My Dear Friend,

I return herewith Surgeon's note. He is a very conscientious as well as p thyical fellow and I would place a good deal of value upon his verdict.

So long as your interpretation does not expunge away the real historical basis or seem to lead it down to the grade of a fable, so long as you do not affect the inspiration of the Scriptures as to diminish their supreme authority over the Conscience's lives. Amen! So long.
as your misinterpretation does not affect the atonement as announced by Jesus and interpreted by the apostles who quoted the O.T. as argument of the Holy Spirit. Satisfaction you will have no serious conflict when you have uttered your last word.
There is linguistic interpretation and there is also the element of life. People, the common people, the soil of the race—felt the facts of Sin and Salvation. And there is a time when all feel there at that time it will not be necessary, but the person of Christ brooks no change. Now the whole controversy hinges upon the result
as affecting the person traced of X.

"According to the Scriptures" is a phrase
appearing in the N.T. repeatedly. What
Scriptures? The O.T. surely. To whose the
appeal was made. To whose life was affixed
after his resurrection (Luke xxiv:3). If the
principle of accommodation be insisted, the
ethical one appears very. He was the truth.
He claimed to be the truth. He insisted
that what he said was truth. To excuse to
coincide with their error to be truth
necessitates a position of requiring
many explanations. The fact is, he
claimed to know & stated all where
that claims. Now the either did not
know, or else he used the principle.
accommodation with the effect. Following
his hearers he remained in their ignorance
while they supposed he was lecturing them
fully. Did he deceive them? How
they say now that he did? So to be U?

Time

When at 6 o’clock you spoke of a
few who had been converted by the passage
“unto Shiloh came & said it was not”.

This conversion is the work of the
Holy Spirit. He has no need to
limit himself to false interpretation.
He could use any scripture. How did
the Holy Spirit use falsely a scripture
to lead a man truthwise? So

Does not the Holy Spirit resolve a
contradiction? Doctrine truth by
means of error when he is the 3rd person

Now there are
Considerations which must receive attention and they center in the question: am I?

"What stands ye of Christ, whose son art thou?"

"And myself. Sometimes think I

in a way that involves no material difficulty what leads me to accept

my much from you. Then again I do not see how you can when

your premises avoid Hallsch misunderstood

Kuenen conclusions. They say that

logically you & Briggs must come to

their position.

Now, My Dear Friend. I believe

in you. I have something more

than a feeling of admiration for your

ability. I have a real feeling of friendliness.
Master yourself, not because we are likely to
obtain a careful accurate knowledge of the
question, because your positions are
known. I must be pure kindness let me say
that there is a feeling of regret at this;
method, there is towards yourself a
feeling of insecurity. Nobody and there is
a feeling of suspicion towards the University.

None regret this more than I, I think.
it fair to point. I hear this often. Nobody
knows what Mr. Hunter's position is and there
is a feeling that you are not frank because
you have not reached your own decision. True
this is far more serious. Have I offended you?
I have not meant to. I am thoughtfully,
earnestly, prayerfully studying this whole
question. I accept much of what I hear on
your side, but the final question is how well these
interpretations affect what lies back. Forget
our life as indicative rise to righteousness, the
department the Divine trust in us for our
salvation.

Finally but Affectionately Yours, Souvenir.
Palmyra, N.J. July 15, 1889.

Thanks for the reply to Mendenhall in Old and New Test. Student. Its spirit is golden. To put them side by side is to see who is right. I have pasted his in the Student near yours. You are on the heights the "Morning after the Battle" he is in the valley, where the smoke hung thick, and it is now seen to be little else but smoke. Also the whole editorial matter is very timely; it couldn't be better. You are our champion.

I am becoming impatient for this week to run out, when I shall, D.V., start for Chautauqua. Miss Voorhis had a week's good work, two hours a day, with me and stopped only when leaving town. She resumes on her return. I shall send in two subscriptions to Student--one for self, and one new one for a friend. I am reading Muir's Life of Mahomet with pleasure. Green's likeness is capital and the feature a good one. Hoping you are well and surrounded by a crowd of good students,

Yours very truly,

It is profound ignorance that inspires a dogmatic tone. He who knows nothing, believes he is teaching others what he has just learned himself. 

_Le Bruyère._
make sure that they cultivate the arts of true exegesis so. Their complacency in their ignorance is amusing. They know nothing of anybody but Alexander, and all the kings, can fly up — no Koning orelli Dillmann or driver. You have the day of the young men, etc. you have an idea of an ideal — "growth; study; progress; improvement. This gives you the future. The conservatives of the dead-orthodoxy type have nothing to offer the young men, no ideal of fire, no future vision or delight of present growth and life for them. Has not Alexander settled all the Hebrew problems of Isaiah? He is orthodox; accept him. Has not Alfred done the same for N. Y.? Accept him. "You have nothing to do but accept," or "to accept." This which is a true picture is doomed, the curse of God is on it. May you live to see it break out into the veins of the streets.
Tuesday noon: I will add a postscript to my hurried composition of yesterday. It cost me the best part of a night to sleep, because my head would not let quiet with fighting Pearl-Princeton. You must stand still, all the more firm now that no smaller fry are trying to stand firm in our chosen place. Like Samson, oppose the Egyptian pharaoh to the last. The one thing that irritates them is the emphasis on Bible-study. Rig the changes on that; that much of the Old Testament is lost to them, they know it: that what a man does not see is helpless to get it. No longer his, whatever his toil; that their state of learned dogmatism ignorance is proved at its true worth by its practical failures, as a system of that study, to keep before them any ideas of study and shall
I sympathize. But do not think I am depressed. I see the whole issue too clearly. Only I could sight for fellowship recognition of my work. If I could know of anything where the suspicion and hostility would be gone I would take it, I think, at once. The vivacity of the thing surprises even me. It shows that ye realities have been setting many minds thinking. Before them the examination-plan my! Thank God for that! The bishop said he depended on his wife's report. He went only out of curiosity. Isn't it sad? What shall I do? Advice me if you can. But as I resign is to take effect next academic year, so as to be free for anything by next school year. Well never minds I will not burden you with these questions; I did not mean to accept my lot and will abide this issue, try not to get myself in the way of the principles I stand for. Only you know the rest is a decision of the denomination and is in the hands of the principal man of the denomination, who was the
most severe & derogatory to you. "No man ought to ask the country professing to be a great Hebrew scholar & upsetting people’s faith! "ought to be ashamed of himself & call that. The minor brethren who hang by the bishop's eyelids said nothing, but listened. The debate was between all the professors & the bishop & the pastor of the strongest church, after the bishop. I stood my ground & replied freely, & in general have not a wish for anything I themes were held & self-assure in a proper way: challenges the bishop to show by grounds of lexigesis or philosophy or anything else grounds that a man was not at liberty to hold Dr. C’s interpretation of the Emmanuel prophecy & still be true to New York. I openly asked once both whether he was my enemy or not, that I preferred to be honest & demanded that he show his real intent. Methinks only I did not say, but I repeat’d John Alfordence. The bishop charged you of course me, as tailing under false colors in pretending to new methods of teaching & I had it in my tongue to reply "That is a question of opinion ultimately of facts. Upon this there is a whole library on education written within 10-15 years that dip with this truth." But I said nothing. The debate grew so warm, 3 men would start together to reply as nice to me. I knocked home every false charge against you & did justice to the opportunity, saying it was purely extemporaneous I do not boast of it. I am grateful that in God's Providence it was so. Of course, I suffer under it. Not one who shows me a particle
The statics are mine. I will not mention the author, there much more like it in my armamentarium.

Of course they must you to declare your opinion, that they use your name. Alas! for the day if that child came true.

Besides an intelligent man, with his mind open can gather y're opinions after a while, in many things, that is the right way.

Just after I wrote my last letter, I heard at Mrs. Nicholas' that Emanuel prophesied. (I'm sure she is said to "run" the Bishop's office.)

So the belief came up to the Seminary, and an outburst of wrath against you "going all the county" dictating people's views so as not going to dying men. This is the truth. (Salvation you see, by dogma — who is that dogma?)

