

is a creature's will energising towards the will of its Creator. God can look on the heart; but your juryman, friend,—can he? If he cannot, what have I to do with his judgment on what the witness really saw and heard? Eye of witness hath not seen nor ear heard the things which belong to our peace, which are the invisible world, and "they which it inherit." That visitation must be known not by this and that sense, not by all the senses, but by these and that which lies behind them all, the spirit in the witness which creates the sensitive flesh to be an organ of knowledge, the personal being of a man who can have intercourse with a personality that is divine.'

The difficulty is with the body. Dr. SKRINE does not deny the resurrection. He denies the physical resurrection. The body went as other bodies go—ashes to ashes, dust to dust. Yet He rose. He appeared to the disciples during forty days. How did He appear? Dr. SKRINE even puts the question in this way: 'With what body did He appear?' For he holds that He appeared to the disciples in a bodily form, in such a form

that He could say to Thomas, 'Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side.' With what body did He appear?

He appeared—emphasize the word 'appeared' now—He appeared with the same body as He had when He was with them in Galilee, the same body as that with which He went up and down doing good. But it was appearance only. How did He succeed in persuading the disciples that it was real? He succeeded by means of telepathy. The secret is out. This is the meaning of the whole book. Jesus died as we all die. Jesus rose again from the dead as we shall all rise. But Jesus had a telepathic power, a telepathic personality, which no one else has ever had. And in the power of that telepathic personality He appeared to the disciples during those forty days and persuaded them that He had risen from the dead in the body.

Dr. SKRINE does not say that He desired to persuade them that His resurrection was a physical resurrection. That was their mistake.

The Beatitudes.

BY THE REV. R. H. CHARLES, M.A., D.LITT., D.D., F.B.A., CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

'Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven: Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.'—Mt 5³⁻⁵.

THE Sermon on the Mount opens with a number of beatitudes. How many those are is a subject of controversy. If we reckon them simply as they stand in vv.³⁻¹¹, there are nine. But it is obvious that the last two are duplicates. Thus in v.¹⁰ we have: 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake,' and in v.¹¹: 'Blessed are ye, when men shall reproach you, and persecute you.' But not only does v.¹¹ appear to be a duplicate of v.¹⁰, but there are reasonable grounds for regarding v.¹⁰ as the last of the beatitudes proper, and v.¹¹ as the beginning of a new section. For in v.¹⁰ the blessed are spoken of in the third person—'blessed are they,'

as in all the preceding beatitudes, whereas in v.¹¹ there is a sudden and unexpected change into the second person—'blessed are ye,' a change which persists throughout the rest of the Sermon. Also it is to be observed that the promise in v.¹⁰ is the same as in v.³, 'for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' These two facts taken together make it probable that the Evangelist intended vv.³⁻¹⁰ to be taken together as a whole, complete in itself, and vv.¹¹⁻¹² to be connected with the section that follows in the second person.

This is the first inference we draw, but before we pursue this subject further, it will be helpful if we briefly contrast the methods of the first and third Evangelists. St. Luke definitely states at the outset his intention to write a life of the events

and sayings of our Lord in their chronological order, and to recbunt them in their original historical setting. But the method of St. Matthew was wholly different. Only in a limited degree does his Gospel observe a chronological order, and in the great collections of the sayings, parables, and other discourses of our Lord he definitely abandons the order of time, and groups together sayings and parables that were uttered on different occasions and addressed to different hearers. If we study St. Luke we see that the Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew consists of several sermons carefully put together by St. Matthew. In the case of both Gospels we have simply a selection of our Lord's words and discourses, and that an incomplete one. The account in one Evangelist needs often to be supplemented by materials from the other.

Let us return now to the beatitudes. We have seen good grounds for regarding vv.³⁻¹⁰ as a whole, but having done so we are brought face to face with a fresh difficulty. These verses include eight beatitudes. But the number eight is not a sacred number in any sense and is without a parallel in St. Matthew, and in St. Matthew certain sacred numbers play a great rôle, as we shall see. In Revelation there are exactly seven beatitudes pronounced in great crises in the world-drama represented in that Book, and this number is no accident there; for it frequently recurs. The same number of beatitudes is also found in 2 Enoch. Similarly in St. Matthew the number seven has a significant rôle. Thus in chap. 23 there are seven¹ woes pronounced against the religious leaders of Judaism—a fact that might suggest that there were seven beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. St. Matthew also² groups together seven parables in 13, and seven petitions in the Lord's Prayer, whereas in Lk 9²⁻⁴ there are only five

