

CHAPTER 16

The Fate of the First Family

"She looketh to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness."

Prov. 31:27

Before resuming the narrative of the life of Cyrus as he pursued his course toward the role of the Matthew Henry of the Progressive Era, let us relate the story of Leontine and the girls to its conclusion.

By diligent effort and careful management, Leontine was able to get her household established on a going basis. Matters improved after she was appointed to the post of librarian. The two girls received the best schooling possible up to and including high school. But more than schooling contributed to the development of the girls. Leontine's essential gentility and culture helped shape the lives of her daughters. Her reputation in Atchison was that she was a wonderful mother.¹ Already noted was the help provided by her widowed mother, Helene LeBeau Cerré during the crucial days of the early 1880's. Mrs. Cerré remained in Atchison with Leontine until her death on March 28, 1892.²

Leontine's position in the library made it possible for her to form friendships which endured for years and which probably would not have been made in other lines of endeavor. She is remembered for possessing the gaiety and vivacity characteristic of the French. Various clippings and letters suggest that Mrs. Scofield continued in contact with both the Pomeroy and Ingalls families, friends from the early days in Atchison. Comment did reach this writer that she was at times temperamental, but one must remember her Gallic heritage.

The oldest daughter, Abigail, taught in the elementary schools in Atchison after she graduated from high school. She became acquainted with Dr. Edward Lincoln Kellogg, a dentist in Atchison and a prominent member of the Trinity Episcopal Church. They were married on June 23, 1902, in St. Benedicts Catholic Church, Atchison.³

After a few years, Dr. Kellogg's health failed. The couple moved to West Plaines, Missouri, and shortly thereafter to San Luis Obispo, California, to benefit Dr. Kellogg's health. Mrs. Kellogg followed in her mother's footsteps by becoming librarian of the Public Library in San Luis Obispo. Through contacts she made there, she became one of the most popular residents of the community. Abigail was known as a gracious and pleasant person with many interests reflecting an active mind.

Helene became a teacher of French at the Barstow School of Girls in Kansas City, Kan. On October 4, 1918, she was married to J. Wheeler Barlow of Atchison. The ceremony took place in the Westminster Congregational Church, Kansas City. The pastor, Rev. Morris H. Tuck, officiated. A contemporary newspaper account lists the guests: Mrs. Leontine Scofield, Rev. Otis E. Gray of Atchison, Dr. and Mrs. E. G. Blair, Rev. and Mrs. Robert Mize, Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Abernathy, Miss Rosa A. Witham, Miss Miriam Babbitt of Kansas City. The list has been placed here to point out the conspicuous absence of the bride's father, Rev. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, who never had the experience of the proud father who "gives away" his daughter to the man who won her heart.

The couple honeymooned by a motor trip to St. Louis and Kentucky, traveling in the groom's Stutz Bear-Cat Roadster,⁴ Barlow was vice-president of Blish, Mize and Silliman Hardware Co., of Atchison,⁵ His mother was a sister of Mrs. Parsh D. Blish, wife of one of the firm. He had spent part of his youth at the Blish home at 300 R Street, Atchison. The R Street property ran through to Riverside Drive, providing an outstanding site for a gracious home. It was there that the three Scofield women were to live out the closing days of their lives.

One of Barlow's interests was the Bar Wood Farm in Atchison County. Helene shared his interest in the ranch where pure bred cattle were raised. Among Helene's other interests, she was a member of the Atchison Library Association and on the Library Board. The Barlows played a significant role socially in Atchison.

The available material gives little that is precise on when Cyrus resumed relations of any sort with his daughters. There are intimations that he was ready to move as soon as the girls' legal majorities made the Court Order of 1883 moot. They may not have been appreciated by the second Mrs. Scofield. One surviving bit of evidence is a letter in Cyrus' own handwriting on his personal letterhead, dated in 1909. The letter gives evidence that he had by that time achieved substantial "victory over humility." The letter will be discussed in Chapter 32, but at this point note that the letter fails to show any concern about the very substantial differences between the faith for which he had become world-famous and that believed in and practiced by his ex-wife and daughters.

Leontine retired from her post at the library in 1917 at the age of 69. She made her home with the Barlows on R Street. Children of people who had been her patrons at the library frequently came to see her. During her retirement she made a number of trips to California to visit Abigail and Edward. Leontine's brother, Henry, passed away on April 9, 1926. No doubt as the older generation passed on, she drew closer to the girls.

On October 27, 1936, the girls hosted a dinner for their mother's 88th birthday. Leontine had remained a devout Catholic and among the guests were her particular friends, the Revs. Richard Burns and Matthew Hall. Two days later, Leontine was stricken with a heart attack. This was followed by pneumonia. She passed away on Friday, November 6, 1936. Burial was in Mount Calvary Cemetery, Atchison.⁸ Interestingly enough, items published at the time of her death, and even items about Leontine published after Cyrus' death in 1921, referred to Leontine as if she had been the *only* Mrs. Scofield.

Abigail's husband, Dr. Kellogg, died on January 5, 1935 in California. His remains were brought to Atchison for internment. Abigail continued to live in California until 1941. When she left to return to Atchison, she was honored at a community gathering and presented with a gift to mark her years of dedication to the library.

J. Wheeler Barlow died on July 7, 1941. It was his passing that prompted Abigail to return to Kansas and live with Helene. The two women maintained the house on R Street for more than 16 years.

On December 10, 1957, Abigail, 87 years old, entered Atchison Hospital. Helene went along to be with her sister. Helene became ill shortly before the end of 1957 and passed away on January 8, 1958. Rev. Matthew Hall, her mother's friend, officiated at the funeral on January 8 at St. Joseph's Church. Her remains were placed alongside those of her mother in Mount Calvary Cemetery.⁷ Abigail remained critically ill until she passed away on February 27, 1958. Rev. Matthew Hall conducted services for her at St. Joseph's on March 1, 1958. Neither woman had any children and Scofield's line through Leontine ended with their deaths.

So great was the esteem in which these three women were held in Atchison, that when this writer commenced gathering material for this work, he found that they were still being referred to as outstanding, 20 and 40 years after they had passed away.

CHAPTER 16 NOTES

1. Based on reports in Atchison newspapers at the time of her death.
2. From family papers loaned by Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison. Mr. Mize read a draft of this portion of the story.
3. From an item in an Atchison newspaper dated October 5, 1916. Collection of John H. Mize.
4. From a newspaper report of the wedding.
5. Information supplied by Mrs. Mize.
6. Reports in the Atchison newspapers, December 1936.
7. From the *Atchison Daily Globe*, Tuesday, January 7, 1938. Abigail's death was reported in the edition of Feb. 28, 1958. The story of Helene's funeral mentioned Cyrus' role in connection with the *Scofield Reference Bible*. The items were made available with the assistance of Margaret Schwein of the *Globe*.

Pastor and Benedict

"There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea four which I know not: . . . ; and the way of a man with a maid."

Proverbs 30:18,19

In the Evangelical tradition, it is usually assumed that the recommendation of a man for a vacant pastorage is based on careful evaluation of the life, character and belief of the candidate. The recommendation of Cyrus Scofield for the vacant Pastorate of the First Congregational Church of Dallas, Texas, cannot possibly have been made on such a basis.

When the word of the vacant pulpit in Dallas got around, Cyrus had, according to his own story, been converted less than three years. He admitted to almost total ignorance of the Scriptures at the reputed time of conversion.¹ He completely lacked any Christian or theological training and his formal schooling appears to have been very limited. The only intellectual attainment was his admission to the Bar of the State of Kansas, a privilege which he abused to the full.

Counseling was not in the 1880's the "in" thing in the church that it is today. But his family status, if honestly related, should have raised serious doubts about his fitness for a pastoral role.

He was later reported to have been:

. . . a wonderful preacher and a world preacher. He would have been at ease in any congregation where he could have preached. Thoughtful people call him a great preacher. There was about his a positiveness, a definitiveness, a certainty. . . .²

More prosaically this could be called a gift of gab which can carry any public figure a long way. It appears that he had a mind which could quickly pick up and expound teaching of a sort which would have delighted J. N. Darby.

In the light of the facts about the man, the recommendation of Scofield clearly ignores the standards set by the Apostle Paul as he wrote to both Timothy and Titus. The actions of Brookes and Goodell are a bit inexplicable. They proposed a man separated from but still legally married to a wife of another faith. And to that family, Scofield was making little contribution in the way of support. Possibly they were unaware of the family, or possibly the three (Brookes, Goodell and Scofield) may have considered Scofield's past so covered by the

blood of Christ that he could forget Leontine and the girls. (As we shall see later, Scofield *never* put them out of his life.)

The kindest position to take (and it may be quite inaccurate) is that Scofield covered his immediate past, possibly never once using the word "bachelor" but giving an impression of marital availability. Unfortunately, to be so kind reflects on the discernment of Brookes and Goodell. It has been noted that Oswald Allis, writing in 1945, unaware of Leontine, seemed convinced that Brookes was involved in a coverup of ideas. Maybe there was more cover-up or just who was pushing Scofield?³

The Church in Dallas issued a call which Scofield accepted. On Saturday, August 19, 1882, C. I. Scofield arrived in Dallas to begin his ministry. In 1882, the streets of Dallas were still largely unpaved. This meant alternation between seas of mud and clouds of dust. Except for the determination of the people, there was no indication of the great future of the city and no hint of its eventually becoming the home of Neiman-Marcus and of W. A. Criswell.

The First Congregational Church was a struggling work, smarting from a justifiable Texas distaste for anything "Yankee." The Congregational denomination had taken a significant part in the effort to end slavery. While the North seemed unaware of problems resulting from the War, the South was still feeling its hurt.

In 1876, the Congregationalists in Dallas had organized into a "Society" under Rev. Henry M. Daniels, sent to the city by the American Home Missionary Society, an agency of the denomination. The group incorporated as the First Congregational Church on January 7, 1877. With 17 charter members, First Church felt prepared to minister to a city of 10,000.

Eleven of the 17 charter members were from the North, adding to the social barriers hindering the acceptance of the church. Its first meeting place was in Crowds Hall at Main and Austin in downtown Dallas. During its first four years, the group met in 15 different locations before finding a permanent home.

Germane to the story of Scofield, early in 1882, the pastor, Rev. W. C. McCue, was sent by the Denominational Society to Fort Worth. Word of the vacancy was noised about the denomination—reaching to St. Louis. (Things like that always manage to get around in religious circles.) Thus an opportunity was opened for Scofield and his dream of church failure.

On his first full day in town, August 20, 1882, Scofield conducted both morning and evening services. In the morning, his text was taken from Psalm 92:10. Basing his statement on Trumbull, BeVier flatly states that the congregation that day consisted of Deacon Page and 11 women.⁴ However, careful reading of Trumbull indicates that the figure

referred to the membership list.⁵ Trumbull noted that six husbands accompanied their wives.

At the evening service, Scofield preached on a most familiar text, John 3:18. As a result of the sermon, two conversions were reported. Trumbull notes that Scofield firmly committed to giving an invitation which required a specific act on the part of the listener who had been moved to respond to the message.⁶

Things went slowly at the start. Scofield himself was accepted socially in the community only after they found out that he had served for a time in the Confederate Army. But they just could not understand why he would preach in a "Yankee" church.

One Sunday, Scofield asked if any one would like to hold a "cottage prayer-meeting."⁷ The only response was from a 12-year-old boy who was at the service without his parents. Scofield found out, much to his surprise, that the boy's father was a saloon keeper and that the home was above the gin-mill. On the appointed night, Scofield went to the home and found it entirely full of people invited by the boy. Before long that entire family was converted. Following this experience, Scofield made the cottage prayer-meeting an integral part of the church program.

When a new superintendent of the denomination visited Dallas six weeks later, he was delighted by the nine people who were received into the church. But the now unidentified superintendent cautioned Scofield in a manner which would have pleased his superiors who were based near Beacon Hill. He advised Scofield not to let the church become a "hoi polloi" affair.⁸ As Trumbull tells of the incident (via Scofield) it appears that the superintendent may have been too much conditioned by his Bostonian base. But, as will be noted in a later chapter, some of the Dallas congregation whose circumstances were modest in 1882, climbed in social position as Dallas grew. Thus the superintendent's advice may have prevailed but in a way he did not expect.

Scofield's temporary arrangement with the church was regularized on October 22, 1882, with a call as pastor of the Congregational Church in Dallas for a term of one year, back-dated to August 11, 1882. On the same day, those nine new members were received into the church. One of them was the superintendent of missions for the Southwest for The American Home Missionary Society. And also on that same day a new building for the church, at the corner of Bryan and Harwood Streets was dedicated.⁹

In June 1883, The First Congregational Church, in a business meeting, voted Scofield a salary of \$1,500 per year. In preparation for accepting the call, Scofield in September added his name to the rolls of First Church by a letter transferring him from the Pilgrim Congregational Church in St. Louis.¹⁰

Scofield had located at 611 Ross Avenue and from the study in that residence, on October 11, 1883, sent a written acceptance of the

call.¹¹ Thus was the way paved for the formal, organizational steps to Scofield's ordination to the Gospel ministry. We have noted that Scofield's ordination which took place that month was unusual in one respect. It was conducted while he was a defendant in a divorce proceeding.