I did not hear him, but the idea, who is one, of my friends, consequently, I'm sure, said by dogma — who is that dogma? I asked them to take the class that you will...
Teaching "views." The whole strength of my position is that you don't teach "views." As I told my students (and I heard last night of a new enemy, among the prominent men of church—men whom I once respected; but fortunately he can't do much bad talk) this is not a question of views of dogma or orthodoxy, but of what is the right way to study the Bible. It has nothing to do with any theology necessarily. But is equally true for an Arminian, Calvinist, Swedenborgian, even. But I need not go on. You cannot but feel all this more than I, but you do not see it any clearer.

It is part of the fascination all you as a teacher. It provides attention — in fact it is the central feature of yr work — that you are uncertain. Metaphysical, Biblical. If yr work is to culminate in and the profession — yr God grant! it will be because this has been fast held to. Allow me a quotation: "The opinion wh. is fruitful is not that wh. is found in the depths, and from the honest necessities of a man's nature, but that wh. he has taken at second-hand, the statement of wh. has pleased his intellect, has puff'd him up with a sense of superiority, and placed in his hands a club with wh. to subjugate his neighbors to his ritual devotion. The true man, even, who aims at perpetuation of his opinion, is rather distracting than aiding the cause of truth for the love of wh. he holds his opinion; for truth is a living thing. Opinion is a dead thing, and transmitted opinion a deadening thing."
Not yet thru the discussion, that you evidently here he is not quite right but being open-minded he is in the right track. Treated the child as quite historical and typical. She asked why, as we did I elsewhere, the child not make this a typical fulfillment too? But the bishop always feels better after his outbursts when it has been my fate to catch in public 2 or 3 times, but I never will take it so quietly again. Have grown stronger bolder. Of course all this makes my position tiring but that does not disturb me. I would go the stake for it, just as I say, it has been a new birth to me. As I wrote you once before, in the last "blow-up", I told the bishop personally, Bishop if you want an easy way to decide whether I shall retain my chair, I can give it you, Dr. Maybe
is well known, he has written much.

It is possible to get his drift better.

That is nice. If you would not allow him to teach then you should not allow me. But he was alone

...and no one else heard it who is not fond of strenuous measures without much

true & plain in his personal relations - not tricky, not fakery, as some.

Last night I came home from an

faculty meeting all on edge. Perhaps I will letter again.

end it all. But I will not, but

rather to put out, being "uncorro-

decended + a Roman", they much

"fetch me not."

Now as to the business: (Hope you

will understand. I am not telling you in this letter - or in my last, I

believe you understand me, as I imagine in part. I will take the examination in Luke, as it is far off yet.

This last letter: I quite like the 2nd elementary in Hebrew.

I would again like to try my skill now reinforced with more facts in the "slow boys."

In conclusion - this to say letters - you are facing the young men, like Paul, to those, Nellie.

of Peter the Heart. It speaks of my own students to join myself to them

in a way which is life from the head. One man so gained is worth a

hundred who are left midway for they are to carry on the work.

Will write an essay soon, as it was published in our paper. Williams

has got a fair ticket of the entrance gate. But advice is

means God be with you.

With love, W.W.
My dear Sir:

I do not see how a man can be a true believer in plenary inspiration and write as you do in the third paragraph of your notice of "The Inspired Word." Inspiration you say is "the burning question!" You excoriante men who are on the right side of that question! You crave a judgment that is willing to wait until all the facts are in, and are hoping for a "final solution" of the problem. If that does not show that you are against us, or it shows at least that you are on the fence with a strong inclination to get down on the wrong side.
with your help.

707 taking place of a train which

for a time to a new station.

and must be written for the
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What do you mean by plenary inspiration? I mean by it that Holy Scripture was God-breathed and as originally given in the ancient tongues, is absolute free from error, both of doctrine and fact. Do you hold to that? If so, I shall be very glad to hear it. If so, why belabor Dr. Bishop?

Some of us do not believe in written in the handiwork of these pete-smoking Dutchmen before we quire in our adherence to the Old Book. We are for it if they are against it. It is the eternal warfare between truth and error. God help us! It is a battle, and you are either on one side or the other.

Yours truly, Thos. Love, Pastor
Missionary Training Institute for the Northwest,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Board of Management.
H. C. MARIE, D. D., (Bapt.) Pres.
REV. D. E. WILLIAMS, (Pres.) Sec'y.
D. C. BELL, (Cong.) Treas.
REV. R. B. WILLIAMS, (Cong.)
J. B. McARTHUR, (Bapt.)
REV. T. C. HORTON, (Pres.)
JAB. BUDVAM, (Meth.)
F. E. ERYANT, (Pres.)
T. A. HILDETH, (Meth.)

Practical and Thorough Course of Study.
Prominence to the English Bible.
Stress on the Life of Faith.
The Scriptural Order in Mission Extension.
Interdenominational in Affiliations.
Co-operates with Existing Agencies.
Open to Men and Women.
For Work Home and Foreign.

REV. C. HERRIOTT, (Pres.) Gen'l Sec'y. 520 Sixth Avenue South, Minneapolis.

Minneapolis, Minn. June 3, 1892

Prof. W. A. Harper A. M.
New Haven
My Dear Bro.

I have answered your letter
some regarding the giving of your lectures and the
ultimate establishment of a summer school here.
Please attribute it to mutual cooperation with
labor in both pastoral and institute.

I am always cordially interested in what interests
you and in your deep interest in Bible Study, etc.
As you know, I have sometimes said and so spoken
left your idea of such study not being too much
in the intellectual aspects, merely of Divine truth,
but you should fail to gain that real insight into
the supernaturalism which often lies between the lines
of Holy Scripture - an insight gained mainly as I
have learned through the most complete self-communi-
cation and obedience to the Spirit as well as the letter of
Scripture. Lately you know I have been and known
little of you. I had no sympathy at all with the
incipient attack on you by Dr. Strong of which I
learned at the time through Rev. Gates.

Latterly I have heard occasional rumors that you were losing faith in the supernaturalism of the Bible, and even of miracle as a whole, and that you were so regarded by some people in New Haven who do not know or can afford to give currency to it. I have not done so, but I would feel, unless compelled, that it would just now be reassuring to me if you could and would send me at least five lines to tell me that such is not the case. Be assured this is not a continued in me, nor the expression of a desire on my part to hold you to any names or traditional views of inspiration or anything else. I care not how many wheels you picture in the divine methods, if their be any licensed to tell us "the living spirit within the wheels" with constant prayer that avert your un-veiled enterprises, and technical studies you may ever live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God"... I remain

Faithfully yours

Henry McElreath

I shall doubtless accept the New Secretaryship offered me, but there are some matters that will require a little delay in the announcement of a decision. When you shall come to us, I shall hope to aid you in every way. God bless and keep you in.
Indianapolis Ind
May 2/92

Prof. W. R. Harper A.B.
University of Chicago.

My dear Sir,

Will you do a kindness to one whom you have never seen or heard of? If so I will take it as a great kindness if you will give me in a word, or a dozen words, your belief on the following question:

I am defied by an intelligent man in this city to discover a cite - "A biblical student, recognized in the literary world as Authority, who asserts that the old Testament Bookes foretold, as a coming event, the coming of Christ as He did come, and in
I don't know what to say.

But I'll try to be a

friend.

I know it's not much, but I'm here to help. If you need anything, just let me know.

I'm not very good at this, but I'll do my best. I'm here for you.
the Character He did 

I am very anxious to convince 

my friend that there are still 

left in the world a few intelligent 

brains and faithful hearts that 

believe that the Bible is the Word of 

God—That Jesus Christ was His 

divine Son—and that, unlike all 

other men that ever lived, He was 

famous (in prophecy) a thousand 

years before He was born, a man. 

That Christ was not "wrong in His 

head"—in His heart either, when He 
thought and declared He was the 

promised Messiah—the Son of God. 

