Hydeur Dr. Harper,

Your kind note is received.

I am so busy with various matters that I see no time for the review articles this month. Hence and I have a scheme for the Biblical World that you may approve of and if you do I will be glad to listen to a proposition from you.

Do you favor a union with Blakelaw?

I now think of preparing an outline of Old Test. Text, and perhaps you would be glad to publish it. I hope to judge the next May for 15 months, and I put my time then for the preparation. Meanwhile we shall see how the Blakelaw course goes. He is enthusiastic. I am not fulsome but think the course will go.

Oct. 5, 1893.
just with you, the fact is I do not
want you to forget me. If we could
meet now when I am sure we
could laugh me some matters.
I am asking till you one thing
but I do not dare to do it because
you cannot keep it. You will think
you can and then you will get
confidential with the Chicago's better
and jin me away. No it will not
do, but there is no harm in among
your curiosity a little. I wonder
what scheme is in your head now
and whether it is destined to become
a plan.

I shall send you within a day
or two the reports. John Sunday School
beams and I ask for you Storper
criticism. I am afraid we
shall be too orthodox, and I write
Newton Centre, Mass.,
April 25, 1888.

My dear Barker,

The circulars have not yet come, though you have written twice that they have been sent. I am sorry you have been so crowded with work. I saw a very flattering notice of your Southern trip in the Examiner and I have been congratulating you on having the time to engage in these outside things. We shall have several Seminary students at the Summer School, some first-rate men. It is true that Roman colleges here are somewhat embarrassed by Summer School work but I do not mind that and shall seem to mend our men to-day. I think you will have more Newmen than ever before.

Let me once more in regard to the N. Y. City Scheme. And if you learn the New scheme I will send the circular to you. As for your successor, I presume you have promised the place to a dozen or so already. If I am led to believe this I think it would be a victory for the Old Testament.

Truly yours,

E. R. Brown

look at my article in this week's Watchman.
Newton Centre, Mass.,
December 16, 1887.

My dear friend,

Enclosed please find₊ecr. Cramner’s Cramner No. 1. If this is what you want, I will go on with the others. If not, please indicate what changes you desire and return to me at your earliest convenience.

I am so sorry you have lost these recommendations. Such things must gradually away from us. I regret that amid the other business, the whole thing has gone away from me and that I cannot take the time for a new study of it. It is possible that it will yet turn up, so that other circula,r I prepared did after it was suffered to be lost.

In great haste:

Charles Rufus Brown.

About two months ago you said that within sixty days you would disclose a great secret, but with it at once.
Newton Centre, Mass.,
October 20, 1887.

My dear Harkin,

Your is received. In regard to your objective to the contract, I have been ready. I have admitted that there is no money in this thing for me; but more trouble than return.

Hence you will not consider me grasping when I suggest that it is not well to allow more for advertising than it is necessary to spend for that purpose. It is not necessary to launch out any in this respect, and in this regard, the cause will be on a very different footing from the Hebrus Correspondence School and Elmontagna: for all that is needed in advertising is a brief note appended to the circulars sent Hebrus Correspondence School: while for the latter a great deal needs to be said about study which
is entirely superseded for those who
have been through Hebrew Themes
and are beginning. I supposed that
a very brief notice of Araunah
became necesary for
such Curcular and that Curcular
need be exercised very seldom and
therefore that $0.25 a man must
be a liberal allowance: and I am
fayre that 10% of the gross
receipts from Araunah Cooperate.

Here is more than it is necessary
to feed for that all such
expenditures go outside our own
interests; if you do not think
so in nature deliberation, you
are at liberty to substitute that
figure for the $0.25 I named.
I can hereon barely write coherently on any subject, all my faculties
are so absorbed with what must
be before you: Are you the President
Black University; is the Institute endowed with 1,000,000 $ are you going into an insane asylum. We all the would look at admiring wonder at you and your humble servant is dwelling with pride among with curiosity. My cabinet glands are even now showing their composition and name will be ready for the 60 days are over if you do not write and believe in strained capacities.

In regard to the time of issue of Astronomic lectures, I do not say that they can be promised for a fixed date, for two reasons. I can not say at this moment what change in my work here will be occasioned by the death of Dr. Swift. Secondly, I can not tell how much later will be involved; and it would not be honorable for me to promise for a date unless I were fully convinced that I could perform them at advertised date.
I would much like to pay you a visit soon but I hardly see that we can arrange it. I am occupied every Sunday now and it is uncertain just what part, fancy, P. Dr. Lincoln is to have I must do. They can not your family return here or visit just this once, you are famous travelers you know. I believe there is nothing else.

