

in particular, the view adopted by Mr. Bennet is favoured by the structure of the book itself—by the frequent occurrence of such expressions as, “then I said in my heart”—and by the difficulty of interpreting some passages on any other principle.

Mr. Bennet's exposition of the lessons of Ecclesiastes is interesting and instructive for all, but especially for a city population. Young men about town would do well to give heed to his warnings against dissipation and licentiousness; whilst his scathing rebukes of commercial dishonesty are fitted to exercise a salutary influence on those who are giving their energies to the race for riches. And his pervading tone of hopefulness for the future, as well as healthful and hearty enjoyment of the present, will go far to conciliate even such readers as feel repelled from the study of the text he expounds, by the dismal echo of the preacher's theme, “Vanity of vanities.”

Highly, however, as we think of this volume, we would not care to endorse all its contents. There is one passage which is so expressed as to do injustice to the author's theology. Mr. Bennet probably means no more than that God is laden with our sins and made to serve by our iniquities—that our sinfulness is repulsive to his nature—and that his compassion for sinners was the source or moving cause of our redemption, for “God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.” But this by no means justifies the statement that “the sufferings of God manifest in the flesh were but the *type and image* of what God had always been enduring on behalf of man, &c.” p. 335. The sufferings of Christ were the type and image of the Father's love; they revealed, and so measured, its depth. But they were more than that.—They were the fruit and result of His love. And it was only by being the fruit and result of His love that they became its type and image. The magnitude of an effect affords a measure of the cause by which it is produced. The distinction between character and conduct—between what a man is and what he does, is simple enough.—And if we attempt to think of God at all we must carry this distinction with us.—

The holy love of God, which hates the abominable thing attaching to its human object, is a phase or aspect of the divine character; and the divine character is simply the moral side of the one divine nature. So long as we think of compassion as simply immanent in the divine nature—not resulting in volition or action—no question arises respecting the persons of the Trinity. As there is one nature, not three natures; so there is one compassion, not three compassions. But it is otherwise when compassion becomes active, providing redemption for the perishing. It is in connexion with this work of redemption that the distinction between the divine Persons is principally, and most clearly, revealed to us. The work is distributed, as it were, amongst them. The Father *wills* redemption. The Son *works it out*, by his obedience unto death. The Spirit *applies* to the hearts and consciences of men for whom it is provided. The office and work of suffering for the sins of men belongs not to the Father, not to the Spirit, but to the Son. It is his, and his exclusively, to make his soul an offering for sin. And he has done it once for all. To say that “God's atonement is continuously going forward,” is to use words in a sense peculiarly liable to be misunderstood. If Christ's sufferings possess no interest or value beyond serving as a type and image of this continuous atonement, he suffered not as a priest but only as a prophet; he died not for our sins but only for our instruction. No such doctrine can be inferred from our Lord's reply to Philip [not Thomas, by the way] “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.” For this reply relates to what God *is*, not to what he *does*; to his character as God, not to his distinctive and peculiar actings as First Person in the Trinity. We do not suppose for a moment that Mr. Bennet intends to set aside the doctrine of the atonement as usually understood; but he has used language that is at least capable of such a construction. It is only a single half-page, however, that is thus apparently vitiated. Elsewhere there are some minor inaccuracies of style and statement to which we might have called attention; but the author's