

✓

Jan. 1, 1889

Dr. Northrup to Mr. Rockefeller:

"I certainly would not take the liberty of writing you this letter, were it not at the urgent request of others - especially Drs. Goodspeed and Smith - whose views I shall substantially express in all the statements here made. I can imagine the tax made upon your time and patience by the flood of letters pouring in upon you from every quarter, and certainly would not increase this were it not for the feeling that I am in a position to say a word that may be helpful to you in forming your judgment concerning important matters now being pressed upon your attention.

1. I am informed that Dr. Strong has expressed to you and Dr. Harper his dissent from some of the views which Dr. H. has advanced at his lectures at Vassar College and thinks the existing arrangement between him and the college should be brought to an end. I gave to Dr. Strong nearly a year ago my impressions concerning Dr. Harper, and have written him this week saying in substance what I now say to you. I have been in relations of the greatest intimacy with Prof. Harper throughout his whole public career, and while I have been at times troubled about what was regarded as rationalistic in tendency and have not been wholly free from doubt as to the position he would ultimately take in relation to the results of the so-called "Higher Criticism", I have a firm conviction, based on a large amount of evidence, (which it is needless to detail) personal interviews, letters, the testimony of the most capable and conservative of his students, etc., that he is coming more and more fully into harmony, in all vital points, with the faith of our people. I presume I have received from Prof. Harper within the past eight months nearly twenty letters, in several of which and those of recent date, he has expressed his confidence in the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible in the strongest and most satisfactory manner. So great is my confidence in his Christian character and his future theological position that, were the way open, I would not hesitate a moment, to recommend our Board to appoint him to his former position in the Seminary faculty. And no one who knows me believes that I am disposed to tolerate doctrinal error; or to regard with any degree of favor the dissemination of religious novelties. But I think that special consideration should be shown in dealing with a young man of magnificent gifts (Dr. Harper is but 32 years old), who, without the help of a systematic theological training, but by independent investigation and thought, is gaining clear, assured and profound views of divine truth. Allowance should be made for modes of statement based on new points of view. Dr. Harper's writings are read by the most critical and conservative scholars in all denominations and I have yet to hear of any serious criticism of his views. With this conviction in regard to Prof. Harper I could but deeply deplore any action that would bring him into discredit and weaken his influence, which is

Jan. 1, 1888

Dr. Northrup to Mr. Rockefeller:

"I certainly would not take the liberty of writing you this letter, were it not at the urgent request of others - especially Mr. Goodspeed and Smith - whose views I shall substantially express in all the statements here made. I can imagine the tax made upon your time and patience by the flood of letters pouring in upon you from every quarter, and certainly would not increase this were it not for the feeling that I am in a position to say a word that may be helpful to you in forming your judgment concerning important matters now being pressed upon your attention.

1. I am informed that Dr. Strong has expressed to you and Dr. Harper his dissent from some of the views which Dr. H. has advanced at his lectures at Nassau College and thinks the existing arrangement between him and the college should be brought to an end. I gave to Dr. Strong nearly a year ago my impressions concerning Dr. Harper, and have written him this week saying in substance what I now say to you. I have been in relations of the greatest intimacy with Prof. Harper throughout his whole public career, and while I have been at times troubled about what was regarded as rationalistic in tendency and have not been wholly free from doubt as to the position he would ultimately take in relation to the results of the so-called "Higher Criticism", I have a firm conviction, based on a large amount of evidence, (which it is needless to detail) personal interviews, letters, the testimony of the most capable and conservative of his students, etc., that he is coming more and more fully into harmony, in all vital points, with the faith of our people. I presume I have received from Prof. Harper within the past eight months nearly twenty letters, in several of which and those of recent date, he has expressed his confidence in the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible in the strongest and most satisfactory manner. So great is my confidence in his Christian character and his future theological position that, were the way open, I would not hesitate a moment to recommend our Board to appoint him to the former position in the University of Albany. And no one who knows me believes that I am disposed to tolerate doctrinal error; or to regard with any degree of favor the dissemination of religious novelties. But I think that special consideration should be shown in dealing with a young man of magnificent gifts (Dr. Harper is but 32 years old), who, without the help of a systematic theological training, but by independent investigation and thought, is gaining clear, sound and profound views of divine truth. Allowance should be made for modes of statement based on new points of view. Dr. Harper's writings are read by the most critical and conservative scholars in all denominations and I have yet to hear of any serious criticism of his views. With this conviction in regard to Prof. Harper I could not deeply deplore any action that would bring him into discredit and weaken his influence, which is

certainly wide-reaching and powerful in behalf of genuine biblical learning.

2. Allow me to say a word in regard to Dr. Strong. That my confidence in him and regard for him are sincere and profound he cannot doubt without doubting my moral integrity. He was a member of the first theological class that I undertook to teach - 32 years ago. I regard him as a man of pre-eminent abilities, of wide and profound scholarship, thoroughly evangelical in spirit and in view and as having accomplished a splendid work both in the pastorate and as President of Rochester Theological Seminary. In my judgment he has no superior, probably no equal, in our denomination, in the qualities needed for the Presidency of a great university. These things I have said more than once to Dr. Strong himself and to others. When a vague rumor, reached me about a year ago concerning what you might undertake to do in founding a Baptist University, I at once wrote to Dr. Strong setting forth the great possibilities of Chicago as an educational centre, and urging him to favor the location of the proposed university here~~x~~ and to identify himself with it and shape its organization and policy. I soon learned, however, that he was thoroughly convinced that New York City would be a far better location than Chicago for the contemplated institution. So his name dropped out of my mind in relation to the Presidency till last week, when I wrote him again, urging him to reconsider the whole question of our denominational education, East and West, in the hope that he might see his way to favor the Chicago enterprise and become the chief agent in its organization. As this letter was sent Monday of this week no reply has yet come to hand. But I would ask your attention to the fact that the letter to Dr. Strong was written before I had heard a word in regard to his dissatisfaction with the views of Dr. Harper.

3. What I have said about Dr. Harper has had chief reference to his theological views. But I am constrained to say a word expressing my judgment concerning him in other respects. You will probably regard my language as extravagant, inspired by a strong but indiscriminating affection. But I speak with deliberation when I say that I regard him as, taken all in all, the most remarkable young man in the religious history of our country in this century. His intellectual abilities are of the highest order, his scholarship is accurate, thorough and wide; he possesses a remarkable genius for organization, has extraordinary power of creative enthusiasm, and is a born leader of men. He is exerting more influence today than any ten men holding similar positions in the same department of work. Withal he is level-headed, a man of discretion and practical judgment. He makes no mistakes in practical matters. His new methods, so fresh and original, show themselves at once to be thoroughly sensible and practicable, so perfectly do they fulfil the end in view. Could he but have adequate scope for his powers he would do a work in behalf of denominational and christian education in this country beyond the expectation of these who regard him with the greatest admiration. I may add in this connection that after Dr. Strong had decided not to consider the question

certainly wide-reaching and powerful in behalf of genuine biblical learn-
ing.

2. Allow me to say a word in regard to Dr. Strong. That my confidence in him and regard for him are sincere and profound he cannot doubt without doubting my moral integrity. He was a member of the first theological class that I undertook to teach - 32 years ago. I regard him as a man of pre-eminent abilities, of wide and profound scholarship, thoroughly evangelical in spirit and in view and as having accomplished a splendid work both in the pastorate and as President of Rochester Theological Seminary. In my judgment he has no superior, probably no equal, in our denomination, in the qualities needed for the Presidency of a great university. These things I have said more than once to Dr. Strong himself and to others. When a vague rumor reached me about a year ago concerning what you might undertake to do in founding a Baptist University, I at once wrote to Dr. Strong setting forth the great possibilities of Chicago as an educational centre, and urging him to favor the location of the proposed university here and to identify himself with it and shape the organization and policy. I soon learned, however, that he was thoroughly convinced that New York City would be a far better location than Chicago for the contemplated institution. So his name dropped out of my mind in relation to the Presidency till last week, when I wrote him again, urging him to reconsider the whole question of our denominational education, East and West, in the hope that he might see his way to favor the Chicago enterprise and become the chief agent in the organization. As this letter was sent Monday of this week no reply has yet come to hand. But I would ask your attention to the fact that the letter to Dr. Strong was written before I had heard a word in regard to his dissatisfaction with the views of Dr. Harper.

3. What I have said about Dr. Harper has had chief reference to his theological views. But I am constrained to say a word expressing my judgment concerning him in other respects. You will probably regard my language as extravagant, inspired by a strong but unbecoming affection. But I speak with deliberation when I say that I regard him as taken all in all, the most remarkable young man in the religious history of our country in this century. His intellectual abilities are of the highest order; his scholarship is accurate, thorough and wide; his possessions a remarkable genius for organization, an extraordinary power of creative enthusiasm, and a born leader of men. He is exerting more influence today than any man holding similar position in the same department of work. Within he is level-headed, a man of discretion and practical judgment. He makes no mistakes in practical matters. His new methods, so fresh and original, show themselves at once to be thoroughly sensible and practicable, so perfectly do they fulfill the end in view. Could he but have adequate scope for his powers he would do a work in behalf of denominational and Christian education in this country beyond the expectation of those who regard him with the greatest admiration. I may add in this connection that after Dr. Strong had decided not to consider the question

of doing any educational work at Chicago, I urged Dr. Harper to consent to take the lead in the organization of the proposed university, knowing, as I did, that our leading men regard him as pre-eminently qualified for such a work. But he has never given me the slightest reason to think that he would favorably consider the question of leaving New Haven for Chicago. I say these things to show that our brethren here would be highly gratified to have either of the men, whose names I have frequently mentioned, as President of the Chicago University, should such an institution ever come to exist.

4. Permit me to say in conclusion that the importance of Chicago as an educational centre has not been and cannot be adequately conceived of; and for this reason, among others, that the conception has not yet been born that at all comes up to the greatness that is to be seen here in the centuries to come. Educational institutions rarely die. Nothing on earth, the Christian Church excepted, has such enduring vitality and recuperative energy as institutions of Christian learning. Great universities on the continent of Europe have survived numerous revolutions and the fall of dynasties not a few. A thousand years ago England began to found two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, and today they are full of the freshness and vigor of youth. Out of them have come the mighty leaders who have made England the foremost nation of the world. I will institute no comparisons as to location. But I have worked twelve years at the East and twenty-two years at the West, and know the minds of the most judicious and far-seeing men among the leaders in our denomination, and I am sure that I but express their common judgment when I say that Chicago, as a centre of educational influence and power, is destined to be second to no city on this continent. The founding of a Christian university at this point would be a permanent addition to the moral forces of the world; - a source of powerful influences which would be felt in the uplifting and salvation of men through all coming time. I say a Christian university, fully endorsing the idea to which Dr. Strong has given so much emphasis that all the teachers in all the departments should be Christians not only in name but in fact.

I again beg pardon for writing at such great length and desire you to feel free to make such use of this letter as you may deem best. With sentiments of highest esteem, I am, - "

of doing any educational work at Chicago, I urged Dr. Harper to consent to take the lead in the organization of the proposed university, knowing as I did, that our leading men regard him as pre-eminently qualified for such a work. But he has never given me the slightest reason to think that he would favorably consider the question of leaving New Haven for Chicago. I say these things to show that our brethren here would be highly gratified to have either of the men, whose names I have frequently mentioned, as President of the Chicago University, should such an institution ever come to exist.

4. Permit me to say in conclusion that the importance of Chicago as an educational centre has not been and cannot be adequately conceived of; and for this reason, among others, that the conception has not yet been born that all come up to the greatness that is to be seen here in the centuries to come. Educational institutions rarely die. Nothing on earth, the Christian Church excepted, has such enduring vitality and recuperative energy as institutions of Christian learning. Great universities on the continent of Europe have survived numerous revolutions and the fall of dynasties not a few. A thousand years ago England began to found two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, and today they are full of the freshness and vigor of youth. Out of them have come the mighty leaders who have made England the foremost nation of the world. I will institute no comparisons as to location. But I have worked twelve years at the East and twenty-two years at the West, and know the minds of the most judicious and far-seeing men among the leaders in our denomination, and I am sure that I but express their common judgment when I say that Chicago, as a centre of educational influence and power, is destined to be second to no city on this continent. The founding of a Christian university at this point would be a permanent addition to the moral forces of the world; - a source of powerful influences which would be felt in the uplifting and salvation of mankind through all coming time. I say a Christian university, fully embracing the idea to which Dr. Strong has given so much emphasis that all the teachers in all the departments should be Christians not only in name but in fact.

I again beg pardon for writing at such great length and desire you to feel free to make such use of this letter as you may deem best. With sentiments of highest esteem, I am, -

✓

Dr. Northrup to Dr. Harper, January 1, 1889.

"I should be right glad if I could have an hour's conversation with you this morning. But as this, 'the absolutely best thing' is impossible, I will do the next best thing - write after the manner of the renowned Joseph Cook, indicating a good many points without much regard to order, either logical or chronological.

1. You can have no manner of doubt that I have been from the first most anxious that you should be President of the proposed University. My recent letters will show how sincerely and strongly I have written with this end in view. But your reply of Dec. 11th showed so many and such weighty objections in your own mind against the acceptance of the Presidency that I lost all hope and began to cast about for another man for the important position.

2. As a result of this work of reconnoitering I concluded to do a thing which I will state with all frankness, though I fear, in view of events of recent date, you will not approve of my act. I wrote to Dr. Strong, chiefly for the following reasons:- (1) To impress him with the greatness of this point as an educational centre. (2) To express my firm conviction, based on a large number of facts, (which I did not specify) that his New York University Scheme will not be realized, at least not in the near future. (3) To assure him that we should be highly gratified to have him become the President of the new University. (4). To lead him to see that of the three positions in which he might do his future work:- (a) as President of the Rochester Theological Seminary; (b) as President of Brown University; (c) as President of Chicago University, the last would be vastly the most important. In writing to him as I did I was ruled by two ideas:- in the first place I regard him as the best man, after yourself, for the Presidency, and in the second place, I desire to do something to change his attitude from one of hostility to one of friendliness in relation to the Chicago enterprise, knowing that Mr. R. would act with reluctance against Dr. Strong's deliberate judgment.

3. After I had written to Dr. S., Dr. Goodspeed read to me your letter in which you indicate the tenor of one received from Dr. S. and also your conversation with Mr. Rockefeller. This new development I cannot but regard as most serious and dangerous, in many ways, - in relation to yourself, to Dr. Strong, to the proposed university scheme, to the Baptist denomination. To explain myself fully on these points would require me to write a hundred pages of fools-cap. Let me indicate some of the thoughts in my mind.

(1). A conflict between you and Dr. Strong such as would result from his proposed action as a member of the board of Trustees of Vassar College, must be avoided."

Dr. Korthrup to Dr. Harper, January 1, 1933.

