

In the view of marriage as usually held in Christian circles, one is not properly supposed to love two women, and having taken marriage vows, can one properly bounce affection back and forth between two different women. The dedication of the book and the sentiments of the letter are in complete conflict. If he had held any love for Leontine in the 1879-1883 period, and if he had possessed one iota of proper Christian concern for his wife, why, why did he allow the divorce to go through? Even the *Atchison Patriot* reporter in 1881 questioned the basis for a divorce. Or was it necessary that Scofield shed a Catholic wife, regardless of feeling, in order that the church might be "blessed" with the *Scofield Reference Bible*?

The letter indicates that the Kellogg bungalow had not materialized. The inability on C. I.'s part to make further contribution to that project is strange in view of the major increase in royalties for the fiscal year which ended on March 31.

Note a further statement, utterly inconsistent with the position of Dispensationalism and with statements of Scofield himself made publically:

Now I say in all seriousness, why don't you seek the special intercession of the San Luis in whose nametown you live? . . . *Now* we shall get that \$1000.

Greenbacks from Papa would have saved San Luis a lot of trouble. By putting a stamp of approval on the practice of praying to saints, Scofield places himself in conflict with his official view of the Catholic Church which he had plainly stated on page 1346 of *The Scofield Reference Bible* (1917).

Note also that when the book of sermons, *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield*, came out, it did not include one entitled "The Un-sinkable Ship." Adam Loughridge has confirmed that such a sermon was *never* delivered in Belfast. Apparently some "exaggerations" had grown into firm delusions as the end approached. Philip Mauro's *Titanic* story is so superior.

In the same month that he wrote Abbie, he had prepared and signed his Last Will and Testament. Remarkably, the copies of that document in the Surrogate's file do not show signing date. (The statement of two of the witnesses, verifying the signature at the time of probate, also have a blank for the date of signing. Why?) No mention was made of either Abigail or Marie Helene. They were to receive no share of the estate. Was Papa working on the will when he made the suggestion to Abbie that she pray to San Luis?

The last time Scofield went to church was on Sunday, May 22, 1921, when he attended the service at the Community Church, Douglaston.⁶ During July, Scofield became distressed by the fierce heat of

the summer. There were many hours of intense suffering, and family and close friends began to realize that complete recovery was impossible. During his last two days he was conscious, but during the last few hours of life, the intense pain seemed to pass and he fell into a restful sleep.

He passed on without awakening just about 11:00 a.m. on Sunday, July 24, at that very hour when church bells were summoning congregations in the Eastern Time Zone to worship. The death certificate gave the cause of death as "Cardio Vascular Renal" disease.⁷

The funeral service was set for Wednesday, July 27, at 2:00 p.m. It is likely that notice was sent to Atchison and to San Luis Obispo. Abbie could not have reached Douglaston in time for the service. Marie Helene might have made it, if she has started immediately after receiving a telegram on Sunday. However, since to the Dispensational community, she was a non-person, her presence would have been a bit of an embarrassment to Scofield's associates in Christian work.

The Community Church of Douglaston had no building of its own. So the services were held in the sanctuary of the First Baptist Church, in nearby Flushing. The Rev. M. Eugene Flipse, pastor of the Community Church, read the Scripture. The Rev. Wm. L. Pettingill presided and gave the funeral sermon. According to reports, the service was utterly informal, more like an hour at a Bible conference than a funeral. In the course of his remarks, Pettengill said:

How many there are who testify that it was a red letter day in the religious experience when Dr. Scofield's little book, "Rightly Dividing the World of Truth" fell into their hands and led them into a working knowledge of the Scriptures. Many years ago in a Bible conference, a speaker testified that that little book had changed his own life, and his testimony was followed by a request to know how many others had been helped by it. Perhaps one hundred hands were held up. Dr. Scofield was a mighty man in the Scriptures. He never *defended* them, but always said, "Let them be taught"⁸

Mr. Flipse said of Scofield:

One of the things that Dr. Scofield helped to accomplish in Douglaston, was the establishment of the Community Church. His influence in the entire community was very marked. He was universally beloved. He served as the pastor of this Community Church in the early days of its establishment a few years ago, and up to the time of his passing he maintained a hearty interest in its work and was one of its liberal supporters.⁸

From New York and Philadelphia came representative of Christian men and a number came over from the missionary conference at nearby Stony Brook. The Rev. Charles E. Hurlburt, general director of the Africa Inland Mission, brought the service to an end. He said:

The debt which the missionary world owes to Dr. Scofield is beyond estimate. Men and women of the mission field, who never can get the time, in the midst of their strenuous labors, to mine as deeply into the treasures of the Word as they could wish, could feel in a large sense that this had been done for them by Dr. Scofield, as they followed him in his illuminating notes and analyses in his Reference Edition of the Bible. Years ago, Mr. Hurlburt said, he had learned that it was a dangerous thing to minister the Word of God without the power of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Scofield not only taught with exceptional clearness, but as he spoke the truth in love his teaching was ever fragrant with the exquisite perfumes of the Holy Spirit.⁸

Scofield was buried in the cemetery at Flushing in a plot which he had purchased earlier. (Possibly his faith in the Rapture had weakened.) The grave was covered by a mass of flowers sent by friends. As the company was dispersing from the graveside, a young man approached one of the men who had spoken at the funeral and said: "Where can I get a copy of that little book to which almost every one at the services this afternoon was referring?"⁸

The separation of man and work was already beginning. When Dr. James M. Gray, speaking at a conference at Eaglesmere, Pennsylvania, announced Scofield's death, he asked the audience present how many had ever heard him speak. Only five or six hands were held up. But when he asked how many were users of the Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible, "there was a perfect forest of hands!"⁸

The man had never been as real as his work.

CHAPTER 37 NOTES

1. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, *Moody Monthly*, March 1943, p. 400.
2. Gary North, *The Dominion Covenant—Genesis*, Institute for Christian Economics, Tyler, TX., 1982, p. 259. North is quoting Robert M. Young "Darwin's Metaphor: Does Nature Select?", *Monist*, LV (1971), p. 496.
3. Luther Rees, *The Central American Bulletin*, No. 188, Sept. 15, 1921, p. 3.
4. *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1922.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Reported to a reporter for *The Sunday School Times* by Rev. M. Eugene Flipse, pastor of the church. *The Sunday School Times*, August 13, 1921, p. 435.
7. Death certificate supplied by the New York State Dept. of Health.
8. All reports on the funeral are taken from "Scofield, Spirit-Gifted Teacher, Falls Asleep," *The Sunday School Times*, August 13, 1921, p. 435.

