

BIBLICAL SOCIOLOGY

DEPOSITED
BY THE COMMITTEE ON
Graduate Studies.

Ixm

1P8.1912



No.

Library of McGill University

MONTREAL

Received

BIBLICAL SOCIOLOGY

**With Special Reference to
Kinship, Genealogies, Circumcision,
Marriage, Divorce, Property Rights,
Inheritance, Maintenance of Social
Order and Burial.**

- :: :: -

J.G. POTTER, B.A.

O U T L I N E

1. Scope of Thesis.
2. Sociology (a) Importance of the Science.
(b) Principles involved in Thesis.
3. Biblical Sociology (a) Factors in the evolution of
Hebrew Society.
(b) Contact with other nations.
4. Special Phases:
 - (a) Kinship
 - (b) Genealogies
 - (c) Circumcision
 - (d) Marriage
 - (e) Divorce
 - (f) Property and Property Rights
 - (g) Inheritance and the Goel.
 - (h) Social Order --- Benevolence and Justice.
 - (i) Burial and Mourning.
5. Conclusion.
6. Bibliography.

SCOPE OF THE THESIS.

In dealing with a subject of such importance and magnitude, it is difficult out of the great mass of data and phenomena to select the materials that will most effectively emphasize the special phases of the subject submitted, without apparently doing injustice to departments of the larger subject that are of very great interest. In order to make clear the value of the sociological movement among the people whose history is largely given in the Old Testament it will be necessary to consider the conditions by which they were surrounded, the characteristics and customs of the people with which they came in contact, the changes in their own history that marked their development from their primitive nomadic condition to a well organized nation, and to examine the laws and principles by which that development took place.

This will involve a summary exposition of the principles of Sociology in general, and a survey of the attitude of eminent sociologists to the question in its practical bearing on human affairs. Having sought to accomplish this it is desirable to enunciate the laws underlying the evolution of man from primitive conditions through all the stages of social improvement. This will necessitate a comparison of many of the different conditions in which the various races of mankind

have been found to exist, and the influences that have led to their physical and moral betterment.

It will imply a consideration of the laws of kinship by which individuals became associated and related. In this, dependence will largely rest on Professor Robertson Smith's most comprehensive treatment in "Kinship and Marriage".

The way having thus been opened up, the special phases of study will be treated. For this purpose the literature of the Hebrew people as found in the Old Testament will be the chief source of information.

In this Bible - which is in reality a 'Library' - we will discover that the evolution of this early Society proceeds in relation to the revelation and conception of 'Elohim' or 'Jahweh'. This conception differentiates this people from all surrounding communities, a new force and life that cannot be found in the history of other peoples, a supernatural revelation of their Deity, making a deep impression upon those who received it. This does not imply that the Hebrews had some distinct plan of evolution apart from others. All society is formed by the unfolding of man's powers in relation to his fellows, as they are drawn into exercise by the circumstances of his life wherever man may be, and under all sorts of conditions. Any special revelation purporting to have been given this particular society does not set aside the general

forces of social evolution in the world at large, but adds new principles and forces to society as a whole. To Abram, the reputed head of this clan, it was said - "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed".

Biblical Sociology may, therefore, be defined as the description, according to the principles of sociology, of the social phenomena which constituted the factors in the evolution of the people whose history the Bible records. The organisation of this society as we shall see begins with a small group or family, and advances successively to a clan, tribe, confederation of tribes, becoming in the ultimate stage a great and powerful nation.

It will be the province of this treatise to deal first of all with the general principles of sociology, then with the particular aspect of the subject as it applied to the Hebrew race, studying its development in the light of its origins, marking the transition that took place on the occupancy of Canaan, following their history through the various stages of their wonderful growth, and describing with some minuteness the laws and customs pertaining to marriage, divorce, property rights, inheritance, circumcision, benevolence and burial.

In concluding the thesis, it will be shown how earnestly

the prophets, called the people to the lofty ideals of social service, also how the principles that guided the people through all their history are the principles that may be applied to all forms of social injustice and oppression, and in following the attitude of the New Testament writers will note the higher and broader meaning that is given to kinship; and, finally, it will be maintained that from unbiased sources eminent testimony has been adduced accentuating the great value of Biblical Literature, with its richness of ideals and its lofty tone, to the problems of society, and the needs of humanity in the present day.

