

## CHAPTER 23

# Under the Elm Trees (Massachusetts)

*"Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ and lie not) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity."*

I Tim. 2:7

**N**orthfield, Massachusetts, is a typical New England village with a Main Street shaded with elm trees. There D. L. Moody was born in 1837. He left before the Civil War. As his ministries flourished and his fame grew, he turned back again to Northfield, once again looking on it as home. In the final years of his life, Northfield, rather than Chicago was his base.

Recognizing a need for training Christian leaders, Moody was instrumental in establishing two preparatory schools, with Christian emphasis, in his home community. Northfield Seminary for Girls opened in 1979; Mt. Hermon School of Boys opened in 1881.<sup>1</sup>

The young Moody, the boy from Northfield, came from an environment virtually Unitarian: He was a product of the apostacy which we have noted, spread from Harvard to blight New England, the East, ultimately touching the entire country.<sup>2</sup> But the Moody who returned to Northfield had been converted and gone "all the way" with the Lord. He was instrumental in changing others. By the 1890's the white-steepled church on the Northfield Green could properly be called "Trinitarian Congregational Church." It was the Trinitarian Congregational Church which late in 1895 issued a call to Rev. C. I. Scofield of Dallas to become its pastor. Since the church was Moody's home church, it is generally assumed that Moody was the instigator of the call to Scofield.<sup>3</sup>

Scofield arrived in Northfield at the beginning of 1896. Hettie presumably was with her husband, but we find no reference to her until James M. Gray related an incident which occurred several years later. Noel, who had just turned 7 when the move to Massachusetts took place, is never mentioned.<sup>4</sup>

BeVier notes that there is little record of Scofield's activities during the Northfield period. The records in Dispensational sources seem confusing at first glance. With careful study they begin to sort out—but in a manner which may be upsetting to Dispensationalists.

The dynamism of Mr. Moody led to the starting of varied programs. These offer room for confusion when one must rely on the memories

of elderly men, but all this cannot account for the confusion about Scofield's ministries in his sixth decade. Certain Dispensational and/or Evangelical sources have held that accepting the call to the pulpit at Northfield was automatically and almost by the same act, appointment to the presidency of the two preparatory schools in the town. Really it is quite naive to think that the schools of the calibre of the preparatory schools in Northfield could or would have functioned with an executive head selected by the calling of a pastor to what was essentially a parochial, rural congregation.

Note that besides the preparatory schools, for a number of years, there was a Northfield Bible Training School, also established by D. L. Moody. Moody never liked to see anything wasted, including space.<sup>5</sup> Since there was space in the Northfield Hotel during the winter, he decided to use it for a school which might have grown into a New England "Moody Institute." The school, begun in 1889, functioned during the winters. It drew students entirely separate from and of different age groups than the two preparatory schools. Scofield was on the faculty of the Training School 1896-1898 and letterheads of 1900 and 1902 refer to him as president. Trumbull refers to the Northfield Bible Training School without any specifics. Careless reading may have led some to think that Trumbull referred to the preparatory schools.<sup>6</sup>

The Northfield Bible Training School does not appear to have survived after Scofield's departure from Northfield in 1903. Except for notes in some biographical sketches, we have not found it referred to in other Evangelical or Fundamental publications. Its 1900 letterhead described it as:

Northfield Training School for Men and Women  
Founded by D. L. Moody

Its 1902 letterhead is that of The Scofield Bible Correspondence Course and identifies Scofield as "President of the Northfield Bible Training School."<sup>7</sup>

The Northfield preparatory schools (Mt. Hermon and Northfield) issued an excellent history of the schools, *So Much To Learn*, written by Burnham Carter and published by the schools in 1976.<sup>8</sup> It has been carefully examined. The name of C. I. Scofield is nowhere found in the book. Dr. Paul Bowman, archivist of the schools, confirms in writing the fact that Scofield was never officially connected with the preparatory schools. The evidence is that his only connection seems to have been to preach to the students on those Sundays when he was in town and when they came to church.

When BeVier was working on his thesis in 1960, he was advised in a letter dated March 14, 1960, from Frank Pearsall, then director of public relations of the schools, as follows:

Your letter of March 5 seeking information about Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield has been handed to me for attention. I am sorry that there is very little information that we can give you about Dr. Scofield since his primary association while in Northfield was with the Trinitarian Congregational Church rather than with The Northfield Schools. He was also connected with the Northfield Summer Conferences and is listed as a speaker at both the Northfield General Conference and the Northfield Girls' Conference in 1898 and 1900. Incidentally, these dates span the final year of Mr. Moody's life which ended in 1899.<sup>9</sup>

The schools have never been able to authenticate the Dispensationalists, view. A. C. Gaebelein's position on the matter of Scofield and the schools is strange. Writing in *Moody Monthly* in November 1942, he recalled a Sunday, April 19, 1900, when he preached in Scofield's pulpit in East Northfield. But writing in 1942, he repeated the claim that Scofield was president of the two preparatory schools.<sup>10</sup>

Note that in 1900, before the days of the auto and airplane, Gaebelein, coming from New York on the New Haven and Boston and Maine Railroad, could not have been in and out of East Northfield the same day. He must have spent at least one or two nights at the manse. Gaebelein should have noted a bit of Scofield's regular schedule. The fact that he had no office in Camp Hall (the administrative center) on the campus should have registered with Gaebelein.

Rather than "crucify" Gaebelein for inaccuracy, we note that when he wrote for *Moody Monthly*, he was 81 years old.<sup>11</sup> Let Frank Maloy Anderson (History Professor at two Universities), provide an "out" or alibi for an elderly gentleman:

It has frequently happened that men writing or speaking after a long interval about an important event they had witnessed have fallen into the error of incorporating into their own recollection details about the event which they did not actually see or hear but had derived from the report of some other witness or reputed witness. Memoirs and reminiscences afford numerous examples of such mistakes.<sup>12</sup>

The school matter is not of the historical import of the event that Anderson was discussing, but he does suggest a possible explanation. Gaebelein, not fully trusting an 81-year-old memory, could have utilized stories circulating in the Dispensational community. But where did the stories start? Who kept them going?

In light of the question at hand, it is interesting to reproduce Dr. James M. Gray's remarks on the Northfield period as he supposedly gave them at a 1916 testimonial dinner for Scofield in New York. (The event will be discussed later:)

On Dr. Scofield's work in Northfield, Mass., there is not time to adequately dwell. But everyone knows it could not have been confined to the pastorate of a country church. What an opportunity was opened there through the hundreds of young lives coming and going every year

in the Northfield Seminary for Girls and the Mt. Hermon School for boys. How many of these, now influential men and women throughout the world, have daily cause to thank God for his enlightened ministry!

Here Dr. Scofield organized and conducted for a while another school for Christian workers. Here he was one of the stronger attractions of the great summer conferences at that beautiful place, as long as D. L. Moody lived. Here his already extensive oral ministry began greatly to increase throughout the United States and England. In Dallas, his church had provided for an annual absence of five months that he might exercise this ministry, and the Northfield pastorate wisely granted him similar freedom.<sup>13</sup>

We are working with a transcript of Gray's statement, but note that it was not published until nearly five years after it was delivered. The second sentence quoted suggests that even in 1916, there were doubters regarding the factuality of the claim of a role for Scofield as school administrator. If, in the third sentence, Gray is claiming the presidency for Scofield, in the light of official records, such a suggestion is inaccurate. It could have been to convince those who accepted the story, and at the same time assure Northfield alumni and others that knew the facts, that Gray was not departing from the truth. Note also that Gray credits Scofield alone for the Northfield Bible Training School which was actually organized by D. L. Moody and functioning some years before Scofield came to Massachusetts from Dallas.

Interestingly enough, Scofield himself cannot be called upon to support the story circulated by his associates, unless he was agreeable to and cooperated in the weaving of it sometime after the alleged event. Writing January 19, 1903, to A. P. Fitt, Moody's son-in-law, Scofield, discussing a matter related in the next chapter, said; "I have sent in my resignation of the Northfield & Mt. Hermon pastorates."<sup>14</sup> No mention of the schools. Note also, that in 1912, when he supplied information to "Who's Who in America," he listed his Northfield role only as pastor. Scofield himself passed up another opportunity to speak of a school post. Speaking at Moody Bible Institute Founder's Week in Chicago during the early years of the century, he said of the schools:

I do not institute comparisons between the great work done by the institutions at Northfield when I exalt the Moody Bible Institute—I could not do that. For seven years I was the pastor of those boys and girls, and I love Northfield, and the institutions there.<sup>15</sup>

And in the same message, he made a reference to a school official:

The principal of Northfield Seminary, Miss Evelyn Hall, is a very great personage in Northfield. I mention her name with reverence and love. She is a remarkable character.<sup>16</sup>

The story of the Presidency may have been created around the time of the 1916 testimonial dinner.

From *So Much to Learn*, we list the officers of the two schools in the "Scofield" period, as taken from official records. This listing is conclusive evidence that the school presidency story is not based on fact.

#### OFFICERS OF THE SCHOOL FROM THE BEGINNING

##### Presidents - Mt. Hermon

1881-1893 Hiram Camp  
 1893-1896 J. M. Harris  
 1897 no President  
 1898-1908 Col. J. J. Janeway

##### Presidents - Northfield

1881-1881 H. M. Moore  
 1881-1886 D. L. Moody  
 1886-1891 David M. Weston  
 1891-1906 H. M. Moore

##### Headmasters of Mt. Hermon School

Mary L. Hammond 1881-1883  
 E. A. Hubbard 1883-1884  
 Henry E. Sawyer 1884-1890  
 Henry Franklin Cutler 1890-1932

##### Principals of Northfield School

Harriette W. Tuttle 1879-1882  
 Emmer Angell Drake 1882-1883  
 Evelyn S. Hall 1883-1911

17

The vacancy noted in the post of corporation president of Mt. Hermon in 1897 does not alter the situation. The corporation functioned during the interregnum without calling on pastor Scofield for help. And note an element of irresponsibility in the Dispensational story; there no distinction is made between the posts of corporation president and that of headmaster charged with the day-to-day running of the schools. A story which sounded good and inflated a man was circulated without checking facts.

The only regular connection Scofield had with the schools were the scheduled Sunday services. The boys from Mt. Hermon Preparatory made the five-mile trek from school to church each Sunday morning and evening on foot. The girls from Northfield Seminary were able to meet the attendance requirement without the lengthy trek.<sup>18</sup>

At the time Scofield arrived in Massachusetts, everything around Northfield was under the shadow of the personality and ideas of D. L. Moody. The shadow loomed larger when he was home from his evangelistic campaigns. For instance, Moody was a strict sabbatarian. The boys were not to study on Sunday. Reading the Sunday paper and bicycle riding were prohibited. Meals for Sunday were prepared on Saturday. Hence, the sermons of Scofield, when he was in town, should have been a big item in the day. The phrase "when in town" was important. At Northfield, Scofield appears to have taken his pastoral duties with about the same level of seriousness as elsewhere. His local charge was always something to be dropped if a broader, more public, opportunity beckoned somewhere else.

As the year 1896 moved on, the congregation in Dallas looked forward to the return of their beloved pastor after his year at East

Northfield. In September, they extended a call for him to return: Included was the offer to support the establishment of a Bible School in Dallas. They offered a salary of \$2,400 a year, with two months annual vacation.<sup>19</sup> Scofield first promised to consider the matter. At the end of October, he declined, citing as his principal reason, that the two months absence would not be enough (the wide, wide world was calling). He suggested that they seek another pastor.<sup>20</sup>

Rev. William L. Reed left Dallas as scheduled for the mission field in November 1896.<sup>21</sup> First Church was left pastorless. Meanwhile, W. Irving Carroll became pastor of the associated Grand Avenue Mission, which was then reorganized as the Grand Avenue Church.<sup>22</sup> BeVier feels that there is evidence that individual members of First Church, Dallas, wrote Scofield, requesting that he return. In a telegram sent in November, Scofield again declined the offer from Dallas.<sup>23</sup> The church remained without a pastor until May 1897.

In April of 1897, Scofield received word from St. Louis that Dr. James H. Brookes had passed away. In the June 1897 issue of *The Truth*, a monthly magazine which had been published by Dr. Brookes for over 23 years, Scofield said:

My own personal obligations to him are beyond words. He sought me in the first days of the Christian life and was my friend and first teacher in the oracles of God.<sup>24</sup>

Later in that year (1897), Brookes' sons published a memorial volume, *James H. Brookes, A Memoir*.<sup>25</sup> The two younger Brookes apparently did not put quite the importance on the relationship between Scofield and Brookes that Scofield and the narrators of the Scofield story did. As we will note in connection with other prominent associates of Scofield, there is no mention of the relationship between the two men. There is no clue in that book as to what actually went on in St. Louis between August 9, 1879, and August 17, 1882. The book does include the following appreciation of Brookes, written by Scofield:

When the word was brought to me that I should see no more with mortal eyes the face of my beloved friend and teacher, James H. Brookes, I felt that he might well have passed to the presence of his Lord with Paul's great triumph song upon his lips; 'I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith.' There was in him the heart of David's mighty men. Like Eleazer, 'his hand clave unto the sword'. The Word of God was ever the end of controversy with him, and also the sword which he valiantly wielded.

Our brother will be remembered as a brave defender of the faith once for all delivered to the saints, but some of us know how tender and how helpful was the great heart now stilled in death. My own personal obligations to him are beyond words. He sought me in the first days of my Christian life, and was my first and best teacher in the oracles of God.<sup>26</sup>

In May 1897, First Church (Dallas) called Frederic A. Hatch as pastor. At that time Scofield transferred his membership from Dallas to the Trinitarian Congregational Church in East Northfield. Presumably Hettie's membership was similarly transferred.<sup>27</sup>

One other matter must be considered before we discuss the Northfield Bible Conference. The 1897 issue of the conference publication, *Northfield Echoes*, listed Scofield as the Rev. C. I. Scofield. In the 1898 issue, he is shown as Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. BeVier, apparently not having noted any previous use of the degree and the title "Dr.," such as the 1892 sermon noted in chapter 22, assumed that it had been awarded during the previous winter. He commented that it is not known what school conferred the degree.<sup>28</sup> No college ever claimed him and we are not aware of any degree-awarding institution which in the 1890's would recognize Dispensational accomplishments.