I could cite my friend many 

books by great biblical students & 

writers, but unfortunately for him 

he seems to think that this is 
such a wise & progressive age 

that the beliefs and teachings of
The Eucharist is both a turned and unturned bread. As long as we can imagine the things that have been said about the Eucharist, it is the one and only way that we can imagine that the Eucharist has been the one and only way that has not been said. How can we be sure that what we imagine is true in reality?
those who died ten or more years ago, are now as dead as those who taught them—so I want, for him, the thought of a brain that is still thinking—the belief of a heart that is still trusting—living testimony!

May I have it, sir, in a word from you? If so, kindly write your reply on the reverse side of this sheet, and return all to me, so that I may show him the whole correspondence and leave him no chance to dodge.

Sincerely yours,
Charles D. Albiggs Jr.
It seems that the document contains handwritten text in English, but the writing is not legible enough to transcribe accurately. The text appears to be a series of sentences, possibly a letter or a note, discussing various ideas or events. Without clearer handwriting, it's challenging to provide a coherent transcription.
My dear Harper:

I ought to beornersing,

but instead have been going thro' your
Pentateuchal effusion. I think I never
read a novel half so interesting. And
the mystery to me is what Dr. Green
can ever fail to say in rejoinder. As a
whole it is magnificent, but I imagine
it will play smash with your standing
in many Orthodox quarters. I miss
my guess if we have a Chicago Univer-
sity after all this. I believe it is necessa-
ry to let in the light. At the same time
I'm afraid the first result will be
hurtful to many good causes. And so
I'm in a dilemma. The first effect
of the reading is to make one say that it
is clear even to demonstration. But we
must wait for Dr. Green. But by and
by University

[Signature]

W. P. McKee
My dear Prof. Harper,

I enclose a few questions to which I think an answer would be helpful to others as well as myself.

You understand, of course, that I do not ask in a capricious manner at all, but simply as one who wishes to get at the truth. What are it may be, and who wants his opinions to crystallize as fast as possible, under the stimulus of your wonderful lectures.

I am not afraid of a opposed to the higher criticism, but
I do not see the truth of all its utterances, and have a feeling that there will be for me at least a via media, by which I can find the harmony between two notes which sometimes seem to be discordant now. I recognize in your work a desire to make inspiration a higher criterion than each other in true harmony. At any rate I am exceedingly glad to hear you, and enjoy the lectures very much,

Most cordially yours,

J. N. Peloubet.
Dr. Harper,

I have read your social ethics speech with great interest. It certainly is the greatest speech you ever made to me. I have known your address.

It seems to me that Dr. Strong's admissions in the Examiner are the most significant utterances of all. Certainly it will help your fight. I should think it would be perfectly easy to speak freely on it, after that.

All will not a word.

Sincerely,

W. P. McKee
I have never known your distance from

the world where I have seen your name

in the company of my mother. I have

never known your name and

I have never known your story.

The world where I have seen your

name and your story is
different from the one

in the company of my mother.

I have never known your name

and your story.
Religious Controversy

Minneapolis, Minn. Oct 15, 1887

My dear Dr. Harper:

Yours at hand, I think I said

that I had not used the Sam'l Studies. I enjoy

the Word Studies & Special Topics in the Mark

Studies, most of all. I miss them in the new

es. (Elementary, Intermediate). As you suggest to

I can't yet see that the division into steps for

the seven days, is the best. When I have given them

a trial my opinion will be worth more, whether it

is practicable to get everybody to use a notebook

so much, is doubtful to me too. The most of my

Mark class do but not all.

I'll mention the Chauteague scheme to Soares,

I will be happy to consider putting my Bible work

in connection with the Institute of Sacred Scripture

I fondly hope to spend a year in study when

I close my pastorate here.

I hardly know what to make

of your remarks about the suggested paper

on the higher criticism. Perhaps my scheme

is premature. The only matter is, no preaching
of my acquaintance pay any special attention to these questions. I don't believe half of them distinguish between Higher Criticism & Rationalism. But when I think of it, it is a little prouder for me to underline to open their eyes. Perhaps I will take up with your suggestion about Prophecy. But here I shall have to advocate views as my own. Do I don't know whether I want to publish what little I think about Prophecy. Wouldn't they, to a man, brand as heresy, the suggestion of fulfillment in the spirit, not literally?

I'm puzzled to know what you mean in your remarks about what I have been reading. You say Dr. Northrup would frown, yet you call it "progressive work". I say you are glad I'm on the "right track." I don't know whether to feel encouraged to press on, or to hold up. This is true, I never read a novel which interested me more than "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," did.
And to confess the truth, Lord was almost equally interesting. I'm going to read Manly, on the other side. But somehow, I feel that I know beforehand, what he will say, a that it will not be true. I confess a fascination for, I a bias towards, the new ideas. What am I to do? Shall it?

But I stuck a snag last week. W.R. Smith thinks David knew nothing of the Judicial Code. But 1 Chronicles 15:12 ff. says that David ascribed the "to act upon us" in the death of Uzzai, to the fact that the Levites brought not the ark. How can we say David knew not the law in view of such testimony? unless we absolutely discredit Chronicles? Can a man hold any real theory of the inspiration of Chronicles & discredit such statements in Chronicles?

The time is near at hand when these studies are going to bring painful strivings of spirit. The time must come where a man can't be.
Non committed any longer. I would give almost anything, if three or four questions were settled, but they seem farther from solution every month. "When ignorance is bliss, -"

Let me know about when you will be in Chicago. I must see you there "one night at least." Let it be early enough in the week so that I can get back for Sunday. I like to be with you (O.C.) I feel as tho I must see you.

Very Sincerely,

Will P. McKee

P.S. W.R. Harper
Dr. Harper:

Geistweid has written the most outlandish sermon for the Standard saying that Dr. B. "disgraces the Savior" in saying Jesus did not speak on matters of authorship. I spent two hours with Geistweid in his study, and told him I thought his article was positively sinful, for he would deny that a man can be a Christian if he does not believe Moses wrote nearly all the Pentateuch. He views you had Columbia too, in private, for your O.J.S. Editorials.

But I am awfully disgusted with Geistweid's "sledge hammer blows," as you are. But is it wise to say a word in reply? This last (this week) is so utterly wrong, that it would be easy to put him to confusion. I could find but one book in his library on the Higher Criticism, i.e., "Drives Search," Young.

Yours very truly,
William Harper, Ph. D.
My dear Dr. Harper,

Many thanks for your kind note, which from so busy a man as yourself I fully appreciate. In connection with what you said the other evening with regard to acceptance or non-acceptance of Jonah's engulfment, and what you say in this letter namely; "If I accept the question of miracles at all &c", I am led to ask one more question. "Do you accept the miracles of the Old Testament at all?" For the reply to that question would of course settle the matter of the Jonah miracle.

Yours very truly,

A. F. Schuffler
My dear Mr. Herbert,

Many thanks for your kind note, which came so

prompt as men are wont to do. I fully sympathize in connection with your

situations, but I must say that the report of your goods-

concerning the quantity and quality of the goods-

sent to the New York Mission, and what you say is my belief. We

have no one to see if the mission of the goods is to the

extent as you say, and the goods are not received.

I notice the mention of the mission of the goods to the

extent of the goods, and the goods are not received.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
My dear Dr. Harper,

Many thanks for your kind reply to my last. I am glad to hear from you as I now do. You ask why I ask the question that I did. I asked it because I inferred from your (really splendid) lecture that you accepted the miracle of the fish. When I asked you that question directly, you replied, "I do not say that I accept it". And when I asked, "Do you reject it?" you replied "I do not say that." So I was left in doubt. I should have taken no further action in the matter had you not written, and in the letter said, "If I accept the question of miracles at all &c", and later, "That I believe in the possibility of miracles goes without saying". That put me in a quandary for Huxley, or at least some of the modern deists say the same thing. They believe in the possibility of miracles but not in their actuality. Now you have made the matter clear, and my mind is at rest. I thank you for doing this, for I know that you are an awfully busy man and have not time to reply to the thousand and one questions that come to you.