CHAPTER 38

The Perils of Probate

"The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup."

Psalm 16:5a

The will which Scofield drew up in May, was presented for probate with the Surrogate of Queens County on August 2, 1921. Scofield noted that he had provided "good and comfortable homes" for his wife and son. This suggests that title to "Greysingles" and "Crestwood" had been transferred prior to Scofield's death. The entire estate was bequeathed to Hettie and Noel.

There is nothing in the will which gives even a hint that Scofield was a Christian. There is no statement of faith in Jesus Christ, no expression of hope for eternity. Statements of such import are often made by devout Christians. Even J. Pierpoint Morgan, Sr., opened his will with a statement of his faith in redemption by Jesus Christ.

Not only were Abigail and Marie Helene not mentioned, but there were no bequests to any Christian work, even those with which Scofield had long been associated. At the funeral, Rev. Mr. Flipse had said that Scofield had been "one of its liberal supporters," speaking of the Community Church in Douglaston. The will would indicate that liberality ended with Scofield's death. Similar treatment was accorded First Church, Dallas, The Central American Mission, The Philadelphia School of The Bible and Moody Bible Institute. No bequests to any of them.

A surrogate's document, Form 27, dated October 5, 1921, indicates that, pursuant to New York law, advertisements had been placed in two newspapers "one in each of four successive weeks" and copies of the notice sent by Registered Mail to Abigail and Marie Helene, notifying them of the filing of their father's will. There is no record of any response, and the girls evidently accepted denial of any share in the inheritance. (Their cooperation was, of course, necessary since to the Dispensational community they were, and had to continue to be, non-persons.)

No real estate is listed in the inventory. Except for \$100.00 on deposit in the Flushing (N. Y.) Branch of the Corn Exchange Bank, the only assets listed in the inventory were these four contracts (agreements) with two provisions and their provision for royalty payments to the deceased. They constitute assets as the royalty payments would continue to be paid to Scofield's designated heirs for the duration of the contracts, as they were identified in the estate papers:

Contract with the Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, Pa., dated February 26, 1918, for publication of book entitled "What Do The Prophets Say?", copy of which contract is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with the Sunday School Times as royalties, \$14.00,

Agreement dated August 4, 1920, between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and the Oxford University Press, New York City, for publication of book entitled "The Scofield Reference to New Testament and Psalms", copy of which contract or agreement is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death on July 24, 1921, there was on deposit with the Oxford University Press as royalties \$168.40, based on an average of six months' earnings.

Contract between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and Oxford University Press, New York City, dated November 1, 1917, for publication of book entitled "The Scofield Reference Bible," edited by deceased, copy of which contract is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with Oxford University Press as royalties \$3,797.60, based on an average of seven months' earnings.

Agreement between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and Oxford University Press, New York City, dated October 1st, 1913, for publication of book entitled "No Room in the Inn" or "Interpretation of the Holy Scripture," copy of which agreement is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with the Oxford University Press as royalties \$1.50.

From the statement of the appraiser, Louis Cohn, submitted April 24, 1922, we note the following most interesting evaluation:

The books that the deceased wrote were reference books to the Bible, and in order to promote the sales of these books, Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the decedent herein, attended religious and Chatauqua conventions, and spoke of his various writings.

The ledger of the Oxford University Press shows that during the five years previous to the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the following amounts were paid to him as royalties.

March 31st. 1916 to March 31st. 1917	\$ 9,975.79
March 31st. 1917 to March 31st. 1918	14,891.91
March 31st. 1918 to March 31st. 1919	13,541.80
March 31st. 1919 to March 31st. 1920	17,908.94
March 31st. 1920 to March 31st. 1921	20,028.89
	Royalties for Five years \$76,347.33
	Average for One year \$15,269.46

Since the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the ledger of the Oxford University Press shows that there has been a consistent falling off of the royalties due the estate, as though the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, there is no one to promote the sales of the various books written by the deceased, and that within a few years these royalties will be a minimum."

The statement of Appraiser Louis Cohn: ". . . that within a few years these royalties will be at a minimum . . ." was a very natural forecast for an experienced appraiser. But it proved to be as wrong as wrong

could be as far as the major work was concerned. The sale of *The Scofield Reference Bible*, 1917 edition and its subsequent printings, soon took off and continued to rise until the revision of 1967. The benefits accrued to Hettie and to Noel as long as the contracts continued in effect. Even Albertus Pieters, first published critic to go on record, could not have imagined the angle of the upward sales curve during the 1920's, '30's and later.¹

Based on the estimate of appraiser Cohn, the Surrogate accepted a total value for the estate of \$23,004.18. On this value, the State of New York collected an inheritance tax of \$111.73.

Hettie continued living at "Greysingles" until her death, which occurred on November 23, 1923. Dr. Byron D. St. John of Port Washington, New York, listed the cause of death as "cystic degeneration of the kidneys and pulmonary edema."² Hettie was buried in the Scofield plot in Flushing Cemetery alongside Cyrus.

Material made available from Atchison gives no hint that Marie Helene or Abigail kept up any contact with Noel after their father passed on. Material has not been available from Noel and family. When William BeVier was working on his thesis in 1960, he made repeated requests of Noel Scofield for information. Had Noel acceded to BeVier's request, we might have had some indication of contact between Long Island and Kansas. However, Noel wrote BeVier: "Regret to advise you I cannot give you the data requested and please do not bother me in the future."³ The church at large may have lost much significant data through such lack of cooperation.

Noel died in December 1962. At the time he was a resident of Nassau County, New York. When Noel's daughter (Scofield's granddaughter) was trying to settle her father's estate, she petitioned the Queens County Surrogate for permission to enter a safety deposit box still maintained by her grandfather's estate to determine whether any documents in that box might assist in settling Noel's estate.⁴ The results of the search did not appear in available papers, and we must speculate on the continued existence of the estate of Cyrus I. Scofield, 40 years after his passing.

Neither Noel, his wife, nor the granddaughter played any role in the Dispensational movement or its evangelical successor.