In the light of the varied items of information uncovered about Scofield's other accomplishments, consider the possibility that NO school ever awarded that degree. This writer feels that it is quite likely that Scofield "conferred" the degree upon himself to add to the prestige of his name.

If this is so, we may be faced with another false statement and a fraudulent claim regarding Scofield's life and history. While weighing the significance of BeVier's comment on the degree, the writer learned that rumors of Scofield's self-awarded degree have been circulating in the Chicago Fundamentalist community for years.<sup>29</sup> In whatever manner Scofield secured the honorary degree, he consistently used it. His associates in the Fundamentalist community, to a great extent, went along.<sup>30</sup> If the degree is false, consider the brazenness of a man who placed a false degree after his name on the title page of an edition of Gold's Holy Word.<sup>31</sup>

The Northfield Summer Conferences, in which Scofield is reported to have had a part, were founded by D. L. Moody back in 1880. For their first 20 years, they revolved around Moody. The purpose, he said, was "not so much to study the Bible (though the Scriptures will be daily searched for instruction and promises) as for solemn self-consecration, to plead God's promises and to wait upon Him for fresh anointing from on high."<sup>32</sup>

In the purpose announced for Northfield, Moody had a vision many cuts above that of the "balmy" Niagara Conference and the later Sea Cliff sessions. As with so much else in Fundamentalism, the conference phenomenon generated its own jargon. Because of the geographic locations usually selected for the Conferences, the term "mountain top blessings" was and is frequently used to describe the conference experience. And in 1896 and for several years thereafter, Scofield helped to make that possible.

Burham Carter, in *So Much to Learn*, related he story of the conferences. It describes some of the environment in which Scofield worked:

#### THE NORTHFIELD SUMMER CONFERENCES

For more than seventy-five years the Schools conducted religious conferences in the summer which made Northfield famous around the world.

Dwight L. Moody founded them in 1880. The purpose, as he said, was "not so much to study the Bible (though the Scriptures will daily be searched for instruction and promises) as for solemn self-consecration, to plead God's promises, and wait upon Him for fresh anointing power from on high."

The first conference was called the "Convocation for Prayer." It lasted ten days and was attended by 350 people. The second, in 1881, lasted the full month of August and drew 900 people. Since Mr. Moody didn't like to see any of his beautiful new Seminary buildings wasted, other conferences were added, to make a tightly-planned eight weeks every summer.

\* \* \*

During their first twenty years the conferences revolved around D. L. Moody. His star-studded roster of speakers attracted a large following, but, in the final analysis, it was Mr. Moody's sense of timing and drama that kept the crowds spellbound. Within a short time Northfield had come to occupy a place of such importance in American religious life that many leading newspapers, including the *Boston Transcript*, sent staff reporters to the meetings, and the *Postal Telegraph Company* ran its wires to the campus to provide service for newsmen.<sup>33</sup>

Both speakers and conference-goers came from all over the world. During Scofield's time at Northfield, Robert Scott of the British publishing house of Morgan and Scott attended. Morgan and Scott were linked with the Plymouth Brethren. As Robert Scott is introduced into the story, it seems Scofield had not met him at the time he is said to have first visited England. The acquaintance was to play a crucial role in the next stage of Scofield's life and ministry.

In the 1898 conference season, the World's Student Conference, sponsored by the World Student Christian Federation, was held at Northfield. The World Student Christian Federation was a student branch of the YMCA and YWCA.<sup>34</sup> In 1898, its national secretary was John R. Mott, of international fame in the soon-to-be-blossoming and burgeoning ecumenical movement. Mott's flexible orthodoxy helped to direct denominational mission boards into unbelief and denial of basic Christian truths. Scofield's ideas of separation were often hazy and expeditious.

During 1899, Henry M. Moore of Boston and Rev. F. B. Meyer, well-known English evangelist, raised \$53,000 to be presented to Moody for his 60th birthday. The gift was to be used for a chapel on the campus. Writing of the gift, his son, W. R. Moody said:



When the fund was presented to him for this purpose, he was deeply touched by the generous tribute, but it was characteristic of him that he would not allow his name to appear anywhere on the building. A bronze tablet in the vestry shows only that it is given by "Friends in England and America to the Glory of God."<sup>35</sup>

Moody, rejecting original plans, had the chapel built to seat 1,000: Local granite from a Northfield quarry, which Moody had reopened, was used in construction. The chapel was completed in 1899, just a few weeks before Moody died. At the suggestion of Henry F. Cutler, the chapel was organized as a regular church. The work of organization was undertaken in September 1899 by a committee of five men, including Cutler and Mr. James McConaughy.

McConaughy had come to Mt. Hermon in September 1891 at the invitation of D. L. Moody. *So Much To Learn*, already referred to, and a pamphlet, *The Mount Hermon Church 1899-1939*, written by Samuel Stark, give the story of the church and McConaughy's role.<sup>36</sup> The stories suggest that McConaughy actually carried out many of the things which the Dispensational movement has credited to Scofield.

The church was organized November 11, 1899, and held its first service the following Sunday. Stark's pamphlet notes regarding Scofield:

Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield was at this time the pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church in Northfield. During the years preceding, the Hermon boys had attended this church Sunday mornings, making the long trek over and back, since it was Mr. Moody's direction, without undue remonstrance. Many of the charter members of the new church at Mount Hermon had taken their letters from Northfield. So it seemed entirely natural that Dr. Scofield should become the charter pastor at Hermon. Dr. Scofield graciously accepted the invitation, and in his annual report to the church at Northfield, January, 1900, we find the following entry—in characteristic style.

"One marked event of the year (1899) was the foundation of the Union Church at Mount Hermon by a colony who, for that laudable purpose, withdrew from our membership. In a very real sense we may, therefore, claim a maternal relation to that vigorous young church."

Dr. Scofield undertook to preach at Mount Hermon one Sunday every month. This service was much interrupted by many obligations, but the very rarity of its rendering made it notable and distinguished. Dr. Scofield spent his earlier years in the practice of the law; he was a student of the Bible very acute and profound; his very eloquent speech and his very dignified presence made his ministry unique and his influence far-reaching.

Dr. Scofield, however, remained at Northfield only three more years, and withdrawal from the one pastorate necessitated withdrawal from the other. While Dr. Scofield's powerful preaching was ever regarded as a remarkable Christian privilege, under the circumstances of remote residence and many other duties, the pastoral function was more or less held in abeyance. It will not be too much to say that during this period Mr. McConaughy was the virtual acting pastor.<sup>36</sup>

The pamphlet credits McConaughy with carrying out the responsibility for pastoral care of the flock. Such things did not, as seen from this distance, appear to weigh heavily on Scofield.

The organization of the Mt. Hermon Church was overshadowed by the death of D. L. Moody at the very end of 1899. Scofield preached the funeral sermon for Moody, and thus his name was carried in newspapers around the world. Clipping services for notables, or for those who could pay, were unknown in 1899. Thus Scofield may not have been aware of the story published in *The Kansas City Journal* in its issue of Tuesday, December 28, 1899, inspired by the report of the funeral sermon. The report unfortunately linked Scofield's role with Moody and his shady past in Kansas. Of great interest was the statement in the article:

When approached by his Kansas creditors Parson Scofield declares that he is poor and unable to pay, but he has never failed to do the right and easy thing by renewing his notes.<sup>37</sup>

As suggested elsewhere, genuineness in conversion and the accompanying change of heart include restitution. Such was an absolute condition in the Old Dispensation.

The making of notes to cover debts incurred by criminal activities is another Scofield inexplicability. (He had demonstrated very flexible ideas about the integrity of notes, anyway.) By 1899, the obligations incurred by crimes of 1873 had gone beyond the statute of limitations. Thus his tolling of the statute by issues, then extending notes is unusual. And we may infer that Emeline had felt that the Kansas debts were either not her concern or beyond her ability to handle.

In his comment on Solzhenitsyn's Harvard Address, Harold J. Berman of the Harvard Law School says:

And many people would say they are entirely justified morally in not paying a debt after the legal time-period has passed within which a claim must be made. Here we are indeed guilty of confusing legality with morality.<sup>38</sup>

But Scofield, with an easy, sleezy option of allowing the statute of limitations to protect him, tolled out that protection. He still refused his legally incurred obligation. Berman's statement shows us that Scofield's position was neither legal or moral. This from a "Man of God."

The Kansas City article generated never a ripple in the Dispensational community. But, of course, many of them read the news with J. N. Darby's view of Matthew 24 as a conditioner. Thus they were blinded to their everyday world.

Scofield continued ministering at Northfield after Moody's death, but the impression prevails that with Moody gone, he was at loose ends. During one of his peripatetic movements, sometime after the

middle of 1900, Scofield met A. C. Gaebelein in New York. Among other things they discussed the discontinuance of the Niagara Bible Conference. Gaebelein says that Scofield proposed another conference early in 1901 in Boston.<sup>39</sup>

Arrangements were made to use the Lecture Room in Park Street Church (the famous "Brimstone Corner"). It repeated the themes of a failing, irrelevant church and a hopelessly decaying world.<sup>40</sup> An offshoot of the conference was a series of monthly meetings for Bible study, conducted by Gaebelein. These continued for 32 years, never once interrupted by The Rapture.

During the Boston Conference, Scofield, Francis Fitch of New York and Alwyn Ball, Jr., a real estate man (from either New York or St. Louis depending on which source you use),<sup>41</sup> and Gaebelein discussed again the breakup of the Niagara Conference. They laid plans which developed into the Sea Cliff Conference to be discussed in the following chapter.

The young 20th Century opened new vistas. With that new century, Scofield was prepared to move on to a new and greater role.

#### CHAPTER 23 NOTES

1. See *So Much To Learn*, Burnham Carter, 1976.
2. See previous references to *The Leaven of the Sadducees* by Ernest Gordon.
3. See chapter 22.
4. See chapter 24 for reference to Hettie, made when Gray spoke at the 1916 testimonial dinner to Scofield.
5. Letter to the writer from Burnham Carter, December 10, 1977.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 53. In his narration, he makes no mention of the preparatory schools.
7. Letters: Scofield to Mrs. A. P. Fitt (1900) and to A. P. Fitt (1902). Originals in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
8. Published by the schools as an Anniversary Issue.
9. Letter Frank W. Pearsall to William BeVier, March 14, 1960.
10. Gaebelein, Moody Monthly, November 1942, p. 135.
11. Born 1861, died 1945, "Who's Who in America."
12. Anderson, Frank Maloy, *op. cit.*, p. 109-110.
13. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, September 1921, p. 551.
14. Letter C. I. Scofield to A. P. Fitt, January 19, 1903. Original in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
15. Moody Bible Institute Monthly, February 1922, p. 799 ff. The message is not dated, the caption "some years ago." The quote is from p. 799 of the magazine.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 800.
17. *So Much To Learn*, Appendix 1, p. 262, 263.
18. *So Much To Learn*, p. 85.
19. Record Book, First Church, p. 152.
20. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Record Book, First Church, p. 152.
23. Church Register, First Church, December 16, 1896.
24. *The Truth*, St. Louis, Mo., Charles B. Cox, Publisher, Vol. XXIII, No. 6, 1890.

25. *James H. Brookes, A Memoir*, Presbyterian Publishing Co., 1897. Both this writer and Ernest Sandeen used the copy in the Library of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. That copy was still in the collection when this writer began his research in the 1970s. It is no longer there. Another copy has not been located at this writing.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Church Register, First Church, p. 26.
28. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 66. He refers to *Northfield Echoes*, East Northfield, Mass., issued of 1897 and 1898. He compares Vol. IV, p. 777, with Vol. V, p. 25.
29. This writer has often heard George Hilton, railroad historian, state that the best way to obtain missing data on a particular railroad was to publish a book. The next mail invariably brings the missing material. This could happen in the matter of the Scofield degree. It is hoped that Dispensational zeal will not result in a posthumous back-dated awarding of the degree.
30. It should be noted that the degree Doctor of Divinity is purely honorary and not given in recognition of serious work. Properly, it should not give the recipient the right to be addressed as "Doctor" in ordinary usage. The British do better than Americans on that point.
31. Note that many people failed to use "Doctor" in addressing and referring to Scofield. See *Central American Bulletin*, November 1921, where Luther Rees used "Mr." consistently. This writer *found* people in official capacities in Dispensational schools who used "Mr." today.
32. *So Much to Learn*, p. 136.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Northfield Echoes*, 1898, Vol. V, p. 25ff and 99ff.
35. *So Much To Learn*, p. 92-93.
36. Privately printed, Northfield, Mass., 1939.
37. *The Kansas City Journal*, Kansas City, Mo., Thursday, Dec. 28, 1899, p. 4.
38. Harold J. Berman, "The Weightier Matters of The Law" in "Solzhenitsyn at Harvard", edited by Ronald Berman, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, D. C., p. 100.
39. *Moody Monthly*, Feb. 1943, p. 277.
40. *Ibid.*
41. *Moody Monthly*, Feb. 1943, p. 278.

## CHAPTER 24

# “Dr.” Scofield and Mr. Moody

*“A man that hath friends must shew himself friendly: and there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.”*

Prov. 18:24

The two previous studies about Scofield, frequently referred to, imply an intimate and continuing relationship between “Dr.” Scofield and Mr. Moody: Those who have written about Moody since 1920 (when Trumbull’s book came out) have accepted the relationship as portrayed in Trumbull. But such a position is assumed without specific support.

With but one exception, the only appearance of Scofield’s name in writing about Moody which came out between 1900 and 1920 was the note that Scofield was pastor in Northfield and conducted the funeral service for Moody. Beyond that appearance, the near-contemporaries seem to have found little that was common knowledge to link the two men as Trumbull did.

