

The Beatitudes

Did the translators of the New Testament have a secular agenda? Did they have an ulterior motive for “ennobling” the suffering of the poor? KENNETH JUPP confronts some difficult historical questions by investigating the problem of rendering the words of the prophets for a modern audience.

As a prescription for translating foreign literature into English Dr Johnson’s neat aphorism could hardly be bettered: “[The translator] is to exhibit his author’s thoughts in such a dress of diction as the author would have given them, had his language been English”. (Life of Dryden)

The translator and his author as ordinary human beings with a bent for literature would have much in common. Where they differed, the translator would know a good deal about the social, economic and cultural environment in which his author lived, and could make a fair attempt to reproduce in himself his author’s thoughts and feelings so as to express them as the author would have done had his language been English.

Translation of the New Testament, however, cannot be done like this especially when it records the sayings of Jesus. It requires different treatment. The records we have are at third or even fourth hand. Someone heard, someone made a note (how much later?), later still someone uses the note to include the saying in a gospel he is writing. What mere human being along that line could possibly have a similar resonance with Jesus Christ? Moreover, at some stages of the transmission there may have been translation already. The most one can do is to take into account the literal meaning of the words, and the social and cultural environment of those to whom they were addressed; leaving it to the readers of the resulting English version to divine the meaning according to the best of the

mental and spiritual endowment of each.

Ever since the gospels were written, Western Man has been trying to imagine what Jesus was like in the flesh. The resulting picture has changed from age to age. From the middle of the 19th century scholarly Biblical criticism became very concerned to find the real life Jesus whom they supposed to be a mild human reformer upon whom His admirers over the years had built up the whole mythical structure of the Christian faith. The great German scholar Harnack (1851-1930), for example, was said to have reduced Christ to a gentleman who would not be out of place in a lady’s drawing room. In the middle of the present century the excitement of discovering the Dead Sea Scrolls just after the war, led to the contention that Jesus may have derived His teaching from the Essenes, and even that He may have lived among them in His unrecorded years from the age of twelve until the beginning of His ministry - the ‘lost years’. More recently *Jerusalem Perspective*, a magazine in which Jewish and Christian scholars together explore the Jewish background to the life and words of Jesus, has suggested (January 1994 No. 42) that His life and teaching is most nearly akin to that of the *Hassidim*, a sect known to have flourished in Galilee in the first century.

The New Testament is written in Greek. The present essay is directed to the translations into English of the Greek Testament made in Tudor times, on which the Authorized (King James)

Version was based. Dr Johnson’s neat summary quoted above would have us consider how Jesus might have expressed His sayings had His language been English. But one must ask What sort of Englishman would He have been? We can hardly take Him as an English gentleman; no English gentleman is both Man and God; nor without sin! One must therefore add to Dr Johnson’s dictum a reference to the state of mind of the translator, as well as that of the people to whom the translation was addressed - their prejudices, their predilections, their social and economic position.

One thing is clear. Our Lord had a thorough knowledge of the scriptures (i.e., the Old Testament). He was always quoting them (in Hebrew?) or referring to them (in Aramaic? we do not know for sure). Moreover those who heard him in the flesh were almost all Jewish, and would usually be well acquainted in one or other of the languages of Palestine, which included Greek, with the scriptures he quoted. One also has to bear in mind that the outlook of the Jewish population of Palestine, whichever language they spoke, was not that of the Western world. Christianity was in its inception an Eastern religion. Latin was the language of the foreign conqueror, just as Greek had been of the earlier Alexandrian conqueror. The translators’ outlook and language were those of Tudor England.

It is on this basis that we approach the subject of the beatitudes.

The Eight Beatitudes form the commencement of the 'Sermon on the Mount' in verses 3 to 10 of the 5th chapter of St Matthew's gospel. First, the Sermon itself. It is unlikely that there was any such 'sermon' preached. Scholars have suggested that the whole of it (107 verses) would have been too long to have been assimilated at one sitting; that certain parts of it seem unconnected with other parts, and are out of keeping with the whole; that only 49 of the verses appear together as one piece in Luke (6; 20 to 49); that 34 others are scattered in different contexts elsewhere in Luke, while the remainder do not appear at all. Moreover it is surprising to find that the 'sermon' includes the Lord's Prayer, which Luke records as given by Jesus to His disciples on an intimate occasion when they found Him at prayer, and asked for instruction how they should pray (Luke 11; 1). An intimate occasion would seem more suitable for such instruction.