"I should be right glad if I could have an hour's conversation with you this morning. But as this, 'the absolutely best thing' is impossible, I will do the next best thing - write after the manner of the renowned Jack, indicating a good many points without much regard to order, either logical or chronological.

1. You can have no manner of doubt that I have been from the first most anxious that you should be President of the proposed University. My recent letters will show how sincerely and strongly I have written with this end in view. But your reply of Dec. 11th showed so many and such weighty objections in your own mind against the acceptance of the Presidency that I lost all hope and began to cast about for another man for the important position.

2. As a result of this work of recommending I concluded to do a thing which I will state with all frankness, though I fear, in view of events of recent date, you will not approve of my act. I wrote to Dr. Strong, chiefly for the following reasons: (1) To impress him with the greatness of this point as an educational center. (2) To express my firm conviction, based on a large number of facts, (which I did not specify) that his New York University Scheme will not be realized, at least not in the near future. (3) To assure him that we should be highly gratified to have him become the President of the new University. (4) To lead him to see that of the three positions in which he might do his future work: (a) as President of Brown University; (b) as President of Chicago University, the last would be vastly the most important. In writing to him as I did I was guided by two ideas: - In the first place I regard him as the best man, after yourself, for the Presidency, and in the second place, I desire to do something to change his attitude from one of hostility to one of friendliness in relation to the Chicago enterprise, knowing that Mr. S. would not with reluctance against Dr. Strong's deliberate judgment.

3. After I had written to Dr. S., Dr. Goodenough read to me your letter in which you indicate the point of one received from Dr. S. and also your conversation with Dr. Rockefeller. This new development I cannot but regard as most serious and dangerous, in many ways. - In relation to yourself, to Dr. Strong, to the proposed university scheme, to the Baptist denomination. To explain myself fully on these points would require me to write a hundred pages of fool-scrap. But an outline some of the thoughts in my mind.

(1). A conflict between you and Dr. Strong such as would result from his proposed action as a member of the Board of Trustees of Vassar College, must be avoided.

"I do not ask you to act in a cowardly or pusillanimous manner; to deny or conceal the views which you honestly hold. But I want you to reply in a cautious manner, explaining from your point of view the matters to which he calls attention as objectionable. I believe, in this way you can show him that there is not sufficient ground to justify his contemplated action.

(2) I shall write him to-day expressing my confidence in you in every respect, assuring him of my profound conviction, based on personal interviews and letters, that you are coming more and more fully into harmony, on all vital matters, with the faith of our people. I shall also write to-day to President Taylor who heard all your lectures and to President Robinson who heard the one from the positions of which Dr. S. especially dissents, suggesting that they write to him expressing the endorsement of your views and dissuading him from the step which he threatens to take.

(3) I have no doubt that you could 'make it hot for him,' nor have I any doubt that he could 'make it hot for you,' by inaugurating a newspaper war and awakening doubt as to the soundness of your theological views which could not fail to damage you in many ways.

As a result of all this you would feel constrained to sever your connection with our denomination; Mr. R. would become disgusted with the miserable contentions and abandon his magnificent educational projects. You would be damaged, as I have said, by the widespread doubt as to your orthodoxy and Dr. Strong would be damaged in the minds of a large number of men who, knowing all the facts, would believe that he was inspired in his course towards you, not by zeal for the truth, but by personal ill-will due to your supposed agency in defeating his New York University Scheme.

I fully sympathize in the warmth of feeling shown in your letter and in that of George Goodspeed; but I am sure that there is no wisdom in acting in the way such strength of feeling might prompt.

(4) As regards endorsement from Morgan Park there are three men, Drs. Smith, Goodspeed and Northrup, who would at any time put their names to a paper which you would regard as satisfactory. You would get no help from the Professor of New Testament Interpretation. As regards the Professor of Church History, though I am in doubt as to his attitude in this matter, I will say these things: (a) He is becoming, under his sharp affliction, more patient and considerate."

"I do not ask you to act in a cowardly or pusillanimous manner; to deny or conceal the views which you honestly hold. But I want you to reply in a cautious manner, explaining from your point of view the matters to which no sane attention is objectionable. I believe, in this way you can show him that there is not sufficient ground to justify his contemplated action.

(2) I shall write him to-day expressing my confidence in you in every respect, assuring him of my personal conviction, based on personal interviews and letters, that you are coming more and more fully into harmony with all vital matters, with the faith of our people. I shall also write to-day to President Taylor who hears all your lectures and to President Robinson who hears the one from the positions of which Dr. H. especially dissents, suggesting that they write to him expressing the endorsement of your views and dissuading him from the step which he threatens to take.

(3) I have no doubt that you could 'make it hot for him,' not have I any doubt that he could 'make it hot for you,' by inaugurating a newspaper war and awakening doubt as to the soundness of your theological views which could not fail to damage you in many ways.

As a result of all this you would feel constrained to sever your connection with our denomination; Mr. H. would become disgusted with the miserable contentions and abandon his insignificant educational projects. You would be damaged, as I have said, by the widespread doubt as to your orthodoxy and Dr. Strong would be damaged in the minds of a large number of men who, knowing all the facts, would believe that he was inspired in his course towards you, not by zeal for the truth, but by personal ill-will due to your supposed agency in detaching his New York University School.

I fully sympathize in the wish of feeling shown in your letter and in that of George Goodspeed; but I am sure that there is no wisdom in acting in the way now suggested of feeling might prompt.

(4) As regards endorsement from Morgan Park there are three men, Drs. Smith, Goodspeed and Hartman, who would at any time put their names to a paper which you would regard as satisfactory. You would get no help from the President of New Testament Interpretation. As regards the President of Church History, though I am in doubt as to his attitude in this matter, I will say these things: (a) He is becoming, under his sharp affliction, more rational and conservative.

"(b) His confidence in you and his regard for you seem to me to have increased since you left the Seminary. (c) His theological conceptions are certainly undergoing modification; his mind is becoming more flexible and is opening to larger views of things; he has more sympathy with new ideas and more patience in dealing with perplexed thinkers. Your friends in the Park will never go back on you.

(5) I suppose it is not practicable but I wish Providence would so arrange it that I could have a conversation with Mr. Rockefeller with special reference to yourself. I am not without confidence that I could make a strong and favorable impression both as regards yourself and the Chicago University scheme. Of course I would not think of visiting him unless the visit could be brought about in a way that the real design would be concealed.

(6) You seem to have thoroughly misunderstood the motives that prompted the reply to Dr. Strong's letter which was sent to you by Dr. Goodspeed. We were not dazed by his letter, we had no thought of lying down and giving up the fight. Our thought was to make a flank movement and not a direct issue with Strong, believing that if the Chicago enterprise was taken in hand it would grow to such dimensions that the New York Scheme would never be heard of again. So our ideas were put out in a moderate way, as a matter of policy, hoping thus to minimize Strong's opposition. His letter did not stun us but simply made it evident that we had a formidable obstacle to overcome. I am still disposed to think that the reply was the best that could have been framed, all circumstances being considered."

"(b) His confidence in you and his regard for you seem to me to have increased since you left the Seminary. (c) His theological conceptions are certainly undergoing modification; his mind is becoming more flexible and is opening to larger views of things; he has more sympathy with new ideas and more patience in dealing with misguided thinkers. Your friends in the Park will never go back on you.

(2) I suppose it is not practicable but I wish Providence would so arrange it that I could have a conversation with Mr. Rockefeller with special reference to yourself. I am not without confidence that I could make a strong and favorable impression both as regards yourself and the Chicago University scheme. Of course I would not think of visiting him unless the visit could be brought about in a way that the total design would be concealed.

(3) You seem to have thoroughly misunderstood the motives that prompted the reply to Dr. Strong's letter which was sent to you by Dr. Goodspeed. We were not biased by his letter, we had no thought of lying down and giving up the fight. Our thought was to make a frank movement and not a direct leave with Strong, believing that if the Chicago enterprise was taken in hand it would grow to such dimensions that the New York Scheme would never be heard of again. So our ideas were put out in a moderate way, as a matter of policy, hoping thus to minimize Strong's opposition. His letter did not stun us but simply made it evident that we had a formidable obstacle to overcome. I am still disposed to think that the reply was the best that could have been framed, all circumstances being considered."

January 1, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Yours of December 31st is at hand. I think I appreciate the gravity of the situation. I feel quite sure that unless something is done very soon the plans for the university will come to grief. I am sorry to see the last edition of the "Standard" in which only a college is spoken of. I do not think there is much to fear from Dr. Boyd, although he is heart and soul against the Chicago University. Everybody understands his attitude toward Dr. Strong but I do not think he has much influence over Mr. Rockefeller, for the latter has talked to me about him several times. I believe you are right when you say some would be glad to have the university scheme defeated in order to give a set-back to the Education Society.

In order that you may know the actual facts in the case concerning my lectures, I make the following quotations from a letter received from Pres. Taylor dated December 29. "I wrote Dr. Strong at once. I insisted with fullest vigor on your fairness, reverence, assertion of the supernatural, and on your conservatism. I told him that my impression was that the young women, instead of being unsettled, were giving up mechanical notions for vital interest in the Word. I added my opinion that the lectures as a whole were such as would win the hearty approval of men like himself." The fact is, there was absolutely nothing in my lectures at which any one could take offense; an additional fact is that while Dr. Strong in his letter to me asked that I set him right at once in reference to these matters and expressed the hope that I should be able to assure him of my positions, etc., without waiting for any reply he wrote at once to Mr. Rockefeller and Pres. Taylor. Goodspeed is very anxious over the result and has been in correspondence with me. He believes that he has said all that can be said in the matter and it is unwise for him to make any further move. I believe the next thing to be done is to have Gates come East and have an official interview with Mr. R. This would put an end to a good deal of uncertainty; do you not agree with me? I think action ought to be taken at once. Will you not telegraph him to come East next week and lay the case officially before Mr. R.? I will do what I can to hold on to Mr. R. as closely as possible and I can do so with a better grace because I have declared positively that I will not accept the presidency of the proposed institution. I shall regard your letter as confidential except that I am sure you will allow me to state the contents to Dr. Goodspeed."

January 1, 1888

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Yours of December 31st is at hand. I think I appreciate the gravity of the situation. I feel quite sure that unless something is done very soon the plans for the university will come to grief. I am sorry to see the last edition of the 'Standard' in which only a college is spoken of. I do not think there is much to fear from Dr. Boyd, although he is heart and soul against the Chicago University. Everybody understands his attitude toward Dr. Strong. But I do not think he has much influence over Mr. Rockefeller, for the latter has talked to me about him several times. I believe you are right when you say some would be glad to have the university scheme defeated in order to give a set-back to the Education Society.

In order that you may know the actual facts in the case concerning my lectures, I make the following quotations from a letter received from Pres. Taylor dated December 28. 'I wrote Dr. Strong at once. I insisted with fullest vigor on your fairness, reverence, and action of the supernatural, and on your conservatism. I told him that my impression was that the young women, instead of being unsettled, were giving up mechanical notions for vital interest in the Word. I added my opinion that the lectures as a whole were such as would win the hearty approval of men like himself.' The fact is, there was absolutely nothing in my lectures at which any one could take offense; an additional fact is that while Dr. Strong in his letter to me asked that I set him right at once in reference to these matters and expressed the hope that I should be able to assure him of my positions, etc., without waiting for any reply he wrote at once to Mr. Rockefeller and Pres. Taylor. Goodspeed is very anxious over the result and has been in correspondence with me. He believes that he has said all that can be said in the matter and it is unwise for him to make any further move. I believe the next thing to be done is to have Gates come West and have an official interview with Mr. R. This would put an end to a good deal of uncertainty; do you not agree with me? I think action ought to be taken at once. Will you not telegraph him to come West next week and lay the case officially before Mr. R.? I will do what I can to hold on to Mr. R. as closely as possible and I can do so with a better grace because I have declared positively that I will not accept the presidency of the proposed institution. I shall regard your letter as confidential except that I am sure you will allow me to state the contents to Dr. Goodspeed."

✓
January 1, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I include two letters; they are both confidential letters but I have assumed the consent of both parties to allow you to see them. Their contents are to be seen only by yourself, Dr. Northrup and Dr. Smith. May I beg you to be careful to follow out to the letter my requests in reference to this confidential business else I shall get myself into trouble. You will see the situation on both sides. Since writing you Saturday I have placed Dr. Strong's letter in the hands of two or three men, among others, Prof. Burnham of Hamilton, who declares positively there is not a shadow of a basis for any charge against me. He would have said himself every word which Dr. Strong quotes me as saying. You will note what Dr. Morehouse says in reference to Boyd. This no doubt will be the source of a good deal of trouble, for Boyd is doing everything he can against the work. Gates is aware of this fact and will explain it to you in more detail. I have advised Morehouse to telegraph Gates to come to New York next week and take hold of things in a vigorous way with New York men. There is no necessity of waiting further. The matter must be pushed and it must be pushed from someone from outside. I have also written this as my opinion to Gates himself. I may be wrong but this is the way I feel under all the circumstances. Kindly return both of the inclosed letters to me."

January 1, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I include two letters; they are both confidential letters but I have assumed the consent of both parties to allow you to see them. Their contents are to be seen only by yourself, Dr. Northrup and Dr. Smith. May I beg you to be careful to follow out to the letter my requests in reference to this confidential business else I shall get myself into trouble. You will see the situation on both sides. Since writing you Saturday I have placed Dr. Strong's letter in the hands of two or three men, among others, Prof. Barnham of Hamilton, who declares positively there is not a shadow of substance for any charge against me. He would have said himself every word which Dr. Strong quotes me as saying. You will note that Dr. Morehouse says in reference to Boyd. This no doubt will be the source of a good deal of trouble, for Boyd is doing everything he can against the work. Gates is aware of this fact and will explain it to you in more detail. I have advised Morehouse to telegraph Gates to come to New York next week and take hold of things in a vigorous way with New York men. There is no necessity of waiting further. The matter must be pushed and it must be pushed from someone from outside. I have also written this as my opinion to Gates himself. I may be wrong but this is the way I feel under all the circumstances. Kindly return both of the inclosed letters to me."

✓

Dr. J. A. Smith to Dr. Harper, January 2, 1889.

"On Monday evening last Dr. Goodspeed read to Dr. Northrup and myself your letter to him. One or the other of the two brethren will doubtless inform you of the correspondence undertaken by them with a view to meet this new movement in opposition to the enterprise here, and in assault upon yourself. I should be quite willing to join them in this, were that necessary, as I need not assure you I am always to be counted in as a 'Harper man' were it come to that, as I am sure you are hoping it never will.

