Apr. 1, 1871.

My dear Professor Harper,

Your letter is just received, I wrote a moment ago for a hasty reply. I cannot agree with your statement that "it is not the opinions, but the method of declaring them that irritates the disturbed". Within the Presbyterian Church, at least, it is the opinions themselves that arouse the sharp antagonism. Those who are disturbed by the method of declaring are usually, of course, my observation. Those who are afraid of the effect of boldness upon others, or conservative men who veil their objection to the opinions under criticism of the mode of their statement. It is inevitable that the tone of opinions, at least in the Presbyterian Church,
should come in conflict with the stationary
opposition which assumes the right to
dictate among us. It is my deliberate
judgment that it was high time the
conflict came. Liberal men allow the
Church have been suppressed, intimidated,
through their influence by the consequences
of their previous bad example of the
prevailing theory. The invasion across
mouth of last year initiated the insurrection
immensely. That movement has tremendous
spent itself, as the Vanquished are all
looking to claim it into the saddle. If they
should succeed it would set back the last
peace for years. There are some who care
for the way in which a doctrine is offered
in the way in which a doctrine is offered
in my view of the situation. I think my temper
Ship of the Bible, or y
it supernatural character
I should reply.

(1) This is not a fair
definition of Rationalism.
On this century, the Plenary
Theory of inspiration is al
theologically on the theory
of inspiration.

(2) With this question
the Science of Biblical
Criticism, though one
for all, is in the entire
and literary study of the
Bible, leave nothing at
all to do. It is de
termined on wholly

York Beach, Me.
July 13, 1887.

My dear Horace,
I only
received yesterday, after
mailing my letter.
That date, the
copy of the Christian
Advocate, sent to
Heamilton. By paper
on not forwarded
by the postmaster, or
are the letter. I
have one other
arrangement for the paper and magazines. Hence they or often delegated in reaching me. Is the turn the letter to you, by this mine, according to your request. I know much the article referred to carefully. There does not allow to be much for me to say about it. Of course, in part it is true. But the criticism I shared make so it is, the writer in very confused.

The idea of the rationalism and Biblical criticism, and the critical and literary study of the Bible, there- be would define rationalism, does not often from any formal statement in his article. It would seem that he would define it, or the rejection of this inspiration and the supernatural author-
other grounds. There with a true definition, or any in fact, he can show the essentially rationalistic character of higher criticism, I do not see. The may show that many higher critics are also rationalists, or even that most of them are. But what is it? Men are not the science. Neither are their philosophical propositions.

Eva you.

T. Burnham.
if you have not seen it before this running eye over it & re-mail it to me.

Cordially yours,

John Burnham

Bataan Ill. Nov. 11 1889
Friend Harper

Today I received Dr. Davidson's article & your letter in which you say it would not be prudent for you to publish it in the "Student" but that you would like to do so.

I wrote to Dr. Davidson & sent him the "Christian Advocate" in which was the article of Dr. Mendenhall, Editor of "Methodist Review" containing a rather formidable act upon the Pulpis of Orthodox Cong. Colleges changing them with being...
headquarters of Rationalism.

Dr. Davidson replied stating it was his opinion after this attack Prof. Huxley dare not publish his article.

I suppose very many of the clergymen who take the "Student" were shocked when you published Dr. Stebbins article aboutabolishing the ass nerves. human speech; so shocked that you should dare to publish Prof. Tylor's article. The real truth is many of your readers are very anxious that you help them to argument to prove that all the

dogmas of these churches are true as all other churches that in any way differ from them are false, If they knew Davidson-Jeg-Stebins told the truth they dislike to have you publish them. I found this out a long time ago and I think you understand this matter. Yan better than I do. I enclosed please your article cut from Saturday Chicago Daily Tribune Nov. 9, 1879.
Now Prof. Harper I hope you will help Dr. Davidson to obtain what he so much wants.

Please mail me the No's of Helvica containing any article by Dr. Davidson for I feel a deep interest to see any thing from his pen - also mail me what he so much wants.

Send me your bill for the magazine &c.

For the time or trouble or expense it causes you to comply with the above request and I will mail you Postal order for the amount.

If the check of your publisher have mailed

Batavia Ill. Dec. 30 1887

Dear Mr. Harper

I believe I sympathise with you in the hard place you occupy.

The trouble is there are so many thousand of preachers priest & people that have their whole mental mussed up spiritual nature prisoned more or less "generally more" with the virus of the perfectly bound dogma of that Old Westminster Confession of Faith, that if you make any discovery of new truth in exploring the fields of the higher criticism - of the sadst
Records. They are all ready to convey you if you dare letter them or allow any correspondent to have the article published in the "Student." This class of preacher-priest-seels are the class that Unit Deacon Farrar so clearly describes in the article I mailed you to-day, which I induced the Editor of our village paper to publish.

Below I copy a letter received from Dr. Davidson:

Dated Dec. 13, 89

"May I ask you to procure and send me the No. 3 of Harper's Bible containing the second part of my notes on the Bible?"

After months of delay and my writing two letters at one time to the Editor, I received a letter today saying he had ordered his publisher to send the first part, which I have already. This is a mistake. I want the second part. His letter says it has been published. Is this so? Not knowing his publisher, I am obliged to trouble you. I forwarded the corrected copy of my article to you. I hope you got it.

Ever your S. Davidson
Dr. Davidson any document probably that in their breasts have not fully directed the same hence he has failed to receive it.

In the Jan 4th No of "Invitation" Amherst Which will appear an Editorial discrediting the Nature of Dr. Davidson Article "New Testament as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Old" also as "Deacon Harris" article "Science & Biblical Criticism" stating they will appear in Feb 4th. No. These will also appear an introduction by myself not by name.
but as a "Subscriber"
I have omitted to say
much I would like to
have said about you.
I am a student of your
connection with the
article by Dr. Davidson
& Dr. McInerney in
Methodist Review of New
Haven, and omitted to
state that the Yale Rep.
cently were struggling
in their boot under the
formidable attack upon their
reputation for Orthodoxy
at the charge that Calvinist
istic Orthodox University
are head quarters of Hotbed
D. Rationalism.

Dear, my John Burnham
Farmington, Conn.,
May 24, 1890.

Prof. W. R. Harper:

My dear Brother:

I enclose two items for the C. F. Students if you can use them in any way, if not throw them into the master basket without a scruple.

I wish once more to repeat my expression of thankfulness to you for your services to the churches, to the ministers and to sound learning.

I thought at first that you had rather live many points at Dartmouth. This, but there was such charm of treatment and unity of aims and definit
was I thought that the effect was simple and strong. I am sure that an minister is the better for the address, and I trust that his preaching will be a little less bad. When I think of the soundness of your views upon the Scriptures I feel like kicking those ignoramus who have been trying to find lies in you. I am glad that you carry your illuminating with such grace and peace. May the Lord bless you more and more.