The one exception is a product of the efforts of Moody’s son, Paul Dwight Moody and his son-in-law Arthur Percy Fitt: It came out in 1900, put together and printed while Moody’s memory was still fresh in the minds of the faithful. Originally it was known as *The Shorter Life of D. L. Moody: Volume 1, His Life, and Volume 2, His Work*. The American Edition was issued by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago (Moody Bible Institute). The two volumes were published as one in England with an Introduction by F. B. Meyer, put out, not surprisingly, by Marshall and Morgan, London. Over the years, Volume 2 of the American Edition appears to have fallen by the wayside. Volume 1, now titled *The Life of D. L. Moody*, has remained on the list of Moody Press. Paul Moody’s name has been deleted from the title page as coauthor (Paul is reported to have gone “liberal” during the 1920’s). We can find no change in the text of the current edition.<sup>1</sup>

It is Volume 1 which is of interest here. Of the original 25 chapters, 24 relate to Moody’s life from Northfield to Northfield, 1837 to 1899, from farm house to cemetery. It is not a study in depth, but facts are correct and value-judgments appear in line. But right in the middle is a short essay, identified as chapter XVI, bearing the caption “D. L. Moody as an Evangelist: His Characteristics and Methods,” by C. I. Scofield, D.D. The four and one-half pages are not a tribute written by a man affected by the departure of a friend. It is simply a comment on Moody as an evangelist with a description of his methods of conducting

his meetings. Much of it is based on Moody's great British campaigns of the 1870's, when Scofield was either chasing Indians on the prairie in Kansas, or else being chased as he tried to avoid prosecution. Scofield's "tribute" was thus based on reports of other men. It cannot be used to affirm (or deny) any level of intimacy between the two men.

What Scofield wrote was an essay which attempted to establish the pattern of Moody as the current definition of evangelism and to suggest that Moody's greatness was to be measured outside the Kingdom of God:

It is the mark of weak men that they break down under unusual responsibilities, of strong men that they are developed by them. The two Americans who in our generation had most in common, Lincoln and Grant, both came to the maturity of their powers under the pressure of immense labors and responsibilities. Both began with a modest estimate of their capacities; both came at last to a singularly humble self-confidence. So it may be said that under the testings of his great English campaign Mr. Moody came to the maturity of his powers.<sup>2</sup>

Later, when Scofield related his story to Trumbull, he made this evaluation of Moody:

Moody was one of the greatest men of his generation. I have sometimes thought that Dwight Moody and General Grant were by any true definition of greatness the greatest men I have ever met.<sup>2</sup>

The comparison with Grant is most interesting, but possibly quite unoriginal. Contemporary newspaper men reporting Moody campaigns made the comparison first. Both men were heavy-set and bearded. Since Scofield had usually promoted Confederate associations (Lee and all that) in building his image, we consider the Grant comparison as more evidence of the eclectic unoriginal thought pattern of Scofield.

The trip to Washington in the Summer of 1873 may have been the only time Scofield saw Grant. (Scofield "admitted" to missing him by 12 miles on April 9, 1865.)<sup>4</sup> But to link Grant with Moody, we feel is somewhat improper to anyone perceptive. Moody wanted to be fully used of God and was so used. Grant, the Grant who Scofield met, was utterly complacent about the rank corruption in his Administration.<sup>5</sup> He died horribly of cancer because he could not or would not master his appetite for cigars. (We admit Grant's greatness as general—see the works of Lloyd Lewis and Bruce Catton.) The comparison is not odious but it suggests some lack of judgment. As recorded in Trumbull, it may be just the stock sort of statement which Scofield remembered and brought out as needed. We suggest that bringing Lincoln into the story by an unrepentant Confederate is an attempt to keep discussion on the level of the daily newspaper and to utilize the political world when it suited.

In a Founder's Week Message, given at Moody Institute some years before Scofield narrated to Trumbull, he made a different statement about Moody's greatness which seems of the same genre:

I think Henry Drummond said the great word about Mr. Moody the man. He said that he was the greatest human he ever knew. Carlyle says that the great man is the man who can conceive great things and do them. If that be a true definition of human greatness, Mr. Moody was a great man.<sup>6</sup>

The Henry Drummond referred to was the Scottish semi-liberal who Scofield was later to condemn strongly.<sup>7</sup> Carlyle's Christian faith is reported to have been destroyed through the instrumentality of his friend, Edward Irving. Scofield's comparisons often made good oratory, but accuracy is another matter.

The present research suggests that Scofield's Northfield ministry, starting at the beginning of 1896, was the only time when the two men could have had much opportunity for intimate personal relationship. Even in those four short years, both men did quite a bit of traveling.

Certain comparisons between Moody and Scofield make us wonder whether the two were so oriented that they could have had a real basis for fellowship. The contrasts are sharply delineated: Moody refused formal ordination; Scofield sought and readily accepted ordination. (But he may have engaged in deception to secure it.) Moody was always "Mr. Moody"; Scofield early identified himself as "Dr. Scofield" and added a degree of "D.D." Evidence suggests that the title was incorrect, the degree self-bestowed. Moody accepted the fact that his formal schooling was limited and allowed the Lord to use him as he was; Scofield made a number of passes at claiming additional schooling which in fact he never had. Moody's relationship with Emma was unblemished; Scofield's marital tangles involving Leontine and Hettie cannot be fitted into a valid Evangelical pattern. Was there any basis for real rapport?

The two first met in St. Louis during Moody's evangelistic campaign, which ran from late November 1879 until April 1880. Scofield at that time had just slithered out of his liability for forgery. Scofield himself related this incident involving Moody, suggesting that it occurred near the beginning of their acquaintance:

I happened to go into Dr. Goodell's study one morning. I found Mr. Moody seated there, waiting for him. I had met him in the after-meeting, and he remember me. He said "I am waiting for Dr. Goodell: he is the Barnabas here, he is the son of consolation. . . ."<sup>8</sup>

The incident is not datable exactly. But the friendship between Scofield and Moody must have developed only as the campaign progressed. Scofield by his own admission was virtually ignorant of the Bible and

matters spiritual when the campaign opened.<sup>9</sup> He did learn, and possibly faster than many, but what basis for intimacy was there even when Moody left St. Louis at the end of the campaign in April?

Observers have reported that Moody's personality and presence were so dynamic that they could not fail to receive a terrific impact just being in Moody's presence. Typical is the oft-related story of Woodrow Wilson in a barber shop:

I was in a barber shop, sitting in a chair, when I became aware that a personality had entered the room. A man had come quietly in upon the same errand as myself and sat in the chair next to me. Every word he uttered, though it was not in the least didactic, showed a personal and vital interest in the man who was serving him; and before I got through with what was being done to me, I was aware that I had attended an evangelistic service, because Mr. Moody was in the next chair. I purposely lingered in the room after he left and noted the singular effect his visit had upon the barbers in that shop. They talked in undertones. They did not know his name, but they knew that something had elevated their thought. And I felt that I left that place as I should have left a place of worship.<sup>10</sup>

This was the impact of a man Scofield claimed to be intimate with. But how could the Scofield unconcerned about theft, unconcerned about family neglect, have a reaction in any way as moving as that of Woodrow Wilson or the barbers in the shop? How could he be intimate with the dynamic commitment to God which was D. L. Moody? Could it be that Scofield was playing a role? A role that covered a reality indifferent to truths that motivated Moody? That role would have to be utterly devoid of conscience, have complete moral relativity (*The Atchison Patriot* story allows for this possibility). The phenomenon is only one of the unexplained elements in the history of Fundamentalism. (The quote from Ernest Sandeen used elsewhere could probably be enlarged to include Fundamentalism as well as Brethrenism.)<sup>11</sup>

We do know that one outcome of the Scofield-Moody Campaign of 1879-1880 was that Scofield picked up the special jargon which is the hallmark of Dispensationalism (see Sydney Harris' column on special language).<sup>12</sup> He picked it up so well that he became a proficient and convincing speaker. But did he convince himself? Did Moody have a chance to pierce that most convincing front which the Rev. C. I. Scofield had? And what did the real Scofield actually think of the dynamo from Northfield, either in campaigns or when the two men were neighbors?

The next recorded contact between the two men was a three day evangelistic campaign in Dallas in March 1886.<sup>13</sup> The schedule of meetings hardly allowed much time for intimate fellowship. Already noted are reports that Scofield was on the program at the Northfield Bible Conference even before the move to Northfield. But we do not note publication of any Scofield messages before the 1895 season. How did



Moody decide that Scofield would fit on the conference schedule? Or did someone else select Scofield for a program spot?

There was nothing unusual in Moody's return to Dallas in 1895 for an evangelistic campaign.<sup>14</sup> But shortly after the campaign ended, a call came to Scofield from the church in East Northfield. Narrators of the Scofield story have credited Moody with the instigation of the call. But, like so much else in the Scofield story, this may not be so. Our research suggests that the idea appeared in Moody stories only after it had been circulated during the build-up of the Scofield image.

We have found nothing attributed to Moody which supports Scofield's claim. Even James M. Gray, (the well-groomed little man in the grey fedora)<sup>15</sup> at the 1916 "wing-ding," failed to credit Moody with the origination of the Northfield move.

In that light it is interesting to note a reference which Samuel Stark put in the Mt. Hermon Church pamphlet about James McConaughy:

Mr. McConaughy was peculiarly fitted for this new task. He had been an Association secretary for many years and had been remarkably successful in his Christian work with young men. At the invitation of Mr. Moody, in September, 1891, he had come to Mount Hermon to carry on this work in the form of Bible teaching. He enjoyed intimate personal friendship with Mr. Moody and was perfectly sympathetic.<sup>16</sup>

As stark describes McConaughy, he appears to have had most of the assets, the talents which both Scofield and Trumbull attributed to the Tennessean from Michigan. So why Scofield?

Richard Ellsworth Day in his centennial biography of Moody "*Bush Aglow*," notes that Moody was much affected by the death of Charles H. Spurgeon in 1891.<sup>17</sup> There are suggestions that Moody had been more influenced by Spurgeon, and Spurgeon's theology than is generally realized.

Moody was theologically unlearned although spiritually acute. In the late 1860's, the Plymouth Brethren had made a special effort to recruit Moody to the Failing Church Eschatology of that sect, a philosophy now marketed as Dispensationalism. Of course, the system has its logic and can seem impressive when vigorously pursued. The trips of Moody to England and the meetings with Spurgeon seem to have unsettled some of the Brethren work. But note that Spurgeon and the Brethren are twain that could never meet.

In his modern biography, J. C. Pollock collected a series of quotes which are an apt summary of Moody's views:

Moody's theological views were, in Speer's words, "the simple central convictions of the evangelical tradition, the Wesleyan evangelistic warmth appealing to human freedom, and the sinews of the Calvinistic reverence for God and His will which Moody felt and knew as a will of love"—a

Biblical theology. As put by Dr. James M. Gray of the Bible Institute, Torrey's future successor, "The brain of his theology was the grip he had on the authority and integrity of the Bible as the Word of God." Sankey gave as one of the reasons for Moody's phenomenal success "that he believed absolutely, implicitly in the message he gave to men. . . . No doubts ever dimmed his faith in the Word of God. To him it was the truth, and the whole truth." "To the Bible he went continually with the spirit of a little child," Dr. Weston wrote. When he preached he held his Bible in his hand through much of the sermon, "often adjusting his glasses to read in a manner that made every hearer feel 'these are the oracles of the living God.'"<sup>10</sup>

In those remembrances of Moody, we see a view which was not the rigid Brethren "doom-hope." Instead of being a precursor of Hal Lindsey, he held views which could be comfortable with Spurgeon's.

The consequences of Moody obviously straying from the Brethren "party-line" on prophecy would have been horrendous to the Dispensational hierarchy whose overt representative was A. C. Gaebelain. It just could not be allowed to happen. We probably will never be able to find a full explanation for the Scofield move from Dallas to Northfield. Remember that Moody had to be kept on the "party-line." That being so, Scofield could have been assigned the task of keeping Moody in the proper prophetic framework.

Gaebelain in 1941 told of an incident which he implies came from Scofield:

Moody himself needed at that time a better knowledge of prophecy, and Scofield was the man to lead him into it. Scofield told us that after he had assumed the pastorate in East Northfield he heard Moody preach a sermon on the life of Paul. Moody described at the close of his sermon how finally Paul died the martyr's death. The executioner came to his cell, and willingly the great man of God put his head upon the executioner's block. One powerful stroke and the head rolled off. But in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, Paul found himself in heaven. The Lord met him and put a glittering crown of gold upon his head, which Paul has been wearing ever since.

"I felt," said Scofield, "that I must set him right on this. So when the proper opportunity came, I asked Mr. Moody a few simple questions."

"Mr. Moody, please tell me how could the Lord put a glittering crown upon the head of the apostle when he had no head at all? The head of Paul was in the Roman prison. The body of the apostle was buried; only his spiritual part appeared in the presence of the Lord. Paul was absent from the body and present with the Lord."

Mr. Moody declared that he had never thought of that.

"And so I asked Mr. Moody to take his Bible. We read together II Timothy 4:6-8. I explained to him the coming of the Lord, that it will mean the resurrection of the righteous dead, and that only then, when I Thessalonians 4:16-18 is fulfilled, will Paul receive a body like unto the glorious body of Christ Himself and receive his crown."

These remarks brought blessing to Mr. Moody and led to a better knowledge of prophecy.<sup>19</sup>

In the relation we see the essentially immature literalness of the Brethren, trying to define heaven in terms of the material earth. In the light of what has been related so far, can anyone be happy about Scofield instructing Moody in anything? While the incident related by Gaebelein does not have much "prophetic light," Gaebelein's opening statement: "Moody himself needed at that time a better knowledge of prophecy, and Scofield was the man to lead him into it" is pregnant with intimations (what had happened to the prophetic instruction of the late 1860's? Didn't it "take"?).

