THE INCREDIBLE CANFIELD AND HIS SCOFIELD HATCHET JOB!

by Robert L. Sumner

The Incredible Scofield and His Book by Joseph M. Canfield; Published by the Author, Asheville, NC; 36 Chapters, 289 Pages; 1984; $10, Paper.

We received this title from the author for review approximately a year and a half ago and had assured him that we would, indeed, evaluate it in this magazine. Part of our delay is due to the distastefulness of the subject matter; quite frankly, it is not the kind of reading or reviewing we enjoy. The author laments that he could get no publisher to handle the book and so was forced to put it out himself in this form. We can understand their viewpoint; we would not have published it, either.

We took it home to read and review during the evening, but the repeated accusations and charges--often the same items voiced over and over--bored us to tears (a time or two we literally fell asleep!) and we eventually gave up. Later our conscience began to bother us about the fact that we had given our word to the author, so last week we took another stab at it here in our office. If we used all the notes we made, the review would be book length, but there are several highlights we do not want to overlook.

Obviously, in this work Canfield is seeking to discredit the teaching of the Scofield Reference Bible but, alas, he has done so by trying to sully and vilify the character of Scofield, the man. While reference Bibles are now dime-a-dozen (figuratively speaking, as you know if you've tried to purchase one), the Scofield masterpiece was, in the modern sense, the father of the flock. Although Canfield doesn't seem to like any reference Bible, he is extremely dedicated to destroying the ministry of this one.

Before we deal with any other matter, perhaps we should examine the author's

Historical Accuracy/Research!

Canfield makes light of both the accuracy and the research in what little biographical material is available today, published and "unpublished," on Cyrus I. Scofield. The three major sources he used consist of a biography written by Charles G. Trumbull, former editor of the now-defunct Sunday School Times, **The Life Story of C. I. Scofield**; the unpublished Master of Arts thesis of William A. BeVier; and a series of six articles by Arno C. Gaebelein which first appeared in Moody Monthly between October 1942 and March 1943, then were released in booklet form.

The scholarly Trumbull, a Yale graduate, was a highly respected journalist--he was long associated with the Toronto Globe and his Sunday school lessons were printed weekly in numerous major newspapers, in addition to his many books and his editorial work with the Times--and, since he died as recently as 1941, is still remembered fondly by many Bible believers.

As for BeVier, currently professor of Bible at Northwestern College in St. Paul, he has three earned degrees, all in history areas, and is obviously a most reliable and competent writer. His advisor at Southern Methodist University, when he wrote the thesis for his Master's in United States history, was Dr. Herbert Gambrell, a published historian with a Ph.D. from the University of Texas. Dr. Gambrell was the son of the illustrious Baptist leader, Dr. James Bruton Gambrell (a prominent editor, author and Southern Baptist Convention executive), and was a member of the First Baptist Chruch in Dallas at the same time Scofield pastored in that city. The young Gambrell knew Scofield personally and, in fact, it was at his suggestion that BeVier made the latter the subject of his thesis. As BeVier noted in private correspondence with this reviewer, "I believe we can be assured [Dr. Gambrell] would not have permitted me to put any errors of unsubstantiated statements in the thesis. His name is on it as the primary grader."

Nor do we have any reason to doubt the credibility of Gaebelein, also an editor and author of note. He founded Our Hope magazine in 1894 and was its editor until his Homegoing in 1945, over a half-century later. Gaebelein was a multi-language scholar (including Hebrew) and authored nearly 50 books, along with innumerable pamphlets. He had the respect of evangelicals everywhere during his lifetime.

We mention the background of these men only because of the "put down" Canfield gives them in his work. Since he derides their accuracy and research throughout his paper, one would expect something better from him. Right? But what are the facts?

How does Canfield's work contrast with the ones he ridicules? There is an indication of things to come on the opening page and in the opening paragraph when he describes William Miller as a cult leader in the same breath with Joseph Smith, the founder of the non-Christian Mormon cult. And later in the book he compounds his error by referring to "William Miller of the Seventh Day Adventists." This is a grave injustice to William Miller, a farmer and Baptist lay-preacher, who was **never** associated with **any** cult, nor ever a member of the Seventh-day Adventist movement. In fact, Miller acknowledged his "date" errors and refused to have anything to do with the Adventist cult which sprang from those blunders. Yet this is a sample of the historical inaccuracy one can expect throughout Canfield's work.

Another illustration of his sloppy and inaccurate research relates to something which proved to be merely Canfield's inability to read. Referring to Scofield's book, What Do the Prophets Say? (published by the Sunday School Times Company)--a work Canfield does not like anyway because of its dispensational, pretribulational and premillennial teaching--he pounced on an imagined error in the Foreword. He wrote: "The Forward [sic] brings out another mix-up in dates. The 'thirty-five years of earnest study' takes us back to early 1883. According to statements made about events of that Fall, there were supposed to have been two years of 'earnest study' running back to 1881 (but we have serious doubts about all stories of that period). Possibly 35 was selected as a round number. But it may be no more accurate than anything else reported by and about Scofield."

He was referring to a statement in the Foreward by Scofield, dated Easter 1918: "This book is a sincere effort to present such an interpretation,

after thirty-five years of earnest study." But three pages prior to Scofield's Foreward the following copyright dates are given: "Copyright, 1916, by the Sunday School Times Company," and "Copyright, 1918, by C. I. Scofield." In other words, these messages were published prior to the book by the Times, probably in its magazine, two years before they were published in book form. That explains the missing two years! And if Scofield had spoken of "thirty-seven years of earnest study," as Canfield thinks he should, that would have been an error, an exaggeration of two years. The period correctly covered 35 years, from 1881 to 1916 (not 1918).

Another flaw due to Canfield's reading problem is seen in his statement, "The same Dallas source has Scofield working in the Library founded by John Calvin in Geneva. (Trumbull places Calvin's Library at Lausanne, not Geneva.)" His documentation for the Trumbull statement is given as page 78 in the biography, but there is no mention of the matter there. However, on page 101 Trumbull said: "At Lausanne, Switzerland, for example, he reveled in the books in the great library there, a library begun by Calvin, some of whose books are still on its shelves." Trumbull did not say the Calvin library was there, only that Clavin founded the Lausanne library and that "some [of his] books are still on its shelves."

Regarding the mistakes in spelling (note Forward above), some could be considered typographical errors if it were not for the fact that Canfield repeatedly misspelled the same words. By way of example, apostasy is spelled consistently throughout as "apostacy" (four times on a single page, for example), except in cases where he was quoting someone else--and then he copied the spelling correctly.

Another historical blunder was committed by Canfield when he confused the two sons of Scofield's sister and brother-in-law, a prominent St. Louis dentist, Dr. and Mrs. William Henry Eames, into one personality. Referring to the Eames couple, who lived in a mansion overlooking the Mississippi, Canfield said: "One of their children, Col. William Eames became a prominent architect."

He erred on two counts. The good colonel was not the architect; that was his brother, William S. Eames. And the colonel's name was not William; it was H. E. Eames. Canfield should have noted those facts when he printed the obituary for Laura Scofield Eames from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which described her as "the mother of the late William S. Eames, architect, and is survived by one son, Colonel H. E. Eames." Canfield was so anxious to find something sinister about the obituary not mentioning Laura's brother Cyrus (but neither did it mention her sisters), he failed to note that the architect was dead and the military man was living, erroneously calling Colonel Eames the architect! This seems quite strange for a man who literarily jumped up and down at every little contradiction he thought he had been able to find in Trumbull or BeVier.

Canfield writes with a very suspicious mind and seems to find something ominous in everything he cannot explain. By way of example, when Trumbull refers to "Mr. Walter Scott" as an "eminent Bible teacher," Canfield responds with a sinister suggestion: "As for Walter Scott, like so many others in the Brethren lineage, we know absolutely nothing about him. Even the library of

his native city, Bristol, could tell us nothing. Were it not for the Scofield visit we might suspect a nom de plume."

This reviewer has been preaching about 43 years and for nearly that length of time has been using some choice Walter Scott illustrations. (The first one we ran across had to do with an open-air preaching incident in London's Hyde Park.) And, in our judgment, Trumbull's evaluation of Scott as an "eminent Bible teacher" is more than justified by his book in our library, Exposition of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, a huge 456-page hardbound volume currently available from Kregel Publications for $14.50--and worth every penny of that price! Pen name (nom de plume)? Nonsense!

Not especially important, perhaps, but indicative of the caliber of his work, Canfield twice lists Lebanon, Tennessee, as being in Franklin County. It is, of course, the seat of Wilson County. Franklin is on the Alabama border, while Wilson is in Middle Tennessee.

Another error is in his remark, "The Niagara Conference grew out of a major effort which originated with the Plymouth Brethren." Yet, to quote an authority Canfield recognizes, Sandeen calls Presbyterian James Hall Brookes "the founding father and controlling spirit of the conference." Among other leaders he mentioned were James Inglis (Baptist), George C. Needham (a Brethren who became a Baptist), L. W. Munhall (Methodist), and William J. Erdman (Congregationalist). Gaebelein also lists as "the leading teachers": A. J. Gordon (Baptist), Albert Erdman (Presbyterian), Canon F. E. Howitt (Episcopal?) W. H. Moorehead (Presbyterian), E. P. Marvin, Arthur T. Pierson (Presbyterian/Baptist), Robert Cameron (Baptist), J. M. Stifler (Baptist), and J. Hudson Taylor (Methodist/Independent). Obviously, Presbyterians and Baptists dominated the conference.

Near the end of his hatchet job, Canfield describes Scofield as "Fundamentalism's most popular figure," a vast overstatement--although Ernest R. Sandeen is guilty of the same exaggeration, saying,". . . but in the calendar of Fundamentalist saints no name is better known or more revered" (The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 224, 1978 edition). But Sandeen, like Canfield, has a strong anti-premillennial bias and any testimony from him must be considered in that light. Incidentally, Canfield makes another blunder in this, giving the Sandeen reference as page 222 when he quotes him. This is simply sloppy research and highlights the fact that no scholar will want to depend upon his data. (The first and only published historian to refer to his work thus far, David O. Beale in In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850, agrees, calling it "a spiteful and inadequately documented attack," which is another way of saying a hatchet job, and concludes, "The author's irrationalism . . . will prevent serious students from accepting many of his conclusions and opinions."

Along the same line, Canfield opens one chapter, "In the previous chapter, we noted that Scofield was officially Pastor of the fledgling church in Douglaston" (emphasis added). But he made no such statement in that chapter, merely saying, "In November, Scofield agreed to preach regularly on Sunday mornings." There is a difference.

In fact, it turns out that some of his undocumented statements are simply things he "remembers"--or thinks he does. Statements by the late A. W.

Tozer are an illustration. While we only recall one undocumented quote by him in the manuscript, Canfield presented several to the reviewer in personal correspondence. We considered them so "unTozerish" we finally observed that, while we had always held Tozer in high esteem, Canfield was giving us second thoughts, "if he really made all the nasty statements you are crediting to him."

One of those was: "In his last sermon of 1956, A. W. Tozer said 'Evangelical Christianity is obsolete and the man who would be God's man must stand up, be counted and get out of it!'" That so shocked us we replied: "Well, evangelical Christianity stands for the deity of Christ, the blood atonement, a bodily resurrection, an inerrant Bible and salvation by grace through faith. Was he saying that?"

Although Canfield did not reply, in a letter to a Rev. Grover Gunn he called our magazine "a sheet" and said, "I mentioned several statements which A. W. Tozer made to his congregations (but never published)." He made the same admission about his lack of documentation in a letter to Dave MacPherson ("they were not published"). In other words, Canfield simply offered verbatim quotes from his memory about what Tozer said in 1956. That is really incredible!

A Massive Hatchet Job

Arno C. Gabelein, in the series of Moody Monthly articles which Canfield read in preparing his thesis, observed: ". . . certain men, in order to break down the influence of this Bible, began to attack the character of the instrument God has used in helping the Church in such a remarkable way, the late Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield. Of all the despicable things anyone can do, in the judgment of this writer, is to impeach the character of one who is no longer among the living, and to make insinuations based upon mere rumors, when the accused is no longer able to meet such attacks. It is the worst kind of slander" (October, 1942, p. 66).

Is Canfield's work an attempt to "impeach the character" of a dead man, "the worst kind of slander"? The title of his book gives the reader an advance impression of what to expect and one looking for an all-out, gung-ho attack on a noble, good [dead] man will not be disappointed. Readers familiar with other dispensational, pretribulational attacks will find themselves being reminded of Dave MacPherson's style, although Canfield, fortunately, does not go to the same satirical extremes. He does refer to MacPherson a few times and in one footnote calls him "the man who discovered the invention of The Rapture," a gross overstatement of the available facts.

Interestingly enough, in a personal letter offering advice on how we (!) should write this review, Canfield said, ". . . a brother in Christ will always be kind, considerate, honest and thoughtful even when he disagrees." We will let our readers determine for themselves how well he followed his own advice in his work. You may not find it kind, considerate, honest or even thoughtful. We didn't!

Are we out of line in calling this work a hatchet job? Let's examine a few of the many examples that might be given.

Does the illustrious Dr. George W. Truett call Scofield "a great preacher"? Then Canfield must tell his readers preaching is only "a gift of gab which can carry any public figure a long way."

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to a Civil War battle where Scofield fought, Canfield makes a special note of saying, "But he never mentioned it," then adds in a footnote: "That the mature Scofield failed to mention it could be one of the indications that Scofield was quite well aware of what 'The Establishment' wanted." Such a judging of Scofield's motives is absolutely "incredible," to use the author's own adjective.

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield roundly criticizes Scofield for putting his comments as footnotes in the Bible, yet at the same time praising and justifying the system of Matthew Henry, Albert Barnes and others, who, in their commentaries, placed the Scripture on the same pages with their comments. (He adds, "But neither Henry nor Barnes had the temerity, guile or gall to get their notes accepted as Scripture itself." To which we immediately respond, "Neither did Scofield!")

However, believe it or not, Canfield turns right around and criticizes Scofield for doing the same thing as Henry and Barnes in his book, What Do the Prophets Say? He objects, "This, of course, succeeded in inflating the size of the book. Eight pages are nothing but Scripture." It is the first time, at least to our knowledge, someone claiming to be an evangelical has complained that Scripture passages being used in a teaching were printed in full! And Canfield is not much better at counting than reading; there are nine pages in the book which are "nothing but Scripture."

Is this a hatchet job? Dr. George W. Truett, the famous orator and Southern Baptist leader who pastored the First Baptist Church of Dallas for nearly a half-century, made the mistake of speaking highly of Scofield after his death, as noted above. So Canfield must point out that Truett was not very smart anyway, saying he "was of that school of Southern Baptist preachers heavier in oratorical preaching than in theological insight. The statement is characteristic." And Canfield's statement is characteristic of him, too!

Is this a hatchet job? When Canfield talks about Scofield's success in the church at Dallas, he adds the observation, "But how could that membership have grown to full Christian maturity on a diet of chopped-up Bible and 'any-moment Rapture'?" His comment is both inane and false, of course, since Canfield has no way of knowing how frequently or infrequently Scofield preached on prophecy, or how well he grounded his people in the fundamentals of the Faith. However, an indication of Scofield's pastoral preaching is seen in the statement of the ecclesiastical council at Northfield, Moody's home church, after seven years in that pulpit. The council called it "strong, skillful, and productive preaching," adding that the hearers "found memorable profit from this pure, fervid, and enriching ministry." Probably most would consider the men on the church council in a better position to evaluate Scofield's ministry than Canfield. And as for "chopped-up Bible," Canfield has the audacity to use 1 Corinthians 15:51a, "Behold, I shew you a mystery," regarding Scofield's war years! Talk about taking a verse out of context and chopping it up!

Is this a hatchet job? Noting that no St. Louis newspaper reprinted a vicious attack on Scofield which had been published in 1899 by a Kansas paper,

Canfield observes, "Possibly that special Providence which is alleged to watch over drunks, children and idiots kept the story out of the St. Louis papers." Since all of Scofield's drinking was prior to his conversion and he obviously was not a child, we find that reference to him as an idiot incredible. (The same phrase about "drunks, children and idiots" is repeated later, again with reference to Scofield.)

Is this a hatchet job? When Canfield cannot find the source of Scofield's income as a new convert, after speculating that "he must have lived on the generosity of Christians who were sympathizers with Moody's evangelism and Brookes' prophecy," he concludes, "In plain words, he was a freeloader." Yet he does not have one word of proof to back up his fanciful imagination.

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to a story told by Luther Rees about a trial Scofield handled, Canfield says it "seems unlikely, even inaccurate" (that is a polite--or perhaps not so polite--way of calling someone a liar). Rees said the opposition attorney quoted from John Greenleaf Whittier's "The Story of the Kansas Emigrants":

> "They crossed the prairies as of old
> The Pilgrims crossed the Sea,
> To make the West as they the East,
> The Homestead of the free."

And Canfield says Scofield "is alleged" (note the questioning of veracity again) to have replied with a rhyme of his own:

> "They crossed the prairies in a band
> To try to steal some railroad land!"

Canfield calls this "probably the cleverest [statement] in all of his writing," adding that it was "en evident parody of Whittier." We are overlooking the accusation of untruthfulness here to point out the insult in calling this "the cleverest" thing Scofield ever wrote (or, more precisely, spoke).

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to how the Dallas church loved and admired Pastor Scofield--refusing to accept his resignations, pleading with him to come back after he had left, giving him liberal vacation time to take outside engagements, paying him when he wasn't around, and eventually making him Pastor Emeritus and paying him simply for holding that title--Canfield describes this as "an exercise in group masochism on the part of the congregation." And he repeats that charge several times.

Is this a hatchet job? Because Scofield believed the clear statements in the Word of God about the apostasy of the last days, Canfield describes his acceptance of the Dallas pastorate in the words, "Thus an opportunity was opened for Scofield and his dream of Church failure." This false accusation is highlighted again and again in the book, erroneously suggesting that Scofield and other dispensationalists actually hoped their ministries would fail in order to prove their prophetic theories. Anyone even remotely familiar with dispensationalism knows that this charge is utterly, totally false--in fact, maliciously so! We will say more later about this "church failure" theme of Canfield.

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to times of poor health in Scofield's life, Canfield quotes Dr.William Sadler, in part,"The sincere acceptance of the teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living would at once wipe out more than half the difficulties and sorrows of the human race," then adds his own comment that such "may be a partial explanation for some of the unaccountable illnesses" Scofield suffered. That was, of course, a cheap shot, as unworthy of him as it would be of us if we were to apply Sadler's comments to the illness that claimed Canfield's first wife. And what about his own "infirmities" that got him a 4-F classification durring World War II? Would he want us to suggest that Sadler's words might be "a partial explanation" for them? We refuse to make any such judgment.

