

tent for the luxury of John Pirie's Estate at Sea Cliff, Long Island, to revel further in balmy days when supposedly mature men discussed the prospect of suffering, repression and devastation for others not so fortunate as to be on John Pirie's invitation list. Gaebelien quotes:

God help us to meet the seriousness of the days in which we live, with an apostate Church, an unnourished Body, a lost world, and an impending advent as our environment.⁹

Since we can write about the letter nearly 80 years after it was written, it would seem that the "impending advent" idea is wearing a bit thin, even though it has helped spread apostasy and devastation over the world.

BeVier, overlooking the Sea Cliff sojourn, comments that during 1906, Scofield was in almost continuous contact (mostly by mail, postage 2c an ounce) with his seven consulting editors.¹⁰ Nothing has come to light which provides any clue as to Scofield's reasons for selecting the individuals so designated. They were:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Arno C. Gaebelien: | "Prophecy Buff", lecturer, editor and writer |
| Henry G. Weston: | Crozier Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. |
| William J. Erdman: | Presbyterian minister and author |
| James M. Gray: | President, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago |
| Arthur T. Pierson: | Author, editor, pastor. Sometime pastor of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London |
| W. P. Moorehead: | President, Xenia Theological Seminary, Xenia, Ohio |
| Elmore Harris: | President, Toronto Bible Institute, Toronto, Canada. ¹¹ |

Gaebelien, super "prophecy buff" with prophetic views identical to Scofield's was the specialist on prophecy as confirmed by that 1905 letter from The Lotos Club. In his relation, Gaebelien notes that Scofield told him that he exchanged many letters with Dr. W. J. Erdman about the term "kingdom" and its use in the New Testament.¹²

In September 1906, Scofield wrote the church in Dallas of his intention to go to London for more study. The research was ostensibly required in the preparation of the Scofield notes.¹³ The church responded by continuing the existing arrangement until the following April, later extending it to the end of 1907. Scofield, after receiving confirmation of the extensions, departed for Europe with Hettie and the notebooks. (We do not know how Miss Pohle occupied her time while two-thirds of the trio were traveling. Still no word of Noel.)

Gaebelien was not the only one who, in relating the Scofield story, was "mixed up" at this point. Trumbull was also inaccurate and, in fact, may have provided the basis for Gaebelien's mix-up, made 23 years later. On his page 97, Trumbull declares that Scofield stayed in Europe two years. The statement is impossible, as it conflicts with

church records and would make impossible the completion of the Bible as it was actually produced.¹⁴

The 1903 reference Scofield made to the Horse Guards suggests that by 1906 he was more familiar with London than most American clergymen of the period. But apparently he had not been to Oxford. He did visit the city in 1906. But we have no hint as to how he reacted to the "City of Bells" when he was there late in 1906.

One may not agree with much that is, and has been, taught at Oxford, but one cannot help being affected by the city itself. More than a generation later, Sheldon Vanauken described the way he and Jean felt when they were there in the 1950's:

Meanwhile, we explored Oxford's grey magic, Oxford "that sweet City with her dreaming spires", Oxford and all the country round, sometimes on our bikes, sometimes on foot. . . .

Coming back to Oxford, we were always, it seemed, greeted by the sound of bells: bells everywhere striking the hour or bells from some tower change-ringing, filling the air with a singing magic. We explored every cranny of this city of enchanting crannies and unexpected breathtaking views of towers and spires. We were conscious all the time of the strong intellectual life of a thousand years. Despite the modern laboratories, Oxford is still "breathing the last enchantments of the middle ages"; this wall part of a great abbey; the Benedictines built the long, lovely buildings that are part of one college quad; the narrow passage where we bought tea things has been called Friars Pantry for centuries; the Colleges bear names like Christ Church and Mary Magdalen and Corpus Christi, and the bells with their lovely clamour have rung through the centuries.

Imperceptibly the ages of faith, when men really believed, when the soaring spires carried their eyes and thoughts up to God, became real to us, not something in a book. . . .¹⁵

In the milieu which generated the Scofield phenomenon, reactions like those of the Vanaukens would have been considered either irrelevant or "worldly." Trumbull describes the Scofield days in Oxford:

Here the treasures of the Oxford libraries were fully at the disposal of the man who was making himself a Bible scholar by mastering the Bible scholarship of the world. He was by no means content to limit his studies and researches to constructive and believing Bible scholarship. He covered the whole field of such scholarship, whether friendly or unfriendly to the Bible. He wanted to know at first-hand all the critics claimed to have done, and he was open to any light that their scholarly researches might, known or unknown to themselves, throw upon the Word of God. He found Prof. Dr. William Sanday, an outstanding scholarly critic, gracious in his readiness to confer. So also with the more extreme critic, Prof. S. R. Driver. Of the conservative Bible scholars abroad, Dr. Scofield gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Profs. A. H. Sayce and David Samuel Margoliouth, of Oxford, and to Mr. Walter Scott, the eminent Bible teacher.¹⁶

Profs. Sayce and Driver were, according to some reports, considered conservative. Margoliouth was noted as being "eccentric."¹⁷ As for Walter

Scott, like so many others in the Brethren lineage, we know absolutely nothing about him. Even the library of his native city, Bristol, could tell us nothing. Were it not for the Scofield visit we might suspect a *nom de plume*.

A serious flaw in the whole Oxford story slipped out during the great Memorial Service for Scofield held in Dallas in November 1921. at that time, Irving Carroll noted:

I sought to get him to talk of his visits to Oxford University and to hear from his lips something of the conversation around the faculty table in the dining hall. Little would he ever say and always was anxious to turn the conversation into other channels.¹⁸

Carroll's comment gives a bit of substance to a suspicion which lurks behind Trumbull's relation. There really wasn't much research nor discussion of theological issues. We hold to this position despite the purpose declared by Trumbull:

It was Dr. Scofield's deliberate purpose to put himself under obligation to the entire field of modern Bible study and scholarship. All through his labors on the Reference Bible he was consulting, either by correspondence or personal interview, the leading scholarly and spiritual Bible students of different lands.¹⁹

If our suspicion is correct, then much of Trumbull's chapter IX, "The Debt To Scholarship," from which these quotes were taken, is propaganda designed to promote a work to a place far beyond its merits, intrinsic or otherwise. Trumbull's statement: "He covered the whole field of such scholarship, whether friendly or unfriendly to the Bible"²⁰ becomes patently impossible. Its improbability should have been evident to Evangelicals long ere this.

It is possible that there were some suspicious ones even while Trumbull wrote. Carried away by his effort to establish valid scholarship, Trumbull says (we repeat the quotation):

Did the sojourns in Great Britain and elsewhere in Europe make any real contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible, apart from the opportunity they gave of freedom from interruption in the work? Could not this Reference Bible just as well have been made at home without stepping foot out of the United States?²¹

Actually the more one considers the ideas that made up this work, the more one studies the reported travels, the stronger the suspicion is that *no* genuine scholarship was involved. The two trips to Europe may have been purely for effect. The effect was greatly heightened by the laborious transportation of the boxes of notebooks.

But was Oxford really a place where one devoted to Jesus Christ could get the advice, the assistance which would honor the Lord? David Fountain has commented on the Evangelical influence at Oxford as it would have been felt at the time Scofield visited:

In England evangelicals were anxious to impress society. They had been kept out of Oxford and Cambridge, and when they were let in they tried to make an impression by their academic attainments. Theology was studied in precisely the same way as mathematics, history or science. The fatal mistake was made of approaching this Book as any other book, by studying it only to gain credit with the world. "Desiring to be teachers of the law . . ." They approached this Book in a way in which it was never intended to be approached—in order to impress the world. But the same mistake is still being made, and shows little sign of abating.²²

How safe was that Oxford for an intellectually agile but untrained cleric from the hinterlands of the American continent?

And a negative influence from the Oxford climate was spelled out in the Introduction to the Scofield Bible when it came out in 1909. On the second page of the Introduction, Scofield acknowledged the influence of two Oxford Biblical scholars, Hort and Westcott. At the time of Scofield's visit (and it has continued to this day), many professional theologians were permeated or should we say mesmerized by the textual views of these two men.

A comment of the Rev. Terrence Brown of the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, spells out the matter:

In the 1860's the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus became available to Biblical scholars, and in 1881 Westcott and Hort advanced the theory that the New Testament text was preserved in an almost perfect state in these two fourth century manuscripts.

Westcott and Hort devised an elaborate theory, based more on imagination and intuition than upon evidence, elevating this little group of MSS to the heights of almost infallible authority. Their treatise on the subject and their edition of the Greek N.T. exercised a powerful and far-reaching influence, not only on the next generation of students and scholars, but also directly upon the minds of millions who have had neither the ability, nor the time, nor the inclination to submit the theory to a searching examination.

Those who do so will find that the whole theory was based upon a fundamental error, namely the assumption that the reliability of these 4th century documents was in proportion to their age. There were no doubt bad copies in every age, some corrupted by accident, some by ignorance and some by design. These two exhibit the most amazing number of incorrect readings.²³

Generations of Biblical scholars have followed the Westcott and Hort trail. No doubt for some the original conditioning to accept Westcott and Hort came while they were using Scofield. Unfortunately, Scofield was not trained in Greek, so in the textual area, he may have been more of a disservice than a help.

In a history of the City of Dallas, published in 1909 while Scofield still had ties in the area, it is stated that Scofield lectured in a number of spots in the British Isles and to English speaking audiences in Rome,

Paris and Berlin.²⁴ Now, one cannot research and still travel around to lecture. Since the entire junket could not have lasted more than seven months, any lecture time would have meant that much less time for research and for writing. Conspicuous transport of boxes of notebooks could not make up for time spent digging into accumulated volumes of past years.

The same Dallas source has Scofield working in the Library founded by John Calvin in Geneva.²⁴ (Trumbull places Calvin's Library at Lausanne, not Geneva.)²⁵ Quite frankly, the more one studies the travel story, the more one gets the impression that it could have been created to give an impression of someone who was everywhere, doing everything, all the time.

The Scofields, man, woman, luggage and notebooks, did end up at Montreux, Switzerland.²⁶ According to Trumbull, Scofield engaged in further study. But he relates this to a two-year stay. This two-year stay, claimed by several sources, is disproven by the fact that they started back to the United States in the Spring of 1907, far less than a year after leaving New York.

The port of departure from Europe was determined by a matter of a more convenient way of handling those boxes of notebooks. They sailed from the port of Boulogne, France.²⁷ When this writer read of the embarkation at Boulogne, he was skeptical to the point of unbelief. Boulogne could not handle trans-Atlantic liners: Through contact with the leading historian of trans-Atlantic steamship services, Mr. N. R. P. Bonsor,²⁸ it was learned that just at the time the Scofields and their boxes made the 1907 return to the States, two steamship lines, Holland-American and Hamburg-American (HAPAG), experimented with calls by certain ships at Boulogne en route to New York.²⁹ And just as Scofield related to Trumbull, a tender carried passengers and luggage from the quay to the liner anchored in the roadstead. Mr. Bonsor even supplied a list of ships with dates of call at Boulogne.

The detail indicates that Scofield was in the hands of people with expert knowledge of travel routes. Normally a trip from Switzerland to New York would have meant train to Paris, then would follow a battle with porters at Gare de Est and a cab ride through Paris to Gare St. Lazare, another battle with porters, thence onto a train for a channel port. Instead, going via Boulogne, the Scofields boarded at Montreux one of the great European expresses destined for Boulogne (with connection to London). At Boulogne Maritime Station they were met by a representative of the steamship line who arranged for the transfer of both luggage and the precious boxes of notebooks to the tender and on to the liner. For a man of 64, as prone to illness as Scofield was reputed to be, the whole arrangement was a blessing.

Trumbull related an incident which may show how close the Christian community came to missing the spread of Dispensationalism:

The ocean voyage went by uneventfully. The steamer was within one day of New York City when somehow Dr. Scofield felt strongly impressed with the desire to see if his precious boxes were safe in the baggage hold of the steamer.

With one of the steamship officers he went to satisfy himself. The boxes were not there.

With a sinking heart Dr. Scofield realized that the boxes might easily have been left in the tender, on the other side of the Atlantic, and then have been carried back to Boulogne. A new search was carefully made, without result. The baggage men were called in and the boxes were accurately described to them. They said that no such boxes had been put aboard with the luggage and this boat!

Now Dr. Scofield and his wife prayed earnestly together. And then it "occurred" to him that it might be worth while to search among the luggage of the emigrants in that boat. This search was now made, in the steerage, and there the boxes were found, safe and sound.³⁰

The conflict between the relation by Gaebelein and that given to Trumbull leads us to suggest that the story of the missing boxes could have originated during the interviewing of Scofield by Trumbull.

After the Scofields arrived in the United States, with the notebooks safe, they stopped in New York for a few days, then traveled to Ashuelot. Crestwood Camp was still a camp. The Scofields were joined by Ella Pohle. Cyrus, Hettie and Ella again shared a tent. A small workshop had been erected and there the immeasurably valuable boxes of manuscript were stored. A second, smaller tent was the spot where the actual work was carried on.

On a Sunday morning in May 1907, the three were working in the small tent.³¹ They heard a cracking noise. They rushed out and found the main tent—the living quarters—on fire. The tent and contents were destroyed. The fire burned itself out without endangering the work tent or the shed where the boxes of manuscript were stored.