With Sincere Esteem,

Sincerely Cordially,

Geo. L. Clark.
Dear Dr. Harper—

I spent an hour or more last evening in company of Dr. Brooks. It was my pleasure to tell him as far as I could about our conversation from Buffalo to Rochester, and also further about our conversation in Chicago. The dear old man seemed very much touched to find that you had any kindly feeling towards him. He listened with deep emotion to my statement that you regretted that he had found it necessary to criticise yourself or your utterances. He then spoke at great length about his personal regard for you, although he had never met you—about how he had and studied the scriptures rejoiced at the way you were awakening people to think, and named the great difficulty he had in reconciling your utterances with what I assured him was your present attitude towards the word of God and our beloved Lord. I assured him that you believed the scriptures to be the word of God and not simply to appertain to that word, and that you had protested in unmistakable terms where others were belittling the scriptures and minimising their contents or the truth. He was deeply moved and went on to say that any utterance that he had made was the outgrowth, not of personal feeling, but of his sense of duty to his Lord. Again and again he assured me of his personal regard for you, and his regret that he had never had the pleasure of meeting you. When I arose to go he stood up before me, and in his characteristic way pointing his finger, gave me a message to deliver to you, which I wish I could now recall, not only in his very words, but in the tender tone in which they were delivered. On the whole it may be summed up as follows: Tell Dr. Harper that some years ago when I heard of his work and read things that he said, there was no man in the whole range of my knowledge of living teachers for whom I had a higher regard from whom I expected greater things; I looked
Dear Mr. Heaven,

I want to express my deep appreciation for your support and guidance. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with you and develop my skills. Your patience and encouragement have been invaluable.

I am pleased to report that I am making progress in my current project. I have completed the initial phase and am now working on refining the details. I am confident that with your mentorship, I will be able to complete this task successfully.

Thank you again for your time and effort. I look forward to continuing our discussions and learning from you.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
upon him as the coming champion of the Word of God against the coming conflict with infidelity in the church and out of it. All my predilections were in Dr. Harper's favor, but when I saw some things in the press which he was reported to have said; when I got letter after letter from people who heard him giving utterance to things, which to me, seemed to be utterly subversive to all faith in God or his word, I could not help giving my testimony against these statements. Moreover I had positive knowledge that the faith of young men was being undermined, and it was my duty as a servant of the Lord, so far as was in my power to counteract these things, therefore I spoke with all the intensity of my soul, but if I have misunderstood Dr. Harper or in any way misrepresented him, no one will be more happy than I to be convinced of the fact, and Dr. Harper never can know what a happiness it will be for me to humbly confess my mistake and offer my apology, and repair, so far I can the wrong that I have done him. Assure him that no one word that I ever said was because of personal animosity or ill will against him.

With this I left him. He thanked me again and again for calling, and expressed the sincere hope that he might meet you and that he might hereafter be able to stand beside you for the advance of the truth, that all that he wanted was that the truth should prevail, that the Lord should be honored and that good should be done. He spoke with trembling tones of the great responsibility which rests upon you now, at the head of this new Chicago University, and hoped that you would have a career of uninterrupted usefulness, and that you would be in that position what he had anticipated from you a number of years ago, a great champion for the truth as opposed to the upstart opposition to the Word of God, as the result of conceit, want of scholarship and absence of piety.
Permit me, dear Dr. Harper, to say how deeply I sympathized with Dr. Brooks in all this. Let me assure you that he has a heart as tender as a woman's, while it is as brave as a lion's. I wish you could meet him and know him as I know him.

And this you may believe, that behind every one of those things that appear so severe from his cutting pen, there is a heart always humble, always tender, always full of greatest charity and always true to the honor of our God. I hope I have not wearied you, but I have done what was in my power and what I had your consent to do. I hope that I have not misrepresented you, and I am sure I have tried to defend you and to serve your interests.

Nothing would please me more than to have two such Bible students - two such enthusiasts in Bible study become better acquainted so as to have a clearer understanding of each other and a larger place in each other's hearts.

I go to Louisville to-night and will write you about affiliation from that point.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
I am very glad to hear that you are well and happy,

especially with the Brooks at Millfield. I hope we may hear that you and your family are well also.

May the Lord bless and prosper you.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
Granville, O. Dec. 31, 1891.

Pres. W. E. Harper,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Friend;

Your very kind letter of the 23rd. telling me that you had recommended me to lecture at Toledo was received just as I was starting to attend the Meetings of the Ohio College Association. Otherwise it would have been answered sooner. On my return I found a letter from Supt. Compton awaiting me. If they go on and make arrangements with me I shall take hold of it most heartily, and do the best I can. I have had a little bit of experience of it already. I began a course in Economics at Newark finishing the first of this month. I had a class of two hundred and held them through, and you know that Newark has not had much interest in such things. I appreciate your kindness to me and the College in this recommendation.

I suppose that you have noticed the recent comments of the Journal & Messenger on yourself. I hope that these comments will not make life a burden to you. I had a long talk with Andrews twice last summer, and we spoke often of you. He is a royal fellow. I am sorry that you are living in a lonely state, for it is lonely to have one's wife in another land. I am not a bit ashamed to confess that I am not a whole man when my home is empty. I wish that I could have an occasional chat with you for they would be enjoyable and inspiring. With an honest hope for your continued and permanent success,

Yours steadily,

R. S. Caldwell
My dear Father:

Your recent letter giving me the option of going to college and taking a job has caused me a lot of concern. I understand the financial pressures which are forcing me to make this decision, but I am still unsure of what is best for me. I have been considering going to college, but I am not sure if it is the right choice.

I believe I have a little bit of experience to offer, but I am not sure how much help it will be. I have worked at various jobs over the years and I think I have a good understanding of the world of work. I am also interested in exploring my options and I believe that college would be a good opportunity for me to gain more knowledge.

I am aware that you have worked hard to provide for me, and I appreciate that. I am sure that college will be a difficult decision for you, but I hope you can find a solution that is best for everyone. I am confident that I can make a good decision, and I hope I can make you proud.

Thank you for your understanding and support.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Lew Fred Sunday
April 28, 1891

My dear brother,

School has fallen through except as the prospects appear to be! Reasons of this have connected with myself, but I will tell it to you and then you can better understand my last letter. Our Presbyterian Synod took to bars a motion petitioning the General Assembly to investigate the case of Dr. Briggs in regard of his inaugural address prior to its publication. They wished to condemn me in the new positions. The whole affair was worked up quietly by certain individuals. Printed slips
were prepared in the office of the Reverend and Presbytery, and ready bound out after the proposed motion was adopted. It was, however, so worded that it was referred to a Committee for reconstruction. This delay both the matter to the ears of the Seminary Professors, and we went down to the next meeting, and spoke in favor of a motion to postpone action until the spring meeting of Presbytery when we would have the entire address in our hands. We argued that the Presbytery was properly under the jurisdiction of the New York Presbytery, that if any one from this Presbytery wished to go to the New York Presbytery and there prefer charges against Dr. Bixy, that would be the proper method of seeking illustrative procedure. 3) That in all wisdom we should wait until we had...
The addresses make it clear that some of the positions, e.g., uninspiration, higher criticism were not opposed to our standards, and were so clearly beyond dispute that they were being widely accepted.

Dr. Evans and Dr. Smith have read papers as the result of this. On Criticism & Inspiration, in which they take of course positions favorable to criticism and squarely opposed to the doctrine of the absolute inerrancy of Scripture in all its parts.