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to a lynching in Texas when a black man was seized by a mob after being charged with raping and killing a three-year-old white girl, Canfield tells how the girl's father took "a white-hot tinners' iron" and commenced searing the terrified man's flesh, starting at the feet and moving upward, finally silencing his tongue and putting out his eyes. The mob then saturated him with oil, placed combustibles around him, then set him aflame. Scofield wrote his minister friend in that community to express "grief and indignation" over the "outrage."

But Canfield put his own interpretation on the incident, arguing: "Yet, why should Scofield, the Dispensationalist, have been concerned? What had happened was completely in accord with the picture of man and society which Dispensationalists like to draw from I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3. From 1893 (and before) right down to the present day, Dispensational preaching has obtained great satisfaction from similar tragedies." To say that dispensationalists "obtain great satisfaction" from such tragedies is horribly unfair and a total misrepresentation. In fact, in the margin of our copy we wrote: "vicious lie!"

Is this a hatchet job? Because of Scofield being on the road so much during the period his young son died, Canfield has the audacity to suggest, "We cannot be sure that Cyrus was at [his wife's] side to comfort her when the little white coffin bearing the remains of Guy was lowered into the grave in St. Louis on a wintery day late in 1874." To make such an intimation, without the slightest of evidence, stoops to a low in journalism unworthy of anyone's imitation. Old-timers called it "yellow journalism."

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield quotes a Reformed writer, William E. Cox, in his attack on dispensationalism: "Scofield's footnotes and his systematized schemes of hermenuetics have been memorized by many as religiously as verses of the Bible. It is not at all uncommon to hear devout men recite these footnotes prefaced by the words, 'The Bible says . . .'."

Never one time in this writer's 64 years of existence--approximately 46 years as a Christian--has he ever heard **anyone** make such a statement or quote as the Word of God "a memorized Scofield footnote." Since we run with the crowd who use the Scofield Reference Bible--and have owned our own copy since 1933--if such claims were usual, our ignorance about it seems strange, to say the least. If Cox (or Canfield, in quoting him) had said that "on occasion" (there are kooks in every group) someone had recited a footnote and prefaced his remark "The Bible says," that would be different. (Just because we have

never heard of even one case doesn't mean it hasn't happened, of course.) But Cox and Canfield are claiming that this is "common"--and such a proposition is totally false, a fact we insist without fear of contradiction.

Is this a hatchet job? On a single page in this treatise Canfield takes a number of cheap shots. Regarding Scofield's Doctor of Divinity degree, he says: "Evidence suggests that the title was incorrect, the degree was self-bestowed." What evidence? The evidence of silence? He says again: "Scofield made a number of passes at claiming additional schooling which in fact he never had." When did he make those claims? Where did he make those claims? What proof, if such claims were made, is there of falsehood? And Canfield sneers at the idea of any close friendship between D. L. Moody and C. I. Scofield. He asks, "Was there any basis for real rapport?" Yes, in mutually shared doctrinal truth!

The older Moody and the younger Scofield could easily have had a Paul and Timothy or Elijah and Elisha rapport. Such is not at all uncommon between an elderly religious figure of note and his younger pastor. In fact, Dr. James M. Gray testified: ". . . Mr. Moody erred not in confiding his interests to his pastor's hands. Indeed his love and veneration for Dr. Scofield never waned, 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," referring to the fact that Scofield first conducted, with R. A. Torrey, a brief private service at the Moody home, then was in charge of the public funeral at the church, leading in prayer and delivering a brief message-- as well as pronouncing the benediction at Round Top before Moody's body was lowered into the grave.

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield says he ran across "persistent rumors" in his research that Scofield "served one or more prison sentences in Canada" during the 1870s, but acknowledges that "prison authorities in the Dominion of Canada, including those of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have no record of term(s) for a prisoner named Cyrus Scofield in the 1870's."

Then why put it in this work? Unless, of course, it is intended as a hatchet job on a dead man's character. (The whole idea of Scofield serving time in Canada is absurd, of course!) As far as we know, Canfield's protestations notwithstanding, there is no evidence that Scofield ever spent a single day in any jail anywere, Canada or the United States--or that he was ever convicted of a single crime!

Is this a hatchet job? The reader is informed that Scofield left his church in St. Louis and accepted the Dallas pulpit to get away from his unsavory past in Kansas. Canfield concludes: "Dallas was, of course, farther from Atchison than St. Louis was." We doubt that the additional mileage would have made any more difference in that day than it does in ours; but, then, we do not have a hatchet job mentality, either.

Is this a hatchet job? Trying to make light of the dispensational position of Scofield and his friends, Canfield refers to a 1914 prophetic conference when, after Scofield's second message, "The attendees adjourned, probably for lunch. The published report makes no mention of fasting, even in the face of the impending doom vividly described by so many speakers." That is smart aleck talk, not worthy of one pretending to be a responsible writer.

Obviously, Canfield has no knowledge of what they did--firsthand or second-hand--nor do we, but we have attended many, many conferences of various kinds when the attendees did indeed get apart for prayer and fasting, sometimes continuing throughout the night.

Is this a hatchet job? At that same 1914 conference, Canfield jumps on Trumbull's statement about Scofield's address, ". . . that message was laughed at by the general public and newspaper reporters at the time," commenting, "The secular press, Hal Lindsay to the contrary, has not moved all that far from its 1914 position, even in the face of daily crises throughout the world." Nor will it ever! Doesn't I Corinthians 2:14 insist,"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Perhaps it might be beneficial, however, to note why the general public laughed at Scofield's message--and all the messages of that conference, in fact. Noel Smith, the highly respected and competent editor of the Baptist Bible Tribune for nearly a quarter of a century (from its founding until his Homegoing), had this to say when he published a sermon from that conference by Dr. James M. Gray: "It was during World War I, which was to make the world 'safe for democracy.' There would never be another; men were too enlightened. The speakers at this conference said the opposite. They said it because they knew and believed the Bible." In other words, the "hooters"--whom time proved were the ones in error--had the postmillennial philosophy of today's Canfields, expecting the world to get better, and ending war was just one step in this cultural evolution. Their jeers were like his jeers in this book!

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to the Scofield Reference Bible, Canfield calls it a "project designed to inculcate people with the idea that the only hope for the world is despair, suffering and apostacy [sic]!" And when he mentioned the first copies being released on January 15, 1909, he sneered, "With its publication, the idea of Church failure and irrelevancy and hopeless decay for the world was on its way to Evangelical respectability." That is sheer nonsense, of course, tripe worthy only of a hatchet job, making us wonder what he would say about our Lord's evaluation, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth" (Luke 18:8)?

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield seems to want to establish a break between Scofield and Moody. He refers to an anecdote he thinks "carries a hint that Moody was retaining the leadership" between the two men (who in the world would ever suggest otherwise?), saying Moody rode by the parsonage at five in the morning and shouted, "Scofield, you'd better get up!" But Scofield himself told this incident and we do not see anything ominous--in fact, it appears more like close, friendly banter or teasing on the part of two intimate friends.

Canfield also quotes a letter, which he charges implies "a real lack of rapport between the two men," written by Scofield to Moody's son-in-law, A. P. Fitt, saying: "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." And Canfield briefly noted, "This letter is the only documentation noting a difference between the two men. But careful review of the Northfield material suggests underlying hints." The "real lack of rapport" is all in Canfield's mind, certainly not proven by what he offers.

Quite frankly, we cannot imagine a dynamic leader like Moody not having "differences" with all his workers! But this one indication was the only "gem" Canfield would uncover between Moody and Scofield. (If he had read the Trumbull work more closely he would have noted another: Moody complained that Scofield was telling his conversion story too much--a criticism for which he later apologized!)

Is this a hatchet job? When increasing speaking engagements opened up for Scofield, the sneering Canfield says: "This gave him an excellent opportunity to broadcast the idea of a failing, irrelevant Church and a decaying world as the hope made available by the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ at Calvary." But this was not "the hope" Christ's sacrifice made available, of course, nor was it the message Scofield preached from that sacrifice.

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to Scofield's third message ("The Doctrine of the Last Things as Found in The Epistles and Revelation") at the 1914 Prophetic Conference, Canfield described it: "Overlooking statements of The Lord and The Apostles which did not suit his purpose, he proclaims his negative hope for the Church." We are not sure what Canfield wanted found in one message evaluating the prophetic theme of all the Epistles and the Book of Revelation. Did he want a 24-hour sermon? This kind of criticism fits only the character of a man with an ax to grind.

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield refers to a letter Scofield wrote one of his daughters by his first wife, Helene, which, incidentally, does not read like a letter from a father who had totally abandoned his chidren (an impression Canfield seeks to establish throughout his work). It is light, jocular and newsy. Yet Canfield takes Scofield's jesting remarks as "gospel" and uses them as ammunition for his vilification gun.

In the letter, Scofield had joked about his "dismally empty" purse (which he called Scofielditis) and remarked about what he would do when he became rich. He spoke of a winter apartment in New York, one in Italy for the spring, and still another in New England for summer and early fall, So he would not have to ship belongings back and forth, he would have everything in triplicate--one set of books, etc., could be retained at each residence. In New York he would also have a large lecture room in the Carnegie Institute so that folks could come and hear him lecture three afternoons and three evenings a week. At his other residences he would "mostly loaf and invite my soul" with Helene and Abbie sharing some of the time at each of the three locations.

Canfield jumped on this as Scofield's true inner feelings and even went so far as to say his "'Scofielditis' contrasts with the promise of Philippians 4:19." But Scofield was jokingly referring to his "wants," and Philippians 4:19 relates only to a Christian's "needs." There is a difference!

Is this a hatchet job? If it were not, why would Canfield make the totally unjustified charge of antinomianism throughout? He begins early by referring to "the antinomian nature of Dispensationalism which Scofield inherited from J. N. Darby," and repeats that suggestion several times. He says, "The movement has frequently spoken of being 'free from the law'. In theological terms this is called antinomianism. Simply it means that being saved, thanks to free grace, one does not need to be particular about moral behavior."

This is a horrible misrepresentation of Scofield's position and that of every biblical dispensationalist. In fact, we would challenge Canfield to produce a single statement from any reasonable dispensationalist who says such a thing, not merely Scofield. And as for being "free from the law," did not Paul make that very claim to the Galatians, arguing with reference to it, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (5:1)?

Either Canfield does not know what dispensationalists teach about the law, or he is deliberately misrepresenting their position. When they sing and speak of being "free from the law," they are not referring to being "free from all law." So when Canfield quotes from a letter by Scofield in which he speaks of "obedience to law" and accuses Scofield of having "worked both sides of the street" on the issue, he does not seem aware that Scofield was not calling for "obedience to the law," but obedience to law."

There is a difference, as the Apostle Paul pointed out in I Corinthians 9:21, declaring to the saints at Corinth: "To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law." No self-respecting dispensationalist would teach anything that even bordered on antinomianism, and only someone trying to do a hatchet job on a dead man would even infer it.

Is this a hatchet job? When Scofield publishes a book in 1910 that reprints "word for word" a sermon delivered in Dallas on October 15, 1892, Canfield is "amazed at the lack of development in 17 years." Yet if his views had changed in that time, Canfield would have charged him with inconsistencies, saying he was being "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." Seemingly, there is no pleasing him.

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to Scofield's son by his second marriage--and the only one to survive to manhood--Canfield says: "No record of military service by Noel Scofield has been located at the time of writing." Ignoring the fact that the lack of such a record is automatically assumed to be some kind of cowardliness or lack of patriotism, Canfield reads far more into the account than it deserves. After all, Scofield was in his 30th year when World War I commenced--apparently a married man and a father at the time. Yet we learned through private correspondence with Canfield that he was at the "perfect" fighting age of 22 when World War II erupted, but remained on the sidelines thoughout those days.

Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! In Canfield's case he was classified 4-F ("my eyes and severe allergy"). Why not give young Scofield (who was much "older" than Canfield in the contrasting cases, hence more susceptible to "infirmities") the benefit of the same possibility, especially when the latter knows absolutely nothing about why the former did not serve?

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to festivities in New York honoring Scofield, Canfield sums it up, "Viewed from this perspective, the whole affair seems a bit too fulsome with praise, and more than a bit tawdry." But what would he expect from a testimonial dinner? A vicious attack? A hatchet job? But his "bit tawdry" remark is tame compared with his comment about a memorial service in Dallas after Scofield's decease, lavishing praise on his Christian

life and work. Canfield used a vulgar expression, which we refuse to repeat, to describe what came "to mind" when he read it.

Is this a hatchet job? Canfield, looking always to discredit Scofield, jumps on a statement in his biography which related to his unconverted days. Trumbull had written: "He had, indeed, become very much dissatisfied with his own life; he was not living up to even his own ideals, unconverted man that he was." But isn't that true of any unconverted person at some time or other in his life? Does not Isaiah 57:20,21, clearly state: "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked"? Couldn't Canfield look back on his unconverted days and acknowledge that he had been "very much dissatisfied with his own life"? This writer certainly could!

Is this a hatchet job? Referring to the unsavory actions of the unconverted Scofield and his fellow Republican politicians in Kansas, Canfield imagines what might have happened and then, after presenting his version out of whole cloth, says, "There is nothing recorded which makes that scenario impossible." Since there is no proof that his imagined version isn't true, then we are to accept it, apparently. In other words, he wants the great argument of "silence" and "we don't know" to indict the unconverted Scofield in a situation based wholly on imagination. That is not a very impressive argument, to say the least.

Is this a hatchet job? While we will have more to say later about his charges of falsifying Scofield's life story, note this statement near the end of his work: "The most reasonable view of the result of the 'Paul and Timothy' collaboration at Crescent City in the late winter of 1919 is that the two men collaborated to produce a story, a story which blithely disregarded fact. It may have helped to promote The Scofield Reference Bible." This is a serious, serious accusation that not only vilifies Scofield, but Trumbull, as the author of the biography, as well. It is a horrendous judging of motives and a character assassination par excellence!

We have not enjoyed rehashing the evidences of Canfield's hatchet job, but it is necessary to understand the intent of the work in order to establish the true facts in the case. While Canfield speaks in his book of "gossipy-minded Fundamentalists," this manuscript is literally loaded with gossip almost from the beginning to the end.

For the final piece of evidence in this section, showing how clearly Canfield's work is a hatchet job on a dead man's character, note this early statement in the book: "Otto Scott told the writer that he was doubtful whether anyone who had been in politics in Kansas in that period could ever have become a genuine Bible teacher." **WE FIND THAT CHARGE ABSOLUTELY INCREDIBLE!** In light of it, could anyone deny that this is a hatchet job? Scott should be ashamed of himself for saying it and Canfield should be humiliated that he quoted it!

According to Scott and Canfield, out the window goes the power of regeneration and any real manifestation of God's grace. Could anyone read about Saul of Tarsus, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," who, after making "havoc of the church" at Jerusalem, obtained permission from the high priest to do the same at Damascus, then

question whether such a man "could ever become a genuine Bible teacher"? If so, he must throw out the 13 or 14 books of the New Testament which came from Paul's pen.

What about the old rumrunner and slave trader, John Newton? What about Mel Trotter, the drunkard who stole the shoes off his dead baby's body in order to get more booze? What about all the others down through the march of the centuries whose lives were transformed by the grace of God and became flamming evangels for Christ? Yes, Scott and Canfield should be ashamed of them-selves . . . and they owe Almighty God an apology!

In the light of this one item alone, we repeat, could anyone deny that Canfield's work is a hatchet job?

Charges of Lying

One gets the impression in reading this manuscript that everyone connected with the dispensational movement is a prevaricator of the first magnitude, and that Cyrus I. Scofield is the biggest deceiver and liar of them all.

We will start with the accusations made against Scofield's only published biographer, Charles G. Trumbull. When the latter speaks of Scofield's boyhood roots in Tennessee, Canfield says: "It could never have influenced him as Trumbull suggests." And on the same subject he quotes a military letter, then declares: ". . . it invalidates the claim made by Trumbull that the family as a whole had located in Wilson County, Tennessee."

Quite frankly, this is one of the things about Canfield's work which troubled us deeply. If he could not find documentation for something Trumbull or Scofield had said, then, ipso facto, it cannot be true! In trying to reconstruct Scofield's early life, even Canfield acknowledges that the documentation is very sketchy. Most of the latter's biographical data came from Congregational Churches in New York State. The Scofield's, apparently, became Episcopalians after leaving New York, but Canfield could find nothing in Episcopal Church records about the Scofields during the entire period between 1833 and the start of the Civil War!

He says Scofield's eldest sister was married in 1850 at Clinton, Michigan, although he gives no documentation. His next reference is for the mid-1850s when William Eames arrived and a courtship began, ending in marriage, with another Scofield girl. Three years later the Eames family moved to Lebanon, Tennessee, and Canfield says that in spite of "assertions in the Dispensational community to the contrary, the Eames, William and Laura were the only part of the Scofield family connection to establish a home in Tennessee."

He does not know that; it is merely an assumption on his part, a conclusion reached only by ignoring the plain biographical statement of Trumbull: "Part of the family moved to Tennessee while he was a young boy, and that Southern State was his home until he was seventeen."

Since Canfield feels free to make assumptions to fill in gaps, perhaps we should do the same and show that his guesses do not have to be true. For

example, it is not beyond the realm of reason to suppose that Scofield's father, after the death of his first wife and his remarriage, decided to "try his luck" in Tennessee, moving to somewhere in the Nashville area, lived there for several years, didn't find it to his liking, then moved back to Michigan. That would explain some of the silence in the Michigan records.

Canfield cannot understand how Scofield's eldest sister met her St. Louis husband in a "backwoods corner of Michigan." Perhaps he met her in Middle Tennessee, but she wanted to go back to the area where she was raised for the wedding. Brides do that sometimes, you know. She would have been in her mid-20s by then, certainly old enough and responsible enough to make such a decision.

That would also explain why the other Scofield daughter, who married Eames, would have wanted to move "back" to Tennessee a few years after her marriage. As far as we know, there is nothing in the documented records to forbid this speculation, but, at the same time, there is positive evidence to support it, namely, the biographical data.

Or, on the other hand, since Canfield acknowledges that another Scofield, Victorine, was living with the Eames family in Tennessee at the time of the 1860 census, why could not Cyrus have been living with them, too? There was only about two years difference between their ages and Canfield admits that Cyrus was not found in the 1860 Michigan census, either.

This would explain another one of Canfield's problems; that is, his inability to locate the Episcopalian rector (English, gratuitous of Rugby Oxford) whom Scofield said influenced him as a youth. Instead of looking in the Michigan church records, perhaps he should have been looking in the Tennessee records. (Trumbull lists "the family home" in those days as being "near Lebanon, Wilson County, Tennessee.") But since Canfield operated from a premise that everyone connected with Scofield was lying and seeking to produce a falsified record, he didn't even bother to check in Tennessee, apparently.