Matthew's version therefore seems more likely to be a collection of important sayings of Jesus gathered together from various sources and given dramatic form by Matthew as a proclamation of 'the kingdom'. This fits in with the well-known 'fragment of Papias' (?60 - 130 AD) Bishop of Hieropolis. Papias wrote five books of the 'oracles of the Lord'. None has survived. But fragments of his work are quoted by other authors. In the best known fragments concerning the origin of the gospels of Matthew and of Mark, Papias states, on the authority of 'the Elder', that Mark, having become the interpreter of St. Peter, set down accurately (ακριβως), though not in order (ου μεντοι ταξει), everything that he remembered of the words and actions of the Lord, and that St. Matthew composed 'the oracles' in Hebrew, and everyone translated them as best he could. Note that this would mean that Matthew's version would be originally in Hebrew, but translated from Greek.

The editors of Jerusalem in general confirm this view. They state that "Matthew used his sources with great freedom in order to reach his carefully worked out ensemble which is so brilliantly adapted for teaching purposes...[he] makes it a *dramatic account in seven acts of the coming of*

the kingdom of heaven". (Introduction p12; original italics). The Editors describe the second of these acts as "the formal proclamation of the charter of the kingdom to the disciples and the public" (*Ibid.*).

Beatitudes - seven or eight?

Each beatitude consists of two clauses: the first beginning 'Blessed are'...; and the second (except in vv.3 and 10), 'for they shall'.... As rendered in the AV, the Blessed are listed as follows:

1. the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.
2. they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.
3. the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.
4. they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.
5. the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.
6. the pure in heart: for they shall see God.
7. the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.
8. they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed. Throughout the Beatitudes this translates the Greek word μακαριος, which in Greek means 'happy'. 'Blessed' would be ευδαιμων or ευλογητος (as in Lk.1;68). This 'ennobling' of the original Greek has been corrected in Jerusalem, G.N.B., and Phillips, who all translate 'happy'.

In notes to vv. 5 and 9, Jerusalem regards the third of the above "as possibly a gloss on [the first]", and goes

The following abbreviations are used for the English versions of the Bible cited:

Jerusalem	The Jerusalem Bible (1966).
AJV	Hebrew Bible; American Jewish Version (1947).
AV	Authorised (King James) Version 1611.
RV	Revised Version (1881-5)
Phil.	New Testament in Modern English; J.B. Phillips (1958).
GNB	The Good News Bible (1976)

The AV is used throughout, unless otherwise stated.

on to state that

its omission would reduce the number of Beatitudes to seven...The number is a favourite of Matthew's: 2x7 generations in the Genealogy (1:17), 7 Beatitudes, (5:4+), 7 parables (13:3+), forgiveness not 7 but 77 times (18:22), 7 ['Woes' or Maledictions] for the Pharisees (23:13+), 7 sections into which the gospel is divided.

These seven 'Woes' unto the scribes and Pharisees in chapter 23 are in fact eight in the AV, but Jerusalem, on the same sort of plan, omits verse 14 (which is identical with Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47) as an interpolation "making eight maledictions instead of the deliberate total of seven" (note to 23; 13).

The Sermon at Nazareth

Certainly, whatever the number, the Beatitudes are intended to balance and contradict the Maledictions, which condemn those -

who keep men out of the kingdom, who are pure only outwardly but unclean within, who 'devour widows houses' in their greed, and for a pretence make long prayer, and who omit the weighty matters of the Law - judgement and mercy (Matt. 23;13 ff.).

Most commentators find a parallel between the 'Beatitudes' and these 'Woes', and some also see the Beatitudes, or at least the first few of them, mirrored in the teaching of Jesus in the synagogue at his home town of Nazareth (Lk. 4;16). All four gospels testify to His teaching in the synagogues around Galilee, but the content of His teaching is only recorded in respect of his teaching in the Nazareth synagogue, and only in Luke.

