

THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST AND
CHRIST OUR CHRISTIANITY

Quinta Press

Meadow View, Weston Rhyn, Oswestry, Shropshire, England,
SY10 7RN

Visit our web-site: www.quintapress.com

Layout copyright © Quinta Press 2023.

Taken from “The Christianity of Christ and Christ Our Christianity”
The Review and Expositor, Vol. 15, July 1918, pp.246–65

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. XV.

July, 1918

No. 3

THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST AND CHRIST
OUR CHRISTIANITY.

BY P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF HACKNEY COL-
LEGE, HAMPSTEAD, AND DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF
THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

It is not uncommon today to hear the Gospels praised at the expense of the Epistles. The character of Jesus is set up in contrast with His redeeming work. And to His teaching is assigned a permanency denied to His person. Being dead He only speaketh; He does not reign and rule. St. Luke is called against his companion and master, St. Paul. And the mysticism of St. John is preferred to that of St. Paul because it is less definite and more idealist in its theology. The real reason, I suspect, is that St. John's mysticism is woven into a story, whereas St. Paul's has a more dialectic form. For I cannot see that the one is less theological than the other. Only in St. John Jesus speaks, while St. Paul speaks for Him; and there is a dramatic interest therefore in John which is not in Paul. What links Luke, and John, and Paul? Let us ask what is the common and permanent element in the New Testament? What is its unity? It is the grace of God as Christ's Cross. I Peter 1:10,11, 12.

It has been generally and truly said that this element is the *work* of Jesus, what He did uniquely for mankind

on the cross in the way of altering fundamentally and finally the relation between the human soul and God. This has been the conviction of the Church as a whole, and the ultimate center of any power it has had upon the world. But to many this has become a piece of theology. It is not an active ingredient in their soul's life and their religious experience. They live more upon religious affection and sympathy than on religious faith. They say the prevalence of such a view is largely due to certain Judaic elements introduced into a simpler Christian faith by St. Paul. So they turn the cross into the latest of the life-long series of self-sacrifices that mark the wonderful character of Christ; and it is upon the *character of Christ* that they fix for the permanent element in His religion. The affection, the wonder, the admiration, the imitation which such a character still calls out—these form the permanent influence which Christianity exercises on the world.

But then it is pointed out that His character is a thing of the past. It is simply now an ideal standing, though it towers and shines, in the far uplands of history. And what we need, they say, is some more positive action coming down and drawing very near, and laying on us a power and a command; not only attracting the soul but lighting up the soul, and searching it, and guiding it, and releasing it, and controlling it,—nay, what is more than all, remaking it. Now one section of those who demand Christ's actual touch on the age find it in the Church. The Church is the continuation of Christ, as it were, into our age, and Christ lays His hand on the soul of the age by the Church, its demands, its ideals, its truths and its privileges. Another section finds that Christ touches the age by a less institutional though no less personal rule over the spiritual world, and by His living access therefore as living Saviour to living souls. The eternal person of Christ is King of the unseen world which permeates the things that are seen. While another section still finds the real point of contact between Christ and the age in His

teaching more even than His presence or example. They find the near, vital, and relevant influence to lie in the teaching of Jesus and its flexible actuality for the time. It is the principles of Jesus that the age needs, they say. The age can no longer believe in His living person as being very relevant to its exigencies. His work on the cross, they say, is a fine and typical martyrdom, but it is not the condition, the foundation, or the vital principle of the new soul. It may contain the moral principle of action in so far as that is sacrifice, but it is not the vital principle of a new spiritual creation. The character of Jesus is as splendid and influential as we should expect from One who crowned life with a death so tragic and noble, but it is still a heroic and remote ideal for today. And it is the insight of the teaching of Jesus in which He was so far ahead of His own time as to be for all time. It is the *teaching* which penetrates to the real sympathies and needs of the age. It is the teaching that is the most precious and permanent legacy from Christ to the world. It is there, and not from a theological cross, that He really tells upon the human soul and human society. It is there that we hear of the Kingdom of God, and there that we learn of that love, sympathy, and pity which is the true health of the soul, and the true cement of souls into a society. No gospel (they say) is of first value for today unless it be human. And it is in the teaching of Jesus that we find the real humanity of His message—the teaching, coupled with whatever deeds of mercy may survive a modern criticism of the miracles. Of course, of the teaching also we can only take what criticism leaves.

Well, but is it not a wonderful thing that if His teaching was His great legacy He wrote nothing, He dictated nothing, He took no means whatever for having any authoritative version of it ready to survive Him. Socrates, to be sure, wrote nothing; but then Socrates did not found a society, or contemplate a line of disciples throughout history as trustees of the Kingdom of God—

He did not contemplate changing the whole of history. Surely one who had that in view, and was before all else a teacher, might have been expected to leave something specific in his main line of work, if only to protect His secret, to keep it pure and powerful and to keep his disciples from quarreling. But He did not. If we were to be kept from quarreling it was not by an original code or record from Christ Himself. That was not His legacy. The Gospels themselves came there by an afterthought, humanly speaking. He did not commission their production. They arose as manuals of instruction. He charged His disciples with a Gospel but not with Gospels. What we have are memoranda, not always quite exact in every detail. Indeed, we often extract His *teaching* from them with so much trouble that an order of specialist interpreters, an educated ministry, is indispensable. He have written had he pleased. He knew letters, though He had not passed through the school and college culture of the day. The craftsman and the scribe were often found in the same man. He was perfectly versed in the old classics of His race; He lived on them; they made His constant breviary. It was a literary age, too, with Josephus, Philo, and others on its front. What reason could He have had for not writing, but that He came for another work. He came to be His own Epistle, especially in His *parousia*, and to call out living reply from the world.

But let us take the teaching. Let us go to the teaching of Jesus as selected by evangelists, and even as sifted by critics. Let us ask there what the central, supreme, and permanent thing is in His intention and in His Gospel. May I suggest in advance what will be found, and then show by some examples how we are forced to find it?

We shall find that for Himself teaching was not the great object of His life but the setting up of a Kingdom and the proclamation of a message, the achievement of a salvation, and the delivery of its Gospel. He did not set

out to solve problems either of thought or life but to perform a task. He spoke not for soul-culture but for change of soul. He was not a sage but a herald, not a teacher but a prophet, not an educator of men so much as a revealer of God. He was not a moral tutor but a holy redeemer. He was not among the men who say things but among those who do things. He was neither sage, herald, nor prophet, but King.

We shall further find that this Gospel, with all the teaching carried in it, was not the outcome of a student's work, nor that of a man of genius. What He uttered was not only, nor chiefly, the result of His observation of life or His insight into the moral world, but the expression of His own character and person. He found more in Himself than in life or the world. You cannot separate His philosophy of things from His person. You can with Shakespeare, for instance, who has done so much for the culture of a world that knows next to nothing about him. But Christ's gift was Himself. His message was the expression of Himself. It was a cast from His own spiritual countenance, and not from the face of the moral world. He spoke less from observation than from consciousness. It was by His knowledge of Himself that He knew both God and man.

Then we shall find that His character, His type of character, was, in His own view, based on something peculiar and unique in His person. The manner of life that He offered the world in His conduct was stamping (*χαρακτήρ*) on the world the meaning that lay in His spiritual constitution and His relation to God. His Messiahship rested on his Sonship. The character which the disciples appreciated so much from the first was based on the mystery of a person which they did not realize till He had passed away. The character which impressed the disciples was the outer garb of a personality which is as real, vivid, and active today and forever as it was then. Their *impression* from His *character* failed them at this great crisis. And

what caught them up and made men of them, what turned them from deserting disciples to apostles that never looked back, was the *regeneration* from His *person*.

We shall find, besides, that the power of that personality today is something which was not only foreseen but purposed by Christ Himself. He did not make Himself everything just to vanish at the last and leave but a tradition. If He made Himself everything it was forever. The centrality He took for Himself was a centrality for the whole soul and for the world eternal. He was central not for His age or His church but for mankind, for all time. "I am with you always." "The same yesterday, today, and forever." If His earthly life was all, it was a poor embodiment of His huge claims, a mere torso of His plan. His death was a beginning rather than a close, historically speaking. It demanded resurrection at least, it moved to exaltation, and involved eternal reign. He looked forward to being all that the Christians of today find Him and much more—both for them and for the world. He claimed to be both King and Lord of mankind, of time's history, and of Eternity's.

And we shall find, lastly, that this power and victory of His was in His own mind due to the one comprehensive, decisive, and final thing He did on earth. It was due to His work as the Redeemer. And I choose the word Redeemer because some of the more humane, liberal, and genial forms of Christianity are shy of it. They speak of the Saviour as the first bom of many saviors of society or man. But they do not readily speak of the Redeemer because they are uneasy about the theological suggestions which certainly give it its distinctive meaning, and confine it to Christ alone.

The point, then, is that Jesus was more conscious of the uniqueness of Himself and His work than of the originality of His teaching. You can parallel much of that teaching from other faiths, and perhaps trace some of it to Hebrew wisdom. But you cannot trace or parallel

Him and the power He gives to fulfill His own leading. His own faith was very humane, but it was more deeply rooted in His difference from men than in His likeness to them. His union with them was indirect, and it depended on His union with God, which was direct. He came to man through God, not to God through man. No one ever helped Him to find God. He was one with man by will more than by birth, by purpose more than by parity, not so much as a member of humanity but for purposes with humanity flowing from His unity with God. His relation to God was first; it determined all. And in His consciousness it was unique. It was one which He did not share with men, even with His disciples. He never prays with them, but for them. He does not say "Our Father" on His knees in their midst. He tells them to say "Our Father" "when ye pray". It was a lesson, not an act of worship, teaching *them* how to pray. He speaks of "My Father and your Fattier, My God and your God". His relation to God and theirs were different. He was not a beneficiary of the Sabbath, He was Lord of the Sabbath, and with it of all the things that were made for man. He was greater than the temple, for whose sancity generations of men had laid down their lives, and would again. That is to say, He was greater than all the temple stood for—greater than the law, greater than the covenant, greater than Israel, greater than Israel's worship. He was the goal and object of it all, the Holy One of Israel. He was to judge even the world. His sanctity had no share in human sinfulness. He confesses His Father, and His own before the Father; but not His sin. It is our sin He bears, not His own. No trace in His words shows the ordinary fellowship of human sin. He tells His disciples that they were evil. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children." He does not say we. They are blessed in suffering only when persecuted *for His sake*. Nay, He ventured on something the sinless alone could do. His relation to God was so different from ours

that He undertook to forgive sins—a function that belonged to holy God alone. Healing the paralytic, He said, “Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven”. His meaning was clear enough to anger the bystanders. They were not left to suppose that He meant mere absolution. They did not understand Him simply to *declare* to the man a forgiveness general and ready, as we might now declare it to a world forgiven in Him. They quite understood Him to mean that He *exercised* the forgiveness of God; for they took it as blasphemy. And He accepted their interpretation of His words, and said that to forgive was as easy and proper to Him as to heal (Matt. 9:2).

Again, He accepted the confession of His disciples that He was the One Messiah. He was not surprised by it, however gratified. It was a confession to which He had been educating them in the most patient and skillful way. It was His own object with them that was reached when Peter owned Him as the Messianic Son of the living God. That meant that He was the sole King of God’s Kingdom; and who could be sole King of God’s Kingdom but God? The indirect object of all His teaching was Himself, His unique and royal self, whom to serve was to serve God. He never plainly said He was the Messiah. His method of education was far profounder than that. He did not *tell* them, *He lived it into them* and forced their faith with a moral compulsion. All His teaching and healing, hearty as it was and occasional, was there for more than pity and passing relief. It was part of one overruling purpose, and with one ultimate goal. It was to prepare and to extort from men the confession of Him and His kingship as a spiritual discovery. And His joy when it came from Peter shows how passionately He had longed and patiently prepared for its coming (Matt. 16).

Take another aspect of the matter. What did He die for? For His teaching? For His view of truth, of the soul, of the divine? For His Sermon on the Mount or His

doctrine of the Kingdom? No, but for His place as the King. He might have preached the Kingdom and kept His life. Preaching of the Kingdom was welcome then. He was popular while He preached that. "We trusted that it had been He who should restore the kingship of the world to Israel." His popularity did not wane till He began to behave as what they thought a *faineant*. And it was that claim which roused the alarm both of Pilate and of Herod. It was a king they feared, not a teacher's spiritual idea. And what cost Him His life was His declaration upon oath at His trial, not that He preached the Kingdom, but that He was Himself the Son of God, *the King*. That threw Pilate into the hands of the Sanhedrin. If they reported to Rome that Pilate treated lightly a rival of Caesar that was the end of Pilate.

And what did He mean by that "King"? Was it a mere metaphor, as we call some hero a king of men, or a vulgar plutocrat a king of finance? No. He claimed the real, veritable, ultimate control of human wills as His right; and He set Himself on the whole world's judgment throne. "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord! (Matt. 7:22.) "In that day if ye shall have confessed Me, I will confess you" (Matt. 10:32). "All things are delivered unto Me of the Father" (Matt. 11:27). "The Son of Man shall send forth His angels to gather" the great harvest of souls at the last (Matt. 13:41). "Heaven and earth shall pass away but *My* words [not *their* words, but *My* words] shall not pass" (24:35). He is the Judge at the great dividing of the sheep and the goats that ends human doings (25:31), His foes, He promised, should see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power (26:64). It has been said that it was the preaching of the Saviour as the Judge that did most to impress the pagan world in the years when Christianity spread so fast at the first. People were not used to a judge that was their Saviour, to a judge unpurchaseable but on their side. He laid down in a royal way the laws of the King-

dom, and He determined its conditions and its course; He began with the Sermon on the Mount, He went on through the parables of the Kingdom; He laid down that doctrine of the Cross as the true King's power in the answer which He gave to the ambitious mother of Zebedee's sons and to the angry ten in her wake. And what is to withstand the great utterance of Matthew 11:25: "No man knoweth the Father save the Son and they to whom the Son wills to reveal Him."

I know that the amount and detail of His teaching was about the Kingdom while the words about Himself are comparatively few. But they are the key to all the rest. If the *bulk* of His teaching was about the Kingdom, the *weight* of it was about Himself. The Kingdom filled the extent of His teaching but its significance was the King. In quantity it was the one, in quality it was the other. He taught the Kingdom as only the King could. And He so taught that the deepest impression left on His disciples was not the Kingdom but the King. From the New Testament, outside the Gospels, the Kingdom vanishes, being merged in the King. And for some today there is about the idea of the Kingdom something slightly archaic, but the King is vital, actual, experimental.

But the ultimacy and eternity of this kingship was due to its nature. He was a priestly King. It was a sacrificial kingship. It was by devotion that He won devotion. He came not born as King, not to proclaim Himself King, but to *make* Himself King. He had to conquer the realm and make subjects He should rule. He made a people He did not find. Like a great new poet He had to make His own constituency. His empire of the world stood historically on His salvation of the world. He came not to wear a dignity but to do a work. And that was not simply to administer a secure office, but to deliver, nay, to create His realm of the soul. He had to found the Kingdom He would rule, and redeem the race He would bless. He could not bless them till He redeemed them into the power

to appropriate His blessing. He takes to Himself the great Old Testament promises of a Redeemer as in Luke 4:18: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me", etc. (from Isaiah 61:1); and He does it in the reply to John's messengers, where Matthew 11:4 reproduces Psalm 146:7 and Isaiah 38:5. This redemption was the work He came to do. It was not simply to exhibit His person but to put His person into an achievement, to put all His person into one, great, decisive, redeeming work *which was God's even more than His*. What else than this is meant by His saying that He came to seek and to save that which was lost; and (still more expressively) that He came to give His life a ransom for many; and that the great fruit of His death should be the remission of human sin and the power of Eternal Life.

The teaching of Christ carries us into the person of Christ. His person carries us into His Cross, and it is out of His Cross that all the kingship springs to which His teaching moved.

It is not possible for criticism to destroy all these passages. I have not quoted others that criticism challenges. But to sweep these out of the record would not be criticism but laceration. It would be cutting the story down to the form and pressure of our time. It would be using the Bible in the most violent way to prove a foregone negative theory of Christ. And that is just what the critics accuse the Church's positive faith of doing—of fitting the historic Jesus to a later theology. But we have no more right to trim the Bible to a shriveled Christ than to an inflated Christ. The day has gone by among responsible scholars when the Gospels could be reduced to legends of the second century. You find such views now only among the derelicts of amateur rationalism, or the mother wit of the cheap secularist press. Christ did say such things about Himself as I have quoted.

If these passages hold, the teaching of Christ Himself carries us much farther than His teaching. He taught

His person, His Cross, His reign. He taught as one who had a unique sense of Himself, a unique relation to God, and a work to do for man which all humanity could not do for itself. He taught as He lived—royally. He lived with other men and loved them, but He did not class Himself with them. He knew the solitary value of His life and death, and we only know that He knew it by what He Himself said. What we have been going on is not theories by His disciples but words of His own.

And we are shut up to one of two conclusions. Either we must accept Christ's account of Himself or else treat Him as a crazy fanatic, a "megalomaniac", filled with a restless lunatic sense of His own imperial importance, and the homage, the worship, due to Him by other men. You cannot separate these teachings I have quoted from the rest. You cannot cut these out as morbid and yet leave the rest as sane. If He is wrong here, where can we trust Him to be right? If wrong and deluded there, He fails even as moral teacher. If He is not more than a teacher, He is less. The Christianity of Christ is Christ as Christianity.

We are driven thus if we turn to the impression He made on those nearest Him, on the first Church, on the New Testament writers and the Christians they had to do with. It is sometimes urged against the godhead of Jesus that He never claimed to be God. But that was not His way. We saw it was not, in His education of the disciples up to their Messianic confession. He did not proceed by way of direct claims. I allow I do not much like the word "claims". When plain men asked Him to say plainly if He was the Christ, He did not indulge them. Christ often disappointed the plain man—the plain man being often but the man impatient for immediate solutions. But He did make the final recognition of His Messiahship inevitable. He forced the confession as a spiritual necessity from their souls by acting on them with His own. So it was with His *godhead*. That word did not

belong to His vocabulary. And the idea is not like the Messianic idea—one that filled the thoughts and hopes of His time. Quite the other way. The idea of a man they knew being God was repulsive and blasphemous to these Jews. It was foreign to the Hebrew mind. It was much more natural to the Greek or the Indian. He was used to incarnations. But the passionate monotheism of the Hebrew left no room for such a thought. To be equal with God was a blasphemous suggestion, and they called it so when they heard Him forgive. Yet this utterly unsemitic idea—so unsemitic that that race has suffered everything rather than admit it—was forced upon many Jews, and on a Jew like Paul besides, by the compulsion of the spiritual situation, by slow, subtle, spiritual logic. The love of Christ constrained them when once they had felt His holy spell on their Spirit and read history with their souls. His godhead was forced in on them by the impression, revelation, and work of Christ on them and for them. Their theology was experimental. They did not give up their monotheism. And yet they held to the godhead of Christ. They did not express it in the elaborate and metaphysical forms of some centuries later. They held it as a religious certainty; as the result and action on their construction of the Gospel, of the Cross, and not of speculation; for who could forgive and recreate but God only? But hold it they did, in the profound, natural way of a spiritual conviction, or rather, a spiritual relation to God in Christ. Paul, writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 8:6), says: “To us there is one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ.” Christ was their one Lord. But if He was not God, then they had a sole Lord who was not God, and God was not their Lord. So again there are “diversities of ministries” but the same Spirit, the same Lord, the same God (1 Corinthians 12:4-6). That Trinity was the ground and unity of all the ministrations—not three unities but one. They “call Jesus Lord to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. 2:11). The godhead of Jesus

glorifies the godhead of the Father. They use the word Lord of Christ in the full Old Testament sense as applied to God. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord" (Romans 10:9). "Whether we live we are the Lord's, or die we are the Lord's." "Christ died and rose that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living" (Romans 14:8, 9). That means more than their master. It means their God. It was much more than a title like "the Lord Serapis" in the papyri. And so in Phil. 2:10: "That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess Him Lord." They apply to Christ (not defiantly, nor in the way of adventurous speculation or dogmatic novelty, but in the way of spiritual *naivete* without being self-conscious over it), the very expression which the devout Jew used of God. They invoked Him as God. They describe themselves as those "that call upon the name of Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 1:2; Rom. 10:12). This means worship. It was not taking His name as descriptive of themselves—like calling themselves Christians. In the Old Testament to call upon the name of the Lord was to pray to Jehovah for salvation (Psa. 116:4): "Then called I upon the name of the Lord; o Lord, I beseech Thee, deliver my soul." So Joel 2:32: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." This very verse is deliberately applied to Christ in the New Testament twice—Romans 10:13 and Acts 2:21.

Paul certainly prayed to Christ and spoke of it to his Corinthians as nothing startling. With his thorn in the flesh he prayed the Lord (meaning Christ, as always) thrice that it might depart. It is hard to see what element of worship to God is omitted in their attitude to Him. They recognize His universal sway. For them He is Lord of all. They give Him absolute, final, unshakable trust, and they commit their eternal souls to Him. They ask and receive from Him forgiveness. They pray to Him. And their ideal life is a walk according to His will. For them the work, the will, the spirit, the Kingdom of Christ

are the work, will, spirit, and Kingdom of God. If all this is given to Christ, what is left to give to God? Has Christ not monopolized from God the worship of the soul? If He be not God, can He be other than God's rival for man's heart? But if He had been, could the apostles write and speak as they did of Him and the Father together? Everything they give and do to Christ, their worship, is given to the glory of God the Father. Is there any doubt that the New Testament, unformed as its doctrine of the Trinity may be, at least is full of the godhead of Christ? He is not identified with the Father but He shares the godhead of the Father. That was the faith of these men, of that Church. It was not yet a system with them; but it was a faith. It was an irresistible, spiritually natural, religiously inevitable, movement of the Christian soul. It was just the congenial response to the touch of Christ on them. It was the impression His word and work made on them—especially His redeeming work on the Cross. It was the effect of His regeneration of them by His Spirit. They had no alternative but to say "God was in Christ reconciling the world"—not using Christ but present and acting in Him. It was this reconciliation, this redemption, that forced them to this huge and, to them, most solemn spiritual step. It did not grow out of doctrines about the Logos. These came after, as mere philosophical ways of putting it. It was the identification of the Redeemer of the Cross with the Redeemer in the Old Testament—God Himself. God was in Christ in such a reconciliation. It was Christ that reconciled, and it was God in the same person and act. God came, He did not send. Not God spoke by Christ, or acted through Him, but God *was* in Christ; and not tending, helping, pitying, loving, lighting, and warming the world—but *reconciling* the world by dealing with its sin atoningly and redemptively. All our systems of incarnation or atonement are but necessary efforts to give a clear account of that faith. They are faith trying to account to itself for itself. But

the faith is always greater than the account of itself it can give, greater than the theology. And the redemption as a reality or a power is greater than even the teaching of Christ Himself about it or about the Kingdom. The Redeemer *did* more than He *said*. His great work was done almost in silence, without strife, or cry, or voice heard in the street. No man heard the sound of the world's creation and very little was heard of its redemption—and least of all from the Redeemer. What really preached His death was not His teaching but His resurrection, His exaltation. The resurrection was the great word that proclaimed to the Church the value of His death and not to the world the evidence of His survival. And the resurrection itself was silent. It was a silent discourse. It was an event speechless like His death, but like His death a deed. It was retired, and to many doubtful, like all the chief steps by which He has impressed His personality upon the world He taught the Kingdom but He acted Himself. The supreme truth was not the Kingdom ; it *was* Himself asking, and it could not be uttered; it had to be lived and died; and the silence in which Christ lives and saves at this moment is only a portion of the great silence round His whole redemption. The silence of the spiritual world is the sign of its unspeakableness rather than its impotence. It is the token of awful action often ironically still. It is ominous silence. But it is the most blessed omen for us; it is auspicious silence. The silence of the whole earth about God is the sign that God is in His holy temple, that He dwells with man, and that His eternal redeeming work is going on with sure and mighty power.

We do not do Christ's teaching justice till we worship Him. We owe Him that as Redeemer. His great claim on us is not that He loved us, nor is it for our love. It is not that He has blessed us, nor is it for our blessing of Him back and our thanks. Had He only loved us He would never have been the Christ for the whole world

and for the soul's deepest, darkest world. Would that more of us loved Him and loved Him more; hut we can never rest there. We must do more even than trust Him; we must trust ourselves to Him. He is more than our lover; He is our Redeemer. The point is the moral omnipotence of His love. It was not helpless love. And we are not just to our Redeemer if we but love Him. There is something in modern piety that is a little too free, and possibly familiar, with its expressions of love. The love of Christ may be too awful for the ready expressions of affection. The forgiven sinner should be too full of His repentance to be very free with expressions of His love. Let him *worship*. It is his Redeemer that is before Him. It is so with every one of us. Let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Redeemer. It is He that hath saved us and not we ourselves. We are *His* people and the travail of His soul. For us He poured out His soul unto death, and the whole silence of the world is His intercession for the transgressors.

"Do you love Christ?" Sometimes we hardly know. I like that hesitation. "Do you trust His love of you?" "Yes, to whom should we go?" That is faith, living faith. "Do you trust Him as your Redeemer?" "Yes, trust and praise." "Trust yourself to Him?" "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit." That is worship—trust and praise for His blood, and death, and might, and majesty, and dominion forever.