vision which allowed him to decry the apostasy of his times without giving up on the elective work of God within human history. This premillennial vision, in turn, also tended to undercut social involvement, in spite of Shields' protestations that such was not the case.

Thus, while his christology affected his view of the Bible directly, it affected his view of Christian involvement in society indirectly through not going far enough in the implications of the incarnation and in alternate theories of the atonement. (Needless, to say a christology which is conceived of in docetic and monophysitic terms will always have problems with the implications of the incarnation -- the Word becoming flesh, in that it tends towards a position which elevates the spirit as good and the body as evil.) It is the indirect manner in which his christology affected his view of Christian and church involvement within society which helps to explain why his social vision displays a certain consistency during the very time that his christology underwent important changes.

Shields' approach to the issue of the Christian's involvement in society set him apart from other

Fundamentalists, particularly in regard to his pre-millennial views. The very fact that the key determining factor in his social vision was the priority of evangelism rather than that of premillennialism was sufficient to differentiate him within the Fundamentalist camp. Walter Ellis states:

Shields' rejection of the social gospel did not mean that he was opposed to social reform. In many ways Shields was an atypical fundamentalist. He did not possess the other-worldly social pessimism that pervaded fundamentalism.¹⁰⁴

Ellis has overstated Shields' differences at this point. He did identify himself, until the 1930's at least, with premillennialist sympathies, and, while at times optimistic about the condition of the world, the majority of his sentiments pointed in the opposite direction towards a pessimistic disenchantment with the world. However, Ellis has put his finger on an important difference and that is that Shields did not start with a premillennialist scenario but discovered premillennialism after he had already established evangelism as his central priority. In a sense Shields was closer to Moody than to his own Fundamentalist contemporaries. Moody married evangelism with premillennial pessimism as evidenced by his famous cry, "God gave me a lifeboat and said, 'Moody save all you can.'"¹⁰⁵ Moody, however, kept the primary focus on evangelism rather than being sidetracked into detailed

speculations about the end times. In this way Shields was similar to Moody and except for one series of sermons in the late 1890's he never entered into protracted debates and analysis of the details of Christ's premillennial return.

In the 1920's, in fact, Shields expressly abandoned any sympathies with dispensationalist premillennialism. In this sense Shields' Fundamentalism is best captured, not by Sandeen's work, with its heavy emphasis on pre-millennialism as one of two primary factors within North American Fundamentalism, but by Marsden's work with its larger scope and its fuller analysis of the various factors which influenced North American Fundamentalism. Where Marsden is perhaps deficient, as has been previously mentioned, is in his discussion of key theological categories such as christology.

It should also be pointed out that "millenarianism served less to . . . determine than to enhance and reinforce fundamentalist views."¹⁰⁶ The way it enhanced Shields' Fundamentalism is best expressed by Douglas Frank, who notes: "To premillennialists looking for the return of the Lord, bad news was essentially good news. The worse things got, the nearer their reward approached."¹⁰⁷ To be fair it must be stated that Shields' reward included not only his own personal triumph and vindication but also the conversion of the sinful and,

most important of all, the vindication of the essential deity of Christ and the infallibility of the Bible as the Word of God.

While Shields' differed from many of his fellow Fundamentalists in regard to his pre-millennialism, both in its contours and in its secondary status within his vision of what should be the Christian's involvement in society, he was, however, remarkably similar to them with respect to his social vision. J. D. Hunter in his analysis of nineteenth century American Evangelicalism has noted that:

A distinct . . . element of the nineteenth century Evangelical world view was the Protestant ethical orientation expressed in ascetic self-discipline (chastity, Temperance, and the like), frugality, industry, pragmatism and so on.¹⁰⁸

Shields operated out of this cultural mindset and called it the Christian way of life. He substituted the values inculcated in him through his upbringing for the values of the Bible. In his article on Fundamentalist' views of society Marsden makes this same point when he grants that even if the Fundamentalist viewpoint of "a coherent concept of a universe governed by God's eternal laws," is granted the question must be asked, did "the fundamentalists properly read those laws?"¹⁰⁹ Marsden's answer is to point out the fact of the striking degree "to which the old-time religion reflects the ideals of nineteenth century America."¹¹⁰ If Marsden is correct in his

view that a shift from the cultural mores of this nineteenth century way of life was the most important fact underlining the Fundamentalist transition from moderation in the 1910's to militancy in the 1920's, then any prophetic element within Shields' attack on society or the church becomes suspect, a restatement of the cultural views of the past rather than the call of God for the future. This, of course, is another ironic element within theology. When the humanity of Christ is downplayed and God's revelatory work is seen to by-pass history and culture, it is then that history and culture most deeply influence and imprison theology. It is only when history and culture (including one's own cultural biases) are taken with seriousness, that the revelatory word of God may be clearly heard.

This imprisonment by tacit, unexamined cultural mores of the past, under the guise of direct biblical revelation, was responsible for the negative, denunciatory tones of Shields' view of society and church and for his move from a conservatism of the people which contained some very progressive elements of social concern to a closed minded conservatism which did not. In the pre-war years Shields spoke out strongly against business trusts and wealthy owners who oppressed and took advantage of the worker. He agreed with the right to strike and he was appalled by the teaching of Social Darwinism,¹¹¹ which

allowed the rich to set the agenda for society. Increasingly, as the years passed, Shields lost this concern as he became more and more certain that social reform was by-passing and, indeed, undercutting the rugged, 'manly' individualism which Christ displayed and which Shields so deeply prized.

Because Shields was immersed in his own social vision and saw it as a direct revelation from the Bible, which by the pre-war years functioned almost as a mediatorial deity, social reform became godless and Modernistic. Moreover, -- the progressive thrust of Shields' evangelistic priority, a thrust which, in spite of its individualism, -- could well have provided a perspective which would encourage social reform, was increasingly blunted as new birth became merely another of the Fundamentalist doctrines.¹¹² In his change Shields was not alone.¹¹³ As Marsden notes, what has been labelled the 'Great Reversal,' "took place from about 1900 to 1930, when all progressive social concern, whether political or private, became suspect among revivalist evangelicals and was relegated to a very minor role."¹¹⁴ This great reversal did not just affect the political and economic vision of the Fundamentalists, such as Shields; it affected their view of the arts¹¹⁵ and of movements such as the increasing public role for women in society and in the

church.¹¹⁶

To conclude, George Marsden has categorized four typical responses of Fundamentalists to the question of Christian involvement in society. These four are: 1) "This Age Condemned: the Premillennial Extreme;" 2) "The Central Tension [i.e. the early Shields' desire not to separate but to strengthen the things that remain]; 3) "William Jennings Bryan: Christian Civilization Preserved;" and 4) "Transforming Culture by the Word."¹¹⁷ Shields danced among all four views and often held them in a contradictory and complex partnership. If broad generalizations are of use, though, it would be possible to defend the thesis that Shields began with the desire to "Transform Culture by the Word," moved quickly into the desire to see "Christian Civilization Preserved"; then, in the early 1920's, he adopted the view labelled by Marsden as "the Central Tension," before arriving at the view of "This Age Condemned." The fascinating thing about Shields is that he never totally abandoned his primary view of "Transforming Culture by the Word." Even during the decade of the 1920's, when through events in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec he ended up adopting a separatistic position, he continued to cherish the ideal of transforming culture through the evangelistic word.

ENDNOTES

¹Shields, "The Greatest Command," John 15:12, October 28, 1894.

²Shields, "They Have Nothing to Eat," Mark 6:36-37, November 11, 1894.

³Shields, "The Next Towns," Mark 1:37-38, March 29, 1896.

⁴Shields, [No title], Luke 8:46, February 26, 1897. [This sermon was delivered at a Baptist Young People's Convention]

⁵Shields, "A Great Work, Nehemiah 6:3, October 11, 1896.

⁶Shields, "Christ's Sovereignty," I Corinthians 15:25, March 4, 1900.

⁷Shields, "Old Man and Missions," Acts 1:8, October 13, 1901. [This sermon was preached by Shields two days after it was first delivered at the annual meeting of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec on the occasion of Foreign Mission's Night, October 15, 1901. One wonders what the McMaster Professors thought of it].

⁸Ibid.

⁹Shields, "Success," Acts 12:24, May 14, 1905.

¹⁰Shields, "The Grace of Christ," II Corinthians 8:9, December 3, 1905.

¹¹Shields, "Sling and Stone," I Samuel 17:50, January 19, 1906.

¹²Shields, "Our Future as Baptists," [no text], November 4, 1908. [According to Shields' records this

sermon was delivered at the first meeting of the Baptist Union of Canada. For a description of Baptist attempts at forming a cross-Canada Union see Harry Renfree, Heritage and Horizon, pp. 292-302.]

¹³Shields, "Greatest Command," John 15:12, October 28, 1894.

¹⁴Shields, "The Christian in the Home," Mark 5:19, December 14, 1913.

¹⁵See George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 127-140.

¹⁶Shields, "Second Coming," Matthew 24:44, July 12, 1896.

¹⁷Shields, "Abide in Him," I John 2:28, November 29, 1896.

¹⁸In the spring of 1897 Shields preached a series on the theme of the return of Christ with the following titles: "I Will Come Again;" "He Cometh With the Clouds;" "The Blessed Hope;" and "The Rapture." For a popular discussion of the differences between dispensational and historic millennialism see Robert G. Clouse ed. The Meaning of the Millennium (Downer's Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977).

¹⁹Shields, "He Cometh With the Clouds," Revelation 1:7, May 2, 1897.

²⁰Shields, "I Will Come Again," John 14:3, May 2, 1897.

²¹Shields, "Will He Be Welcome," Revelation 1:7, February 13, 1916.

²²Shields, "They Have Nothing to Eat," Mark 6:36-37, November 11, 1894.

²³Shields, "Harps on the Willows," Psalm 137:2, September 15, 1895.

²⁴Ernest Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 13.

²⁵Shields, [No title], Luke 8:46, February 26, 1897.

²⁶Shields, "The Gospel," Acts 4:14, August 11, 1901.

²⁷Shields, "The Price of Coal," Romans 12:20, October

11, 1902.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Shields, "Baptists and Missions," [no text], June 16, 1911.

³⁰Shields, "The Cross in the Old Testament," I Peter 1:18-20, March 17, 1912.

³¹Interestingly a contemporary evangelical theologian, disenchanted with the pessimism implicit within a premillennialist viewpoint, calls for a return to postmillennialism. J. J. Davis writes: "the years ahead may well witness a revival of post-millennialism in evangelical circles A renewal of such a vision of the church's future, based not on some evolutionary optimism but on an aggressive confidence in the present sovereignty of the risen Lord, could infuse tremendous energy and hope into the urgent task of reaching the 'hidden peoples' with the gospel of Jesus Christ." John Jefferson Davis, Foundations of Evangelical Theology, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 39.

³²Shields, "Look, Wait, Believe," Micah 7:7, January 30, 1897.

³³Shields, "Israel Numbered," I Chronicles 21:1, October 22, 1899.

³⁴Shields, "How to Get Rich -- Chapter Three," Galatians 2:24, July 20, 1902.

³⁵Shields, "Church Union," Ephesians 1:23, June 17,

³⁶Niebuhr's well known typology of: Christ Against Culture; Christ of Culture; Christ Above Culture; Christ and Culture in Paradox; and Christ the Transformer of Culture; is still extremely useful in the categorization of one's approach to the interface between faith and society. See H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).

³⁷Shields, "Loyalty to Christ in All things," [An address], September 26, 1895.

³⁸Shields, "Christian Business Men," Matthew 20:25-28, January 25, 1914.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 24.

⁴¹While Shields advocated the policy of separatism with regard to ecclesiastical concerns, it was tactical separation only and not the separation of one who wished to have nothing to do with the wider Church or the state. It was separation as a weapon to transform both Church and state.

⁴²Shields, "Thanksgiving," I Samuel 15:22, November 22, 1894.

⁴³Shields, "Christ's Sovereignty," I Corinthians 15:25, March 4, 1900. See also Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 15.

⁴⁴Shields, "A Name Above Every Name," Philippians 2:9, December 11, 1904.

⁴⁵Shields, "The Next Towns," Mark 1:37-38, March 29, 1896.

⁴⁶Shields, "North West Autonomy," Acts 22:26, March 19, 1905.

⁴⁷Shields, "Autonomy bill," [no text], March 12, 1905.

⁴⁸Shields, "Loyalty to Christ in All Things," [Address], September 26, 1895.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Shields, "Revised Church Roll, Revelation 3:4, November 15, 1896.

⁵¹Shields, "Bargain Day," Hebrews 12:16-17, May 14, 1899.

⁵²Shields, "Loyalty to Christ in All Things."

⁵³Shields, "Boss Alcohol," Galatians 2:21-22, December 17, 1905.

⁵⁴Shields, "Up-to-Date-Men," I Chronicles 12:32, February 9, 1902.

⁵⁵Shields, "Daniel," Daniel 1:8, May 10, 1896.

⁵⁶Shields, "Up-to-Date-Men."

⁵⁷Shields, "Looking Glass," James 1:26, February 1, 1903.

⁵⁸Shields, "The Widow of Zarephath," I Kings 17:8-16, December 1, 1907.

⁵⁹Shields, "Baptists and Missions," [no text], June 16, 1911.

⁶⁰Shields, "The Christian Employer," Colossians 4:1, January 11, 1914.

⁶²Louis Gaspar, The Fundamentalist Movement 1930-1956, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963), p. 126.

⁶²Shields, "Apostolic Aggressiveness," Acts 14:1-3, September 3, 1922.

⁶³Shields, "Why some Individuals and Institutions Need to be Blown Up With Dynamite," The Gospel Witness (January 31, 1924), p. 2.

⁶⁴Shields, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements," I Corinthians 8:11, February 12, 1921. For Shields' perspective on the effect of this sermon see Shields, The Plot That Failed, pp. 230-238. In the pamphlet version of the sermon date given for the sermon is August 1922. The correct date, however, was February 12, 1921. The August 1922 date may have been a repeat use of the sermon or, as I suspect, may simply be incorrect.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 125.

⁶⁵Ibid, p. 123.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁹Shields, "The Second Coming of Christ," [Monday evening address], February 13, 1922.

⁷⁰Shields, [no title], [Monday evening address of theme of the return of Christ], April 3, 1922.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Shields [Sermon], April 27, 1924, p. 3.

⁷³See Leslie Tarr, Shields of Canada, p. 124

- ⁷⁴Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 117.
- ⁷⁵Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 116.
- ⁷⁶Shields, "The Rapture," Matthew 24:4-42, May 8, 1897.
- ⁷⁷Shields, "How to Get Ready for the Lord's Return," The Gospel Witness (October 9, 1930), p. 8.
- ⁷⁸Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 201.
- ⁷⁹C. Allyn Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," p. 264.
- ⁸⁰Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, pp. 204-208.
- ⁸¹George Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 39.
- ⁸²Shields, "Contending for the Faith," The Gospel Witness (May 31, 1923)
- ⁸³Shields, "Church Union," The Gospel Witness (January 29, 1925), p. 5. Shields' view of the church as the agency for the saving of souls comes closer to the Roman Catholic view of the church as the institute of salvation than it does to the Anabaptist view of the church as the fellowship of the redeemed. In many senses Latin American Liberation ecclesiology which views the church as the Sacrament of salvation is closer to this Anabaptist view than was Shields.
- ⁸⁴Ibid, p. 6.
- ⁸⁵Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 117.
- ⁸⁶Shields, Other Little Ships, p. 161.
- ⁸⁷Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, pp. 136-137.
- ⁸⁸Ibid, p. 137.
- ⁸⁹Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 55.
- ⁹⁰Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 6.
- ⁹¹Shields, The Most Famous Trial of History, p. 139.
- ⁹²For an anlysis of the cultural captivity of the theological moderate wing of the Baptist Convention of

Ontario and Quebec see George Rawlyk, "A. L. McCrimmon, H. P. Whidden, T. T. Shields, Christian Higher Education, and McMaster University," in Canadian Baptists in Higher Education. Why Fundamentalists such as Shields never were able to mount a systematic criticism of the cultural captivity of the Christian Church by the forces of modernity is an interesting question. One answer could be that they redirected everything to doctrinal matters. Another answer lies in the fact that they were able to make criticism of modern society because they were operating out of the cultural perspective of a previous generation. This allowed them to be critical but when it came to being constructive all they could offer were old formulas which proved to be inadequate. A third argument (the one advanced by this dissertation) would contend that their theological framework and particularly their christology did not allow for constructive interplay with culture unless that culture was under the control of the church. Nonetheless, it is interesting that Harvey Cox feels that the rebirth of postmodern theology (although spearheaded by liberation theology and not Fundamentalist theology) will emerge more "readily from the evangelical-conservative than from the liberal wing of American Christianity." Harvey Cox, Religion in the Secular City, p. 267.

⁹³Concerning Social Darwinism Shields stated: "It is a merciless principle which determines the ruthless course of many commercial interests known as 'trusts'. And all sorts of inequities have been justified by the specious plea that it is only the operation of the universal law of the survival of the fittest No more immoral doctrine was ever promulgated." Shields, Revelations of the War, p. 25.

⁹⁴Shields, The Most Famous Trial of History, p. 137.

⁹⁵Ibid, p. 141.

⁹⁶Shields, Christ in the Old Testament, p. 131.

⁹⁷Shields, "Shall He Find Faith on the Earth?" Luke 18:8, December 19, 1920.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 53.

¹⁰⁰On the subject of bobbed hair, Shields stated: "I hope you ladies will let your hair grow again! Be sorry for yourselves until it is grown. That is just a little

serious pleasantry by the way. You bobbed your hair in ignorance; but let Nature teach you. If God wanted you to have short hair He would not have made it natural for your hair to grow long." Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 12. On the subject of dancing, a sermon on "Peter's Denial" has this fascinating condemnation: "If I have told you this story before I will repeat it. I heard my friend, Dr. H. M. Wharton, recently gone home to glory, tell the story of two young people he knew, a young man and woman who were brother and sister. The young man was an out-and-out Christian, while his sister was but a nominal Christian. She was fond of the gaieties of the world. She was very attractive, and was invited everywhere. She was particularly fond of dancing. The brother was concerned about her, and one day he said to her, 'You know, sis, I do not think you are doing the right thing as a Christian going to those places.' 'Why not?' said she. 'There is no harm in it for me.' 'But you could not bear testimony for Christ at a dance, could you?' 'Certainly I could.' 'You are sure?' 'Yes, I am sure.' 'Well I want you to make me a promise. I understand you are going to a dance Friday night. After your first dance when you come off the floor, I want you to turn to your partner and say, 'Mr. So-and-So, are you a Christian?' Try to lead that man to Christ, and tell me the result.' 'All right, I will do that.' 'Very well, I shall expect a report Friday morning.' Early the next week, he had not heard from her, so at last he said to her, 'By the way, what about Friday night? You have not reported.' 'Oh,' said she, 'do not talk about it.' Come now, you promised and I want a report. Did you go?' 'Certainly I went.' 'Did you do what you promised to do?' 'Yes, I did.' 'Tell me about it.' 'Well,' she said, 'I danced with Mr. So-and-So, and when the dance was finished I did what you suggested. I said, 'Mr. So-and-So, are you a Christian?' He smiled and looked rather vacantly at me, and said, 'I beg your pardon?' 'Are you a Christian?' 'A what?' 'Are you a Christian?' 'Why, no, of course I am not -- are you?' I said, 'Yes.' He replied: 'Then what in the world are you doing here?'" Shields, The Most Famous Trial of History, p. 45.

¹⁰¹Shields, The Prodigal and His Brother, p. 124.

¹⁰²Shields, The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed, p. 33.

¹⁰³Shields, The Most Famous Trial in History, p. 141.

¹⁰⁴Walter Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors", p.

¹⁰⁵Quoted in Marsden, Fundamentalism and American

Culture, p. 38.

¹⁰⁶Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism," p. 238.

¹⁰⁷Douglas Frank, More Than Conquerors, p. 69.

¹⁰⁸J. D. Hunter, American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1983), p. 24.

¹⁰⁹Marsden, "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Society," in Reformed Faith and Politics ed. Ronald Stone, p. 74.

¹¹⁰Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 141.

¹¹¹Martin Marty depicts Carnegie as the popularizer of Social Darwinism. Marty writes: "Having discarded the old Calvinist faith that God favoured the elect with success, Carnegie, in the spirit of his new day, looked for a scientific alternative to explain the process. It was at this point that he both read and found coincidence with the thought of Herbert Spencer. He favoured an idea of Darwin's, which he applied glibly to: 'the fittest survived by the process of natural selection.' In Carnegie's case it was not just physical but, more importantly, financial fitness which guaranteed evolutionary immortality." Martin E. Marty, Pilgrims in their Own Land: 550 Years of Religion in America (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1984), p. 308. Marty notes that Rockefeller, in particular, advocated Social Darwinist thought: "the Rockefeller parable [i.e. that of pruning the lesser buds of the rose bush so the greater buds could blossom] for the way the fittest financiers prevailed over competitors in America might represent the opposite pole to biblical language about how the last were first in the kingdom of Jesus, but even conservative Church leadership by then had changed enough not to be literal about words from the Gospel. It was left to muckrakers outside the church to raise embarrasssing questions." Ibid, p. 309. Marty's analysis clearly does not take account of Shields' vehement opposition to Rockefeller and Social Darwinism. This opposition, however, got deflected into doctrinal differences where Rockefeller was used more as a symbol of theological infidelity than as a symbol of an economic system which was unjust.

