

# The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES  
AND IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.  
\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.  
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 18, No. 7

TORONTO, JUNE 22, 1939

Whole Number 892

## A REPLY TO THE BAPTIST TIMES

In our issue of January 19th, we published an item about the Pastors' College—Spurgeon's—having applied for affiliation with the Baptist Union, under the heading, "Another Czechoslovakia Thrown to the Wolves". The article we then published was as follows:

### ANOTHER CZECHOSLOVAKIA THROWN TO THE WOLVES

In *The Life of Faith*, London, England, of December 28th, there occurs this short but significant announcement:

"At its recent meeting SPURGEON'S COLLEGE Council resolved to apply for affiliation with the Baptist Union."

The Pastors' College was founded by the great and incomparable Charles H. Spurgeon. Almost from the beginning it far surpassed all other Baptist colleges in England, in the number of students it trained. The influence of the College upon Baptist life in England—and, indeed, throughout the world—cannot be estimated. It is known to our readers that Mr. Spurgeon, toward the close of his great ministry, fought valiantly against the encroachments of Modernism in the Baptist denomination, until at last the Baptist Union passed a resolution of censure upon the greatest gospel preacher of all the ages. Mr. Spurgeon withdrew from the Union, and there are some who believe that the anguish of soul he suffered on account of the controversy and its accompaniments had something to do with shortening his life, and closing his great ministry when he was but fifty-eight years of age.

But the Baptist Union of Spurgeon's day was almost ultra-orthodox in comparison with its present-day standards. Long since the Union has gone to the end of the road, as Mr. Spurgeon foresaw it would. While within the Union doubtless there are many churches and ministers who still stand true to the gospel, the Union officially has forfeited all right to be regarded as an evangelical body. An organization that could elect Dr. T. Reavley Glover to its Presidency, and that could establish one like Professor L. H. Marshall in one of its colleges—to name only two of the many ultra-Modernist leaders—is no longer entitled to be regarded as evangelical, by those who believe the Bible to be the Word of God.

During the years of the Secretaryship of Rev. J. H. Shakespear, a sum of money was raised to serve as a Sustentation Fund. It was raised from all the churches, and committed to the servants of the churches for administration. The Book of Proverbs says, "A man's gift maketh room for him." Weak churches, dependent upon the augmentation of their funds by the treasury of the Sustentation Fund, are required to be loyal to the Modernistic Union of which the Fund is a part.

Spurgeon's College has fallen prey, we assume, to that Fund. Its students want positions—and so Spurgeon's College seeks affiliation with the Baptist Union that censured, and virtually, if not actually, withdrew its fellowship from the world's greatest preacher, who was the Founder of the College! The name of Spurgeon, from the day that it elec-

trified the religious world until now has been regarded as a synonym for biblical, evangelical orthodoxy. We respectfully suggest that since it seeks affiliation with the Baptist Union, by which Mr. Spurgeon was crucified, the Council of Spurgeon's College ought, in common decency, to change its name; and thus save it from the offence of associating Mr. Spurgeon's name with an organization from which, in his lifetime, in protest against its apostasy he withdrew.

In *The Baptist Times* of March 9th, 1939, an article was advertised in a headline right across the page, three-eighths of an inch deep, "The Man with a Load of Mischief"; and on page one hundred and ninety-four, the article under the same heading appeared, and was as follows:

Dr. T. T. Shields, of Toronto, has again come to the front as the champion of Evangelical teaching in this country. He is very indignant over the Pastors' College entering the Baptist Union. "It is another Czechoslovakia thrown to the wolves." Dr. Shields, with unenviable disregard for facts, says: "The Baptist Union of Spurgeon's day was almost ultra-orthodox in comparison with its present-day standards. Long since the Union has gone to the end of the road as Mr. Spurgeon foresaw it would."

Dr. Shields sees the Baptist Union in the light of invincible prejudice. His statement is as foolish as it is inaccurate. He writes: "While within the Union doubtless there are many churches and ministers who still stand true to the Gospel, the Union has officially forfeited all rights to be regarded as an Evangelical body."

Dr. Shields' inaccuracy is glaringly manifest in the statement: "Weak churches dependent upon the augmentation of their funds by the treasury of the Sustentation Fund are required to be loyal to the Modernistic Union of which the Fund is a part. Spurgeon's College has fallen prey, we assume, to that Fund. Its students want positions, and so Spurgeon's College seeks affiliation with the Baptist Union." This statement is not only inaccurate; it is a libel upon Spurgeon's men. During many years students from the Pastors' College, when they settled in the ministry, came into union with the denominational organization; there was no question about their wanting positions. The only change is that the College is now formally in association with the Union. It has long been informally associated.

The Chairman of the College Committee have been members of the Ministerial Committee of the Union. Professor Walter Hackney, Rev. Thomas Greenwood, and Dr. Percy Evans have served the Committee.

Spurgeon's men have played a great part in the Evangelical life of our churches. Those who are on the Council of the Baptist Union are among the leaders recognized in all the Churches as devoted servants of Jesus Christ.

First of all we call attention to the fact that in our article reproduced above we have offered no criticism

whatever of the theological position taken by Spurgeon's College or any of its teachers. We have always assumed that Spurgeon's College has stood true to the Spurgeon tradition—by which we mean, merely, true to the Bible. We assume, and sincerely hope, that that is still true. Our criticism was only respecting the affiliation of the College with the Baptist Union.

We have had a fairly extensive experience of these matters, and our observation is that in nothing is the truth of the proverb, that a man is known by the company he keeps, more generally exemplified than in religious associations. It does not, of course, appear at once; but one or the other of two differing bodies must change if they are to walk together. And if the mighty Spurgeon himself had no power to lead the Baptist Union back into paths of orthodoxy, we greatly fear that the Pastors' College will prove itself certainly no mightier than he.

In the article quoted from *The Baptist Times*, the writer represents us as "the champion of evangelical teaching in this country". The doctrinal position of most religious bodies can fairly be estimated by the doctrinal position of its officers. Living in Canada, our only way of knowing what the English Baptists Union stands for is through its authorized publications, and through its visiting official representatives to this country.

For a number of years Canada has had full opportunity of judging the doctrinal quality of the officers of the Baptist Union, for we have had many of them visit this land. And it was on our appraisal of the theological position of these Union officials we reached the conclusion that "the Baptist Union of Spurgeon's day was almost ultra-orthodox in comparison with its present-day standards".

We may modestly claim to know something of what Mr. Spurgeon's standards were. We have, we believe, practically everything he published on our shelves, and we have been steeped in Mr. Spurgeon's teaching ever since our conversion in our teens. We have read everything that has been published on the "downgrade controversy", and we venture to say that, had we been older, and had lived in England at the time of the "downgrade controversy", it would have been very nearly impossible to have been more thoroughly informed of all the particulars.

Canada has frequently been visited by Dr. T. R. Glover, a former President of the Baptist Union. We have every book that Dr. Glover has published on our shelves, and have read them thoroughly. Most of them we reviewed extensively at the time of the visit of the Baptist World Alliance some years ago. Surely he would be not only a bold, but an utterly daring man who would claim that Dr. Glover's theological position has any kinship with evangelical orthodoxy. Certainly there was no Baptist of Spurgeon's day of whom we have ever read, who went to such lengths as Dr. Glover.

If one should say that Dr. Glover is not the Baptist Union, we answer, It is exceedingly improbable that a man of Dr. Glover's known theological position would have been elected to the Presidency of the Union—a position that seems to be very highly prized by certain men, and coveted by others—had not the majority of the ministers of the Union been in full sympathy with him.

But we have very sad reasons for knowing just what

the Baptist Union stands for. In 1925, McMaster University imported Rev. L. H. Marshall, to occupy a Chair on the theological faculty of McMaster University. Mr. Marshall boasted that he had the full confidence of Dr. Glover, Mr. Aubrey, and Dr. Carlile. If Professor L. H. Marshall was not a Modernist double-dyed, through and through, there is no such thing as Modernism anywhere.