Sincerely,

Charles Rufus Brown
some suggestion in that line par-
ticular. I'm sure we must have a
scheme that will meet the approval
of a conservative such as Beecher
and a progressive such as - shall
I say Herrick? or Price?

In me so disappointed not
to see you and not to see you.
Your kind visitation was thought
appreciated. I send most
cordial greeting to Mrs. Herrick
and yourself and to the younger
people -

With love, Hammer

Brown.
Newton Centre, Mass.,
February 23, 1888.

My dear Brother,

Some came this morning. I must see you by all means on Saturday and will hold myself in readiness to go to Boston in answer to your telegram at a moment's notice. I think it will be better, however, for you to take your meals here and remain with me until about 9 P.M.; then it may be that I will go to Boston and see you off. I take it that you need not be confined to the meetings all day, and an interview with me just now is as necessary as your attendance at T. M. C. A. meetings.

I have read your enclosures with very great care, and while I can not regard the case as so desperate as they seem to do, I could not fail to be impressed by some of the considerations adduced. I will now go through the two letters briefly, touching the salient points.

1. Brondesby. (1) Quite right. I am not indeed thereby giving more weight to the newer hypothesis, I suppose you intended 6 to do so. (2) Brondesby assumes that you yourself are not a follower of the new School. If you have not made up your mind
I think you would better not enter this discussion, for the influence fit on you would be disastrous, not be fair.

I do not think that a discussion between Green and Toy or Lynn would do any good in clearing up the question at issue. I think Brodno overestimates Lynn; he is scholarly but not keen on controversy or "contagiously enthusiastic". Toy is impractical and cold. Neither Toy nor Green would understand each other. No. Brodno has not proposed an expedient nor an alternative arrangement or dealt at a proper one. Burgo might do it, he is not the Man. In my opinion Francis Broun is the best Man on the glove for the work (next to yourself) and probably he would decline. I cannot at this mind that you yourself that you conduct the discussion with Green as you have proposed.

II Brodno assumed that you are a conservative. Nor sure that you long for our & Rationalism. I do not think that the latter is quite self-consistent. On the other he says that people will accept the
and possibly try to argue a different conclusion.

Then again I can see quite that you
have not any hold by your own committed
altitude. It has succeeded admirably
with the C.T. student. It is a cause
exactly in accord with a letter. Events
must proceed, whose opinion must be
shared by many from conservative ministry.
Next Petham would rather have a pacific
non-committal than one committed to the
enemy. I can not see the force of
Dr. N. considerations at least till
the full extent. There are other prominent
scholars who have not announced their
position; viz. J. Brown, More, Tanners.

With this idea that error is more likely to
gain from truth than is truth from error,
I can not possibly agree. Witness the
abundant fruit which has sprung out of
Patriotism and Militarianism, while
the latter are in a dying condition; and
the only reason that the promulgation of new
truth can ever weaken faith is
that the argument will not allow the simple
facts to make their impression apart from
their prejudged and fixed conceptions for which
they pretend to bring the authority of the divine
word: He assumes throughout that Green is the on the diligence, but may be not bring objections of the Radicals in sentences. Reason which they must rack their brains for hono and excuse in favor of the truth is in their side; and they have the requisite mental form.

But I must stop. My own impression are easily gathered from the above - there are:

1. If you discuss the question the weight will certainly be on the side of the free enterprise.
2. If you discuss it, you will finish by being an ardent advocate of the critical hypothesis in their main features.
3. If you have any only tendenies in that direction, the time is not ripe for the discussion.
4. If you have gone over the question as to whether your periodical is or ground firm enough to stand the blue sky which will be raised.
5. If you withdraw, your main object may be gained by introducing T. Brown, or Bang delight or (doubtful of Briggs) Briggs.

Properly Brown would not accept any properly green world object of Briggs. But we will go over this whole matter on Saturday.
P.S. I have just read this & my wife who says I have nowhere expressed belief that you may really have gone over to the Radical school; but I give you the credit for more core judgment than does Dr. Hortrup who ought to know you so well, and I do not believe you will go until you see good reasons for so doing. She (my wife) adds that she hopes you will not engage in the Hebrewica business, a topic which I heartily endorse.