BIBLICAL SOCIOLOGY

With Special Reference to
Kinship, Genealogies, Circumcision, Marriage,
Divorce, Property Rights, Inheritance, Bene-
volence and Burial.

SOCIOLOGY - ITS IMPORTANCE.

Sociology may be described as the Science of man as a social being, and the investigation and statement of the development and scope of social relations. It indicates the powers of man as a 'socius', discovers his relation to persons and things about him, recognizes his place in the order of creation and reveals his art of forming associations with the persons or things about him, all of which will result in a higher social condition.

By this science, therefore, search is made for all the phenomena of society obtainable in all stages of its evolution, and for that purpose, it calls into requisition many other sciences to contribute facts relative to the origins, history, principles, laws and customs discoverable among the tribes, groups, or nations throughout the world.

Hence Anthropology, Archaeology, Biology, Geology, History and Comparative Philology are sources from which data

may be gathered for such a study and statement.

It will be manifest that the claim that many students of this science make, regarding its great importance has some ground for existence, for they consider it the culminating and combining science. They claim that it undertakes to show that man stands as the culmination of the magnificent progress in the life of the world as to persons and that he holds regnant power as to things in their social relation. The same voice that uttered "It is not good for man to be alone" said "replenish ye the earth and have ye dominion over every living thing upon it". (Gen. 1. 28). The former connects man with Education, Metaphysics and Religion; the latter connects man with Industry, Commerce, Land, Inheritance and Economics generally.

Dr. Westermarck speaking before the Sociological Society at its meeting in London University in 1904 said: "Those who are interested in sociology should well understand that sociology is still in the making. It will no doubt go rapidly". Dr. Westermarck's language was prophetic, for no department of study is destined to receive more attention by universities throughout the world than the department of Social Science. This is no doubt due to the fact that it will make it possible not only to study all the conditions of

primitive and modern society, but will give opportunity to apply to the social problems confronting every nation the principles and laws that will best make for the highest welfare of the race.

A glance at the "Année Sociologique" for 1902 will indicate the scope of sociology, and will give some idea of the strength and direction of the sociological movement in the different countries. The groups are designated as follows:
General Sociology: including Social Philosophy and types of civilization.

Religious Sociology: Elementary forms, magic, ritual, beliefs, and practices concerning the dead.

Juridicial and Moral Sociology:

Political and Domestic organization, Laws of Property, Contract, Criminal Law.

Criminal Sociology and Moral Statistics:

Factors of general criminality,
Functioning of Repressive System.

Economic Sociology:

Economic System, form of production, classes,
Legislation regarding social condition.

Social Morphology:

Geographical base of society,

Population in general,
Urban and Rural groupings.

Miscellaneous:

Aesthetic sociology of Language and Conditions of
War.

The arrangement of the "Revista Italiana Sociologia" displays the far reaching inclusion of the co-related sciences already mentioned.

1. Anthropology and Ethnology.
2. Demography.
3. Social Psychology.
4. Social Economy.
5. Jurisprudence.
6. Politics.
7. Criminal Sociology.

Other periodicals add 'Social History', 'Evolution Theory', 'Medicine and Hygiene', 'Science of Language', 'Aesthetics', 'Natural Philosophy' and 'Education'.

There will be great difference of opinion as to the number of these various departments that ought to be included under any system of sociology. Truth is the common property of all, and while each science is a "special" and important study in itself, it is claimed for sociology that, as a pure

science, it is a deliberate, systematic and ever continuing attempt to construct a more and more fully reasoned social theory - a theory of the origin and growth, of the structures and functions, of the ideals and destiny of human society; and, - as an applied science - the construction of principles applicable to the ordering of social life insofar as concrete problems can be shown to come within the range of verifiable knowledge. In addition to this definition, Branford, in London University Sociological papers published in 1905, asserts that every "ultra sectional investigator" will have all his available knowledge of man and his action and re-action with environment focussed for two purposes. The first of these is a speculative one - the understanding and interpreting of that unfolding process or drama of social evolution, in which we are all interested as spectators and as participants. The second purpose is practical - the utilisation of our knowledge, gathered and unified from its manifold sources, for the directing, as far as may be, and in part the controlling, of this evolutionary process.