Since ordination was then generally considered to be a formal, public declaration of a calling already made, ostensibly with primary motivation from God Himself, rigid professional and educational standards were generally not required as they are today. This was especially true in loosely organized bodies like the Congregational Church as it functioned in the United States. But with Scofield we are faced with the fact that he not only lacked formal training, but also he had been but a short time in the Christian life.

Dr. Arnold Ehlert, writing while at Dallas Seminary, said that Scofield was ordained ". . . after a course of study lasting 18 months, in which he went through three standard treatises on theology and numerous other works."¹² Now back-dating 18 months from the Ordination Day puts us in April 1882. Scofield was then involved in quashing, without reconciliation, Atchison County divorce case No. 2161. The state of mind suggested by his position in the case (and as related by *The Atchison Patriot* reporter) was hardly conducive to a real understanding of the deeper matters of the Word. (He must have been doing some studying to turn out two or three messages a week to serve his congregations, first in St. Louis, then in Dallas.)

In describing Scofield's arrival in Dallas on August 19, 1882, Trumbull implies that Scofield came with little more than a carpetbag.¹³ (Of course he could have gone over to the express office during the week and picked up a trunk and a box of books.) The Scofield library no doubt grew after 1882. The new volumes came with regularity and all were called on in preparing sermons.

Looking again at Ehlert's statements, if Scofield began "cramming" for ordination as early as April 1882, either Goodell with Brookes' assistance was doing a "snow job" among Congregationalists or else someone not identified in material so far discovered had already designated Scofield for a ministerial role as a step to something else.

The whole Dispensational-Millenarian story is full of unexplained events and influences. As Ernest Sandeen says:

. . . But when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of Brethren teaching, when full account of energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.¹⁴

A similar lack of knowledge is apparent in the matter of the Scofield ordination and his entire clerical career.

As we noted in Chapter 15, Leontine had filed the second divorce plea in Kansas on October 1, 1883. As in the first case, Cyrus had

responded with a complete denial; purely a legal tactic. If the *Atchison Patriot* story is correct, Scofield probably welcomed the suit. Action by Leontine in another state would free him of an encumbrance in a manner which would not impair the image he was trying to create in Congregational circles. Among the unexplained points, there is a nagging suspicion that while officially without family ties, he was very well aware of what was going on in Atchison and timed his moves accordingly.

The Ordination Council for Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was part of the First Meeting of the North Texas Congregational Association held at First Church, Dallas, on Wednesday and Thursday, October 17 and 18, 1883.¹⁵ Ehlert says that the ordination was conducted by "... a large committee of Congregational Ministers . . ." ¹⁶ Apparently Ehlert never read the minutes of First Church, nor saw a copy of the printed program.¹⁷ In the church minutes, it is recorded that the Council was made up of representatives from the five Congregational churches then in the North Texas area and one from the Congregational Church at Caddo, Indian Territory. Such council was not large by either usual or Texas standards.

While apparently not noted in the minutes, the printed program lists as participants a Rev. Robert West of Chicago and Rev. C. L. Goodell of St. Louis, Mo. As noted earlier, Goodell must have been aware of the *Atchison Patriot* story and the other misadventures of Scofield.

On Wednesday morning between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, Scofield met with the Council and was examined as to his fitness for the Gospel ministry. The Minute Book of the church notes that during the examination Scofield related his "Christian experiences" and read a statement of his doctrinal views. The statement is reproduced in full and discussed in the next chapter.

On May 30, 1926, five years after Scofield's death, *The Daily Times Herald* of Dallas carried a story about Scofield which referred to the events of October 17, 1883.¹⁸ The article said that the Presbytery (this at once makes us suspicious) was told of Scofield's whole past life. The impression is that the council assumed that his past was covered by the Blood of Christ.

Unless the secretary had his "tongue in cheek" in recording the council session, we feel that the newspaper story includes some "embellishment." Now even in the 1880's, Texas did not hold to the blue-stocking views attributed to New England. But we must feel that had the ministers, other than Goodell, making up the council heard about Vollmer's buggy ride or been apprised of the utter neglect of Leontine and the girls, the ordination would not have gone through. "The Christian experiences" related according to the minutes, were as genuine as a Confederate three-dollar bill. Scofield and Goodell had some secrets which they shared among themselves and kept from the council.

The Ordination and Installation Exercises started at 7:30 p.m. that evening. The Ordination Sermon was preached by Goodell. The Benediction was pronounced by the newly ordained Rev. C. I. Scofield.

Next afternoon, the new ordinate joined with Goodell in a discussion, "Shall we seek largely through Revivals the upbuilding and increase of our Churches?" The Session concluded with a social gathering at 7:30 p.m. and a closing address (subject not given) by Rev. C. I. Scofield.

A family from Ypsilanti, Michigan, referred to variously as Wark or Van Wark, moved to Dallas late in 1883. Two daughters, Hettie and her sister, started attending First Church and joined in December 1883.

In January 1884 Scofield submitted his first annual report as pastor. He noted that the membership had reached a count of 75 (including Hettie Van Wark). The Sunday School was weak and Scofield criticized a "dangerous deficiency" in interest in missions.¹⁸

Scofield, feeling free from Leontine, began paying attention to Hettie Van Wark. The relationship moved quite rapidly from friendship to courtship to marriage. Here again we find discrepancy piled upon discrepancy. The Marriage Certificate, on file with properly constituted authorities, is dated March 11, 1884. But in "Who's Who in America," Scofield gave the wedding date as July 14, 1884.¹⁹ Now the tendency of American husbands to forget anniversary dates is legendary, but we submit that the conflict in this case is not due to mere forgetfulness.

It was reported by Trumbull and others that Cyrus and Hettie were married after a friendship of about six months.²⁰ Now backdating six months from March 1884, takes us to September 1883. Cyrus was then still legally bound to Leontine and not morally free to court Hettie or anyone else. Based on the date the Wark (or Van Wark) sisters joined First Church, we cannot be sure that they were in Dallas six months prior to the date shown on the marriage certificate. The July date may have been circulated to give an impression that the courtship did not begin until the decree of divorce became final in December 1883.

CHAPTER 17 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 26. Trumbull says of Scofield's Sunday School experience: "... and he learned a little there."
2. Statement of George W. Truett at the Memorial service for Scofield November 27, 1921, reported in *The Dallas Morning News*, November 28, 1921.
3. "Prophecy and The Church" by Oswald Allis, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1948, p. 13. Allis in turn refers to H. A. Ironside, "The Brethren Movement," p. 196.
4. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
5. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
6. Trumbull, *ibid.* For a comment on "The Invitation System," see pamphlet by Iain Murray issued by The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburg, Scotland and Carlisle, Pa. Scofield's pattern has been typical of the movement which grew out of his teaching,

but has never been accepted in some branches of the Protestant Church, including those of the Reformed tradition.

7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
9. Record Book, First Congregational Church, Mss., p. 11.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
11. Church Records, First Congregational Church, Dallas, Mss., p. 21-24.
12. Arnold Ehlert, *A Bibliographic History of Dispensationalism*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1965, p. 83. Ehlert in turn bases his statement on Trumbull, p. 43.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
14. Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism 1800-1830*, University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 80.
15. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 40, based on records of First Church.
16. Ehlert, *op. cit.*, p. 83, again based on Trumbull, p. 43.
17. The Printed Program is preserved in the Collection of the Philadelphia College of The Bible, Langhorne, Pa.
18. *The Daily Times Herald*, May 30, 1926, p. 1 of Section 6. Note that the items considered in the newspaper story are not those of a sort considered by a reporter, but suggest material released by someone interested in the Scofield image. We will note that one of the Dallas papers was owned by a family in the Scofield Church. The improbability of Scofield making revelations of the sort implied in the newspaper is heightened by noting that 25 years after the ordination, when Scofield was working on the "Bible," he was still sensitive enough about his pre-1883 omissions that he avoided comment on verses in both Testaments which dealt with such matters. He could not have been less sensitive in 1883.
19. Church Records, Mss. p. 32.
20. "Who's Who in America, 1912."
21. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

CHAPTER 18

The Doctrinal Statement of a Minister

"Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,; keep thyself pure."

I Tim. 5:22

At his ordination examination, October 17, 1883, Cyrus I. Scofield presented the following doctrinal statement. The original is preserved as pages 25-29 of the Record Book, First Congregational Church, Dallas, Texas (now known as the Scofield Memorial Church). The statement is:

Jesus of Nazareth is the centre and source of my theology. Presented to me in the four Gospels (narratives which reason and research alike tell me could not have been invented) as a supernatural Being—God manifested in the flesh (I Tim. 3:16, John 1:14). I find in history, and in my own experience, results wrought by Him which fully vindicate His claims. I therefore believe in Him.

I believe in the divine origin and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures because I find in them such a record as Jesus promised, by the Spirit (John 16: 12–13). Those are the sufficient reasons, though there are others, weighty and convincing, why I believe that the Bible, as we have it, is the Word of God, a revelation from and of Him, infallible, and absolutely binding upon the conscience and conduct of men.

Taking, then, the Holy Scriptures, authenticated by Jesus, as final and conclusive authority, I find God revealed as a Spirit, (John 4:24), eternally existing, (1 Tim. 1:17) as Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Jesus Christ is the son of Man and the Son of God: the Eternal Word. (John 1:1) manifest in the flesh, perfect man and perfect God. I believe this without understanding the mystery of two natures constituting but one Personality, nor am I able to explain it by analogical illustration.

The Holy Spirit is revealed as the Creative Agent in regeneration, (John 3:6–8), as baptising the believer into the one body of Christ; as sealing him unto the day of his redemption; as his abiding and indwelling Comforter and Sanctifier (John 14:16-17), and as his Power for service, (Acts 1:8).

The Scriptures, and Jesus Christ, reveal God as a Being infinitely compassionate, long-suffering, tender and forbearing, and He is defined to be Love; but revelation also presents Him as a Law-Giver—as the Lord God omnipotent who reigneth, and who has supreme and inescapable claims upon the obedience of His creature, man.

The Scriptures declare that all men have voluntarily transgressed that law, and therefore, describe the race as "lost," (Luke 19:20); as "dead in trespasses and sins," and "by nature the children of wrath," (Eph. 2:1-2); as having a mind which is "enmity against God" (Ro. 8:7); and a heart

"deceitful about all things and desperately wicked." (Jer. 17:9) As to practices it is said that "there is no difference for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and that "there is none righteous, no, not one." I receive this arraignment as true, upon the testimony of Scripture, but I find it amply confirmed by Self-knowledge, and by a wide observation.

The Scriptures teach that all the benefits secured for the race by the expiatory death of Christ are received by the individual only through faith in Him. By believing on the Lord Jesus Christ I do not understand merely the acceptance of a scheme of salvation, or theory of the Atonement, however scriptural they may be, but a hearty faith in Jesus Himself as the personal saviour of the believer.

I hold that such faith is always accompanied by that sincere repentance which involves a change of mind toward God, and in respect of the guilt of sin.

As the results of such belief in Jesus Christ, the Scriptures assure the believer that he is completely justified, has peace with God and a standing in His favor; (Acts 13:39, Ro. 5: 1) becomes through regeneration His child; (John 1: 12-13; Gal. 3:26), and so a partaker of the Divine Nature, (2 Ret. (*sic*) 1:4), and a recipient of the gift of eternal life, with the assurance that he shall never perish. (John 3:14-16; John 5:24; John 10:27-29).

But the Scriptures, while strenuously insisting upon the utter inefficiency of good works to salvation, are equally strenuous in the assertion that good works are inseparable *from* it. The man thus saved will live a changed life. It is true that "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit;" (John 3:6) and that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would," (Gal. 5:17) and it may be conceded that entire sanctification is unattainable in this life, yet it remains Scripturally true that the fruits of the Spirit will result from the possession of the Spirit—that a righteous character will be the sure outcome of the righteous nature; and that the stern *dictum* of James:—"Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead," (Jas. 2:29) should be insisted on most of all by the man who preaches that salvation is "not of works lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:9).

I believe that such sincere believers constitute the "Church which is the body of Christ;" and that such, and only such, should be gathered into a visible church composed of self-governing local assemblies.

I believe that the Word should be ministered in such assemblies only by regenerate persons who manifestly have been endued with one or more of the spiritual gifts of Prophet, Evangelist, Pastor or Teacher, and that it is proper that one such person should be set apart by each assembly to minister the Word, but I do not believe he should be intrusted with any priestly authority.

In view of such plain and nonfigurative Scriptures as Matthew 24:37-41; Luke 18:8; 2 Thess. 23:1-11; 2 Tim. 1:15; 2 Tim. 2:19-21; 2 Tim. :1-8; 2 Tim. 4:3; Titus 1:10, 11; 1 Pet. 4:17-18; 2 Pet. 2:1-12; 2 Pet. (entire 3rd chap.); 1 John 2:18; 1 John 4:1-3; Jude 17, 18, 19; and the Parables of the Tares and Net in Matt. 13, I am unable to believe that the world will be converted to Christ before His second coming; and I do

believe that His second coming will be personal, (Acts 1:11) and pre-millennial.

Those who are familiar with the eschatology of the Pre-Millennial Second Advent know that it excludes the possibility of future probations, in which, therefore, I do not believe.

