

that in course of conversation with him Professor Matthews had stated that he held substantially the same views of the Old Testament as those enunciated by Professor James Orr in his "The Problem of the Old Testament." It will be remembered that at this point I suggested that the matter be held in abeyance.

I append herewith, as part of this communication, a stenographic report of thirteen lectures of Professor Matthews.

The views of Professor Matthews are opposed to those of Professor Orr on every essential point, as they are presented in the thesis of the Rev. J. Glyn Williams, and in his stenographic report of the Professor's lectures, and are purely destructive of the historicity, truthfulness and integrity of the Word of God. It will be found 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.

I leave you to judge whether this is the kind of teaching our people generally would commend, or which, in your estimation, would be profitable to young men preparing to preach the Gospel of the grace of God. I am quite sure that unless this destructive criticism comes to an end in our University, it will simply 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.

I beg leave to call your attention to the following extract from the Rev. J. Glyn Williams' letter, which is appended to the thesis already referred to:

"The most injurious feature of the course of lectures is the implication that is in them of the denial of the supernatural, or as far as the Hexateuch is concerned, that there has ever been a revelation from God. If the lectures are correct in their conception, it inevitably follows that the Founder of our religion and the writers of the New Testament were ignorant of the history of the race whence they sprang. I am heartily in favor of historical criticism, and I owe a debt to the Professor for giving me an insight into it; but I have no love for that criticism which is too shortsighted and feeble to give a true interpretation of the facts of oriental history, and which is irreverent because it has no faith and leaves the deplorable impression on the mind of the student that the sacred writers wrote with a deliberate attempt to deceive."

Personally, I feel quite sure that in view of the facts thus brought to light, the usefulness of Professor Matthews to our University is gone I am,

Yours sincerely,

ELMORE HARRIS.