¹¹²My research on Shields supports C. Norman Kraus' contention that, "what has traditionally held the

Evangelical movement together is an emphasis upon the supernatural experience of salvation by grace rather than a given set of fundamental doctrinal propositions. . . . With the emergence of modern liberalism in the churches the supernatural new birth became one of the fundamental doctrines. Emphasis shifted from a positive conservatism to a negative conservatism, to correct doctrinal statement and an objectified authority for truth found in an inerrant Bible." C. Norman Kraus, "The Great Evangelical Coalition: Pentecostal and Fundamentalist," in Evangelicalism and Anabaptism, edited by C. Norman Kraus, pp. 29-30.

¹¹³A positive conservatism, in my definition, is the conservatism Shields displayed when he spoke out against the abuse of the working class by the societal changes which were going on within Canadian society. A negative conservatism is a conservatism which seeks to safeguard one's own position within society rather than safeguarding the less fortunate. J. Lawrence Burkholder puts it this way: "Whereas their [i.e. Evangelicalism's] earlier attitudes emanated from the consciousness of the dispossessed and were directed against the powerful (city people, Wall Street, the Eastern establishment, political leaders . . .), now they are directed against those who would threaten the establishment." J. Lawrence Burkholder, "Popular Evangelicalism: An Appraisal," in Evangelicalism and Anabaptism, pp. 29-30. Burkholder's criticism of the movement from a positive to a negative conservatism is correct. The transition point did not occur with the movement from Fundamentalism to Neo-Evangelicalism, however, but occurred in the decade of the twenties, within Fundamentalism itself.

¹¹⁴Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 86. To claim that Fundamentalism was captured by culture is not to exonerate Modernism and its spiritual child of liberalism. Reginald Bibby in his survey of the religious beliefs and attitudes of modern Canadians notes that throughout Canadian churches, "The Comfortable Pew has been replaced by the Cultural Pew." Reginald W. Bibby, Fragmented Gods: the Poverty and Potential of Religion in Canada (Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 1987), p. 1. Indeed, Bibby claims that it is only in the conservative denominations, and then only in the area of sexual values, that a significant difference can be detected between the values of the Canadian churches and those of secular society. Ramsay Cook's observation is also interesting when he concludes that the "religious regenerators" of the late 1800's led their respective church groupings in the direction of secular captivity rather than Christian

propheticism. Cook notes, "and so my argument: the supreme irony of the regenerators was that the new birth to which they contributed was not, as they had hoped, the city of God on earth but rather the secular city." Ramsay Cook, The Regenerators Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 4.

¹¹⁵Concerning their attitude towards the arts, Roger Lundin observes that, "Fundamentalists of the first half of our century wrote almost no essays of significance on the arts. When the arts are mentioned in fundamentalist works, either their value or their use is called into question." Roger Lundin, "Offspring of an Odd Union: Evangelical Attitudes Towards the Arts," in Evangelicalism and Modern America, ed. George Marsden (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984), p. 144.

¹¹⁶ Margaret Bendroth comments on Fundamentalist and Evangelical attitudes towards the role of women noting that, "in the first half of the twentieth century, the typical evangelical response to shifting social mores and an increasingly public role for women was to perpetuate a traditional Victorian model of femininity." Margaret L. Bendroth, "The Search for 'Women's Role' in American Evangelicalism," in Evangelicalism and American Culture, p. 122.

¹¹⁷Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 125-133.

CONCLUSION

Dr. T. T. Shields . . . I am visiting in Seaforth, Ontario for a few weeks and while in this province I felt I should like to see you and some of the other strong fundamentalists to ascertain if anything could be done to complete a fellowship of our fundamentalists in Calgary and also in the Province of Alberta with you and the others of Ontario.¹

William Aberhart's letter of July 26, 1928 to Thomas Todhunter Shields underscores the stature and the reputation Shields had within Fundamentalist circles. In both Canada and the United States and, to a lesser degree, other English-speaking countries such as Great Britain and Australia, Shields was viewed as one of the leading Fundamentalist figures of his day. Through his speaking and his writing activities his message was disseminated far and wide.

Born in Bristol, England on November 1, 1873 into a religious home, Shields came to Canada along with his family, which emigrated to Ontario where his father assumed the pastorate of the Plattsville Baptist Church on December 30, 1888. Determined to follow in his father's footsteps, Shields became a minister within the Baptist

Convention of Ontario and Quebec in 1894. He served with distinction, capturing the eye of denominational officials and church search committees as he moved rapidly from smaller to larger churches. In time, he was called to the largest and most influential Baptist Church in Canada at that time, the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in the city of Toronto.

In 1910, when Shields first began his ministry in Jarvis Street Church few would have predicted that this individual would become the controversialist that he became. By the beginning of the 1920's, however, it was clear that Shields was no ordinary pastor. Throwing his lot in with the Fundamentalist movement and providing it with some of its strongest leadership, the name of Thomas Todhunter Shields became a name to revere and a name to revile.

The revulsion came from those who found Shields' Fundamentalism unpalatable and his tactics indefensible. This negative portrayal of T. T. Shields, in particular, and of Fundamentalism, in general, became the dominant scholarly depiction. Moreover, in their analysis, scholars sometimes distorted the historical facts concerning the North American Fundamentalist movement, due to inadequate research and sympathies which were clearly hostile to Fundamentalist thought.

While more "objective scholars" such as Ernest

Sandeen and George Marsden, to name just two, have helped to rectify this distortion, there is still much to be done if Fundamentalism is to be accurately understood and appreciated. In particular, there has been a great paucity of scholarly material on Canadian Fundamentalism as well as on the theological thought of major Fundamentalist leaders.

In order to rectify this situation this dissertation has focussed on the thought of T. T. Shields in regard to his view of the person and nature of Jesus Christ. Two reasons lay behind this choice. The first is that christology is the heart of theology. The second is due to the fact that in the early years of his ministry, Shields maintained a strong focus on the person and work of Christ as the essence of Christian faith.

As the conflict between the supporters of Fundamentalism and those of Modernism intensified, however, Shields, with ironic blindness, removed the focus from Christ and shifted it to the "inerrant" scriptures. This shift was facilitated by Shields' christology, which was docetic and monophysitic. In his view of God, Shields quite quickly became monistic, conflating the person of the Father/Creator with Christ and ignoring the person of the Holy Spirit. This christo-monism ended by removing Christ from his mediatorial role between God the

Father/Creator and humanity. A vacuum was created into which Shields placed the scriptures.

Whether this replacement of Christ by the Bible would have happened naturally in Shields' theological journey, or whether it was a result of his attempts to combat Modernism, is beyond the scope of this study to determine. Once this shift had taken place, however, Shields ironically (and unconsciously) ended up forsaking the orthodox faith which he claimed to be defending.

This dissertation also examined how Shields' christology affected his view of the Bible, noting that his docetism and monophysitic view of Christ was transferred to the scriptures. As a result of this transference, the Bible was seen by Shields to be a book entirely without error, divine and inerrant -- a Fundamentalist version of the golden plates of Mormon's Joseph Smith.

To complete the study the impact of Shield's christology on his view of the role of the Christian within society was also examined. Once again, a defective christology resulted in a truncated view of the Christian's role. Individual sins were targeted while social sins were ignored. This truncation meant that the prophetic critique of modernity, which Fundamentalists such as Shields could have mounted, never came to fruition. The gospel was deprived of much of its power and the concept

of the Kingdom of God was interiorized and rendered relatively socially impotent.

While this dissertation was not undertaken in order to provide lessons to present day religious conservatives, the conclusions, nonetheless, are obvious. If present day conservatives wish to be faithful to the orthodox faith they claim to preserve they must not only shift the focus back to the person of Christ, but they must also rethink what it means that Christ was both "very God" and "very Man." Whether such creative theologizing can be found within conservative, North American Protestantism remains an open question.

Another unanswered question concerns the role that Fundamentalism could have played in preserving the Christian Church in North America from its blind and destructive embrace of modernity. Harvey Cox has examined this issue and concluded that present-day Fundamentalism does not offer much that is of value in the construction of post-modernistic theology. Cox states:

During my research I came to believe that fundamentalism, at least in its early days, was putting many of the right questions to modern theology, and that the current comeback of fundamentalism, this time via the television and computer mailings, will probably contribute a good deal to the demise of modern theology. **But I do not believe fundamentalism has much to offer to postmodern theology.**² [emphasis mine]

Thus, while it is somewhat speculative to suggest

that if Fundamentalist leaders such as T. T. Shields had taken a different view of the person of Christ later Fundamentalism might have had more to contribute to theology, it is nonetheless a suggestive avenue of thought. Certainly Shields strongly opposed four features of modernity in that: he protested the growing dominance of science-based technology; he fought against the growing bureaucratization of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec; he soundly criticized Social Darwinism with its quest for profit maximization; and he tried to withstand the secularization and trivialization of religion. Indeed, the only feature in Harvey Cox's five pillars of modernity which Shields did not attack was the establishment of sovereign national states as "the legally defined units of the global system."³

The question must be asked, then, why the Fundamentalism of such people as T. T. Shields was not able to withstand the forces of modernity. Indeed, contemporary Fundamentalists have not only dropped any opposition to such things as profit maximization, the domination of technology, and the bureaucratization of society but have embraced these concepts and used them to their own advantage.

Clearly, the lack of unity within the Christian community concerning modernity was one factor. Instead of a joint pooling of resources to deal with the challenges

of modern life, a theological war ensued which drove people to extremes and which consumed energy and goodwill that could have been used in much more productive and creative fashions. Another factor was the support for modernity offered by government, media, academic and business groups. It would be wilfully erroneous, however, not to acknowledge the role of theological factors in this process. Indeed, not only did Shields' truncated christology mean that he could not offer a coherent critique of modernity, it was also an important factor in contributing to the trivialization of religious faith which he, himself, decried.

In this, Shields was at least consistent. While he often had keen insight into the symptoms of modernity, particularly in the earlier years of his ministry, the solutions which he offered to alleviate these symptoms were often superficial and unhelpful. His powers of analysis were sometimes very clear but his responses were almost invariably trivial. Rather than attacking an attitude towards life characterized by consumerism,⁴ he attacked dancing, make-up, bobbed hair and the improper riding of a bicycle! Moreover, instead of seeking to form alliances with Christians of all theological backgrounds in order to withstand the forces of modernity, he attacked fellow Christians and heaped his most scathing

denunciation on fellow conservatives who refused to echo his militaristic and separatistic rhetoric.

To conclude with Shields' own comments, he did not feel his own nothingness and Christ's all-sufficiency⁵ but rather set himself up as the champion of orthodoxy. Moreover, he did so without fully understanding the orthodoxy which he sought so passionately to defend.

ENDNOTES

¹William Aberhart to T. T. Shields, July 26, 1928, The T. T. Shields Papers, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

²Harvey Cox, Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Post-modern Theology (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 25.

³"'Modernism' means the attempt to come to terms -- in art, poetry, religion, or anything else -- with the modern world, the world supported by what I call the five 'pillars' of modernity. Viewed from this angle, the 'modern' world is (or was, depending on how far gone one thinks it is) constituted by 1) sovereign nation states as the legally defined units of the global system; 2) science-based technology as the 'modern' world's principal source of its images of life and its possibilities; 3) bureaucratic rationalism as its major mode of organizing and administering human thought and activity; 4) the quest for profit maximization, in both capitalist and allegedly socialist countries, as its means of motivating work and distributing goods and services; and 5) the secularization of trivialization of religion and the harnessing of the spiritual for patently profane purposes, as its most characteristic attitude toward the holy." Cox, Religion in the Secular City, p. 183.

⁴George Rawlyk has argued that consumerism was the main factor in the disintegration of nineteenth century North American Evangelicalism rather than the forces of Darwinism, critical biblical scholarship and comparative religious studies. See George Rawlyk, "A. L. McCrimmon, H. P. Whidden, T. T. Shields, Christian Education, and McMaster University," chap. in Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education ((Kingston, McGill-Queen's Press, 1988), pp. 36-40.

⁵Shields, The Doctrines of Grace, p. 135.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

1. Manuscript Sermons and Sermon Notes by T. T. Shields¹

a. Numbered

1. "This Same Jesus." Acts 1:11. October 21, 1894.
2. "Greatest Command." John 15:12. October 28, 1894.
3. "Transformation." Isaiah 35:1-2. November 4, 1894.
4. "An Important Question." James 4:14. November 4, 1894.

¹The sermon titles are taken, almost exclusively, from a list of sermons which T. T. Shields kept between the years 1894 - 1920. The titles are different from those which, sometimes, he included on the cover of his sermon manuscripts, usually being shorter versions of the longer original. They also will differ within the listing of sermons itself. An example of this is sermon number 610 which originally was entitled "Jezebel" but when repitched was titled "Painted Face." When titles are taken directly from the manuscripts this will be indicated by the use of rounded brackets. An asterik beside a sermon indicates that the sermon is on Shields' listing but I have been unable to locate and read the sermon in its manuscript form. A plus mark indicates that while the sermon is part of Shield's numbering system it does not appear in his listing of sermons preached. The reasons for this vary from sermons which were written but not preached, to sermons which were preached at occasions other than church worship services. The dates of the sermons are the dates preached. To determine the dates when the sermons were written the front cover of the actual manuscript should be consulted. The numbering of the sermons is Shield's own numbering system. The sermons are filed by myself by date and number, and are stored at Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Ontario.

5. "They Have Nothing to Eat." Mark 6:36-37. November 11,

1894.

6. "Shields of Earth." Psalm 9:47. November 18, 1894.
7. "Thanksgiving." I Samuel 15:22. November 22, 1894.
8. "Launch into Deep." Luke 5:4. November 25, 1894.
9. "Faithful Four." Mark 2:3-4. December 2, 1894.
10. "Atmost" Acts 26:28. December 2, 1894.
11. "Going to Canaan." Genesis 12:5. December 9, 1894.
12. "No More Sea." Revelation 21:1. December 16, 1894.
13. "Christ's Mission." Luke 2:14. December 23, 1894.
14. "A Warning." John 3:4. January 6, 1895.
15. "The Tables Turned." Luke 2:7 and Revelation 20:11.
January 6, 1895.
16. "Cause of Rejoicing." Luke 10:20. January 13, 1895.
17. "Families and Schools." [Address]. Colossians 3:14f.
January 18, 1895.
18. "Completeness of Christ." Colossians 3:11. January 20,
1895.
19. "Sufficiency of Christ." Colossians 3:11. January
20, 1895.
20. "God's Sovereignty." Esther 4:14. January 27, 1895.
21. "Lot's Wife." Luke 17:22. January 25, 1895.
22. "How to Fill a Church." John 12:32. February 3, 1895.
23. "Young Man Absalom." II Samuel 18:29, 1895.
24. "A Pleasant Journey." Numbers 11:23. February 3, 1895.
- * 25. "A Foolish Question." Canticles 7:3. February 6,
1895.
26. "God Our Dwelling." Psalm 90:1. February 10, 1895.
27. "Pearl of Great Price." Matthew 13:45-46. February 10,
1895.

28. [No Title]. Acts 17:3. February 12, 1895.
- * 29. "Redeeming Sinners. Luke 15:2. February 15, 1895.
30. "Manliness." I Kings 2:2. March 3, 1895.
31. "Christ Preeminent." I Colossians 1:18. March 10, 1895.
32. "Hardest Way of Life." Proverbs 13:15. March 10, 1895.
33. "Mind of Christ." Philippians 2:5. March 17, 1895.
34. "Take Ye Away the Stone." John 11:39. March 17, 1895.
35. "Life as a Tale." Psalm 90:9. March 24, 1895.
36. "What Have I Done?" Jeremiah 18:6. March 29, 1895.
- * 37. "They That Were Last." Luke 19:32. April 7, 1895.
38. "Saved by Grace." Ephesians 2:8-9. April 7, 1895.
39. "Why Seek Ye the Living?" Luke 24:5-6. April 14, 1895.
40. "Lazarus at Table." John 12:2. April 14, 1895.
- * 41. "Israel Had Light." Exodus 10:23. April 12, 1895.
42. "When I See the Blood." Exodus 12:13 and 13:40. April 12, 1895.
- * 43. "Our Father." Matthew 6:9. April 28, 1895.
44. "Which Art in Heaven." Matthew 6:9. April 28, 1895.
45. "Hallowed Be Thy Name." Matthew 6:9. May 5, 1895.
46. "Thy Kingdom Come." Matthew 6:9. May 5, 1895.
47. "Thy Will Be Done." Matthew 6:9. May 12, 1895.
48. "Give Us This Day." Matthew 6:11. May 12, 1895.
49. "Forgive Us Our Trespases." Matthew 6:12. May 19, 1895.
50. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." Matthew 6:13. May 26, 1895.

51. "Thine is the Kingdom." Matthew 6:13. May 26, 1895.
52. "Christian Baptism." Mark 16:16. May 26, 1895.
53. "In Remembrance of Me." Luke 22:19. June 2, 1895.
54. "Eating Drink and Play." Exodus 32:6. June 2, 1895.
55. "Trust Neglected." I Kings 20:40. June 9, 1895.
56. "Devil's Plan of Attack." Genesis 3:1-5. June 9, 1895.
57. "Swelling of Jordan." Jeremiah 12:5. June 16, 1895.
58. "Saul Built the House." I Kings 6:14. July 14, 1895.
59. "For Jonathan's Sake." II Samuel 9:1. July 7, 1895.
60. "Cutting Roll." Jeremiah 36:22-24. July 28, 1895.
61. "She Hath Done What She Could." Mark 14:8. July 28, 1895.
62. "A Hole in the Wall." Ezekiel 8:7. August 4, 1895.
63. "Christian's Constraint." II Corinthians 5:14-15. August 11, 1895.
64. "Shameful Facts." II Samuel 7:2. August 11, 1895.
65. "Words and Wagons." Genesis 45:27-28. August 18, 1895.
66. "I Pray for Them." John 17:9. September 8, 1895.
67. "Brightened Life." Genesis 19:23. September 8, 1895.
68. "Harps on the Willows." Psalm 137:2. September 15, 1895.
69. "Vanquished Foes." Mark 6:47-51. September 15, 1895.
70. "Christ's Glory." Hebrews 1:2-3. September 22, 1895.
71. "Goodness of God." Romans 2:4. September 22, 1895.
72. "Loyalty to Christ in All Things. [Address]. September 26, 1895.
73. "Death of Terah." Genesis 11:31-32. September 29, 1895.

- * 74. "Good Wine at the Last." John 2:10. September 29, 1895.
- 75. "Dispossession." Deuteronomy 7:17-19. October 13, 1895.
- 76. "Christ a Stranger." Matthew 25:43. October 13, 1895.
- 77. "Strong Determination." I Kings 22:14. November 10, 1895.
- 78. "World Upside Down." Acts 7:6. February 9, 1896.
- 79. "Blunt Iron." Ecclesiastes 10:15. November 24, 1895.
- 80. "Prodigal Son." Luke 15:11-24. December 1, 1895.
- 81. "God So Loved." John 3:16. December 22, 1895.
- 82. "Begin at My Sanctuary." Ezekiel 9:7. January 6, 1896.
- 83. "I Have Put Off My Coat." Canticles 5:3, January 7, 1896.
- 84. "Why Call Ye Me?" Luke 6:46. January 8, 1896.
- 85. "How Long Halt Ye?" I Kings 18:21. January 9, 1896.
- 86. "Belshazzar." Daniel 5:22. January 12, 1895.
- 87. "Strong Man Armed." Luke 11:21-22. January 17, 1896.
- 88. "Out Into the Night." John 13:30. February 2, 1896.
- 89. "Absalom's Beauty." II Samuel 14:25. February 3, 1896.
- 90. "Treasure's of Snow." Job 38:22. February 16, 1896.
- 91. "Christ Lifted Up." John 3:14-15. February 16, 1896.
- + 92. (True Manhood). [No text]. February 19, 1896.
- 93. "Unjust Reserved." II Peter 2:9. February 23, 1896.
- + 94. (Without Christ). Ephesians 2:12. February 26, 1896.
- 95. "Lazarus." John 11:14. March 2, 1896.
- 96. "Shields of Earth." Psalm 47:9. March 15, 1896.
- 97. "Living Water." John 4:10. March 15, 1896.

98. "Christ's Wisdom." John 7:15. March 22, 1896.
99. "Esau's Folly." Hebrews 12:16-17. March 22, 1896.
100. [Funeral Sermon]. John 19:41-42. March 28, 1896.
101. "The Next Towns." Mark 1:37-38. March 29, 1896.
102. "Whosoever Will." Revelation 22:17. March 29, 1896.
103. "Risen With Christ." Colossians 3:1. April 5, 1896.
104. "He Shewed Them His Hands." John 20:20. April 5, 1896.
105. "If Any Knoweth." I Corinthians 8:2. April 19, 1896.
106. "Moses's Choice." Hebrews 11:22-24. April 19, 1896.
107. "Serve and Follow." John 12:26. April 26, 1896.
108. "They Watched Him Then." Matthew 27:36. April 26, 1896.
109. "Body of Christ." I Corinthians 12:27. May 3, 1896.
110. "Daniel." Daniel 1:8. May 10, 1896.
111. "Gentleness." Psalm 18:35. May 17, 1896.
112. "Baptism." Psalm 119:126-128. May 17, 1896.
113. "Life in Christ." [No text]. May 21, 1896.
114. "Stand Fast." Galatians 5:1. May 24, 1896.
115. "God's Time and Man's Time." John 7:6. June 7, 1896.
116. "How Readeest Thou?" Luke 10:26. June 7, 1896.
117. "The Absentee." John 20:24. June 21, 1896.
118. [Funeral Sermon]. II Samuel 12:23. June 30, 1896.
119. "Barabbas or Jesus." John 18:40. July 5, 1896.
120. "Grand Ligne." Romans 10:1-3. July 12, 1896.
121. "Second Coming." Matthew 24:44. July 12, 1896.