CHAPTER 38 NOTES

1. Pieters, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, put his criticism of the work in print in the early 1920's. See *A Candid Examination of The Scofield Bible* by Albertus Pieters. Available from Reiner Publications, Swengel, Pa.
2. From death certificate supplied by The New York State Department of Public Health.
3. Letter, Noel P. Scofield to William A. BeVier, March 21, 1960. Quoted in BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
4. Copy of petition in Cyrus Scofield estate papers, Surrogate of Queens County, New York.

CHAPTER 39

Canonizing a Dispensational Saint

"Let us now praise famous men."

Ecclesiastis 44:1a

On Monday July 25, 1921, *The New York Times*, on its page 13, carried the following obituary of Scofield:

DR. CYRUS I. SCOFIELD DIES.
Religious Editor and Author Passes
Away in Douglaston, L.I.

The Rev. Dr. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield of the Southern Presbyterian Church, editor of the Scofield Reference Bible, died yesterday of a general breakdown at his home, Greyshingles, Douglaston, L.I. He was born in Lenawee County, Mich., seventy-eight years ago, and fought under Lee in the Confederate Army.

Soon after being admitted to the bar in 1869, he served a term in the Kansas Legislature and for a time was United States Attorney for that State. It was in 1879 that, to use his own words, he was "converted to the Christian religion," three years later receiving his ordination. From then until 1895 he was pastor of the First Church in Dallas, Texas, leaving to take charge of the Moody Church at Northfield, Mass. Dr. Scofield returned to Dallas again for four years, retiring in 1909, and a few years later moved to Douglaston. He lectured extensively in Europe and this country. His many writings on religious subjects included "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit" and "Rightly Dividing the World of Truth." He was the founder and secretary of the Central American Mission.¹

The obituary was rather innocuous and close to the truth. A bereaved family can easily overlook details on the day of death and the undertaker never can know all details of the family background.

The obituary might not have been written if there had not been a paid insertion on the same page. This paid notice read:

SCOFIELD, Dr. C.T. (sic), noted Bible Scholar and author, Sunday, at his home in Douglaston, L.I. Funeral will be held at Dr. Douglas's Church in Flushing, L.I., Wednesday, 2 P.M. St. Louis, Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Harrisburg papers please copy.

A similar notice, but with correct middle initial, appeared in the *Tribune* (New York) next day. The selection of cities asked to note Scofield's passing is interesting. Dallas was probably taken care of by direct insertion. Atchison is conspicuously overlooked. It is not clear why Boston, Detroit, and Harrisburg were considered important, although Scofield's Michigan birthplace and his connections with the Northfield,

Mass., church and Bible School in Pennsylvania may have figured into the request for news coverage in those areas.

As far as we have been able to determine, the Chicago papers did not accede to the request from New York.

The *Kansas City Journal* did pick up the New York notice and in its edition of August 3, 1921, published the following story:

A BIT OF KANSAS HISTORY

An exceptionally well informed Kansan sends to The Journal some interesting facts connected with the political and ministerial history of the late Rev. Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield, who died a few days ago at Douglaston, N.Y. Somewhat condensed, the facts are thus stated by The Journal's informant:

Just before the sensational senatorial episode which resulted in the election John J. Ingalls over Samuel C. Pomeroy, Mr. Scofield, a young lawyer associated with Ingalls in Atchison, was a member of the legislature in 1872. Ingalls, who aspired to succeed Senator Pomeroy, in 1873, championed the candidacy of Scofield for that year—the legislature then being elected annually.

Senator Pomeroy, who also lived in Atchison county, at Muscotah, succeeded in defeating Scofield for renomination in Atchison county, but Ingalls quietly sent the young lawyer to Nemaha county to acquire a residence. Scofield was elected and in January, 1893, when the senatorial battle began, Ingalls had a staunch partisan in him.

At the anti-Pomeroy caucus Ingalls was nominated over John M. Price. Pomeroy was nominated by the regular caucus of his own supporters. When the legislature began balloting on the following day, State Senator A. M. York of Montgomery county sprang his famous bribery charge against Pomeroy, and Ingalls went to the senate to begin the great career which continued for so many years.

Scofield was rewarded with the United States district attorneyship, succeeding Albert H. Horton, who became United States judge, when he succeeded Mark W. Delahay, in turn being succeeded by Cassius G. Foster. Scofield as district attorney was succeeded by George R. Peck, and was seriously ill for a long time. He forsook the law on his recovery and embraced the ministry.

"He was a man of rare eloquence and power," remarks The Journal informant, "equal to any pulpit. When he appeared at Dallas, Tex., early in his career, his congregation worshipped in a shack, and when he was called to a pastorate in Connecticut he left behind the finest church edifice in Dallas. From the outset of his career he grew in force and power, until he became a noted preacher among the pulpit orators of the world.

"Dr. Scofield's widow and two married daughters live in Atchison. Mrs. Scofield was Miss Leontine Cerre of the noted French family of Papiu at St. Louis. Her father, Henry Cerre, was second in command of "Captain Bonneville's Adventures," written of so entertainingly by Washington Irving. This enterprise was financed by the original John Jacob Astor early in the last century, and was the first passage across the American continent in wagons."²

At least by 1921, the correspondent and paper had learned the correct spelling of the name. But the New England pastorate had slipped

down the Connecticut Valley one state. The correspondent referred to Leontine as widow, rather than ex-wife, a role Leontine was to take on in a few years. But in view of the sentiments which we understand were expressed in the letter of May 4, 1921, the "well-informed Kansan" may have chosen words more wisely than he knew. The other details of Scofield's life appear rather accurate.

The first memorial to Scofield in Christian circles appeared in the August 13, 1921, issue of *The Sunday School times*, the most prestigious Dispensational journal. Apparently, *Times* readers in the Kansas City area were not bothered by two reports in just over 10 days referring to different wives in different cities. (People are not supposed to remember news after three days.)

