

legalism of the Pharisees, he really does give us a legalism which though more inner is just about as far removed from the Gospel of grace. The book is well printed and attractive, and the author's style is clear and popular.

J. H. FARMER.

The Christian Faith Under Modern Searchlights. By William Hallock Johnson, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Greek and New Testament Literature in Lincoln University, Pennsylvania. With an Introduction by Francis Landey Patton, D.D., LL.D., President Emeritus of Princeton Theological Seminary. New York, 1916, Fleming H. Revell Company. 252 pp. \$1.25 net.

This volume contains the Princeton "L. P. Stone Lectures of 1914, revised and elaborated." They are six in number and deal with the more pressing apologetic problems of Christianity: "What Is the Christian Faith?" "The Christian Faith and Modern Science"; "The Christian Faith and Psychology"; "The Christian Faith and Recent Philosophy"; "The Christian Faith and Other Religions"; "The Christian Faith and Biblical Criticism."

The author shows wide and accurate acquaintance with the various critical questions of the day in all these fields. His frankness and general spirit of fairness are entirely satisfactory. He walks firmly in a secure rational faith amid all the forms of doubt and uncertainty that stalk abroad. He has read many apologetic works and quotes rather too freely at times, but is independent withal.

Covering so large a scope in a single volume much of the discussion must needs be summary. Here, however, it is always clear and incisive. The items reviewed are the important ones.

There was need for such a general survey of the field and this work must, on that account, be set down as one of the best of recent apologetic volumes, one among the list of first selections.

W. O. CARVER.

The Religion of Experience. By Horace J. Bridges. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1916. 275 pp. \$1.50.

On the title page it is announced that this is a book for laymen and the unchurched. Its author starts with the usual assumption of the multitude of writers proposing universal remedies. That assumption is that there is something radically wrong with the churches or denominations. The strong tendency of the age is towards the idea of August Comte and his theory that knowledge is limited to our apprehension of phenomena. "And yet," says the author, "the soul refuses to acquiesce permanently in such a proposal." There is such a thing as religious experience, but it is best to study it from the psychological and functional standpoint. Man is irrepressibly and incurably religious. This fact must be recognized. One is encouraged by this to hope that the author is about to give us a satisfying discussion. This is confirmed by the further assertion that the religious experience has a real object. It is not a merely subjective play of the emotions. But when the author comes to define this object he leaves us pretty much where he found us. Instead of a personal God who answers to the religious need he speaks of a vague Somewhat made up of the universal moral law, a subtle something which pervades all moral struggle, a "democratic" as opposed to a "monarchial" God, whatever that may mean.

He finds little proof of the reliability of the Gospel records, but admits there must have been a Jesus because the disciples could not have invented him. Jesus, however, is only one of many great religious leaders. His domination of man's religious life ought to come to an end. Other great teachers should have their turn. In one chapter the author pleads for a "resurrection" of Socrates. Socrates was a great champion of intellectual freedom. He has not had his chance. We should listen to him. It does not seem to occur to the author that the real resurrection of Jesus explains the difference between him and Socrates, that in Jesus we are dealing with a form of the "real" which we do not encounter elsewhere. The author has no expectation that the various religious bodies will become one any time in the near future. Yet he thinks that all sects and religious denominations, Catholics, Protestants, Jews and Free Thinkers, Atheists and Theists, ought to be able to unite upon his proposed platform of

religious experience, which consists chiefly of a sense of dependence, and a struggle towards moral ideals, but which excludes incarnation and atonement, and the new birth. Surely a daring programme is this!

Little needs to be said by way of criticism. One or two remarks, however, may be added. The first is that evidently the author is chiefly concerned with an intellectual rather than a religious interest. He has no definition of religion which will stand critical scrutiny. It is evident that he has ability and if along with it he had possessed horizon and sympathy he might have written a book of real power. The volume, however, belongs to the literature of revolt and protest. It offers no constructive principle which will attract even the passing notice of the churches. His conception of Christianity and its meaning is completely at variance with the facts at most points. And his proposal to merge Christianity with Judaism and other divergent and contradictory systems is like proposing to level the Rocky Mountains with the surrounding plains.

E. Y. MULLINS.

Our Troublesome Religious Question. By Edward Leigh Pell. New York, 1916: Fleming H. Revell Co. 251 pp. \$1.25.

Right boldly and with mind as keen as a rapier and pen as trenchant as the best does Mr. Pell face the varied army of critics of present day Christianity; and with equal vigor does he assail the insincere and unalert of the Christian army. Here is not partisan defence of traditional and seemingly content religion, nor any cringing fear of new-forged weapons of offense against the faith of the fathers. His view is that all truth is of God and for man's good. He will neither allow the "sectarian scientist" to monopolize modern discovery and invention, nor suffer the sectarian traditionalist to exclude the stream of new life from inflowing the soul of the church. If he rightly estimates himself when he says he is essentially a dissenter and has made it his "habit in writing on religious subjects to write as a rebel," then is he led in bondage to an erroneous principle.