122. "Tent and Altar." Genesis 12:8. July 26, 1896.
123. "He That Hath No Money." Isaiah 55:1. July 26, 1896.
124. "God is One." Galatians 3:20. August 2, 1896.
125. "Death of Wicked." Ezekiel 33:11. August 2, 1896.
126. "Be One." John 17:21. August 9, 1896.
127. "No Sun." Luke 16:24 and Revelation 7:16. August 9, 1896.
128. "God's Pattern." Hebrews 8:5. August 23, 1896.
129. "Empty House." Luke 11:24-26. August 23, 1896.
130. "The Lamb of God." John 1:29. August 30, 1896.
131. "Model Young Lady." Proverbs 31:30. September 6, 1896.
132. "Shew Thyself a Man." I Kings 2:2. September 13, 1896.
133. "Home Mission." Matthew 14:15-21. October 4, 1896.
134. "Holy Spirit." Acts 5:32. October 4, 1896.
135. "A Great Work." Nehemiah 6:3. October 11, 1896.
136. "Whose Son is He?" Matthew 22:42. October 11, 1896.
137. "Sanctification." John 17:17. October 18, 1896.
138. "Redemption." Psalm 49:8. October 18:18.
139. "Constancy." Luke 9:32. October 20, 1896.
140. "Fourth Beattitude." Matthew 5:6. October 25, 1896.
141. "Opposition to Jesus." Matthew 2:20. October 25, 1896.
142. "God's Faithfulness." II Samuel 23:5. November 1, 1896.
143. "Wonderful Love." II Samuel 1:26. November 1, 1896.
144. "Wilt Thou Be Made Whole?" John 5:6. Novemeber 8,

1896.

145. "Rev[ised] Church Roll." Revelation 3:4 November 15, 1896.
146. "God's Laugh Mission." Psalm 2:4 and Luke 8:53. November 15, 1896.
147. "Why Men Are Lost." John 3:18. November 22, 1896.
148. "The Spirit of Christ." Romans 8:9. November 22, 1896.
149. "Abide in Him." I John 2:28. November 29, 1896.
150. "Judas." Acts 1:25. November 29, 1896.
151. "Different Kinds of Faith." John 2:23-25. December 6, 1896.
152. "Christ the Restorer." Psalm 23:8. December 6, 1896.
153. "Mary Weeping." John 20:11-14. December 27, 1896.
154. "Jesus Savior." Matthew 1:21. December 27, 1896.
155. "Christ's Sorrow." Matthew 26:38. January 3, 1897.
156. "An Unreliable Calf." Hosea 8:5. January 10, 1897.
157. "Funeral." Psalm 90:9. January 14, 1897.
158. "Mathematics." Mark 8:36. January 17, 1897.
159. "Christ's Agony." Luke 22:29. January 127, 1897.
160. "Hear the Wind." Jeremiah 22:29. January 24, 1897.
161. "Chariots of Fire." II Kings 6:15-17. January 24, 1897.
162. "Look, Wait, Believe." Micah 7:7. January 31, 1897.
163. "Love of Christ." Ephesians 3:19. February 7, 1897.
164. "Blessing and Curse." Deuteronomy 11:23. February 7, 1897.
165. "The Faith." John 8:32. February 14, 1897.
166. "Are Few Saved?" Luke 13:23-24. February 14, 1897.

- + 167. [No title]. Luke 8:46. February 26, 1897.
168. "Two Natures." Romans 7:25. February 28, 1897.
- *+ 169. "Four Ways to Heaven." Titus 2:11. February 28, 1897.
170. "Not Your Own." I Corinthians 6:19, March 7, 1897.
171. "Wages of Sin." Romans 6:23. March 7, 1897.
172. "Salvation of God." Psalm 3:8. March 10, 1897.
173. "Peace in Obedience." Psalm 119:165. March 11, 1897.
174. "Commands Not Grievous." I John 5:3. March 12, 1897.
175. "Christ Precious." I Peter 2:7. March 14, 1897.
176. "My Yoke is Easy." Matthew 11:30. March 14, 1897.
177. "Faith." Hebrews 11:6. March 15, 1897.
178. "Capernaum." Matthew 11:23. March 16, 1897.
179. "Seeking Lost." Luke 19:10. March 18, 1897.
- + 180. [No title]. Isaiah 53:3 and John 15:11. March 20, 1897.
181. "Israel Destroyed." Hosea 13:9. March 23, 1897.
182. "Standing in the Gap." Ezekiel 22:30. March 21, 1897.
183. "Jacob's Prayers." Genesis 32:24-29. March 28, 1897.
- + 184. [No title]. Genesis 40:41 and Luke 23:42. March 27, 1897.
185. "Four Ways." Joshua 7:21. March 28, 1897.
186. "The Scapegoat." Leviticus 16:22. March 30, 1897.
187. "Jesus the Sinner's Guest." Luke 19:7. April 1, 1897.
188. "Two Masters." Matthew 6:24. April 2, 1897.
189. "In Christ." Ephesians 2:6-7. April 4, 1897.
190. "He That Believeth." John 3:36. April 4, 1897.

191. "As You Go, Preach." Matthew 10:7. April 5, 1897.
192. "The Gospel of Christ." Romans 1:16. April 6, 1897.
193. "The Gospel of ____." Exodus 15:16. April 7, 1897.
194. "The Christian Orphans." John 14:18. April 8, 1897.
195. "Divine Guidance." Exodus 23:20. April 11, 1897.
196. "Divine Vengeance." Romans 12:19. April 11, 1897.
197. "Pearl of Great Price." Matthew 13:45-46. April 25, 1897.
198. "Example of Christ." John 13:15. April 25, 1897.
199. "I Will Come Again." John 14:3. May 2, 1897.
200. "He Cometh With Clouds." Revelation 1:7. May 2, 1897.
201. "Blessed Hope." Titus 2:13. May 9, 1897.
202. "Rapture." Matthew 24:40-42. May 9, 1897.
203. "Christ's Custom." Luke 4:16. May 16, 1897.
204. "In As Much As." Matthew 25:40. May 16, 1897.
205. "Waiting Upon God." Psalm 62:5. May 23, 1897.
206. "Without Christ." Ephesians 2:12. May 23, 1897.
207. "When I Am Weak." II Corinthians 12:10. May 30, 1897.
208. "Have Me Excused." Luke 14:18. May 30, 1897.
209. "Rights of Sons." John 1:12. June 6, 1897.
210. "Unalterable Law." Daniel 6:15. June 6, 1897.
211. "Philosophy of Clouds." Job 37:11-13. June 13, 1897.
212. "Herein is Love." I John 4:10. June 13, 1897.
213. "Prepared Way." Psalm 146:8. June 27, 1897.
214. "Golden Candlesticks." Revelation 1:12. July 4, 1897.

- 
215. "Son of Man." Revelation 1:13. July 4, 1897.
216. "Work of Christ." John 17:4. July 25, 1897.
217. "Jehoshaphat." II Kings 3:14. July 25, 1897.
218. [Funeral Sermon.] John 3:16. July 30, 1897.
219. "Rest of Faith." Hebrews 4:3. August 1, 1897.
220. "To Backsliders." John 6:66-68. August 1, 1897.
221. "Christ Our Beloved." Canticles 1:7. August 15, 1897.
- * 222. "Lovely Things." Philippians 4:8. August 15, 1897.
223. "Nebuchadrezzar." Daniel 4:28. August 22, 1897.
224. "Faith." Matthew 14:36. August 22, 1897.
225. "Where Are The Nine?" Luke 17:17. August 29, 1897.
226. "Three Crosses." Luke 23:33. Matthew 29, 1897.
227. "Our Calling." Ephesians 1:17-18. September 5, 1897.
228. "Herod Displeased." Acts 12:20. September 5, 1897.
229. "Love One Another." John 15:12. September 12, 1897.
230. "David's Longing." II Samuel 13:39. September 12, 1897.
231. "My Kindness." Isaiah 54:10. September 19, 1897.
232. "Joseph." Genesis 41:36. September 19, 1897.
233. "Why Will Ye Die?" Ezekiel 33:11. September 26, 1897.
- * 234. "God and the Word." Acts 20:32. September 26, 1897.
235. "To Live is Christ." I Philippians 1:21. October 12, 1897.
236. "Go Ye Therefore." Matthew 28:18-19. November 14, 1897.
237. "They Began to be Merry." Luke 15:24. November 14, 1897.

238. "Power of an Endless Life." Hebrews 7:17. December 12, 1897.
239. "Jesus Savior." Matthew 1:21. November 28, 1897.
240. "Wonderful." II Samuel 1:26. December 12, 1897.
241. "Fishermen." Matthew 4:19. December 19, 1897.
242. "God's Gift." John 3:16. December 26, 1897.
243. "Samson." Judges 16:20. January 2, 1898.
244. "Foot Shall Slide." Dueteronomy 32:35. January 9, 1898.
- * 245. "Peter in Prison." Acts 12:5. January 12, 1898.
246. "Jesus Called a Child." Matthew 18:2. January 13, 1898.
- * 247. "Have Faith in God." Mark 11:22. January 16, 1898.
248. "Soul Saving." Matthew 27:42. January 27, 1898.
249. "Judgement Seat." II Corinthinas 5:10. January 31, 1898.
250. "Christ the Light." John 12:46. February 1, 1898.
- * 251. "A Heavenly Vision." Acts 26:19. February 13, 1898.
- * 252. "Lame Man Healed." Acts 4:14. February 27, 1898.
- * 253. "Lazarus Sleepeth." John 11:11. February 27, 1898.
- * 254. "God's Last Appeal." Matthew 21:39. March 13 1898.
- * 255. "Glory in the Cross." Galatians 6:14. March 6, 1898.
- * 256. "Seeking a Wife." Genesis 24:49. March 20, 1898.
- * 257. "No Man Cared." Psalm 142:4. April 3, 1898.
- * 258. "If I Wash Thee Not." John 13:8. March 27 1898.
- * 259. "She Knew Not Anything." II Samuel 15:11. April 3, 1898.

- * 260. "Jesus Met Them." Matthew 28:9-10. April 10, 1898.
- * 261. "Crown of Thorns." Matthew 27:29. April 10, 1898.
- * 262. "Christ's Standpoint." Luke 19:41. April 24, 1898.
- * 263. "War and its Consequences." Luke 14:31-32. May 1, 1898.
- * 264. "Gold Dim." Lamentations 4:1-2. May 8, 1898.
- * 265. "Obedience." John 4:34. May 15, 1898.
- * 266. "Ahab's Disguise." I Kings 22:30. May 15, 1898.
- * 267. "Christ's Workmanship." Ephesians 2:10. May 29, 1898.
- * 268. [Meeting of Elgin Association]. [No Title or text]. June 2, 1898.
- * 269. "All For Good." Romans 8:28. June 5, 1898.
- * 270. "Rivers of Damascus." II Kings 5:12. June 5, 1898.
- * 271. "Secret of the Lord." Psalm 25:14. June 12, 1898.
- * 272. "Friend of Sinners." Matthew 11:19. June 12, 1898.
- * 273. "Public Worship." Psalm 122:1. June 19, 1898.
- * 274. "Seek Ye the Lord." Isaiah 55:6. June 19, 1898.
- * 275. "Grace Bestowed." I Corinthians 15:10. June 26, 1898.
- * 276. "Christ at Cana." John 2:10. June 26, 1898.
- * 277. "Best Wine." John 2:10. July 3, 1898.
- * 278. [No title]. Matthew 27:22. July 10, 1898.
- * 279. [No title]. I Corinthians 6:19. July 10, 1898.
- * 280. [No title]. Matthew 27:22. July 17, 1898.
- * 281. [No title]. John 4:6-7. July 24, 1898.
- * 282. [No title]. Hebrews 12:14. July 24, 1898.
- * 283. "Through Faith." Ephesians 2:8. July 31, 1898.


- * 284. "Not So Lord." Acts 10:14. July 31, 1898.
- * 285. "Lord What." Acts 9:6. August 7, 1898.
- *+ 286.
- * 287. "No Hope." Ephesians 2:1. August 14, 1898.
- * 288. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. August 21, 1898.
- * 289. "Buried With Christ." Romans 6:4. August 21, 1898.
- * 290. "Self Denial." Matthew 16:24. August 28, 1898.
- * 291. "Departing Christ." Matthew 8:34. August 28, 1898.
- * 292. "Prodigal's Welcome." Luke 15:20. September 4, 1898.
- * 293. [No title]. Revelation 1:12-13. September 11, 1898.
- * 294. [No title]. Matthew 27:29. September 11, 1898.
- * 295. "Christ's Increase." John 3:30. October 9, 1898.
- * 296. "The Best Robe." Luke 15:22. October 16, 1898.
- * 297. "Babel Tower." Genesis 11:4. October 16, 1898.
- * 298. "Kohath, Gershon etc." Numbers 10:21. October 23, 1898.
- * 299. "Nabal the Churl." I Samuel 25:10. October 23, 1898.
- * 300. "The Lamb the Light." Revelation 21:23. October 30, 1898.
- * 301. "Seeking the Lost." Luke 19:10. October 30, 1898.
- * 302. "All Things Ready." Luke 14:17. November 6, 1898.
- * 303. "The Lord With Joseph." Genesis 39:2-6. November 6, 1898.
- * 304. "Jesus Went With Them." Luke 24:15,28-29. November 13, 1898.
- * 305. "Capernaum." Matthew 11. November 20, 1898.

- * 306. "Thanksgiving." Romans 12:1-3. November 24, 1898.
- * 307. "God's Battle Ax." Jeremiah 51:20. November 27, 1898.
- * 308. "Christ's Silence." John 19:9. November 27, 1898.
- * 309. [Funeral Sermon]. Matthew 24:44. December 22, 1898.
- * 310. "The Young Child." Matthew 2:11. December 25, 1898.
- * 311. "Thy Statutes My Songs." Psalm 119:54. January 1, 1899.
- * 312. "Surplus and Deficiency." Mark 12:41-44. January 8, 1899.
- * 313. "Cripple at Lystra." Acts 14:8-10. January 8, 1899.
- * 314. "Lord Who is It?" Mark 14:18-19 and John 13:25. January 22, 1899.
- * 315. "It is John -- Risen." Mark 6:16. January 22, 1899.
- * 316. "By Grace Are Ye Saved." Ephesians 2:8. January 29, 1899.
- * 317. "Justified by Faith." Romans 5:1. January 29, 1899.
- * 318. "Prepare." Amos 4:12. February 12, 1899.
- * 319. "I Will Make Thy Grave." Nahum 1:14. February 26, 1899.
- * 320. "Resting Upon Words." II Chronicles 8:32. February 26, 1899.
- * 321. "The Sword of the Spirit." Ephesians 6:17. March 5, 1899.
- * 322. "I Thought on My Ways." Psalm 119:59. March 5, 1899.
- * 323. "Wicked Balances." Micah 6:11. March 19, 1899.
- * 324. "How to Hear." Matthew 11:15. March 12, 1899.
- * 325. "Suffering for Christ." Philippians 1:29. March 19, 1899.
- * 326. "Joseph Knew." Genesis 42:8. March 26, 1899.

- * 327. "Troubles Increased." Psalm 3:1-8. March 26, 1899.
- * 328. "Awake! Arise!" Ephesians 5:1-4. April 2, 1899.
- * 329. "Jesus, Thomas." John 20:24. April 2, 1899.
- 330. "Christ's Authority." Matthew 7:29. April 15, 1899.
- 331. "Backsliding." Jeremiah 3:12-13. April 23, 1899.
- 332. "Martha and Mary." Luke 10:38-42. April 23, 1899.
- 333. "The Little Maid." II Kings 5:2-3. April 30, 1899.
- 334. "Behold the Man." John 19:5. April 30, 1899.
- 335. "Ezekiel's Wheels." Ezekiel 1:20. May 7, 1899.
- 336. "The Queen of Sheba." I Kings 10:1-8. May 7, 1899.
- 337. "Bargain Day." Hebrews 12:16-17. May 14, 1899.
- 338. "Going to Jerusalem." Mark 10:33. May 14, 1899.
- 339. "God's Glory." Ezekiel 36:22. May 21, 1899.
- 340. "What Give Me?" Matthew 26:15. May 21, 1899.
- 341. "Jesus' Stripes." Isaiah 53:5. June 4, 1899.
- 342. "Jabez." I Chronicles 4:10. June 4, 1899.
- 343. "Glorying in God." I Chronicles 1:31. June 11, 1899.
- 344. "Dying Thief." Luke 23:42-43. June 11, 1899.
- 345. "Unjust Steward." Luke 16:5. June 18, 1899.
- 346. "Wonderful." Isaiah 9:6. June 18, 1899.
- 347. "Spiritual Suicide." Numbers 16:38. June 25, 1899.
- 348. "Gideon." Judges 6:11-14. June 25, 1899.
- 349. [No title]. Luke 19:1-10. June 25, 1899.
- 350. "Nicodemus." John 3:3. July 2, 1899.
- 351. "New Birth." John 3:7. June 2, 1899.
- 352. "Gethsemane." Matthew 26:40. July 2, 1899.

353. "Christ Unknown." John 16:3. July 9, 1899.
354. "Word of the Lord." Jeremiah 22:29. July 9, 1899.
355. "Paul at Corinth." Acts 18:9-10. July 10, 1899.
356. "Repentance." Acts 20:21. July 11, 1899.
357. "The Lord my Shepherd." Psalm 23:1. July 12, 1899.
358. "Son of Man." Matthew 9:6. July 16, 1899.
- * 359. "The Rich Ruler." Mark 10:17. July 13, 1899.
360. "Jacob." Genesis 32:24. July 16, 1899.
361. "Naaman." II Kings 5:12. July 16, 1899.
362. "Lovest Thou Me?" John 21:15-19. July 23, 1899.
363. [No title]. Genesis 19:12-16. July 23, 1899.
- * 364. "He is of Age." John 9:21. July 23, 1899.
365. "Well of Bethlehem." II Samuel 23:14-16. August 6, 1899.
366. "Joab and Amasa." II Samuel 20:8-10. July 30, 1899.
- * 367. "Jehoram, Jehoshaphat and Elisha." II Kings 3:4-29. July 30, 1899.
368. "David, Amasa and Joab." II Samuel 18:5,14. July 30, 1899.
369. "The Second Mile." Matthew 5:41;27:32 and Acts 21:13. August 6, 1899.
- * 370. "Staight Gate." Luke 13:24. August 6, 1899.
371. "Walking on Sea." Matthew 14:22-25. August 13, 1899.
- * 372. "Bethesda." John 5:1-9. August 13, 1899.
- * 373. "The Passover." Exodus 11:21-22. August 13, 1899.
374. "Abundance of Rain." I Kings 18:41-45. August 27, 1899.
375. "Goodness of God." Romans 2:4. August 27, 1899.

376. "Dry Bones." Ezekiel 37:1-10. August 27, 1899.
- * 377.
378. "Bringing Back." Psalm 85:1. September 10, 1899.
379. "Would Be Disciples." Luke 9:57-62. September 10, 1899.
380. "Dreyfus Case." Luke 23:14. September 17, 1899.
381. "Burning Bush." Exodus 3:1-6. September 17, 1899.
382. "Daniel Loved." Daniel 6:10. October 1, 1899.
383. "Years Restored." Joel 2:25. October 15, 1899.
384. "Come Unto Me." Matthew 11:28. October 15, 1899.
385. "Giants of Gath." I Chronicles 20:4-8. October 22, 1899.
386. "Israel Numbered." I Chronicles 21:1. October 22, 1899.
387. "Alphabet of Faith." John 8:45. October 29, 1899.
388. "No Fault." John 19:4. October 29, 1899..
389. "Warfare." I Corinthians 10:4. November 5, 1899.
390. "Election." John 6:37. November 5, 1899.
391. "Grace." Isaiah 43:21. November 12, 1899.
392. "None Other Name." Acts 4:12. November 12, 1899.
393. "The Apostle's Doctrine." Acts 2:42. November 19, 1899.
394. "Roelike Asahel." II Samuel 2:29, November 19, 1899.
395. "Call of Levi." Luke 5:27-29. December 10, 1899.
396. "Leaving Nazareth." Luke 4:30. December 17, 1899.
397. "Nathanael." John 1:45-51. December 31, 1899.
398. "Honour of Serving." Mark 10:35-45. January 7, 1900.

- 
399. "Treasuring Wrath." Romans 2:5. January 14, 1900.
400. "A Good Land." Numbers 14:7-9. January 14, 1900.
401. "Christ's and His People's Work." Matthew 4:23-25.
January 21, 1900.
402. "The Great Salvation." Hebrews 2:3. January 21, 1900.
403. "True Conversion." Acts 21:13;26:9. January 28, 1900.
404. "Look Unto Me." Isaiah 45:22. January 28, 1900.
405. "Caring for Souls." Psalm 142:4. February 4, 1900.
406. "Shammah and Benaiah." II Samuel 23:8,11,12,20.
February 4, 1900.
407. "All Have Sinned." Romans 3:32. February 5, 1900.
408. "What is Your Life?" James 4:14. February 4, 1900.
409. "Come, See a Man." John 4:28-30. February 11, 1900.
410. "Hatred Without Cause." John 15:25. February 11,
1900.
411. "Consolation, Caution, Conviction." I Peter 4:12-19.
February 18, 1900.
412. "The Enduring Word." I Peter 1:25. February 18, 1900.
413. "Ye Are Witnesses." Luke 24:40. February 19, 1900.
414. "The Lord's Hand." Isaiah 59:1. February 23, 1900.
415. "Joy, Cross, Shame." Hebrews 12:2. February 25, 1900.
416. "Joy in Heaven." Luke 15:7,10. February 25, 1900.
- * 417.
- * 418.
419. "Christ a King." Psalm 2:6. March 4, 1900.
420. "Christ's Sovereignty." I Corinthians 15:25. March 4,
1900.
421. "Christ Died For Us." Romans 5:8. March 10, 1900.

