LIKE HER ELDERS, Edith, who is eight years old, was lit-
tifying herself in the back bedroom. Her face is per-
fectly smooth, but she was not yet
quite prepared for the event. She
staidly walked with her personal prepu-
cussion. "Nothing," she said, "is
old. If you have a nice time, well,
there.
"Why, Edith, what was wrong with your
hair?
"Oh don't, it's not, and all the other
hair was knky. I sha'nt go to the
dance with my hair like that.
"Well, what, when another lavish
lace came for the little girl, her
hair can be put in a neat and
approved style. I hope your mother
had a mirror and a comb, and that
little, what do you think of him?"
Edith hesitated in her decision, and
then slowly, turning around, glanced
at the man.

THE SUMERIAN RIVER
"That's the Sumerian River, mother?" she
asked in surprise. "No, that is the
stream that fed for a sea and extrac-
time. The Sumerian River was one of
them here was each a river in geography
with me to the north of the high
jumble; and yet it was not, other-
things, but a stream that fed for a
forest, joining the Mexican Gulf and
the Gulf of California. It is an
unknown river, fed for a sea and
extratime. The Sumerian River was
one of the streams that fed for a
sea and extratime.

EDITH ON THE ROAD
W. Somers, the coachman, said to
Edith, the parlour maid, "Never
mind, it is a long journey, and
you are not at all ill at ease.
When we come to the
light of the sun, you will
be in the air, and then
you will see my lighted
head-light, and know that
you are in the air, and
then you will see my
lighted head-light, and
know that you are in
the air.

THE RULE OF THE ROAD.

"I'm not going to be in the air, mother, I'm going
to drive," said Edith, taking up the reins with a
shaking ship, but it is in a most equable fashion
and the wheels are turning in the wheels, and
the wheels are turning in the wheels.

W. Somers, the coachman, said to
Edith, the parlour maid, "Never
mind, it is a long journey, and
you are not at all ill at ease.
When we come to the
light of the sun, you will
be in the air, and then
you will see my lighted
head-light, and know that
you are in the air, and
then you will see my
lighted head-light, and
know that you are in
the air.

W. Somers, the coachman, said to
Edith, the parlour maid, "Never
mind, it is a long journey, and
you are not at all ill at ease.
When we come to the
light of the sun, you will
be in the air, and then
you will see my lighted
head-light, and know that
you are in the air, and
then you will see my
lighted head-light, and
know that you are in
the air.
821 Fourth Ave.
Louisville, Feb. 9, 1891

My dear Dr. Harper:

Yours of 8th received, and I answer with the frankness of cordial friendship. I do not think it would be advisable for you to give the proposed discourse before the Publication Society. I heard your lecture with profound interest, and with hearty admiration for the moderation and modesty which you couple with such extraordinary vigor and push. Your results were gratifying, except as to the point that you put forward errors in the Word of God as being the normal situation, analogous to the evils existing in the divinely directed history. This is striking, but I am not sure that you will always consider the analogy as convincing, analogies being always precarious as a foundation for positive truth. There is the counter analogy of the person of Jesus Christ, who was thoroughly human, and yet entirely free from sin; and so the Word of God might be thoroughly human and yet divinely preserved from all real error. Sins were ascribed to Jesus, but unjustly; so errors have been ascribed to the Bible, some of which have been proven to be unfounded, several within my recollection. I am only pointing out that the one analogy may be met by the other. Of course you have carefully considered the matter, but then we all hold ourselves open to possible change of opinion in future. For my part, I should earnestly wish to die before I have to abandon the hope of making progress. Well then, as this has been your opinion for only a few
years at most, it seems to me undesirable for yourself that you formally proclaim it in a way which would commit you before the whole denomination throughout the United States, until you have given yourself more time for renewed consideration of a matter so important.

I can easily see how you might regard this reason as inadequate. But there is another. The Publication Society is trying to gain the support of Baptists in all parts of the country. Many in some parts of the North are lukewarm towards it, and many in the South are indifferent, while not a few go so far as to be hostile. Now the public opinion of Southern Baptists, a good deal stimulated by Dr. N. Toy's history, is extremely sensitive as to any departure from prevailing opinions in regard to the Bible. A discourse before the Publication Society by so famous a man as yourself, proclaiming that there are errors in the Bible, would be promptly seized upon by multitudes in the South, as a reason for breaking with the Society completely. This would seriously damage the Society's work and prospects, and would aggravate a tendency among Southern Baptists to split on the Publication question.

I think therefore that it would be wiser for yourself, and greatly better for the Society's interests, that you should decline the invitation, without giving any particular reason. A man who does so many things, and works up to so high a standard, surely has enough general reasons always on hand.
Allow me to add that I was very much interested in your lectures on
Isaiah, and did not find much from which I should strongly dissent.

And I beg pardon for saying, because while comparisons are odious
they are sometimes useful, that I think your spirit and method stand
in the most gratifying contrast to those of my friend Dr. Briggs.

He seems to be a regular sensationist. His sneering attacks upon
theologians and apologists, his delight in assuming the boldest and
most startling positions, his arrogant claim that every opinion of
the group of critics to which he belongs is science, all stand in
the queerest contrast to his quiet and gentlemanly ways in private.

In your case, you not only do not agree with him as to many points,
but you show a discrimination, sobriety, earnest effort to find the
real truth, readiness to recognize that this or that question can-
not now be settled, that on one point or another Christian scholars
are much divided— in a word your general tone and spirit, please
me greatly in the comparison. The fact is, it takes a great deal
more of independence and high manliness to maintain sobriety and
conservative sympathies in Biblical inquiry at the present time,
than it does to catch up what are called the most advanced ideas,
and thereby get great credit for independence. It is very hard for
those of us who have many administrative duties, and irons of many
kinds in the fire, to find time for that sober and oft-repeated and
grave reflection which some of these profound Biblical questions
deserve and demand.
I should not concern myself about the question whether they want me at Chautauqua the coming summer, but for the fact that several important invitations to preach at different Colleges and churches are impatiently waiting upon me. Some of them were presented last summer, and postponed according to my custom until January. Some I shall certainly be obliged to decline, but cannot say which, until I can contemplate a general programme; and where I do decline, the parties have a right to know at as soon as possible. I am not sure that I ought to continue teaching at Chautauqua, as an excess of summer work last year made me sick, and might likely enough do so again. Yet I have in many ways enjoyed the Chautauqua teaching, and particularly the intimate association with you. And so, while I do not know beforehand how the matter will look, I am anxious for the sake of others to have some definite proposition from Chautauqua before I decide. Bishop Vincent said that he was sure George was expecting me to return the coming summer, but then I have heard nothing from him or from any one. Let me explain a little further, why I hurriedly mentioned the matter to you on the platform, and now mention it again. If I had gone on indefinitely waiting, I should have been seriously incommoding several parties who are waiting on me. If I had accepted this, that and the other, then whenever propositions from Chautauqua might arrive, I might have found myself precluded from doing what was desired.

Very truly yours,

John T. Broadus
My dear Dr. Harper,

I cannot deny myself the relief of saying to you that, no matter whether you are right or wrong in the opinions with which you have been stirring up conservative Baptists, you have at least shown one qualification to engage in and promote liberty of discussion: you know how to treat dissent from your views with courtesy. I have not noted anything like wrath or contempt toward the old fogies, nor even toward your traducers.

