

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

The Evangelical Quarterly

OCTOBER 15TH, 1931

THE ETHICS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. ITS HARMONY WITH PHILOSOPHICAL ETHICS AND WITH OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS.

The first point to be emphasised in the discussion of the ethics of the New Testament is its harmony with philosophical ethics and with Old Testament ethics. We must be on our guard against supposing that Christ taught a morality at variance with what preceded Him. Not only did His precepts not contradict it; they were not even independent of it; on the contrary, they were vitally related to it; they were organically one with it. The law of Christ is the completion both of the law of nature and of the law of Moses. This is so for two reasons:

Unity of authorship. The law of nature and the law of Moses are as truly the law of Christ as are the ethical precepts of the Gospels. As the Eternal Word of God "by whom all things were made that were made" He created nature and so ordained the law which its constitution implies, which is written on the natural heart, and whose claim the natural conscience, in so far as its voice has not been silenced, enforces. So, too, it was the same Eternal Word that created nature and that afterward became incarnate in Christ who under the old dispensation revealed the plan of God for our redemption and the law of God for our obedience. Therefore, the three systems of ethics, that implied in nature, that made known in the Old Testament, that contained in the Gospel, have the unity that unity of authorship involves. Though their matter may be different, their essential characteristics must be the same. They are the product of one and the same Mind.

Unity of purpose. It is not correct to speak of the purposes of God. Since He "knows the end from the beginning," and

since "known unto Him are *all* things from the foundation of the world," it must be that *one* eternal purpose runs through all events and controls the entire development of the universe. It will follow, then, that God's successive revelations, whether ethical or dogmatic, not only have that identity of style which unity of authorship secures, but also have that oneness of tendency and, as to fundamental material, that sameness which unity of purpose implies. While each revelation will contain what was not in its predecessor, each will take up and restate what was fundamental in its predecessor. It is impossible that He whose eternal purpose embraces *all* things should ever lay foundations from which His temple of truth should afterwards have to be moved.

Let us notice, then :

I. The Identity of New Testament ethics with the leading principles of philosophical ethics. The New Testament always implies and it often emphasises those moral truths which, because they rest on the essential and so necessary nature of God or are included in His constitution of things, may be known even to fallen man, and have been more or less discerned by him, independently of all special revelation and of all particular spiritual illumination. For example, the Epistle to the Romans declares that the nature and claims of God are so clearly manifested in the constitution and course of the world which He has made that we are inexcusable if we do not recognise and discharge our natural obligations to Him. What, if not this, does Romans i. 20 mean? "For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse."

Again, the same apostle, after laying down the principle that only those Jews who keep the law which God has revealed to them shall be justified, proceeds to show that what is essential in this principle applies also to the Gentiles, though to them the Mosaic law has not been made known. His language is (Rom. ii. 12-15).¹

¹ This has been paraphrased by Meyer as follows

"With right and reason I say: the doers of the law shall be justified; for as to the case of the Gentiles, that ye may not regard them as beyond reach of that rule, it is proved in fact by those instances in which Gentiles, though not in possession of the law of Moses, do by nature the requirements of this law, that they are the law unto themselves, because, namely, they thereby show that its obligation stands written in their hearts," etc.

Accordingly, we find that all the precepts of the moral law, that is, all those precepts which, because they rest on the nature of God or grow out of His constitution of things, would bind all men, even if God had not explicitly promulgated them in the Old Testament in the "Ten Commandments"—we find that all these precepts the New Testament repeats and explains and emphasises. Thus, for example, in Matt. iv. 10, we have the "First Commandment." In Colossians iii. 5, we have the "Second," the "Seventh" and the "Tenth" Commandments either expressed or implied. In Matt. v. 34-37, we have the "Third Commandment" reiterated and explained. In Mark ii. 23-28 and the parallel passages, we have the "Fourth Commandment" guarded against perversion. In Eph. vi. 1-3, we have the "Fifth Commandment" recited almost literally and reinforced. In Matt. v. 21f, we find the "Sixth Commandment" treated in like manner; and in Matt. v. 27-32, the "Seventh." In Eph. iv. 28, we have a re-statement of and an explication of the "Eighth Commandment." In Colossians iii. 9, we have the "Ninth Commandment," and in Colossians iii. 5, as already noticed, the "Tenth Commandment." These are but a few illustrations of the way in which the New Testament repeats and explains and emphasises the precepts of the moral law, those precepts which bind all men as men and because men, and which would bind them, had they never found expression in the New Testament nor been summarised in the "Ten Commandments" nor been formulated in any legal code.

Nor is this recognition of the principles of philosophical or natural ethics by the New Testament only occasional and incidental. On the contrary, as was pointed out in our consideration of the importance of the study of Christian ethics, not only does ethical teaching occupy a large place and often the position of importance in the New Testament, but the ethical teaching is mainly concerned with philosophical ethics. To be convinced of this, remember, how much of the epistles is taken up with moral precepts; how the doctrinal portions are clearly in order to the enforcement of these precepts; and how prominently these relate to such domestic, social, and political duties as would be such had Christianity never come into the world. If the Greek and Roman writers emphasise wisdom, temperance, courage, and justice as the cardinal virtues, it would be easy to show that these are insisted on at least as much in the New Testament. Its

ethical system is not original in any such sense as that it is not founded on philosophical or natural ethics.

Nor is this our interpretation. The first Christians took the same view. Their "sacrament," as Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan informs us, was a "solemn league and covenant with God," in which they devoted themselves anew to be conscientiously careful in the ordinary duties of man to man. In a word, the Gospel of the new creation in Christ Jesus emphasises, as is done nowhere else, the moral precepts involved in the first creation. As it is in God's revelation of salvation to fallen and lost men, the Old Testament, that we have the clearest and most explicit statement of what would have been our duties had we never fallen and come to need salvation, viz., the "Ten Commandments": so God's law for redeemed and regenerate men, the New Testament, is largely concerned with the restatement and development of this law of nature.

A moment's reflection will show that it could not have been otherwise. Indeed, we have already seen that if the first creation was "very good," as the Word of God affirms that it was, and as it must have been in view of its author; then the new creation, though it may be far more comprehensive and glorious, must still rest on it and involve it.

Attention, moreover, is called to this harmony of New Testament ethics with philosophical ethics, not because it is obscure either as to its nature or as to its cause, but to emphasise the important fact that, whatever Christianity may require, it requires of us first and always that we should be *men*. If Christian discipleship does not make one more faithful than otherwise he would have been to the ordinary duties of life, to those duties which would have been such had Christ never come to the world or God never revealed Himself even from Sinai, it can be only because the individual in question has not truly learned of Christ. No one ever emphasised philosophical or natural ethics so strongly as does His Gospel. A striking illustration of this is seen in the case of such a virtue as courage. Though pre-eminently a natural virtue, it is in Christianity that it attains incomparably its highest development.¹

2. The Identity of New Testament Ethics with the special Characteristics of Old Testament Ethics.

a. The style of both is the same.

¹ *Vide*. Blackie's *Four Phases of Morals*, pp. 231-234.

(1) In the New Testament, as in the Old, it is nowhere stated, but is always assumed, that man has a moral nature and is under moral law; that he knows this; and that he ought to live to secure the highest good. Thus, conscience is appealed to as bearing witness to "the law written on the heart," and it is taken for granted that its function in this respect needs neither proof nor explanation.

(2) The ethical system of the New Testament, as of the Old, is presented to us in, with, and through the religion with which it is connected. This union is vital. The dogmatic portions of the New Testament are in order to their ethical application. God's love for man is unfolded that it may be seen how man's love ought to manifest itself and may be constrained to manifest itself. Were the former presented alone, it would seem to be lacking in result; and were the latter exhibited by itself, it would appear to be without an adequate cause. In the career of the individual Christian, too, there is the same vital union of religion and morality. As there cannot be regeneration and it not issue in ethical living, so there can be no true ethical living unless one has been born of the Spirit. As Blackie has well said²: "The individual virtues of a Christian man are merely the flower and the fruit of a living plant, of which the root is theology and the sap piety. Christian virtue, in fact, can no more exist without piety, than Socratic virtue can exist without logic."

(3) The New Testament, as the Old, though embodying the truths of philosophical ethics, lacks its specific abstract terms. This is the more significant, too, because the Greek language, unlike the Hebrew, abounds in such expressions. Thus, though the vehicle and the material of the two Testaments may differ, their genius is evidently the same.

b. Notwithstanding important differences in material, the fundamentals of Old Testament ethics appear in the New Testament.

(1) New Testament ethics, as that of the Old, is a morality of hope. If the latter looks forward for its complete revelation to the coming of the Messiah, the former for its perfect realisation is ever "looking for and hastening unto that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," Who shall introduce "the new heavens and the new earth

² *Vide. Four Phases of Morals*, p. 209.

wherein dwelleth righteousness," wherein the law already fully revealed shall be perfectly kept.

(2) In both Testaments also the ethical system, as to its ground as well as to its development, is personal and only personal. In the New Testament, as in the Old, the conception of God is central. It is even more personal, if that could be. The eternal and invisible Word becomes flesh, and in Him who is "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh," and who is "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin," we behold "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his substance." It is His will, moreover, the will of one who, in addition to being personal, is a person in form and fashion like ourselves—it is His will that we are to obey; it is in following Him that true morality consists. Could it have a more strikingly personal ground than this?

Nor is it otherwise as to its development. Man is as free to follow Christ under the New Testament as he is to choose Jehovah under the Old. In both his freedom is emphasised with equal distinctness. The Gospel is to be preached to every creature; for all ought to accept it, since "whosoever *will* may come and take of the water of life freely." Nor is God's faithfulness even to His children represented as independent of their fidelity to Him; that is, of their right exercise of freedom with reference to Him. It is in keeping them faithful, in enabling and disposing them freely to fulfil the necessary conditions of His service, that His faithfulness to them manifests itself. "We are to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who worketh in us to will and to do of His good pleasure."

(3) The conception of God in the New Testament, as in the Old, is uniquely high; and it is highest, if we may so speak, along the same lines as in the Old. Nowhere do we have so impressive an exhibition of the unity of God as when we behold His glory in the face of Jesus Christ. By no one is the spirituality of God affirmed so strongly, as by Him who taught that "God is spirit and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." How could God reveal Himself to us as a person so clearly as in "the man Christ Jesus"?

Thus, too, the divine omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence find their most striking illustration in Him who burst the bars of death, who "knew what was in man," and who, while

on earth in the flesh, could still speak of Himself as "the Son of man which is from heaven."

Nor is it otherwise as to the divine holiness. Just because our Lord is "the man Christ Jesus" do we have in the positive as well as negative perfection of His life and character the most intelligible and striking manifestation of the absolute holiness of God. In a word, if in Judaism God was apprehended as He could not be in surrounding nations, it is in "the face of Jesus Christ" that we behold the most definite and most glorious revelation of Jehovah.