I believe in Eternal Life as the present and future possession of the believer in Jesus Christ, and in everlasting punishment as the fate of those who end this life in unbelief.

The Rev. Geoffrey Thomas, pastor of the Alfred Place Baptist Church, Aberystwyth, Wales, at the request of this writer made a number of interesting comments on the Scofield Doctrinal Statement. When Rev. Mr. Thomas made his comments, he had only the test of the confession, the maker not being identified.

Several things in the statement were found objectionable. Note that Thomas writes from the viewpoint of the Reformed Faith which has never accepted the premises of Dispensational interpretation. Since points questioned by Thomas are integral to the fabric of Scofield's later thought, it might behove the Chiliastic constituency to consider whether or not there is an essential lack of orthodoxy in Dispensationalism.

Thomas comments:

The personal statement of faith you sent me is interesting reading. In many ways it is typical of the decline in confessions of faith of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Instead of the full great confessions like the Westminster, Savoy or Philadelphia being taken, men made their own brief statements of gospel fundamentals embracing a wide spectrum of evangelicals, *e.g.* containing not a reference to the ordinance of baptism, but obviously independent of church government, and pre-mill—as if this were synonymous with evangelicalism/orthodoxy.

The weakness of minimal creeds displays itself in any local church situation where there are folk convinced of both the Arminian *and* Calvinistic systems of theology, or of both paedobaptism and believers' baptism. Then such a creed could not hold the two groups together and would be an insufficient court of appeal (in matters like the invitation system in evangelism which would be anathema to a Calvinist—pleading for men to do what God is powerless to do and to show it by a physical act. The whole atmosphere of piety and reverence accompanies a church committed to the whole counsel of God.) Statements of faith such as these are inadequate for the purposes of evangelism and worship, and discipline. . . . (It lacks the whole 4th dimension of an awareness of the past and its importance in forming and structuring our worship and convictions until today. The break in historical continuity is serious: Rome capitalises so much about this.¹)

It is to a great extent that lack of historical continuity which impelled this writer into the present study. To find that concern shared by another is gratifying. But to realize that the historical lack is so inherent in the Dispensational scheme that it can be recognized even when a doc-

ument is not labeled, suggests that in the work of Scofield there are serious doctrinal problems.

The loss of historical sense helps to downgrade the uniqueness of the Bible. The loss of value causes the adherent to lose a base for sensible valuing of our present dilemma and the ability to provide Biblically based solutions to the serious social and political problems of the day.

Thomas is quite specific about certain statements which he considers objectionable in the light of Historic Christian faith:

1) that he absolutises the person and work of *one* of the members of the Godhead. It is important to remember the great confession of the OT that God is *one* God. We are not Jesus worshippers; we are Trinitarian. Start with God.

2) His confidence in the 4 Gospels (again, not the starting place of the Holy Bible) is based upon reason and research, rather than upon their own self-attestation to their own infallibility. They do not need another authority like "reason and research" to confirm that they are true. Another man might say—as thousands have said—that reason and research persuade them that the 4 Gospels are *not* true.

3) Similarly his commitment to Christ is based upon his observations of the results of Christ's working in history and his own experience. This is not so; it is based upon the Holy Spirit working conviction and pointing to Christ in his own life.

4) We believe the Scriptures ultimately because of their testimony to their own veracity. God is the only sufficient witness to himself.

5) The reference to the benefits the "race" receives from the death of Christ needs clarification. If the human race benefits, why are these benefits not shown? That is, if Christ did something for the whole of humanity on the cross where is the evidence in the life of humanity? You must either limit the purpose of the death of Christ to some and say how they indicate these benefits in their lives, or you must say He did something for everybody which was much milder and weaker and failed to apply it to them.

6) Lastly, he makes regeneration follow after a man believing, as one of the *benefits* of personal faith and constituting *adoption*, rather than regeneration being the very necessary means to a stony heart believing on Christ. (*i.e.* regeneration is the means to faith, not the result of faith.)

The comments of Geoffrey Thomas are more than a bit devastating to the validity of the beliefs of the man on whom hands were laid in Dallas on that October day in 1883. But as he was making his comments, Thomas had no idea of the life of the man who offered the statement as evidence of his fitness for a pastoral role.

Some additional comments are in order, based on knowledge of man and deed. The statement: "... supreme and inescapable claims upon the obedience of His creature, man," raises questions—and even eyebrows. The narrative of the deeds of the period suggests that our

subject either had very flexible definitions of obedience or offered the statements with his tongue as far in his cheek as he could push it.

He says: "I hold that such faith is always accompanied by that sincere repentance which involves a change of mind toward God, and in respect of the guilt of sin." It has been noted that the repentance of Cyrus Scofield never included restitution to Simpson, McLean, Vollmer and probably not the Kansas Republicans. And certainly the neglect of Leontine was never made up. A quarter of a century later, we will find certain omissions from his great opus which might well indicate that he had not resolved the problem of his own guilt.

In the days of World War I, he referred thus to David: "Here are the last words of David, the sweet Psalmist of Israel; his life stained with many sins, yet a man who loved God supremely."² Is it possible that he thus wrote because he even then could not claim the release of the 51st Psalm as his own experience?

Scofield very firmly sets out his beliefs in the area of eschatology in his statement. The very positiveness is remarkable for a man who a few short years before was living by forgery and who by his own admission was almost illiterate spiritually. His definite statement "plain and nonfigurative Scripture" confirms his commitment to the ideas of J. N. Darby. But in four short years of the Christian life Scofield probably had not had an opportunity to be exposed to or consider any other system of interpretation.

The sixteen Scripture passages he lists to be taken literally to the exclusion of all else may or may not support Scofield's position. The view that he supports gives redeemed man no hope of victory over the forces of evil short of heaven. It calls for total victory for evil, with redeemed humanity rescued from failure only by a personal intervention by Christ. Man just goes along for the ride.

Scofield's citation of Acts 1:11 overlooks the fact that the statement of the Angel (all believers would see Him as He returns) conflicts with the firm Dispensational belief in a "secret Rapture." Then no one is supposed to see Him until they get "into the clouds" leaving their autos behind them. Or so Scofield and successors interpret I Thes. 4:16, 17.

The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares (*Matthew 13*) which Scofield cites says quite plainly that the Lord will have the wicked (tares) removed first at the end. Scofield (*SRB*, p. 1629) has the believers (wheat) taken out first. Who is right, Jesus or Scofield?

Similar analysis is possible for other verses cited in the statement.

The Doctrinal Statement might pass if one accepted to the full the failing church syndrome—and if the statement were really sincerely offered.³ The presence of Atchison County divorce case No. 2681 on the court's current docket in Kansas makes any reasonable person have serious questions on the matter of his sincerity.

The succeeding chapters will show the sort of ministry which followed the Statement. There will be hints of how the objectives of the "Failing Church Syndrome" were obtained.

But is that really what Jesus meant when He said "The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church!" Who really wrote the Statement?

CHAPTER 18 NOTES

1. Letter to the writer dated 16 September 1976. Mr. Thomas' consent was obtained at the time that the writer advised Mr. Thomas that the Statement he commented on was that of C. I. Scofield.
2. "Addresses on Prophecy" by C. I. Scofield, A. C. Gaebelein, New York Publisher, 1910, p. 75.
3. The idea of social failure for the church has continued. Note the statement of Carl F. H. Henry at the end of 1977: "Another year has passed in which the movement has registered no notable influences on the formative ideas and ideals of American culture." The statement, made in TIME, December 27, 1977, p. 77 has been followed in succeeding years by similar statements. Henry is part of the movement built on the foundation that Scofield laid. Henry remarkably seems agreeable to the failure noted and its promotion by Hal Lindsey. He further seems amenable to a "Post Christian" era for which we can find no Biblical basis. R. J. Rushdoony explains why the church is responsible for its own weakness: "In the modern era, the church, while numerically strong, has grown less and less influential and more and more peripheral to everyday life, to politics, economics, the arts and sciences, and all else. For most people, the church is irrelevant to the "real world" of human affairs. It provides a limited moral training for children, a social focus for the family, and not much more. Churches have numbers, not strength. Both in membership and in leadership, the churches are radically weak. (*Journal of Christian Reconstruction, Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 96*). Rushdoony has pointed out that the church consistently fails when it loses its vision of victory over sin and evil in social and cultural settings as well as in the context of personal salvation.

CHAPTER 19

A Growing Ministry

"Preach the Word, Be instant in season and out of season."

II Tim. 4:2a

It is interesting to note progress in church life in the First Congregational Church of Dallas, even in the face of questionable items in the life of Scofield, the minister. Possibly in a society under pressure from the ideas of men as diverse as Voltaire, Marx, Darwin and Darby, no other channels for the Gospel were readily available. As Neatby, historian of the Plymouth Brethren, has said:

I am far from denying that God many bestow a measure of His blessing where there is a great deal of confusion. If he did not, I fear there would be no blessing at all for the Church on earth. But I deny that His favours are so indiscriminately bestowed as to constitute no criterion whatever of His approval.¹

With Leontine "forgotten," at least officially, and Hettie installed in the parsonage, Scofield had numerical success in his church. But how could that membership have grown to full Christian maturity on a diet of chopped-up Bible and "any-moment Rapture"?

The church had been regarded, quite justly, as Yankee and that in the most derogatory sense of that term. After all, the Congregational denomination had helped to split the country apart in achieving its goal of abolition. While Scofield's own congregation never conformed to the denominational norm, outsiders could hardly be blamed for failing to note fine distinctions in sectarian beliefs.

Dr. James M. Gray, president of Moody Bible Institute, related a story in this connection at the Testimonial Dinner for Scofield held in New York on October 26, 1916. Gray noted that the story had come to him second hand:

His church was regarded as a northern church, for which reason, as all of the wounds of the Civil War were not yet healed, he was not very cordially received by the citizens at large. Yet he never alluded to the fact that he had fought with Lee in the Confederate Army. But one day, an out-of-town Editor met him on the street, one who had been his companion in arms, and who straightway published an account of meeting with him. He told of the battles in which Scofield and he had fought side by side, and ate or starved together as the days came and went. Lo, what a change was wrought in Dallas so far as the esteem of Dr. Scofield was concerned.²

It is, of course, well that Scofield had made no allusion to fighting with Lee. Military records show that Scofield, throughout his recorded military service, would have had no direct contact with Lee and often was as far from him as Abraham Lincoln was. But we do wish that Gray and the unidentified editor-friend had been more specific. "Editor" and his military record might just have been a channel through which we could solve some of the mystery referred to in Chapter 6. A horrible thought! What would have happened if the out-of-town editor had been from Atchison, Kansas, where Scofield's reputation has remained un-savoury over a century?

Speculation aside, the now-unidentified editor did a service to Scofield and his growing ministry. As mentioned in Chapter 7, the Yankee stigma was gradually obliterated. The church became quite acceptable in a southern community. And editor-companion-at-arms may have helped Scofield see new potential in his one year of military service.

In 1886, D. L. Moody, accompanied by Ira D. Sankey, conducted meetings in Dallas, March 5 through March 7. The services were held in the local skating rink. One report indicated that the building was packed with up to 4,000 people.³

After nearly four years of Scofield's pastorate, on May 1, 1886, the First Congregational Church of Dallas assumed its own support. In severing its ties as a mission project, the church expressed "heartfelt thanks" to The American Home Missionary Society for its years of support.⁴ At that time, the Scofields, Cyrus and Hettie, lived at 1126 Jackson Street, between Ervay and South Harwood Streets.⁵

Early in the fall of 1886, The American Home Missionary Society offered Scofield the position of superintendent for the states of Louisiana and Texas.⁶ The congregation learned of the negotiations in October and adopted a resolution asking their pastor not to accept the offer. For nearly a quarter of a century, the people of First Church were determined to hold Scofield as pastor; he was equally determined to serve wider fields, giving the congregation that part of his time which did not interfere with other opportunities. The Dallas post provided a base income which was reasonably steady.

It appears that Scofield conducted the negotiations with little or no consultation with the Church. In his annual report, made in November 1886, Scofield noted that he would continue to serve the Dallas church but would be acting missionary superintendent until the Society could appoint another man. During that period the Society agreed to pay part of Scofield's salary.⁷ That other man was not appointed until Scofield left Dallas nine years later. The activities as superintendent will be related in the next chapter.

The annual report included a note by Scofield, thanking the congregation for the "unusually long vacation" granted him that year. He

went on to say that he expected to be absent from Dallas, from the beginning of July 1887 until the end of October ministering in Bible conferences elsewhere.⁸

Scotfield maintained a teaching ministry in Dallas that reached out beyond the parish of First Church. He conducted a weekly class at the YMCA, and he led training classes for young men who showed evidence of pastoral and evangelistic gifts. Of the men who participated in those classes, only 10 reportedly finished the course.⁹ The 10 were ordained to the ministry after suitable examination and with appropriate ordination ceremonies.