¹ It is noteworthy that in later MSS. these seven woes were expanded into eight (see p. 538 note 2), just as we hope to prove that the seven beatitudes were expanded into eight by the very early interpolator of v.⁴

² Another instance of our Evangelist's devotion to certain numbers is to be seen in his division of his book into five sections, 7²⁸ 11¹ 13⁵³ 19¹¹ 26¹, after the example of the five books of the Pentateuch, the five books of the Psalms, the five Megilloth, the five divisions of Sirach, of 1 Enoch, and of the ethical work *The Sayings of the Fathers*. Three also is a favourite number: cf. 5²⁸ (three degrees of sin); 6¹⁻¹⁸ (three external duties of alms, prayer, and fasting). See Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, 165 sqq.

petitions.³ Again in chap. 1 St. Matthew deliberately omits several names in the genealogy of Christ in order to compress it into three groups each of 14 names, *i.e.* six groups of seven.

Bearing these facts in mind let us now return to the eight beatitudes, in reference to which the analogies just cited would lead us to expect seven, and let us question the MSS. as to whether they contain any evidence for or against the text as it stands in our English Bibles and in most of the Greek MSS. Now though there are several unquestionably corrupt passages in the N.T., where the MSS. wholly fail us owing to the fact that these corruptions arose before the existing MSS. and Versions came into being, it happens that we are more fortunate in respect to the passage before us. For ancient evidence attests a diversity in the order of the second and third beatitudes. Thus, whereas most MSS. and Versions uphold the present order of vv.^{4,5}, one great uncial and the two oldest Versions reverse the order and put v.⁵ before v.⁴. On the ground of this fact two distinguished scholars—Wellhausen and Professor Bacon of Yale—say that v.⁵, 'Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth,' which is really Ps 36¹¹, was first written as a gloss in the margin and subsequently incorporated in the text by most authorities after v.⁴, and by a powerful minority after v.³. If this is the correct solution of the difficulty, and at first sight it is rather attractive, we have then exactly seven beatitudes. But the more closely we study this solution of the difficulty, the more unsatisfactory it becomes.

I will now put before you briefly certain grounds for rejecting Wellhausen's hypothesis, and the solution which I have arrived at from a fresh study of the passage. First of all the conflicting order of the verses attested in the two classes of textual authorities does naturally, though not necessarily, point to some interpolation, but that it is not v.⁵ that is interpolated but v.⁴ I will now produce evidence.

First of all v.⁴ comes in most awkwardly between v.³ and v.⁵, which are essentially related to each other seeing that v.⁵ presupposes v.³. That is, the meekness that is commended in v.⁵ presupposes the humility that is commended in v.³. Hence we

³ Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, 166 n.) draws attention to the fact that each of the two additional petitions contains a characteristic Matthean word, $\gamma\epsilon\mu\theta\eta\tau\omega$ and δ $\pi\omega\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ or $\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\omega\eta\rho\acute{o}\nu$.

should expect v.⁵ to follow immediately on v.⁸. In confirmation of this close connexion between v.⁵ and v.³ we might quote Mt 11²⁹, where the two ideas are brought together in the same sentence: 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and humble in heart.' Nowhere else in the other three Gospels does this combination of these two graces occur. In other words, this combination is peculiar to St. Matthew.

Now some of my hearers may reflect, What of the Magnificat in St. Luke, in which it is stated that 'He hath exalted the humble and meek'?¹ Here we have an interesting instance in which a corrupt reading established itself in our Prayer Book. The reading 'humble and meek' is not older than the sixteenth century. It is not found in a single Greek MS. nor in any ancient version. Thus the combination 'humble and meek' belongs only to the first Gospel. Hence to read v.⁵ immediately after v.⁸ would be thoroughly characteristic of St. Matthew, and if any verse is to be rejected it is not v.⁵ but v.⁴, since it severs two ideas which are essentially allied. But this is not all. Even if we follow the less strongly attested text and read v.⁴ after v.⁵, this will not be sufficient. For v.⁴, 'Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted,' is different in form from the rest of the beatitudes in St. Matthew. In St. Matthew each class that is blessed is carefully defined, so that it is at once recognized as worthy to be blessed—the poor in spirit, the meek, those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, those that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. But there is no such definiteness in the words: 'Blessed are they that mourn.' The class of mourners here would, if this beatitude came from St. Matthew's hand, have been as carefully defined as are the other classes in the rest of the beatitudes. For these mourners do not include individuals or nations mourning over the wreck of their baffled knaveries, or the miscarriage of their treacherous deceptions. Hence since the MSS. show that the text is here somewhat doubtful, since, further, the very diction and form are against the genuineness of the beatitude relating to the mourners, and in

¹ Humble and meek is not found in any of the great English Versions: it is not found in Henry VIII.'s Goodly Primer of 1535, but it appears in Edward VI.'s first Prayer Book in 1549, and in every successive edition of his work. The true reading of course is 'the humble.'

favour of that relating to the meek, we may with good reason conclude that the second beatitude here originated in a gloss which was written by a scribe in the margin and incorporated by a later scribe in the text.