I stand strongly in support of my colleague, so does my young and brilliant friend and fellow housekeeper, as well as colleague Dr. McIffet. On the other hand Dr. Roberts is a rabid defender of the higher critics and the inerrancy of the entire Scripture and all parts. Doctrine of inerrant inspiration which they claim to be the historic faith of the church, clearly falsifying history in doing so. Dr. Morris holds to a doctrine of "plenary inspiration" which is in reality no better than the other.

The result of all this debate is not yet
discernible. One incidental and immediate result, however, and as I think, largely through the influence of Dr. Roberts, is that the Executive Committee have informed the faculty that it is inexpedient at present to proceed with the inauguration of myself— and Dr. McElhenny and declare the arrangement for the measures proposed until after the meeting of the Board in May. It is all due to the influence of Dr. Roberts and the Southerners who are much grieved at having their pet scheme defeated & because they are being resisted in their untenable positions. Broadwell & McDonald are under their influence and the other members of the Executive Committee are under Morris—hence their action. With this too is connected the abandonment of the school. Mr. Addy is one of the members of the Board, a warm friend of mine and who was the first whom I approached on the subject. He advised me not to proceed. He offered the share of $100 and named other men. McDonald & Broadwell among them, from whom $1000, or could be secured. But, having a conference with the Donalds, he told me that he did not think the Executive Committee would give the sum $1357, of course if not that, then they would not aid financially.

This whole matter is a profound search for
the present, at least, and you will please to regard it. It will explain to you both my letter asking for information helpful to another situation. The disappointment of not being able to add another school to the Institute.

I accept Mr. McGivern's offer. On Saturday, I had other plans but have abandoned them.

Let me hear from you soon.

J. Craig.

P.S. I do not apprehend that the Board will attempt to cancel the appointments made at its last session, but the action has been most unwise and the entire ethic's grip upon the management in so far as related to us and to others as a representation of its capabilities that neither has felt inclined to tarry. This is all for the best.

J. A. C.
Sanborn Me. Nov. 2 1889

Dear Prof. Harper:

In regard to your request respecting the use of my name as associate member of the American Institute of Sacred Literature, yes you may put it in. I have looked in vain for the name of Dr. Mendenhall. I have just read the Editorial in the Meth. Review for Oct. As you are not a truthful man unless the inner consciousness of Dr. Mendenhall is at fault of course you ought not to have the fellowship of any of the Methodist ministers, bishops and Theol. professors. How is it "Brer Rabbit" that you have their names in the places that I find them? Seriously I was amazed to read the article. I had not read the previous one. Have you any personal acquaintance with Dr. Mendenhall? How are you prospering in your various projects? I wish to know how the proposed grammar and commentaries are prospering. I wonder when I shall have a chance to talk over matters with you again. There being no Exegetical Soc. to take me to N. Y. this winter and I not feeling sure about any vacation trip I do not know when I can.

Cordially Yours

K. B. [Signature]
to the accepted faith, both in the classroom and in the press. If they become unsettled, they themselves, let them return to their denominations, and become independent, and then examine the question at issue. I would not defer any professor or minister from private study of such questions, but he should not make public utterance of unsettled matters.

By all means let the studies in the higher criticism proceed. Let the discussion go on. I expect it will increase our knowledge.

Augusta, New York
Feb. 13th 1889

Publisher of
O.T. Student:

Dear Sir:

My subscription expires with the February number. Will you kindly write my name from the subscription list, as much as I have decided to discontinue it.

I like the O.T. Student for many things, but do not like the attention it gives to the Higher Criticism. I am not opposed to investigation or progress, but I am opposed to leading theological students into the
uncertainties of the discussion. Theological students should be trained for teachers and gospel workers. It is their mission, not to make creeds, but to propagate the faith, already accepted by the churches they serve. It weakens a minister's power in the hard-to-hand conflicts of the ministry to be in uncertainty about his foundations. A man ought not enter the ministry unless he has settled his foundations. If during his ministry his mind became unsettled, he should desist till it is clear again.

If all that the advocates of the Higher Criticism claim should become established as truth, it is manifest that our ideas as to the accuracy and authority of the Scriptures will have to be materially lowered. The doctrine of Inspiration will undergo a great change. This is a most fundamental matter to our Protestant faith.

If they you lead a student thru the uncertainties of the Higher Criticism you unsettle the very foundation of his whole system. If he is uncertain about his Bible or its authority, what heart can he have left to teach his faith as sure truth.

My advice and opinion is that theological professors should confine themselves
it out of the pulpit at Theological Hall. I had no intention of writing so much when I began.

Yours sincerely,
H. M. Dodd

Pastor, Possley Church

of the Bible. In the course of time whatever of Truth it really contains will become generally established and accepted. Then it will be time enough to introduce the true results into the ministry & the Seminaries. I have no stomach to follow the controversy thru all its stages. I have other work to do. You have other work to do, as a teacher of students. If you must follow the controversy don't disturb their minds with it.

I suppose that in the recesses of a professor's heart as in other hearts, there is a
desire to confer honor on the institution by literary work of an original character. There is also a gust for truth, fact, discovery. This love of investigation spurs to be on the alert for new theories. Does it not also disqualify them for impartial judging of the evidence? Is there not an unconscious bias together in their minds—a profession in favor the (supposed) new theories. No professor would ever consciously allow himself to have any bias, but is he not liable to it? It seems to me that the final decision of the questions started in the Higher Criticism & the jury that must weigh & value the evidence is not the (detectives) who got the evidence, or the advocates who presented various sides of the case, but the common-sense of the average Christian world, who, though they may be utterly unable to do the investigating, & arguing, are able to weigh the evidence with cool critical keeness. When therefore this matter has reached the stage of general acceptance among us, it will be time for the Seminaries to teach it. Till then let it be relegated to the books & conflicts of outside theological controversy. Let the controversy go on, seek keep
Dear Doctor Harper:

I am just in receipt of a letter from Dr. Brooks, who sent me your two letters with the first copy of your letter to you of Dec. 8th. His first impulse was to get consent to publish both letters, but the pressure of business, upon him prevented his writing till it was too late for the Febry number of the North. Mean while your second letter was read by him. He says: "It is not at all satisfactory as a defense against the serious charge brought both by the writer in the N.Y. Tribune, viz., the student who sent me the statement which appeared in the Jan. No. of the North." He thinks, "it is a poor excuse to say that the objectionable language he used about the word of God was altered in the form of badgering to draw her out." If he had ended his badgering by telling her the story that it was bad for the class, that it was bad for the school, as well as condemnation of the views he had advanced in print, his position would have been very different from that in which the two writers leave him.

Thus you see how Dr. B. stands affected at present. Perhaps your doubts, like that of the professor himself, Lec. 8:25, has been staggered at times. Your words, unhappily, if not incorrect. Yest, my dear brother, so above for it by each pronouncement as will admit of no double interpretation that will honor God and His Word. I was yesterday reading Kelly on the Minor Prophets, and I sympathized with him when I read: "We cannot exaggerate the heinousness of the Sin," namely, "that Man should allow his mind or acquirements, whatever be his measure, to rise up in judgment of the precious and perfect Word of God, to insinuate the theory as far as his influence extends, the absolute divine authority of every thing God has written."

