

The Kingdom announced as "at hand" by John the Baptist, by the King Himself and by the Twelve and attested to by mighty works has been *morally* rejected.²³

But Scofield has not produced any reference which enable one to pinpoint the exact place in Scripture where such an offer was made. The point is noted by teachers and theologians on both sides of the Atlantic. For instance, George Ladd, in his book *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God*, says:

Jesus did not offer to the Jews the earthly kingdom *anymore than he offered himself to them as their glorious earthly king*. Here we may take our stand on firm ground.²⁴

The British writer who signed himself "Touchstone," writing in the leading Brethren publication, *The Witness*, notes:

The postponement of the kingdom which has been popularized by the Scofield Bible, but which in our judgment, lacks entirely any Scriptural basis. Christ came to die, not to establish His earthly kingdom, and it is good that this doctrine has largely been set aside for what it is worth.²⁵

When he wrote, "Touchstone" had not spent any time around either Greenville, South Carolina, or Dallas, Texas, or Lynchburg, Virginia. Even though attacked and somewhat beleaguered, the "postponement idea" has more vitality than is good for either the church or for persons living at the eastern end of the Mediterranean.

Daniel P. Fuller has note:

If the Dispensationalist affirms that the Davidic kingdom was offered at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, there must have been some point where the offer was withdrawn, because Christ was crucified at the end of his ministry.²⁶

Pointing out difficulties in the Dispensational system, Fuller notes that the withdrawal cannot be found:

The dispensational problem of exactly when Jesus withdrew the offer to establish the glorious Davidic kingdom for the Jews would also vanish, along with the attempt to distinguish between the "moral rejection," the "official rejection," and the "final official rejection."²⁷

Unfortunately, not only in this message, but throughout his teaching, Scofield holds to the "Postponed Kingdom" theory. Now the kingdom subject was very much in the mind of the Spirit who inspired the Word. Philip Mauro points out that the kingdom subject is mentioned 139 times in the New Testament.²⁸ But of the 139, Scofield avoids comment on 118 of the 139 passages, Why? Because those 118 verses could not sustain his "Postponed Kingdom" theory.

Thus Scofield, to protect his views violates a principle laid down in the introduction to that very work:

II. The last fifty years have witnessed an intensity and breadth of interest in Bible study unprecedented in the history of the Christian Church. Never before have so many reverent, learned, and spiritual men brought to the study of the Scriptures minds so free from merely controversial motive. A new and vast exegetical and expository literature has been created, inaccessible for bulk, cost, and time to the average reader. The winnowed and attested results of this half-century of Bible study are embodied in the notes, summaries, and definitions of this edition. Expository novelties and merely personal views and interpretations, have been rejected.

Pertinent particularly to the issue here:

IV. All of the connected topical lines of reference end in analytic summaries of the whole teaching of Scripture on that subject, thus guarding the reader against hasty generalizations from a few passages or proof texts. The saying that "anything may be proved by the Bible" is both true and false—true if isolated passages are used; utterly false if the whole divine revelation is in view.²⁹

If 118 out of 139 verses on a subject are not commented on, then his purpose, declared under Roman numeral IV is not carried out. Yet this failure protected the position which he was propounding on this second day of the conference.

Typical of verses which have not received the benefit of Scofield's wisdom are (with page in his work): Matt. 18:3 (SRB 1024), Matt. 19:14 (SRB 1025), Mark 10:14 (SRB 1058), Luke 18:17 (SRB 1101), Luke 16:16 (SRB 1098). Note also Scofield's handling of verses dealing with those whom he claimed rejected the Kingdom. See Luke 17:20,21 (SRB 1100) and John 18:38 (SRB 1141).³⁰

Careful consideration of those passages support the idea that Scofield's great work has actually a semantic device to promote certain ideas. It should not be considered objective Biblical scholarship. The idea being promoted as he told the *Titanic* story is one of the most blatant examples.

It may be more than coincidence that Philip Mauro was the one to point out a serious fallacy of the "Postponed Kingdom" idea. In a study "Dispensationalism Justifies the Crucifixion," Mauro notes:

The question which a modern system of doctrine that has found acceptance with many orthodox Christians forces upon us is this:

Did our Lord, during His earthly ministry, either commit (or authorize others to commit) overt acts, or utter (or authorize His disciples to utter) words of treasonable or seditious import? Did He ever commit or authorize acts or utter or authorize words in their nature subversive of the then subsisting government of the land? Specifically did He ever present or announce Himself as an earthly King, the claimant of David's throne? Did he ever offer to the oppressed people of Judea, either in person or through the lips of His disciples, the earthly kingdom they had been taught to expect?

Had He ever, by word or act, sought to incite insurrection against the rule of Caesar, or given any countenance whatever to the political ambitions of the Jews?³¹

Mauro discussed the point with another Christian lawyer. This man brought out a point which explodes the "Postponed Kingdom" theory:

It is this: "Manifestly, had the Lord uttered a single word that could have been construed as a proclamation or suggestion that He was about to claim the throne, or would accept it, there would have been thousands of witnesses to prove the accusation. But there was no proof forthcoming. And be it noted that anything which would prove today our friends' theory, would have proved then the accusation which the priests and Pharisses brought against the Lord before Pilate."

That last sentence puts the whole case in a nut shell; and I do not see how anyone can get away from it. It is surprising to me that Dr. Scofield being a lawyer by profession, and for many years in actual practice, did not see this as a fatal objection to his theory, but then as I say, I wholly missed the point myself until my attention was called to it in your book.³²

The fact that Dispensational teachers overlook the lawyer's point suggests that their thought is either shoddy or predetermined. And in the lawyer's last statement, we see one consequence of the Dispensational heirarchy being, even up to the time of writing, far from candid about Scofield's life. Had that lawyer friend of Mauro known that Scofield's legal experience appears to have consisted of one unpaid express bill, the family land case, caucusing in smoke-filled rooms and chasing Indians on the prairie, he would have understood Scofield's lack of legal perception.

To return to 1914, Scofield's second message was delivered in the morning. The attendees adjourned, probably for lunch. The published report makes no mention of fasting, even in the face of the impending doom vividly described by so many speakers.

In the third message, Scofield went right into his view of The Epistles and The Revelation. Overlooking statements of the Lord and the Apostles which did not suit his purpose, he proclaims his negative hope for the church. Speaking of the Parable of The Wheat and The Tares, he says:

It is not a statement that there should be through this whole period wicked men in the world. It is a statement that in the very sphere of profession there would be "the children of the wicked one", so closely resembling the true children of the Kingdom that human servants could not be trusted to effect a separation.³³

This, of course, overlooks Christ's statement that "the gates of Hell would not prevail against the Church." Scofield, by referring to the Church as the "true children of the kingdom," is blithely inconsistent with the system which is his major thesis. Going on, he says:

The prophecies concerning the Church are simple. The professing Church goes into apostasy (2 Thess. 2:3; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1-8; 4:3,4; 2 Pet. 2:1-3; Jude 1-25; Rev. 3:14-18). As the Spirit of prophecy looks down the history of the visible Church, the professing Church, He does not see a converted world, with upturned faces, praising God, waiting for the descending King. The prophetic picture of the close of the earthly pathway of the Church as a professing body, the visible Church, is one of wide-spread declension and departure from the truth.³⁴

Continuing, he referred to the passage where the Dispensationists are probably as inaccurate as at any place in Scripture. (If the passage is properly interpreted, we may get a clue as to the reason young Saul of Tarsus was apprenticed as a tent-maker.) He quoted Acts 15:14-17, then said:

There is a great passage that clears all obscurity, in the broad sense, from the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy. The Lord is now calling out from the Gentiles a people for His name. That is obvious. Never anywhere has the gospel failed to call out some. Never anywhere, for nineteen hundred years, has it converted everybody. The apostle Paul said he had fully preached the gospel in the regions of Syria and Asia Minor. Did he mean to say that he had converted everybody in Syria and Asia Minor? No; but he had evangelized them. He brought men right up before the cross, and some fell at the pierced feet while some turned away. So it has been, and so it is now. It is the time of the out-call; and that is what the word "Church" means, "the called-out assembly."³⁵

We agree that the passage "clears all obscurity" but not as the Dispensationists use it. They try to make a passage of political, secular, governmental significance. They fail to take the quoted passage back beyond Amos.

Amos was referring to the Tabernacle (tent) of David erected on Mt. Zion to hold the Ark of the Covenant when David brought it up to Jerusalem (at the time he wrote the 24th Psalm). The event is described in II Samuel 8. The Hebrew word for tent or tabernacle makes the reference very clear. There is not space to develop the theme here. Study of the books of Samuel and Kings and the Psalms make it clear that the services in the Tabernacle of David were very similar to the pattern traditionally observed in evangelical churches. The Dispensationist claim that Acts 15:18 refers to Israel or a political kingdom is incorrect. The Tabernacle of David was a type of the church. The Dispensationist claim that the church is not found in the Old Testament is here exploded.

Why was Saul (Paul) a tent-maker? As he traveled through Asia and Europe planting and building churches, he, a tent-maker, was carrying out the prophecy of Amos, "rebuilding the Tabernacle of David which is fallen down."

Scofield concluded the message with:

I want to tell you another thing: I am not looking for death. I may pass to Him in that way, surely I may; but I am not looking and waiting for death. I am looking and waiting for Him, and He knows it. Oh, may God bless you, dear friends. Who are we, that we should be privileged to sit here under the teaching of these men of God! How wonderful this conference is. I have never seen anything like this. The spirit is the spirit of old Niagara, as some of you veterans know, but it is Niagara multiplied by about ten. Thank God for giving us this conference! May God bless you!³⁶

But despite Scofield's fond hope, he was not raptured, a fact confirmed by legal documents which support the story in chapter 38. Whatever the Lord "knew" about Scofield, He did know that Scofield was not going to be raptured. The Lord never, never gives His people incorrect ideas. Where did Scofield get this idea he would be "raptured"?

Convinced that they would be raptured with Scofield, the delegates left the meeting. Most of them went to lunch. Charles G. Trumbull relates what Scofield did:

One of the first impressions I ever had of Dr. Scofield was as to the ease with which people could get to him. It was at the time of the great Prophetic Conference held in Chicago in February of 1914, less than six months before the storm of the world war broke. He gave a fearless Scriptural message on the assurance in God's Word that world-wide and permanent peace can never come save by the coming of the Prince of Peace, though that message was laughed at by the general public and newspaper reporters at that time. I think this was the first time I had ever seen or heard Dr. Scofield, and I hoped I might get his autograph in my personal copy of the Scofield Reference Bible.

At the close of one of his addresses I sought him out, and found that others had the same desire. And I supposed that a man of his prominence, so much in demand for public addresses, must be more or less annoyed by the importunity of strangers coming to him and "bothering" him for an autograph. Even then he was about to leave the church to catch a train. But he greeted every individual who came up to him at the close of that meeting, even as he greeted me, then an entire stranger, as though we were all doing him a personal favor by letting him write in our Bibles! I think I have never seen such genuine courtesy and unaffected Christian love in a conference speaker or Bible teacher as I saw in him at that time, and as I have seen in him many times since.³⁷

It is amazing to us that Trumbull and Scofield had not met previously, especially in view of their many common interests and Trumbull's evident journalistic skill. However, all things are possible. One result of the meeting was that Trumbull secured the services of Scofield to write for his paper, *The Sunday School Times*.³⁸

Since the last day of the conference was Friday, the train that Scofield was about to catch was most likely for New York. He probably went from Moody Church to the Union Station on the first leg of his return to Douglaston.

