

and reliability in other spheres believed firmly that they did happen, and failing to find any essential flaw in the evidence produced in support of their happening, is it necessary to postulate for them a cause differing in kind from those known causes already at work in the world? And in the careful examination of all analogous incidents, in the very restricted field of experiment, and in various other ways, an answer to this question must be sought.

Now it is quite possible that as the field of knowledge widens, miracles may be explained without reference to any cataclysmic irruption of forces beyond those manifested by God in His stable methods of ordering and governing all that is. Or it may be that in the case of some of Christ's own miraculous doings, His unique spiritual and

moral Personality was an essential cause, and that these doings will consequently remain for ever in a class by themselves. But, however this may be, one feels most strongly in connexion with the whole subject, that it is along the lines of explanation rather than along the lines of wholesale excision that advance is most probable.

Apply, then, to all documents the strict canons of pure historical criticism. Establish the probability of all facts by precisely similar criteria. And then let physical science or any other branch of knowledge deal with these facts by way of explanation. We shall be often mistaken, sometimes deceived. But it is better to gain one item of positive knowledge than to entirely shut out the possibility of doing so by categorical exclusion on wholly insufficient grounds.

The Church after the War.

BY THE REV. JOHN DOUGLAS, M.A., C.F.

To one who has returned from considerable periods of service among the troops in France, first as a worker in the Y.M.C.A. and subsequently as a chaplain, and returned in such a way as to give much leisure, in hospital and during convalescence, for reading and some thought, it has been of special interest to notice the discussion of the question, What is the Church to do, to meet worthily the men who come back from the war?

That such a question should be widely canvassed throughout the Church is in itself some sign of the needed awakening, and is good if, as seems the case, it betokens a sense of penitence and a desire for reform, a sense of the new time demanding readjustments in the Church's life and work.

It is felt, too, and not unnaturally, that from what is termed 'religion at the front' guidance is to be looked for by the leaders of the Churches who are to meet and win, if they may, the returning armies. It is not the purpose of the present writer to describe or analyze the religious situation among our men overseas, but to gather together one or two suggestions for that guidance of the Churches which they need, and which seem to arise from his experience as a minister of the Church and the gospel among those men.

In religious journals and elsewhere this problem of the Church after the War has presented itself often as a question of what the men who come back will want of the Church, to satisfy their requirements of what the Church, if they are to serve her, should be. And it is right that this side of the matter should not be left unconsidered. That great capacity for splendid loyalty, devoted service, moving self-sacrifice, and glorious comradeship, displayed by our men, the Church longs, and is in her place in the nation, to win. What, then, is the Church to be and to do which will attract to herself those men and all that loyalty, sacrifice, fellowship, service? Obviously we must not turn a deaf ear to the criticism and the demand which they may express.

But this is not by any means the main aspect of the problem, which lies rather in the question, What is it that the men, and all men, need of the Church in what we call the new time? not merely, What is it they want or ask for? For they may well ask sometimes, and others are asking on their behalf, for things which it is no part of the Church's essential business to provide.

Where and whence, then, is the needed movement of change to come? In what directions must it issue, to effect the ends desired?

I should answer, first, in the studies, and thence in the pulpits, of the Church's ministers, her priests and prophets.

We have heard for many years back the cry, from the pew and from without 'the bounds,' against 'doctrinal' preaching. The cry has met from too many pulpits with an all too facile response, and the vogue of what one may well call fancy texts and freak subjects came in, proving popular, let it be admitted, in not a few quarters, especially among a floating population of churchgoers on Sunday evenings. Yet it is a fact, which I believe must now be recognized, that doctrine, dogma if you will, requires to be preached, both because it should be, and needs to be, and also because it will be wanted and listened to. And this will require of many of us a tremendous new discipline in our studies, a discipline involving—under, let us not forget, the leading and teaching of the Holy Spirit—hard reading and as clear thinking and simplicity of expression as we can achieve and command. And this should never be impossible. We have come to see, in startling revelations of the truth, that it matters everything what a man believes; and it is a supreme obligation lying upon the preacher of the Word that he should be a teacher and leader in the things which are to be believed among men. A carefully prepared and full-fed soil of doctrine, of dogmatic, must give strength and richness to our future preaching. And this does not involve our sermons becoming on the one hand misty abstractions, or on the other hand soulless and hard pronouncements of theology. The great audiences of men who listened breathlessly of nights, after days of the hardest toil, in Y.M.C.A. huts in France, to Professor Cairns of Aberdeen, as he spoke to them of the Reasonableness of the Christian Faith, and to lesser men than he in courses of apologetic lectures, even where the thud of the distant guns was in their ears, did not find doctrinal preaching uninteresting and not worth while. The very reverse was the case.