Coronado, Feb. 3d 1870.
Do not, my dear friend, allow Prof. Riggs or any of his school, to influence your mind. Dr. Brookes says: "the professor states distinctly that there are errors of transcriptions, not only in all translations, but in the text of the Bible, but in the original manuscript, as they came from the hands of the first writers." This Dr. P. says: "though not only inspiration but revelation is logically impossible, infidelity is very little worse." I would remind Riggs of the last words of the great astronomer La Place: "ce que nous connaissons est peu de chose; ce que nous ignorons est immense." He was no bad exponent of the unspeakable nature of the finite knowledge which finite man acquires in his short life about the infinite, these works! What is the difference between the finite, the infinite? I heard a Methodist minister in commenting on this passage, "even the hairs of your head are all numbered," say, that if one hair had escaped God's observation then He was not an infinite God but finite! The Bible, as we have it, is infallible and that it has not been corrupted by Satan, acting thro' his retained emissaries, is a miracle! and Yahveh Elohim declares Ps. 72:18 that He, alone, is a door of miracles.

I beg you to see the widely increasing influence in reading up for the Book, as it has come to us, against all adversaries. If you do not receive a reward in this life, you are sure to fit the plan at "well done, good and faithful servant" from the lips of the Master when He comes back they in to reign.

Your faithfully,
B. B. Haggard.
Hotel del Coronado,  
Coronado, Calif.  
Dec. 6/89.

My dear Mr. Harper:

I was greatly disappointed at not meeting you in Chicago last August. It grieved me to learn that the doctor had ordered you away from Chattanooga for a period of rest, as that you had gone to England. Your editorials in the N.T. no. of the Old Testament Student satisfy me that you are at home again as of old, at least as much as I can judge from the occasional letters which I hear from you in my correspondance. I congratulate you on the great work you are doing in the Master's service. You have already done much, but I hear occasionally some criticism on your course. May I ask you, in view of your long friendship and correspondence, a little advice? I feel somewhat bound up with you in your past history.

Have you seen the article in the Spirit which appeared in the N.T. last winter or early fall and have you read Mr. Brodie's comments on some of them in the N.T.? In one of them, some student asked you: Do you mean to say that any reason you give for the rejection of a Scripture statement is an excuse for your rejection of it? Had your reply been: 'Certainly, if that is your reason, your reason from you.' The student asked: 'Is it not like putting your own reason over against that of the Scripture when I find that it is fully declared? Do this you replied: I am disappointed in you, friend, too, for all your study, knowledge, etc. things you still cling to the old, disapproved versions of the Bible! Were you correctly replied? I hope not.

Some of your friends, in this I'll have them again, said to me that in view of your statement, they feared lest you might get away from the truth. I have invariably stood by you, defended you while I acknowledged that your correspondence with the perfect scholars of...
In any protest speech, belong only to the Old Testament in Hebrew or the New Testament in Greek, which by God's singular care and providence have been kept pure in all ages. The preacher must read the very words which were immediately inspired of God without the intervention of any human agency. If the Bible is to be read, then it is perfect, then it is infallible. Inferior work on the other hand is of necessity imperfect. So is human! Our traditional education fills us full of wrong beliefs, erroneous criteria. Christianity are groping in the dark and the only light that shines is from the word of God. I believe that there has not been a book written or a sermon preached or a prayer of any length offered since the Apostles' time that was not built with error in God's sight; and it is only through what the Scribes nominate, the frittering, of preaching, that the conscience, to partially enlighten man's darkened understanding scarce last soul.

Paid on me, my dear friend, for intruding my private opinion upon you but you know, without my saying it, that I have not been wasted when you; as you are becoming more and more a light in the scholarly world I beg you to take Jeremiah's advice to ask for the old path, where is the good way; and walk therein for your soul.

Yours very truly,

B. Dean.
Santa Barbara,
Jan. 6, 1902.

My Dear Dr. Harper:

It gives me great pleasure in reply to your of 29th ulto. to enclose the two Certificates of Stock in the AM. Inst. of Hebrew. The one is for fifty shares, the other for seven and a half shares.

You may have seen, perhaps, my paper on "Higher Criticism" in the "Occident," Subsequently published by Dr. Brooke in the "Bibl." In that paper I have denounced Briggs, Brown & included my friend Harper also! I hated to make a reflection on you but loyalty to God's infallible Word, as I regard it, compelled it. We must love Him better than Father, Mother, Brother, Sister, Wife, Child or Friend, or we cannot be His disciple. You have made a great mistake, my dear friend, in denouncing the Bible as false in its facts of history & science!

I pray the Lord to give you to open your eyes to see your error.

Ever, your friend & Well Wisher,

A. Douglas.
God's word says this is "the blessed hope."—Titus 2:13.

Hotel del Coronado,
Coronado, Calif.
Dec. 5/89.

My dear Dr. Harper:

I was greatly disappointed at not meeting you in Chicago last August. It grieved me to learn that the doctor had ordered you away from Chautauqua for a period of rest; and that you had gone to England. Your articles in the Nov. no. of the Old Testament Student satisfy me that you are at home again or in hospitals or wherever. I congratulate you on hope that you may live many years. To do great work in the Master's vineyard. You have already done much, but I hear occasionally some criticism on your course. May I not, in view of our long friendship, tell you, in a confidential way, what I have heard? I venture a little advice as I feel somewhat bound up with you in your past history?

Have you seen the articles referring you which appeared in the Bible Home last Summer or early Fall? Have you noticed Mr. Brocher's comment on one of them in the Truth? It seems that some student asked you: Do you mean to say that, if my reason contradicts any Scripture statement, am I at liberty to reject it? And your reply was: certainly, for what purpose was your reason from you? The student ended by saying: I shall discredit my own reason to heed the Scripture when I find what it falsely declares. To this you replied: I am disappointed in you. You profess, too, that after all your study of knowledge of these things you still cling to the old-fashioned systems of the Bible! Were you correct in reply? I hope not.

Some of your friends, in this still, have again and again made to me that in view of your position they feared lest you might put off from the Truth. I have invariably stood by you, defended you while I acknowledged that your correspondence with the finest scholars of
Dr. W. R. Harper,
New Haven, Conn.

My Dear Brother:

I enclose you a clipping from the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 25th, which will explain itself. Before making any comment upon it, I think it is fair to you to ask whether you did say the things therein stated. I know that newspaper reporters frequently misrepresent men. Please let me know, at your earliest convenience, whether what you said is correctly represented in the enclosed clipping.

Very sincerely yours,

T. T. Eaton.
Dr. W. R. Harper,

Mael University,

New Haven, Conn.

Dear Brother:

I am very glad to learn from your letter that the publication in the Cincinnati Enquirer was a gross exaggeration. I happened to be out of the city last week, and did not see the Standard, and cannot find a copy here now. I would be much obliged, therefore, if you would send me the clipping. I was a good deal concerned when I read what the Enquirer said of you, and I hope when I see the article in the Standard to be entirely relieved. Your letter goes a good way in relieving me.