Trumbull states that the fire occurred on Hettie's birthday.³² However, the sequence in which the incident is narrated places it in May 1907. Legal documents establish that Hettie's birthday was actually October 7.³³ At the time of the fire, she was just past the middle of her 48th year. Possibly the fire made Scofield think again. Possibly, being nearly 64, he found tent life a bit rugged. In June 1907, he decided to leave Ashuelot. He selected the conference grounds at Lake Orion, Michigan, as a spot to continue his labors.

CHAPTER 28 NOTES

1. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 344; (*Moody Monthly*, Feb. 1943).
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75, based on church records and Trumbull.
4. Gaebelein appears to have written his sketch without careful reading of Trumbull.
5. Reproduced in type in *Moody Monthly*, Feb. 1943, p. 344.
6. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

7. The letter was photographically reproduced in *Moody Monthly*, Oct. 1942, and also in the booklet edition of the story. No reader of the sketch noted the discrepancy produced by the inclusion of the letter.
8. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 344.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 345.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
11. Listed by both Trumbull and BeVier, also referred to by Gaebelein. The authoritative listing is on the title page of The Scofield Reference Bible.
12. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 344. BeVier, p. 77, refers to Gaebelein but has the correspondence with Weston, not Erdman. No doubt Scofield corresponded with both and with the others as well.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
14. Compare Trumbull, pp. 94 and 96, to note the conflict.
15. Sheldon Vanauken, *A Severe Mercy*, Harper, 1977, p. 79.
16. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98. Note that BeVier on p. 78 speaks of "The Oxford University Library." There is no Oxford Library as such. No doubt Scofield obtained a ticket to the famous Bodelian. There are numerous other libraries in the "City of Bells."
17. So says Gilbert Highet in *The Immortal Profession*, p. 149, Weybright and Talley, New York, 1976. Highet does tie the eccentricity with brilliance.
18. *The Dallas Morning News*, Monday, November 28, 1921, p. 7.
19. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 98.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
22. Rev. David Fountain of Southampton, England. From an Address at the Annual Meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society at Jarvis Baptist Church, Toronto, 1977. Reproduced in *The Gospel Witness*, vol. 59, No. 19, Dec. 8, 1977, p. 12.
23. The Trinitarian Bible Society Record.
24. *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, 1909, Vol. 11, p. 282.
25. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 110.
28. Mr. Bonsor resides on the Island of Jersey at Petit Port, Corbiere.
29. Letter to the writer, November 30, 1976.
30. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111. If the letter which Gaebelein reproduced on p. 344 of *Moody Monthly* (see above) would be dated 1907 instead of 1906, it would demolish the story of the temporary misplacing of the boxes of notebooks. A 1926 newspaper story about Scofield to be referred to later, related the missing notebooks story in such a way as to weaken its credibility.
31. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
32. *Ibid.*
33. The Death Certificate, New York State Department of Health.

CHAPTER 29

Accepted by Oxford

"Wisdom is the principle thing,; therefore get wisdom and with all thy getting get understanding."

Prov. 4:7

When Scofield left Ashuelot in early June 1907 for Lake Orion, he went via New York. There on June 5, 1907, Scofield signed the most important agreement he made in his entire life, the contract with Oxford University Press for the publication of The Scofield Reference Bible.

Scofield presumably spent most of Wednesday, June 5, at the Oxford University Press office at 156 Fifth Avenue and in the company of Mr. Armstrong. The contract he signed read:

5th June, 1907.

Dear Dr. Scofield,

It is agreed between us that the Oxford University Press is to produce and publish at its own expense your Annotated Edition of the Bible, Authorized Version, with your new system of references, and that we are to secure copyright in England and America in our own name and assign it to you. In the first instance the book is to be set up and printed in America in 8vo size, the type and arrangement of the pages to conform as nearly as possible to the larger specimen page set up at Oxford which you have approved.

The agreement shall remain in force during the continuance of the copyright, or for such shorter period as you and our Mr. Armstrong may arrange, it being understood in the latter event, that you will take over the stock and plates at a valuation at the end, and pay such other expenses that may not have been recouped.

Your royalty is to be 1/- per copy of all copies sold in cloth binding and 1/6 per copy on all copies sold in leather binding until the total number sold amounts to 25,000, after which the royalty payable will be at the rate of 1/3 per copy for cloth and 2/- per copy for leather. No royalties shall be paid on copies given away for review of other purposes.

Should a demand be found to exist for an edition in a size other than 8vo, we shall be at liberty to produce it at our own risk and expense and shall pay you such royalty as shall be mutually arranged.

The question of an edition de luxe, to consist of not more than 1000 copies and to be printed with wide margins on writing paper from the plates of the 8vo edition, is to be arranged between yourself and our Mr. Armstrong.

You will guarantee that the matter incorporated in your book is in no way whatever a violation of any existing copyright, and that will indemnify us from all suits, claims and proceedings, damages and costs,

which may be made, taken or incurred by or against us on the ground that the work is an infringement of copyright.

Accounts had better be made up annually at March, 31 and rendered to you (or at your direction) within six weeks of that date, and the balance of royalty then due can be paid to you by June 15. But an approximate return of sales for the first half of each financial year (April 1 to September 30) will be sent to you during October in each year, and royalty can be paid upon the sales shown by such a return by November 15 in each year.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) HY. FROWDE.

This provisional agreement is accepted by Dr. Scofield.

(Signed) C. I. SCOFIELD¹

After Scofield signed, the original of the agreement had to be sent to London for the signature of Henry Frowde.

It is interesting to note that despite the enthusiastic response reported from the 1904 meeting in the Press headquarters in London, no formal agreement was made until the signing of June 5, 1907. But in 1904, the Bible was still little more than an idea. There was nothing substantial enough to justify the Press making any commitment of either intent or resources.

The Press had a very hard-headed policy in selecting books for publication. The existence of the notebooks by 1907 may have been something sufficiently tangible to meet the requirements of management. But Scofield's whole program after the 1904 meeting suggests that he had substantial assurance from someone that Oxford would be the publisher.

At this point some consideration should be given to the implications of Oxford University selecting for its list a basically sectarian work which the Scofield Reference Bible turned out to be. Trumbull referred to Oxford University Press as a "Bible-publishing house." While this was the original major role of the American branch, it was in no way adequate to describe the Press as a whole. A. M. Hadfield, who was at Oxford University Press in the days of Charles Williams, describes the organization and concept of the Press:

. . . Henry Frowde was head of the London Branch of the firm as the Publisher. At Oxford was the Clarendon Press, Charles Cannan and Horace Hart were the doubleheaded god as Secretary to the Delegates, the Printer to the University. The Delegates were an unknown band of great members of the University, felt by ordinary humans in the firm to be related to the Medes and Persians and quite unfathomably obscurantist, to whom in a yearly meeting the existence of every new publication had to be justified in its cash return. But for that return, we used to doubt if the Delegates, had they existed, would have countenanced the publication of the Bible. . . .

The Press was concerned with the publication and sale of learning and literature. It had among its staffmen who were interested in learning and literature, who recognized an intellectual quality when they met it.²

The connection between the Press and the University are plainly stated by Hadfield. While the atmosphere at Oxford, its bells and Gothic towers, suggest godliness, the teaching at the University has placed it in the forefront for the dissemination of sophisticated and humanistic ideas completely opposed to those suggested by Dispensationalism. Its normal bias would be and has been in directions opposite to that of The Scofield Reference Bible and to many of the statements in the notes.

It was the essential incongruity of this work being published by Oxford that impelled this writer to follow the trail of Scofield—man and Bible. Robert L. Pierce, pursuing a similar but not identical line of research, had a similar question. Pierce said of the publication of the Scofield Bible by the Oxford University Press:

Informed patriots know the important part played by Oxford University in the promotion and spreading of Fabian Socialism in both England and America.³ The fact that a university so saturated with the ideology of Godless collectivism should have published, and should continue to publish even today, a Bible which purports to uphold fundamental Christianity, should provide any Americanist with food for thought. Scofield, who apparently had never before published anything except one small book and some pamphlets and tracts, seemed to have amazingly easy entry into one of the most prestigious and exclusive publishing houses in the English-speaking world.⁴

Incidentally, the ready access of Robert Scott to Oxford University Press may be another indication that the Brethren "separation" based on II Corinthians 6:14 was something for the rank and file. The upper echelon laid it aside when convenient. When it was not laid aside, it was both awkward and far from edifying to those outside the camp.⁵

Brethren contacts or not, we cannot in any way consider that the publication of a sectarian work like The Scofield Bible was a return to faith in Biblical integrity. The men at the Press kept their counsels and, as we shall see, by the acceptance of the contract, picked a cash winner.

On June 25, Scofield, by now settled in at the Lake Orion Conference grounds, wrote Gaebalein regarding the contract. Gaebalein reproduced the text of the letter in 1943:

After much delay, for which, though unwittingly, I was alone responsible, I followed dear Brother Ball's counsel and closed an arrangement with the Oxford University Press direct, for the publication of our new Bible. They put their own capital into it, and organization back of it. Both Mr. Frowde in England and Mr. Armstrong in New York are very enthusiastic about it. I feel sure everything their capital, wide experience, and the best trade facilities can do to insure its wide circulation will be done. The proofs are to be sent here. I am turning down all invitations and shall devote the summer to this work alone.⁶

The signing of the contract meant that Scofield had to buckle down and produce. Lake Orion had been selected because he hoped that he would be free from the interruptions which had occurred in Dallas because of his dual role.⁷

But he had already become too well known. He was plagued with interruptions from conference attendees. (Conference habitués were known in those days to come up with serious questions like "Is Kaiser Bill the Anti-Christ?" or "Where did Cain get his wife?") It reached a point where Scofield seriously considered returning to Montreux so that he could work without interruption.

He gave up the idea of another trip to Europe and went to Dallas in October. For the first time in a number of years, he presided over a meeting of the church's Joint Boards.⁸ His whereabouts and the scope of activity on the Bible, even the location of the notebooks for the rest of 1907, are not readily determined from available sources.

Scofield was in Dallas for the annual meeting of First Church in 1908. As a pleasant contrast to previous years, he delivered his annual report in person. But, of course, most of his activities had little direct relation to First Church and its local ministry. Scofield commended Carroll's work as associate. Incidentally, it was noted that the membership figure again topped 500—all of them, no doubt, anxiously anticipating the Rapture.⁹ The report included reference to the work of the Latin American Mission. Note was made of the fact that the Bible Correspondence Course had 5,000 students, around the world. All 5,000 were learning of the prospect of a failing, irrelevant Bride of Christ.¹⁰ The report also stated:

I believe the new edition of the Scriptures which we are about to give to the church and the world is incomparably the most blessed work which the grace of God ever gave us to do.¹¹

In the report, difficulties with the Congregational denomination were noted—the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was reaching the simmering stage. Scofield also noted the likelihood of future absences from the church. Such absences were to be expected as the actual production of the Bible got underway. He was back in New York by the end of January.

The work on the Bible was now reaching the place where serious technical matters in the area of the competence of the printing trades had to be decided. The type face was selected. The actual type was imported from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, a functional division of the Oxford University Press.¹²

Cyrus and Hettie took an apartment at 21 Fort Washington Ave., New York, and used it as a base for their work.¹³ Cyrus, no doubt, traveled between the apartment and the Oxford University Press Office

via the new IRT Subway, using the 155th St. Station. Those much traveled notebooks, originally prepared by Hettie, were cut up, and about twenty pages at a time, were sent to the DeVinne Press for composition. The galleys were checked by DeVinne's proofreaders, a task absolutely crucial and one difficult to handle. With four to six incompatible type styles on each page, checking of the layout was equally important to the checking of spelling and punctuation.¹⁴

As winter turned to spring and spring to summer, DeVinne's typesetters worked and proofreaders checked the galleys. Along with the originals they were returned to Scofield. Trumbull tells us that all were checked line by line by Cyrus and Hettie.¹⁵ The summer of 1908 was unusually hot.¹⁶ During even the "dog days," Hettie would read from the original copy as Cyrus read the galleys and corrected where necessary. According to Trumbull, the "days" usually lasted from 5 a.m. until it was too dark to see at night. But the task was so stupendous—was it really possible for the Scofields to cover the whole work in the course of a hot summer? (Accustomed as we are to air conditioning, it is almost impossible to imagine conditions in a New York apartment house in that extremely hot summer!)

But Scofield did not keep as close to the task as has been inferred by some. Trumbull notes his relationship with the consulting editors:

In addition to a great deal of correspondence with these consulting editors, three meetings of the group were held; and one can well imagine what interesting conferences these meetings must have been. The last of the three, reviewing the whole work, was held at Princeton, New Jersey, when several of the editorial board spent many days together, with access to the great theological library there.¹⁷

While those sessions were being held, he was not proofreading.

He did reject one request for writing which would have taken time from work on the Bible. Lyman Stewart, one of the founders of the Union Oil Company of California, which today markets petroleum products under the orange and blue UNION 76 emblem, was a vigorous supporter of Dispensational causes. He contributed to Scofield's work on *The Scofield Reference Bible*. During the summer of 1908, he wrote Scofield, suggesting that Scofield prepare a study or lengthy essay defending the Fundamental faith from the attacks of modern infidelity. Scofield replied that his work on the Reference Bible precluded other activities at the moment.¹⁸

In the Lyman Stewart papers at Biola College, Los Angeles, there is a letter of Scofield's written on the letterhead of Grove City College, Grove City, Pennsylvania, on August 7, 1908. The letter reads:

My Dear Mr. Stewart:

We have just closed the first conferences of Christian scholars in review of my editorial work on the new edition of the Scriptures, and it

certainly has been a most profitable week. We went minutely over the Four Gospels, & my work thereon, adding, clarifying, modifying. The brethren gathered were Prof. W. G. Moorehead, United Pres. Theo. Seminary of Xenia, Ohio, Prof. Chas. R. Erdman of Princeton Theo. Sem., and Dr. W. J. Erdman, the well known expositor.