What he taught there was certainly a revolutionary doctrine, for although "all...wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth", at the end of it they were "filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill on which their city stood, that they might cast him down headlong. But he passing through them went his way." (Lk.4;28ff.)

The Beatitudes, the 'Woes', and the Nazareth teaching are all based on the Prophets and the Psalms, which in turn

are based on the Torah (the Law).

The Teaching at Nazareth (Luke 4:16 ff)

This is a useful reference point because Jesus here read from the book of the prophet Isaiah, having himself "found the place" (Is.61;1 and 2) where it is written...

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, [to set at liberty them that are bruised,] to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book...

Here we are on firm ground, because the Greek of St.Luke is word for word the same as the Greek of Isaiah in the Septuagint - the translation of the Old Testament made in Alexandria in the 3rd or second century B.C. There is one deviation only; the words in square brackets above are omitted from the Greek in the Septuagint, as indeed they are from the Hebrew in the AJV.

Words and Phrases

The Acceptable Year of the Lord. This was a constant theme of the prophets, especially of Isaiah. They bemoaned the fact that the Lord's Year was not being kept according to the law - the Torah. Its origin is found in Lev.Ch 25. Every seventh year was a sabbath year. Every seven sabbaths of years...

"shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubile to sound...throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family".

This is the Jubilee year, when the debtors were released from slavery whether or not they had paid their debts, and when every man returned to his inheritance of land. (Lev. 25, 8 ff.) The prophets' concern was that the jubilee was not being honoured according to law.

The poor The Greek is πτωχοι, meaning 'beggars'. Its root meaning is 'cringing' or 'cowering' (πτωσσω).

Liddell and Scott's Greek Dictionary points out that the word always had a bad sense in Greek 'until ennobled by the gospels'! Dr Bullinger (App.127) remarks that three Greek words (πτωχος, πενης, and πραυς) "are used in the Septuagint interchangeably for the same Hebrew word; but the contexts show that they are all used for the same class, viz., the fellahin, or poor of an oppressed country, living quiet lives under tyrannical and oppressive rulers, and suffering deprivation from tax gatherers and lawless neighbours."

It has to be understood that the language of the Bible deals with Eastern conditions where poverty is always associated with oppression. Psalm 10, for instance, describes the wicked who "sitteth in the lurking places of the villages; in the secret places doth he murder the innocent; his eyes are privily set against the poor. He lieth in wait secretly as a lion in his den; he lieth in wait to catch the poor; he doth catch the poor, when he draweth him into his net." Or Psalm 35;10, "All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto Thee, which delivereth the poor from him that is too strong for him, yea, the poor and needy from him that spoileth him". Similarly in the prophets; Is.3;14, "The Lord will enter into judgment with the ancients of his people, and the princes thereof: for ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses. What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of Hosts." Or again, Is.5;8: "Woe unto them that join house to house, and field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!" The book of the prophet Micah is one long bemoaning of the oppression of the poor by robbing them of their heritage of land:- 2;2 "they covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage". Jesus uses the same sort of language in declaring 'Woe' unto the hypocritical Establishment of His day "for ye devour widows houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation".

Whether or not there is a correspondence between the first few Beatitudes and the teaching at Nazareth, what has been quoted above at least

constitutes important background to the Beatitudes. There are any number of similar instances throughout the Psalms and the Prophets. The Jews to whom Jesus directed His teaching would have been familiar with them. The Psalms have often been called 'the Hymnal of the Second Temple', and the Book of Psalms was from earliest times a regular source of public and private prayer. Extracts from the Prophets would have been read regularly as the second reading (the haftorah) on every sabbath and every feast day in the synagogue. Those who heard the teaching of Jesus in the flesh would be taking His words in the context of the Scriptures they knew so well; for Jesus' teaching was aimed at Jews, and for the most part he refused to teach Gentiles (Cf. Matt. 15; 24 ff. - "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel").