It may have been suggested by one of the beatitudes in St. Luke; for the class of mourners is mentioned without any definition, just as it is in three cases out of four in St. Luke, and it is left to the reader to interpret them in a spiritual sense: 'blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of heaven'; 'blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled': 'blessed are ye that weep now; for ye shall laugh.'²

If, then, we may conclude that there were originally seven beatitudes and that v.⁴ is an intrusion, the thought is very illuminating. Let us, to begin, read these two beatitudes together, as we infer they stood originally: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit (that is the humble); for theirs is the kingdom of heaven: blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.' Here the two classes that are blessed are 'the humble' and 'the meek.' Of the former it is said that theirs is the kingdom of heaven, that they are already citizens of the kingdom of heaven; of the second—not that they do possess the earth, but that at some future time they shall possess it. In certain respects, therefore, the two classes are distinct. Who, then, are these two classes? This is an important question, as some recent scholars have treated the two phrases 'the poor in spirit' and 'the meek' as practically identical. But the meaning of the Greek words makes this identification impossible. Who, then, are 'the poor in spirit,' and who are 'the meek'?

First, as regards the former—'the poor in spirit.' The word 'poor'³ in Hebrew had two distinct

² Attention has already been drawn to the fact that in the true text of Mt 23 there are seven woes and no more. But it is instructive to observe that in 23¹⁴ (found in the A.V., but rightly omitted in the R.V.) we have an interesting analogy to v.⁴. First of all the textual evidence makes it clear that the woe in 23¹⁴ is an interpolation. In the next place the textual authorities that support 23¹⁴ are divided as to the place where they add it as they are in v.⁴. Thus E F G H *al* with some Versions add this verse before v.¹³, whereas some cursives, the itala, and the Syr. cur. add it after v.¹³, κ B D L Z, etc., omit this verse. From these facts it follows that 23¹⁴ (adapted from Mk 12⁴⁰, Lk 20⁴⁷) was interpolated at a much later date than v.⁴.

³ *ânî* translated in the LXX 41 times by *πτωχός* or *πένυς*, 9 or 10 times by *ταπεινός*, and 3 times by *πρᾶσις*.

meanings—a literal and metaphorical one. Literally it meant those who were afflicted or impoverished or without adequate means of subsistence: metaphorically, it meant those who were humble in heart, disposition, and character. Now it is obvious that the word 'poor' has here its metaphorical meaning, and St. Matthew by adding the phrase 'in spirit' puts this beyond doubt. And yet, even if this phrase were omitted, we should have to interpret the word 'poor' according to its secondary Hebrew meaning, just as we do in Lk 6¹, 'Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of heaven.' This beatitude, therefore, deals with humility, which is the initial grace of the Christian life. And further, since, though the texts of the beatitudes differ both as regards number and form, they agree in placing this beatitude first, we may conclude that it was the first to fall from our Lord's lips.

There is, moreover, a notable fitness in the first beatitude being pronounced on humility; for humility is the indispensable condition of progress not only in religion and morals, but also in science, in matters of peace, in the affairs of war. For its essential characteristic is—a willingness to learn, whether from friend or foe. On the place of humility in science I will content myself by quoting the pronouncements of Bacon and Huxley in this respect. 'Into the kingdom of science,' writes Bacon, in his *Nov. Org.*, 'as into the kingdom of heaven one cannot enter save as a little child'; and Huxley, in a letter to Kingsley, expresses himself as follows: 'Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth, which is embodied in the Christian conception of entire surrender to the will of God. Sit down before the facts as a little child, follow humbly wherever nature leads, or you shall learn nothing.'¹

That humility is the indispensable condition of progress is universally conceded. Since, then, in all departments of life and character it is a prerequisite of progress therein, we naturally desire a clearer knowledge of what humility is. Now the first step to such knowledge is to disabuse our minds of the popular false conception of it, which unfortunately has the sanction of St. Chrysostom, who fell into the amazing error of defining humility as a making ourselves small when we are great. Exhibitions of this phase of humility are

familiar to us all. Which of us has not heard certain individuals among our friends or acquaintances morbidly deploring their shortcomings and depreciating their gifts and achievements? And, whilst we listened in uncomfortable silence to such outpourings, did we not reflect that, if we were but to express our concurrence with such confessions, we should run the risk of losing their friendship for ever? Such a misconception of humility is not infrequent even amongst excellent people. For a picture of this caricature of humility in its worst form we have only to turn to Dickens' portrait of Uriah Heap.

