

should not make this assertion of these Bedell Lectures; but they are wonderfully close to the ground taken by Dr. Bushnell, without being marked with anything like his theological grip or inspiring profundity.

...The Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons publish the Bedell Lectures for 1883, *Revealed Religion Expounded by its Relations of the Moral Being of God*, by the Right Rev. Henry Cotterill, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh, Scotland. The volume contains three lectures, edited with supplementary notes and reports of proceedings on Founder's Day at Gambier. The lectures start with the definition and exposition of divine love as the fundamental principle of theology. The second lecture unfolds the relation of this principle to the "Christian doctrine of the Trinity," and the third expands the general proposition that "The redemption of man is the complete exponent of the principle that love is the being of God." In the definition of love the Scotch Bishop repudiates the sentimental view and accepts that given by Mortimer and by Professor Wace, that love is a positive principle with opposite poles and relations to opposite things. The evolution of important theological doctrines from the divine love is interesting, especially from a practical point of view, but is not carried far enough to have considerable theological importance. The remarks on the Atonement are sufficient to fix the author's position theologically (not ecclesiastically. Save the mark!) in the school of dissenters. He repudiates "vicarious punishment" as a "mean view of redemption." Justice requires us to remember that the lecturer's plan carries him no further than the exhibition of the relation of man's redemption to the being of God apprehended as love, as to which he carries us for some considerable distance on a kindling and promising line of provisional speculation. When the essential difficulty which theology has to deal with appears in sight, he declares that it is not to be reached on this line nor any other, which sounds to us like a heartfelt recognition of the theological inadequacy of the method. As far as we are able to fix the theological content of the Bishop's position, it bears a close resemblance to Dr. Bushnell's supplementary correction of the doctrine taught in his "Vicarious Sacrifice." The Bishop tells his hearers first (p. 73), that the Redeemer's work "was to be effected through suffering, even unto death, in man's nature," and on p. 75 he goes on to say that "Reparation for an injury to love can only be made by acts or other proofs of love, with which he who has done the wrong is personally in spirit identified" and that the most serious objection to the view of Christ's sacrifice as "vicarious punishment" is "that it obscures the truth that the love of God for man is *wholly in Christ*, the Son of his love." We have always denied that Dr. Bushnell's theory can be adequately described as that of salvation by moral influence, and we