If Baptists are going to do anything in a scholarly or a literary way, they must learn that candor is indispensable to progress, and courtesy is indispensable to candor. As a fast friend of freedom I feel no little chagrin at the tart spirit of Dr. Hill's response in the 'Examiner' to Mr. Vedder. Your way is something worth thanks and love. It has them both from me, and I am persuaded from hosts of others.

Fraternally yours,

E. H. Johnson.
Oct 17, 1895

Gloucester, Mass.

Dear Dr. Harper:

I regard it astonishing that any sensible critic should misunderstand the editor's relation to the note on "Blessed of Water and the Spirit" in Word of Aug 14. I read it as a curious piece of interpretation by Dr. Briggs and let it pass for that.

It is not a little singular, however, that the reference to the passage cited in James 3, 5 instead of according John 3, 5.

Sincerely yours, Henry L. Wriston
Piqua Ohio, Nov. 1st, 1889

Prof. W. R. Harper,
Chair of Biblical Literature
Yale College, Dear Sir,

Pardon me for addressing you. I am a member of the Cincinnati Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, and pastor of a congregation in this place. Have been interested in the discussion which has been going on in reference to the charge made by the Editor of Methodist Review of rationalism as to yourself and others.

In the last Review he has an article in which he refers to a published interview with yourself and also to some demon.
station at Chehantangua.

Could you send me the interview or tell me where I could get the account of the Chehantangua demonstration to which he alludes? I have had but one side of this matter, viz., what he has said in the Review and other church papers and at our conference sessions.

Ann well acquainted with the editor of the Review and have reason to apprehend that there has been unfairness and misrepresentation in his presentation of this matter to the public. I should like to hear at least something from the other side as to his course and statements. Put me on the track of what has been said or written in reply please. If you will mail me any matter I will remit to you what ever expense there may be.

Very sincerely,

E. J. Wells, Peoria.
New York, March 14, 1892.

Prof. W.R. Harper, Ph. D.

My Dear Sir:

One of your friends has informed me that you think I have done you an injustice in my citation of your name as a teacher of the Higher Criticism in my recent articles published in The Examiner. I have hesitated a little as to the proper course to pursue, because my only knowledge of your feeling is second-hand. If you think I have done you an injustice I might naturally think myself entitled to be informed of the fact directly, and not through a friend. But I do not stand on dignity. Frankly, I have always had for you a high personal regard, and the greatest respect for your attainments. Unwilling to seem to do an injustice to any man, least of all to one who has shown me friendly courtesy when we have met, I come right to the point and ask:

1. Is it a fact that you think I have done you an injustice?

2. Is it untrue that you teach the Higher Criticism?

3. What is your position regarding the composition of the Hexateuch?

Of course you are not under the slightest obligation to answer any one of these questions. If you do answer them I pledge myself to hold your answers strictly confidential, and to make such use of any part of them as you may hereafter explicitly
authorize. Moreover, if it turns out that I have misstated your position, and done you an injustice, I will make a retraction or correction, in a form to be approved by yourself, as public as the original offence. As an honorable man, as a Christian man, I could do no less than this.

With great esteem, I am

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Note: The handwriting and signature are unclear.]

Please express your opinion in the Examiner.

I once again trust I have given you an accurate impression of my position, and I hope my remarks will be understood in that light. I believe in the necessity of being correct and precise in our dealings with others. If you have been aggrieved, I regret it deeply.

Frankly, I have always held you in high regard for your knowledge and willingness to serve.

I am grateful to hear that you agree with me and appreciate the cooperation expressed in our dealings.

[Note: The handwriting and signature are unclear.]

If it is a fact that you think I have gone too far in-

[Note: The handwriting is unclear.]

I trust that you have taken the matter seriously and do not delay in expressing your concerns.

If you cannot agree on the details of these objections, let me know how I may assist you further.

Please consider these points carefully before making any decisions.
August 6, 1890.

Professor William R. Harper,

My dear Dr. Harper:

My attention has been called, from outside, to your comment, in the current number of "The Old and New Testament Student", on the International Sunday-school system, and I confess that I am greatly surprised at it.

Intelligent criticism on methods of Bible study are always desirable, as are suggestions as to better methods; but this article does not seem to be in the line of criticism or of suggestion, but rather of personal attack. To be frank, indeed, with you, it looks as if there were some personal feeling over a supposed grievance at the bottom of it, rather than a sincere purpose of securing a better state of things. If it had been written by Dr. Mendenhall while he was suffering from a sun-stroke, it would be entirely intelligible, but as it is I cannot comprehend it.

My first impulse was to take it up for public answer.

But in view of our personal relations, and your important position
as a Bible teacher, I am unwilling to do this before writing to you on the subject; hence this note. If, indeed, you would prefer to revise your opinions on this subject, and say your own say in view of the impression which you find this to make, on my mind for example, I shall be glad to leave you entirely free to do so. But if, on the other hand, you prefer to stand by what is there said as your deliberate conviction, I assure you that I shall be ready to take the matter up, and say what is to be said on the other side.

As preliminary to this, however, I want to say most emphatically that, in my opinion, the main statements in that paragraph are not only absolutely, but ridiculously, false. Of course, I have no idea that there was in its writing any intentional misrepresentation; but I do think that it was written either in impulsive thoughtlessness, or in lamentable ignorance of the facts.

You will see by this letter that I am really indignant at the article as it stands, but you will also see that I do not want to make a public issue where you may not have intended any thing of the sort.

Yours sincerely,

Dictated.
Welburn, No.

July 2, 1889.

My dear Dr. Harper,

For care with great propriety
decline all such invitations as Dr. B. has made,
for an to busy. I cannot be drawn into
entomology. If you cure his horn disease
long get wind to the ed. of the Advocate
that you think his Dr. not unjust 2 you,
it might be good, but it would be
better not all such things go utterly un.
noticed them to go into practice.

A brief and few-emphatic words in the present might be all. I know your care is to deliberate a matter in C.T. terms in to-day's days. You can not certainly be charged with rashness. But then an hour of an order by miles of judgment in.

Brothers whose minds are justifying the basis of some such.

Prove impartiality. I share my love for Chicago, we will take. Do not be discouraged. Look out for your health. Trust in God this truth.

E. B. D. Anderson.
My dear Pres. Harper:

I must confess to no little astonishment at the contents of Prof. Burton's letter just received. I should not have supposed it could be necessary to inform such a scholar as he that I am not a Unitarian, but I judge he must be under some such impression from his suggestion that I should so "modify my statement as to leave room for the recognition of the divinity of Christ"! I had not supposed there was an inch of room for any other idea. Since it appears to be necessary to correct a mistaken impression, will you kindly let him know that I am an intense Trinitarian, laying all possible emphasis on the fact that without the doctrine of the divinity of Christ the Gospel is no gospel; that I believe it knowing what I believe, and why I believe it; that I believe it in the full sense of the fourth gospel and of the Greek fathers and the Nicene creed, to the very last, and all-important iota, the homo-ousia, and not the mere homo-i-ousia; and that I count myself able to defend the doctrine both from Scripture and from fact.