CHAPTER 32 NOTES

1. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, BICA, Chicago, 1914, p. 9.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.
3. Richard Ellsworth Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat*, Moody Press, 1946, p. 168.
4. So Day described Dr. Gray, *Ibid.*, p. 167.
5. Letter Wilbur Smith to Day, *ibid.*, p. 168.
6. Scofield's role as an "authority" went through some changes. In 1896 he was the expert to straighten out D. L. Moody. In 1905, in the Lotos Club letter, he deferred to Gaebelein. In 1914, he is an "authority."
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
8. C. I. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things as Found in the Prophets," in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, BICA, 1914, p. 40.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
12. See chapter 11.
13. Scofield, *The Doctrine . . . Prophets*, p. 47.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
15. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things as Found in the Gospels," in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, BICA, 1914, p. 115.
16. As noted in the previous chapter, *The Northern Whig* was reviewed by Rev. Adam Loughridge of the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary, Belfast.
17. Scofield apparently convinced himself. In a letter written May 4, 1921, to his daughter, Abigail Kellogg, he said that the message "The Unsinkable Ship" would be included in his sermon collection *In Many Pulpits With Dr. C. I. Scofield*. The table of contents of the book (Oxford Univ. Press, 1922), does not list such a title and there is no sermon resembling it in the collection. *The Sunday School Times*, in its memorial article after Scofield's death (Vol. LXIII, 33, page 535, Aug. 13, 1921), contained the following: "How Dr. Scofield's whole life was an illustration of the way in which opportunities come to one who lives his life in the sweep of the Holy Spirit's guidance, was dwelt upon by another speaker, as he related the incident of a visit by Dr. Scofield to Belfast, Ireland, just at the time when the *Titanic*, "the unsinkable ship", built at and sailing from Belfast, had sunk in the mid-Atlantic after collision with an iceberg. There were newly-made widows and orphans in Belfast then because not a few of the workmen on the *Titanic* had gone across on this maiden voyage as part of her crew. There was a tenseness of feeling over the whole city which kept men from prosecuting their business with calmness and deliberation, and to break the spell of sadness a great mass-meeting had been arranged for the coming Sunday afternoon. The Mayor of the city asked Dr. Scofield to bring the message. God seemed to say to him that he should speak about the only unsinkable ship, the little craft upon which our Lord sailed across Galilee. Dr. Scofield drew from this incident wonderful lessons of comfort and help for the people of that bereaved city as he pointed out that there was safety for time and eternity only in the Lord Jesus Christ." This relation has details added which Scofield had not included in the original presentation.
18. All references to the Mauros and their *Titanic* involvement are from Gardner, *Champion of The Kingdom*, Bread of Life, New York, 1961, p. 44 ff.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
20. *Ibid.* In the letter Mauro refers to his book, *The World and Its God*. Published in 1907, in the early days of Mauro's Christian experience, it displays the essential pessimism which would have delighted J. N. Darby and made Scofield and Gaebelein quite happy. Its tone conflicts with the logic of the position which Mauro moved to

- in *The Gospel of The Kingdom* and other works after World War I. *The World and Its God* was recently reissued by a press which has not recognized Mauro's other works. We cannot be sure that the later Mauro would have approved of the reissue.
21. Note that Mauro and Scofield were both lawyers, both had two daughters. Mauro was successful in his chosen field, in contrast to Scofield. Mauro's two daughters joined their father in the faith. Mauro was able to publicly acknowledge his daughters. He participated in the wedding (only one daughter married). There were some differences!
 22. Scofield, *Doctrine . . . Gospels*, p. 115.
 23. Page citation from the 1917 Edition.
 24. George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God*, Eerdmanns, 1952, p. 113.
 25. Touchstone (*nom de plume*) writing in "A Short-Lived Journal" in *The Witness*, London, 1972, p. 262. *The Witness* is the official publication of the Brethren in England. The 1972 view is in contrast to the view of Scofield's writings in a review when *Addresses in Prophecy* came out in 1910. In the English edition (Pickering and Inglis), entitled *Prophecy Made Plain*, the publishers included this comment: "Many Christians seem to have a kind of dread for anything associated with the word "prophecy", and consequently leave the study of it alone. To all such, and to Christians generally, we would commend this volume. By a perusal of this book a commencement may be made, along simple lines, with the study of this fascinating and important theme." (*The Witness*).
- We penetrated the *nom de plume* of the 1972 writer. He assured us that the comment in the text is good Brethren position in the 1970's and 1980's.
26. Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel & Law, Contrast or Continuum?*, Eerdmanns, 1980, p. 157.
 27. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
 28. Philip R. Mauro, *The Gospel of The Kingdom with an Examination of Modern Dispensationalism*, currently available from Reiner Publications, Sweagal, Pa.
 29. Unnumbered page, Introduction to the 1917 edition, *The Scofield Reference Bible*.
 30. Page citation from the 1917 edition. We find no comment on any of these verses in Scofield's work.
 31. Originally published in his work *God's Present Kingdom*. The relevant portion was reissued as *Dispensationalism Justifies The Crucifixion*, by Reiner Publications, Swengal, Pa., p. 6.
 32. Mauro, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
 33. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things Found" in *The Epistles and Revelation, in The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, BICA, 1914, p. 175.
 34. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
 35. *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179. The true significance of The Tabernacle of David has been obfuscated by the entire Premillennial movement. We know of but one work which treats on the subject. It is: *The Harmony of Divine Dispensations*, "Being A Series of Discourses on Select Portions of the Holy Scripture, Designed to Show the Spirituality, Efficacy, and Harmony of Divine Revelations made to Mankind from the Beginning," by George Smith. Smith was a Cornish Wesleyan preacher, mining engineer, railway official and writer. The first edition was issued by Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, London 1856. The American edition came out shortly thereafter from Carlton & Porter and went into three editions. We know of only one or two copies extant. Since it was so widely circulated originally, its disappearance is most strange. Could it have been the subject of an intentional, quiet Dispensational book-burning? We wonder!
 36. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
 37. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
 38. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

CHAPTER 33

Prophecy Enters Good Society

"But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

Mark 13:23

One writer has suggested that at the 1914 prophecy conference "... prophecy thereupon got out of its rags and entered good society."¹ In the previous chapter, we considered Scofield's part in the conference. A further look at the published report of the event² has established that the negative bias of Scofield's message was not uniquely associated with the Tennessean from Michigan. But was that negative bias really good for society?

Let us start with the words of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. As His earthly ministry was nearing its end, He told men (followers, listeners): "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, but my father only" (*Matt. 24:36*).

The organizers of the 1914 conference belonged to a group which gave ostensible lip service to that statement of the Lord. But their action in scheduling the conference belied their words. If the 12 men who signed the conference call³ had not made some determinations about the time they expected the Lord to rapture the church, they would never have issued the call phrased as it was. Without some judgment as to at least an approximate time for that event, the whole bias of the conference would have been different.

Brethren writer F. Roy Coad has stated:

It is here useful to notice on interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to visualize their own age as other than the end time. As a consequence, beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.⁴

Such revision makes last year's prophecy more outdated than last year's fashion in women's dress. Fashions can and do come back. But prophecy, especially when linked to secular events, cannot come back. This should make thoughtful people pause.

There is an aspect, not noted by other commentators, which may be downright evil. If the Father, as our Lord stated, is not going to reveal to any man the time of the Son's return, then any man who claims an inkling of that time, is mistaken. But he also cannot have gotten his mistaken idea from the Lord of Glory. This must have been

true of the 12 men who signed the call of 1914. So where did they get the idea?

Analysis of the published record of the 1914 conference suggests that what at that time entered "good society" would have been better left outside, Richard Ellsworth Day to the contrary. Space does not permit comment on every message. But one message, besides Scofield's, will give new focus, we feel, to the prophecy movement.

Between Scofield's first and second message on the "kingdom," a message entitled "Second Coming in Relation to Evangelism" was delivered by the Rev. Leander W. Munhall, evangelist, of Germantown, Pennsylvania.⁵ Some of Munhall's statements seem incredible.⁶

Munhall appeared to subscribe to Scofield's idea of "evangelization, not conversion." He said:

Our business is to publish the glad tidings to earth's remotest bounds, that all may know the good news. It is the business of Jesus to save—He alone can do it: "God our Saviour; who willeth that all men should be saved" (1 Tim. 2:4). But many say, "We will not that this man reign over us (Luke 19:14); and He said of such "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life (John 5:40). He, of course, knows who is the last one to be saved. "And then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. 15:24,25).

When he talks about Christ reigning, the context shows that he actually defers this to a latter age. The whole business of preaching without concern about results makes the activity seem like running in a squirrel cage.

In the next paragraph, Munhall departs from reality:

The most eloquent language and vivid imagery possible to human thought are used to describe the rapture of the Church and unfading glories of the Kingdom that is to subdue all other kingdoms: no more tears; no more sin; no more death; no more curse. War, pestilence, famine, storm, earthquake, sickness, old age, heartache—all forever done away.

Munhall could not have been more wrong on one thing. The idea of the Rapture (so profitable for Hal Lindsay) is *not* anywhere in the Scripture described in "vivid imagery." The Rapture idea is based on a very highly questionable use of three verses in I Thessalonians, verses in a message written by Paul for an entirely different purpose. Even Rev. Cornelius Stam of Chicago, an ultra-Dispensationalist, admits that the usual Rapture pictures (of wrecked automobiles all over the streets after believing drivers are "raptured" out from behind the wheel) says, "Yet the Scriptures do not say *one word* about all this."⁷ This admission of Stam confirms our view that much teaching of Fundamentalism is based on fantasy, not real Biblical interpretation.⁸

Munhall then “raptured” over the Niagara Bible Conference:

We used to look forward with great anticipation, as we have looked forward to this conference, to the old Niagara Conference gatherings. We would be planning for weeks and months to get together; and the best part of it all was the fellowship we had. That fellowship, as in the fellowship here, was so delightful that if there were no other reason for our coming together, that alone would justify it. . . .

We noted in a previous chapter the unusual phenomenon of the Niagara Conference—grown men sitting around in comfortable surroundings quite “rapturing” over the likelihood of famine, suffering, persecution and horrible death for others, but very definitely not for themselves.

Continuing, Munhall tried to legitimize his position and that of the conference by very selective quotations from Luther and Calvin:

Luther once said:

“Some say that before the last day the world shall become Christian. That is a falsehood, forged by Satan, that he might darken sound doctrine.” John Calvin said: “There is no reason why any person should expect the conversion of the world, for at length—when it will be too late, and will yield to them no advantage—they will look on Him Whom they have pierced. Moreover it must be held as a first principle that, ever since the appearing of Christ, there is nothing left to the faithful but with wakeful minds to be always ready, intent on his second advent.”⁹

We have not found a study of Luther with specific relation to his views on the Second Coming. Calvin’s writings have been studied and from those studies, we hold that Munhall’s quotation (without citation) takes something out of the context of Calvin’s message.

In 1955, John Knox Press issued *Calvin’s Doctrine of the Last Things* by Heinrich Quistorp. It concludes that Calvin’s views in no way coincided with those of the 1914 conference. While we admit to this study’s issue 40 years later, we do suggest that Munhall’s statement was not accurate nor made on the basis of true scholarship.¹⁰

Then in the Winter 1878-77 issue of the *Journal of Christian-Reconstruction*, subtitled “Symposium on The Millennium,” Greg L. Bahnsen devoted eight pages of an essay entitled “The Prima Facie Acceptability of Postmillennialism” to a survey of Calvin’s views of eschatology.¹¹ Conclusion: Calvin would never have been invited to a Dispensational prophecy “bash.” Another indication that Pre-millennialists are short of scholarship.

To further attempt to legitimize his position, Munhall then says: “I had a personal acquaintance and fellowship with the late Charles Haddon Spurgeon, an out-and-out Premillennialist.” Now Munhall is not mentioned in most Spurgeon studies and while Spurgeon did adopt a sort of Premillennialism in his later years, it was only after he had

suffered defeat after defeat in Baptist groups as he battled the entry of liberalism. Rev. Norman Street of the Jarvis Baptist Church in Toronto placed this quotation from Spurgeon in *The Gospel Witness*, Dec. 27, 1984, issue:

We anticipate the happy day when the whole world shall be converted to Christ; when the gods of the heathen shall be cast to the moles and the bats; when Romanism shall be exploded, and the crescent of Mohammed shall wane, never again to cast its baneful rays upon the nations; when kings shall bow down before the Prince of Peace, and all nations shall call their Redeemer blessed. Some despair of this. They look upon the world as a vessel breaking up and going to pieces, never to float again. We know that the world and all that is therein is one day to be burnt up, and afterwards we look for new heavens and for a new earth; but we cannot read our Bibles without the conviction that—

“Jesus shall reign where'er the sun

Does his successive journeys run.”

We are not discouraged by the length of His delays; we are not disheartened by the long period which he allots to the church in which to struggle with little success and much defeat. We believe that God will never suffer this world, which has once seen Christ's blood shed upon it, to be always the devil's stronghold. Christ came hither to deliver this world from the detested sway of the powers of darkness. What a shout shall that be when men and angels shall unite to cry, “Hallelujah, hallelujah, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!” What a satisfaction will it be in that day to have had a share in the fight, to have helped to break the arrows of the bow, and to have aided in winning the victory for our Lord! Happy are they who trust themselves with this conquering Lord, and who fight side by side with Him, doing their little in His name and by His strength! How unhappy are those on the side of evil! It is a losing side, and it is a matter wherein to lose is to lose and to be lost for ever. On whose side are you?¹²

If the prophecy buffs of Victorian England (including the “deluded” Plymouth Brethren, had held to a better vision of the church and its role, Spurgeon might have seen the victory he describes in the quotation above. Somehow Munhall's statement seems to be lacking in veracity.

Continuing his pessimillennarian message of hopelessness, Munhall refers to the hymn writers of the 18th and 19th centuries:

Charles Wesley was known as “the millennial poet.” He wrote over 7,000 hymns, and more than 5,000 were premillennial. Here are two or three samples:

“Lo! He comes, with clouds descending,
Once for favored sinners slain.
Thousand thousand saints attending,
Swell the triumph of His train.
Hallelujah! Hallelujah!
God appears on earth to reign.”

”Come, Lord, Thy glorious Spirit cries,
Add souls beneath the altar groan;

Come, Lord, the Bride on earth replies,
And perfect all our souls in one."

"Thou Who hast kept us to this hour,
Oh, keep us faithful to the end;
When, robed in majesty and power
Our Jesus shall from heaven descent,
His friends and witnesses to own,
And seat us on His glorious throne."

Denny, Milton, Cowper, Watts, Bathurst, Montgomery, Newton, Alford and McCheyne, sang the same sweet songs of hope and victory.¹³

But the "sweet songs of hope and victory" of the hymn writers was *not* the failing-church-quick-escape hope of the conference. It is simply not correct to fit these men into the pattern of Scofield and Hal Lindsay.