Professor Marshall boldly declared his disbelief in some parts of the Bible. After one of his addresses, *The Toronto Star* published a headline on the front page of the paper in letters an inch or an inch and a quarter deep, "Marshall Says Bible Not All True." At several Conventions we had the entire educational session—one lasting from ten one morning until half past two the next morning—stenographically reported. For the purpose, we employed two *Hansard* reporters, and each of those reports cost us, for stenography alone, more than one hundred and twenty pounds—in Canadian money, six hundred dollars. We have those reports in our files. We had the records made by two reporters who worked independently of each other, so that each could check the accuracy of the other's report.

Our *Baptist Times* critic says: "Dr. Shields, with unenviable disregard for facts", etc. We have not disregarded facts, but at great pains and expense we have always ascertained the facts. And when we say that Professor Marshall was a Modernist of the Modernists, we are writing with a full knowledge of his position, derived from his own addresses stenographically reported, in duplicate. Professor Marshall, prompted by the Canadian arch-enemy of evangelicalism, dared to say that his position on the Atonement was exactly similar to Spurgeon's. Either Professor Marshall did not know what Mr. Spurgeon taught, or he was guilty of an absolute, deliberate, falsehood. Professor Marshall held the idea of the infallibility of Holy Scripture up to ridicule, and even contempt. He endeavoured to explain away all miracles; mocked at the idea of the historicity of the book of Jonah; and, worst of all, utterly repudiated the vicarious, expiatory, value of the death of Christ.

Professor Marshall was thrust upon the Denomination by a handful of Modernists, who, by a villainous campaign of misrepresentation, managed to deceive the people. Nearly all of these leaders have passed to the Great Beyond where they will be required to give an account of their stewardship by the "God of knowledge, by whom actions are weighed".

The deadly, paralyzing, effect of Marshallism is now making itself felt in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

But there are some here who say, as does Mr. Olney, of the leaders of the Baptist Union in Spurgeon's day, since these leaders are gone things have greatly improved. We answered that in our article of last week.

This must be said of all the representatives of the Baptist Union who have come to Canada, that they have aided and abetted the most pronounced Modernists we have in this country. Of course, they have associated also with those who are left in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec who still claim to be evangelicals. But judging by the samples of the Baptist Union that have come to Canada, we are sure we are well within the facts of the case in saying, "Long since the Union has

gone to the end of the road, as Mr. Spurgeon foresaw it would."

Perhaps, since Mr. Carlile has made several visits to Canada, we ought specifically to refer to him. We have never supposed that Dr. Carlile was a Modernist. So far as we have observed, he is, "Hail, fellow, well met", with both Modernists and Evangelicals; and is equally at home in either camp. Professor Marshall, we believe, is now a professor in Rawdon College.

The writer in *The Baptist Times* calls us, "The man with a load of mischief" because we have expressed concern over the affiliation of the Pastors' College with the Baptist Union. It is because we venerate the name of Spurgeon, and because we love the truth which Spurgeon preached, that we regret so profoundly that an institution which he founded should seek affiliation with the Union which censured him, which broke his heart, and perhaps hastened his death; and more especially because the Union has not officially reversed its position.

Be that as it may, we are by no means alone in feeling some anxiety about this matter. We publish below an article from *The Outlook*, the quarterly magazine issued by Highgate Road Baptist Church, of which Rev. John Wilmot is the Editor, entitled, "More about Spurgeon's College and the Baptist Union"; and also an article by Rev. Henry Oakley, of Trinity Road, Upper Tooting, which we have reproduced from THE WITNESS of June, 1939. These articles follow, and speak for themselves.

### MORE ABOUT SPURGEON'S COLLEGE AND THE BAPTIST UNION

By Rev. John Wilmot

Our further reference to this subject is occasioned thus: Mr. John Huntley of Bath, a reader of OUR OUTLOOK, wrote me in this way, "What are we coming to? These words about Spurgeon's College make sad reading. What does Mr. William Olney think about it?" Mr. Olney replied that he is a member of the College Council and approved of its decision. He asked me to give publicity in this issue to two assurances. One of these is so amazing that it calls for evidence before acceptance. Therefore, I give additional particulars. They will show which way the wind is blowing. They are but a few *specimen* items which would indicate that the "facts" are not as Mr. Olney supposes. I realize that one may be charged with intermeddling with other men's matters. Something like that was said before. I also realize that, as Rev. Henry Oakley and F. T. Passmore remark, "Protest makes no difference". But one day faithful witnesses will receive Divine recognition. "Overcoming" in Scripture is related to the subtleties of error, to anti-christianism and apostasy. That is often obscured. And a true biblical "sanctification", such as Spurgeon perceived and practised with wholesome boldness, is similarly related. The ethical as well as theological position—faith and a good conscience—weighed with Spurgeon.

The official statement that Spurgeon's College Council had resolved to apply for affiliation with the Baptist Union was coupled with the dual explanation that this did not mean any theological change; but that it is a contribution to Christian unity.

We venture an enquiry as to the theology both of the College and the Union, and we pointed out that Mr. Spurgeon himself recognized that there were men in the Union as true to the fundamental truths of Holy Scripture as he himself desired and claimed and was known to be. But there were also in the Union, leaders and others, whose unbelief stood opposed to historic Baptist orthodoxy. Mr. Spurgeon stated his case as clearly as words may do in the quotation which we gave and here repeat. He wrote:—

"One thing is clear to us, we cannot be expected to meet in any Union which comprehends those whose teaching on fundamental points is exactly the reverse of that which we hold dear. Cost what it may, to

separate ourselves from those who separate themselves from the Truth of God is not alone our liberty but our duty."

Not alone theological corruption did Mr. Spurgeon perceive in the Union of his day, but a policy of comprehension of which the Word of God disapproved, and the duty of obedience to the Truth required separation from such a mixture. (See 2 Cor. vi.) The College Council, therefore, would seem to have officially set aside one of the fundamental principles by which the faith and action of its revered founder were directed.

Here is the assurance which Mr. Olney has requested me to publish in this number:—

"First of all the Baptist Union is in a quite different position to its condition when C. H. Spurgeon separated from it. Those then prominent in teaching modernist doctrines have been called away, and to-day we rejoice to know that *the leaders*, both older and young, that is to say our best known Baptist ministers, *are preaching the Truth as faithfully as did Spurgeon himself* (italics ours).

"Secondly, the Council through their representative made public statement that the step means no departure whatever from the Spurgeonic theology which has been taught there since its foundation."

I submitted this assurance to some who had expressed their concern, and the following is taken from replies received:—

"I confess that seeing the men whom they have invited of recent years I am not altogether surprised. Dear Spurgeon, and his magnificent, and to him costly, protest—and now! . . . I agree with Dr. Shields that they should cease to use the name of Spurgeon since his spirit has departed. . . ."

"I have the greatest esteem for Mr. Olney and am surprised that this receives his approval. I wish that what he thinks were true. But is it? Can we ever forget the dastardly attack on the memory of C.H.S. by T. Reaveley Glover? Is he not still in the B.U.? Has he ever expressed his sorrow for that insult? How can we fraternize with such? Who of these 'best-known Baptist ministers' proclaims the truth of Divine Election as Spurgeon did? Who of them glories in the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ as Spurgeon did? One admires the generous spirit of our brother but all the charity in the world will not turn error into truth."

"How I wish that what it is desired we should believe from this memorandum were really true, but anyone reading the journal of the denomination or listening to its preachers must form another impression. I am grieved that our friend should not have taken the separate position which would be appropriate to his great and honoured name."

"This claim is amazing. What about Drs. Glover, Wheeler Robinson and Underwood. He was asked to address the annual meeting of the College last year. Even *The Sword and the Trowel* said it was a new thing but would make for unity. If in 1887-8 there were half-a-dozen higher critics in the Union, as they were then called, there are dozens of them now. Only last Tuesday I heard of a deacon who has resigned because of the modernism of the young minister. It is simply that Mr. Olney does not know."

"Mr. Olney's statement *re* the Baptist Union is astoundingly contrary to fact. As to the position of the College, I suggest that you ask whether he can *vouch* that the Verbal Inspiration of Holy Scripture is taught to the students there as it was by C.H.S. and subsequently by Dr. McCraig. I have been credibly informed that it is not."

