

sin only for the sake of something else. Compared with him, all human sinning is only derived. In the devil is to be found the ultimate principle of all sinning in the world. Thus the human sinner does not stand isolated with his sinning; he has a principle of sin within him; he is a child of another sinning one. Here John presents the notion of the devil under the point of view from which that notion has its practical importance. We should not be satisfied with merely considering our own sin; but in order rightly to understand it, we should go back upon the idea of sin in all its distinctness, and turn our attention to that form of it in which it has reached its height. When we look at our own sin, we find much in it that extenuates it in our eyes. It seems to be weakness; and accordingly we do not feel due abhorrence of it. When, however, we are looking at the sin of our neighbour, we should not overlook anything that might tend to excuse him.

The sinning of the devil is to be understood of his own sinning, not of the sinning of man through his tempting activity. If now, says John, the devil is the sinner from principle, and therefore the real sinner, the sinner in the full sense of the term, he who doeth sin belongs to *him*. He cannot belong to Christ (ii. 29), for He was

manifested for the express purpose of making a thorough end of all sinning, *i.e.* of all the works of the devil (John xii. 31, xvi. 11). The ultimate aim of the appearing of the *Son of God* is the thorough-going destruction of sin by the destruction of the kingdom of sin and of the prince of this kingdom. Only the Son of God could accomplish this destruction. The use of this expression (Son of God) emphasises the greatness of the might that in Christ has been opposed to Satan. This, it is true, is only the negative aspect of His work; but it is essentially involved in all that He did. The founding of the kingdom of God is always accompanied by an attempt to destroy the kingdom of the devil, which is opposed to it. It is therefore, also, an essential feature of the morality of the Christian, that in all he does and suffers he aims at a complete annihilation of sin. He must not only labour positively at the realisation of the good; his morality must also include this opposition to sin. In this there is no doubt something humbling to the Christian. It would be pleasant to be able to turn one's attention merely to what is good; but this pleasure and comfort is meanwhile absolutely denied to the Christian. In his loftiest endeavours, he always keeps his eye upon sin.

Table Fellowship (Tischgemeinschaft) of Jew and Gentile.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH STRAUSS, PH.D., M.A., RABBI, BRADFORD.

THIS question is one of historical interest in its bearing on the social life of the Jewish people, and especially on the relation of Jew and Gentile in the primitive Christian Church; but it is somewhat obscure and difficult, and has not, so far as we know, been thoroughly discussed. The following is offered as a contribution to its settlement. In dealing with the matter, we treat it chronologically, and distinguish two main features. (I.) The Jew eating with the Gentile in the Gentile's house; (II.) The Gentile eating with the Jew in the Jew's house.

I. *The Jew eating with the Gentile in the Gentile's house.*—(a) In early Bible times we find eating with certain heathenish nations altogether forbidden, as is clear from Ex. xxxiv. 15, 16, "Make

thou no covenant with the inhabitants of the land (of Canaan), lest, when they go astray after their gods, and sacrifice unto their gods, any one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice. And lest thou take of his daughters who, going astray after their gods, make thy sons also go astray after their gods." This passage, in forbidding the Jew to celebrate the feasts of the aborigines of Palestine and to eat with them, gives a very weighty reason for it, *sc.* lest the Israelites, becoming too intimate with these heathens, might marry their daughters, who, as the great lawgiver justly fears, and as experience teaches, might lead their Jewish husbands astray from the service of the only one eternal God, and cause them to worship idols, and thus commit all kinds of abominable customs that were rampant among the Canaanitish nations.

This prohibition has only been limited to the Canaanites, who, according to the intention of the lawgiver, were to be totally extirpated, although as a matter of fact it had not been done. Other nations around Palestine were treated with more toleration, though a distinction is made between them, especially with regard to proselytes to the Jewish faith. Thus, according to Deut. xxiii. 6-8, a man descending from the Ammonites and Moabites was never to be admitted among Israelites. "Even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of the Eternal for ever;" whereas an Egyptian and an Edomite were allowed "to enter the community of Israel in the third generation."

(b) In later (the Talmudic down to modern) times, notably after Alexander the Great, when Jews came in contact with Greeks, and Grecian manners and customs penetrated Judea, the intercourse between Jews and heathens was not only frequent, but actually became intimate, and the eating of Jews with Gentiles was permitted. For a time, it is true, a reaction set in, when Antiochus Epiphanes began, about 170 B.C., to force the Jews to submit to idolatrous (Syro-Grecian) practices, and to eat unclean or forbidden meat (1 Macc. i.). In consequence, the law was more strictly applied by the Maccabeans, so that the Chasidim, the pious, such as, e.g., Jose ben Joaser, living about 167 B.C., would not eat anything from or with a Gentile (Talmud Babli, treatise Synhedrin, page 23^a, and Chagiga, 18^b). But this reaction did not last long, for when the Maccabean victories over the Syrian armies had made Israel independent for two centuries, the Gentiles were looked upon with greater toleration. Thus Rabbi Yochanan (198-278 A.C.), who was in favour of receiving proselytes from the heathens, and was altogether more lenient in his views regarding non-Jews, declared that a heathen who uttered words of wisdom deserved to be called Rabbi, *i.e.* a Doctor of Law (Talmud Babli, treatise Megilla, 16^a). Another great savant, Rabbi Yoshua ben Levi, acknowledged the good actions of a heathen as of such high merit that they should be imitated by Jews (Synhedrin, 39^b). And the outcome of all this is, that the statute book of the Shulchan Aruch,¹ section Yoreh De'ah, paragraph 152, per-

¹ The Shulchan Aruch, *i.e.* "Spread or arranged table," is a codification of the opinions of the learned Talmudic doctors; it was compiled in the fourteenth century, and is

mits a Jew of the present time to eat with a heathen in the latter's house, provided it is not a solemn festival meal, where the Jew would have to witness and submit to certain idolatrous practices.