Fraternally,

T. T. Eaton.
My dear sir,

I am glad you attended the

meeting called to the same charge as

the article in the Christian Advocate.

Whatever statement you may have

made or point in which you differ

with me, I think you may chose to make.

I am fully determined to defend

the article against naturalism, to

defend the rights of criticism and the

free and radical, within the orthodox church

and that criticism is recent and does not overstep the

natural law in the Bible and in Christianity, and to

deny that human reason should call

by an opposition spirit to those scholars

who are carrying forward Biblical

studies simply because they do not
accept the ancient ideas in matters of historical and literary criticism of the Bible. I shall see my judgment, that you will make to me as to the Brethren's first statement as I suggested in my letter to you. If you do not, then your last note to me is sufficient for my purpose, providing you would accede to use it.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

He. Geo. B. E. Harper
New Haven, Conn.
Minneapolis, Oct. 28th, 1882

My dear Doctor Harper,

I have been referred to our ledgers to look into the
Botanical Institute (Vol. III-VIII except
the notes) and have carefully gone over
the whole set and found almost entire
acquaintance from the charge of each.
Now I will forebear speaking a word
against in anything further I may
write. I gladly take the note a year
silent and offer my wish and the name
of the publisher when I publish it
from my church. This periodical
is of great value and thank for
heartily nothing for the task, but
also for the complimentary titles
for next year. I will appreciate
much to perceive.

While waiting for


fence the attitude of a super-
naturalist in regard to the Scriptures
I hope you will allow the narrow
restrictions of this letter to move
you in your management of your
journals, but will in the future
make them the forum for the discussion of
critical questions in the spirit
and for all spirits of
novel. What we want is the Bible,
and if traditional views stand
in the way of that, there must
then yield to every. The author
of the Scriptures as to God's law stand
not in the tradition of the sacred, but as
their self-evidencing power and say to
the conscience and the heart of
every genuine man.

Again thanking you for your kindness,
I remain yours sincerely
Joseph H. McElheny
Minotka, May 22, 1889.

My dear Doctor Harper, [Handwritten and unclear.]

Thank you for your kind words and for your appreciation. In case any articles are published, I will be fully repaid for the labor they have caused me by the auspicwsness that I have tried my best to do justice to men to whom I owe so much. Have derived as much help in my own appreciation of the Bible and the my dearer scope of its true principle on which it must be defended by the wise and honest minds of all good men, and more lately by your own.
Periodicals, that I could see value in the fifth for has given me as well as to the debt which I owe to these men, if I did not call a share to the wild denunciations of their work to which the Methodist Conference, I have lately listened, in my student days, I listened to the lectures which have since been delivered by Dr. Ladd's great work. Have had his work with even more frequent in the last several years, and it is not assenting to that it can. I know indeed to accept my place as a humble disciple in the Kingdom of the Word, unless I utter any protest against the banishing a man of God views to the hands of enemies of rationalism.
I regret that the mailing of this letter has been delayed. In the meantime, the discussion has called out an article in Zion's Herald (Boston) by Rev. Bishop Little, Syracuse University, in which an entirely different view is taken of the right of critical inquiry that taken by Dr. Mendenhall. I have sent for some extra copies of the paper, and will forward one to you. I desire to assure you that Dr. M's remarks denouncing Mr. Mosher's speech to you and many of our thoughtful speakers and clear thinkers.
Minowa Pa. July 16, 1879

My dear Dr. Harper,

The case of D. O. T. Student, 142, is kindly addressed to me. I wrote a notice in the Advocate to the effect of its having been referred against you. If Dr. Haskell and his article had not appeared when your own statement—perfectly satisfactory and convincing—appeared in the Christian Advocate, then your name at the present time, in the Advocate, would have found, but the article in my own paper, I quote more fully from your article. I hope my defense will prove satisfactory to you. It has been in the Office of the Advocate for several days. I have also sent it to Dr. Haskell in respect to the defense of Prof. Dodd (in respect to miracles; the facts alleged against him in the first article of Dr. W.) and a
this piece of a more serious character, bringing the facts concerning Yale College's attitude to the Christian faith. Under another hand does this work, I intend to present a survey of the material critical questions on scholarship and inspiration in answer to the late contributions of Dr. W. from a higher and broader point of view than that assumed by the latter.

I anticipate much pleasure in reading the O. and T. Student. So write me, please, take the book now, at your leisure. Hope you will not believe that the narrow spirit evidenced by Dr. W. is indeed prevalent all over. More than the ministers and teachers, it is not the case.

Yours faithfully, [Signature]
June 17—

Dear Dr. Hapalus,

Will you kindly send me a copy of the syllabus of your lecture before our Conference, if you have any left?

You have stirred things up, that United Reformer, a sharp fellow. He was around this morning getting opinions on your address. He maintains you are a Bugga man, and ought to be recognized as such. I maintain you are not that the whole tendency of your

Pardon my frustration.

Cordially yours,

Wm. P. Florence.
teaching is different.

My Father, who represents

Hovey, Horace E., maintains
that whether you are right or
wrong, you are descending
from the high place of a
University President to
engage in current skirmishes
which must endanger the
 success of the Chicago enter-
prise. They say you are
now vacating more than a
Hebrew specialist, vastly greater
than a Semitic teacher, you
are engaged in coeducating
schools and striving all
the learning of our day in
a great curriculum, and
that for you to engage in

checkmate in Pentateuchal
criticism, where so much
is uncertain, is as much
a descent as for Free. Eliot
to declare himself for or
against Bishop Brooke or
Revis Brenton.

I have endorsed
your position heartily and
shall do so. At the
same time I am glad
you do not prepare to
dictate next year. Let the
instruction scale in for
a while, and let nothing
hinder the good work.

After all our theory of
the Pentateuch is not the
2 West 46th. St. New York;
May 30th. 1891.

My dear Dr. Harper:

I telegraphed you last Friday morning in response to your letter, saying that I would be at home any time on Friday or Saturday, and be very glad to see you. But you did not appear. Perhaps you thought better of the idea of giving a statement to the papers. I was not quite decided in my own mind whether that was demanded by the recently published report or not. I cannot tell just how things stand—as true and false are mingled in all I hear.

I trust that you are bent on keeping your health at any price. More depends on that than you can dream.

With kindest regards, and full assurance that all will come out right,

as ever, yours sincerely,

[Signature]
My dear Dr. Herman,

I telegraphed you last Friday morning in response to your letter saying that I would be at home any time on Friday or Saturday, and I very glad to see you.

But you did not reply. Perhaps you thought better of the idea of giving a statement to the proper. I was not due anything in my mind whether it was genuine or the recently published report.

or not. I cannot really know how things stand as true and false are mingled in all I hear.

I trust that you are well on keeping your health at any price. More depends on that than you can imagine.

With kindest regards and till assurance that I will come.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
D. W. R., Harper,

My Dear Teacher,

I am just reminded by the reading of an article in which you are accused of an unfounded purpose.

In their attacks upon you, you have my hearty sympathy. It is impossible that—on some points—I might not arrive at the same conclusions with yourself. But your method is correct. It is the only way to save the Bible from ultimate contempt, because it is Biblical and permits the Bible to speak for itself.

