
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

p. 84) identified with Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Darius (שלשה וג' זה כורש ואחשורוש ודריוש). Further, it is remarked that the Persian dominion 'in the presence of the temple' comprised 34 years (*Seder o. r.*, ch. 30, p. 91: מלכות פרס בפני הבית שלשים וד' שנה). Hence in the words, 'the sum of the years of the kings of Persia and Media is 250 years' (ch. 30), Meyer (pp. 89, 1142) rightly recognizes a typographical error (חמשים ומאתים instead of ח' ושתים). He might, it appears to me, have reached this conclusion simply from the arrangement of the words.

(*b*) Other 'traces that the time of Malachi was fixed as late as Alexander' have not been found by me in the more recent works (the *Einleitungen* of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, *et al.*, the Commentaries, etc.). But L. Cappellus was of opinion that Malachi prophesied after the 22nd year of Artaxerxes Mnemon (405–361 B.C.), and before the 1st year of Ptolemy Euergetes (246–221) [*Opera posthuma*, p. 178; Wähner, *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, i. p. 65]. Further, Joh. Meyer (p. 1085) remarks, 'Malachiam nonnulli putant haud diu ante Christum floruisse.' This rests, of course, upon the supposition that the prediction, 'the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple' (Mal 3^1) must been uttered not long before the advent of Christ. But Meyer has already rightly opposed this late date for Malachi in the words, 'quod verisimile non videtur, quia tempore Maccabæorum destituti erant prophetis (1 Mac 4^{46} 9^{27} 14^{41}).'

4. Such a *contraction of a longer period* might happen all the more readily, the less information there was regarding it (cf. Chwolson, *Corpus inscr. Heb.*, col. 486). In the same way the years 701–681 are in Tob $1^{18\text{-}21}$ contracted to πεντήκοντα (*var. lect.* τεσσαράκοντα) ἡμέραι (cf. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr.* pp. 110, 113). Compare also Ex 12^{40} (according to which the Hebrews sojourned 430 years in Egypt) with Gal 3^{17} (according to which they were 430 years in Canaan *and* Egypt). It is self-evident that this characteristic of the chronological knowledge of the Jews helps to explain the Book of Daniel, and especially the 70 sevens (less properly 'weeks') of years (cf. regarding the internal value of this external uncertainty of the data of the Book of Daniel, my *Einleitung*, p. 390). Moreover, I have been for long struck with the circumstance that alongside of the plur. *shābū'ōth* (Ex 34^{22}, Nu 28^{26}, Dt $16^{9f.\ 16}$, Jer 5^{24}, Ezk 45^{21}, 2 Ch 8^{13} [all]) the form *shābū'îm* is found only in the Book of Daniel, 6 times ($9^{24.\ 25a.\ b.\ 26}$ $10^{2b.\ 3b}$), and that it is always written without ו. Hence for many years I have cherished the notion that this plural form has a double source in the author's circle of ideas. In the first place, this orthography is intended to prevent *literal* weeks being thought of. Secondly, the constant form שָׁבֻעִים is meant to indicate that these *shābū'îm* represent simply an amplified form of the round number שִׁבְעִים (*shibʿîm*, 'seventy') of Jer 25^{11} and 29^{10}.

Ed. König.

Rostock.

Sacramental Hospitality.

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

In a previous article (on 'Bible Hospitality') I showed that the wonderful hospitality of Bible times has been stereotyped among those Palestinian Arabs of to-day, who have not been touched by European influences. I also gave some specimens of the expository helps offered to us by these new-old customs. My plan was, and is, to lay alongside of each other the heavenly medallion and the earthly mould in which it was fashioned. I am now to exhibit four of the incandescent side-lights which Arab hospitality—ancient and modern—sheds upon the Lord's Supper. The very best thing in Oriental life has been utilized by Christ as an image of the very best of God's gifts to man.

