

for some reason committed to small type. One quickly discovers that Beha Ullah had vastly different conceptions of God and his relations to men from those of Abbas Effendi. He was narrower, but more consistent and more truly spiritual.

The author gives us a *Conclusion* in which he displays a deep prejudice against Christianity and a morbid view of the religious hypocrisy of all Christian lands.

While one is bound in justice to expose the glaring weaknesses of this book, one must also gladly bear witness that it is admirably written with a splendid, if somewhat blind, enthusiasm, and that both in the criticisms of our own Faith and in the exposition of Beha'ism there are wholesome lessons, partly taught, more suggested, for Christians and Christian advocates.

W. O. CARVER.

The Atonement and the Modern Mind.

By James Denny, D.D. A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York. 1903.

This work, which has already appeared in the form of articles in *THE EXPOSITOR*, is intended as a supplement to *The Death of Christ* by the same author. The book was called forth by the criticisms and correspondence aroused by the first book, and was written with the avowed purpose of removing hindrances to the acceptance of the doctrine of the atonement by the modern mind. Dr. Denny believes in the atonement with all his might. "It is the most profound of all truths, and the most recreative. It determines, more than anything else, our conceptions of God, of man, of history, and even of nature. . . . It is the inspiration of all thought, the impulse and the law of all action, the key, in the last resort, to all suffering." p. 13. "For those who recognize it at all it is Christianity in brief; it concentrates in itself, as in a germ of infinite potency, all that the wisdom, power and love of

God mean in relation to sinful men." p. 14. These extracts will serve to show the profound belief of the author in the reality and importance of the atonement. "The cross of Christ is man's only glory, or it is his final stumbling-block." What the author seeks to do "is so to present the facts as to mediate, if possible, between the mind of our time and the atonement." p. 16.

The modern mind in so far as it differs from the universal mind of all ages, has been formed by the influence of the physical sciences, the idealistic philosophy and the historic study and spirit. The author maintains that "far more mind has had its characteristic qualities and temper imparted to it by scientific study than by study in any other field." This study, especially the study of biology, is favorable to the conception of the atonement in so far as it has emphasized the unity of life; but it has been unfavorable in its tendency to reduce the whole life to the lower plane of the physical. This ignores the highest and best in man. The idealistic philosophy "teaches the essential unity of God and man. Man is as necessary to God as God is to man. God is the truth of man, but man is the reality of God. God comes to consciousness of himself in man, and man in being conscious of himself is at the same time conscious of God." p. 46. Such a conception of the spiritual world renders the atonement unnecessary and impossible. To this conception the author offers the consciousness of Jesus Christ. Against that consciousness of self which can not be self-delusion, such a conception is shattered. The great historic movement of the nineteenth century has been unfavorable to a belief in the atonement, because it has been inclined to assert that whatever is historical can have no eternal significance. Jesus Christ appeared at a definite time and place, lived the life of the people and died an ordinary death at the hands of judicial executioners. It is impossible that he should have eternal significance. The author

properly answers that this does not follow. In making such an assertion history goes beyond its province.

Having pointed out the factors in modern culture which tend to prejudice the mind against the atonement, he takes up in the last two lectures the doctrine of the atonement. The objection to the doctrine on the ground that God forgives sin freely has no force, because we all agree that God forgives freely. The question is not as to whether God forgives freely, but as to what it costs him to do so. The author repudiates a forensic or legal or judicial conception of the atonement, because it rests upon a forensic or legal or judicial conception of man's relation to God. p. 69. These relations are first of all personal. "Religion is an experience of the personality of God, and of our own personality in relation to it." But in the second place they are universal, that is they are not independent of law. "The relations of God and man are not lawless, they are not capricious, incalculable, incapable of moral meaning; they are personal, but determined by something of universal import; in other words, they are not merely personal but ethical." pp. 67, 68. There is neither the weakness of an indulgent parent nor the indifference of an immoral one in God. His relations to men are necessarily ethical. In the third place they have been deranged by sin. "Sin is, in fact, nothing else than this derangement or disturbance; it is that in which wrong is done to the moral constitution under which we live." p. 79. The fact of sin can not be explained away, and there is an inevitable and vital connection between sin and death. Death is everywhere the penalty, the effect of sin. "The atonement, as the New Testament presents it, assumes the connection of sin and death. Apart from some sense and recognition of such connection, the mediation of forgiveness through the death of Christ can only appear an arbitrary, irrational, unacceptable idea." p. 108. To the question whether God can forgive sin, the

world has two answers. One class say forgiveness is impossible. This is a world of law and forgiveness is against nature. Nothing but eternal punishment is reasonable or possible. The other class emphasises the free personal element in God and asserts forgiveness for all because of God's nature. "The Christian religion teaches that forgiveness is mediated to sinners through Christ, and spiritually through his death." p. 112. There is both a divine and a human necessity for the atonement. God could not forgive otherwise, and man could not receive forgiveness mediated otherwise. "He stands in our stead, facing all our responsibilities for us as God would have them faced; and it is what he does for us, and not the effect which this produces in us, still less the fantastic abstraction of a 'racial act,' which is the atonement in the sense of the New Testament.

Dr. Denny has produced another strong book. He believes in the atonement profoundly and argues ably, but it is doubtful if he has made it any more acceptable to the modern mind. There is no place for an atonement in independent human thinking. It is a doctrine of the Bible, and as a rule it will be accepted, modified or rejected in proportion to the fulness and completeness of the acceptance of the Bible as a revelation from God. Dr. Denny admits that an *a priori* assertion of the necessity of an atonement would be highly presumptuous, but since the event it is not at all unreasonable. But the facts upon which the doctrine is based are found in the Bible, and hence a man must accept the Bible before he can accept an atonement.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Representative Modern Preachers.

By Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., Professor of Homiletics in the Yale Divinity School. The Macmillan Company. New York.

The preachers chosen for notice in this volume are Schleiermacher, F. W. Robertson, Bushnell, Beecher,