It may be the clue to the Northfield period and at the same time Dispensational double-talk. In chapter 21, we noted how limited Scofield's role was in the prophetic conferences. He apparently could not compete with the experts who held those platforms. And we will see that as late as 1905, in a letter written from The Lotos Club, New York City, he deferred to Gaebelein on the prophetic material for the *Magnum Opus*. The official explanation for Scofield in Northfield just does not fit.

The two men could not have been together constantly. In that undated Founder's Week message, Scofield noted:

We used to long for Spring to come around, not only because it brought the flowers, and the green came out on those matchless hills, and carpeted that unrivaled valley, but because it was the time when Mr. Moody came back from his winter's evangelistic work.<sup>20</sup>

And as Scofield accoladed Moody, he let oratory carry him into "mush." Speaking of Moody, he said; "He was a great human. I like to emphasize that word 'human.'" A few heartbeats later, he said: "Mr. Moody was the greatest 'human' Drummond ever saw, and Drummond lived in a country where there were a great many human people, and he was a very human man himself."<sup>20</sup> (Speaking here, of course, of Professor Drummond, not Banker Drummond.) All that reminds one of a review in *The New York Times Book Review* when John Steinbeck's *Cannery Row* first came out. Steinbeck had justified his story of pimps, perverts and prostitutes claiming that his creations were "real people." The reviewer, with justified contempt which would not today be allowed in *The New York Times*, said, "I know how to find real people, stick a pin in. If it draws blood, they are real." A similar comment would be appropriate for Scofield's gush over the word "human."

A vignette from Scofield shows the midseason closeness of the two men, but carries a hint that Moody was retaining the leadership:

It was a great event when Mr. Moody came back. He used to doff his preaching clothes, and get into the strangest garments! Wherever he got some of the clothes he used to wear around Northfield nobody ever knew. He used to get into his buggy, with his little daughter or granddaughter by his side, and he would pass my parsonage at the unholy hour of five in the morning, and call out, "Scofield, you had better get up!"<sup>21</sup>

Scotfield told of the relationship between Moody and Emma:

I cannot speak of many things, but I wish I could tell you—it is almost *too* sacred to talk of—about the beautiful home life of Mr. Moody. No one who ever knew them can think of Mr. and Mrs. Moody apart; *no* one can think of one without thinking of the other, so much was that beautiful character, the very type of high, refined and devoted wifehood and womanhood, a part of her great husband, and so comically did that strong man lean on her for help and wisdom.<sup>21</sup>

The ability to glibly relate the story of Dwight and Emma, with no apparent evidence of any twinge of conscience about his own situation and his treatment of wives again suggests that the man was capable of saying what the occasion called for without concern. And he had most certainly not made the slightest attempt to lay any foundation for a relationship with Leontine such as he described for the Moodys. We rely on *The Atchison Patriot* reporter for confirmation.

Moody must have felt that there were times when Scotfield had to be considered. James M. Gray reports an incident which appears to have taken place during the 1898 Northfield Conference. The incident was another one related during that dinner in New York in 1916:

But the first time I really came to know him had a touch of humor to it. It was at a summer Bible conference at Northfield, where he was then pastor of the church of which D. L. Moody was a member.

Devoted brethren were present at the conference and were discussing the conducting of it, which was not entirely to their liking. "hey felt, justly or unjustly, that Mr. Moody himself was to blame for it. And one day they held a prayer-meeting about it in the woods, at the close of which it was determined that one of them should present their complaint and criticism to Mr. Moody personally. But who should be the one?"

"Wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch," and so the older and wiser men held back, for D. L. Moody was not to be trifled with. No one volunteered, until at length the youngest and silliest of the group offered himself for the sacrifice.

Bearding the lion in his den, in other words, waylaying Mr. Moody, as he was leaving the auditorium, I told him what was thought of him, expecting to get my walking papers on the spot. However, when I finished, he thought a moment and then simply said:

"Is that what the old guard think of me?"

"Yes," I answered.

Whereupon he added, "Call them together in my library at three o'clock this afternoon, will you?"

I said I would, and immediately started for Dr. Scotfield's parsonage, feeling that he was the only man who could adequately handle the situation for the complainants.

But the defendant got ahead of me. I missed no time, it seemed to me, but Mr. Moody must have run; for when I rang Dr. Scotfield's doorbell"

Mrs. Scotfield (Hettie) answered the door and told Gray that he would have to wait, for her husband had Mr. Moody closeted with him in his study!

Not to prolong the harrowing tale, the "old guard" did not win their case. I think Dr. Scofield, in his tactful way, helped them to feel that they had gotten *something* out of it, "a leg or a piece of an ear," as Amos said of Israel. Theirs was not entirely a lost cause in other words, but Mr. Moody erred not in confiding his interests to his pastor's hands. Indeed his love and veneration for Dr. Scofield never wanted, and it was a kindly providence that permitted the latter to say the farewell words as the snow-clad earth covered all that was mortal of that great man.<sup>22</sup>

But with all this, we cannot be sure that Scofield really got the best of Moody's independent thinking. Moody's son, Will, who was as remote from Dispensationalism as anyone in Northfield, when writing about his father, included this letter of 1898, written in answer to an invitation from Australia:

The work in my own country has never been so promising as it is now. Destructive theology on the one side, and the no less evil spirit of extreme intolerance on the other side, have wrought wide dissension in many communities in America. Instead of fighting error by the emphasis of truth, there has been too much "splitting of hairs" and only too often an unchristian spirit of bitterness. This has frequently resulted in depleted churches, and has opened the way for the entrance of still greater errors. Under these conditions the question of the authorship of the individual books of the Bible has become of less immediate importance than a knowledge of the teaching of the Bible itself the question of the two Isaiahs less urgent than a familiarity with the prophecy itself.<sup>23</sup>

The letter does not appear to have been noted by other biographers. The opening sentence quoted would send shudders up and down the spine of a Brethren or of a devotee of a "balmy" Bible conference like Niagara. The letter describes conditions of bitterness for which the Brethren were notorious, especially in the 19th Century.

Scofield was a few years later to imply a real lack of rapport between the two men. In a letter of July 1, 1905, written to A. P. Fitt, Moody's son-in-law, Scofield said:

Year by year the greatness and goodness of Mr. Moody grew upon me, & I find it one of my anticipations of heaven that there—past all misunderstandings—I shall renew my fellowship with him.<sup>24</sup>

Someone, Fitt or a curator of the Moodyiana Collection, has both underlined and marked with a "star" the phrase "past all misunderstandings." This letter is the only documentation noting a difference between the two men. But careful review of the Northfield material suggests underlying hints.

While the schools may have taken no notice of "Dr." Scofield, except on Sunday morning and evening, they were always aware of Mr. Moody. In *So Much to Learn* there is this note, evidently based on common knowledge and valid tradition carried down to the present time:

The years were winding down for Mr. Moody, not because he was old—he was only sixty in 1897—but because he had poured his extraordinary energy into his causes without stint and because he had let himself become too heavy, by over-eating and failing to exercise.<sup>25</sup>

Remember, and this point is found even in elementary psychology texts, overeating can sometimes be a reaction to pressure. Such pressure may be what was referred to in the 1905 letter. Whatever, Moody had not much longer to live. In fact, he did not live long enough to be completely taken into the Dispensational inner party circle.

The story of the end of D. L. Moody, as far as this earth is concerned, is related from a combination of sources; *So Much to Learn*, a report in the magazine *The Christian*, issue of Jan. 11, 1900 (p. 24, 25), Scofield's own program for the service and even a comment by Scofield:

In Kansas City, the great auditorium held 15,000 people, and thousands more were unable to get inside for Moody's meetings. Once every night and once every day for five days Moody spoke to them. After the first day he could not walk; he was carried to the platform. Once there he was able to stand for an hour for the service. By Friday he was so weak he called a doctor, who told him he must terminate his mission at once.<sup>26</sup>

Scofield related:

When I saw him in his carriage come up from the station, and cross the little bridge over the beautiful brook at Northfield, when I looked into his face, and he raised his hand as he recognized me, I could not believe that Dwight L. Moody had come home to die. Until the very last I could not believe it.<sup>27</sup>

We continue from *So Much to Learn*:

He returned to Northfield to stay in bed in his house. At 3:00 on his last morning, December 22, 1899, W. R. Moody, his son, took his turn as watcher in the sickchamber. Moody fell asleep, and woke after about an hour, speaking in slow and measured words:

"Earth recedes. Heaven opens before me."

His son thought he was dreaming and tried to rouse him.

"No, this is no dream, Will," he said. "It is beautiful! If this is death, it is sweet. God is calling me, and I must go."

He told Will that he should continue to work for Mount Hermon; Paul the younger brother who was still in college would supervise the Northfield Seminary; the nephew Ambert would help with the general management; and Moody's son-in-law A. P. Fitt would look after the Bible Institute in Chicago.

He sank again into a coma and again emerged, exclaiming: "This is a strange thing! I've been beyond the gates of death to the very portals of Heaven and here I am back again. It is very strange." He was excited and happy, and a few hours later he died.<sup>28</sup>

*The Christian*, issue of January 11, 1900, notes regarding the services of December 26, 1899:

At 10 o'clock there was a brief service at the house, conducted by Dr. C. I. Scofield, pastor of the Congregational Church. . . .<sup>29</sup>

From Carter:

On the day after Christmas, thirty-two Mount Hermon boys carried Dwight L. Moody in his simple coffin half a mile from the Homestead to the Congregational Church in town.<sup>30</sup>

Again from *The Christian*:

At 2:00 PM, the Church was filled for services shared in by Geo. Stebbins, D. L. Towner, F. H. Jacobs, close associates of Moody in his work, Dr. Scofield, Dr. Arthur T. Pierson and Rev. George C. Needham.<sup>31</sup>

Again, from Carter:

After the service they carried him to Round Top where he was buried and where his wife would be interred later. Round Top is a landmark on the Northfield campus and looks across the Connecticut River to the western hills.

At the Round Top, a short service proceeded the lowering of the casket.<sup>32</sup> Carter continues:

Everyone knew that Dwight L. Moody's death marked the end of an era; for while Moody had never been active in the administration of the schools, he was always *there*—within reach—offering an unfailing spring of faith.<sup>33</sup>

We can never be really sure what Scofield thought of Moody. The Founder's Day accolade which appeared in *Moody Monthly* in 1922 sounds extremely legitimate and most wonderful.

In 1909, two Dallas lawyers were writing a history of the city. L. B. Hill undertook a sketch of short biographies of leading Dallas figures. The sketch on C. I. Scofield, to be considered in due course, is appropriate to concluding the chapter on Scofield and Moody. Note the following, which Trumbull apparently never saw.

Having formed a strong personal attachment to the late Dwight L. Moody, of Northfield, Massachusetts, Dr. Scofield went to that city and became president of the Northfield Bible School and pastor of the Northfield church, and during the seven years of his service in these positions Mr. Moody died.<sup>34</sup>

#### CHAPTER 24 NOTES

1. The copy we noted was one of the Moody Press paperbacks. Remarkably, at no time did Volume 1 or its present issue give the slightest indication except in the index and at the heading of chapter 16 that Scofield had any part in the book. Scofield's contribution at this point has been overlooked by compilers of Scofield bibliographies.
2. Scofield, in Fitt, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
5. See Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, p. 50, and any standard history of the period.

6. C. I. Scofield, *Dwight L. Moody as I Knew Him*, *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, February, 1922, pp. 799-901, p. 799.
7. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Christ Jesus*, BICA, Chicago, 1915, p. 111. The support by Americans for Professor Drummond may have wavered as time passed. It could have been to some extent a creation of the religious press.
8. Scofield, *D. L. Moody as I Knew Him*, p. 801.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
10. Often quoted. We took it from *So Much to Learn*, p. 21.
11. Ernest Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
12. Sydney J. Harris, *Strictly Personal, How Slang Conceals Dishonesty*, column of January 22, 1973, in syndicated newspapers.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 43, from Lindsley, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, p. 146.
14. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
15. So referred to by Richard Ellsworth Day in *Breakfast Table Autocrat, The Life of Henry Parsons Crowell*, Moody Press, 1946, p. 167.
16. Stark, *The Mt. Hermon Church*, 1899, 1939, p. 9.
17. Richard Ellsworth Day, *Bush Aglow*, Judson Press, 1937, p. 306.
18. J. C. Pollock, *Moody without Sankey*, Hodder and Stroughton, p. 256.
19. Gaebelein, *Moody Monthly*, p. 129.
20. Scofield, *Dwight Moody as I Knew Him*, p. 800.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, September 1921, printing the story of the 1916 dinner. Note that Gray did not identify the one who answered the door at the Manse. That detail is taken from *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute* by Wm. M. Runyan, Oxford University Press, 1935, p. 7.
23. Moody, William R., *D. L. Moody*, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1930, p. 52.
24. Letter, Scofield to A. P. Fitt in Moodyiana Collection, *Moody Bible Institute*. Letter written from 558 Fifth Avenue, New York. The address is probably the Manse of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church.
25. *So Much to Learn*, p. 94.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Scofield, *Dwight Moody as I Knew Him*, p. 799.
28. *So Much to Learn*, p. 94.
29. *The Christian*, January 11, 1900, p. 24, 25.
30. *So Much to Learn*.
31. *The Christian*.
32. *So Much to Learn*.
33. *The Christian*, January 11, 1900.
34. *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, Vol. 11, Selected Biography and Memoirs, Mr. L. B. Hill, Editor, The Lewis Publishing Co., Chicago, p. 282.



## CHAPTER 25

# The Dispensational Norm or “Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth”

*“Open my eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.”*

Psalm 119:18

By the time Moody passed on, Scofield was widely known among some Christian groups on both sides of the Atlantic. His reputation was quite different from that which still prevails in Kansas. Those who recognized the religious Scofield held some beliefs which set them off from mainstream Protestant Christianity.

Except when he had been working for the American home Missionary Society, Scofield taught and proclaimed those distinct beliefs. With Moody's death, he was looking toward a new project which would give his ideas a circulation and even a permanence that no 19th Century Christian could have imagined.