- * 422. "The Cross of Christ." Galatians 6:14. March 11, 1900.
423. "Unjust Steward." Luke 16:1-15. March 18, 1900.
424. "Rebekah." Genesis 24:49. March 22, 1900.
425. "Christ a Stumbling Block." Matthew 11:6. April 6, 1900.
426. "Blind Bartimaeus." Matthew 10:46-52. April 1, 1900.
427. "Abram and Lot." Genesis 12-13. April 8, 1900.
428. "It is God That Justifieth." Romans 8:33. April 8, 1900.
429. "A Corn of Wheat." John 12:24. April 15, 1900.
430. "Seek First the Kingdom." Matthew 6:34. April 15, 1900.
431. "Fighting and Praying." Numbers 17:8-13. April 22, 1900.
432. "Accusing Christ." Luke 11:54. April 22, 1900.
433. "Mercy and Compassion." Lamentations 3:22. April 29, 1900.
434. "Deceitfulness of Sin." Hebrews 3:13. May 6, 1900.
435. "The Visage of Jesus." Isaiah 52:14. May 6, 1900.
436. "The Spirit of the World." I Corinthians 2:12. May 13, 1900.
- * 437. "Christ Crucified." I Corinthians 1:23-24. May 13, 1900.
- * 438. "Salvation of the Elect." John 17:12. May 20, 1900.
- * 439. "What Sinners Cannot Do." John 6:44. May 20, 1900.
440. "The Snow of Lebanon." Jeremiah 18:14. May 27, 1900.
- * 441. "The Curse of the Law." Galatians 3:10. May 27, 1900.
442. "Paul Before Felix." Acts 24:25. June 3, 1900.

443. "Go Forward." Exodus 14:15. June 3, 1900.
444. "Keeping the Heart." Proverbs 4:23. June 10, 1900.
445. "Altogether Lovely." Canticles 5:8. June 10, 1900.
446. "David Encouraged." I Samuel 30:6. June 17, 1900.
447. "Plenty and Famine." Genesis 41:53-54. June 17, 1900.
448. "I Have Gone Astray." Psalm 119:176. June 24, 1900.
449. "The Author of the Cross." Isaiah 53:10. June 24, 1900.
450. "Mephiboseth." II Samuel 19:30. July 22, 1900.
451. "Doctrine of Sin." Psalm 51:4. July 29, 1900.
452. "The Soul's Rest." Psalm 116:7. July 29, 1900.
453. "The Lord's Remembrances." Isaiah 62:6-7. August 5, 1900.
454. "In the Way of His Father." I Kings 22:52. August 5, 1900.
455. "Why Many Are Weak." II Corinthians 11:20. August 12, 1900.
456. "The Faith of Noah." Hebrews 11:7. August 12, 1900.
457. "In Remembrance." I Corinthians 11:24. August 26, 1900.
458. "The Prudent Man." Proverbs 22:3. August 26, 1900.
459. "Christ, Sin For Us." II Corinthians 5:21. August 26, 1900.
460. "Crisis, Crown and Cross." Luke 9:51. September 16, 1900.
461. "Through Him." Ephesians 2:18. September 16, 1900.
- * 462. "The Image of Jealousy." Ezekiel 8:5-6. September 23, 1900.
463. "Ahab and the Sunset." I Kings 22:35. September 23, 1900.

- * 464. "The Shut Gate." Ezekiel 44:1-3. October 21, 1900.
- 465. "One Name." Acts 4:12. October 7, 1900.
- 466. "The Head of Christ." Ephesians 1:22-23. October 28, 1900.
- 467. "The Cross of Christ." Galatians 6:14. October 28, 1900.
- 468. "Fear Not." Acts 18:10. December 9, 1900.
- 469. "The Power of an Endless Life." Hebrews 7:16. December 23, 1900.
- * 470.
- 471. "Clove of Zeal." Isaiah 59:17. January 27, 1901.
- 472. "Come! Come! Come!" Revelation 22:17. February 3, 1901.
- 473. "Ephraim Armed." Psalm 78:9. February 3, 1901.
- + 474. (The Earnest of Our Inheritance). Ephesians 1:13-14. January 2, 1901.
- * 475. "Ruler's Daughter." Mark 5:38-43. February 10, 1901.
- 476. "Law and Grace." Luke 15:15-22. February 17, 1901.
- 477. "Purpose, Promise, Proof." Jeremiah 24:7. February 24, 1901.
- 478. "To Whom Liken." Isaiah 40:25. March 3, 1901.
- 479. "Work and Wages." Matthew 11:28. March 10, 1901.
- 480. "Pharoah a Noise." Jeremiah 46:15-19. March 17, 1901.
- 481. "King Alcohol." [Temperance Hall - No text]. March 17, 1901.
- * 482. "Belshazzar." Daniel 5:30. March 24, 1901.
- 483. "Service." Matthew 20:25-28. March 31, 1901.
- 484. "Naaman and Rimmon." II Kings 5:18-19. March 31, 1901.
- + 485. (Christ Died for Us). Romans 5:8. April 2, 1901.

486. "Lamb Slain." Revelation 5:6. April 7, 1901.
487. "Intercession." Genesis 19:29. April 21, 1901.
488. "Epaphras." Colossians 4:12. April 21, 1901.
489. "Consecration." Exodus 29 and Leviticus 28. April 29, 1901.¹
490. "Christ or Barabbas." John 18:40. May 12, 1901.
491. "Tears Behind the Scenes." Genesis 42:24. May 19, 1901.
492. "Words and Wagons." Genesis 45:25-28. June 9, 1901.
493. "More Excellent Way." I Corinthians 12:31. June 23, 1901.
494. "A Great Work." Nehemiah 6:6. June 30, 1901.
495. "Ephraim." Hosea 4:17. June 30, 1901.
496. "Ishbosheth." II Samuel 4:5. July 7, 1901.
497. "Abraham." Genesis 18:1. July 7, 1901.
498. "In Bed at Noon." II Samuel 4:5. July 14, 1901.
499. "Crooked and Perverse." Philippians 2:14-15. July 21, 1901.
500. "The Gospel." Acts 4:14. August 11, 1901.
501. "I Have Put Off My Coat." Canticles 5:3. August 18, 1901.
- + 502. (No Man Hath Ascended Up to Heaven). John 3:13. August 23, 1901.
503. "A Faithful Saying." I Timothy 1:15. August 25, 1901.

¹ This sermon was originally preached at a Baptist Young People's Rally. It appears in Shield's listing on January 11, 1903.

504. "Strong as Ever." Joshua 14:11-12. September 1, 1901.
- * 505. "The Mercy Seat." Exodus 25:17. September 1, 1901.
506. "Christ's Calling List." Luke 5:32. September 6, 1901.
507. "Ointment Poured Forth." I Canticles 1:3. September 8, 1901.
508. "Hezekiah." Isaiah 39:1-2. September 8, 1901.
509. "Anarchy." Romans 8:7. September 15, 1901.
510. "Old Man and Missions." Acts 1:8. October 13, 1901.
511. "Wonderful Love." II Samuel 1:26. October 13, 1901.
512. "A Great House." II Timothy 2:20-21. October 27, 1901.
513. "The Refuge of Lies." Isaiah 28:17. November 3, 1901.
514. "Bethany Revisted." Luke 10:41-42. November 10, 1901.
515. "With All Your Heart." Jeremiah 29:13. November 3, 1901.
516. "My Jewels." Malachi 3:17. November 17, 1901.
517. "Burial of the Wicked." Ecclesiastes 8:10. December 5, 1901.
518. "Admah and Zeboim." Hosea 11:8. December 29, 1901.
519. "Vowing and Praying." Ecclesiastes 5:4. January 5, 1902.
520. "A New Year's Party." Luke 15:24. January 5, 1902.
521. "Wireless Telegraphy." I Kings 8:30. January 12, 1902.
522. "Life Insurance." Proverbs 22:3. January 12, 1902.
523. "Old Testament Heroes." I Chronicles 12:8. January 19, 1902.
524. "A Game of Chance." John 19:23-24. January 19, 1902.
525. "Saving the Parcel." I Chronicles 11:12-14. January

26, 1902.

526. "A Wonderful Hypnotist." II Corinthians 4:3-4. January 26, 1902.
527. (Aids to the Christian Life). II Peter 1:2-4. January 6, 1902
528. "A Firebrand." Zechariah 3:2. February 2, 1902.
- 529 "God Loved the World." John 3:16. February 3, 1902.
530. "He Gave His Only Son." John 3:16. February 4, 1902.
531. "Might Not Perish." John 3:16. February 5, 1902.
532. "Have Everlasting Life." John 3:16. February 6, 1902.
533. "Whosoever Believeth." John 3:16. February 7, 1902.
534. "Up-to-date Men." I Chronicles 12:32. February 9, 1902.
535. "Strong Man Armed." Luke 11:21-22. February 16, 1902.
536. "Mordecai." Esther 4:1. February 18, 1902.
537. "Men of Ninevah." Matthew 12:41. February 19, 1902.
538. "A Situation Vacant." I Chronicles 12:8. March 2, 1902.
539. "Comfort." II Corinthians 7:6. March 2, 1902.
540. "Curiosity." Luke 23:48. March 2, 1902.
541. "Tragedy and Triumph." Luke 22:37. March 9, 1902.
542. "Fame and Fortune." Hebrews 11:24-28. March 16, 1902.
543. "New Life." John 14:19. March 30, 1902.
544. "Lord's Banished." II Samuel 14:14. March 30, 1902.
545. "Borrowed Ax." II Kings 6:1-7.
- * 546. "Quack Doctors." Mark 5:33. April 6, 1902.
547. "An Ideal Church." Revelation 1:13.
548. "City Water." I Chronicles 11:16-19. April 20, 1902.

549. "One Like a Son of Man." Revelation 1:13. April 27, 1902.
550. "Our Schoolmaster." Galatians 3:24. April 27, 1902.
551. "The Savior's Paradise." Psalm 149:4. May 4, 1902.
552. "The New Teacher." John 2:3. May 4, 1902.
553. "St. Pierre Disaster." Luke 17:28-30. May 20, 1902.
554. "Lamb of God." John 1:29. May 23, 1902.
555. "Disciple Whom Jesus Loved." John 13:23. June 1, 1902.
556. "The Sword of the Spirit." Ephesians 6:17. June 8, 1902.
557. "Conditions of Peace." Luke 14:31-32. June 8, 1902.
558. "The Word Made Flesh." John 1:14. June 15, 1902.
559. "Without Christ." Ephesians 2:12. June 15, 1902.
560. "Work Out Your Own Salvation." Philippians 2:12-13. June 22, 1902.
561. "Where Hast Thou Gleaned?" Ruth 2:19. June 22, 1902.
562. "Ambassadors From Babylon." II Chronicles 32:31. June 29, 1902.
563. "How to Get Rich - Chapter One." Psalm 78:2. July 6, 1902.
564. "Trees Seeking a King" Judges 9:8-15. July 6, 1902.
565. "How to Get Rich - Chapter Two." Proverbs 14:12. July 13, 1902.
566. "How to Get Rich - Chapter Three." Galatians 2:24. July 20, 1902.
567. "Jonathan's Sake." II Samuel 9:1. July 27, 1902.
568. "Barzillai." II Samuel 19:32-35. August 31, 1902.
569. "Wages of Sin." Romans 6:23. September 14, 1902.

570. "A Great Woman." II Kings 4:18-23. September 21, 1902.
571. "Believer's Dwelling." Psalm 90:1. September 28, 1902.
572. "Gospel of Cheer." Acts 27:22. September 28, 1902.
573. "The Price of Coal." Romans 12:20. October 12. 1902.
574. "Wash Day." Nehemiah 4:23. October 19, 1902.
575. "Pearl of Great Price." Matthew 13:45-46. October 19, 1902.
576. "The Gospel of Power." Ephesians 1:19-20. October 26, 1902.
577. "Exaltation of Christ." Philippians 2:9-11. October 26, 1902.
578. "Sinner's Perilous Position." Jude 1:23. November 2, 1902.
579. "Come Now - Reason." Isaiah 1:18. November 2, 1902.
580. "Common People Heard Him Gladly." Mark 12:37. November 9, 1902.
581. "A Notorious Criminal." Galatians 3:19. November 16, 1902.
582. "If Thou Shalt Say." Deuteronomy 7:15-17. November 16, 1902.
583. "Aaron Bearing the Names." Exodus 28:12,28-29. November 23, 1902.
584. "Thy Calf, O Samaria." Hosea 8:5. November 30, 1902.
585. "Place Called Calvary." Luke 23:33. December 7, 1902.
586. "Is It Nothing to You?" Lamentations 1:12. December 14, 1902.
587. "Honour the Lord." Proverbs 3:9-10. December 14, 1902.
588. "Absence of Titus." II Corinthians 2:12-13. December 21, 1902.

589. "Whom My Soul Loveth." Canticles 1:7-8. December 28, 1902.
590. "Reading King's Heart." II Samuel 14:1,3. January 4, 1903.
591. "Sapphire Throne." Ezekiel 1:26-28. January 11, 1903.
592. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 18, 1903.
594. "Christ Crucified." I Corinthians 1:23-24. January 18, 1903.
595. "Looking Glass." James 1:26. February 1, 1903.
596. "Run on the Bank." Genesis 19:12. February 1, 1903.
597. "Rejected Suitor." Hosea 2:14-15. February 8, 1903.
598. "Roots and Fruits." II Corinthians 8:5. February 8, 1903.
599. "No More Stranger." Ephesians 2:19. February 22, 1903.
600. "Bringing Home Ark." I Chronicles 15:11-13. February 22, 1903.
601. "What to Think Of." Psalm 48:9. March 29, 1903.
602. "Time of Eliseus." Luke 4:27. March 29, 1903.
603. "New Suit of Clothes." I Samuel 18:4. April 5, 1903.
604. "Thine Are We David." I Chronicles 12:18. April 19, 1903.
605. "He Shall Not Strive." Matthew 12:19-20. April 26, 1903.
606. "David in the Wood." I Samuel 23:16. May 10, 1903.
607. "Kingship of Jesus." John 19:22. May 31, 1903.
608. "Whom to Fear." Luke 12:11. June 18, 1903.
609. "Generation of Vipers." Matthew 3:4. July 3, 1903.
- * 610. "Jezebel." II Kings 9:30. September 3, 1903.
611. (The Nobleman's Faith). John 4:46-50. November 9,

1903.

612. "Gentlemen If You Please." II Samuel 15:11. November 15, 1903.
613. "Mephibosheth." II Samuel 21:7. December 8, 1903.
614. "One That is Mighty." Psalm 89:19. March 2, 1904.
615. "Christ Loved the Church." Ephesians 5:25. March 28, 1904.
616. (My Kindness Shall Not Depart From Thee). Isaiah 54:10. May 15, 1904.
617. (At the Altar But Too Late). I Kings 2:28. May 27, 1904.
618. (The Glory of God). John 11:14. August 28, 1904.
619. (Is It Nothing to You?). Lamentations 1:12. August 28, 1904.
620. (There is a Lad Here). John 11:4. October 2, 1904.
621. (Jospheh Knew His Brethren). Genesis 42:8. October 16, 1904.
622. "Swelling of the Jordan." Jeremiah 12:5. October 30, 1904.
623. "The Best Wine." John 2:10. November 6, 1904.
624. "Thanksgiving." I Corinthians 15:57. November 17, 1904.
625. "He Commanded Us to Preach." Acts 10:42-43. December 4, 1904.
626. "A Name Above Every Name." Philippians 2:9. December 11, 1904.
627. "Prayer, Fire and Glory." II Chronicles 7:1. December 18, 1904.
628. "His Star." Matthew 2:2. December 25, 1904.
629. "An Endless Life." Hebrews 7:16. December 25, 1904.
630. "Church of Living God." I Timothy 3:15. January 1, 1905.

631. "Return to the Lord." Hosea 6:1. January 8, 1905.
632. "I Will Make Thy Grave." Nahum 1:14. January 15, 1905.
634. "Joseph in Prison." Genesis 39:20-22. January 22, 1905.
- * 635. "In Heavenly Place With Christ." Ephesians 1:3. January 29, 1905.
- + 636. (The Spider in King's Palaces). Proverbs 30:28. February 3, 1905.
637. "The Sound of a Gong." II Samuel 5:24. March 5, 1905.
638. "Autonomy Bill." [No text]. March 12, 1905.
639. "North West Autonomy." Acts 22:26. March 19, 1905.
640. "Awake! Arise!" Ephesians 6:14. March 20, 1905.
641. "Wonderful Love." II Samuel 1:26. March 26, 1905.
642. "O Satisfy Us." Psalm 90:14. April 2, 1905.
- * 643. "Valley Full of Ditches." II Kings 3:16. April 2, 1905.
644. "The Garden Grave." Genesis 2:8 and John 19:41-42. April 23, 1905.
645. "Fire on the Altar." Leviticus 6:13. April 30, 1905.
646. " ____ Young Man." II Samuel 18:33. April 30, 1905.
647. "Ruth." Ruth 2:14. May 7, 1905.
648. "Success." Acts 12:24. May 14, 1905.
649. "Good Politics." Acts 12:20. May 21, 1905.
650. "Promise of the Father." Luke 24:49. May 21, 1905.
651. "Little Ships." Mark 4:36. May 28, 1905.
652. "Worth Ten Thousand." II Samuel 18:4. May 28, 1905.
- * 653. "This Do." I Corinthians 11:25. June 4, 1905.

654. "Joseph's Wagons." Genesis 45:27-28. June 4, 1905.
655. (The Second Mile). Matthew 5:41. July 23, 1905.
656. "Restoring Years." Joel 2:25. August 20, 1905.
657. "One Thing Desired." Psalm 127:4. August 27, 1905.
658. "The Gospel." I Thessalonians 2:4. September 3, 1905.
659. "End of War." Isaiah 27:4-5. September 3, 1905.
660. "He Brought Us Out." Deuteronomy 6:23. September 10, 1905.
661. "The Church's Future." I Timothy 3:15 and I Thessalonians 1:8 and Galatians 6:10. September 20, 1905.
- * 662. "Faint, Yet Pursuing." Judges 8:4. October 1, 1905.
663. "Saul." I Chronicles 10:13-14. October 8, 1905.
664. (My Lord and My God). John 20:28. October 29, 1905.
665. (Love's King). II Chronicles 9:8. October 29, 1905.
666. (One Foundation). I Corinthians 3:11 November 12, 1905.
667. (He Brought Me to the Banquet). Canticles 2:4. November 19, 1905.
668. "Macedonian Example." II Corinthians 8:2-4. November 26, 1905.
669. "The Grace of Christ." II Corinthians 8:9. December 3, 1905.
670. "Without Christ." Ephesians 2:12. December 3, 1905.
671. "Joseph's Hands." Genesis 46:4. December 10, 1905.
672. "Boss Alcohol." Galatians 2:21-22. December 17, 1905.
673. "Lion, Bear and Giant." I Samuel 17:37. December 31, 1905.
- 674A. "Peter's Fall." Luke 22:54-60. January 14, 1906.

- 674B. "Peter's Restoration." Luke 22:60-62. January 14, 1906.
675. "Sling and Stone." I Samuel 17:50. January 21, 1906.
676. "How to Come Back." Canticles 1:4. January 28, 1906.
- * 677. "Gate Toward East." Ezekiel 43:4. February 11, 1906.
678. "According to Scripture." I Corinthians 15:3-4. February 11, 1906.
679. "Mouth Filled With Laughter." Psalm 126:1-3. February 25, 1906.
680. "In Simon's House." Luke 7:36. March 4, 1906.
681. "Spirit - Convincing of Sin." John 16:8-11. March 4, 1906.
682. "Sanctification of the Spirit." I Peter 1:2. March 11, 1906.
683. "Gentleman in Heaven." Hebrews 8:10. March 11, 1906.
684. "Death of Abner." II Samuel 3:33. March 18, 1906.
685. "Encouragement for Seeking Souls." I Peter 2. March 18, 1906.
- * 686. "David Recovered All." I Samuel 30:18-20. March 25, 1906.
- * 687. "Promise of the Spirit." Acts 2:39. April 1, 1906.
688. "Where the Lord Lay." May 28:6. April 15, 1906.
689. "Christ the Musician." Hebrews 2:12. April 22, 1906.
690. "San Francisco." John 36:18. April 22, 1906.
- * 691. "Philosophy of Clouds." John 37:11-13. April 29, 1906.
692. "Saved by Grace." Ephesians 2:8. April 29, 1906.
693. "None of These Things Move Me." Acts 20:24. May 4, 1906.
694. "Pilate's Question." Matthew 27:22. May 13, 1906.

695. "Going to Canaan." Genesis 12:5. May 20, 1906.
696. "A Church's Capital." Acts 3:6. May 23, 1906.
697. "Morning, Moon and Sun." Canticles 6:10. May 27, 1906.
698. "Church Union." Ephesians 1:23. June 17, 1906.
699. "Church Union." Ephesians 4:5. June 24, 1906.
700. "Killed by a Woman." Judges 5:28. July 1, 1906.
701. "Jehoshaphath's Ships." I Kings 22:48. July 8, 1906.
702. "Peace, Perfect, Peace." I Chronicles 21:27. July 22, 1906.
703. "Vision and Victory." Acts 26:19. July 29, 1906.
- * 704. "Burning Bush." Exodus 3:3. September 2, 1906.
705. "Taken by Violence." Matthew 11:12. September 9, 1906.
706. "Parable From Life." Luke 18:1. September 16, 1906.
707. "Bringing King Back." II Samuel 19:10. September 23, 1906.
708. "Occupy 'Til I Come." Luke 19:13. September 23, 1906.
709. "Four Faced Creatures." Ezekiel 1:5-12. September 30, 1906.
710. "Look Unto Me." Isaiah 45:22. September 30, 1906.
711. "Gentlemen and Greatmen." Psalm 18:34-35. October 7, 1906.
712. "Hiding Place." Isaiah 32:2. October 14, 1906.
713. "Mary's Ointment." Matthew 26:13. October 28, 1906.
714. "Gadding About." Jeremiah 2:36. October 28, 1906.
715. "Teaching Children." Psalm 34:11. November 4, 1906.