By the beginning of 1888, with 250 new members, all no doubt waiting for the "any-moment Rapture," it became necessary for the Church to make a decision on the matter of a new and larger building. After much discussion and some reversals of earlier decisions, the congregation at a meeting in October, decided to erect a new building on the site already in use at the corner of Bryan and Harwood Streets. Before making that commitment, they had been able to enlarge the property by purchase of adjoining plots. Construction of the new church took place during 1889. The building stood until 1950.¹⁰

In this period, something of a mystery develops concerning Scotfield's personal life. The Dallas City Directory for 1888-1889 shows Scotfield residing in rented rooms Mrs. Gillie Cockrell at 301 Pearl Street, corner Cottage Lane.¹¹ (Gillie sounds almost as though she came out of some British novel, say H. G. Wells' "Mr. Polly.") Hettie, during nine months of 1888, was pregnant. Rented rooms are not the most desirable place for a pregnant mother to reside, especially if her husband is traveling to promote any-moment end of the age.

The pregnancy ended December 22, 1888, with the birth of a son named Noel Paul. But available records indicate that Noel's birth occurred in Michigan, not Dallas.¹² The explanation eludes—but notice must be taken of the fact that in 1888, Abigail became 21 and her relationship with her father came out from under the ban of the District Court in Atchison. Hettie had then to cope with a situation for which few wives, especially wives of ministers, were prepared in Victorian years.

In the office of the county clerk of Dallas County, there is a document dated October 1, 1889, by which Thomas J. Jones, a bachelor, transferred to Cyrus I. Scotfield, the property at 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas, including the residence erected and standing thereon. Scotfield is recorded as paying for the property with \$731.25 in cash and five notes, amounts and due dates as follows:

No. 1	\$2400.00	Due on or before October 1, 1894.
2	412.60	Due on or before April 10, 1890.
3	400.00	Due on or before April 10, 1891.

4	300.00	Due on or before November 10, 1892.
5	256.15	Due on or before November 15, 1893.

The last four notes were listed as drawing interest at 10 percent payable semi-annually. (Six percent was the maximum interest legally permitted under the Texas Constitution by an Amendment of 1891, unless a higher rate not exceeding 10 percent was agreed to by the parties.) Jones was a member of the church and scion of one of its leading families. By the time the compilers closed the entries for the Dallas City Directory, 1890 Edition, Cyrus, Hettie and Noel were in residence.¹³

While real estate matters were occupying a large place on Scofield's mind and taking up some of his time, an event occurred in St. Louis which should be noted. The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* October 27, 1889, carried the following obituary:

Papin, Emiline E., wife of the late Sylvester V. Papin at Webster Groves, October 25, 1889. Funeral Sunday the 27th inst. at 2 o'clock p.m. from St. John's Episcopal Church, corner of Hickory and Dolman Streets. Relatives of S. V. Papin will please meet at the residence of John G. Prather, Esq., 1411 Chouteau Avenue.¹⁴

Omission of the maiden name made it difficult for anyone in the Dispensational community to connect Emeline with a noted Bible teacher. Emeline's will filed for probate in St. Louis County (county offices are now in Clayton, Missouri), provided that the bulk of her estate was to be invested. The interest thus earned was to be paid out equally to her surviving brother and sisters. As already noted, the bequest to Cyrus was modified to provide that Cyrus' share was to be divided between Cyrus and Leontine if the two were not living together. In view of the divorce decree in 1883, Cyrus and Leontine both began receiving payments amounting to one-sixth of the income from Emeline's estate. Cyrus' portion was a pleasant supplement to the Conference Love Offerings.

By this time, Scofield's ideas, divided Dispensationally, had assumed the shape there were to manifest in the Scofield Reference Bible. But essentially the theology had to be eclectic. Except for the missing months when he was shedding Leontine, there is no positive evidence, as with the Apostle Paul, of an Arabian period (*Galatians 1.:17, 18*) when he could have reflected, meditated and been filled with the Word. Scofield, according to the record, got right into service. He remained active until well past the three-score and ten terminal point.

Unfortunately, we have no details as to the volumes which made up his library. Nor have we seen reference to the disposition of the volumes from which he drew his ideas. The writings of Darby, Trotter, Kelly, Walter Scott (not the novelist, the other one) and CHM (Mackintosh) must have contributed something.¹⁵ It has been suggested that Malachi Taylor of New York City has some influence.¹⁶

But we must note the possibility of an influence closer at hand—in the American Southwest. In 1883, a Southern Baptist minister, J. R. Graves, published: *The Work of Christ Consummated in Seven Dispensations.* Issued by the Baptist Sunday School Board of Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., it includes a preface signed by the author from “Arcadia near Memphis, Tenn.” It features a dispensational scheme quite similar to one which was later used in the Scofield Reference Bible. For some strange reason, Graves is almost never mentioned by Dispensational writers who are not committed Baptists.¹⁷ The appearance of Dispensational ideas, seemingly out-of-the-blue in Middle America in apparent isolation from the mainstream flowing from Albury and Powerscourt, is remarkable. Officially, Graves and William Miller of the Seventh-day Adventists are the only two thinkers along advent lines whose ideas apparently sprung from native soil. But as the movements are studied, that home-grown stance might prove to be more apparent than real.

Rev. Milburn Cockrell of Ashland, Ky., the leading exponent of Graves’ teaching today, said in a letter to the writer:

J. R. Graves is undoubtedly the most interesting man of his generation. Scholars handle him like a hot potato. It is true that dispensationalists tend to ignore him, but I am not sure why, unless it is because of his firm stand on the local church only.¹⁸

George W. Dollar, in his history of Fundamentalism, does refer to Graves. His comments confirm Cockrell’s valuation—Graves held for the visible local church in contrast to Darby’s “invisible church.”¹⁹ This places Graves outside the pale.

Since Graves’ work had its primary circulation in the area Scofield was using as a base, the possibility of an unacknowledged debt to Graves must be considered. With Scofield’s lack of formal training and a need to learn fast, no reasonable source of help would have been overlooked. Mention of some sources could have been intentionally forgotten.

As a result of Scofield’s study, he broke into print in 1888. *Rightly Dividing the World of Truth* was an outgrowth of the study to teach his classes and give them tangible lesson help. It faithfully presented the Dispensational view. The final touches were put on his manuscript while he was in atmosphere of prophetic hope (and social despair) at the Niagara Bible Conference.²⁰ The booklet contained what Trumbull called the central doctrines “essential to any real comprehension of the message.”²¹ The first edition was printed by the Plymouth Brethren house, Loizeaux Brothers of New York. The study has appeared in a number of editions and has been on the lists of several houses. For example, Through the Bible Publishers, Dallas, Texas, printed 35,000 copies between 1945 and 1954.²²

The booklet was so unfortunate and so unnecessary. Back in 1856, while Scofield was hunting raccoon in Lenawee County, Michigan, a kindly, Godly, Scot named Patrick Fairbairn, freed from years of entrapment in an early form of Dispensationalism, had written a Scripturally based refutation of the whole business.²³ In the light of Fairbairn's work, to name just one, the activity of Scofield should have been a case of "beating a dead horse." But Dispensationalists have been effective in covering up orthodox works of differing prophetic bias. They continue to "beat the dead horse," as the followers are unaware of the real status of prophetic knowledge and of other prophetic views.

CHAPTER 19 NOTES

1. Neatby, *A History of the Plymouth Brethren*, p. 337.
2. Testimonial to Rev. C. I. Scofield, D. D., *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, Sept. 1921, p. 500ff. There must be some question about this story. Since local editors do not customarily open their pages to "visiting firemen," the way the story might have come was for a Dallas editor to pickup the story from a copy of the editor's paper which came across the exchange desk. We do not know whether at the time of the story, any Dallas newspaper owners were members of Scofield's church, as they were in the next decade. Without citation, the story related by Gray is difficult to trace.
3. D. Phillip Lindsley, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, pp. 146-7.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
5. Dallas City Directory 1886-1887, Dallas Public Library.
6. Record Book, First Congregational Church, mss. p. 39.
7. Record Book, First Congregational Church, p. 51.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
10. Record Book, First Congregational Church, pp. 54, 56, Church Register, mss. pp. 42-47.
11. Dallas City Directory, 1888, Dallas Public Library.
12. The clue of Noel's birthplace, which came after much fruitless search, was in his Death Certificate on file with the New York State Department of Health, Albany, N.Y. The birth is not confirmed by entry in the State of Michigan Health Records.
13. Dallas City Directory, 1890 Edition.
14. Newspaper item supplied by the St. Louis Public Library.
15. Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America*, John Knox, 1958, p. 113.
16. Philip Mauro, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 20.
17. See Jesse W. Hodges (Oklahoma City) *Christ's Kingdom and Coming* and George W. Dollar in *A History of Fundamentalism in America*.
18. Letter from Cockrell to the writer, September 13, 1976.
19. Dollar, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
20. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
21. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
22. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 46, note 116.
23. Patrick Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy*. Reprinted 1964 by The Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, Scotland, and Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER 20

Peripatetic Pastor

"... unto whom I now send thee. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God. . . ."

Acts 26:17b, 18a

Scofield barely got First Church established on a self-supporting basis when he started to engage in ministries outside the church, outside the city, outside the state. The outside ministeries meant that he had to divide his time, even as his teaching divided the Word (Dispensationally, of course).

We have noted that he was able to get the church to agree to lengthy vacation periods which made those extended ministries possible. Yet the record suggests that the people of First Church wanted Scofield as their pastor and agreed to the lengthy leaves as an alternative to losing him entirely. The attachment of the Dallas congregation for C. I. Scofield continued unabated until it merged into the respect for him generated after 1909 by the spread of the Scofield Reference Bible.

As the story continues, it will be noted that Scofield treated his later pastorates in the same manner as he treated First Church. He was always ready to accept speaking engagements elsewhere, leaving to local talent or itinerent visitors the job of filling the gap created by his absence.

Scofield's request for long vacation time was supported by the claim that he had a role in the growing Bible Conference movement. He was primarily concerned with the Prophetic Bible Conference which were to reshape a significant part of American Protestantism. By this time Middle America was acquiring a level of sophistication which would make the traditional camp meeting of frontier days seem crude. As the interest in prophecy (we call it the "failing church syndrome") developed, conference grounds with simple refinements missing from camp meetings, began to play a role in religious life. Sensational messages were beginning to attract large crowds. Reproductions, as large as life, of the image of Daniel 2 (as imagined by a poster artist) were greeted with wide-open eyes and mouths of the audiences, and they responded with questions such as whether the Kaiser was the "Anti-Christ."

In such prophetic conferences, the emotional element was somewhat restrained, especially when compared with the camp meetings.

Groups gathered for prophetic confabs seemed to be more selective in their make-up. A sobering note was provided by the prophetic warhorse of "recovering neglected truths." The neglected truths were invented by Lacunza and Darby.

Like his "master," Darby, Scofield did not keep itineraries and schedules meticulously in his conference roles. One conference, which became the elite, the Oxford, the Canterbury, of the movement was the Niagara Bible Conference. This was so closely related to Scofield and his teaching that it receives separate consideration in the next chapter.

But Scofield may have been farther afield than prophetic conferences in North America. In August 1903, he preached a sermon at Moody Church in Chicago. In that message, we find the following: "When I am in London I often go to that part of the city in which is situated the building called the "Horse Guards." It is the Headquarters of the British Army. . . ."1 The reference suggests that before 1903 he had become quite familiar with London, even though getting there would have meant somewhat lengthy steamship crossings. Yet, no mention has been made by either Trumbull or BeVier of any European trips in the 19th Century. Both are quite specific in referring to the first European trip of the Scofields as "Mrs. Scofield's first trip."²

Scofield's European reputation did not develop until the Bible project got under way. So a trip to London before 1900 cannot be attributed to conference ministries. But there are times during his vacations from the Dallas pulpit when he could have gone to England.

We are reminded of the questions C. S. Lewis has his character Miss Hardcastle ask Jane Studdock in "*That Hideous Strength*":

"And where had you been honey?"

"You hadn't been getting up to mischief while Hubby was away, had you?"

"Where had you been by that train?"³

We would ask Scofield:

"Where had you been on that ship?"

"Who paid for the trips?"

"Who did you see?"

Note in this connection that when Robert Scott, the Plymouth Brethren publisher, appears in the Scofield story in 1898 and later in 1904, he is introduced as someone new to Scofield as though not contacted on the trips that took Scofield to the Horse Guards.

Ernest Sandeen has commented:

. . . but when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of Brethren teaching, when full account of the energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.⁴

An understanding of the 19th Century ocean crossings by Scofield might contribute something to filling in the lack which Sandeen noted.

In the previous chapter, we related Scofield's negotiations with the American Home Missionary Society, conducted originally without consulting the church. AHMS was an arm of the Congregational denomination, headquartered at Bible House, Astor Place, New York City: As a result of the negotiations with Scofield, he became their superintendent for Texas and Louisiana. That position along with the conference ministry was the basis for his request for the extended vacation periods which the church granted. But there must have been times when the superintendency required travel by Scofield outside the five-month period. So there must have been times when someone else had to fill the pulpit at First Church.

It is evident that Scofield conducted a considerable amount of the superintendent's task by correspondence. Some of Scofield's correspondence with Rev. Joseph M. Clark, secretary of the Society, has been preserved and is now at the Amisted Research Center, New Orleans, La.⁶ From these letters we get another view of Scofield's ministries, along with glimpses of conditions under which church activities were conducted in the Southwest in the late 1880's and 1890's: The letters show that the jargon and lingo usually associated with Dispensationalism were never used in discussing matters with Rev. Clark.⁶ Even when Scofield expressed concern about lack of funds, lack of workers or failure to meet the need of areas under his superintendence, no hint of Dispensational hope (hopelessness) can be found. The concern about lack of workers and failure to meet the challenge of advancing settlement which Scofield notes had been a burden of the churches even back in the days when the frontier had not yet crossed the Blue Ridge, and Darby had not yet invented Dispensationalism.