Dr. Charles Brown contributed an article to *The British Weekly* to the memory of C.H.S. in 1934, at the time of his Centenary. Spurgeon, he said, "was not without blame in the lamentable Downgrade controversy", and "probably his judgment was often at fault". Rev. A. G. Edgerton wrote the next week: "It is a real pity Dr. Brown could not lay his wreath upon the great preacher's memory without inter-

twining it with a twig of thorn"; and an anonymous correspondent, supporting Dr. Brown, asked, "Is it honest to pretend that Spurgeon's own college stands to-day where Spurgeon stood in all things?"

At the same time the editor of *The Baptist Times* had a note about the Principal of Spurgeon's College in his capacity as a member of the Baptist Union Council. The note distinguished Dr. Evans from other members of the Council and Union Committees as being "loyal to the Spurgeon tradition, he represents the evangelical, point of view. There is no compromise over his theology, but his sympathies are very wide." The only possible inference from this is that other members of the Union hold other theological "points of view", and are not "loyal to the Spurgeon tradition".

And did not Dr. Glover write a Discipleship Campaign booklet on "The Atonement" which, by its Modernist content, occasioned a taking sides for and against in the B.U. Council Chamber? And in order to satisfy both the Evangelicals and the Modernists in the Union, was not a compromise effected by the decision to issue another booklet presenting the Evangelical point of view while allowing the Modernist booklet still to circulate? That represents the "Comprehension" of to-day as compared with its tiny beginnings in Mr. Spurgeon's time—sweet water and bitter, light and darkness, truth and error, believers and unbelievers, Christ and belial—the "evangelical point of view" and the Modernist points of view fellowshiping together!

The late Dr. Harold Morton published articles in *The Fundamentalist* a few years ago on these questions; he wrote me then as follows:—

"At the request of Mr. Chilvers and Prof. Evans, the Rev. Thomas Greenwood, President of the College Council, came to see me the other day. He tried to show that Spurgeon withdrew his advice to separate from the Union immediately after he had given it, and that, so far as Spurgeon was concerned, settled the whole question of relationship to the B.U. He brought me *The Sword and Trowel* to prove this. Having carefully examined *The Sword and Trowel*, not only for the year 1888, but for 1889 and right on to 1892, the very issue before Spurgeon's death, I have been able to make it clear to Mr. Greenwood, and also shall make it clear in the Journal, that Mr. Greenwood entirely misunderstands Spurgeon's words and attitude."

*The Sword and the Trowel* for March last has an article from the Secretary's pen championing the College decision and attempting some reply to a protest made by Dr. Shields, entitled "Another Czechoslovakia thrown to the wolves". Admittedly this is a bold title, but it may not be as "foolish" as the writer suggests, neither is Dr. Shields "ignorant or ill-informed" on the matter, or "blinded by prejudice". Things like these were thrown at Spurgeon when he made his protest. It was the Lord Jesus Himself who warned His disciples of "wolves in sheep's clothing", and Paul followed his Lord in reminding the Church of the same thing. Nor must it be supposed that the Baptist Denomination is immune, or that false prophets may not be found within the comprehension of the Baptist Union, as they were in Spurgeon's day.

The reply appears under "Wayside Notes", surely an appropriate setting, for undeniably the decision is a stepping aside from that direct path of separation where Spurgeon led by costly resolve and example.

Regrettable also is it to read that "in an impressive speech in support of the resolution, Dr. Scroggie stressed the point that the churches of this country may be subject to an attack from the forces of paganism which will make it necessary for them to stand together if they are to survive". But we have heard Dr. Scroggie stress the scriptural principle that the only way by which spiritual life and effectiveness can survive is, not by uniting with contrary elements, but by standing apart therefrom with the Lord and His Word. However, Dr. Scroggie has himself in recent years become a personal member of the Baptist Union. We heard Mr. Scroggie some years ago at Spurgeon's Tabernacle (before Mr. Chilvers's settlement)—much was being said at the time about Church Union—advocate ecclesiastical separation in strong terms and declare that the day would come when the Church would even "federate with the Devil"!

On Tuesday, April 18th, Dr. Scroggie delivered his Presidential address to Spurgeon's College Conference. We suggest that certain principles he enunciated might very fittingly be applied to this Biblical and Spurgeonic aspect of Separation: "Is there not a great discrepancy between what we profess and what we express?" And again, "Fellowship . . . must be rooted in deep spiritual convictions and rich spiritual experiences, which have Christ for their common denominator—not the Christ of Modernism, but the Christ of the New Testament." If Spurgeon's practical sanctification was right in his day, it cannot be wrong in our day. Unity in the Truth, by all means; but where principles are compromised, "United we perish"!

The programme of the B.U. Assembly at Birmingham during the first week in May includes the ultra-modernist Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. E. W. Barnes. It would be interesting to know whether the Principal of Spurgeon's College in his capacity as member of the B.U. Council; and who, the denominational paper affirms, remains "loyal to the Spurgeon tradition", approved or opposed this inclusion. Here are Spurgeon's words again: "Cost what it may, to separate ourselves from those who separate themselves from the Truth of God is not alone our liberty but our duty".

By its affiliation the College officially, and not alone its Principal in his individual capacity as hitherto, must share its measure of responsibility for and complicity with the policy of the Union. This principle also actuated Mr. Spurgeon in his withdrawal. Is the College Council's "contribution to Christian unity" so latitudinarian as to embrace the policy of welcoming ultra-modernist speakers to the Baptist platform? Loyalty to the Spurgeon tradition would require the rescinding of the affiliation proposal forthwith. "As soon as I saw," said Mr. Spurgeon, "that error had become firmly established, I did not deliberate but quitted the body at once."

The College President supported the affiliation proposal "in an impressive speech". In his Presidential address a little later he laid down the basis of "Fellowship" in the terms given above. And, in the same address he asked, if there were not a "great discrepancy between what we profess and what we express?" It would seem that the "discrepancy" here is "great" indeed!

I would propose a very simple and straightforward test of the accuracy of Mr. Olney's contention given above. At the time of Mr. Spurgeon's separation from the Union he, with like-minded brethren, drew up a doctrinal statement which they called "A Confession". It embodies simply and without burden of detail, their theological and ethical position. This is it:

"We, the undersigned, banded together in fraternal union, observing with growing pain and sorrow the loosening hold of many upon the truths of Revelation, are constrained to avow our firmest belief in the *Verbal Inspiration* of all Holy Scripture as originally given. To us, the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God, but it is the Word of God. From beginning to end we accept it, and continue to preach it. To us, the Old Testament is no less inspired than the New, the book is an organic whole. Reverence for the New Testament accompanied by scepticism as to the Old appears to us absurd. The two must stand or fall together. We accept Christ's Own verdict concerning, 'Moses and all the prophets' in preference to any of the supposed discoveries of so-called higher criticism.

"We hold and maintain the truths generally known as '*the Doctrines of Grace*'. The electing love of God the Father, the propitiatory and substitutionary sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ; regeneration by the Holy Ghost; the imputation of Christ's righteousness, the justification of the sinner (once for all) by faith, his walk in newness of life and growth in grace by the active indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the priestly intercession of our Lord Jesus, as also the hopeless perdition of all who reject the Saviour, according to the words of the Lord Jesus in Matt. xxv. 46, 'These shall go away into eternal punishment'—are in our judgment, revealed and fundamental truths."

(Continued on page 10)

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH

A Sermon by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, June 18th, 1939

(Stenographically reported)

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3.

*(Dr. E. Hooper, well known to all Canadian Baptists, though a physician, a Baptist minister for more than fifty years, was in the congregation, and was called to the platform to lead in prayer. Dr. Hooper is ninety-three years old and had preached in the morning in another church, but was full of vigour in the evening and walked and spoke like a young man. Jarvis St. has long rejoiced in his fellowship.)*

Prayer by Rev. E. Hooper, M.D., Brockville, Ont.

Gracious God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee that we can praise Thee together. We thank Thee that we not only have Thy many gifts; for a thousand blessings from Thy hand deserve ten thousand songs of praise—we not only have Thy gifts, but we know that we have Thee. Do Thou grant that Thy gracious presence may be realized by Thy people here to-night. Far better than the gifts is it to have accompanying them the Giver.

We thank Thee that Thou hast saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but according to Thy purpose of grace which Thou hast purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. May we be true followers of Jesus Christ! May we not run before Him; may we not be far behind Him. We thank Thee that we can come by the new and living way into the holy place where Thou art, that we ourselves can come to Thee as Thou hast graciously accommodated Thyself to our needs, so that at any time, and in any place, where e'er we seek Thee, Thou art found, and every place is hallowed ground.

