

pitying the lady for the noble husband of whom she was bereaved, and the husband for the noble wife whom he had left, never to see her more. But Pantheia bade her eunuchs withdraw, "until," said she, "I have mourned for my husband after my heart's desire." But her nurse she told to remain by her, and directed her when she was dead to wrap herself and her husband in one shroud. The nurse besought her earnestly not to do this thing—but when she prevailed not and saw her mistress waxing angry she sat down and wept. And so Pantheia slew herself with a scimitar which she had long kept in readiness, and laying her head upon her husband's bosom, breathed her last. The nurse wailed aloud, and wrapped both bodies in a shroud as Pantheia had commanded her.

Cyrus on hearing of the woman's deed was deeply moved, and hastened up to see if he could give any aid. The three eunuchs when they saw what had befallen, drew their scimitars in their turn and slew themselves on the spot where she had bidden them stand. Cyrus having drawn near to the woful scene, paid the lady his tribute of wonder and tears and so departed. And due care was taken for the dead that they should have all honour, and the tomb built for them was, it is said, of exceeding magnificence.

CONTRIBUTED.

Mr. Editor:—

WE had the pleasure of attending the meetings of the Theological Alumni; and amongst all that was said with regard to Higher Criticism, Development and Modern Thought we have hardly as yet had an opportunity to get settled in our own ideas. However, with your permission, we would like to make a few observations.

The attitude which men take with regard to these questions is quite varied, but it may be laid down under three heads.

There is first, the reverent believer in the sacredness of the past, who cannot break with the faith of his fathers, and who looks upon all questioning on such matters as little short of sacrilegious. Then there is secondly, the man with open mind, anxious to see the light and learn the truth, and ready to recognize and welcome it as soon as he is convinced that it is the truth that he sees. And lastly, there is the extremist, the radical, who is taken up with the latest theory in criticism or philosophy, and must make everything bend to that theory or die in the attempt.

Now, to a certain extent, men in each of these classes are open to criticism. In the first place, the man who is known as the "Traditionalist" must remember that Progress is the watchword of human-

ity, and that that which "was good enough for our fathers" is *not* "good enough for us." A ten-year-old looks up at the heavens and is satisfied that he has explained it all when he calls the stars the candles of God, but a man bows in reverence before a manifestation which staggers his powers of comprehension. So ninth century views of Christ and religion cannot suit 19th century life, and 19th century men should be ready to take the higher point of view which is God's better gift. While we would not say that it was "fatal," we certainly say that it is unworthy for a man in our day to be fully satisfied with views held a century ago, and to defend himself in so doing on the very ground which ought to be his shame.

Those who come under the second heading are usually open to the criticism of being over afraid of surrendering too much to those of the third. They err on the conservative side if they err at all. However, as working pastors, and as men who must go from their studies where these questions perplex out to their pulpits to preach to their people their deepest and best thought, we consider that it is better to err on the side of conservatism than to be too anxious to pull down the old house before they are sure of the foundation for the new.

Then comes the last class, and here we are almost afraid we may rank as one of those who are said "to step in where angels fear to tread." But criticism, if it is anything, must be impartial. We are convinced that if there is one thing more than another that makes the modern criticism distasteful, it is the attitude which its followers are too prone to assume. They are apt to be unsympathetic in their treatment of opponents, oftentimes patronizing in their manner, and almost always confident and self-satisfied in the way they lay down their conclusions. They impress you with the fact that their side has a monopoly of scholarship, critical acumen and love of truth; they are too apt to call their opponents names and accuse them of blindness and dogmatism; and they state their wildest conjectures with a certitude that hardly admits of a doubt. They enter the field with a "theory," and everything *must* of necessity fall into line. By taking such a course (and it is done unconsciously) the critic at once brings on himself an opposition that soon becomes bitter antagonism, even on the part of those who might otherwise sympathize with his views. We venture the suggestion that had Dr. Briggs used milder language and been more considerate with his opponents, his friends would have been far more numerous than they are to-day. This method of stating a position is more fatally dogmatic than even the idolatry of the past, which is the traditionalist's besetting sin.

To take up another point,—during the Conference much was said about Development. As a theory it