(4) In the New Testament, as in the Old, God's claim on man is all comprehensive. For example :

(a) The organisation of humanity the New Testament regards as of God in all its essential relations and institutions, and the accomplishment of His purpose in this organisation it makes His deep concern. Hence, the numerous precepts with reference to parents and children, husbands and wives, masters and servants. If the Old Testament represents family and social life as distinctively and essentially religious, the New Testament does this even more explicitly. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right"—such is its characteristic announcement on this subject (Eph. vi. 1).

(b) Our responsibility to God is represented in the New Testament, as in the Old, as extending also to the inferior creation. Surely we have duties to the brutes when He whose nature is the ground and norm of law takes care of the sparrows : and if duties of this kind are not formally urged on us, it is not because they are not conceived as duties ; it is because, they are self-evidently so, and specially because as in the Old Testament, the principle of proportion obtains and this claims the emphasis for duties of relatively greater importance.

(c) In the New Testament, as in the Old, man's treatment of himself, both body and spirit, comes within the sphere of ethics. So far from being our own, we are "bought with a price, even the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Hence, intemperance, lust, and all bodily vices are abominable ; and we are bound to glorify God in our body and in our spirit which are God's.

(d) In the New Testament, as in the Old, the divine claim extends to "the thoughts and intents of the heart." We shall be

judged, not only for our idle words, but also for our vain thoughts and our foolish imaginations. Indeed, the heart is represented as the source and centre of the moral life, and the characteristic feature of the judgment is to be that then "the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed."

Thus the claim of New Testament ethics could not be more comprehensive than it is. If the Old Testament commands us to "do with our might whatsoever our hands find to do," the New Testament requires us, "whether we eat or drink, to do all to the glory of God."

(5) In the New Testament, as in the Old, God's concern for the ethical life is shown :

(a) By provision for our moral development. God becomes incarnate in Christ, not only to deliver us from guilt, but "to redeem us from all iniquity and to purify unto Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." He "fulfils all righteousness" that He may show us what it is to be righteous. He sends His Holy Spirit to quicken and to refine our moral sense. Keeping the law of God He interprets as following the divine human Christ, and to conscience He gives the authority and impressiveness of the personal command of the Lord Jesus.

(b) By provision against hero-worship. No more than the saints of the Old Testament are those of the New represented as perfect. Their righteousness and piety are neither denied nor unappreciated. Yet they are never presented as examples, save in so far as they are observed to follow Christ. On the contrary, the inspired records relate even of the most eminent disciples manifold sins and sins which are evidently related as such. The apostles are represented as quarrelling over which of them should be the greatest, as misunderstanding their Lord and Master, as failing to sympathise with Him, even as forsaking Him. Peter's threefold denial is set forth in all its shamefulness. No concealment is made of the strife between Paul and Barnabas. Paul describes vividly his own internal conflict with the law of sin and death and refers to himself as "the chief of sinners." No pains are spared to keep men from resting content with human models, to cause them to look ever and only to "Jesus the author and finisher of our faith."

(6) In the New Testament, as in the Old, not only does God bring His people into closest personal relation to Himself, but He

represents Himself as sustaining a unique relation to them. They are "an elect race, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that they may show forth the excellencies of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light." He has made them to believe on Him, and He has covenanted with them to be their God and redeemer.

(a) Thus the promise made to Abraham, the "father of the faithful," is really the promise which the New Testament fulfils. Indeed, such is the declaration in Gal. iii.

(b) In the New Testament, as in the Old, the promise, though given to the peculiar people of God, is given to them for the world. The Saviour's last commission is that they should go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; and the declared result of this ingathering is that all Israel, though they had denied Him and in consequence been rejected, should at last be saved. Indeed, it is pre-eminently in the New Testament that we find that special election into God's kingdom is in order to its universal establishment.

(c) In the New Testament, as in the Old, the blessing of God's covenant is conceived as essentially spiritual. (Rom. xv. 17.)

(d) Nor is there absent from the New Testament that collective conception of the highest good which is so characteristic of the Old Testament. This appears clearly in the fact that what Christ came to do was not only to save individual souls but also to establish a spiritual kingdom, even the kingdom of heaven.

(e) In the New Testament, as in the Old, however, temporal rewards are promised as well as spiritual ones. (I Tim. iv. 8.)

(7) In the New Testament, as in the Old, the essence of obedience and of virtue is faith, and faith is represented as "the gift of God." He is set forth as both the author and the sustainer of the moral life which He requires. Only the saved can bring forth fruit unto holiness. (Eph. ii. 8-10.)

(8) Hence, as Old Testament ethics, so New Testament ethics begins by exalting God and ends by dignifying man. If it makes Christ absolutely supreme so that His mere word is the highest law, it bestows unique honour on men by calling them to "the glorious liberty of the children of God" and by pointing

them to a day when they shall "reign with Christ as kings and priests unto God." And this it does without distinction of race or age or sex. Indeed, it is in the New Testament that we have the highest exhibition of the brotherhood of man.

(9) So, too, the characteristic duty of the Old Testament is emphasised in the New. Not less avowedly than in the former did Christ come to "call sinners to repentance." If He makes the primary duty of the Christian life faith in Him as the Saviour, He insists on sincere repentance as indispensable to saving faith. Only one who feels and deplors his guilt can lay hold of the righteousness of Christ. He would save us from sin, never in sin.

(10) Nor is it otherwise as to what may be called the characteristic emphasis of the two Testaments. This, as we have seen, is in the Old Testament on the divine justice rather than on the divine grace. It has been often and urgently objected to the Old Testament that it dwells on God's severity in punishing sin much more than on His love for sinners and mercy to them. Yet the divine justice is presented in the New Testament as strongly, if not so frequently, as in the Old. To the wicked God is a "consuming fire." The impenitent shall go away into "everlasting punishment where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." It is doubtful whether the Old Testament has any assertion of the retributive justice of God so terrible as this. Nor should we forget that the sacrifice of the cross, the highest manifestation of divine grace, is also the supreme vindication of divine justice. God gave His Son to die for us that He "might be *just* and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

Thus it should be evident that the ethics of the New Testament embraces whatever is fundamental in that of the Old Testament as well as in that of nature. Man as fallen, which is the Old Testament conception, may have duties, as that of repentance, additional to those of man as unfallen, which is the conception of natural ethics; but he has still the duties of the latter: and man as redeemed, which is the New Testament conception, may have duties, as that of evangelical faith, additional to those of man as unfallen or as fallen; but he will still have the duties of the two former.

Indeed, the law of nature and the law of Moses and the law of Christ are one law, different stages in the development of the law of the one God. This can scarcely be repeated too often or

emphasised too strongly. The law of Christ can not be regarded as God's complete ethical revelation, unless it be considered as also re-enacting, explaining, and confirming His previous revelations. It is only when it has been shown to do this that we are in a position to discuss its distinctive characteristics, those features which make it the complete statement of the divine law. In a word, the very perfection of the New Testament as an ethical revelation is founded on its essential harmony with all the earlier revelations.

A further remark should be made before leaving this subject. As the ethics of the Old Testament is preparatory for and disciplinary with reference to that of the New Testament, so we should study it in the light thrown on it by that of the New. Its incomplete precepts should mean for us what the New Testament shows us that they were tending toward. The mature man often turns back to the text books of his childhood: but it is only that in their more definite, because partial, representations he may find vivid illustrations of certain aspects of the truth which he has already grasped in its entirety and relations and which he would continue so to hold. He never rests content with the partial, however definite. He always views them through the truth in its completeness.

II. THE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS.

We come now to the consideration of the respects in which New Testament Ethics differs from and is superior to Philosophical Ethics and even Old Testament Ethics.

I. This difference and superiority has its explanation in the following facts:

a. Under the New Testament, as was not the case before, both the moral subject and the moral norm are realised fully.

(1) This is so in the case of the moral subject. Under the Gospel, man, the moral subject, is completely equipped for moral life. On the one hand, he has attained to a new and deep consciousness of sin, of both its extent and its guilt. The Holy Spirit has been sent by Christ specially to "convict the world with respect of sin," and in the Son of God crucified for the sin of the world the Christian has an object lesson of unique impressiveness both as to the extent and as to the guilt of sin. It can not but be that this lesson, especially when applied to the

conscience by the convicting Spirit, will deepen as was never done before, and as could be done in no other way, the sense of sin, the necessity of repentance, and the obligation to holiness. It is impossible for the spiritually-minded man to think of his Saviour crucified for his sins, and not at once determine to renounce them and to live unto Him. Thus the Gospel gives a new and unique impulse to the moral life. It makes it the most urgent of all necessities.

On the other hand, the "new man in Christ Jesus" has become free from his bondage under sin, and has risen again to moral freedom. The Spirit of the Lord has made him able to accomplish the moral task which, as we have seen, the same Spirit in convicting him of sin, pressed upon him. In both respects, therefore, both with reference to his sense of sin to be overcome, and with reference to his ability to live unto God, the moral subject has for the first time been made fully sufficient. Must not a higher morality result?

(2) The same is true as to the norm of the ethical life. This, under the New Testament is fully, personally and historically, revealed to man in the person and life of Jesus Christ. In Him, that is in human and so intelligible form, man beholds "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his substance." Thus the perfection of the ethical, the ethical itself, is actualised for man under his own conditions. Before he had heard what he ought to be; now he sees it. Nor is this all. The Holy Spirit who has been given to him, who has transformed him, and who lives in him, has clarified his spiritual vision, has enabled him to see in Christ "the chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely"; and has taken of the things of Christ and interpreted them for him and applied them to him. Beyond all this God has come into an entirely new relation to man. There is no longer the antithesis that there was between him as a sin-estranged creature and the terribly holy God; but in Christ God is seen to be reconciled with him, and, as a graciously loving Father, is felt to be present to him and in constant sanctifying and strengthening life-communion with him. Thus under the New Testament the moral norm has been made complete, as we have seen that the moral subject has been. Must not, then, a higher ethical system result?

b. Under the New Testament the goal of morality is presented not as something to be struggled after, but as something

to be developed and enjoyed because already attained. Thus the Christian does not have to strive toward divine sonship; but if a Christian at all, he lives and acts in it and as inspired by it. Indeed, it is only as God's child that he can live a truly moral life. From the first, therefore, his effort is not, as it was under the Old Testament, toward the goal; it is rather in the development and realisation of what is involved in his already attained divine sonship. He looks forward to greater fidelity in this; he does not look forward to a surer grasp on it. He would ever be a better son of God, but at the same time, he feels that he could never be more truly a son. Must not this essential difference between the two Testaments most favourably affect the ethical system of the later?

c. The ethical standpoint also of the two Testaments is unlike. In the New Testament morality, as just implied, has risen from the faithful obedience of the servant to the loving devotion of the son. That is, What ought I to do? has been transfigured into, How much may I do? The command of duty thus comes no longer as a merely outward and objective one, uncongenial to our subjective nature; but as an inner one, an inner power at one with our personality itself, and, hence, no more as a yoke or burden. The Christian does not have to bend to the will of another external to himself. In the profoundest sense it is the will of one who has come into such vital union with him as to have made his own will his; for "it is no more he who lives, but Christ who lives in him." Thus the ethical life is not so much conformity to the divine law within him; it is rather the development of the divine law within him, the principle of his new life. If nowhere else, do we not here have the ground for a higher, a complete ethical system?