We thank Thee, gracious God, for Thy holy Word. We thank Thee for our access to it. May we, Thy children, feed on it, by the light and power of the Holy Spirit day by day. May we, as we are exhorted by the Psalmist, meditate upon it day and night! May it not be only a Sunday ordinance or duty, but the very life-giving food that we seek after, that we must have, and for which we constantly thank Thee.

We praise Thee that this church is a Bible-reading church. We thank Thee for the teachers that unfold the Word. We thank Thee for the great Bible School where the truth is unfolded to the young. We thank Thee for the many exhortations for the people to lay hold of the Word. We thank Thee for Thy word, as a church. Oh, that all churches might get back to Thy Word, and abide in Thy truth.

We praise Thee for the privilege of prayer. We come to Thee unitedly, seeking Thy blessing. May this not only be an exercise, but a daily privilege, that we shall speak with Thee, and that we may be quiet before Thee. Quiet, Lord, our broken heart; make me teachable and mild; enable me to wait upon Thee quietly, to hear what Thou wilt say to me in Thy word, in Thy providences, in Thy dealings which are often mysterious. Lord, grant that we may hear Thy voice this night.

We thank Thee, with many, many others, that Thou hast again restored this place of worship. Grant that Thy largest blessing may be with those who meet here. May the atmosphere be the Spirit of God! May the anointing be continuous as Thou dost abide with Thy people. We thank Thee for Thy servant who ministers here. Grant him long years yet of service.

Hear our prayer for the young man who was baptized—baptized into Thy death, buried with Christ in baptism. Oh that we all might be crucified with Christ; that we might be enabled to know what it is to live in Christ so that we

could say with the Apostle, Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Bless this evening's service: bless the minister, and those who listen. God, bless every heart. In Jesus' name, and in His love, Amen.

I am sometimes at a loss to know whether to be amused or annoyed when frequently I find myself referred to in the press as "the militant Pastor of Jarvis Street Church". I should like to enquire, What other sort of Pastor is of any use to anyone?

We read this evening the distinction between the good shepherd and the hireling. It is said of the latter: "The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." He leaves his sheep to the tender mercies of the wolves; but a good shepherd, rather than fail in the fulfilment of his trust, will lay down his life for the sheep.

David was a shepherd: he was still a shepherd when God selected him for the throne. Before he went to battle against the Philistine, he modestly recited his experiences as a shepherd. He said, "Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock: and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth. . . thy servant slew both the lion and the bear." David did not send in a report to the Convention, to explain that his membership was depleted: he was able to report that his flock was one hundred per cent. safe—because he was a "militant" shepherd.

Any man who is of any use anywhere must be militant. I dare say there are some salesmen here. You plead the merits of the product you sell. You insist that it is superior to anything else. You are aggressive; you go after business; you try to overcome opposition. If you are an honest man, you will not exaggerate, but you will be aggressive and militant.

Every builder who is worth his salt must be a militant builder. He must ever be on his guard against wrong and unsafe methods of construction. He must build safely. Every good mother is a militant mother. She hates the diseases that would rob her of her children; and from the beginning she declares war against them, and is ever on the alert lest one of her children should fall victim to some deadly plague.

Science—true science—is in its very nature militant, always trying to discover defects in its observations and reasonings, always trying to improve on the old. That is true of science in all departments. Medical science is militant if it is any good at all; and more and more the medical profession are advocating the advantages of preventive medicine—attacking the enemy before the



enemy has a chance to attack. That is the principle of the toxoid and inoculation, in general, fortifying the system against alien powers.

Every true minister must be a militant minister. If he thinks of his own comfort, if he seeks the applause of men, if he is concerned for worldly preferments and emoluments, he will be "hail, fellow, well met"; and drift with the tide. But if he is faithful to his charge, if he is concerned for the spiritual welfare of those who are under his care, he will be always on guard against everything that could injure them. He will always meet the enemy with a drawn sword—not because he loves fighting, but because he loves his people, and because it is "required in stewards, that a man be found faithful."

Someone told me recently that my silence was being urged as an argument in defense of the orthodoxy of a certain educational institution. He said, "They say that Dr. Shields no longer criticizes it so it must be orthodox now." I suppose it is an undesigned compliment; but if a health officer puts up a red sign, "Smallpox here", once, he does not do it again the next morning. I have endeavoured, for the safeguarding of many, to placard some institutions as centres of religious infection, as the disseminators and "carriers" of deadly poison.

I want you to think of this subject this evening. Get a copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS as you go out the door. I do not know how many times I was asked last week if I were going to a certain Baptist Convention. The papers insisted that I had been invited. I said I had not received an invitation—we did receive an invitation twelve years ago, an invitation to leave them; and we left. And we have had abounding blessing since. You will find in THE GOSPEL WITNESS an article in which I have told them that unless and until they have rescinded every resolution endorsing a man who mocked at the infallibility of the Book, and held the vicarious, expiatory atonement of Jesus Christ up to ridicule and contempt, they would but waste their time and postage stamps sending invitations to me. We still believe the old gospel, and we are still determined to preach it.

But before I come to the text, I must join with a good many others in protesting against a certain moral evil rampant in this city. This church was not destroyed by accident. The fire began behind the pulpit and in the tower at the same time. I have protested against these dens of iniquity, known as "beverage rooms", one right across the street, and ten others within two blocks. Now, in opposition to the churches, and to the practically unanimously expressed wish of the business interests of the West end, with arbitrary, dictatorial powers, this accursed Liquor Control Board proposes to erect another new hotel, near the Sunnyside amusement centre. When this church was burned, there were certain offices in Queen's Park that held a jubilation because Jarvis Street Church was burning. We received several communications warning us that we would never be permitted to re-erect it. But you will have observed that it is up, steeple and all—and it is very well protected now. We withdraw nothing of our protest. I believe to-day, as I have always believed, that Premier Hepburn and his crowd, are the most unmitigated blight that has ever inflicted this country; and I hope the day will come when we shall drive him and his ilk into everlasting oblivion. I make no apology for saying this. I have no respect for him or his machine. They have flooded this country with

iniquity, and the time will come when the Province will relieve itself of this impediment. Meanwhile I join with all others who protest against the imposition of an unwanted "hotel" on the Sunnyside district.

Why should we preach the old-fashioned gospel? You have it in our text. Jude said it was "needful" that he should exhort those to whom he wrote that they should "earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints". Not bind it in velum, wrap it in silk, and put it away on the library shelf; but use it, contend for it, let it be the principle of all our conduct and labour.

### I.

WHAT IS "THE FAITH" FOR WHICH WE ARE TO CONTEND? That is a very large question. That would require the measure of an encyclopaedia to answer in full; yet it may be answered briefly. There are many scriptures which are, as Moody would have said, little Bibles. They epitomize the whole faith once delivered. John three, sixteen, is one: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." That is "the faith." "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." That is "the faith." "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." That is "the faith." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." That is "the faith." "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." That is "the faith." "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." That is "the faith."

But in principle, what is it? The principle of the Christian religion, fundamentally, is that God has broken in upon the darkness of the human mind; that He has intervened and interposed in the course of human history, and that it has pleased Him to reveal Himself to men. That believed, evolution goes by the board. Our knowledge of God has not been evolved out of some innate, natural, religious consciousness. Such knowledge of God as men possess, has been communicated to them from Heaven.

Adam, after his transgression, did not seek God, but God sought him; and when He asked, "Where art thou?" it was the beginning of His disclosure of Himself to sinful man. Thereafter you find Him again and again coming to men in their spiritual darkness. Thus and because of that, "Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him." Thus and because of that, Noah built the ark: "By faith, Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." That is another little Bible. That is "the faith."

God came to Abraham: "I called Abraham alone." Abraham did not find God: God found Abraham. Abraham did not choose God: God chose Abraham. He called Moses out of the house of Pharaoh, and spake to him.

And so of all the prophets. You have the summary of it in the opening chapter of Hebrews: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, who he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." That is the ultimate revelation of God, in Christ. "The Word was made flesh."