On April 2, 1889, Scofield wrote Clark regarding those waves of immigrants pouring into the Texas panhandle and into Southwestern Louisiana. (The letter is the first in the collection to be written on a typewriter:) Scofield noted that new communities faced the possibility of being "... left in absolute destitution of religious privileges, and that in the very stage of their development when those influences are most needed."⁷ Noting that most of the settlers were from the North, Scofield felt that his group and its backers in the North had a large responsibility: While there was some growth of Congregationalism in the Southwest, the vision of Scofield for its expansion never materialized: Other denominations and some cults provided the major thrust in the area.

Both records of First Congregational Church, Dallas, and items in the AHMS correspondence suggest that the Panic of 1893 was felt in the Southwest earlier than it was in some other parts of the country.

Its severity was measured in the drop in funds raised locally and in those which came into the AHMS home office.

Social unrest was also noted: Late in January 1893, a 3-year-old girl was raped and murdered in Paris, Texas. A Negro, Henry Smith, was accused. Smith was seized by a mob and on Feb. 1 was lynched in what may have been the most brutal lynching to occur in the South. He was bound in a chair fixed on top of a cotton float. The child's father, with a white-hot tinner's iron, seared Smith's flesh starting at the feet and moving upward. The torture ended by silencing his tongue and putting out his eyes. The mob then saturated Smith with oil, piled combustibles around him and set him afire. Pleas from Governor Jim Hogg for mercy went unheeded.⁸

Scofield was not in Paris, Texas, but received reports from his associate Luther Rees and from Judge D. H. Scott. Scofield wrote Clark on the 4th, saying he was:

... full of grief and indignation because of the Paris outrage. When I heard of the burning, with tortures unspeakable, of that negro, I felt resolved to leave Texas. . . . But now I feel like staying just because such things are possible here.

The outrage committed by the negro, and that committed upon him, alike illustrate the problem to be solved here. Surely the Gospel is the only remedy.⁹

What had happened was completely in accord with the picture of man and society which Dispensationalists like to draw from I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3. From 1893 (and before) right down to the present day, Dispensational preaching has obtained great satisfaction from similar tragedies. They cite them as proof that the picture given in I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3 is the inevitable fate for society—Christian and otherwise. That with the corollary that the Lord could be back before the meeting ended.

The failing-church-any-moment syndrome, derived from J. N. Darby's "church in ruins" axiom meant that neither Scofield nor Rees could offer the citizens of Paris, Texas, anything which would help them out of the moral pit which the Henry Smith incident revealed. Scofield's impulse to leave Texas was natural to his theology. No doubt the Main Street Church (the Congregational work there) did snatch a few souls, but that could hardly be described as prevailing against the "Gates of Hell" which had opened right in town.

Even while apparently under the shock of the Paris outrage, Scofield could, in the same letter (February 4, 1893) speak of Congregational work in El Paso, all the way across the state. Under his superintendence, progress was reported. The Rio Grande Training School for Mexican workers was established in El Paso. A letter in March notes that workers from the school had been blessed with some success in itinerant work

among Mexicans living in the county. To back up the school, it was decided to establish a Congregational Church in El Paso. To prepare for the opening service on March 2, 1893, word was taken to each house in El Paso by the distribution of a flyer: A copy was preserved among the Scofield letters in the Amisted collection although Scofield does not appear to have had anything to do with its preparation.

Scofield was also president of the Board of Trustees of Lake Charles College, a Congregational school in the Louisiana city. In the same letter, Scofield notes that conditions in that area were difficult; there was smallpox at Jennings, La: A syndicate was holding land prices high and discouraging settlement. Church workers supposedly recruited from the North, failed to report for duty. But a new church of 25 members was being organized at Oberlin La.¹⁰

Despite the lynching, Paris was the bright spot in Scofield's district. At the end of March 1893, Scofield reported to Clark that the work (Main Street Congregational Church) was assuming self-support.¹¹ Luther Rees, trained by Scofield, was pastor, and he was to remain associated with Scofield up to the end of the latter's life. Judge D. H. Scott, who will be referred to several times as the story progresses, was to continue a leading member of the church.

Main Street Church had been able to afford printed letterheads. A letter from Luther Rees to Dr. J. H. Clark is in the AHMS, Amisted Collection¹² The letterhead displays a Scripture quotation: "Behold, I Come Quickly" (Rev. 22:12). That quotation on the letterhead is absolutely the ONLY premillennial reference in the entire group of letters addressed to AHMS by Scofield or anyone else: We consider it entirely probable that Rees, like most other Dispensationalists, thought or talked as though "Quickly" in that verse means "soon." That idea is the basis for the Dispensational cliché about the "Soon-coming Lord," so often heard from pulpits and in the religious media.

The Greek word "Tachu" used in the original, refers to the rate of movement or of appearance. To use it as Dispensationalists do, making "quickly" mean "soon" is bad language. Further it violates the principle laid down by the Lord, Himself: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only" (*Matt. 24:36*). Any man who claims that the Lord is coming soon, "knows" something that only the Father was to know. The verse states that the Father is not sharing His knowledge with people anywhere, even in Texas, so the passage on the letterhead is incorrectly used.

Among the 1893 correspondence between Scofield and Clark is an exchange regarding a request from a Mrs. Blakeslee of Brackettville, Texas, regarding a possible Congregational work there. Brackettville, county seat of Kenney County, is in the Rio Grande Valley about midway between Uvalde and Del Rio (1980 population: 1,539): Scofield suggested

that a work there could not become self-supporting in 20 years, hence the appeal of Mrs: Blakeslee could not be heeded.¹³

Scofield indicated a preference to build up strong churches in major centers. El Paso and Paris are typical: As the works in the main centers built up, he hoped that they would serve as "mother" churches and reach out to unchurched smaller communities: This is essentially the method used successfully during many periods of growth during the church era and in strategic centers of missionary growth. But such a vision was completely contrary to the failing church view which Scofield was proclaiming in his correspondence course and which is a hallmark of his teaching.

The views expressed to Rev. Clark were a complete contrast to the Dispensational views. The difference in Scofield's viewpoints in the two ministries is not just a case of "wearing another hat:" Rather it suggests that Scofield was playing two entirely different roles, roles which were calculated to produce different results. But the two views were utterly inconsistent. Congregational churches in major centers in Texas did prosper, but Scofield's vision of Congregationalism expressed to Rev. Clark was never shared either by churches in Texas nor by denominational leadership.

Throughout this period, Scofield was also head of the Southwestern School of the Bible in Dallas, forerunner of the present Dallas Theological Seminary. That school, now located on Swiss Avenue, Dallas, is a major center for the dissemination of Scofield's views.

We have noted that it is hardly likely that Scofield could have carried out his responsibilities as superintendent of the AHMS by confining trips on their account to the period of release from the pulpit for conference work. He must have done a lot of traveling. And travel in those days was a time-consuming ordeal. Much of it meant sitting up in a hard-backed seat in a day coach, with smoke and cinders from the locomotive and dust from the right-of-way pouring in the windows: Some trips, especially those to conference points could have been a bit easier, thanks to Mr. Pullman's sleeping car. But the ordeal of travel was such that there must be some question of how much detailed direction Scofield was able to give the various posts which were his roles.

In the AHMS collection, we have the first reference to Hettie as a helper. On April 10, 1893, a money order for \$70.00 was forwarded to Rev. J. Clark. The accompanying note bears a signature "Mrs. C. I. Scofield." The remittance was identified as a sum raised by the Women's Missionary Society of First Church, Dallas. But when we compared the signature on the note with Hettie's signature in family legal documents, and with Cyrus' signature on many letters, it became evident that Cyrus signed Hettie's name.

Further evidence of Scofield's peripatetic role are two more letters, one dated April 26, 1893, indicating his willingness to go from Dallas to Saratoga, N.Y., to a meeting of the society (AHMS), and the second, dated May 26, 1893, handwritten on the letterhead of the Fred Harvey Eating House and Hotel at Hutchinson, Kansas, while he was en route to Saratoga. The idea of Scofield being served his repast by a Harvey Girl provides a human interest touch. But the trip meant an absence of several weeks from both the pulpit of First Church and the superintendency.

Either The American Home Missionary Society did not find Scofield's Dispensationalism incongruous with its position, or else, it was officially unaware of the prophetic bent of First Church (Dallas) and its pastor. Whatever, in November 1893, they invited Scofield to become superintendent of missions in Colorado and the surrounding area. This would naturally mean more travel. A compromise was arranged. The church agreed to officially grant Scofield five months vacation each year if he would continue as pastor. This would leave him committed to the pulpit for but seven months.¹⁴

A call from a church in Massachusetts, which came at the end of 1895, meant leaving Dallas and the end of Scofield's connection with The American Home Missionary Society. His superintendence appears, as we have noted, to have made little impress on the Congregational denomination in the states under his charge. That denomination never became a leader in the "Bible Belt." Scofield's own groups led in promoting church irrelevance and imminent Rapture. Why did he take and hold the superintendent's post?

CHAPTER 20 NOTES

1. "As on Eagle Wings", notes on a sermon delivered at Chicago Avenue Church, Chicago, Sunday, August 9, 1903, by Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. The message was delivered at a date later than the period covered by this chapter. The Horse Guards reference is made in such a way that Scofield gives the impression of being a world traveler.
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
3. *That Hideous Strength*, by C. S. Lewis, MacMillan, 1948, pp. 174—5.
4. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
5. The Amisted Research Center receives support from the American Missionary Center and the United Church Board for Homeland Missions. The Scofield letters were included in a collection of documents which had been held by the Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, prior to being turned over to Amisted.
6. Dispensationalism has developed set terms and has applied special meanings to some words and phrases, which makes its language distinctive. This provides a certain bond which helps give its adherents a sense of belonging. Syndicated columnist Sydney J. Harris in his column of Jan. 22, 1973, entitled "How Slang Conceals Dishonesty" notes the cohesiveness of special language and jargon, but suggests that such special language can be very immoral. We must have questions about the jargon of Dispensationalism.

7. Letter to J. B. Clark, April 2, 1889.
8. Information on the lynching was supplied by the Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas. Information included copies of documents and relevant excerpts from *The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900*, by L. D. Rice, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, La.
9. Scofield's letter to Clark, February 4, 1893.
10. Letter of February 4, 1893.
11. Letter of March 20, 1893.
12. Brackettville was the subject of two letters to J. B. Clark, both typed March 20, 1893. The recent telephone directory carrying listings for the Brackettville Exchange shows three churches, Baptist, Methodist and Catholic.
13. Letter of March 20, 1893.
14. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

CHAPTER 21

The “Balmy” Niagara Bible Conference

*“Our hearts be pure from evil
That we may see aright
The Lord in rays eternal
Of resurrection light,
And, listening to His accents
May hear, so calm and plain
His own All Hail! and hearing
May raise the victor strain.”*

John of Damascus, 8th Century¹

The heart of the religious system which made Scofield’s name famous is its prophetic stance. The proponents of that system claim that the Scofield prophetic ideas represent a recovery of “lost truths,” lost since the early days of the church. That point is not confirmed by careful scholarship. As F. Roy Coad says:

Few fragments have survived from the earliest days of the Church’s history, and it would be wrong to read into the ideas of such fragments as we have any of our modern formulated systems. Their one supreme hope was the Second Advent and detail was of secondary importance.²

The ideas which were to be popularized by Scofield’s work, were hammered into presentable shape by a series of Bible and Prophetic Conferences held in various cities in North America beginning in 1875. The most important was the Niagara Bible Conference, held, as its name indicates, at Niagara Falls, on the Canadian side.

Scofield, taking advantage of the long vacations granted by First Church, began attending the conference in 1887. Trumbull, noting that Scofield’s first published work (in 1888) *Rightly Dividing The Word of Truth* was completed at Niagara, said:

The work of making the little book was a time-consuming and laborious task for him then and “spoiled” his vacation (1888) entirely one summer at Niagara. But what a blessing it has been to multitudes of others!³

(The manuscript apparently went directly from the conference grounds to Loizeaux Brothers, New York, the Plymouth Brethren “house” publishers. They still have it on their list nearly a century later.)

Later on, when A. C. Gaebelien was recounting his relationship with Scofield, he spoke of “balmy days of the Niagara Bible Conference.” He implied that Scofield agreed with that value-judgment.

The Niagara Conference, at its 1878 session, had adopted a series of resolutions setting out its views and purpose. Relevant at this point in our story is Article XIV:

We believe that the world will not be converted during the present dispensation, but is fast ripening for judgment, while there will be a fearful apostasy in the professing Christian body; and hence that the Lord Jesus will come in person to introduce the millennial age, when Israel shall be restored to their own land, and the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord; and that this personal and premillennial advent is the blessed hope set before us in the Gospel for which we should be constantly looking: Luke 12:35-40; 17:26-30; 18:8; Acts 15:14-17; 2 Thess. 2:3-8; 2 Tim. 3:1-5; Tit. 2:11-15.⁴

Not only was the position of the Article adhered to by the conference leadership but a significant part of the group interpreted Matthew 24, I Timothy 4, II Timothy 3 and Revelation 9-19 as the only future for the world. That future held only a succession of natural catastrophes, war, famine, want, disease, repression and torture.