It is perfectly apparent, therefore, that whatever in this article may appear to have a sense incompatible with this, is either a misunderstanding on Prof. Burton's part, or so awkward an expression on my part as to seem to state what I do not mean. Both may be true. In either case I should wish to alter any such expression till it no longer admitted of misunderstanding.
I can scarcely think it possible that the objection raised can refer to my positive and intentional emphasizing of the absolute manhood of Christ, implying the doctrine of the kenosis and subjectionism, because that is quite as essential a part of orthodox Trinitarianism as its complement. If the objection raised is to my inculcation of the Johannine doctrines "My Father is greater than I" and "I can do nothing of myself; the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works", the doctrine that the divinity which Jesus claims is claimed as the representative of humanity "because he is the Son of Man", then to alter my statements would be not only false to my most vital religious faiths, but would make me guilty of the very unorthodoxy which you wish to be clear of. This, as I say, seems to me hardly credible; but in the absence of any citation of expressions objected to I am completely at a loss to know what is wrong. I am conscious that my view of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is in some respects novel, perhaps unique; but certainly not unorthodox, and not consciously different from that of John. I had supposed that such originality would rather commend it than otherwise to your columns. I hope it is not this, but some misunderstood expression which makes it unacceptable. If so, it has merely to be specified to be made plain. If not, I must ask the return of the ms. by means of the postage originally enclosed with it.

With thanks for the enclosure, which I return, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Benj. W. Bacon.
237 Wash.St., Hoboken, N.J.

December 31, 1839.

W.R. Harper, Ph.D.

Dear Brother; A few days since I had a conversation with Bro. Beiler, who is associated with me on the Business Committee of the Methodist Preachers' Meeting. He informed me that intimations had been given to you that there might be some unpleasant feature about your reception when you should deliver your address. He mentioned the matter to me as the Chairman of the Com. I told him that I would write, assuring you that such need not be anticipated. I would not consent to an invitation being sent, if for a moment I was apprehensive of anything of the kind.

Lay aside any such apprehension, Dear Doctor, and expect a hearty reception and a candid hearing.

May I trouble you to help me in a personal matter. I wish to take the Old and New Testament Student, and do not know to whom to send. Will you consider me as a subscriber, and send bill. If I should apply to some other
December 21, 1880

W. R. H. St. Peter, P. O. D.

Dear Brother: A few years since I had a convulsion with me on

station with Rev. Beiler, who is associated with me on

the Business Committee of the Mennonite Presebptory,

meeting. He informed me that instructions had been given

to you that there might be some unpleasant feelings

arise. He wanted me to speak to me as the Christia

and advise me to write to me as the Committee.

I find that I do not have the words to express

your gratitude, as my first impression was appreciative of my friend of the kind.

May I trouble you to help me in this important matter.

Wish to take the Old and New Testament, and to not

know to whom to send. Will you consider me as a sup-

scriptor, and send this. If I should supply to some other
party, will you let me know to whom. I have used your inductive method in my Bible class, with excellent results.

Hoping soon to see you, and have the pleasure of hearing you upon the theme for which you bespoken by us, I remain

Yours Fraternally,

chas. r. barnes

Pastor "First" Methodist

Episcopal Church.
Dear Mr. Smith,

I am writing to express my gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the Bible class with your excellent teaching method. I hope to see you soon and have the pleasure of hearing you speak on the theme for which you prepared.

I am Iremi

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Pastor First Methodist Episcopal Church
1425 Christian St. Phila  
April 1st. 1889

Prof. W. R. Harper,

Dear Sir:

As I write the point in the 'Instructor' referring to what you said about the "higher criticism" I may briefly add a note favor of March 27th. received at the office this morning.

You may be right in relation to higher criticism in a certain sense being near 110 years old, but I am quite sure that what is in these days technically called "the higher criticism" has no such antiquity. It is of comparatively modern birth, so I may say then with...
Scored an occasion has been both found—well for the course
of truth had it not been born
at all.

I am quite sure that it is not
a mistake to say that Prof. Mr.
Henry Green is not a higher critic
in the technical sense. And
that is the only proper sense in
it has in these days. He has
staunchly combatted what is tech-
nically called the higher criti-
cism. Dr. Briggs of Union The-
ological Seminary is a higher critic. Dr.
Green is not. To give the higher
criticism the meaning which you
seem to attach to it is not com-
mented by the common and
well understood use of the
terns in this day. You will
permit me to say further that
is dangerous to give in the meaning which you do and thereby attack such orthodox nuances as those of Dr. Green. It gives it a standing which it does not deserve, which it may make the impression that it is a contemptible thing when seen like Dr. Green. If quoted as it advocates, it the higher critics be closed when they technically properly belong to they will words much harm, but identify orthodox men with them to give the higher criticism a reading altogether different from the one it proper bears and immense
injury to the truth may re-
result. In that direction the
Old Testament Student seems
to be tending and out of the
rear of this arose our criti-
cism of your words.
I may say that the other
editors of the Institute suit
agree with me in what I
have here expressed.

With great respect I re-
main your sincere

WLL & BRRT
1425 Christian St. Phila
April 10, 1889

Prof. W. R. Harper,
Dear Bro:—Thank you for your favor of the 5th inst. I quite agree with you that the modern criticism is one
of definition. I am quite disposed to think (I know it is not deemed "Scholar") that your definition is not wrong it
is at least unfortunate. It may be that the term "Higher Criticism" has
long been applied by scholars referring to the literary criticism of
the Bible. I confess I did not know this, or else the term has not
been in common use until quite lately. I do not meet with it in any
of the English Commentaries on the
Scriptures until within a few years.
Yes those Commentaries dealt with
the Literary Criticism of the Bible.
as well as the textual. Indeed it is simply impossible to dispute them. But this as it may "Higher Criticism" has now a technical meaning which anybody except the "Scholars" thinks of as soon as it is named. I am aware that the Independents, the Christian Le., view a few other papers have made the distinction that you made to define, but I would be for you regarding these papers as representatives of the orthodoxy of the times. They are not all more inclined to the destructive side than the constructive. The fact that they recognize some advocate the definition which you give of the term "higher Criticism" has little weight with me. Nor does the fact that a conservative Presbyterian Minister wrote the editorial in the St. Louis which called for the "Higher Criticism" effort my view. I still think the use which is made of the term "Higher Criticism" is unfortunate, unnecessary, indeed wrong in
fact. It is unimportant because it implies what in itself is good and necessary. We cannot avoid the literary criticism of the Bible, with the destructive criticism. It puts it in both company or tend to dignify, to ward off suspicion from what is reading dangerous—one of the covert tendencies of our age destructive criticism. I would give up the definition at the name of for no other reason than this.

It is unnecessary. What you mean by "higher criticism" can be just as well represented by another term—say literary criticism—one that will not be misunderstood, or will not at once be in both company.

The term "higher criticism" as applied to the literary criticism is wrong. It implies precision or more important criticism than any other. I do not think this is correct. It is far more important to me to know what one of David's Psalms means than to know who wrote it. I do not care how much
about the relation of the different parts
I said as I do about what the text
means. I am exceptionally more con-
cerned to know exactly what one
of the minor prophets means than I
can to know who wrote it. The Bible
itself is evidently not meant to make
encouraged to have us know who wrote
its books, or to have us know what
the language of the books mean. It
has preferred or offered no names to
the gospels, but it has told us in them
to search the Scriptures. If we must
think it have "higher criticism," or all
let us apply it when it most appro-
priately belongs to the text.

I am aware that all this is not
"scholar," or that it is a prejudice in the
eyes of the scholars, but let me be like
Paul a "fool," if I may but have some
of Paul's peace & grace & reverence for
his word.