The distinctives are a system known as Dispensationalism. An analysis of Scofield's first published work, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, will give an indication of what Scofield and, more importantly, his backers wanted to propagate.<sup>1</sup>

Using I Timothy 2:15 as a base, Scofield, in opening his work, says:

The Word of Truth, then, has right divisions, and it must be evident that, as one cannot be “a workman that needeth not to be ashamed” without observing them, so *any study of that Word* which ignores those divisions must be in large measure profitless and confusing.

\* \* \*

The purpose of this pamphlet is to indicate the more important divisions of the Word of Truth. . . .<sup>2</sup>

The thrust of the work appears in the Table of Contents, which lists chapters with the following headings: “The Jew, the Gentile, and the Church of God;” “The Seven Dispensations;” “The Two Advents;” “The Two Resurrections;” “The Five Judgments;” “Law and Grace;” “The Believer's Two Natures;” “The Believer's Standing and State;” and “Salvation and Rewards.”<sup>3</sup>

The key verse for the first study is: “Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God” (*I Cor. 10:32*). Here Scofield divides the world not into the legendary “two classes” but into three—the idea is warp and woof of Dispensational teaching.

The flaw is that it lacks Biblical basis. In the New Testament, there are but two classes, those in the church and those lost. There is no way that any person of any race or culture can be saved except he come by those steps which bring him into the church—the Body of Christ. There is absolutely no Scripture which supports the idea of Darby and Scofield that a body special to God exists outside the church.

In the second lesson, Scofield presents his idea that there are seven different ways that God has dealt with men. He calls them Dispensations. In a later chapter, we will measure that concept against the Word of God itself, as Scofield placed his ideas alongside the text. Darby, Scofield and successors take unconscionable liberties with the meaning of the word “dispensation.”

The third lesson is typical Dispensational teaching. It is based on the premise that those who do not accept Dispensational eschatology do not believe in the return of the Lord and disbelieve in the authority of Scripture. These views have clouded the discussion to a degree unimaginable, have muddied the waters and in many instances have kept believers from breaking with unbelievers. There are reams of evidence that belief in the Lord’s return, on a truly Scriptural basis, does not require accepting Scofield’s system.

On page 20 of this pamphlet, Scofield notes, “The last prayer in the Bible is for Christ’s speedy return” (*Rev. 22:20*). Now we should note that at least since Emily Cardale in Irving’s church in 1831, people of that mental bent have looked for a soon-return. This view puts a strain on the meaning of the Greek word *tachu*, which is agreed to be the key word. But to hold that the hope of a soon-return could be stretched out for more than 1,900 years, an indefinite period, assumes that the Lord is either misusing a word or playing semantics. Neither idea is holy.

Before Scofield wrote, back in 1878, a London pastor, J. Stuart Hussell, noted of the text “Behold I am coming quickly” (*Rev. 22:12*):

This may be called the keynote of the Apocalypse: it is the thesis or text of the whole. To those who can persuade themselves that there is *no* indicator of time in such a declaration, “Behold, he is coming” or that it is so indefinite that it may apply equally to a year, a century, or a millenium, this passage may not be convincing; but to every candid judgment it will be decisive proof that the event referred to is imminent.<sup>5</sup>

Russell’s point was that the event referred to did take place within a short time span after the words were written and thus are no longer future. Russell’s work was one of many carefully overlooked by the Dispensationalists in working up their interpretation. If the imminent event is already past, then our hope lies in another direction entirely.

In that same lesson, Scofield selectively sets out Scriptures which have convinced supporters of both the failure of the church and the

failure of the age. An equally strong list of verses proving the opposite could be quoted. But Scofield says:

It is, however, sometimes said that this coming cannot occur until after the world has been converted by the preaching of the gospel, and has submitted to the spiritual reign of Christ for one thousand years. It is submitted that this view is wholly erroneous, because:

1st. Scripture clearly describes the condition of the earth at the second coming of Christ to be one, not of millennial blessedness, but of awful wickedness (Luke 17:26–32, with Gen. 6:5–7 and Gen. 13:13; Luke 18:8; Luke 21:25–27).

2nd. Scripture describes the whole course of this dispensation from the beginning to the end in such terms as to exclude the possibility of a converted world in any part of it (Matt. 13:36–43, 47–50; Matt. 25:1–10; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1–9; 4:3,4; 2 Pet. 3:3,4; Jude 17–19).

3rd. The purpose of God in this dispensation is declared to be, not the conversion of the world, but to “gather out of the Gentiles a people for his name.” After this he “will return,” and *then*, and *not* before, will the world be converted. See Acts 15:14–17; Matt. 24:14 (“for a witness”); Rom. 1:5 (“among,” not “of” all nations); Rom. 11:14 (“some,” not “all”); 1 Cor 9:22; Rev. 5:9 (“out of,” not “all” of).

4th. It would be impossible to “watch” and “wait” for an event which we knew could *not* occur for more than one thousand years.

Scofield’s fourth proposition agrees with J. Stuart Russell, except that Scofield draws an opposite conclusion than does Russell. But all of this gives encouragement to Darby’s required abstention from political life. The hopelessness of the cause has meant misdirection of social aims. The interpretation of Scofield was not universally accepted then. It reached the high point just after World War II and is being rejected by steadily increasing numbers today.

In another study, “The Five Judgments,” Scofield injected a novelty into interpretation to fit the Dispensational plan. He disregards the long-held teaching about The Great White Throne of Revelation 20: 11–15. The Dispensational view injects human or earthly time into eternity. It sets up a series of judgments which would have the God of the Universe judging so often that he would be busier than a traffic court judge in a resort town on a holiday weekend. The idea is neither reverent or edifying.

Study 6, “Law or Grace,” touches one of the most controversial areas of Dispensational teaching. Two issues appear in Scofield’s lesson. *One*, what really is the role of Law set out in Exodus 20? *Two*, if one is “free from the Law,” is it necessary to be moral? Or to put it another way, will free grace cover everything? We hold that the Scofield position misunderstands God’s purpose in giving the Law at Sinai and it misunderstands the role the Law was to play in the nation of Israel.<sup>7</sup> As L. E. Maxwell noted in *Crowded to Christ*:

Nor should we rashly presume that he who manifested salvation by grace ever since the fall of man should suddenly alter the basic condition of entrance into life to that of a hopeless covenant of works. That a fundamental expositor (*e.g.* Scofield) should fall into precisely the same error as that of carnally minded Jews and reduce the covenant of the Lord Jesus Christ at Sinai to a mere covenant of human works, is to say the least, a revelation of how completely astray we can wander from the Scriptures, once we assume a false premise.<sup>8</sup>

Scofield's position led to a frivolous view of sin. Generations later, the fruit of Scofield's teaching has been the use of the term "legalism" to denigrate any attempt to set (or imply) Biblical standards of conduct. The term "legalism," as used by suburban Evangelicals, carries more than a connotation of Pharisaical hypocrisy.

In his final study, "Believers and Professors," Scofield suggests that his followers will never possess or transmit real power. There will be some who do not "come through" but remain on the fringes. But Scofield's view in this lesson carries the point he thinks the Lord made in the parable of "The Wheat and the Tares" far beyond any sensible interpretation. He seems to have wanted a church full of non-productives.

To appreciate the social and cultural climate for Scofield's teaching, we return to Lesson 2, "The Two Advents." In this regard, we would especially note again Scofield's third proposition: "The purpose of God in this dispensation is declared to be, not the conversion of the world, but to 'gather out of the Gentiles a people for his name.' After this he 'will return,' and *then*, and not before, will the world be converted."

It is here that Scofield blares out his Brethren influence. There is a relationship to that noted toward the end of our present chapter 14, the quotation from Harold Rowden and earlier Brethren. The "fact" that the world is *not* to be converted (Darby and Scofield) strengthens the belief that Christians must *not* involve themselves in political or social (in the broad sense) affairs. Too many have learned this lesson only too well.

At the time Scofield was coming to fame, American politics reached what was then considered a nadir to contemporaries (they could not have imagined the present day). Corruption was rampant. Decent people, without Scofield's help, did shun politics. Chicago at the time spawned two "outstanding" civic leaders, "Bath House" Groggins and "Hinkey-Dink" Kenna. Both were able to operate without the least concern that either James M. Gray or C. I. Scofield would ever interfere (probably neither Groggins or Kenna ever heard of these teachers). During the same period, John Alexander Dowie was conducting evangelistic services in his auditorium at Roosevelt and Wabash.<sup>10</sup> Nine blocks south on Wabash Avenue, the Everly sisters were running their notorious "Palace of Pleasure" with complete assurance that neither Dowie, Gray nor

Scotfield would ever bother them. The situation corresponds so closely to the Dispensationalist view of I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3. J. N. Darby must have been delighted.

#### CHAPTER 25 NOTES

1. C. I. Scotfield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, Loizeaux Brothers, Neptune, N.J., First Edition 1896.
2. Scotfield, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
5. J. Stuart Russell, *The Parousia, A Study of the New Testament Doctrines of Our Lord's Second Coming*, Baker, Grand Rapids, Mich., reprinted from original edition of 1887, p. 368.
6. Scotfield, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
7. We would gather that the Enlightenment philosopher of Jewish origin, Moses Mendelssohn, had a better idea of the significance of Sinai than Scotfield. See *Moses Mendelssohn, A Biographical Study*, by Alexander Altmann, University of Alabama Press, 1973.
8. L. E. Maxwell, *Crowded to Christ*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950, p. 20. In *Prairie Overcomer*, May 1984, T. E. Rendall, Maxwell's successor, notes in an article, "L. E. Maxwell, His Literary Legacy": "If any book deserves to be called Mr. Maxwell's *magnum opus*, it is his 354 page volume *Crowded in Christ*, the manuscript of which was rejected by Moody Press, but published by Eerdmans in 1950. . . . The reason for its rejection lay in the independent approach of Mr. Maxwell to the entire subject of 'law and grace.' . . . He often quoted the original *Scotfield Reference Bible's* comment on the giving of the law at Sinai to illustrate what he had concluded was an erroneous approach to the function of law."
9. Scotfield, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
10. Noted in Richard E. Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat, The Life Story of Henry Parsons Crowell*, Moody Press, 1946, p. 166.

## CHAPTER 26

# Defender of the Faith

*"... ye should contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."*

Jude 3b

The final years of Scofield's ministry in Northfield seem to be something of an interregnum. It is almost as though with Moody's departure to be with the Lord, Scofield had nothing to do in Massachusetts and was waiting for directions in starting on his next assignment.

Following his usual pattern, Scofield, in July 1901, took a leave from his charge in East Northfield.<sup>1</sup> He joined others of like mind in the first series of new conferences intended to revive the defunct Niagara gatherings. The new conferences were to repeat the theme (balmy to some, doleful to others—the blessed hopelessness) of an ultimately failing and irrelevant church, a hopelessly decaying world and convenient escape (called "The Rapture") for a select "in" group to which the conferees assumed they belonged.<sup>2</sup>

The organizers of the Niagara Conference had gone on record as quite pleased that the conference site on the Canadian side of the Niagara River was secluded, from pollution by tourists and honeymooners who frequented the Falls. The successor conference was to be sure of the same thing—no contact with the common man. (The contrast with the experience of the Lord as related in Mark 12:37 is notable. There it is said "... the common people heard him gladly." The Niagara people would have none of that.)

John T. Pirie of the Chicago Department Store family had an estate at Sea Cliff on the North Shore of Long Island. As owner of an estate in one of the most exclusive neighborhoods in America, he offered that estate to the men who had enjoyed the "balmy" Niagara gathering. At Sea Cliff, the hoi polloi could be kept at arms length.

The conference headquarters, for the period July 23-29, 1901 was the Pirie estate itself. Pirie arranged for the erection of a tent on a large plot of ground in the center of the Village of Sea Cliff. There the conference sessions were held. Thus Sea Cliff was an American adaptation of the pattern originated at Albury (England) and carried on at Powerscourt (Ireland).

Arno Clemens Gaebelain, Bible teacher, super prophecy buff, editor of the magazine *Our Hope* and soon to be an editor in association with

Scotfield's next and greatest project, was one of the conference speakers. He reported a crucial conference conversation with Scotfield:

One night, about the middle of that week, Dr. Scotfield suggested, after the evening service, that we take a stroll along the shore. It was a beautiful night. Our walk along the shore of the sound lasted until midnight. For the first time he mentioned the plan of producing a Reference Bible, and outlined the method he had in mind. He said he had thought of it for many years and had spoken to others about it, but had not received much encouragement. The scheme came to him in the early days of his ministry in Dallas, and later, during the balmy days of the Niagara Conferences he had submitted his desire to a number of brethren, who all approved it, but nothing came of it. He expressed the hope that the new beginning and this new testimony in Sea Cliff might open the way to bring about the publication of such a Bible with references and copious footnotes.<sup>3</sup>

It was at some time during this period that Cyrus Scotfield, former private in the 7th Tennessee Regiment of the Confederate Army, received from The United Daughters of the Confederacy, their decoration, the "Cross of Honor." This decoration was given, starting in 1900, by the hundreds to all Confederate veterans (or their heirs) who had not been dishonorably discharged.<sup>4</sup>

After 1901-02, when Scotfield referred to his "Cross of Honor" he referred to it as though it was akin to the Congressional Medal of Honor or the Victoria Cross as an award by a government. This bluff worked for years. The cleverly phrased misrepresentation of the nature of the medal went hand-in-hand with Scotfield's Bible teaching and his prophetic lectures in the "failing church syndrome." To have deliberate misrepresentation in mind as a great work of Bible study is being gestated is really quite inconceivable. The principle of James 3:11 might be applied here.