As Richard Weaver has said, "ideas do have consequences." One consequence of the Niagara Conference "balmy" days has been to give to the church, especially in North America, a negative hope. As Kenneth Genry said:

Unfortunately neither pre- nor amillennialism can break from the chains of pessimism concerning the future course of this world. Some people think that this mindset of doom has a debilitating effect on long-range Christian cultural and political endeavor: "where there is no vision, the people perish" (Prov. 29:18).⁵

How did this happen? How does it relate to Scofield?

The Niagara Conference grew out of a major effort which originated with the Plymouth Brethren. In the period after the Civil War, they pushed very hard to get general acceptance for that interest in prophecy which had started in England following the French Revolution. While there had been millennial elements in the movement which forced the United States into the Civil war, the Plymouth Brethren position had not completely taken over. The church or at least a large part of it, had to be directed to the view that its hope was in its own failure.

In speaking of the spread of Premillennialism, according to the Plymouth Brethren, keep in mind that statement of Ernest Sandeen:

But when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of the Brethren teaching, when full account of the energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.⁶

Some of this is noted in the area of our study, but even with study, full explanation eludes the student.

The Niagara Conference itself originated with an informal conference in New York in 1868 by men associated with the millenarian

periodical "Waymarks in the Wilderness."⁷ Several leaders of this informal group died during the early 1870's and the group was reconstituted in 1875. It met thereafter for one or two weeks each year, usually in a resort setting. From 1883 to 1897, it met at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario. In the story, we detect traces of what Blair Neatby called "the High-Church" origin of the Brethren.⁶ One of the leaders wrote of the 1897 session:

To an uninitiated on-looker, Niagara Conference must be something of a mystery. In the quietest and sweetest of retreats, without ostentation and with only the nearest semblance of advertising; with no attractions of singing or musical instruments, without badges, salutes, mottoes, sensational oratory, or any of the usual accessories of a modern conventicle, a large company of sober, cultivated, well-mannered people come together, year after year, ostensibly to study concerning "the things of the Kingdom of God." . . . But what is Niagara Convention?

To answer is both hard and easy. In Apostolic days the name "Believer" stood for all that involved separation unto Christ, and the reproach of His cross. The name "Christian" to-day is lost in an accretion of worldly maxims and practices. The Niagara company are simply aiming to manifest the primitive, New Testament idea of an ecclesia.⁹

James H. Brookes, whom Scofield claimed as mentor, described the 1892 conference in a way which would have brought joy to the heart of any Brethren conditioned in its "High-Church" tradition:

The meeting this year, commencing July 7 and closing on the evening of July 13, was more largely attended than ever before. Often every seat in the pavilion was occupied, and the porches were filled with eager hearers of the Word. The place too becomes more beautiful as the years go by, and it would be difficult to find a spot better suited to the quiet and prayerful study of the Sacred Scriptures. The building in which the Conference meets, over-looking lake Ontario and the river Niagara, and surrounded by green trees, is secluded from the noise of the world: and so excellent were the arrangements for the accommodation of the guests, both in Queen's Royal Hotel and in the boarding houses of the village, that not a word of complaint was heard from any one.¹⁰

It is obvious that the "balmy" atmosphere was originated by careful selection of the "quietest and sweetest of retreats," "secluded from the noise of the world," with "excellent arrangements for the accommodation of guests"—all this to contemplate with apparent delight the prospect of suffering, want, torture, disease, death and worse, the failure of the church. If this could positively be supported from Scripture, fine. But to hold so strongly to what is only an interpretation, an interpretation of suffering for others, and to contemplate it in a setting of luxury! Is it incongruous to have so done? Interestingly enough, up to the present, the Dispensational movement has been so lacking in social concern that the incongruity of the Niagara position has not been noticed.

As with almost everything else about Scofield, examination of available material suggests that his overt role was far less important

than has been implied by those who wrote about him. Few published messages bear his name and we feel that he may have been more of a listener and learner. In the 1895 session he delivered a message entitled "Barabbas' Theory of the Atonement."¹¹ The idea was that Barabbas, saved by a substitute, was like the believer, saved by the substitutionary work of Christ. The flaw in the message is that it overlooks the gross depravity affecting those involved in the crucifixion drama on the official side. To assume the redemption of Barabbas is worse than romantic, it is dangerously close to blasphemy.

In 1897, when Scofield traveled to Niagara from Massachusetts, he brought a message entitled "The Return of The Lord."¹² It really was not original, and it was along a pattern which has become standard in Scofield's following: Early in the message, he said:

The signs and portents of the end-time are now so many and so omnious that men of vision everywhere, and in every walk of life, are taking note of them; and this quite apart from the interpretation of them which prophecy gives. Men like Gladstone and Bismarck have said that the catastrophe of present day civilization is near and cannot be averted; that the destructive agencies are more and mightier than the forces of conservatism, and that no man may predict what form the reconstructed social order will assume after the inevitable cataclysm. Emperor William has said to a friend of his boyhood, that society to-day lives over a volcano, the moment of eruption may be postponed, but cannot be averted. A French member of the Institute says, "I can almost hear the gallop of the man on horseback."¹³

This was the proper style of discussion in the light of the conference's declared purpose. Continuing, Scofield tried to link the disaster with the idea of a "soon-coming" Lord:

Well, that is just what we have been saying for some years. We have risen from our study of the Word of God to come up here year by year to utter this warning—that the age ends in disaster, in ruin, in the great, final, world-catastrophe; and for saying it we have been branded as pessimists.¹³

Yet, while he tries to link disaster with the return of Jesus Christ, we must hedge just a bit:

When will our Lord return? We shall find a two-fold answer. *Absolutely*, that is as to the time fixed in the divine purpose, we do not know, we are not told. The admonition is, "Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore, be ye also ready: for in such an hour as you think not, the Son of man cometh." Matt. xxiv. 42-44; also, Matt. xxv. 13; Acts i. 7.

But, while the time according to earth's chronology is uncertain, the time relatively to other predicted events and epochs is not left in doubt.¹⁴

And the reason he was forced to hedge, just as every Premillennialist must do today, is the words of Jesus Christ, Himself: "But of the day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only" (*Matthew 24:36*).

In the light of that statement, Scofield dared not openly disobey the Lord and fix a date, even though the logic of his scheme required it. Worse, he had the example of William Miller and his date-setting. To avoid overt disobedience to the Lord and to avoid the example of William Miller, Scofield had to indulge in semantics as we note in the quotation. He had painted himself into a corner. As Roy Coad said:

It is here useful to notice one interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to visualise their own age as other than end time. As a consequence, beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.¹⁵

Coad overlooked the capacity of Dispensationalists for semantics: But Scofield failed to avoid a trap which the early Plymouth Brethren worked themselves into. As Blair Neatby notes:

If anyone had told the first Brethren that three quarters of a century might elapse and the Church still be on earth, the answer would probably have been a smile, partly of pity, partly of disapproval, wholly of incredulity. Yet so it has proved. It is impossible not to respect hopes so congenial to an ardent devotion; yet it is clear now that Brethrenism took shape under the influence of a delusion, and that that delusion was a decisive element in all its distinctive features.¹⁶

Just as the early Brethren could not have imagined the end of the 19th Century being possible, so the Niagara attendees probably could not in anyway have imagined the now approaching end of the 20th Century which looms before us. Neatby, being as fair as possible, referred to the Brethren hope as a "delusion." In a like manner, assuming at this point sincerity, the best value we can place on the hopes of the Niagara group is likewise "delusion."

The leadership of the gatherings was in the hands of James H: Brookes until his death in 1897. The corresponding secretary was Rev: W. R. Erdman (the group was at one time heavy with Presbyterians). While Brookes was Darbyite right down the line, Erdman was Premillennial without holding rigid Darbyite views. A. J. Gordon, a Baptist from Boston, was prominent in the group. Gordon died in 1895, and the group seemed to lose something with his passing. When Brookes died early in 1897, before the conference of that year, A. C. Gaebelein took the lead role. He was, however, unable to keep the conference going. The conference was failing to attract younger men as the founders passed on, and certain differences in prophetic view made unity, and even functioning, impossible once Brookes' personality was no longer commanding. And it is possible that Gaebelein's vision, which was to

produce the Scofield Reference Bible, was making the conference irrelevant.

Because of its impact on eschatological thinking, the Niagara Conference has been studied by George H. Ladd (*The Blessed Hope*). C. Norman Kraus (*Dispensationalism in America*), Ernest Sandeen (*The Roots of Fundamentalism*), and it has been reported from a different view by George W. Dollar (*Fundamentalism in America*). And we have the benefit of two unpublished studies by Richard H. Reiter (Trinity Seminary). All the studies make it clear that despite an official stand on prophecy as set out in Article XIV, reproduced above, (the now widely accepted Dispensational view), unity among the brethren (small "b") was not achieved. Such lack of unity seems inherent in any group where the influence of the Brethren (capital "B") is felt. The Brethren were, in the 19th Century, noted for disunity and its promotion under the guise of separation and the seeking of doctrinal purity.

The disunity of Niagara appears to have been present for almost the life of the conference. It makes one wonder about the real basis for Gaebelein's value-judgment "balmy." Robert Cameron of Brantford, Ontario noted:

At the 1884 Conference it came to be "fashion" of every speaker to "ring the changes" on the possibility of Christ coming any moment—before the morning dawned, before the meeting closed, and even before the speaker had completed his address.¹⁷

Cameron's statement makes it evident that the disagreement which seethed under the "balmy" surface of the conference was, as Reiter succinctly puts it "Rupture about the Rapture."¹⁸

The "Rapture-Rupture" essentially had Robert Cameron, Nathaniel West, and later W. R. Erdman, holding for a "Rapture" at the very end of the age. They were to be supported by W. G. Moorehead of Xenia Theological Seminary. An apparent majority of the Niagarans, including Brookes, Scofield, Gaebelein, Parson, Gordon and George Needham, were holding for what has become the traditional pretribulation view.

The conference sessions were officially reported in Brookes' magazine *The Truth* and A. J. Gordon's publication *Watchword*. As West's opposition to the party line grew, he took to other publications to air his views.

Despite careful programming, the difference of view was never resolved during the life of the conference. Gaebelein notes:

. . . I roomed with Dr. West, but it was a sleepless night; on towards five in the morning did I get some rest. Dr. West was a great scholar and strong advocate of the premillennial coming of our Lord. But we differed on the church and the great tribulation.

Unlike Brookes, Gordon, Parsons, Needham, myself and others, Dr. West believed that the church would be on earth till the very end of that

period of trouble. He tried hard to win me over to his side. . . . It was a hot conflict which strengthened greatly my belief in my view, which I believe is based on Scripture. We were good friends.¹⁹

The differences between prophetic teachers caused concern among other Fundamental leaders. Cautions were uttered. Both D. L. Moody and A. J. Gordon warned about the effects of the continued argument, the "Rupture about the Rapture."²⁰ But no one yielded. Our own subject, C. I. Scofield, is never mentioned in connection with the disputes. His messages show that he was firmly committed to the Darbyite position which was later to be woven into the structure of his major work.

The differences persisted after the Niagara Conference was discontinued: The personal conflicts appear to have been resolved. For instance, Scofield was later to use two of the opposing view, W. R. Erdman and W. G. Moorehead, as editors of the Scofield Bible. But so successful was the Gaebelein party that after the middle of the 20th Century, the recovery of a differing point of view was to be almost like recovering lost truths.

As we consider the implications of such a great area of difference, a comment by Duncan McDougall is relevant:

Be not deceived! God is not the Author of confusion. He has not given us the Book of Revelation to put our minds in a muddle, nor yet as a Happy Hunting Ground for our imagination. We should be very careful how we speculate or dogmatize about any prophecy that is as yet unfulfilled.²¹

It must be recognized that it is impossible for God to lead people in different directions in the same situation. So it must be obvious that at least one of the differing parties in the Niagara "Rapture-Rupture" was committed to a position which belied their claim to be in the Will of the Lord they proclaimed.

Recently, T. S. Randell speaking of the matter of the Will of God, said:

But it is possible to extract from the Bible phrases and segments of sentences and employ them as justification for some course of action that we have already decided upon. The words of the Bible are then taken in the sense we have decided previously to give them.²²

Continuing, he says:

It is as we permit the principles of Scripture to permeate our thinking that we think God's thoughts after him.²³

We must consider Scripture itself at this point. Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, besought the church (and the Niagarans must be included):

That we all come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness

of Christ: That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive (*Ephesians 4:13, 14*).

We would submit that what Paul suggested was normal for the church was a bit out of reach during the "Rapture-Rapture." As we move on we quote a statement of Duncan McDougall which must fit here:

THERE IS NOT A BIBLE TEACHER NOR ANYONE ELSE LIVING IN THE WORLD TODAY WHO HAS FOUND A SECRET RAPTURE IN THE BIBLE BY HIS OWN INDEPENDENT STUDY OF BIBLE ITSELF. These teachers all come to the Bible with cut-and-dried theories which they have learnt elsewhere, and twist and torture texts to fit the theory.²⁴

And it is just that "Secret Rapture" which was Gaebelein's and Scofield's position.