I write, in great measure, to renew my frequent expressions of regard for you, and faith in you in every way. Your very explicit letter to Dr. Goodspeed - explicit as to your own position especially, was quite enough to reassure us, were that necessary. Upon many points I feel sure that I am in sympathy with you, and with those in our denomination who believe that the last word has by no means yet been spoken either as to certain questions of interpretation, or as to the form of statement best adapted to express the exact truth upon certain points of doctrine. A cast-iron orthodoxy is not the kind of orthodoxy which most consists with either the spirit of the Baptist denominations, or with its position in history. It is rather the orthodoxy which admits of re-statement and readjustment in accordance with the best thinking and the most devout learning of the time. I suppose we ought all of us to be in the position of learners, as well as of champions, though always careful to make 'the law and the testimony' our final tribunal.

I have it in my heart to say one thing more. I hope you will never permit yourself to lose faith in your own denomination. If Dr. Strong's present attitude should mean anything like an attack upon you, it might be natural for you to feel as if he were carrying with him the denomination as a body; more especially as there would be so many who would never have opportunity to express to you their own personal sentiments. Let me assure you that you have a very firm place in the hearts of your brethren, and especially of those younger men in our ministry who represent the best hope of the denomination in years to come. This is not because they see in you the leader of any movement antagonistic to what is traditional and historical in the attitude of the denomination toward vital questions; but because they have faith in you as representing a larger culture in certain directions than has ever before been attempted amongst us and also holding firmly to certain fundamental truths which will rectify any less maturely considered views upon questions more incidental and collateral. These brethren will stand by you, and with them will stand others who have known you longer than these have, and have no mind to see you compelled to seek other fellowships because of what may occur within the lines of that where"

Dr. J. A. Smith to Dr. Harper, January 2, 1889.

"On Monday evening last Dr. Goodspeed read to Dr. Northrup and myself your letter to him. One or the other of the two brethren will doubtless inform you of the correspondence undertaken by them with a view to meet this new movement in opposition to the enterprise here, and in season upon yourself. I should be quite willing to join them in this, were that necessary, as I need not assure you I am always to be counted in as a 'Harper man,' were it come to that, as I am sure you are hoping he never will.

I write, in great measure, to renew my frequent expressions of regard for you, and faith in you in every way. Your very explicit letter to Dr. Goodspeed - explicit as to your own position especially, was quite enough to reassure me, were that necessary. Upon many points I feel sure that I am in sympathy with you, and with those in our denomination who believe that the last word has by no means yet been spoken either as to certain questions of interpretation, or as to the form of statement best adapted to express the exact truth upon certain points of doctrine. A east-iron orthodoxy is not the kind of orthodoxy which most coincide with either the spirit of the Baptist denomination, or with its position in history. It is rather the orthodoxy which admits of re-statement and readjustment in accordance with the best thinking and the most devout learning of the time. I suppose we ought all of us to be in the position of learners, as well as of champions, though always careful to make 'the law and the testimony' our final tribunal.

I have it in my heart to say one thing more. I hope you will never permit yourself to lose faith in your own denomination. If Dr. Strong's present attitude should mean anything like an attack upon you, it might be natural for you to feel as if he were carrying with him the denomination as a body; more especially as there would be no many who would never have opportunity to express to you their own personal sentiments. Let me assure you that you have a very firm place in the hearts of your brethren, and especially of those younger men in our ministry who represent the best hope of the denomination in years to come. This is not because they see in you the leader of any movement antagonistic to what is traditional and historical in the attitude of the denomination toward vital questions; but because they have faith in you as representing a larger culture in certain directions than has ever before been attempted amongst us and also holding firmly to certain fundamental truths which will readily any less maturely considered views upon questions more incidental and collateral. These brethren will stand by you, and with them will stand others who have known you longer than these have, and have no mind to see you compelled to seek other fellow-ships because of what may occur within the lines of that where

"you now are.

We are all very sorry at the posture of things as regards Mr. Rockefeller. It will be a great calamity if any collapse comes now. Do not feel, however, that in the judgment of your brethren any blame will attach to yourself. I cannot but hope that letters written by Dr. Northrup and Goodspeed will effectually meet this new phase of things."

.....

"You now are."

We are all very sorry at the posture of things as regards Mr. Rockefeller. It will be regrettable if any collapse comes now. Do not feel, however, that in the judgment of your brethren any blame will attach to yourself. I cannot but hope that letters written by Dr. Hordrup and Goodspeed will effectually meet this new phase of things.

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, January 2, 1889.

"I do not know whether you will approve of all we have done here. But we have certainly done one thing. We have been standing by you with a vengeance.

One thing will certainly please you. Hulbert is with you heart and soul. I thought it wise to open the matter to him and without a moment's hesitation and in the most outspoken and loyal way he authorized me to say that he is with and for you for all he is worth.

Dr. Northrup has girded up his loins like the giant he is and has laid himself out in a series of letters which are wonders of clearness and force, and love and loyalty to you. He determined at once to address Strong, Taylor, and Robinson. His letters to Strong and Robinson he has read to Dr. S. and me. Last night I took Dr. S. over and told Dr. N. that I had come to the conclusion that he should in your interest write to Mr. R. in his own behalf and in Dr. Smith's name and mine. He has spent the day in doing so and read me the letter which he sent tonight. It was a magnificent tribute to you from the man who knows you better than any other man living.

He made four points (1) giving his conception of your views and tendencies, (2) speaking a few kind and generous words of Strong, (3) giving his estimate of you as a teacher, organizer, leader of men and your future usefulness to the denomination and the cause of Biblical learning, (4) speaking of the proposed University. He deprecated in the strongest way any assault on you as a public calamity which must not be permitted to befall our cause. It was altogether the finest letter I think the Doctor ever wrote. All these letters have been most wisely expressed and can only do good I am perfectly confident.

At all events we have taken our stand unequivocally and positively by your side. We will not quietly see you arraigned, and it is our profound conviction that if you are, a great army of friends will rally promptly to your support. We cannot believe you will be attacked in any public manner, but if you are we are certain the liberal, progressive half of the denomination will be found with us. It will not be as it was with Behrman and others. The case is a wholly different one. It will be a question as to whether any freedom is to be allowed in the re-examination of the O. T. and whether a man

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, January 2, 1899.

"I do not know whether you will approve of all we have done here. But we have certainly done one thing. We have been standing by you with a vengeance.

One thing will certainly please you. Hubert is with you heart and soul. I thought it wise to open the matter to him and without a moment's hesitation and in the most outspoken and loyal way he authorized me to say that he is with and for you for all he is worth.

Dr. Northrup has picked up his line like the giant he is and has laid himself out in a series of letters which are wonders of clearness and force, and love and loyalty to you. He determined at once to address Strong, Taylor, and Robinson. His letters to Strong and Robinson he has read to Dr. S. and me. Last night I took Dr. S. over and told Dr. S. that I had come to the conclusion that he should in your interest write to Mr. S. in his own behalf and in Dr. Smith's name and mine. He has spent the day in doing so and read me the letter which he sent tonight. It was a magnificent tribute to you from the man who knows you better than any other man living.

He made four points (1) giving his conception of your views and tendencies, (2) speaking a few kind and generous words of Strong, (3) giving his estimate of you as a teacher, organizer, leader of men and your future usefulness to the denomination and the cause of Biblical learning, (4) speaking of the proposed University. He deprecated in the strongest way any attempt on your part to publicize the matter which must not be permitted to reach our cause. It was altogether the finest letter I think the Doctor ever wrote. All these letters have been most wisely expressed and can only do good I am perfectly confident.

At all events we have taken our stand unflinchingly and positively by your side. We will not quietly see you swayed, and it is our profound conviction that if you are, a great many of friends will rally promptly to your support. We cannot believe you will be swayed in any public manner, but if you are we are certain the liberal, progressive half of the denomination will be found with us. It will not be as it was with Buchanan and others. The case is a wholly different one. It will be a question as to whether any freedom is to be allowed in the re-examination of the O. T. and whether a man

"who holds to the supernatural character of the O. T. is to be forbidden to express any opinion differing from the traditional views. The larger half of the denomination will say to the first question, yes, and to the second, no!, and Dr. Strong will find himself in the minority. If the fight comes you must do your utmost to hold up our hands and to strengthen your friends by taking the most conservative attitude you in good conscience can take, minimizing your differences from the old views and making the most of your agreement with the great body of your brethren. In other words, you must stand by us and so make it easier for your friends to rally the largest host possible to your support. We deprecate any conflict. If there is any let others make it, and take the responsibility and bear the consequences. Do not on your part develop any spirit of defiance. I am sure you will not. Let no one be able to say that you are not in substantial accord with evangelical religion and the views of our people.

Dr. N. assured Mr. R. that we would not hesitate to recall you to the Seminary if we could secure you and that he believed you were doing more than any ten men in the country to encourage Biblical study.

What you have written in regard to this matter we shall regard as wholly confidential. I have opened it to Hulbert only because I felt sure of him and wished to be able to assure you of him. It would have gratified you if you could have heard him speak of it three hours ago in my study. I never saw Dr. N. more aroused. He loves you and believes in you and is like a lion roused from his lair. Dr. Smith is quiet, but no man ever had a friend who would stand by him with more utter fidelity than he will show to you.

I have thought better of the letter I proposed to write to Mr. R. and only wrote a few lines to say that Dr. S. and I had suggested to Dr. N. to write him and wished to be understood as endorsing every word he wrote in regard to you, that we loved and admired you as we believed he, Mr. R., did and it was impossible for us to be silent when you were touched.

I earnestly hope you will accept Mr. R's invitation and see him as often as you can, and keep the University matter before his mind. Does he delay because we have asked too much? Are we likely to lose all on this account? If you discover this to be so, will it not be wise to fall in with the suggestion of a first class

who holds to the supernatural character of the O. T. is so forbidden to express any opinion differing from the traditional views. The larger half of the denomination will say to the first question, yes, and to the second, no, and Dr. Strong will find himself in the minority. If the light comes you must do your utmost to hold up our hands and to strengthen your friends by taking the most conservative attitude you in good conscience can take, minimizing your differences from the old views and making the most of your agreement with the great body of your brethren. In other words, you must stand by us and so make it easier for your friends to rally the largest host possible to your support. We deprecate any conflict. If there is any let others make it, and take the responsibility and bear the consequences. Do not on your part develop any spirit of defiance. I am sure you will not. Let no one be able to say that you are not in substantial accord with evangelical religion and the views of our people.

Dr. H. answered Mr. R. that we would not hesitate to recall you to the Seminary if we could secure you and that he believed you were doing more than any ten men in the country to encourage Biblical study.

What you have written in regard to this matter we shall regard as wholly confidential. I have opened it to Hubert only because I felt sure of him and wished to be able to assure you of him. It would have gratified you if you could have heard him speak of it three hours ago in my study. I never saw Dr. H. more aroused. He loves you and believes in you and is like a lion roused from his lair. Dr. Smith is quiet, but no man ever had a friend who would stand by him with more utter fidelity than he will show to you.

I have thought better of the letter I proposed to write to Mr. R. and only wrote a few lines to say that Dr. S. and I had suggested to Mr. R. to write him and wished to be understood as endorsing every word he wrote in regard to you, that we loved and admired you as we believed he, Mr. R., did and it was impossible for us to be silent when you were touched.

I earnestly hope you will accept Mr. R.'s invitation and see him as often as you can, and keep the University matter before his mind. Does he delay because we have asked too much? Are we likely to lose all on this account? If you discover this to be so, will it not be wise to fall in with the suggestion of a first class

"College? If we cannot do better shall we not do well to get a College with an endowment of a million - we to provide the equipment? Do not misunderstand me. I am not weakening. But if we cannot have the earth let us at least have a fraction of it. If we can have a College, with an endowment of a million, it will grow.

What you write me about the volunteer advice Mr. R. is receiving and the unfavorable views presented to him amazes me and disturbs me."
"If you succeed in overcoming all the ~~adverse~~ adverse influences you will score a most notable victory.

I have been thinking, that, after all, this attack on you, this friction, this revelation of their selfish motives by men who fear if Mr. R. gives his money for this cause, they will get less of it for their own purposes, may be *overruled* for our benefit and may *dispose* him to do more than he would otherwise have done. 'The wrath of man shall pain him, and the remainder will he restrain.'

Let us trust it may be so in this case. I fear however we must wait and waiting is weary work. Our strong ground of hope is that you have Mr. R's ear and confidence as no other man has and you will do your best. That you may have increasing grace and wisdom is my daily prayer."

"College? If we cannot do better shall we not do well
to get a College with an endowment of a million - we
to provide the equipment? Do not misunderstand me.
I am not weakening. But if we cannot have the earth
let us at least have a fraction of it. If we can have
a College, with an endowment of a million, it will grow.

What you write me about the volunteer advice Mr. R.
is receiving and the unfavorable views presented to
him amuses me and disturbs me."
"If you succeed in overcoming all the obstacles
influences you will secure a most notable victory.

I have been thinking, that, after all, this attack
on you, this friction, this revelation of their selfish
motives by men who fear if Mr. R. gives his money
for this cause, they will get less of it for their own
purposes, may be prevented for our benefit and may change
him to do more than he would otherwise have done.
'The wrath of man shall pain him, and the remainder
will be restrained.'

Let us trust it may be so in this case. I fear
however we must wait and waiting is weary work. Our
strong ground of hope is that you have Mr. R.'s ear
and confidence as no other man has and you will do
your best. That you may have increasing grace and
wisdom is my daily prayer."

✓

January 2, 1889.

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Rockefeller:-

"Knowing the demands on your time and attention we are always reluctant to claim them. I think Dr. Northrup is especially so and he writes you now only at the earnest solicitation of Dr. Smith and myself. We have felt since hearing from Dr. Harper that we were not at liberty to keep silence. Dr. Northrup knows him better than any other man does, and we have been clear that he ought to give you his inmost thoughts and his real and full estimate of Dr. Harper's character, abilities, views and tendencies.

We have here a very great affection for Dr. Harper as well as great admiration of him. We believe you feel toward him very much as we do. But we have believed that just at this time you would welcome a full statement of Dr. Northrup's views regarding him. And we have overborne his reluctance to add to the demands on your time, and persuaded him to write, which he does on our behalf as well as his own. Every word he says we wish to endorse."

January 2, 1888.

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Rockefeller:-

"Knowing the demands on your time and attention we are always reluctant to claim them. I think Dr. Northrup is especially so and he writes you now only at the earnest solicitation of Dr. Smith and myself. We have felt since hearing from Dr. Harper that we were not at liberty to keep silence. Dr. Northrup knows him better than any other man does, and we have been clear that he ought to give you his innermost thoughts and his real and full estimate of Dr. Harper's character, abilities, views and tendencies. We have here a very great affection for Dr. Harper as well as great admiration of him. We believe you feel toward him very much as we do. But we have believed that just at this time you would welcome a full statement of Dr. Northrup's views regarding him. And we have overcome his reluctance to add to the demands on your time, and persuaded him to write, which he does on our behalf as well as his own. Every word he says we wish to endorse."