(1) The poor in Spirit; for Their's is the kingdom of Heaven

In fact, however, there are correspondences with these words in the Beatitudes. Πτωχος is 'poor' in the first beatitude; πραυς is 'meek' in the third.

Πτωχος has the addition of τωι πνευματι. Πνευμα can mean breath, wind, life, soul; and it is not easy to see what it means here. Luke has this same saying (Lk. 6;20), but without those qualifying words. Πτωχος is used for the beggar Lazarus, full of sores, in Luke (16;20), and for the poor man as opposed to the man with a gold ring in Jas.2; 2. τωι πνευματι is probably used to emphasise the parlous state of the beggar, and should possibly be translated 'the destitute', or in up-to-date parlance, 'the down-and-out'.

Kingdom. This is a trap for the modern English reader. 'Kingdom' is a correct translation of βασιλεια only if due regard is paid to its second syllable - the third syllable of Anglo-Saxon *Cyningsdoom*, - meaning 'law'. It must be understood in its Old English meaning of 'kingly function, authority, or power; sovereignty; kingship.' (Shorter Oxf. Dict. 1st meaning). Unfortunately modern idiom uses 'kingdom' to designate the territory or country ruled over by a king (Ibid. 2nd meaning). This is not what it means in the biblical expression 'God's Kingdom', although often taken in that sense. For example,

in the Lord's Prayer 'Thy Kingdom come' refers not to some other place but to the rule of God — theocracy. Accordingly the first beatitude, literally translated, would read: "Happy are the destitute beggars, for they rule in the heavens".

(2) They that mourn, for they shall be comforted

Shall be comforted. The change to the future tense is noteworthy. This could refer to the next life rather than the present, and no doubt some take it so. It is also to be noted that the Greek παρακληθησονται is the verb which in its nominal form produces the word 'paraclete' in John 14; 26; 'the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost'; or 'the spirit of truth' (15;26).

There is here a direct link with the malediction in Mt.6; 25, which is an aid in eliciting the meaning of the Beatitude: "Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep".

(3) The Meek shall inherit the Earth

This is a direct quotation from Psalm 37;11.

The earth: Thus the AV, Jerusalem, N.E.B., and Phillips. But the Hebrew in the psalm is *Ha Aretz*. both here in verse 11, and also in verses 9, 22, 29, and 34 of the psalm. In each case in the AJV it is translated 'land', and refers to the 'land' which they shall inherit. This is the word used of the promised land, the land which must not be sold for ever (Lev.25, 23). It is extraordinary that in the English versions of this Psalm in verse 11 alone is *Ha Aretz* picked out to be translated 'earth' as it is in this beatitude. However, the AV (margin) corrects this to 'land' in all four verses of the Psalm.

Shall inherit. The trouble may lie in the Greek word in both N.T. and the Septuagint for 'shall inherit' - κληρονομησουσιν. Its root is κληρος, meaning the 'lot' inscribed with one's name which is cast into a helmet whence the winner's name is drawn. Hence it comes to mean that which is assigned by lot - an allotment of land to the citizens: hence again any piece of land, farm or estate; also to receive one's share of an inheritance (Liddell and Scott's Greek Dictionary).

The meek. Gk. οι πραεις, (in the

Septuagint οι πονηρευομενοι) means 'patient oppressed ones' (Dr Bullinger - note to verse 11 in the Companion Bible, 'the fellahin or poor...etc. (Ibid, App. 127)').

(4) They which hunger and thirst after righteousness

Righteousness. Here again the English translators of the 16th and early 17th century seem to have chosen English words which give a more spiritual flavour to these early Beatitudes: Blessed, poor, meek, the Earth, inherit. 'Righteousness' is another example. The Greek is δικαιοσυνη, which means 'Justice'. The noun is δικη, 'law', 'decree'. In some contexts it can be ennobled. It is in translations of Plato. But is it rightly so here? Oppressed classes anywhere yearn for a change in the laws under which they are oppressed. The poor who heard Jesus would have understood the necessity for justice more than anything else as a priority in the heavenly kingdom. Why should the translators have ennobled this word? Scripture can and often does have layer upon layer of meaning - plain physical, psychological, spiritual, at least; and occasionally something more even than that. Of course they may have been genuinely striving to get at the higher meanings. But there may have been extraneous pressures to make them deal circumspectly with this saying. The translators may have had good reason to feel this should be treated with discretion, having regard to the political and economic climate of the time.