The same writer emphasizes the fact that while the sociologist derives his general attitude, his mental tendency and outlook from philosophy, the positive contents of his study he derives from the sciences, drawing in turn upon the

whole circle of the positive sciences' material, mental and moral. He cites Comte, Spencer and other sociologists as pointing out that an investigator must have some command not only of the special social sciences, but also must grasp at least one branch - and that a central one - of each of the three great groups of the preliminary sciences - the mathematical, the physical and the biological; but, according to these great thinkers, the equipment will be inadequate without a training in philosophical and historical studies.

The political and economic condition of the nations to-day, as well as the astounding changes affecting monarchical and constitutional governments, the unrest amongst the European countries and the emigration problems confronting the new and rapidly developing republics and colonial possessions, all demand some co-related and conjunct study that will in some measure solve the problems that appeal to every lover of humanity. Take for example the case of Germany. Since 1815 when Germany was a mere name on the map - a collection of disunited states - down to the present year there has been unceasing activity on the part of the German States through systematic management and a policy of colonial expansion to regulate the social and commercial conditions of national life. The Hohenzolleren tradition of the State, and the "blood and iron" policy of

Prince Bismarck led to the union of many principalities and electorates by brute force, the establishment of a strong Prussian fighting force, and the overthrow of states such as Austria that refused to be co-erced into union. The war with France with its heavy indemnity of two billion dollars paid to Germany made for a different condition of things in both countries, In France it led to thrift and industry, in Germany after the ~~shower~~ of gold there followed industrial failures and depression. Since that time Germany has been compelled to change her trade relations with other nations, and has entered upon an expansion policy that has cost her an immense amount of money and great anxiety, the subjugation of her colonial possessions in Africa costing her \$150,000,000. The relations of the state to the people have been strained, although the Emperor and the Reichstag have done much to make the Imperial power popular, and we find that there is a strong and potent socialistic party in the German Parliament that is determined to undermine the autocratic powers of the State. The social unrest is so acute that it is causing the greatest concern to the government at the present time.

So also the United States, with its great prosperity and expansion, reveals a social condition that is costing the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars to investigate,

expose, and if at all possible, remedy. In the name of the socialistic party, crying out for a change in social conditions, one hundred and fifty thousand votes were cast in the Presidential election of 1900, four hundred thousand votes were registered in 1904, and four hundred and fifty thousand in 1908. The stern determination of this party is perhaps accentuated by the extreme men among them taking vengeance on officials and press who opposed them, as evidenced in the destruction of property in Los Angeles and other places. The official investigation regarding this matter impresses one with the widespread, and deeply-rooted social troubles which must be faced, studied, and treated in a serious manner.

Within the past few weeks, the entire power of empire in China has been handed over to Dr. Sen and those associated with him in the recent revolution in that land with its ancient civilization. At one stroke the new regime does away with ancient barbarous social customs, and begins a reformation along educational, social, and ethical lines.

All these conditions point to a state of things that demand the most devout investigation, the closest scrutiny, and the adaptation of such methods and principles as will effectively minimize the causes of social disorder, and suggest methods by which all the related phases of human existence may be brought into harmony.

In other words, it is clearly the province of sociology to describe and suggest the influences, facts, principles and forces that may be used for the highest boon to all mankind in all the departments of human experience. In this way the hope is fondly cherished that this science will yet afford the complete answer to the most rabid socialism and reveal a remedy for any apparent disorder. It must be always remembered that the theory of socialism - with its eight million devotees - threatens the institutions of society as at present constituted, and must therefore be answered in a way that it will respect, and eventually accept as the only and best solution of a people's need.

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY.

Having thus undertaken to prove the great importance of sociology, let us proceed to examine its principles, insofar as they deal with the consideration of social progress in primitive conditions. Herbert Spencer enunciated certain laws governing the development of all sciences. In his first principles he propounded the formula "Evolution is an integration of matter with a concomitant dissipation of motion during which the matter progresses from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite coherent heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation".

Spencer traces this law through all the stages of astronomy, geology, biology, psychology and sociology. In zoology, for example, he would trace this process from the early jelly-fish, indefinite, incoherent, homogeneous mass to the fish with head, eyes, backbone, fins, tail, a definite, coherent heterogeneous animal. In like manner he applies this formula to the realm of sociology and traces the process from the savage or barbarian tribe, where all hunt and fish and fight, an indefinite, incoherent, homogeneous mass, to the modern city with legislative, executive and judicial departments, with its tradesmen, professional men, merchants, a definite coherent heterogeneous society. Spencer does not undertake to tell us of the origin of the species. Everything must terminate with the absolute of which he cannot affirm anything.