Two other actions of Scotfield both in 1901 are just a bit out of line for one ostensibly dedicated to a separated life in preparation for the Rapture at any moment. On October 21, 1901, Taft and Martha P. Schmidt deeded to "C. I. Schofield" (*sic*), a piece of property in the Village of Ashuelot, Town of Winchester, Cheshire County, New Hampshire, estimated to contain about eight and one-fourth acres.<sup>5</sup> Now it should be possible to erect quite an establishment on 8¼ acres. Scotfield was to express a desire to own homes in various parts of the world so that he could divide his time as he lived out his days—all assuming that The Rapture did not interfere. At the time he purchased the property, he was 58 years old, so prompt action in erecting a building was indicated. This was quite important as, according to Scotfield's own teaching from the pulpit, The Rapture was a threat even as the papers were being signed and settlement made.

Possibly concern about The Rapture was for public consumption only. We shall see that as late as 1907, he, Hettie and another were

still occupying a tent when they stayed at Crestwood, as the property was named.

Speaking at Moody Bible Institute in the tribute to D. L. Moody, previously referred to, Scofield said:

From my summer home on a mountain top above Northfield, I can see the hill which overlooks the birthplace of Marshall Field, and I can look down into Northfield and see the birthplace of Dwight L. Moody.<sup>6</sup>

Trumbull, keeping in advance of The Rapture, visited Crestwood at some time after the royalties from the Bible had been coming in regularly. He described it:

It is a steep climb up the New Hampshire mountain roadway, severely testing the hill-climbing powers of an automobile, to get to "Crestwood," the summer home of Dr. C. I. Scofield at Ashuelot. But the hilltop view, after you have reached it, is worth the climb. From the house itself, and the garden round about it, one looks off over the beautiful Connecticut Valley with a sense of satisfying height and distance, and sky and clouds and the glories of God's world. East Northfield, rich with memories of the ministry of D. L. Moody, seen in the distance. Birds and flowers are round about in abundance. A bit of a cabin a hundred yards or more from the house, forms a secluded study for Dr. Scofield, and there one finds chosen treasures of his rich library, marked and well-worn Bibles, and jottings on sermons and addresses.<sup>7</sup>

The other act of 1901 was one that, according to the principles of the Brethren, should have made J. N. Darby spin in his grave. Scofield was admitted to membership in The Lotos Club in New York City. Now such a step was in complete conflict with the standard Plymouth Brethren working interpretation of II Cor. 6:14: "Be ye not equally yoked together with unbelievers."

The Lotos Club is an exclusive club of a sort more common in London, as so often described in British literature. The phenomenon, while present in the United States, has never developed on this side of the Atlantic to the extent it did in England. The founders were prominent New Yorkers, including Whitelaw Reid of *The New York Tribune*. Reid was as good an establishment figure as could be found at the time. The club's purpose as noted in Article I, Section II of its Constitution, was:

The primary object of this Club shall be to promote social intercourse among journalists, artists, and members of the musical and dramatic professions, and representatives, amateurs, and friends of Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts: and at least one third of the members shall be connected with said classes.<sup>8</sup>

Since the theatre was taboo and worse in the circles where Cyrus had moved since 1879, we assume and we think rightly, that someone felt that Scofield could qualify in the literary category. But, that qualification



could hardly have been on the basis of Scofield's literary output up to that time. There must have been anticipation.

The club's Literary Committee, when Scofield's application was presented, included Samuel Untermeyer (1858-1941), a notorious criminal lawyer. Untermeyer's accomplishments, described in *Who's Who in America*<sup>9</sup> take up more than two columns. There is not one activity listed which would suggest that Untermeyer could have appreciated either Scofield's Bible Correspondence Course or his magazine *The Believer*.<sup>9</sup> Untermeyer's life was so remote from the circles in which Scofield normally moved, that we must remain amazed that Untermeyer would have given Scofield the "white ball" rather than the "black ball." A possible clue—Scofield's "postponed Kingdom" theory (of which more anon—many Christians hold that theory to be without Scriptural basis) was most helpful in getting Fundamental Christians to back the international interest in one of Untermeyer's pet projects—the Zionist Movement. Untermeyer's character was such that stories about him were still circulating in the Metropolitan Area in the late 1940's.

It defies understanding that an "obscure" pastor from the hinterlands, whose literary output up to 1901 consisted of very sectarian booklets, articles and courses, would be considered acceptable in The Lotos Club. Indications are that had Reid or Samuel Untermeyer seen any of Scofield's works, they would have reacted with raucous laughter. Scofield kept up his membership in Lotos until his death in 1921. The membership was not referred to in any obituary or eulogy. (The Dispensational community knew nothing of it!) The club was given as Scofield's residence in 1912 in *Who's Who in America*.<sup>10</sup> The 1905 letter to Gaebelein was written on The Lotos Club stationery. That gem was first presented to the Christian public by Gaebelein in *Moody Monthly* in 1942.<sup>11</sup> As usual, the penny failed to drop; the significance of The Lotos Club was not noted.

The selection of Scofield for admission to The Lotos Club, which could not have been sought by Scofield, strengthens the suspicion which has cropped up before, that someone was directing the career of C. I. Scofield. Such direction probably was motivated by concerns remote from fidelity to the person, work and truth of Jesus Christ.

Scofield at this time was in regular communication with people in Dallas. Apparently some plans were being laid.<sup>12</sup> The records of the County of Dallas (Texas) includes a deed which states that on March 12, 1902, William G. and Martha Breg conveyed to Mrs. M. C. Starke, Neil Starke and W. S. Mosher, the property at 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas. The Bregs had held title to No. 157 since Scofield had left for Massachusetts.<sup>13</sup> On the 24th of March, the Starkes and Mosher conveyed the property to Cyrus and Hettie Scofield. The consideration was \$1.00 and "the further consideration of love and affection that we have for

the said C. I. Scofield and wife Hettie Scofield.”<sup>14</sup> The consideration was, even in 1902, far below fair market value. Something was cooking.

The Bible project must have remained on the back burner. It is next mentioned in connection with the Sea Cliff Conference of 1902, held July 20-August 4. In Gaebelein’s 1942 relation, the “outpouring of spiritual blessing” was incidental to another issue. Gaebelein reported:

Again Dr. Scofield and the writer took several walks and, as was to be expected, the chief topic of our conversation was the planned Reference Bible. Dr. Scofield expressed his positive opinion that the time for definite action had come, that after much prayer he had decided to start the work at once. He would resign his position in East Northfield, as he did, and return to Dallas, where he would be able to give more time to this undertaking.<sup>15</sup>

Note that Gaebelein conflicts with himself. He spoke of resigning a “position,” singular. But Gaebelein, in the same article, had said that Scofield held two posts. Continuing his narration, Gaebelein said:

After a second walk along the shore of Long Island Sound he consented that the writer should speak to a number of brethren about the publication of the Reference Bible and sound them out as to there support.<sup>15</sup>

This quotation makes it clear that the Bible project was *NOT* originally based on the support of a broad spectrum of the Christian constituency. It was supported from a select group who were economically able to finance special ideas and ride ideological hobbies.

Alwyn B. Ball, a New York real estate man, was approached for support. Gaebelein notes:

He fairly bubbled over with joy, and fully endorsed the plan; and, better than that, Mr. Ball pledged a considerable sum of money to assist the project.<sup>16</sup>

To “bubble over with joy” about a project designed to inculcate people with the idea that the only hope for the world is despair, suffering and apostasy, makes a mockery of the victory our Lord achieved on the cross.

John T. Pirie contributed, his largess made possible by the ringing of cash registers in the store on Chicago’s State Street. Others approached included John B. Buss of St. Louis (was he aware of Scofield’s “French Connection”?) Then Gaebelein went to Francis E. Fitch, a Plymouth Brethren of New York City. Fitch had published Scofield’s Bible Correspondence Course. Fitch’s principal business was the publishing of New York Stock Exchange lists—a role which put him on the very edge of Plymouth Brethren separation as ostensibly required by Darby’s view of II Corinthians 6. Gaebelein notes:

While the publication of the course was going on Mr. Fitch experienced considerable difficulty with our friend Dr. Scofield, in furnishing the

needed material on time, which made it very unpleasant for Mr. Fitch, as the subscribers to the course thought the fault was his own. Some charged the delay from the side of Dr. Scofield to procrastination, but the writer thinks it was the kind spirit of our friend which was responsible. It was hard for him to refuse the many appeals which came to him to preach and to teach. He accepted too many calls, hence the completion of the correspondence course was repeatedly delayed. Said Mr. Fitch, "I know he can never finish such a work." I told Dr. Scofield what Mr. Fitch had said, and he cheerfully acknowledged his fault. After our assuring Mr. Fitch that Dr. Scofield would stick to the task before him, Mr. Fitch likewise fell in line with the other brethren, heartily endorsing the proposed Bible.<sup>17</sup>

Which tends to strengthen suspicions about diligence on Scofield's part as well as his basic desire for roles that kept him in the public eye rather than those calling for hard, patient regular work. One gets the impression that the halo which Scofield now wears in the Dispensational community had not been fitted in 1902. Fitch eventually did "join the club."

The close association between Scofield and Gaebelein deserves special comment, particularly as one considers Gaebelein's first autobiography (yes, he did two—a possible case of victory over humility.<sup>18</sup> In *Half a Century, the Autobiography of a Servant*, Gaebelein makes obvious references to his contacts with leaders of industry and business. Sandeen notes that Gaebelein, in a manner quite remarkable for those outside the denominations, never seemed to have the least trouble about financial support.<sup>19</sup> The story of the next few years suggests that the largess was shared to some extent with Scofield.

Gaebelein gives an impression of not grasping the fact that those "captains" (more often lieutenants) of industry who were willing to put money on Gaebelein and through him, Scofield, stopped right there. No indication appears that they cared the least about getting the "gospel" of Dispensationalism accepted in their own peer groups.<sup>20</sup> The "gospel" (the failing church syndrome) was fine for the middle and lower orders who were to purchase Scofield Bibles by the millions. It was not until after World War II that Dispensationalism infiltrated all strata of American culture.

Just like its ideological predecessor, Brethrenism in England, Dispensationalism was a class movement. The "betters," the "rich," the "proper ones," felt that the "any-moment rapture" would be a good idea to keep the middle and lower orders in line. They would not upset the social and economic "applecart" while they were expecting the "any-moment Rapture."

R. J. Rushdoony has commented on the phenomenon:

There is too little good news in much gospel preaching of today. One of the most prominent of modern fundamentalist preachers has declared,

in defining the Christian mission as saving souls only, "You don't polish brass on a sinking ship." Such a view is as surely a surrender of the world to the devil as anything the middle ages produced, and the growing importance of such Christianity in its influence on the world scene is a natural consequence of its theology. It is easy for the high and mighty of the world, when it suits their purpose, to give their blessings to such evangelism: after all, it is productive of better citizens, and it leaves them unchallenged.<sup>21</sup>

Of course, businessmen, typically are too much like George F. Babbitt, of Zenith to think these things up. Ideas, when pushed and promoted by Babbitts and Scofield-Bible-carrying Babbitts, come from intellectuals. Rushdoony speaks of:

. . . the elitism which marks the intellectual. The intellectual believes that his rationality gives him autonomy from God and from the herd-like emotions and appetites of the masses. As a result he feels that he can determine what is good and evil for mankind.<sup>22</sup>

And their cause has received so much help by having a body of devout, faithful people whose greatest expectation is The Rapture. (Dare we call it The Rapture Cult?)

The social implications of Scofield's ploy, with financial help from Gaebelein, as the Matthew Henry of the Progressive Era, may well be a working out of "the Theory of Democratic Elitism." (Credit Peter Bachrach of Bryn Mawr and Temple University for the term.)<sup>23</sup> By now it is quite evident that there is an "elite" who have, by their standards, been successful in running society as they think it should be run. Because of its very eliteness, the elite has accomplished a great deal without, until recently, being exposed or forced to become overt. The group who attended Sea Cliff were the base of Scofield's financial support until the royalties started coming in during the next decade.

On September 10, 1902, A. P. Fitt wrote to Scofield from Moody Institute, Chicago. He asked that Scofield and the others at Northfield join in prayer for the Institute. Scofield, on the 17th, sent a typed reply, committing the folks at Northfield so to do. The closing salutation was:

"Sincerely your friend and pastor."

(*signed*) C. I. Scofield<sup>24</sup>

A hand written postscript of great significance (to us) read:

"Our ch. com. unanimously refused to accept my resignation & voted me 6 mos. on ½ salary—they to supply the pulpit. A supply com.—A. G. M. [Moody], Dr. A. Barber & W. Fay Smith—was appointed. We are corresponding with Gray for part of the time.

A call from Dallas was months in the future. But the conveyance of 157 Holmes Avenue in March, and the discussions at Sea Cliff were indications that decisions were being made behind the scenes. Con-

gregational voting would merely rubber-stamp decisions made at the seat of power.

During 1902, a number of problems arose in First Church (Dallas). The incumbent pastor, T. C. Horton, resigned in June. In October, 42 members signed and submitted a resolution stating their intent to withdraw and form a new congregation. The dissent appears from this distance to be largely a matter of personality clashes. Doctrinal differences were a luxury which developed in the seceding group after the secession was accomplished. The dissidents, under the leadership of E. M. Powell, organized a new church.<sup>25</sup> Those remaining loyal to First Church apparently had no appreciation of the vision of Scofield which was to place him on the threshold of worldwide fame. They asked him to return to the essentially parochial role of helping First Church over its local crisis.<sup>26</sup>

Scofield's reaction to the problems of First Church are a bit mystifying. Possibly the burden of the Sea Cliff Conference and the thought of work on the "Bible" were too much for him. He incurred another unspecified illness. The church in Dallas issued a call which reached him at the Sanatorium at Clifton Springs, New York, where he was recuperating.<sup>27</sup> In a letter dated Nov. 13, 1902, Scofield asked the church for more details. But in asking he indicated that he could not give the call serious consideration.<sup>28</sup> It was reported that he had already begun the seven-year task of preparing material for his Reference Bible. Upon his recovery, he went from Clifton Springs back to East Northfield.