I wish to say farther than when I
wrote in my last that the O.T. Student
seemed to be tending towards the "high
or criticism. I did not unfairly
ly to the short editorials which I
criticised. I have seen with new
views coming in that direc-
tion to have been sorry to see them.
I may add that if you insist upon
carrying out your ideas of the "high
or criticism." I do not doubt that
I and many others will see or
put many things which the student
will contain. I do not believe
that it can be done without in-
jing in the cause of truth. It is
because of my interest in you to
see the genuine usefulness of the
Student, that I have written a word
either in our paper or in these
letters. You will now understand
my intention. If you cannot agree
with all I say.
I am glad we have had this
correspondence. It will give me a subject for a long editorial one of these days. It will be on the "higher criticism," as you call it, without, of course, referring to you, or our correspondence. If we are going to have such a mixture in the "higher criticism" the public ought to know it. If the "higher criticism" is to be despised by linking with it orthodox names, if genuine literary critics the public should be warned of the danger.

I have said that other matters on the student have made me appreciate I may mention among these your criticism of the volume issued by the Convention on the interpretation of the Bible held in this city a year or more ago. I had no connection with the undertaking of that Convention, but I regarded it as a noble defense of the orthodox views of interpretation. You dismissed it as creditable, but inadequate.

I cease now for wanting you at such length, and for all this pleasure of speech. If there is any conclusion, they are that of a sincere friend and well-wisher. yours very truly, W. W. Barn
July 8, 59

My dear Harper,

I have read your reply to Dr. Mendenhall, and aside from any feeling of friendship, it seems to me a complete vindication. I wonder at your patience and forbearance. His whole attack is exceedingly unfair.

Let me say, I question the wisdom of putting this reply in the O. T. Student. Take my advice of some of your
friends about it. If it were my case I would not do it. You simply advertise the attack on you and perhaps may create suspicion in some minds where it does not now exist. I would either say nothing or put the reply in the Advocate where the attack was made. It is old now & largely forgotten. The more I think of it the more I feel it would be a mistake to put it in The Student. Dr. Griffin had a long talk with me today. He feels that it is very important that I should be in Chautauqua on the 25th. Do you think I should expect the men.

G. C. Peckley.

Sincerely yours,
ed a rigorous society to death in a prominent church here where the bond was made that no society should ever be formed.

Did you ever read Birkins "Arrows of the Chace" his collected letters? Well, sometime when you are thoroughly made and don't want to use profane language out of respect for your "orthodoxy", take them up. They are
gall & vitriol: But among them I found this on teaching by correspondence. I copied it thinking it might interest you.

When are you coming again? Write often. Kind remembrances to Mrs. Harper from Mrs. Beckley.

Sincerely yours.

J. T. Beckley.
Cassion, I believe, of Strong's objection to the debate with Green and an address at Vassar—a who of his latter they did not seem (an address somewhere) to be sure. Strong I believe has written you also. They asked me if I thought you cared at all for Strong of your orthodoxy. I answered frankly "No" for I did not.

Phil., Jan 9, 06

My dear Harper,

We were rejoiced at the tidings from New Haven. Please accept our hearty congratulations. If there is anything in a name what a boy that will be. We think the combination very beautiful. You have a great deal to be thankful for and I have no doubt your heart is full of joy.

I wish you were here at night. I want to talk to you and what I want...
to say would fill a book.
In the first place you
crowed too soon about your
orthodoxy. Strong is up in
arms about you. A letter
has come here and I am
asked to communicate with
you because I can write
to you freely without any
misunderstanding. Dr. Dit-
ting wants you and would
not lose your services on any
account. Dr. Griffith feels

That the Society has a big
fight on its hands for May.
That special Committee of
Mr. Caldwell to Ch. man will
bring in two reports. Dr.
Griffith does not want to
make the fight any more
extensive than necessary.
He does not care for Dr.
Strong but he says Strong
carries the Examiner and
they don’t want to fight
the Examiner. The oc-
I see Garrison has been preaching for them. Does he want to change?

I have tonight received a note from F. E. Clark calling my attention to "a very unworthy attack on the United Society of C. E. from the pen of Blackburn of Lowell and asking me to reply. It was in the Standard of last week. I form.

Think Strong's real objection was theological, and I doubted if he was anxious to be assured. They don't like Strong and say he is one of the Narrowest of men. Dr. Griffith said well ask him if he can keep strong quiet. You see his position. I wish the Society would take higher ground. I am afraid they made a
Great mistake in throwing over Shifler. It was not a manly thing to do. Do you see the Southern papers? They are keeping up the battle at a great rate.

Jenkins, the tourist agent came to see me at Hoyt's suggestion and I told him to send his Palestine papers to you. Hoyt thinks he will go.

In Felix for a three month tour I want me to go. I cannot. I talked with Weston about it and I think he will go.

James wrote me to-day reading Mr. Howard's letter to him which was kind but which evidently means he is not the coming man. I am sorry. It will be a great disappointment.
229 Prospect Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Oct. 30, 1889.

Prof. W.R. Harper;

My dear Friend;

I was delighted with the suggestion that I arrange for your appearance before the "Meeting of the Methodist Ministers of New York and Vicinity". It so happens that I represent the New York East Conference on the Business Committee of six that has absolute control of the Programme for the meetings. At the meeting of the Committee on Monday morning I suggested your name as a speaker in the near future. They were delighted with my suggestion that we try to secure you, and voted that I send you an invitation, which here and now do I most heartily. Sometime since I suggested that we invite Dr. Mendenhall to address us for two reasons, 1st, for his own sake, as he never appeared before the body; and 2nd, that some members of the meeting who are aching for a chance, might have an opportunity to pitch into him a little!! It was invited, and the chairman saw him at least two weeks ago, and he consented to address us sometime after the 1st of January. I speak of this that you may know the exact state of things, and choose as to whether you will come before or after the Dr. I do not know anything about the line Dr. M. is to follow in his address, nor even his subject, more than that it is to be on the "Old Testament" question.

The Committee suggested as early a date as the third Monday in November (Nov. 17), but the invitation is not limited as to date. I did not care to tell them you could not come till later, lest I ap-
Dear Mr. Webster,

My dear friend,

I was delighted with the suggestion that I should return your appearance before the meeting of the Metropolitan Ministries of New York and vicinity. It was proposed that I represent the New York East Conference on the Business Committee of six that has absolute control of the program for the meeting.

At the meeting of the committee on Monday morning I suggested your name as a speaker in the near future. They were delighted with the suggestion that we try to secure you and noted that I send you an invitation which I have not yet been able to express.

I suggested that we invite Mr. Mendelsohn to speak on the program as he never speaks before the public. Some felt for his own sake, as he never speaks before the public, that he should be allowed as a speaker at some time. I pressed some members of the committee who sent the program for a chance and then had an opportunity to bring it to him's notice. It was my wish to secure us sometime after the first of January. I spoke of it to you and asked for your exact date of time, and you said, "I go not know why, whether you will come before or after the 15th of November (Nov. 15th), but the invitation is not limited as to date."

I am not sure how you would appear to come out of the third month, and just to make the time of the meeting is not in the "official" discussion.

The committee suggested as early a date as the third month.

In November (Nov. 15th), but the invitation is not limited as to date.
pear to know too much. If you will choose any Monday in December, except the first one, I think there will be no trouble in accommodating you. I think I can not only assure you that your coming will awaken great interest on the part of the ministers, but that you will have the sympathy (not in any commiserating sense, but in your position) of many. The President is a confidential friend, and in private conversation has severely condemned Dr. M’s. methods, and also his supposed position on this question, but I would not care to have it made public through my reporting it. You will be heartily welcomed, I am sure.