2. Let us notice, then, the elements of this completeness, this superiority, of New Testament ethics.

a. These elements begin to emerge even at the points of fundamental agreement between the three ethical systems, and they should be carefully studied in connection with these agreements.

(1) New Testament ethics, while embracing natural ethics, transcends it. This raises the question, What has New Testament ethics to say of the natural virtues, such as parental and filial affection, generosity, honesty, etc.; virtues which would be such had God never given a special revelation requiring them;

virtues found in unsurpassed excellence, at least as to form, in many who have never experienced the work of special grace ?

(a) Christianity, as we have seen, emphasises the importance of these virtues. It makes them fundamental. It teaches that one can not follow Christ and not excel in them. With the qualification that the Holy Spirit is the ultimate author of all that is good in nature, it admits that they are natural or belong to the first creation ; that to a large degree they exist among men ; that in some form and measure they are almost universally present in human life and character. We cannot but feel this to be so ; and as Chalmers says, " God's Word is not in conflict with the consciousness of men. They are natural virtues." Indeed, the precepts of the Old and New Testaments not only recognise these virtues, but they enjoin them as having their basis in nature, in the first creation rather than in grace and the new creation or regeneration. Hence, Rom. ii. 14, teaches that the Gentiles, " though not having the revealed law, do by nature the things of the law." Could there be a stronger assertion of the reality and of the prevalence of natural virtue ? Thus far, therefore, the three ethical systems are at one.

(b) We come now to the difference and the superiority of the two supernatural revealed systems as compared with the natural one. Natural ethics does not ignore God, but in the relations of men its tendency is to regard only two parties as concerned in the practice of virtues ; viz., man and his neighbour. Old Testament ethics and New Testament ethics, on the contrary, recognise invariably three parties, and God is the third. They both teach that our ordinary duties should be discharged primarily for God's sake, in His fear, and for His glory. Col. iii. 22, 23 ; Titus ii. 9-10 ; 1 Tim. v. 8 ; Rom. xiii. 1-5 ; Eph. vi. 1 ; Eph. v. 22. Thus we see that in all the relations of men as men God is recognised as a third party. Even when justice has been done so far as two of the parties are concerned, virtue is still, from the Old or the New Testament standpoint, radically defective until it has taken account of the third party, i.e., God.

This is true of all the natural virtues. For example, charity ceases to be truly such, unless it is inspired by Christian love. (1 Cor. xiii. 3.) Sincerity as a mere impulse is not enough. It must be " sincerity of God " ; i.e., prompted and sustained by Him. (2 Cor. i. 12.)

We may get the New Testament's estimate of the natural virtues by examining the epithets and phrases by which it describes character and indicates the ground of its judgment. One group of these phrases is *σάρκιος, ψυχικός, πνευματικός*. Sometimes all of these, and sometimes only two of them, are brought into contrast. *Vide* 1 Cor. ii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 4; Gal. vi. 1, 8; Rom. vii. 14; Jas. iii. 15; Jude 19; Rom. viii. 5. The first two of these terms, *σάρκιος* and *ψυχικός*, though not the same psychologically, are identical ethically. They represent the ruling principle of the virtue which they characterise as being within from the man himself. In contradistinction from this, the third term, *πνευματικός*, represents the virtues which it characterises as having their ruling principle without the man himself and from God. Hence, it is this kind of virtue, and only this kind of virtue, that the New Testament approves. It recognises as real and praiseworthy the virtues which spring from man's own immaterial nature or *ψύχη* but it declares at the same time that they are not what they should be until they are inspired and controlled by the divine *πνεύμα*.

The attitude of New Testament ethics toward the natural virtues may, therefore, be summarised as follows:

(α) So far forth as they spring from man's original unvitiated *ψύχη* or immaterial nature, they are appropriate virtues.

(β) So far as they have respect to their proper objects, they are right.

(γ) So far as the sanction of conscience as God's representative is regarded, they are commended.

(δ) So far, in a word, as they are rooted in and spring from a right moral disposition, they are endorsed.

(ε) They are, however, censured, notwithstanding all this, so far as they are cherished and manifested without regard to God, so far as man relies on his own judgment and acts from his own impulses. A life that shall please God and satisfy us must proceed at all points from a supernatural principle. "Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do *all* to the glory of God." It is in this that Biblical ethics differs radically from philosophical ethics and transcends it immeasurably. The outward form of both may be identical. The inward inspiring and controlling principle is essentially different. Natural virtue is of man; Christian virtue is of God. They may often look alike, but the power in them is always infinitely

unlike. In a word, the essence of Christianity is not a particular type of character; it is a unique relation to a unique person: it is not Christlikeness; it is union with Christ. As Father Tyrrell says,¹ "Morality is not our highest life," and, "For Jesus the moral is not the highest life, but its condition."

(2) Observe next how New Testament ethics, while embracing Old Testament ethics, transcends even it.

(a) The conception of duty presented in the New Testament. In it, as in the Old, duty consists in obedience to the will of God. As compared with the Old Testament, however, the New makes less of the legal aspects of duty and lays more stress on its rational or moral nature. Duties are often urged as self-justifying. Arguments are sometimes used to remove misapprehension or to overcome prejudice.² Above all, such a revelation of God is made in Christ that what God commands is seen to commend itself, is felt to be approved by right reason and conscience. The moral claim is not less personal than under the Old Testament, but the person making that claim is revealed so fully with reference to his work for us and in us that we can not but feel that we ought to do what He requires of us, even had He not required it.

Beyond this, the New Testament introduces into the substance of duty a new simplicity and unity by making the great all-embracing duty to be love and the obedience which it prompts. This, too, follows from the revelation which the new Testament is of God. The supreme exhibition of Him and specially of His love, our duty to Him, and so to all others, will be summed up in love; and so love will become "the fulfilling of the law."

Thus the difference at this point between the Old Testament and the New may be compared to that between a righteous king and a gracious father. Under the Old Testament God is characteristically presented as a righteous king. In so far as He is conceived as a father, it is rather as the father of the nation. Hence, what He commands ought to be obeyed because it is the law. It is right because it has been imposed by a competent authority. This, however, requires that duty should be set forth in detail; for every command depends for its force on the clearness of its connection with the imposing authority. Under a legal system,

¹ "Christianity at the Cross Roads," *Hibbert Journal*, April 1911, p. 613.

² *Vide Butler's Analogy*, p. 200.

therefore, there can not be one duty ; there must be many duties. When, however, our king becomes our reconciled and gracious father, as in the New Testament, it is quite different. The comprehensive principle that was lacking under the legal system of the Old Testament is now supplied. Whatever God commands we ought to do from love to Him, and whatever true love to Him suggests we ought to regard as having the authority of His command. Hence, if we love Him, we shall discharge our whole duty ; and we can not perform our whole duty, or any part of it rightly unless we love Him. Thus the New Testament unifies all duties by making love to God the one great duty. Of course, as we have seen, the Old Testament taught the same doctrine. It is only in the New Testament, however, in its revelation of the love of God for us in Christ, that the reason why this is the first and great commandment of both Testaments is adequately presented.

Here, too, we have the explanation of the fact that the duty of repentance seems to be made less prominent than in the Old Testament. It is not that it is any less a duty. That could not be. Repentance is a duty of man as fallen and independently of what God has done for him. Even if no plan of salvation had been revealed, it would still be the sinner's duty to renounce his sin. He is bound to forsake it because it is sin and whether or not he will be saved through so doing. When, however, the plan of salvation has been made known, when God's amazing and infinite compassion for sinners has been disclosed, when Christ is visibly crucified before the world for the sin of the world, then,—in the case of the sinner who appreciates this, as the Christian must, repentance becomes a necessity as well as a duty. One can not but feel that he ought to give up, and can not but try to give up, the sins which have crucified his Lord and Saviour and dearest friend. Thus under the New Testament repentance becomes so urgent a necessity as to be self-evidently a duty. It is not emphasised, therefore, so frequently as in the Old Testament: to do this would be superfluous.

The revelation of divine love which makes love for God "the fulfilling of the law" does not need to dwell often on the necessity of repentance ; in itself such a revelation guarantees it.

To sum up, nothing is more characteristic of the morality of the New Testament than this, that it does not consist in a series of rules and precepts ; but in general principles from which

we are for ourselves to derive these, and specially in the all embracing principle of love to Him who so loved us as to give Himself up for us.

(b) The reward of ethical living as conceived by the New Testament. Under the Old Testament this reward was characteristically temporal. This was so even when it was viewed in its spiritual aspect, as it often was. The righteous were to expect God's favour, but it was usually here and now that it was to be enjoyed.

In the New Testament, while the reward is assured and even entered on in time, it is consummated only in eternity. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life," and yet it is not until the judgment that the righteous are said to "enter into life eternal." Indeed, the New Testament has no more striking characteristic than the prominence which it gives to the future life. Do we suffer now? (Rom. viii. 18). Are we perplexed here? "We shall yet know even as also we are known" (1 Cor. xiii. 12). Are we distressed at present by the apparent injustice of the divine administration? "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have his praise from God" (1 Cor. iv. 5). Are we weary in the conflict with sin? Think of "the rest which remains for the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9). Hear our Saviour's words: "In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also" (St. John, xiv. 2, 3). What wonder that the New Testament should bid us to live as those who have here "no continuing city, but seek one to come," and to be "looking forward and hastening unto that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." It could not well do otherwise. If Christ be "our life," if to be like Him be our aim, then the future life in which we shall be "at home" with Him and shall be changed into His glorious image, must be for us the only true life, the one toward which our strongest expectation and keenest desire should ever be going out.

In view of this, there is no more alarming tendency than that which would puts the emphasis on the present state of

existence, which would turn the thoughts of men from the bliss of heaven to the happiness of this world, which would encourage the interests of time to crowd out preparation for eternity. This tendency the church, if she would be true to the New Testament, can not resist too strenuously; and one of the most depressing facts of our day is that much of our popular preaching would seem rather to foster it. The favourite doctrine, that if we live for the present, the future will take care of itself, is a doctrine of devils. The Christian life must lack its needed support, indeed, we can not be true Christians, unless while we suffer and fight now, we keep our gaze on those "ages to come" in which God has promised to "show to us the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 7). To live for the present as Christ would have us live, we must live for the future that is ours "in Christ." Even to this extent must we admit, and we are glad to admit, that Christianity is other-worldly.

(c) The New Testament conception of virtue. Its difference from that of the Old Testament is one of degree rather than of kind. In both Testaments true virtue is traced to God as its author. Nowhere have we clearer recognition than in David's psalms that if there is to be a clean heart and a right spirit, God must "create" the one and "renew" the other. In the New Testament, however, the supernatural origin of true virtue is affirmed more frequently and taught more formally. Such virtue, we are shown, is not found in man as he is. He ought to realise it and, therefore, he must have the capacity to do so. That is, he needs no other faculties than he already has. He is not, however, in the moral state and so he has not the moral ability for the right use of his faculties. In consequence of the fall, he lacks both the resolution and the disposition for the virtuous exercise of these powers, and there is no provision in his own nature whereby he can regain these. If he is to do this, he must be "born again," and he must be born from "above." Only God can now bring about in him what the divine law requires.