By January 1903, Scofield felt able to make a trip to Dallas. During that visit, there must have been serious discussions, some, no doubt, with those in the official life of First Church. On January 19, 1903, writing from 157 Holmes Avenue, he addressed A. P. Fitt at Moody Institute, Chicago. The text is:

My dear Mr. Fitt:

I have sent in my resignation of the Northfield & Mount Hermon pastorates. While very well in body I do *not* feel that I have recovered sufficient strength to do justice to the Northfield work. As you know, this was my feeling last September. The committee here generously thought otherwise, and I came away—first to Clifton & then here. Now I am convinced that the interests of the church and of the Northfield work require a younger and stronger man.

It is not *certain* that I shall resume my pastorate here, though I am pressed to do so, and am offered an assistant pastor and unlimited liberty to teach and preach whenever the Lord opens the way and I feel led to go.

Invitations have poured in since the papers made that announcement—Charleston, S. C., Savannah, Ga., Richmond, Va., Birmingham, Ala., Memphis & Nashville, Tenn., New Orleans, La., & other places. I have also a pressing invitation to address both the Seminary & the University student body at Princeton.

I think the Institute ought to be linked on to a big lot of work in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri and Texas—but as to this you will know best.

I expect to keep my summer home at (or near) East Northfield & hope never to lose my deep interest in all the work which Mr. Moody planted. Trusting that the work goes on under blessing and that you, Mrs. Fitt & Emma are well, I am,

Yours as ever

*Signed C. I. Scofield*

I may say (referring to the enclosed slip) that I have no thought of establishing a college of the Bible here. The Institute is near enough.<sup>29</sup>

There are hints in the correspondence that the needs of the churches were secondary in the discussions. And we again can find behind the words, suggestions (felt at other points in the story) that some specific individual or individuals was (were) making plans for Scofield.

At the time of this particular exchange between Scofield and Fitt, the latter's administration at Moody Bible Institute could be described as interregnum. The period so identified runs from the death of D. L. Moody at the end of 1899 to the appointment of Dr. James M. Gray as dean in 1904. Under consideration for the "helm" at Moody was a "troika." It was proposed to have three deans, each teaching at Moody for four months a year (one school semester) and spending eight months in Bible teaching and evangelistic work in the field.

James M. Gray had consented to be one of the three. Dr. Reuben A. Torrey had also accepted. It was expected that C. I. Scofield would be the third. Torrey, meanwhile, was led more and more into evangelistic work. By September 1905, he wrote Fitt from England:

I fear I shall not be able to give much time to the Institute for some years to come, even if I do not resign altogether.<sup>30</sup>

No records of any contacts with Scofield on behalf of the Institute "troika" have come to light. Gray, from his appointment as dean in 1904, functioned as administrative head. Whether the "troika" plan might have succeeded will never be known.<sup>31</sup>

Scofield was at the start of a project which was to make his name famous. As the next few years demonstrated, he could never have handled a commitment at Moody as envisioned in the "troika" plan and still have made his contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible.

By the beginning of February 1903, Scofield had returned to East Northfield, terminated the charge and settled his personal affairs and returned to take up duties in Dallas. Trumbull reproduced the resolution adopted by the church in East Northfield when they accepted Scofield's resignation:

The council discern issues of unusual weight in this case. This church gathers and disperses religious forces felt throughout the Union. Each year from all over the country Christian strangers and many from

other lands make it a shrine: in part from hallowed associations and more for the pursuit of the higher religious life. The pastor here is, in a measure, a host to Christian pilgrims from half the world. Hence a change of the pastorate touches wide circles in the Gospel kingdom. The pastorate now closing has in its seven years gathered into the church 196 by confession and 112 by letter, a total of 308; and has spent large activities in the yearly convocations held here. It has been marked by strong, skilful, and productive preaching to the dwellers here, to the members of the favored schools here, and to the strangers visiting the town. These have found memorable profit from this pure, fervid, and enriching ministry.

And while the council can but sympathize with the church for the frequent absences of the pastor to meet the calls which his eminent evangelistic power created, they also rejoice in the blessed gifts which have so profited other churches. We trust the Head of the Church will recompense this Zion by future pastoral faithfulness for the sacrifices thus made for other peoples.

It is the happiness of the council to record their enjoyment of the personal relations between themselves and Rev. Dr. Scofield. His urbanity, fraternal fulness of heart, and enkindling spiritual fervors have made him a brother by us; and while deploring our loss of these gifts, they give emphasis to our commendation to him to the churches and ministers of Christ to whom he goes.<sup>32</sup>

BeVier never saw the letter to Fitt, but even as he studied the church records, he seemed to feel that there were unanswered questions.<sup>33</sup> He comments:

Scofield never liked the Dallas summers, and in 1903 his health was already bad. However, a photograph taken soon after his return to Dallas would *not* suggest any serious illness. He appears portly, with a moustache and gray hair. He looked somewhat like Theodore Roosevelt without the pince-nez.<sup>34</sup>

The health question and the reports of recurring illness still must be marked with question marks. Reference is again made to the quotation from Dr. Sadler in chapter 22.

Health or no, Scofield still managed to cover his summer circuit in 1903, just like a drummer making his calls on the trade. It was on August 9, 1903, that his wanderings found him in Chicago. He delivered at the Chicago Avenue Church (now Moody Church) the sermon entitled "As on Eagles Wings," mentioned in an earlier chapter in which we got the hint that Scofield had been making trips to England long before anyone had any notice of such goings and comings.

In September 1903, Scofield was in Brantford, Ontario for a Bible and prophetic conference at the Zion Presbyterian Church. Scofield was in town ahead of the group and spoke to a group of 200 men at Wickliffe Hall. His text was taken from Acts 26:28,29, where Paul is addressing Festus. The *Brantford Daily Courier* of Monday, the 21st, said that the subject of the message was "Almost or altogether, which?" The paper noted that Dr. (*sic*) Scofield spoke eloquently on the subject, pointing

out the great need for complete and whole conversion.<sup>35</sup> In the light of Scofield's continuing character flaws, the message seems to be another example of Scofield's ability to say what he felt would enhance his status in the Fundamentalist community, knowing full well that it had not really applied to him.

The state of the Dallas congregation in 1903, following that split of the previous autumn should have called for more pastoral activity than the work on the Scofield Reference Bible permitted, even with the associate work of Luther Rees.<sup>36</sup> Scofield's pastoral duties must have been a secondary consideration. And it does not appear that the salary the church was able to pay him provided any substantial cashflow to maintain the Scofield household.

As might reasonably be expected, the arrangement between Scofield and the church, that described in paragraph two of the letter to Fitt, did not work out. By late 1903, Scofield realized that he must either give up work on the Reference Bible or give up the church. Apparently the pastoral duties were, without formal action, shifted on to Luther Rees entirely. Rees at the time was also Congregational missionary superintendent for Texas and Louisiana.<sup>37</sup> Fortunately, the church's condition improved despite the divided leadership, (see the quote from Blair Neatby at the beginning of chapter 19) and its financial obligations were met.

But Scofield was still faced with the need for a decision. The congregation seems to have continued indulging in group masochism in their determination to cling to Scofield as pastor, even though he had an evident desire for that which would make him a world figure. Apparently, Scofield was prevailed upon to make a decision which was no decision.<sup>38</sup> That matter had to be reconsidered at subsequent church business meetings in 1905 and 1906.

Early in 1904, Scofield addressed a gathering of Confederate veterans in Dallas, probably the State Convention of the United Confederate Veterans. The message, preserved only in his outline, was mentioned in chapter 6 because it could throw light on his activities during the last years of The War Between The States. In that outline (on page 4) we find the following: "right superior race to bear white man's burden of an inferior race in its own way."<sup>39</sup> The notes continue: "seemed as if *principle* lost/I permit no man to go before me in admiration of *Puritan character* etc, etc./But today *principle* conceded." The evangelical movement today would brand the first quoted note as "racist." The idea pregnant in the note is contrary to views held and espoused in Michigan, Massachusetts and Kansas. We cite it to show that Scofield was always able and willing to please the ears of a particular audience by special references. This could mean being at different times on different sides of any ideological fence. It does not suggest changing views, but views which changed easily with the occasion.



## CHAPTER 26 NOTES

1. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
2. See chapter 21.
3. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, *Moody Monthly*, January 1943, p. 278. The story of the Sea Cliff Conferences is largely based on this relation.
4. See chapter 5 for details of the Cross of Honor.
5. From the deed, copy supplied by the register of deeds, Cheshire County, New Hampshire.
6. C. I. Scofield, "Dwight Moody As I Knew Him," *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, February 1922, p. 798.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
8. Constitution, The Lotos Club. Copy supplied by The New York Public Library. The club declined to answer queries by the writer.
9. *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 8, 1920-1921, p. 1264.
10. *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 7, 1912-1912, p. 1856.
11. First reproduced in *Moody Monthly*, October 1942, p. 66. Later used by Frank E. Gaebelein in *The Story of The Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1959, p. 12.
12. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
13. Breg was at one time superintendent of the Sunday school of First Church. He was actively engaged in finance and utilities, having connection with Eastern financiers, and was ultimately an official of the Dallas Gas Company.
14. From the text of the deed, supplied by the County of Dallas.
15. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, January 1943, p. 279.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. Our Hope Publishing Company, New York, 1931.
19. Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930*, Chicago, 1970, p. 214,215.
20. Note again Carl Henry's admission of evangelical irrelevancy: "Another year has passed in which the movement has registered no notable influence on the formative ideas and ideals of American culture." *TIME*, December 1957. Eighty years of no progress is unusual, but the Premills have managed it.
21. R. J. Rushdoony, *By What Standard, A Critique of Cornelius Van Til*, p. 175.
22. R. J. Rushdoony, *Revolt Against Maturity*, Thoburn Press, 1977, p. 127.
23. Peter Bachrach, *The Theory of Democratic Elitism, A Critique*, Little Brown & Company, 1967.
24. Letter in the Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, written on the letterhead of The Scofield Bible Correspondence Course by C. I. Scofield, D.D. The letterhead refers all business correspondence to Francis Fitch.
25. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 69. Also Ernest B. Comstock, Ed., *History of Central Congregational Church 1902-1952*, Dallas, 1952, p. 7.
26. Letter to Scofield, November 13, 1902. Letter from Scofield, Nov. 13, 1902, in church records, Scofield Memorial Church, Dallas.
27. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
28. Letters of November 1902.
29. Letter, Scofield to A. P. Pitt. Original in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
30. Torrey's letter is reproduced in *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute*, by William Runyan, Oxford University Press, 1935. Torrey's letter is on page 139 where the story of the "troika" plan is related.

31. The "troika" plan appears to have been largely forgotten. But one of the present staff at Moody commented to the writer that it would never have worked. The three men were too "strong willed" to have pulled together.
32. Quote in Trumbell, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
33. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 72-72.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Copy of the newspaper article supplied through the courtesy of Brantford Public Library (Ontario).
36. *Ibid.*, p. 73, based on pastor's report for 1903. First Congregational Church, Dallas, Mss. Our understanding of the role of Luther Rees was helped by a letter from P. R. Byers, present pastor of the Paris Bible Church, Paris, Tex., formerly the Main Street Congregational Church. Byers made it clear that Rees, while ordained, never gave up a role in business and pastored in Paris only between the terms of other pastors. Thus he was also available for work in Dallas in assisting Scofield.
37. 1903 Report First Church.
38. *Ibid.*
39. From Outline "Address to Confederates" in Collection of Scofield Sermon Outlines, donated to Moodyiana Collection by Rev. Wendell P. Loveless.

## CHAPTER 27

# Across the Bounding Main

*"They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters."*

Psalm 107:23

As Scofield was dividing the Word and his time (as pastor, speaker and commentator) he gave evidence of developing a wanderlust. The rationalization was that research was needed to produce the quality references envisioned for the Reference Bible. Of course, if the proposed work was to receive worldwide circulation, some indication of European research would reduce the "stigma" of its being a purely "Yankee" work. (That had not hampered the spread of the Mormon message and the Book of Mormon supposedly given to a Yankee.)

By early 1904, a trip to Europe for Cyrus and Hettie was in the planning stage. In those days, a real cash flow was necessary for travel to Europe. (It is exactly this point which raises so many questions about the previous trips by Cyrus which he must have made to produce the reference to the Horse Guards.) Gaebelein's solicitations in this period of Scofield's life were both indispensable and evidently successful. The trip became a reality.

Some reports of the trip are quite specific. The trip was the first abroad for Hettie. Cyrus, by his own admission, had been there before (when has been carefully hidden among reports of conference engagements). The original intent was to spend two months on vacation. The remaining time abroad—which stretched to nine months—was supposed to be for work on the Reference Bible. We have found no reference to Noel during 1904.

Possibly the publicity-type stories which circulated in the Fundamentalist press during the second decade of the century were not always accepted at face value. When Trumbull was writing his story of Scofield, he commented on the European junket in a manner which suggested he was answering critics by making a confident assertion:

Did the sojourns in Great Britain and elsewhere in Europe make any real contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible, apart from the opportunity they gave of freedom from interruption in the work? Could not this Reference Bible just as well have been made at home without stepping foot out of the United States? The question has been sincerely asked, and the facts here given answer it.

It is true that most of the explanatory and interpretative comment represents material that was familiar to the comparatively few soundly

instructed and well-grounded students of the Word of God in our country and abroad. But the work done on the Scofield Reference Bible includes far more than this. It is a result that could have been produced only after an exhaustive study of books, and conferences with men, both friendly and unfriendly to the Word of God, both believing and unbelieving, both conservative and radical, so that every statement of the editor was finally made only after an intelligent and scholarly familiarity with the whole realm of modern Bible Research. When a positive statement is made in the notes it is made in full recognition of the negative positions on that same point. All this made possible an orientation of the editor and gave the work a background, an atmosphere, a sometimes tacit evidence of familiarity with all view-points while presenting only the true viewpoint, which could never have been brought to pass without the travel and contact and research that went into it.<sup>1</sup>

A most excellent comment by Trumbell, if the notes, on analysis, really reflect great scholarship, but some reservations are in order.