Whatever view one might hold about the creation of the first socius - whether by a process of evolution from protoplasm, or by a spontaneous act - it will still be true that he was created with a conscious power of reproduction, a power of adapting himself to surroundings, the power of transmitting to his offspring the attainments he has possessed, the power of living for others and, above all, possessing the higher elements of reason, emotion, jealousy and affection.

Sociology therefore assumes the existence of a social unit, whether that unit denotes an individual or a group, and society in its simplest form is found wherever a socius has found a companion and adapts himself in a friendly way to his surroundings, or his relation to one or more units. The question at once arises how the units of society become related or grouped. We find three elements operating - that which is inherent in nature, the necessity of outward conditions, and the intentional or voluntary. Hence the varied wants of nature, in its different phases of expression, seek satisfaction in the ways that correspond to such cravings. It is well to remember that wherever there are a number of individual units all the elements of society are there, and co-existing in the same territory upon which they are dependent for continued existence with the means of communication, their thoughts and feelings expressed by common words or signs; like-mindedness springs into exercise, and sympathy arises between them; companionship gives pleasure and secures safety from common dangers, and increase of comfort by helpfulness and co-operation.

Society is an organism. It is living. It grows and acts. It is constituted an aggregate of living cells or individuals. These individuals are distinguishable, and only differ in degree and in their relations to each other. While some societies may be complex, we find that the different parts

or cells co-operate with each other, and it is necessary, if the realization of a complete harmonious organism is desired that the co-operation will be complete. It is said that all the parts and organs of an organism are arranged in at least four great systems, and its welfare depends upon the complete co-operation of these systems:

1. The sustaining system - food and its nourishing properties;
2. The transporting system - the heart and the perfect circulation of blood;
3. The communicating system - the nerves that carry their messages and commands to all parts of the system;
4. The regulating system - the marvellous nerve cells of the brain forming the realm of the general in command.

All these elements enter into our conception of society and have a very important part in the study of the growth of primitive society ; the land and its products, the exchange with other clans, the roads, need of other commodities, caravans, the sending and gathering of information, the alliances in kinship, groups, chiefs, councils with their systems of legal fiction, laws of equity and legislation, and as we shall see in the Hebrew social system a conception of Jahweh that reflects itself in all their history.

Aristotle taught that human society only reaches its highest development when it is founded upon a community of

ideas of good and evil, of just and unjust - when it becomes

ristotle
olitics
k. 1.10

in a word a moral organism. He shows how it is modified by the influence of the human organism and by geographical and historical environment, how there is nothing arbitrary in its

ristotle
thics
k. 1.5

elements, which are produced in such exact proportions, that the elimination or diminution of one of them suffices to change the whole social equilibrium.

ristotle
olitics
k.II.p.6

Government is simply the expression of the social organism, the bond which holds all its parts in due subordination; and inasmuch as it alone has the idea of justice; it is distinct from any other phase of society and in particular the animal.

ristotle
list of
nimals;
.10

The same characterisation holds good throughout history. As soon as an aggregate of men emerge from barbarism their relations become increasingly regulated by a principle of justice. Its manifestations may be at first rude and imperfect; but the principle of right is already asserting itself and regulating the mutual relations of men, both as to their actions, and in the possession of property. In primitive social life the select few have asserted their rights by strength, by conquest or by their age; but those rights are reciprocal and eventually in the process of evolution there comes a time when the weak and unprotected, the poor, the slave, the women and children are considered and protected until in the later years of the Biblical

Record it becomes the mark of the highest social spirit that the naked, hungry, sick, prisoner and destitute were all the recipients of social sympathy. (I Kings, 17:19 - Hosea 14:3 - Micah 6:8). This of course was not in accordance with Herbert Spencer's position, for, consistent to this end with the principles of his system, he blames the useless philanthropy which exaggerates the protection of the weak and ignorant, and so impedes the process of natural selection. The great working law of the social structure has been expressed in words like these:- "Life builds up its own organism by the inner force adapting itself to outward conditions".

BIBLICAL SOCIOLOGY.