While, however, Christian virtue is thus supernatural in its origin, even more definitely than the Old Testament does the New represent it as natural to the new man. It is not merely accredited or imputed to him, as is the righteousness of Christ on the ground of which the sinner is justified: it is so wrought in

him that it becomes truly his own ; it makes him a " new man," a " new creature." He is not a mere figure on which God displays the costume and drapery of virtue. On the contrary, his moral disposition has been so changed by the Holy Spirit and is so supported and so energised by Him that now of his own will and with his own power he does the will of God. The reality and importance of his own agency in the production of virtue comes out more clearly in view of the fact that his development of virtue is progressive. If he were " made perfect in holiness at once," it could not be that he, inasmuch as he was " dead through trespasses and sins," had any share in it. Because, however, it is only by slow and painful degrees and with many falls that he attains to holiness, it must be that its attainment is conditioned in part on his own imperfect efforts. This the New Testament emphasises as strongly as the Old and much more variously. Clearly and decidedly as it insists that regeneration is necessary and is wholly of God, and that sanctification too is impossible without the guidance and support of the Holy Spirit, it insists no less clearly and decidedly that man must at all points co-operate with God in the work of sanctification, if he would " bring forth fruit unto holiness." If he is to " grow in grace," he must himself exercise his own new nature. Hence, he should " walk in the Spirit " (Gal. v. 16), he should " deny himself and take up the cross " (Matt. xvi. 24), he should " forsake all and be Christ's disciple " (Luke xiv. 33), he should " crucify the flesh " (Gal. v. 24), he should " put on the new man " (Eph. iv. 24), he should " abound in the work of the Lord " (1 Cor. xv. 58), he should " follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace " (2 Tim. ii. 22), he should " yield his members unto holiness " (Rom. vi. 19), he should " work out his own salvation with fear and trembling " (Phil. ii. 12), he should " fight the good fight of faith " (2 Tim. iv. 7), he should " run with patience the race set before him " (Heb. xii. 1), he should " contend earnestly for the faith, which was once for all delivered unto the saints " (Jude 3), he should " endure unto the end " (Matt. x. 22). In a word, he should proceed on the assumption that, as Palmer has said, " All divine training is fruitless unless I train myself."

This active and indispensable co-operation of the moral subject does, not, however, render Christian virtue meritorious in the common sense of the term. Our work in the development

of Christian character is so dependent on God, both as its sole author and as its necessary sustainer, it is so clearly the fruit of grace, that there is no ground for or demand of reward. Hence, while God's character requires and the New Testament teaches that we shall be "rewarded according" to our good works, it never teaches that we shall be rewarded on account of them. The degree and kind of our reward will be and must be determined by our own works; that is, it will in any event be at least related to them and adapted to our character: but our right to a reward at all rests altogether on Christ's work for us: and the reward will often be graciously out of proportion to our good works (*vide* the Parable of the Labourers and the Vineyard). Reward, then, as conceived by the New Testament, is always related to character but it is never earned by character. It is the gift of Him who, while He may not allot to any less or other than His due, delights, in the exercise of His sovereign grace, freely to bestow on His reconciled children the utmost that by their character they are fitted to improve.

From what has just been said there must follow the denial of the Romish doctrine as to "counsels of perfection" and "works of supererogation." If no human virtue at all is meritorious, how can there be any that, by more than fulfilling the law, will acquire for its subject more merit than he needs for himself? Thus, aside entirely from any consideration of the claims of the law of God, the fallacy of this Romish teaching may be exposed. Those who of themselves can never do anything as they ought, who at best are "but unprofitable servants," certainly may not hope to do better than they ought.

(*d*) The New Testament conception of the supreme good. Like the Old Testament, as we have seen, it recognises the collective or social aspect of this.¹ Also like the Old Testament, the New Testament finds the supreme good itself in perfect likeness to God and so in perfect sonship with reference to Him and thus in perfect bliss in Him. This perfect likeness to God is not, however, something which is to be attained exclusively by moral action. On the contrary, in its essence it is a power graciously conferred on the willing heart. It is a power which has true morality, not as its means, but as its fruit; and which manifests itself, not in striving after grace, but in faithfulness in developing the grace which has been

¹ See Stalker, *The Ethics of Jesus*, p. 28.

already received. In a word, the highest good of the Christian is not something which he has to work to obtain ; it is something the appreciation and improvement of which is his great work.

Now this is a conception which ever in the Old Testament is placed only in the promised future. Indeed, nothing is more distinctive of Christian morality than this, that it consists in fidelity in improving good already received as a free gift, and not in effort to earn the good. Thus throughout is the morality of the New Testament gracious. The grace of God is the great motive to duty ; the grace of God is the source and support of virtue ; the supreme good is the gracious and already bestowed gift of divine sonship. In a word, the essence of New Testament morality is to appropriate the grace of God in Christ. The truly ethical life is found in fidelity to it. We are to work *out* our own salvation ; we are not to work for it.

Nowhere does the gracious character of New Testament ethics come out more clearly than in relation to justice. It is on the latter that the emphasis rests in the Old Testament ; and the latter, too, as we have also noticed, could not be asserted more strongly and even terribly than it is in the New Testament. It is, however, in order to the exercise of grace that God in the New Testament represents his justice as supremely vindicated. He gives His own Son to "fulfil all righteousness" and He visits on Him the extreme penalty of the law that it may become right for Him to manifest grace to sinners. He would not abate one whit the claim of justice, but He would show that salvation is the work in which He delights. This is the distinctive message of the New Testament. Who does not see that it can not fail to give rise to what may be called Evangelical duties, to duties which, unlike natural ones, and unlike even repentance, are duties only because of the mercies of God, only because "the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men" ?

b. The Evangelical duties.—These, because peculiar to the New Testament, are its chief characteristics and its crowning excellence. Yet we need to be on our guard against supposing that the Old Testament knows nothing of them. Such is the unity of the two Testaments that even what is most distinctive of the later is foreshadowed in the earlier. As the saints of the Old Dispensation were saved through accepting the promise of redemption, the fulfilment of which promise it was that brought

these evangelical duties into prominence ; so these duties could not but have been more or less clearly implied in the promise itself. Thus they become *the* distinction of New Testament ethics, not because they appear in it for the first time, but because it is in it that they first appear as developed and emphasised. They were anticipated under the Old Testament ; the consciousness of their obligation is one of the great facts of the New Testament. These Evangelical duties and virtues are three :

(1) *Faith*, the primary and appropriating virtue. This must not be confounded with mere confidence in God or with general fidelity to Him. God has only to reveal Himself as God for either of these to become a duty and to be a virtue. The creature has no right to disobey or to doubt the infinite power, justice, goodness, and holiness of his Creator. Reason alone teaches this. It would be absurd, were it to do so.

By faith in the evangelical sense, however, we mean that specific form of faith which becomes a duty and a virtue in view of what God promised to do for us and has done for us in Christ. What, then, is this ? The comprehensive answer is, He has redeemed us. Faith, therefore, in the evangelical sense, as has been remarked, is more than general confidence in God and common obedience to Him : it is confidence in God as our redeemer ; it is obedience to Him as our Saviour ; and it proceeds on the fundamental fact that we are drawn to Christ and laid hold of by Him. Resting on this fact, it *appropriates* Him in all the fullness of His person and work for us. Nothing less than such confidence, such obedience, such appropriation, can be due to Him who "so loved us that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life," and who by His Spirit draws us to and enables us to appreciate this Saviour whom He has provided ; and in view of all this, no confidence in God, no obedience to Him, can be right and acceptable, unless it be rooted in the specific kind of confidence and obedience, in a word, in the believing appropriation just described. Hence, the New Testament makes evangelical faith a necessary antecedent to the performance of any and all man's general duties. According to it the spring of every right action is faith. When once the grace of God has appeared bringing salvation, the sinner can not be in a right relation to God until he is disposed to accept this amazing and priceless grace and to act on it ; and the sin of all sins must be that hardness of heart

which refuses to believe in the divine Saviour, the only begotten Son of God. In a word, the primary duty of the Christian and the primary virtue is and must be faith in Christ. Because of what God is to us in Him, it could not be otherwise. Nothing could be taught more plainly. (Rom. xiv. 23; Heb. xi. 6.)

The first and most general expression of this evangelical faith will, of course, be prayer; for this, as it brings us into the closest personal communion with God, is *the* means to the largest and freest appropriation of Him and His best benefits. Prayer, it is true, is not a duty under the New Testament alone. It was pre-eminently a duty under the Old Testament, in which the divine Saviour was conceived as promised rather than given. It is a duty, too, even of natural ethics; for this conceives of God as good and, therefore, His creatures ought to thank Him and to bring their wants to Him. Under the New Testament, however, prayer becomes to the believer what breathing is to the physical man. He can not live without it; he lives by means of it; to neglect it would be suicide; and so to persist in it is the first of all duties.

And we can see why it should be so. In Christ the Christian beholds God "reconciling the world unto Himself." In Christ the Holy Spirit assures him that he himself has been adopted into the family of God. In Christ he feels that the Holy Spirit has become the principle of his new and true life. Can he be thus in Christ and refuse permanently to join that Spirit in His spontaneous and necessary outgoing to the Father? Could he succeed in doing so, could he persist in thus refusing to appropriate what God has done for him and is doing for him and would do for him in Christ, it would be the creature overcoming the Holy Spirit the Creator, and so both outraging Him and cutting itself off from the one source of life. It must be, therefore, that the first duty, or rather the prime necessity, of every Christian, is, as Paul says, "to pray without ceasing." Indeed the Christian life does not so much depend on as it does consist in "in everything, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, letting our requests be made known unto God." It is not so true that the Christian life is one of prayer as it is true that it itself is one long prayer. Not to speak of the other elements of prayer, the Christian, in proportion as he is spiritually well, is always breathing out his desires to the God whose infinite love for him Christ has shown him; and he feels that there is no

wish which he may not and should not make known to his Father in heaven, if only it be done in the name of Christ, that is, purified by fellowship with Him. Nothing but such uninterrupted and free communion with God can secure that appropriation of Christ in which his life has now come to consist.

All this, however, does not lessen the importance of special and regular seasons and acts of prayer. On the contrary, it increases it. Constant prayerfulness depends on punctuality in the observance of fixed times and places of prayer. He who does not, like Christ, go often and systematically "apart" to pray will find ere long that the spirit of true prayer, and so the life of Christ, was never in him.

The true development of the life of faith, which is the life of prayer, depends on the full appropriation, and so the just appreciation of the three offices of Christ as our redeemer, of what each one of them means for us and so demands of us.

(a) His office of *Prophet*. As such, He "reveals to us by His Word and Spirit the will of God for our salvation." Hence, for us the following duties will result :

(a) The duty of searching the Scriptures. Not to study them would be practical unbelief ; "for they are they which testify of Christ" (St. John v. 39), and they are able to "make us wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. iii. 15). So, too, not to *search* them must issue eventually in prayerlessness ; for as the burden of true prayer is that Christ may be known to us more fully, so not to search the Scriptures, in which He has revealed Himself most fully is really to pray without regard to the answer, and thus to make prayer a mere form incapable of long continuance.