Yours very truly,

A. F. Schauffler
NEW YORK CITY MISSION

My dear Mr. Hebert,

Thank you for your kind reply to my letter. I too

feel the need to hear from you as I was so glad to see the document. Again, I say I feel the need because I understand that you (myself included) are not always ready to hear when I write. I often feel that you are the recipient of the tasks. When I write, I feel I am doing something for you, but I feel I am not doing it for you. I often feel that you expect me to do what I did not expect. And when I speak, I often feel I am doing it because I said it. I often feel that I am doing it because I said it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.
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I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.

I am not sure if you have received my letter, but I hope it has been received. I hope you have read it, and I hope you have understood it. I hope you have appreciated it. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope you have liked it. I hope you have been encouraged by it. I hope you have been inspired by it. I hope you have been moved by it. I hope you have been touched by it.
Chicago, June 18, 1891

Dear Sir,

I beg to enclose an abstract of your recent discourse and to congratulate you for the most part on your views and the reception accorded them. For your conclusion that the Bible errs in matters of science and history but is infallible in matters of faith and practice seems extraordinary and unwarranted. I can not imagine on what grounds you make such a distinction. If a reason why such a difference should be probable or possible I can not conceive. Owing the leadership in the most manifest educational enterprise of the day you can hardly afford to err in this point. May I hear from you or see you in this city or Evanston? Very truly, Geo. Shirley.
Chicago, June 21, 1891

Dr. W. C. Thompson
New York

My Dear Sir,

Recently I sent you a friendly criticism of your latest utterance on what most concerns your work. I beg to enclose you an editorial from the Evening Journal this city of the 20th which emphasizes the fact which I casually brought to your notice.

Amidst flattering it may be to the men conventional orthodoxy to be told their views are compatible with the best results of the modern criticism, the world at large will not have to it more specially when it is remarkable a view is absolutely unopposed and the recent case attenuation. Hoping you will be led to see the fatal defect in your argument if indeed it be not in your studies and that I may confer with you regarding the matter. Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
New York, June 11, 1876.

Rev. Mr. R. Harper D.D.

Dear Sir:

I reply to your cir-{C}

ular of May 13. I would say that in my opinion the

great drawback about the

true thing of Realism is

that it cannot be put in

to a few neat phrases. And

as I am not possessed of

sufficient leisure to discuss

the question at any length

here, I feel undispersed to

say anything about it but

the misunderstanding. We said
In religion the man is asked if it, as we do in Science, that the true expression which satisfied me, is explanations (such as "Nathan abides a vacuum", "God backed with man face to face") are not sufficient, that all life is vicarious. And every complex that was once supposed, was once supposed.

Thus St. Jerome says in Answer to Justin (1.) yes, I believe in gradualness of Revelation in this sense, that God revealed himself to men as I am obliged to reveal myself to my children. But there is this difference, that
The condition precedent to my children’s care is that they cannot take more than they choose. I have no idea how to give it to them. 

While in Rev. Can Digest, it was Latin, the amount given was by the necessity, controlled. By the necessity of not being able to generate the energies of men, and the free will of men. 

(1) not to be free to trust who would have seemed so consistent with what they supposed themselves capable of in the physical life as in the spiritual life. 

But their, us to discredited. In their minds, the Revelation. In their minds, the Revelation. So with came to the people. So with came to the people of God not as water though a pipe, but as water going
Though a gloomy soil, not an spring comes to Greenland, but as the bire of vegetation extends itself in the American desert the plants present a variety of shape. Each species being the active cause of the next.

When we are asked how we can distinguish between God's clear truth in the Bible, or the human mind, we can give one element, we can give no answer, that would satisfy a child, an ignorant servant, or a peasant. A consciousness of a power of insight trained by constant experience in the school of study in the school of Christ, is our modern touchstone. A most
3.

Worse! But it is
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constant study of chemi-
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hand, controls life, to the whole most heartily.

As to Question (2) if

My reasoning is unwound in regard to (1) my answer to (2) won't be worth less. But if sound, the nature of the application to (2) is obvious.

Regarding Question (3) I expect that the abandonment rooted inspiration will be the unsettling of many minds. The power of the Roman Catholic Church today shows how in spite of a thousand separations. The claim to an infallible thing is irresistible.
To the multitude, they shudder at being thrust upon their eyes. They are also plunged into horror. But I believe that the issue will bring men, in the end, into a more intellectual and noble life. The religion of course, will also. But two hundred years later, true religion, i.e., the true religion through the power of Christ, is a greater power than in Galilee's day. This is a more...
The train to Enlargen in it.
The subject is one to which Pascal celebrated success for a long letter (that had he the time he would have made it more condensed)
for not apply.

Very truly yours,

Alexander Mackay-Smith.
June 12.

772 Madison Avenue.

Sir:

I am in reply to a note of yours received from you yesterday a brief exposition of my views on the subject of inspiration. Since their reflection has convinced me that it is brief a open it

Very truly yours,

Alex. Mackay-Smith
Is it possible to do the subject justice? That such inadequate treatment as I gave it in my letter must give an imperfect view of cruelty to women which I am anxious to avoid.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
What I would like from you is first information as to any book or letter from the
mistakes or contradictions of the Bible. Also the reasons for a dual authorship of
Isaiah and Second Isaiah. Can I say to the parishioner who heard you one
Monday that will do you justice and save them from harm?

Continually Yours

S. Lewis B. Spear

P.S. I must not say that I have not the
smallest idea that your position and my
parishioner agree to the slightest part,
ime the slightest error or
error. But how can I prevent
him from following his own unpre-

tence and claim your example?
Encumbered by your position that the Bible that “mistaken and contradictory” and the Christian minister is not their the man
prophet, and that we cannot meet Bob. Ingersoll for by admitting the Bible to have “mistaken contradiction in the audience on
March 18 was a layman of my Church, a Skeptic of good judgment. He will not accept this because he does not accept the
Bible as authority. Another

minister of my congregation makes a false Bible authority as to say that it was as much the fault of Jesus as was his fault
of himself. How are I to prevent these skeptics from amusing themselves with your declaration about the Bible? You,
Eminent Scholar? Is your consciousness positive, your personal magnetism all reinforce any error which can
Claim your sanction.
Substances used to induce a sense
of the presence of the Sacred
Word in the Eucharist.

My heartfelt thanks for your kind
words of encouragement.

Minneapolis, Minn.
Jan 23 1891

My dear Dr. Harper,

I have your brief reply. I was not
surprised by your delay
for I have some idea of the pressure before
your time. Strength.

It occurred to me that
once one must learn
let it be in a friendly
volume. What I wrote
to show you were...
early point me to it.
I have always believed
the original of the
Sacred Scriptures incorrect
in many particulars with
common sense as that of language: i.e. misunder-
standing what it means
by the one thing.
setting: If I were
willing: If I were
percentage: This
thing of consequence
are willing to be.
but must her face
compelling my one.
begot in his followers in their conceptions. Score for the earliest bible and in their godess living. I do not therefore conclude that Deed of Circum. I should be taught but should it not to Caution and warning.

At Medebury there fore and in the college taught a stable of Jesus Bible Class in my hearing. That is Lord. Scripture that in reference to the death of Christ. As cited Isaiah.

Minneapolis, Minn.
Feb. 4, 1891

My dear Dr. Harper,

Having quite Dear from your article repeated traveling I return the same herewith. Thanking you most sincerely for sending it.

About the question of Pat. Ecclesi Origen of books of the Bible no opposition to the views therein. I am
I am not qualified to decide, but I do not for a moment believe that age is the same with science. I have studied the matter most carefully and traced the conclusions that are drawn. It is wonderful how Confucius stands in clear account. Have you read Woes and Modern Science by Prof. James Elliott of Leechs College London.

