

ity is needed. *Of course* we cannot do away with war, with the saloon, with the public thief, until public opinion is aroused. Shall we, therefore, become part of that unaroused public opinion? Because society can not be saved until it awakes from sleep, shall those who are awake go to sleep and wait for it to wake? We are told that we will lose our influence by setting ourselves distinctly for righteousness; that we had better condone unrighteousness so as to make friends with the world, and then work for better things on the sly.

In fact, is it not true that those who make this plea are merely afraid of finding out that they *have* no influence? While they throw their strength with the world, their weakness cannot be seen; if they strive against it they will be found out. Shame on such faithlessness! "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end persevere in the right as God gives us to see the right."

A firm and consistent stand on these questions on the part of even so small a body as our Society would have great influence in these days when firm stands are almost unknown. At present we have not and cannot expect an influence since our voices and our votes are in opposite directions.

It may be said that our nation would be destroyed if it were generally known that it would not engage in war and had no provision for war. This I do not believe. I believe that mankind has advanced beyond the point when a nation wholly peaceful in every way would be attacked. On the other hand, if distrust as to our possible purposes were removed, our government would gain an influence such as she has never yet had in all disputes among our sister nations. But finally, suppose our nation were destroyed; is that necessarily the worst thing in the world? Jesus of Nazareth went to his death and apparently to destruction and failure for principle,

and the principles he represented have felt the strength of his death ever since. It may be that righteousness demands the death of a nation for the salvation of many—even of the best and highest nation. Shall the best and highest nation refuse this Messiahship?

It will be said that to be consistent we must dispense with all force in all dealings; that, therefore, the police system must go with the military system, and personal non resistance must be the rule of individual life. Amen, then, so be it, so soon as we can come up to this ideal and bring mankind with us. So be it with us as individuals so soon as our duty is made clear. But in the meantime let us not so much strive to be consistent as to be true.

We have a testimony against war; let us be true to that testimony or publicly recant it. We claim a testimony against the saloon; let us make it manifest by our united action, or withdraw it. We have a testimony for honest dealing in public and in private. Let it appear that we mean what we say. Let our communications be yea and nay before all men, and let us turn our backs on shams and pretenses, on policy and on partizanship, and, if necessary, endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ.

JESSIE H. HOLMES.

THE GOSPELS.

II.—DATE OF THE WRITING.

There is nothing except inferential evidence, that derived from the Gospels themselves, regarding the time when they were written. Prof. Carpenter calls attention to the circumstance that in Matthew the writer feels it necessary to translate words which he uses, which need not to have been done for residents of Palestine. Thus, he explains that the Hebrew word Immanuel, means "God with us" (1, 23); that the Aramean Golgotha