Humility does not consist in the mere absence of pretension, certainly not in a morbid self-depreciating spirit; it is no transient state of feeling into which a man may artificially work himself; rather it is a true and right estimate of ourselves, made in all soundness of mind, an estimate which Christian ethics does not require us to falsify or unjustly lower. St. Paul bids us not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to have a right and sound judgment.

But, this being so, how comes it that the Greek moralists of our Lord's day and back to the time of Aristotle depreciated humility and regarded it as the mark of an abject or mean-spirited man, whereas the N.T. recognizes it as the first and indispensable grace of Christianity? These diverse estimates as to the worth of humility arose from the different standards acknowledged by ancient Greek and Christian teachers. The Greek had confessedly a low standard, and the goodness that achieved this standard grew proud through such achievement, and accordingly could see in humility only a veritable meanness and slavishness of spirit. Thus lowness of ideal and pride of attainment go hand in hand, even as conceit of intellect and dogmatic assurance are generally strongest where intellectual aspiration and intellectual attainments are weakest. But, whereas the standard in Greek ethics, and throughout the heathen world, was low, the standard in Christianity is a divine one; for therein man is set face to face with God, and so Christian goodness is an aspiration ever straining towards a divine ideal and ever receiving fulfilment in some measure, yet hardly fulfilled ere a higher has dawned upon it. But at every stage fulfilment is at best imperfect. And from this contrast of that which he has done with that which he ought to have done arises the Christian

¹ *Life and Letters*, ed. Huxley, 1900, i. 219.

grace of humility. Divine ideals and true humility are never sundered, and so self-complacency and simple self-content are impossible elements in the Christian life. With each fresh grace won a diviner ideal ever dawns upon the faithful heart and deepens humility as it enlarges aspiration. The Christian man cannot but think lowly of himself, if he would think truly; for he knows that his real worth in the world is that which he stands for—not in man's sight, but in God's.

Such being the nature of humility, the promise given by Christ to the humble in spirit is that even now theirs is the kingdom of heaven: that is, that they are already citizens of God's kingdom: just as St. Paul declares in Ph 3²⁰, 'Our citizenship is even now in heaven,' we are already members of the divine commonwealth, of again in Eph 2¹⁹, 'Ye are no more strangers and sojourners but fellow-citizens with the saints and members of God's own household.'

Having now studied the first beatitude, we proceed to its natural sequel: 'Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.' If we ask in what respect meekness is related to humility in the N.T., the answer is not far to seek. Meekness is in the main the outward expression of humility, humility being essentially a grace of the spirit or inner man. Meekness, so far as it is a Christian grace, must spring from true humility of heart. It presupposes humility, and presupposing it cannot exist without it. They are in a certain sense the complements of each other. Christian meekness is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of humility. But meekness is more than this: it is humility itself coming into manifestation in the sphere of human life.

Having now grasped the source and inner spring of meekness, we shall best apprehend its character and manifestation by contrasting it with some of its counterfeits. Christian meekness has nothing in common with that constitutional meekness which is sometimes synonymous with timidity, and sometimes with insensibility to insult and affront. It has nothing in common either with weak-kneed irresolution, and certainly nothing whatever to do with that meanness of spirit, that in some popular novels is made to masquerade in the guise of Christian meekness. The meek man in Christ's sense of the word has surrendered himself to the Divine Power that has made and fashioned him. His aim, however faulty he may

be in its fulfilment, is to do God's will and not to achieve his own individual rights or vindicate his own individual claims or dignities. So far as he succeeds in realizing the grace of meekness, he becomes forgetful of self and more and more bent on the accomplishment of God's will, whether in the Church, in the State, in society, in the family life, or in the guild or community of which he is a member. The meek herein are the law-abiding, where the law is not a fixed conventional enactment or tradition, but an ever-growing manifestation of God's will and righteousness not only in man's personal life but also in his social and business relations, and in that of his community in its national and international relations. According to the O.T. (Nu 13⁸), Moses was the meekest man on all the earth as well as the most self-sacrificing, as when he prayed on behalf of rebellious Israel: 'If thou wilt not forgive them, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book' (Ex 32³²). It is significant that the meekest and most self-sacrificing man of ancient Israel was also its strongest, at once the most willing and humblest servant of God's will and the greatest lawgiver of the ancient world.