Chair of Mathematics Leechs College London - North - Stonegate - It has only 120,000. Your excellency's personal acquaintance gives tremendous satisfaction to every one of you. Good men are not responsible for me, like bad men of their position. I see necessary, but without criticism only confirmed.
P.S. #2. I also regret your leaning towards the theory that Jesus may be understood to refer to females as to a current tradition, so that we are not authorized in counting the exact history, because of such reference. I mention thoroughly your preference for the New One: but why encourage the other in the least? Your mention of the minister's extreme love of salvation is not the alternative inevitable fruit of one error in interpretation. But
The error is unfortunate in its effect on principles of interpretation. When he refers to Diodorus Siculus, do we not establish our belief in their existence? When he refers to Moses, the prophet and the people, are we not to believe in their existence? Is there anything in his teaching that does not make the real for illustration? The parables all deal with actual life. The only one we must take on trust is that of Deucalion and Pyrrha. So far as concerns the new world and renown, L.H. S.

Eschatology needs faith in the full parable.
first click the corresponding passage to

formulate. After reading

Robertson Smith.

The Lord requirs but

longer has to often

come after God's

lapses of doctrine—Such

express requirements may be necessary—

Sincerely Yours

J. L. B. Speer

Do you agree with Mr.

Lord? Write the Bible?
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF
The Young Men's Christian Associations
OF MASSACHUSETTS AND RHODE ISLAND.

Y. M. C. A. Building, Boston.

WALTER G. DOUGLASS, State Secretary, Boston.

Dear Sir, Workman,

In reply to your letter of March 18th, I do not know that I need
waste time in an entomological debate that would
be resumption in one to you. Now it is with a critical effort,
I have no inclination to that. I write and now write only
as a Christian man to whom he cannot accomplished a high trust
for young men. No one than young men the least educated, such
as might deal with, in Dr. Schenck's word, the despised questions, dead
from modern metaphysics and which I said must stand
in the Christian time. They are almost altogether the class
that every fairing man who in this simplicity, as the
read" "Heavenly by expounding it would not act in the midst
of, one in a thousand of these, as he reads the words, vsferred to by Dr. Schenck, to doubt that, as add one blessed
Lord, plainly declares, Moses to be the author, and they words
acceptable literally as. So expounding, it is not to be doubted that
Christ's words, and speak of the whole, "intended under the
term the law of Moses.

It may impossible for many eloquently and perversely
Theological tenors, to avoid these questions, but their ad-
tension by the young men, the Y. M. C. A. could only lead to
such the oppression of their faith in the O'Gares and
under their confidence in the Bible as the word of God.

I ask you why I write to you? to Dr. Schenck. I cannot
See how one who deceive who thinks really not can take his
assertions as he would, three of any other man whichever. He
so misled say Moses worked with me through the frequency of
authorized, but Moses who said before Abraham gone. One knew
More, personally, saw two times and participated in the writing
of the Testament. He could not therefore speak according to
any accepted tradition. This day, indeed, it was also fact.

More than this, he who saw the seer's of test in never
have uttered word to which he knew should coincide generations
of men both learned and simple, and the true meaning which
would require the critical scrutiny of the 19th century to bring to light.
Why are so many Christians still uncertain to know that there did
not speak for Moses as the author of the Testament? It is not because
they must acknowledge that he did speak for Moses, and if Moses
did write these books then their teaching must be accepted?

Thus the scientific man, not wholly subject to the teaching
of the Church, finds difficulty in having once more the Supreme
Jesus to consult with what he wrote there, thank he knows, do
he search in some way to be true to his God and yet be with
devout fellow.

The liberal Christian, if he acknowledge the authority of the whole
Bible, if he accepts the Old Testament and New as their
message with fulness, and seeks then as undoubtedly they are,
a fruit of inspiration, must necessarily also accept doctrines
which are utterly repugnant to human nature. And he
refuses to do, hence the persuasive influence of a giant
tide to say to lessen the authority of the Bible.

Of such and blessed Lord long ago said. I say, so believed Moses
We would have believed, but he wrote of one but if he believed
not his writings, how should we believe my words?

To obtain from you thank you to your courtesy which once-
written to a daymaid.

Sincerely yours in the faith

Pereauce Fugio

Do not feel obliged to answer.
My dear friend:

I am extremely glad to have seen you, and to have heard from you on topics which I have known of your convictions. I can little for the formulæ terms "inspiration", "infallible", or even that which we can truly do without "supernatural". But that we must hold to a personal Holy Spirit who has imparted a absolutely new life to believers, and who during a certain period did at times communicate new facts and truths. Cone, the future life as it will reveal to the minds of "prophets"—facts and truths.
that without such direct personal
revelation, much harm remained
untold to men — this, I am
sure, vital and one of the articles
by which the Chrs. of Christ stand
or fall.

You may be sure that I
shall avail myself of the privilege
of friendship, and speak even
more pointedly regarding your dignity
and the character of your work than
I have done before.

But I write especially to
ask what you are willing to
have me communicate the facts you
have me last nigh regarding the
Univ. Business to one or other
name: I mean Dr. Rubins of our
Faculty. He is the chrestest of men,
is keenly interested in our educ. matter,
it influence not a few other men
by his judgments. There are reasons
GRAND UNION HOTEL
Opposite Grand Central Depot.

W. D. GARRISON,
Manager.

New York, 188
why I believe it is desirable for him to know something of last years business, just as you stated it to me. So many others know it facts, of course, that it can do no harm for those things to be said to him; yet I feel myself bound by your request without exception, unless you allow this.

God bless you and direct all your plans to still greater success.

Fraternally,

Mr. Arnold Stevens

Prof. W.R. Harper
New Haven
Religious

Controversy

Rochester,
Nov. 18, 1891.

Dear Dr. Harper:

I am glad you like the articles. They represent the view that is indicated in my "Systematic Theology" (page 105), as a possible one, so that they do not, except in the way of explicit statement, mark an entirely new departure in my teaching. Of course I do not agree with the opinions attributed to Dr. Briggs. (1) While he judges many positive errors, I only say that I can find plausible explanations of them, but am not sure in every case, that my explanations are sufficient. (2) While he regards the Pentateuch as written long after Moses' time, I do not see why I may not hold that it was written mainly by Moses. (3) While he minimizes the element of th
Supernatural, and almost divinely sweet protection, I am inclined to equate that
element in the Old Testament. (4) While, he seems, to make Church and Reason coordinate
authorities with Scripture, I would both reason and Church recognize the Bible’s supremacy.

We all enjoyed your visit here,
and hope not far away to have it repeated.
I trust the prospects of the new University
in Chicago are growing brighter continually,
and I want you to remember your promise
to write to me when you have raised
your million.

Faithfully yours,

Augustus W. Hareg.
Rochester Theological Seminary,
President's Office,
Rochester, N. Y., Nov. 6, 1888.

Dear Prof. Harper:

It is a long time since I heard from you. I have not written because things have remained in status quo. Two weeks ago however I gave utterance in Cleveland before the Ohio Baptist Education Society to my views about a University—of course not revealing details of plan, and not alluding in any way to Mr. Rockefeller. The audience seemed impressed, if not stunned. Mr. Rockefeller heard it and I am warmly that he had given him some new points. I suppose he alluded to my idea that the new American Baptist Education Society might be the auxiliary to the New Institution, and might embrace the University in the system which it promoted. I also urged that the higher institutions always in points of time preceded the lower, as Harvard and Yale preceded Emory and Andover. I hear that you met Mr. R. and had some
talk with him at Vassar last Sunday. I should be glad to know how you found his mind tending, or whether he spoke about the matter at all. I do not myself give up one jot of heart or hope, but rather regard the new University as one of the certainties of the future. It is, however, by faith that I perceive all this, and not by sight.

Now does your discussion with Dr. Green now stand? Is it really to be held, or not? It seems to me that Egyptology and Anthropology are doing a good deal to undermine the Higher Criticism, especially as respects the claim that the Chokmah Creatures, the monotheistic idea, and our elaborate ritual, could not have been developed at so early a date as that of the Exodus.

I wish you could come to Rochester and see me, but I suppose I shall have to wait till I go to New York again, when I hope to have a conference.