We did! What did we find? Well, with kind assistance from a worker in the historical division at the National Archives of the Episcopal Church, we were given a dozen possibilities. A couple of English born and Oxford bred (Rugby is the equivalent of our high school and that information is hard to come by) men were first suggested, but we felt the dates would be wrong from them. Others we discounted for other reasons. Three, however, were pastoring in Middle Tennessee at the right time--all born in England--and one even pastored in Lebanon, Wilson County, when Scofield would have been in his middle teens. Another of the three went into the Civil War as a chaplain--something that could have influenced the 17-year-old Scofield to do the same. We are not saying that any of these men was the one mentioned in the biography; we are just saying that Canfield was "shooting from the hip" without enough of the facts.

Much of the above is mere speculation--but so is what Canfield writes--although ours is backed up by the testimony of Scofield and Trumbull (whom Canfield credits with lying). His only offer of proof to discredit the "Tennessee connection" is a letter the teen-aged Scofield wrote to the Confederate Secretary of War, seeking to establish his "northern roots" by saying he was "visiting" in Tennessee when he volunteered with the 7th Regiment of the Tennessee Infantry. The unconverted Scofield may have been lying about

being a visitor, anxious to be freed from the battles which had not turned out to be the romantic glamour he had envisioned when he enlisted. (While Canfield wants the converted Scofield guilty of lying, we are certainly willing to concede this sin when he was unconverted! After all, he lied to get into the army, saying he was 21 instead of 17; perhaps he lied to get out as well.)

Or perhaps the family, after Scofield enlisted, found being Yankees in Tennessee during the war too uncomfortable and moved back to Michigan, which might have caused Scofield to think he could truthfully list himself as a resident of Michigan and a visitor in Tennessee. Be that as it may, the official biography of Scofield plainly states about the latter's boyhood days: "His family then was living in Tennessee." Period! And Canfield has no evidence to dispute it.

At the end of the book he is still "beating this dead horse," to use one of his own favorite phrases, saying, "The story by Scofield of being raised in the South was again accepted and promoted," because James M. Gray said of him at a testimonial dinner, "Some of you who know and love him wee will recall that smile and recognize that characteristic--part of his inheritance from the poetic and sunny South where hurry is not a virtue." But he did live most of his life in the "sunny South," even if the Tennessee years are discarded. Or doesn't Canfield consider Texas part of the South?

Canfield accuses Trumbull of falsifying the record when the latter said, "The Cross of Honor was awarded to him for bravery at Antietam," arguing that "Antietam was not a Confederate term." But it was a "Union" man who was telling the story, C. G. Trumbull, born in Connecticut and educated at Yale! In fact, Trumbull was not even born until after the Civil War had ended, and all of his life and ministry were either in the Northern United States or Canada. So we do not put any credence in Canfield's argument, ". . . if the statement had been correct it would have said: 'The Cross of Honor was awarded to him for bravery at Sharpsburg.'" After all, the war had been history for over a half-century when those words were written--and Union language would have been more acceptable than Confederate everywhere. Too, Trumbull was not writing as a historian, but as a biographer; there is a difference!

Because Trumbull writes that Scofield took a job "as a clerk in an office for the examination of land titles--a line closely related to the law" so that he could "get together money for his legal education," Canfield says, ". . . we hold that Scofield . . . never contemplated law school." But how could Canfield possibly know in the 1980s what Scofield contemplated in the 1860s? Note also that Canfield has made "legal education" to mean "law school," although the two were not necessarily synonymous in those days--especially when you remember that law school was not required for the legal profession at the time. His charge is not responsible journalism, to say the least.

Canfield describes Trumbull's claim "of a successful law practice" for Scofield as "very unlikely." We will answer this more in detail later in our review, but we mention it now in passing merely to show the accusation of falsehood for Trumbull.

With reference to Scofield's conversion, another matter we will look at more closely later, Canfield tells us, "Trumbull very carefully developed the

story," and adds, "The story of Scofield's drunkenness may have been part of the package of merchandising that elevated Scofield to such prominence in Fundamental circles." If you can't buy that version, Canfield offers "another value to the story. Just in case rumors of a past life, which did not meet Fundamentalist standards should surface, the 'drunkenness story' was ready. It was tailor-made to preserve Scofield's image as 'Mr. Clean' or more properly 'Mr. Cleaned-up' to his Dispensational following."

By the end of the book Canfield is claiming to have found "38 errors" in the Trumbull biography and says "the most ready explanation" for many of the discrepancies "would be deliberate fabrication." That is a very, very serious charge and reflects deeply upon the character of the noble, good man [now dead] who edited The Sunday School Times for so long. In other places Canfield uses such terms as "highly questionable" and "the list of Scofield improbabilities" about Trumbull's statements.

Canfield also questions the veracity of the "saintly" (as many of his peers described him) James M. Gray (author of this reviewer's favorite gospel song, "Only A Sinner, Saved by GRace"), late president of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. He mentions a number of things that he imagines are discrepancies in Gray's statements, but especially troubling to us was Canfield's comment about Gray's reference to Scofield's work in Moody's hometown of Northfield, Massachusetts. Gray had said: "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."

While here is nothing even remotely misleading in this statement, because some have erroneously though Scofield headed up those schools along with his other duties in Northfield, Canfield implies that Gray was trying to implant or endorse this false impression. In act, Canfield says, "This may have been the time when the story that Scofield had official connection with the Preparatory Schools got started. If so, Gray was an expert in semantics."

What blatant, evil judging is that statement! Obviously, Gray was merely referring to the fact that these students sat under Scofield's ministry every Sunday at the church, not that Scofield had an "official connection" with the schools. When the church's ecclesiastical council accepted Scofield's resignation, it spoke of his ministry "to the dwellers here, **to the members of the favored schools here**, and to the strangers visiting the town" (emphasis added). Apparently Canfield is the only one who doubts Scofield's close ties with the students, but this is typical of how he attempts to find a boogeyman lurking behind every tree in the accounts of Scofield's life and ministry.

Canfield implies another falsification in the matter of "a medal of membership and a diploma" Scofield received late in life, announcing that he had been elected to the Societe Academique d'Histoyrie Internationale, an arm at the time of the L'Institut de France. The story, after first appearing in a newspaper at Scofield's winter residence in Florida, was reproduced in the Dallas Morning News (which Canfield emphasizes was "owned by a member" of Scofield's church in that city), but Canfield's church in that city), but Canfield complains that after mention of the honor in Trumbull's book, no other information is available. And he laments that "the present whereabouts of the medal is unknown." Once again, why he makes such a big deal out of the fact

that no one knows the whereabouts of a medal over 65 years later is beyond us. But the Canfield hatchet is sharp, indeed.

Obviously, in order to fit his major thesis, the main accusations of falsehood must be leveled against Scofield himself. For example, when Scofield sent the information requested by the publishers of Who's Who in America in 1912, Canfield jumps on his statement: "pvtly fitted for coll., but univ studies interrupted by breaking out of Civil War." Canfield observes: "For this there is no confirmation." The inference is clear.

Referring again to his days in Tennessee, Canfield says, "Despite his later claims of roots in and loyalty for Tennessee, he had no real ties left there." In other words, he lied about it!

Because Scofield introduced Tennessee Governor Robert Taylor in "eloquent terms" when the latter spoke at the Texas State Fair, Canfield says, "Possibly Scofield was more eloquent than truthful." But Scofield was not presenting Taylor as a Congregational preacher or a Baptist deacon, he was introducing him as the governor of a great State and there would have been many things he could have truthfully said about him "in eloquent terms" in such a situation. How wicked to suggest that Scofield lied because of some unknown reporter's claim that he was eloquent!

Canfield hints that Scofield was lying about his research at the Oxford Libraries in England, prior to the release of the Scofield Reference Bible, and he says about "The Debt to Scholarship" chapter in Trumbull's book, "If our suspicion is correct, then much of [it] is propaganda designed to promote a work to a place far beyond its merits, intrinsic or otherwise." But why go on "suspicion"? Why insinuate it is false propaganda inspired by sinister designs? Why not let the Scofield Reference Bible stand on its own merit?

Along this line, Canfield smells falsehood in Scofield's speaking engagements while overseas doing research. He argues, ". . . it is stated that Scofield lectured in a number of spots in the British Isles and to English speaking audiences in Rome, Paris and Berlin. Now one cannot research and still travel around to lecture."

Evidently Canfield knows more about using a hatchet than he does about speaking engagements (he is a layman). As one whose ministries have taken him into every State of the Union and many foreign countries, I see no problem whatsoever with this published information about Scofield. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that is he had been in a town for research, on Sunday he would have been invited to speak somewhere. And because such a speaker would only need to take a sermon outline from his suitcase (if you will permit oversimplification), we do not consider it any big deal; it would not have interrupted or interfered with his Monday through Saturday research in the slightest. Canfield is trying to make a mountain out of a molehill with such an inane accusation.

He knows more about using a hatchet than writing books, too, since he refers to Scofield's purchase of "a supply of large-page, wide-margin notebooks" for use in pasting up the text of the Bible, then says: "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." But there is no inconsistency here whatsoever. To offer one illustration from our own experience, we wrote the huge biography of Dr. John R. Rice, MAN SENT FROM GOD, in a matter of few weeks--after first spending about two years in research and "getting ready." But the latter is a time-consuming job that must be done before any actual writing takes place, as any experienced author should know. Not only so, but "soliciting funds" for a project of that magnitude must start well in advance of production, as any knowledgeable person is well aware.

On one occasion, when Scofield was returning from overseas with the fruits of his research in boxes of notebooks, he "felt strangely impressed" to check on that precious cargo. The boxes were nowhere to be found! Trumbull told the story: "Now Dr. Scofield and his wife prayed earnestly together. And then it 'occurred' to him that it might be worthwhile to search among the luggage of the emigrants in that boat. The search was now made, in the steerage, and there the boxes were found, safe and sound."

Instead of an act of providence, a wonderful answer to prayer, Canfield sees this as an item of prevarication. He writes: "Here again, we must be the stinker. [An excellent word choice!--RLS] The conflict between the relation by Gaebelein and that given to Trumbull, leads us to have the temerity to suggest that the story of the missing boxes could have originated during the interviewing of Scofield by Trumbull."

The "conflict" between Scofield and Gaebelein, to which Canfield referred, related to confusion about the exact dates the former was in Europe and had nothing to do with the missing boxes. In fact, Canfield had just mentioned the fact that when Trumbull said Scofield had sailed from Boulogne, France, he "was skeptical to the point of unbelief" since he didn't think Boulogne was a port of departure for transatlantic steamship service. When Canfield investigated, however, he discovered that at the very time in question at least two steamship lines were experimenting with boarding passengers from the port. He sounded disappointed that he had not found an untruth, but he satisfied himself by noting something sinister in it all, reverting to those mysterious people he thinks were in the background: "The detail indicates that Scofield was in the hands of people with expert knowledge of travel routes."

Because of apostasy in his Congregational denomination, Scofield severed his connection in 1910 and united with "the Southern Presbyterian Church." Although this separation from ecclesiastical error was well in advance of most Fundamentalists from their apostate denominations, Canfield tells us that "possibly" some questioned why Scofield delayed so long, therefore, "In an attempt to justify the timing of his move, he said that while he was working on the Reference Bible, he had been out of touch with developments in the Congregational denomination. He told Trumbull: 'And so it happened that, at last, I lifted my face from my work and found that the denomination in whose fellowship I have found great and true men of God, had resolutely moved to positions I could not follow.'"

What does Canfield say about this? He writes, "Quite frankly, this writer considers the statement to be so much malarkey"! And he notes that Ernest E. Gordon's The Leaven of the Sadducees had documented the trend and its early nature. But Gordon's work was published in 1926, a full 16 years after Scofield came out of his liberal denomination and a half-decade after

Scofield's death. We find it strange that a man who purports to love God and His Word (something we are not denying) would describe as "so much malarkey" another man's obedience to the scriptural injunction for separation, whether on time or tardy.

Another incident in Canfield's questioning of Scofield's honesty relates to an address the latter made at Dallas in 1904 to the Confederate Veterans. His only evidence was Scofield's incomplete sermon notes, but on the second page he found a notation about the many converted in the Civil War. Sensing something sinister, Canfield acknowledges the correctness of the notes, but offers the opinion that "Scofield's reference to the Confederate Revival could have been picked up second hand, rather than by being observed even as a scoffer." And he suggests William W. Bennett's The Great Revival in the Confederate Armies as a book that "could have been the source of Scofield's comment on the revival." Then he adds, "It would have been required reading for any cleric who wanted to keep up a 'Confederate image'." While we see nothing wrong with any preacher using sources in his research, what Canfield intimates is a suggestion of gross hypocrisy.

Then there is the "Titanic" matter that Canfield does his best to sink. In the 1914 prophetic conference, where Scofield spoke several times, he told a story about the Titanic which Canfield, in his infinite wisdom, describes as "substantially false." In fact, he says, "The implications of falsehood just a couple of heartbeats before propounding a major religious theory are frightening." After giving the illustration as Scofield told it, he relates how he checked on the story and found it "to be quite at variance with published reports at the time."

Summed up, Scofield was in Belfast, where the Titanic was built, the Sunday after the luxury liner sank on its maiden voyage. Scofield says he was invited to address a great memorial meeting, referred to the response of the entire city to the sinking, and described some of the things he emphasized in his message. In his rebuttal, Canfield quoted a newspaper account of the service which he felt discredited Scofield's version. Actually, there was very little contradiction between the two and most of it could be explained by the type of source Canfield quoted. Scofield said the meeting was held in Wellington Hall; the Northern Whig said it was "in the Y.M.C.A. Hall (Wellington Place)." Scofield said the great hall was "packed"; the newspaper said the service was "very largely attended." Scofield said he spoke; the newspaper said "the chief speaker" was "Rev. Dr. C. I. Schofield [sic], well-known American clergyman."

Canfield insists there was "no general meeting as Scofield implied," but it seems logical to us that if the meeting were in Wellington Place (the Y.M.C.A. hall), it would have been a "general meeting." In fact, it featured several different ministers who represented several different denominations, which certainly sounds like a "general meeting" to us. Canfield argues that "the meeting addressed by Scofield was but one of many held that day." Scofield does not say otherwise. So, what's the fuss?

Although he does not give an exact quote from the newspaper in this regard, Canfield says: "The newspaper also reported that in contrast to Scofield's claim, the city was very calm and sobered and filled with awe by the tragic event." But Scofield's description is not "in contrast"; the only thing

he said was, "All Belfast was smitten with sorrow. I have never seen a whole city in such grief." Only a hatchet man would try to find a discrepancy between those two accounts and it certainly shows how desperate Canfield was in his attempt to find lies in the Scofield story.

Perhaps Canfield's strongest argument, however, is that Scofield, on another occasion, said his subject for the hour was "The Unsinkable Ship," using as his text the boat in which our Lord sailed across the Sea of Galilee. Canfield tells us that the newspaper article, in a section which he does not quote, said Scofield's message was "apparently based on the the theme 'God Is Love.'" But why expect a newspaper man, who cannot even spell Scofield's name correctly, to adequately describe Scofield's theme, especially when he acknowledges he is only guessing, as implied by the use of the word "apparently"? Surely he did emphasize the love of God and how "God in His mercy had brought a life boat alongside that could hold us all" (Scofield's own report of what he said). We think Canfield is way out of line in claiming that Scofield "embroider[ed] the simple story of a speaking engagement in a distant city."

Canfield had his own idea about why Scofield supposedly falsified this incident. It seems that another Bible teacher, who held a different view in one area of prophecy from Scofield, was on the S.S. Carpathia with his daughter, Margaret, when the survivors were rescued and he had a delightfully fascinating first-person account of what happened, including many the two won to Christ among the survivors. Canfield thinks Scofield's Titanic story was of the "can you top this?" variety and "could have been inserted as a reaction to Philip Mauro. The possibility is intriguing." And so is Canfield's imagination!

Canfield "discovers" another discrepancy because Scofield, in a letter to daughter Abbie, assured her that the sermon "The Unsinkable Ship" would be in his new book, Many Pulpits, and he would send her a copy. Canfield is delighted to assure us that the volume has no sermon with such a title, nor is any message in it comparable to the subject matter described.

But is a dead man responsible for a book's final form? (Scofield had gone to be with the Lord before the book was published!) Such editorial decisions by publishers are not at all uncommon, we suppose. When the Zondervan Publishing House brought out my book of sermons, Hell Is No Joke! (1959), it decided to omit, apparently because of the size it wanted the volume to be, the message The Worst Thing that Can Happen to You and release it separately under that title. Fortunately I have lived to offer an explanation, but if I had written someone that my "Worst Thing" sermon would appear in Hell Is No Joke! and later researchers could not find it, would I be accused by someone like Canfield of lying? But Canfield appears to delight in producing mountains from molehills, seemingly obsessed with the idea of making Scofield out to be a liar, or die trying.

Not only does he blame Scofield for the contents of a book published posthumously, but he makes him shoulder the responsibility for every "myth" ever circulated about him. After enumerating what he things are contradictions in Scofield's entry in Who's Who in America (1912), he then lists items not found therein which he says "circulated in areas where he ministered or among his followers." But is the poor gentleman responsible for every wild story

told about him? Is Davy Crockett responsible for the tale that he killed a bear when he was only three? Am I responsible for the widely-circulated myth that I am Dr. John R. Rice's son-in-law? I have done everything I know to do to discredit the story--even mentioning it in a biography of Dr. Rice written over 30 years ago--but the story still persists and I often face it even today in areas where I go to minister.

If, as Canfield insists, misrepresenting the truth is lying (and we certainly concur that it is), then obviously Canfield does more than a little lying on his own. Many places in the book he first theorizes something as possible being true, but before the end he is referring to it as fact.

Judging Motives!

In addition to his accusations of lying, Canfield is guilty repeatedly of judging motives. Let's note some examples. Does Trumbull, in the biography, refer to a dinner meeting in Washington where Senator Roscoe Conkling was present? Then Canfield tells us, "In the interest of 'image-building', the Conkling story was slipped into the narrative after the blue pencil had been used."

Does the president of a railroad permit the newly-converted Scofield to preach at a camp of railroad workers? Then the president's concern for the workers is only "alleged compassion."

Does a daughter want help from her father in purchasing a dwelling? (Apparently he already had $700 set aside for this project in 1918, and he wrote her a note saying, "I have at least one & I think two pen-jobs which will be good for $500 each. One would raise us to $1200 & two to $1700. Would the latter amount suffice? It would here for a living room, 2 bedrooms, bath, kitchen & small maid's room.") Canfield jumps on this with the remark, "The wording of the letter gives a very strong impression that cash, not edification of the saints motivated his writing." How silly! It was nothing more than an intelligent man planning a budget with money he expected to earn shortly.