Yours sincerely,

Charles Rufus Brown.
PROFESSORS.
Rev. LEVI L. Paine, D. D.,
Ecclesiastical History.
Rev. JOHN S. sewall, D. D.,
Sacred Rhetoric.
Rev. LEWIS F. STEARNS, D. D.,
Christian Theology.
Rev. CHARLES J. H. ROGERS, A. M.,
Rev. FRANCIS B. DENIO, A. B.,
Old Testament Exegesis.

Dear brock Harper,
Since I wrote to you a day or two ago, a project has come to my mind. Do you know that one of the great drawbacks to an intelligent discussion of the Pentateuchal question is the lack of a definite knowledge of the facts at the basis of the literary criticism. In Kleinert's Deuteronomium pp. 214ff. is a discussion of the peculiarities of Deuteronomy, linguistic. Kuenen in the Hexateuch pp. 110ff. makes use of this material. The linguistic peculiarities of the PrieserCodex are not given by him. I am not aware that any one has yet in English given the data that lie at the basis of the literary criticism. If any one has, I should be thankful enough to have someone direct me to it. In fact I do not know where I can find the subject fully treated in German. I suppose that Ryssel's De Elohistee. Pentateuchici sermoni would give some help in that direction. I hope to have a copy at hand soon. Then, too, there is the language of the younger Elohist and of the Yahwist. I know of nothing to help in all this but the commentary of Dillman and the help he has to give is spread all through the entire commentary so far as I have seen.

Is it not possible to have this lack remedied to English speaking scholars? We shall never get ahead in the discussion of literary criticism until this lack is supplied. It is necessary to do this before the proper separation can be maintained between the historical criticism which is, after all, the burden of the Hexateuch of Kuenen. The discussions which we are having in this subject are nearly all historical yet the literary subjects are often referred to as though they were known to everyone and the basis of the historical. When as you and I know there is very little real knowledge.

I wish that we had some thing like this complete for the Pentateuch: PRIESTERCODEX. YAHWIST. ELohist. DEUTERONOMIST.

then it would be desirable to have all grammatical peculiarities noted. E.g. In the first account of the creation you know, the object of the verb: If a pronoun is not once suffixed. GEN. 182, 26. דָּרָסְתָּם. is this a peculiarity of the Elohist?
DEAR WALTER,

I wrote to you a day or two ago a letter about a project I have in mind. I do not know that one of the greatest problems in an intelligent discussion of the Pentateuch on the question of the lack of a detailed knowledge of the text or the results of the literary criticism in general, is the question of the Pentateuchal criticism. In Hebrew, the Pentateuch is a series of documents. If we want to make sense of this material, we have to understand the linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch. We cannot base our work on the assumption that any one writer or group of writers can be pinpointed. I do not know where I can find the evidence. I suppose that I am right. I do not know if there is more knowledge, but the evidence of the younger scholars and of the older writers. I know of nothing to help me in this effort. I am not sure if I have the help I need. I hope to have a copy of the book by the time I see you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Bangor Theological Seminary.

Professors.
Rev. Levi L. Paine, D.D.,
Ecclesiastical History.
Rev. John S. Sewall, D.D.,
Sacred Elohist.
Rev. Lewis F. Stearns, D.D.,
Christian Theology.
Rev. Charles J. H. Hopes, A.M.,
Rev. Francis B. Denio, A.B.,
Old Testament Exegesis.

Rev. Benjamin Tappan, D.D.,
President Board of Trustees.
Joseph S. Wheelwright, Esq.,
Vice-President.
John L. Crosby, Esq.,
Secretary.
Samuel D. Thurston,
Treasurer.

Bangor, Maine.

Can you not get this done and published in the hebraica inasmuch as there is a general agreement among the critics as to the limits of the Elohist, the Jehovist, and the Deuteronomist, would it not be well to take such an analysis as Schrader's or Dillmann's or Wellhausen's or Kuenen's and ignoring the distinction between the younger Elohist and the Jahvist make out such a study as I have indicated? Who will do it? That is the rub. I have thought of two persons, or rather two sets of persons. Suppose it be parcelled out to several persons such as Rev. W.R. Wright and Rev. Mr. Fletcher who used to be in Illinois [he may be there yet for all I know].