I was much encouraged, & wish I could believe all the kind things these learned brethren said as to the great good which the new Bible will do.

The next conference is to be held here, the last week in August, & the last at Princeton, N. J. in September—both with different groups of brethren of different denominations.

Your kind and generous gift will, I am sure, cover the expense of all this, including some modest compensation to the brethren.

Thank you in our Lord's precious name.

Yours sincerely

C. I. Scofield¹⁹

The list of brethren attending the two subsequent conferences have not come to light, and we have no idea exactly what changes might have been made in the notes even as press date was approaching. The conferences, while referred to by Trumbull, have been largely unnoticed. When the Bible was published Scofield did include a list of consulting editors, including the men he had conferred with in 1908.²⁰

Sandeen comments:

Just what role these consulting editors played in the project has been the subject of some confusion. Apparently Scofield only meant to gain support for his publication from both sides of the millenarian movement with this device.²¹

In a letter to Sandeen, written after his (Sandeen's) work was published, Wilbur M. Smith stated that he (Smith) had spent a good deal of time trying to discover some relevant material on the editorial group and its work. His search ended in total failure. He had even written to descendants of the group for any relevant correspondence. Replies were all in the negative.²²

The mystery of the Scofield Reference Bible remains. And despite the list of editors, the impression has been promoted that The Scofield Reference Bible was largely the work of one man. Both the Dispensational hierarchy and the publisher have helped to build this illusion.

In a pamphlet issued by Oxford University Press in 1959 and written by Dr. Frank E. Gaebelin (A. C.'s son), the legend is promoted:

Although the Scofield Reference Bible was so largely the work of one man, it was not, as we have seen, produced in isolation.²³

Seven years later, Frank Gaebelin was to say:

But Dr. Scofield's consultants gave him much helpful advice, the Reference Bible was *not* a group effort. In fact, his achievement was largely his own, for he did his work almost single-handed. His was a ground-breaking

effort and in the history of Bible annotations it occupies a distinctive place.²⁴

Scotfield's image was always fragile and any boost was helpful.

Conferences, correspondence and all that aside, progress must have been made on the magnum opus. On October 23, 1908, Scotfield wrote Gaebelein:

My dear Brother:

Yours to hand. As to the date of publication—the typesetters are in John, but are going very rapidly now, and I expect to get through here in about three weeks. The book will not, however, be issued till January¹⁵. The publisher fixes that date. He is importing the paper for both editions, the ordinary Bible paper and the India. It certainly is going to be beautiful from a typographical point of view. I shall go home for a few weeks after I finish here, but expect to be in the East and Middle West after January till March, then the Pacific Coast. Many invitations are coming in. Will send you schedule in December. We ought to get together in some, or most, of these meetings.

With every best wish,

Yours as ever,
Scotfield²⁵

We suggest that some of the letter was intended more for publication or to impress future readers than for actual transmission of current information. Some points are a bit improbable in the light of the actual production schedule. If the typesetters were working on John, following straight textual order, there remained after John, 212 pages to be set and corrected. Scotfield claimed that he would be able to depart from New York in about three weeks (about November 15). Correcting that many pages, along with Scotfield's other concerns would be difficult. Further, three major holidays loomed ahead. They would mean suspension of publication work by all the printing trades.

The reference to the India paper seems unlikely. India paper for Bibles is not produced like newsprint. A house like Oxford would normally need to have a steady flow of India paper arranged to keep presses rolling. This may be another comment designed for future readers.

The facts were more probably:

1. The typesetters were working on the Gospel of John to fit in the corrections resulting from the conferences in Grove City and Princeton.
2. The production schedule could accommodate the changes because of the decision to start each book of the Bible on a new page, regardless of amount of open spaces left. Thus most of the Old Testament had been printed and the folios were in a warehouse or at the binders waiting for collation when all the pages were completed.

3. Only a small part of the opus remained to be worked on, thus the scheduled publication date would be met.

BeVier, commenting on the travel notes in the October 23 letter, seems to think Scofield meant New Hampshire.²⁶ That assumption overlooks Scofield's own statement in the letter and would be valid only if a permanent building had been erected. New Hampshire is no place for a 65-year-old man to live in a tent in December. BeVier was unaware that Scofield had reacquired 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas.

Trumbull relates the following incident, suggesting that it occurred in 1908 (probably before November 15):

One day a friend met Dr. Scofield in New York, by appointment, upon another matter, and they went together for a walk on Fifth Avenue. The friend asked concerning the progress of the work on the Reference Bible. Dr. Scofield abruptly came to a full stop in their walk as he said: "At eleven o'clock last night I came upon those impressive words, 'The End.' Yes, the work is finished—that is, in the sense in which any human work can ever be finished; for I am confident that there is only one work ever undertaken upon this earth which has in an absolute sense been finished, to which nothing can ever be added and from which nothing can be taken away. That is the finished work of Christ."²⁷

Production schedules could be maintained in those days. The Scofield Reference Bible, original edition, was officially published January 15, 1909.²⁸ With its publication, the idea of church failure and irrelevancy and hopeless decay for the world was on its way to evangelical respectability.

CHAPTER 29 NOTES

1. The original contract was incorporated into the contract for the 1917 edition. The entire contract is in the papers of the Scofield Estate file, Surrogates Office, Queens County, Jamaica, New York.
2. A. M. Hadfield, *An Introduction to Charles Williams*.
3. See Martin L. Rose, *Fabian Freeway*, Western Island, Boston and Los Angeles, 1966.
4. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, Signal Mountain Press, Signal Mountain, Tennessee, 1978, p. 50.
5. Typical view of "Brethren" in high places was noted by Hamilton Ellis in his history of the London and Southwestern Railway. His picture shows one of the less edifying aspects of Brethrenism: "Godfrey Knight was secretary of the company from 1898 to 1922. One of the more austere sort of Plymouth Brethren, he would never attend any social function." *The South Western Railway* by C. Hamilton Ellis, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1956, p. 206.
6. Reproduced in type in *Moody Monthly*. Apparently among the Scofield letters in the "Gaebelein" collection.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
8. Secretary's Book of Board of Elders, First Church, Dallas, October 17, 1907, Mss.
9. Pastor's Report to the Congregation for 1907.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*

12. Clarendon Press is the working, functional portion of Oxford University Press, actually doing the printing in the British Isles. See "A Little Quincentenary History, 1478-1978", Oxford University Press.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
14. Note almost any page of The Scofield Reference Bible.
15. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
16. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 112, confirmed from weather pages of *The New York Times* by the General Humanities Division, The New York Public Library.
17. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
18. Thanks to Ernest Sandeen who, in preparation for *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, examined the Lyman Stewart papers at Biola College.
19. Original in the Lyman Stewart papers, Biola College.
20. The list was published on the title page of the Bible.
21. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 224.
22. Letter to Ernest R. Sandeen, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., from Wilbur M. Smith at 2490 Ridgeway Road, San Marino, Calif., August 31, 1970.
23. Frank E. Gaebelin, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible*, New York, Oxford University Press, p. 14.
24. Frank E. Gaebelin, *The New Scofield Reference Bible*, New York, 1967, Oxford University Press, p. 15.
25. A. C. Gaebelin, *op. cit.*, p. 400, (*Moody Monthly*).
26. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
27. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
28. It was the first book to be originated by the Oxford University Press, American branch. See "A Little Quincentenary History," p. 14.

CHAPTER 30

The Scofield Reference Bible

"Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him. Add thou not unto His words lest he reprove thee; and thou be found a liar."

Proverbs 30:5,6

Into an America which delighted in Theodore Roosevelt's *Strenuous Life*, Thorstein Veblen, Peter Finley Dunne's *Mr. Dooley*, Ida Tarbell and the International Correspondence School, came The Scofield Reference Bible. It was a day in which people expected quick learning and quick fixes for social ills. It was assumed that cramming facts into the brain could provide easy access to knowledge and culture without interrupting the necessitous areas of life. While its end philosophy set it off from most other cultural innovations of the day, The Scofield Reference Bible's methodology fit quite easily into the milieu of The Progressive Era.

Several years later, Charles G. Trumbull said that Scofield was convinced that people want to study the Bible, but did not know how. Because of this, Scofield:

... saw that if his Bible studies were to be of the widest usefulness they would need to be attached to the Word itself—and in a form not too bulky.¹

Thus was the form of The Scofield Reference Bible determined. But in his method, Scofield was not original. Albertus Pieters, the first serious critic of Scofield, noted:

To be sure, this has been done before, as in the great Dutch "Staten Bijbel"; but that method has passed out of use, precisely because it was recognized that fallible interpretation should not thus be associated with infallible revelation. It was a clever idea of Dr. Scofield thus to revive it. Had his notes been published separately, by themselves, as a commentary, they would by this time have been forgotten.²

Linking comment and text for convenient reference in the course of study is acceptable if, and only if, the work is offered as a commentary. Otherwise it is neither sound nor intellectually honest.

Matthew Henry, who is a "bad boy" of prophetic interpretation to many Dispensationalists, did link text and comment. But his five volumes have always been offered as a commentary on the entire Bible and have covered the whole Sacred Library, not select portions. Albert

Barnes, Philadelphia Presbyterian of the 1830's, issued comprehensive notes which included the text of Scripture. But neither Henry nor Barnes had the temerity, guile or gall to get their notes accepted as Scripture itself.³ Matthew Henry and Barnes have other merits not found in Scofield. But as we shall see, the idea has been firmly planted in the Dispensational camp even today.⁴

Harry A. Ironside, a leading Dispensationalist who pastored Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, said:

Alas, how ready are well-meaning people to put the ministry of human teachers in the place of the Holy Scriptures, and almost unconsciously begin "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."⁵

Unfortunately, Ironside never realized that his indictment could be applied to the very system he spent his life defending and propagating.

In looking at Scofield's finished work, other serious questions arise. For instance, did the project take seven years? The question is important if Scofield was actually the scholar he is touted as being. His ideas had been formulated (or handed to him) at an early point in his ministry. He had been teaching the ideas for years. His correspondence course had been along the lines taken by his notes. The Brethren, whom Scofield claimed as spiritual forebearers, had produced a bulk of material which could have been culled to produce the notes.

The 66 heading summaries for the individual books as placed in The Scofield Reference Bible are strictly in line with the thinking of the Brethren and Dispensational movements. No great amount of research should have been required. A fairly ample culling of Brethren writings should have sufficed.

The crux of Scofield's Reference system should be the Reference comments placed on the pages of text. As noted just above, Scofield indicated via Trumbull that these were absolutely necessary to his theology. This necessity makes a page count of his material most revealing.

Of course, all text on every single page of the Bible may not require the same amount of extended comment. The population lists in Numbers, for example, are properly passed over without discussion in general commentaries. But, to find, as we do, that 781 pages out of the total 1,353 in Scofield's work lack comment, suggests that we are dealing with something highly selective and subjective. Interestingly enough, there are four books in the two Testaments which in the Scofield tome have no comment except for the heading summaries.

An indication of the bias of Scofield's system is noted in the page-study of the four Gospels. It is a point of faith in Dispensationalism that the first Gospel is primarily Jewish in emphasis, thus of limited value today, if not actually *verboten* to the church. But Scofield was

ostensibly, being in advance of The Rapture, addressing the non-jewish redeemed. Thus, it should have been logical for him to have concentrated on the other Gospels of "non-Jewish" emphasis.

The page count, presented below, shows that Scofield placed comment on only 39 pages, total, in the "non-jewish" Gospels, only four in the Gospel of Mark. In contrast, he produced 48 pages with comment in the "Jewish" Gospel of Matthew which some of his extreme followers say Christians are not to use.

Mention has been made of Scofield's report to Lyman Stewart regarding the week-long session at Grove City College with the Erdmans and others going through notes and making comments on the References on the Gospel pages.⁶ Did the Erdmans grasp the unbalance to which we refer? Did they realize the inconsistency between comment and theology?

Before presenting the specific page count, it might be well to clear the air on the matter of Matthew's Gospel with some words from J. Gresham Machen:

It is widely held that this Gospel is addressed particularly to the Jews. Its Jewish destination appears, for example, in the peculiar prominence which it assigns to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the events of the life of Jesus, and also, perhaps, in certain answers which it seems to give to specific Jewish attacks.