Before starting on a serious work, Cyrus and Hettie according to reports, enjoyed to the full a stay in London. (We hope their enjoyments were fully acceptable to Fundamental and Brethren standards.) But even during those months of ostensible vacation a contact of major importance was made. Throughout the Scofield story, especially the part after 1879, there is always a place where, if nothing else serves as explanation, we can find traces of Brethren influence. The major contact of 1904 was arranged through one of the Brethren.

Robert Scott of the London religious publishing house of Morgan & Scott (now Marshall, Morgan & Scott) is mentioned as one of those attending the 1898 Northfield Conference. Scott was, as far as we can find out, no relation to either Walter of Kenilworth or to Bible teacher Walter, residing in Bristol, England. As Scott is introduced in the story, it is not possible to tell whether Scofield and Scott first met in Northfield in 1898 or whether they met during one of those undated times when Scofield saw the Horse Guards. The acquaintance between Scofield and Scott had developed in 1898 as they had enjoyed the conference. In 1904, Scofield must have made at least one call at the firm headquarters, 12, Pasternoster Buildings, Ludgate Hill, London. And the Scotts entertained the Scofields. At some time during the two month's stay in England, the Scotts took the Scofields down to their country home in the delightful Surrey countryside near Dorking. No doubt they traveled by train, probably starting from London Bridge Station. In 1904, the engine may have been still painted in the wonderful yellow livery invented earlier by William Stroudley.<sup>2</sup>

At Dorking, Scofield was only five or six miles from Albury where banker Henry Drummond's money had been used to institute a major shift in the direction of the church, a move which Scofield continued to push.

During the visit to Dorking, Scofield told Scott of his plans for a new "Reference Bible." Trumbull reported the conversation as Scofield related it to him 15 years later:

"Who is going to publish it?" at once asked Mr. Scott.

"I do not know," was the reply. "I have not taken that up. The first thing I must do is to get the material ready; then it will be time enough to think of a publisher."

"But the question of the publisher is one of the utmost importance," replied Mr. Scott. "And there is only one concern that ought to publish that Bible. My own house would be glad to publish it, of course; but we could not give it the worldwide introduction which it must have. The publishers of this Bible must be the Oxford University Press."

"I do not know any one connected with the Oxford Press," said Dr. Scofield.

"I can easily arrange that," answered Mr. Scott; and forthwith he took his friend to call upon Mr. Henry Frowde, then the head of the great Bible publishing house of Great Britain and the English-speaking world.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Frowde was interested. He said he would consult Mr. Armstrong, then head of the American branch of the Oxford University Press. Mr. Armstrong was immediately enthusiastic at the suggestion that this new Reference Bible be brought out by the Oxford Press, and a preliminary understanding was quickly reached. Mr. Frowde assured Dr. Scofield that, if he finally decided to place the Bible with them, they could readily arrange a proper contract for the publication, in the interests of each party. And so the publishing question was settled, God having fulfilled his word that "before they call, I will answer" (*Isaiah 65:24*).<sup>4</sup>

And here enters another possible flaw in the story. Armstrong was assigned to Oxford's New York branch. Was he in London, for vacation or reporting to the home office? Did Frowde cable him or did he keep Scofield (and Scott) on hold while steamers crossed and recrossed the Atlantic with question and reply. The trans-Atlantic telephone was years in the future. Despite the reported enthusiasm, no binding commitments were to be made for more than three years. It is easy to infer from available material that in 1904 there was nothing tangible which would give Frowde justification for drawing up a contract.

Scofield did not keep an itinerary of his travels and we are not really sure when he traveled. The various reports are in conflict at many points. The story here represents this writer's attempt to resolve conflicting stories. It is apparent that after about two months in England, Cyrus and Hettie traveled to Switzerland. They settled at Montreux, at the east end of Lake Geneva. The declared intention of going to Montreux was to permit uninterrupted work on the Bible. It was not to be. For four months, Scofield reportedly was sick and unable to do any work whatsoever.<sup>5</sup>

At this point in the narrative, either Trumbull slipped up or else Scofield was carried away and Trumbull's editorial skill deserted him. Two pages after relating the four-months sickness, Trumbull states

that Scofield spent nine months at Montreux in uninterrupted labor. One of the stories is inaccurate. And Gaebelein confuses things further by stating that the illness at Montreux was in 1906—when other sources have Scofield at Lake Orion, Michigan, not Switzerland.<sup>6</sup>

To prepare for the period of work, Scofield had ordered from Geneva a supply of large-page, wide-margin notebooks.<sup>7</sup> Scofield planned to paste the text of the entire Bible, page by page into the notebooks. The pages would receive the notes as he worked them up. These notebooks, purchased in mid-1904, were the first recorded tangible evidence of actual production of a work for which Scofield and Gaebelein had been soliciting funds for two years.

While Cyrus was sick, Hettie was not idle. She was the one who pasted the entire Bible, page by page, into the notebooks. Some pages were never to have much more than the text of Scripture on them, right up to that day in 1908 when they were handed to the typesetters. The notebooks were ready for Cyrus when he recovered. They were to become among the most traveled in religious history. How much use was made of them before they were torn apart by the typesetters remains a question.

A source in Dallas claims that while overseas, Scofield made a trip to the Holy Land.<sup>8</sup> The trip must have taken place either very late in 1904, at some time after the four months illness, or early in 1905. But after a debilitating illness and faced with a widely announced schedule of heavy work, time for a lengthy excursion seems unlikely. Travel times of various routes linking Switzerland and Palestine were looked at. The search included the schedule of the famous "Orient Express." A trip with any reasonable time to view the "holy" sites could not have been made in less than a month or six weeks. Two months would be more likely. But in the face of the illness, such a trip would leave little time for working on the notebooks, so carefully prepared by Hettie.

The matter is complicated by the usual reticence about the specific nature of Scofield's illness. Travel in the Holy Land in the first decade of this century was not for the ailing. Either the trip was not made or else precious little time was spent at Montreux in writing. Take your choice.

Exact travel dates are not available, but early (before June) in 1905 Scofield and Hettie returned to Dallas. Trumbull quite plainly declares that Scofield's finances, or rather lack of same, required the return.<sup>9</sup> The funds previously obtained through Gaebelein's efforts had been exhausted by payments to Swiss physicians or by baksheesh to muledrivers in Galilee. In early 1905, a regular cash flow in sufficient amount had not developed.

When Scofield returned to Dallas, he found the church in need of more pastoral attention than could be provided by a "scholar" on the

threshold of worldwide fame. The church was paying the price for trying to hold on to Scofield. Once again, Scofield faced a decision. The result again was a decision which was no decision. He again "found out" what he had noted in 1902 and 1903. He could not properly minister to the church and make genuine progress on the Reference Bible.<sup>10</sup>

The decisions appear to have been made for him. Reports indicate that he became ill.<sup>11</sup> He returned to the Sanitarium at Clifton Springs, New York, to recuperate and work on his opus. The notebooks made another journey. It would seem that New York City was on the route from Dallas to Clifton Springs. Gaebelein reproduced a letter written by Scofield on stationery of The Lotos Club:

In view of the statement made by Gaebelein in 1942, (to which we referred in chapter 24, that Scofield was to give D. L. Moody in-

struction in prophecy, the deference to Gaebelein expressed here is interesting.<sup>13</sup> Actually the letter may have been written more with a view to impressing future readers or for use in an ad than for any actual communication with Gaebelein. But it tends to confirm the impression of Robert L. Pierce (and others) that Gaebelein had much to do with the shaping of Dispensational prophetic views.<sup>14</sup> As already noted, no one raised any question about The Lotos Club.

At Clifton Springs, Scofield was joined by Miss Ella Pohle, who had helped him with the preparation of the Bible Correspondence Course. Miss Pohle remained with Scofield for the next year and was a material help in the work on the Bible.

Back in Dallas, the church called a Scofield protege, the Rev. W. Irving Carroll from the associated Grand Avenue Church to the post of associate pastor at First Church. This no doubt helped to cover those areas not handled by Scofield.<sup>15</sup> At a business meeting, the church, in addition to confirming Carroll as associate at a salary of \$1,500 per year, retained Scofield as pastor. His salary was set at \$1,000 per year.<sup>16</sup> That figure suggests that Gaebelein must have been hitting the solicitation trail hard. Even in 1905, \$1,000 per year was hardly capable of supporting scholarship, keeping Hettie in hats and Noel in school, and most important of all, paying the dues of The Lotos Club.

#### CHAPTER 27 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, 103.
2. See *The London, Brighton and South Coast Railway* by C. Hamilton Ellis, Ian Allen, Ltd., 1960, especially p. 105 and p. 162 for the story of "Stroudley's Improved Engine Green" as the near sighted expert called his yellow color.
3. The reference to Oxford University Press solely as a Bible Publishing House suggests complete cultural ignorance on someone's part or else a desire to keep the clientele in that state. See the 500th Anniversary pamphlet of Oxford University Press issued in 1978 for a better picture of the true scope of the Press.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 90. Compare with p. 94.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 94. Gaebelein, *The Story of The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 344, *Moody Monthly*.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
8. L. B. Hill, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, p. 282.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 94; BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 76; Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
12. First reproduced in *Moody Monthly*, October 1942, p. 66, later used in *The Story of The Scofield Reference Bible, 1909-1958* by Frank E. Gaebelein, Oxford, New York, 1958, p. 12.
13. Gaebelein's statement is in *Story*, p. 129, *Moody Monthly*.
14. See *The Rapture Cult* by Robert L. Pierce, Signal Point Press, Signal Mountain, Tennessee, 1978.
15. *Record Book*, MSS, First Congregational Church, Dallas, p. 215.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 213.



## CHAPTER 28

# The Road to Oxford

*"... I will go along by the highway, I will neither turn unto the right hand nor to the left."*

Deut. 2:27b

Where was Scofield when the year 1906 came in? Gaebelein places him in Montreux, Switzerland.<sup>1</sup> But Trumbull had him in Dallas during much of 1905. As the year passed on Scofield again realized that he could not go on with the Bible work and the church work together. He had something of a breakdown in health. He spent the winter at Clifton Springs, New York. Trumbull comments that this was:

... not such much as an invalid but because of the splendid facilities there for the best food and air, and medical attention when needed, and at the same time freedom to go on with his work.<sup>2</sup>

Miss Ella Pohle joined the Scofields and helped in the work.

The Dallas church in a business meeting in January raised Scofield's salary to \$3,000 per year with full freedom for meetings and other activities as opportunities arose.<sup>3</sup> Even in 1906, the \$3,000 would hardly support the lifestyle and activities of three Scofields.

By May 1906, Scofield had made some progress on the notes and felt able to travel. Cyrus, Hettie and Ella and, of course, the notebooks came to New York City. For Cyrus, The Lotos Club was available. Hettie and Ella, at a location undisclosed, continued the work of placing the cross references on the proper pages of the notebooks. Before the end of the month, the trio moved to New Hampshire. This is the first note we have of the Crestwood Camp property being used. And camp they did. No buildings had been erected, so tents were necessary. One large tent was for living and sleeping; a smaller tent was a work area. No mention of other facilities. Rather rugged for a man of 63 with questionable health. And there is no indication of the place of 17-year-old Noel.

It is at this point that Gaebelein's narrative is, at best, quite faulty.<sup>4</sup> In chapter 24, we provided an alibi for his inaccuracy, the alibi being a quotation from Frank Maloy Anderson. Without recalling the alibi, we hereby note the inaccuracy without making a value judgment. Gaebelein has Scofield going to Europe in 1904, staying two years with four months sickness at Montreux in 1906, and an arrival in New York

on May 25, 1906. His claim is supported by the alleged text of a letter, dated May 27, 1906, and from Crestwood Camp, reading:

Crestwood Camp  
Ashuelot, N. H.  
May 27, 1906

My beloved Brother,

We reached New York Friday after a slow but pleasant voyage, and came right here. Was sorry to pass through New York without seeing you, but could ill bear the expense of a delay with my family. . . . Thanks for Stebbins' letter. I am in splendid health, rested and refreshed by the voyage of thirteen days. I must soon go to New York. Will let you know when the date is fixed. Found here a pressing invitation to occupy my old pulpit at East Northfield next Lord's Day and I have accepted. Love to all.

As ever yours,

C. I. S.<sup>5</sup>

If the letter is valid, ship arrivals in the Port of New York for Friday, May 25, 1906, should show an arrival which fits with the travel story. *The New York Times* for that day lists eleven ships, including five from Mediterranean ports, one from South Shields, England. The S. S. Provence had departed Le Havre, France, on May 19, not fitting in any way the 13 day voyage mentioned in the letter. And Le Havre is never mentioned as an embarkation point in the Scofield story.

Now, according to material developed by BeVier, Scofield had been in Dallas in January 1906, then gone to Clifton Springs.<sup>6</sup> Even if the Scofields and Miss Pohle had used the Hudson River Day Line from Albany, the trip to New York from Clifton Springs could hardly be described as a voyage.

The reliability of Gaebelein's story is further impaired by the fact that in 1942 he reproduced a letter Scofield wrote him on September 2, 1905. The letter was on stationery of The Lotos Club in New York, so we may reasonably assume that he was not in Switzerland at the time.<sup>7</sup> Yet according to Gaebelein's story, Scofield should have been in Montreux on the last lap of his two-year sojourn. Interestingly enough, neither Gaebelein as writer or book editor nor the magazine editor at Moody noticed the discrepancy.

The origination of the text of the letter published with the date of May 27, 1906, is obscure. When he wrote in 1942, Gaebelein declared that he had on his desk an accumulation of Scofield's letters from 1903 to 1909. Chronological arrangement should have provided a basis for a more accurate itinerary.<sup>8</sup>

But back to three-in-a-tent at Ashuelot. The story as related by all previous writers suggests that all three kept up work on the great opus throughout 1906. But Gaebelein refutes his own claim by reference to a letter written on June 9, 1906. Scofield was preparing to leave the