Or I have thought that you would have a good chance with all the students under you to get it done by several, if the work is properly divided among them. I can not do such a work alone yet I am anxious to see it done. Then the hebraica would be a good place to publish it in, and I should think that it might add to the subscription list.

What do you think of the project? Do you know any literature that would be a help in such an undertaking. Doubtless there is considerable of which I do not know in German. If you can put me on the track of any I shall be thankful enough. The article of Dr. Green in the hebraica for Oct. 1886 is not just what is needed. We need the materials in some accessible form upon which such articles are based. You see I am somewhat at a loss in dealing with the students to give them a clear idea of the subject for the lack of anything in English so far as I know. Please give me your ideas on the subject.

Cordially yours,

J. B. Dennis

I have Dillmann on the entire Pentateuch and of course I have something else. I am doing my best to get on the altar. I have nothing else so far as I know so full as that except Kleinert's De uteronomismus. We need such a work in English as I suggest, is it not practicable? Of course one may take Dillmann A B C D & arrange under those heads.

J. B. D.
CAN YOU NOT GET THIS DONE AND PUBLISHED IN THE NEBREWADIAN TIMES AS THERE IS A
GENERAL AGREEMENT AMONG THE CRITICS AS TO THE LIMITS OF THE EXACTLY THE
SCHOOLER, AND THE DETERMINED RULE IT NOT BE MELT TO TAKE SUCH AN ALTERNATIVE AS SOMETIMES OR STYLES.
WATER" OR MILLENIAN OR KINNERS, AND INTRODUCING THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN THE YOUNGER
SCHOOLER AND THE THEOCRIST, MAKE OUR STUDY OF SUCH A STUDY AS I HAVE INFORMATION, AND WILL DO IT.

THAT IS THE RUB. I HAVE THINKED OF TWO PERSONS, OR RATHER TWO SETS OF PERSONS,
SUPOSED TO BE PROCEDED OR TO BEYOND PERIODS, SUCH AS REYNARD'S, WRIGHT, AND WYAT. MR.
PETERS AND WHO USED TO BE IN JUTLAND. I MEAN THE THREE SET FOR ALL I KNOW.
NOW I HAVE THOUGHT THAT YOU WOULD HAVE A GOOD CHANCE WITH ALL THE STUDENTS UNDER YOU
TO GET IT DONE IN GENERAL, IF THE WORK IS PROPERLY DIVIDED AMONG THEM. I CAN NOT DO
SUCH A WORK, BUT I CAN ANYTHING TO SEE IT DONE. THEN THE NEBREWADIAN WOULD BE A GOOD
PLACE TO PUBLISH IT IN AND I SHOULD THINK THAT IT WOULD ADD TO THE SUBSCRIPTION LIST.
WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT, AND I SHOULD THINK THAT IT WOULD ADD TO THE SUBSCRIPTION LIST.
SUCH AN INTEREST. DO YOU KNOW ANY LITERATURE THAT WOULD BE A HELP IN
SUCH AN UNDERSTANDING? DOUBTFUL THERES IS CONSIDERABLE OF WHICH I DO NOT KNOW IN
GERMANY. IF YOU CAN PUT ME ON THE TRACK OF ANY I SHALL BE THANGFUL ENOUGH.
THE ARTICLE OF
GREEN IN THE NEBREWADIAN TIMES IS NOT JUST WHAT I WANTED. WE NEED THE MATERIALS
IN SOME ACCESSIBLE FORM FROM WHICH SUCH STUDENTS TO GIVE THEM A CLEAR IDEA OF THE SUBJECT FOR THE
LOOK OF AIVANTIN IN ENGLISH OR FRENCH. I KNOW.

PLEASE GIVE ME YOUR IDEAS ON THE SUB-

Yours,

[Signature]
Dear Prof. Harper:

Your letter of Feb. 2nd in reference to the Pentateuchal matter is at hand with the enclosure of the announcement respecting the proposed discussion of the question between yourself and Dr. Green. I shall be glad to see it, and hope that nothing will interfere with the completion of the work. At the same time I feel that the work of which I wrote ought to be done. I was nearly sick when I wrote you, and the next day was confined to my bed with a threatened attack of bilious fever, but that is, I hope, thrown off and I am now as is usual in such cases, gaining strength slowly. I see that you are hardly able to do much with this project just now. Would you give me the names of half a dozen men who might be enlisted in such a project? The first thing to do would be to get a table wrought out like this:

\[ A \]
Gen. 1.
\[ B \]
2, 1-4a
\[ C \]
Gen. 2, 4b-end.
3, 1-24
5, 29.