What, however, needs most to be emphasised is that the Scriptures should be *sought regularly* and *diligently*. The occasional study of them, or the regular but listless reading of them, is not enough. The will of *God* for our salvation is dishonoured and so in effect He is doubted, if the Bible itself is not made the subject of constant study and the most serious study of which we are capable. Indeed, there is nothing more unchristian than the careless attitude of many Christians toward the word of God.

(β) The duty of special prayer for the illumination of the Holy Spirit. It is only as He enlightens us, as He "guides us into all truth," as He "takes of the things of Christ and shows

them unto us," that we can discern the spiritual meaning of the Bible or perceive the real preciousness and beauty of the Saviour. Therefore, to study the Scriptures without such prayer is practically the same as not to study them at all. It is to disregard, and so to doubt Christ as our prophet.

(γ) The duty of meditation in "the things of Christ." This is an obligation growing out of the two duties just named, inasmuch as it is the condition of their profitable performance. Truth can act on us only in accordance with the laws of the mind, and the operation of the Holy Spirit in applying the truth is in and through these laws and not in independence of them. Now one of the primary laws of the mind is that truth is appropriated and appreciated in proportion as we make it the subject of continued and serious reflection. It is as we think, and usually only as we think closely, that what is thought of comes out in its fulness and reality. Unless, therefore, like the Psalmist, we "meditate in the law of the Lord" almost "day and night", we practically say that we do not care to understand His will for our salvation; and what is this but the acme of unbelief in Him as our prophet? Yet it is a form of unbelief which is alarmingly common. There is no more alarming tendency in the church than the present general tendency to neglect private devotion. The real reason why Christian life is so frequently superficial is that there are so few thoughtful Christians. The Holy Spirit has chosen to operate in the sphere of thought, and in the case of the majority this condition is seldom fulfilled.

(δ) The duty of sanctifying the Lord's Day. Unless this be done, not many can have the time necessary for meditation on "the things of the Spirit." Modern life is so busy, the just demands of the world are so numerous and so exacting, that if we do not keep the Sabbath, and do not keep it as a holy day rather than as a holiday, as a day set apart even from right secular uses to distinctively sacred ends, we shall have almost no opportunity for the special cultivation of the religious life, we shall in effect say that we do not care to know what God has revealed concerning the development of this life, and so with reference to our salvation. Thus viewed, and this is the only true view, the warrant for the Sabbath is clearer now, if not stronger, than it was under the old Dispensation. It is more evidently necessary to-day than it was then. In an important sense the application of the redemption purchased for us by Christ depends

on its observance. The very demand that is made on it for social purposes only emphasises its demand on us for its complete sanctification. Should it be lost to us, it would be true that even Christ had died for us in vain.

(ε) The duty of acting on the doctrines and obeying the precepts of the Bible as soon as these are ascertained. This is a *sine qua non*, if they are to be understood and appreciated. It is only as we do or try to do the will of God that we can know of the doctrine. Even meditation, though itself indispensable, is not itself enough. There must be both thought and action with reference to the will of God for our salvation, if the Holy Spirit is to guide us into the truth of that will. Thus not so to act involves indifference to that will and is, therefore, really unbelief.

(b) Christ's office of *Priest*. As such He "once offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, and He makes continual intercession for us." Hence, for us the following duties will result :

(α) The duty of recognising that we are sinners. This is fundamental. Otherwise, we should be untrue to ourselves and should even charge God with untruth. (1 John 1. 8). The Scriptures never represent man as becoming confirmed in holiness in this life. On the contrary, the elect must be "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed at the last time" (1 Peter 1. 5). A belief, therefore, in present perfection is in so far forth unbelief in God.

(β) The duty of appreciating the pollution of sin. Failure at this point is also to doubt the revelation of God in Christ. If He was manifested to "redeem us from all iniquity and to purify unto Himself a people for his own possession zealous of good works," we can not truly believe Him and not be conscious of pollution from which we need to be cleansed. Hence, the obligation of self-examination, of comparison of ourselves with the perfect standard given us by Christ in his own perfect career, and specially of prayer that we may be enabled to see ourselves as we cannot but appear to Him. In view of the pollution which sin must involve anything like self-complacency is radically unchristian.

(γ) The duty of realising the guilt of sin. It is true that "there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

The *reatus poenae* or obligation to suffer punishment has been forever removed. Nevertheless, the *reatus culpae* or inherent ill-desert remains. Hence, while the Christian should feel that on account of what Christ has done for him he is free from condemnation, he ought at the same time to feel that in himself he deserves condemnation. To think of himself otherwise is to deny that in himself he still needs a Saviour, and so it is to take a position inconsistent with the appropriation of the salvation which is in Christ.

(δ) The duty of appreciating the helplessness consequent on sin. The Christian ought to feel that as he could do nothing to meet the law's demands on him with respect to punishment, so he can still render the obedience which the law requires only by the grace of Christ. Unless he is constrained to cry out with Paul, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. vii. 24), he will not exclaim with him, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vii. 25). Indeed, self-sufficiency is fatal to Christian growth, and one reason is that it is fatal to that appropriation of Christ in which spiritual growth consists.

(ε) The duty of positively resting on Christ for sanctification as well as for justification. He "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity." How, then, can we do less than look to Him for "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption"? Not to do so could mean only that we doubted Him.

(ς) The duty of assurance of salvation. While this is not of the essence of faith, it is the appropriate fruit of faith. Its absence need not indicate the lack of saving faith, but it does indicate an undeveloped faith. It is consistent with our being children of God, but it is inconsistent with our being what as children of God we ought to be. If Christ died that we might have peace with God through Him, not to realise such peace is to fail in appropriating the full benefit of His death and so to fall short of the faith which is His due.

(η) The duty of confessing our sins to Christ constantly, freely and fully. He not only died for us, but He ever lives to "make intercession" for us. Thus He accomplishes for each one of His people the salvation which He opened up for them all by His death. For each one of our sins He secures the

application of that pardon which He obtained for them all on the cross. Can we, then, believe on Him, unless we seek the benefit of His intercession? And can we seek this intelligently and honestly, unless we go to Him with our needs, and especially unless we confess to Him our sins, since, first of all and above all, we need the forgiveness of these?

(*θ*) The duty of partaking regularly and with due preparation of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour. In this His death for us is, as it were, set forth. In this peculiarly we receive the benefit of His body broken and of His blood shed for our sins. In this, in a special sense, we, by faith, appropriate His life to our own growth in grace. To absent ourselves from the sacrament, therefore, is one of the most glaring forms of practical unbelief in Christ as our priest; and the same remark in principle should be made with reference to baptism.

(*c*) Christ's office of *King*. As such, "He subdues us to Himself; He rules and defends us; He restrains and conquers all His and our enemies." Hence, for us the following duties will result:

(*a*) The duty of submission to the will of God. Always man's duty because God is his sovereign, this is much more the duty of the Christian because he recognises the will of God not only as that of a good sovereign, but also and specially as that of a gracious and mediatorial king. To him a lost sinner God offers His own Son, that the latter may rule over him with direct reference to his salvation. Not to submit to such gracious dominion, therefore, would be ungrateful and unbelieving. We cannot believe that Christ is the King that He declares Himself to be and not appropriate the benefits of His reign over us; and, of course, we can not do this, unless we submit ourselves to His will.

(*β*) The duty of contentment with the allotments of Providence. This involves submission, but goes beyond it. It not only acquiesces in the will of God for us as revealed in providence; it feels this will to be right and so best. There is this positive element, this cheerful tone, in Paul's words when he writes while bound to a Roman soldier and in expectation of a far from favourable issue to his confinement, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content" (Phil.

iv. 11). And there is good reason why it should have been so in his case and why it should be so in the case of every Christian. The Lord of providence is Christ. Christ is our Saviour, our "friend that sticketh closer than a brother," the one who is "touched with the feeling of all our infirmities," especially He who so strengtheneth us that in Him we "can do all things." How, then, can the dispensations of providence be other than dispensations for our good, or we be unable, so long as we rely on the grace of Christ, to realise the good in them? The spirit of contentment must, therefore, be a consequence of faith in Christ as our king. Only this spirit will or can appropriate the blessings of His providential reign.

(γ) The duty of joy even in the midst of trials. "Rejoice in the Lord always: again I will say, Rejoice" (Phil. iv. 4), wrote Paul; and he wrote it also while confined at Rome, and while contemplating at least the possibility of death by the executioner's sword. And the reason of this duty, too, is evident. We can not believe that Christ is our king and so appropriate Him as such, and not believe that in spite of our trials and seeming defeats, yea, even because of them, He is "restraining and conquering all his and our enemies"; and we can not truly believe this, that is, can not fully appreciate Christ as our king, and not, even in the hour of fiercest struggle, be buoyed up by the joy of approaching and certain victory. In a word, if Christ be what in the New Testament He has revealed Himself as being, we are bound to take Him as He offers Himself to us; and we can not take such a prophet, such a priest, such a king, as He is and not have His joy fulfilled in us. Thus, while holy joy is not the first element manifested in Christian faith, it is its crown.

(2) *Love*, the dominating and productive virtue. This must not be confounded with general love for God and the consecration and obedience which that implies. Because of the goodness of God as revealed in the Old Testament and even in nature, it can not but be that "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" should be the first and the great commandment, in an important sense, "the fulfilling of the law." By love in the evangelical meaning, however, is intended that special form of love which becomes a duty and virtue in view of God's love for us in Christ.

This evangelical love is a consequence of evangelical faith, or rather a development of it. This faith, the appropriating virtue, itself the result of the regenerating energy of God, admits the divine saving power to take further possession of a man. Thus he becomes in his own person the central seat of a new life. It follows, then, that the new man, born of God, can not but image forth the divine love. God's love for him in Christ will constrain him to like love for God and man. In this way receptivity on his part will become spontaneity and productivity; and so Christian faith may be described, as in the New Testament it is, as that which "worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6). Hence, while faith is the primary Christian virtue, love is the dominating one; and so it is, as we shall see even more clearly when we take up hope, that, though faith, hope, and love ever "abide," "the greatest of these is love." The love of the man who has been born into the life of God and so has in the exercise of faith received Christ as the supreme gift of the love of God turns naturally toward its divine origin and becomes:

(a) Free, reverent, filial love to the triune God who first loved him and gave His Son up for him. This form of Christian love will express itself in the virtues to which the following duties correspond:

(a) The duty of thankfulness. No argument can be needed to prove that we ought to be always thankful to God for His "unspeakable gift" to us of His Son. Even if the trials of the Christian did not all have a gracious design, they never could be so many or so great as to admit of comparison with the blessings to come, or even with those that have already come to us in and through Christ. Hence, the Scriptures may well bid us, as in Eph. v. 20, "to give thanks *always* in *all* things to God." At least such an expression of love from us His love to us makes His due.