Exaggerations, indeed, should be avoided at this point. On the one hand, all of the Gospels—not merely this Gospel—are interested in the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy; and on the other hand, this Gospel is certainly not Jewish in the sense that it stands in any disagreement with the principles of the Gentile mission in the early Church or in the sense that it obtrudes into the history in any disturbing way its answers to Jewish attacks.⁷

The page count for the entire work as tabulated shows:

| <i>Book</i> | <i>Total Pages</i> | <i>Pages with Comment</i> | <i>More than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Less than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Pages with no Comment</i> |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Genesis | 67 | 39 | 14 | 25 | 28 |
| Exodus | 54 | 28 | 5 | 23 | 26 |
| Leviticus | 38 | 22 | 4 | 18 | 16 |
| Numbers | 49 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 32 |
| Deuteronomy | 49 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 38 |
| Joshua | 27 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 20 |
| Judges | 27 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 24 |
| Ruth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| I Samuel | 35 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 33 |
| II Samuel | 29 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 24 |
| I Kings | 35 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 32 |
| II Kings | 35 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| I Chronicles | 34 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 30 |

| <i>Book</i> | <i>Total Pages</i> | <i>Pages with Comment</i> | <i>More than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Less than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Pages with no Comment</i> |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| II Chronicles | 38 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 35 |
| Ezra | 12 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Nehemiah | 17 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| Esther | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Job | | | | 9 | 21 |
| Psalms | 72 | 25 | 1 | 24 | 47 |
| Proverbs | 23 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| Ecclesiastes | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Canticles | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Isaiah | 59 | 31 | 1 | 30 | 28 |
| Jeremiah | 62 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 41 |
| Lamentations | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Ezekiel | 58 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 44 |
| Daniel | 23 | 21 | 5 | 16 | 2 |
| Hosea | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Joel | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Amos | 7 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| Obadiah | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Jonah | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Micah | 6 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Nahum | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Habakkuk | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Zephaniah | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Haggai | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Zechariah | 15 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Malachi | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Old Testament | | 327 | | | 643 |

Total

| <i>Book</i> | <i>Total Pages</i> | <i>Pages with Comment</i> | <i>More than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Less than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Pages with No Comment</i> |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Matthew | 52 | 48 | 20 | 28 | 4 |
| Mark | 24 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| Luke | 43 | 17 | 1 | 16 | 26 |
| John | 32 | 18 | 2 | 16 | 14 |
| Acts | 44 | 21 | 3 | 18 | 23 |
| Romans | 19 | 13 | 4 | 9 | 6 |
| I Corinthians | 18 | 14 | 3 | 11 | 4 |
| II Corinthians | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Galatians | 8 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Ephesians | 8 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Philippians | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Colossians | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| I Thessa- | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| II lonians | | | | | |

| <i>Book</i> | <i>Total Pages</i> | <i>Pages with Comment</i> | <i>More than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Less than 2' Comment</i> | <i>Pages with No Comment</i> |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| II Thessalonians | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| I Timothy | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| II Timothy | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Titus | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Philemon | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Hebrews | 15 | 10 | 1 | 9 | 5 |
| James | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| I Peter | 6 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| II Peter | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| I John | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| II John | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| III John | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Jude | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Rovelation | 23 | <u>19</u> | 6 | 13 | <u>4</u> |
| New Testament Total | | 214 | | | 138 |

The tabulation suggests that the great work of C. I. Scofield is hardly a reliable commentary on the Bible. Yet, it has been accepted by millions as a fully adequate source of help, illumination and information.

Trumbull was to say of Scofield:

The man who gave his lifetime study to the making of notes and comments in the Scofield Reference Bible *was concerned to find and state exactly what the Bible itself had to say on any and every point.*⁸

That statement is not quite correct. When we looked at certain Bible portions of matters of practical everyday significance, we found gaping omissions. Possible more than coincidentally, verses which deal with breaches of some moral and/or civil laws, breaches which occurred in the course of Scofield's life, are not commented on.

| Date | Offense | Scripture Passage | Page In SRB (1917) | Lines of Comment |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1873 | False oath of Office | Lev. 6:3 Hos. 10:14 Ps.24:4 | 132 927 610 | |
| 1874 | Bribes | Amos 5:12 Isa.26:10 | 937 611 | |
| 1874 | Failure to provide for his own | I Tim. 5:8 | 1276 | |
| 1877 | Fraud and forgery | Lev. 19:13 | 151 | |

| Date | Offense | Scripture Passage | Page In SRB (1917) | Lines of Comment |
|------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 1879 | Failure to pay promissory note | Lev. 6:2 | 132 | |
| 1883 | Divorce | Deut. 24:1-4 Matt. 5:31,32 Matt. 19:3-7 Mark 10:2-9 | 242 1001 1025 1058 | |
| 1892 | False degree | Prov. 19:5 | 685 | |
| 1902 | False story about war decoration | Prov. 19:6 | 685 | |
| 1909 | Adding to the Word of God | Prov. 30:5,6 | 685 | |

Consider the significance of the complete blank of the last column of the chart. Scofield, in his Introduction, dated Jan. 1, 1909, claimed that his "Bible" contained ". . . the elements which must combine to facilitate the study and intelligent use of the Bible. . . ."9 He goes on to say that these elements ". . . became clear in his mind."

Possibly Scofield did not consider that intelligent use of the Bible included application to practical affairs of life. Or was it possible that he wanted to avoid calling attention to the fact that there had been problem areas in his life? For instance, his marital status was contrary to the accepted position in Dispensational circles in 1909. Had he commented according to the accepted position, his comments would have been belied by his own status. To comment according to the facts of his life would have destroyed his position as a commentator. So avoid, avoid, avoid.

But this brings up another aspect of the Dispensational position. The movement has frequently spoken of being "free from the law." In theological terms, this is called antinomianism. Simply it means that being saved, thanks to free grace, one does not need to be particular about moral behaviour.

As we look through the papers, we find that Scofield appears to have "worked both sides of the street" on the issue. For instance, in a letter written April 2, 1889, to Rev. J. B. Clark of the Congregational society, Scofield, speaking of the need to expand Christian work in Texas, said:

Nothing can be more certain than that this opportunity to plant the tree that bears the fruit of godliness, loyalty, and obedience to law, will not wait. Already San Antonio and Fort Worth are lost to us. The questions all feel to be unsettled—questions, too, fraught with the most awful possibilities—confront this generation. How unspeakably wicked, then, to neglect the chance God is offering us to create, in the South itself, a sound and righteous public sentiment concerning them.¹⁰

But obedience to the Law is contrary to Brethren Dispensational teaching. What did Scofield mean?

A work of 1913, *No Room in The Inn*, might suggest a development in thought. There Scofield says:

So long as we regard the law as fatherly advice, or as mere ideal to be striven toward, trusting meanwhile on the vague mercy of God to overlook our shortcomings, and to accept our good intentions in the place of perfect obedience, we are steeling our consciences against the very work the law set to do.¹¹

But two years later, in 1915, in *The New Life in Christ Jesus*, we find him saying:

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.¹²

Commenting on the very first verse of the Bible, Scofield introduces error. Note 2 (page 3) refers to the word "create" (Bara) in Genesis 1:1. Scofield states in his note: ". . . the first creative act refers to the dateless past and gives scope for all the geologic ages." This statement accommodates to evolutionary theory.

Such an "opening to the left" is another evidence that Scofield was neither an original nor a deep thinker. Here he was accepting a popular view which attempted to effect a compromise between the Biblical record and the alleged science of Charles Darwin.¹³

The theistic evolutionists in the Neo-Evangelical camp accepted evolution without the benefit of Scofield. But the presence of Note 2 in the "Bible" must have made them feel much more comfortable with their compromise. The note also made the folks in the pews feel more like accommodating to the science of periodicals like *TIME* and *News-week*. Some Dispensationalists did not remain creationists. But the implications of Scofield's Note 2 make their position just a bit untenable.

The late Wilbur M. Smith noted that even though The Scofield Reference Bible had been the greatest means of promoting millenarianism, there is not a word about "millennium" in the Scofield notes at Revelation 20. Smith considered this a strange phenomenon.¹⁴ In a service of eulogy to Scofield in Dallas, on November 28, 1921, Dr. Irving Carroll, one of Scofield's students commented on this point, even though Smith appeared to be unaware of it. Carroll said:

In his writings he (Scofield) was careful of his choice of words and used those that delicately balanced with his meanings. The word millennium is a perfectly good Biblical word (sic) and yet you will not find it used by Dr. (sic) Scofield. It suggests controversial aspects, so he always employed the word "kingdom."¹⁵

Scofield's views in so many places seem to downgrade the integrity of the Word of God. For instance, on page 1,252 (Ephesians 3) he says: "In his (Paul's) writings alone we find the doctrine, position, walk, and destiny of the Church." Such a statement contradicts II Tim. 3:16 and is the basis for the ultradispensational heresy that most of the Bible is of no use to the church in the present day. (Of course, there are many who claim a place in the church who so act.)¹⁶

Speaking of Scofield's work, Yona Malachy of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, said:

The basic element of modern Dispensationalism and that which gave the movement its name, is the belief that human history is divided into well-defined periods (or dispensations) in which God relates to man in different ways. According to the classical definition of C. I. Scofield, one of the movement's leading theologians, a dispensation "is a period of time during which man is tested in respect to obedience to some specific revelation of the will of God. Seven such are distinguished in Scripture."¹⁷

And this system is an obvious characteristic of The Scofield Reference Bible, or at least Scofield says so. In the Introduction to the 1917 edition, Scofield said:

The Dispensations are distinguished, exhibiting the majestic, progressive order of the divine dealings of God with humanity, "the increasing purpose", which runs through and links together the ages, from the beginning of the life of man to the end of eternity. Augustine said: Distinguish the ages, and the Scriptures harmonize."¹⁸

Yet in his work, Scofield does not follow through with the claim he made in the Introduction. When this writer went to his copy of The Scofield Reference Bible, he found that the Dispensations could not in many cases be easily picked out, even from the comment written by Scofield. The notes and even sub-headings gave no clue. In trying to chart the system, interpolation had to be used.

The tabulation, worked out as well as possible, is:

CHART OF DISPENSATIONS

| <i>Dispensations by Scofield</i> | <i>Text</i> | <i>Opening Page</i> | <i>Closing Page</i> | <i>Total Pages</i> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Innocence | Gen. 1:28-3:22 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| 2. Conscience | Gen. 3:22-8:19 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 3. Human Government | Gen. 8:20-11:32 | 16 | 20 | 4 |
| Promise | Gen. 12:1-Ex. 19:8 | 20 | 94 | 74 |

But after Dispensation 4 and its preceding "minor" Dispensations, we find a major problem with a major epoch. The Holy Spirit said (via the Apostle Mark): "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (*Mark 1.:1*). If we are to keep our chart in line with Scofield's

thesis, we must disregard the Holy Spirit. We make an assumption for the end of Dispensation 5. The result is:

| | | | | |
|--------|---------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 5. Law | Ex. 19:8-Matt.27:35 | 94 | 1041 | 948 |
| | Mark | 1045 | 1068 | 23 |
| | Luke | 1070 | 1111 | 41 |
| | John | 1114 | 1142 | <u>28</u> |
| | | | | 1,040 |

Scofield never quite clearly stated where the Dispensation ends. Nor do other Dispensational scholars. Their judgment does not agree with the Holy Spirit, as most conservative scholars would. To continue our chart effort, we will use Scofield's principles:

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------|------|-----|
| 6. Church | Acts 1-Rev. 3 | 1147 | 1334 | 287 |
|-----------|---------------|------|------|-----|

Having worked through the Church era, we found fourteen pages which cannot properly be fitted into the Dispensational structure:

| | | | | |
|----|-----------|------|------|----|
| ?? | Rev. 4-10 | 1335 | 1349 | 14 |
|----|-----------|------|------|----|

If we consider this period a Dispensation in its own right, then the magic "seven" of the system goes out the window. If we consider it a reversion to period five (Law), then some of Scofield's claims are faulted.¹⁹ Then, what do we do with the Millennium?

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|------|------|---|
| ? Millennium | Rev. 20 | 1349 | 1351 | 3 |
|--------------|---------|------|------|---|

The final period is:

| | | | | |
|-------------|------------|------|------|---|
| 7. Eternity | Rev. 21-22 | 1351 | 1353 | 2 |
|-------------|------------|------|------|---|

To recapitulate without comment:

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|------|-------------|-----|
| 1. Innocence | Gen. 1-28-3:22 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| 2. Conscience | Gen. 3:22-8:19 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 3. Human Government | Gen. 8:20-11:32 | 16 | 20 | 4 |
| 4. Promise | Gen. 12:1-Ex. 19:8 | 20 | 94 | 74 |
| 5. Law | Ex. 19:8-Matt. 27:35 | 94 | 1041 | 948 |
| | Mark | 1045 | 1068 | 23 |
| | Luke | 1070 | 1111 | 41 |
| | John | 1114 | <u>1142</u> | 28 |
| | | | 1040 | |
| 6. Church | Acts 1-Rev. 3 | 1147 | 1134 | 287 |
| ? ? | Rev. 4-19 | 1335 | 1349 | 14 |
| ? Millenium | Rev. 20 | 1349 | 1351 | 3 |
| 7. Eternity | Rev. 21-22 | 1351 | 1353 | 2 |

The idea that we have tried to chart was inherent in his thought from the very beginning. In a comment on his system, Scofield was to say:

... there is a beautiful system in this gradualness of unfolding. The past is seen to fall into periods, marked off by distinct limits, and distinguishable

period from period by something peculiar to each. Thus it comes to be understood that there is a doctrine of Ages or Dispensations in the Bible.²⁰

But somehow, when this system is put against the actual text of Scripture, even Scofield himself could not make the system and text congruent.

Something else; the verse breaks to which we have become accustomed were placed in the Bible first in English, in the Geneva Bible of 1560. If the breaks alleged by Scofield actually indicate substantial changes in God's dealing with man, is it not strange that the divisions would not have been marked more strikingly before 1560? We cannot down a lurking suspicion that there is a disagreement between Dispensational teaching and the Holy Spirit who inspired the original writers. Note again Mark 1:1: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," confirmed in Matthew 11:13: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John."

The confusion of Scofield's system grows. In addition to Dispensations for which we find no clear basis in Scripture, Scofield adds a system of Covenants. In his Introduction²¹ Scofield states that a Dispensation is a method of testing while a Covenant is everlasting and unconditional. (The blasphemy of binding God who is Holy to unconditional relationships with sinful man is blithely overlooked.)