I did not receive my ‘Nov-Dec. Review’ until yesterday. I was about to write you, but concluded I had better wait till I had cooled off a little. I hardly know what to say, now, that 24 hours have passed, and I have spent an hour with Prof. Ellinwood in the study of Comparative Religions, and an hour and a half with Chancellor MacCracken in the study of Plato's Ethics, and have slept eight hours (being one or two hours extra). I only wish he were as fair as Ellinwood in treating the other religions; and that he had measured up to Plato's personal irresistible convictions of right & wrong. I cannot help but feel that he is ungentlemanly and unchristian in impugning your motives in charging you with 'self-conceited hilarity' &c; with "using questionable means of defense"; with 'taking advantage of your position at Chatauqua'; with 'reluctantly (((?)))' appearing in an 'interview' which 'bears the earmarks of ]]]] having been prepared, both questions and answers, by the Professor himself'; with 'evincing a purpose to misrepresent'; with 'making it convenient to go to Europe', as if running away from him; with 'hypocrisy'; &c., &c. He shows a sublime egotism in implying, if not saying, that because of his "in-
If you will excuse my entering this matter in the present, except the first one, I think there will be no trouble in securing communication with you. I think I can not only assure you that your coming will awaken great interest on the part of the ministers, but that you will have the sympathetic and in some degree friendly interest of the President in many respects connected with the several accomplishments of Mr. F.'s. and also the frequent opportunities to discuss this question, and I would not dare to have you make public through myreport this if you will be politely welcome.

I am sure I did not receive my "November Review," with your letter.

I was sure to write you but concluded I had better write still. I have no object all a little. I partly know what to say now there are 6 hours have passed, and I have spoken in your will and in the study of Comparative Religion, and in your own and my part with complete for MacCauslon in the study of Plato's Ethics, and have spoken eight hours (being one or two hours extra.) I only wish to were as fast 1

as my own in the study the other religions, and that you had means as Elfinwood. In the study the other religions, I do not to Plato's because of the characteristic connection of itself and a whole I cannot help but feel that we are underestimating and overestimating in the many ways your motives in qualifying you with self-conceived mentality and with various doubts possible sense of measure of genday's, with limiting the passing of your position of Christians with lexicology (Y)" arising in an interest, which passes the coarse of of the passing of the present, with "sympathy" both doubt fears and amazement at the present state, with "making it connunctive to be to عن)

He shows as if announcing same from him with "proposition" "X" as a universe beyond in underlying, if not saying, the presence of the in-
dictment," after a fitful gasp, two colleges, 'seem to have already yielded the point, and by silence confess guilt'; that 'Vale is in the toils, struggling with tremendous energy', that 'Prof. Ladd has hid himself in the fogs', that you needed 'to recover lost ground and reinstate yourself as an orthodox writer', that you 'are showing great progress toward orthodoxy' and 'yielding to discipline', and 'swinging to the right side'; that 'tremendous efforts are necessary to resist it'; that 'he has aroused scholars (Green, Schodde, Curtis, Dawson, &c,) to discern the precipice of rationalism, and refuse to plunge into the abyss'; and that he has rallied around him the Methodist clergy, the Methodist press (with one unenviable exception) and many thinkers of different denominations! I confess this surpasses the effect of any bugle blast ere heard in Scottish hills, and I wonder that the United States does not cease to make great guns, torpedoes, and ships of war, and simply employ Mendenhall to guard our extended coasts against the world, the flesh, and the devil! If our Government remains blind to his merits, I think he ought to be commended to the Czar of all the Russias!!

He is either blind to wide distinctions, or is very unfair in the use he makes of material; as in his whole interpretation of the Chatauqua affair as brought about by you, when the Press distinctly stated that you tried to avoid it; in his using all sorts of reports against you, even second and third hand, but refusing to quote Vincent in your favor because it was not over the Bishop's own signature; in saying that because you claim that the Bible may be best studied on its human side as 'books' rather than as 'a book,' therefore you are an extreme rationalist or destructive critic— that because
After a short gap, the college's seem to have started
viewing the point and a silence comes, until what's left is in the
corner, struggling with Tremendous energy, that's logic and logic
himself in the joke, First you need to recover your ground and
start seeing yourself as an anchor point, that you're somehow Great
progresses towards orthodoxy, and valuing to disbelieving and trying
to get to the right side, that Tremendous effort and necessity to be
after it. Now, the fresh armchair, Green, secondly, outdoors, down
so much, to address the principle of rationalism, and believe to involve
into the space, until there's nothing standing behind the mentalistic
errors, the mentalistic thesis (with the unanswerable exception) and many
errors, the mentalistic thesis.

I confess, this intransigence!

Think of different genocidal acts!

I'm afraid of any purely past and present in scattered halls, and I own
let that the United States does not cease to make great guns, torpedoes,
hot and shots of war, and amplify American magnanimity to burn our ex-
other, it's very significant the watch, the sleep, and the heaven!

Government remains blind to the merits; I think he ought to be common-

Here is another blind to wipe frictions, or in any moment.

In the use of makes of material as in the whole interpretation of
the Crusaders affect as a powerful point, you own The Crossed

It seems that you tried to sound it in this way, with some of the
bores shorter, you've even become and third hand, but retaining to chance

Viscous in your favor, presence if we are not over the Hight's own area

Sure; in seeking that presence you claim that the Right may be best

You see the extreme fragments of gelatinous critique - that presence

studies on it's hymn, the Deep, deeper than as "book", therefore

You see in extreme stalwart as gelatine critique - that presence
you call attention to the human side of the Bible, therefore you deny its inspiration or that it has a divine side; in thinking that because you present an opponent's position, as a teacher may do to refute it, you are in sympathy with your opponent; in twisting your position that prophecy was not given simply for the sake of prophesying but for religious instruction, to mean that you deny prophecy or destroy its force as prophecy;—and so the Gospels were not written primarily and simply to preserve history, but while being history in the highest sense, their purpose was religious instruction, and by their purpose they are to be judged, and in that light studied,—to mean that they cease to be history or biography; in turning Hamlin's words about another matter and other men, against you; in representing that your co-laborers Schodde and Curtis, and also Dawson, have turned their guns on you, when they have reference to an entirely different class of men. If all this is not intentional it is a splendid illustration of the saying of Prof. Bowne, 'great is the power of the Understanding, but infinitely greater is the power of the Misunderstanding'.

It would be easy to show contradictions of himself, and other blemishes unworthy of a place in our 'Review', but I must not tax your patience. I did not expect to write so much, but point led to point.

I would be glad to chat with you about the new 'Institute'. I may be in New Haven the 19 and 20 of Nov., and if I am will see you.

With profound feelings of gratitude for the work you have done for me in Bible lines;

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
you call attention to the human side of the triple problem you gen-

the proposition of first if it is a giving side; and in putting that

persuasion or present as opponent's position, as a desperate way to go to

true if you see in sympathy with your opponent, in trying your do-

sion that property was not given simply for the sake of property

put for religious instruction; to mean that you gain property or ge-

either the force as property; and to the Gospels were not written but-

highest sense, their purpose was religious instruction, and in their

purposes play are to be judged, and in that light studied—to mean

purposes cease to be fiction or philology; in winning Hamilton's more

apart another matter and other men, strange your in expectation that

your co-leaders speakers and critics, and also because have turned

their guns on you, when they have relevance to an entirely different

If I still this is not intellectual to an expending

illustration of the saying of Peter, Homer's stress in the power of the

understanding, but intellectual guess in the power of the Mindset.

standing.