716. (Helping One Another). II Samuel 10:11. October, 1906.¹
717. "Belief and Conduct." Mark 16:16. November 18, 1906.
718. "Faith." John 4:50. November 18, 1906.
719. "Cords of Vanity." Isaiah 5:18. November 25, 1906.
720. "Path of the Just." Proverbs 4:18. December 2, 1906.
721. "Gray Hairs." Hosea 7:9. December 9, 1906.
722. "Good Works." Ephesians 2:10. December 9, 1906.
723. "Gray Hairs." Hosea 7:9. December 16, 1906.
724. "A Lover and a Judge." Hosea 11:8. December 30, 1906.
725. "Esther's Love." Esther 8:6. January 6, 1907.
726. "Religion of Smiles." II Chronicles 33:13. January 6, 1907.
727. "How to Pray". Psalm 65:2 and Luke 11:2. January 13, 1907.
728. "Did Jesus Die in Vain?" II Timothy 2:10. January 13, 1907.
729. "Praying in Christ's Name." John 16:23. January 20, 1907.
730. "Everlasting Covenant." Hebrews 8:6. January 20, 1907.
731. "Prayer in Spirit." Ephesians 2:8. January 27, 1907.
732. "Christ's body." Ephesians 5:29-30. January 27, 1907.
733. "According to Promise." II Samuel 7:27. February 3, 1907.
734. "Sure Promise." Revelation 19:7. February 3, 1907.

¹ This sermon is first listed in Shield's listing under the date November 16, 1919.

735. "Excellent Knowledge." Philippians 3:7-8. February 10, 1907.
736. "Jonah Asleep." Jonah 1:6. February 24, 1907.
737. "Inasmuch." Matthew 25:42-43. March 3, 1907.
738. "Shimei." II Samuel 19:23. March 3, 1907.
739. "Study in the Life of Joseph." Genesis 37:20; 41:39-40; 42:8; 44:18; 45:1. March 11 to 15, 1907.
740. "Lot." Genesis 19:12. March 17, 1907.
741. "Come! Come! Come!" Revelation 22:17. March 24, 1907.
742. "Thaw Trial". Psalm 49:6. April 14, 1907.
743. "Daniel." Daniel 6:28. April 21, 1907.
- * 744. "His Weight in ____ ." Isaiah 13:12. April 28, 1907.
- * 745. "According to Pattern." Hebrews 8:5. May 5, 1907.
746. "Dumb and Deaf Spirit." Mark 9:28-29. May 12, 1907.
747. "He Saved Others." Matthew 27:42. May 19, 1907.
748. "The Lamb of God." John 1:29. May 26, 1907.
749. "Christ's Other Sheep." John 10:16. June 2, 1907.
750. "Amasa." II Samuel 20:12-13. June 9, 1907.
751. "Asahel the Swift." II Samuel 2:23. June 23, 1907.
752. "Day of Good Tidings." II Kings 7:9. June 30, 1907.
753. "Preachers Who Hustle." Genesis 19:15-16. June 29, 1907.
- * 754. "Jotham." II Chronicles 27:6. July 7, 1907.
755. "David Thirsting." II Chronicles 11:16-19. July 7, 1907.
756. "David's Blue Monday." I Samuel 27:1. July 14, 1907.
757. "Crystal Hall Wreck." Luke 23:35. July 21, 1907.

758. "Thou Has Been My Help." Psalm 63:7. September 1, 1907.
759. "Priest's Standing." Hebrews 10:11-12. September 1, 1907.
760. "Crossing at Flood." I Chronicles 12:15. September 8, 1907.
761. "Supposing No Jesus." Luke 11:53-54. September 8, 1907.
762. "Lift Up Thine Eyes." Isaiah 49:18-20. September 15, 1907.
763. "The Lamb the Light." Revelation 21:23. September 15, 1907.
764. "Enlarge Thy Tent." Isaiah 54:2. September 22, 1907.
765. "Seeking the Lost." Luke 15:4-6. September 22, 1907.
766. "Elijah the Detective." I Kings 21:20. September 29, 1907.
767. "And Peter." Mark 16:7. October 6, 1907.
768. "Watching Jesus." Matthew 27:54. October 6, 1907.
769. "After the Cubits." Ezekiel 43:13. November 14, 1907.
770. "The God of Hope." romans 15:13. October 20, 1907.
771. "Steadfast, Unmoveable." I Corinthians 15:58. November 17, 1907.
772. "Where Prayer is Wont to be Made." Acts 16:13. November 24, 1907.
773. "The Widow of Zarephath." I Kings 17:8-16. December 1, 1907.
774. "Lazarus Come Forth." John 11:43-44. December 1, 1907.
775. "Reopening." Jeremiah 22:29. December 15, 1907.
776. "New Wine in New Bottles." Mark 2:22. December 22, 1907.
777. "Ittai the Gittite." II Samuel 15:21. December 22,

1907.

778. "Launch into Deep." Luke 5:1-11. December 29, 1907.
779. "Pleasures of Sin." Hebrews 11:25. December 29, 1907.
780. "The Bible." John 9:30. January 5, 1908.
781. "The Bible." I Peter 1:24-25. January 12, 1908.
782. "Three Crosses." Luke 23:39-43. January 26, 1908.
- + 783. (Take Ye Away the Stone). John 11:39. January 25, 1908.
784. "Future Punishment." Luke 12:5. February 16, 1908.
785. "Unjust Steward." Luke 16. February 23, 1908.
786. "Saul." I Samuel 12:13. February 23, 1908.
787. "Prodigal's Brother." Luke 15:28. March 1, 1908.
788. "David." I Samuel 16:14-28. March 1, 1908.
789. "Backsliders." Hosea 14:1-8. March 8, 1908.
790. "Solomon." I Kings 10:1-8. March 8, 1908.
791. "Christian Testimony." Acts 26:1-2. March 15, 1908.
792. "Rehoboam." I Kings 12:13-14. March 15, 1908.
793. "Ordering the Battle." I Kings 20:13-14. March 22, 1908.
794. "Plenteous Years." Genesis 41:53-54. March 24, 1908.
795. "All Things Ready." Luke 14:17. March 27, 1908.
796. "Prayer and Power." Acts 4:31. March 29, 1908.
797. "Baptism." I Peter 3:20-21. April 12, 1908.
798. "Members of His Body." Ephesians 5:30. April 19, 1908.
799. "Hospitality." Hebrews 13:2. April 26, 1908.
800. "Apostolic Christianity." Acts 2:47. May 3, 1908.

801. "Touching Hem of Garment." Luke 8:43-47. May 3, 1908.
802. "Looking Back." Luke 9:61-62. May 10, 1908.
803. "Concerning the Collection." I Corinthians 15:56-16:1. May 17, 1908.
804. "Victorious Life." Micah 7:8. May 17, 1908.
805. "Judas' Despair." Matthew 27:4. May 24, 1908.
806. "Epaphroditus." Phillipians 2:30;3:10. May 31, 1908.
807. "Wood, Hay, Stubble." I Corinthians 3:14-15. June 7, 1908.
808. "Preaching the Word." Acts 8:4. April 12. 1908.
809. "A Big Bonfire." Acts 19:18-20. June 21, 1908.
810. "John Mark." Acts 12:25;13:13;15:36-40 and II Timothy 4:11. June 21, 1908.
811. "Altar Cubits." Ezekiel 43:13. June 28, 1908.
812. "Bethel." Genesis 28:17. July 5, 1908.
813. "No More Death." Revelation 21:4. July 5, 1908.
814. "He is of Age." John 9:20-21. July 12, 1908.
- * 815.
816. "The Better Country." Hebrews 11:16. October 11, 1908.
817. (Our Future as Baptists). [No text]. November 4, 1908.¹
818. "Ruth." Ruth 1:16. November 15, 1908.
819. "What is Become of Him?" Exodus 32:1. November 22, 1908.
820. "Abigail." I Samuel 25:3. November 22, 1908.

¹ This sermon/address was delivered, according to Shield's notes, at the first meeting of the Baptist Union of Canada.


821. "Wife of Jeroboam." I Kings 14:6. December 15, 1908.
822. "Human Guilt and Saving Grace." Ezekiel 20:5-9.
December 5, 1908.
823. "Steadfastly Set His Face." Luke 9:51. December 13,
1908.
- * 824. "Another Way." Matthew 2:12. December 20, 1908.
825. "Dead That Sought Your Child's Life." Matthew 2:20.
December 27, 1908.
826. "When Clock Strikes." Matthew 25:6. December 27, 1908.
827. "Shoes of Iron and Brass." Deuteronomy 33:25. January
4, 1909.
828. "Saved and Kept." Romans 11:6. January 10, 1909.
829. "Spiritual Meat." John 4:31-34. January 17, 1909.
830. "That House May Be Full." Luke 14:23. January 24,
1909.
831. "Prayer." Acts 27:22. January 31, 1909.
832. "Foolishness of Preaching." I Corinthians 1:21.
February 7, 1909.
833. "Token of Blood." Exodus 12:13. February 14, 1909.
834. "Ambassadors." II Corinthians 5:20. February 21,
1909.
835. "God's Best." Luke 15:22. February 21, 1909.
836. "Put a Ring." Luke 15:22. March 7, 1909.
837. "The Cross." John 12:32. March 7, 1909.
838. "Not Forsaking." Hebrews 10:23-25. March 14, 1909.
839. "Serpent in Garden." Genesis 3:1-5 and II Corinthians
11:3. March 14, 1909.
840. "So Did Not I." Nehemiah 5:15. March 21, 1909.
841. "Blood of Abel." Genesis 4:9-10 and Hebrews 2:24.
March 21, 1909.

842. "Fools and Flood." Genesis 7:21-23 and Luke 17:26-27. March 28, 1909.
843. "Road to Emmaus." Luke 24:33-35. April 11, 1909.
844. "Grave in Garden." John 19:41-42. April 11, 1909.
845. "I Sanctify Myself." John 17:19. April 18, 1909.
846. "True Conversion." Acts 9:15-16. April 18, 1909.
847. "Hungry Esau." Hebrews 12:16-17. April 25, 1909.
848. "A Popular King." II Samuel 3:36. April 25, 1909.
849. "Jacob and the Angels." Genesis 32:1. May 2, 1909.
850. "Better Than Sheep." Matthew 12:12. May 9, 1909.
851. "Gates of Zion." Psalm 77:2. May 16, 1909.
852. "Abraham's Faith." Romans 4:3. May 16, 1909.
853. "Rainbow." Revelation 3:2-3. May 32, 1909.
854. "Things Respected." I Peter 1:12. May 23, 1909.
855. "I Was Glad." Psalm 122:1-19. May 30, 1909.
856. "In Tune With God." Colossians 1:16-17. June 13, 1909.
857. "Voice of Jesus." John 10:27. June 13, 1909.
858. "Tell it Not in Gath." II Samuel 1:20. June 27, 1909.
859. "Everlasting Love." Jeremiah 31:3. June 27, 1909.
860. "Way to Greatness." Matthew 18:3. July 18, 1909.
861. "Love's Last Appeal." Matthew 26:50. July 25, 1909.
862. "Everyone Given Grace." Ephesians 4:7. September 5, 1909.
863. "Wedding Guests." Matthew 22:10. September 12, 1909.
864. "Discovery of Pole." John 3:13. September 12, 1909.
865. "Big Men." John 17:14-18. September 19, 1909.

866. "Great Man's Sister." Exodus 2:2-10. September 26, 1909.
867. "Christ in You." I Colossians 1:27. September 26, 1909.
868. "Blood of New Testament." Matthew 26:28. October 3, 1909.
869. "Demoniac of Gadara." Luke 8:35. October 10, 1909.
870. "Misery of Murmuring." Numbers 21:1-9. October 9, 1909.
871. "A Lying Spirit." I Kings 22:23. October 24, 1909.
- * 872. "Hezekiah." I Chronicles 29:1-3. October 31, 1909.
873. "If I Were Hungry." Psalm 50:12. November 7, 1909.
874. "Go Ye Forth of Babylon." Isaiah 48:20-21. November 7, 1909.
875. "Use of Temptation." Judges 3:1-4. November 21, 1909.
876. "The Beautiful Life." II Thessalonians 5:23. November 21, 1909.
877. "Unjust Steward." Luke 16:5. November 12, 1909.¹
878. "Should Women Propose." Ruth 3:9-10 and Luke 7:37-38. December 5, 1909.
879. "Making Jewels of Tears." Ruth 1:19-22. December 12, 1909.
880. "Numbered." I Kings 20:26-27. January 23, 1910.
881. "Fear and Faith." Mark 5:36. January 30, 1910.
882. "The Work of Christ." Philippians 2:29-30. March 20, 1910.
883. "Men Which Are Asleep." I Thessalonians 4:13-14. March 27, 1910.

¹ This sermon is first listed in Shield's list on March 11, 1911.

884. "Paul at Philippi." Acts 16:12-15. May 1, 1910.
885. "Blood of Everlasting Covenant." Hebrews 13:20-21. May 8, 1910.
886. "Touching the King." Psalm 45:1. May 8, 1910.
887. "Religion and Light." John 12:46. June 19, 1910.
888. "Mordecai." Esther 10:3. September 25, 1910.
889. "Civic Righteousness." Matthew 5:41. November 27, 1910.
890. "Paul at Troas." II Corinthians 2:12-13. December 4, 1910.
891. "Standing With Them." Acts 4:14. December 11, 1910.
- * 892. "Faith Spiritual Invitation." John 14:11. December 11, 1910.
893. "His Star." Matthew 2:2. December 25, 1910.
894. "Shadows of Christmas." [No text]. December 25, 1910.
895. "New Creature." II Corinthians 5:17. January 1, 1911.
896. "Asa's Good Reign." II Chronicles 15:1-15. January 8, 1911.
897. "Omri and Ahab." I Kings 16:15-33. January 15, 1911.
898. "Elijah Under Juniper." I Kings 19:1-18. February 12, 1911.
899. "Answering by Fire." I Kings 18:21-24. February 12, 1911.
900. "Omniscience of Jesus." John 8:13-16. March 5, 1911.
901. "Samson and Lion." Judges 14:5-9. March 26, 1911.
- + 902. (The Second Coming of Christ as Related to the Believer's Life). [No text]. March 27, 1911
903. "Down-town Problem." I Kings 20:20-28. April 9, 1911.
904. "Power of Resurrection." Philippians 3:10-11. april 16, 1911.

- 
905. "Accepted in the Beloved." Ephesians 1:6. June 4, 1911.
906. "He Brought Up Hadassah." Esther 2:7. June 11, 1911.
907. "Ultimatum of Grace." Mark 12:6. June 11, 1911.
908. "Purpose of Discipleship." [No text]. June 16, 1911.
909. "Baptists and Missions." [No text]. June 16, 1911.
910. "Elijah at Dothan." II Kings 6:15-17. July 16, 1911.
911. "Cross Justifying God." Romans 3:24-26. July 23, 1911.
912. "Cooperating With God." Philippians 2:2. August 27, 1911.
913. "Weapons of Warfare." II Corinthians 10:4. September 3, 1911.
914. "A Call to Prayer." Romans 15:30-32. September 10, 1911.
915. "An Empty House." Luke 11:24. September 10, 1911.
916. "A Brand Plucked Out." Zechariah 3:1-2. September 17, 1911.
917. "Baptized With Moses." I Corinthians 10:1-4. September 24, 1911.
918. "God is Able." Matthew 3:9. October 1, 1911.
919. "Member's Day." II Corinthians 8:5. October 8, 1911.
920. "Safe Side of Uncertainty." Galatians 4:21;5:23. October 22, 1911.
921. (Stand Fast). Philippians 1:27-30. October 22, 1911.
922. "Moses' Faith." Hebrews 11:27. October 29, 1911.
923. "About the Minister." Philippians 4:10-18. November 5, 1911.
924. "Thanksgiving." I Corinthians 15:57. October 29, 1911.

925. "A Faithful Saying." I Timothy 1:15. November 12, 1911.
926. "Joseph's Hands." Genesis 46:4. November 19, 1911.
927. "Save to the Uttermost." Hebrews 7:24-25. November 19, 1911.
928. "Christ in the Home." Luke 14:12-14. November 26, 1911.
929. "Daybreak in Soul." Luke 24:11,31. December 4, 1911.
930. "Not By Bread Alone." Matthew 4:4. December 10, 1911.
931. "The Babbling Spring." John 4:13-16. December 17, 1911.
932. "The Pinnacle of Temple." Matthew 4:5-7. December 17, 1911.
933. "Word Made Flesh." John 1:14. December 24, 1911.
934. "Love One Another." I John 4:7. January 7, 1911.
- + 935. "In Memory of Dr. Elmore Harris." [No text]. December 27, 1911.
936. "Revelation and Reason." Matthew 4:7. January 14, 1912.
937. "The Kingdoms of the World." Matthew 4:8-10. January 21, 1912.
- * 938. "Tongue of the Learned." Isaiah 50:4. January 21, 1912.
939. "Jesus Full of Holy Spirit." Luke 4:1,14-15. January 28, 1912.
- * 940. "Ruth the Moabite." Ruth 1:16. January 28, 1912.
941. "Queen of Sheba." I Kings 10:1. February 4, 1912.
942. "Jehovah Jireh." Genesis 22:7-8. February 11, 1912.
943. "Story of Eden." Genesis 2:8. February 18, 1912.
944. "Big Men." Judges 17:14-18. February 25, 1912.
945. "Outside the Gate." Genesis 3:22-24. February 25,

1912.

946. "The Cheribum." Genesis 3:24. March 3, 1912.
947. "Samson." Judges 16:19-21. March 17, 1912.
948. "Cross in Old Testament." I Peter 1:18-20. March 17, 1912.
949. "Samson." Judges 16:22. March 24, 1912.
950. "Humanity of Jesus." John 1:14 and Hebrews 2:16-18. March 24, 1912.
951. "The Deity of Jesus." John 1:18 and Galatians 4:4-5. March 31, 1912.
952. "We See Jesus." Hebrews 2:8-9. April 7, 1912.
953. "Death of Christ." John 10:17-18. April 14, 1912.
954. "Wreck of Titanic." Jeremiah 9:23-24. April 21, 1912.
955. "Curse of the Law." Galatians 3:13. April 21, 1912.
956. "Glory in Religion." Jeremiah 9:23-24. April 28, 1912.
957. "It is Finished." John 19:30. April 28, 1912.
958. "Resurrection." Acts 4:10. May 5, 1912.
959. "Lilies of the Field." Matthew 6:28-29. May 12, 1912.
960. "Ye Must Be Born Again." John 3:7. May 12, 1912.
961. "Godliness and Contentment." I Timothy 6:5-6. May 19, 1912.
962. "The Forgiveness of Sins." Ephesians 1:7. May 19, 1912.
963. "In Remembrance of Me." Luke 22:19. June 2, 1912.
964. "Isaiah and Ahaz." Isaiah 8:11-14. June 9, 1912.
965. "Assurance." II Timothy 1:12. June 9, 1912.
966. "A Power Invoked." Isaiah 8:13-14. June 16, 1912.
967. "A Stone of Stumbling." Isaiah 8:13-14. June 30,

- 1912.
968. "Putting on Uniform." Matthew 10:32-33. June 30, 1912.
969. "In the Midst of Trouble." Psalm 138:7-8. July 14, 1912.
970. "The Body of Christ." I Corinthians 12:27. July 14, 1912.
971. "Heavenly Excursion." John 4:28-29. July 21, 1912.
972. "Unpopular Preaching." I Kings 22:5-8. July 21, 1912.
973. "The Throne of Thy Glory." Jeremiah 14:21. July 28, 1912.
974. "Do We Need a New Gospel." Galatians 2:21. July 28, 1912.
975. "Progress of Faith." John 9:35-38. September 1, 1912.
976. "King Who Knew Not Joseph." Exodus 1:8. September 8, 1912.
977. "Why Men Laugh at Gospel." I Corinthians 2:14. September 15, 1912.
978. "Christian's Workshop." I Corinthians 12:28. September 22, 1912.
979. "Complete in Christ." Colossians 2:10. October 6, 1912.
980. "Belshazzar's Feast." Daniel 5:3-4. October 13, 1912.
981. "Questioning the Disciples." Mark 9:14-17. October 20, 1912.
982. "Salvation in Christ." II Timothy 2:10. October 20, 1912.
983. "Thanksgiving." Deuteronomy 4:7-8. October 27, 1912.
984. "Moral Reform." I Peter 2:14. October 27, 1912.
- + 985. "Moral Reform." [No text]. November 1, 1912.
986. "Silver in Solomon's Days." II Chronicles 9:20. November 3, 1912.