On his Page 20, Scofield suggests that the Covenant with Noah and the "Third" Dispensation are identical.²² We hold the idea of the "Third" Dispensation preposterous and can note no substantial change in God's dealing with men at that time. The Palestinian Covenant, noted on page 250 of the SRB and ostensibly based on Deuteronomy 30:3, appears under the Dispensation of Law (referred to by Scofield as a horrible mistake). The confusion is intolerable.

As Norman Kraus says:

Covenants, at least some of them, have to do not only with man's life on earth, but also with his salvation, while Dispensations apparently do not. As a matter of fact, Scofield's eight Covenants are of different sorts, conditioning both life in this world (see his statement that dispensations "condition human life on earth") and salvation. His lack of consistency on this point makes his notes very difficult to interpret.²³

With Scofield's lack of formal training and somewhat irregular career, what else could one expect?

The influence of The Scofield Reference Bible resulted from the spread of a revised edition which Scofield made in 1917. Some of its features will be noted in chapter 33. Inadequate or no, Scofield's work received highest praise from those who held to its system. And that praise meant that many in the pew failed to distinguish between the words of Scofield and those of the Holy Spirit:

As the late William E. Cox said:

Scofield's footnotes and his systematized schemes of hermeneutics have been memorized by many as religiously as have verses of the Bible. It is not at all uncommon to hear devout men recite these footnotes prefaced by the words, "The Bible says. . . ." Many a pastor has lost all influence with members of his congregation and has been branded a liberal for no other reason than failure to concur in all the footnotes of Dr. Scofield. Even many ministers use the teachings of Scofield as tests of orthodoxy! Charles G. Trumbull, late editor of the *Sunday School Times*, spoke of the *Scofield Bible* in the following terms, in his book, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield*: "God-planned, God-guided, God-energized work."²⁴

This writer remembers feeling betrayed when one of his teachers in a Dispensational Bible institute suggested care in accepting Scofield's notes. He created an atmosphere of near shock when he suggested that had Scofield then been living he might have made changes in some of his notes!

So firmly had the Scofield system (in its 1917 form) attached itself to the Fundamentalist community that when a revision was decided on after World War II, the strong Dispensationalists rose as to a call to arms. Pastor Cornelius Stam of Chicago mused:

Would revision neutralize the dispensational distinctions which Dr. Scofield had brought to light? Would it represent a retreat rather than an advance for dispensational truth? Would it impair the Reference Bible which had brought so much blessing to so many thousands of people?²⁵

Stam flooded the Revision Committee with literature which he felt would persuade them to "hold the line." In October 1955, he had his constituency flood the committee with postcards reading in part:

Since there has been a retreat from Scofield's dispensational teachings among many fundamentalists and we fear that this will affect the revision of the notes in this beloved and God-honored reference Bible, we earnestly beseech you, each one, to READ AT LEAST ONE OF THE ABOVE NAMED BOOKS THOUGHTFULLY AND PRAYERFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING FURTHER WITH THE REVISION.²⁶

Stam feels that his campaign did have some influence.²⁷ The new product seems to be a remarkably similar work to the 1909 and 1917 issues.

CHAPTER 30 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
2. *A Candid Examination of the Scofield Bible* by Albertus Pieters, p. 7, originally issued by Douma Publications, Grand Rapids. Now available through Reiner Publications, Swengel, Pa.
3. *Barnes Notes on The New Testament* is now on the list of Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids. Both Henry and Barnes take views of prophecy completely at variance with the views of Darby, Scofield, Gaebelein and Walvoord.
4. Dr. Warren Wiersbe, writing in *Moody Monthly* (column "Insight") issue of Feb. 1977, said: "Annotated editions of the Kings James Bible continue to be published,

- and the public buys them. Like makes of cars or brands of toothpaste, each has its promoters and supporters and detractors, almost to the point of making this a test of orthodoxy or spiritual fellowship" (p. 125). The success of the Ryrie and Criswell Bibles confirms his point.
5. H. A. Ironside, *The Four Hundred Silent Tears*, Loizeaux Bros., Neptune, N. J., p. 22. Ironside is speaking about the teaching of the Maccabean period and the Talmud. However, the Scofield system which he encouraged and supported has had a similar effect on the Dispensational constituency.
 6. Chapter 30.
 7. J. Gresham Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, pp. 169, 170.
 8. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 81.
 9. *Scofield Reference Bible*, Introduction, unnumbered page.
 10. Letter of April 2, 1889, to Rev. J. B. Clark in the AHMS Collection. We cannot be entirely sure of the exact concept of "law" Scofield referred to, but in 1889, the distinctions which seem normal today were largely the playthings of theologians. Hence, we do not feel that we are reading into Scofield's letter something not intended.
 11. C. I. Scofield, *No Room in The Inn*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1913, p. 14.
 12. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Christ Jesus*, Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1915, p. 49.
 13. In "*Dominion Covenant: Genesis*" (Institute for Christian Economics, Tyler, Tex., 1982), Gary North noted (p. 392) that the defeat of Orthodox creationism was not an overnight event. There was a steady retreat from 1750 to 1859 when Darwin's work was published. The idea of geologic ages provided most of the impetus for that retreat. Scofield's orthodoxy must be measured by the implications of Note 2, page 3, and in the light of Gary North's statement.
 14. Letter, previously referred to from Wilbur M. Smith to Ernest Sandeen August 31, 1970. Except for the following statement the point was not noticed before, and we must wonder why no one noticed it.
 15. The service was reported in *The Dallas Morning News* of November 23, 1921. We fail to find that "millennium" is a good Biblical word.
 16. This note was quoted with pride in the ultradispensational magazine *The Berean Searchlight*, edited by Cornelius Stam in the January 1987 issue in an article entitled "Collateral Proof" by John Willison. The idea is entirely consistent with the views of the ultra group, and some *not* so "ultra" as well. It makes Christian carnality so much easier.
 17. Yona Malachy, *American Fundamentalism and Israel*. The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 1978. Malachy quotes from *The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 5.
 18. Introduction to the *Scofield Reference Bible*.
 19. When Scofield spoke at the opening of the Philadelphia School of the Bible in 1914, he said: "You would find this fact invariably true of those great highways through the Bible, that is, those great lines of truth that run through the books, namely, that, beginning with the first emergence of a truth and following chronologically through, the writer, though he may pick up the pen of the inspired writer of one hundred to two hundred years before, carries it on from just where this other writer left it, and it becomes more complete; and you follow the truth, ever growing larger and fuller, until it finally brings you to Christ. Is not that a very remarkable fact, that never once does the writer recur to a more elementary statement, but always carries the truth on and on?" Found in "The Spirit and Method of Bible Study," reprinted with Rev. Wilbur M. Smith's address of the same title in 1939, from page 9. If the seven-year period is a reversion to "Law" it conflicts with Scofield's views as expressed to the Philadelphians.
 20. C. I. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy*, Chas. C. Cook, New York, 1914, p. 13.

21. *Scofield Reference Bible*, 1917 Edition, Introduction, unnumbered page, paragraphs IX and X.
22. *The Scofield Reference Bible*, 1917, p. 20.
23. C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America*, John Knox Press, 1958, p. 119.
24. William E. Cox, *An Examination of Dispensationalism*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974. The quotation is from Appendix, p. 54. It had originally appeared in *The Baptist Leader*, November 1959.
25. Cornelius R. Stam, *The New Scofield Reference Bible, An Appraisal*, Berean Bible Society, Chicago, p. 12.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

CHAPTER 31

A Touch of Fame

"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world.: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

I John 5:4

The publication of a new edition of the Bible is not celebrated in the manner that publishers and authors announce a new novel. So we have no record of a celebration at 156 Fifth Avenue (Oxford headquarters) on January 15, 1909, when *The Scofield Reference Bible* was officially published. The man who made it possible was not there. By the 13th he was in Dallas, presiding at a business meeting for First Church.¹ While getting the Bible ready for the printer, Scofield had found time to prepare a report on his activities of 1908 for the church.²

In the report he expressed a desire to visit the fields where the Central American Mission was laboring.³ There is, however, no record of a trip to Latin America.

Scofield declared his approval of the decision of the church to withdraw from the Lone Star Association of the Congregational Church.⁴ That step was the culmination of a growing difference in point of view. The final break was triggered by the decision of the association to accept Rev. E. F. Maddox as a member of the association. Maddox, who had been dropped by the Presbyterians of the South on doctrinal grounds, was one of the early modernists in the South.

At some time during 1909, Scofield was taken with a bit of pride of accomplishment. This pride impelled him to send copies of *The Scofield Reference Bible* to each of his girls. Something did not go right. The copy sent to Helene did not arrive. (Post Office troubles are apparently nothing new.) Papa was hard pressed to explain. Note from the letter reproduced just below, that Papa stated a replacement was on the way, and that he had intended no discrimination.

Scofield's neglect of the girls after 1879, and even earlier, particularly the neglect while engaged in "Christian work," was especially heinous in the light of the imperative given Dispensationalists to witness to loved ones outside the camp. In the face of neglect of many years, a gesture after one approaches fame cannot compensate.

The apparent failure of Scofield to witness to his own becomes particularly inconceivable in the face of major differences between Dispensationalism and the official positions of the Roman Catholic

Church. That discrepancy is highlighted by Scofield's own note on Page 1346 of the Bible where he strongly condemns the Catholic Church. The news of the lost Bible was part of a letter whose text is:

30 Sept. '09

My dear Helene:

Your letter of the 27th finds me still at "Crestwood" but just in the miseries of packing to go. It is hard to leave the glory of these autumn forests and streams, but work calls, & even louder is the call of a purse which has grown dismally empty—Scofielditis, you know. I hate to gather up books & papers for so many fittings as I seem doomed to make. When I get rich I am going to have 3 homes—one in a winter apartment on Washington Heights, N. Y. City, one at Crestwood, one at Sorrento, Italy. I shall then have duplicates-triplicates—of everything in the way of belongings which I especially value—works of reference for serious studies; my favorite books, prints &c. I shall live in N. Y., Nov.-February; Sorrento, March-May; Crestwood, June-October. In N. Y. I shall have a large lecture room in the Carnegie Institute, & hold forth to all & sundry who may come for biblical instruction say 3 afternoons & 3 evenings in the week. At Sorrento & Crestwood I shall write books—un peu—but mostly loaf and invite my soul. The first year of that arrangement I shall divide myself & family up so that part of *each* of my three semesters shall be shared by you & Abbie. How bad that all this depends on the cure of my (chronic) Scofielditis!

My dear! Did not you get the Bible I ordered sent you simultaneously with Abbie? I am distressed beyond words. No wonder you marvelled what could be the reason for your exclusion. There was of course *no* reason—how could there be? I will look the matter up teute suite. Of a certainty you shall have a copy. The idea!

Noel is in the Hawley School of Steam & Electric Engineering in Boston—six feet high, frail as a reed, never really well—& we are to spend the winter in Boston, a city that I loathe & abhor past any descriptive words available to a Christian. It will not do to leave that most careless of created beings to his own devices as to changes of clothing, care of diet &c-&c. He is a thoroughly fine fellow, but oh so heedless of the things which alone keep him on his long legs.

I have been entrusted by the University of Oxford with the task of gathering a large company of American Hebrew & Greek scholars for the preparation of a great Commemorative Edition of the English Bible to be issued in 1911—the 300th anniversary of the publication of the A. V. in 1611. Boston is a good place to do such work—but oh the beastly cold & the east wind!

My address there will be, at present, The Canterbury 14 Charlesgate W. Thanks for your news. Have courage, dear. If my ----- itis is ever healed you shall have ease too.

Your loving father
C. I. Scofield^s

One thing that comes out in the letter is that Scofield must have let down on his "Rapture-watching."⁶ Or, was that only for Dispensational hoi-polloi and not for the leaders? The desire to have three homes at some time in the future is more than unusual for a cleric. And, this

at age 66. Scofield writes as though the housing prospectus in John 14: 1 had no appeal. The schedule of home occupancy suggests that more than a little earthly day-dreaming had been mixed in with the preparation of what some have called a "God-breathed" study.⁷

The desire to live in Sorrento, Italy, is quite amazing for a man who ostensibly had the values usually attributed to Dispensationalists. There is something quite different in the atmosphere of Sorrento (and the Amalfi Coast). This writer, when he was there, felt that it would not have been surprising, as one turned the next street corner, to see a cloven-hoofed satyr sitting on a rock, blowing his pipes. It is just not possible to conceive that Scofield was culturally capable of appreciating or adapting to Sorrento, religious variations aside.

We note another inconsistency between the public and private Scofield. In a message which he gave to The Union Bible Training Class in Dallas in December 1904, he said:

Go to the great cities, the great pleasure resorts of the world, look along the Italian Riviera and see the idlers of the earth and fill your soul with loathing and contempt for them; they are the inventors of new vices, the degraders of humanity. They are living upon the *too-much* toil of some men.⁸

The geography of the area establishes that Sorrento is separated from the Riviera by the Ligurian and Tyrrhenian Seas, but the Amalfi Coast is noted for exactly the same thing that Scofield in 1904 condemned as occurring along the Riviera. In the letter, he explicitly states that he wants to do what he condemned before the Bible class. Where the idea of Sorrento originated, we cannot be sure, but how it could have come up as he was doing the "God-breathed" study we cannot imagine. Incidentally, Philip Mauro, another Bible teacher and lawyer, had a summer home in Rapallo, Italy.⁹

From chapter 16, we noted that while Papa was never able to do much for Helene's "Scofielditis," a capable American entrepreneur did come to her rescue. Scofield's continuing "Scofielditis" contrasts with the promise of Philippians 4:19: "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus."