It is now that I shape under the limitations which a large, undevolved but developing pastorate lay upon...
[Handwritten text not legible]
me. I cannot have the time required to write the articles and help in the battle for the truth. I am obliged to fight against a temptation to minimize my place and work as much as possible without any doing what I should greatly delight in doing.

I got Mendenhall's Articles and have read his illogical and unhistorical inferences in The Methodist Review.

In our Bishop's Conference in this city, I have heard the privilege of standing for that truth respecting the Word which ultimately brings men into divine convictions. But I have not found the time to carry
out my purpose of sending some contributions to the press respecting this controversy. How I wish I might have part in it! But others abler are doing, and I must be content to let them work and simply give them whatever I can.

It is the fact that this field is so undeveloped that takes up much of my time and energy. It has two missions. My men are praying only what they did previously to my coming, and I must press the work. It is pressing me, too. I fear a break may come soon, but I am guarding against it all I can. If I can just sit through the next eight weeks, I think I can
Sundin it until vacation, then will be.

But I had no thought to write. Let me say again that myself. So while in some particular I might not conclude with you, I can and do most readily say that I believe most thoroughly in the pressing and prosecution of higher criticism by among whom should perhaps Evangelical students. We must have a truly Biblical theology based upon a scientific historical spirit. Higher criticism must give us the historical setting and consequent point in the development of religious experience. If each of the books and their constituent records do this you are laying the foundation.

I wish I could help, but I cannot now.

With kindred regards to all goodness.

C. A. [Signature]
Rev. Dr. W. R. Harper,
Chicago University,
Dear Sir:-

I have no disposition whatever to entrap you or to criticise you unfairly, nor indeed to continue the discussion. All I want is that the position of the university should be clearly defined. It seems to me that definitions should be as clear in this department of thought as in any other, and that there is much gain in perspicuity everywhere.

If you choose to define your position more clearly I will take pleasure in printing it without comment. The only thing that is left in doubt by your excerpt, which I have printed this week - so much of it as seemed to me to define - is the meaning of the words "Biblical material" in which there is a possibility of misrepresenting your views. You refer to this "material" but do not say what it was. I say it is Chaldaic mythology, religious ritual and rules, legends, myths, sacrificial rites, ceremonial, etc., to which you refer, as having been taken up by the prophets, purified and employed as vehicles of moral and spiritual truth. If I am wrong in this, say so, and that will end controversy so far as I am concerned. I will not pursue the subject, nor you.
Rev. Dr. W. R. Harper
Chicago University
Dear Sir:

I do not propose to interfere with your plan to open your classes.

I take you up to the point of the minimum number of professors.

It seems to me that the number of professors should be as clear as this.

Department of English as in any other, and that there is much gain
in basing it everywhere.

If you choose to carry your position more openly I will take
pleasure in bringing it without comment. The only thing left is to
let it go to your conscience, which I believe you have this week.

If you wish to make a change in your position to a basis of
freedom from the necessity of removing.

Perhaps material in disaster there is a possibility of improvement
in your view of the "perpetuity put up for any kind.

If you are a man in Chicago's history, all kinds of material and
more, Japanese, Chinese, and other, according to the principle,
and shall not, as well as the rest of the country, so far as I
know in this, can your great and your accomplishments.

I am sincerely,

You understand that The Examiner, Journal and Messenger, and perhaps other Baptist papers, made themselves very busy in our church troubles. I have taken a little vindictive pleasure in smoking them out now. And that is only fair. They did their best to provoke schism in our church, which I was laboring as best I could to prevent. They must now either take an ironic or schismatic position. They made such a rush at our people that they exposed their flank - to put it mildly.

Of course I will push the interests of our Presbyterian institutions. I resisted your efforts to capture Lake Forest, and will make it as lively for you as I can whenever I catch you on our preserves. Play a fair game and shinny on your own side, and it will be all right. I have nothing but high respect and good-will for you personally.

Truly yours,

[Signature]
You can imagine that the exposure to the elements and the weather took their toll on the buildings and the materials used in their construction.

The buildings were made of wood and bricks, which were considered sturdy and durable at the time. However, as the years went by, the elements took a toll on the structures, causing them to deteriorate over time.

From what we've learned, it seems that the buildings were designed to withstand the harsh conditions of the area. The windows were large and made of thick glass, which allowed plenty of light to enter the rooms while also providing some protection from the wind.

In addition, the buildings were built with a solid foundation, which helped to prevent them from settling or leaning. The roofs were sloped and made of durable materials, such as slate or shingles, which helped to shed rainwater and reduce the risk of damage.

Despite these precautions, the buildings were not immune to the ravages of time. Over the years, they were subjected to a variety of natural disasters, including fires, tsunamis, and earthquakes.

In recent years, efforts have been made to restore and preserve the buildings, as they serve as a reminder of the area's rich history and cultural heritage.
Highway, Clinton Co., Ky.,
Feb. 27, '95.

William R. Harper, Ph.D.,
President, University of Chicago.

Dear Sir,-We are beginning to use your Greek Primer, and think of introducing the Latin soon. The nature of our school makes it very desirable that we should know as much as possible of the religious experience and life of the authors of our text-books. Could you kindly answer the following questions?

1. Are you a child of God? Does the Spirit of God witness clearly within you that you have the new life in Christ Jesus?

2. Do you believe that you wrote your books with an eye single to the glory of God? Did the divine Hand guide you and help you in writing?

3. How do you think your associates...
those would answer these questions. Do you know anything of their religious experience, from their lives and testimonies?

The plan of the primer is exactly according to my ideal, so far as I have examined. The only change I would make would be in the use of New Testament text instead of that from heathen writers. The Lord bless you.

Yours in Him,

E. P. Gifford,

(Principle of Bible Mission School)
Battle Creek, Iowa, July 11, 1891.

Prof. W. R. Harper,

My Dear Sir: Your very courteous letter of the 21st inst. came to hand; and I certainly have no reason to complain of the Spirit, or language with which you receive my complaint. Still, I cannot but regret, that you feel unable to spend upon the effort required, to point out where or how Genesis contradicts itself as to the length of the flood. In your previous letter the excuse was, that it would require so much detail, that you must refer me to your 50-page treatise on the subject. But now it seems that this matter of the deluge occupies "a small portion only of one page" of that treatise. How can I help thinking, that you might give me an outline of so brief and argument as that, or the gist of it in a sentence, or at least name chapters and verse where the account is contradictory, in your opinion? I am sorry you are so crowded with work, that you cannot give even that much help to a brother student of the Bible seeking for light.

I make no accusation; but I will tell you how it looks. It looks as if you had borrowed your charges of scripture inconsistency largely from your predecessors in higher criticism, Neinew, Prof. Robertson Smith, et al., (as we know these things are currently detailed from author to author); and that, when I pointed out to you (as in my first letter) a new and original view of the matter, showing conclusively that it is simply impossible from the Old and Jehovah sections to make out any contradiction of time-length for the flood,—you found yourself unprepared to meet and answer that refutation I gave of that accusation against
Genesis, without spending more time than you can afford upon one. It looks as if I had given you a web which you find it hard to catch, and that it requires more work to meet the real issue thus presented, than simple, to take second-hand the gibbles which the critics have raised. The folly of Robertson Smith's effort on this point (the length of the deluge) I showed in my last letter. And seeing that you have got to invent some new device superior to his, I can sympathize in your lack of time to give me at once an answer to my decisive argument. This alone will explain the case.