England in Tudor times

The AV was published in 1611. It was based on translations made in the previous century, particularly Tyndale (1525-35), Coverdale (1535), and The Bishops' Bible (1568). It was a time of high inflation, and greedy speculation in land, which necessarily gave rise to great wealth standing in stark contrast with great poverty. There was much controversy between the radical protestant and conservative catholic factions, usually expressed in the somewhat fierce rhetorical language of the age.

St. Thomas More in his *Utopia* (1516)

had outlined in the form of a Platonic dialogue the ideal state in which wealth was shared as Plato suggested in his *Laws* (740a). More wrote of the sheep-breeding ecclesiastical landlords: "Sheep have become so great devourers and so wild that they eat up and swallow down the very men themselves. They consume, destroy and devour whole fields, houses, and cities". He noted the "great dearth of victualles" in a time of rising prices. These economic changes - now accepted as a test of growing prosperity - were at the time looked upon as an unmitigated evil. More ultimately lost his head, although not as an English protestant, since he wrote chiefly in Latin.

Latimer's seven Lenten sermons before Edward VI in 1549 were in ripe colloquial English. They contain stinging indictments of the rich, and vigorous pleas in defence of the poor. He had already been accused of sedition to Henry VIII and was now accused of treason. (3rd sermon p82; Constable 1895). He railed against judges taking bribes. He pointed to the sins of landlords' extortionate rents, and to the impoverishment of the English yeoman class from which he himself had come. He publicised the oppression of poor widows by their rapacious overlords. He ridiculed a certain bishop of Winchester to whom "the Bishop of Rome sent a Cardinal's hatte. He should have had a Tyburne tippet, a halpeny halter, and all such proud prelates." Latimer died eventually at the stake.

Parliament in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII passed Enclosure Acts in an attempt to curb 'the pulling down of towns', 'the waste of houses', and the decay of husbandry. So ineffective was this attempt that 17 commissions were appointed by Wolsey to inquire what towns and hamlets, houses and buildings had been destroyed since the passing of the first such Act; what and how much land had been converted to pasture; what new parks had been made, and what additions had been made to existing parks. (J.D. Mackie, *The Early Tudors*, Oxford 1952, p.451).

"The Inquiry of 1517 showed that in Bedfordshire, Leicestershire and Warwickshire the chances of eviction were about even for tenants on both lay and ecclesiastical estates. In

Leicestershire the enclosure carried out by the Abbey of Leicester (notably Baggrave and Ingardsby) prompted the violent attack of Thomas Rous: 'It is a den of thieves and murderers. The profit of the enclosures the monks enjoy...but the blood of those slain and mutilated there cries every year to God for vengeance'." (Peter Ramsey, *Tudor Economic Problems*, Gollancz, 1972, p.27-8).

The Monasteries were by no means the worst offenders. In the 65 years after the Battle of Bosworth 18 per cent of the enclosures were effected by the monasteries, and 12 per cent by the nobility; the rest mainly by the 'squirearchy', whose ranks included men who had risen from the peasantry and some of the wealthier yeomen, but the core consisted of gentry families well-established in the county. (*Ibid.* p33) The Dissolution of the Monasteries by Acts of Parliament of 1336 and 1349 put an end to the monastic landlords, but not to the enclosures, which went on apace in other hands. Nevertheless, while they had the temporal power, the ecclesiastical landlords bore a significant share in creating the poverty of the beggars who were a prominent feature of Tudor England - rendered landless by the greed of the landed.