I. *The Lord's Supper is a Reconciliation Feast.*—Schumacher (see his *Across the Jordan*), when selecting the route for the railway which is to connect Damascus, the Sea of Galilee, and Haifa, often came into collision with the chiefs. When they wished to come to terms with him, they made what they called 'a reconciliation feast,'

and invited him to it. To decline their invitation was practically a declaration of war between them and the Sultan; to accept the invitation was a complete assurance of friendship. This flashes a welcome gleam of fresh light upon many a Bible page. It is one of the root-ideas in the Lord's Supper; in the parables about feasts; and also, though not so obviously, in the Passover. True, it does not explicitly present the idea of sacrifice or atonement. As in the meeting of Laban and Jacob at Mizpah, the eating of bread is the sign and seal of a covenant. God's saints are defined in Ps 50[5] as those who have made a covenant with Him by sacrifice. A traveller tells that when he neared the summit of the great St. Bernard Pass, he first saw the cross and then the hospice; and he adds finely, 'Yes, we find God's hospitality at the Cross.' To eat food offered to idols is to be identified with them in the strongest possible way; it is to be partakers of their altar, and to 'have fellowship with devils' (1 Co 10[16-20]). The worshipper has become the spiritual guest of, and so been 'brothered' with, these idols. By parity of reason, the communicant shares at the Lord's Table the covenant-hospitality of God, and enters into close mystic union with Him.

The conditions of this high privilege are not hard. In explaining this sacred object-lesson, we fix our eyes upon the object that we may not miss the lesson. If an enemy only touches a rope of his foe's tent, he is safe. 'Now the past is past,' said an Arab to Bruce, with whom he had quarrelled, after they had drunk coffee together. The covenant is sealed even by eating one morsel of a chief's bread; amity is pledged by drinking one mouthful of his water. When Rob Roy was at the Lake of Merom, he was made a prisoner by the thievish Arabs there. They seized his canoe, and carried it to their tents. But his wit was level with the occasion, and executed a fine stroke of diplomacy. The Arabs are very fond of sweetmeats. The Jews of Tiberias turn this weakness into merchandise. They carry sweetmeats among the Arabs, and barter them for such goods as they possess. But the Gentile for once surpassed the Jew in ingenuity. He took a tin box out of his pocket, and began to swallow its contents, smacking his lips with evident relish. The chief's fondness for sweets moved him to take a pinch out of the box. He put it to his lips, and lo, it was salt! Rob Roy had outwitted the thieves, and gained the protection of Arab hospitality. His canoe was restored, and he was treated as an honoured guest. I have also read that a robber in the dark stumbled over a piece of rock-salt, tasted it, and at once gave up his booty.

And Arab hospitality would lose its charms and value if its welcome were limited. The Arab here is in accord with the ancient Greek. Admetus, in the Alcestis of Euripides, gives 'guest-welcome' to Herakles, though his wife lay a corpse. He was afraid that his palace should be called 'Guest-hating Hall.' 'Guest-fain was he; guest-fain over much,' says the poet. He must show 'pity towards strangers.' Even escaped criminals can claim hospitality; no chief can deny it, even to his deadliest enemy when he flees to him. A friend was dining one day in the tent of a chief near Jericho. A man sprang in, seized a bit of bread, and ate it. There was a blood-feud between that man and the chief; and by that act the poor fellow, from being a foe, became the guest of the man who was seeking his life. Any enemy may become a friend by choosing to be a guest, and may also secure for himself the first place in the tent. The Arab must welcome all comers.

Is heaven's hospitality poorer than earth's? Can the drop be as great as the ocean? Is God less generous than Abraham or Abraham's modern descendants?

II. *The Lord's Supper is a Brotherly Feast.*—Communicants are fellow-guests who sign and seal their covenant with God, and with one another.