Munhall may have made his "value judgment" after perusing hymnals compiled in America by Dispensationalists to use at prophecy conferences. If he had looked at hymnals used in British churches or at American hymnals of the early 18th Century, he could not have supported his allegation of the Premillennial bias of the great hymn writers.

We made a study (so far unpublished) comparing hymns as published in British and American hymnals. (Note that British congregations sing all stanzas printed, no matter how many.) The British hymnals do include *all* stanzas which came from the pen and inspiration of the writers. American compilers, especially of Dispensational bent, have done a workman-like job of editing hymns of the great writers. Stanza after stanza sing of the triumph of the church and the dominion of our Lord have been edited out. The edit in the American hymnals which thus reflect the "Failing Church Syndrome" suggests a determination to shape (or brainwash) the constituency by every available means. This is intellectual dishonesty.

Analysis of the other 1914 conference messages strengthens our point that the whole affair was built on a skewed bias. As the conference was ending, a committee prepared a set of resolutions published as *The Conference Testimony*. The committee appointed by Dr. Gray during a meeting of speakers on the second day of the conference consisted of: Dr. Robert McW. Russell, president of Westminster College (Pennsylvania); The Rev. Canon F.E. Howitt of Hamilton, Ontario; The Rev. Dr. R.A. Torrey, dean of The Bible Institute, Los Angeles; A.C. Gaebelein, editor of *Our Hope*, New York City; The Rev. Dr. L.W. Munhall of Germantown (Pennsylvania). The report was presented and unanimously adopted "on the afternoon of the last day when nearly 2,000 people were present." The report read:

The brethren gathered for the Conference on the Prophetic Scriptures heartily indorse the declarations made by the previous prophetic con-

ferences; but also feel it their solemn duty in view of the existing conditions of the professing church, to restate and reaffirm their unswerving belief in the following fundamental truths of our holy faith:

1. We believe that the Bible is the Word and Revelation of God and therefore our only authority.
2. We believe in the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He is very God by Whom and for Whom "all things were created."
3. We believe in his Virgin Birth, that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit and is therefore God manifested in the flesh.
4. We believe in Salvation by Divine Sacrifice, that the Son of God gave "His life a ransom for many" and bore "our sins in His own body on the tree."
5. We believe in His physical Resurrection from the dead and in His bodily presence at the right hand of God as our Priest and Advocate.
6. We believe in the universality and heinousness of Sin, and in Salvation by Grace, "not of works, lest any man should boast"; that sonship with God is attained only by regeneration through the Holy Spirit and faith in Jesus Christ.
7. We believe in the Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit, Who came down upon earth on the day of Pentecost to indwell believers and to be the Administrator in the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ; Who is also here to "reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."
8. We believe in the Great Commission, which our Lord has given to His Church to evangelize the world, and this evangelization is the great mission of the Church.
9. We believe in the second, visible and imminent Coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to establish His world-wide Kingdom on the earth.
10. We believe in a Heaven of eternal bliss for the righteous, and in the conscious and eternal punishment of the wicked.

Furthermore, we exhort the people of God in all denominations to stand by these great truths, so much rejected in our days, and to contend earnestly for the faith which our God has, in His Holy Word, delivered unto the saints.¹⁴

Had anyone suggested to the nearly 2,000 people on that last day of the conference in 1914 that we could be writing about the conference more than 70 years later, they would have looked at the speaker with as much disbelief as Neatby reports of the early Plymouth Brethren. They probably would have had serious reservations about the orthodoxy or sanity of anyone who so suggested. Yet, passage of time has shown that they were just as deluded as Neatby considered the early Brethren to have been.

When the conference messages were published, there was included an appendix with a list of individuals identified as "Some Exponents of Premillennialism." Since the list of supposed exponents had originally appeared as an editorial in *The Christian Workers Magazine*, it must bear the imprint of Dr. Gray. The list is headed by a short essay:

By "premillennialism" is meant the teaching that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ will come again to this earth personally and visibly, and that this coming will take place prior to that period of a thousand years of which the Scriptures speak, when peace and righteousness shall prevail upon the earth. In other words, it is the coming of our Lord that shall introduce this period and make it a possibility. As to the details of the event opinions differ among godly students of the Bible, but in broad outline the foregoing is a sufficient definition for our present purpose.¹⁵

The list is strictly in alphabetical order without regard for century. And asterisk does mark off those deceased at time of publication. As the list includes those in the generation of Fathers who immediately succeeded the Apostles, we quote again from Brethren writer F. Roy Coad, whose comment is pertinent to the use of the Early Fathers by Dr. Gray:

Few fragments have survived from the earliest years of the Church's history, and it would be *wrong* to read into the ideas of such fragments as we have any of our modern formulated systems. Their one supreme hope was the Second Advent, and detail was of secondary importance.¹⁶

For Gray to include medieval schoolmen is out of line as they could in no way properly be called on to support American Dispensationalism. Philip Edgecombe Hughes' volume *The Theology of the English Reformers*, makes it clear that Gray is out of line by including Cranmer or Latimer.¹⁷ Nor can we countenance the inclusion of mystics like Jacob Boehme. Nor should Count Zinzendorf be placed in the Evangelical mainstream.

To include Jesuit Lacunza or the eccentric Edward Irving must raise questions about Gray's motivation. In view of the disputes which racked the Brethren in early days, linking so casually Darby, Newton and Tregelles is inconsiderate.

There is at least one outright error. David Bogue, listed by Gray, said in 1813:

How wise and pious men could ever suppose that the saints, whose souls are now in heaven, should, after the resurrection of the body from the grave, descend to live on earth again; and that Jesus Christ should quit the throne of his glory above, and descend and reign personally over them here below, in distinguished splendour, for a thousand years, may justly excite our astonishment, since it is in direct opposition to the whole tenor of the doctrinal parts of the sacred volume. Such, however, have been the opinions of some great men. Happy will it be if we take warning from their aberrations.¹⁸

Obviously, he does not belong on Gray's list.

There are two remarkable omissions from the list. The first is Sydney Watson, author of the soap-opera type novel on the Rapture, *In the Twinkling of an Eye*, which is the inspiration for so much Rapture-cult preaching. We tried to read a biography of Watson and could not

decide whether it was about one or two men. The other omission is that of the "noted Bible teacher," Walter Scott, referred to by Scofield. We finally located and confirmed the existence of Scott but for some reason Gray did not find room for a "noted Bible teacher."

Gray was later criticized for making the list and for its inclusions.¹⁹ We get an impression that he was attempting to overwhelm at the sacrifice of scholarly integrity. Many of his inclusions may have been made on the assumption that most readers would never bother to check his accuracy.

This sort of thing does not commend the movement. And this is what Day suggested was entering "good society."

CHAPTER 33 NOTES

1. Richard Ellsworth Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat: The Life Story of Henry Parson Crowell*, Moody Press, 1946, p. 168.
2. Published as *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1914.
3. John Timothy Stone, Robert N. Russell, Wm. G. Moorehead, E. Y. Mullins, T. R. O'Meara, W. H. Griffith Thomas, C. I. Scofield, H. B. Hartzler, A. C. Gaebelein, R. A. Torrey, James M. Gray.
4. F. Roy Coad, *Prophetic Developments*, a Christian Brethren Research Fellowship Occasional Paper, CBRF, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 10.
5. Since this writer was born and grew up in Germantown, Pa., we looked up Munhall's residence. He lived at 226 W. Harvey Street, a street of large homes, many three-story, sitting high on the embankments reached by long rows of concrete steps. It was a street of upper, middle-level management types. (The doctor who officiated at the writer's birth lived just around the corner.) Munhall lived until 1934 and this writer many times passed his house. Certainly, Munhall's hope for immediate rapture did not interfere with comfortable living in a middle-class, prosperous neighborhood. How many neighbors appreciated his views of the Rapture may be questioned.
6. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, p. 94ff.
7. Cornelius Stam, "The Imminence of The Rapture, Its Two Most Urgent Lessons," in *The Berean Searchlight*, Chicago, January 1985, Vol. XLV, No. 10, p. 293. Stam is the brother of John Stam, missionary martyred by Chinese Communists in 1935.
8. In 1979, Robert Jewett published *Jesus Against The Rapture* (Westminster, Philadelphia). Jewett holds that on the basis of Mark 13:32-33, Luke 10:17-20, Luke 4:16-30, Matt. 16:1-4, Matt. 23:39-39, Luke 28:28-31 and Luke 23:14-17, Jesus Himself could not in any way approve of the idea of the Rapture as expounded by Scofield, Sydney, Watson or Hal Lindsay.
9. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, p. 94ff.
10. Heinrich Quistorp, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things*, trans. Harold Knight, John Knox Press, 1955.
11. *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* is a publication of Chalcedon, Vallecito, Calif. At the last word, we knew of not one premillennial Evangelical school which had bothered to acknowledge the publication of the *Journal*, nor dared to expose its students to the *Journal's* message of Christian Hope.
12. *The Gospel Witness*, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.
13. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, p. 96.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 239.
15. *The Christian Workers Magazine* was a predecessor to *Moody Monthly*.

16. Coad, *op. cit.*, p. 11. (Emphasis added.)
17. Published by Eerdmanns, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965.
18. David Bogue, *Discourses on the Millennium*, 1818, p. 17, quoted in Iain Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, The Banner of Truth, 1971, p. 187.
19. Timothy Weber, in chapter one of *Living in the Shadow of The Second Coming* (Oxford, 1979) comments on Gray's list and notes that Gray was widely criticized at the time over the integrity of his list. Gray later made other statements which needlessly caused trouble for his administration and school.

CHAPTER 34

A New School and a New Church

"Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them, and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst."

Neh. 9:20

No analysis of the structure of the Fundamentalist movement can proceed very far if the role of the Bible institute is ignored. A great deal of the confusion which has existed over the nature of the Fundamentalist movement could have been resolved by devoting more attention to this aspect of the problem. Fundamentalism was a part of both the intellectual and the social history of the United States—that is, its thought can be identified, analyzed, and placed in historical context. Its institutional structure possesses some of the same distinctiveness. By assuming that the faith of Fundamentalism simply reflected traditional Protestantism, scholars have lost one key to understanding; and by failing to examine the manner in which the Bible institutes provided a form of social structure for Fundamentalism, they have lost another.¹

Ernest Sandeen appears to be the first writer to recognize the phenomenon. He explains the role of the Bible institute:

The simplest way to explain the function of the Bible institute within the Fundamentalist movement is to compare its role to that of the headquarters of a denomination. In many cases, the educational task of the institute, though never derogated, formed only a small part of the school's total mission. Students would be drawn to a Bible institute because of its reputation as a center of piety and sound doctrine, as these concepts had been understood in the millenarian tradition. Perhaps the family of the student had heard of the school through its periodical or had heard one of its faculty preach at a Bible conference or in a series of special meetings in their local church. Possibly their own pastor graduated from the school.²

Scofield recognized or felt what Sandeen spelled out. He was greatly interested in having a Bible institute on the East Coast.³ He hoped it would occupy a role similar to that played by Moody in the Midwest. His desire seemed to be realized by the establishment of such an institute in Philadelphia.

The spade work of organizing and opening the school went on during 1914. William L. Pettengill of Philadelphia, in association with others, worked out the arrangements.⁴ Bearing the name "Philadelphia School of the Bible," the school opened October 1, 1914, with evening classes. It met in rented quarters at 1720 Arch Street. Scofield addressed the opening session. His message, "The Spirit and Method of Bible Study," commenced:

I suppose, dear friends, it is well understood that I am to speak tonight on "Spirit and Method of Bible Study." It can scarcely be necessary for me to explain the sense in which I use the work "spirit" in this connection. As absolutely essential as it is that we shall have the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit, it is not of Him that I speak in making the theme such as I have made it, but rather of our own attitude toward the Bible, of our own spirits, of our own spiritual state as we approach the study of God's Holy Word. We may come to the Bible cold and merely inquisitive, and it will give us very little. We may come to it in a mere curiosity, because it is a strange book, differing fundamentally from all other books, and we shall go away largely disappointed. It is certainly one of the paradoxes of life that the Bible is so little read—that Book which is the most widely circulated of all books; that Book which, broadly speaking is in every home. For it is true, as every pastor knows, and I see several of my brethren here tonight, that every pastor who goes about among people, and people within and without the church, is aware of the fact that it is hard to find a family, an American family anyway, or one long resident here, without a Bible in the house. . . .⁵

By October 1914, the World War, so fervently expected by speakers at the prophetic conference in February, was well under way. Scofield noted this as he neared the conclusion of his message:

A brother linked his arm in mine one day as I was leaving a meeting, and said, "Oh, you poor pessimist!" And I said, "Don't call me that!" The Bible is the most optimistic Book on earth; it absolutely refuses to hang its head, or to let the shine out of its eyes. It sees the chasm into which this world is plunging, and we can almost hear the echo of the guns over yonder, but the Bible looks straight across that chasm, and sees earth's golden age; sees the shining faces of the redeemed; sees the earth filled with "the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea"; sees humanity brought to its highest possible blessing and its highest possible capacity; sees God vindicated, after all the ages, during which the wickedness of man has drenched this earth with blood and tears, sees that all the time it was disobedience and sin; and sees at last God, not only vindicated, but God happy in the redeemed. Oh, this is the Book!"⁶

Unfortunately for Scofield, we are quite into the chasm, 70 years later. Consistent with his view (the falling Church Syndrome), he sees no blessing or prosperity for the church, but looks only to a future age for others.