In Vol. VIII of the *Oxford History of England* (2nd Edn.1959), Prof. J.B.Black describes the character of later Tudor England as 'the worship of Mammon: company promoters, clerical cupidity, speculators, embezzlers...Land-hunger, litigiousness and lawlessness' (Contents p.xviii covering pp. 259-261). Here are three short extracts from the text:

Undoubtedly there was a land hunger in Elizabethan England. Not only were capitalists dabbling in real estate: the law courts were busy from one end of the country to the other with claims arising out of land, or disputed successions to manors. Men flew to law on the slightest provocation, if they thought they could establish an advantage over their neighbours... [Cf. Deut. 19.14]: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark...etc." (Page 261)

If the government neglected the roads the great floating population of vagabonds who used them presented a problem which could not be ignored. Here the need for action on a nationwide scale was more than

ever apparent, for in spite of all previous attempts to control the plague of beggars their numbers had increased so greatly as to constitute a grave menace to public order. According to Harrison the vagabonds or 'sturdy beggars' alone numbered 10,000. Harman, the contemporary anatomizer of roguery, asserts that there were no fewer than twenty-three categories of thieves and swindlers... [here enumerated in detail]... Such was the composition of this 'merry England' that slept in haylofts, sheeppcotes, or on doorsteps, spreading terror in the country and disease in the towns." (Page 264)

The official attitude to the whole fraternity of vagabonds had always been, and still was, one of fear-ridden ferocity: they were the true 'caterpillars of the commonwealth', who lick the sweat from the labourers' brows. But the impotent poor, the poor by casualty, who were 'poor in very deed', were acknowledged to be a charge on public benevolence". Pauper enactments in 1563 and 1572 eventually established the rating system to support the 'impotent, aged and needy'. For the rogues it was whipping, and in the last resort if they continued in their roguery, death for felony. (Page 265).

In this social and political climate it would not be surprising if the translators of the time toned down the political implications of Jesus' teaching and heightened the spiritual aspects of it. A number of words of quite ordinary meaning in the Greek have been 'ennobled' by the Authorized Version, and this nobility has largely stuck to them in more modern renderings. But not in all.

For example, 'Blessed are...' for the perfectly ordinary Greek Μακάριοι, 'happy', is rendered as 'happy' in Jerusalem, Phillips, and the GNB.

Again, 'the poor in spirit', the A.V. translation of οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, in Luke VI.20 occurs simply as πτωχοὶ without τῷ πνεύματι. Πτωχός undoubtedly means 'a beggar'. It is the same Greek word that Jesus used at Nazareth in the synagogue, when he read from Isaiah 61,3. The full quotation (given above) is significant. It ends abruptly: "To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book and gave it again to the minister".

This closing of the book was in mid-sentence. The rest of the sentence reads "and the day of vengeance of our God". Its significance seems to lie in the fact that Jesus was presenting the

opportunity to accept the sovereignty of God. Only later when the Kingdom had been firmly rejected would 'the day of vengeance of our God' become relevant.

Much might be gleaned from this, especially since the result of it was an attempt to kill Him. To-day His teaching so far as it concerned the Kingdom (viz, the Rule) of God on earth remains rejected. His insistence that only in a proper division of land can beggars be eliminated was replaced in the highest circles of the Church by a system of poor relief which, after the dissolution of the monasteries, turned into the state Poor Law of Tudor times, and has evolved into the welfare state which now lies about our necks gradually strangling us.

To counter this, as some do, by suggesting this is only out of date Old Testament theology is to overlook Jesus' own words (Matt 5;17): "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no way pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

One lesson can be distinctly recognized in the beatitudes as a whole. The remaining beatitudes dealing with 'the pure in heart' and 'the peacemakers' describe *The Way* of the Christian Mystics (St. Paul, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, St. John of The Cross *et al.*). They have been dealt with in the second part of this Essay. Among the desires of the heart that have to be given up (and this may be only at a late stage, but the sooner the better) is the desire for a merely personal salvation. Any desire we have must be for the liberation of the whole creation (Rom. 8: 17-21; and to end of the chapter). We ignore the beggars and the oppressed at our peril. They are not to be fobbed off with charity, or welfare, or social security, or any other kind of help, however well-meant, which may degrade their dignity, lower their human stature or reduce their self-respect, while we selfishly pursue our personal salvation. Such a course will not succeed. They must be liberated along with the rest of creation. Our liberation is inhibited by their bondage.