Faithfully yours, Augustus H. Strong.
Dear Dr. Harper:

"If I have done you injustice, I am very sorry and will make ample reparation. But the notes I saw seemed to me to leave no room for doubt that you denied that Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch and that David was the writer of the 110th Psalm. This seemed equivalent to saying that Christ taught falsely when he said: "Moses... wrote of me"; "David in the Spirit calleth him Lord," and that the Apostles taught falsely when they said: "He foreseeing this spoke by the resurrection of the Christ," "Moses... said... A prophet shall God raise up unto you like unto me," "Moses writeth that the man that сотh... shall live."

Jan 14, 1889.
My system of faith stands or falls with the
veracity of Christ and his apostles; and I cannot
any longer believe in their inspiration, if they teach
falsely in such matters as these.

I shall wait anxiously for the statement
which you promise. I have told no one
that I wrote you, except President Taylor and
W. Rockefeller, and I did this in order to
explain my position and clear myself from
responsibility. I have the deepest interest in
your holding to the orthodox faith and I want
to save your influence to the Baptist denomination
and to the Christian world. It would be a great
sigh to me if you should follow Dr. Toy; for
I should then think you no longer capable of
being of any use to Baptists, or to any who hold
that Christ's words are final authority.

Faithfully Yours,
Augustus N. Strong.
I do not believe that the composite authorship of the Pentateuch (except within the narrow limits of slight inspired addition and recension) is a conclusion of science. I do not want to have it taught for science, for I think it as hasty and irrational a conclusion as the New Testament theory of Baur. I think a sufficient refutation of it can be drawn from the Old Testament itself. But my great and decisive reason for rejecting it is the testimony of Jesus Christ.

Let me confine myself to this turning-point of the whole controversy. You do not think it was the work of our Lord while on earth to rectify erroneous opinions in reference to literary and historical questions. Your faith in him is not shaken in the least by the acknowledgement that the Pentateuch as we have it is not from the hand of Moses. How this means, if it means anything distinct to the discussion, that when Jesus said Moses wrote of him and David in the Spirit called him Lord, his words are not a sufficient and final guarantee of the truth. I think your view logically implies much more than this, for in these cases there is not a mere declaration of ignorance on the part of Christ, or an abstinence from "rectifying erroneous opinions" held by others, but there is an express teaching of what upon your view is untruth. This seems to me inconsistent with any belief in Christ as the Truth of God. He who inspired David and Moses surely would not mistake the person whom he inspired. I must apply here the declaration.

Rochester,
Jan. 9, 1889.

My dear Mr. Harper:

I have carefully read your letter which I received last Saturday evening. It gives me great pleasure to find that some of my ill-impressions were due to brevity or mistake in my daughter's notes. Your explanation of the sentence "Prophets were oral until the time of Joel and Amos"—as referring only to those who were technically prophets, such as Elijah, Elisha and Jonah, is quite satisfactory, especially as you grant that there was written prophecy before their time.

Your definition of a "type" is excellent and removes all ground for my criticism. On some of the other points I freely and gladly accept your explanations of your position, although in some particulars I should
probably express myself more definitely and strongly than you. It is reassuring to read your avowal of belief in supernatural inspiration pervading the sacred records.

I should not lay too much stress even on this if I did not find you, in your answer to my second point, practically acknowledging that you held what I mainly objected to in your views, namely that the Pentateuch was not for substance written by Moses but was of composite and much later authorship, and that our Lord's references to it as "Moses' writings," like his ascription of the 110th Psalm to David, are not final or authoritative. This seems to me a grievous Error—a twofold Error, in both aspects of it of serious consequence. The dismemberment of the Pentateuch and the reference of its authorship to a later time has not been induced—in the case of the most noted destructive critics—by merely literary considerations. Like the theory of Baur as to the New Testament documents, both Kuenen and Dillmann are mainly animated by a desire to get rid of the supernatural, whether miracles or prophecy, in the Pentateuch. If they can bring down the authorship to a much later date than Moses, they will give time for the growth of myth and legend, for the "idealization" of the facts, for the concoction of fables.
of Christ himself: "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."

If Jesus could accommodate himself to the erroneous opinions of his times in respect to the authorship of the 165th Psalm and the Pentateuch, why could he not also have accommodated himself to the erroneous opinions of his times when he recognized the existence of evil spirits? Where are we to draw the line? What utterance of Jesus can be relied on, if there cannot be? You acknowledge that it was an error to print Dr. Toy's article, in which he declares Paul to have been mistaken in his interpretations of the Old Testament. But if Jesus was wrong about David and Moses, why should you object to Dr. Toy's doctrine that Paul was wrong about the meaning of the word "seed"? Surely the disciple is not about his Lord. If Jesus could have been mistaken, Paul could much more easily have been so.

It seems to me that this view of the Pentateuch, taken in connection with your view about the mistakes of Christ, throws much light back upon your doctrine of inspiration and shows that you mean by that something quite different from a special influence of the Holy Spirit which guarantees the truthfulness of the Scripture writers. I must regard your view as inconsistent with a proper faith in Christ, and
tending to undermine faith in his whole revelation. I do not mean that I doubt your personal love and loyalty to Christ, nor do I mean that you consciously disbelieve in inspiration. I am referring to read your avowals of faith. But I am no less convinced that you have permitted yourself to be dominated by a theory which in spite of yourself will carry you further than you now imagine or in the way to extreme disbelief. The same rule which idealizes the Mosaic history will idealize the gospels. And disbelief in Christ’s truth with regard to David and Moses will lead men to give up Christ’s deity, just as disbelief in Christ’s testimony about Daniel led Robert Elmslie to give it up.

My whole system of faith stands or falls with the veracity of Jesus Christ. Your doctrine seems to me bad, chiefly because it removes that great central pillar of Christianity. You say that your views with regard to the Pentateuch and Christ’s testimony respecting it is “taught in more than one Baptist Theological Seminary.” I shall try and ascertain if this is true. If it is true, it is the first time it has ever come to my knowledge. I shall be very sorry if it is so. If such views were taught in any Seminary I should think it my duty at once to take steps toward putting an end to such teaching. Of course I recognize the great difference between holding a question open and coming to a decision upon it. There may rightly be a period of debate and investigation. So long as a teacher does his debating and investigation in private and teaches only adequately and accepted truth, I will have no controversy with him. Until very recently I have supposed that this was your position. It was only my daughter’s note that led me to believe that you had at least accepted the conclusions of the destructive criticism and had begun publicly to assert them. Your letter, although it speaks me with regard to your intent to hold to Christ’s inspiration, and the supernatural, still leaves me convinced that you are on the wrong track and that your wrong views must more or less color all your teaching about the Old Testament, lead you (unless you change) into still more serious error, and render your influence injurious over the unprepared minds to whom you lecture at Newd. I wish you could even now reconsider the whole subject, change your views, become a bulwark of the old faith. I have so much admired your gifts and have so trusted in your future that I cannot give you up. You might do the very greatest work for our Baptist baby, and I would do my utmost to lift you to the very top, if you could only hold, as simple Baptists always have, to the absolute truth of the Scriptures. Let us not “bow to the passing fashions,” while we turn our backs upon the Constellations of all the ages.”  

Faithfully Yours,  
Augustus N. Strong.
I have not written you in reply to your letter of Nov. 27, for the reason that to reply would only be to repeat what I had said before. My views have not changed. I favor a strong college in Chicago, but I would make the institution existing but a college, in order that our University proper may lie in New York, near to our base of supplies in the College, and in order that we may not leave behind us untaught the greatest strength of all.

So put an institution for advanced and professional instruction in Chicago, would be simply to compound another generation to undo our work and tire the wind out of the sails of the Chicago institution, say faculty under far more unfavorable circumstances. Hence the institution we ought suiting to have founded in the greatest city of our nation.