In his concluding paragraph, he mentions his idea of the role of the school and the substance of his prayers for it:

Well, now, I am going to tell you something about the Philadelphia School of the Bible; let me put it into a word. A few of us want to help. We want to help the Christian life and service of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania; we want to help every pastor in this city; we want to take some of his bright young men and young women and train them for more efficient work; and we want these, thus trained, to go where God may need them, where the need is great; and we want to teach this Book after the spirit and in the method that I have been speaking about here tonight;

and we want you all to help. Pray—and give us some money, if the Lord so lead you, but pray anyway. I can tell you truthfully I have *no* ambition to serve; there is nothing I want from you but your love and prayers; and I do want to feel that somehow all of us are working here—we Christians in Philadelphia—and if this is our brotherly attitude, if this is our real heart longing, we shall see great things, if the Lord tarry.⁷

Now it happened that another Bible teacher, William Rugh, had a similar vision for Philadelphia. At virtually the same time, Rugh established the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania. It duplicated Scofield's school in every area of belief, doctrine and eschatology. While there was no apparent friction between the two schools at the official or executive level, it seems likely that financial and prayer support was diluted for many years.⁸ The merger of the two into the Philadelphia College of the Bible in the years following World War II was a wise move.

Scofield appears to have commuted from his home in Douglaston to Philadelphia. Clarence E. Mason, long-time dean of the school, described Scofield's role to BeVier as "front-man."⁹ The actual head was William L. Pettengill, who oversaw the day to day running of the institute. Scofield served as president until 1918 when his health forced him to resign.

In 1915, Scofield actually started his agreed writing for *The Sunday School Times*. His Bible Correspondence Course was taken over by Moody Press, a part of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. The course remains an integral part of Moody's ministry today.¹⁰

That year also saw the publication of another collection of messages. *The New Life in Christ Jesus* was issued by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago. In a note "To The Reader," Scofield said:

All of the matter composing this book was preached to my congregations in my two pastorates at Dallas, Texas, and Northfield, Massachusetts, and all save the first in the "Dallas News." These, reprinted in "The Christian Worker's Magazine", awoke a desire which seemed to be unusually widespread that these teachings concerning the New Life in Christ Jesus might be collected into a book. This, by arrangement with The Bible Institute Colportage Association, has now been done.

The book is here and now committed to the care of Him who it seeks to exalt in the fervent prayer that through His grace it may show the way into happy, victorious, fruitful Christian living to many in bondage.

C. I. Scofield

Greyshingles
Douglaston, N. Y.
April 1915¹¹

The dedication reads:

To My Wife

Who has been my untiring helper in whatever I have said or written for thirty-one blessed years. Always abiding in the ministries of a Christian

home, she has left to me the thanks and prayers of those who have been blessed through our joint labours, content so only that Christ was exalted.¹²

One note shows up at several places in the book. (Selective quotation can be dangerous, however the point we make is consistent with Scofield's teaching elsewhere.) In the book there is a negative view of the Law. That negative view is so stated that the "weaker brother"¹³ could readily conclude that moral standards are irrelevant to Christian experience. Typically, in the chapter "The Imparted Life":

First, life by precept, by rule. There is a large truth here. The Bible is a great instruction in righteousness; a great revelation of the mind of God about human life. No inner light can take the place of the divine revelation. It is perfect ethically and also complete.

But it has the fatal defect of furnishing no dynamic. "The law made nothing perfect." Precept gives a perfect rule of life, and by it life must always be tested, but precept carries no enablement. "The law *** was weak through the flesh." A chart does not carry us across the ocean, but it shows us where we are on the trackless deep, and where to go. The life by precept was tried under law and left the whole world of humanity in speechless guilt before God.¹⁴

The view of the Old Testament period is neither historically or theologically accurate, but is good Dispensational teaching.

In the chapter, "The Delivered Life," with the subheading, "The Process of Deliverance," he says:

The believer is told that he is not under law, that is, a system of probation to see if he can work out a righteousness for himself, but under grace, that is, a system of divine inworking, which produces the very righteousness which the law required, but which man never achieved. The believer is assured that Christ has given to him eternal life, and that he shall never perish; that nothing is able to pluck him out of the omnipotent hand which holds him; that He who began a good work in him will perfect it till the day of Christ. As for his sins; they are blotted out, cast behind God's back, buried in the depths of the sea, forgiven and forgotten. And this is a necessary first work, for no man is really free who is under the bondage of fear.¹⁵

The view of the role of "law" is inaccurate. But implicit in the passage is a lurking antinomianism which justifies immorality.

Remember the Scofield who said, "We will not attempt in this age the work which God has reserved for the next,"¹⁶ relegating social action to the future. Well, in this book, in the chapter, "The Larger Christian Life," he says:

"The field is the world." Your field is the world. Keep your sympathies world wide. If your heart is in China or Africa or Central America, and with the work there, it is just the same as if you were there, wherever your body may happen to be.¹⁷

In 1915, he possibly could have avoided conflict between the two positions. But today, we find that the careful following of his first axiom "We will

not attempt . . ." has resulted in conditions which make difficult carrying out the second.

A British writer has noted:

. . . Jewish appreciation of the sumptuous and the grandiose goes back to long before the splendours of Solomon's Temple, of the description of the Tabernacle, *Exodus XXXV-XXXIX*.¹⁸

Scofield's vision must have been somewhat similar. He is enthralled by the grandiose in Solomon's Temple and the Tabernacle of Moses, overlooking the Christian significance of the Tabernacle of David. In a chapter, "The Consecration," he uses the Ark in the Tabernacle of Moses and Solomon's Temple to show Christian consecration. For instance, speaking of the role of the priests, he says:

. . . They went out. They did not remain to share the holy of holies with Jehovah. And you observe, it was "when the priests were come out of the holy place, the cloud filled the house of the Lord." I am well persuaded that the cloud would never have filled the house if the priests had remained within. They went out.¹⁹

The Christian relationship is much better illustrated by the visible Shekinah presence, open to all the Tabernacle of David.²⁰

At one point, Scofield took a position which may have cleared up something which had been a bit garbled in reports of Moody's activities. Moody had been quite impressed with Professor Henry Drummond of Edinburgh for his Christian stand. However, it became apparent that Drummond (not related to the Banker of Albury) was an evolutionist of rather firm convictions. Careful review suggests that Moody's support was something less enthusiastic than reported and that Moody dropped him as he realized the "scientific" views involved. But circulated reports gave Drummond quite a boost among Fundamentalists. Scofield sought to correct this, for which we commend him:

Witness the importation by professed Christians of Henry Drummond to lecture upon the "Ascent of Man" while they know that their Bibles give one long testimony to the descent of man. Never perhaps in all the history of the church was there such a turning of the back upon the altar of God and the temple of God to worship nature, as now, and never were these things doing such serious harm. To millions of professed Christians Drummond and Darwin are more authoritative than Moses.²¹

At this point, Scofield is sound, sensible and orthodox.

During 1915, Scofield joined with a number of other residents of Douglaston in organizing The Community Church of Douglaston. The first service was held May 2, 1915, in the Douglas Manor Inn. The group leased a store on Main Street for services, looking toward a future permanent edifice. Scofield and the Rev. John Baumeister officiated at the first Lord's Supper celebrated by the church on October

31, 1915. In November, Scofield agreed to preach regularly on Sunday mornings. The first social event of the church was a reception honoring Cyrus and Hettie (Dr. and Mrs.) Scofield held on February 9, 1916.²²

Early in 1916, Marie Helene made a trip from Atchison to visit her father. The situation at "Greysingles" during that visit was not one provided for in either Victorian or Fundamentalist etiquette. Apparently the whole thing came off with decorum. No comments have come down to us.

With the passing of the year 1916, someone (or some people) in the Dispensational leadership felt that Scofield should be honored by a testimonial dinner. Arrangements were made to hold the affair on October 26, 1916, at the Collegiate Reformed Church, New York, located at Fifth Avenue and 26th Street.²³ Remarkably, few reports of the affair have come down to us. Evidence suggests that Dr. James M. Gray was the instigator of the affair and was the principal speaker.

Testimonies were collected from many people who had known and worked with Scofield. The letters have been preserved in the Scofield Memorial Church, Dallas, but have not been available for inspection and research since the fire in 1976 which destroyed the old sanctuary.²⁴ William Nason of the church in Dallas collected testimonials from that area and forwarded them to Gray. BeVier, who examined the collection at the former building of the Scofield Church, noted one from the Baptist preacher, Rev. George W. Truett:

He is easily one of the first preachers of his generation. But momentous as has been his work as a preacher, his greatest work, probably, has been in inspiring the multitudes to study God's Word. . . . His Reference Bible is a monumental achievement.²⁵

Truett was of that school of Southern Baptist preachers heavier in oratorical preaching than in theological insight. The statement is characteristic.

The affair appears to have been ignored by much of the secular press. But strangely enough we have not found any place where it was noted in the religious or Fundamental press. And it does not appear that the promoters of the affair made any independent effort to circulate the proceedings on their own. We have not found a pamphlet in any Evangelical library consulted. Five years later, Dr. James M. Gray published his speech in *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* in lieu of an obituary for Scofield.

Gray started with an anecdote, no doubt designed to provoke laughter from the audience and set the mood of the affair:

In speaking to a lady of the honor which had come to me—a friend of Dr. Scofield as well as myself—she asked if he would be present on the occasion? And when I answered, "Yes," she exclaimed, in some dismay, I thought, "What will you ever do, you'll *have* to praise him?"²⁶

1916 was long before the days of Helen Hokanson, so we must assume that the lady in question expressed her feelings sincerely. But what did she mean?

The story of Scofield of being raised in the South was again accepted and promoted:

Some of you who know and love him well will recall that smile and recognize that characteristic—part of his inheritance from the poetic and sunny South where hurry is not a virtue.²⁶

The Southern upbringing is not confirmed by data already presented. The “transparency” incident in St. Louis was related:

. . . It is on record also that after his conversion he once paraded with a banner advertising a gospel meeting, and although he had served as the United States district attorney, for by profession he was a lawyer, yet with the courage of his convictions, he marched up and down the street where many lawyers were located who had been his professional associates.²⁷

But official records establish that Scofield, not being professionally established in St. Louis, would not have had professional associates.

Gray, referring to Scofield’s time in The War Between The States, said: “He had fought with Lee,” obviously an attempt to puff Scofield, who may never have seen Lee. The Northfield period was referred to:

On Dr. Scofield’s work in Northfield, Mass., there is not time adequately to dwell. But everybody knows it could not have been confined to the pastorate of a country church. What an opportunity was opened there through the hundreds of young lives coming and going every year in the Northfield Seminary for girls, and the Mt. Hermon School for boys. How many of these, now influential men and women throughout the world, have daily cause to thank God for his enlightened ministry!²⁸

This may have been the time when the story that Scofield had official connection with the Preparatory Schools got started. If so, Gray was an expert in semantics. The story was told so that those who were to accept the school connection had something, while the Northfield alumni who might have been in the audience thought Gray was sticking to the facts.

Of course, *The Scofield Reference Bible* and Scofield’s role was mentioned. This, in fact, may have been a major purpose of the “wing-ding.” Gray said:

This is Dr Scofield’s richest gift. He knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, “No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions on any subject.” His insight pierces the intricacies.

A Christian father, himself charmed by the Scofield Reference Bible, was pleased to see his young sons take it up night after night, because

they said, "It was so easy to find out things." Thank God for a Bible expositer that can command the interest of children.²⁹

Even though we find no publication of the speech before 1921, we found these identical words, from this part of Gray's speech in the original publication of Trumbull's sketch of Scofield which came out in 1919.

BeVier, who saw the collected testimonials, commented that no testimonials were received from people who had known him in Kansas.³⁰ But, as BeVier himself noted, those who knew him in Kansas could only know of him as he lived before 1879. The statement smacks a bit of naivete as those who knew the Kansas Scofield would not have appreciated the whole affair and further would have made comments utterly out of keeping with the ones read that evening.

Viewed from this perspective, the whole affair seems a bit too fulsome with praise, and more than a bit tawdry.

CHAPTER 34 NOTES

1. Ernest Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, p. 241.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 241, 242.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
5. C. I. Scofield, *The Spirit and Method of Bible Study*, reproduced in a Silver Anniversary Momento by the Philadelphia School of the Bible, Philadelphia, 1939, p. 3.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 12, 13.
8. The writer attended the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania in the 1930's. We noted no friction at the official level, but did find jibes and taunts exchanged between students of the two schools while working together on part-time jobs. Accusations of "fanatic" and "compromiser" were those most usually tossed back and forth.
9. Letter, Clarence E. Mason to William BeVier, Feb. 10, 1960, cited by BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
10. *Scofield Bible Correspondence Course* (Chicago, Moody Bible Institute). In a letter to the writer, dated Sept. 5, 1979, Paul D. Weiland noted that the course was then set up in six volumes; cost \$115.00. The student is given four years to complete the course. With concentrated study it can be completed in two years. Up to 1979, 54,590 students had enrolled. The 1978 enrollment was 2,800.
11. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Jesus Christ*, BICA, Chicago, 1915, on unnumbered page which by location would be page 7.
12. *Ibid.*, unnumbered page, located as page 5.
13. See Paul in Romans 14:21 and I Corinthians 8:13.
14. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
16. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy*, p. 27.
17. Scofield, *The New Life*, p. 66.
18. C. Hamilton Ellis, *The London, Brighton and South Coast Railway*, Ian Allen, Ltd., London, 1960, p. 171.
19. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
20. See our comments on The Tabernacle of David and the writing of George Smith in chapter 32.
21. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

22. Letter to the writer from Rev. John H. Meyor, present pastor of the church.
23. The church is presently the Marble Collegiate Church, base of Norman Vincent Peale.
24. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
25. *Ibid.*
26. James M. Gray, "Testimonial to Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D.," *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, September 1921, p. 550.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 551.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*, p. 552.
30. BeVier, *op. cit.*, pp. 89, 90.