(β) The duty of self-consecration. That this is the supreme duty is felt as soon as one begins really to appreciate what Christ is and what God has done for us and will do for us in Him. Even if we had not been told to "deny ourselves and to take up the cross and to follow Christ" (Mark viii. 34), the believer would feel that he ought to do so. Indeed, this charge is given, not so much for his sake as for the sake of men of the world that they may not embrace Christ without understanding the

cost. Even so exacting a requirement as that we should love the Saviour more than father or mother or son or daughter, or that in His service we should not count even our lives dear unto ourselves is seen to be entirely reasonable, as the very least that could be expected of us, in view of the cross and its revelation to us of the grace of God. "Love so amazing, so divine, demands our souls, our lives, our all." Even such an offering, though all that we can make, does not begin to pay our debt. Not more really do the requirements of the moral law grow out of the nature of God or out of His constitution of things than the demands of Christian love are rooted in the very nature of the plan of redemption.

This consecration will express itself, first of all, at least in spirit and as regards standards of living, in separation from whatever is distinctively worldly. Ultimately, it is a question of taking the world's standard rather than of personal association with men of the world. To break off such association would often be neither possible or right. Where it is enjoined, as in 2 Cor. vi. 14, it is because the union of husband and wife must normally lead to the adoption of the same standard: or because, as in 1 Cor. v. 10, it is required with reference to members of the church who have fallen into grievous and open sin, for the sake of the offenders, for their chastisement, if not for their punishment; and it is distinctly stated that this rule could not be carried out with regard to the world generally.

This separation from the world in spirit and with respect to standards of living means more than the avoidance of what is inherently evil. The command is, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John ii. 15). That is, if we love God as we ought, we should not and indeed, can not, take pleasure in the world, even as made by Him, so long and so far as it is under the control of "the Prince of this world." For example, many forms of amusement or of business may be intrinsically harmless and yet have been so monopolised by "the Prince of this world" that the Christian can not enter into them and not seem to side with him. For the true Christian disciple this, of course, will be decisive. The question with him will not be whether anything proposed is intrinsically right or wrong. Or rather, this inquiry will concern him only negatively and in order to a more important one. That a thing is

wrong in itself will at once prohibit it for him, but that it is right in itself will not of itself make it right for him. In addition to being right in itself, it must be right in view of the claim on him of true love for Christ. This being so, he will feel that he ought to separate even from an amusement inherently innocent, if, as a matter of course, it is associated with the evil from which Christ died to redeem him; as, for example, some of the games regarded as appropriated by gamblers. He will feel that he ought to withdraw from a business, though good enough in itself, if it *really* cannot be engaged in without the sacrifice of Christian influence. He will feel that he ought not to mingle in fashionable society, if, in his case, there is likely to be in consequence any loss of clearness or positiveness in his testimony for Him who "loved him and gave Himself up for him."

Nor will he be moved by the objection that there is no reason why we should give up what is good in the world in the fact that the devil has laid hold of it; that, on the contrary, this is *the* reason why we should strive to win it back for Christ. The salvation of the *world* depends on the purity of the church. The purity of the Church depends in a large measure on the separateness of the Church. If the Christian would save the world, he must live in it; but he will himself be destroyed by the world, if he suffers himself to become of it; and he will run great risk of becoming of it, if he engages in anything to which its Prince has laid exclusive claim. The spirit through which God will regenerate humanity and the world is not the spirit of compromise, but is the spirit that "counts all things but dung that it may win Christ" (Phil. iii. 8). No spirit less positive in its consecration is powerful enough to stand against "the Prince of this world." It is in danger of losing itself as well as its influence for Christ. Hence it is that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews exhorts us to lay aside not only "the sin that does so easily beset us," but "every weight" too. Hence, also, it is that the Saviour said: "If thy hand or thy foot offend thee or cause thee to stumble"—so good, so useful a thing as a hand or a foot—"cut it off and cast it from thee. It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed than having two hands or two feet to be cast into hell fire" (St. Mark xi. 43-45).

Thus the great question is not whether a distinctly worldly amusement or business is or could be innocent in itself; it is, How will participation in it just now and just here affect my

testimony to my Lord, and so express my love for Him and thus develop in me the only power that can save the world or even the amusement or business in question. Were this kept in mind, many inquiries that now perplex us with reference to our relation to the world would become easy. They almost settle themselves when we take them out of natural ethics into Christian ethics. There is no such solvent of moral difficulties as a constraining love for Him who "gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a people for his own possession zealous of good works" (Titus ii. 14).

Yet nothing that has been said should be regarded as even seeming to imply the Romish doctrine that self-denial and asceticism are in themselves meritorious. They have no worth of their own. Even a hand or a foot ought to be cut off, if it stands in the way of our consecration; but it is far better to be able to consecrate our hands and our feet. It is not a mutilated humanity but our "whole spirit and soul and body," that we should pray to be able to have "preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. v. 23). We should give up even the good things of the world rather than compromise with the devil; but our aim in so doing should be that we may overcome the devil and thus save the world. In a word, the motive of Christian self-denial and asceticism is never the earning of merit; it is always and only prudential. The soldier of Christ may not take chances. (2 Tim. ii. 4.) If for no other reason, he loves his commander too much to do so. He receives and enjoys to the full His gifts; he regards it his duty to do so; but he loves Him Himself so much more than His gifts that he will renounce them should they have been so perverted as to endanger his loyalty. At the same time, however, he will be on his guard against a prudence which is unreasonable and, therefore, excessive. Self-denial is necessary for all of us in order to true consecration, but even self-denial may tend to destroy the self and so leave nothing to be consecrated.

This self-consecration will express itself next and positively in the devotion of all that we have and are to the kingdom of Christ as distinguished from the kingdom of this world. Thus it will show itself in more than in keeping oneself, as we have just seen, distinct from the world. As Christian virtue always is, self-consecration is characteristically positive. Indeed, it is negative that it may be more positive than otherwise it could be.

It denies the spirit and gives up the standards of the world that it may identify itself more closely and clearly with the kingdom of Christ.

This devotion, therefore, should include all our possessions. Nothing may be kept back from Him who spared not His own life for us and who thus sacrificed Himself in our stead, when we were in active rebellion against Him, and, spiritually, were "dead through trespasses and sins." Here, then, will emerge the duty of Christian stewardship. All that the Christian has he will feel that he holds for God and is bound to administer in the interests of Christ's kingdom. This, on the one hand, will be inconsistent with every form of Communism, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Faith in divine providence will believe that when God made one man superior to another in intellectual ability or social station or opportunities for acquiring wealth, He knew what He was about and meant that the superiority should be improved for the benefit of others rather than destroyed or ignored.

On the other hand, the idea of Christian stewardship is equally inconsistent with every thing like selfish individualism. While it recognises it a duty to retain and develop talents and wealth, it recognises also that the duty is to retain and develop them that they may be used altogether in the interests of Christ's kingdom. Thus, for example, the Christian man of business should ordinarily hold on to his capital, but he should do this that he may have a larger income to spend for the kingdom of Him who "gave Himself a ransom for him." The presumption will always be that the talent for acquiring wealth implies wisdom in using it.

True self-consecration will not, however, and should not, rest content with the devotion of all that one has to Christ's kingdom in general. It will express itself also and particularly in devotion to the church, the divinely appointed agency for the establishment of the kingdom. The amount that will be given to the church will depend in every case on one's circumstances, inasmuch as these are always determined by Him who is the "head of the church"; and it will be proportioned to the ability and wealth of the individual. What the New Testament teaches on this subject is that giving should be proportionate and systematic, "as God has prospered" and "on the first day of the week" (*vide* 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2). It does not re-enact the

law of the tithe which obtained under the Old Testament. Certainly, however, in view of the larger work to be done by the church of the New Dispensation, and specially because of the revelation which God has made to us in Christ, it would seem that ordinarily no Christian could feel justified or could be justified in giving less than the tithe; as if the "love of Christ" would usually constrain a larger thankoffering.

True self-consecration will express itself also in the active service of God, and not merely in the devotion to Him of our possessions. It is in such service that this devotion will culminate. The Christian will feel that he must *work* for Him to whom he has unreservedly given himself. This service will be implied in the gift. It will, therefore, like the gift, be all comprehending. (Col. iii. 17.) Thus the whole field of natural ethics will come under the control of Christian ethics. All that we ought to have done, had God never revealed Himself in Christ, we shall feel that we ought specially to do, and ought to do specially well, because of this supreme exhibition of God's grace to us. Hence, the Christian ought to be the best husband, the best father, the best son, the best friend, the best citizen, the best business man in the community, the best soldier in the army, the best student in the college, in any relation and in all relations, the best *man*. It would seem that he could not be otherwise. Did not Christ die that he might become like Himself? and is not Christ in every respect the ideal man? How, then, can he love Christ and not try to reach the ideal as a man as well as a Christian, as a man specially because he is a Christian?

As in the case of possessions, however, so his service will be particular and not general merely. He will not fall into the mistake of many, the mistake of supposing that, because an indispensable means of advancing the kingdom of God is the performance for Christ's sake of the ordinary duties of men, therefore, this is all that is required of him. On the contrary, he will realise that such general faithfulness to the kingdom can not be maintained without particular fidelity to the church. Love, too, for the Head of the church will constrain him to do for and in the work of the church the utmost that his divinely appointed position in the kingdom, that is, his true relation to the sanctified interests of the world, will allow. If he is free to give himself wholly to the preaching of the Gospel and has also the necessary qualifications, he will feel, "Woe is unto

me, if I preach not the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 16); and if he is not thus called to the special work of the ministry, he will still regard himself bound, as of his property, so of his time and talents, to give, proportionately to his ability and systematically, to the great work of the church, the work of "testifying the Gospel of the grace of God."

(b) Out of the love for God just considered there arises in the new man love for self. This is evidently a duty. We ought to love him who has been made, as we have been, in the divine image and for the redemption of whom, as for us, God gave His only-begotten and well-beloved Son. If we love Him, we must love ourselves whom He loves so much.

This Christian self-love will reveal itself :

(a) In relation to itself. As such it may be considered negatively or under the aspect of righteousness. It will then give rise to the duty of resisting what is opposed to our highest spiritual or intellectual or physical well-being, and also whatever is prejudicial to our good name or possessions. This will be a duty not merely, as in natural ethics, because of our inherent dignity as men; nor even because, as in the Old Testament, we are conceived as the servants of God; but specially because we have been redeemed with "the precious blood of Christ," and have been regenerated by His Spirit. How abominable, then, becomes anything like impurity or lust: it is to defile "the temple of the Holy Ghost." How shameful must be indiscriminate novel-reading: it is to weaken the mind which ought rather to be strengthened for the service of its Redeemer. How utterly wrong can not but be unbusinesslike habits: they involve the waste of property which, because it is that of the redeemed child of God, belongs in a special sense to His kingdom. These are but examples. Christian self-love requires us for Christ's sake to protest against unrighteousness in ourselves or injustice to ourselves.

Positively, Christian self-love manifests itself in relation to itself in Christian culture in the widest sense of that word. Thus love for Christ will constrain us to infuse a distinctly moral spirit into all our mental and physical energies even on their individual side. For example, we ought not to be content with refraining in eating and drinking from all that would be harmful; we should aim, "whether we eat or drink, to do all

to the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31). In the selection of books we should not eschew merely those which will weaken the mind or corrupt the taste; we should choose only those that will tend, and in proportion as they will tend, on the whole, to raise our thoughts to Christ, to perfect us in the fullest sense, and to fit us for His service. This is a high ideal, but it seems inadequate to the love which realises what God has done for us in His Son.