The memorial article, appearing on page 435 of that August 13, 1921, issue was entitled: "Scofield, Spirit-Gifted Teacher, Falls Aleep." Written by Howard A. Banks, it bore the subtitle: "How" his hand clave to the sword." An introductory passage, including a quotation from Scofield's Reference Bible, read:

"Physical death has for the believer a peculiar qualification. It is called 'sleep,' because his body may be awakened at any moment (Phi. 3:21,21; I Thess. 4:18-14). The soul and spirit live, independently of the death of the body, which is described as a tabernacle (tent), in which the 'I' dwells, and which may be put off (2 Cor. 5:1-8; cf. I Cor. 15:42-44; 2 Pet. 1:13-15). At the believer's death he is clothed upon with a 'house from heaven' pending the resurrection of the 'earthly house,' and is at once 'with the Lord' (2 Cor. 5:1-8; Phil. 1:23; Luke 23:43)."—Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible, page 1299.

In addition to the glimpse on this page of the closing days of Dr. Scofield, and his record of a few all *too* inadequate tributes by friends, it is planned to publish several weeks hence a Scofield Memorial Issue of *The Sunday School Times*, when a fuller estimate of his notable life and ministry may be given.³

Strangely, or maybe not so strangely, the Scofield Memorial Issue never appeared. Apparently, the subscribers never demanded it. Trumbull and staff may have known quite a bit, including what we uncovered, which suggested that details were not advisable. 1921 was not the time to "rock the boat." The Scofield Reference Bible has a great future which not even Trumbull dared risk.

The article opened with a typical attempt to link Scofield and Moody:

C.I. Scofield was D.L. Moody's pastor at Northfield. In a conversation between them one day it was agreed that if Moody died first, and Scofield was within reach, he was to preach at Moody's funeral; if Scofield died first, and Moody was within reach, he was to preach at Scofield's funeral. The text he would choose, Mr. Moody informed his pastor, if he were to be in the pulpit, would be 2 Samuel 23:10, where it was recorded of

Eleazar, one of David's "mighty men," that he had battled against the enemies of the Lord until he was weary. . . .

As we noted in chapter 24, while Scofield pastored the church in Northfield, even Scofield himself would hardly have claimed to actually have been Moody's pastor in a personal sense. This story may have been a step in the attempt to intimately link the two men.

The Scofield family is described as follows:

Mrs. Scofield, who was Miss Hetty van Wart; Mr. and Mrs. Noel P. Scofield, son and daughter-in-law, and their little daughter, constitute the surviving family.

Even the Surrogate of Queens County knew better, but it was Dispensational necessity that Abigail and Marie Helene be non-persons. The existence of Leontine? Imagine what a furor it would have created in Dispensational circles.

Banks reported that someone (carefully unidentified) at the funeral service had developed the *Titanic* story with a few embellishments that Scofield had not included at Moody in 1914:

How Dr. Scofield's whole life was an illustration of the way in which opportunities come to one who lives his life in the sweep at the Holy Spirit's guidance, was dwelt upon by another speaker, as he related the incident of a visit by Dr. Scofield to Belfast, Ireland, just at the time when the *Titanic*, "the unsinkable ship," built at and sailing from Belfast, had sunk in the mid-Atlantic after collision with an iceberg. There were newly made widows and orphans in Belfast then because not a few of the workmen on the *Titanic* had gone across on this maiden voyage as part of her crew. There was a tenseness of feeling over the whole city which kept men from prosecuting their business with calmness and deliberation, and to break the spell of sadness a great mass-meeting had been arranged for the coming Sunday afternoon. The Mayor of the city asked Dr. Scofield to bring the message at that meeting. as he prayed for his message, God seemed to say to him that he should speak about the only unsinkable ship, the little craft upon which our Lord sailed across Galilee. Dr. Scofield drew from this incident wonderful lessons of comfort and help for the people of that bereaved city, as he pointed out that there was safety for time and eternity only in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The records of First Church, Dallas, do indicate a steady run of accessions to membership by profession of faith. But even Trumbull never dared to refer to Scofield as an "evangelist" aside from the evangelistic role of a true pastor. And Scofield's peripatetic schedule limited his pastoral role. But Pettengill at the funeral said of Scofield;

(A)s one who loved and preached the saving Gospel message he was an evangelist, and as one who had shepherded little flocks, twice at Dallas, Texas, in his earlier ministry, as well as at Northfield, he was a pastor, but supremely he was a teacher, and this was his great life ministry.

In chapter 37, we referred to the reaction of Dr. James M. Gray as it was reported at the funeral. It seems to have been part of an effort

to make the work (SRB) become more prominent, as the man and his life were effaced. Back home, Gray saw to it that his journal never published a true obituary. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, in its September, 1921 issue, published, reputedly for the first time, Gray's testimonial to Scofield, given at the dinner held in New York nearly five years earlier. The article had under its heading, the following:

The news of Dr. Scofield's death reached us as this issue was in preparation, and time being too brief to prepare a more adequate tribute to his memory, it being deemed not inappropriate to publish this testimonial which had not previously appeared in print.⁴

The note does not close the door, at least by implication, to the possibility of more on Scofield. However, nothing appeared for 21 years.

We have commented on other parts of Gray's testimonial. Note here that Gray either was inaccurate or else afflicted with a failing memory. Speaking of *The Scofield Reference Bible*, he said: "I think I am not wrong in saying that at Northfield, was begun the crowning work of Dr. Scofield's life—the Scofield Reference Bible."⁵ Gaebelein has a different story, and we will note a third version. Who is correct? Commenting on the Bible, Gray said:

This is Dr. Scofield's richest gift, he knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, "No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions of any subject! His insight pierces the intricacies."⁶

There are shelves full of commentaries which show that Scofield's determinateness was worse than misdirected. Gray may have been "using a shovel," but his statement was good advertising copy.

In September 1921, *The Central American Bulletin*, paper of the mission which Scofield founded, published memorials to its founder. The lead story by Luther Rees, one-time assistant to Scofield, opened with:

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was born near Detroit, Michigan on August 19, 1843, where his father, an officer in the regular Army was stationed at the time. The family home was near Lebanon, Tennessee, and here he received his early education.

As we noted earlier, Clinton was not "near" Detroit. The National Archives could find no record of military service for Elias Scofield either as an officer or enlisted man. Tennessee was never the "family" home, only the residence of a brother-in-law. The story of education in Tennessee conflicts with both Trumbull and fact.

The article refers to "legends" that Scofield told about The War Between the States, accepts Scofield's exaggerated story of his role in the Regis Loisel case, makes Scofield a member of the Kansas Senate

instead of the lower House, and it repeats the factually impossible story of the conversion.