Another illustration of Canfield judging motives is seen when he says that the Brethren movement in England "was a class movement." He explained, "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'." We consider that blasphemy, in addition to a total judging of motives.

When a newspaper reporter revealed that Scofield was reissuing notes for debts incurred during his unconverted days--even though the statute of limitations had expired on them and he was not legally obligated--readers are told by Canfield that Scofield did this "even though he could not have had any intentions of repayment." Canfield must have some exceedingly strong psychic powers if he can tell, more than three-quarters of a century later, what was in the heart and mind of Scofield back in the 1800s.

Concerning those alleged debts (which may or may not have been repaid, by the way; there is no authoritative record either way), Canfield says later,

"It has been noted that the repentence [sic] of Cyrus Scofield never included restitution to Simpson, McLean, Vollmar and probably not the Kansas Republicans." The reader will note that Canfield has gone from assuming that the debts were never made right to a position of flatly asserting it!

Even more, when Scofield refers, a few years before his own death, to the last words of David, "the sweet Psalmist of Israel; his life stained with many sins, yet a man who loved God supremely," Canfield asks, "Is it possible that he thus wrote because he even then could not claim the release of the 51st Psalm as his own experience?" What a low-level illustration of judging another's heart!

Does Scofield refer to his association with Dwight Lyman Moody? Then the judging Canfield writes: "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," and he refers to a secular newspaper article to support his judgment. Yet such a statement simply oozes with hatred for either the man or his message (or both); we are not sure which.

Canfield questions the honesty of Scofield in his doctrinal statement at the time of his ordination. He says it "might pass if one accepted to the full the failing church syndrome--and if the statement were really sincerely offered" (emphasis added).

Does Scofield's ministry take him hither and yon, across the country and around the world? Then the judging Canfield suggests, after referring to an incident Gaebelein noted: "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." We are almost embarrassed to repeat such sinful judging of motives, even for the purpose of this review.

Speaking of Gaebelein, when the later published Scofield's book, Addresses on Prophecy, why did he do it? Canfield says: "Whether Gaebelein was trying to capitalize on Scofield, the Bible commentator, or whether Gaebelein was hoping to push the Bible by issuing Scofield's lectures in book form we cannot tell." What a judging of motives--and, if he "cannot tell," why put it into his manuscript? Why not assume that it was published for a reason even Canfield acknowledges as true, namely, ". . . the book is so very, very representative of the thinking and theology of the school which Scofield made legitimate." Why look for some hidden, sinister motive and judge Gaebelien's intent?

Perhaps the most shocking of all of Canfield's judging of Scofield's motives is his suggestion that the latter wrote personal letters "intended more for publication or to impress future readers than for actual transmission of current information," or "for use in an ad." Such statements really, really take the cake! (Especially when one realizes that "handwritten letters" were involved which, unless kept by the receiver--as in the cases Canfield quotes--there would be no record.)

In fact, we close this section with a notation that Canfield interpreted Scofield's every move as something to enhance a career, not a

following of what he believed was the will of God for his life. For example, he ended one chapter by insinuating, "The young 20th century opened new vistas. With that new century, Scofield was prepared to move on to a new and great role."

Perhaps Canfield does not consider any of the above judging; after all, people sometimes manifest strange reasoning when it comes to facing their own sins. When we were preparing this review, we noted an "Emma June" comic strip where Emma was telling her boyfriend, "I am not judgmental . . . ," adding in the next panel: "You bubble-headed, misguided, witless, unperceptive, obtuse, fatuous, inept, preposterous, unenlightened, mullet-brained miscreant!"

Wild Speculation

If the reader of Canfield's work does not notice anything else, he will be overwhelmed with the amount of its speculation. Again and again, he will read phrases like "it may have," "the most reasonable view," "highly questionable," "maybe," "apparently," "may indicate," "could have been," "no doubt," "if we assume," "could have meant," "highly improbable," "persistent rumors," "if our suspicion is correct," "the possibility must not be overlooked," "it seems unlikely," "improbabilities," "the jury may have felt," "it is unreasonable to assume," "it appears most unlikely," or, "we again can find behind the words, suggestions."

Does he question Scofield's apprenticeship in the office of a reputable law firm? Then he must note that it is "a point not confirmed by available records." (Nor disproved, either, we hasten to add!)

Does Canfield locate an opposition newspaper article hinting that blackmail may have been given to Ingalls and Scofield by the railroads and the settlers in Kansas? Then Canfield speculates, "If that report could be substantiated, Scofield would be utterly devoid of moral principle . . . ." Ignoring the fact that he speaks of the unconverted Scofield, we remind our readers that it <u>never was</u> substantiated and it is yellow journalism for Canfield to repeat it today.

Is Scofield invited to join an exclusive club in New York City? Then, to Canfield, it "strengthens the suspicion which has cropped up before, that someone was directing the career of C. I. Scofield." And if the reader has not been shocked by that statement, Canfield adds: "Such direction probably was motivated by concerns remote from fidelity to the Person, Work and Truth of Jesus Christ."

Regarding that club, Canfield feels membership therein by Scofield was inconsistent with his position on separation. The Lotus Club was mainly for "journalists, artists, and members of the musical and dramatic profession, and representatives, amateurs, and friends of LIterature." In fact, club regulations demanded that a minimum of one-third of its members be composed of such classes. In Scofield's case, we think joining was more of a convenience for a place to stay when in New York City than anything else. His "compromise," is such it was, could be likened to someone joining the YMCA in order to have a place to swim, play handball or otherwise exercise.

In our own case, we were invited to join the International Platform Association, a non-profit organization growing out of the American Platform, which Daniel Webster founded. Fourteen United States Presidents have been members over the years, as have some of the most influential in the Senate and House of Representatives, various State governors, foreign ambassadors, cabinet officers--along with many of the greatest literary names in the world. Membership is by invitation only, on the part of the Board of Governors and the Membership Committee, and we suppose it was a high honor to have been nominated. While we refused the invitation, would we have been compromising the Faith to have accepted? Canfield, in our judgment, is making his usual mountain from a molehill.

Referring to the two daughters by his first wife, Canfield speaks of "apparent failure" on Scofield's part "to witness to his own." But how would Canfield know that this alleged failure was fact? Was it because he discovered no letter during his research in which Scofield outlined the "4 spiritual laws," or took his daughters on a trip down "the Romans Road"? We find such speculation as repulsive as it is unfair.

Concerning the troubles Scofield found himself facing at the time of his conversion in St. Louis, Canfield speculates: "The timing of the dismissal of the case, the conclusion of the other cases of record, suggest that Scofield was the beneficiary of what today is referred to as 'clout'." And that this clout "to clear him for his role in Christian work," Canfield suggests, may have come from D. L. Moody or the leaders in the latter's St. Louis crusade.

What happens when Canfield cannot find details about J. N. Darby's visits to St. Louis? He imagines something sinister and concludes, "Darby carefully avoids being specific about his contacts in that city." We wonder what he thought Darby was trying to hide? Or what "specifics" he feels Darby should have given? The whole matter seems quite inane to us.

Canfield's suspicious mind finds something ominous in the ocean crossings of Scofield. Because he cannot document the early ones, he notes that Scofield indicated he was quite familiar with London before 1903, "Yet no mention has been made by either Trumbull or BeVier of any European trips in the 19th century. Both are quite specific in referring to the first European trip of the Scofields as 'Mrs. Scofield's first trip.'" Then it evidently was not <u>his</u> first trip, was it?

Is Scofield sick on several occasions? Then Canfield must describe them as "unaccountable illnesses."

Does a friend of Scofield quote Revelation 22:12 on his letterhead, **"Behold, I Come Quickly"**? Then Canfield considers it "entirely probable that [he], like most other Dispensationalists thought or talked as though 'Quickly' in that verse means 'soon'." While we readily acknowledge that many premillennialists (including Spurgeon, one of the few premillennialists of whom Canfield speaks kindly) have made this mistake, to assume that a man is in error for quoting a Scripture on his letterhead is a most unreasonable and remarkable conclusion. In our own case, we seldom quote that verse without explaining that <u>quickly</u> simply means "suddenly."

Does the biographer of Scofield acknowledge that the latter had a drinking problem in his unconverted days? Then the judgmental Canfield jumps on the confession to say, "The story of Scofield's drunkenness may have been part of the package of merchandising that elevated Scofield to such prominence in Fundamental circles. After 1879, Scofield's associations were almost entirely in groups where beverage alcohol was taboo and where a man was considered a hopeless drunk after the second drink [sic]. In such a setting the value of a victory over 'demon rum' would be tremendous." Isn't that incredible?

Because he cannot tolerate the thought of Scofield having any intelligence or scholarship of his own, he must speculate repeatedly about where Scofield obtained his ideas. He laments, "Unfortunately we have no details as to the volumes which made up his library. Nor have we seen references to the disposition of the volumes in which he drew his ideas." He speculates that Scofield got his information from Darby, Mackintosh, Kelly and some others, then adds the gossip, "It has been suggested that Malachi Taylor of New York City had some influence." There is not the slightest acknowledgement on Canfield's part that Scofield might have gotten anything from his own personal Bible study!

As for the dispensational aspect, he emphasizes "the possibility of an unacknowledged debt to [J. R.] Graves must be considered." At any rate, Canfield concludes--in his usual speculative, judgmental style: "With Scofield's lack of formal training and a need to learn fast, no reasonable source of help would have been overlooked. Mention of some sources could have been intentionally forgotten" (emphasis added).

In fact, Canfield makes a big deal out of what he imagines to be Scofield's own inability to prepare the kind of notes found in the Scofield Reference Bible. For one thing, he cannot imagine why it took seven years to prepare that monumental work, although, as usual, he finds a sinister answer to his own question. He comments, "For instance, why, except for Scofield's interest in Biblical numerics, did the project take seven years?" Since, he assures us, Scofield's "ideas had been formulated (or handed to him) at an early point in his ministry," he thinks he should have been able to put them down quickly. Yet earlier in the manuscript Canfield was questioning how Scofield accomplished the matter in so little time, arguing that he could not have done so much in such a short time with all the preaching activities and travel abroad. Canfield is really a hard man to please!

He manifests the same indecision about whether to consider the Scofield Reference Bible as completely the work of Scofield alone, or to presume that it was a joint project. On the one hand, he is not willing to admit that Scofield was scholar enough to have handled the project alone; on the other hand, he does not seem to want "scholars" identified with the dispensational position set forth therein, which Canfield so totally abhors. In other words, he would really like to have his cake and eat it too, but that is not possible.

Canfield also questions aloud about who financed Scofield. He finds a closeness between dispensationalism "and what groups and interests like the Carnegie Peace Foundation, the Elites, have wanted for the rest of mankind," hinting that Scofield may have been backed by them. Shades of Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny! Anyone who thinks the CPF, the "Elites," etc., would be

interested in promoting Fundamentalism in any form must have an elevator that doesn't go all the way to the top, to use a descriptive phrase of our day. Yet in another place Canfield describes Scofield as a toy of the rich and, because he dedicated on of his books to a wealthy man, calls it "an indication that Scofield for years had been a plaything of men of considerable wealth who could finance special activities or hobbies."

When Trumbull says that Scofield was a "man who gave his lifetime study to the making of the notes and comments in the Scofield Reference Bible," Canfield jumps on it as "very very incorrect," responding, "He did NOT give a life of study to the notes" (emphasis Canfield's). That disclaimer impressed this reviewer since I wrote advertising for the late John R. Rice's Reference Bible and said the same about it. Did I mean that all of his life Rice had been accumulating materials, intending to publish them in a Reference Bible? Absolutely not! Surely no intelligent person would understand it that way. I simply meant, and readers so understood, that the materials in the work were the result of a lifetime of study. We think it is only fair to assume that Trumbull was merely making the same point.

But it is on this very issue that Canfield made a very strong and totally unsupported charge. He declared: "We know some who say he did NOTHING toward the notes" (again the emphasis is Canfield's). Since this is a very serious and vicious charge, we challenge Mr. Canfield to "put up or shut up!" Who said it? When? Where? And note that Canfield put his accusation in the plural ("some"), insisting that he personally knows more than one individual making such a claim. Who are they? What evidence do they have? Is it any wonder that, in light of such smear tactics, we refer to Canfield's book as "a hatchet job"?

As a result of all these accusations of lying, this judging of motives, these wild speculations--and we have only given samplings in our review--the Scripture is forcibly brought to mind that warns: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things" (Romans 2:1).

Nit-Picking

Several things that Canfield complains about can only be described as nit-picking, making mountains out of molehills. By way of example, Canfield is troubled that Scofield accepted so many outside speaking engagements while pastoring the church in Dallas. We are not sure why it bothers him so much since it apparently did not bother the local church in the slightest. In fact, in the first 12 years Scofield led the congregation, the membership grew from 12 to 550! Not at all bad for those times! And at the end of 14 years, Scofield's report to the church showed 812 members received, three-fourths of them "upon confession of their faith in Jesus Christ." (At the Northfield church, there were 308 additions in seven years--112 by letter and all the rest, nearly 200, on confession of faith.)

On one occasion, when Dr. James M. Gray was relating a Northfield incident, Canfield actually asked his readers to note that when Gray told the story, he "did not identify the one who answered the door at the Manse." What

difference did who answered the door make to the point of the anecdote? None whatsoever; it was merely another suggestion of something sinister on Canfield's part.

Canfield even criticizes the dead Scofield's last will and testament. He complains, "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. Pierpont Morgan, Sr., opened his Will with a statement of his faith in redemption by Jesus Christ."

If Canfield is around to examine this reviewer's will, he will find the same omission. While we think such sentiments are nice, perhaps, if the life has been what it ought to have been, it will speak much louder than the reading of a pious paper in a lawyer's office. In the case of J. Pierpont Morgan, it may have been necessary.

In one place Canfield makes an issue over the fact that Scofield's biographer did not mention his stepmother. Since she remembered him and another of the children in her will, he calls the omission "a bit of ingratitude." On another occasion, he criticizes the fact that Scofield's sister Laura and her husband "were never mentioned by Scofield in relating the story of his life." But since the latter was "a prominent dentist in St. Louis and taught for many years at the Missouri Dental College," if Scofield were merely looking for prestige, as Canfield repeatedly alleges, tidbits like that could have been dropped with considerable profit.

Does Scofield refer to "the very substance" of Finney's preaching as "stiff-doctrine," then add, "So in our day we find Spurgeon and Moody, preachers of the dear old doctrines"? Then Canfield must argue, "His assertion that Spurgeon and Finney preached the same message is incorrect. The views of the two men were so far apart that reconciliation is impossible. The statement is another suggestions that Scofield's knowledge was superficial and his expressed views suited to occasion and congregation."

Quite the contrary, the superficiality is all in Canfield's reading and he missed the point completely. Scofield did not say that Spurgeon and Finney (he said "Spurgeon and Moody," anyway) "preached the same message," but only that, like Finney, Spurgeon and Moody were <u>doctrinal</u> preachers, which was the point he was emphasizing.

When Scofield finally bought a home in Dallas, Canfield describes it: "While real estate matters were occupying a large place on Scofield's mind and taking up some of his time . . . ." In addition to nit-picking, what a prime example this is of judging what was "occupying a large place on Scofield's mind" at the time. How would Canfield know?

Another prime example of nit-picking is Canfield's criticism of the prophetic conferences where Scofield and others participated. The sponsors had previously chosen a site at Niagara Falls where they would not be bothered by tourists and honeymooners, so Canfield commented about the next one: "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.)"

How silly! The Lord whom the common people heard gladly also said, "Come apart . . . and rest a while" (Mark 6:31). Why try to make the one run counter to the other when there is no contradiction present? Both are vital and essential in the Christian experience, the mixing for witnessing and the separating for rest and relaxation. As the late Vance Havner was fond of noting, Christians either "come apart or they come apart."

Canfield makes a big deal over a "Paul and Timothy" photograph which appears in the Trumbull biography, portraying Scofield and Trumbull sitting and talking at a Bible conference in Florida. Canfield objects that "it has created an implied association with Trumbull's visit to Scofield in 1919," but he does not think Scofield looks feeble enough in the picture for it to have been taken then!

We just paused to take another look at the picture. In the first place, there is not the slightest "Implication" that it was taken in 1919; it is found in a section called "As His Friends Know Him." As for feebleness, even if taken in 1919, he looks like any 76-year-old man to us--as we remember our grandfather at that age, for example--although his head is turned to look at Trumbull, making it a side view shot and difficult for anyone to determine. We called our associate, Doug Kutilek, into our office and handed him the picture, asking, "How old would you judge the man on the right to be?" He studied it for a few moments, then responded, "A man in his seventies, at least." That Canfield would make such an issue regarding an innocent photograph seems very foolish to us, but, as we noted earlier, we do not have a hatchet-job mentality.

In another incident (the Senator Conkling matter referred to previously), Canfield raises the objection that Trumbull listed is as a "Confederate Reminiscence" in the biography. It had to do with Conkling explaining his tardiness for a formal occasion by saying, "The senior Senator from Massachusetts (Sumner) had just been making his annual attempt to enact a law to abolish the distinction made by God Almighty between black and white." Canfield responds by noting that Scofield probably did attend a dinner in Washington where Conkling spoke, "But it did not take place during a period that would make it proper to be called a 'Confederate Reminiscence'." That is nit-picking and we think the subject matter of the joke entitled it to be considered as exactly such a reminiscence, no matter when it took place.

Canfield went on to make an issue about how Conkling did not become Senator until after the War, but we do not think that this has anything to do with how he was addressed in the anecdote. It is a very common practice to give a man his highest title, even though the incident being described may have been before he received it. To us, that is nit-picking.

Because Scofield spoke of the prophetic portions of the Bible as rising to the greatest heights of ethical demand, then adding, "The Sermon on the Mount is but the ethical teaching of the prophets lifted to its highest potency," Canfield says "he was following the Dispensational practice of downgrading the Sermon on the Mount in the eyes of the Church." That is

"downgrading"? And Canfield goes on to add that he sees "a suggestion in Scofield's eyes, that only Israel can really be acceptable to The Holy One."

Perhaps we should also list under nit-picking the fact that Canfield constantly refers to Scofield's lack of formal education. For example, in one place he calls him the "untrained cleric from the hinterlands of the American continent." Yet some of the greatest men of all time were self-taught scholars. We think of Spurgeon, Moody, Morgan, Ironside and, for one on the secular level, Abraham Lincoln. On the other hand, many men with Ph.D.s could be classified as "educated fools," individuals whose minds brim with accumulated knowledge but who seem totally devoid of wisdom.