And as of Moses so it holds true of all men: to be truly meek one must be strong; for the meek man has forsworn his own private aims and personal ambitions and resolved to follow God's will at all costs and at all hazards. Thus meekness requires courage, singleness of aim, self-control, self-sacrifice. And to such men the promise of Christ naturally is: 'The meek'—that is, the willing servants of God's will—'shall inherit the earth.'

It is not to the arrogant, the high-handed, the rapacious, it is not to the so-called supermen in this or other lands—the shameless disciples of a demoniac creed—that the earth and all that is therein shall ultimately belong, but to the humble and meek, to those who, having sought first and above all the kingdom of God and its righteousness, find that to this eternal heritage there is added another they did not seek—even the heritage of this world.

Even in the domain of nature this law holds to some extent: 'the meek shall inherit the earth.' The untamable monsters of the historic foretime failed to maintain themselves, and their place was taken by animals of a more amenable type. In the present day this process is still more effectual; for the great carnivora and reptiles that refuse to part with their savagery are being steadily exter-

minated. At no distant date all animals of this contumacious type will inherit—not the earth—but only iron cages in Zoological collections. And should there be certain castes or communities amongst men, hopeless alike in their savagery and morals, they will no doubt inherit in due time—not the earth—but an enclosure in wired reserves or a house of bondage and fetters of steel. But God forbid that there should be any such hopeless class of permanent outlaws from civilization and the kingdom of God. The analogies of the past all point to the elimination of such characters from this world. The ruthless empires of ancient days fell successively before more law-abiding powers, till at last Rome, the most law-respecting nation of pre-Christian times, notwithstanding its severities, became the inheritor of the ancient world. At present the whole world is threatened with a reversion to those old and evil days, when might claimed only too successfully to be right, and when the weak, the few in number, the friendless and the destitute, were helpless thralls of the merciless and the strong. But the promise abideth sure: 'Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.'

Of these great words an American humorist made use in order to give point to a jest at the expense of England, when he said, 'The English must be a very meek people, seeing they inherit

so large a part of the earth.' But herein Mark Twain expressed unwittingly a great truth. For it is just because Great Britain, despite its many grievous sins of intemperance, impurity, covetousness, and unfaithfulness to pledged word on the part of corporations of employers and employed, it is just because that Great Britain, we repeat, has, in spite of these grievous derelictions, been obedient more than any other nation in the present or the past to the higher light vouchsafed it by God, alike in its internal and its international relations, and has more than any other people striven to be faithful to its covenants; to be just to the weak, a stronghold to the needy in their distress, a champion of the oppressed, that in its case the promise of this beatitude—'the meek shall inherit the earth'—has in some measure been fulfilled and justified.

In conclusion, I cannot sum up better the promise of these two great beatitudes than in the words of St. Paul. If as individuals and if as a nation we learn to be humble in heart and manifest this humility in our conduct and character as willing servants of our God, then we can claim as ours the wondrous promise set forth by the Apostle: 'All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.'

Literature.

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS.

IN *The Rise of the Christian Religion* (Macmillan; 12s. net), Dr. Charles Frederick Nolloth has given a full account of Apostolic Christianity—as full at any rate as any man can desire who is not intending to specialize upon it.

He has described the Sources (first Jewish and Pagan, next Christian), and the Preparation (first in Judaism, next in the Dispersion and especially Philo, then in Greek Thought, in Greek and in Roman Religion). He has discussed the modern attitude to Miracles and to History. He has written a Life of Jesus in thirteen rich chapters, one of which explains the doctrine of the Two Natures (so far as we are able to receive it). He passes into the Acts of the Apostles, being first

arrested at Pentecost and then astounded at the progress of the gospel throughout the Roman world. He expounds the doctrinal and ethical teaching of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John. He ends with the transition from the Apostolic to the Sub-apostolic Age.

It is an immense subject, but the range is not impossibly wide for one man. Dr. Nolloth, as we know, has made the New Testament the study of his manhood. And he has never lost time by running after barren novelties, never even been tempted to covet the heretic's ephemeral fame. The whole book is sane, the author's own undoubted, and therefore original enough—personal experience, as every good work and word must be, but experience tested by the thoughts of other men and of the whole Church of God. It is a strong