The many calls upon your time (as you describe them) I can appreciate; and if I do not wish to add to your onerous burden. But to my mind, the many calls upon you only enhance your responsibility to give true information on every point coming before you. If a brother kindly points out to you a mistake you have made, (as wrongly expounding Scripture) - you ought certainly to take time (notore volens), unwilling to go further till the mistake is corrected, or found to be an mistake. It is a serious matter publicly to accuse the Bible of glaring inaccuracy. And the many who are calling up on you for light, makes it the more imperative, that you pause long enough, in this swift career of popularity, and influence, with which God blesses you, to study anew any point when you are boldly challenged, and be sure you are right before you go ahead.

Fortunately, I am able by my long studies to feel from myself your charge of Bible inaccuracy concerning the flood; which, if I believed it, would make me an infidel at once. For, I have nothing to rest my faith upon but a truth-speaking Bible. But alas! how many of the public have no such safeguard as I have? and will be plunged into scepticism, and confusion, (by your confident assertion of Scripture contradiction. You are a man having authority, and your open denial (of such sort), carelessly uttered, may ruin souls. O that the leaders in Zion knew their responsibility, not heedlessly to throw out such assertions upon the faith of christendom; but if they have novel theories which they feel constrained to broach, would modestly mention its theories only, and leave time and general study to decide their value.

Excuse the well-meant admonition of a further in the gospel ministry. This correspondence is no private random talk; it is the open questioning of a public man concerning his public utterance by one of the public listener to his lecture. I give you full credit for good intentions in all your work. Only let us add that wisdom which is profitable to direct.

Yours, Fraternally,

Smith B. Godenow.
Dansville, N.Y.
Mar. 23rd 1871.

American Institute of Sacred Literature,
Prof. D. R. Harper,
Principal of Schools.

Dear Sir:—

I protest.

Against furnishing opportunities for learned men to make less sacred the Sacred Scriptures do I protest.

That such addresses as are reported in the public prints from Drs Briggs and Thayer are against the convictions of a large number of the associate members, from my personal acquaintance with them, I am able to vouch. It is indeed necessary for the Institute to decline endorsing the Calvinism of one member, the Apostolic succession of another, and the immersion of a third, but it should expect and require of all its lecturers that they reverence the Holy Scriptures, the common ground of the faith of all. It should remind them, when ne-
cessary, that they are accountable to God though not to the Institute.

From a sense of duty, I protest.

I am respectfully yours,

[Signature]
Chicago, July 11th, 1894.

My dear Dr. Harper:

Isend but again to you the warmth of my personal friendship. That any questioning upon the part of the Judges of your theory of the best of Genesis is complicated by the personal element.

I have been unwilling to believe that you were correctedly reported by the paper, but the account that appeared this morning in The Record is so circumstantial that apparently it confirms to your
Any words that I fear your position to that which is therein indicated. If to be have sorrowfully come to the parting of the ways.

If this account does you injustice it would be a great relief to say you heard the words of chargin' others if you would be good enough to let me know in what particulars you are being accused.

Very truly,

[Signature]
Prof. W. R. Harper,

New Haven, Conn.

Dear Sir and Brother:

It was my good fortune to listen to your lecture on "The Divine and Human element in Prophesy" and my misfortune to get somewhat tangled up thereby. Here are some questions which I should be pleased to have you answer concerning some statements which I understood you to make—now bear in mind I do not say you did make these statements but that myself and one or two others understood you to make them—they are, (I do not pretend to quote the exact words but merely the thought)

"While the Bible as a whole is the Word of God and has in it the words of God, not all words in the Bible are God's Words", again, "although it is extensively denied, still it is a well known fact that many of the most eminent scholars admit that there are errors and inconsistencies in the Bible"

Unfortunately I am not a student in Greek and Hebrew so I may not be able to comprehend your answer but I should be pleased to have you state wherein the errors and inconsistencies lie and also why, if you credit God with sufficient interest in human affairs to inspire a portion of the Bible, you do not credit Him with interest and foresight enough to forbid that this inspired portion should be mixed up with any trash emanating from the brain of men, or in other words, if the Bible as a whole is God's Word and contains the
Words of God why are not all words therein God's Words?

I understood you to discuss in your lecture as do I in these questions the original text of the Scriptures. In some trouble concerning "Inspiration", I am.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Asst. State Secretary.
My dear Dr. Harper:

By this mail I forward to you my essay in reply to Christianicty'r Millstone. I trust that it will prove what is needed to expose the fallacy of the arguments of the distinguished Englishman and American essayist. I read it before a Fortnightly Club here which is made up of all sorts of men in theological classification, atheists, agnostics, deists, trinitarians. The surprise of the first three classes that an "orthodox" minister could write such a paper was amusing to see, and we had fun with them.

Day before yesterday I read it to our Essex North Association of Congregationalist ministers, and it was received so differently there. Two or three of the more conservative men said that they could not go with me, and one said that he would like to kill me, --for I deserved it---but that they would keep me alive to kill off worse men, like Goldwin Smith. From these two tests I conclude that I have answered Goldwin Smith fairly. I hope that the essay will prove useful in the larger circle of your magazine, for which I shall now be able to subscribe.

I have cut down the Ms. until I reckon that there are not over 8500 words. It will be manifestly better to publish it in two instalments, if not in one, for there is only one natural dividing point. I regret that the Ms. looks so bad, but I had only one object yesterday,---to cut wherever it was possible, and it was done in the quickest way. It is at all events legible.

With regard, I am

Sincerely yours,


P.S.---I left my bibliography in, that you may use it if you wish.
My Dear Mr. Hatchet:

By this mail I forward to you my essay in reply to Mr. Hattie.

Dr. Hattie, I trust that if my essay will prove what is needed to preserve the faith of the American Baptist Church, my essay will be published in your paper.

With respect,

Sincerely yours,

Newportport, Mass., April 8th, 1884.
Oshkosh, Nebraska
Feb. 7, 1890

Dr. So.-

In your Feb. 1st, No. Sert. Stated
one pps. 70 & 71. In answer to the question: "Does the Bible attract or dispute?" you reply:

(PP. 70) "The Man who is really at home in it is a Man of Clear-

the Day, p. 2 (PP. 71),

For this part you speak of "Misrepresentation" "Interruption," "Interpolation," or

"Is the reasonable - correct - clear - false, leading of false as called Christian.

See these pp. p. 2 (PP 71)

Now what I object to is the broad,

undiscriminating character of this

language. Why not tell what these

false teaching are, who, or what

class they are of? Then I do not know whether one
"The false preacher," or "my Brethren over yonder," a — your sqg.

(Handwritten text that is difficult to read, possibly discussing a religious or philosophical topic.

Please note that the text is not clearly legible due to the handwriting.

Please send me your book...

Rev. P. C. Johnson,
York District
Nebraska Conference,
Oscoda, Nebraska.
Kalamazoo, Mich.  
March 7th 1872.