What is the implication of all this? I say, the supreme illustration of divine intervention is when the Infinite stooped and submitted to be wrapped in the swaddling bands of a child, when He took on Him our nature, and was made in the likeness of men. Jesus Christ was not the product of evolution: He came from Heaven. "Before Abraham was, I am." He entered human flesh, and interposed in human life miraculously; hence the virgin birth of Christ; the miracle of the incarnation; His miraculous life, and His vicarious, expiatory, death; and His miraculous resurrection. That is "*the faith*," that God has actually come to men, and that the Son of God bore our sins in His own body on the tree; that "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

That is faith objectively considered, the thing we are to believe about God: that we do not know God, cannot know God, apart from Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the only God we know. And if we would keep "*the faith*," we must be on guard against every encroachment upon that precious doctrine; we must repudiate all those who question the virgin birth and deny the essential Deity of Jesus Christ, with all the implications of His divine Sonship. These are the things we are to believe.

*The faith of Christ may be subjectively considered as well.* It means that, believing thus in Him, we appropriate all the benefits of His miraculous interposition in our behalf. It means, as symbolized in the ordinance of baptism you witnessed to-night, that we are participants in the supernatural; that we are sharers in the power of His resurrection; that we are the subjects of the regenerating grace of God that makes us new creatures. As He took on Him our nature, so we, by His grace, are made partakers of His nature; and we are brought into eternal oneness with Him through the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ, and the regenerating grace of His Spirit.

*Of that faith, we have a record.* I have spoken to you of the principle of revelation, but that faith is said to have been "delivered to the saints". How was it delivered? By those who spake by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Peter tells us: "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." He said: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." So completely were they mastered by the Spirit of God that they wrote things that they themselves could not understand, "unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister, the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto

you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look unto."

The faith, prophetically and in promise, was delivered to the saints of Old Testament days, but supremely delivered to the world in the person of God's Son: the ultimate Revelation, the divine Ultimatum, God's last Word to the world. *But we now have an inspired record of that revelation.* We read in the New Testament of "the record that God gave of his Son". So reliable, so accurate, is that record that we are told that whosoever believes it not, makes God a liar. If you say to a man who addresses you orally, "I do not believe you", virtually you imply that he is an untruthful man. If he sends you a letter, and you send it back, saying, "I do not believe what you say", you call him a liar; and the Bible says that those who refuse to believe the record which God has given us of His Son, make Him a liar.

You remember how John at least implies inspiration when he says, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." If you study Paul's Epistles, you will find that repeatedly he claims direct inspiration for his writings. He told the Galatians that the gospel he preached was not after man, neither had he received it from man, "but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He tells us of being "caught up into the third heaven, and seeing things which it was not lawful for him to utter;" and of how the thorn in the flesh was given to him to humble him "lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations" that were given unto him. To the Ephesians he said in effect, "You may wonder how I know so much? You must be asking questions as to my knowledge of the Lord Jesus?" Then he tells them that these things were especially revealed to him as they were not revealed unto the fathers. In the text I quoted from Corinthians he says, "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received." He first of all received it of the Lord, and then delivered it.

Peter spoke of Paul's Epistles, classing them with "other Scriptures." I say, then, that "*the faith*" has been once for all delivered unto the saints in this body of revealed truth—the Truth itself, the Centre and Circumference of it, the Incarnate God; and *the record of it*, the inspired volume which is the record given us by God of His Son.

That has been delivered to the saints, and *it has been delivered once for all.* We ought always to be learning, but of the same gospel. Some superior gentlemen talk about "amending the gospel", improving it to meet their modern taste. No, my friends. When you write a letter, you usually add a postscript. Why? Because you forgot something. But when God gave us the record of His Son, He did not forget anything—and if He had forgotten, He would not ask a graduate of McMaster University or of Chicago University, to write His postscript.

*The faith is "once for all delivered unto the saints".* It is as full of truth as are the seven seas with water. It is not possible for us ever to exhaust the fulness of the Holy Scripture. It is true that there can break forth still more light from God's Word, but there is nothing to be added to it, nothing to be taken from it. It is "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." I have preached it

a few years, and I am getting younger all the time. I am going to live to be as old as Dr. Hooper! (How old are you, Dr. Hooper? "Nearly ninety-three.") You Jarvis Street people will have to put up with me for a good many years yet! And if I live to be as old as Dr. Hooper, having his health and strength, I hope to be like him, still standing by the old gospel. This morning we had a great crowd of boys and girls respond to the gospel invitation, and I asked the army of teachers in the gallery to indicate at what age they had been converted. Most of them were converted when they were very young; and the Superintendent of our Junior Department, Mr. Thomas Kear, who went through the School, was converted at the age of fourteen. That is one of the advantages of staying a little while in one place: one sees the children grow up and become men and women in Christ, "strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might", in "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints".

We need no alteration, nothing added or subtracted. We receive it as it has been delivered to us from the Lord, as a deposit of truth having in it all that is necessary for us to know about God for time; and in eternity I think we shall still use it as a text-book.

## II.

We are told that WE MUST "CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

*How are we to contend?* Our text says, "earnestly." That is a very interesting word. "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly." The word translated "earnestly" is cognate to the word rendered "agony." He agonized in the garden, and went forth to the cross. In our contention for the faith, we too must agonize. We are not to do it lightly. We are not to contend for the faith in order to prove the correctness of our own opinions. I do not fear legitimate contention, but I hate a spirit of contentiousness. I avoid people who love contention for contention's sake; who are never happy unless they are miserable, and never at peace until they are at war. That attitude and spirit are far removed from that which is recommended to us here. We are to be downright in earnest in our contention for the faith. We are so to contend that even though it bring us agony, a desperate struggle, a conflict with principalities and powers in heavenly places, and with their incarnate dupes who do their will clothed in flesh—we are to contend earnestly for the faith. Nor by mere argument. It is important that we should entertain correct opinions of the Scripture, but the elaboration of a theory, going to war for a theory, and clubbing everyone over the head because he does not accept your theory,—I, at least, have no sympathy with that. That is not the contention for the faith that is here enjoined. There is a great deal of religious controversy that is a grief to the Spirit of God. But when there is some great matter at issue, where it is a question of life and death, where it means the conservation of God's truth, where it means loyalty to Christ and to the faith once for all delivered, we must contend, and contend so earnestly as to be ready to endure the last agony of death itself if need be, and, to strive, or resist unto blood—our own blood, not others,—all attempts to turn people away from the faith.

But the best way—and the most effective—to contend for the faith is to be ourselves the incarnations of it. I have no sympathy with an orthodoxy that does not make men and women better men and women; I shall

not contend for any doctrinal system that does not make men and women more like Christ. I would not waste my breath contending for the scripturalness of baptism merely as an ordinance. What is the best way to persuade people of immersion as the scriptural baptism? A man planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and walking in the likeness of His resurrection. When a man has been raised with Christ to walk in newness of life, and when he is actually walking in Christ Jesus, showing as well as telling, to all around what a dear Saviour he has found, you will need no argument, in support of believer's baptism. People will say, "Now I understand it. I knew him when he was a sinner. I heard of his conversion, I heard of his baptism; and I declare he is a new man." That is the way to contend for that aspect of the faith—and the way to contend for every other aspect of the faith: to exemplify it.

But I do not say there is no place for argumentative discussion of these great matters. Otherwise, why has God set some in the church, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ"? We must argue about it; we must give people line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. We must explain wherein Modernism is wrong, and wherein it is contrary to the teaching of Scripture; we must set people, young and old, on their guard.

I referred to a young girl a week or two ago, whose name was Joan. Joan was about thirteen years of age, and her mother was a widow, a waitress in one of the restaurants here. Little Joan came to our Bible School and learned about the Lord Jesus, and was converted, baptized, and became a member of the church. She wanted to serve the Lord, was taught in the things of God; but her mother was not a Christian. She was very fond of going to the theatre and engaging in other worldly pursuits in such time as she could command, and wanted to take Joan with her. Joan talked with Mr. Hutchinson, and came to me about it, asking, "What shall I do? I do not want to go, but mother says I must. As long as she is maintaining me, I suppose I must obey her in this matter." I told her since she was a little girl, that she could not legally disobey her mother. I advised her to tell her mother that she did not want to go to the theatre, that she would be taking her against her will, and against her conscience, but that if she insisted that she must go, she would obey.