✓
January 2, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Harper:-

"Yours of the 29th ult. received. I have read the paper.
It seems very good.

I hope on the question of Biblical education you wise men
will all see eye to eye and that your brethren with less learning
may not be unsettled and shaken in the true faith."

✓
January 2, 1888.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Harper:-

"Yours of the 29th ult. received. I have read the paper.
It seems very good.
I hope on the question of Biblical education you will see
will all see eye to eye and that your brethren with less learning
may not be unsettled and shaken in the true faith."

January 3, 1889.

Mr. Gates to Dr. Morehouse:-

".....Harper has written me. Strong is charging him to Rockefeller of heresy and evidently trying to break down his influence. As a trustee of Vassar Strong calls Harper in a letter to him to account for his alleged heretical teaching there and demands that Harper shall assert his belief in "the literal interpretations of all transactions and in the literal interpretation of New Testament references to the old." (quoted fr. Harper's letter) Harper is troubled and disposed to withdraw from any further connection with the Chicago matter, but appeals to the West to sustain him. Northrup has written Strong, Taylor (who sustains Harper) & Robinson and also Rockefeller, sustaining Harper and declaring him to be all right. In conversation with Harper I have been impressed with his piety. It is living and growing. He believes in the Piety of Jesus, the resurrection and all evangelical religion. He believes in the inspiration of the Old Test., but his theory is broad, perhaps none too broad. He follows Owelli which I have read. Owelli is devout and reverent, a book commended to me by a very orthodox man. I hope we are to have no revival of the Spanish Inquisition. Your letter to Harper was timely and hit the point exactly. Harper thinks Rockefeller will not be influenced by Strong's letter. Their relations are cordial and uninterrupted. R. gives Harper a carte blanche for meetings between them. I hope that the result of this latest attack will be to fix Rockefeller more firmly to Harper. But I fear its effects on Harper himself. He is timid and in doubt about his position with the denomination at large. Smith and others besides Northrup, among them Mabie, are trying to comfort and reassure Harper. I shall write today. Get all this from others before you use it at all.

Strong is melancholy, a profoundly unhappy and disappointed man, I fear almost desperate.

I have read the Inquirer. Crandall spoke admirably. There was little relatedness between McArthur's sentences & paragraphs & his object.".....

Editor's Note The beliefs then current among Dr. Hoopes' friends and partly shared by Mr. Gates, that Dr. Strong's attack on Dr. Hoopes' teaching at Vassar was not wholly disinterested, was, I am persuaded, mistaken and very unjust to Dr. Strong. With the views Dr. Strong then held, he comes not as a trustee of Vassar, pursue any other course. His letter to Dr. Hoopes, as teacher, to Dr. Taylor as President were wholly proper, and are self explanatory. His letter to Mr. Rockefeller is justified by Dr. Strong's previous correspondence with Mr. R. about Dr. Hoopes. Dr. Strong much has done this reluctantly, knowing that its effect must be to embarrass his plans for a University in New York in which Dr. Hoopes had better to figure as an important if not an essential factor.

✓

Dr. Northrup to Dr. Harper, January 3, 1888.

"As suggested in my last letter I wrote to Drs. Robinson and Taylor and a second time to Dr. Strong on Tuesday. Then at the urgent request of Drs. Goodspeed and Smith I wrote yesterday to Mr. Rockefeller giving four hours to the preparation of the letter which covered six pages of lecture sized paper printed from the typewriter. All these letters were written with great care yet with firmness *doing* full justice to you and with every one of which I am sure you would feel satisfied. In the letter to Mr. R. which I hope he will show to you and Strong I made four points:-

1. Harper and Strong (explanatory, confirmatory, *venical*, etc.)
2. Strong (Appreciation - good and strong)
3. Harper (Appreciation - better and stronger)
4. Rockefeller and the Chicago University (best and strongest)

Dr. Goodspeed said the letter was 'A L, magnificent, etc.'

I gave Mr. R. liberty to use the letter as he might deem best. One statement I made was this: 'That if the way was open I would not hesitate a moment to recommend our Board to appoint you to your former position in the Theological Faculty.'

You will readily see Mr. R. has been placed in a somewhat embarrassing position, as you have not forgotten the doubts which I expressed about a year ago in relation to your future theological position. But my present judgment is based on evidence of recent date (within eight months) e.g. personal interviews, letters and the testimony of some of the most capable and conservative of your students like McKee, who wrote me a long letter at the close of the Hebrew School at Evanston, speaking in strong and favorable terms of your tendencies and views as they were shown in the course of the school.

I am not without hope that good will come out of it all, for it is ever true of God that 'His ways are not as our ways.' Whatever may be the designs of men, His thoughts are deeper and his arm mightier than theirs."

Dr. Northrup to Dr. Harper, January 3, 1888.

"As suggested in my last letter I wrote to Drs. Robinson and Taylor and a second time to Dr. Strong on Tuesday. Then at the urgent request of Drs. Goodspeed and Smith I wrote yesterday to Mr. Rockefeller giving four hours to the preparation of the letter which covered six pages of lecture sized paper printed from the typewriter. All these letters were written with great care yet with firmness. I am sure you would feel with every one of which I am sure you would feel satisfied. In the letter to Mr. R. which I hope he will show to you and Strong I made four points:-

1. Harper and Strong (explanatory, confirmatory, etc.)

2. Strong (Appreciation - Good and strong)

3. Harper (Appreciation - better and stronger)

4. Rockefeller and the Chicago University (best and strongest)

Dr. Goodspeed said the letter was 'A 1, magnificent, etc.'

I gave Mr. R. liberty to use the letter as he might deem best. One statement I made was this: 'That if the way was open I would not hesitate a moment to recommend our Board to appoint you to your former position in the Theological Faculty.'

You will readily see Mr. R. has been placed in a somewhat embarrassing position, as you have not forgotten the doubts which I expressed about a year ago in relation to your future theological position. But my present judgment is based on evidence of recent date (within eight months) e.g. personal interviews, letters and the testimony of some of the most capable and conservative of your students like McKee, who wrote me a long letter at the close of the Hebrew School at Evanston, speaking in strong and favorable terms of your tendencies and views as they were shown in the course of the school.

I am not without hope that good will come out of it all, for it is ever true of God that 'His ways are not as our ways.' Whatever may be the designs of men, His thoughts are deeper and his arm mightier than theirs."

C O P Y

Jan. 4th, 1889.

Prof. W. R. Harper,
New Haven, Conn.

Dear Bro.

Yours of the 1st was duly received. I thank you for the further information in regard to the course of affairs. I have thought over your suggestion about having Gates come on to see Mr. Rockefeller, but remembering Mr. Rockefeller's disinclination to see Mr. Gates when he was here I have hesitated to ask him to come on. I have decided at least to do this thing first, namely, to ask Gates to write a letter, the points of which I have given him, to Goodspeed, giving Goodspeed permission to forward the letter to Mr. Rockefeller. The Education Society can not indefinitely dance attendance on uncertainties. If Mr. Rockefeller can not make up his mind in view of all that has been said, the alternative will be to accept the Morgan Park offer and make the most ~~use~~ of it. When I was at Washington I was apprehensive that in trying to ride two horses we might fall between both. There is this danger; if the Morgan Park people withdraw their offer and Mr. Rockefeller should decide to do nothing, we would be left in a sad predicament.

I believe that if the right man can be found to be at the head of the institution it would greatly expedite Mr. Rockefeller's decision; but the presidential timber is so scarce I hardly know where to look for the man.

As regards the eager and hasty action of Dr. S. to supplant you in Mr. Rockefeller's estimation I have not the patience or grace to trust myself to speak as I feel. I believe, however, it will all be overruled for your good and that Dr. S. will find in this as in another thing that he did it will react upon himself.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) H.L. Morehouse.

Jan. 4th. 1889.

Prof. W. R. Harper,
New Haven, Conn.

Dear Bro.

Yours of the 1st was duly received. I thank you for the further information in regard to the course of affairs. I have thought over your suggestion about having Gates come on to see Mr. Rockefeller, but remembering Mr. Rockefeller's disinclination to see Mr. Gates when he was here I have hesitated to ask him to come on. I have decided at least to do this thing first, namely, to ask Gates to write a letter, the points of which I have given him, to Goodspeed, giving Goodspeed permission to forward the letter to Mr. Rockefeller. The Education Society can not indefinitely delay attendance on uncertainties. If Mr. Rockefeller can not make up his mind in view of all that has been said, the alternative will be to accept the Morgan Park offer and make the most use of it. When I was at Washington I was apprehensive that in trying to ride two horses we might fall between both. There is this danger; if the Morgan Park people withdraw their offer and Mr. Rockefeller should decide to do nothing, we would be left in a sad predicament.

I believe that if the right man can be found to be at the head of the institution it would greatly expedite Mr. Rockefeller's decision; but the presidential timber is so scarce I hardly know where to look for the man.

As regards the eager and hasty action of Dr. S. to appoint you in Mr. Rockefeller's estimation I have not the patience or grace to trust myself to speak as I feel. I believe, however, it will all be overruled for your good and that Dr. S. will find in this as in another thing that he did it will rest upon himself.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) H. L. Morehouse.

D. Harper to D. Strong

Jan. 4 1889

"I desire now with your permission to refer briefly to the points suggested in your letter of Dec. 25th.

1. The statement "Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos" had reference merely to the work of the prophets technically so-called; Elijah and Jonah had lived and worked but had left little or nothing in writing, - nothing certainly like that which was left by Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, etc. I did not have in mind at all the question of the Davidic writings; these form the subject of another lecture and do not technically come under the head of prophetic writings although of course many of them are prophetic. I have no doubt at all that there was early prophetic writing, but this was not the point then in my mind.

2. I do not find myself able to grant the conclusion which you think is derived from the premises in reference to the testimony of Christ touching the Old Testament. I do not think it was the work of our Lord while on earth to rectify erroneous opinions in reference to literary or historical questions. My faith in him is not shaken in the least by an acknowledgment that the Pentateuch as we have it is not from the hand of Moses; and I think that this view is very generally held by those who are what is called the most conservative Bible-students. It is a view (I refer not to the analysis but to the relation of Jesus' statement) which is certainly taught in more than one Baptist theological seminary.

3. The statement that "the words of a prophecy belonging to an early age must have a more general meaning than if they belonged to a later age" is one with which I cannot see how any person can take exception. We certainly believe that the idea of the Christ grew more and more definite as the centuries rolled by. Surely, Isaiah speaks of him more definitely than his predecessors, and with each succeeding generation the representation of him becomes more and more distinct. Here again, I am able to find no scholar who thinks otherwise.

4. The statement "In the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ" is hardly a clear one. I emphasized most emphatically that the whole Pentateuch, its history, its institutions, its material of every kind, pointed directly and definitely to Christ; that without the historic Christ all this was an enigma. On the other hand I objected to the old interpretation of the Pentateuch which finds a definite statement concerning the historic Christ in every chapter or verse. I interpret all the so-called Messianic passages, even Gen. 3:15, 16 as having their final fulfillment in the Christ; but I insisted - as today all Old Testament exegetes insist - upon the typical interpretation, viz. that these passages refer primarily perhaps chiefly to an earlier condition or person the fulfillment of which was Christ.

5. You will allow me to give you an extract from the dictation which I give my classes on the subject of types; this has not yet been given at Vassar. "God is unchangeable in that he always acts with certain eternal, unchangeable principles. He is changeable in so far as he is continually presenting to us everywhere enlarging manifestations of himself and of his plans. His movement in history is a spiral; all motion in one ring of the spiral is a prophecy of a higher and larger ring. The type

Jan. 4, 1929

Dr. Harkins & Dr. Starn

"I desire now with your permission to refer briefly to the

points suggested in your letter of Dec. 28th.

1. The statement "Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos" had reference merely to the work of the prophets technically so-called; Elijah and Jonah had lived and worked but had left little or nothing in writing, - nothing certainly like that which was left by Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, etc. I did not have in mind at all the question of the Davidic writings; these form the subject of another lecture and do not technically come under the head of prophetic writings although of course many of them are prophetic. I have no doubt at all that there were early prophetic writing, but this was not the point then in my mind.

2. I do not find myself able to grant the conclusion which you think is derived from the premises in reference to the testimony of Christ touching the Old Testament. I do not think it was the work of our Lord while on earth to rectify erroneous opinions in reference to literary or historical questions. My faith in him is not shaken in the least by an acknowledgment that the Pentateuch as we have it is not from the hand of Moses; and I think that this view is very generally held by those who are what is called the most conservative Bible-students. It is a view (I refer not to the analysis but to the relation of Jesus' statement) which is certainly taught in more than one Baptist theological seminary.

3. The statement that "the words of a prophecy belonging to an early age must have a more general meaning than if they belonged to a later age" is one with which I cannot see how any person can take exception. We certainly believe that the idea of the Christ grew more and more definite as the centuries rolled by. Surely, Isaiah speaks of him more definitely than his predecessors, and with each succeeding generation the representation of him becomes more and more distinct. Here again, I am able to find no scholar who thinks otherwise.

4. The statement "in the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ" is hardly a clear one. I emphasized most emphatically that the whole Pentateuch, its history, its institutions, its material of every kind, pointed directly and definitely to Christ; that without the historic Christ all this was an enigma. On the other hand I objected to the old interpretation of the Pentateuch which finds a definite statement concerning the historic Christ in every chapter or verse. I interpret all the so-called Messianic passages, even Gen. 3:15, as having their final fulfillment in the Christ; but I interpret - as today all Old Testament exegesis insists - upon the typical interpretation, viz. that these passages refer primarily perhaps chiefly to an earlier condition or person than the fulfillment of which was Christ.

5. You will allow me to give you an extract from the dissertation which I give my classes on the subject of types; this has not yet been given at Vassar. "God is unchangeable in that he always acts with certain eternal, unchangeable principles. He is changeable in so far as he is continually presenting to us everywhere enduring manifestations of himself and of his plans. His movement in history is a spiral; all motion in one ring of the spiral is a prophecy of a higher and larger ring. The type

Jan. 4

is the lower ring of the spiral of which the anti type is the higher or highest ring (substantially Burnham). A type is a historical person, thing or fact definitely intended to prefigure some corresponding person, thing or fact in the future. A passage is typical when it is understood to refer primarily to some historical person or event and secondly to some person or event in the future of which the first person or event is a type.

"Characteristics of the type: (1) There must be some resemblance and, so far as it goes, a real resemblance between the type and the anti-type, etc. (2) The type must be intended by God to represent the thing typified; not accidental, but intentional, pre-ordained similarity must exist. The type, the anti-type and other resemblances must have been arranged for from the beginning. It is not necessary that this divine pre-arrangement be announced in Scripture. (3) The type must refer to the future; it is a shadow, a prophecy of what is yet to come. Old Testament institutions were preparatory to those of the New; they were the germs which blossomed out in the New. Old Testament persons, things, events, are prophetic shadows of corresponding persons, things and events, of the New Testament." As I said above, this is my position in reference to types, and is word for word the material dictated to my classes here at New Haven.