CHAPTER 35

A Mix-up in Dates

"So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

Psalm 90:12

In the previous chapter, we noted that Scofield was officially pastor of the fledgling church in Douglaston. There is every indication that he was also filling numerous speaking engagements elsewhere, a practice noted as far back as the 1880's. To protect the local responsibility, in November 1916, Trevor P. Mordecai, a Princeton Seminary student became part-time student supply pastor. Mordecai resigned early in 1917. Rev. Lloyd G. David was engaged to preach Sunday mornings in Scofield's absence.¹

But we must remember that by 1916, Scofield was 73 years old. With a physical state not always top notch, he may not have been able to really carry the load of his various responsibilities. His commitment to *The Sunday School Times*; his speaking engagements; his work at the Philadelphia School of the Bible, all had to be paced according to his health.

Besides all this, during 1916 and 1917, someone was working with Oxford University Press on a revision of the Scofield Reference Bible. We have not been blessed with details of the actual revision process as we were with the original edition of 1909. The matter is complicated by the almost complete disappearance of the 1909 original edition, making detailed comparison difficult. (Our own Scofield Bible is a printing of the 1917 edition, the most common, most widely circulated issue.)

Possibly the study at "Greysingles" and the Oxford University Press office were the scenes of most of the revising work. Scofield's part could have been fitted in between trips to Philadelphia and speaking engagements in other cities. The fact that a revision could even be contemplated less than eight years after the original, highlights the essential lack of integrity of the "Reference Bible" idea. The Word of God is eternal. It stands by itself, and as the Lord Himself stated near the close of the record:

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book (*Rev. 22:18*).

In the light of that statement, the concept of the Scofield Reference Bible (and those of its several successors) skates on very, very thin ice. This is especially so when thousands of less sophisticated users fail to

distinguish between the sacred text and the words of fallible man, when they are placed right together.

Comment on the Word and explanation of its teaching is not to be criticized, per se: it is entirely and absolutely necessary. But no real commentator is likely to be completely and finally satisfied with any statement. If he is developing spiritually, his views will develop. Even the greatest commentator will want to say something a little differently the next time. Thus to link the comments of fallible men, good or bad, with the sacred Word is of questionable integrity. None of this bothered Scofield in the least. And we will see that four years later in the last months of his life, he was contemplating yet another revision, the idea being halted only by his death.

The most notable change made in the 1917 edition of Scofield's work was the placing of a date on each page of text. The date was an interpretation of the chronology which Bishop Ussher had worked out in 1650-1654.² The good bishop may have been sincere and devout, but his scholarship was limited by the resources available in his own time. His work by 1917 had been largely supplanted in the minds of even conservative scholars. (It is still more realistic than anything worked out by Leakey, however.)

Scofield was not only unconcerned about the proper value of Ussher, but in both the 1917 edition of the Bible and other writings of the same period, he utilized and praised a very different Biblical chronology. The conflict he created passed unnoticed until Oswald Allis wrote in 1945.³ In the intervening years, the Ussher dates were accepted as just as inspired as the Scofield notes by thousands of Scofield Reference Bible users.

When he wrote for *The Sunday School Times* in 1916, Scofield had opted for the Chronology of Anstey. (1913). Speaking of the problems of the 70 Weeks (*Daniel 9:25*) he said:

Indeed, certain divisions of the time are distinctly announced. There is, first, a period of seven sevens 49 years during which Jerusalem is to be rebuilt, and this was fulfilled as we are told by Ezra and Nehemiah. Secondly, there is to be a period of sixty-two sevens = 434 years "unto the Messiah" who is to be "cut-off." And this also was exactly fulfilled according to Biblical chronology. Whatever confusion has existed at that point has been due to following Ptolemaic instead of the Biblical chronology, as Anstey in his "Romance of Biblical Chronology" (Association Press, New York City) has shown.⁴

When Oswald Allis compared that statement of Scofield, the 1917 notes and the dated pages, he found discrepancies. Note:

In the notes on this prophecy in *RB* we meet one of the most remarkable phenomena in this *Reference Bible*. In *What Do the Prophets Say?*, which appeared serially in 1916 and in book-form in 1918, Scofield

asserts emphatically that the prophecy of 70 weeks commences with the decree of Cyrus in 538 B.C. (pp. 142ff.); and he accepts Anstey's solution of the difficulty raised by this interpretation, viz., that the Ptolemaic chronology for the Persian period is *82 years too long*. Yet the notes on Dan. ix. 24-27 are exactly the same in the 1917 edition of *RB* as in the first edition where the 70 weeks are described as beginning with the decree of Artaxerxes. It is hard to reconcile these facts with the claim that the edition of 1917 represented an at all careful revision of the original edition. Somewhere between 1909 and 1917 Scofield evidently decided to print the Ussher chronology in the margin of the new edition. Somewhere between 1913 and 1916 he accepted, certainly in some important features, Anstey's system of chronology (*The Romance of Bible Chronology* appeared in 1913), which required a radical revision of the Ussher chronology. Yet not attempt is made to harmonize these differences, and the fact of their existence is not even referred to in *RB*. This is singular to say the least!"⁵

Not only singular, but a rather clear indication that the scholarship of The Scofield Reference Bible is less than excellent. But since Allis' comments, published in 1945, 28 years after the 1917 edition, were the first time the discrepancy was noted, we may properly wonder how much scholarly capability was present or used among the "Fighting Fundamentalist" camp in the 1920's and 1930's.

Allis' critiques help to measure Scofield's work:

... it is not clear from the notes in *RB* whether he accepted the claim that the triumphal entry formed the concluding event of the 69th week. He seems to have deprecated the attempt to be very exact in dealing with the chronological data, pointing out that prophecy is "so indeterminate as to give no satisfaction to mere curiosity." This looks a little like a slur on Anderson's mathematical calculation. But the words "mere curiosity" would certainly not apply to Anderson. Apparently, Scofield was uncertain as to the details of interpretation. On several points, however, he was quite specific. According to the notes in *RB* the beginning of the period of the 70 weeks is to be counted from Artaxerxes' decree which was issued "between 454 and 444 B.C."; and in the first 7 weeks (49 years) "Jerusalem was to be rebuilt in "troublous times". This was fulfilled, as Ezra and Nehemiah record." 483 years (69 weeks) counted from 450 B.C. would extend to approximately 33 A.D. (Ussher's date for the crucifixion). But Scofield merely says that they bring us "to the time of Christ." On the two points, which are characteristic of the Dispensational interpretation he is quite explicit: the crucifixion comes after the 69th week, and the entire 70th week is postponed and still future.⁶

Further comments suggest that the Scofield Bibles Notes are not merely inadequate, but actually carelessly put together:

How full his "chronological data" correspond with Ussher's chronology is indicated by the fact that the marginal dates given in the Book of Esther (B.C. 521-509) identify Ahasuerus with Darius Hystaspis (cf. marginal dates of Haggai and Zechariah). Yet in the margin of Ezra iv.6 it is positively stated that Ahasuerus was Xerxes. In the case of the Epistle

of James, Scofield has given Ussher's date (A.D. 60), but has expressed complete agreement with Weston's opinion that James was "the first Epistle to Christians," which would date it at or before A.D. 54 (cf. *RB*, p. 1267). On the other hand, in the case of Obadiah he changed Ussher's date (B.C. 587) to B.C. 887 a date which readers unfamiliar with the reasons for the divergence might easily regard as a misprint. Most remarkable of all, about the time when the decision was made to place the Ussher chronology in the margin of *RB*, Scofield adopted one of the most radical of the modifications of that chronology proposed by Anstey. Such being the case, it would have avoided confusion and misunderstanding had he simply stated that, for the sake of convenience, he was restoring the Ussher chronology in the margin of the text and at the same time pointed out in what respects he deemed it unreliable and in need of correction. This would not only have removed the difficulties just mentioned, it would also have relieved Scofield of direct responsibility for such dates as B.C. 1520 for Job, 1014 for the Song of Songs, 977 for Ecclesiastes, dates which at best can only be approximate, but give the appearance of an accurate knowledge which no one can justly claim to possess.⁷

One of Scofield's most loyal supporters has found another "goof." Pastor Cornelius Stam noted:

In 1917 the introduction to "The Jewish-Christian Epistles" indicates emphatically that Paul did *not* write the Epistle to the Hebrews, while the introduction to the epistle itself states that "the reference in II Pet. 3:15 seems conclusive that Paul was the writer"! That was a bad one!⁸

In his work, Oswald Allis noted material on 85 pages which he considered unscriptural.⁹ Jesse Hodges' study refers to 15 pages where he finds material out of line. (His 15 pages differ from the 85 noted by Allis.)¹⁰ Since only 565 pages of the Scofield tome really have comment, and two commentators find 100 pages open to criticism, what is the value of his work?

In this light, the gushing praise heaped on Scofield's work by Dr. James M. Gray seems a bit forced:

This is Dr. Scofield's richest gift. He knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, "No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions on any subject." His insight pierces in intricacies.¹¹

The evaluation of Charles G. Trumbull in his "biography" seems worse than a public relations puff. He was to say of the work: "God-planned, God-guided, God-illuminated and God-energized work."¹²

Scofield and his followers have always been quick to quote II Tim. 2:15: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth." But can the careless handling we have just cited be the work of one who "needeth not to be ashamed"? Is the Dispensational method "rightly dividing the Word of Truth"?

While Scofield was working with Oxford University Press on the revision, President Wilson was leading the country into World War I. Outside of Scofield's prophetic interest and the difficulty which Hettie, along with other housewives had in purchasing sugar, the conflict does not appear to have particularly touched the Scofield household in Douglaston. Noel was 29 years old when Wilson asked Congress for the declaration of war. Many men of that age, single and married, were taken into the armed forces, some giving their lives. No record of military service by Noel Scofield has been located at the time of writing.¹³

On August 19, 1917, Scofield reached the age of 74. Even the limited personal references in published materials suggest that his pace of activity was slowing down, as appropriate to his years. Another indication of the passing of time was the death of one who had shared the early years of life with him. His sister Laura died on November 8, 1917. Her obituary, from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* for Nov. 9, 1917, is:

Mrs. Laura S. Eames Dies

Mrs. Laura Scofield Eames, wife of the late Dr. W. H. Eames, died yesterday at her residence, 316 North Newstead Avenue, after a short illness. She is the mother of the late William S. Eames, architect, and is survived by one son, Col. H. E. Eames, four daughters, eight grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren. The funeral will take place Saturday afternoon at 2:30 from St. George's Chapel.¹⁴

It is interesting that the Eames did not think that a surviving brother (uncle) of world-wide fame should be listed as a survivor. The relation of Scofield and his sisters after he entered his ministerial role is not at all clear. They evidently did not view him in the same manner that he was viewed by the Fundamentalist community. They may have been somewhat ambivalent about things in Cyrus' life which would have horrified the Fundamentalists. There is no report of anyone from Douglaston attending the service at St. George Chapel.

One of the interesting things about modern religious prophecy is the extent to which "prophecy buffs" have made their prophecies conform with the events which the chancelleries of the major powers have brought to pass. Most religious prophets did their best to prepare followers for August 1914 and what followed. Scofield during the war kept in close touch with events on the world scene, filtering everything according to the Dispensational view of Matthew 24. Referring to General Allenby's entry into Jerusalem on December 11, 1917, he wrote to Charles H. Trumbull: "Now for the first time, we have real a prophetic sign."¹⁵ His statement, of course, overlooks Matthew 16:4 which suggests that no signs are to be given. The value of the "sign" mentioned by Scofield can be measured by the fact that a very similar statement was made nearly 50 years later when the modern Israelis entered the old city of

Jerusalem at the end of the Six-Day War. Quite simply, events have not moved according to the scheme which the Dispensationalists have drawn up from Daniel 9:25, 26.

A further indication of Scofield's advancing age was the fact that he began the then rather uncommon practice of spending the winters in Florida to escape the rigors of northern winters. For his winter abode, he chose Crescent City. Located in Putnam County, on Crescent Lake, Crescent City is about 20 miles south of Palatka. It would appear that Scofield stayed in either a hotel or a rented house for the first several winters.¹⁶

In March 1918, the Central American Mission recognized its founder and held its Executive Committee meeting at Crescent City. It was the last meeting of the mission which Scofield attended.