5. except 29 and so on through the Hexateuch. It does not make so much difference whether Dillmann's division is taken as above, or Wellhausen's or Kuenen's. I should think that Wellhausen's might be the most easily wrought out. I have his analysis of the Hexateuch and would lend it to one who could read German for him to work it out. After this I should propose that letters of the alphabet be assigned to each one so that by division of labor the entire alphabet could be gone through with. This would require that each have a Hebrew concordance, either the Englishman's, Fuerst's, Davidson's or the Vade-Mecum or some other equally good one if there is one. Then it would be desirable for each one to read through the Pent—no Hexateuch and note as fully as possible all all idiomatic and grammatical peculiarities in each so-called document, reading by itself. This would of course be a work of time. It would take perhaps two or three years to get it done and published in the Hebraica. It would materially help progress to a result and give us the deepest linguistic foundation possible. Cannot it be done? Cannot you give some help in getting the thing started? I will do what I can to help it on. I suspect that many peculiarities will disappear, that the foundation for the
literary criticism will largely diminish. Hence the superstructure must likewise diminish. There is no way of showing this but by a full and as exact a showing as possible of the bottom facts. You see that I have the thing on my mind and wish to see it through. We ought to combine our forces and divide the labor. Then after that is the work of studying the Theology of the various documents and to see just how much basis there is for the various terms priest, theocratic, prophetic, Israelish, Judean etc. This can be done independently of the work of the Concordances. Cannot you get some of your students into this kind of work? I do not thing that we should end the whole discussion, but we could help to clear up some of the questions.

What is wanted above all just now is a getting at the facts without any reference to the later use of them. Without ever raising a question what the facts mean until the facts are gathered together. When that is done we shall be in a condition to draw some conclusions. For one I have not sufficient basis to form a conclusion that satisfies myself. I do not believe that many persons in this country have such a knowledge of the facts as would warrant them to express a matured conclusion on the subject of literary criticism. This is the result of my study of the discussions. I have about forewarn them all until we do get at the facts.

If you will send me the copies of the advanced lessons as I asked I will go without the references to the Syntax that you have published. Cannot you send me one set for my own benefit? I should esteem it a favor.

Cordially Yours,

[Signature]

P.S. Can you tell me the meaning of the * in the references in Bunsen's Commentary. E.g. in the Composition of the Pentateuch p. 613 and subsequent it is often used. It is to denote that I cannot find it and doubt if I rounded. I have thought it might refer to the Redactor. [Signature]
Dr. Charles Rufus Brown, in the Watchman, speaking of the unaffected nature of the late Dr. Harper, says:

"I shall never forget my first meeting with him. I had wondered all the way to Chicago as to what sort he might prove to be, and when I stepped upon the railway platform at Morgan Park and grasped the hand of this man, I was content. Let the reader picture to himself a smooth faced man, who looked about twenty years of age, with straightforward and penetrating but pleasant glance of the eye, a man showing even in ordinary movements the evidence of his strength, accompanied by the greatest simplicity, approachableness, and kindness, a man who for the time had dropped all care, and who proceeded to devote several consecutive hours to a stranger, to tell his own story, and to elicit the other's, and all without conventionality on the one hand, or effusiveness on the other, this friendliness being more gracious by his entrancing smile, and he will readily understand that it was a case of love at first sight with me, and that I was committed to him to the end."
in Austin and four years' residence in Houston, resided. He served in Robert's Regiment, Randall's Confederate States Army. In 1876 he was elected county judge of Smith county. In 1882 he was chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee, and was Secretary of State under Governor Hogg from 1891 to 1895.

About four years ago he was stricken with partial paralysis, from which he never fully recovered, and, suffering a recurrent attack January 24, died at 1 o'clock without regaining consciousness. He is survived by his widow, two sons and two daughters, all of whom reside in Colorado City. We extend heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved.

The Western Recorder, in its issue of January 18, says:

"Mrs. J. N. Hall says the statement that Rev. J. N. Hall was the richest Baptist preacher in the South is a mistake. Since we copied the statement, we cheerfully make the correction. It might be of some interest to know who is the richest Baptist preacher in the South. As a rough guess, we would name Dr. J. B. Cranfill as the man. We wish all these men well and may God bless them."
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