(*β*) With regard to others Christian self-love manifests itself, negatively, in Christian independence and self-reliance; positively, in Christian care for one's good name and personal influence. The Christian will feel that, for the sake of his Lord and of his neighbour, as well as for his own sake, he ought to keep himself pure and to develop himself that he may be of more service to others. Thus Christian self-love is never selfish. It cultivates self that it may spend it for Christ in the world.

(*γ*) Out of love for God and through Christian self-love is derived love for our neighbour. As we ought to love ourselves because of God's love for us in Christ, so we ought to love our neighbours, even our enemies (St. Matt. v. 44) as ourselves (St. Mark xii. 31) and as Christ has loved us (St. John xiii. 34), because the Saviour was given for them as truly as for us. Hence, love for God will issue naturally and necessarily, as in love for ourselves, so in like love for others. The latter will be the best manifestation of love for God. (1 John iv. 12.) Indeed, where there is not the love of one's neighbour, there can not be the love of God. The former is an invariable expression of the latter. (1 John iv. 20.) This love for one's neighbour on the negative side takes the form of respect and justice; and on its positive side it is love in the form of kindness: and these must never be inwardly separated. Like "our Father which is in heaven" we must be kind in our justice and just in our kindness. Outwardly, however, love must often be veiled in justice; but though thus kept in restraint so far as manifestation is concerned, it must be present inwardly—nay, it is love itself which must thus put restraint on itself. That is not true love which would show kindness to any at the cost of justice to others; and a reason why it is not is that such kindness must tend to be detrimental to the highest spiritual interests of those to whom it is shown, and it is the advancement of these interests that Christian love seeks first of all and above all for one's

neighbour. Thus, while kindness goes far beyond justice and in all respects has the primacy with regard to it, they go hand in hand so far as justice can go.

In an important sense this is true even of justice to oneself. For the sake of kindness to our neighbour we may not deny or ignore our own rights any more than we may violate those of others. Self-sacrifice for others is, however, as much a right as any, and in the case of one who has been redeemed through the love of Him who for us gave up His own right to life it is of all rights the most precious. How could the Christian follow his Saviour, if he might not, like Him, though in an infinitely lower sense, "give his life a ransom for many." Only it must ever be kept in mind that such self-sacrifice may not be made if it involve a sacrifice of the rights of others than oneself; and that if it is made, we must guard against the impression that it is done as a matter of justice rather than because of love. Thus it is not Christian for one who has a family depending on him to break down his health in church work; and while one who is free may often be privileged and so called to sacrifice himself for others, it is not Christian for him to admit to himself that justice requires this of him or, though not himself admitting this, to let others so suppose. In a word, Christian love to one's neighbour is always and essentially according to truth. Christianity, therefore, is both and equally egoistic and altruistic; for truth is violated, if our neighbour be loved more or less than ourselves. Egoism and altruism, moreover, are indispensable the one to the other. On the one hand, he who neglects himself has little to give to others. On the other hand, our own welfare waits on the welfare of others. We achieve God's highest design for ourselves when we seek it for others.

(d) Christian love appears still further as love for the world.

This form of love has a three-fold ground. First, God has created the world. Therefore, we ought to love it if we love Him; for it is the work of His hands. Secondly, God is good to the world. He wishes it well (Ps. cxlv. 9). Ought not we to love that toward which He who is the object of our supreme affection is thus benevolent? Thirdly, God has given His own Son for the redemption of the world. We should not forget that "the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God"

(Rom. viii. 21). Must it not, then, be a grievous sin not to love the world which our Heavenly Father has so loved? It should, however, be observed that this love for the world is not an indiscriminate desire or affection. It is not the world as dominated and corrupted by sin that the Christian loves; but the world as it came from God and was pronounced by Him "very good." It is the world, therefore, as truly natural, and only in so far as truly natural, that ought to be the object of Christian love. Toward the spirit and standards of the world as it is under the power of Satan the Christian, as we have seen, may cherish only the most positive and the most unrelenting opposition.

Christian love for the world ought, then, to express itself along two lines. First, we ought to labour together with God for the redemption of the world. To deliver its right because natural interests from Satan's sway must be one of the duties of the Christian life. One reason why we have been born again is that we should work for the regeneration of the world for which our Saviour died.

Secondly, we ought to develop the world. Adam was put into the garden of Eden before he fell "to dress it and to keep it" (Gen. ii. 15). Nothing could have been more appropriate. What God has made man may well elaborate. Thus the legitimate work of the world may become and ought always to be a religious service. The artist, the artisan, as truly as the preacher of the Gospel, may be doing "Our Father's business."

The question, however, arises at this point, Is not the former of these duties so urgent and so important as, for the time at least, to set aside the latter? How can the development of the world be a duty while it is still under the power of sin? Ought not every Christian to bend all his energies to the salvation of sinners and so to the purification of the world which they have defiled and polluted?

Doubtless, this would be so, were it not that these two duties are so mutually dependent as to be practically inseparable. If the development of the world is labour thrown away unless the world has been redeemed, so the redemption of the world can not be accomplished unless in connection with its development. It is as it is with the invalid. It is not enough to combat his disease: he himself must be built up at the same time. Hence, history teaches nothing more clearly than that to neglect the

right interests of the world even for the sake of evangelism is ordinarily to play into the hands of Satan (1 Tim. iv. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12). In a word, we can not love the world as we ought unless we strive *both* to save it from sin and to develop all its right interests. If the latter is useless without the former, the former soon becomes impossible without the latter.

(e) Love for the kingdom of God. That this is a duty results in part from the duty just considered. If we ought to love the world, much more ought we to love the kingdom of God for which this world is the divinely appointed seat. More clearly yet, however, is the obligation of love for the kingdom of God evident from the fact that our great work and that of our neighbour's is the establishment universally of this kingdom. If, therefore, as we have seen, we ought to love ourselves and our neighbours as Christ has loved us, ought we not also to love that kingdom which, in an important sense, is the end of our being? Clearest of all, however, does the obligation of such love appear in the facts that God sent His own Son to earth and that He of Himself came to earth to establish on it the kingdom of heaven. The burden of His forerunner's preaching was, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (St. Matt. iii. 2). He trained His disciples that they might lay its foundations. He died that it might be consummated. He gave His Spirit to His church that through her this glorious work might be assured and hastened. He is to come again to complete its triumph. We fail to understand the Old Testament, unless we perceive that the work of Christ finds its explanation, and its only explanation, in the kingdom or rule of God. How is it possible, then, that any should be constrained by the love of Christ and not realise that their first and chief duty, the reason why they are here, is that they should live and die for the establishment of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," the results or manifestations of the kingdom of God (Rom. xiv. 17); that while all right human interests may and should contribute to the advancement of God's kingdom and so have a place in it, no human interests are rightly regarded, unless they be made to spread the knowledge of Christ, to commend Him as the only Saviour, and to persuade men and nations to bow before Him as their rightful king.

Here, then, we have the key to the problem involved in what is called "the conflict of duties." The interests of this

life should always be made tributary to those of the life in Christ. We are to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness" (St. Matt. vi. 33).

In this view of the case—and from the Christian standpoint there can be no other view—what duty can be so imperative as that of missions and how can any Christian think himself exempt from this duty? and in consideration of the total ignorance of Christ throughout the larger part of the world beyond our own borders, can any department of missions, other things being equal, have so strong a claim on us as the Foreign one? In the light of the teachings of the New Testament and of the present indications of providence, Foreign Missions are the supreme demand of Christian love, as it is the dominating virtue of "the life hid with Christ in God."

(3) *Hope*, the crowning virtue. This, like love, is a productive virtue. It differs from it in being the cardinal virtue of the intellect as love is the cardinal virtue of the will. United with love, it becomes ideal energy; and as such it is the crowning virtue of the Christian character.

It is not to be confounded with that union of desire for the triumph of right and expectation of it, which desire and expectation are always a duty in view of the fact that everything is under the control of God and that He, because God, will and must do right.

Evangelical hope is distinctively knowledge of the truth which is revealed in Christ. It comes in answer to the prayer in Eph. i. 17-23. Christian hope, then, is the practical knowledge of God's love as the absolute reality. Like love, it is a development of faith. Indeed, as true faith "works by love," so it issues in hope. Faith appropriates Christ as its own; then rises to love for Him of Whose love for us Christ is the supreme expression; and then, through love, realises so strongly the present fact of God's love for us and discerns so clearly what is implied in it that it disposes and enables us to feel and to act as if the supreme good of the Christian life, in addition to having been received, had been consummated.

That such hope must be a duty follows from all that has been said concerning the Christian conception of the supreme good. This, as we have seen, is regarded as really present; not to be striven after, but to be developed and appreciated; not to be looked forward to as a power that is to come into our

moral life, but as the great power by which it is or should now be controlled. This is what Christ means to us. In Him we have received "the adoption of sons." Ought we not, therefore, here and now to feel and to live as "the children of the King"? What could be more displeasing to Him than that we should ignore our divine sonship and go mourning all our days?

This duty of Christian hope involves the following duties :

(a) Hope with reference to ourselves. This embraces :

(a) The duty of holding it as certain that we are intended to become and can become sinless and holy. That this is a duty is clear from the fact that Christ died "to redeem us from *all* iniquity." Not confidently to expect ultimate perfection of character and constant progress toward it is, therefore, to question the success of His mission. Nor is this duty less important than it is real. It is only as Christian hope inspires our efforts to be like Christ that we can resist the common tendency to lower our ideal or to be too lenient with our faults. It is in hope that the true work of faith must be performed.

(β) The duty of setting one's mind on "things above" and so subordinating the interests of earth to those of heaven. This can not but be a duty in view of the fact that even now the Christian's citizenship is in heaven. How wrong, then, not to grasp this with a sure hope and act accordingly. Not to be controlled in all the affairs of this life by the knowledge that our true interests are all in that eternal life and that "continuing city" toward which we are hastening, and so not to be inspired in all that we do here by this "better hope" of what is to come is either to fail to appreciate what Christ has done for us or else to doubt it.

(γ) The duty of entering heartily into the present life because the glory of the future is sure and the present is the divinely appointed preparation for it. Hence, Christian hope must make us faithful, joyful stewards. It must dignify every legitimate earthly calling, sweeten all its right interests, and intensify the happiness to be derived from all its right relations. This can not but be so; for Christian hope assures us that "our labour is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv. 58). Thus to make the most of "the life that now is" one must live for "the life that is to come."

(b) Hope with reference to the world. This embraces :

(a) The duty of Christian optimism. This is opposed to pessimism, but it is equally opposed to that worldly optimism which is moral apathy. It does not take a discouraging view of the future of the world, but neither does it disregard the power of evil in the world. It recognises that the world is in bondage to Satan, but it recognises, too, that He "whose is all power in heaven and on earth" has redeemed it and is surely, if slowly, bringing it to Himself. Therefore, the Christian confidently resists the evil in the world, because, in spite of the evil, he has a sure hope of victory.