And ordinary men, doing honestly in the study, led by the Spirit of truth, must speak to their fellows of those things which are most certainly believed among us—the great facts and the urgent (for they are urgent) implications of the facts of the New Testament and the Church's development. So the Incarnation and the Cross and the Resurrection and the Holy Spirit and the Judge-

ment will come to their own, with life in all its aspects set in the light of them, in our pulpits. And men and women will listen, and in such numbers and in such a way, as perhaps they seldom listen to us now.

To cite one illustration of the need of all this: they will not hear any more, one may hope, the disastrously unethical sermons on the subject of the men who die in battle, to which they are so often subjected to-day; sermons which are subversive of both the grace and the righteousness of God, and which leave confusion worse confounded in the minds of thoughtful men and women, and minister to the shallow optimism of the thoughtless.

There is another direction in which many of us preachers must change within the sphere of the study and therefore of the pulpit: namely, in our outlook upon Social and World movements of our time.

This is not to say that our shelves are to be filled henceforth with volumes—the volumes few can afford to buy in any case—of economics, sociology, ethnology, international politics, and the rest. For that way the average preacher's business does not lie. But along the way of the Old Testament prophets, and along the way of the New Testament teaching and spirit of the Kingdom of God, there lie to the preacher's hand the things he must take up and declare about all the relationships in which men and communities and nations are to stand towards each other. And the preacher must make himself at least intelligent along these lines with regard to the Social and World movements of our time, not only because men and women will listen to the Christian message—it must be distinctively Christian—about these things, but also in order that, as a recent writer has put it, the Church may 'have a mind and so help the nation which so sorely needs it to have one too,' to express in these matters.

But the pulpit ministry of the Church is not the Church. And it is very far from being the case that the responsibility of what the Church shall be after the war rests wholly upon the shoulders of her ministers. A radical change is called for in 'the pew.' Of this let there be no doubt. The spirit of 'class,' the snobbish temper, the selfish fear of change and of new ideas, must be purged away. And the impression must be made by the average membership of the Church upon the

world, that here is a devoted fellowship of believers in God through Christ, and servants of Christ, worshipping Him in humble adoration and grateful love, and, further, out in the world as the Body of Christ on the great adventure of conquest for Him. It is when men, in observing and in coming into contact with the Church, get a sense of the life which is life indeed, a sense, too, of high and holy endeavour about her, a self-denying battle for God and love and all goodness—it is then that they will be drawn to yield to her their fellowship, loyalty, service, self-sacrifice.

All this, when one considers the timidity and fatal self-complacent respectability and selfish

temper characteristic of so much of our Church life, at least in the years out of which we are passing into a new era, may seem a change too drastic and towards a level too high. Perhaps all one may say here is that this thing can be only by prayer (much prayer) and, perhaps after all, by something akin to fasting, too. At anyrate, the effecting of changes such as have been sketched here will assuredly go far towards winning for the Church and her Lord the men she is to-day looking towards with longing eyes, will go far towards solving the problem of what she must be—for it is not so much a problem of what she is to do—after the war.

In the Study.

War.

TOWARDS AN ANTHOLOGY.

Professor J. A. Cramb.

THE question 'What is War?' has been variously answered, according as the aim of the writer is to illustrate its methods historically, or from the operations of the wars of the past to deduce precepts for the tactics or the strategy of the present, or as in the writings of Aristotle and Grotius, of Montesquieu and Bluntschli, to assign the limits of its fury, or fix the basis of its ethics, its distinction as just or unjust.

War, therefore, I would define as a phase in the life-effort of the State towards completer self-realization, a phase of the eternal *nisus*, the perpetual omnipresent strife of all being towards self-fulfilment.

Nietzsche.

Ye say it is a good cause which halloweth even war. I say unto you it is the good war that halloweth every cause.

War has achieved more than was ever achieved by love of one's neighbour.

General Sherman.

War is Hell.

Moltke.

War is the most devilish but also the most heroic of human things.

Treitschke.

War is of God, it is God's dreadful medicine.

Clausewitz.

War is an act of violence to compel our opponent to fulfil our will.

J. R. P. Sclater.

War is an evil thing—it was born of the devil and its birthplace was hell.

Principal P. T. Forsyth.

War is the greatest of all the awful and complex moral situations of the world—second only to the final judgment day.

Verestchagin.

War is the loss of all human sense; under its influence men become animals entirely. The artist looks always for passion, and passion is seen at its height on the battlefield. Every hour brings something new, something never seen before, something outside the range of ordinary human life. *It is the reversal of Christianity*, and for the artist, the author, and the philosopher it must always have a supreme interest. But what a foolish game it is.

Mazzini.

War is the greatest of crimes, when it is not waged for the benefit of mankind, for the sake of a great truth to enthrone or of a great lie to entomb.