His distaste for Boston is remarkable, especially since he had been both economically and ideologically a product of what Boston stood for. We cannot get a real picture of son Noel from the comments of September 1909.

Scofield was back in Dallas for a business meeting of First Church on November 3, 1909.¹⁰ All three ministers of the church submitted their resignations. Scofield (as noted in the letter to Helene) had accepted an invitation from Oxford University Press to serve as editor of a tercentenary edition of the Kings James Bible. This was scheduled for

release in 1911 as a commemoration of the Authorized Version of 1611.¹¹ The church in Dallas made Scofield pastor emeritus and gave him a salary of \$600 per year. Meanwhile, he was getting an increasing number of speaking engagements. This gave him an excellent opportunity to broadcast the idea of a failing, irrelevant church and a decaying world as the hope made available by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ at Calvary.²

During 1910, Scofield followed the congregation of First Church in severing his connection with the Congregational denomination on account of its growing liberalism (Sadducean leaven). He requested and was granted membership in the Paris (Texas) presbytery of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Possibly some questioned why he had so delayed his break with apostasy. In an attempt to justify the timing of his move, he said that while he was working on the Reference Bible, he had been out of touch with developments in the Congregational denomination. He told Trumbull:

And so it happened that, at last, I lifted by face from my work and found that the denomination in whose fellowship I have found great and true men of God, had resolutely moved to positions I could not follow.¹³

Quite frankly, this writer considers the statement to be so much malarkey. The E. E. Gordon work, cited several times, makes it clear that the trend was apparent even before the days when Scofield hunted possum in Wilson County. "Prophecy buffs" have loved to regale conference sessions with stories, including specifics as to time, day, place and person, of apostasy in the church. This is done to give firm proof that the requirements for announcing the unannounced coming of the Lord are being met.¹⁴ Such concerns were always part of conferences such as Niagara and Sea Cliff. The conference pattern has not changed as the century has passed, except for the specific citations and the intensity of the reported apostasy. Thus, we feel that Scofield's statement that he was unaware of apostasy is at best very, very strange for a man whose perception has been cited as being so good.

Cause and effect cannot always be easily placed in proper relationship. This is especially true about a book which came out with the date of 1910 and C. I. Scofield as author. The title was *Addresses on Prophecy*; the publisher, A. C. Gaebelein, 456 Fifth Avenue, New York. It was a collection of lectures or messages on prophecy which Scofield had given over previous years. Whether Gaebelein was trying to capitalize on Scofield, the Bible commentator, or whether Gaebelein was hoping to push the Bible by issuing Scofield's lectures in book form, we cannot tell. In any case, the book is so very, very representative of the thinking and theology of the school which Scofield made legitimate. The Table of Contents lists:

CONTENTS

Influence of Prophetic Truth Upon Character and Conduct3
 God's Purpose in this Age13
 The Church of God28
 The Israel of God I. Past42
 do. II. Future56
 do. III. The Messianic Question67
 The Millennium104
 The Future State120¹⁵

The first lecture "Influence of Prophetic Truth Upon Character and Conduct" is, for Scofield, a most amazing tour-de-force. From page 4, note the following:

... It is therefore a believing understanding of prophetic truth which was an influence upon either character or conduct.

I have mentioned these two words, character and conduct. Perhaps it would be well to make a little explanation here. Character is what we are. Conduct is what we do. A great many people seem to think that reputation and character are identical things. This is not so. Reputation is what is said about us. Character is what we are. I believe that, in the long run, character and reputation and conduct will all harmonize. For a time our reputation may be better or may be worse than we deserve. Very severe things may be said about us. If we are right with God though, we need not mind that. We need not greatly concern ourselves about it, for in due time we shall be vindicated. On the other hand, we may be believed to be better than we are. Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a good man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.¹⁶

The preceding pages suggest that there was a substantial variation between the way in which Scofield lived and the ideas which he touted in this essay.

His comments on character formation are interesting, for when considered in the light of his life, they carry a negative impact for the theology or the system he expounded. The principles are:

First, association. Our intimacies, our associations, perhaps more powerfully than any other influence, determine, in the long run, what we are. . . .

A second formative influence, which we all recognize and will admit, is knowledge. . . .

Third, it is expectation which forms us—that which we look forward to; a large element of hope or of fear, whichever it may be. . . .¹⁷

The third is the most important of our study. The character deficiencies which we have noted and those which appear as we go on, even in this chapter, must raise a question as to the value of The Imminent Return as a character-building idea.

The second lecture was picked up word for word from a pamphlet which published the message when it was first delivered in Dallas on

October 15, 1892. Constancy and stability are important. But in areas as controversial as prophetic interpretation, as shifting and unsure as typical eschatology was in those days, we must be amazed at the lack of development in 17 years. Our analysis of the message, in chapter 21 shows that Scofield was committed to failure for the church and suffering for the world, suffering which he intended to avoid sharing.

In the third message, we get a view of what he thought about the church, what this writer has noted as the "Failing Church Syndrome"—that the church is not to succeed in *any* mission given it by the Lord. He limits his exposition by clinging to a dichotomy of idea which is peculiar to Dispensationalism:

It is not so much wealth, luxury, power, pomp, and pride that have served to deflect the church from her appointed course, as the notion, founded upon Israelitish promises, tha the church is of the world, and that therefore, her mission is to improve this world. Promises which were given to Israel alone are quoted as justifying what we see all about us. The church, therefore, has failed to follow her appointed pathway of separation, holiness, heavenliness and testimony to an absent but coming Christ; she has turned aside from that purpose to the work of civilizing the world, building magnificent temples, and acquiring earthly power and wealth, and in this way, has ceased to follow in the footsteps of Him who had not where to lay His head. Did you ever put side by side the promises given to the church, and to Israel, and see how absolutely in contrast they are? It is impossible to mingle them.

Then he brings in a fate of the church in which Dr. Scofield does not expect to share:

The promise to the church is a promise of persecution, if faithful in this world, but a promise of a great inheritance and reward thereafter. In the meantime, she is to be a pilgrim body, passing through this scene, but not abiding here.¹⁸

Then he places all earthly blessing in the future, a future from which the Church of Christ is excluded:

I believe that that day is drawing very near. Oh that in the last remnant of time, before we hear the shout of our descending Lord and rise to meet him in the air, we might come back with holiness of heart to the simplicity of our mission, the evangelization of the world! Dear friends, let us leave the government of the world till the King comes; let us leave the civilizing of the world to be the incidental effect of the presence there of the gospel of Christ, and let us give our time, our strength, our money, our days to the mission distinctively committed to the church, namely: to make Christ known "to every creature."¹⁹

We have commented elsewhere on the inability to understand his idea of evangelization without conversion. The fact that we can write this message more than 70 years after it was printed makes the idea "drawing very near" seem strained. We suggest that Scofield's sense of time was

not that which the Lord has really provided for the edification of the saints. Again, note that he would bar the church from social impact, from any steps toward relief of suffering, from any steps toward decency.

The lecture, "The Millennium," gives Scofield a chance to trot out a warhorse which his prophetic cult likes to use against those who have a different eschatology:

. . . Scripture, as we have abundantly seen in the previous articles, never speaks of a time *in this age* when the whole world would be a converted world. . . .²⁰

Now the idea of a *totally* converted world smacks of universalism. And it has never been held by any reputable conservative nonpremillennialist. The statement is a bit of semantic trickery. (The growing Biblical Postmillennial movement calls not for a totally converted world, but for a Christian dominated world especially with totally Christian direction of the culture. This is a far different idea, but it is supported by Scriptures, especially I John 5:4 and Rev. 2:26.) We would note that Scofield by his straw-man-warhorse forced his followers into a position which makes a mockery of The Great Commission (*Matt. 28:19*).²¹ And while Scofield claims that the position he derides is never spoken of by the Lord, the Lord did make statements which refute the claim of the Dispensationalists that the Church Age is to be a failure. Note that the Lord specifically told His followers to pray that the Lord's Will was to be done on Earth as it is in Heaven. The Lord's Will could hardly be done in the world which the Dispensationalists from Scofield to Hal Lindsay envisage as the future. This may be why some followers of Scofield refuse to pray as the Lord commanded.

Scofield ends the message we are considering with a completely racist idea that God, even after Calvary, deals with men differently according to their racial make-up (the idea is known as the Postponed Kingdom Theory). This idea had permeated the Bible Institute movement until they seem shackled to one concept at the expense of the church as a whole. Scofield's book was reprinted several times and remarkably has been accepted without it seemingly obvious faults being noted.

Another opportunity for publication came to Scofield in this period. Rev. Amzi E. Dixon, D.D., had been appointed editor of a project called *The Fundamentals*. Lyman Stewart, founder of the Union Oil Company of California, was appalled at the tide of modernism and infidelity sweeping the world. To stem it, he proposed issuing a series of essays on the various points of faith to show what the fundamental elements of Christian belief were. Lyman was assisted financially in the project by his brother, Milton. The whole scheme was permeated with the Dispensational view, which the Stewarts, lacking deep background, took to be traditional Christianity.

Scotfield's contribution was an essay entitled "The Grace of God." It is entirely consistent with the Dispensational theological position. Quite properly it could be entitled "A Short Commentary on Galatians, Dispensationally interpreted." The study is largely an exposition of Scotfield's bias against the Law and an expression of his antinomian understanding of grace. He says:

... It is, however, of the most vital moment to observe that Scripture never, in any dispensation, mingles these two principles. Law always has a place and work distinct and wholly diverse from that of grace. Law is God prohibiting, and requiring (Ex. 20:1, 17); grace is God beseeching, and bestowing (2 Cor. 5:18,21). Law is a ministry of condemnation (Rom 3:19); grace, of forgiveness (Eph. 1:7). Law curses (Gal. 3: 10); grace redeems from that curse (Gal. 3:1). Law kills (Rom. 7:9,11); grace makes alive (John 10:10). Law shuts every mouth before God; grace opens every mouth to praise Him. Law puts a great and guilty distance between man and God (Ex. 20:18,19); grace makes guilty man nigh to God (Eph. 2:13). Law says 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' (Ex. 21:24); grace says "Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on they right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matt. 5:39). Law says, "Hate thine enemy" grace, "Love your enemies, bless them that despitefully use you." Law says, do and live (Luke 10:26,28); grace, believe and live (John 5:24). Law never had a missionary; grace is to be preached to every creature. Law utterly condemns the best man (Phil. 3:4,9); grace freely justifies the worst (Luke 23:24); Rom. 5:5; I Tim. 1:15; I Cor. 6:9,11). Law is a system of probation; grace, of favor. Law stones an adulteress (Deut 22:21); grace says, "Neither do I condemn thee" (John 8: 1,11). Under law the sheep dies for the shepherd; under grace the shepherd dies for the sheep (John 10.11)²²

Anyone with even a modicum of exposure to Reformed theology can go over the quotation with a red pencil and line out statement after statement.

A page or so later, Scotfield pronounces an idea which has, in more recent times, brought forth the anathema of A. W. Tozer. Scotfield wrote:

Grace, on the contrary, is not looking for good men whom it may approve, for it is not grace, but mere justice, to approve goodness, but it is looking for condemned, guilty, speechless and helpless men whom it may save through faith, sanctify and glorify.²³

Tozer's anathema stems from the fact that this idea plants in the seeker a motivation to become bad, dip deep into fleshly sins or even crimes, in order to start on the path to redemption. such a view is utterly unbiblical, but is given encouragement from such statements as that of "Dr." Cyrus.

In concluding this glimpse into the ideas of a man who proudly misrepresented his war decoration, we quote another passage which shows his twisting of the Law which, in turn, impugnes the idea of morality in the life of the individual believer:

Protestant theology, alas, is for the most part, thoroughly Galatianized, in that neither law nor grace are given their distinct and separated places, as in the counsels of God, but are mingled together in one incoherent system. The law is no longer, as in the Divine intent, a ministration of death (2 Cor. 3:7), of cursing (Gal. 3:10), of conviction (Rom. 3:19), because we are taught that we must try to keep it, and that by Divine help we may.²⁴

Its obsession with the "Failing Church Syndrome" may not have been the only reason that the impact of *The Fundamentalist* was less than overwhelming.²⁵

Scotfield spent sometime during the summer of 1910 at Crestwood. The last reference to Crestwood was the fire of 1907. Within the next year or so, a substantial structure replaced the impermanence of tents. On his 70th birthday, Scotfield had a picture taken with the house in the background. He sent a print to his sister's family. On the back he wrote:

70th Birthday, August 19, 1913. At my home "Crestwood", Ashuelot, N. H. Grateful to God for His grace in salvation and some measure of usefulness.²⁶

During this period Scotfield was working with and for Oxford University Press on the edition of the Bible which was to mark the tercentenary of the King James Version. At the time of Scotfield's death, *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* published a photograph taken in 1910 or 1911 showing Scotfield and his associates at work. The photograph was taken in the Alcove of the Library at Princeton.²⁷ The committee included: Prof. Robert Dick Wilson of Princeton Seminary, Raven of New Brunswick, Creelam of Auburn, Robinson of McCormick Seminary (Chicago), Dr. Joseph Kyle of Xenia, Thomas J. Packard of Maryland, Hayes of Garrett Bible Institute (Evanston, Illinois), Crawford of Virginia Theological Seminary, O'Meara of Wycliffe College (Toronto), James M. Gray of Moody Bible Institute (Chicago), and C. I. Scotfield.