In fact, since Canfield made such an issue of Scofield's lack of formal Bible training, we wrote and inquired about his own. Canfield had one year (1936-37) at "the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia" (which later merged with the Philadelphia School of the Bible and is now known as the Philadelphia College of the Bible). Offhand, we would consider Scofield, who spent his life in the ministry, to be as well qualified to speak on biblical issues as Canfield, who spent most of his life in the fields of industrial traffic management and railroad freight rates (now retired). From what he wrote us, we think he may have read widely on biblical themes, but so had Scofield. And it is significant to note that there is almost no attempt at Bible teaching in Canfield's manuscript; it is merely a hatchet job on a dead man's character, plain and simple.

While he calls it "blasphemy," it seems more like nit-picking to us when Canfield criticizes an 1895 Scofield conference sermon, "Barabbas' Theory of the Atonement." He complains: "The idea was that Barabbas, saved by a substitute, was like the Believer, saved by the substitutionary work of Christ. The flaw in the message is that it overlooks the gross depravity affecting those involved in the Crucifixion drama on the official side. To assume the redemption of Barabbas is worse than romantic, it is dangerously close to blasphemy."

In the first place, those knowledgeable about typology understand that there is no perfect type--nor is a type intended to be so. Does the fact that Jonah was fleeing from the will of God when he ended up in the belly of the great fish make it any less of a type of Christ? Does that reflect in any way on how Christ ended up in the heart of the earth? Does it imply that the Son was rebelling against the Father's will, leading to His crucifixion and burial? Of course not!

In the second place, Canfield has apparently misrepresented what Scofield said. The same sermon (he quotes it from a "tract") is found (or one very similar to it, since it uses the same expressions) in the book, In Many Pulpits With Dr. C. I. Scofield. Nowhere does Scofield even come close to implying that Barabbas was saved "like the Believer." In fact, he closes the sermon with the words: "Whether Barabbas became the disciple of Jesus who died in his place we do not know. What is more important for us, is to decide, each for himself, that we shall be His disciples" (emphasis in original).

Scofield merely used Barabbas' physical salvation to illustrate a believer's spiritual one. We see no blasphemy in that; quite the contrary, it

is a good object lesson and we have heard and read a number of other noble preachers making the same applications.

As a final reference in this section, although perhaps it would fit better with the hatchet job data, note the remark Canfield made when describing Scofield's early, unsavory, unconverted days. He suggests: "His sudden disappearance from the scene at the beginning of 1874 must have left Editors wondering. Some may have known stories that discretion made it inadvisable to print." Canfield, after digging up every unsavory morsel he can find that might impugn Scofield's character, suggests it might be a lot worse if all the facts were in . One thing seems for sure: if the editors had every set type to those imagined stories, Canfield would have included them in his work.

Doctrinal Matters

There is very little of doctrinal substance in this work, probably for the simple reason that it doesn't fit its intent. And what is that? Apparently, to discredit Scofield the man and, by so doing, discredit dispensationalism. In fact, when summing up his work, Canfield admits as much, frankly saying, "Hopefully our analysis will encourage some to remove the halo which [Scofield] now wears," and he says he does so "in order to highlight the inadequacy of Scofield's teaching." This, of course, is an old tactic, one that has been used by enemies of differing theological positions repeatedly down through the centuries: if you cannot answer the doctrine, vilify the ones who effectuate it.

Incidentally, Canfield is an ex-dispensationalist and ex-premillennialist himself, one who changed horses in the middle of the stream (yet he accuses Scofield of being "tossed to and fro" by winds of doctrine), so he should know whereof he speaks when he talks about dispensationalism. Yet he repeatedly gives a false picture of its views on prophecy, often making totally erroneous statements.

On one occasion, for example, he quoted a Scofield letter to an associate calling for the establishing of new churches and reaching out in a vigorous missionary program. Canfield called "such a vision . . . completely contrary to the failing church view which Scofield was proclaiming in his Correspondence course and which is a hallmark of his teaching," adding that it was "a complete contrast to the Dispensational views." But this complete contrast is only in Canfield's mind and the two views are in total harmony, when properly understood. Yet Canfield calls them "utterly inconsistent," ignoring the fact that Scofield, as noted elsewhere in this review, was a cofounder of the Central American Mission and involved with it right up to his death, terming Central America our "Samaria."

Canfield's hatred of dispensationalism and premillennialism is so strong that he repeatedly uses sarcastic and unfair terms in referring to them. He calls dispensationalists "prophecy buffs" and, on occasion, "professional 'prophecy buffs'." (Since he charges $10 for his mimeograph-style workbook, perhaps it would be proper to call him a "professional hatchet man"!) He calls the talk of dispensationalists "jargon," refers to their views as "boom-boom," and says the wealthy who financed Gaebelein and Scofield showed no indication "that they cared the least about getting the 'Gospel' of Dispensationalism

accepted in their own peer groups." He says, "The 'Gospel' (the failing Church syndrome) was fine for the middle and lower orders who were to purchase Scofield Bibles by the millions." And when he refers to the influence James H. Brookes had on the new convert, Scofield, he must "note that Brookes' view of prophecy was not universally held at that time." But whose is--at any time? Is Canfield's?

In private correspondence with this reviewer, he spoke of "Rapture Cultists"--a flagrant misuse of the term cult--and referred to all premillennialists as "deluded." He said, in fact, he was "tempted to use the term 'deluded' in addressing the envelope" for his letter to me, but "Christian courtesy got the better" of him and he refrained from making "you and the cause of Christ look ridiculous to the world, especially postal employees." In spite of the restraint he showed, however, it does show the heart attitude of the man who penned this incredible attack on the dead Scofield.

Incidentally, on the "cult" matter, when we privately questioned him about the use of the term toward Bible believers looking for the blessed hope, he defended its use and, as proof, sent us a letter from an ex-Armstrongite, Stephen E. Dalton, in which the latter had listed "cultic traits" os Scofieldism, using David Breese's "Marks of A Cult" as his standard. Apparently neither Dalton nor Canfield was aware that the author of the standard by which they were defining Scofieldism as a cult is, himself, a strong advocate of the pretribulation, premillennial, dispensational position.

Canfield jumped on a remark Gaebelein made about the happy times in their conferences, quoting him as referring to the "balmy days of the Niagara Bible Conference" (not an exact quote; Gaebelein spoke of "the balmy days of The Niagara Conferences," but this is typical of Canfield's sloppy work). Canfield misappropriated this "balmy days" phrase repeatedly, referring to people who attended such conferences as "balmy," as he did to the conferences themselves.

Yet even that sarcasm could not match his grudging acknowledgement that Scofield's Dallas church had grown to over 500 members, of which he said: ". . . all of them, no doubt, anxiously anticipating the Rapture." But what was wrong with doing that? I am anxiously anticipating the rapture myself. So was the Apostle Paul, according to his testimony in I Thessalonians 4:17, where he put himself into the group he expected to be "alive and remain" at that event. So are unnumbered multitudes of others.

Peter, remember, declared 1,900 years ago that "the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer" (I Peter 4:7, emphasis added). James sounded his voice, crying, "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh" (5:8, emphasis added). Canfield calls this expectancy, this looking for the Lord to suddenly return at any moment, "beating a dead horse." For all practical purposes, he joins the predicted scoffers of the last days in sneering, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation" (II Peter 3:4).

Along this line, it might be well to refer here to a quote Canfield credits to Roy Coad. After charging that Scofield's expectation of the any-moment return of Christ, plus the biblical ban on date setting, caused Scofield

to paint himself into a corner, he quoted Coad: "It is here useful to notice one interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to visualize their own age as other than end time."

But this obviously is exactly what God intended by His biblical language! He wanted each generation to be looking for the any-moment return of His Son to receive His own. They were all to be "watching," "looking," "expecting" His return to take place at any time, "perhaps today!" If God had given the impression in His Word that Christ would not or could not return for a long period of time--or until, in Canfield's view, the postmillennial victory over the world could be achieved--who would be looking, longing or living in the light of His return? God revealed just enough to cause expectancy for every age, but held back enough so there should be no date setting. We consider it one of the marvels of biblical formation. No doubt that is why, since He knew there would be many generations looking for Him to come who would be disappointed, God offers a special "crown of rejoicing" for all who, like Paul, expected without experiencing (II Timothy 4:8).

Canfield falsely and viciously portrays Scofield and other dispensationalists in the words: "After all, suffering, persecution, torture, repression, hunger, apostacy [sic] and decline were so much on their minds, **they must have wanted it for others**" (emphasis added). That is utterly untrue, totally unfair, completely unjustified. Equally unfair and unjustified is Canfield's statement about dispensationalism: "That teaching has sapped the moral fibre of the church." Such as claim is silly on the surface, totally without documentation.

Perhaps, before going further, we should say something about Canfield's description of Scofield's position as "the failing Church syndrome." He sneers repeatedly at the idea of an "any-moment rapture," premillennialism, or the world failing to get better and better. He describes the position of Scofield and all other dispensationalists as being "that the Church is not to succeed in ANY mission given it by the Lord" (emphasis his). And he argues that the dispensational view "gives redeemed man no hope of victory over the forces of evil short of heaven." (Perhaps he should obtain and read the late Dr. H. C. Morrison's book, The Optimism of Premillennialism!)

Canfield's problem, however, is that he has confused Christendom with he church and vice versa. Dispensationalists and premillennialists have always held that the gates of Hell would not and could not prevail against the true church, and that our mission in this age is to be one of vigorous evangelism and the building of strong local churches. As our good friend, Dr. John R. Rice--who was thoroughly pretribulation and premillennial in his position--titled his series of lectures on evangelism at Bob Jones University, We Can Have Revival Now! Our position is anything but pessimistic, as Canfield claims. He simply does not--or will not--understand it.

It is Christendom that is failing--and the apostasy there will continue, increasing until Christ returns for His own. The kind of "victory over the forces of evil" Canfield calls for in his postmillennialism is utterly impossible. In fact, for 6,000 years now there has been no such victory and the prophetic portions tell us there never will be until Christ Himself returns to establish His kingdom and His own reign of righteousness.

All biblical language about the end of the age relates to apostasy. Even Charles Hodge, a Reformed theologian and postmillennialist, acknowledged that Christ told His disciples "that the sign of the coming of the Son of Man was to be great defection int he Church, dreadful persecutions, and all but irresistible temptations, and that with his coming were to be connected the final judgment and the end of the world; but that the time when those events were to occur, was not given unto them to know, nor even to the angels of heaven."

Probably the most influential postmillennialist of our day is Loraine Boettner. Yet even he admits, in his The Millennium, "It may well be, however, that just before the end God does permit a limited manifestation of evil, that it may be seen anew and more clearly what an awful thing sin is and how deserving of punishment" (p. 69).

Canfield refers to Spurgeon and asks his readers to "note that Spurgeon and the Brethren are at a twain that could never meet." What did Spurgeon say about the return of Christ? Preaching on the text in Luke 18:8, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" he declared: "I know not how long this dispensation of longsuffering will last; but certainly the longer it continues the more wantonly wicked does unbelief become. The more God reveals himself to man in ways of providence, the more base is it on man's part to belie his solemn witness. But yet, my brethren, at the winding-up of all things, when revelation shall have received its utmost confirmation, even then faith will be such a rarity on the earth that it is a question if the Lord himself will find it. You have perhaps a notion that faith will go on increasing in the world; that the Church will grow purer and brighter, that there will be a wonderful degree of faith among men in the day of our Lord's appearing. Our Saviour does not tell us so; but he puts the question of our text about it. Even concerning the dawn of the golden age he asks, 'When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?'" (Sermons on the Second Coming and the Last Things, pp. 92, 93). In other words, Spurgeon not only repudiated Canfield's postmillennialism, but he was guilty of what the latter calls "the failing church syndrome."

If another statement from Spurgeon would be helpful, consider this from his sermon on Zechariah 2:1-5, "The Man with the Measuring Line": "I am not given to prophesying, and I fear that the fixing of dates and periods has been exceedingly injurious to the whole system of premillennial teaching; but I think I clearly see in Scripture--so far I go, and take my stand--that the Lord Jesus Christ will come personally to reign upon this earth. At his coming it appears clear to me that he will gather together the Jewish people, that Jerusalem shall become the metropolis of the new empire which shall then extend from pole to pole, from the river even to the ends of the earth. If this be a correct interpretation of prophecy, you may read the whole of this chapter through and understand it; you have the key to every sentence: without such a belief, I see not how to interpret the prophet's meaning" (emphasis for "personally" in the original, other emphasis added; The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, Vo. X, p. 494).

As for Moody, Canfield is careful to note that he was "theological unlearned" (a safe way to describe someone who may not agree with you), yet admits that he was "spiritually acute." He claims the Plymouth Brethren, in the late 1860s, "had made a special effort to recruit Moody to the Failing

Church Eschatology of that sect, a philosophy now marketed as Dispensationalism."

Evidently they enjoyed a pretty fair measure of success, if his preaching is any evidence. As for postmillennialism, the "spiritually acute" Moody fervently declared: "Some people say, 'I believe Christ will come on the other side of the millennium.' Where do you get it? I can't find it. The Word of God nowhere tells me to watch and wait for the coming of the millennium, but for the coming of the Lord. I don't find any place where God says the world is to grow better and better, and that Christ is to have a spiritual reign on earth of a thousand years. I find that the earth is to grow worse and worse, and that at length there is going to be a separation" (New Sermons, Addresses and Prayers, p. 522).

He continued: "Now some of your think this is a new and strange doctrine, that they who peach it are speckled birds. But let me tell you that most of the spiritual men in the pulpits of Great Britain are firm in this faith. Spurgeon preaches it. I have heard Newman Hall say that he knew no reason why Christ might not come before he got through with his sermon" (p. 522). One could not be any more "at-any-moment" than that!

Moody went on to answer the objection of the Canfields of his day: "Some people say, 'Oh, you will discourage the young converts if you preach that doctrine.' We.., my friends, that hasn't been my experience. I have felt like working three times as hard ever since I came to understand that my Lord was coming back again. I look on this world as a wrecked vessel. God has given me a life-boat, and said to me, 'Moody, save all you can.' . . . This world is getting darker and darker; and its ruin is coming nearer and nearer. If you have any friends on this wreck unsaved, you have better lose no time in getting them off. But some will say, 'Do you, then, make the grace of God a failure?' No; grace is not a failure, but man is. The antediluvian world was a failure; the Jewish world was a failure; man has been a failure everywhere, when he has had his own way and been left to himself. Christ will save His Church, but He will save them finally by taking them out of the world" (pp. 522, 523).

As already noted, our Lord was also guilty of "the failing church syndrome," going to the extreme of asking in Luke 18:8, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"

Paul was guilty of "the failing church syndrome," writing to young Timothy: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (II Timothy 3:1-5).

Peter was guilty of "the failing church syndrome," warning: "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (II Peter 3:3, 4).

Permit a note of humor here. Canfield quotes the premillennialist, Carl F. H. Henry, as saying, "Another year has passed in which the movement has registered no notable influences on the formative ideas and ideals of American culture." Then he quotes the postmillennialist, R. J. Rushdoony: "In the modern era, the church, while numerically strong, has grown less and less influential and more and more peripheral to everyday life, to politics, economics, the arts and sciences, and all else. For most people, the church is irrelevant to the 'real world' of human affairs. It provides a limited moral training for children, a social focus for the family, and not much more. Churches have numbers, not strength. Both in membership and in leadership, the churches are radically weak."

While he quotes both men twice, the first time he calls Rushdoony's words **"in contrast"** to Henry's, while the second time he says the Rushdoony quote **"is confirmed"** by what Henry says. He wants to have it both ways, depending upon the point he wishes to "prove" at the moment. And in still another place, where he gives the Henry quote by itself, he sneers, "Eighty years of no progress is unusual, but the Premills have managed it." So, apparently, have the postmills and the amills!

Incidentally, perhaps Canfield should obtain and read Henry's latest book, Christian Countermoves In A Decadent Culture, recently published by Multnomah Press. It might clear up some of his misconceptions. By way of example, consider this paragraph:

"Christ's resurrection spurs the church not only to the evangelistic proclamation of personal salvation, but to the promotion of world justice. The victory over in justice and evil that Jesus won in his own conquest over sin and death he wishes to extend through the church, of which he has become the living and exalted head. The church is not simply to preach personal salvation, but is to publish the criteria by which Christ will judge the world and even now judges it, and to affirm God's interest in the whole person and the whole world. The church is to live as the new society within a rebellious world, and is to challenge and call humanity to authentic life and hope, and to exhibit what it means to live by standards of the returning King. The resurrection therefore strips away all racial, national, economic, and cultural distinctions; it is not bounded by differences of color or culture, of race and rank. It reminds us that the God of the eternal future is the God of creation and redemption who discriminates not on the basis of pigment, but on the basis of justice and mercy, of purity and penitence" (p. 102).

Before leaving this point it would be well to note that Canfield seems to labor under the impression that premillennialists are making no impact upon today's culture whatsoever. In private correspondence, he told this reviewer that his "disillusionment with Dispensationalism began about six weeks after arriving in Chicago and actually seeing the impact (or lack thereof) of Moody on community or culture." While he did not identify "Moody" as the institute or the church (perhaps both), we were intrigued and wrote back, inquiring, "Could you supply me with a postmillennial school or church which has had significant impact on its local community or culture?" We sincerely wanted to know what he would consider a good example of such influence.

Much to our surprise, instead of answering the question, he responded indignantly by charging, "Your counter claim that Postmil has not changed

society is an attempt at a loaded question. In the first place you characteristically try to equate Walter Rauschenbush and R. J. Rushdoony. Second, you never think that if we try to do something, we have to first get the Premils who work for out of our way before we can do anything" (the last sentence does not make sense and we are not sure what he meant; obviously, some words were left out or letters transposed). We replied:

"I am at a loss to know why it was any more loaded or different than you claim that Moody had no impact on Chicago's community or culture. While you limited your remark to one community regarding premillennialism, I offered you 'the world' for a defense of postmillennialism. Nor did I claim that postmillennialism hadn't had an impact on any community or culture. I merely asked it you could supply me with one school or church that had had a significant impact in this way. Apparently you can't.

"And then you way I 'characteristically try to equate Walter Rauschenbush and R. J. Rushdoony.' My dear brother, I didn't even mention either man. I find that very strange."

He has not replied further and we still do not know what church or school in postmillennial circles he feels has made "a significant impact" on its city. (Actually, liberals make far more of a splash in cultural waters than either premillennialists or postmillennialists. They don't have anything else to do!)

As for dispensationalism, Canfield calmly announced to his readers that J. N. Darby "invented" it. Apparently he is not aware that "dispensation" is a good Bible word and the God Himself speaks of such. Canfield even goes so far as to misrepresent the dispensational position by saying, "This may be why some followers of Scofield refuse to pray as the Lord commanded," implying that they will not pray, "Thy kingdom come." Scofield himself, however, was not of that number.