The Hebrew conception of the race as given in the Bible was that it originated from one head. All men were descendants of one father and mother. This constituted a kinship, making all men brothers, and an equality so far as their inherent nature was concerned. Whatever opinions are held regarding the first chapters of Genesis as to early or later origin, this conception lies at the base of all the exclusiveness by which the Hebrew nation has been characterized. Another remarkable conception was that the head of the race was made in the image of 'Elohim', and as a result they were constantly imbued with the sense that 'Elohim' was the real father of their race.

This conception gave a new meaning to that like-mindedness referred to as one of the elements of social improvement. The like-mindedness of man with man is held to come from and is measured by the like-mindedness of man with Elohim.

FACTORS IN HEBREW SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Herbert Spencer in his "Synthetic Philosophy" begins his elaborate work with a treatment of the factors of society. He enumerates them as:

1. External - land, climate, flora, fauna, and
2. Internal - primitive man physical, emotional and intellectual. The Biblical Record says the first society started in a well watered garden, the land, the climate, the flora and fauna were of the finest, and the socius and his companion are found endowed with physical, emotional, and intellectual nature.

That this region was the "cradle" of the Semitic people is generally admitted. The question has been one of much research, discussion, and writing; and other places have been referred to as the early home or origin of the race. The bulk of the evidence, however, goes to show that Arabia was the place of Semitic early development.

Professor J.L. Myers of Oxford refers to Arabia as one of the earth's greatest reservoirs of men. Much of it,

indeed, is usually uninhabitable; but its surface, gently sloping eastward till it dips into the Persian Gulf, is much more diversified than the Libyan desert by hollows which are moist enough for grass. These are at all times numerous enough to be within easy reach of each other; and parts of the peninsula are a maze of interwoven tracks. When the supply of moisture is at its maximum, Arabia can therefore breed and support vast masses of pastoral folk, each with its wealth of sheep and goats, its rigid patriarchal society, its ill-defined orbit within which it claims first bite of the grass and first draught of the wells, which it believes its forefathers opened. But if moisture fails, as there is reason to believe that it does from time to time, in large pulsations of climatic change, man and his flocks must either escape or perish. Fortunately escape is easy; the tribes are always on the move; and the drought spread but gradually. There are only two obstacles. To reach the edge of the desert the way lies, for all but the outermost, through the pastures of other tribes: and for those escape is perilous, for they are already in perennial feud with all who hold lands where they can practise agriculture.

The secret of their security was in some master spirit grasping the situation, and leading forth a large tribe whose numbers and mobility would successfully meet any obstructions. Thus the desert population penetrated wherever there was pasture;

far into the hills and deep into marshes.

Professor Barton in his sketch of Semitic origins says: "The peculiar conditions of life which the Arabian deserts and oases have presented for millenniums furnish the matrix in which Semitic character was born. It is a land of barren and volcanic mountains, of broad stretches of dry, waste, unproductive soil and wide areas of shifting sand, interrupted by an occasional oasis and strips of excessive fertility - a land where for the most part, water is difficult to obtain, where famine is always imminent, where hunger, thirst, heat and exposure are the constant experience of the inhabitants. The Bedawi are always underfed, they suffer constantly from hunger and thirst, and their bodies thus weakened fall an easy prey to disease; they range the silent desert, almost devoid of life, where the sun is all powerful by day and the stars exceedingly brilliant at night. This environment begets in them intensity of faith of a certain kind, ferocity, exclusiveness, and imagination. These are all Semitic characteristics wherever we find Semites and there can be little doubt but that this is the land in which these traits were ingrained in the race. We conclude, then, that we must hold to the Arabic origin of the Semites".

Professor J.F. McCurdy in his "History, Prophecy and the Monuments" narrates the principal argument in favor of this

view. In the first place there is the fact that the historical distribution of the several families is thus best accounted for. Secondly, the dominant characteristics of the ancient Egyptians are generally admitted to indicate a strong interfusion of Semitic and African elements, and as their civilization is very old, it is to be supposed that the immigration took place from the region which, as far back as the records of history speak, constantly supplied the Nile valley with new settlers; that is, the Arabian desert. In the third place, the permanent genius of the Semites which disinclined them to inhabit or colonize extended mountain regions, would seem to betray an inherited aptitude for life upon the plains. Finally, the nomadic origin of the Semites is attested by words relating to the life and association of nomads (e.g. "sheep", "shepherd", "camel", "bow", "arrow") which are found in all dialects of the race, and must therefore have been used by the common ancestors of all. The only desert and wilderness land whose location suits the geographical distribution of the race is that of Northern Arabia. To the ancient Hebrews and their contemporaries, the dividing line of the whole North Semitic region was "the great river, the river Euphrates". It was in the lands of the Lower Euphrates and Tigris that historical research indicates to have been the seat of the earliest civilization, and where the Bible makes known to us the scene of man's creation. In this region were

founded the ancient cities of Babylon, Asshur, and Nineveh.