Under the heading *APPRECIATIONS*, Judge D. H. Scott of Paris, Texas, gives a possible hint as to when Scofield first saw the Horse Guards in London. His comments suggest that Scofield was unknown in England in 1892.⁸ But it was different when Scott went back in 1904: "When in 1904, I went again, it was generally conceded that he had no superiors and few equals in that land." The Horse Guards must have been first seen when Scofield was supposed to be functioning as Moody's pastor in Northfield.

Scott makes another statement which conflicts with an exchange of letters with Gaebelien, to which we referred earlier. Scott said: "For some three years past, Dr. Scofield has been growing feeble and has had less to do with this old earth and its affairs. . . ."⁹ But he still wanted to revise the Scofield Bible. Hardly an early retreat in the direction of Heaven. Men just could not seem to report accurately when they spoke of Scofield.

On Sunday, November 27, 1921, the whole day was given over to memorial services for Scofield at the First Church in Dallas. The *Dallas Morning News*, next day, devoted five columns on its page 7 to reporting the affair. Looking at the report of the day, one gets an impression that some tributes dripped with gooey syrup, if they had any truth in them.

Dr. W. Irving Carroll, one of Scofield's students and, at the time, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Marshall, Texas, delivered the address at the morning service. Speaking of Scofield's work, he said:

He was the greatest Bible expositor of his generation and there have been none to equal him in clarity of thought nor brevity of thought of any generation. I am saying this, not in fulsome flattery of the man's life, but simply in recognition of a great fact. I say again that no man ever had a deeper insight into the revealed truth of Scriptures nor a broader grasp.¹⁰

This is, of course, why Trumbull's staff preferred Matthew Henry to Scofield (chapter 34).

It was in that address that Carroll brought out Scofield's evasiveness about his visit to Oxford:

I sought to get him to talk of his visits to Oxford University and to hear from his lip something of the conversation around the faculty table in the dining hall. Little would he ever say and always was anxious to turn the conversation into other channels.¹¹

We have suggested that the evasiveness was necessary because of what actually happened on Scofield's trip.

In chapter 30, we noted the matter of the world "millennium." Carroll's statement at this point is:

In his writings he is careful of his choice of words and used those that delicately balanced with his meanings. The word millenium is a perfectly good Biblical word [Not so—JMC] and yet you will not find it used by Dr. Scofield. It suggests controversial aspects, so he always employed the word "Kingdom."

True, the word *millennium* is not found in the Bible. Its use in the Scofield camp is because of a questionable use of one passage, Rev. 20:1-5, and that usage is a very terrible example of a racist view.

In the afternoon of the November 27 memorial service, there were five speakers. The first speaker, the well-known pulpit orator, Dr. George W. Truett of the First Baptist Church, Dallas, included the following statement about Scofield in his remarks: "Sincerity was as real to him as life itself. If sincerity is lacking, life is a ghastly shadow. Everyone felt that he was a prince of a true man."¹² But, unknown to Dr. Truett, there were three women, one in California and two in Kansas, who might dispute that statement. Truett could be easily carried away. In preparation for the 1916 wing-ding, he had written a testimonial which sounded very much like his remarks in 1921. In the written statement, he included this line: ". . . His reference Bible is a monumental achievement. As years have passed, disagreement with this point has grown. How much did Truett really study the Scofield opus?"

The fourth afternoon speaker, George B. Dealey, a parishioner of the church, newspaperman and friend of Scofield, led into his tribute to Scofield with a capsule history of the English Bible. As he neared his conclusion, he said of Scofield: "Yet with all his wonderful accomplishments, his power and wisdom and remarkable talents in expounding the Word, he was the most modest of men, sure evidence of this true greatness."¹³ But true modesty does not appropriate false honors or claim false achievements.

The conclusion of the services was not reported, but following the speakers, letters of appreciation were read from writers all over the country, all apparently in the same vein.

One would hardly expect Oxford University Press to be either objective or negative about its prize property, but considering that with Scofield, slight praise usually builds up into exaggeration, a comment in an Oxford University Press book published in 1925 (New York) is most interesting. The work was *A Year's Bible Course* by Rev. Charles H. Morgan, Ph.D., with 475 "Questions and Answers For Class Use and Private Study." Not only was the work based on the Scofield Bible notes, but it was printed with the same type and bound to exactly resemble the cloth binding in which the major work was issued. In the foreword, Morgan (a connection with either G. Campbell Morgan or J. Pierpont Morgan has not been established) says of Scofield:

Dr. C.I. Scofield was not only a great evangelical teacher but a great evangelistic teacher. Multitudes have been drawn toward the gates of

the life eternal, multitudes of converts have been grounded in the new life in Christ by the Scofield Reference Bible; and the author and publishers of this course press with prayerful aspiration toward the same goal. Evangelists and pastors can largely insure the spiritual health, happiness, and continuance of all person newly enlisted for Christ by seeing that they possess the Scofield Reference Bible and this instructor in the same—A Year's Bible Course.¹⁴

While we do not deny that exposure to the Word, even when laden with Scofield notes, can bring seeking souls to a knowledge of Jesus Christ, we find no evidence that he could be placed in the company of "evangelists" as 20th Century American Fundamentalists measures them. The idea that the publishers are concerned about men finding new life in Christ Jesus is remarkable in view of the bias of Oxford University noted from 1830 on and even experienced in modern times by C. S. Lewis.¹⁵ Exaggeration and Scofield seem always linked.

On Sunday, May 30, 1926 (which in Texas was *not* Memorial Day), a Scofield feature appeared in *The Daily Times Herald* of Dallas. Most of the first page of the paper's Part 6 (Automotive-Radio-Special Features) was devoted to Scofield and his book. The by-line is that of Carey Snyder. But Snyder must have worked closely with or utilized a hand-out from someone either at the church or at the school (now Dallas Seminary), who was interested in image-building. The article includes items that could only have been made available by an intimate of Scofield and not obtainable through the usual digging of a reporter.