Arab hospitality, in this respect, abounds with great spiritual suggestions. 'The bread and the salt make all brothers,' an Arab said to Doughty. 'We have eaten salt together' is still the strongest bond of friendship. Some renew the bond every twenty-four hours lest it should grow weak. Burton speaks of 'salt-law' and 'terms of salt.' The Arabs define their relation to their guests by such beautiful phrases as 'brother-share' and 'brother-help.' Their eating together is accepted by all as a sacrament of union and brotherly love. A fellow-guest who betrays or injures is called 'an abuser of the salt'; this is the most stinging taunt among the Arabs; it emphasizes what they hold to be the most monstrous baseness.

Perhaps the weakest point in average modern Christianity is its slender recognition of the bonds of Christian brotherhood. By its lowly ministering

brotherly love in a loveless age, the faith of Christ conquered the heathen world, and we must have a revival of this spirit before we can witness similar triumphs. The ideal of Arab hospitality vividly places before us the perfection of Christian brotherhood. In its light we can better understand the sacramental teachings about brotherly love. 'For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread' (1 Co 10^{17}).

Like the Passover, the Supper is a family meal, and the hour when the family feeling reaches its fullest consciousness. Every guest is a fellow-child of our Father in heaven. 'I am your brother and companion,' St. John says. Companion means literally bread-fellow (*con* and *panis*). According to De Quincey, the name *Free Masons* comes from the word *mess*: they are mess-fellows or bread-fellows. To be a bread-fellow or a cup-fellow, binds the Arab to every social duty which is pressed upon us in the New Testament: it even pledges him, if need be, to die for his comrade. I believe that Christ and His apostles laid their hands upon these well-known usages, and consecrated them to evangelical and sacramental uses. Were this understood and practised, our church-life would be revolutionized, and the world would be impressed as it never yet has been.

III. *The Lord's Supper is a Satisfying Feast.*—The Arab does his utmost to secure that all his guests shall be safe and satisfied. As we have seen, the Arab's deadliest enemy is safe in his tent. It is said that the Sultan could not force a refugee from the tent of his host except by exterminating the whole tribe. The protection given even to an enemy is all the more remarkable as blood-revenge is the Arab's idol. It is not only a most sacred duty, it is also, in the absence of a settled government, the only protection of life. Without this wild justice might would everywhere be right. The 23rd Psalm (v.^{5}) illustrates this point: 'Thou preparest a table for me in the presence of mine enemies.'

The avenger has pursued the shedder of blood, who casts himself on the hospitality of a powerful chief. He is welcomed, of course. His pursuers halt; they are now powerless to injure the fugitive; the host, like Abraham, spreads a table 'under the tree,' and royally entertains his guest; his baffled enemies can only gnash their teeth and pass away.

And the guest is satisfied. For the laws of hospitality oblige the host to supply the every want of the humblest guest. The claims of such a guest on his host are stronger than those created by blood or affinity. Christ's washing of the disciples' feet comes under the category of hospitality. The guest becomes a member of the family, and much more than that. He is for the time the lord of the tent, and all in it is at his disposal. If hitherto an enemy, he receives much more than bare reconciliation.

Salvation and satisfaction are the two leading ideas in the Lord's Supper. Christ has so arranged it, that though it represents His death of pain and shame, all its symbols are refined and delightful, and are, in this respect, in marked contrast to the Passover. This striking difference is in manifest harmony with the genius of the New Covenant. The Supper is vastly more than a fitful and doubtful vision of the holy grail. The cup of blessing is the symbol of the most real enjoyment. It symbolizes 'the remission of sins,' and it is called 'a feast,' not a meal. It does not offer paupers' rations or prisoners' fare. Bread and wine represent both the necessaries and the luxuries of life. They who partake of it are satisfied with the abundant goodness of God's house. Man at God's table doth eat angels' food, even though it be mixed with the 'bitter herbs' of penitence for sin and lost sacramental honour. Christ meets our crave for light, pardon, rest, strength, solace, and immortality. Thus the noblest hunger of the soul is appeased.