6. This certainly covers the point made in your objection to my definition of a type, though I do not remember in what connection I have spoken of types to the class at Vassar. It must have been only a passing allusion. Concerning the point made in reference to prophecy, viz., that the element of divine inspiration is left out, I desire to say that no statement to my knowledge has ever been made which would furnish a basis for this criticism. I have, it is true, emphasized as strongly as possible the fact that the Old Testament prophet was the New Testament preacher; that he did for his day and generation what the New Testament preacher does for his day and generation. I have, however, in the case of every lecture emphasized the points (here I take the matter directly from one of my lectures delivered at Vassar) (1) that the prophet was divinely appointed; (2) that each prophet was given a particular work to do.

7. I cannot agree with you that in my interpretation of separate prophecies I leave in them as little as can possibly be left consistent with the claim that they are religious. I maintain my position that in general nothing was detracted from the supernatural character of these prophecies. I maintain further that the supernatural element which I find in them is marked and distinct, and that nothing have I said from which could be drawn the conclusion, logically or illogically, that there is no supernatural element in them.

8. I desire further to add that never in my life have I felt more deeply or strongly the fact of the supernatural element in the Old Testament religion than within the past two years. There was a time when my mind was filled with doubts; that time has entirely passed. There is no one point which I emphasize more firmly or more forcibly in my class here at New Haven or in my work at Vassar, than the unique character of Old Testament history. This was the sum and substance of the lecture prepared last year for the Inspiration Conference, the preparation of which did me personally more good than any other one piece of work that I have undertaken. It was a comparison of Hebrew records - history and

is the lower ring of the spiral of which the anti type is the higher or highest ring (substantially Burnham). A type is a historical person, thing or fact definitely intended to prefigure some corresponding person, thing or fact in the future. A passage is typical when it is understood to refer primarily to some historical person or event and secondly to some person or event in the future of which the first person or event is a type.

"Characteristics of the type: (1) There must be some resemblance and, no far as it goes, a real resemblance between the type and the anti-type. (2) The type must be intended by God to represent the thing typified; not accidental, but intentional, pre-ordained similarity must exist. The type, the anti-type and other resemblances must have been arranged for from the beginning. It is not necessary that this divine pre-arrangement be announced in Scripture. (3) The type must refer to the future; it is a shadow, a prophecy of what is yet to come. Old Testament institutions were preparatory to those of the New; they were the germs which blossomed out in the New. Old Testament persons, things, events, are prophetic shadows of corresponding persons, things and events of the New Testament." As I said above, this is my position in reference to types, and is word for word the material dictated to my classes here at New Haven.

6. This certainly covers the point made in your objection to my definition of a type, though I do not remember in what connection I have spoken of types to the class at Vassar. It must have been only a passing allusion. Concerning the point made in reference to prophecy, viz., that the element of divine inspiration is left out, I desire to say that no statement to my knowledge has ever been made which would furnish a basis for this criticism. I have, it is true, emphasized as strongly as possible the fact that the Old Testament prophet was the New Testament preacher; that he did for his day and generation what the New Testament preacher does for his day and generation. I have, however, in the case of every lecture emphasized the point (here I take the matter directly from one of my lectures delivered at Vassar) (1) that the prophet was divinely appointed; (2) that each prophet was given a particular work to do.

7. I cannot agree with you that in my interpretation of separate prophecies I leave in them an little as can possibly be left consistent with the claim that they are religious. I maintain my position that in general nothing was detracted from the supernatural character of these prophecies. I maintain further that the supernatural element which I find in them is marked and distinct, and that nothing have I said from which could be drawn the conclusion, logically or illogically, that there is no supernatural element in them.

8. I desire further to add that never in my life have I felt more deeply or strongly the fact of the supernatural element in the Old Testament religion than within the past two years. There was a time when my mind was filled with doubts; that time has entirely passed. There is no one point which I emphasize more firmly or more forcibly in my classes here at New Haven or in my work at Vassar, than the unique character of Old Testament history. This was the man and substance of the lecture prepared last year for the Inspiration Conference, the preparation of which did me personally more good than any other one piece of work that I have undertaken. It was a comparison of Hebrew records - history and

Psalmody - with Assyrian, and my conclusion reached from both direct and indirect arguments, was that everywhere in the Hebrew was found a something which could not be explained on any other supposition than that it was divinely inspired.

9. Your reference to the publication of Dr. Toy's article also deserves a word. As I have written Dr. Osgood, I do not think that another such article will soon gain admittance to the pages of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT. I felt that inasmuch as he was to be followed by other gentlemen of an evangelical reputation greater than his, viz. Prof. Stevens of Yale and Pres. Hovey or Newton, no harm would be done by the publication of this paper, unfortunate as it was. If the matter were to be done over again the paper would not be published, and yet I think that my purpose in the matter was a good one.

10. I have no doubt that my views concerning the composition of the Hexateuch are more liberal - though they are very conservative - than would be acceptable to many gentlemen of our denomination; and still I am sure that I hold these views - liberal as they may be - in strict subjection to a strong and constantly growing belief in the direct and definite inspiration of the contents of the Pentateuch. I make this statement in order that whatever presentation I make in HEBRAICA on this subject with Prof. Green, you may not misunderstand my personal position.

11. I am very sorry (a) that my statements - in the fragmentary form in which they must have been received by your daughter, rapidly as I delivered the material - should have been thought by you sufficient basis for the charges (shall I call them) which the letter contains; (b) that the well known conservatism of Pres. Taylor who heard every word of every lecture should not have seemed to you a sufficient guarantee that the teaching was not pernicious in its influence. (It is certainly worth noting that my original arrangement was to close at Christmas and was renewed only at the earnest solicitation of Pres. Taylor and the members of his faculty and at the request of the Executive Committee after my seventh lecture had been given.) (c) that as stated in my brief letter day before yesterday you did not give me an opportunity of replying to your letter before writing to Pres. Taylor and others concerning the matter.

deserted
12. You will allow me in closing to assure you that in no way have I ~~desired~~ to seem to have deserted the plan of a New York university. I should rejoice today to see such an institution. I have taken no initiative step in the Chicago matter now under consideration. The matter came to me and, naturally enough, I encouraged it; for I did not believe that in encouraging it I was doing anything which would in the end defeat the other plan. I believed then as I believe now that Mr. R. is not ready to take hold of your plan, great as it is. I have always believed that the first need of our denomination was a university, in the ordinary sense of that term, in Chicago; I still believe this. I shall be very sorry if the plan shall fail. I desire also to correct an impression which I am aware exists in many minds: should a university be organized at Chicago, it is not my desire, my wish or my purpose, nor has it ever been (although the Chicago gentlemen have urged it upon me most unanimously and heartily) to have any connection with said university. My present position I regard in every respect as more desirable.

Trusting that I may seem to you to have removed at least some of the apprehensions which you have felt concerning my work, and thanking you for your interest in my personal views, and my personal teaching,"

Penitence - with Assyrian, and my conclusion reached from both direct and indirect arguments, was that everywhere in the Hebrew was found a something which could not be explained on any other supposition than that it was divinely inspired.

9. Your reference to the publication of Dr. Toy's article also deserves a word. As I have written Dr. Osgood, I do not think that another such article will soon gain admittance to the pages of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT. I felt that inasmuch as he was to be followed by other gentlemen of an evangelical reputation greater than his, viz. Prof. Stevens of Yale and Pres. Hovey of Newton, no harm would be done by the publication of this paper, unfortunate as it was. If the matter were to be done over again the paper would not be published, and yet I think that my purpose in the matter was a good one.

10. I have no doubt that my views concerning the composition of the Hexateuch are more liberal - though they are very conservative - than would be acceptable to many gentlemen of our denomination; and still I am sure that I hold these views - liberal as they may be - in strict objection to a strong and constantly growing belief in the direct and definite inspiration of the contents of the Pentateuch. I make this statement in order that whatever presentation I make in HEBRAICA on this subject with Prof. Green, you may not misunderstand my personal position.

11. I am very sorry (a) that my statements - in the fragmentary form in which they have been received by your daughter, rapidly as I delivered the material - should have been thought by you sufficient basis for the charges (which I call them) which the letter contains; (b) that the well known conservatism of Pres. Taylor who heard every word of every lecture should not have seemed to you a sufficient guarantee that the teaching was not pernicious in its influence. (It is certainly worth noting that my original arrangement was to discuss the Pentateuch and was renewed only at the earnest solicitation of Pres. Taylor and the members of his faculty and at the request of the Executive Committee after my seventh lecture had been given.) (c) that an attack in my brief letter day before yesterday you did not give me an opportunity of replying to your letter before writing to Pres. Taylor and others concerning the matter.

12. You will allow me in closing to assure you that in no way have I desired to seem to have generated the plan of a New York University. I should rejoice today to see such an institution. The matter came to me step in the Chicago matter now under consideration. I did not believe that in any and, naturally enough, I encouraged it; for I did not believe that in any way I was doing anything which would in the end defeat the other plan. I believed then as I believe now that Mr. H. is not ready to take hold of your plan, great as it is. I have always believed that the first need of our denomination was a university, in the ordinary sense of that term, in Chicago; I still believe this. I shall be very sorry if the plan shall fail. I desire also to correct an impression which I am aware exists in many minds: should a university be organized at Chicago, it is not my desire, my wish or my purpose, nor has it ever been (although the Chicago gentlemen have urged it upon me most unanimously and heartily) to have any connection with said university. My present position I regard in every respect as more desirable.

Trusting that I may seem to you to have removed at least some of the apprehensions which you have felt concerning my work, and thanking you for your interest in my personal welfare, and my personal teaching.

✓

January 4, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Strong:-

251

Acknowledges his of the 20th of December. ".....I sincerely hope that further information may give you reason to modify your views in respect to the teaching of Dr. Harper. He was in one day since the receipt of your letter and I made some reference to the question. He seemed very much surprised and has, I presume, written you fully before this....."

January 4, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Strong:-

Acknowledges his of the 30th of December. ".....I sincerely

hope that further information may give you reason to modify your views

in respect to the teaching of Dr. Harper. He was in one day since

the receipt of your letter and I made some reference to the question.

He seemed very much surprised and has, I presume, written you fully

before this....."

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Harper:

Jan. 4th, 1889.

"Yours of the 1st was duly received. I thank you for the further information in regard to the course of affairs. I have thought over your suggestion about having Gates come on to see Mr. Rockefeller, but remembering Mr. Rockefeller's disinclination to see Mr. Gates when he was here I have hesitated to ask him to come on. I have decided at least to do this thing first, namely, to ask Gates to write a letter, the points of which I have given him, to Goodspeed, giving Goodspeed permission to forward the letter to Mr. Rockefeller. The Education Society cannot indefinitely dance attendance on uncertainties. If Mr. Rockefeller cannot make up his mind in view of all that has been said, the alternative will be to accept the Morgan Park offer and make the most of it. When I was at Washington I was apprehensive that in trying to ride two horses we might fall between both. There is this danger; if the Morgan Park people withdraw their offer and Mr. Rockefeller should decide to do nothing, we would be left in a sad predicament.

"I believe that if the right man can be found to be at the head of the institution it would greatly expedite Mr. Rockefeller's decision; but the presidential timber is so scarce I hardly know where to look for the man.

"As regards the eager and hasty action of Dr. S. to supplant you in Mr. Rockefeller's estimation I have not the patience or grace to trust myself to speak as I feel. I believe, however, it will all be overruled for your good and that Dr. S. will find in this as in another thing that he did it will react upon himself".

Jan. 4th, 1889.

Mr. Morehouse to Mr. Harper.

"Yours of the 1st was duly received. I thank you for the further information in regard to the course of affairs. I have thought over your suggestion about having Gates come on to see Mr. Rockefeller, but remembering Mr. Rockefeller's disinclination to see Mr. Gates when he was here I have hesitated to ask him to come on. I have decided at least to do this thing first, namely, to ask Gates to write a letter, the points of which I have given him, to Goodspeed, giving Goodspeed permission to forward the letter to Mr. Rockefeller. The Education Society cannot indefinitely delay attendance on meetings. If Mr. Rockefeller cannot make up his mind in view of all that has been said, the alternative will be to accept the Morgan Park offer and make the most of it. When I was at Washington I was apprehensive that in trying to ride two horses we might fall between both. There is this danger; if the Morgan Park people withdraw their offer and Mr. Rockefeller should decide to do nothing, we would be left in a sad predicament.

"I believe that if the right man can be found to be at the head of the institution it would greatly expedite Mr. Rockefeller's decision; but the presidential timber is so scarce I hardly know where to look for the man.

"As regards the eager and hasty action of Dr. S. to supplant you in Mr. Rockefeller's estimation I have got the patience or grace to trust myself to speak as I feel. I believe, however, it will all be overruled for your good and that Dr. S. will find in this as in another thing that he did it will react upon himself."

January 4, 1889.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:-

"Yesterday I received a letter from Bro. Harper in reply to one that I wrote him a few days before. He has peremptorily declined to take the presidency of the proposed University of Chicago and says that he has told Mr. Rockefeller so. The reasons for this you will know in due time if not now. They are in addition to reasons which he stated to you when you were here, as there have been some new developments. He recognizes the gravity of the present situation. He says Goodspeed has written him that he does not feel that he can do anything more with Mr. Rockefeller. Harper does not know what else he can do. The matter is hanging fire and every week that decision is delayed makes the case more dubious. I am convinced in my own mind that Mr. Rockefeller is waiting for the right man to be found for the presidency of the institution. He takes great stock in men. I believe if Harper would have accepted a month ago that Mr. Rockefeller's decision would have been given then; but he has taken himself out of the field and as nobody else is conspicuous for the place I am apprehensive that Mr. Rockefeller will wait until the right man is found. If therefore my theory is correct, and his decision hinges upon a man it may be months before he will decide.