Years later, Gaebelein mentioned something else which he felt contributed to the Niagara breakup. As he was giving his version of the Scofield story, he mentioned a "serpent" which crept into the gathering. The "serpent" was Edward Irving (1792-1834). As Gaebelein told the story:

Toward the end of the Niagara meetings several of the teachers, influenced by one man, who was considered an outstanding biblical and ecclesiastical scholar (as he undoubtedly was), began to abandon this distinction and branded it a mere invention. One of them went so far as to say that the teaching that the Lord would remove His true Church before the predicted Great Tribulation judgment, and that so far as His coming for His saints is concerned that it might occur at any moment, originated in the days of Edward Irving and his spurious gift of tongues' revival. And so the blessed hope of the imminent coming of the Lord was more or less charged to the influence of subtle demons.²⁵

Gaebelein's opinion of Irving has been accepted throughout the Dispensational movement. As recently as 1976, John Walvoord made this comment:

The often-repeated charge that Darby secured his pretribulationism from Edward Irving has never been actually documented. One can hardly account for the wide acceptance of pretribulationism by Plymouth Brethren, who are devoted students of the bible, to the offering of this view by a person who had no reputation for orthodoxy.²⁶

By using a bit of semantic writing, Walvoord tries to cover the origin of the ideas he propounds. In doing so, he differs markedly from British writers who are closer to the subject. Neatby, writing in 1901, Howard Rowdon in 1967, F. Roy Coad in 1968 and Iain Murray in 1971, all find direct and reasonable links between the ideas of Irving and the role

of J. N. Darby.²⁷ The link is so evident that a denial, using semantics on Walvoord's part, does not "wash."

Possibly a reaction to the Irving link helped break up the Niagara meetings. Gaebelein should have been more cautious when he wrote in 1942. In the light of works cited above, there is no excuse for Walvoord's position in 1976.

A statement which Sidney Watson placed in his sensational prophetic soap-opera novel, "The Twinkling of an Eye," shows the mind-set which produced Niagara's Article XIV, the Scofield Bible and Walvoord's statement:

But, even as I pen this millenium-like picture, I know, from the Word of God, that it *cannot be before* Christ comes. But I seek to arouse every *Christian* to God's call to them on this matter. You, who profess to be Christ's, dare not refuse this truth, save at the peril of losing the *Crown of Life*.

The vast bulk of the churches, I know, preach, that the world will continually improve until the earth shall be fit for Christ to come and reign. But I defy any cleric or layman to show me a single word of scripture that gives the faintest colour to that belief, or statement—unless the person wrests the passage so advanced from its distinctly marked *dispositional* setting.²⁸

Watson started with the Dispensational idea fixed in his mind and read Scripture accordingly. The movement has followed him.

Gaebelein never got away from his "doom-boom" view which was promoted in the "balmy" Niagara Conference in the luxury of Queen's Royal Hotel. Writing in 1942, he said:

The truth about the political, moral and religious future of our age, as revealed in the Bible, is clearly stated and unfolded in the Reference Bible. Thousands of Christians, through its enlightening comments, received the true light as to the character of world conditions as they were almost half a century ago, and were delivered from the unscriptural expectation of an ever-increasing and improving betterment of the age.

Then came the terrific crash of 1914, and a good part of the world was plunged into the great catastrophe which we have labeled the first World War. The fact remains that before the war ever came into existence this group of seven men, under the leadership of the late Dr. C. I. Scofield, had sounded the alarm, not as prophets, but as sane and spiritual exponents of sacred prophecy.²⁹

That statement was made 40 years before this page was written.

In 1981, Columnist William Pfaff noted the "doom-boom" speaking from a political viewpoint, but well aware of the religious input:

The country seems resigned to the worst, and this, perhaps, the reason for its current taste in apocalyptic preachings, however idiotic. It can be comforting to think, when times are bad, that events are out of human hands. If we blame it on God, we are free of responsibility.³⁰

Pfaff doesn't know how much of that thought pattern is a result of the influence of the "balmy" Niagara Bible Conference and of Scofield's time spent there. But we can see a direct link.

CHAPTER 21 NOTES

1. John of Damascus, 8th Century, translated by John Mason Neale, 1862, as second stanza of the hymn "The Day of Resurrection."
2. F. Roy Coad, *Prophetic Developments with Particular Reference to the Early Brethren Movement*, Christian Brethren Research Fellowship, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 11.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 61, 62.
4. Resolution was printed as Appendix A of "The Roots of Fundamentalism etc.," by Ernest Sandeen, University of Chicago, 1970.
5. Kenneth Gentry, Pastor Midway Presbyterian Church, Jonesboro, Tenn. Book review, "When Will it All End?", *Christianity Today*, Nov. 8, 1978, pp. 42, 43. Gentry "broke the ice" by taking notice in an evangelical publication of the resurgent postmillennial movement.
6. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
7. Sandeen, p. 133. The 1868 meeting included James Inglis, editor of "Waymarks," and George Needham, who had recently emigrated from Ireland. Needham claimed that the idea originated in Ireland (Powerscourt?). Incidentally, Needham is another figure in the line of prophetic development about whom very little is known.
8. W. Blair Neatby, *A History of The Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1901.
9. *Watchword* (periodical) No. 19 (1897), p. 144.
10. *Truth* (periodical) No. 18 (1892), p. 936.
11. Frequently circulated as a tract.
12. *Truth* 19 (1897) p. 385.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 385.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 387, 388.
15. Coad, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
16. Neatby, *op. cit.*, p. 339.
17. Robert Cameron, *Scriptural Truth about the Lord's Return*, New York, 1922, pp. 145-146.
18. Richard R. Reiter, *The Decline of the Niagara Bible Conference and Breakup of the United Premillennial Movement*. Unpublished paper, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1976, p. 2. See also, Reiter, *The Rapture Controversary in Late Nineteenth Century American Fundamenalism*, unpublished paper, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1980.
19. A. C. Gaebelain, *Half a Century, The Autobiography of a Servent*, Publication Office "Our Hope," New York, 1930, pp. 153-154. The incident described actually occurred at a conference sponsored by Brookes in St. Louis, but was entirely typical of the sort of proselyting which went on at Niagara and when attendees got together anywhere.
20. Reiter, *Decline*.
21. Duncan McDougall, *The Rapture of the Saints*, O.F.P.M. Publishers, Blackwood, New Jersey, 1970, p. 56.
22. T. S. Rendall, *The Lord Led Me—But did He?*, The Prairie Overcomer, May 1982, p. 202.
23. Rendall, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
24. McDougall, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
25. Gaebelain, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible*, Moody Monthly, January 1943, p. 278.

26. John R. Walvoord, *The Blessed Hope and The Tribulation*, Zondervan, 1976, p. 48.
27. Walvoord's denial of an Irvingite influence is most remarkable since all the books mentioned are in the Library at Dallas Seminary and were available to Walvoord. Neatby has been on hand for years. Rowdon's work was acquired in April 1968, Coad's study in December 1978 and the paperback edition of Murray's *The Puritan Hope* was acquired in March 1976, according to notations in the volumes. Thus they were readily available to Walvoord as he wrote.
28. Sidney Watson, "In The Twinkling of an Eye," p. 197. Note that Watson makes salvation dependent on a certain Rapture view.
29. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, Moody Monthly, October 1942, p. 66.
30. William Pfaff, "Apocalyptic Preachings Focus on Political Fears," *The Chicago Tribune*, Friday, March 20, 1981.

CHAPTER 22

Into the Mauve Decade

"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

I Tim. 4:14

The peripatetic activities of C. I. Scofield related in the previous chapter took us into the middle of the 1890's. In relating Scofield's activities in Dallas, we must make a chronological backtrack to 1890—the opening of the "Mauve" decade.

In July 1890, Scofield suffered the first of recurrent illnesses which were to trouble him until his death: The Death Certificate issued 31 years later, lists cardial vascular problems as a cause of death. But Scofield never behaved like a heart patient. As Scofield's life shapes up under examination and as recurring periods of illness are noted in succeeding chapters, a comment of Dr. William Sadler should be seriously considered:

No one can appreciate fully as a doctor the amazingly large percentage of human disease and suffering which is directly traceable to worry, fear, conflict, immorality, dissipation, and ignorance to wholesome thinking and unclean living. *The sincere acceptance of the teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living would at once wipe out more than half the difficulties and sorrows of the human race.*¹

It has been established that Scofield's life included certain deficiencies that might have brought his situation into the scope of Sadler's statement. In that may be a partial explanation for some of the unaccountable illnesses.

The 1890 illness did not interfere with two new publishing ventures by Scofield. A monthly, *The Believer*, made its appearance in July with a 16-page issue. Scofield, as editor, listed three reasons for starting the magazine:

1. to bear testimony to a "body of truth being neglected"
2. to aid Bible study
3. to correct the "nearly complete effacement of the line separating the Church from the world."

Reason No. 1 is a typical Dispensational "warhorse" trotted out at intervals to convince the unconvinced and to reassure the convinced. But it is not really true: Was he, in No. 3, hinting at the famous "five

don'ts" of Fundamentalism? The magazine survived for nine issues, the last appearing in March 1891.²

The second publication project of 1890 was the beginning of his Comprehensive Bible Correspondence Course.³ While encouraging Bible study is most commendable, in the light of the work of Patrick Fairbairn, the Hodges, R. L. Dabney, Warfield and others, it is most unfortunate that the course was one means of shackling the Dispensational idea on to American Christendom.⁴ Scofield continued to direct the course until 1914 when it was taken over by the Moody Bible Institute.⁵ Under Scofield's direction, the course enrolled some tens of thousands of students scattered all over the world. These students were all dedicated to the idea of the failing church.⁶

Scofield must have cast off his illness in time to participate in the Texas State Fair of 1890: On Tennessee Day, he introduced Governor Robert Taylor of the "Volunteer State." Many citizens of Dallas had come from Tennessee. Scofield's service in a Tennessee Regiment for one year of the war was being played up as an asset which made his ministry more acceptable to ex-Confederates: An eye-witness reported that he introduced to governor in "eloquent terms."⁷ Possibly Scofield was more eloquent than truthful. That eloquence could have been the basis for two reputable publications asserting without contradiction by Scofield and his supporters that he was born in Tennessee rather than Michigan.⁶

BeVier describes another activity of Scofield's which was intended to reach out beyond the bounds of the First Congregational Parish:

For a number of years prior to 1890 Scofield had been interested in foreign missions for several successive years he had been with Hudson Taylor, the founder and director of the China Inland Mission, at the Niagara Bible Conference. Scofield's contacts with Taylor caused his interest in missions to grow. After studying several possibilities Scofield's attention was turned to Central America, an unoccupied field from the Protestant viewpoint. With a plan in mind, Scofield in November, 1890 called Messrs. Powell, Rees and Nason to his home. Following this meeting the Central American Mission was organized on November 14, and has become another lasting evidence of Scofield's ministry. The organization was subsequently approved by the Church, whose members became enthusiastic supporters. The early support of the mission came largely from the Dallas church, but later its constituency became nationwide.⁹

But, as we will note later, the much traveled Scofield never ventured into those countries where the missionaries of the Central American Mission were laboring.

It is well that First Church built up its own staff of men with pulpit capability. The church records noted that in May 1891, the Pastor's health failed from overwork.¹⁰ Scofield was given a five-month vacation to recuperate. (Coincidentally, this period matched the time when the

bible Conferences were being held around the country. Or was this the time he saw the Horse Guards?) BeVier suggests that Scofield may never have adjusted to the hot summers in Dallas.¹¹ Details of health matters are so vague. By any measure, the church was growing despite a somewhat discontinuous pulpit presence on Scofield's part. Keep in mind the quotation from Neatby at the beginning of chapter 19.

During Scofield's frequent absences in 1890, 1891 and early 1892, Luther Rees, a graduate of the earlier class of 10, is noted as associate pastor.¹² Rees was ordained to the ministry by Scofield on June 1, 1892, Scofield preaching the sermon. The ordination sermon for Luther Rees has been preserved in a pamphlet bearing the title, "Jesus Christ as Preacher." The pamphlet bears the heading "Sermon preached by *Dr.* C. I. Scofield" (emphasis added). This is the first time we have noted the title "Dr." No research has yet uncovered any institution which in the early 1890's would have awarded a degree, academic or honorary to a preacher holding Dispensational views. Dispensationalism was then too much of an oddity to be accepted in academic circles.

The title "Dr." conveys a bit more prestige than just plain "Pastor" or "Mr." Scofield may have felt that "Dr." was more appropriate for the head of a growing church. But it is really not proper to award such a title to one's self—for it appears most likely that this is what occurred in Scofield's case.