Joan had a hard time, but she stood like a rock. Then she told us her mother was going to move to New York, and she wanted to know where she could go to church there. I said, "Joan, be careful where you go in New York, it is full of danger to young people. Go to the churches and find out where they honour the Word of God, and the Christ of the Word. If you find the preacher of any church does not magnify the Lord Jesus Whom you have come to love, do not go a second time." Sometime after that, I went to New York to preach in Calvary Baptist Church of which my friend, the late Dr. John Roach Stration, was then Pastor. There was a large congregation, and as I talked with people at the close of the service, Joan came up. She was a most attractive child. She gripped my hand and said, "Pastor, I am glad to see you." I asked her how she got there, and she said, "I went to a good many places, but they did not taste right. The Lord was not magnified. Then



I came here, and I heard Jesus Christ exalted, and I knew this was the place for me."

That is contending for the faith, so to instruct young people, and boys and girls, that they will know the difference between truth and error. Joan took the Lord Jesus with her, the word of God dwelt in her richly, so that she was able to stand against all the temptations of that great American metropolis. That is one way in which we are to contend.

But I believe *we are justified in distinguishing between the true shepherd and the wolf in sheep's clothing.* I have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is not a prophet of God. The man who denies everything that is written, and puts others on an equality with the Lord Jesus, cannot be God's prophet.

I know I was right when I opposed Professor Marshall in McMaster University. I am positive I was right. He mocked at the Book; he poured contempt upon the principle of expiation in the death of Christ. He was not a prophet of the Lord. We did our best to warn people against him. I had been in the Convention for years. I had given more time to the work of other churches than to my own. Professor Marshall was brought from across the sea in order to reopen the controversy, and to centre it around a personality. And this church, which was the heart of the whole Denomination, this church which originally was built largely by the munificence of Senator McMaster, this church that had written into its Trust Deed exactly the same Statement of Faith that is written into the Trust Deed of McMaster University (and it was while a member of this church that Senator McMaster left his fortune of a million or more for the propagation of the gospel which he believed, the same gospel we preach. And I preach nothing different from what Dr. Thomas, or Dr. Cassel, or Dr. Caldecott, or Dr. Fyfe, preached. They all stood exactly where Jarvis Street Church stands to-day)—this church was expelled from the Convention. They brought a stranger from afar, who wounded our spirits by his sacrilegious attitude, and who poisoned the very springs of our denominational life; and he was at last applauded to the echo while he repudiated the sacred things we love. And last week they had the audacity to tell the press that they had given us an invitation to attend their Convention! This they later corrected by saying a general invitation had been issued to all former members of the Convention to come home.

I mourn all such schisms; but if contention for the faith provokes it; if loyalty to Jesus Christ and to his gospel necessitates separation from the dearest friend I have on earth, I think I can say to the praise of the glory of God's grace, I would bid all my friends, Adieu. I will stand by the Book if we have to stand alone. God has witnessed to us. Surely, surely, if people have any discernment, they will recognize that the maintenance of this work which has touched the ends of the earth with its influence, is a testimony to the praise and power and approval of God upon the witness we have tried to bear to Him from this place. We are happy in the Lord:

"O happy day that fixed my choice  
On Thee, my Saviour and my God;  
Well may my glowing heart rejoice,  
And tell its raptures all abroad."

We must contend for the faith. *But why? For the honour of the Lord.* Suppose someone were to bring me

a letter bearing the signature of Mr. Brown, or of Dr. Hooper, or of Mr. Whitcombe, or of some other honoured brother in Christ. And suppose he were to say, "That is not true, yet it bears that man's signature." If the brother who wrote it were absent, you would have a fight on your hands at once. Why? I should feel I was the custodian of his honour. I should have to say, "I know that man, and I know he would not set his signature to that which is untrue."

And "let God be true, and every man a liar." When people deny the record He has given of His Son, that makes God a liar; and I am at war with such a man no matter who he is, nor what his scholarship. The honour of the Lord requires that we should uphold His standards. We have been singing, "God, save the King", with all our hearts. We have rejoiced in the visit of Their Majesties to this Continent. I believe they have exerted a most salutary influence, not only upon our political life, but upon other aspects of life. If you ladies want to be like the Queen, throw away your lipsticks. God never intended human lips to look like a bloody gash such as you see every day on the streets. If He wanted you to look like that, He would have made you so. I was glad to read that all the toasts that were proposed in their honour, were drunk by Her Majesty in water. The King is a noble man; and the Queen is a splendid example of womanliness, true to the core. There is a genuineness about them both, in which we glory, and when we sing, "God, save the King"—we mean it.

We are concerned for the King's honour. And yet there is a sense in which he is only a symbol of government. He does what his advisers counsel him to do. But we have another King Who infinitely transcends in every quality our own gracious King. He gathers up in Himself all the powers of government, not of an empire such as the British Empire, or even of this world, but of the whole universe—a benevolent Despot, an absolute Dictator benevolently ruling the universe in love; and the enemy would discount the revelation which He has given us—I say, for His sake, for the honour of His name, we must contend for "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints."

It is not "needful" that we contend for the faith *in the sense of preventing its destruction.* The faith, as such, can never be endangered, even by the most vicious assaults of the most powerful foes. We need have no fear that the Lord Jesus Christ can at any point be defeated. Hell did its worst when it brought Him to the cross—and there He "spoiled principalities and powers, making a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." It is written, "He must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

Nor need we have any fear for the Bible. It has withstood the assault of the enemy through all the centuries. Once we heard a preacher remark, when dealing with the impregnability of Holy Scripture, that after every earthquake of unbelief or alleged scholarship, all the books of the Bible might be heard saying to the critics, what Paul said to the Philippian jailer when he would have committed suicide: "Do thyself no harm; we are all here."

The Bible still stands—and will stand; and they are greatly mistaken who suppose that we have any fear for the truth. We can with all our hearts—as we often do in this place—join in Luther's hymn, and declare:

"And though this world, with devils filled,  
Should threaten to undo us,  
We will not fear; for God hath willed  
His truth to triumph through us.  
Let goods and kindred go,  
This mortal life also;  
The body they may kill:  
God's truth abideth still,  
His kingdom is for ever."

But we must contend for our own sakes. A woman in Los Angeles said to me, "Mr. Shields, I find that I have to be always fighting against Modernistic encroachments upon my mental outlook, because these doubts are being insinuated into my mind by everything I read in the press. I have to go forth armed, and fight for my faith in order to stand." Of course we must. Do you know why we are not in some sanitarium for consumptives? Or why we are not stricken with some other fell disease? Not because we have not been exposed to the contagion; not because we have not taken, germinally, into our system many diseases; but because an exuberant health enables us to throw them off. (Is that not so, Dr. Hooper? "It is, sir.") Dr. Hooper is a medical doctor as well as a minister—and ought to have been made a D.D. years ago.

And that is why we must contend for the faith, to build ourselves up in the things of Christ, so that everything in us will fight against error whenever it presents itself. We need to be so thoroughly inoculated with what Spurgeon called "bibline," as to become immune to the bacilli of all anti-Christian and erroneous *isms*.

We must contend also for the sake of others. Yes: for the sake of the little children. Did you ever hear of a company of men who were shipwrecked, and among them all they had but one match with which to light a fire to stand between them and death? The wind was blowing, and one after another urged that someone else strike the match, so fearful was everyone lest he should make a mistake, and the life of the party be endangered. Their very life depended upon their ability to build a fire to keep themselves warm. Shall we allow anyone to rob the children of the life-giving warmth of the gospel?

Would you rob a mother of the remedy that would save her child from death? Would you stand between her and the doctor as he hastens to the bedside of a dying child? Why is it that in the history of military campaigns we very often read of the sacrifice of an enormous number of lives in the defense of a spring or a well? And, on the other side, of great sacrifice of life in an attempt to get possession of it? Why does not the military commander say, "Let them have it if they want it"? He cannot afford to. The life of his army depends upon access to pure water.

I tell you, our very life depends upon "the faith." We cannot afford to let anyone take our gospel from us, for our own sakes, and for others' sakes. "All that a man hath will he give for his life", Satan said, when, for once he told the truth; and when once the believer has learned that his eternal salvation depends wholly upon the truth of the gospel, he will die rather than surrender it. That is why the martyrs gave their lives rather than betray their Lord. And what we do for ourselves, we must do for others.