Snyder started the article by referring to the Bible and its beginning, a beginning quite different from what Gray related in 1916 or what Gaebelein was to write in 1942:

Mid the poverty of a saloon keeper's home in Dallas more than forty years ago was born the inspiration which finally resulted in the compilation of the most important Bible reference work today.¹⁶

Snyder continues his story with the usual legends circulated within Fundamentalism and even makes D.L. Moody a member of Dr. Goodell's Pilgrim Congregational Church in St. Louis. Several other noteworthy points are:

1. The Cross of Honor is carefully referred to, but in such way that the exaggerated claim can be reinforced, but at the same time squelch questions by knowing Confederate veterans in the Dallas area.
2. The transparency incident (chapter 12) is placed in East St. Louis, rather than St. Louis. If any of Scofield's "society friends" were in East St. Louis to see him parade, they must have been real rounders.
3. His ordination is referred to with the following statement: ". . . and he was soon ordained to the Christian ministry. Instead of passing lightly over his past life during the ordination services, Dr. Scofield insisted that his whole past life he entered into by the presbytry so that they would understand thoroughly under what conditions he came to the church."¹⁷

The word *presbytery* in the story may be a clue that this bit was made up long after the event. We find it impossible to believe that the council (Congregational, not Presbyterian) would have accepted Scofield if he had done what Snyder claimed. This is especially true regarding the divorce suit pending on the day of ordination.¹⁸

4. The story of the missing boxes (chapter 29) on shipboard is related as taking place on a return from England, not Switzerland. Snyder has them delivered from the ship to New Hampshire after Scofield's landing. And in almost the same breath, he relates the story of the burning tent at Ashuelot. The manner of reference increases our doubts about the truth of both incidents.

Could it have been that stories were beginning to circulate about the Tennessean from Michigan? If so, the Dispensational hierarchy would want stories circulating around Dallas, so well-knit, so "authenticated" that they would be, in advance, refutation of questions which were rearing their nasty heads. Maybe sales of the Bible needed a bit of a boost.

The nearest thing to an attempt to tell about Scofield's life came in 1942, and even that effort was primarily to promote the Bible, with biographical details incidental. A.C. Gaebelein, the last surviving editor of the original Scofield Bible, wrote a series on the book which ran in *Moody Monthly News* late in 1942 and early 1943. Even then, criticism of Scofield stung those closest to him. On that point, Gaebelein whined:

It seems that after his home-call the critics of the splendid service he rendered the Church increased as never before. Why did they keep so silent during this lifetime? Why did they wait until an answer from his side was no longer possible?¹⁹

Scofield's critics had not originally been able to pierce the cloud of respectability which was associated with the SRB. They had never expected American Christians to really accept what *The Scofield Reference Bible* turned out to be. And why, at any time, should the work of a very fallible human being so immune from criticism?

In his story, Gaebelein repeats the clichés about the war decoration. He jumps flatfootedly into the academic career that never was. The relation of events in Kansas leaves the required impression that Cyrus was a bachelor at the time.

Gaebelein relates with some fullness an item noted by Trumbull.²⁰ This human interest gem is that after Scofield's conversion (which took place in a non-existent law office), Cyrus was told that his mother, prior to her death, had expressed a wish that he enter Christian service.

The story just oozes both human interest and "Christian" devotion. Its factual basis is a bit flimsy. Both Trumbull and Gaebelein relate it in such a way that its veracity cannot be checked. Elias had died in

1870, nine years before the "official" conversion date. There is no firm evidence that Cyrus ever saw his father after his discharge from the Army. Only Emeline might have been old enough in 1843 to have remembered such a wish—if it was actually expressed. The attitude of Scofield's sisters, nieces and nephews about his role after 1879 suggests that they could not have been the source of the story. It sounds so like trite Fundamentalist jargon that it could not have originated in either 1879 or 1843.

As evangelical publishing came of age after World War II, the idea of a real biography of Scofield was either passed over, rejected or not considered. The lists of Christian biographies do not include anything on the most prominent Fundamentalist.

In the late 1950's, William A. BeVier, then a graduate student at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, undertook a study of Scofield as his master's thesis. The work has been referred to frequently in this study, but it has not been formally published. Copies are in the libraries of a number of Christian schools, colleges and seminaries.²¹

BeVier's work is inadequate because it takes Trumbull as an accurate biography and uses it as a standard against which all other data is to be measured. Further, as already noted, BeVier found that Scofield's only direct survivor refused to cooperate, making the work inadequate on family matters. Even the acceptance of BeVier's thesis did not stimulate any interest within the Evangelical-Fundamentalist camp for a real biography.

It seems that the Dispensational establishment finds image to be of more concern than accuracy. Dr. Frank E. Gaebelein, son of A.C., in 1959, prepared a Golden Anniversary pamphlet on *The Scofield Reference Bible* for Oxford University Press. This was followed in 1967 by another, *The New Scofield Reference Bible: Its Background and Making*.²² Both pamphlets were probably promotional material.

Frank Gaebelein must have utilized Trumbull for his biographical data. However, Gaebelein managed to produce conflicts between his 1959 and 1967 sketches. In 1959, he made a reasonable condensation of Trumbull, making the district attorney role distinct from the St. Louis period.²³

Possibly he felt that some revision should accompany the *Revised Scofield Reference Bible*. In the 1957 pamphlet, he says: "Following a term in the State Legislature, in 1879 he was appointed United States Attorney for Kansas by President Grant. The same year he became a Christian."²⁴ Besides giving Grant a term as president which he never served, the more recent relation condenses to the point of improbability and complete inaccuracy. Such carelessness on the part of a professional educator could imply contempt for the intelligence of the clientele.

Scofield inflated his accomplishments and altered the story of his life with considerable abandon. The abandon leads the researcher to

feel that truth was the first casualty. Further, it suggests the appalling possibility that some of his associates, men of cloth, not only revelled in the hope of suffering for others (the pre-tribulation Rapture), but were also completely ambivalent in dealing with facts.

A quotation from Scofield himself is appropriate to repeat at this point:

... Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a good man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.²⁵

How come, "Dr." Scofield?