According to William M. Runyan, Gray was a member of the Old Testament Committee, a section of the main group. Few references to this 1911 Bible have been noted. In his sketch "Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute," Runyan gave this description of the 1911 work:

This Bible is not another version, but a reexamination of the text of the King James' with a view of correcting, in the light of the best modern research, such passages as are recognized by all scholars as in any measure misleading or needlessly obscure.²⁸

Scotfield was the only one of the group who lacked academic training in the areas of the committee's charge. There was nothing in his chequered career which qualified him for the task at hand, except his gift of gab, and the support of unidentified sponsors. It would be interesting

to know what the actual reaction of a true scholar like Robert Dick Wilson was to Scofield. (The Moody caption misprinted his name as Richard Dick. The error was apparently unnoticed for over half a century.)²⁹ Did Wilson's perception find any chink in the cover-up which Scofield had been erecting with considerable success since 1879?

The 1911 Bible came out as scheduled. Oxford in its trade catalog said:

A system of chain references specially prepared by Dr. C. I. Scofield, D.D., Editor of the Scofield Reference Bible tracing through the whole Bible the greater themes of Divine revelation from their first clear emergence to the final and complete form in the New Testament.³⁰

The tercentenary edition of the Bible appears to have had no great impact and was soon forgotten. It was not mentioned in the booklet issued by the Press for its 500th anniversary.³¹

Late in 1911 or early in 1912, Scofield received a request from Marquis Publishing Company, Chicago. They wanted information about his life from entry in *Who's Who in America, Vol. 7*. Relatively few Fundamental clergymen were considered for this recognition and we wonder whether Cyrus Scofield would have been asked for data if his Bible had not been published by Oxford University Press. The form sent by Marquis was duly filled in as Cyrus considered proper and returned. Marquis ordinarily accepts the material submitted, assuming (we think rightly so) that if a subject is of sufficient interest to merit entry, the data submitted should be substantially correct. It would be naive to expect Marquis to act as a conscience to a society whose standards are flexible. Scofield and the Coster-Musica affair of the late 1930's were two cases where Marquis' technique was inadequate.

The entry, on page 1850 of the 1912 work is:

SCOFIELD, Cyrus Ingerson, clergyman; b. Lenawee Co., Mich., Aug. 19, 1843, and reared in Wilson Co., Tenn; S. Elias and Abl. (Goodrich) S: pvtly fitted for coll., but univ. studies interrupted by breaking out of Civil War; m. Hettie van Wart, of Ypsilanti, Mich., July 14, 1884. Pvt. Co. H. 7th Tenn. Inf. May 1861 to close of Civil War; served in Army of Northern Va. under Gen. Lee, and awarded Cross of Honor for valor at battle of Antietam; admitted to Kan. bar, 1869, mem. Kan. Ho. of Rep. from Atchison and Nemaha cos., 1870-1; apptd U. S. atty. for Kan. by President Grant, 1873. Converted to Christian religion at St. Louis, 1879, ordained Congregational ministry, 1883, pastor First Ch., Dallas, Tex., 1882-1895, Moody Ch. Northfield, Mass. 1895-1902 and First Ch., Dallas, 1905-7. Has lectured extensively on bible subjects in Europe and America. Mem. S. A. R. Colonial Founders, Soc. Colonial Wars, *Club Lotos, Author Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, 1885, *Addresses on Prophecy* 1909, *The Doctrine of The Holy Spirit*, 1906, *Lectures on Galatians*, 1907, *Editor, Scofield Reference Bible*, 1910, *Bible of 1911*, 1911. Head of Scofield Corr. Bible Sch. *Home, "Crestwood"*, Ashuelot, N. H., and *Lotos Club*, New York. *Office* 156 5th Av., New York.³²

In this 1912 entry, we note the following:

A. Mis-statements or factual inaccuracies:

STATEMENT

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Reared in Wilson Co., Tenn. | No contact with Tenn. before 1858 |
| 2. University studies interrupted by War | No evidence |
| 3. Service in Confederate Army until end of War | Discharged in 1862 |
| 4. Service under General Lee | Only as GI's in WWII were under Eisenhower |
| 5. Decorated for valor at Antietam | Utterly false—see Chap. 5 |
| 6. Wedding day, July 14, 1884 | Correct dates: Sept. 21, 1866 March 11, 1884 Certificates available |

B. Omission of items pertinent but not known in Christian community:

1. Leontine
2. Abigail, Marie Helene and Guy Sylvestere
3. The divorce of 1882-1883

C. Items omitted from *Who's Who* but circulated in areas where he ministered or among his followers:

1. Story of birth in Tennessee
2. Existence of Son, Noel
3. The "law practice" in St. Louis
(The Presidency of the Northfield Schools may be a story invented later.)

The items listed under A all sound quite reasonable and would not be checked on unless a devoted history "buff" was working on a serious biographic study of the subject. Thus the chance of being tripped up could have seemed so unlikely that fact was stretched beyond limits.

The item identified as C 3 above may be more significant in evaluating Dispensationalism and its developers than any exposition of any part of Scripture. It may serve better than the various carefully thought out commentaries on Dispensational distinctives which have been appearing in the last generation.

Some readers by this point may be feeling that we have made too much of the discrepancies in the stories told about Scofield's life. After all, could they not have originated through carelessness or misunderstanding? The likelihood of that is virtually impossible with regards the *Who's Who* entry. The story of the law practice in St. Louis, widely circulated in Fundamental circles, has no support in official records. But it has circulated with impunity among Dispensationalists and Evangelicals. Whoever prepared the data for Marquis or whoever advised Scofield on what to submit knew that the story of the St. Louis law practice could not safely be published outside the Dispensational com-

munity. Such selectivity is not a matter of carelessness, but rather of careful calculation in deception and how much one may "get away with." It further indicates a contempt for the intelligence of followers. They could be expected not to check up on any stories, no matter how reasonable or outlandish. If a system whose interpretation can be faulted uses calculated falsehood in describing its "patriarch," can the system (Dispensationalism) have any credibility?

Scofield made a trip to the British Isles early in 1912. At the time of the sinking of the S. S. *Titanic* (April 14, 1912), he was in Belfast, Ulster. After his return to the United States, he related some rather embroidered stories about his activities in Belfast. He reported that on the Sunday following the disaster, the city was in a state of tension and turmoil (he should have seen it in the 1970's and 1980's). Scofield's report was that the Lord Mayor of Belfast (that official in 1912 was Robert J. McMordie, a Presbyterian) asked him (Scofield) to address the populace. Scofield related that he delivered a message entitled "The Unsinkable Ship." He was also to declare that through the efforts of one C. I. Scofield, the entire city was calmed.³³

Feeling that some details of the story were in need of verification, this writer checked the files of Belfast newspaper held by the British Library in London. The issues of April 1912 noted the horror felt but indicated no tension or turmoil and, more significant, made no reference to an American named Scofield.

Thanks to the Rev. Adam Loughridge of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, it was possible to have access to files of *The Northern Whig*, a now defunct paper, whose issues were not in the British Library collection. That paper, in its day, gave very good coverage to religious events. On page 9, issue of April 22, 1912, it is noted:

A service in the Y.M.C.A. Hall, (Wellington Place) was very largely attended, the chief speaker being Rev. Dr. Schofield, well known American Clergyman. An offering was taken for relief funds.³⁴

In a much fuller report on another page it was noted, as reported to the writer by Prof. Loughridge:

. . . Sir James Henderson presided; the prayer was offered by Rev. J. M. Alley of the Methodist Church; the Scriptures were read by the Rev. Robert Duff, Presbyterian; the address was given by Dr. Scofield. There follows the usual newspaper-type summary of the address, which seems to have been based on the text, "God is Love." At the close, the hymn "Nearer My God to Thee" was sung and the benediction pronounced by the Ref. F. E. Marsh.

Continuing, Prof. Loughridge says:

In the summary of the address I could find no reference to his suggested theme, "The Unsinkable Ship," and certainly his claim to have been

instrumental in calming the city is typical Scofield bombast, as this meeting was only one of many held in the city that day. The impression I gained from reading other reports of the tragedy in *The Northern Whig*, is that the city was very calm and sober and filled with a deep sense of awe by the event.³⁵

Note that Rev. Loughridge was unable to find any reference of contact between Lord Mayor McMordie and the incredible Cyrus Scofield. Embellished stories or not, the European trip of 1912 appears to have been of shorter duration than previous trips when he claimed to be researching or writing.³⁶

Sometime in this period, the Scofields moved their residence to "Greyshingles" at the corner of Main Street and Virginia Ave., Douglaston, in the eastern extremity of the Borough of Queens, New York City. Douglaston was and remained for years an exclusive enclave. It had its own atmosphere, a bit cut off from all that was Gotham. The available material of these years does not provide an explanation of how the Scofields lived. The letter quoted at the beginning of this chapter suggests that financial insecurity was regular enough to be entitled "Scofielditis." The only guaranteed income was \$600 per year from First Church.³⁷ The cost of keeping Noel in Hawley would have taken all that and possibly more. There would be little or nothing for European junkets—or for purchasing a house in a "better" neighborhood. How was it done?

On his 70th birthday, August 19, 1913, addressing a friend, Scofield quoted the 71st Psalm, verse 18, applying it to himself:

Hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works. Now also when I am old, and gray-headed, O God, forsake me not, until I have showed Thy strength unto this generation and Thy power to every one that is to come.³⁸

CHAPTER 31 NOTES

1. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
2. Pastor's Report to First Congregational Church, 1908.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. Original lent to the writer by Mr. John H. Mize, Atchison, Kan.
6. In a letter of January 19, 1903, to A. P. Fitt (see chapter 24), Scofield had said: "I expect to keep my summer home at (or near) E. Northfield." Since at that time Crestwood was largely unimproved property the statement must have been based on a lot of earthly planning or day-dreaming.
7. Reference to a statement in Dr. James M. Gray's puff of Scofield's work.
8. "The Seven Covenants," address by C. I. Scofield before The Union Bible Training Class, Dallas, Texas, Dec. 5, 1904, p. 10.
9. See *Champion of The Kingdom*, by Gordon P. Gardinar, Bread of Life, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1961, p. 34.
10. Record Book, Minutes of First Church, Nov. 3, 1909.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Salary figure quote by BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

14. Citations ad nauseam could be given. The result would only use up space.
15. Facing page 3. The work was reprinted in 1914 by Charles C. Cook, N. Y., and more recently by The Gospel Hour, Greenville, S. C. The last edition refers to a total issue of 35,000 copies.
16. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
21. The "Great Commission" calls for the baptizing of all nations. This can occur only after people believe, so it must mean widespread, general conversion. The Scofield-induced doctrine of a remnant waiting to be "Raptured" is completely at variance with the direct word of The Lord. The essentially negative view of Scofield's beliefs is only now being noted.
22. Chapter VII, "The Grace of God" by Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. in *The Fundamentals*, p. 100.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
25. While *The Fundamentals* continues in print and is circulated, the effect has been negligible. The only evaluation of its impact noted is *The Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* by Ernest Sandeen, pp. 188-207. Sandeen is reasonably objective about the positions of the papers but notes that the format discouraged all but the most studious. This writer feels that the definite Dispensational Premillennial bias doomed the whole effort.
26. Original photograph property of Mr. Richard Kammerer, Gettysburg, Pa. Lent to the writer for this work.
27. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, Sept. 1921, p. 552.
28. Wm. M. Runyan, *Dr. James M. Gray* at Moody Bible Institute, Oxford University Press, New York, 1935, p. 99.
29. The Scofield Memorial article of September 1921.
30. *Trade Catalog*, Oxford University Press, 1911.
31. *A Little Quincentenary History, 1478-1978*, Oxford University Press, 1978.
32. *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 7, 1912, 1913, Marquis Publishing Co., Chicago, 1912, p. 1856.
33. *The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Gospels*, p. 115, in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, BICA, Chicago, 1914. Also in *The Sunday School Times*, LXIII, August 13, 1921, and *The Dallas Morning News*, November 28, 1921, p. 7.
34. As quoted to the writer by Ref. Adam Loughridge.
35. Letter to the writer from Rev. Adam Loughridge. Quoted by permission.
36. More on the *Titanic* incident in the next chapter.
37. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
38. Scofield must have related the incident, or shown the letter to James M. Gray. Gray referred to it in his testimonial in 1916 and published it in the 1921 tribute, *Moody Monthly*, p. 552, where we located it.

CHAPTER 32

Scofield Postpones the Kingdom— and Sinks the *Titanic*

“. . . Now is come salvation, and strength and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ . . .”

Rev. 12:10

In 1914, Scofield “made it.” He appeared on the platform of a major prophetic conference. The idea of a premillennial return of the Lord had been carefully merchandised in North America by a series of “prophetic conferences” held in major cities.

The first, in New York, October 1878, was about a year before Scofield was converted. At the time of the second, in Chicago, November 1886, Scofield was a tyro pastor with little more than a local reputation. The third, held in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, in December 1895 occurred when Scofield was busy moving from Dallas to Northfield. The fourth, in Boston in 1901, either was not ready for Scofield, or Scofield was not ready for it.¹

By the time the fifth conference was in the planning stage, Scofield’s reputation, as editor of *The Scofield Reference Bible*, made a place for him on the program a certainty. He was one of the signers of the call to the conference which went out Dec. 1, 1913. Note the tone and purpose of the affair as seen in this excerpt from the call:

To Christian Believers in the United States and Canada,
Dear Brethren:

It is twelve years since the International Prophetic Conference was held in the city of Boston, and many brethren feel that the times demand testimony to the doctrine of the premillennial coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We therefore cordially and urgently invite you to meet with us and others for this holy purpose, at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill., from Tuesday to Friday, February 24th to 27th, 1914.