Harper wanted me to telegraph you to come down at once and make an official visit to Mr. Rockefeller. I have not deemed best to pursue this course. After sleeping over the matter and turning it over in its various aspects it has seemed to me that probably the best course to pursue will be as follows: That you should write a letter to Dr. Goodspeed briefly reciting the situation from the time the Provisional Committee asked the Education Society to take hold of the enterprise. You can refer to the Washington meeting and the expectations that were then raised. You can refer to the positive offer from Morgan Park and that unless something better is speedily presented it will be the duty of the Education Society to close in with that offer, however greatly we might regret to do so. You can refer to the general sentiment of the denomination that the university should be in Chicago and yet the impossibility of going a step farther in this matter unless Mr. Rockefeller is prepared to say what he will do. You can also make an effective point that the Education Society has for several months been holding its other work in abeyance in expectation of something definite from Mr. Rockefeller, and that some successful steps have been taken to secure subscriptions for the institution in Chicago all of which work will be lost if the enterprise is to be abandoned. These, with other things which will suggest themselves to you it seems to me might be incorporated in a letter to Dr. Goodspeed. At the close of the letter you might say that you wish he would make a general statement of these points to Mr. Rockefeller. In a separate note you could request him to forward your letter, with his own letter, to Mr. Rockefeller. We can then see what effect this will have and be prepared for the next move. I shall not write to Goodspeed on this subject till after hearing from you for I want him to say to Mr. Rockefeller, if he forwards your letter,

If this scheme meets with your approval will you not act upon the suggestion at once? If you have anything better throw it aside and do the thing that seems best to yourself. I have not seen Mr. R. Indeed I do not think he is particularly desirous of conferring with me on this subject. I will write further in a few days as new facts come to my notice."

January 4, 1882.

- 2 -

that this letter came from you to him without any suggestions whatever on his part but he thinks it so important that he forwards it to him for his consideration.

If this scheme meets with your approval will you not act upon the suggestion at once? If you have anything better to say it aside and do the thing that seems best to yourself. I have not seen Mr. R. Indeed I do not think he is particularly desirous of conferring with me on this subject. I will write further in a few days as new facts come to my notice."

✓

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, January 4, 1889.

"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, spake of the resurrection of the Christ;' 'Moses----said-----a prophet shall God raise up unto you, like unto me;' 'Moses writeth that ^{that} the man doeth shall live.' 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 Mr. 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 grief 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."

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, January 4, 1889.

"If I have done you injustice, I am very sorry and will make ample reparation. But the notes I now send to me do 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 foretelling this, spoke of the resurrection of the Christ'; 'Moses---said---a prophet shall God raise up unto you, like unto me'; 'Moses wrote that the man doeth shall live.' My system of false prophecies 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 with reluctance take the position which the promise. I have held as one that I cannot give, except incidentally and Mr. 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 in the Baptist denomination and to the Christian world. It would be a great trial to me, if you should follow Dr. Fay, for I should then stand you no longer capable of doing of any use to Baptists, or to any who hold that Christ's words are final authority."

✓
January 5, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Northrup:-

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st inst., for which
please accept many thanks."

✓
January 5, 1882.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Northrup:-

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st inst., for which

please accept many thanks."

✓
January 5, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Goodspeed:-

Acknowledges his letter of the 2nd, "for which please
accept many thanks."

January 2, 1882.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Goodspeed:-

Acknowledges his letter of the 2nd, "for which please

accept many thanks."

January 5, 1889.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:-

"You have doubtless seen Dr. Wood's article in the Examiner of this week. The emphasis which he lays upon Washington is evidently intended to take the wind partly out of the sails of the university scheme for New York City. I have read your communication in the Standard with your comments on Dr. Robinson's note. I don't think the thing could have been better stated.

I have heard nothing further from Harper. We must keep his spirits up and let him know that he is not under the ban for anything he has said; for I am sure that Mr. Rockefeller's action will depend more upon Harper's influence over him than upon any other, or perhaps all other, influence that may reach him....."

January 2, 1882.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Bates:-

".....You have doubtless seen Dr. Wood's article in the Examiner of this week. The emphasis which he lays upon Washington is evidently intended to take the wind partly out of the sails of the university scheme for New York City. I have read your communication in the Standard with your comments on Dr. Robinson's note. I don't think the thing could have been better stated. I have heard nothing further from Harper. We must keep his spirits up and let him know that he is not under the ban for anything he has said; for I am sure that Mr. Rockefeller's action will depend more upon Harper's influence over him than upon any other, or perhaps all other, influence that may reach him....."

✓

January 5, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Yours of the 31st was received. I telegraphed you Thursday night and think my telegram must have been understood. I do not believe that the time has come to relinquish our demands. I am sure that it will be as easy to get a large thing as a small thing. When Mr. Rockefeller has refused to do the large thing then we are in a position to ask the small and it is not necessary to do it until then. I believe myself that you ought to write him and, as I telegraphed, that Dr. Northrup and Mr. Gates ought to visit him."

"N.B. I have just sent letters to Drs. Northrup and Smith in which you may be interested; one of them containing my reply to Dr. Strong. As long as correspondence was carried on with one of you it was an easier matter than it now is with three.

"N.B.B. 'Paul Vincent Harper' was born this morning at 12:30. All very well. This event is almost lost sight of in the excitement etc. of other affairs."

January 5, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Yours of the 31st was received. I telegraphed you Thursday night and think my telegram must have been understood. I do not believe that the time has come to relinquish our demands. I am sure that it will be as easy to get a large thing as a small thing. When Mr. Rockefeller has refused to do the large thing then we are in a position to ask the small and it is not necessary to do it until then. I believe myself that you ought to write him and, as I telegraphed, that Dr. Northrup and Mr. Gates ought to visit him."

"M.B. I have just sent letters to Drs. Northrup and Smith in which you may be interested; one of them containing my reply to Dr. Strong. As long as correspondence was carried on with one of you it was an easier matter than it now is with three."

"M.B.B. 'Paul Vincent Harper' was born this morning at 12:30. All very well. This event is almost lost sight of in the excitement etc. of other affairs."

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to his sons, January 5, 1889.

.....

"No further University news except that Mr. Gates will tomorrow go east to do what he can to counteract the influence at work in New York. I shall no doubt have a letter from Harper tomorrow. I had a telegram Friday urging that Gates and Dr. N. come east and that we should not moderate our demands. Dr. N. will not go however unless Mr. R. himself desires it."

.....

Dr. Goodspeed to his sons, January 8, 1882.

.....
"We further University news except that Mr. Gates will

tomorrow go east to do what he can to counteract the

influence at work in New York. I shall no doubt have a

letter from Harper tomorrow. I had a telegram Friday urging

that Gates and Dr. H. come east and that we should not

moderate our demands. Dr. H. will not go however unless

Mr. H. himself desires it."

.....

January 6, 1889.

Mr. Gates to Dr. Morehouse:-

".....Our situation is certainly very embarrassing. Mr. Rockefeller ought to know the whole truth about it. However, the main purpose in Mr. Rockefeller's invitation to Dr. Goodspeed to come to New York some time ago seems to have been to learn certainly whether the Morgan Park movement was likely to succeed. Dr. Goodspeed told him he thought not. In Dr. Goodspeed's judgment in such a matter Mr. Rockefeller would place entire confidence. I doubt if we could make much impression on Mr. Rockefeller by pressing that point. To our plea of embarrassment Mr. Rockefeller might with entire truth and justice reply that he had not authorized any communication to the Education Society and could not accept the responsibility of the situation. The Morgan Park proposition is now dead. The time has lapsed and the Land Company have made such changes in their business as to make a renewal doubtful. Besides the Education Society would hesitate to accept the trust even if it were offered. But more decisive than all I think no proposition to found a University of Chicago will now be considered practically by the people there so long as there is the least hope that Mr. Rockefeller will do at any time what he has been contemplating. And hope will live as long as Mr. Rockefeller lives.

I am inclined to think you are right in thinking that Mr. Rockefeller is waiting for a man. That I think, however, is not the sole reason of his delay. Another is I think the doubt whether to found a college or a university. He is being strongly dissuaded from the latter by men of influence. I do not think any amount of pressure that could be brought on him in the lines you suggest would move him until both these difficulties are solved.

I have in mind a possible solution.

I would suggest that Mr. Rockefeller proceed now on the basis of a very high grade college with not less than two or three millions of money. But if that is too much then let him give for such a purpose what he will. Let the question of associated schools be held for the present in abeyance. I would compromise on this basis for these reasons among others. The Strong party are willing to see this done and will not object to a very large sum. Even Boyd you know says he believes in a college.

The college with an Academy near by will meet our most immediate and pressing needs. Even with a university ultimately in view the different schools could probably be founded and developed at intervals and as opportunity offered better than all together at the start. In practice I think it quite likely that even if Mr. Rockefeller were now to do all he proposes the associated schools would be developed somewhat slowly and in after years. If we give Mr. Rockefeller time on the question of associated schools we can appeal to him later as occasion arises with much more definiteness and with the certitude arising from a more careful study of the situation than is now possible. We may hope too that a large gift already made and a prosperous college will add to his interest. My own opinion all along has been that if I myself were to decide the question I would hold the question of a university in abeyance. I will say to you what I have not ventured to say to anyone else and what

January 6, 1889.

Mr. Gates to Dr. Morehouse:-

".....Our situation is certainly very embarrassing. Mr. Rockefeller ought to know the whole truth about it. However, the main purpose in Mr. Rockefeller's invitation to Dr. Goodspeed to come to New York some time ago seems to have been to learn certainly whether the Morgan Park movement was likely to succeed. Dr. Goodspeed told him he thought not. In Dr. Goodspeed's judgment in such a matter Mr. Rockefeller would place entire confidence. I doubt if we could make much impression on Mr. Rockefeller by pressing that point. To our plan of embarrassment Mr. Rockefeller might with entire truth and justice reply that he had not authorized any communication to the Education Society and could not accept the responsibility of the situation. The Morgan Park proposition is now dead. The time has passed and the land Company have made such changes in their business as to make a renewal doubtful. Besides the Education Society would hesitate to accept the trust even if it were offered. But more decisive than all I think no proposition to found a University of Chicago will now be considered practically by the people there so long as there is the least hope that Mr. Rockefeller will do at any time what he has been contemplating. And hope will live as long as Mr. Rockefeller lives.

I am inclined to think you are right in thinking that Mr. Rockefeller is waiting for a man. That I think, however, is not the sole reason of his delay. Another is I think the doubt whether to found a college or a university. He is being strongly dissuaded from the latter by men of influence. I do not think any amount of pressure that could be brought on him in the lines you suggest would move him until both these difficulties are solved.

I have in mind a possible solution. I would suggest that Mr. Rockefeller proceed now on the basis of a very high grade college with not less than two or three millions of money. But if that is too much then let him give for such a purpose what he will. Let the question of associated schools be held for the present in abeyance. I would compromise on this basis for these reasons among others. The Strong party are willing to see this done and will not object to a very large sum. Even Boyd you know says he believes in a college.

The college with an academy near by will meet our most immediate and pressing needs. Even with a university ultimately in view the different schools could probably be founded and developed at intervals and as opportunity offered better than all together at the start. In practice I think it quite likely that even if Mr. Rockefeller were now to do all he proposes the associated schools would be developed somewhat slowly and in after years. If we give Mr. Rockefeller time on the question of associated schools we can appeal to him later on occasion arising with much more definiteness and with the certainties arising from a more careful study of the situation than is now possible. We may hope too that a large gift already made and a prosperous college will add to his interest. My own opinion all along has been that if I myself were to decide the question I would hold the question of a university in abeyance. I will say to you what I have not ventured to say to anyone else and what

January 6, 1889.

I wish you to hold strictly private and that is that I think that it is a serious question if Mr. Rockefeller could not devote a million or two more wisely to helping struggling colleges and endowing academies through the Education Society for the next ten years than by putting it into professional schools in the city of Chicago. I am not averse to giving the humbler education the benefit of the doubt.

As to the second difficulty, the one of President, I would suggest that Dr. Goodspeed be made Chancellor, an office to be created when the new body is incorporated but subject to lapse of course. As such Dr. Goodspeed might have charge of the correspondence organization and equipment of the college including the selection of site the raising of supplemental funds the selection of teachers and the general oversight of the institution. He would not be required to do any teaching. The President nominally should remain vacant. The vacancy might be left for Prof. Harper as soon as he could finish the work he has contracted to do. If he will give no encouragement that he will ever take it then it might remain vacant until the right man can be found. But I am inclined to think that to save us Prof. Harper would give the required encouragement.

As to Dr. Goodspeed's fitness for such a position I have personally no doubt. I think Mr. Rockefeller has great confidence in him and for much of the work to be done in the first five or ten years I think him superior to Prof. Harper. You are so well acquainted with his ability experience and fitness that I need not enlarge. I think Dr. Goodspeed might be secured by giving a fractional amount of the sum proposed, to the Seminary to tide over present embarrassment, securing compensation by making some conditional offers in the college matter to be met. The Seminary ought in any case to be got out of the way of the college.

I am to have a conference by appointment tomorrow with Drs. Goodspeed and Northrup with reference to going east. Prof. Harper has telegraphed to have me come and both the above named brethren urge my going. I shall present the plan in outline to them which I here have proposed to you. Some time ago I presented the question of compromise on the matter of scope to Dr. Northrup and he accepted the suggestion as probably involving no loss and affording a hope of much gain. The question of a chancellorship for Dr. Goodspeed I have not named but shall do so tomorrow.

I will let you know the result of our conference at once."

I wish you to hold strictly private and that is that I think that it is a serious question if Mr. Rockefeller could not devote a million or two more wisely to helping struggling colleges and endowing academies through the Education Society for the next ten years than by putting it into professional schools in the city of Chicago. I am not averse to giving the number education the benefit of the doubt.

As to the second difficulty, the one of President, I would suggest that Dr. Goodspeed be made Chancellor, an office to be created when the new body is incorporated but subject to lapses of course. As such Dr. Goodspeed might have charge of the correspondence organization and equipment of the college including the selection of site the raising of supplemental funds the selection of teachers and the general oversight of the institution. He would not be required to do any teaching. The President nominally should remain vacant. The vacancy might be left for Prof. Harper as soon as he could finish the work he has contracted to do. If he will give no encouragement that he will ever take it then it might remain vacant until the right man can be found. But I am inclined to think that to save us Prof. Harper would give the required encouragement.

As to Dr. Goodspeed's fitness for such a position I have personally no doubt. I think Mr. Rockefeller has great confidence in him and for much of the work to be done in the first five or ten years I think him superior to Prof. Harper. You are so well acquainted with his ability experience and fitness that I need not enlarge. I think Dr. Goodspeed might be secured by giving a fractional amount of the sum proposed, to the Seminary to tide over present embarrassment, securing compensation by making some conditional offer in the college matter to be met. The Seminary ought in any case to be got out of the way of the college.

I am to have a conference by appointment tomorrow with Drs. Goodspeed and Northrup with reference to going east. Prof. Harper has telegraphed to have me come and both the above named brethren urge my going. I shall present the plan in outline to them which I have here proposed to you. Some time ago I presented the question of compromise on the matter of maps to Dr. Northrup and he accepted the suggestion as probably involving no loss and affording a hope of much gain. The question of a chancellorship for Dr. Goodspeed I have not named but shall do so tomorrow.

I will let you know the result of our conference at once."

January 7, 1889.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Harper:-

Invitation to *d*ine at six o'clock on Thursday evening.

January 7, 1882.