If you can say to show contributions of thinking, and of

et principles unmerited of a place in our Review, but I must not tax

your patience. I give not expect to write so much, but Bountiful to

point. I would be glad to offer with you and expect. I sent

may be in New Haven the 13 and 20 of Nov., and if I can write you

with profound feelings of gratitude for the work you have

gone for me in Bectile eyes,

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
Oct. 23, 1889.

Prof. W.R. Harper.

Dear Friend, I had thought of writing to you a number of times about the attack made on you by 'Brother' Mendenhall. I have not been an uninterested spectator. You are both personal acquaintances and I have had the warmest feeling of sympathy with each. Dr. M. and I were near by each other in pastores in Ohio. I am interested in the 'Review', and especially in the position of Methodism in the world of Scholars. I have been waiting in hope that the 'Review' might in some way justify itself, and at the same time free you from the misrepresentation of this attack. I hope that after the above remark I need not say that I most heartily approve of your methods of work and believe in your essential orthodoxy. I sympathize with you in your position, and I think I know what it is, as a careful reader of both of your periodicals from their first numbers. I do not approve of the methods of Dr. Mendenhall in this discussion. Indeed he does not either, so far as the personal feature of it is concerned, into which he feels that he was forced especially by Prof. Ladd's severe attack in the Advocate. Up to that time he had avoided all personal mention, and intended to also in the entire discussion. As to the Dr's 'method of Bible study I am utterly in the dark, as I am to his position as to the whole question of Biblical Criticism. In the number of the 'Review' about appearing, I believe he has something more to say, and in the January number will give his own position.
...SS Prospect Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Oct. 28, 1892.

Dear Mr. Harper,

I had thoughts of writing to you a number of times, but the attack made on you by "Brother" Mencken I have not been an uninterested spectator. You are perfectly pardonable for being shocked with such a review. I am interested in the "Review" and especially in the position of Metaphysics in the world of Science. I have been writing to hope that the "Review" might in some way justify itself, and at the same time give you from the metaphysicist's point of view. I hope you will try to keep your position in your most patient patience of work and patience in your most sensible patience. I sympathize with you in your position, and I think you will be, as a sensitive person of part of your brain, cut off from their first numbers. I am not opposed to the metaphysicists. Indeed, he does not exist, so let us be the original case of "Why is it concerned?" which he feels that he was not exactly especially a plot. I had a nase attack in the Adoration. Up to that time he had nothing at all personal mention, and interesting to me in the entire discussion. As to the D.P. 105 at a Hubble study I am uttering in the work, as I am to our position in the whole question of different criteria. In the number of the "Review" and personal assertions I believe he is sometimes more to say, and in the January number will give his own position.
So far the discussion places Dr. Mendenhall at a disadvantage, or at least in a position to be judged a mossback from the school of verbal inspiration with all its follies. It looks as if he might think the present order of 'books' chronological, and that chronology that of Usher exactly; that no pre-existing material was used in the production of the 'books', and the present text must be received not only by an unquestioning faith, but that reason must be padlocked or banished entirely from the field. If such be the case he is 'done for,' and so is the 'Review' I fear. But I hope that when he states his position, he will be found a little more modern, and possibly be compelled to come to your own ground. Frankly with you, and this in confidence, please, my conviction is that he was not prepared to pass judgment on 'Old Testament' questions, that he is not much of a Hebrew scholar, and his knowledge in this whole field is rather superficial. Such being the case it would be difficult for his Methodist Brethren to do much with him. If we could persuade him to put himself under your tuition for a few years, there might be some hopes!! Still, he is a student, a hard-worker, and not a dead conservative, but rather progressive, and my hope is that now that he is out of a busy pastorate, and seems to be interested in this question, he may study it thoroughly enough to become reasonable, if not a "rationalist" in the sense that frightens him. He has been in the West mostly for four months, and I had not seen him in that time till last Monday, and then only for a few minutes.

My judgment is that so far the discussion has not hurt you to any extent you need care for among the students of the Methodist Church. You have their sympathy, while they look at the other side with anxiety.

Yours sincerely;

J. L. Beiler
To let the impression please at your disposal of a more profound knowledge.

I understand that no amount of study, no amount of observation, no amount of experience, no amount of reading, no amount of research, no amount of discussion, or no amount of study, is likely to provide a complete and accurate understanding of the subject. It requires a profound knowledge of the subject to judge a proposition to be true or false. I look to the concept of a thorough understanding with the fullest possible insight. The concept of thorough understanding is not to be taken lightly; it requires a profound knowledge of the subject to judge a proposition to be true or false. I look to the concept of a thorough understanding with the fullest possible insight.

The concept of thorough understanding is not to be taken lightly; it requires a profound knowledge of the subject to judge a proposition to be true or false. I look to the concept of a thorough understanding with the fullest possible insight.

Please be advised that I have enclosed a little more material to be considered in the context of the question. I hope that this may be of some help.

I am enclosing a little more material to be considered in the context of the question. I hope that this may be of some help.

The concept of thorough understanding is not to be taken lightly; it requires a profound knowledge of the subject to judge a proposition to be true or false. I look to the concept of a thorough understanding with the fullest possible insight.

Please be advised that I have enclosed a little more material to be considered in the context of the question. I hope that this may be of some help.

I am enclosing a little more material to be considered in the context of the question. I hope that this may be of some help.

The concept of thorough understanding is not to be taken lightly; it requires a profound knowledge of the subject to judge a proposition to be true or false. I look to the concept of a thorough understanding with the fullest possible insight.
June 12th, 1891.

Prof. W. R. Harper,

Dear Bro:-

If you think that any sensible men take stock in the idle newspaper twaddle about you, I want to hasten to tell you that no student of my acquaintance fails to sympathize with you. Of course there are Bible lovers of the allegorist Organic type who have little love for those who smash their absurd theories. But as a pastor, I confirm what I know is your observation as an educator of wide acquaintance. The younger men who love their Bibles as never before are with you. The growing use
of the historical method has opened many blind eyes to newer and richer truth, and emancipated many from mistakes.

My church Bible class for the study of the Life of Christ according to your scheme has been a most pronounced success. At least fifty of my members have said to me: 'Thank God for Dr. Harper!' You are reaching further than you know. I can now declare to my congregation truths which excite only love because prejudices and past misinformation have been banished. The leaven is working.

We all owe you a debt of gratitude. Do not be anxious or alarmed, or discouraged. You have been yourself.
God's interpretative prophet to so many thousands. All these love you and will stand by you. Just imagine yourself girdled by a multitude of hearts, and endorsed by as many heads, and you will conceive your real place.

Our innings will come after a while. And where it does we will have a new era of consecration. I judge by the very marked effect on my own people of our studies.

Pardon my length. I fear that you are just a little disturbed. It's only a little breeze, and "Peace, be still," will be spoken soon.

I will be on hand Monday morning. God bless you. I am greatly indebted to you personally. Your
...
Whole life has been an inspiration to so many of us. And your lectures and writings have helped to make the Bible a new book.

I am willing for you to think me "guilty," or anything else, just so that I can comfort you a little, and express my own indebtedness to you.