With a view to clearness in the discussion of the social life of the particular society described in this Biblical record it is well to note the divisions of the Semitic race. The division is based partly upon the evidence afforded by linguistic affinity, and partly upon geographical and historical distribution.

A. Northern Semites:

- 1. Babylonian:
 - (a. Old Babylonian.
 - (
 - (b. Assyrian.
 - (
 - (c. Chaldaean.
- II. Aramaean:
 - (a. Mesopotannia
 - (
 - (b. Syrian
- III. Canaanitic:
 - (a. Canaanites
 - (
 - (b. Phoenicians
- IV. Hebraic:
 - (a. Hebrews
 - (
 - (b. Moabites
 - (
 - (c. Ammonites
 - (
 - (d. Edomites.

B. Southern Semites:

- I. Sabaens.
- II. Ethiopians.
- III. Arabs.

As we have already seen, the home of the Semitic race before its separation, was North Arabia. It is impossible to assign any limited area as the dwelling place of such an aggregation of kindred tribes as that from which the Semitic peoples were descended. When we speak of the home of the early Semites, we must picture to ourselves a number of closely related tribes or clans, occupying a region covering thousands of square miles, having similar pursuits, and moving along parallel lines of development by reason of free intercourse with one another. Such an hypothesis is necessary to explain both the degree of culture which they attained in common, and, on the other hand, the possibility of their division into distinct families and groups with all their historic differences of language, religion, and social institutions.

The Hebraic division of the Semites made their permanent settlement in and about Palestine. Their ancestors of the family of Terah emigrated from Southern Babylonia more than two thousand years before the Christian Era. From Deut. 26.5, we would understand that they came of Aramaean stock:

אֲרַמִּי אֲבִי וְיִגְרָא מִצְרַיִם וַיָּבֹא
בְּמִתְנֵי מִצְרַיִם וַיְהִי-שָׁם לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל עָצוּם וְרַב

"A Syrian ready to perish was my father; and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a great nation, great, mighty and populous".

Harrān the great commercial gathering place of the Aramaeans gave them temporary shelter on their way, and a part of the clan, the family of Nahor, made their permanent home among this people of shepherds and traders. To Abram there was the vision of a country westward and a land of better promise called him and his family to Southern Canaan where for centuries he and his descendants dwelt in tents as pilgrims and strangers. After a time Moab and Ammon secured a precarious footing in the valleys and uplands east of the Jordan, where they maintained a struggle for existence with the non-Semitic Amorites, a struggle which terminated in their favor by the assistance of the men of Israel, who then shared with them the disputed territory.

Edom contented himself with a roving frontier life on the southern border of Canaan. His brethren of Israel, after a unique and chequered history, including a long sojourn in Egypt, and subsequent displacement of the Amorites from the country east of the Jordan, at length made Central Palestine securely their own and the home of their tribal settlements. All of the immigrants had early adopted "the language of Canaan" known in later times as "Hebrew".

The physical conditions of this region had much to do with the high idealism which in future years became the chief characteristic of the Hebrew nation. The highlands of Judaea and Galilee gave them vantage ground from which they could

look down upon the surrounding people, and literally look up to the hills of their God. The importance of a knowledge of the physical conditions of Palestine has been emphasized by Dean Adams in his recent public lecture on that subject. Along the coast line and through the Valley of Esdraelon is found the low lying level country making the great and easy passage from Egypt to Damascus or to Assyria ; explaining to some extent the various and repeated influences of the foreign nations upon those tribes in the vicinity of the valleys of this international highway and battle-ground. On the other hand it indicates the natural protection by which the seclusion of the people on the Judaen hills was maintained from the excursions of the nations passing and re-passing.