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Harper:-

Invitation to dine at six o'clock on Thursday evening.

January 7, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Yours of January 4th is at hand. I did not know that Mr. Rockefeller had expressed disinclination in reference to seeing Mr. Gates. I have just received word from Chicago that some letters have been written on the subject and imagine that something will be done one way or the other soon. Your plan to have Gates write a letter to Goodspeed is the next best thing to having him come on. It seems to me that somebody ought to be on the ground pushing things. The Morgan Park matter is settled. The offer has been practically withdrawn; indeed, it could not be continued longer than January 1st, and, further, if it had been continued it could not have been accepted, and so there is only one thing to be done and that is to get hold of Mr. R. I have had correspondence with Dr. Strong and think the matters will be fixed up smoothly."

January 7, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Yours of January 4th is at hand. I did not know that Mr.

Rockefeller had expressed dissatisfaction in reference to seeing Mr. Gates. I have just received word from Chicago that some letters have been written on the subject and imagine that something will be done one way or the other soon. Your plan to have Gates write a letter to Goodspeed is the next best thing to having him come on. It seems to me that somebody ought to be on the ground pushing things. The Morgan Park matter is settled. The offer has been practically withdrawn; indeed, it could not be continued longer than January 1st, and, further, if it had been continued it could not have been accepted, and so there is only one thing to be done and that is to get hold of Mr. R. I have had correspondence with Dr. Strong and think the matters will be fixed up smoothly."

January 7, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:-

"Your favor of January 5th is at hand. Things have been moving on quite rapidly the last two weeks. I have no doubt that you will get a detailed statement from Dr. Goodspeed who has just written me that you are to meet him. I cannot add anything to this. I inclose a copy of my reply to Strong which, it seems to me, was sufficiently conciliatory. I am afraid that my connection with the Chicago matter will be settled absolutely within a very short time. A proposition has just been made me at the University which, if accepted, will put forever out of my power such a plan. I am being pressed to settle it within a few days. I wish that before that time I could see you; if you come East you must be sure to come to New Haven, or I will try to meet you in New York. For the kind words which your letter contains I am very much obliged."

January 7, 1939.

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gifford:-

"Your favor of January 5th is at hand. Things have been moving on quite rapidly the last two weeks. I have no doubt that you will get a detailed statement from Dr. Goodspeed who has just written me that you are to meet him. I cannot add anything to this. I inclose a copy of my reply to Strong which, it seems to me, was sufficiently conciliatory. I am afraid that my connection with the Chicago matter will be settled absolutely within a very short time. A proposition has just been made me at the University which, if accepted, will put forever out of my power such a plan. I am being pressed to settle it within a few days. I wish that before that time I could see you; if you come East you must be sure to come to New Haven, or I will try to meet you in New York. For the kind words which your letter contains I am very much obliged."

✓

January 7, 1889.

Dr. Morehouse to Dr. Harper:-

"I have a reassuring word for you. Dr. Wood has just come over from the Pastors' Conference where he met a gentleman whose name he is not prepared to give but whose name I think I mentioned to you in a recent letter as one whom I thought adverse to the University scheme at Chicago. This gentleman lunched with Mr. R. a week ago to-day. He was then asked his opinion about the establishment of a university at Chicago. He gave his opinion that it was a most important thing to be done. The matter was discussed in its various aspects. Mr. R. told him that he had substantially decided to assist the enterprise although possibly he might not do so much as some hoped he would do at the outset; but would put several hundred thousand dollars, or perhaps a million, into it to start with. It was stated by this gentleman that Mr. R. intimated that undue pressure had been brought to bear upon him by certain parties in New York and that there might be a little delay in putting everything into definite shape. I don't know whether this gentleman made exact representation of the case in this respect for I do not know of anybody in New York who has been urging him to a speedy decision of the matter. You are not included in this criticism, if it has any foundation, indeed. It is understood that your relations with Mr. R. are of the pleasantest kind.

I thought it would be somewhat comforting and reassuring to hear these words, both because of the additional confirmation it gives us of Mr. R. intentions and because it dispels, in part, the suspicion that certain parties are trying to defeat the Chicago scheme."

January 7, 1899.

Dr. Morehouse to Dr. Harper:-

"I have a reassuring word for you. Dr. Wood has just come over from the Pastors' Conference where he met a gentleman whose name he is not prepared to give but whose name I think I mentioned to you in a recent letter as one whom I thought adverse to the University scheme at Chicago. This gentleman lunched with Mr. R. a week ago today. He was then asked his opinion about the establishment of a university at Chicago. He gave his opinion that it was a most important thing to be done. The matter was discussed in its various aspects. Mr. R. told him that he had substantially decided to assist the enterprise although possibly he might not do so much as some hoped he would do at the outset; but would put several hundred thousand dollars, or perhaps a million, into it to start with. It was stated by this gentleman that Mr. R. intimated that undue pressure had been brought to bear upon him by certain parties in New York and that there might be a little delay in putting everything into definite shape. I don't know whether this gentleman made exact representation of the case in this respect for I do not know of anybody in New York who has been writing him to a speedy decision of the matter. You are not included in this criticism if it has any foundation, indeed. It is understood that your relations with Mr. R. are of the pleasantest kind. I thought it would be somewhat comforting and reassuring to hear these words, both because of the additional confirmation it gives us of Mr. R. intentions and because it dispels, in part, the suspicion that certain parties are trying to defeat the Chicago scheme."

✓

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, January 8, 1889.

"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 with regard to your Vassar lectures are due to brevity or mistake in my daughter's notes. Your explanation of the sentence 'Prophecies 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 record.

And yet you will know that some of the greatest errorists have stoutly maintained their belief in inspiration - Newman, Morell and Parker declare that the scriptures are inspired. On inquiry we find however that this inspiration is nothing extraordinary, but only a higher degree of that which belongs to all men. Homer is inspired, but Jesus somewhat more so. It becomes necessary always to ask, therefore, whether the inspiration meant guarantees the truth of the Scripture record, or whether it leaves room for error. I wish that on this point you could have been more explicit, and I am the more desirous of knowing your mind on this point, because in my daughter's notes I find such phrases as 'a historical basis'; 'idealized history'; 'the writer revised and colored'; 'the form is of a later time.' These phrases seem to intimate that the inspiration you believe in does not after all secure the absolute truthfulness of the Old Testament documents.

I should not lay so much stress even on this if I did not find you, in your answer to my second point, practically acknowledging that you hold 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 authority 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. I do not believe"

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, January 8, 1888.

"I have carefully read your letter which I received last Saturday evening. It gives me great pleasure to find that some of my ill-considered remarks to your paper, inserted are due to poverty of phraseology in my language, and not to any intention of the sentence 'Prophecy' which you have given 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 frankly 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 regarding the sacred records.

And yet you will find that some of the greatest errors have actually maintained itself in inspiration--Homer, Hesiod and Pindar--that the scriptures are inspired. On inquiry we find however that this inspiration is nothing extraordinary, but only a higher degree of that which belongs to all men. Homer is inspired, but Jesus is more so. It becomes necessary always to ask, therefore, whether the inspiration meant guarantees the truth of the scriptures record or whether it leaves room for error. I wish that on this point you could have been more explicit, and I am the more desirous of knowing your mind on this point, because in my daughter's notes I find such phrases as 'a historical basis'; 'idealized history'; 'the writer revised and colored'; 'the form is of a later time'. These phrases seem to indicate that the inspiration you believe in does not after all secure the absolute truthfulness of the Old Testament documents.

I should not say so much as you have said on this if I did not find you, in your answer to my second point, practically acknowledging that you hold what is really objected to in your views, namely that the inspiration was not for guidance and correction by those but was of a predictive and with infallible character, and that our Lord's reference to it as 'written' and 'fulfilled' like his recognition of the fact that it is a written record is a self-evident fact. This seems to me a serious error--a fatal error, in your opinion, of it of serious consequence--the displacement of the inspiration and the reference to the authority as a later time has not been advanced in the case of the most noted prophetic writers by merely literary considerations. Like the theory of inspiration as being a matter of a document, both James and William are really opposed by a desire to get rid of the supernatural, which is the only way to get rid of the supernatural. It may be said that the authority as a written record is not given, they all give time for the growth of myth and legend, the 'idealization' of the facts, the 'coloring' of the facts, 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 reputation 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 acknowledgment that the Pentateuch as we have it is not from the hand of Moses.' Now this means if it means anything pertinent 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 abstaining 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 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 110th 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 these 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 above 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,"

"That the composite authorship of the Pentateuch (except
the narrow limits of eight inspired additions and
recension) is a conclusion of science. I do not want to have
it taught for science, for I think it as deeply and irrationally
a conclusion as the New Testament theory of Paul. I think a
sufficient reputation of it can be drawn from the
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 testify erroneous opinions in reference to
literary and historical questions. - Your 'Letter to the
Shakers in the West' by the acknowledged author of the
as we have it is not from the hand of Moses. Now this means
if it means anything pertinent to the discussion, that when
Jesus said Moses wrote of him and David in the Bible 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
apostasy from 'testifying erroneous opinions' held by
others, but there is an explicit teaching of what upon your
view is untrue. This seems to me inconsistent with any
belief in Christ as the first of God. He who inspired David
and Moses surely would not mistake the person whom he
inspired. I must apply here the declaration 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 time in respect to the authorship of the
Pentateuch and the 'Letter to the Shakers', why could he not also have
accommodated himself to the erroneous opinions of his time
when he recognized the existence of evil spirits? Where are
we to draw the line? What assurance of Jesus can be relied
on if these cannot be? You acknowledge that it was an error
to print Dr. Jay's article, in which he declared that he
had been mistaken in his interpretation of the old Testament.
But if Jesus was wrong about David and Moses, why should you
object to Dr. Jay's doctrine that Jesus was wrong about the
meaning of the word 'Lord'? Surely this doctrine is not
above his Lord. If Jesus could have been mistaken, could
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 authorship of Christ,
shows much light upon your doctrine of inspiration and
shows that you mean by that something quite different from
a special influence of the Holy Spirit upon particular men
truthfulness of the Holy Scriptures. I must regard your
view as inconsistent with a proper faith in Christ, and
further to substantiate faith in the 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 rejoiced 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 on the way to extreme unbelief. The same rule which idealized 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 David led 'Robert Elsmere' 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 view 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 my own 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 ascertained 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 notes that led me to believe that you had at last accepted the conclusions of the destructive criticism and had begun publicly to avow them. Your letter, although it reassured me with regard to your intent to hold to Christ, 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 unsalutary over the unprepared minds to whom you lecture at Vassar. 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 body, 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 Zeitgeist, while we turn our backs upon the consensus of all the ages.'

"nor do I mean that you consciously disbelieve in inspiration. I am rejoiced to read your avowal 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 on the way to extreme unbelief. The same rule which idealized the Moslem history will idealize the gospel. And disbelieve in Christ's truth with regard to David and Moses will lead men to give up Christ's truth. And as disbelieve in Christ's testimony about David and Moses, 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 view 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 my own 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. As long as a teacher does his teaching and investigation in private and teaches only what he has 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 notes that led me to believe that you had at least suggested the conclusions of the destructive criticism and had begun publicly to teach them. Your letter, although it respected me with regard to your intent to hold to Christ, inspiration, and the supernatural, still leaves me convinced that you are on the wrong track, and that your strong view must more or less color all your teaching about the Old Testament, Jesus Christ, and the change that will come when error, and render your influence destructive over the unprepared minds to whom you lecture at Wrentham. I wish you could even now reconsider the whole subject, change your views, become a believer in 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 people today, 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 simple truth of the Scriptures. But we are not 'now as we were in the past.' While we turn our backs upon the commandment in all the ages."

January 8, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Your favor received this morning. It is certainly encouraging for the university cause. I am glad to know that Mr. R. is coming to the conclusion. I am sure we shall all be glad at this outcome of the matter. I am obliged to you for thinking of me."

January 8, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:-

"Your favor received this morning. It is certainly encouraging for the university cause. I am glad to know that Mr. R. is coming to the conclusion. I am sure we shall all be glad at this outcome of the matter. I am obliged to you for thinking of me."

✓
January 8, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I inclose a letter just received. You will interpret its meaning. I think we will all be glad that the thing is progressing so favorably. I have not heard anything since Dr. Northrup's letters reached him."

January 8, 1989

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I inclose a letter just received. You will interpret its meaning. I think we will all be glad that the thing is progressing so favorably. I have not heard anything since Dr. Northrup's letters reached him."

✓

January 8, 1889.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I do not know that it is worth my while to write you this letter. I had thought until this evening that I would not do so. In view of everything in the past, however, it seems on the whole advisable for me to state to you the facts as they stand today. You will remember when you were in New Haven I told you that Dr. Day had come to me and made a proposition in reference to the future. This has been talked of more at length. In some way or other down at Providence or New York City Dr. Fisher got hold of the scheme of the New York City university and of my connection with it,- (mark you, not the Chicago university); he came to me about it and wanted to know the facts in the case. I told him that the New York City university was about given up but that there was talk of a Chicago university and that I had been talked of for President, but that I had not seen my way clear to give any assent to the matter. He at once wanted to know what was needed to make me satisfied at New Haven. I told him that I had no demands to make. The next day the President came to me and has been to me three or four times. As a result of the whole matter the thing stands today in the following shape:

(1) They propose that no professor shall be elected to take Dr. Day's place when he gives up his work, which will be within one or two years; (2) that I shall go into the Theological Seminary (remaining a Baptist) and do the eight hours' instruction in connection with my university work, arranging the classes so as to work both departments together to the best possible advantage; (3) that I shall be appointed by the corporation a full professor in the Theological Department as well as in the Philosophical Department, and thus be on the managing board of the Theological department; (4) that they will pay me for my theological work one-half of professor's salary in addition to my present income as professor in the Philosophical Faculty, viz., sixteen hundred dollars a year; furthermore that they will pay this in advance for five years, viz., eight thousand dollars,- this sum to be used by me in covering the debt of the Publication Society of Hebrew, which I have decided to do myself; (5) they propose a Semitic Department room in the new recitation building with complete furnishings in the way of a special library, maps, photographs, casts, etc.; (6) they will give me as much absence in Europe from time to time as I desire, with full salary and (7) they will furnish a satisfactory assistant to aid me in my work.

I have been surprised at some points of the offer, especially at No. 4. I could hardly believe it but was asked to call upon the treasurer and did so this afternoon; I found that nine thousand dollars instead of eight thousand stood to my order. Of course, the acceptance of this proposition absolutely and forever binds me. In my letters to Dr. Northrup I have indicated to him reasons why I thought I was not the man for the presidency at Chicago, and yet before taking this step which will be irrevocable I have hesitated somewhat.