987. "In the House of Rimmon." II Kings 5:18. November 3, 1912.
988. "Away From Home." Daniel 1:8. November 10, 1912.
989. "An Aged Prophet." II Kings 13:14. November 17, 1912.
990. "Daniel Prospering." Daniel 2:48-49. November 17, 1912.
991. "The Ox and the Pit." Exodus 21:28. November 24, 1912.
992. "Nebuchadrezzar's Furnace." Daniel 3:16-18. November 24, 1912.
993. "Daniel Among Lions." Daniel 6:10. December 1, 1912.
994. "Restoring the Faulty." Galatians 6:1. December 8, 1912.
- * 995. "Hell of Science." Galatians 6:7. December 8, 1912.
996. "Mother of Souls." Psalm 87:5-6. December 15, 1912.
997. "Life Everlasting." I Peter 1:23. December 15, 1912.
998. "Angel's Music." Luke 2:15. December 22, 1912.
999. "Born King." Matthew 2:1-12. December 22, 1912.
1000. "Buried With Christ." Colossians 2:12. December 29, 1912.
1001. "Religious Education." Colossians 2:6-7. January 5, 1913.
1002. "Christ Before Annas." John 18:19-24. January 5, 1913.
1003. "Christ Before Caiaphas." Matthew 26:59-66. January 12, 1913.
1004. "Labourers Few." Matthew 9:36-38. January 12, 1913.
1005. "God's Set Time." Psalm 102:13-18. January 19, 1913.
1006. "Peter's Denial." Luke 22:54-62. January 19, 1913.
1007. "The Iron Gate." Acts 12:5-17. January 26, 1913.

1008. "A Man's Chance." Luke 22:66-71. January 26, 1913.
1009. "A Woman's Power for Evil." Matthew 26:69-72.
February 2, 1913.
1010. "Judas." Matthew 27:3-5. February 9, 1913.
1011. "Why Trouble Comes." I Peter 1:6-7. February 16,
1913.
1012. "Christ Before Pilate." Luke 23:1-7. February 16,
1913.
1013. "Trial of Faith." I Peter 1:7. February 23, 1913.
1014. "A Human Fox." Luke 23:8-11. February 23, 1913.
1015. "Loving ____." I Peter 1:8-9. March 2, 1913.
1016. "Feast of Love." Luke 22:7-20. March 2, 1913.
1017. "God of Hope." Romans 15:13. March 8, 1913.
1018. "Far as East From West." Psalm 103:11-12. March 9,
1913.
1019. "Christ or Barabbas." John 18:40. March 16, 1913.
1020. "Pilate's Decision." Luke 23:20-25. March 23, 1913.
1021. "Treasure in Heaven." Luke 12:31-34. March 30, 1913.
1022. "A New Thing." Isaiah 34:18-20. April 6, 1913.
1023. "The Supper." I Corinthians 11:27-31. April 6, 1913.
1024. "Hope Not Ashamed." I Kings 8:23-24. April 13, 1913.
1025. "____ and Rebekah." Genesis 24:49. April 13, 1913.
1026. "The Temple of Silence." I Kings 6:7. April 27,
1913.
1027. "Well of Bethlehem." I Chronicles 11:15-19. April
27, 1913.
1028. (Pastor's and Deacons). Acts 6:1-7. April 29, 1913.
1029. "Conquest of the World." John 16:33. May 18, 1913.

1030. "Measureless Mercy." Psalm 51. May 18, 1913.
1031. "Mephibosheth." II Samuel 9:7. May 25, 1913.
1032. "Ministry of Praise." II Chronicles 20:21-22. May 25, 1913.
1034. "Suretiship." [sic] Genesis 43:9. June 1, 1913.
1035. "Bartimaeus." Mark 10:42-52. June 15, 1913.
1036. "Everlasting Name." Isaiah 63:12-14. June 22, 1913.
1037. "Border of His Garment." Mark 6:56. September 7, 1913.
1038. "Father of Lights." James 1:16-17. September 14, 1913.
1039. "Two Years Before Earthquake." Amos 1:1. September 14, 1913.
1040. "Speaking in Parables." Mark 4:33-34. September 21, 1913.
1041. "Demoniac of Gadara." Mark 5:1-20. September 21, 1913.
1042. "Study of Mankind." Matthew 5:47. September 28, 1913.
1043. "It is John." Mark 6:16. September 28, 1913.
1044. "Mystic Shadows." Mark 9:32. October 12, 1913.
1045. "Sentence of Death." I Peter 2:24. October 12, 1913.
1046. "Widow of Zarephath." I Kings 17:8-16. October 19, 1913.
1047. "Josph could Not Refrain." Genesis 45:1. October 19, 1913.
1048. "All Things Well." Mark 7:37. October 26, 1913.
1049. "Crucified With Christ." Galatians 2:20. November 2, 1913.
1050. "An Angry Son." Luke 15:28. November 23, 1913.
1051. "Joshua Magnified." Joshua 4:14. November 30, 1913.

1052. "Jonathan and His Armourbearer." I Samuel 14:11-13. November 30, 1913.
1053. "They Sung An Hymn." Mark 14:26. December 7, 1913.
1054. "Putting Off Clothes." Nehemiah 4:23. December 14, 1913.
1055. "Christian in the Home." Mark 5:19. December 14, 1913.
1056. "The Star Went Before." Matthew 2:9. December 21, 1913.
1057. "Dayspring." Luke 1:78. December 21, 1913.
1058. "The Days of Old." Psalm 43:5-6. December 28, 1913.
1059. "Church Member." I Timothy 3:14-15. December 28, 1913.
1060. "Remembering How God Forgets." Luke 22:19 and Hebrews 10:17. January 4, 1914.
1061. "The Christian Employer." Colossians 4:1. January 11, 1914.
1062. "Christian Employee." Ephesians 6:5-8. January 19, 1914.
1063. "God's Choice." I Corinthians 1:26-29. January 19, 1914.
1064. "Souls Distressed." Psalm 37:3-7. January 25, 1914.
1065. "Christian Business Men." Matthew 20:25-28. January 25, 1914.
1066. "Saul and Jonathan." I Samuel 1:23. February 1, 1914.
1067. "Faith and Good Conscience." I Timothy 3:9. February 8, 1913.
1068. "Conversion of Lydia." Acts 16:12-15. February 8, 1914.
1069. "Shipwreck of Faith." I Timothy 3:9. February 15, 1914.

1070. "I Stand at Door." Revelation 3:20. February 22, 1914.
1071. "Dreaming of Food." Isaiah 29:8. February 22, 1914.
- * 1072. "And Peter." Mark 16:7. March 1, 1914.
1073. "Judas." John 13:30. March 1, 1914.
1074. "As They Went." Luke 17:14. March 8, 1914.
1075. "The Blessed Man." Psalm 1:1-3. March 8, 1914.
1076. [No title]. Romans 1:14. March 22, 1914.
1077. "Like the Chaff." Psalm 1:4. March 15, 1914.
1078. "Prince and a Savior." Acts 5:30-31. March 29, 1914.
1079. "House to Be Builded." I Chronicles 22:5. March 29, 1914.
1080. "Add Thereto." I Chronicles 22:14. April 5, 1914.
1081. "Rising of the Sun." Mark 16:2. April 12, 1914.
1082. "Joseph Yet Alive." Genesis 45:28. April 12, 1914.
- + 1083. (Take Heed Therefore Unto Yourselves and to All the Flock). Acts 20:28. April 16, 1914.
- * 1084. "Great Faith." Matthew 8:10. April 26, 1914.
1085. "The Lord is Great in Zion." Psalm 99:2. May 3, 1914.
1086. "Eternal Kingdom." Isaiah 54:10. May 10, 1914.
1087. "Shimei of Bahurim." II Samuel 19:18-23. May 10, 1914.
1088. "Gad, Reuben, Manasseh." Number 32:32. May 17, 1914.
1089. "Zaccheus." Luke 19:1-10. May 17, 1914.
1090. "Empress of Ireland." Psalm 77:13,19. May 31, 1914.
1091. "Be Ye Ready." Matthew 24:34. May 31, 1914.
1092. "It is of Faith." Romans 4:16. June 7, 1914.

1093. "The Joy of the Lord." Matthew 25:21. June 14, 1914.
1094. "Paul's Sufferings." Acts 9:16. June 14, 1914.
- * 1095. "Names in Heaven." Luke 10:20. July 5, 1914.
1096. "Art Thou He?" Matthew 11:2-6. July 12, 1914.
1097. "Eternal Life." John 10:26-28. July 26, 1914.
1098. "A Man of War." Exodus 15:3. September 6, 1914.
1099. "Tarrying By the Staff." I Samuel 30:21-25.
September 6, 1914.
1100. "Girding the Mind." I Peter 1:13. September 13,
1914.
1101. "The War." Psalm 76:7-10. September 13, 1914.
1102. "Today and Tomorrow." Luke 13:32-33 and James 4:13-
14. September 20, 1914.
1103. "A.B.C." Romans 10:1-4. September 27, 1914.
1104. "Learning War." Judges 3:1-4. September 27, 1914.
1105. "Elisha at Shunem." II Kings 4:18-13. October 4,
1914.
1106. "Began to Be Merry." Luke 15:24. October 4, 1914.
1107. "Great Things Elisha." II Kings 8:4. October 11,
1914.
1108. "More About Elisha." II Kings 8:4. October 18, 1914.
1109. "Jehoshaphat's Sake." II Kings 3:13-14. October 25,
1914.
1110. "Jesus and Widow of Nain." Luke 7:11-16. October 25,
1914.
1111. "Bear Ye One." Galatians 6:2. November 1, 1914.
1112. "Woman a Sinner." Luke 7:36-51. November 1, 1914.
1113. "God Hath Set in the Church." I Corinthians 12:28.
November 8, 1914.
1114. "Receiving Sinners." Luke 7:41-42. November 8, 1914.

1115. "Prophet of War." Jeremiah 6:21-23. November 22, 1914.
1116. "Prophecy." John 12:16. November 29, 1914.
1117. "Second Coming." Matthew 24:3-4. December 6, 1914.
1118. "Burning Bush." Exodus 3:1-6. December 20, 1914.
1119. "Moral Invincibility." Ephesians 6:14-16. December 20, 1914.
1120. "No Room in the Inn." Luke 2:7 and Revelation 20:11. December 27, 1914.
1121. (Aaron and _____ Stayed Up His Hands). Exodus 17:8-16. January 3, 1915.
1122. "Psalm 82." Psalm 92. January 10, 1915.
1123. "Priest's Work Never Done." Hebrews 10:11-13. January 10, 1915.
1124. "The War and Human Nature." Romans 8:6-7. January 17, 1915.
1125. "Boaz." Ruth 3:18. January 24, 1915.
1126. "Culture and Evolution." [No text]. January 24, 1915.
1127. "Poor Man's Wisdom." Ecclesiastes 9:13-16. January 31, 1915.
1128. "Virtue of Hatred." [No text]. January 31, 1915.
1129. "Belgium and Expiation." [No text]. February 7, 1915.
1130. "Germany and Punishment." Luke 11:49-51. February 14, 1915.
1131. "I Have Given Them My Word." John 17:14. February 21, 1915.
1132. "Kaiser and Beelzebub." Ephesians 6:10-12. February 21, 1915.
1133. "Poor Rich in Faith." James 2:5. February 28, 1915.

1134. "War and Sovereignty." John 19:11 and Acts 2:23-24. February 28, 1915.
1135. "The Bible and the War." Daniel 10:21. March 7, 1915.
1136. "Faint Yet Pursuing." Judges 8:4. March 14, 1915.
1137. "Measureless Grace." Isaiah 43:22-26. March 14, 1915.
1138. "When Creation Sings." Isaiah 44:20-23. March 21, 1915.
1140. "What is a Christian Church." Acts 2:47. March 28, 1915.
1141. "Make it Sure." Matthew 27:65. April 4, 1915.
1142. "Buried With Christ." Romans 6:3-5. April 25, 1915.
- * 1143.
1144. "Unafraid of Evil Tidings." Psalm 112:7. May 2, 1915.
1145. "In Remembrance of Me." II Samuel 18:18 and Luke 22:19. May 2, 1915.
1146. "My Heart is Fixed." Psalm 57:7. May 9, 1915.
1147. "Sinking of Luisitania." I Kings 22:23. May 9, 1915.
1148. "Like Precious Faith." II Peter 1:1-2. May 16, 1915.
1149. "How Are the Mighty Fallen." II Samuel 1:27. May 16, 1915.
1150. "For His Name's Sake." Psalm 106:8. May 32, 1915.
- + 1151. (The Christian Patriot). [No text]. May 3, 1915.
1152. "Gave Them Their Request." Psalm 106:15. May 30, 1915.
1153. "Nebuchadrezzar." Daniel 4:30-31. May 30, 1915.
1154. "Stand Still." Exodus 14:13. June 6, 1915.
1155. "Formal Versus Experimental Religion." John 5:10-11. June 20, 1915.

1156. "Finding Lost Sheep." Luke 15:5. June 20, 1915.
1157. "Angel of Mons." II Kings 7:1-3. September 12, 1915.
1158. "It Was Not Possible." Acts 2:24. September 12, 1915.
1159. "Peter Out of Prison." Acts 12:11. September 26, 1915.
1160. "Made Nigh by Blood." Ephesians 2:13. September 26, 1915.
1161. "Law of Sacrifice." John 10:17. October 3, 1915.
1162. "Judah Rejoiced." II Chronicles 15:15. October 3, 1915.
1163. "Year Uzziah Died." Isaiah 6:1-3. October 10, 1915.
1164. "Wilt Thou Be Whole." John 5:5-9. October 10, 1915.
1165. "Woman of Canaan." Matthew 15:21-28. October 17, 1915.
1166. "The Lord's Hand." Isaiah 59:1. October 24, 1915.
1167. "Understanding Times." I Chronicles 12:22,32. October 24, 1915.
1168. "Restoreth Soul." Psalm 23:3. October 31, 1915.
1169. "The Blood of Covenant." Hebrews 13:20. October 31, 1915.
- * 1170.
1171. "Preaching the Word." Acts 8:4. November 7, 1915.
1172. "Where is the Great Chamber?" Mark 14:15. November 7, 1915.
1173. "Philip at Samaria." Acts 8:5. November 14, 1915.
1174. "Folly of Neutrality." matthew 27:22. November 14, 1915.
1175. "Bartimeus." Mark 10:46-52. November 21, 1915.
1176. "Your Old Estates." Ezekiel 36:11. November 28,

1915.

- 1177. "For My Name's Sake." Ezekiel 36:21-22. December 5, 1915.
- 1178. "Through the Veil." Hebrews 10:20. December 5, 1915.
- 1179. "Our Feet Shall Stand." Psalm 122:3-4. December 12, 1915.
- 1180. "Killed in Action." John 3:14-15. December 12, 1915.
- 1181. "Ittai." II Samuel 15:21. December 19, 1915.
- 1182. "No More Offering." Hebrews 10:18. December 19, 1915.
- 1183. "The Spirit Helpeth." Romans 8:26-27. January 2, 1916.
- 1184. "Remembering Love." Canticles 1:4. January 2, 1916.
- 1185. "Beauty Incognito." Isaiah 53:2. January 9, 1915.
- 1186. "Unsearchable Riches." Ephesians 3:8. January 16, 1916.
- 1187. "In Right Mind." Luke 8:35. January 16, 1916.
- 1188. "Centurion's Faith." Luke 7:1-10. January 23, 1916.
- 1189. "Will Christ Come?" Hebrews 9:28. January 23, 1916.
- 1190. "Is Coming Personal?" Acts 1:11. January 30, 1916.
- 1191. "Ananias and Saul." Acts 9:17. February 6, 1916.
- 1192. "Signs of Christ's Coming." Matthew 24:3. February 6, 1916.
- 1193. "Will He Be Welcome?" Revelation 1:7. February 13, 1916.
- 1194. "Weapons of Warfare." II Corinthians 10:4. February 13, 1916.
- 1195. "Second Coming and the War." Psalm 103:19. February 20, 1916.
- 1196. "Second Coming and Christ." Colossians 3:4. February 27, 1916.

1197. "Beauty for Ashes." Isaiah 61:3. May 5, 1916.
1198. "Second Coming and Ungodly." Hebrews 9:28. May 5, 1916.
1199. "Gehazi." II Kings 5:25. March 26, 1916.
1200. "Naaman." II Kings 5:1. March 26, 1916.
1201. "Overcoming Evil." Romans 12:21. April 2, 1916.
1202. "Christ Died in Vain." Galatians 2:21. April 2, 1916.
1203. (Imperial London at War). [No text] April 9, 1916.
1204. "Golden Key." John 14:6,9. April 16, 1916.
1205. "Chambers of King." Canticles 4:1 and Ephesians 2:5-6. April 23, 1916.
1206. "Windows Open Wide." Jude 1:20. April 30, 1916.
1207. "Gospel and the Sword." Matthew 5:38-48. April 30, 1916.
1208. "Christ's Fortitude." Luke 23:27-28. May 14, 1916.
1209. "Eleazar and Shammah." II Samuel 23:9-12. May 21, 1916.
1210. "Lord's Remembrances." Isaiah 43:26;62:6. May 28, 1916.
1211. "Chariot of Israel." II Kings 13:14. June 4, 1916.
1212. "Two or Three." Matthew 18:19-20. June 11, 1916.
1213. "Conversion of Lydia." Acts 16:10-14. June 18, 1916.
1214. "Judge Nothing." I Corinthians 4:5 June 18, 1916.
1215. "McMaster." Ephesians 4:15. June 25, 1916.
1216. "Jacob at Peniel." Genesis 32. June 25, 1916.
1217. "About David." I Kings 11:36. July 2, 1916.
1218. "Philip and Ethiopian." Acts 8:26-40. July 2, 1916.

1219. "Christ's Reign." II Kings 25:27-30. July 9, 1916.
1220. "Rich Ruler." Mark 10:17-22. July 9, 1916.
1221. "Hagar and Ishmael." Genesis 21:15-20. July 16, 1916.
1222. "Joseph of Arimethaea." John 19:38. July 16, 1916.
1223. "Well of Bethlehem." I Chronicles 11:15-19. July 30, 1916.¹
- + 1223a. (Breakfast at Sea.) John 21:1-14. July 30, 1916.
1224. "Christians as Believers." Acts 5:14. September 10, 1916.
1225. "Exemplary Believers." I Thessalonians 1:5-8. September 17, 1916.
1226. "Achan." Joshua 7:19-21. September 17, 1916.
1227. "Glory of the Gospel." Romans 1:16. September 24, 1916.
1228. "Itching Ears." II Timothy 4:1-5. October 1, 1916.
1229. "Is There a Hell?" Matthew 25:46. October 1, 1916.
1230. "Faith of Abraham." Hebrews 11:17-19. October 8, 1916.
1231. "The Longest Hope." Isaiah 56:6. October 8, 1916.
1232. "Bringing to Christ." Matthew 14:34-36. October 15, 1915.
1233. "Wedding Guests." Matthew 22:10. October 15, 1916.
1234. "Heaven God's Throne." Isaiah 66:1-2. October 22, 1916.

¹ This sermon was preached from a previous manuscript, possibly number 1027. Often Shields preached variations on the same passage. When he preached the same sermon, however, he usually did not assign it a new number but simply noted where the sermon was preached in the flyleaf of the manuscript. In this case he did assign a new number but the manuscript is empty.

1235. "The Angel of Hope." Romans 8:24. October 9, 1916.
1236. "No Temple Therein." Revelation 21:22. October 29, 1916.
1237. "The Angel of Joy." Psalm 30:5. November 5, 1916.
1238. "New Covenant." I Corinthians 11:25. November 5, 1916.
1239. "Household of God." Ephesians 2:9. November 12, 1916.
1240. "O My son Absalom!" II Samuel 18:33. November 12, 1916.
1241. "Rejoicing Wilderness." Isaiah 35:5-10. November 19, 1916.
1242. "High Cost of Living." Genesis 41:46-49. November 12, 1916.
1243. "Devil Threw Him Down." Luke 9:37-42. November 26, 1916.
1244. "Three Crosses." Luke 23:33-43. December 3, 1916.
1245. "Christmas." Luke 2:10-12. December 24, 1916.
1246. "President's Impertinence." I Kings 21:17-20. December 24, 1916.
1247. "Whom Shall I Send?" Isaiah 6:8. December 31, 1916.
1248. "National Service." Acts 9:6. December 31, 1916.
1249. "Sons of God." Romans 8:35. January 5, 1917.
1250. "Jonah." Jonah. January 7, 1917.
1251. "More Than Conquerors." Romans 8:37. January 14, 1917.
1252. "Jonah." Jonah 1:1-3. January 14, 1917.
- * 1253. "Love." Romans 8:38-39. January 21, 1917.
1254. "Jonah." Jonah 1:4-10. January 21, 1917.
1255. "Trolley to Heaven." [No text]. January 28, 1917.

1256. "Jonah." Jonah 1:11-16. January 28, 1917.
1257. "I Have Given Them." John 17:14. February 18, 1917.
1258. "Jonah." Jonah 1:17. February 18, 1917.
1259. "Preaching at Ninevah." Jonah 3. February 25, 1917.
1260. "Solomon's Choice." I Kings 3:5-13. March 4, 1917.
1261. "Jonah's Reputation." Jonah 4. March 4, 1917.
- * 1262. "Jabesh Gilead." II Samuel 2:5-7. March 11, 1917.
1263. "Jonah a Type." Matthew 12:38-41. March 11, 1917.
1264. "Abundant Rain." I Kings 18:41-46. March 18, 1917.
1265. "Moral Courage." John 12:42-43. March 18, 1917.
1266. "Dry Bones." Ezekiel 37:1-10. March 25, 1917.
1267. "Call of Levi." Matthew 9:9-13. March 25, 1917.
1268. "Peter and Cornelius." Acts 10:33. April 1, 1917.
1269. "Elisha at Shunem." II Kings 4:18-37. April 8, 1917.
1270. "Buried in Baptism." Colossians 2:12. April 8, 1917.
1271. "Enquiring of the Lord." I Kings 22:5-8 and II Kings 3:11-12. April 29, 1917.
1272. "David." II Samuel 3:29. April 29, 1917.
1273. "Caleb." Joshua 14:6-14. May 6, 1917.
1274. "Your Own Salvation." Philippians 2:12. May 6, 1917.
1275. "Give Us Bread." Genesis 47:15. May 13, 1917.
1276. "Return." Hosea 14:1-9. May 20, 1917.
1277. "Home Missions." Acts 5:29. May 27, 1917.
1278. "Ointment Poured." Canticles 1:3. June 3, 1917.
1279. "In Affliction." Isaiah 63:9. June 10, 1917.