CHAPTER 39 NOTES

1. *The New York Times*, Monday, July 25, 1921, p. 13.
2. *The Kansas City Journal*, Aug. 3, 1921.
3. *The Sunday School Times*, Aug. 13, 1921, p. 435ff.
4. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, September 1921, p. 550ff
5. *Ibid.*, p. 552.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *The Central American Bulletin*, Paris, Tex., Sept. 15, 1921, No. 188, p. 1.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
10. *The Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 28, 1921, p. 7.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *A Year's Bible Course*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1925, p. 10.
15. Walter Hooper, *Through Joy and Beyond*, Macmillan, 1982. Note especially p. 125: "But it was considered unforgivable that Lewis wrote international best-sellers, and worse still that many were of a religious nature."
16. *The Dallas Times Herald*, May 30, 1928, Section 8, p. 1.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Compare Snyder's story with chapters 15 and 17 herein.
19. A.C. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 401, March 1943 installment.
20. A.C. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 128, November 1942 installment; Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
21. The full title is cited in the Introduction to the present work.
22. Frank E. Gaebelein, *Golden Anniversary, The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1959, p. 7.
23. Frank E. Gaebelein, *The New Scofield Reference Bible, Its Background and Making*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1967, p. 5.
24. *Ibid.*
25. C.I. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy*, p. 4.

CHAPTER 40

In Conclusion

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."

Ecclesiastes 12:13

This study of the life of C. I. Scofield is different from any biography of any person who ever played a part in the development and spread of the Christian message. Unfortunately, legal documents which establish dates and verify events in the man's life do not permit a truly "Christian biography." From Scofield's life, we cannot learn that which edifies, inspires or instructs by example. The man's letters suggest a discrepancy between the public and private man, a discrepancy of considerable proportion. The sermons viewed over a span of years suggest little, if any, development of thought. Some speeches suggest crass opportunism.

Even a limited study of his major work, *The Scofield Reference Bible*, suggests that it is a shoddy piece of work. In no way does it deserve the praise heaped on it by his contemporaries and by later adherents. It is not worthy of the place it occupies among Evangelical and Fundamental Christians. And what possible justification was there for the "revision" of 1967?

It would be hard to praise a man like Scofield and still adhere to truth or be accurate. Those who have spoken and written in his praise have not attempted the difficult, nearly impossible task of being accurate. Praise appears to have been more important. Even the inaccuracies of Trumbull's book cannot carry the entire blame for inaccurate reports about the man.

Chapter 39 outlines the Dispensationalists' lack of regard for accuracy. This carelessness (or worse!) seems endemic among those who accept the Scofield system of interpretation of Scripture. A recent appearance The most recent appearance of the Scofield "story" was in *The Fundamentalist Journal*, October 1983, issue. Written by William A. BeVier (who previously wrote the thesis referred to in this work), it is entitled *C. I. Scofield: Dedicated and Determined*.¹ The article started on page 37 of the magazine, ran on page 38, continuing on page 39. At the bottom of the unfinished last column of page 39 was a note

"continued on page 56." We thumbed the magazine, but could find nothing more on Scofield. The magazine has a different edition of the article, with the story complete and ending on page 39. (The corrected edition deletes the story of the academic career that never was.) This corrected edition, at time of writing, has not been made generally available. Blame for the fiasco was placed on a "production error."² This sounds entirely too much like a typical management "cop-out" which places the blame somewhere down the line of command.

Our check showed at least nine errors in the original story. Since BeVier had been in touch with this writer, both before and while preparing the article, his failure to take advantage of later research is amazing.

Carelessness with everyday truth permeates the movement. Note stories, related with breathless abandon, of trainloads of stone shipped from southern Indiana to New York, thence Israel for rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem. As one familiar with railroads, the inability of the railroads to locate such shipments might not seem surprising, except that such have never been made. Common sense views of Scripture and firm refutation by Israeli embassies indicate that such stories are total fabrications. Unembarrassed Fundamentalist denials indicate no sense of shame for playing with truth or the faith of the following.

Dwight Wilson, in *Armageddon Now!*³ notes:

The premillarian's history, however, is strewn with a mass of erroneous speculations which have undermined their credibility. Sometimes false identifications have been made dogmatically, at other times only as probabilities or possibilities, but the net result has always been the same—an increased skepticism toward Premillennialism.

Wilson then lists events from the Russo-Japanese War to the Six Day War of 1967 which were noted by Premils as "prophetic fulfillments." Of particular interest, he notes:

. . . The supposed restoration of Israel has confused the problem of whether the Jews are to be restored before or after the coming of the Messiah. The restoration . . . has been pinpointed to have begun in 1897, 1917, and 1948.

He starts the final paragraph of his chapter with: "It is not likely that the situation (untrue "prophetic fulfillments") will change greatly."

When the heirs of Scofield try to be scholarly, they come up very short, and even then display a lack of responsibility toward the laity they lead and who support them. Charles C. Ryrie, well-known for his "Ryrie Study Bible" (a late 20th Century revision of Scofield's opus), is the author of two quality works on Dispensationalism. In *The Basis of The Premillennial Faith* (1953)⁴, he says: "Premillennialism is the historic faith of the Church." In his *Dispensationalism Today* (1965)⁵,

we note: "... At any rate, evidence is available that Dispensational concepts were held early and throughout the history of the Church." Both statements are rather lacking in accuracy.

In 1977, the Department of Historical Theology of Dallas Seminary accepted a graduate thesis prepared by Alan Patrick Boyd, entitled: "A Dispensational Premillennial Analysis of the Eschatology of the Post-apostolic Fathers (Until the Death of Justin Martyr)"⁶ In his conclusion, page 89, Boyd says: "It is the conclusion of this thesis that Dr. Ryrie's statement (from Basis, *supra*) is historically invalid within the chronological framework of this thesis." He then cites five reasons why the Dallas view cannot be considered congruent with the views held in the Patristic period. Thus he invalidates the claim (made from Darby to Lindsay) that the view represents a recovery of past teaching.

In the "Preface" to the thesis, Boyd notes:

... the author would like to acknowledge, on the basis of classroom and private discussion, that Dr. Charles Ryrie, whose statements regarding the historicity of Dispensational premillennialism in the Church Fathers are carefully scrutinized in this thesis, has clarified his position on these matters. Unfortunately, he has not published these clarifications, and it is hoped that we will do so in the near future.⁷

Unfortunately, from that day (1977) to the present, we have noted no move in this direction. The statements are at best evidence of careless scholarship, at worst something much more undesirable. But they remain as definitive statements for the instruction of the Dispensational following even though they are palpably incorrect. But, a stream can rise no higher than its source, that source being C. I. Scofield.