Yours sincerely,

W.C. Bitting.
June 17th 1891

Dear Doctor Harper,

Will you please send me the name of that book of Mr. Senjido(?) of which you spoke?

Also a few copies of the syllabus of your address.

The lecture still grips. The impression is profounder than we thought last Monday. I have had a great chat with Milton M. Smith, pastor Central Presbyterian Church, and a director of Union Sem. He asked to hear you but could not. He is grateful for the action of our Baptist Conference, and thinks it will help matters
Cannot read the text.
Have seen only one man who called your address "book." He rose in my prayer meeting and found in the mission of Abraham's servant for Rebekah a type of God sending his Son after the Holy Spirit for the Church. "Whoop see! You see what note I have in hand. Everyone laughed at him, and so may you.

God bless you.

Yours Sincerely,

W. C. Bitting.
[Handwritten text not legible]
Newark, N. J.
269 Broad St.
June 16, 1901.

Dear Dr. Harper,

Illness kept me away from the N. Y. Conference yesterday, but I have read this morning’s report of your address with great delight. May God help and bless you. I had a long talk with Dr. Right about a week ago, and gave him your speech concerning recent editorials in the Examiner, which I told him were “precarious & dishonest.” He disclaimed their authorship and called in Vedder, who acknowledged that he wrote them and incidentally confirmed my suspicion that your Rochester friend (?) was their inspirer.

I gave them to understand that tho’ I had been the life-long champion of the Examiner, I could no longer defend its attitude, if recent utterances were repeated. And I assured him that the rising ministry of an Churchman was absolutely opposed to the recent attitude of the Examiner.

It seems to me that it is of the utmost importance to you, and the Church you represent, that the right man be put in the pulpit of Emanuel Ch. Chicago. Helen is well committed to the traditional views. You ought to have an able and warm friend there.

Now, please regard your health this Summer. There is a limit to human power of endurance. For the sake of the great future before us, take care of yourself. Don’t overwork.

Yours truly,
M. M. Boyd.
My dear Professor:

The Essyan
has come down like the
wolf on the fold, and
Other words upon our
lusty infant, the Boston
Branch of the A. I. S. L.
has swooped down the
Eagle what scents heresy
and persevere and devise
sentences in everything out
of the old lines. I had
a long talk with good
Dr. Olmst yesterday who
Untrue, we have been unfair and one-sided in the lectures offered. That we have no business to appeal to the churches for support, that S. S. teachers and scholars go and bear their fellows and get their just relief. That the old Bible is good enough for him that the idea that there can be any change in the attitude toward the Bible is preposterous and so on.

Prepare yourself for protests. Pull in your sails and stand against the hurricane. Dr. O. says a number of the ministers may send us a written protest.
I do not consider him a representative of most of our orthodox ministers. He is still sure of his Audenrot. Board matters are in bad order, Andrews are back of these causes. I do not think he will make us any great trouble, and I have no fears. But that a majority of the evangelical men believe to oppose the causes. But we must be candid, where we can, and state. Only controversy if possible.
you must not go back on us. We can do it otherwise than to go in with the cause; we have a good thing and we need not fear to go to the public with it.

Brigade was heard by 250 persons Tue. night.

We'll talk these matters over Monday. Don't be alarmed, only I thought it would be well to put you on the situation. But the Lord reigns.

Your fellow-hunter.

H. &. Budge

Your fellow-hunter.
THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

This Company TRANSMITS and DELIVERS messages only on conditions limiting its liability, which have been assented to by the sender of the following message. Errors can be guarded against only by repeating a message back to the sending station for comparison. In transmission or delivery of Unrepeated Messages, beyond the amount of tolls paid thereon, nor in any case where the claim is not presented for writing within sixty days after the message is filed with the Company for transmission.

This is an UNREPEATED MESSAGE, and is delivered by request of the sender, under the conditions named above.

THOS. T. ECKERT, General Manager.

NORVIN GREEN, President.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SENT BY</th>
<th>RECD BY</th>
<th>CHECK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>10½d</td>
<td>7906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECEIVED at NEW HAVEN, CONN. Mar 31 1891

Dated Boston 31

To Prof. W. R. Harper

Nigher Criticism Completely Routed
Boston Fully Convinced Mosiac Authorship

Bible

T. A. Bridgeman
My dear Professor Harper,

I was an expectant audience
that swarmed into the hall
last night. All the old-
liners rallied hoping to see
The destructive criticism
knocked into the middle
of the next century. Dr.
Olcott was there and his
countenance grew more
seraphic as the lecture ad-
anced. Dr. Wellman The
Audience prosecuted
speech a prominent seat
and was ready to remarks.
with great impetus when
the thing was through. "There
That's sense," Dr. Judson
Smith and Dr. Thompson
The defenders of the faiths
at the American Board
some chuckled and grew
fat as green crawfish
you and Silberman in the
Almst. And there was
Addison Foster of the
Advance proudly reflecting
he will not his little
Street had created all
pencil had created all
this big hullaboo. Oh
this big hullaboo. Oh
yes it was a glorious
sight to see the array of
good orthodox brethren who
Came turn out for Green
were never going to
put who were going to
resist Providence and were
their faith by going away.
When you
Well it was a complete
walk-over for Princeton.
Bets were even before the
time was up. As the
game progressed,
Yale began to fall
and kept on sinking until
it fell far lower than
the ideally historic Adam.

We did our best to bolster
up your side of the case.
Sent Beach up after some
who was persuaded to sit
on the platform and to
offer the opening merger.
The nature of that service preempted him from giving very exhaustively into the critical questions at issue and besides he didn't know quite what Green would go to say. So when Green was once up he had things all his own way. And as we listened to his meandering story we all wondered how we came ever have been seduced by that specious and fallacious reasoning which tries to make us believe that there are two separate accounts of the creation. So may with your heathen myths and imaginary discrepancies. Come not further begain to perplex us with your Jahnist and Elohist. We want a literal garden and real snakes. Olden legends transformed with the Christian spirit and purged from heathen cupidity may do for New Haven or Chicago but Boston cares something substantial, something sure-satisfying. Don't you know Triumph is your friend?
New York June 17, 1889.

My dear Dr. Harper:

I was sorry to see the article in the Christian Advocate. It was written, as you may be aware, by the editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review, and for that reason will certainly attract attention. I have always had faith in your integrity on the question of the inspiration of the Bible, but so many persons have doubted it, and expressed their doubts, that it seems to me the better way would be for you to write me a letter avowing your faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures as it is held by orthodox scholars of our own denomination. It seems to me that a letter of that kind would do great good in every way. You speak of your belief in the supernatural element in the Old
Testament, but I fear some men would carp at that phrase, and would twist it into something that was not an avowal of your belief in the real inspiration of the Bible. What I desire is that you would make such an avowal of your faith in its inspiration as would put the matter at rest. I am sure your warmest personal friends would be glad to see it.

Very truly yours,

Edward

Professor W. R. Harper, Ph. D.
821 Fourth Ave.
Louisville, Feb. 17, 1888.