Professor Brockwell asserts with much force that the protection thus afforded gave these people abundant opportunity to develop those national traits of character by which they were distinguished. Many are under the delusion that the people of Israel were always under Babylonian influence, but that such was not the case is attested by the El-Amarna Tablets; and Archaeology goes to show that it was not till after the Babylonian captivity that the great influence of that nation was felt amongst the Jewish people.

However, we have reason to believe that, with the well known remarkable adaptability of the Jews, together with his

rigid conservatism, whatever was good and useful he would readily adopt, while holding rigidly to his national or tribal ideals. Moses was brought up as an Egyptian prince, and had spent some years in Arabia. When he led the people out of Egypt he took them by the way of Sinai and Kadesh where their laws were formulated to some extent. Then followed the occupation of Canaan, and the dislodging of the Canaanite. There is no doubt but that alliances were formed with the conquered peoples. Joshua was friendly disposed to the Gibeonites, and in the days of Abimeleck, the Shechemites and Ephraimites joined in reverencing El or Baal-berith, the God of the Covenant. Throughout this period, says Canon Foakes-Jackson (Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge) the Israelites were evidently adopting many of the rites, ceremonies, and sacred places of the older Canaanite inhabitants.

To what extent these other nations influenced Israel may not be fully known but it is quite certain that the social life of these people was gradually undergoing a great change. That gradual process of development from their nomadic and pastoral life is worthy of notice. Such phrases as "the firstling of the flock", "the fruit of the field", "a mighty hunter before the Lord", give us an idea of the manner of their early life. Esau and his descendants were skin-clad men living by the chase (Gen. 25:27). It is quite evident that hunting, pastoral and

agricultural activities were the chief sources of subsistence. Among the Canaanites Sid the hunter was a god and gave his name to the City of Sidon.

The food laws in Deut. 12:15, 15:5 and 15:22, show that the hart, gazelle, the roe buck, the wild goat, the antelope and mountain sheep were the animals hunted. The larger carnivora, such as the unicorn - the 'Bos primigenus' of the naturalist, the lion, the leopard, the wolf and the bear were killed in self-defense. The instruments used were the sling, bow, javelin, spear, sword and clubs, and pits were also dug into which the animals fell. The "gin" or snare was the method of bird capture.

The sheep, goat and camel were the domestic animals of earlier years. The horse and ass were introduced later. In order to secure pasture and water for their flocks, they were obliged to move quite frequently from place to place - quite often at great distances from home, thus incurring great risks from wild animals, and from the bands of foreign traders.

Gen. 37:28 — — — אֲנָשִׁים מִדִּינִים סִתְּרִים

Gen. 37:33 — — — חִתָּה רָעָה אֲכָלְתָּהּ

The fathers of the Semites were all given up to this pastoral life and remained so till the time of the conquest of Canaan. The whole Biblical Record reveals the influence of

their nomadic life for psalmists and prophets constantly use figures of speech clearly pointing to the pastoral time as the most promising time in their history. We have good authority for believing that certain groups, such as the Kenites, Reuben, Gad and Machir remained nomads all through their history (I. Sam. 25:2). Nabal, with three thousand sheep and one thousand goats was a representative Israelite at the beginning of the period of the Kings. The prophet Amos (Amos 1:1) was a breeder of sheep.

With the migration of the Semites into the well watered regions of Babylonia, Mesopotania and Syria they soon acquired the art of tilling the soil. As early as 2500 B.C. there is archaeological evidence that the Canaanites cultivated wheat, barley and other grains, olives, figs, vines and other fruit. Tradition states that at the time of the conquest of Canaan by the Egyptian kings of the eighteenth dynasty, immense quantities of grain were captured as spoils of war. When the Hebrews settled in Canaan they gradually adopted the manner of life of their predecessors. Their primitive idea of possessing a land flowing with milk and honey gave place to the new ideal of sitting every man under his vine and fig tree.

Gideon received his call while he was threshing out his wheat (Judges 6:11) Jesse sent as a present to Saul ten

loaves of bread, a skin of wine and a kid (I. Sam.16:20); Abigail brought to David two hundred loaves of bread, two skins of wine, five sheep, five measures of parched grain, one hundred clusters of raisins, two hundred cubes of figs (I Sam. 25:18).

The nobles of Gilead brought David wheat, barley, meal, parched corn, beans, pulse, honey, butter, sheep and cream of kine (2 Sam. 17:28).