Value-judgments are unpopular and, of course, should be carefully made. Remarkably, we have a statement from Scofield himself, which can well serve as a value-judgment on the Scofield phenomenon:

Character is what we are. Conduct is what we do. A great many people seem to think that reputation and character are identical things. That is not so. Reputation is what is said about us. Character is what we are. I believe that, in the long run, character and reputation and conduct will all harmonize. For a time our reputation may be better or may be worse than we deserve. Very severe things may be said about us. If we are right with God though, we need not mind that. We need not greatly concern ourselves about it, for in due time we shall be vindicated. On the other hand, we may be believed to be better than we are. Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a bad man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.⁸

It is hard to avoid a feeling that the whole business makes a mockery of the Dispensational affection for II Timothy 2:15: "A workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The ultimate value-judgment may be that the movement produced neither competent workmen nor those actually concerned about Truth.

Dr. Arnold Dallimore, biographer of George Whitfield and more recently writer of a study of Edward Irving, has said:

If a person writing history makes a false statement whether because of carelessness, lack of knowledge or in a desire to make his account agree with some preconceived idea—his error will be compounded by being repeated again and again throughout generations to come. How unconscionable a man must be to indulge in such conduct, and with what great carefullness ought he to search out the facts, diligently examining all the evidence on every side of any issue, and presenting his findings with exactitude!⁹

We submit that this has not been observed in the matter of Cyrus Scofield, and that the whole prophetic subject has been treated with similar carelessness. This could account for the lack of careful history noted by Dr. Wilbur M. Smith.

It may turn out that this attempt to study seriously the prophetic movement and its men will be a case of "whistle-blowing." The most reasonable interpretation of the work of Scofield is that it is neither honest nor valid. As such it should have the "whistle" blown, for it is properly outside the line of valid Christianity. Unfortunately, "whistle-blowing" remains unpopular. Frederick Sturdivant of Ohio State University noted regarding "whistle-blowing":

People have a team-spirit mentality. To violate the code—to be a squealer and break up the team—is generally frowned on.¹⁰

There is more than a hint that the well-established Evangelical movement has tried to protect itself against such a dreadful prospect. The idea of a Scofield study was suggested to nine different publishers of Christian books. Despite the fact that the man has never received definitive treatment, the subject was dismissed without consideration of the manuscript and its merits. The claim was generally "no interest," a claim belied by Jerry Falwell's decision to have a Scofield story in his magazine.

Why would Evangelicals, devoted to be Truth, fear "whistle-blowing" on the Scofield matter? Time has run out for the "Rapture Cult" idea. This is due in part to the utter inadequacy of the idea, and in greater part to the dedicated work of people as diverse as Dave MacPherson and R. J. Rushdoony. Evangelicals are trying to disengage themselves from what must seem a tottering wreck; a wreck erected by Gaebelein and Scofield.

Indications of a shift in the prophetic trend come in from all over the land. But the leaders have done entirely too well in educating the people in the pew, who, will in most cases not follow their leaders. If the pulpit takes a firm stand, it risks alienating the constituency, with costly consequences. Thus, they are moving gradually, carefully, timidly

and with real conviction. Now is no time for a "whistle-blower" to upset things.

Speaking of the typical consequences of "whistle-blowing," Henry Druham, an ex-Lockheed worker said:

There's certainly a defect in our society when people who call attention to wrongdoings are ostracized, fried, criticized and virtually abandoned.¹¹

We rather expect that from La Mirada to Langhorne, from Barrington to Greenville, this work will be treated with disdain, the writer villified and discredited in every way possible. (Of course, it may be treated to the censorship of complete neglect.) It is not unlikely that at locations along Swiss Avenue, Abrams Road, North LaSalle Street, and West Belmont Avenue, the writer will be as welcome as Adolf Eichmann might have been at a synagogue in Brooklyn.

Somehow, we get the feeling, very strongly, that the words of The Preacher of long ago: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this the whole duty of man" (*Ecclesiastes 12:13*) have not been observed in the camp which centered around Scofield. Had all the church observed this, the whole matter would not have arisen. The passage just quoted is the only solution to matters prophetic, temporal and personal.

CHAPTER 40 NOTES

1. *The Fundamentalist Journal* is the publication of the movement headed by Jerry Falwell. It originates in Lynchburg, Va.
2. Letter of October 5, 1983 from Earlene R. Goodwin, editorial assistant of the *Fundamentalist Journal*, sent to Wm. A. BeVier.
3. Dwight Wilson, *Armageddon Now!* Baker, 1977, pp. 216-218. Wilson is Professor of Bible at Bethany Bible College, Santa Cruz, Calif.
4. Charles C. Ryrie, *The Basis of The Premillennial Faith* (Neptune, N.J., Loiseaux Brothers, 1953), p. 17.
5. Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today* (Chicago, Moody Press, 1965), p. 68.
6. The thesis remains unpublished. This writer obtained access to a copy through the Interlibrary Loan System. In his preface, Boyd, who has consistently held to the Dallas-Dispensational theology, said, in an attempt to hold thought to a Dispensational straightjacket:

"At this point, the author would assert that any apologetical or polemical use of the conclusions of this thesis must be based on a viable historiography of patristic theology. In other words, one can not assume the truthfulness of his eschatological position simply because there are adumbrations of it in the patristic writings."
7. The preface to the thesis is on two unnumbered pages at the beginning of the work.
8. C. I. Scofield, *Address on Prophecy, Our Hope*, New York, 1910, p. 4.
9. Arnold A. Dallimore, *Ministerial Strength and Weakness: A More Realistic Look at John Wesley*, Spring Lecture delivered at Toronto Baptist Seminar, February 20-22, 1980. Published in *The Gospel Witness*, August 14, 1980, p. 7. Fundamentalist Robert Sumner, editor of *The Biblical Evangelist*, in his blast at the writer referred to in the Foreword, tried to apply the Dallimore quote to this writer. He was so sure that

anything which did not slavishly follow the Dispensationalal "party-line" had to be untrue and written only for base motives.

10. *The Wall Street Journal*, May 21, 1976. Article "Spilling the Beans," "Disclosing Misdeeds of Corporations Can Backfire on Tattlers," by John S. Lublin. Quotation is from the article.
11. Also from "Spilling the Beans."