In another place Canfield quotes Duncan McDougall as saying: "THERE IS NOT A BIBLE TEACHER NOR ANYONE ELSE LIVING IN THE WORLD TODAY WHO HAS FOUND A SECRET RAPTURE IN THE BIBLE BY HIS OWN INDEPENDENT STUDY OF THE BIBLE ITSELF" (emphasis in Canfield's work, not credited to either McDougall or himself). While we think the remark would more aptly fit postmillennialism--and "secret" is dependent upon who is defining it--the charge is simply false, not true.

By way of example, we have heard Dr. Lee Roberson tell his early ministry experience many times and how he, a bachelor shut up in his one-room apartment with little to do in his spare time other than study the Word of God, discovered the truth of Christ's any-moment coming for His saints--and didn't even know what he was (theologically) until someone heard him preach and told him! Dr. Roberson had no Scofield Bible at the time, nor any other "helps" to unfold the truth to him. He developed his convictions with nothing before him but the Bible.

Canfield sneers at the idea of a soon coming Christ and says "it would seem that the 'impending advent' idea is wearing a bit thin, even though it has helped spread apostacy [sic] and devastation over the world." The thought that the imminent return of Christ and premillennialism has spread apostasy and ruin worldwide is so inane, surely he does not expect it to be accepted by

intelligent people, although a booklet Canfield sent this reviewer was guilty of using even stronger language, being titled, Premillennialism: A System of Infidelity. It seems absolutely incredible that anyone could call this teaching about the blessed hope, the oldest of all the millennial positions, "infidelity." Are they not aware that the New Testament apostles--over 1900 years ago--spoke of the soon coming of the Lord? Yet Canfield calls it "beating a dead horse."

Perhaps we should substantiate premillennialism as the "oldest" view by quoting a professor at the successor school where Canfield received his one year of Bible training. Dr. Renald E. Showers writes: "Numerous historians declare that Premillennialism (initially called chiliasm) was the first major millennial view of the Church and that it was the predominant view of orthodox believers from the first to the third centuries" ("A Description and Early History of Millennial Views," Israel My Glory, June/July 1986). And then he quoted such historians as Edward Gibbon (who was hostile to Christianity and therefore certainly not pro-premillennialism), J. K. L. Gieseler (Lutheran), Henry C. Sheldon (Methodist), Philip Schaff (Reformed), Adolph Harnack (liberal Lutheran), and Will Durant (secular author of The Story of Civilization) as acknowledging this as the primary view of the early church in eschatology.

Canfield criticizes Scofield for referring to the Lord's Prayer (adding a sneer that it is "a part of Scripture which many of his followers consign almost to perdition," a grossly unfair evaluation), saying: "Surely there is no opportunity for evasion there. A King shall reign, prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth. What is the Lord's prayer? 'Thy kingdom come.' What is that Kingdom? 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven.' That will be when a King reigns in righteousness and prosperity." Any good pretribulational, premillennial dispensationalist could and would say a hearty **"Amen!"** to that, including Scofield. (In fact, we would suggest that Canfield read Scofield's sermon on the Lord's Prayer in the book, In Many Pulpits With Dr. C. I. Scofield, to learn what he really did teach about it.)

Canfield goes on to say: "Now any common sense view of that prayer and the way in which The Lord presented it, places it in the Church Age." While we cannot speak for all dispensationalists (there are several varieties), I, for one, can pray it eagerly, anxiously, enthusiastically, knowing that the sooner the kingdom is to come, even sooner the King will come, since His appearance will precede it.

Alas, however, His will is not being done in the church age as it is in Heaven. Does Canfield think it is? Doesn't he read the paper or listen to the news on television? Is he so insulated from reality that he thinks the vileness, the viciousness, the wickedness, the evil of this day is what God wants, that it is His will being done on earth as it is in Heaven? After all, there is a difference between what God wants and what God permits, since He wants everyone to be saved (II Peter 3:9; I Timothy 2:3, 4), but permits many to be damned (Matthew 25:41, 46; Revelation 20:14, 15).

Yet Canfield attacks the dispensational position as "more than demeaning of the power of Our Lord and Saviour." Quoting from one of Scofield's books where he says that, during the millennium, "there will be those who, hating God, sullenly obey Christ the King," Canfield objects: "That the Lord physically present on the Earth (a point not firmly supported in

Scripture) cannot bring all men to acknowledgement of Him suggests that Scofield has no real vision of the power and majesty of The Lord."

Aside from the fact that if the Lord's physical presence on earth is not "firmly supported in Scripture" nothing is, we suggest that "cannot" is the wrong word; it is that He "chooses not" to do so, just as He chooses not to force all to love Him and obey Him during the present age. Does Canfield think it is "demeaning" to God and His power that some hate Him now? Surely not! Was it "demeaning" to God and His power that many hated Christ when He was on earth? Some, remember, evaluated hogs more highly than His presence and "began to pray him to depart out of their coasts" (mark 5:17). His physical presence on earth the first time did not force all men to acknowledge His Lordship; why should it be so surprising that His second physical presence on earth will not, either? Obviously, not all will love Him during the millennium or there would be none to join in Satan's final rebellion at the completion of the 1,000-year reign (see Revelation 20:7-9).

But Canfield thinks the dispensational view "overlooks Christ's statement that 'the gates of Hell would not prevail against the Church'." However, while He did indeed say that the gates of Hell would not prevail against the church, it must also be kept in mind that He did not say the church would prevail against the gates of Hell. Neither Christ nor Scofield predicted total apostasy. Down through the march of the centuries there has always been a remnant who stood true to God and His Word--and there always will be, right up to the time of the shout, the voice and the trump (I Thessalonians 4:16). Thank God for that!

Canfield makes a very serious accusation against God, calling Him a racist if the dispensational view be true. Referring to a message by Scofield, he says it ended "with a completely racist idea that God, even after Calvary, deals with men differently according to their racial make-up." But surely it is not "racist" to believe that God will keep His Word to His chosen people, Israel, even though the promises were made before Calvary! If it is, was it also "racist" for Him to have made the Jews His "chosen people," giving them special privileges in Old Testament days? (See, e.g., Deuteronomy 7:6; I Kings 3:8; I Chronicles 16:13; Psalm 33:12; 105:42, 43; Isaiah 43:20, 21; etc., etc.) Calling God a "racist" is a serious flaw, one by which Canfield has painted himself into a corner.

Canfield is not stingy with his "racist" charge. He shares it with Scofield because, in a speech before the Confederate veterans in Dallas in 1904, he found in his sermon notes the words: "right superior race to bear white man's burden of an inferior race in its own way." But, again, he has done a good man an injustice. There is no suggestion in any of Scofield's writings which imply he considered the white man either superior or inferior, or that he thought the black man was inferior or superior. While neither Canfield nor we can be sure of what Scofield actually said in his speech on the basis of an incomplete sentence in some 80-year-old sermon notes, in all probability he simply referred to the fact that the men who fought (it was a meeting of Civil War veterans, remember) were men of a free race bearing the burden of a slave race, setting the latter free. Understood thusly, there is not the slightest hint of racism.

Canfield also suggested that Senator Conkling was a "racist" for telling the joke at the dinner in Washington, previously noted. But, surely, refusing to deny "the distinction made by God Almighty between black and white" is not racism. After all, He did create that distinction!

Incidentally, Canfield does not think Scofield and Trumbull should have even mentioned Conkling. He argues: ". . . Senator Conkling was the first prominent figure in the political life of our Republic to openly flaunt an adulterous relationship." But this is nit-picking carried to an extreme. Is it wrong today to repeat a joke told by a John Kennedy (who practically turned the White House into a bordello during his administration, with sex partners coming and going more profusely than foreign dignitaries), or a Lyndon Johnson, or an FDR, or some of our other national embarrassments?

Obviously, Canfield despises the Scofield Reference Bible and his criticism of it flows freely throughout his work. He cannot seemingly tolerate the thought of any scholarship in it and he speaks of Trumbull as being "carried away by his effort to establish valid scholarship."

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

The key to the above is the use of the word **"he"** in reference to both Allis and Hodges. And surely Canfield could find other commentators who would find other points of "disagreement" (and the key is disagreement, not error)! Any postmillennial, anti-dispensational, anti-premillennial critic could surely find much with which to disagree, but does that make the work valueless? If so, without value to whom? We have made critical notes on almost every--is not every--page of Canfield's manuscript, so, based on his own criteria, how valuable does that make his work?

Some of Canfield's criticism is due to the fact that he apparently does not understand the purpose of a "reference" Bible. He makes a big deal out of the fact that most of Scofield's notes on the Gospels are in Matthew, saying: "The page count . . . shows that Scofield placed comment on only 39 pages, total, in the 'non-Jewish' Gospels, only four in the Gospel of Mark. In contrast, he produced 48 pages with comment in the 'Jewish' Gospel of Matthew which some of his extreme followers say Christians are not to use."

This is incredible! Most of the notes are in Matthew simply because that is the first Gospel! There is no need for repetition regarding the same incidents which are retold once, twice or three times in the other Gospels. That should be obvious to anyone.

The same could be said of a kindred criticism when Canfield notes: "Philip Mauro points out that the Kingdom subject is mentioned 139 times in the New Testament. But of the 139, Scofield avoids comment on 118 of the 139 passages. Why?" But has Canfield forgotten that he is dealing with a reference Bible, not a commentary? Does he want Scofield to say the same thing

139 times? Not having to do so is, after all, one of the reasons for a "cross reference" system.

It seems to catch in Canfield's craw that the prestigious Oxford Press published the Scofield Reference Bible, so he speaks of "the essential incongruity of this work being published by Oxford." He suggests that there may have been something sinister behind the decision, but we think it was just that Oxford Press smelled "a winner" and entered the project as any business organization would, expecting to make money. In fact, Canfield himself acknowledges that they "picked a cash winner." Indeed, they did!

Canfield also sees the association between Scofield and Oxford Press as "in directions opposite to that of The Scofield Reference Bible and to many of the statements in the Notes." But Scofield chose Oxford Press because it would "insure its wide circulation"; in other words, it was a simple business proposition with him as well, just as a church might advertise in the Los Angeles Times to reach the masses with its message, even though that same newspaper might be carrying ads for liquor, tobacco, R-rated or X-rated films, etc., etc., in the same issue.

This reviewer has had books published by five different publishers and certainly would not endorse the positions of all of them, nor necessarily endorse all the other titles they publish. We think Canfield has misunderstood the dispensational position on separation--which is not isolation in any sense of the word, nor appeal for the saints to become monks and hermits in monasteries or caves.

Perhaps, before leaving the doctrinal section, we ought to note Canfield's own soteriological/eschatological position--wince it explains much of his opposition to Scofield. For one thing, he is of the "reformed" persuasion. He quoted a section from Scofield's article in The Fundamentals on "The Grace of God," in which the latter showed distinctions between law and grace, then passionately declared: "Any one with even a modicum of exposure to Reformed theology can go over the quotation with a red pencil and line out statement after statement." (He neglected to list even one, however!)

Then he attacked a statement in that article by Scofield which he says "brought forth the anathema of A. W. Tozer" (although he offers no documentation for it, either): "Grace, on the contrary, is not looking for good men whom it may approve, for it is not grace, but mere justice, to approve goodness, but it is looking for condemned, guilty, speechless and helpless men whom it may save through faith, sanctify and glorify."

But what, pray tell, is wrong with that? Is that not the condition of all men and women from the time of birth? Does not even Reformed theology, with its "total depravity" view, teach this? Canfield erroneously argues that such an "idea plants in the seeker a motivation to become bad, dip deep into fleshly sins or even crimes, in order to start on the path of Redemption." Such a statement is silly on the surface; we know of no one who has ever received such an idea from the teaching of grace (if he did, we hasten to add, we seriously doubt that he would ever be converted later).

Canfield is also dogmatically a postmillennialist--a Roman Catholic view developed for Protestants by the Unitarian Daniel Whitby--waiting for the

world to get better and better. He calls those aligned with his position "the resurgent postmillennial movement." But he is careful to disassociate his understanding from the idea that the world will be "TOTALLY converted" (his emphasis) before Christ returns (which he erroneously says "smacks of Universalism"). He explains: "The growing Biblical Postmillennial movement calls not for a totally converted world, but for a Christian dominated world especially with totally Christian direction of the culture." (And he criticizes Scofield, Gaebelein and others for their "semantics"!) That, of course, is a position totally devoid of reality for over 1,900 years and the prospects for it on the horizon are absolutely nil. When, we wonder, are Canfield and other postmillennialists going to succeed? Premillennialists have the answer: when Christ returns and establishes His reign of righteousness on King David's throne!

In fact, it would take the proverbial ostrich with his head in the sand to generate much hope or enthusiasm with such an unrealistic attitude. Lloyd Billingsley, in The Generation That Knew Not Josef, quotes Solzhenitsyn as estimating that "as high as sixty million" were liquidated under Stalin. Milovan Djilas, who knew the latter personally, called him "the greatest criminal in history." Our copy of the Guinness Book of World Records (vintage 1972) attributes the massacre of 26,300,000 Chinese to the regime of Mao Tse-tung between 1949 and May, 1965. And do not forget the 6,000,000 Jews annihilated by Hitler in the ovens or cut up in the laboratories, used as guinea pigs. All of this took place in relatively recent days, in the mid-20th century. Murder, suicide, rape and kindred crimes are increasing on every hand. So is terrorism, war and other forms of man's inhumanity to man. How discouraged must those be whose theology depends upon the world getting "gooder and gooder" as we approach the end of the age! We are not rejoicing; we are facing reality. (And he says premillennialism is pessimistic!)

Canfield, in all of his 289 pages of attack, offers only two verses of Scripture to support his postmillennialism. One is I John 5:4, "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." But that verse has absolutely nothing to do with world conditions or Christian domination in the world, simply with victory in an individual Christian's life and ministry.

His other "proof text" is Revelation 2:26, "And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations." This, of course, is a statement made to a specific church (Thyatira) in the 1st century, although it would certainly have spiritual application to Christians today. As for the "overcoming," the same is true here as in I John 5:4; that is, it is individual victory, not national or worldwide victory. The reference to "power over the nations" is something not given the overcomer until after "the end"; that is, he will rule with Christ during the millennium. Instead of endorsing postmillennialism, this passage favors the premillennial position.

As for the Great Tribulation, Canfield endorses the view of Friedrich A. Tholuck of Germany "in placing [it] in A.D. 70, rather than at a time when the expressways are to be littered with driverless autos." While we do not believe expressways will "be littered with driverless autos" at the time of the rapture, if Tholuck and Canfield are correct, Christ must have returned some 1,900 years ago, since He said He would come "immediately after the tribulation of those days" (Matthew 24:27-30).

Perhaps the most "far out" factor in Canfield's doctrinal views, however, relates to his explanation of Paul as a tentmaker. To use it as a prop for his postmillennial "kingdom building," he declares: "Why was Saul (Paul) a tentmaker? As he travelled through Asia and Europe planting and building Churches, he, a tent-maker, was carrying out the prophecy of Amos, 'rebuilding the Tabernacle of David which was fallen down.'" And later, when he wants to criticize something Scofield said in his book What Do The Prophets Say? he repeats: "We have noted and will note again that any reasonable interpretation of the 'Tabernacle of David' is not literal, but rather an Institution raised by a Tentmaker endued with Power from on High. And that tent, though a bit tattered is a living organism today. Whether Scofield's failure to note the proper interpretation arose from ignorance or obfuscation we have no knowledge."

Overlooking Canfield's humble assertion that his interpretation is the only "reasonable" and "proper" one and that anyone's failure to agree with him is either due to "ignorance or obfuscation," we will simply note that his explanation is absolutely incredible. Even accepting the idea that he could write those words with a straight face, a quick look at Acts 18:3 about Paul the tentmaker should explode his thesis. It says, "And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers." Note the following about this:

(1) There is nothing in the verse to even remotely suggest that it should be taken in any manner other than literally.

(2) The words "same craft" (Greek, homotechnon) simply mean "same trade," and are rendered thus in other translations. They merely say that Paul, Aquila and Priscilla earned their livelihood in the same manner.

(3) Being tentmakers was their "occupation," or "trade."

(4) Vine tells us that "craft" is literally "an art," and the English equivalent would be "technique, technical." The profession of making tents of goats' hair or leather was an art that involved technical skill.

(5) In I Corinthians 4:12, Paul spoke of laboring by "working with our own hands"; in I Thessalonians 2:9 he spoke of "labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you"; and in II Thessalonians 3:8 he said he "wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you." Paul, who freely acknowledged that he could have been supported by those to whom he ministered (I Corinthians 9:3-15), chose instead to earn his livelihood by making tents.

(6) The 19th century commentator, David Thomas, calls the Jewish father's responsibility of teaching his son a trade "well-nigh as binding as law," and adds: "The Fathers suppose Paul to be a worker on leather, or a tent-maker. Chrysostom says, 'By his trade he was employed upon skins.' The fact that war tents were made of leather, induced the old writers to suppose that Paul worked on this material. The probability is, that as a kind of shagged, rough-haired goat was very common in Cilicia, and as the hair of this animal was manufactured into a thick, course cloth, and as this manufacture may have been very common in Paul's native province, he therefore selected it as his employment" (Acts of the Apostles, p. 291).

This natural explanation of a literal tentmaker has been the common, accepted understanding down through the course of Christendom and we find it very anomalous that Canfield would interpret it as "building the kingdom."

Perhaps, in light of his vicious attack on Scofield, we should let the latter personally answer Canfield's postmillennialism. In response to the question, "What scriptural reason can you give against the post-millennial teaching?" he replied, "The divine program, Acts 15:14-17, puts the reestablishment of David's throne after the return. The divine program, Revelation 19-20, puts the kingdom after the resurrection of the 'holy,' and that is 'at His coming.' The divine program, Matthew 25, puts the 'throne' after His return. The divine program, Romans 11, puts the coming after the fullness of the Gentiles. The divine program, Matthew 13, excludes the possibility of a millennium during this age. The divine program, Daniel 2, puts the kingdom of the heavens after the destruction of the present political world-system. The divine program for the kingdom, Isaiah 11, Deuteronomy 30, etc., requires the restoration of Israel as the initial fact and that follows the return, Deuteronomy 30:3" (Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box, Compiled by Ella E. Pohle, pp. 126-127).

Canfield repeatedly paints a false picture of dispensationalism, almost implying that its adherents do nothing but sit around and look toward the sky, anticipating the rapture. He portrays them as both anti-evangelistic and anti-missionary, suggesting that such a philosophy leads to the abandoning of evangelistic and social responsibilities. Admitting his "inability to understand [Scofield's] idea of evangelization without conversion," he continued, "We would note that Scofield by his straw-man-warhorse forced his followers into a position which makes a mockery of The Great Commission (Matt. 28:19)."