The success of Boston University with its 467 scientific and professional students, as against 537 at Harvard, shows that we can hold our own against Columbia. We have our own constituency, and we can draw our other denominations also.
But my present object in writing is quite another, namely, to ask you some questions about your 13th Lectures at Yarrow. My daughter has brought home her Note-books, and I have been interested in reading them over. I find in them some things that surprise me, as coming from you, for I had not believed that you accepted the views of the Critical School. But in these notes I find you reported as saying: "Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos." Now I find Jesus Christ in John 5: 46, 47 saying "Moses ... his writings," and saying "he wrote y n me." So I find Peter in Acts 3:22, declaring "Moses said," and Paul in Rom. 10:5 "Moses wrote," Your words, it seems to me, are your own words, seem to imply that there was no such Early prophetic writing by Moses. In Matt. 22:43, 44 Jesus refers to the 110th Psalm, declaring that in that Psalm Daniel in Spirit "called Mihah Lord." This is surely a testimony that there was a prophetic Psalm written before the time of Joel and Amos. I might multiply passages from Christ and the Apostles, but you know them quite as well as I. Now it seems to me that unless an attribute to an inspired early teaching, we are bound to accept his authority to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm.

You know that in "Robert Cleaver" the turning point in the hero's experience is when the conclusion, an unconvincing evidence as it seems to me, that the so-called Book of Daniel was written 250 years or so after Daniel's time, and therefore Jesus refers to a passage or the book and calls it the Book of the Prophet Daniel, concludes the second place that Jesus Christ is not God but man only. This is logical, and the conclusion is consistent with the premises as presented. Are you willing to accept the premises, when the conclusion can be nothing else than the submission of your faith in Christ?

I was very sorry to see you from Yarrow. Dr. King's recent essay called attention to that Paul was mistaken in his interpretation of the Old Testament. I do not see what inspiration work taking about it left after much an admission is made. And I can only say that the student with such teaching cannot be any more true. Concerning about your own personal views and personal feelings, I find you saying that "if the words of a prophecy belong to an early age, they must have a more general meaning than if they belonged to a later age." In the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ. But Christ's name is called...
April 12, 1889.

My dear Professor Harper——

I am sorry to hear that you are in any trouble at all in regard to your New Testament article. You are fighting the "good fight" for us all, who wish to see some good honest work done in Biblical criticism in this country.

Of course you will have seen Crosby's attack on Dr. Briggs, and the latter's pretty trenchant answer. It is good that the matter has come up. It is true that is fully venti-

lated.
March 15, 1928

[Handwritten text]

...and then...
Did you ever receive a little contribution sheet for Helvaica a few weeks ago? You have 3 things: Review, article, and note. I should like them to appear in Helvaica, so as to get them off my hands before I leave for Europe. Do you any chance?

Cordially yours,

Richard F. Pyle
November 11, 1889.

My dear Harper,

I am sorry to see that you evidently misunderstand what I have in view. Need I repeat that I have not the slightest idea of undertaking Hebreaica, or any work you are doing? I should not care to be so ungrateful to you for the aid and impulsion you have given to Oriental matters in this country. I intend to remain a constant contributor to Hebreaica; and I shall assist you in any plan you may have for enlarging its scope (though I understand from Justinus that you seemed less inclined to do just as at present). I believe genuine and think that we were in error in speaking of the Sino-Japanese war. But you forget that Hebreaica may touch Asiatic interests. We are going to tackle the whole Orient, with no fear of your work being too long. We are not going to print off short notices and short articles. You get your support from the religious element in America. We shall appeal to quite a different one. We do not intend to rely on...
upon subscriptions. If needs be we will distribute our little offering gratis. It is to be so small and unpretentious that it can not possibly conflict with anything else. You are giving it too much importance to think that it will stand in the way of Hebraica. In fact, I rather think it will help Hebraica, by causing additional interest in these studies.

I do sincerely hope that you will not look at this in the wrong light. I should hate, above all things, to have anything like this come between us. I say, again, that there is not the slightest intention on my part to antagonize anyone, much less you. If you will think over the matter again in this light, I think you will see that there is nothing at which you can possibly take offence. If needs be, I will come up to N. Haven and talk the matter over with you.

Ever cordially yours,

Richard L. Neill

Mrs. Neill let me see
Prof. [Signature]
Newton Centre
Feb 7, 1891

My dear Res Harper:

I have recently seen the programme of lectures to be delivered in Boston under the auspices of the "Ann Druck of Peace Literature" of which you are the head - will you pardon me if I say I wish to say that the author of the form of the representatives of a scheme of interpretation which is [in?] God so to God, let God be in the interpretation of or rather in the interpretation, I think established, a constitution. I challenge the word "constituent". It is the word "question of an institution other - wise intolerable. - It is assumed that there are no "most competent" to guide - that is to say, their theories are used. The endorsement by the Senate of it is implied. On and on - and the whole - I mean all this is not derived from any sort of this to the Reidahl.

Theodore

Newton Centre March 25, 1891

My dear Dr Harper:

Absence from home has prevented an earlier response to yours of 20th Inst.

I appreciate the courtesy of your proposition, and if I do not, as I cannot assent to it, it is not because I do not heartily reciprocate the kind spirit that prompted it.

I do not reckon as a "prejudice" the judgment which severs me in sympathy from the "Institute" as I understand its present attitude: for prejudice is either unintelligent or irrational.

Having offered to the public the recent lectures in Boston, with a guaranty of the competency of the lecturers as instructors, the "Institute" stands sponsor for their utterances until it disavows them. Some of those utterances, at least, were exceedingly caustic and contemptuous in impeachment of views still widely cherished. Whether it is wise to fling out such sweepingly destructive criticism, leaving the emphasis chiefly there, among a promiscuous audience, many of whom are young, adventurous, and undisciplined, and who have neither opportunity nor preparation for thorough and independent inquiry, seems to me more than doubtful. But if it be tolerable in any case it surely is not so, where novel views are offered as authoritative, the matter being still sub judice: especially if under the wing of an institution whose avowed purpose of instruction has disarmed apprehension.

Pardon me if I speak too bluntly. I do not assume superior judgment in the premises, but I sincerely desire that both the "Institute" and its president may be saved from the unfriendly criticism (which has already begun in some quarters, and
which I am confident is withheld in other quarters mainly from motives of delicacy and affection, which it seems to me needless to provoke. It was this that prompted me to intrude my remonstrance upon you before, for which I ought to have asked your pardon at the time. I thought it only candid to say to you what I knew some were sure to say of you. (Indeed had already said).

With best wishes for success in your new and responsible position,

I am, Faithfully Yours,

[Signature]

P.S. Am I wrong forced as to the delivery of my lecture at Chicago & to my stay at New Haven under the same auspices?
Chicago, Feb. 6th, 1891.

Rev. E. L. Curtis, D. D.,
501 Fulton St., Chicago.

Dear Brother:—

At the recent Bible Institute at Farwell Hall, as you know, a great deal was said to the theological students of this city along the line of destructive criticism, and no adequate opportunity was given to the other side to reply, the sound men on the program, like Broadus, not being on for critical subjects at all. Of course, I do not wish to say that this was designed, but such was the unquestionable fact, as a glance at the program will show any one. Many of the conservative Christians of the city feel very deeply about this matter, as you doubtless know. We are fortunate in having with us at the present time, Dr. West, who seems to be eminently calculated to handle this subject. We have arranged for him to lecture at the Institute Thursday, February 12th, as you will see by the enclosed program. Will you kindly invite your students to the lecture.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. Torrey.

Dictated to C. E. W.
Dear Brother:—

At the recent Bible Institute at Portland Hall, as you know, a great deal was said to the theologians' advantage of the fact that the line ofgetherness criticism and no emphasis on the work done on the program, the lectures, the press, and the other viva to verify the sounding men of the program. The impression is not only due to our confidence but also to the great interest that is shown by the students. Many of the comparative criticisms of the city feel very greatly about this matter, as you are aware. We are not sure in having with me at the present time, Dr. West, who seems to be more interested in coming to terms with the Institute than he was in the past, as you will see by the enclosed program. Will you kindly invite your students to the lecture?

Sincerely yours,

R. A. Topney.
Prof. W. R. Harper,

New Haven, Conn.

My Dear Sir:—

Your letter of March 9th was received some time ago, but I have been unable to find time until this morning to answer it. I would be very glad to have the personal talk with you "in reference to certain difficulties," which you speak of desiring.