II. *The Gentile eating with the Jew in the Jew's house.*—(a) From a law in early Bible times, Ex. xii. 48, "No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof," *i.e.* of the Paschal lamb, we can infer that a heathen was permitted to sit down with a Jew and eat with him in his house, provided it was not a special national religious meal, as that of the Pascha.

The prayer of King Solomon after the completion of the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kings viii. 41-43), in which the king pleads for the admission of the foreigner and heathen (נֹכְרִי) into the house of prayer, and for the hearing and granting of the latter's prayers, breathes such a liberal spirit as might well be imitated by some Christians and Jews of the present day.

More liberal still is the Deutero-Isaiah who, in the 56th chapter, proclaims the admittance of the foreigner to the Levitical and priestly order, even "to minister" before the Lord God of Israel. These passages sufficiently show that already in those early times Gentiles must have had friendly relations with Israelites, freely mixed with them, and took part in their convivial gatherings.

(b) In Talmudic times, when there was a constant intercourse between Jew and Gentile, the Tischgemeinschaft was an established fact. Pages of the Talmud, devoted to the discussion of the subject of proselytes, show that Israel could no longer be exclusive to strangers, consequently the terms of admission into the Jewish community became more liberal, and proselytes could find easier access to Judaism. This is prominently shown by the fact that besides the righteous or perfect proselyte, the גֵּר צְדִיק, who conforms to all the laws and ordinances of Judaism, inclusive of the ceremony of circumcision, an easier mode of proselytism was introduced, that of the "resident proselyte," the גֵּר הוֹשֵׁב, or in the Talmud called "proselyte of the gate," גֵּר שַׁעַר, *i.e.* one who needs no circumcision, and only comes as far as the inner gate of Judaism, but is in other respects considered a Jew, especially in so far as he may eat and pray with Jewish brethren. From other still obeyed by the so-called orthodox section of modern Jews, whilst enlightened reformed Jews do not consider it as a guide-book.

passages in the Talmud, such as treatises Sabbath 116^a and ^b and Midrash Koheleth, *vocē* כל הדברים, we notice an active and intimate intercourse between Jews and primitive Christians. Friendly discussions as to the relative merit of the new doctrine are held, and in the treatise of Sabbath there is actually a quotation from the New Testament, Matt. v. 17, 18, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."

Since the Jews came in contact with the Romans under the rule of Judas and Simon Maccabeus, the former of whom made an alliance with the Romans in 160 B.C., more especially after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, 70 A.C., their relations to Gentiles became continuous and very friendly. We find Jews settled in Asia Minor and in Greece, and a great number of them residing in Rome. The Talmud reports many incidents, from which we gather that not only early Christians, but Jews too, were zealous in making proselytes; often

Christians and Jews were taken for one and the same sect. In Talmud Yerushalmi Megilla, i. 72, and Babli Abhoda Zara, p. xi, the conversion and circumcision of a Roman senator and a considerable number of soldiers are reported. From all we can safely infer that the table-fellowship of Jew and Gentile was no new thing during the time of the primitive Christian Church; and the sitting down of the Gentile with an Israelite to take meals together, either in the former's or latter's house, was an everyday occurrence.

In connection with this, it may perhaps be of interest to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to mention that before and after a proper meal the Jew was enjoined to wash his hands. A short prayer was said before meal, and a longer grace after the meal. Passages relating thereto are 1 Sam. ix. 13; Luke ix. 16; John vi. 11; Deut. viii. 10; Talmud Chulin, p. 105; Shulchan Aruch, section Orach Chayim, p. 158; Matt. xv. 20; Luke xi. 38. The custom of washing hands also prevailed among the ancient Greeks; comp. *Iliad*, x. 577; *Odyssey*, i. 136; and Xenophon's *Cyrop.* i. 35.

Horton's "Revelation and the Bible."

BY THE REV. D. WITTON JENKINS, GLASGOW.

"THIS book is the fulfilment of a promise made in the Preface of the second edition of *Inspiration and the Bible*. . . . The following pages are a series of suggestions towards this most helpful work of reconstruction." So says Mr. Horton in his Preface. We are glad he has fulfilled his promise. There was need for it. The former book left an uneasy feeling, and much dissatisfaction. This "pretends to be nothing more than a series of tentative suggestions," which must be kept in mind in our estimate of the book. Whether or not it is always wise to rush to print with "tentative suggestions," is a matter of opinion. Some might prefer to wait, and allow their thoughts to filter and clarify. Probably many, after reading *Revelation and the Bible*, will think that Mr. Horton would have acted wisely in waiting a few years.

It staggers one to be told at the beginning that "any one who, making use of the Index, puts

¹ T. Fisher Unwin. 1892. 7s. 6d.

together the definite statements about revelation may gather with some distinctness how the matter shapes itself in his (the author's) own mind." Readers should be saved such trouble. But the author is scarcely just to himself; for the Introduction clearly indicates his own creed, and strikes us as being the best part of the book. "My whole position," he says, "which is that of a settled faith in the revelation of the Bible, makes it a matter of secondary importance what the conclusions of the so-called Higher Criticism may be." Here we get the secret and purpose of the book. The author endeavours to bring others to the same position.

Revelation is defined thus: "By revelation is meant a truth or truths received from God into the minds of men, not by the ordinary methods of inquiry, such as observation and reasoning, but by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit." Again, "Revelation, in the strictest use of the term, is that body of truth which is made known in a special