

the lectures mirror the real teaching of Professor Matthews or not, the Committee was impressed with its fragmentary and elliptical character, especially in some parts. In a number of places a simple word was written down, evidently to aid the student in recalling a whole sentence and to indicate merely the drift of the discussion. The Committee found that the reading of the copy of an ordinary lecture took only about ten minutes whereas the lecture period lasted an hour.

With reference to the second of the documents filed by Dr. Harris, viz., the thesis on the "Composition of the Hexateuch," the Committee felt compelled to rule it out of court altogether. They found it to be a conglomerate of material gathered from the Professor's lectures and from various encyclopaedias—together with Mr. Williams' own views. So far as representing Professor Matthews' own standpoint, the latter disclaimed all responsibility and in so far as it represents Mr. Williams' own views, the positions taken are those of the advanced critics. A grave error was made in ever bringing in as evidence against a Professor an original thesis purporting to give the results of Mr. Williams' own investigations on the "Composition of the Hexateuch."

As to the excerpt from the letter of Mr. Williams, the third document filed as evidence against Professor Matthews, the Committee found that it was not a part of the original thesis, but was attached to it when Mr. Williams sent the manuscript to Dr. Harris.

#### THE CHARGES.

Coming to the charges against Professor Matthews' teaching, as set forth in Dr. Harris' letter, the Committee finds that they are five in number, and may be summarized as follows:

No. 1. That "the views of Professor Matthews are opposed to those of Professor Orr on every essential point, as they are presented in the thesis of Rev. J. Glyn Williams and in the stenographic report of the Professor's lectures."

No. 2. That these views "are purely destructive of the historicity, truthfulness and integrity of the Word of God."

No. 3. That "they are wholly occupied with discrepancies and contradictions in the Old Testament, which have no real existence apart from the rationalistic method of dealing with the Word of God."

No. 4. That unless the kind of teaching given by Professor Matthews, which Dr. Harris chooses to call "Destructive criticism," comes to an end in our University, "it will mean trouble of the most serious kind for us, and will militate against our missionary and evangelistic work as a denomination, and wean away the sympathy and financial help of our people, when the facts become known."