There is, probably, no reason why I should write you this, as I said above, but I have felt that in view of all the facts I ought not to take this permanent step without, at all events, indicating the

January 8, 1893.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"I do not know that it is worth my while to write you this letter. I had thought until this evening that I would not do so. In view of everything in the past, however, it seems on the whole advisable for me to state to you the facts as they stand today. You will remember when you were in New Haven I told you that Dr. Day had come to me and made a proposition in reference to the future. This has been talked of more at length. In some way or other down at Providence or New York City Dr. Fisher got hold of the scheme of the New York City University and of my connection with it. (Mark you, not the Chicago University); he came to me about it and wanted to know the facts in the case. I told him that the New York City University was about given up but that there was talk of a Chicago University and that I had been talked of for President, but that I had not seen my way clear to give any answer to the matter. He at once wanted to know what was needed to make me satisfied at New Haven. I told him that I had no demands to make. The next day the President came to me and has been to me three or four times. As a result of the whole matter the thing stands today in the following shape:

(1) They propose that no professor shall be elected to take Dr. Day's place when he gives up his work, which will be within one or two years; (2) that I shall go into the Theological Seminary (retaining a Baptist) and do the eight hours' instruction in connection with my university work, arranging the classes so as to work both departments together to the best possible advantage; (3) that I shall be appointed by the corporation a full professor in the Theological Department as well as in the Philosophical Department, and then be on the managing board of the Theological Department; (4) that they will pay me for my theological work one-half of professor's salary in addition to my present income as professor in the Philosophical Faculty, viz., sixteen hundred dollars a year; furthermore that they will pay this in advance for five years, viz., eight thousand dollars, - this sum to be used by me in covering the debt of the Publication Society of Haverhill, which I have decided to do myself; (5) they propose a Genetic Department room in the new recitation building with complete furnishings in the way of a special library, maps, photographs, casts, etc.; (6) they will give me as much absence in Europe from time to time as I desire, with full salary and (7) they will furnish a satisfactory assistant to aid me in my work.

I have been surprised at some points of the offer, especially at No. 4. I could hardly believe it but was asked to call upon the treasurer and did so this afternoon; I found that nine thousand dollars instead of eight thousand stood to my order. Of course, the acceptance of this proposition absolutely and forever binds me. In my letter to Dr. Northrup I have indicated to him reasons why I thought this was not the man for the presidency at Chicago, and yet before taking this step which will be irrevocable I have hesitated somewhat. There is, probably, no reason why I should write you this, as I said above, but I have felt that in view of all the facts I ought not to take this permanent step without, at all events, indicating the

January 8, 1889.

fact beforehand to you, Dr. Smith and Dr. Northrup who have stood by me and have had so much interest in the Chicago University; and all this especially in view of the letter of Dr. Morehouse which I have forwarded you today. I think I will not ultimately decide the matter before next Monday. Some financial matters are very pressing and make it desirable to do so at an early date. Perhaps something will occur between now and then to indicate more clearly to me what is duty."

January 8, 1889.

-2-

I am referring to you, Dr. Smith and Dr. Northrup who have stood by me
and have had so much interest in the Chicago University; and all this
especially in view of the letter of Dr. Northrup which I have for-
warded you today. I think I will not ultimately decide the matter
before next Monday. Some financial matters are very pressing and make
it desirable to do so at an early date. Perhaps something will occur
between now and then to indicate more clearly to me what is duty."

✓

Dr. J. A. Smith to Dr. Harper, January 8, 1889

"I see that I must have expressed myself in a very blundering way. What I meant to convey to you was an assurance that those who have known you so long, and those who have come to know you through your work are not going to join any crusade against you, nor are you likely to be put in a position where such an alternative as I hinted at will even be before you. Such a feeling as 'distrust' concerning you, in any way whatever, was never in my heart.

Your letter to Dr. Strong ought to satisfy him. I do not need to say, however, how hard it is to convince a man against his will. Dr. Northrup, when I read it to him, pronounced it a 'good letter', and noted only one or two points where criticism would be even possible. Dr. Goodspeed has not yet seen it. Your request to 'burn' will be complied with. The tone of it is excellent, while the assurances near the close ought to be sufficient for any one. Mr. Gates leaves today for New York. I do not see how it is possible for us to fail altogether. With such a verdict of the denomination, and such a manifest call to occupy a field that really seems to be kept open for us, it will be extraordinary if nothing comes of it all. In that case I, for one, am done. I do not believe that I shall feel any more interest in educational affairs, whether here or elsewhere, but in the short remainder of my life try to be rid of that worry, at any rate."

.....

Dr. J. A. Smith to Dr. Harper, January 2, 1882

"I see that I must have expressed myself in a very

plundering way. What I meant to convey to you was an assurance that those who have known you so long, and those who have come to know you through your work are not going to join any crusade against you, nor are you likely to be put in a position where such an alternative as I hinted at will even be before you. Such a feeling as 'disgrace' concerning you, in any way whatever, was never in my heart. Your letter to Dr. Strong ought to satisfy him. I do

not need to say, however, how hard it is to convince a man against his will. Dr. Northrup, when I read it to him, pronounced it a 'good letter', and noted only one or two points where criticism would be even possible. Dr. Goodspeed has not yet seen it. Your request to 'burn'

will be complied with. The fact of it is excellent, while the assurance near the close ought to be sufficient for any one. Mr. Gates leaves today for New York. I do not see how it is possible for us to fail altogether. With such a verdict of the denomination, and such a manifest call to occupy a field that really seems to be kept open for us, it will be extraordinary if nothing comes of it all. In that case I, for one, am done. I do not believe that I shall feel any more interest in educational efforts, whether here or elsewhere, but in the short remainder of my life try to be rid of that worry, at any rate."

.....

January 9, 1889.

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Rockefeller:-

".....Your second line of the above date leads me to believe that our letter referring to Dr. Harper was not unwelcome. I wish to add a single word in regard to the proposed institution here at Chicago. Every question relating to it, its scope, its location, its President, its Board, its name, its possible relation, if it has any, to the Seminary, we desire to be understood as submitting absolutely to you. When we know what you are prepared to propose you will find the brethren here of one mind in their readiness to accept your proposals and do their part.

Mr. Gates, the Secy. of the New Ed. Soc'y is now in New York. I commend him to you & hope you will meet him, as I am confident you will like him and find him a man to be trusted."

January 9, 1882.

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Rockefeller:-

".....Your second line of the above date leads me to believe

that our letter referring to Dr. Harper was not unwelcome. I wish to

add a single word in regard to the proposed institution here at Chicago-

Every question relating to it, its scope, its location, its

President, its Board, its name, its possible relation, if it has any, to

the Seminary, we desire to be understood as submitting absolutely to you.

When we know what you are prepared to propose you will find the brethren

here of one mind in their readiness to accept your proposals and do

their part.

Mr. Gates, the Secy. of the New Ed. Soc'y is now in New

York. I commend him to you & hope you will meet him, as I am confi-

dent you will like him and find him a man to be trusted."

January 9, 1889.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:-

"Yours of the 6th is at hand. Although I reply immediately I shall not be surprised if before my letter reaches Racine you will have put in your appearance at New York. Indeed I am not sure but that it will be best for you to come to New York and through Harper's influence get an interview with Mr. Rockefeller. If you can have such an interview together it will be all the better.

The course I suggested was the best that presented itself to me at the time and was simply suggestive. I know that you have made a study of the situation and of the tendency of things more closely than I and I have no doubt you are correct in your views as expressed in your letter. Your suggestion that Dr. Goodspeed be made chancellor of the institution to look after its financial affairs and its general equipment and correspondence I think would be very favorably considered by Mr. Rockefeller.

Dr. Wood on Monday came back from the Ministers' Conference to tell me that he had just had an interview with a gentleman who lunched with Mr. Rockefeller a week ago and who stated that Mr. Rockefeller talked freely with him about the plans for the institution at Chicago, giving him to understand that his mind was substantially made up to assist largely in that enterprise. This gentleman, on being asked his opinion as to the desirability of the measure, gave his warm approval, at least so he told Dr. Wood. You will be the more surprised at this when I tell you that this man is the one whom we have supposed to be Dr. Strong's influential assistant in opposing the scheme. He would not consent that Dr. Wood should give me his name, but Dr. Wood by circumlocution gave me to understand who the man is. You will also understand that he lives not far from Newark, N.J. All this is reassuring. So I am inclined to think that after all opposition is ceasing and it is only a question of time when Mr. Rockefeller will put his proposition in shape. Harper writes me that the matter between Dr. Strong and himself will be satisfactorily adjusted. I should hope so."

January 9, 1888.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:-

"Yours of the 6th is at hand. I shall not be surprised if before my letter reaches Racine you will have put in your appearance at New York. Indeed I am not sure but that it will be best for you to come to New York and through Harper's influence get an interview with Mr. Rockefeller. If you can have such an interview together it will be all the better.

The course I suggested was the best that presented itself to me at the time and was simply suggestive. I know that you have made a study of the situation and of the tendency of things more closely than I and I have no doubt you are correct in your views as expressed in your letter. Your suggestion that Dr. Goodspeed be made chancellor of the institution to look after its financial affairs and its general equipment and correspondence I think would be very favorably considered by Mr. Rockefeller.

Dr. Wood on Monday came back from the Ministers' Conference to tell me that he had just had an interview with a gentleman who lunched with Mr. Rockefeller a week ago and who stated that Mr. Rockefeller talked freely with him about the plans for the institution at Chicago, giving him to understand that his mind was substantially made up to assist largely in that enterprise. This gentleman, on being asked his opinion as to the desirability of the measure, gave his warm approval, at least so he told Dr. Wood. You will be more surprised at this when I tell you that this man is the one whom we have supposed to be Dr. Strong's influential assistant in opposing the scheme. He would not consent that Dr. Wood should give me his name, but Dr. Wood by circumlocution gave me to understand who the man is. You will also understand that he lives not far from Newark, N. J. All this is reassuring. So I am inclined to think that after all opposition is ceasing and it is only a question of time when Mr. Rockefeller will put his proposition in shape. Harper writes me that the matter between Dr. Strong and himself will be satisfactorily adjusted. I should hope so."

✓
Jan. 10, 1889

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"My friend, Mr. Gates of the Education Society is now visiting me here at my invitation. He has some suggestions on the matter of the "Chicago University", which, as I have heard them, seem to me to remove several practical difficulties, and to throw light on some questions.

"I shall be in New York on Saturday, (12th inst) at 4 P.M., and can be there on Sunday after 1 P.M. If your engagements permit I should like very much to introduce to you Mr. Gates. If these hours are not convenient, I should be pleased to come at any time which would suit you.

"It is due Mr. Gates to say that he appreciates the pressure upon your time and that this suggestion of an interview is my own. I make it in the belief that he may prove serviceable to you in this and other educational inquiries that you are making.

"I desire also very much to show you that I am not, as perhaps Dr. Strong would have you believe, 'wandering from the faith'."

Jan. 10, 1889

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"My friend, Mr. Gates of the Education Society is now visiting me here at my invitation. He has some suggestions on the matter of the 'Chicago University', which, as I have heard them, seem to me to remove several practical difficulties, and to throw light on some questions.

"I shall be in New York on Saturday, (12th inst) at 4 P.M., and can be there on Sunday after 1 P.M. If your engagements permit I should like very much to introduce to you Mr. Gates. If these hours are not convenient, I should be pleased to come at any time which would suit you.

"It is due Mr. Gates to say that he appreciates the pressure upon your time and that this suggestion of an interview is my own. I make it in the belief that he may prove serviceable to you in this and other educational inquiries that you are making.

"I desire also very much to show you that I am not, as perhaps Dr. Strong would have you believe, 'wantering from the faith'."

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, January 10, 1889.

"Your line enclosing Dr. Morehouse's letter is at hand and gives us the liveliest satisfaction. It seems to me to indicate that the main question is decided favorably and that the matter now in doubt is how much Mr. R. shall give. I shall now rest in the confidence that we are to have an Institution. I wish it might be a great one, but beggars must not be choosers.

Gates, as of course you know, went East Tuesday. I had occasion to acknowledge to Mr. R. the receipt of some money day before yesterday and commended Gates to him and told him I hoped he would meet him, as I felt sure he would be pleased with him.

Your letter^s to Dr. Strong ~~have~~^{has} given us great satisfaction. Only the second point seems a little mixed and that is one on which no man can afford to be too positive, for to come right down to facts, no man knows much about it. The rest of the letter is *unassailable*. "

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, January 10, 1889.

"Your line enclosing Dr. Morehouse's letter is at hand

and gives us the liveliest satisfaction. It seems to me

to indicate that the main question is decided favorably

and that the matter now in doubt is how much Mr. R. shall

give. I shall now rest in the confidence that we are

to have an institution. I wish it might be a great one,

but beggars must not be choosers.

Gates, as of course you know, went West Tuesday.

I had occasion to acknowledge to Mr. R. the receipt of

some money day before yesterday and commended Gates to

him and told him I hoped he would meet him, as I felt

sure he would be pleased with him.

Your letter to Dr. Strong has given us great

satisfaction. Only the second point seems a little mixed

and that is one on which no man can afford to be too

positive, for to come right down to facts, no man knows

much about it. The rest of the letter is satisfactory."

Jan. 11-1889.

F. F. Gates to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I went straight to New Haven without stop, spending yesterday with Prof. Harper and your nephew. Dr. Harper very cordially seconded the suggestions I made and has written Mr. R. inviting an interview. What is now in Mr. R's mind, what his difficulties are I am as much in the dark about as ever. Prof. Harper will undertake to prove that he can do quite as much for the institution from Yale as if he were on the ground as President. You and he could cooperate delightfully and he thinks there are special advantages in his remaining in Yale even over a presidency. Dr. Morehouse welcomes the suggestion of the Chancellorship.

"The interview is sought for Saturday or Sunday.

"I have no further news that you do not know. I leave Prof. Harper himself to write you regarding Dr. Strong's reply. I fear there will be a fight. The issue is clearly drawn by Dr. S's last and both are of course immovable."

"I will keep you informed of any developments".

Jan. 11-1889.

T. F. Gates to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I went straight to New Haven without stop, spending yesterday with Prof. Harper and your nephew. Dr. Harper very cordially seconded the suggestions I made and has written Mr. R. inviting an interview. What is now in Mr. R.'s mind, what his difficulties are I am as much in the dark about as ever. Prof. Harper will undertake to prove that he can do quite as much for the Institution from Yale as if he were on the ground as President. You and he could cooperate delightfully and he thinks there are special advantages in his remaining in Yale even over a presidency. Dr. Worcester welcomes the suggestion of the Chancellorship.

"The interview is sought for Saturday or Sunday.

"I have no further news that you do not know. I leave Prof. Harper himself to write you regarding Dr. Strong's reply. I fear there will be a fight. The issue is clearly drawn by Dr. S. last and both are of course immovable.

"I will keep you informed of any developments."