I could multiply metaphors. We fight for bread, we fight for means of escape from the perils which sur-

round us; and we must contend for the faith because there is no other way of salvation.

Is there someone here who is not a Christian who says, "I thought Christians ought not to fight. I thought they ought to be very peaceful people." It all depends on what we fight for, dear friends. We are fighting for you. We are endeavouring to pass on to others the glorious gospel of the blessed God. The church is called "the pillar and ground of the truth", in the New Testament. Not in the sense in which the Roman Catholic Church claims the monopoly of that deposit. The truth is not conserved by the practice of the doctrine of apostolic succession, that the Holy Ghost is transmitted by the touch of a Bishop's fingers. That is not what the Bible means when it says the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth.

The church is made up of people who are the incarnations of the Bible, people who are born again, who are members of the body of Christ. The body of truth is with them. They are the conservators of the truth; and God will always find someone to stand for the truth until the last syllable of recorded time. We must contend for the faith in order that there may be a church of regenerated people, a church made up of people who enjoy the blessing of those who "know the joyful sound". They are the pillar and ground of the truth; and as long as there are such people in the world, even though they be found full often without the camp, they will stand for His truth—and contend for it.

I speak to you who are unsaved: we want to have the gospel to preach to you. I will not let anyone cast doubt upon the truth of salvation by Christ's blood without protest, because no one—and particularly this poor sinner—can be saved without it. I covet every man I know—and millions I do not know—for Christ; and therefore I am resolved that we will hold fast by the gospel of the grace of God. No one shall take it away from us.

"Should all the forms that men devise  
Assail my faith with treacherous art;  
I'll call them vanity and lies,  
And bind the gospel to my heart."

"Dear, dying Lamb, Thy precious blood  
Shall never lose its power,  
Till all the ransomed Church of God  
Be saved to sin no more."

"E'er since by faith, I saw the stream  
Thy flowing wounds supply,  
Redeeming love hath been my theme,  
And shall be till I die."

"When this poor, lisping, stammering tongue  
Lies silent in the grave,  
Then in a nobler, sweeter song,  
I'll sing Thy power to save."

#### MORE ABOUT SPURGEON'S COLLEGE

(Continued from page 4)

This was Spurgeon's ground for the "being banded together in fraternal union". Do the members of the College Council and Faculty and of the Baptist Union, personally and officially, subscribe to this "Confession" of Spurgeon's? "Let your Yea be Yea and your Nay Nay." And let the College President's principle be applied, that there be no discrepancy "between what we profess and what we express."

## WHY I CANNOT

Rev. Henry Oakley, Trinity Road, Upper Tooting

There is a pretty widely spread disposition to claim for unity more than either Scripture or experience warrants. There is a unity that is strength and there is a unity that is weakness. In the Great War there was unity between Germany and Austria, but Austria went far to Germany's undoing.

The question of union has arisen with some poignancy, owing to Mr. Spurgeon's College having sought entrance into the Baptist Union. In many quarters, of course, it is welcomed with loudest acclamations. Dr. Evans has been fittingly rewarded by being elected to the vice-presidency of the Baptist Union, but even Dr. Evans, with all his delightful urbanity and overflowing kindness of disposition, will surely find himself in a strange place next year when he must preside over a company of men with strangely mixed degrees of faith. He will find some ultra-modernists, more modernists, some groupists, a majority of ministerial trade unionists, some anythingarians and a few young ritualists, and quite a few sound evangelicals. Intellectually and theologically, he will be wholly with the evangelicals, but he will have to smile and be at home with those with whom he will have no shred of sympathy in their outstanding thinking or teaching. Such union may mean something to him; it would be a vexation and a sorrow to me. Yet some of my friends have written to me to remind me that "the last citadel is falling" and why not join with the rest and show a "united front" to the world? All that I have to answer is that while things are as they are, "I cannot."

In a series of articles in *The British Weekly* under the general title, "Does the verdict stand?" Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, the principal of my old college, Regent's Park College, wrote upon "The Authority of the Church," as illustrated by the case of Robertson Smith. It is in many ways a wise and discerning article with apparently every sentence considered. I have read it three or four times and my admiration of its moderation and considerateness have increased upon each reading. But as sometimes in any ivy covered trellis you get a sight of the unsoundness of the wood beneath, so here the true man peeps out. There is nothing of the irresponsible blurtings of Dr. T. R. Glover, nor the unveiled cynicism of Dr. Underwood, but there is enough in the article to identify the writer with the author of "The religious ideas of the Old Testament."

In one sentence Dr. Robinson writes, "The Church ought always to consider whether 'safety first' is likely to win the world for the Galilean Adventurer." We take it he means Jesus Christ. If so, is it blasphemy, or does it only seem like it? The learned professor has the perfect right as an individual to write thus of the Son of God, but as Principal of a Christian College I am not sure. I need not insist on this; my complaint, and the thing that keeps me apart, is that the man who writes thus of the Only Begotten Son of God is set on high among unionist Baptists. Only two or three years ago he was appointed to conduct the New Year's Prayer Meeting in the Baptist Mission House. Suppose I had been there and the learned Principal had opened in prayer, "Thou Galilean Adventurer, stand among us and be with every missionary." It would have been an offence to my intelligence and to my faith. My whole being would have shrunk from such an address to Him "in whom all fulness dwells." I cannot join with men who write thus of our Saviour. He was no "Galilean Adventurer"!

Perhaps I should stop there and write no more. I have given what is to me a sufficient reason why "I cannot." Yet the article allures me to write a little further although it will add little to my main purpose in writing. It is the last of these rationalistic effusions from leading Baptists that I have read.

It is very evident in the article that the Principal's sympathies are entirely with Dr. Robertson Smith. Yet Dr. Smith did very little original work. He simply popularized the theories of Dr. Wellhausen, the German critic. When Dr. Robertson Nicol first went to Germany he sought out Dr. Wellhausen and had a long talk with him. Dr. Nicol writes, "We spoke of Robertson Smith. I said that Smith held the Bible to be inspired and historically true along with his (Wellhausen's) views. Wellhausen shook his head and said that Smith's position was *sehr sonderbar*, very strange

... Smith, he said, was not a scholar but clever at presenting other men's theories."

Dr. Robertson Smith taught these German theories of the Old Testament from his Chair as professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Aberdeen, for which by the Free Church Assembly in 1879 he was relieved of his professorship and came afterwards, I believe, to reside in Cambridge. The Graf-Wellhausen theories have long been discredited in Germany. Only the other day I read an article by Principal Cave, D.D., the present principal of Hackney College. In it he wrote. "I believe with that talented man, Professor Strach of Berlin, that 'in spite of the great popularity which the views of Graf and Wellhausen have enjoyed, I am, nevertheless, persuaded that an essential change in the previous treatment of the history of Israel, and especially of the activity of Moses, will not exist permanently.' Nay, I go further than Dr. Strach, for he qualifies this statement of his somewhat; *in my view, criticism, under the stress of criticism, will ultimately complete the circle, and avow, as a further adjustment, that the Pentateuch was written by Moses after all.*"

When I face these facts I find it difficult to concur in putting men of the type of Dr. Wheeler Robinson in positions of great Biblical responsibility and setting them on high among Believers.

In this same article Dr. Robinson writes:—"The educated Christian of to-day is usually not perturbed by such matters as the date of Deuteronomy. He regards such things as matters for the experts." Perhaps the learned Doctor is not as omniscient as he thinks he is; there may be quite a number of "educated Christians" who are still anxious about the date of the Pentateuch and are not willing to leave the matter with that most fickle and dangerous order of men "the experts". If Christ is merely a "Galilean Adventurer", as Dr. Robinson dares to name Him, I can understand his not being "perturbed" about the date of Deuteronomy, but suppose he believed that Christ was "Very God of Very God" and that this "Very God of Very God" said, "Moses wrote of me," would not his intelligence demand something a little less easygoing in his attitude to the date of Deuteronomy? Anyhow, I am not going to think that the man lacks education who says "The Pentateuch is of the nature of a *foundation*; I must be interested in it, in its date, its author and in its words. Moreover, Christ quoted from it freely and I am not ready to dismiss Him as a 'Galilean Adventurer'. He is my Saviour and all my hopes are in Him."