- + 1280. (Should We Have Conscription). Numbers 32:6.
June 10. 1917.¹
1281. "Martha and Mary." Luke 10:38-42. June 17, 1917.
1282. "Jehovah - Shalom." Judges 6:24. July 1, 1917.
1283. "A Rod and Branch." Isaiah 11:1. July 8, 1917.
1284. (The Seeking Savior). Luke 15:4-6. August 12, 1917.
1285. "He Staggered Not." Romans 4:20. September 16, 1917.
1286. "Blessing in the Curse." Deuteronomy 23:5. September 16, 1917.
1287. "I Am Ready." Romans 1:15. October 17, 1917.
1288. "Thanksgivings." Exodus 23:14-17. October 7, 1917.
1289. "Yea, Rather." Romans 8:34. October 14, 1917.
1290. "Shadow of Wings." Psalm 36:7. October 21, 1917.
1291. "Shepherd of Israel." Psalm 80:1. October 21, 1917.
- + 1292. (A Holy Man of God Which Passeth By Us Continually).
[No text]. October 29, 1917.
1293. "Encouraged in God." I Samuel 30:6. November 4, 1917.
1294. "Abraham and Lot." Genesis 13:1-4. November 11, 1917.
1295. "Bathed in Heaven." Isaiah 34:5. November 18, 1917.
1296. "First War of History." Genesis 14. November 18, 1917.
1297. "Egyptian War Lord." Exodus 15:9. December 2, 1917.
1298. "Patriotic Appeal." [No text]. November 25, 1917.
- * 1299. "Be of Good Cheer." John 16:33. December 9, 1917.

¹ This was a fifteen minute talk which preceded the sermon and thus was not listed by Shields.

1300. "North and South Gates." Ezekiel 46:9. December 16, 1917.
1301. "Glory to God." Luke 2:14. December 23, 1917.
1302. "Ahab and Jezebel." I Kings 16:30-33. December 23, 1917.
1303. "Waiting to be Gracious." Isaiah 30:18. December 30, 1917.
1304. "Attitudes Towards Christ." Mark 5:17-19. December 30, 1917.
1305. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 13, 1918.
1306. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 13, 1918.
1307. "Mission of Christ." John 6. November 4, 1917.
- + 1308. (Good Soldiers of Christ). [No text]. December 5, 1917.
1309. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 20, 1918.
1310. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 20, 1918.
1311. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. January 27, 1918.
1312. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. February 3, 1918.
1313. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. February 3, 1918.
1314. "Comfort of Scriptures." Acts 4:23-40. February 17, 1918.
1315. "The Word of God." Isaiah 55:10-11. February 24, 1918.
1316. "He Brought Us Out." Deuteronomy 6:23. March 3, 1918.
1317. "Perfect Peace." Isaiah 26:3. March 10, 1918.
1318. "Certainty in Salvation." I John 5:13. March 10, 1918.
1319. "The Lord's Supper." I Corinthians 11:27. March 3, 1918.
1320. "The Master is Come." John 11:28. March 17, 1918.

1321. "The Lamb." Revelation 5:6. March 17, 1918.
1322. "Mordecai at King's Gate." Esther 4:1-2. March 24, 1918.
1323. "White Robed Throng." Revelation 7:13-17.
1324. "Jesus Only." Matthew 17:8. March 31, 1918.
- * 1325. "But Now." I Corinthians 15:19-20. March 31, 1918.
1326. "Names Written in Heaven." Luke 10:20. April 7, 1918.
1327. "The Day of Trouble." Psalm 50:15. April 14, 1918.
1328. "In the Beginning, God." Genesis 1:1-3 and John 1:1. April 21, 1918.
1329. "It Was of the Lord." Joshua 11:20. April 28, 1918.
1330. "Valley of Achor." Hosea 2:14-15. May 5, 1918.
1331. "The Lord's Death." I Corinthians 11:26. May 5, 1918.
1332. "Burden of Kohath." Numbers 7:9. May 19, 1918.
1333. "Except the Lord Build." Psalm 127:1-2. May 26, 1918.
1334. "The God of Hope." Romans 15:13. June 2, 1918.
1335. "Grace and Glory." John 17:24. June 9, 1918.
1336. "Bridegroom Cometh." Matthew 25:6. June 9, 1918.
1337. "Repentance." Hosea 5:13-15. June 30, 1918
1338. "Memory's Inspection." Philippians 1:3. July 7, 1918.
1339. "Prisoner's of Hope." Zechariah 9:12. July 7, 1918.
1340. "Epaphroditus." Philippians 2:30. July 14, 1918.
1341. "Endless Life." Hebrews 7:16. July 14, 1918.
1342. [No title]. I Chronicles 20:4-8. September 22, 1918.
1343. "The Joy of Victory." Isaiah 61:3. December 8, 1918.

1344. "The End of the Charge." I Timothy 1:5. December 15, 1918.
1345. "Haman's Gallows." Esther 7:9-10. December 15, 1918.
1346. "Survival of Goodness." Matthew 2:20. December 22, 1918.
1347. "Having Made Peace." I Colossians 1:20. December 22, 1918.
1348. "Wish For New Year." I Peter 5:10. December 29, 1918.
1349. "Who Loved Me." Galatians 2:20. December 29, 1918.
1350. "Sufficiency of God." II Corinthians 3:5. January 5, 1919.
1351. "Love His Appearing." II Timothy 4:8. January 5, 1919.
1352. "Remember Former Things." Isaiah 46:9-11. January 26, 1919.
1353. "Light in Window." Luke 15:20. January 26, 1919.
1354. "The Apostolic Church." Acts 2:47. February 2, 1919.
1355. "Policy of Antichrist." Daniel 8:25. February 2, 1919.
1356. "Went Away in Rage." II Kings 5:12-15. February 9, 1919.
1357. "Blessing of Salvation." Acts 3:26. February 16, 1919.
1358. "This Grace Also." II Corinthians 8:8-9. February 23, 1919.
1359. "Link Between Two Worlds." II Timothy 1:10. March 9, 1919.
1360. "Recognition Beyond." Hebrews 12:23. March 16, 1919.
1361. "Communicate With Dead?" John 14:6. March 23, 1919.
1362. "Lure of Golden City." Hebrews 11:10. March 30, 1919.

1363. "Choosing Bride." II Thessalonians 2:13-14. April 6, 1919.
1364. "Christ the Wooer." Hosea 2:19-20. April 13, 1919.
1365. "Love of Christ." Song of Solomon 8:6-7. April 20, 1919.
- * 1366. "Golden Vials." Revelation 5:8. April 27, 1919.
1367. "Marriage of Lamb." Revelation 19:7. April 27, 1919.
- * 1368. "The Golden Altar." Revelation 8:3-4. May 4, 1919.
1369. "The Lord's Passover." Exodus 12:11. May 4, 1919.
1370. "Lazarus." John 12:9-11. May 11, 1919.
1371. "Eight Wonderful Days." John 20:19-29. May 11, 1919.
- * 1372. "Angel at the Altar." Revelation 8:3-4. May 18, 1919.
1373. "The Working God." Isaiah 64:4 and I Corinthians 2:9-10. May 25, 1919.
1374. "Sinners Against." Numbers 16:38. May 25, 1919.
1375. "And Peter." Mark 16:7. June 1, 1919.
1376. "The Lord Thy Healer." Exodus 15:26. June 1, 1919.
1377. "Shaken Leaf." Leviticus 26:36. June 8, 1919.
1378. "Vail [sic] Done Away." II Corinthians 3:14. June 8, 1919.
- * 1379. "In Tent Door." Genesis 18:1. June 15, 1919.
1380. "Where Hast Thou Gleaned?" Ruth 2:19. June 22, 1919.
1381. "Receiving Sinners." Luke 15:2. June 22,, 1919.
1382. "Retribution." Proverbs 26:27. June 29, 1919.
1383. "How War Was Won." Judges 5:20. July 6, 1919.
1384. "Kaiser's Trial." I Kings 20:42. July 13, 1919.
1385. "Eternal Redemption." Hebrews 9:12. August 3, 1919.

1386. "Ahab." II Chronicles 18:34. August 10, 1919.
1387. "What Doest Thou Here?" I Kings 19:13-18. October 5, 1919.
1388. "David's Mighty Men." II Samuel 23:9-10. October 12, 1919.
1389. "The Precious Blood." I Peter 1:19-21. October 12, 1919.
1390. "The Good Samaritan." Luke 10:30,37. October 19, 1919.
1391. "Well Doing." II Thessalonians 3:13. October 26, 1919.
1392. "Much of Little." Mark 6:34-43. November 2, 1919.
1393. "All Against Me." Genesis 42:36. November 9, 1919.
1394. "The Lord's Banished." II Samuel 14:14. November 9, 1919.
1395. "Deity of Christ," II Corinthians 4:13. November 23, 1919.
1396. "Until He Find It." Luke 15:4. November 30, 1919.
1397. "The Incarnate God." John 1:14. November 30, 1919.
1398. "The Scriptures." II Peter 1:19-20. December 7, 1919.
1399. "Christ." I John 5:20. December 21, 1919.
1400. "The Eternal Covenant." Ephesians 3:11 and I Corinthians 1:19-20. December 28, 1919.
1401. "The Glorious Cross." I Corinthians 11:26. January 4, 1920.
1402. "Divine Independence." Esther 4:14. January 11, 1920.
1403. "Gospel of Grace." Galatians 1:11-12. January 11, 1920.
1404. "Eternal Life." Hebrews 5:9. January 18, 1920.
1405. "Reuben, Gad and Manassah." Joshua 1:13-15. January

26, 1920.

- 1406. "Triumphant Christ." Revelation 19:16. January 26, 1920.
- 1407. "Go Forward." Exodus 14:15. February 1, 1920.
- 1408. "Nobleman's Faith." John 4:46-54. February 22, 1920.
- 1409. "Following Christ." Luke 11:33-62. February 29, 1920.
- 1410. "The Atonement." I Corinthians 15:3. February 29, 1920.
- 1411. "Lord's Supper." I Corinthians 11:26. March 7, 1920.
- 1412. "King at the Flood." Psalm 29:10. March 14, 1920.
- 1413. "Speechless." Genesis 43:3. March 14, 1920.
- 1414. "Utterance." Ephesians 6:19. March 21, 1920.
- 1415. "Do It With Might." Galatians 9:10. March 28, 1920.
- 1416. "At the Sepulchre." Matthew 28:11-15 and Luke 24:1-12. April 4, 1920.
- 1417. "Life's Turning Point." Luke 24:33. April 4, 1920.
- 1418. "Church of Father's Heart." Luke 15:20. April 11, 1920.
- 1419. "Taking Bearings." John 16:8-9. April 18, 1920.
- 1420. "Golgotha." John 19:30. April 25, 1920.
- * 1421. "Garden Grave." Romans 4:25. May 2, 1920.
- 1422. "Great Things." Mark 5:18-19. May 9, 1920.
- 1423. "Tenth Anniversary." I Corinthians 9:16. May 16, 1920.
- 1424. "Adoption." Galatians 4:5-6. May 16, 1920.
- 1425. "Made an Heir." Romans 8:17. May 23, 1920.
- 1426. "All Things Work." Romans 8:28. May 30, 1920.
- 1427. "Wearing Livery." Galatians 3:27. May 30, 1920.

- 1428. "Father, I Will." John 17:24. June 6, 1920.
- 1429. "The Lord's Death." I Corinthians 11:26. June 6, 1920.
- 1430. "The Lord On Our Side." Psalm 124:1. June 13, 1920.
- 1431. "Death Abolished." I Peter 1:19-20. June 13, 1920.
- 1432. "He Endured." Hebrews 11:27. June 20, 1920.
- 1433. "David Recovered." I Samuel 30:19. July 18, 1920.
- 1434. "Absalom's Place." II Samuel 18:18 and I Corinthians 11:20. October 3, 1920.
- 1435. "Dorcas." Acts 9:36-41. October 10, 1920.
- 1436. "Lambeth Appeal." Ephesians 2:3,13. October 17, 1920.
- 1437. "Picture of God." John 1:18. October 24, 1920.
- 1438. "Meagre Faith." Genesis 50:15-21. October 31, 1920.
- 1439. "Prayer." Luke 18:1. November 7, 1920.
- 1440. "Whence Wars?" James 4:1. November 7, 1920.

b. Unnumbered Sermons and Sermon Notes:

- "The Pleasure and Profit of Theological Study." [No text]. November 11, 1912.
- "It is My Mouth That Speaketh Unto You." Genesis 45:12-13. December 11, 1920.
- "Shall He Find Faith on Earth?" Luke 18:8, December 20, 1918.
- "Thou Shalt Call His Name Jesus." Matthew 1:21. December 25, 1920.
- "The Dawn of the Ultimate Glory." [No text]. December 26, 1920.
- "How to Watch For the Morning." [No text]. January 2, 1921.
- "The Certainty of a Perfect Day." Revelation 22:15.

January 9, 1921.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem." Luke 13:34-35. January 23, 1921.

"The Love of Christ Constraineth Me." II Corinthians 5:14-15. February 6, 1921.

"Philip [and] the Ethiopian." Acts 8:26-35. February 6, 1921.

"The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements." I Corinthians 8:11. February 12, 1921.

"Food for the Young." I Peter 2:2. February 19, 1921.

"Risen With Christ." Colossians 3:1-3. February 26, 1921.

"Wilt Thou Be Made Whole?" John 5:6. February 27, 1921.

"The Passover and the Lord's Supper." [Illegible text]. March 6, 1921.

"Abraham's Trial." Genesis 32:1-14. March 6, 1921.

"Abraham's Reward." Genesis 22:15-18. March 3, 1921.

"More About Abraham." Acts 7:2-5 and Hebrews 11:8-10, 13-16. March 19, 1921.

"The Stranger on the Road." Luke 24:17. March 26, 1921.

"In Remembrance of Me." Luke 22:19. April 3, 1921.

"The Qualification of a New Testament Deacon." Acts 6:1-4. and I Timothy 3:8-13. January 25, 1921.

"What a Millionaire Will Do for Jarvis Street Church." John 6:6. June 26, 1921.

"The Battle Before and Behind." II Chronicles 13:14. July 3, 1921.

"Who Can Forgive and Forget." Hebrews 10:15-17. July 10, 1921.

"The Apostolic Versus the Modern Church." [No text]. July 16, 1921.

"The Contagiousness of Evil and the Untransmissibility of Goodness." Haggai 2:11-13. July 30, 1921.

"Come! Come! Come!" Revelation 22:17. August 13, 1921.

"The Fate of a Woman of the World." Luke 17:32. August 14, 1921.

"Beginning at Jerusalem." Luke 24:47. September 3, 1921.

"The Supreme Glory of the Church." Ephesians 2:21. September 11, 1921.

"Does God Care For His Own." John 10:28-29. September 18, 1921.

"Hallelujah." Revelation 19:6. September 25, 1921.

"He Sat Down With the Twelve." Matthew 26:20. October 1, 1921.

"The Strait Gate." Luke 13:24. October 2, 1921.

"The Meaning of the Lord's Supper." I Corinthians 11:23-26. December 4, 1921.

"There Shall Not Be an Hoof Be Left Behind." Exodus 10:24-26. December 11, 1921.

"When I See the Blood." Exodus 12:13 and Leviticus 17:11. December 18, 1921.

"Feeding on Christ." John 6:57. December 31, 1921.

"The Jarvis Street of 1922 and After." Hebrews 4:1,11. January 1, 1922.

"Healing of Paralytic." Mark 2:1-12. January 15, 1922.

"The Ministry of the Holy Spirit." [No text]. January 9, 1922.

"Hallelujah! What a Savior!" I Corinthinas 15:1-8. January 29, 1922.

"Peter's Big Catch." [No text]. January 29, 1922.

"How a Great Scholar Was Converted." Acts 21:13;26:9. February 4, 1922.

"Prayer." [No text]. February 5, 1922.

"A Sham Conversion." [No text]. February 12, 1922.

"The Second Coming of Christ." [No text]. February 13, 1922.

"How a Rich Man Was Saved Going Home From Church." Acts 8:26-40. February 19, 1922.

"The Second Coming of Christ." [No text]. February 20, 1922.

"From Candlelight to Noon Day." [No text]. February 26, 1922.

"The Experience of a Business Woman." Acts 16:13-15. March 5, 1922.

"We Cannot But Speak." Acts 4:19-20. March 5, 1922.

"Almost a Suicide." Acts 16:25-34. March 12, 1922.

"The Second Coming of Christ." [No text]. March 13, 1922.

"Redeemed From the Curse of the Law." Galatians 3:13. March 19, 1922.

"What is the Millenium?" [No text]. March 20, 1922.

"How Will the Millenium Be Inaugurated?" [No text]. March 27, 1922.

"How Will the Millenium Come?" [No text]. April 3, 1922.

"Cleave Unto the Lord." Acts 11:23. April 9, 1922.

"Will You Also Go Away?" [No text]. April 30, 1922.

"What is the Unpardonable Sin?" Matthew 12:22-32 and Mark 3:22-30 and Luke 12:10 and I John 5:16. May 1, 1922.

"Abraham Believed God." Romans 4:3. August 13, 1922.

"Receiving Christ." John 1:12-13. August 13, 1922.

"The Joy of Prayer." John 16:24. August 20, 1922.

"When Right is Might." II Kings 6:16. August 27, 1922.

"Apostolic Aggressiveness." Acts 14:1-3. September 3, 1922.

"How Men Would Adulterate the Gospel and How God Preserves its Purity." Acts 15:7-11. September 10, 1922.

"Abraham's Intercession." Genesis 18:22. September 16, 1922.

"Wilt Thou Be Made Whole?" John 5:6. October 1, 1922.

"What Some Baptists Are Determined to Stand For." Jude 1:3. October 22, 1922.

"Ahab and Jehoshaphat." II Kings 22:30. November 12, 1922.

"Hearing, Preaching, Sending." Romans 10:13-15. November 26, 1922.

"Paul Before Felix." Acts 24:24-26. December 10, 1922.

"Philip, Ananias and Peter." Acts 8;9;10. December 10, 1922.

"Somebody Hath Touched Me." Mark 9:20 and Luke 8:43-48. December 17, 1922.

"Is Jesus of the Manger God Upon the Throne." Isaiah 9:6-7 and Luke 1:32-33. December 24, 1922.

[Memorial Address]. Hebrews 7:19. December 31, 1922.

"Christian ____ ." Luke 13:24. February 25, 1923.

"The Strait Gate." Luke 13:24. February 25, 1923.

[Two Addresses to Students of Gordon College, Boston]. March 29 and 30, 1923.

"The Lord is Risen Indeed." Luke 24:33-34. March 31, 1923.

"The Qualifications of Deacons." [No text]. April 22, 1923.

2. Periodicals

The Gospel Witness, 1922-1930¹

3. Books and Pamphlets

a. Pamphlets

Shields, T. T. The Baptist Message.

_____. The Necessity of Declaring War on Modernism.
Toronto.

_____. The Christian Church and Amusements. 1922.

_____. The Prodigal and His Brother. Toronto: The
Gospel Witness, 1924.

_____. Is "The Blessed Hope" a Delusion?. Toronto,
1925.

_____. The Oxford Movement Analyzed. Toronto: The
Gospel Witness, 1933.

_____. The Hepburn Government's Betrayal of Its Public
Trust by Diverting Public School Revenue to the Support
Of Roman Catholic Separate Schools. Toronto: The
Gospel Witness, 1936.

_____. The Roman Catholic Horseleach. Toronto: The
Gospel Witness, 1936.

_____. Three Addresses.

_____. Canadians Losing at Home the Freedom for Which
They are Fighting Abroad. Toronto: The Gospel Witness,
1943.

_____. Does "Killed in Action" Mean "Gone to Heaven?".
Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1944.

_____. Russellism or Rutherfordism, Toronto: The Gospel
Witness, 1946.

¹The Gospel Witness continues to be published. At
present back issues are being indexed by Rev. John Bodner.

_____. How to Receive Eternal Life. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1951.

_____. The Finality of Christ. 1952.

_____. Will Manitoba Taxpayers Consent to Pay for Roman Catholic Separate Schools. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1952.

_____. The Papacy in the Light of Scriptures. Toronto: The Canadian Protestant League.

_____. The God of All Comfort.

_____. Scriptures for Seekers and Soul-Winners.

b. Books

Shields, T. T. Revelations of the War. Toronto: The Standard Publishing Company, 1915.

_____. The Most Famous Trial of History. Toronto: The Gospel Witness. [Sermons originally preached in 1928]

_____. Other Little Ships. Toronto: The Hunter-Rose Company, 1935.

_____. The Plot That Failed. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1937.

_____. Christ in the Old Testament. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1972. [Sermons originally delivered in 1923]

_____. The Doctrines of Grace. Toronto: The Gospel Witness. [Addresses originally delivered in 1931]

c. Correspondence

Correspondence of T. T. Shields, 1910-1955. T. T. Shields Papers. Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

B. Secondary Sources

1. Books

Abraham, William J. The Coming Great Revival: Recovering the Full Evangelical Tradition. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984.

Ackroyd, P. R. and Evans, C. F. eds. The Cambridge History of the Bible. I From the Beginnings to Jerome. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. A Religious History of the American People. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Aldwinckle, Russell. More Than Man: a Study in Christology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.

Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ: an Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. London: Faber and Faber, 1956.

Ban, Joseph D. and Dekar, Paul, eds. In the Great Tradition: In Honor of Winthrop S. Hudson: Essays on Pluralism, Voluntarism and Revivalism. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1982.

Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. Year Books 1890-1930. Toronto: Standard Publishing Company and others.

Barr, James. Beyond Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.

_____. Fundamentalism. London: SCM Press, 1981.

Barth, Karl. Dogmatics in Outline. Trans. G. T. Thompson. London: SCM Press, 1949. Reprint edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

_____. Church Dogmatics The Doctrine of the Word of God. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1956.

Beale, David. In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850. Greenville, South Carolina: Unusual Publications, 1986.

Bebbington, W. Evangelicalism in England. London: Unwin-Hyman Books, 1989.

Berkhof, L. Systematic Theology. Revised edition. Grand

- Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953.
- Berkouwer, G. C. Studies in Dogmatics: The Work of Christ.
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965.
- _____. Studies in Dogmatics: The Person of Christ. Grand
Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954.
- Bibby, Reginald. Fragmented Gods: the Poverty and
Potential of Religion in Canada. Toronto: Irwin
Publishing, 1987.
- Bloesch, Donald. Essentials of Evangelical Theology. Vol.
1: God, Authority and Salvation. San Francisco: Harper
and Row, 1978.
- _____. Essentials of Evangelical Theology. Vol. 2:
Life, Ministry and Hope. San Francisco: Harper and
Row, 1978.
- _____. The Evangelical Renaissance. Grand Rapids: Wm.
B. Eerdmans, 1973.
- _____. The Future of Evangelical Christianity: a Call
for Unity Amidst Diversity. Garden City, New York:
Doubleday and Company, 1983.
- Boone, Kathleen. The Bible Tells Them So: the Discourse of
Protestant Fundamentalism. Albany: State University of
New York Press, 1989.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. Christology. Introduction by E. H.
Robertson. Translated by John Bowden. London: Collins,
1966.
- Brunner, Emil. The Mediator: a Study of the Central
Doctrine of the Christian Faith. Translated by Olive
Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- Bush, L. Russ and Nettles, Tom. Baptists and the Bible:
the Baptist Doctrines of Biblical Inspiration and Religious
Authority in Historical Perspective. Chicago: Moody
Press, 1980.
- By His Grace to His Glory: 60 Years of Ministry. Toronto:
Toronto Baptist Seminary and Bible College, 1987.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of Christian Religion. Vol. 1.
and 2. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis
Battles. The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. 20.
Edited by John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P.

- Van Dusen. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Caplan, Lionel, ed. Studies in Religious Fundamentalism. London: MacMillan Press, 1987.
- Carnell, Edward John. Christian Commitment: an Apologetic. New York: MacMillan Company, 1957.
- _____. The Case for Orthodox Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- _____. An Introduction to Christian Apologetics. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950.
- Carroll, Jackson; Johnson, Douglas and Marty, Martin E. Religion in America: 1950 to the Present. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
- A Century and a Half: an Historical Sketch of the Queen Street Baptist Church, St. Catherines, Ontario 1833-1983. Published by the 150th Anniversary Committee of the Queen Street Baptist Church, St. Catherines, Ontario.
- Claybaugh, Gary. Thunder on the Right: the Protestant Fundamentalists. Chicago: Nelson Hall Company, 1974.
- Clouse, Robert G. ed. The Meaning of the Millenium. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1977.
- Cole, Stewart. The History of Fundamentalism. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1963; reprint ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1931.
- Coleman, Richard Issues in Theological Warfare: Evangelicals and Liberals. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972.
- Cook, Ramsay. The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.
- Cox, Harvey. Religion in the Secular City: Towards a Postmodern Theology. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Cunliffe-Jones, Hurbert, ed. A History of Christian Doctrine. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Davis, John Jefferson. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.

- Dayton, Donald. Discovering an Evangelical Heritage. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Dollar, George. A History of Fundamentalism in America. Greenville, North Carolina: Bob Jones University Press, 1973.
- Ellingsen, Mark. The Evangelical Movement: Growth, Impact Controversy, Dialog. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.
- Elwell, Walter, ed. Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Fackre, Gabriel. The Religious Right and Christian Faith. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- Falwell, Jerry ed; Dobson, Ed and Hindson, Ed. The Fundamentalist Phenomenon: the Resurgence of Conservative Christianity. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1981.
- Flake, Carol. Redemptorama: Culture, Politics and the New Evangelicalism. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1984.
- Ford, Murray J. S. Convention Chronicles: a Historical Overview of the Ministry and Mission of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. Toronto: Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1988.
- Frank, Douglas. Less Than Conquerors: How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century. Grand Rapids: Wm. D. Eerdmans, 1986.
- The Fundamentals: a Testimony. 10 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.
- Furniss, Norman. The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918 - 1931. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Gaspar, Louis. The Fundamentalist Movement 1930-1956. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981. reprint ed. Netherlands: Mouton and Company, 1963.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. Dissent in American Religion Chicago History of American Religion. Edited by Martin Marty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Gonzalez, Justo. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. 1:

From the Beginnings to the Council of Chalcedon.
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

. A History of Christian Thought. Vol 2: From Augustine to the Eve of the Reformation. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971.

. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. 3: From the Protestant Reformation to Our Twentieth Century. New York: Abingdon Press, 1975.

Grant, John Webster. The Church in the Canadian Era.
Toronto: Welch Publishing, 1988.

Greenslade, S. L. ed. The Cambridge History of the Bible. 3 The West from the Reformation to the Present Day.
London: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Gritsch, E. W. Born Againism, Perspectives on the Movement. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Hall, Douglas. Lighten Our Darkness: Towards an Indigenous Theology of the Cross. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

. The Canada Crisis. Toronto: The Anglican Book House,

Hamilton, Neill. Recovery of the Protestant Adventure. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.

Handy, Robert. The Protestant Quest for a Christian America 1830 - 1930. Facet Books Historical Series in American History, edited by Richard Wolf.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

. A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976.

. The American Religious Depression 1925 - 1935. Facet Books Historical Series in American History, edited by Richard Wolf. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Heick, Otto W. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. 2.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Henry, Carl F. H. Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957.

- _____. The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism.
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1947.
- Hill, Samuel, ed. Encyclopedia of Religion in the South.
Macon, Georgia: Mercer University press, 1984.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred Knoff, 1963.
- Hordern, William. A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology.
New York: MacMillan Company, 1955.
- Hunter, James Davidson. American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandry of Modernity.
New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- Hutchinson, William, ed. American Protestant Thought in the Liberal Era. New York: University Press of America, 1968.
- _____. The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Jansen, John. Calvin's Doctrine of the Work Christ.
London: James Clarke and Company, 1956.
- Johnston, Charles. McMaster University. Vol. 1: The Toronto Years. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Johnston, William. Christian Mysticism Today. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Jorstad, Erling. The Politics of Doomsday. New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Kilbourn, William; Forrest, A. C. and Watson, Patrick. Religion in Canada: the Spiritual Development of a Nation. The Canadian Illustrated Library. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- Kraus, C. Norman ed. Evangelicalism and Anabaptism.
Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1979.
- _____. Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958.
- Lienhard, Marc. Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ: Stages and Themes of the Reformer's Christology. Translated by Edwin Robertson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing

House, 1982.

Littell, Franklin. From State Church to Pluralism: a Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History. Revised ed. New York: MacMillan Company, 1971.

Lohse, Bernard. A Short History of Christian Doctrine. Translated by F. Ernest Stoeffler. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Lotz, David W., Donald Shriver Jr., John F. Wilson. Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America, 1935-1985. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1989.

Lull, Timothy F. ed. Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Lumpkin, William. Baptist Confessions of Faith. Revised ed. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1969.

Macquarrie, John. Principles of Christian Theology. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Mann, William Edward. Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955.

Marsden, George. Fundamentalism and American Culture: the Shape of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870 - 1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

_____. Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and Seminary and the New Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987.

_____, ed. Evangelicalism and Modern America. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984.

Marty, Martin. Pilgrims in Their Own Land 500 Years of Religion in America. New York: Penguin Books, 1984.

_____. A Nation of Behavers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

_____. Modern American Religion. Vol. 1: The Irony of it all 1893-1919. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

_____. Righteous Empire: the Protestant Experience in America. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

McBeth, Leon. The Baptist Heritage: Four Centuries of

- Baptist Witness. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987.
- McGrath, Alister. The Making of Modern German Christology: From the Enlightenment to Pannenberg. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- McLoughlin, William. Modern Revivalism Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.
- _____. Revivals, Awakenings and Reform: an Essay on Religion and Social Change in America 1607-1977. Chicago History of American Religion. Edited by Martin Marty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Mol, Hans. Faith and Fragility: Religion and Identity in Canada. Burlington, Ontario: Trinity Press, 1985.
- _____. Identity and the Sacred: a Sketch for a New Social Scientific Theory of Religion. New York: the Free Press, 1976.
- Moltmann, Jurgen. The Crucified God: the Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology. Translated by John Bowden and R. A. Wilson. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Morton, Desmond. Years of Conflict: 1911-1921. Toronto: Grolier Limited, 1983.
- Mullins, Edgar Young. The Christian Religion in its Doctrinal Expression Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1917.
- Murray, Iain. D. Martin Lloyd Jones: the First Forty Years 1899-1939. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. Does Civilization Need Religion: a Study in the Social Resources and Limitations of Religion in Modern Life. New York: MacMillan Company, 1927.
- _____. The Irony of American History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1957. Reprint ed. Henry Holt and Company, 1929.
- _____. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Noll, Mark Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals,

Scholarship, and the Bible in America. San Francisco:
Harper and Row, 1986.

_____, ed. The Princeton Theology 1812-1921 Scripture
Science and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander
to Benjamin Warfield. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House,
1983.

_____; Hatch, Nathan; Marsden, George; Wells, David and
Woodbridge, John. Eerdman's Handbook to Christianity
in America. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.

Packer, J. I. "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God Some
Evangelical Principles. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans,
1985. Reprint ed., 1958

Pannenberg, Wolfart. Jesus - God and Man. 2nd ed.
Translated by Lewis Wilkins and Duane Priebe.
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. Jesus Through the Centuries: His
Place in the History of Culture. New Haven: Yale
University Press, 1985.

_____. The Christian Tradition: a History of the
Development of Doctrine. Vol. 1: The Emergence
of the Catholic Tradition (100-600). Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1971.

_____. The Christian Tradition: a History of the
Development of Doctrine. Vol. 4: Reformation of
Church and Dogma (1300-1700). Chicago: University of
Chicago Press. 1984.

_____. The Christian Tradition: a History of the
Development of Doctrine. Vol. 5: Christian Doctrine
and Modern Culture (since 1700). Chicago: University
of Chicago Press, 1989.

Piepkorn, Arthur. Profiles in Belief. Vol. 4: Evangelical,
Fundamentalist and Other Christian Bodies. San
Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979.

Proceedings of the Education Session of the Baptist Convention
of Ontario and Quebec Held in Hamilton, October 16-
22, 1925. Reported by E. J. Bengough, Issued by
Authority of McMaster University.

Proceedings of the Education Session of the Baptist Convention
of Ontario and Quebec Held in First Avenue Baptist Church,
Toronto, October 19, 1926. Stenographic Report.

Published by the Executive Committee of the Convention.

Quebedeaux, Richard. The Worldly Evangelicals. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

Rahner, Karl ed. Encyclopedia of Theology: the Concise Sacramentum Mundi. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982.

Ramm, Bernard. An Evangelical Christology - Ecumenic and Historic. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985.

_____. After Fundamentalism: the Future of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983.

_____. The Pathway of Religious Authority. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959.

Rawlyk, George, ed. Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 1988.

_____. Champions of the Truth: Fundamentalism, Modernism and the Maritime Baptists. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1990.

_____. ed. Henry Alline: Selected Writings. Sources of American Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.

Reid, David G.; Linder, Robert D., Shelley, Bruce L. and Stout, Harry S. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

Renfree, Harry. Heritage and Horizon: the Baptist Story in Canada. Mississauga, Ontario: Canadian Baptist Federation, 1988.

Russell, C. Allyn. Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Sandeen, Ernest. The Origins of Fundamentalism: Towards an Historical Interpretation. Facet Books Historical Series, Edited by Richard Wolf. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

_____. The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800 - 1930. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

- Selvidge, Marla, ed. Fundamentalism Today: What Makes it so Attractive?. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Press, 1984.
- Stevick, Daniel B. Beyond Fundamentalism Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964.
- Stone, Ronald, ed. Reformed Faith and Politics. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1983.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1907.
- Strout, Cushing. The New Heavens and the New Earth: Political Religion in America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1974.
- Sweet, Leonard. ed. The Evangelical Tradition in America. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Thielicke, Helmut. The Evangelical Faith. Vol. 2: The Doctrine of God and of Christ. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Thompson, John. Christ in Perspective - Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978.
- Tillich, Paul. A History of Christian Thought: from its Judaic and Hellenistic Origins to Existentialism. Edited by Carl Braaten. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967, 1968.
- _____. Systematic Theology 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Torbet, Robert G. A History of the Baptists. 3rd ed. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1963.
- Torrance, T. F. Reality and Evangelical Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.
- Urban, Linwood. A Short History of Christian Thought. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Vos, Arvin. Aquinas, Calvin and Contemporary Thought: a Critique of Protestant Views on the Thought of Aquinas. Washington, D.C.: Christian University Press, 1985.
- Wacker, Grant. Augustus Strong and the Dilemma of Historical Consciousness. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1985.

- Wade, Mason. The French Canadians 1760-1967. Toronto: MacMillan Company, 1968.
- Walsh, H. H. The Christian Church in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1956.
- Warfield, B. B. The Person and Work of Christ. Edited by S. C. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1950.
- Watt, J. H. The Fellowship Story Our First Twenty-Five Years. Toronto: Fellowship Baptist Publication, 1978.
- Weber, Timothy. Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism 1875 - 1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Weber, Otto. Foundations of Dogmatics. Translated and annotated by Darrell Guder. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981.
- Welch, Claude. Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 2: 1870 - 1914. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Wells, David and Woodbridge, John eds. The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing. New York: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Wilson, Douglas. The Church Grows in Canada. Toronto: Committee on Missionary Education of the Canadian Council of Churches, 1966.
- Wilson, John. Religion in American Society: the Effective Presence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Wogaman, J. Philip. Faith and Fragmentation: Christianity for a New Age. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Woodbridge, John; Noll, Mark and Hatch, Nathan. The Gospel in America: Themes in the Story of American Evangelicals. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.
- Woodbridge, John and Carson, D. A. eds. Scripture and Truth. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic Books, 1983.
- Zeman, J. K. ed. Costly Vision the Baptist Pilgrimage in Canada. Burlington, Ontario: Welch Publishing company, 1988.

- _____. ed. Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity. Burlington, Ontario: G. R. Welch, 1980.
- _____. and Klassen, Walter. The Believer's Church in Canada: Addresses and Papers from the Study Conference in Winnipeg May 1978. Brantford and Winnipeg: Baptist Federation of Canada and Mennonite Central Committee, 1979.
2. Articles
- Anglin, Gerald. "The Battling Baptist." MacLeans. 62 (June 15, 1949).
- Ashcraft, Morris. "The Theology of Fundamentalism." Review and Expositor. 79 (Winter, 1982): pp. 31-44.
- Brett, G. S. "The Modern Mind and Modernism." Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. 5 (March-April, 1928): 91-104.
- The Canadian Baptist, 1894 to 1930.
- Carpenter, Joel. "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism." Church History. 49 (March, 1980): 62-75.
- Coleman, John. "A Changed Liberal - But Still a Liberal." Christian Century: 56; (February 8, 1939): 179-81.
- Christopherson, K. E. "Fundamentalism." Dialog: a Journal of Theology 19 (Summer, 1980): 209-13.
- Dayton, Donald. "The Social and Political Conservatism of Modern American Evangelicalism: a Preliminary Search for Reasons." Union Seminary Quarterly Review 31 (Winter, 1977): 71-80.
- Ellis, Walter E. "Gilboa to Ichabod: Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Canadian Baptists 1895-1934." Foundations. 20 (April-June, 1977): 116-117.
- Glass, William. "The Ministry of Leonard G. Broughton at Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1898-1912: a Source of Southern Fundamentalism." American Baptist Quarterly (March, 1985): 35-60.

- Harrop, Gerald G. "The Era of the 'Great Preacher' Among Canadian Baptists." Foundations. 23 (January-March, 1980): pp
- Hinson, E. Glenn. "Neo-Fundamentalism an Interpretation and Critique." Baptist History and Heritage (April, 1981): 33-49.
- Horton, Walter Marshall. "Between Liberalism and the New Orthodoxy." Christian Century 61 (May 17, 1939): 637-40.
- Johnston, Charles M. McMaster University. Vol. 1 The Toronto Years. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, , 1976.
- Land, Richard. "Southern Baptists and the Fundamentalist Tradition in Biblical Interpretation, 1845-1945." Baptist History and Heritage 29 (July, 1984): 29-32.
- Leonard, Bill. "The Origin and Character of Fundamentalism." Review and Expositor 79 (Winter, 1982): 5-17.
- Livingstone, David. "B. B. Warfield the Theory of Evolution and Early Fundamentalism." The Evangelical Quarterly 58 (January 1986): 69-83.
- Marsden, George. "Fundamentalism as an American Phenomenon, a Comparison With English Evangelicalism." Church History. 46 (March, 1977): 215-232.
- Marty, Martin. "Fundamentalism as a Social Phenomenon." Review and Expositor. 79 (Winter, 1982): 19-30.
- May, George. "Des Moines University and Dr. T. T. Shields." Iowa Journal of History 54 (1956): 193-232.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. "Fundamentalism," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. E. R. Seligman, ed. 3. New York: MacMillan Company, 1938: pp. 526-527.
- Noll, Mark. Review of Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century: Vol. 1, 1799-1870 and Vol. 2, 1870-1914. By Claude Welch. Fides et Historia. (January, 1988):
- Parker, David. "The Bible Union: a Case Study in American Fundamentalism." Journal of Religious History. 14 (June, 1986): 71-99.
- Rawlyk, George. "Fundamentalism, Modernism and the Maritime

Baptists in the 1920's and 1930's." Acadiensis.
(Autumn, 1987): 3-33.

Russell, C. Allyn. "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian
Fundamentalist." Ontario History. 70 (1978): 263-280.

_____. "Adoniram Judson Gordon: Nineteenth Century
Fundamentalist." American Baptist Quarterly. 4 (March,
1985): 61-89.

Sandeen, Ernest. "The Problem of Authority in American
Fundamentalism." Review and Expositor 75 (Spring,
1978): 211-2118.

Shelley, Bruce. "Sources of Pietistic Fundamentalism."
Fides et Historia 5 (Spring, 1973): 68-78.

Stewart, George Craig. "A Bend in the River." Christian
Century 56 (May 10, 1939): 605-09.

Sweet Leonard. "Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: the
New Evangelical Historiography." Journal of the
American Academy of Religion. 56 (Fall, 1988):

Tarr, Leslie. "T. T. Shields: a Soldier in the Field."
Fundamentalist Journal. 2 (June, 1983): 42-44.

Taylor, W. R. "Modernism, Its Nature and Grounds." The
Canadian Journal of Theology. 6 (March-April, 1929):
81-90.

3. Dissertations

Carpenter, Joel Allan. "The Renewal of American
Fundamentalism 1930 - 1945." Ph. D. Dissertation: John
Hopkins University, 1984.

Carder, William Gordon. "Controversy in the Baptist
Convention of Ontario and Quebec." B. D. Thesis,
McMaster University, May, 1950.

Delnay, Robert George. "A History of the Baptist Bible
Union." Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological
Seminary, 1963.

Dozois, John. "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields (1873-1955) In
the Stream of Fundamentalism." B. D. Thesis, McMaster
University, 1963.

Elliot, David Raymond. "The Intellectual World of Canadian

Fundamentalism 1870 - 1970." Ph. D. dissertation,
University of British Columbia, 1989.

Ellis, Walter E. "Social and Religious Factors in the
Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in
North America, 1895-1934." Ph. D. dissertation,
University of Pittsburg, 1974.

Hart, Nelson, Hodges. "The True and the False: the Worlds
of an Emerging Evangelical Protestant Fundamentalism
in American 1890 - 1920." Ann Arbor, Michigan:
University Microfilms International, 1983.

Sawatsky, Ronald George. "'Looking For That Blessed
Hope:' the Roots of Fundamentalism in Canada 1878 -
1914." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto,
1986.

Stackhouse, John. "Proclaiming the Word: Canadian
Evangelicalism Since World War I." Ph. D.
dissertation, University of Chicago, 1987.

Whan, R. L. "Premillennialism in Canadian Baptist History."
B. D. thesis, McMaster University, 1945.

4. Newspapers

"Shields vs. Satan." The Globe and Mail, 10 February,
1975.

"Two Canadian Clerics Included in New Christian Hall of
Fame." The London Free Press. 14 May, 1966.

5. Unpublished Material

Crawford, J. C. to T. T. Shields. 13 January, 1930. T. T.
Shields Papers. Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

Farmer, J. H. to T. T. Shields. 19 March, 1910. T. T.
Shields Papers. Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

MacLennan, Stewart P. tp T. T. Shields. 12 October, 1926.
T. T. Shields. Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

Morrison, W. E. to T. T. Shields. 18 March, 1910. T. T.
Shields Papers. Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

Parent, Mark. "T. T. Shields and the First World War."
Paper presented at the Evangelical Theological

Society (Canada Region), May 8, 1989.

Purchase, LeeAnn. "T. T. Shields: Devil or Saint?" Paper
Submitted for Church History Course at McMaster
Divinity College, November 20, 1986.