Prof. W. H. Harper:

Dear Sir, Permit me to trouble you with a question.  
Mr. S., W. D. Johnston, is at Brown University— in his junior year.  He thinks of entering the University of Chicago, next year, to graduate.  This involves several considerations.  Will there be Scholarships, or any pecuniary advantage open to competition or any among the sons of ordinary bright men?  Is the best time it would be best to make the change?
but would not offer him if the way seems socially clear.

Now a word on D.T. studies and prophecy—this theological affair dissent.

Please, accept the thanks of a humble student of God's Word for all you have written on this subject—

The apple of your eye shall I call it.

God has been pleased to use you with others for giving birth to a new speech of interest—I would sense passion for Bible study! There is a mighty

and miraculous grandeur, it marks the first time of scientific and accurate.
methods, and spirit, as well. Who should be happy in this? Surely, ministers of the Word.

I wanted to say that in all you have written, I have reprinted almost literally, except in a single sentence. I do not recall it distinctly. Concerning the passage in Deut. 34:10, I think, however, a fuller analysis of the subject would bring out the points in dispute into greater clarity. For example, under the general discussion of the relation of prophecy to the historical and literary elements in the O. T. could there might be a specific analysis, say, Didactic, Didactical?
symbolical, prediction etc.

The relation of the prediction to the
Citation in the New Could be deal-
with disconnection often a great
deal of irrelevant matter.

Under other subdivisions it could
be seen how the Spirit of prophecy
was mediating the New, third the
organic life of the Old Testament.
It would then appear thattertions
of the prophetic writings of the
and Testament had no imme-
diate reference to Christ himself
and yet in larger and more
impressive ways the activity of
the last moment of time was
a mighty voice crying in the wilder-
ness preparing the way of the Lord.

It is not for me to say, but some one who
has the clearness of your eye and the firmness
of your hand must help dullards out
with the lesson. (Signature: J. A. Leeming)
Pres. W.R. Harper, LL.D.,

Dear Bro.: Yours of the 15th reaches me only today after a return home from a trip to Granville and Columbus.

Please accept thanks for kind words and courteous treatment. I was on the point of writing you to say that Dr. Nordell had already confessed to having written the articles in question; and though he did not write confidentially, it did not seem to me to be right for us to take advantage of that and bruit the fact to the world. You notice that, in my articles, I am careful not to say that he is the author of the things criticized, as also to make no reference to you.
Dear Mr. Hackett,

I hope the following information is of interest to you:

After a short stay at home, I intend to go to the country and continue my studies. I have been wondering whether it is possible for me to try out for a position as an assistant in the laboratory, and I should be very grateful if you would kindly let me know your opinion on the matter.

You are, of course, the only person who can decide on this matter, but I thought it might be of some interest to you to know that I am seriously thinking of going into research. I am interested not only in research, but also in teaching, and I believe that this combination of the two would be of great benefit to the students.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

P.S. I have enclosed a copy of the Central National Examinations for your information.
The same is true, this week, when I deal still further with the article of Nordell. Indeed, I could hardly believe that you were the author of the editorials, especially after what you had said and written to me. But there they were, editorial, in a publication for which you were to be held responsible as editor. How could we do otherwise than attribute them to you. We often canvassed the subject, wondering how you could have written the articles. I am certainly very glad to know that you are not the author, and that you are going to take the business into your own hands again, though I hardly see how it is possible for you to keep so many irons from burning.

I do not think that you have had occasion to doubt my friendship, except in the matter of criticisms upon things which you were supposed to have written. I do not want to rank you with the neologists and
The case in the first place, when I can tell it further with the ette...

The case in the first place, when I can tell it further with the ette.

Of course I count partially on you that you were the

subject of the atrocity, especially when you are to be dealt with.

you to me, and from then we are neither in a position for which

you were to be held responsible as such. How could we go otherwise

then anticipate what to you. we after everything the next morning

and how you could have written the article. I am particularly very

fear to know that you are not the culprit. But that you are going to

take the punishment into your own hand. maybe you want to send it.

see how it is beautiful for you to keep so many from your paternity

I do not think that you have my permission to gossip with everybody.

in the matter of atrocity. now things which you were importunate

to have written. I do not want to keep you with the conduct of any
destructives. I remember that when you began, it was with the idea of strengthening the faith of God's people and of convincing gain-sayers of the truth of the Old as well as of the New Testament Scriptures. During all the years I have seen but little to which I objected, until the appearance of that editorial in Dec. '90; that was too much for me. But the editorials of '91 were, if possible, worse than the others. I cannot believe it possible that you would have written anything like those articles. I trust you never will, and that when the next number of the O. & N. T. S. appears, it will take ground so conservative that we shall be able to note the difference.

I am receiving from all quarters congratulations on my position and treatment of the case. I care more for the truth of God than for any such thing, and expect to stand firmly by the truth, whatever may come. Shall be glad to hear from you again. Meantime, let me assure you of personal respect and friendship. I criticize only what I regard the unjust treatment of my Master. Very truly Yours,
continuation. I recognize that when you present the case with the facts of
its foundation, the need of God's people and of continuing evan-
sayer of the facts of the Old so well as of the New Testament story
towards purely all the views I have seen but little to which I object
be without the presence of that aptitude to do, too, that men
too much for me or for the aptitude of 9h more it becomes more
than the occasion I cannot believe it becomes that you would have
written an addition to those statements I want you never will say the
when the next number of the O. E. T. 8. 8. 8. will take up the
so concerning that we shall do hope to note the difference
I am receiving from all different considerations of my position and
slum of the case I can only refer the facts of God they for
and now find my excuse to hang firmly on the finger and may
come. Shall be glad to hear from you shortly. Meanwhile, for me become a
received-I received my introduction. I attribute only what I receive a
migrant present at my breast. Very truly yours,

Aug. 5th, 1889.

My dear Dr. Barker,

A friend of mine, Mrs. D. W. Dickens, has become much interested in Hebrew & entertains some thoughts of becoming a member of your Correspondence School. Will you kindly send to her at 147 Broadway, Norwich, Connecticut, your circulars which explain the method of study & give directions for joining the School?

I have been much interested in the full & graphic accounts of the Mohawk work which have appeared from day to day in the Tribune, I am very
glad that your part of that work is in such a fair prospects condition.

It was with very great pleasure that I read to day the interview in which you reply to the strictures passed on your Biblical Criticism by Dr. Mendenhall. I am sure all your friends will rejoice in the fact that you take your stand so strongly & unequivocally on the side of revealed truth.

Please do not think that I have lost my interest in Hebrew for the reason that I am not with you this summer & have for the time being out of the Correspondence School. I could not will do otherwise. However I continue reading my Hebrew Bible. But I am at present finishing the Philosophical Course of the University of this city & that occupies fully all my spare time. I select Hebrew as one part of that course & while studying it, last winter, under the instruction of a born Jew and I obtained a better idea than I had before of the benefit your course of instruction had been to me. After finishing this course I intend to take up the work with you where I left off.

With the kindest regards & best wishes

very sincerely yours,

Joseph J. Lane.

Prof. Mr. B. Forbes Ph.D.