No, "I cannot!" I have no pleasure in these men who treat the Scriptures and the Only Begotten Son of God as though both were an examination paper for them to mark and correct. I not only have no pleasure in them, but they are an offence to me. It is for me still to remain "without the camp bearing His reproach."

## Bible School Lesson Outline

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

Vol. 3 Third Quarter Lesson 27 July 2nd, 1939

### THE MANNA FROM HEAVEN

Lesson Text: Exodus 16.

Golden Text: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."—John 6:35.

For Reading: John 6.

I. Murmurings for Meat—verses 1-12.

The Divinely-appointed path of Israel lay beside the palm-trees of Elim. Elim with its reviving coolness was a place of rest. The Lord in His loving wisdom knew that His people would need refreshment before undertaking the journey through the wilderness (Num. 33:9-11; Psa. 23:2, 3; Isa. 40:29-31).

Murmuring against God is a sinful habit (Exod. 15:24; 17:3; Num. 14:2, 11, 12; 16:41; 21:5; 1 Cor. 10:10). The Israelites were discontented with God's dealings with them. In punishment for such rebellion of heart their carcasses fell

# Shields Congratulated By Baptist Convention Pastor Chose To Shun

## Greetings Are Conveyed to "That Distinguished Minister of That His- toric Church"

Congratulations were extended by the Jubilee convention of Ontario-Quebec Baptists at the C.N.E. Automotive Building yesterday afternoon to Rev. T. T. Shields and officers of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto. But Dr Shields' name was not mentioned specifically. The militant Toronto pastor who left the convention some years ago and formed a group of his own which he still heads, was merely referred to as "the distinguished minister of that historic church."

It was late in the afternoon when Rev. J. A. Johnston, of Montreal, president-elect for 1940, rose on a "question of privilege."

"There has been some newspaper publicity, in which my name was mentioned as having stated that Dr. Shields was invited to this convention personally," he said. "Dr. Shields was not invited personally; the writer to whom I gave the information apparently misunderstood me. An invitation was extended through the daily newspapers and the Canadian Baptist to all those former members of this convention still living within its area to join us."

### SEND CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Johnston then referred to "that historic Toronto Baptist Church which has played such an important part in this convention and which was destroyed by fire" and moved that "the congratulations of this convention be extended to its distinguished minister and its officers for their part in re-opening the edifice to the Glory of God."

nor are we ungrateful, for this kind gesture. We are only sad that McMaster University and its Modernism form an insuperable barrier to re-union.

### EXPLANATORY

This is a reproduction of an item appearing in *The Evening Telegram* of Toronto for June 16th. It speaks for itself.

We appreciate the courtesy of Dr. Johnston in proposing that a message of congratulation be sent to Jarvis Street Church and its Pastor on the reopening of our splendid temple. We earnestly wish that the fire of God could burn up the last rubbish heap of Modernism, and make it possible, on the basis of uncompromising loyalty to the inspired, infallible, and supremely authoritative Word of God, for us all to unite and dwell together in unity.

We are grateful to Dr. Johnston for his reference to Jarvis Street's Pastor as "its distinguished minister"; and perhaps he will smile with us at the recollection that if the Convention which approved his resolution could have had its way twelve years ago, we should long since have been the extinguished minister of Jarvis Street Church! We are not unappreciative,

in the wilderness (Num. 14:29; Psa. 106:14, 15). The mixed multitude from Egypt, the camp-followers, were doubtless the first to show disquietude, but the disaffection spread till the whole congregation murmured (Exod. 12:58; Num. 11:4, 5). They sinfully longed for the carnal delights of Egypt. The backslider refuses the true bread, yet desires the husks (Jer. 2:18; Luke 15:16).

God promised to rain bread upon them. The figure of rain suggests that the food would be abundant, that it would come from above, and that it would appear as a refreshing, fruitful blessing (Psa. 72:6; Isa. 55:10; Heb. 6:7).

The manna was sent as a test of the steadfastness of the people (Exod. 15:25; Deut. 8:2), and as a proof of the faithfulness of God. The children of Israel would know that it was a God of power and of love Who had delivered them from Egypt. Every evening and every morning they would have evidence of His mercy and faithfulness (Lam. 3:22, 23).

To murmur and rebel against God's messengers is to murmur and rebel against God Himself. Moses and Aaron were

nothing in themselves, but they represented God (Num. 12:8; 16:11; 1 Sam. 8:7; Zech. 2:8; Acts 9:5).

### II. Measures of Manna—verses 13-21.

The manna was a type of Christ, as He Himself explained (John 6:32-58). It was sent, not by Moses, but by God (John 5:30; 6:32, 33). Its heavenly origin is indicated in its names; "the bread from heaven", "the bread of heaven", "the corn of heaven", "angel's food" (Neh. 9:15; Psa. 78:24, 25; Psa. 105:40). Christ came from heaven to save us.

The nature of the manna was a mystery (Deut. 8:3). They called it "manna", a word denoting in the Hebrew "What is it"? The Incarnation of Christ as the Son of God, perfect God and perfect Man, is a mystery which the human mind cannot fathom (1 Tim. 3:16). In His Person He is the hidden manna (Rev. 2:17).

In appearance the manna was round, small, and as insignificant as a tiny seed or as the hoar frost (Num. 11:7; Isa. 53:2). It was white, the colour denoting purity, thus symbolic of the holiness of Christ (Luke 23:4; 1 Pet. 2:22). It had the rich taste of fresh oil (Num. 11:8). Christ gives the oil of joy and the unction of the Holy Spirit to His followers (Psa. 23:5; Isa. 61:3; John 14:26; 16:7). The manna had a sweet taste like honey (Psa. 19:10; 34:8; 119:103; Ezek. 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:3).

The manna was ground and made into bread, "the staff of life". Christ by His death preserved us, and by His life nourishes us. We must by faith partake of Him by feeding upon His Word (John 6:51-58). He is "the bread of the mighty" (Psa. 78:25 margin).

Each person gathered his measure of manna. It was sufficient for his requirements, but not more than he needed (2 Cor. 8:14, 15; Phil. 4:19). The manna was satisfying to each, as well as sufficient; God gave them meat "to the full" (Psa. 78:25). It suited every taste, and provided a wholesome diet for all the children of Israel for forty years. No matter what our condition of life or disposition of mind, our Christ can satisfy. His grace is sufficient for all people at all times (Psa. 105:40; 1 Cor. 10:3; 2 Cor. 3:5; 12:9).

Every type and symbol falls short of the reality. The manna, though supernaturally dispensed, was material. Man, being a spiritual being, cannot live by bread alone; he needs the nourishment which the Holy Spirit supplies to the one who partakes of Christ, according to Divine appointment (Deut. 8:3; Matt. 4:4; Luke 4:4). Being material, the manna was perishable; the sun melted it and the air corrupted it. We must labour for the meat which does not perish (John 6:27).

The bread from heaven was but a temporary blessing, and the life which it brought did not last. A new supply of manna must be gathered each day except on the Sabbath (Matt. 6:11). The fathers of Israel who were nourished by the heavenly manna died in the process of time. Christ the Living Bread furnishes the believers with life eternal (John 4:14; 6:47-51; 7:37).

### III. Memorials of Mercy—verses 22-36.

The supernatural preservation of the manna from the sixth day to the seventh day marked the Sabbath as a Divine institution. God put a difference between that day and other days. He sanctified the Sabbath to His own glory (Gen. 2:3; Exod. 20:8; 31:12-17; 35:2, 3; Lev. 23:3). Similarly, the Lord's Day is to remind us of the supernatural escape of Christ from corruption, of His resurrection unto life eternal. We are to sanctify His day by worship and service.

God would have His people remember His dealings with them. The Passover was a memorial of His grace in redeeming the people by blood from Egypt's bondage. An omer of manna, about three quarts according to our system of measurement, was to be kept in a pot as a perpetual reminder of His grace in supplying their need of nourishment. A golden pot containing manna was placed in the ark of the covenant, and with the tables of stone and Aaron's rod constituted God's testimony to His people (Exod. 25:16; 26:33, 34; 40:3; Heb. 9:4). He is still Jehovah-Jireh, the Lord Who provides (Gen. 22:8, 14).