Certain statements in the sermon deserve our consideration as they help to show the development of Scofield's theology and thought. On the third page of the pamphlet, we find:

Will you bear with me while I just briefly name the doctrines that I found? First of all—his own absolute Deity; next, His own absolute humanity; then the inspiration and authority of Old Testament Scriptures, including the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; the prophetic character of Daniel, and the truth of Old Testament miracles. All these affirm what is the true basis and frame-work of the teachings of Jesus Christ. Then again, himself presented as the Mediator between God and man; the necessity of the new birth; salvation through faith alone; the fatherhood of God limited to those who receive Jesus Christ as a Saviour; the eternal punishment of the unsaved; eternal assurance based on His own keeping power, and remission of sins through the shedding of His blood only; His own second advent, the ushering in of His millennial Kingdom; the privilege of prayer, and the duty of service. These great fundamental doctrines, which we are accustomed to hear called "Pauline," I find dear friends, upon the study of Christ's words alone, to be "Christine" as well as "Pauline."¹³

All of which, except for the "millennial kingdom," sounds quite orthodox. But on the next page, trading theology for evangelistic history, he finds things a bit out of line.

Why friends, we, who are so accustomed to a style of evangelism just now that deals in sentiment and pretty songs, are amazed when we turn

back to the preaching of Finney and find that the very substance of it was stiff doctrine. But, because it was *God's* doctrine, men fell in thousands at the feet of Jesus, so in our day we find Spurgeon and Moody, preachers of the dear old doctrines.¹⁴

The trouble is that it was the evangelism of Finney which started that very trend which Scofield complained of. His assertion that Spurgeon and Finney preached the same message is incorrect. The views of the two men were so far apart that reconciliation is impossible. The statement is another suggestion that Scofield's knowledge was superficial and his expressed views suited to occasion and congregation.

The charge to Rees ended the sermon:

These men, my brother Rees, these are the soul winners; these are the heroes of faith; these will shine like the stars for evermore when the rosewater preachers of "sweetness and light" and of a bloodless atonement, are forgotten, if not damned.¹⁵

Unfortunately, Rees did not consistently carry out the obligations noted in the charge. A 1901 letter from Scofield to Mrs. A. P. Fitt (Emma Moody) notes that Rees had been "connected for years with a large investment house." Other reports indicate that Rees was never consistently in the full-time ministry.

Scofield's relations with Rees continued close after Rees took a charge in Paris, Texas: Judge D. H. Scott of the Paris congregation, in his eulogy, offered just after Scofield's passing, said: ". . . our little Church was so fond of him, he sometimes spent a whole week, teaching and preaching the word."¹⁶

The Scofield residence at 157 Holmes Avenue (present house number is 2819)¹⁷ highlights a point of some interest. BeVier in his study comments that First Church was something of a neighborhood church. But it was not a neighborhood church in the vicinity of the sanctuary, but rather in the neighborhood on Holmes Avenue.¹⁸ The membership list of 1893 showed 19 families living on Holmes Avenue between Grand and Forest Avenues, then definitely an upper middle class area. In addition to the three Scofields in the parsonage, BeVier noted the following and their business connections: Mrs: Ninnie Baird, Baird Baking Co.; The John Cravens, Mrs. Craven was a member of the Dealey family of the Dallas *Morning News*; The Edward Clardys, later, Pastor, Pilgrim Congregational Church; The Samuel Dealeys, Dealey Brothers Wholesale Lumber Co.' The George Dealeys, Dallas *Morning News*¹⁹ The Fitzhugh Hawkes superintendent Sanger Brothers Department Store; The Theodore Mosher Family, Mosher Steel Company; The Thomas J. Jones family, Treasurer, Mosher Steel Co. (Mrs: Jones was a Mosher):²⁰ House calls to this group could conveniently be made without a horse and carriage and without utilizing the horse cars which were beginning to run in Dallas. The group could easily get together

socially: The distinction between church and private social affairs may have often been quite indistinct.

BeVier failed to follow to a conclusion the intriguing leads offered by the list of business connections. The Baird Baking Company still produces the staff of life in Dallas. Signs advertising Mrs. Baird's Bread are in plain sight on the freeways in Dallas, the trade being conducted under a name which honors Ninnie, herself.

The Mosher family at the time we refer to was deeply involved in laying the basis for the present Mosher Steel Company, leading fabricator and secondary producer of steel in Texas. The Moshers made no move toward primary production and thus were utterly dependent upon the "Steel Trust" (Carnegie, Frick, *et. al.*) for the basic materials of their business. The History of the Mosher Steel Company²¹ indicates that its flow of basic steel was uninterrupted. Apparently they were able to live with the monopoly pricing system of the steel trust known as "Pittsburgh Plus."²²

Bachelor Jones, who sold the 157 Holmes property to Scofield, was of the next generation of Joneses. With the Dealeys running one of Dallas' leading newspapers, it would appear that in the long run, Scofield and his intimates must have been receptive to the early advice of the superintendent from Boston, noted in chapter 17, about the place of the hoi polloi in the church. Certainly they were not in the leadership and do not appear to have been the pastor's intimates.

During the autumn of 1893, Scofield preached a series of Sunday sermons, largely on prophetic subjects, which were transcribed and published. The message of October 15, 1893, entitled "The Purpose of God in This Age" is of great interest. Firmly Dispensational, the message is committed to the irrelevant church and its replacement by others. The social effect of such a message on an upper middle class congregation, moving in places of social prominence in a growing city, must have been horrendous.

On page 19, Scofield says, speaking of the "age" or Dispensation concept:

As you are aware, they are marked, as to their beginning, by some new probation for man, as to their ending by some act of judgment—for man always fails at last.²³

The sermon is a rehash of the Scripturally unproven Darbyite chopup of Scripture: The sermon, on its page 23, is brimming over with Dispensational "hope," which is something very different from the "Blessed Hope":

There is not a passage, nor a line, of Scripture which intimates that the world is to be converted during this age.

Nay, not Paul only, but the Lord also describes the whole course of this again terms which exclude the possibility of a converted world during its continuance. The parable of the tares in Matt. xiii declares in express terms that the children of the devil are to be mingled with the children of the kingdom until the end of the age. The *purpose of God* in this age, then, is the calling out of the church.²⁴

This purpose was firmly held and propagated by both Darby and Scofield.

As Scofield waxed eloquent, he gave the congregation a distinction which can be only an exercise in semantics: "The evangelization of the world, then, and not its conversion, is the mission committed to us." But conversion is the only valid measure of evangelization. Here Scofield ignores the principle of Isaiah 55:11. Further, he puts a limitation on the church which ignores the important message of Ephesians 3:

To do this, to preach the gospel unto the uttermost parts of the earth, to offer salvation to every creature is our responsibility. It is the divinely appointed means for the calling out a people for his name, the church, the "Ecclesia."²⁵

He would turn the task of changing the world over to another group, one which in the 1890's was indifferent to Jesus Christ, remains so today, is even active in opposing Him:

It follows that the purpose of God in this age is not the establishment of the kingdom.

I have already said that the kingdom is the great theme of the prophets. They tell us in perfectly simple, unambiguous language how the kingdom is to be brought in, who is to be its ruler, and the extent and character of that rule, and the result in the universal prevalence of peace and righteousness. We perceive at once that this kingdom is to regenerate society, to deal directly with economic questions, to concern itself with the temporal as well as with the eternal interests of man.²⁶

While the possibility of social reform under the impact of the Gospel is noted, do we detect a note of horror at the possibility?

That the preaching of the gospel produces everywhere many of the kingdom conditions is blessedly true. Where the gospel and an open Bible go, the humanities and ameliorations which are to have their full fruition in the kingdom age spring up. Even the unconverted acknowledge the new ethical ideal, and there is an immense quickening of the higher powers of man. These are gracious and beautiful results in which we may legitimately rejoice. They are vindications of the truth of our blessed faith.

But what we need to guard ourselves against is the notion—now, alas! all but universally prevalent—that these results are the chief object and end of our mission; that we are sent into the world to civilize it. No, my hearers, these are its incidentals.²⁷

In concluding the message, Scofield makes a firm and determined commitment to irrelevancy: "We will not attempt in this age the work which God has reserved for the next."²⁸

In November 1893, the church agreed to give Scofield five months vacation each year. He, in turn, agreed to serve as pastor for another seven.²⁹ The decision was made as a result of the attempt already mentioned of The American Home Missionary Society to give Scofield added responsibilities in connection with their work.

The Panic of 1893 threatened to wreck the arrangement. Dallas was affected by serious business failures. No doubt, the aspiring tycoons had to "pull in" a bit. The *hoi polloi* were still present in First Church. Scofield reported actual destitution among wage earners in the congregation.³⁰ The Church, however, did manage to pay Scofield's salary and even kept paid supplies in the pulpit during his absences.

By the end of 1894, the membership roll of the church stood at 550—all no doubt waiting for the "Any-Moment Rapture." At the 1895 annual meeting, the church, on Scofield's recommendation, voted to delete names of inactive members from the rolls. At this meeting the vacation-salary arrangement with Scofield was continued.³¹

In February 1895, D. L. Moody returned to Dallas to conduct another series of evangelistic meetings: Moody had been in Dallas in 1886 at Scofield's invitation. He had for several years previous to 1895 scheduled Scofield as a speaker at the summer conferences held at East Northfield.³²

It would appear that the association between Scofield and Moody may have been responsible for the call received by Scofield to become pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church of East Northfield, Mass. As the notice of the call is recorded in an insert on page 162 of the Record Book of First Congregational Church (now Scofield Memorial Church), it refers to a call from the Trinitarian Congregational Church and "the accompanying presidency of the two Northfield preparatory schools which Moody had founded."³³ Scofield decided to accept the call and the Dallas church released him for one year.³⁴

There is a serious question about the entry in the First Church Record Book. As will be discussed in the next chapter, at the time Scofield accepted the call to the church in East Northfield, no record can be found in the schools of any change in the presidencies of those two institutions.³⁵ No evidence has been found that the schools issued a call to Scofield, nor that any action of the church was in anyway binding on the schools: Those in the Dispensational community who hold, and some quite vigorously, that Scofield headed the preparatory schools are laboring under a delusion.

In accepting the call to Northfield, Scofield recommended his successor to the pulpit in Dallas. The recommendation was for one year, suggesting that Scofield either expected to return or else did not feel free to make his intentions clear to the Dallas congregation. He recommended Rev: William F. Reed of Avoca, Iowa, who was planning to

depart for the mission field late in 1896 and was willing to take the pulpit until he left for the field³⁶ Scofield recommended a salary of \$1,200 for Reed. The church accepted both recommendations.

In January 1896, Scofield submitted his final annual pastor's report for his ministry in Dallas. It reviewed his 14 years. Note was made of the fact that the membership had growth from 14: Some 812 members had been received (75 percent "upon confession of their faith in Jesus Christ"). The actual active membership at the time of the report was 533. The conclusion of the report had several recommendations including a proposal to organize a "Bible School" in Dallas. The report came to Dallas from Northfield where Scofield was already at work.³⁷

CHAPTER 22 NOTES

1. William C. Sadler, *The Practice of Psychiatry*, St. Louis, Mo., C. V. Mosby Co., 1953, p. 1008. Originally noted as a quotation in S. I. McMillan, *None of These Diseases*, Revell, 1963.
2. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 51 and Footnote 123.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
4. The diligence of Scofield and others to implant the idea of church failure must amaze the Christian who sees Christ triumphant in the world as declared in Scripture. The Manichaean nature of Scofield's view becomes clearer as the idea is given deeper study.
5. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
6. BeVier, footnote 121.
7. Lindsey, *op. cit.*, pp. 245, 249.
8. Lindsley and Hill. The entry for Scofield in the work contains 16 errors in the space of two pages. The information was most likely supplied by either Scofield or the church. As already noted, there is no support for the story of birth in Tennessee. All associates of Scofield in the Dispensational movement affirm the Michigan birthplace.
9. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
10. Record Book, First Church, p. 97.
11. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
12. *Ibid.*
13. The sermon printed in pamphlet form. Copy in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
14. From the ordination sermon.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Central American Bulletin, September 1921, p. 4.
17. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
18. Manual of First Congregational Church, pp. 33-50.
19. Note that Dealey Square where President John F. Kennedy was assassinated bears the name of the family.
20. One of the Joneses conveyed 157 Holmes to Scofield.
21. *The Mosher Steel Company, a History of 75 Years*, privately printed, Dallas, 1976.
22. "Pittsburgh Plus" was the system of selling all steel produced in the United States at a price representing the cost at Pittsburgh, plus freight from Pittsburgh to destination. This applied no matter where the steel was produced. This *added* to the cost in many instances and hindered the orderly growth of the steel industry. The practice was finally broken up after World War II. Col. Robert R. McCormick of *The Chicago Tribune* was a leader in the crusade against the practice.

23. *The Purpose of God in This Age*, a sermon preached by C. I. Scofield at First Congregational, Dallas, October 15, 1893, p. 19.
24. *Ibid*, p. 23.
25. *Ibid*, p. 26.
26. *Ibid*, p. 31.
27. *Ibid*, p. 31.
28. *Ibid*, p. 32.
29. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
30. Scofield letter to Rev. J. B. Clark, March 17, 1893.
31. Record Book, MSS, pp. 117-119.
32. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 52, Trumbull, p. 52.
33. Insert on p. 163, Record Book, MSS, First Church.
34. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
35. See *So Much to Learn* by Burnham Carter, Northfield Schools, Northfield, Mass., 1976.
36. Letter from Scofield to Elder Harvey Page, Dec. 26, 1895. Noted by BeVier from the First Church collection.
37. Record Book, First Church, Pastor's Report, 1895.