(β) The duty of viewing worldly interests in the light of their eternal relations. The Christian will find the true significance of all events in their spiritual bearing. He will not be disturbed even by the crash of empires because his hope enables him to appreciate the fact that this does but tend toward the glorious consummation when "He whose right it is shall reign" and "the nations shall not learn war any more." Hence, while he lives in the world, he will not be of it; his purpose in the use of it will be spiritual, he will do business for heaven. This very attitude of mind and heart, however, will suggest and demonstrate

(γ) The duty of finding a new and supreme value in this world just because of its relation to the world to come. Its philosophy, its science, its art, its commerce, its amusements even,—all become of new and of unique importance when we see, as Christian hope always does see, that it is through these and really, if only partly, by means of these, that the kingdoms of this world are becoming the kingdoms of God and of His Christ. Thus the true value of this world appears only to him who is living for "the kingdom of heaven."

(c) *The Motive Power* in Christian Ethics. This is of supreme practical importance. It will make no difference how perfect an engine may be in design and construction. It will effect nothing, unless there has been generated, or there can be generated, steam sufficient to drive it. In like manner, an ethical system may be without flaw so far as its principles and precepts are concerned; but it will have no influence on character and life, it will be only an abstract and dead theory, if it have not inherent in it that which can secure the performance of its

duties, the development of its virtues, and the attainment of its supreme good. Without such a force, it may be most interesting to study, but it will not work. Thus in an important sense its whole value will not exceed the power of its motive.

(1) "A motive," as defined by Professor Calderwood, "is an internal force which moves and excites the mind toward a single definite action."

In every intelligent agent the power thus moving him consists :

(a) In his views or judgments. These may be judgments of prudence. As such they are concerned with self-interest and derive their impulse from it. Thus when one judges that "honesty is the best policy" his regard for himself will prompt him to honesty. So, too, if one were to see in Christ "the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely," a pure self-love would move him to follow Christ. Again, these judgments may be judgments of rectitude. They may rouse a sense of duty and so derive their impulse from it. Thus the judgment that honesty is right, whether the best policy or not, will also prompt one to honesty. So, too, the judgment that Christ is our rightful Lord, will, independently of His attractiveness, move one also to consecrate himself to Him.

These two kinds of judgment may, and often do, unite. We may decide on an honest life, both because we take the view that we ought to and because we take the view that it will be best for us to. We may give ourselves to Christ both because we see Him to be our Lord and because we behold in Him unique attractiveness.

One of these judgments, moreover, may depend on and grow out of the other. Thus the judgment of prudence may and should follow the judgment of rectitude. What we deem right we ought to consider best, at least in the long run ; and it is only as it will issue in the long run that it is rational for immortal beings like ourselves to regard any course of action. So, too, the judgment of rectitude may result from the judgment of prudence. That we see Christ to be "the chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely" is a reason why we ought to follow Him. That is to say, what, as in this case, is really the best becomes on this ground alone a duty. In such ways as these

do our judgments enter into our motives. They constitute the rational element in them. They supply regulation as well as impulse.

(*b*) The other element in a motive is the dispositions. These are non-rational. They give impulse, but not regulation. Like our judgments, they impel us to action; but unlike our judgments, they should not also guide and control us in action. They include desires and affections. Desire is impulse to draw into our possession what is fitted to satisfy us. As present in consciousness, it involves three things: a sense of want; consequent restlessness; and longing for satisfaction. Desires in seeking self-satisfaction are not selfish, not seeking their end by injury of others; yet do they constantly expose to risk of selfishness. On the other hand, in proportion as they depend on intelligence, and so are distinguished from mere appetites, do they indicate greatness of nature and give promise of enlarging usefulness. Thus the craving for truth will impel one to satisfy his desire by a straightforward life, and in so far as his desire is the result of an intelligent conception of truth and its claims will his efforts to speak and to live the truth be vigorous and enduring.

Affection is inclination of feeling toward others, disposing us to give from our own resources for their gratification. In practical tendency affections are the reverse of desires. Desires absorb. Affections give out. Affection, moreover, inasmuch as it presupposes in its object the possibility of sympathy, has reference only to beings; not, as desires, to things as well as beings. Thus we can desire money, but we can not feel affection for it. That is, we can crave its possession for our own gratification; but we can not long to give ourselves to it for its gratification, for it is incapable of being gratified.

Affections take the form of love or hate according as their objects are esteemed in any sense good or bad; and love will prompt the bestowal of self on the being loved, and hate, the withdrawal of self from the being hated. Thus the love of Christ will constrain consecration to Him, and hatred of the Devil will impel us to flee from him; and reverence will inspire worship and pity will express itself in words and works of mercy. Thus reverence for God will lead us to adore Him and pity for the poor will prompt us to help them. Such, in brief, is the operation of the affections.

Our dispositions which, as we have seen, include our desires and affections, are closely related to our judgments. On the one hand, they presuppose them and are impossible without them. To desire truth we must have formed some judgment with reference to the desirability of it. To love Christ we must have formed some judgment of Him that will incline our feeling toward Him. Indeed, our dispositions can not become impulses and so motives save as the mind forms judgments: otherwise there would be no reason for the action to which they impel. In a word, a judgment may not give rise either to desire or affection; it may continue purely abstract or theoretical, as in mathematics: but desire or affection in every case presupposes a judgment and is impossible without it.

On the other hand, our judgments and our dispositions may conflict as well as concur. We may judge that we ought to speak the truth and yet we may not desire to. We may judge that we ought to love God and yet we may feel little affection for Him. In all such cases the decision should be given to the judgment. We ought to speak the truth, though we do not wish to. We ought to love God, though our hearts are cold toward Him. The reason why the decision should thus be given to the judgment is that it is rational, whereas the dispositions are not. The very nature of judgment, therefore, fits it to rule, while that of the dispositions indicates them as needing to be ruled. Such, in brief, is the motive power in man.

(2) The motive power in the Christian man is :

(a) So far as its rational element, its views or judgments, are concerned, the revelation which it makes of the nature, character, relations, and purposes of God, especially in Christ. The substance of this revelation is the grace of God. It does not disparage his other attributes. On the contrary, as has been seen, it both exhibits them with unique clearness and vindicates them with unique power. It gives, however, the pre-eminence to the divine grace, and it sets forth this as it has never elsewhere been even conceived.

As has been indicated, the motive object in which God's love is found most fully embodied is the person and work of Christ. This motive object is presented by Christianity in three ways as adapted to influence us :

(a) As a new test, to show us what we ourselves are—that is, sinners. It is when one compares himself with Christ, as Christianity ensures his doing, that he perceives and feels as never before how great his sin is and how loathsome it is. Thus a crisis must arise in his experience. His power to love the truth, his inclination to follow it, are put to the supreme test; for in Christ he beholds the truth incarnate.

(β) As a new point of departure in our whole religious and moral life. Before the revelation of God's love in Christ we see what we have not been and what we ought to be: and from that moment we can not but go in one of two directions; if we take Him for our Lord, heavenward, if we reject Him, hellward. Neutrality or indifference is impossible. Christ's claim is so immediate, so personal, so vital in its demands, that the Gospel which presents it must become at once to all who *hear* it either "a savour of life unto life or of death unto death" (2 Cor. ii. 16).

(γ) As a new source and reservoir of motive power, exciting our desires and affections. The revelation of the love of God in Christ becomes this because it is of all truths the most vital, practical, and winning. All the power of God is brought near to us and to bear on us in our Saviour. If we are not moved by the spectacle of the Son of God crucified for our sins, dying that we may become holy and without blame before God in love, nothing more can be done from the outside to move us. In the presence of a sacrifice so voluntary, so far reaching in its benefits, so gracious in its aim and spirit, so essentially ethical, both the judgment of prudence and the judgment of rectitude must be that "Love so amazing, so divine, demands our souls, our lives, our all." Indeed, the love of God for us in Christ becomes the starting point for heaven as truly as for earth. Even the angels now know God as they did not know Him before Christ's work. The mystery on which they gaze with adoring wonder,—it is made the theme of their eternal song.

Such, then, is the natural rational element in the motive power of Christianity. It presents a motive object which can not be truly discerned by the intellect and its judgment not be that advantage no less than duty and duty no less than advantage require us to "count all things but dung" that we may win it and realise the holiness that its possession involves.

(b) The impulsive element in Christianity consists, as has already appeared, in the new and unique desires and affections which the revelation of the love of God for us in Christ is fitted to call forth. When once His grace is appreciated, there can not but arise a desire to possess Him as our only and sufficient Saviour, our dearest and everlasting friend ; and also an affection which will prompt us to give ourselves to Him who gave Himself for us. But this is not all. In the way just described Christianity does all that can be done naturally to provide a motive power of unique force ; it sets before us a motive object of such attractiveness and with such claims that it can not be rightly apprehended and we not judge that we ought to make it and feel that we must make it the all-controlling aim of our lives.

(c) Beyond doing this, however, all that could be done naturally and from the outside, it brings to bear a new and supernatural power inside the man himself. This power is the Holy Spirit. The Gospel offers Him to all. "God," it says, "is more ready to give Him to them that ask Him than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children" (St. Luke xi. 13). When, moreover, He is given, it is no more we who live, but Christ who lives in us by His Spirit. Hence, the Christian is not influenced and actuated only by his own unaided judgments and dispositions. On the contrary, the eyes of his understanding have been enlightened by the Holy Spirit, so that, in a sense that would have been impossible before, he discerns in Christ "the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely." A new heart has been created within him by the Holy Spirit so that he desires and loves the Saviour as otherwise he never could have done. His will has been renewed by the Holy Spirit so that, what before was out of the question, he can now will and do God's good pleasure. In a word, the Christian is controlled and impelled by judgments and impelled by dispositions which, though they have become truly his own, are of divine origin and are sustained by divine power. Paul sums it all up when he says, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. xii. 3).

(d) Even this, however, is not all. Not only does Christianity bring into play a new and divine motive power, even that of the Holy Spirit ; it also provides a new and adequate sphere for the development of this power. Because Christ is Lord of

the world the whole of every life comes into relation to Him and so, "whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do," we ought to do all to His glory and thus from and with the power of His Spirit. And as if this were not enough, that the supernatural motive object and the supernatural motive force of Christianity may have the largest opportunity for exercise, particular and additional duties and virtues, those that we have already described as evangelical, are called for. They owe their existence to God's love for us in Christ, and it is because of them that God's power in us through the Holy Spirit can be appropriately and adequately manifested.

Such, then, is Christianity's provision for motive force. With regard to it, it differs from and it surpasses all other ethical systems in three respects : (*a*) it does all that can be done naturally and from the outside to form in us the judgments and to inspire the dispositions needed for the attainment of its uniquely high standard ; (*β*) it puts within us a new and supernatural power to enlighten our minds and renew and intensify our dispositions ; (*γ*) it demands and develops a life such as to call this supernatural power fully into exercise. In a word, in the ethical sphere, more strikingly than in any other, Christ gives what He commands.