It is believed that the signers of this invitation are a guarantee that the Conference will not offer an opportunity for modern prophets to ventilate their speculations, to fix dates, or to mark out a detailed program of the future; but that, to incorporate the language of and earlier conference, the occasion will be used for students of prophecy to give prominence to neglected truths; to employ the true principles of Scripture interpretation; to warn against present-day apostasy; to awaken slumbering Christians; to present the most majestic of all motives for worldwide evangelism; to call attention to the doctrine of “last things” as a bulwark

against the skepticism of modern theology; and to bring into closer fellowship all those who 'love His appearing.'²

The "call" was signed by:

- JOHN TIMOTHY STONE,
Pastor, Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago (Moderator of the
Presbyterian Church U.S.A.)
- ROBERT McWATTY RUSSELL,
President, Westminster College, (Moderator of the United Pres-
byterian Church)
- WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD,
President, Xenia Theological Seminary
- E. Y. MULLINS,
President, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
- T. R. O'MEARA,
Principal, Wycliffe College, Toronto
- W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS,
Professor, Wycliffe College, Toronto
- C. I. SCOFIELD,
Editor, *The Scofield Reference Bible*.
- H. B. HARTZLER,
Editor, *The Evangelical*
- A. C. GAEBELEIN,
Editor, *Our Hope*
- R. A. TORREY,
Dean, The Bible Institute, Los Angeles
- W. B. RILEY,
Pastor, First Baptist Church, Minneapolis,
President, Northwestern Bible School
- JAMES M. GRAY,
Dean, The Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.

The name of Rev. John Timothy Stone at the head of the list of conveners provided a note of "class." Chicago's Fourth Presbyterian Church has always had an atmosphere missing from Dispensational churches, no matter how large. Even though he led the list of conveners, Stone was unable to be present at the sessions.

The conference did differ from its predecessors. Richard Ellsworth Day was to say of it: "It is fair to say that prophecy thereupon got out of its rags and entered good society."³

Undoubtedly the burden of planning had fallen on "The Well-groomed Little Man in the Grey Fedora," Dr. James M. Gray.⁴ In speaking of the 1914 Conference, Dr. Wilbur M. Smith was later to say:

You could not gather together, if you combed the world and promised ten thousand dollars to each of them, such a group of prophetic authorities as Dr. Gray gathered for the Conference.⁵

One of the "authorities" is the subject of this work, C. I. Scofield.⁶ Charles G. Trumbull, speaking of Scofield's part noted: ". . . that message was laughed at by the general public and newspaper reporters at the

time.”⁷ The secular press, Hal Lindsay to the contrary, has not moved all that far from its 1914 position, even in the face of daily crises throughout the world.

Scofield delivered three messages on successive mornings. The topics were: “The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Prophets,” “The Doctrine of the Last Things as Found in The Gospels,” “The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Epistles and Revelation.”

In the first message, Scofield tried to define the role of the prophet, but he did it in such a way that he justified the particular system which he espoused:

You will find that the prophet saw two kinds of things: he saw his own age, the times in which he lived, from the divine point of view, and that is a very different thing from seeing it from the human point of view. That was the radical difference between the true prophets and the false prophets. The latter judged everything from the human standard. The true prophet was the analyst and the exponent of his own time. But in whatever Jehovah may have had controversy with his ancient people, the true prophet was on God’s side, and therefore he was the unpopular man.⁸

Scofield uses a term which is a “war-horse” of his system, “His ancient people” to describe the people of the Two Kingdoms. Note that the obedient Israelites—and only the obedient ones—were the people identified with the purpose of God. But their chosen role was always conditional on obedience. The thought in the term “ancient people” carries implications which are incorrect, for God used the method of a special people only until Calvary and A.D. 70.

Continuing, Scofield says:

The real prophet of God was an unpopular man because he saw, below the superficial prosperity of the time, that which a holy God could not approve. The man of God “saw” because he *was* a man of God, and, seeing, he spoke, and so we have the prophetic ministry.⁹

True, but the popularity of the prophetic teachers of the 20th century belies either the principle Scofield enunciated or the position of the teachers. Again typing the prophetic role to his system, Scofield says:

Then came a promise of encouragement. After seventy years, a remnant should return (Jer. 25:11,12). It was necessary that Messiah should be born in that land; it was necessary that the Mosaic law should be in full operation in that land, when the Messiah should come.⁹

But that last statement is obviously false. This can be proven from passage after passage in the Gospels. The Mosaic law was really not in operation in the Roman provinces of Judah and Galilee around 30 A.D. The incident at the opening of John 8, of the woman and the leaders, is typical.

The nature of the prophecy being presented those February days is shown by this quotation:

THE KINGDOM NOT THE CHURCH

The first thing we need to remember, and always to remember, when we are studying the prophetic picture of the Kingdom is that it is not in any sense whatever a picture of the Church. We are told distinctly by the apostle Paul that the Old Testament prophet did not see the Church (Eph. 3:1-10). The Old Testament prophet saw a world-wide salvation; saw not only Israel as the object and beneficiary of that salvation, but also the Gentiles; and you know how copiously the apostle Paul, in the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters of Romans, quotes from the Old Testament prophetic writings, to show that the Gentile was always in God's thought in connection with the saving work of the Messiah.¹⁰

The statement "the Old Testament prophet did not see the Church" is reached only by using the Darby-Scotfield system of interpretation. In the rest of the paragraph, Scotfield tries to make a distinction essential to Dispensationalism, but as the paragraph progresses it seems that his citations argue both sides of the question. He fails to prove that there is a distinction between kingdom and church.

Scotfield did look to a better day, but one which did not include the church:

Next the prophet sees the spiritual nature of that Kingdom. The very power by which the King will establish His Kingdom is the resistless power of the Spirit of God.¹¹

In contrasting the present and future, he made a personal reference, the full significance of which was lost on that 1914 audience:

... And yet how clumsy are our attempts at justice, after all! I used to practice law, and so had a first-hand opportunity of seeing how often justice miscarries.¹¹

He was very familiar with miscarriage of justice, especially in the cases of Jephtha Simpson, James McLean and Frank Vollmer (unless, as *The Atchison Patriot* reporter claimed, Emeline paid up.)¹² Personal references should be carefully made.

As he continued, Scotfield made reference to the Lord's Prayer, a part of Scripture which many of his followers consign almost to perdition:

Surely there is no opportunity for evasion there. A King shall reign, prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth. What is the Lord's prayer? "Thy Kingdom come." What is that Kingdom? "Thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven." That will be when a King reigns in righteousness, and prosperity.¹³

Now any common sense view of that prayer and the way in which the Lord presented it, places it in the Church Age. But Scotfield is so anxious to have everything held until Gentiles are out of the way, that the full

blessing of the prayer is lost on many church goers. He clung to that idea as he closed the message:

The ultimate vision of the prophet is that Kingdom of righteousness and peace on this earth, with regathered Israel for its center, and the nations gathered in, to its blessing; and it is always in connection with the setting up of the Kingdom that we get that great expression:

"Then shall the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

We always get that in connection with the Kingdom. I have done. May God add His blessing, for Jesus' sake!¹⁴

The message concluded before lunch.

The next day, Scofield started his second message by citing the Old Testament prophecies of the kingly role of the Messiah. Then John the Baptist's proclamation "The Kingdom is at Hand!" is noted. Scofield follows the party-line by having the King rejected and the King declaring judgment.

At this point in the message, just about two heartbeats before he firmly sets out what is now called the "Postponed Kingdom" theory, he introduces, supposedly for illustration, a personal experience. Unfortunately, the experience was presented in a way which is substantially false. The implications of falsehood just a couple of heartbeats before propounding a major religious theory are frightening.

The story he introduced was the *Titanic* story, his version of his visit to Belfast, Northern Ireland, 22 months before:

It fell to my lot to be in Belfast, where the *Titanic* was built, the Sunday after the great ship went down. A great memorial meeting was held in Wellington Hall. They asked me to give the message at that meeting. All Belfast was smitten with sorrow. I have never seen a whole city in such grief. That ship was built there, and a considerable number of the men who were aboard her in various capacities, who went down with the ship, lived in Belfast. Every order of people was there, from the bishops and the nobility up to the laboring class. They packed that great hall.

I tried to preach the gospel from that awful incident, the loss of the *Titanic*. I told them that we were all on a doomed ship; but that God in His mercy had brought a life boat alongside that would hold us all. And the ship upon which humanity is crossing the sea of time is doomed.¹⁵

No one in the assembly thought to check on the story. We did and, as stated in chapter 31 found the relation to be quite at variance with published reports at the time.

To refresh our memories, note that the newspaper, *Nothern Whig*, issue of April 22, 1912, on page 9 reported meetings in Belfast, memorials for the lost *Titanic* and its company, but no general meeting as Scofield implied. Referring to the meeting addressed by Scofield, we repeat:

A service in the Y.M.C.A. Hall (Wellington Place) was very largely attended, the chief speaker being Rev. Dr. C. I. Scofield, well-known American Clergymen. An offering was taken for relief funds.¹⁶

The article summarized Scofield's address, apparently based on the theme "God is Love" and makes no mention of the subject "The Un-sinkable Ship" which Scofield claimed was the subject of his message. The newspaper also reported that in contrast to Scofield's claim, the city was very calm and sobered and filled with awe by the tragic event. The report makes it quite clear that the meeting addressed by Scofield was but one of many held that day. His story was quite embroidered and was to receive further embellishment in the Fundamentalist community in the next few years.¹⁷

But why embroider the simple story of a speaking engagement in a distant city nearly two years previously? Why force the story into the message without its being really relevant?

Another Bible teacher was really involved in the *Titanic* affair. Very early in the morning of Monday, April 15, 1912, the wireless operator of the Cunarder, *S. S. Carpathia* received a message from the *Titanic*: "Come at once, we have struck a berg, It's a C.O.D., old man. Position 41'58" N. 50'14" W. M.G.Y." This was followed by a second message: "S.O.S. M.G.Y."

When the wireless operator on the *Carpathia* replied, "Coming Hard," Bible teacher Philip Mauro and his daughter, Margaret, were asleep in their cabin on the ship. In a letter to daughter, Isabel, Mauro described the scene at daybreak when the *Carpathia* reached the spot where the *Titanic* sank.

The scene that greeted our eyes when we went on deck yesterday (Monday) morning is indescribable.

We were lying a few thousand yards from a perfect continent of ice, which stretched as far as the eye could reach, with here and there huge ice peaks sticking up into the air. And all around us in the sea were detached icebergs glistening in the sun. It was a perfect polar scene, and although it was only yesterday, and although we remained for hours skirting along the icefield looking for boats and bodies, it seems already like a dream—so unreal and strange does it appear. Surely the hand of God is most manifestly appearing in the affairs of men.

You can imagine the depression and discomfort pervading this boat, with such a cargo of concentrated abjectness and misery added to the rather full passenger list that we had at the start.

Mr. Mauro continued in his letter to Isabel:

There are more *Titanic* passengers than *Carpathians*, and, of course, there are no accommodations for them in the ordinary sense.¹⁸

Margaret has given away most of her things (underwear, etc.). There has been (no great demand for masculine apparel—but I quickly parted with some stockings, pajamas, and handkerchiefs, besides the

nice, felt slippers my dear Charlie gave me. the dozen toothbrushes I had were most acceptable. Of course, the people had absolutely nothing but what was on their persons—not even hand togs. They were told up to the last few moments that there was no danger of the ship's going down.¹⁹

But more than physical help was offered. Note a typical incident from the letter.:

Wednesday. The opportunities are opening out. A splendid one was offered this morning before breakfast. A young man, Albert A. Dick, was saved with his wife (married less than a year ago). The Lord put him in my way. He has made money (three quarters of a million, he told me) and is about quitting business, meaning to devote the rest of his life to "doing good." Said he was not a Christian, but had been reading the Bible trying to find out if there were a God. Was quite ready to listen, and I gave him the truth for some hours. He was in a state similar to that of the Ethiopian treasurer. I am sure the Lord sent me to him and that He gave me the word for him.

* * *

Thursday. We are expecting to reach New York this evening. The opportunities that have opened for ministry have been simply wonderful. Most of them came to Margaret. Such a day as she had yesterday: Hope she may be able to write you some of the marvelous doings of the Lord. Now I want you to send a copy of the *World and Its God* to A. L. Solomon, 345 Broadway, New York. . . . He is a Jew, but his heart is quite tender just now.²⁰

Mauro related the *Titanic* experience in *God's Pilgrims*, a study of Hebrews which came out in 1913.

The prophetic conference of February 1914 was the largest public appearance made by Scofield after his Belfast visit of 1912—and after Mauro's book came out in 1913. Scofield's *Titanic* story, even if it had been correct, added nothing to his exposition of the Postponed Kingdom" idea. It could have been inserted as a reaction to Philip Mauro. The possibility is intriguing.²¹

With the *Titanic* sunk, Scofield proceeded in his message to "postpone" the Kingdom (blithely disregarding the possibility that Jesus had not postponed anything):

Then what? The King has come. The King has announced that His Kingdom is at hand. He has shown His power to establish the Kingdom, and to bring in Kingdom blessings, but Israel will not have her King.

He wept over Jerusalem, and that very weeping, and what He said to Jerusalem is prophetic (Matt. 23:39) for which His rejection as King He begins His predictive testimony concerning this age in which we live. And for this age He has a new message, and His message is not now "the kingdom of heaven is at hand."²²

The idea had been plainly set out by Scofield in his great opus (The Reference Bible). Footnote 1, page 1011 of The Scofield Bible says: