the Father, the abiding in Him by His  
word abiding in them, the victory over  
him in whom “*the whole world lieth*,”  
—these particulars have been enounced :  
and though there may be a more apparent  
reason why the young should have this  
dehortation addressed to them, and more  
apparent allusion to the words “*ye have  
conquered the wicked one*” in the bringing  
out of the “*world*,” yet there can be no  
doubt that it is to *all* that this address  
is made. All are in the world, and as  
long as they are, are in danger of being  
betrayed by the senses to cleave to the  
things present and seen, to the forgetfulness  
of those which are absent and unseen.  
This general reference is shewn by  
the “*If any man*” which follows.

**15.] Love not the world** (what is **the  
world**, in the diction of St. John? And  
what does he import by **loving the world?**  
When we read John iii. 16, “*God so***loved the world**,” &c. are we to understand  
the same thing by the words as  
here ? and if not, are *both* [viz. *the world*  
and love] taken in a different sense, or  
if one only, *which*? It would seem that  
the *world* in both cases is the same, the  
*love* is different. In John iii. 16 it is  
the love of divine compassion and creative  
and redeeming mercy: here, it is the love  
of selfish desire, cherishing avarice or pride.  
But then recurs our question, What is *the  
world?* And it is no easy one to answer. If  
1) we reply so as to make it *personal*, we  
are met at once by the difficulty of *“the  
things in the world:*” from which we  
cannot escape by saying that these are as  
below, “*the lust, &c.*” for none can be  
said to *love* the lust, but the *lust is*  
the *love*. Hence some have been led to  
take these three, *the lust of the flesh, the  
lust of the eyes, the vain-glory of life*, as  
put for the things desired, and the material  
of the *vain glory*. But this manifestly  
will not hold, owing to the opposition  
in ver. 17 between “*the world and the  
lust thereof*” on the one hand, and “*he  
that doeth the will of God*” on the other,  
which evidently requires that its first member  
should be personal as well as its second.  
And this last will be a weighty reason also  
against 2) taking *the world* as merely *material*,  
the present order of things, in so far as  
it is alien from God. We are thus brought to  
a point, for our understanding of the term,  
intermediate between personal and material.  
But then our question is, which of the two  
is to take the first place ? Is *the world* the  
world of matter, including the men who  
dwell in it, or is it the world of man, including matter  
as subordinate to man? If  
the former, we seem in danger of falling  
into a dualism, in which God and the world  
of matter should be set over against one  
another as independent existences : for thus  
the evil one, the *ruler of the world*, and  
his spiritual agents would themselves be  
included in the *world*, and adjuncts to  
the world of matter: a mode of thought  
which nowhere appears in the apostolic  
writings. We are thus narrowed to our  
other alternative, that of understanding  
*the world* as of human persons, including  
the inferior ranks of created being, and  
the mass of inanimate matter which they  
inhabit. Let us see whether this view  
will meet the necessities of our text  
and of similar passages. Thus understood,  
the *world* was constituted at first  
in Adam, well-pleasing to God and obedient  
to Him: it was man’s world, and  
in man it is summed up: and in man it  
fell from God’s light into the darkness  
of selfish pursuits and *worldly lusts*,  
in and by which man, who should be  
rising through his cosmic corporeal nature  
to God, has become materialized  
in spirit and dragged down so as to be  
worldly and sensual, and like him who has  
led him astray, and who now, having thus  
subjected man’s nature by temptation, has  
become the *ruler of the world*. And thus  
the *world* is “*man and man’s world,*”  
in his and its fall from God. It was this  
world which God loved, in its enmity to  
Him, with the holy love of Redemption :  
it is this world which we are not to love,  
in its alienation from Him, with the selfish  
love of participation. And this *world* is  
spoken of sometimes as personal, sometimes  
as material, according to the context in  
which it occurs. To give but a few decisive  
examples: of the purely personal  
sense, John xv. 18, “*If the world hateth  
you*, &c.,” followed by “*If they persecuted  
Me, they will persecute you also*,” where  
the singular is broken up into the individual  
persons: of the purely material,  
John xi. 9, “*If any one walk in the day,  
he stumbleth not, because he beholdeth  
the light of this world.*” And in passages  
like the present, these two senses alternate  
with and interpenetrate one another : e.g.