Scofield returned to Douglaston before Easter (March 31 that year). Soon after he was taken ill, the illness, as always, unspecified. Before illness struck, he was able to write the dedication and foreword to a collection of messages entitled *What Do The Prophets Say?* They had appeared during 1916 in *The Sunday School Times*, which published them in book form. One of those messages was referred to earlier in the chapter. The dedication read:

To
My Friend
ALWYN BALL, JUNIOR

whose generous fellowship and constant affection have done so much to make possible such work as I have, by God's grace, been enabled to do, I dedicate this book as a token of gratitude.

C. I. Scofield

Easter, 1918
Greyslinges,
Douglaston, Long Island, N.Y.¹⁶

Ball was one of the original contributors to the cost of the Bible project. The dedication is an indication that Scofield for years had been a plaything of men of considerable wealth who could finance special activities or hobbies. Through their "generosity," ideas were promoted and publicized which otherwise would have had little chance of wide acceptance. Full details of Scofield's support will probably never be known. But the overt supporters were always men on the fringes of the world of finance.

The foreword was so completely contemporary as to make it meaningless to those who have lived through World War II and the last half of the 20th Century.

FOREWORD

That the human race is in a supreme crisis is obvious to the dullest intelligence. Nothing like it has ever marked the long life of humanity on the earth. It is impossible to restrain the effort to find the meaning of it all. No one is really either satisfied with or convinced by the easy

solutions proposed by a shallow optimism. For thirty years these prophets of peace without righteousness have assured us that great and serious wars were ended forever; and yet we are in the greatest and most serious of all wars. *What does it all mean?*

The Christian believes that somehow, somewhere, the answer is in the writings of the prophets-writings authenticated by Jesus Christ (Luke 16:31, 24:27,44), and by hundreds of literal fulfilments. But these writings, plain and explicit in themselves, have been forced into meanings utterly foreign to the language used, in the effort to make them apply to the Church instead of to Israel; or have been the ready resort of unscholarly fanatics.

Surely it is timely that a sane and reasonable interpretation of those writings should be found. This book is a sincere effort to present such an interpretation, after thirty-five years of earnest study.

C. I. Scofield

Greyslinges, Douglaston, L.I.
Easter, 1918.

The foreward brings out another mix-up in dates. The "thirty-five years of earnest study" takes us back to early 1883. According to statements made about events of that fall, there were supposed to have been two years of "earnest study" running back to 1881 (but we have serious doubts about all stories of that period). Possibly 35 was selected as a round number. But it may be no more accurate than anything else reported by and about Scofield.

The articles or messages actually placed between covers are: Does The Bible Throw Light On This War?, The Prophet, The Ethical Message, The Messiah, The Vision Of The Kingdom, The Prophetic Ministry of Jesus Christ, The Prophetic Message of The Acts, Prophecy In The Epistles, The Revelation, The Last Seven Years Of The Age, and Earth's Golden Age. Below the list of subjects, Scofield placed this note:

As a convenience to the reader, almost every passage of Scripture referred to throughout this book is given, in whole or in part, in the footnotes. And the reader will find that, for his further convenience, the same Scripture material is repeated over and over again in these footnotes, so that he may have constantly before him, without having to turn pages or look up references in his Bible, the Word of God on which this book is based.

A Scripture Index at the end of the book will enable one to find the location of every Scripture passage here discussed; the Topical Index locates many details of prophecy on which God's Word throws light.¹⁹

This, of course, succeeded in inflating the size of the book. Eight pages are nothing but Scripture. Many have but a few lines of Scofield's text. The result is that a typical reader with a Scofield Bible and a copy of *What Do The Prophets Say?* would get the feeling that there was a completely inseparable bond between the Holy Writ and the Tennessean-from-Michigan. In its own little way, the book helped place Scofield's head in the halo which he now wears in so many Dispensational minds.

As we consider this bit of Scofield's writing, it would be well to keep in mind the statement of Brethren writer, F. Roy Coad:

It is here useful to notice one interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to envision their own age as other than the end time. As a consequence beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.²⁰

The messages in this work were written by the Scofield who in 1914 claimed that he rather expected the Rapture to preclude the possibility of physical death.²¹ The whole sense of the messages are that the events of World War I place the church and the world just about at the end of Revelation 3 and approaching the beginning of Revelation 4 as Dispensationally interpreted. As F. Roy Coad said, this belief has required restatement. Dare we say that the very need for restatement suggests that somehow the hand of the Holy Spirit is missing from such interpretation?

If, because of its obsolescence, we are "beating a dead horse" in commenting on it, we do so in order to highlight the inadequacy of Scofield's teaching. Hopefully our analysis will encourage some to remove the halo which he now wears. And since today prophetic teachers in pulpit, pamphlet and television are using similar methods, revised as noted by Coad, we hope that readers will be better able to measure that sort of teaching.

In his first chapter, "Does The Bible Throw Light on The War?", Scofield starts from the usual inaccurate prophetic interpretation of the Image of Daniel 2. He proceeded to relate the war to an imminent and dismal end for the age:

It may, however, be helpful to present in outline the prophetic testimony concerning the end-time of Gentile rule over the earth, taking up throughout this book the proof in detail.

1. The age ends in catastrophe. No prophetic voice describes the end of the "times of the Gentiles" in the peaceful terms which uninspired forecasters in pulpits and newspapers have made familiar. Daniel says that the end "shall be with a flood"; and that "unto the end wars and desolations are determined". The Lord Jesus finds in the Biblical history of the flood, and of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, suited pictures of the end-time of the age. "As it was in the days of Noah." "As it was in the days of Lot." The significance is terrible.²²

All of which may be Darbyism and Scofieldism, but not guaranteed to accurately present the Lord's meaning. He continues the hopelessness:

2. So far as the prophetic Word has spoken there is not the least warrant for the expectation that the nations engaged in the present gigantic struggle will or can make a permanent peace. It is fondly dreamed that out of all the suffering and carnage and destruction of this war will be born such a hatred of war as will bring to pass a federation of the

nations—The United States of the World—in which will exist but one army, and that an international police, rather than an army.

For once there is some correspondence between a popular dream and the prophetic Word. For that word certainly points to a federated world-empire in the end-time of the age. . . .²³

Here again note the remarkably close correspondence between what a prophetic teacher said and what groups and interests like the Carnegie Peace Foundation, the Elites, have wanted for the rest of mankind. Who financed Scofield? Today the prophecy crowd looks to the European Common Market to be the basis of the "End-Time Federation." This writer has worked, socialized and even worshipped with people of the Common Market staff. Such contact confirms the feeling that this association in prophetic minds is somewhat out of reality.

Continuing, Scofield admits that some sort of peace is possible, but he refuses to let down on his fervent hope for doom and suffering:

It is, of course, possible, nay, probable that some temporary truce may end, or suspend for a time, the present world-war, for ten kingdoms will exist at the end-time in the territory once ruled over by Rome. . . .²⁴

We have no evidence that Scofield was gleeful about the prospect, but he surely presses his point.

In chapter 2, "The Prophet," we note an interesting comment on the matter of righteousness:

The primary ministry of the prophets, therefore, was patriotic and intensely ethical. They say peace for Israel only through righteousness (Isa. 32:17, for example). Nothing else would answer. On that high condition and no other would Jehovah throw about the land which he had given to his people the invisible wall of his protection; on that condition and no other should the people be at peace among themselves; on that condition and no other might the individual Israelite be at peace in his own soul. In no part of the Scriptures does the ethical demand rise to greater heights. The Sermon on the Mount is but the ethical teaching of the prophets lifted to its highest potency.²⁵

In the last line quoted, he was following the Dispensational practice of downgrading the Sermon on the Mount in the eyes of the church. And we see a suggestion in Scofield's eyes, that only Israel can really be acceptable to the Holy One.

"The Messiah" is the title of chapter 4. Here again, Scofield allows only gloom and failure for the church age. He looks only beyond, saying: "Amos also testifies to the exaltation of Messiah at his second advent:" (he has no meaning for the passage before that):

"In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old" (Amos 9:11). And here, as in the prophecy of Zechariah, there is no possibility of giving the words figurative inter-

pretation, for the passage is quoted in the New Testament and applied to the return of the Lord (Acts 15:13–18).²⁰

We have noted and will note again that any reasonable interpretation of the “Tabernacle of David” is not literal, but rather an institution raised by a tentmaker endued with power from on high. And that tent though a bit tattered, is a living organism today. Whether Scofield’s failure to note the proper interpretation arose from ignorance or obfuscation, we have no knowledge. But such failure has hurt church and church member.

In Message V, “The Vision of The Kingdom,” Scofield expounds a Dispensational position which is more than demeaning of the power of Our Lord and Saviour:

And even in the millennial kingdom on earth, when Christ is reigning with a rod of iron, not all men will be His willing subjects. There cannot in that age be any “unbelievers” on earth, for Christ will be manifested in glory, and unbelief therefore will be impossible. But there will be those who, hating God, sullenly obey Christ the King.²⁷

That the Lord, physically present on the Earth (a point not firmly supported in Scripture), cannot bring all men to acknowledgement of Him suggests that Scofield has no real vision of the power and majesty of the Lord.

We could go on and on in the analysis of the volume, but the excerpts we have given suggest that the scholarship and the devotion of Scofield leave something to be desired. In the matter of the chronology in both the message and the revised notes, we submit that the claim of scholarship for Scofield’s work is far from correct. He put out works which were designed to promote particular views which were desired by the group who looked to him as their figurehead. But who should this be so strange? Our study has indicated that Scofield had neither the background, the training, nor the time for real scholarship.

In May, Scofield was taken ill, but by June he was able to make the trip to Ashuelot where he spent the summer. On Aug. 5, 1918, he wrote daughter Abigail, replying to a letter of hers. In addition to giving some particulars about the Florida residence, it discusses some family financial matters. The text is:

Aug. 5/18

My dearest Abbie:

Don’t think that I have forgotten the bungalow. I was taken ill in May & that left me in great weakness & I’m only now at my desk again. But I have at least one & I think two pen jobs which will be good for \$500 each. One would raise us to \$1200 & two to \$1700. Would the latter amount suffice? It would here for living room, 2 bedrooms, bath, kitchen & small maid’s room. A “Steel magnate” is building one like that in Florida which I am to have free use of while I live. Shall I send you a sketch of the Plan?

With cordial best wishes to Doctor, & love.

Father²⁸

The wording of the letter gives a very strong impression that cash, not edification of the saints, motivated his writing.

In chapter 16, we noted that Abbie and Edward (Dr. Kellogg) had moved to California after Dr. Kellogg's health failed and he was forced to give up the practice of dentistry. Abbie's post at the San Luis Obispo Library was undoubtedly a matter of financial necessity. From the first sentence of the letter, we gather that in previous correspondence, Abbie had suggested the possibility of financial assistance from her father, who was world-renowned and who had a considerable income from royalties on his writings.

The ailment of "Scofielditis" which he referred to in the 1909 letter to Helene would seem not to have been "cured" by 1918. The mystery of Scofield finances, first mentioned in the relation of the second St. Louis sojourn (chapter 12) remains just beyond satisfactory explanation. But as we near the end of his life, we have a glimmer. In connection with the settlement of Scofield's estate after his demise, a CPA noted the following royalty payments from the legers of Oxford University Press, American branch.²⁹ The years are fiscal, ending March 31 in each instance.)

1917	\$9,975.79
1918	14,891.91
1919	13,541.80
1920	17,908.94
1921	20,028.09

(These figures should be multiplied many times to be comparable to the depreciated currency of the present inflation.)

Many authors with acclaim in the world at large did not do so well. (Edgar Rice Burroughs, Booth Tarkington and Gene Stratton Porter being notable exceptions.) There were royalties to Cyrus from other publishers as well. The rather generous figure, especially the one for fiscal 1918 makes one wonder about the continued delay on father's part in responding to Abigail's need.

In the last week of November 1918, a prophetic conference was held in New York City. The main sessions were in Carnegie Hall on West 57th Street (close to The Lotos Club). A. C. Gaebelein directed and planned the conference. Scofield was invited to speak, but he declined. He did attend one session and sat on the platform. Gaebelein later reported, "His feebleness was apparent to all."³⁰

This was the conference where R. A. Torrey waxed rapturous over anarchy and upset:

Autocracy is a dangerous thing; anarchy is a far more dangerous thing. But as I hear the low rumblings of the thunder of the coming

storm, as I go over to the East Side of New York, as I go across the river in Chicago, as I walk the streets of Milwaukee, as I go down the Los Angeles streets and see the soap box orators of the I.W.W., my heart is not heavy, not a bit. When men's hearts are quaking for fear, says our Lord Jesus, look up, for your redemption draweth nigh. The Lord is coming.

Oh, how those words ought to thrill our hearts. He is coming! Perhaps within a year, perhaps in a month, perhaps in a day, perhaps tonight. Would you be glad if right here now before another song is sung, or anything is done, there should burst suddenly upon this audience the voice of the archangel, the trump of God, the shout of command?³¹

Now this hardly sounds like the concern which the Lord expressed as He forecast suffering for Jerusalem. It is so lacking in human compassion. Yet, this is entirely in the milieu of the movement to which Scofield's name and fame is applied.

Trumbull reports that in January 1919, Scofield received a letter from France stating that he had been elected to membership in the Societe Academique d'Histoire Internationale, a part of the Academie Francaise (L'Institut de France). As reported, a medal of membership and a diploma came with the notification. The diploma read (as translated):

International Academic History Society
Founded in 1903

Certified in conformity to the Law of
1 July 1901, NO. 154,142

50, Boulevard St. Jacques, 50 Paris
Perpetual Honorary President

Mr. Frederic Mistral

Commander of the Legion of Honor
Awards a Founding Member Diploma to

Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield
Paris, 6 February 1919

The President
Officer of the Legion of Honor
Vicount de Faries

Officer of the Secretary General
of Public Instruction³²

Whatever Scofield's actual reaction to the diploma was, neither he nor his associates thought it worthy of notice in the prestigious newspaper, *The New York Times*. The first public notice of the award appeared in the Palatka, Florida *NEWS*.³³ Palatka was, as noted, not far from Scofield's winter residence at Crescent City. The appearance of the story late in March 1919 coincided with Trumbull's visit which produced the work discussed in the next chapter. On April 3, *The Dallas Morning News*, owned by a member of First Church, picked up the story. It, of course, appeared in Trumbull's articles and book. After that, silence. And the present whereabouts of the medal is unknown.

It is not at either Dallas Seminary nor the present Scofield Memorial Church.

And there are several unresolved flaws in the story. Note that in the alleged text of the diploma, the French poet, Frederic Mistral (who had passed on in 1914), is identified as "Mr." That is just not the true writing of anyone connected with the Academie Francaise. We found no reference anywhere to the "Société Académique d'Histoire Internationale." All that the present staff of the Academy could tell us was that the Societe had gone out of existence in 1920. From a copy of the alleged diploma, they could give us no detail of the group, nor any clue as to why Scofield would be honored.³⁴ They noted that M. Mistral had no connection with the Academy.

Note that ever since the French Revolution, official and academic France has been committed to a philosophy today called "humanistic" and is and has been complete at variance with any ideas represented by Fundamental Christianity. The reports on the medal gave accurate highlights about the founding of the Academy, itself, by Cardinal Richelieu in 1635, but offered no reason why the Scofield Reference Bible fit in such company. The fact that the alleged medal went unnoticed after the original faint splash in 1919, makes us have very serious questions about the whole business. And our review of Scofield's magnum opus (note the title of this chapter) makes it unlikely that any scholar connected in any way with the Academy would have awarded anything to Scofield.

CHAPTER 35 NOTES

1. Letter to the writer from Rev. John D. Meyer, pastor of the church in the 1970's.
2. Originally published in *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamentum* 1650-1654. Ussher was a bishop in Ireland; was in England at the time of the Civil War. While never fully accepting the Puritan position, he was given a post by Cromwell. He never returned to Ireland. His chronology, while loyal to the Word, has been made obsolete by modern Bible-believing scholarship. It was sufficiently out-of-date in 1917 that Scofield should never have placed it in his new edition.
3. Allis' work was *Prophecy and The Church*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945.
4. Scofield, *What Do The Prophets Say?*, The Sunday School Times Co., 1918, p. 142.
5. Allis, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 307.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 268.
8. Cornelius R. Stam, *The New Scofield Reference Bible, An Appraisal*, The Berean Bible Society, Chicago, 1967, p. 8.
9. The writers count of the notes in the Allis work cited.
10. Noted in *Christ's Kingdom and Coming*, with an analysis of Dispensationalism, Eerdmans, 1957.
11. James M. Gray, "A Tribute to Rev. C. I. Scofield," *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, Sept. 1921, p. 552.
12. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

13. According to military records of the State of New York and the National Archives.
14. *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, November 9, 1917. Supplied by the Missouri Historical Society.
15. Quoted by Charles G. Trumbull in *Prophecy's Light on Today*, Revell, New York, 1937, p. 67. Trumbull merely quotes the phrase, but gives no details of the circumstances. We do not know whether the letter has survived.
16. See Scofield's letter of August 5, 1918, quoted above. The steel magnate could have been one of the Mosher family of Dallas, whose role in the Mosher Steel Company and the Scofield Church have already been noted.
17. Luther Rees in *The Central American Bulletin*, No. 188, Sept. 15, 1921, p. 3.
18. Scofield, *What Do The Prophets Say?*, The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1918, p. 5.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
20. F. Roy Coad, *Prophetic Developments*, The Brethren Research Fellowship, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 10.
21. See report of the 1914 Conference in chapters 35 and 36.
22. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
28. Original letter in possession of Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison, Kansas.
29. Data in the file of the Scofield estate, Surrogate's Office, Queens County, N. Y. See chapter 40.
30. A. C. Gaebelein, "The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible," *Moody Monthly*, January 1943, p. 65.
31. A. C. Gaebelein, editor, *Christ and Glory*, Publication Office, Our Hope. R. A. Torrey. *That Blessed Hope*, p. 33.
32. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 105.
33. Copies of the Palatka, Florida *NEWS* for early 1919 are not extant and cannot be checked to confirm the report carried by the Dallas paper in April.
34. Letters from Bibliotheque d'L'Institut de France to the writer.

CHAPTER 36

“Paul and Timothy” or The Role of Charles G. Trumbull

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine.”

II Tim. 4:2,3a

A photograph of C. I. Scofield and Charles G. Trumbull, sitting and talking in the Florida sun at the Southfield Bible Conference in Crescent City, has been reproduced in several books. Informally titled “Paul and Timothy,” it has created an implied association with Trumbull’s visit to Scofield in 1919. The exact date of the photograph has not been established, but the feebleness which was reported during Scofield’s appearance in Cargenie Hall in November 1918 is not apparent.

The “Paul and Timothy” allusion is heightened in the photograph because Trumbull, either actually or by careful posing, looks much younger than a man in his 40’s. (Trumbull was in his 40’s when he made the 1919 visit.) The photograph and caption create the impression that the two men had a relationship much like that which existed between the Apostle and Timothy, as noted in the two epistles.

Apparently the “steel magnate’s” bungalow had been completed by the time that Scofield reached Crescent City in the winter of 1919, so Trumbull had a place to stay. His visit was for more than a few days as it had a definite purpose. Trumbull interviewed Scofield to gather material for a series of articles on Scofield’s life and work which appeared in *The Sunday School Times* between May and September of that year.

In 1920, Oxford University Press picked up the articles, and issued them in book form as *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield*. The book is the only attempt at biographical coverage of Fundamentalism’s most popular figure, and remarkably the circulation of the book may have been quite limited. Copies are virtually unobtainable in the active market for used religious classics.

A study of what Trumbull accomplished during his visit to Crescent City provides another dimension for measuring man, men and movement. The various references “Trumbull, *op. cit.*” in this work must have already suggested that Trumbull’s sketch of Scofield is a most

unusual venture in biography. Trumbull was probably the most competent religious journalist on the American scene in the first half of the 20th Century. He had spent his entire career, since his graduation from Yale in 1893, in religious journalism, combined with conference speaking and the writing of tracts and books.

The writing which came from the Trumbull visit to Crescent City in 1919 is quite different from the other writing which bears his name. *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield* (we have worked from the book, not the magazine articles) is peppered with inaccuracies. Our check shows more than 38 errors in the 130 pages which make up the book form of the story. Several can be explained by careless editing. Some may be due to interpretation as lengthy narratives were condensed to the space allotment of the articles. But there are evident problems in accounting for some of the shortcomings. There are a number of discrepancies for which the most ready explanation would be deliberate fabrication. They cannot be fitted into the category of an aging man's faulty memory. We do not accuse; fabrication is so utterly characteristic of Fundamental Christianity.

In November, Scofield had been noted as physically feeble, but even two years after the interview, visitors noted that his mind was clear. If he did have a clear mind and reasonable memory in early 1919, he must bear the responsibility for being inaccurate. If Trumbull was more interested in story than fact, his integrity must be placed on the line. Was the departure from fact a joint collaboration of Scofield and Trumbull? How much did the school leaders, the church officials, the evangelists know of the careless story-telling?

Inconsistencies in the Trumbull narration have been noted chapter by chapter. The reader, by now, may consider that his attempt was not serious or definitive biography. But there are certain discrepancies which deserve particular comment.

On page 25 (these references are to pages in the book) speaking of Scofield in the 1870's, Trumbull said: "He had, indeed, become very much dissatisfied with his own life; he was not living up to even his own ideals, unconverted man that he was."¹ In the light of the St. Louis Court records and the *Atchison Patriot*, Trumbull's statement is convenient judgment after the fact.

On page 30, Trumbull notes regarding Scofield's conversion: "But the facts have been given here as they actually occurred and as Dr. Scofield wants them known."² Passing over the propriety of the use of "Dr.," note from chapter 12 herein, that the "facts" Trumbull wrote down, apparently with Scofield's blessing, do not agree with the data in official public records. What Trumbull related may have been only what Scofield wanted known. Our investigation suggests that it departs substantially from unvarnished truth. In the previous line, Trumbull wrote:

There have been all sorts of inaccurate and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr. Scofield, passing from mouth to mouth. Some of them have gained currency, and as he says, himself, he long ago gave up hope of correcting or denying them!

Sounds like "Paul and Timothy" were attempting to "stonewall." But apparently there were some who could not accept the Scofield story even when he was still alive.

The relation of the Civil War period in previous chapters speaks for itself. But we remain amazed that some Confederate veteran who also received the Cross of Honor failed to call Scofield or Trumbull on its proper significance.

Note that Trumbull and Scofield worked out a story of his life between 1866 and 1874 that left the impression of his being a bachelor even though that word was not used. The very careful use of language did not result from hasty note taking, nor were these the ramblings of an aged mind. The specific word bachelor was not used, but the treatment leaves an impression completely at variance with facts.

It is not now possible to determine whether Scofield or Trumbull or someone else originated the story of the alleged period of drunkenness. The value of a story of a victorious bout with demon rum has been noted.⁴ George Marsden has noted the social significance of the interplay between Fundamentalism and "demon rum."⁵

Trumbull's claim of a two-year term as district attorney is not a simple mistake. Here again, it is not possible to ascertain whether Scofield had been using two years instead of six months or whether the time was selected during the "Paul and Timothy" session.

When the results of the interview reached publishable form, they included, as a "Confederate reminiscence," what we have referred to as the "Conkling Incident." From page 128 of the book, note:

Another Confederate reminiscence which appeals to Dr. Scofield's sense of humor is in connection with a formal dinner that he attended, to which Senator Roscoe Conkling had been invited. The Senator failed to appear until quite late, and then came, in immaculate evening dress of course, to join the rest who had been expectantly waiting his arrival. "In his oracular and ponderous way" says Dr. Scofield, "the great statesman explained his delay: 'The senior Senator from Massachusetts (Sumner) has just been making his annual attempt to enact a law to abolish the distinction made by God Almighty between black and white.'"⁶

No doubt Scofield attended a dinner in Washington addressed by Conkling. But it did not take place during a period that would make it proper to be called a "Confederate reminiscence."

The flaws in the story cleared by Scofield and published by Trumbull are:

1. Roscoe Conkling (R-N.Y.) did not become senator until 1867—after the War. As suggested before, the dinner was probably in late June or July 1873 in the period covered by chapter 9.
2. If Scofield had been still in the Army of Northern Virginia, as Trumbull averred on his page 9, up to April 1865, he had *no* business being in the “enemy” capitol during the War, hence could not properly have attended a dinner in Washington at any time between 1862 and 1865.
3. There is no record of Scofield in the Army of Northern Virginia after September 1862, so if he were near Appomattox on April 9, 1865, as claimed in the Trumbull story, he must have been fulfilling some other role.
4. The references to being in Washington, placed under the heading “Confederate reminiscences” hint that between 1862 and 1865, he had a role that gave him facility in crossing the battle lines from side to side, almost at will, or as ordered by some “higher up.” We know of but one possible role where this would have been possible.
5. The last sentence quote is interesting. Is it a hint at a position now called “racist”? But Conkling was associated with the liberals who had pushed the North into war. Was his “liberalism” only for political effect?

Trumbull’s narrative at this point is, in relation to the rest of his text, extremely clumsy. Possibly Scofield had been “carried away” in “raconteuring” to Trumbull. Something may have been put down which was too “hot” for the Dispensational clientele in 1919. When Scofield checked the galleys, he saw something that had to be deleted. A clumsy rewrite thus may have been necessary. The rewrite, if it occurred, is so clumsy that it may hint at more than it covers. Fortunately for Scofield and Trumbull, Dispensationalists, lay and cleric, are rarely history buffs or Civil War buffs. The Dispensational thought pattern was insurance which meant no one saw that the story was brimming over with discrepancies.

Note further that Senator Conkling was the first prominent figure in the political life of our Republic to openly flaunt an adulterous relationship. Christian edification might well have suggested omitting mention of Conkling, entirely.

On his page 125, Trumbull said:

Dr. Scofield loves all nature—not only men and women and children, but the whole created world, still so beautiful in spite of what Satan and sinners have done to mar God’s work.⁷

Much of the truth of that statement is belied by his treatment, during their growing years, of Abigail and Marie Helene. There is firm evidence that during years when a growing family needs both parents, Cyrus was neglecting them financially and posing as a bachelor. He accepted without murmur the denial of visitation rights. Then, posing as a new benedict, wed to someone else, he continued to accept the legal bar until the rights became moot with the girls’ legal majorities.