Yet Scofield founded a mission (Central American Mission); was a worker with a mission (the American Home Missionary Society); established new churches; built strong soul-winning ministries in his own churches (growth we have already noted); was associated with and held leadership posts in schools for training missionaries, evangelists and pastors; and in numerous other ways proved how real the Great Commission was to him.

To answer Canfield's "inability to understand," we simply explain that evangelizing the world means seeking to take the gospel to every creature throughout the world; converting the world would be winning every person in the world to Christ. Neither reason nor revelation supports the latter. Quite simply, it is the Christian's obligation to present the message; he is not responsible for the response. We do not see how that is so difficult to understand.

We might also point out that the ones who have done the most in fulfilling the Great Commission throughout the centuries have been premillennial in theology. The most noted missionaries and the greatest missionary organizations were--and still are--grounded in premillennial doctrine. And the greatest soul-winning churches in America and around the world today are premillennial, too.

Quite frankly, Canfield is neither fair nor honest in his repeated charges that Scofield and other dispensationalists are mired in inactivity and

unconcern for the world because of what he calls their "failing church" and "sinking ship" philosophy. In fact, just as we were ready to send copy of this review to our printer, we read an article in an anti-dispensational, anti-premillennial, rigidly-Calvinistic publication which faulted Christians "on an ego trip" who "have such a deep psychological need to win [a debate] that they really are not all that interested in truth. So they seek to guarantee 'victory' by misrepresenting their opponent."

After illustrating from the Calvinist/Arminian debate, the writer went on to speak of men like Canfield, saying: "In espousing a postmillennial eschatology, Theonomists fault Dispensationalists with a 'sinking ship' theology. It is alleged that Dispensational premillennialists do nothing constructive in society because their next eschatological event is the church's removal from an increasingly evil world. 'No one polishes the brass on a sinking ship' [R. J. Rushdoony, God's Plan for Victory]. And yet, is it not interesting how Dispensationalists are often more actively involved in the affairs of this life than are those who, theologically, should be?" (Larry Spargimino, "Biblical Clarity or Confusion--Can We Trust the Saints With Scripture?"; Searching Together, Spring/Summer 1986).

Canfield's charges in this area seem especially strange in light of the fact that it was a pretribulation, premillennial ministry which brought him the good news of redemption and won him to Christ. He was saved, he acknowledges, "through the radio ministry of Rev. Percy Crawford."

Incidentally, in private correspondence with the reviewer, Canfield has repeatedly poked fun at noted any-moment men. For example, he wrote: "Marvin DeHaan has been with the Lord for sometime now and the first thing that he learned when he became 'absent from the body, but present with the Lord' was that the Lord had absolutely NO intention of coming as DeHaan had preached than the Lord had of coming as Darby suggested" (emphasis his).

To which we responded: "You, dear brother, to use your own adjective, are 'incredible.' Do you really think you know 'the first thing that [Marvin DeHaan] learned when he became "absent from the body, but present with the Lord"'? And instead of making light about the at-any-moment views of DeHaan, Ryrie, Scofield, Ketcham and other giants of the 19th and 20th centuries, why not go back more than 1,900 years? I can give you the name of a fellow who actually said, 'If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you **BY THE WORD OF THE LORD,** that **WE WHICH ARE ALIVE AND REMAIN UNTO THE COMING OF THE LORD** shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven . . . .' That poor fellow was not only expecting to be alive and one of those raptured, but he was claiming inside information from God Almighty Himself. If you are interested, I'll give you his name and you can start using him in your satire of those looking for a pretrib, premill return!" Apparently he was now interested in that man's identity because there has been no response.

Basic Charges Against Scofield

While we have already given considerable indication of these charges, perhaps it would be well to examine them one by one. Before we do so, however,

we want to make it perfectly clear that we do not endorse any of Scofield's wrong doing. We abhor any man's sins and want all to understand it. But the reader will be quick to note that most of the charges Canfield digs up against Scofield relate to his unconverted state and were "under the blood" throughout his long and fruitful ministry for Christ.

The first one we will examine is the matter of Scofield being,

A. A "Successful Lawyer!"

Credit for this seems to grate on Canfield's nerves very deeply. In one place he describes "Trumbull's story of a successful law practice" as being "very unlikely." He bemoans that Scofield was "given a great advantage in his start in the law, but we must consider it a case of pure, simple nepotism." He says the court records "belie the story by Trumbull and others that Scofield was a successful lawyer, serving a respectable clientele." And we have already seen Canfield's judging that Scofield "never contemplated law school."

How about it? Is Canfield correct? Did Trumbull, Gaebelein, BeVier and the others falsely represent Scofield? Well, as the lawyers/politicians of today say, "Let's look at the record!" (1) He was admitted to the Kansas Bar in 1869, "when about 26 years of age." (2) He worked in the law office of Kansas Senator (later United States Senator) John James Ingalls, a prestigious position. (3) His legal expertise was considered adequate and qualified enough (i.e., "successful") for the constituents of Atchison and Nemaha counties to elect him to the Kansas House of Representatives. (4) He opened his own law office. (5) United States President Ulysses Simpson Grant appointed him United States District Attorney for the entire State of Kansas. **At that time Scofield was "scarcely thirty years" of age and the youngest district attorney in the country!**

In the light of all this, for anyone to object to calling Scofield a successful lawyer borders on the incredulous--even the ludicrous! But if other evidence is needed, we refer to Canfield's own sources. When the young lawyer was elected to the House of Representatives, the Atchison Patriot, an opposition newspaper which had fought his election, said: "Mr. Scofield is a gentleman of fine address and a scholar and we have no doubt he will reflect credit upon this city in the legislative halls." After he had served some time in the House and had been made Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary (a recognition of his legal talent!), the Kansas Daily Commonwealth of Topeka editorialized: "C. I. Scofield, the chairman, although a young man and inexperienced in the halls of legislation, has proved himself well qualified for the position."

The latter paper, incidentally, after charges were first aired about the young Scofield, editorialized again: "At first we were inclined to regard the appointment of Mr. Scofield with disfavor, but subsequently we have had high hopes for him, which were justified by his gentlemanly bearing and display of legal skill. We sincerely trust that an inquiry into the charges preferred by Mr. Pomeroy's affidavit will result in thorough vindication of his character." Note the reference not only to his "gentlemanly bearing" but to his "legal skill" as well.

For Canfield to question Scofield's success as a lawyer is another prime example of nit-picking. In fact, since Scofield served the entire State as the Kansas District Attorney, Canfield's mockery of Trumbull's claim that he served "a respectable clientele" indicts the whole State of Kansas! Perhaps he would like to rethink that charge.

B. Not Paying Debts (Fraud, Etc.)

That the young Scofield, in his unconverted days, may have been a scalawag of the first magnitude is a matter we are not prepared to debate. And we think probably Canfield's suspicions of his crookedness during that time, at least in part, may also be true. Scofield did resign his federal post in Kansas, a fact Trumbull credits to his dissatisfaction with politics; Canfield implies it was a case of needing to get out of town before sunset.

The latter claims Scofield was bilking "prominent" Kansas Republicans out of thousands of dollars in Senator Ingall's name (without his knowledge), but when "the shady nature of Scofield's financial transactions became known to Ingalls and the money lenders . . . then followed an explosion which compelled Scofield to resign his federal office and leave the state." But if this wee true, how come, as Canfield acknowledges, "the Ingalls . . . remained on good personal terms with the Scofield families during the rest of their respective lives" (emphasis his), adding, "Scofield did keep in touch with the families of his associates to the end of his life"? That hardly sounds like the victims' reaction to the perpetrator of a con game.

Canfield says Scofield forged his sister's signature on notes, but there was "no proof to substantiate the charge" (St. Louis Republican, November 7, 1879). The court dropped the charge at the request of the prosecution. The same newspaper account said that Scofield "had employed Mr. Martin to defend him, and was determined in case the matter reached a trial to fight it vigorously," adding that he "had little to fear of a conviction" in such an event.

On the other hand, what is revealed of Scofield's make-up during that period would not rule out such a possibility, nor would it with any other lost man. Yet Canfield's flat assertion that Scofield "never" paid his debts and that "he could not have had any intention" of so doing goes far beyond the bounds of either propriety or the facts in the case. Equally unfounded is the claim that Scofield was "living by forgery" during those years. There is absolutely no evidence of this whatsoever.

Much of Canfield's ammunition against Scofield in the area of fraud and finances comes from a newspaper item printed in two Kansas papers, first in the Atchison Patriot and then in the Topeka Daily Capital (Canfield presents it from the latter). The account obviously comes under the category of "hostile witness" and is loaded with contradictions and misrepresentations. The writer, who did not even know how to spell Scofield's name, expressed his venom in such terms as "peer among scalawags," "series of forgeries and confidence games," "base forgeries," and kindred terms. Our evaluation agrees totally with BeVier, whom Canfield says "considered it largely a fabrication with intent to slander. He found what he considered discrepancies which, to him, made the item unreliable." Canfield claims his "research" confirmed some of the items, then flippantly says: "As for the rest, the most prestigious newspapers today

have an 'Errors and Ommissions' [sic] entry almost daily--so what else is new?" Then why not merely print what his research "confirmed"?

Yet even this hostile witness said Scofield's "wealthy widowed sister" had "generally come to the front and squared up Cyrus' little follies and foibles by paying good round sums of money." And later in the article the writer said that, after Scofield's jailhouse "conversion" (which the reporter sneers at, as well as misrepresents), "his wealthy sister came forward and paid his way out by settling the forgeries."

However, a newspaper in St. Louis, where these alleged forgeries took place, on the very day after the event (not nearly two years later, as per the Kansas papers), reported the matter thusly: "A case of forgery against Cyrus I. Scofield was disposed of in the criminal court yesterday. Mr. Scofield was arrested about a year ago and his case has been continued from time to time, and never come to trial. Yesterday it was admitted by the prosecution that a case could not be made, and as there was no proof to substantiate the charge against Mr. Scofield, who is a gentleman well known as having occupied positions of trust, a nolle prosequi was entered by order of Judge Laughlin. The defendant had employed Mr. Martin to defend him, and was determined in case the matter reached a trial to fight it vigorously. He had little fear of conviction, but to have determination of the case yesterday was a relief to him." Note carefully the words: "there was no proof to substantiate the charge."

So it basically boils down to which newspaper you prefer to believe. If you are out to do a hatchet job on Scofield, you will probably believe the Kansas papers. If you believe the American system that a man is innocent until proved guilty, you will probably accept the St. Louis account. At any rate, to use one of his own expressions, it seems to us that Canfield is "beating a dead horse" in this matter.

C. Scofield's Army Career

When an underage, unconverted teen lies about his age to get into the Army during days of war and experiences several major battles, one might think it improper to question the account. But Canfield does! He uses such expressions as "where Scofield claimed to be serving" (emphasis added), and, it he cannot find proof for some of the data more than a century later, he is willing to accuse Scofield and Trumbull of falsifying the story--yet at the same time admitting that the military records of the day were neither complete nor fully accurate.

Canfield describes Scofield as "a man who proudly misrepresented his war decorations" (an untrue accusation, by the way). He even criticizes James Gray's reference to Scofield as having "fought with Lee in the Confederate Army" and BeVier's statement that "Scofield served as a private, Company H, 7th Tennessee Infantry in the Army of Northern Virginia under General Lee." Canfield argues that Scofield "would have had no direct contact with Lee and often was as far from him as Abraham Lincoln was."

That is not only inane, it is grossly unfair. Surely it would be honest to describe any man involved anywhere in the entire Confederate Army as having fought "with Lee" and "under Lee." This is nit-picking of the first

magnitude on Canfield's part, who says Scofield "may never have seen Lee," and dismisses it as "obviously an attempt to puff Scofield," judging both the motives and the honesty of the men involved. We would not call a man a liar who said he fought in Europe "with Eisenhower" or in the Pacific "under MacArthur"--even it he were no closer to the former than Hitler was, or to the latter than Hirohito!

Yet the thing about the Army career that gives Canfield the most excitement relates to the "Cross of Honor" Scofield claims to have received "for valor at the battle of Antietam." Canfield is upset because he thinks Trumbull and Scofield were trying to misrepresent the facts, pointing out that "the Cross of Honor was not an award of the Confederate Government."

That is true, but no one has ever said it was--at least not Scofield or Trumbull. And the fact that Scofield received the Cross of Honor, even Canfield cannot deny. So why all the fuss? Would anyone deny it was for bravery when the motto on the award was Fortes Creantur Fortibus ("the brave beget the brave")? The official description calls it "a special mark of valor for those who distinguished themselves in feats of courage." So we do not see that anyone misrepresented anything.

Canfield points out that the award, not given until after the war was over, was a presentation made by the United Daughters of the Confederacy for those who served the South honorably. Recipients were told, "Guard it safely, wear it proudly. It represents your Confederate Heritage and your patriotism and service to your Country in time of war."

Furthermore, we think everyone at the time knew exactly what the Cross of Honor was, so there was no intent on anyone's part to deceive anybody. Surely Scofield was too wise a man to try to fool others by listing himself in that prestigious Who's Who as being "awarded Cross of Honor for valor at battle of Antietam," and not expect to be immediately hooted out of the country if it involved misrepresentation. In fact, if everything about the Cross of Honor had not been well known at the time, surely the Marquis Publishing Company of Chicago, sponsors of Who's Who in America, would have questioned or deleted it. Even Canfield expresses amazement "that some Confederate veteran who also received the Cross of Honor failed to call Scofield or Trumbull on its proper significance," then again offers his explanation of special providence watching over "drunks, children and idiots."

He finally dismissed it by concluding that dispensationalists "are rarely history buffs or Civil War buffs." To us it seems much more logical and reasonable to assume--from the fact that no Confederate veteran pointed out what Canfield calls the award's "proper significance"--that there was absolutely nothing wrong. We might also call attention to the fact that one of Canfield's sources, BeVier, is a dispensationalist who holds three graduate degrees with majors in history. His Master's was in United States history, he considers himself "a Civil War buff," and he currently has logged over 37 years of military service, active and reserve. In addition, he has been teaching history on the collegiate level since 1958. We think, beyond question, he knows more about the matter than the critic Canfield!

D. The "Doctor of Divinity"

In a word, this is Canfield's insinuation that Scofield awarded himself a Doctor of Divinity. In fact, he makes the flat accusation, "Evidence suggests that the title was incorrect, the degree was self-bestowed." What evidence? The evidence of silence? The evidence that Canfield, more than three-quarters of a century later, cannot find the source? In typical Canfield manner, this flat, positive statement was made after first developing an earlier insinuation, namely, "This writer feels that it is quite likely that Scofield 'conferred' the degree upon himself to add to the prestige of his name" (emphasis added). Such is a common Canfield custom: raise a question about something, then later state that question as an absolute fact supported by firm evidence (when there is none).

Where did Scofield get his degree? We have no idea! On the other hand, as in the case of the Cross of Honor, we think that if he suddenly started sprouting one of unknown origin there would have been immediate questions. In our own case, if friends unexpectedly begin calling themselves "Doctor," we inquire as to the source of the degree and, when informed, offer hearty congratulations. To date, none has replied, "I conferred it upon myself"--or even refused to identify the source. We think the same would have been true in Scofield's day, especially when honorary degrees were not the "dime a dozen" they are today.

Please remember that Canfield is questioning the source of Scofield's degree nearly 90 years after the fact! For that matter, where did Arno C. Gaebelein (another Canfield target) receive his doctorate? Where did William Bell Riley receive his doctorates (D.D., LL.D.)? Where did Bob Jones, Sr., receive his degrees (D.D., LL.D.)? What about other heroes of Fundamentalism with honorary titles? Simply because I do not know where and when the degrees were conferred, does that mean I doubt their validity? Not in the slightest!

E. Scofield's Conversion Experience

Although Scofield's account of his coming to Christ is told in his biography in his own words, Canfield seems to think that he knows more about it than Scofield himself! Is such presumption on his part a case of, as he repeatedly sneers about Scofield, "victory over humility"? Frankly, it would be unthinkable for us to claim that we knew more about another's conversion than did the individual himself.

One of Canfield's objections if that the story is given as "a verbatim report of a completely private conversation." He argues, "Now, the moment may be vividly etched on a convert's mind, but it is doubtful if Scofield's memory 40 years later justified use of the conversational form. Tape recorders were years in the future."

We do not consider either argument valid. If talking about the death of a dog and attempting to recall what was said 40 years later, that might be another matter. But we are talking about Scofield's own conversion--his deliverance from Hell and guarantee from God of Heaven--and, surely, he told it and retold it hundreds of times over those 40 years. Remember Moody's criticism that he told it too frequently!

In my own case, I relate details of my conversion in "verbatim form" and tell what various individuals said and what I said. I quote the one beside me in the congregation, the people behind me, the dean of the youth camp, the personal worker, and even what I said to the Lord. It was not only "vividly etched" on my mind 46 years ago, but the retelling of it again and again has added to the deepening of that "groove" in my brain.

As for Trumbull's account of it, while he may not have had a tape recorder, he did have pencil and paper--and Canfield has no way of knowing how detailed were the notes he made or it he wrote it down verbatim while Scofield related it. Too, since Scofield told the story in his preaching so frequently, no doubt Trumbull had heard it many, many times. We think Canfield is nit-picking to complain about a "verbatim report." (This is the same man, remember, who gave a "verbatim report" of what he thinks he heard A. W. Tozer say a single time in a single sermon--30 years after the fact!)

Canfield argues that Scofield was not a member of the Bar in Missouri; in fact, that he did not even have a law office in St. Louis. Yet Canfield himself acknowledges that the St. Louis City Directory for 1877 listed Scofield as "Lawyer" and his office as being at "206 North 8th Street," with his residence at "3029 Dickson." What Canfield means in denying that Scofield was licensed to practice law in Missouri is merely that he cannot find proof of that fact which he is willing to accept! But even if Canfield is correct in this, there were still certain things that an experienced lawyer from another State could do without acting illegally, or perhaps he was a part of another lawyer's legal complex at the time. The options are too unlimited to merely dismiss the possibility by saying "there is no record" more than a century later. Since neither Canfield nor we can say what his work in that office involved, it would be presumptuous and wicked for either of us to dogmatically speculate.

Canfield also scoffs at the idea of Thomas S. McPheeters being the Lord's agent in the conversion, although he acknowledges that McPheeters was an outstanding Christian and a fervent soul winner, a man really sold out to Jesus Christ. Canfield admits that such an evaluation of McPheeters is "confirmed by official sources" (what in the world does that mean?), but he points out that since his "business interests required the best legal talent available," it would rule out Scofield. He considers the going of McPheeters to Scofield's office on business "very unlikely" and assures one and all that the two may have met socially, "but never as client and legal counsel." (He laments that since McPheeters is dead, "he could not be reached to clarify any discrepancies," but neither can Scofield "be reached" to clarify the false and libelous insinuations of Canfield!)