Prof. William R. Harper, Ph. D.,
My dear Sir:

Professor Sampey shows me your circular about a discussion between yourself and Dr. Green. Pardon me for offering one or two suggestions. (1) I think there will be grave dissatisfaction among conservative scholars and conservative circles in general that by this arrangement you throw the weight of the publication in favor of the destructive side. The editor of a periodical necessarily represents the periodical itself. No disclaimer can prevent this from being felt. You give the destructive views a marked advantage, and you cannot help it. I will add, what I am sure many will feel, that Professor Green is by no means your equal in mental keenness, nor in contagious enthusiasm; and that is another advantage. (2) I should really fear for the effect upon your own mind. No mortal man can pursue such a discussion without becoming insensibly biased in favor of the views he advocates. I have tried this myself in debating society days, and to some extent in conversational discussions at a later period. I have talked with many men of ability and experience on the subject, and am accustomed to caution my students in that regard. I am scared at the very idea of your undertaking such an advocacy. I dread it for the sake of what
Prof. Willman of Harvard, etc.,

Mr. Greenhill,

Professor Spearman shows me your address and sends his best wishes.

I agree perfectly with you. I can see no advantage in one more conservative party or conservative action in certain cases.

In fact, by the same argument, you show the weakness of the proposition.

The object of a national party is to level off the contradictions which are inherent in the system. You give the contradictions away a market for themselves. You cannot help it. With and without our knowledge, and you cannot help it. It will, and what I am saying means a mere statement that I know no one else, for no conservative will deny that the extreme left and extreme right are both beyond the pale of reality. But few have learned to see the contradictions and share in another.

In a word, I have never seen such a disagreement without proceeding in vain of the views of others except I have tried to get behind the scenes. I have tried to get behind the scenes, and to some extent to confound some of the more obvious and superficial contradictions and, of course, to confound the expectations of a future position. I have talked with many old and new friends and acquaintances on the subject, and am convinced that

Your understanding, etc.,

I agree. It is for the sake of a
I believe to be vital truth, and for your own sake personally, as a man of extraordinary powers and possibilities. If by calm and unbiased investigation you should be led to advocate the destructive views, then of course I have nothing to express but regret. But I am fully persuaded that it is unwise to expose yourself to this unfair disadvantage.

Even if you laughingly set aside my second consideration -- though you will make a mistake if you do -- yet I insist on my first. The patrons of both your periodicals will in many cases feel that they have grave right to complain. Now can you not get somebody else to take the destructive side? If Toy were at home he would be the man. I have just learned that he is coming home to be married in May or June. Perhaps you might delay one quarter, and see if you cannot engage him. If that will not do, and you know of no better man, then why not try Lyon? He is one of the ablest men in some respects, and one of the most accurate scholars, where I was prepared to judge, that I have known. He is far gone in the destructive views already, and for him to go farther would not injure his own position at Harvard, nor materially hurt the general interests involved. If Professor Green should think Lyon not a foe-man worthy of his steel, he would be greatly mistaken. Lyon would make him see stars in the daytime. Now why can you not make such a change, without any public announcement, and if you are asked pri-
vately you can say that it was represented to you that the editor in such a case ought to remain neutral, and that there would be grave complaint at his seeming to put the editorial influence on that side, and you had concluded that it would be better to make the other arrangement. Now my dear fellow, I respectfully and earnestly urge upon you these views. I am not intruding into another man's affairs; for I am profoundly interested in the movements of American Biblical learning, and in the wholesome progress of your own influence and usefulness.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Broadus

P. S. I received yesterday your letter about Chautauqua. It is possible I might stand two weeks, with two lessons a day for four days. It would take the whole day until bed-time to make the trip between that point and Detroit. Whether I could undertake it would depend partly upon the time of Mr. Moody's Northfield meetings for students, not yet fixed. I will write and see if one of his lieutenants can indicate the probable time, and can probably decide within a fortnight, if you can wait that long.
Louisville, 1888.

...
Newton Centre, Mass.,
February 12, 1889.

My dearlearner,

I can breakfast with you in Boston next Saturday morning but if you can not you can eat here; I will send the train from Boston at 7, and go back as early as you choose. Please write me that you will do this, and I will have the best beef please you ever put in your mouth. I can not serve, I will go.

I think you have summed up the evidence on your side in first class shape. Then will have the pretty shock to meet you. I will doubtless hear my own opinions through strong, as the shun their best. But what they are is when is he to write and when is he to do it. Please keep me advised when I am certain that he has written. Sorry, I want to have a talk with the latter. I wonder if
anyone but you had set them in the trail, till I can say is, it seems the man hung a heavy on his head just now in keeping peace in his own family.

Sincerely,

C R Ream

I wish you would get a Sunday's supply at Grant St. church in Fair Haven for Rev. W A. Faunce of this institution.

C R R
Newton Centre, Mass
March 11th, 1889

My dear Osborn Harper,

Yours is received with enclosure. The acknowledgment made by Prof. Jaëtlov is so shabby that I must really ask you to expunge the whole reference to our Institution. Beyond this I cannot really advise you; for after making one proposal to you, I could hardly be expected to make another. You say of Jaëtlov's statement "It does not seem to me to do what ought to be done, but I hardly know how to change it now that he has sent this article for the next Hebrew." I do not see why you should be afraid of Jaëtlov and when you are convinced that you want to do what ought to be done, you usually find a way to do it. Indecisive to print Jaëtlov's article, which in relation to Juleit should take second place, you will not strain our relations at all, but you will give me the impression that you are willing to cover up Jaëtlov's mistake at the expense of Newton. I do not see how you could have supposed I would be
satisfied, with a word about Assyrian etc. sandwiched between a lot of schools on two sides which are teaching Hebrew alone, or listening to a few lectures on Assyriology.

If you were a professor in this Institution and I were editor of Hebrew, I think I should know what to do.

You were very kind to arrange for me to preach at the First Church in connection with our Committee meeting. I shall value the opportunity especially for the privilege of seeing you.

Very truly yours,

Charles Rufus Brown
NEW ENGLAND BOARD
FOR THE
Introduction of Baptist Churches and Ministers

A MEDIUM for the use of such churches and ministers only as may apply to it for introductions looking to the settlement of pastors or the supply of vacant pulpits. The Board now consists of seven members appointed as follows: one each by the Conventions of Maine, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and by the Alumni of Newton; and three by the Massachusetts Baptist Convention.

Rev. A. J. Gordon President Boston
Mr. L. B. Philbrick Salem
Rev. A. T. Dunn Portland
Rev. W. H. Alden Portsmouth
Rev. P. S. Evans New Haven
Prof. Charles Rufus Brown Secretary

Address: Temple Falls, N.H.
Newton Centre, Mass., June 10, 189

My dear Professor Harper,

I am very sorry you are sick. I am not physically strong or am never not get sick. I hope you will give up something else and come to Cambridge. This failure to come means disaster for us, and you have been advertised for here. I am sorry Boston is considered unsound in some quarters. I assure you he is all right, but I shall continue thus as you suggest. I have not seen the other article in which you are selected for special
attack. What are they? I am sure you will come through the battle all right if there is the a battle; but you are so orthodox that I am sure also that the friends of sound learning will rally of necessity to you. It seems to me idle to contemplate the possibility of your leaving the University of Chicago. If I can be of any service to you I shall be glad posted if he is in it have a letter sent to him about 900 men. to the effect that the express favor the free full discussion of certain questions? What do you say? Can you not give me the names of the prominent divines who criticized Burtis teaching; had Aysey, or Vrictly or Bakerman one of the two? I think Patton had Briggs where the hair is short what Briggs put a splendid weapon in his hands. I knew that Burtis had them against the chair in New Haven.

Yours,

Brown.