While Victorian attitudes still prevailed when both Abigail and Marie Helene were married, we must still question Cyrus' willingness to avoid being involved in either wedding. Even the letters we have referred to, sent to the girls, fail to support Trumbull's claim which may have been an attempt to create the image of a "Progressive Era" St. Francis of Assisi.

The only references to Noel so far discovered are on Trumbull's page 127, where he has Noel playing with his father's watch, (a human interest note which should have pleased female Dispensationalists) and the reference in the September 30, 1909, letter to Marie Helene. In the letter, Scofield hardly showed greater concern for this son than he had for his daughters. The complete absence of reference to Noel during the years when Scofield carried the boxes of notebooks back and forth across the Atlantic belies "love for children," especially his own. There is a suggestion of Dispensational lack of perception in Trumbull's stance.

Trumbull, in his chapter X, beginning on page 108, gets rather garbled on Scofield's Transatlantic wanderings. He has the Scofields apparently in Europe on a trip between the 1904 and 1907 journeys. The implied trip cannot be fitted in between the appearances of Scofield in Dallas recorded in First Church minutes (checked by BeVier). But the poor structure of Trumbull's story made a base for Gaebelein's later attempt to place Scofield in Europe in 1906 when he was actually at Lake Orion, Oakland County, Michigan.⁸

On his page 99, Trumbull refers to the conference which Scofield discussed in his letter of 7 August 1908 to Lyman Stewart.⁹ But he plays down the role of the other editors as he wanted to build up the image of Scofield as the principal creator of the Great Opus. To promote man, work or both, Trumbull said:

The man who gave his lifetime study to the making of the notes and comments in the Scofield Reference Bible was concerned only to *find and state exactly what the Bible itself had to say* on any and every point.¹⁰

The statement is incorrect on a number of counts. First, we have shown that he did *not* give a life of study to the notes. (We know some who say he did *nothing* toward the notes.) The comment in no way describes the notes, as Scofield studiously avoids comment on any passage relating to either divorce or family responsibility. The notes fall very far short of commenting on "any and every point." Matthew Henry does comment on the Scripture in the manner claimed by Trumbull, but not Scofield.

Either Trumbull was writing a blurb with the reckless abandon of an advertising man, or else he later lost his affection for *The Scofield Reference Bible*. In his introduction to an edition of Matthew Henry's *Commentary*, written on April 15, 1935, Trumbull said:

Matthew Henry digs deep down below the surface of God's Word; he sees truths hidden from most of us until he has shown them. He finds the most practical applications of God's wisdom in our everyday life; and applications also from the successes and failures of the men and women who live before us in the pages of the Bible.¹¹

Trumbull goes on and says:

The Commentary is in constant use by the undersigned and other members of the editorial staff of *The Sunday School Times*.

While some people attempt to utilize both *The Scofield Reference Bible* and the *Matthew Henry Commentary*, the views on many important issues are so divergent that compatibility is almost impossible.¹² The use of Matthew Henry by the staff of *The Sunday School Times* suggests that the laity have been left with a work that is less than quality.

The most reasonable view of the result of the "Paul and Timothy" collaboration at Crescent City in the late winter of 1919 is that the two men collaborated to produce a story, a story which blithely disregarded fact. It may have helped promote *The Scofield Reference Bible*.

Trumbull did complete the interviews, then took the train back to Philadelphia. From his notes came the story which would become the book we have today. But the time Trumbull had his work ready for checking, Scofield was most likely back in Douglaston. We noted at least one place where hasty revision may have been made. Most of the issues of *The Sunday School Times* came out during the period Scofield usually spent at Crestwood.

There is every indication that both men were well satisfied with the production. But we hold that the story is the worst attempt at "biography" outside the political realm which came out in the early 20th Century. As a religious biography, it is unique, especially in the light of the professions of the movement to which author and subject belonged. Trumbull, with Scofield's assistance, used a pitchfork to do a "snow" job.

CHAPTER 36 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
3. *Ibid.*
4. See chapter 14.
5. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Oxford, 1980, especially chapter XXIII.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 128. Incidentally, Conkling's paramour was Kate Chase Sprague, daughter of Lincoln's secretary of the treasury, Salmon P. Chase. Kate had been exposed to the group who welcomed and accepted The Secret Six.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
8. Gaebelein, *Moody Monthly*, February 1943, p. 344.

9. See chapter 29.
10. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 81.
11. Introduction to *Matthew Henry's Commentary of the Whole Bible*, Fleming H. Revell Co. Trumbull's note is dated April 15, 1935, so the edition was either 1935 or 1936.
12. Gaebelein was very ready to run down Matthew Henry's views on prophecy, using Dispensationalism as the bench mark.

CHAPTER 37

Gathered Unto His Fathers

*"Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea."*

Tennyson

Scofield returned to Crescent City, Florida, for the winter of 1919-1920. Evidently his mind was still very active even if he was failing physically. He was thinking of a revision of the Scofield notes. He wrote Gaebelein on March 22, 1920

My dear Gaebelein:

Thanks for telegram and letter from Galveston, I am greatly encouraged. Here are my thoughts concerning the work which you have so kindly consented to take upon your already overburdened shoulders: To

- (1) call my attention to any passage
 - (a) needing a better rendering (in Margin)
 - (b) particularly difficult passages which I have passed over,
or
- (2) any editorial matter in which I seem to you to have erred.

The copy which you will thus help to make more useful will be reset, but the Oxford people desire to preserve the present facsimile idea as carried out in the octavo and duo editions now out. A broad margin edition will be issued. Again thanking you,

Yours as ever

C. I. Scofield¹

This communication appears to have had no circulation among the Dispensational public until Gaebelein wrote his sketch in 1942-43. And the sketch first appeared serially in a magazine, attracting little attention. The letter (and we have no other correspondence) suggests that in the minds of Scofield and Gaebelein, even with the revision of 1917, they had not produced a truly quality work.

The need for continual revision reminds us of none other than Charles Darwin who was continually revising his major work. Gary North notes of *Origin of Species*:

The sixth edition was so far removed from the first that something like 75 percent of the first was rewritten by the final edition—rewritten as many as five times each, in the case of some sentences. The sixth edition was one-third longer than the first.²

Hardly evidence of developed thought of real assurance of values.

The willingness of those who master-minded *The Scofield Reference Bible* to revise, and to do so often, makes the heavy praise heaped on the work by Trumbull and Fundamentalist leaders over the years seem a bit trashy. And there is a moral responsibility also. If the notes were so badly in need of revision, then the leaders were derelict in allowing generations of Christians to have their religious thinking and their view of Biblical teaching shaped by notes greatly in need of revision. Unless, of course, they wanted an immature body of believers.

Our own study makes it evident that The Scofield Notes do not do justice to the Scriptures and are in many cases highly biased and sectarian comment. The whole thing makes clear the utter impropriety of linking the Eternal Word so closely with the comments of fallible men. The complacency with which the group around Scofield were willing to bring the Scriptures down to the level of men suggests that the group were afflicted with a strong case of "victory over humility."

Actually, despite the interest expressed to Gaebelein, nothing tangible resulted and the *Scofield Reference Bible's* notes remained intact until the revision of 1967. By 1920 Scofield was physically unable to really take on such a project. He returned to Douglaston in the Spring of 1920. There are no published reports of Scofield and his travels, if any, for the rest of 1920.

Luther Rees visited Scofield in Douglaston in January 1921. He reported that Scofield was not in good health, but that his mind was still clear. Rees mentioned that a book of Scofield's sermons was being put together.³ While the book of sermons was not issued until after Scofield's death, its foreword was written in February 1921, shortly after the visit of Luther Rees.

The collection was entitled *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield*, and was issued by Oxford University Press. The foreword read:

My withdrawal from pastoral work that I might prepare for publication the Scofield Reference Bible, made possible the larger pulpit ministry to which many doors in the United States, England, Scotland, the North of Ireland and Canada were open. From that ministry this book is a selection. Some sermons preached to my own people in Dallas, Texas, and East Northfield, Massachusetts, are also included.⁴

The dedication was an utterly appropriate dedication for a pastor and husband:

To
HETTIE
My Cherished Wife
And Co-Worker
Through So Many, Many Years,
I Dedicate This Book⁵

But there are intimations that Scofield held some quite different sentiments, sentiments expressed privately. We have a transcript of a letter dated May 4, 1921. If the transcript accurately copies Scofield's words, the letter written in Douglaston and sent to daughter Abigail in San Luis Obispo contains statements utterly out of keeping with the ideals of the movement with which Scofield's name is linked.

The original of that letter was held by Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison, Kansas, after Abigail Kellogg died in 1958. In January of 1974, Mr. Mize sent me a packet of Scofield memorabilia, including the original of the May 4, 1921, letter, to Dallas Theological Seminary. Receipt of that material was acknowledged by Dr. John A. Witmer, librarian of the Seminary Library in his letter of January 23, 1974, to Mr. Mize. A pertinent paragraph reads:

I have glanced at the collection, but have not had the opportunity as yet to examine it in detail and to place any valuation on it. From my preliminary glance I feel that it would probably be best to turn the material over to Scofield Memorial Church. If I do that, I will indicate to them my valuation of the material for tax purposes and they will issue you a tax deductible gift receipt.

Dr. Witmer concluded his letter:

I do appreciate you much (*sic*) your willingness to make this material available either to Dallas Seminary or to Scofield Church. I can assure you that it will be preserved and used in further research on Dr. Scofield's life.

Rather remarkably, in the light of Dr. Witmer's statement to Mr. Mize, when this writer visited Dallas, first in 1979, and again in 1982, neither the seminary, nor the church were able to produce any Scofield memorabilia. (The sanctuary of the Scofield Church was destroyed by fire in 1976 and replaced by a new edifice on Abrams Road in 1980. The writer has been assured by Pastor Ashcraft that no Scofield memorabilia nor Church historical records were harmed in the fire of 1976.)

If the text reproduced below is accurate, and we feel that it is, it may have been considered necessary, in order to preserve a facade of integrity, to destroy that material which Dr. Witmer acknowledged on January 23, 1974. The style, abbreviations, and punctuation agree with Scofield's style in other letters which we have seen in the original. We consider it unlikely that anyone "making up" a letter would be able or careful enough to recreate Scofield's own style. The letter reads:

May 4/21

Douglaston Road
Douglaston, Long Island, N. Y.

My dearest Abbie:

Since your last letter came I have had spells of rather severe illness with intervals of lethargy—perhaps I should say laziness—and these, all

together, have kept my pen out of use. I forgive myself—too easily no doubt—for not summoning enough energy to write letters on the ground that despite giving no proof of it I have never lived so much in my love for you & Helen & L.M. as during these months of growing infirmity and—shall I say? uselessness.

Some work is going on, per secretary, mostly, but will soon end. I have prepared a book of my sermons which were preached here & there in the homeland and in England, Ireland, & Scotland. It will make a book of 320 pages. A copy will of course be sent you & Doctor. It will be called "With Dr. C. I. Scofield in Many Pulpits". I shall be glad if you will read the address which I gave in Wellington Hall, Belfast, on the Sunday following the loss of the Titanic. That ship was built in Belfast and many Belfast lives were lost in her sinking. I reached there Saturday (she sank Wednesday) and the Lord Mayor asked me to give the address at the memorial meeting arranged for Sunday afternoon. I spoke on "The Unsinkable Ship". They had called the "Titanic" by that name! I said that the only unsinkable ship in history was a frail boat on a stormy lake in Galilee, and it was unsinkable because the Lord of heaven & earth was asleep on her—etc. etc. etc.

A word about your bungalow—which is I suppose waiting realization for that third thousand dollars. How I long to start it on its way to you! Since beginning this letter it has come to me clearly that my fault lies in not really trusting *God* to give it to me. Instead I have been trying to "make" it. Lets pray together—you in Sam Luis Obispo, I in Douglaston—and it will surely come to one or the other of us. I believe with absolute conviction in the communion of saints—so do you, but you also believe in their intercession. Now I say in all reverence & seriousness, why don't you seek the special intercession of the San Luis in whose name-town you live? You surely will *not* accuse or suspect me of any lack of sincerity in this. Ah! *Now* we shall get that \$1000. And our Heavenly Father loves us so that He might very likely add another five hundred to the thousand. Oh! but it will make me happy when it comes. We Scofields are home lovers. I can't bear to think of your increasing years under rented roofs. Mrs. Ingalls wrote me that Helen's husband had inherited a comfortable home. Thank God! Helen saw my home & will be able to tell you that it has the comforts which an aged man (78 in August!) needs. What a God and Father we have. Now do write me, Dearie. With love to Dr. Kellogg & to the L.M. if she is still with you.

Papa

Several statements in the letter are quite remarkable, especially if written by a man who has been built up as a remarkable saint in the Fundamentalist hagiography. Such as:

Despite giving no proof of it I have never lived so much in my love for you & Helen & L.M. as during these months of growing infirmity and—shall I say? uselessness.

And: "With love to Dr. Kellogg & to the L.M. if she is still with you." "L.M." refers, of course to Leontine. If as hinted, there was still some feeling for Leontine, the marriage to Hettie becomes a sham. And why the divorce?