The latter goes on to argue, in a footnote, that a St. Louis friend of his is "acquainted" with the descendants of McPheeters and "she agrees with [Canfield] that no member of the McPheeters' family would have utilized a 'drunken' lawyer bearing a taint of forgery for legal business." That is "an opinion" straight from a friend of a friend (or, at least, an "acquaintance," neither of whom probably ever met the man), a full century after the fact! (Incidentally, this is not the only time Canfield quotes such a source. About Scofield leaving Kansas, he wrote: "An Atchison resident, Arthur Metz, told a friend of the writer that Scofield had a bad reputation and that he just 'skeedaddled out of town!'" This supposed incident took place more than a

century before this friend of a stranger detailed it. What an authority!) On the other hand, Trumbull quotes a long-time personal friend of McPheeters (not a mere acquaintance of the heirs), J. L. Woodbridge, who, after reading the conversion story, declared: "I know the account you give is accurate because it is just the way he would go about it."

But we do not see any discrepancy with the facts, no matter how saintly McPheeters or how evil Scofield. In the first place, any pollster knows how to ask loaded questions to assure the "right" responses. If one approached a friend and inquired, "Do you think a great man like the late and lamented Mr. So-and-so would have ever done business with a rogue, a drunk, a shyster and a crook?"--what would the answer be? All of us know exactly--and that is precisely the response Canfield obtained. All that is necessary for this type of documentation is "acquaintance" with a "friend" from whom you may "inquire."

In the second place, what all of us--pro and anti Scofield--agree upon about the character of McPheeters indicates that he was exactly the kind of man who might have gone to Scofield in exactly the manner described. Perhaps the business he took to him was very irrelevant and unimportant, but it gave him an opportunity to witness to one whom he recognized as needing Christ desperately. We are confident that many, many soul winners have done exactly as McPheeters may have done: if necessary, even "making up business" as an excuse to get into an office and witness for Christ. We have. As is his custom, Canfield simply makes a mountain out of a molehill, seeking an excuse to tarnish the name and memory of a great man of God.

We noted earlier that Canfield is also troubled about the "you know my weakness" statement of Scofield to McPheeters. He interprets this to mean "alcoholic" (the philosophy of humanism), and he speaks of Scofield's "alleged period of drunkenness." However, Canfield then turns around and says that either "Scofield or Trumbull, or someone else originated" the liquor problem. He passes it off as possibly "part of the package of merchandising" Scofield to the "Fundamentalist circles."

Perhaps his biggest problem about the conversion account, however, is that Canfield would rather take the word of ungodly reporters writing for opposition newspapers who, like himself, were fashioning a hatchet job--men who knew nothing about spiritual matters--than he would of Scofield himself or the editor of the prestigious Sunday School Times. The two secular newspaper stories were truly "hatchet jobs," filled with errors and discrepancies. Both were written by far-removed reporters in Kansas (the conversion took place in St. Louis), and their accounts were overflowing with ridicule and sarcasm about Scofield being "converted."

One attributed his conversion to "a young and beautiful girl, the only daughter of a wealthy St. Louisan," but the other pictured it as resulting from "a band of Christian women who prayed with him and worked his conversion." Canfield prefers the account that a "girl from the Flower Mission" won him to Christ while he was in jail, and he assures his readers, "The continued acceptance of the Flower Mission Girl incident does, however, suggest the possibility of 'crawling things' just below the surface. We would leave them there until we can get the eschatology straightened out."

If he is going to "leave them there," why is he making the insinuation of "crawling things" being hidden? And when he speaks of "continued acceptance" of the story, we ask, "Acceptance by whom?" Incidentally, what we have quoted here from Canfield is in the same paragraph where he speaks of "gossipy-minded Fundamentalists." What a graphic illustration this is of Romans 2:1!

At the end of the book Canfield is still talking of the conversion story discrepancies and insisting that the Trumbull/Scofield account does "not agree with the data in official public records." Where "in official public records" is data about Scofield's conversion? And he jumps on Trumbull's statement, "There have been all sorts of inaccurate and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr. Scofield, passing from mouth to mouth, some of these have gained currency, and as he says himself, he long ago gave up hope of correcting or denying them!" It is significant, perhaps, that Canfield omitted Trumbull's words which immediately followed the above: "But these facts have been given here **as they actually occurred . . .**" (emphasis added).

We think samples of those inaccuracies are given in Canfield's work, taken from hostile newspaper accounts, but "the facts," as Trumbull calls them, are given in the official biography "as they actually occurred." Honest, intelligent people without an ax to grind are willing to accept the Scofield/Trumbull version, we feel sure.

Canfield's problem, as already noted, is his desire to accept newspaper accounts, often extremely hostile, over the testimony of the man involved. Yet, if such an account does not agree with his theories or say what he wants it to say, he is perfectly willing to discount his own witness as unreliable. To offer one illustration, when Canfield referred to a press account of Scofield's ordination--which said that the ordination council had been told about his past--Canfield said he "consider[ed] that part of the newspaper story unlikely," adding the qualifier, "unless the minutes were written with an official tongue-in-cheek." On the other side of the coin again, Canfield is willing to accept statements from a "City of Dallas" history about Scofield's lectures abroad, if he thinks they discredit Scofield on another matter.

Quite frankly, we do not know why Canfield is so dead set against accepting the official biographical account of the conversion. After all, isn't the grace of God sufficient to blot out the kind of past Scofield may have had, even if we accept the wildest exaggerations regarding those sins? When we publicly referred to these charges about Scofield in THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST (February 3, 1984) as they were first aired by Dave MacPherson (Canfield acknowledged in a private letter to this reviewer that he supplied MacPherson with that ammunition to use as "something of a 'trial balloon'"), namely, that the Scofield Reference Bible should be discredited because of Scofield's life before his new birth, we wrote: "We don't think so! Should the 13 or 14 books that the Apostle Paul penned in the New Testament be discredited because before his conversion he was a 'blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious' (I Timothy 1:13), and made 'havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison' (Acts 8:3)? To merely ask the question is to show the absurdity of MacPherson's conclusions." We are of the same conviction still.

Scofield's work should no more be discredited on such a basis than one would disavow the ministry of Augustine, Mel Trotter, Chuck Colson, John Newton (should we stop singing "Amazing Grace"?) or any other "chief of sinners" (I Timothy 1:15) who has been redeemed by the grace of God and his sins blotted out by the blood of Christ. To say otherwise would be limiting (and doubting) God.

How wicked, then, for Canfield to infer, "Thus we still do not know the facts of the conversion of a man who had profound influence in an important segment of the Church." The options boil down to two: accept Scofield's own statement about his own conversion, or adopt Canfield's speculations and insinuations. We prefer the former and we think most good Christians will, too.

When all is said and done, surely Scofield knew more about his own conversion experience than Canfield ever will--at least this side of Glory. After all, as the Southern singers would say, "He was there when it happened, and he ought to know!"

The last basic charge against Scofield which Canfield makes can be summed up,

F. Divorce and Remarriage

Beyond any question of a doubt, this is by far the most serious of all the accusations against Scofield. In our judgment, every other charge fades almost into insignificance when compared to it. While Canfield uses such terms about the two marriages as "calculated deception" and flatly declares Scofield did not have "the slightest twinge of remorse" about what had happened "except possibly in the very last months of his life," we think the picture in the Psalms of David's inward remorse more realistically describes the situation. How wicked it is to judge another's inner motives!

Here are the facts which none deny; Scofield and Leontine Cerre were united in marriage by a Justice of the Peace in St. Louis on September 21, 1866. She was a Roman Catholic. From that union were born three children: Abigail Leontine Terese (July 13, 1867), Marie Helene (October 4, 1869), and later in Kansas a son, Guy Sylvestre (June, 1872), who died barely 2 1/2 years after birth.

Shortly after Scofield resigned his federal post in Kansas, he left that State and returned to St. Louis. Apparently he traveled back and forth between Missouri and Kansas for a time, then the marriage was irretrievably broken. On July 23, 1881, Leontine signed papers for a divorce (it was filed on December 9) and Scofield then filed a response. On March 4 of the following year, Scofield appealed for a dismissal of the action and his request was granted. Even Canfield acknowledges that there were reports of a reconciliation attempt. If so, it was not successful and on October 1, 1883, Leontine again filed for a divorce. On December 8, barely two months later, it was granted.

Now comes the more difficult part in the account. On March 11, 1884 (if you accept the marriage certificate) or July 14, 1884 (if you accept Who's

Who in America), Cyrus Scofield took his second wife, Hettie Hall Van Wart, a member of his church in Dallas.

There is no justifying this action in our mind whatsoever! While even Canfield acknowledges Leontine "was at times temperamental" (which he excuses on "her Gallic heritage"), that is no biblical reason for breaking a divine wedlock, accepting a divorce, then remarrying. Beale, in his In Pursuit of Purity, says Leontine "would no longer tolerate his new lifestyle," adding that Scofield remarried "on the basis of I Corinthians 7:15," but he gives no documentation for either statement. BeVier, in private correspondence with this reviewer, suggested the possibility that Scofield, in 1883-84, did not know what the Scripture taught on divorce and remarriage--and that no one, not even his mentor, Dr. James H. Brookes of St. Louis, had instructed him.

Scofield was ordained to the gospel ministry on October 17, 1883, barely two weeks after the second divorce action was filed (hence, before it was effected). This is, indeed, one fact Canfield reveals that is truly incredible.

What would we have done if we had been on the ordaining council? It is impossible to say from our present vantage point, since we do not know for certain what Scofield did or did not tell that body. If we had known that a divorce action was pending, we would have recommended another reconciliation attempt for Scofield and a postponement for the council. If the divorce had already been granted (which it had not, of course), we would have walked out, refusing to lay hands on the candidate. We have strong convictions about the qualifications for the gospel ministry. While we are second to none in insisting that there is forgiveness for any sin, we nonetheless recognize that some actions have consequences not even conversion removes.

At the same time, we also freely acknowledge that our position is a minority one and that many of our evangelical brethren feel certain situations make a second marriage for a divorced minister possible. In fact, some of the men for whom we have considerable respect hold tenaciously to such a position . As a result, we maintain our own convictions but are willing to show grace toward others who do not concur. We know men in the ministry today with a past something like Scofield's and we are willing to work with them, love them, honor them and leave the rest to God--who often, by the way, will use a man in His permissive will who has in the past violated standards of His direct will. We leave the whole situation to God to handle at the Judgment Seat of Christ.

If we had lived and ministered in Scofield's day, we would have had perfect freedom to work with him in getting out the precious gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. There would have been no objection on our part about holding crusades in his churches, supporting missionaries going out under the Mission he headed, or working with him in the great prophetic conferences.

In light of all this, we have no problem endorsing the Scofield Reference Bible or recommending its use. We do have objections to a number of the notes therein, but they are not things dealing with major doctrines and we feel free to criticize them, just as we would the notes of any other man. So, to us, the hatchet job Canfield has done on Scofield fails to accomplish his stated purpose. He has not refuted the teaching by discrediting the individual.

If Scofield were alive today and his actions just committed, we would not necessarily say the same in every detail. But we think Scofield proved himself by the remainder of his life, and the mistake of the divorce--about which he may have had no choice--should not be held against him. He did, however, have a choice in the matter of remarriage.

Perhaps it would be beneficial to close this section with a word from Scofield himself, stating his own position on the subject. In answer to a question, "Is there a passage in the New Testament which settles conclusively the question of divorce?" he replied: "The New Testament teaching as to marriage and divorce is not to be gathered from any single passage, but from the harmony of them all. This is admirably done in the Westminster Confession, chapter 24, sections i-vi. There is a shameful and unscriptural laxity in the United States in respect of marriage and divorce. It threatens not only the spirituality of the churches, but the very integrity of society. But these evils are not to be cured by an extra biblical strictness, but only by a steadfast demand that this most vital of all human relations shall be regulated neither by lust nor by Pharisaism, but by the mind of God as revealed in the Scriptures" (Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box, Compiled by Ella E. Pohle, p. 96). We gather from this, especially the reference to "extra biblical strictness," he felt his own situation, as outlined above, was in conformity to the biblical guidelines.

Conclusion

We did not enjoy reading Canfield's manuscript and we certainly have not delighted in writing this review. The truth probably lies somewhere between the "hero figure" some dispensationalists have made of Scofield and the "utterly contemptible cad" Canfield portrays. We do not think what the latter has written will impress intelligent people--unless they are looking for ammunition to use in an attack on dispensationalism, pretribulationism, premillennialism, etc., and then they will love it!

What will Canfield's work do? Unfortunately, by the enemies of the premillennial position it will be taken as gospel truth in every detail (and the spicier the detail, the louder it will be trumpeted). We have a review written by J. R. Boyd in The Researcher (a Canadian publication) which has already accepted every accusation as absolute truth. He refers to "the deceptive notes" of the Scofield Reference Bible as coming "from a deceived and deceptive heart" (contra: he had a new heart, received through a new birth); calls Scofield an ex-alcoholic (contra: alcoholic goes beyond the evidence); says he divorced his wife without any grounds at all (contra: she divorced him); says he fathered four children "with the youngest dying" (contra: it was the third child who died); says he "never supported them" (contra: such a statement takes in Noel, the son of his second marriage); says "he impressed the fundamentalist camp that he was a bachelor" (contra: while Canfield only dares hint at this, there is no evidence to support it); accuses Trumbull of "adding some flavor" to the life story of Scofield (contra: no misrepresentation is proved); flatly accuses Scofield of "lying" about receiving the Cross of Honor for bravery (contra: he did receive it and it was stated as being for bravery); swallows all the hostile newspaper articles as absolute truth (contra: like the witnesses at Jesus' trial, "neither so did their witness agree together"); says Scofield "was converted in jail"--

thousands have been); says Scofield "gave himself" the honorary doctorate "to elevate himself" (contra: there is no evidence of this at all); etc., etc. You will note that Boyd accepts everything Canfield says without the slightest deviation--aside from the fact that he gives confusing reports about what Canfield actually did say, going even beyond the evidence Canfield offers! We thought it was humorous that, immediately following Boyd's 4-page review was a poem by Zylma M. Walker which Scofield would have loved, "In An Hour That Ye Think Not," about the unexpected, any-moment return of Christ!

Another review, much briefer--but still swallowing everything "hook, line and sinker" in the Canfield treatise--appeared in The Banner of Truth. Written by Geoffrey Thomas, like Boyd's review it accepted everything Canfield said as "gospel," and, also like Boyd's, added embellishment beyond what Canfield did write. By way of example, Thomas referred to the Reference Bible royalties, saying they "subsequently was [sic] left to his son and granddaughter **who had no interest in evangelical Christianity.**" That last phrase, for which we have added boldface type, goes beyond what the book says. Canfield does not say this--nor does either Thomas or Canfield know it. But it is this "enlarging" on the data that makes a book like this one especially dangerous and damaging to the cause of Christ around the world.

Even the respected scholar, R. J. Rushdoony, in his Chalcedon "Book Notices" (No. 10), got carried away and sinned in this manner. He wrote in his review: "Scofield, who in his Bible notes promoted antinomianism, dispensationalism, and pre-tribulationism, had good reason to try to render God's law null and void! He was a man of bad character, a perjurer, a liar, a convicted forger, and more, and his sins were not limited to the years prior to his supposed conversion. No one has been able to challenge Canfield's research. Instead, the adherents of Scofieldianism are trying to ignore this book; publishers have been afraid to touch it. We predict, however, that this book will in time put an end to Scofieldianism are trying to ignore this book; publishers have been afraid to touch it. We predict, however, that this book will in time put an end to Scofieldianism. To get the truth out, get this book and get copies to pass on to others."

Alas, note the following: (1) Scofield did not promote antinomianism and Rushdoony cannot produce evidence that he did, at least if the theological definition of it is accepted and not his own concept.

(2) Scofield, following his conversion, was not a man of "bad character" in any sense of the word. In fact, we have produced statements in this review insisting that he was a man of good reputation even before his conversion.

(3) Rushdoony either very carelessly read Canfield's evidence or he deliberately misrepresents the truth when he says Scofield was "a convicted forger"--either before or after conversion. There is no evidence that he was ever convicted in any court of law of anything, not even stealing a post office pen!

(4) We are not sure what Rushdoony means when he says Scofield's "sins were not limited to the years prior to his supposed conversion." Are anyone's? But if he means the ones he catalogued, he has done a horrible injustice to Scofield's memory.

(5) Unless Rushdoony writes through personal divine revelation, he owes a sincere apology for speaking of a "supposed" conversion for Scofield, violating the clear command in Matthew 7:1-5 about judging--which we understand to refer to matters of the heart, since numerous other passages command us to judge actions. Antidispensationalists sneer at some for saying that the Sermon on the Mount is not for this age (don't count us among that number), but is such any worse than professing to adopt it and then ignoring its commands?

(6) The reason no one has challenged "Canfield's research" is not because they were unable, as Rushdoony supposes, but because he did such a sloppy job doing so would be an almost endless task. Be that as it may, now we have challenged it.

(7) It will take something more credible than Canfield's work to "put an end to Scofieldianism," as Rushdoony calls it. We think a single reading of this review will make that plain.

(8) As for his advice to "get copies to pass on to others," it is only fair to warn those who do that they will be responsible before God for disseminating the kind of slander and untruths found in Canfield's work.

We know little about the author other than that he is a retired layman in North Carolina who had one year of Bible training 50 years ago, but we are very frank to say that, while Canfield attacks the character of every dispensationalist he can connect to Scofield, we do not have very much confidence in a man who would write this kind of a hatchet job. He makes much in his work about who financed Scofield (Sandeen, in The Roots of Fundamentalism, says Gaebelein "put Scofield in touch with several of his supporters, Alwyn Ball, Jr., John T. Pirie, and Francis E. Fitch, all of whom contributed toward Scofield's expenses during the next few years while he worked on the manuscript"; Trumbull says basically the same and Gaebelein, in his Moody Monthly articles, said: "The two prominent sponsors were Alwyn Ball, Jr., of New York, and John T. Pirie, of Chicago and New York"), but we cannot help wondering who financed Canfield's work? With all the research and trips to sources and other matters he speaks of in this volume, it must have taken considerable time and tremendous expense would have been involved. However, we are not going to see anything ominous in it, even though he delights to find something sinister in where Scofield obtained his support. As far as we are concerned, he did it on his own time, accomplished his own research, and did it all at his own expense. We are willing to give him all the credit--and all the blame.

We conclude our review with a quotation Canfield himself offers from the pen of Dr. Arnold Dallimore: "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 carefulness ought he to search out the facts, diligently examining all the evidence on every side of any issue, and presenting his findings with exactitude!"

What an indictment this is of Canfield and his "incredible" hatchet job!