This line of exposition lights up and restores the faded metaphors in many familiar texts. It also emphasizes the fact that the Lord's Supper is essentially a feast, not the offering of a sacrifice for sin. It is presented on a table, not on an altar. There is no transforming magic in the act of consecration. 'The cup which *we* bless,' St. Paul says; the act of blessing is the act of the whole flock through their representative. 'The bread which we break,' he adds; it remains bread after it has been consecrated and broken. It is interesting to read in the *Life of Lord Tennyson*, that when in his bedroom he received the Lord's Supper shortly before his death, he explained to the clergyman that he could partake of it only on the understanding that it was not a mass, but a communion; not a sacrifice, but a life-giving feast.

IV. *The Lord's Supper is the Symbol of an Eternal*

Feast.—It is more than a mere viaticum or provision for our journey. It is, as the old divines called it, the pledge and earnest, the prologue and infancy of immortality. 'I am a stranger with thee,' says David (Ps 39^{12}), 'and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.' We may thus paraphrase these words: 'I have come to Thy door, and cast myself upon Thy hospitality and protection. In danger of becoming the outcast of both worlds, I appeal to Thee for guest privileges.' The words might also be supposed to hint at hereditary hospitality, as the son of a guest had special claims.

'Go in peace,' said a chief to M. Schumacher (*Across the Jordan*, p. 115), 'you have eaten bread and salt with me. Our friendship shall last for ever. You will always be safe, for Muhammed Es Senir with his life guarantees yours.'

Among the Greeks and Romans salt and hospitality were synonymous. Among Orientals salt, by reason of its preciousness and its preserving virtue, is the most prized element in a feast. It is the accepted symbol of eternity. A 'covenant of salt' thus means an unalterable and everlasting covenant. Such a covenant has mystic and indefinite significations, and thus shadows forth the marriage supper of the Lamb in heaven.

Biblical hospitality thus suggests the permanency of the great gospel feast. 'For even Christ our Paschal Lamb has been sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast' (1 Co $5^{7.8}$). This means that life is to be an unbroken banquet, as the relation formed by Christ's death is not one that is to be severed: God's guest is to sit every day at the table of the great King. And the feast stretches into eternity, for the communion table is to be prolonged from the upper room at Jerusalem to heaven itself. To be God's guest-friend once is to be His guest-friend for ever. The 23rd Psalm exults in this truth, 'Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.' These bold words mean that the Psalmist has guest-rights worthy of his Host; he has been welcomed into Jehovah's tent, and in Jehovah's tent he shall remain for ever. The same great truth is rehearsed in John's vision of heaven. 'He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them' (R.V.); that is, they shall be Jehovah's guests. Therefore, 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.' Hunger and thirst and fatigue under the merciless sun are the evils which afflict the traveller, and from all of which he is delivered in the most grateful resting-place which his entertainer has prepared for him. All these phrases are carried up from the earthly life to the heavenly. 'For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.'

That would be the very perfection of Divine hospitality. Again, we read (Rev $21^{3.4}$), 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle (literally the tent) of God is with men; He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain.' The hospitality is worthy of the Host: God's guests receive God-like entertainment.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS v. 24.

'And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.'

EXPOSITION.

'Enoch walked with God.'—This is translated in the LXX, 'Enoch pleased God,' whence comes the 'testimony' quoted in Heb 11^{5}. Really it gives the cause of which the Greek phrase is the effect; for it denotes a steady continuance in well-doing, and a life spent in the immediate presence of and in constant communion with God.—PAYNE-SMITH.

HIS mind was pure; his spirit rose above the turmoil of worldliness; he delighted in calm communion with God; once more the familiar intercourse between God and man, which had existed in the time of Paradise, was restored; the path commenced by Seth was continued by Enoch; the former addressed God by the medium of the *word*; the latter approached Him by the still more spiritual medium