I believe as firmly as you do that there is work to be done along the line of Biblical criticism, but I am thoroughly convinced that the position of Wellhausen, Kuenen, Driver, Cheyne, Briggs, etc., is but a magnificent example of perverted ingenuity. I am inclined to think that their theories are no more specious than those of the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism, which had so wide a spread in their day and are now so hopelessly exploded. In a few years Old Testament critics will regard the present theories in regard to the composite character of the Pentateuch and Isaiah as critics do to-day the theories of Baur and his co-laborers. I was once infatuated with the theories now held by Prof. Briggs and yourself, but through the study of the Bible itself I have become persuaded that there is nothing in them.
Your letter of "March 30" has reached some time ago,

but I have been unable to find time until this morning to answer.

If I might be very frank to have the pleasure of talking with you "in

reference to certain difficulties" which you speak of cautiously.

I believe as firmly as you do that there is work to be done.

from the life of intellectual criticism, but I am exceedingly convinced

that the position of well-meaning, known, Draper, Church, Critic, etc.,

are to put a moral example of burnishing humanity. I am

infatuated to think that their influence is on mere specious thin

spite of the Tipton school of new treatment criticism which I

so write a reply to the very few of the now so popularly accepted,

in a few years our treatment writers will have the pleasure of

rise in rank to the composite character of the patient and

learn an act of God, to-day the success of burn and the co-labor-

are I was once interested with the success of the story of the White House.

Pray my carroll, put yourself in the way to the White House.

have become persuaded that there is room in the

DEAR SIR:

Mr. SHERBET,

we have arrived.

Your letter of "March 30" has received some time ago,

but I have been unable to find time until this morning to answer.

If I might be very frank to have the pleasure of talking with you "in

reference to certain difficulties" which you speak of cautiously.

I believe as firmly as you do that there is work to be done.

from the life of intellectual criticism, but I am exceedingly convinced

that the position of well-meaning, known, Draper, Church, Critic, etc.,

are to put a moral example of burnishing humanity. I am

infatuated to think that their influence is on mere specious thin

spite of the Tipton school of new treatment criticism which I

so write a reply to the very few of the now so popularly accepted,

in a few years our treatment writers will have the pleasure of

rise in rank to the composite character of the patient and

learn an act of God, to-day the success of burn and the co-labor-

are I was once interested with the success of the story of the White House.

Pray my carroll, put yourself in the way to the White House.

have become persuaded that there is room in the
You say, "I think you will agree with me that most of the work was along substantial lines." I think that many good and helpful things were said, but the general tendency of the handling of critical themes was calculated to undermine faith in the Word of God. I need not enter into details at this time, but if the position of Dr. Briggs, and some of those taken by yourself, were true, to any logical thinker it would thoroughly undermine the authority of Jesus Christ. If I believed that Prof. Briggs sustained his positions, I would feel like saying, "What a pity that Jesus of Nazareth could not have gone to school to Prof. Briggs, and thus avoided the serious mistakes into which he fell." I do not think that you can for a moment perceive what the logical outcome of your theories is, but many of your hearers do, and they carry your positions to their logical conclusion. Only last week I heard of a Bible class of young men that had been reduced, if I remember the numbers correctly, from forty to twelve, because, as they said to their teacher, "We believe Dr. Briggs' view of the Bible is correct and we do not see any use of studying it." One has the feeling, as he looks over the Program of the late Bible Institute in Farwell Hall, that there was a studied attempt to put conservative men in for such subjects as "The Inter-Biblical History of the Jews,"
where the question of the authorship of the books of the Bible, or that of Inspiration, would not arise, and men of radical and perverse views for critical subjects. It is not a sufficient explanation to say that Dr. Broadus and Dr. Vincent have made no special study of those subjects. There are men of conservative views in the country who have, as for example, Dr. Greene of Princeton, who to many minds has very satisfactorily answered the position taken by yourself.

I am not a bit afraid of criticism, not a bit afraid that the Bible will suffer from such books as Prof. Briggs writes, but many men preparing for the ministry will be injured and great mischief done to the cause of Christ. Prof. Briggs is a keen thinker, but some of his arguments are simply childish. There seems to be at the present time a studied attempt to foist these views upon an unsuspecting church by saying, "This is simply a critical question, which does not in any wise affect the authority of the Bible." But it does affect the authority of the Bible, and, what is more important, the authority of Jesus Christ. Any view that attributes a statement that is ascribed by the Lord Jesus Christ to Isaiah to some other author puts Christ in error, and his authority, if this view is true, must go. In your own magazine, "Hebraica," vol. V,
where the dispute of the authority of the people of the People on the
state of navigation would not arise, and we of U.S. and you-
cave always to certain subjects. It is not a suitable subject
mention to say that Dr. Potter and Dr. Vincent have made no spe-
ful study of these subjects. There are no men of consequence among
in the community who have been for examples, Dr. Chase of Princeton,
who to many minds is very satisfactory or among the position

Feuer pr omonent.

I am not a party to criticism, nor a party to criticism, nor a party to criticism.
Mr. Willet衍生 from every book as Prof. Willet writes, and may
be prejudiced on the misty will be judging and great mistakes
have gone to the sense of fair. Prof. Potter is a keen thinker, and
there seems to be at
the pleasure at a subject or some to have seen an
"the is simply a subject or some" and
which goes not to many writers affect the authority of the People. It
is seen almost the authority of the People and next the estimate of
the authority of these writers. They view that is applicable to
statement that is necessary by the long time Chapter of Lunacy to
some other subject more suitable in all or any the authority. It
view is true what to. In your own message, "spectacles" not a.
nos. 2 & 3, page 102, we read,—

"It is usual to take this Psalm as Messianic and to interpret it of Messiah's warfare and exaltation. The New Testament is cited as a proof of this; our Lord himself saying that David wrote it with regard to a greater than himself, that is, the expected Messiah......But Christ did not meddle with critical questions connected with the Old Testament, as his mission was of another character; he simply acquiesced in the current views of such questions as long as they did not affect the nature of that mission."

Further down on the page we read,—"The Psalm probably refers to the Maccabean times, and to one of the Hasmonaean princes, such as Jonathan."

Now can any one say that whether Prof. Davidson is right in this position is simply a critical question that does not affect the authority of Jesus Christ, when we make him apply to himself, and silence his opponents, by the use of a Psalm which does not at all apply to himself but to a brother of Judas Maccabaeus. In other words, either Jesus of Nazareth either did not know enough to know what passages of the Old Testament applied to himself, or else deliberately deceived and pulled the wool over the eyes of his
hearers. I say that such teaching is simply outrageous, and let me say frankly, that I question whether the editor of a magazine can escape responsibility for such pernicious poison by saying on the cover of the magazine, "The editors are not responsible for the views expressed by contributors."

On the same page, in the same paragraph, it says,--

"In regard to the Apostles, we cannot in all cases adopt their interpretations of the Old Testament, since they were not infallible." In other words, we must go to Profs. Briggs, Davidson, Driver, etc., to find out when the Apostles were right and when they were wrong. Does this, or does it not undermine the authority of Christ and the Apostles? I have not the slightest fear that those views will prevail.

I have spoken frankly in this letter, for I feel that it is due you. You are an honest man, and want an honest expression of other men's convictions.

Sincerely yours,

Dictated.

R.T. Lovey.
I can think of no simpler or more effective method of
preventing war than to have an actual demonstration of the
use of the atomic bomb. If I were to describe for the
benefit of the reader the action and effects of the
atomic bomb, I should not be able to convey the
idea of the utter destruction which it would cause.
The cover of the magazine "The Atlantic" was not responsible for the
views expressed by contributors.

On the same page, in the same paragraph, it says:

"In reply to the question, we cannot in all cases expect that
interpretation of the Old Testament since they were not intended
as a "text" to be quoted word for word, "chapter and verse."

ver. etc., to find out when the question was relevant and when
was more. Does this or that not undermine the authority of
certainty and the question? I have not the slightest fear that these
views will prevail.

I have spoken frankly in this letter, but I feel that it is
true. You are my housemate and want no house expression of
other men's convictions.

Sincerely yours.

[Signature]