Not much is said about industrial development before the time of the Kings. Among the early Semites all necessary utensils were "home"made. The women moulded and baked the necessary vessels - made baskets of twigs, dressed skins, and wove the cloth of goat-hair or wool out of which the tents and garments were made. The metal utensils were made by Canaanitic pedlars called "merchantmen", who journeyed from tribe to tribe, so that what the Hebrew could not make they purchased from these pedlars.

After the establishment of the monarchy, the increased prosperity by conquest and commerce led to a development in industrial pursuits. Foreign artizans settled in Israel, and for the increasingly large public works David and Solomon imported carpenters, stone-cutters, masons, and founders from Tyre (2 Sam. 5:11; I Kings 5:18). According to tradition many of these workmen remained in the land and from them the

Israelites gradually learned their trades. In the days of the later Kings many of the arts of the ancient world became naturalized in Israel, so we read of Semites, founders, goldsmiths, and silversmiths, stone cutters, masons, engravers, carpenters, image-makers , potters, painters, weavers, fullers, bakers, cooks, barbers, perfumers, apothecaries, and physicians.

The increasing development of industrial life led to extensive trading with Phoenicia and during the reigns of David and Solomon resulted in a very advanced state of civilization. This rapid development in commercial and national life was not without its perils, for in the international exchanges there came the adoption of many of the customs of their industrial allies until we find the palace as well as the priests and people involved in the corrupting social influences of Phoenicea, no doubt introduced and accentuated by the hateful Phoenician Princess Jezebel, now Ahab's Queen. The challenge of Elijah, Israel's stalwart social reformer (I Kings 18:21) shows the extent to which demoralization had developed.

It is after the exile that we find Ezra and Nehemiah determinedly set against any alliance whatever with aliens. Nehemiah's strenuous contention with Sanballat and the caution with which the genealogies were scrutinized show his determination to be exclusive and to emphasize the patriarchal system. The treatment of the children of Barzillai of the

KINSHIP

Robertson Smith takes the "clan" as the earliest social unit. In his "Religion of the Semites" he shows that this extended far back into pre-historic times.

The earliest history reveals the existence of cities in Babylonia that no doubt had superseded the communal clan organization. There is every reason to believe that such cities as Ur and Eridu, two of the oldest places of Babylonia were at first fortified dwellings of clansmen. As these clans grew in number, it became customary to refer to the clan by the name of some leading member of it. In the genealogical tables of the Old Testament this can be seen. The clans of whole Israelitish tribes were combined and the name of one man used to represent the combination, and the tribes referred to as his sons. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord", and "more than all the dwellings of Jacob", and by the process of legal fiction derived from an eponymous hero, e.g. Shem, Ham, Japeth, Caleb.

The lists in Gen. 25:12 ff and Gen. 36 refer to such a system and Robertson Smith points out that throughout Arabia the existence of clan organization is fully attested. The Sabaen inscriptions which have recently been recovered give evidence of this condition of things having existed in that region.

swine's flesh and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord".

Ezek. 8:10. "So I went in and saw; and beheld every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about".

Among the Midianite chieftains as narrated in Judges are mentioned Oreb and Zeeb (Raven and Wolf).

In I Kings 12:28 the calves of Bethel and Dan were said to be the images of Jahweh.

Because of these and other references some eminent scholars are of the opinion that the totemic clan was found extensively in primitive social organisation.

According to Robertson Smith who follows McLennan in the supposition, the evolution of primitive society made progress through four stages, (1) unrestrained promiscuity, (2) a state of polyandry, (3) polygamy, (4) monogamy. In the polyandrous state kinship would of necessity be reckoned through the mother, and the mother was the head of the clan. Sociologists such as Spencer, Westermarck, Lubbock and Giddings do not altogether agree with this view and affirm that promiscuity existed among a few races only - the Nairs of the Malabar Coast, the Andaman islanders and very few others. It is probable

that if Robertson Smith had been living to-day he would have abandoned this position.

It is interesting to note that as a general rule in the polyandrous state of society, the maternal uncle is the head of the clan, and assumes the responsibility of rearing the children of his sister.

There is good reason to believe that this early totemic clanship co-existed with exogamy, both being under mother kinship. In due time there would be a demand for some recognition of relationship among descendants. The fathers were not known, and constant difficulty would arise. In view of the possibility of the equal division of property, as under mother kinship, the time would come when a record of descent would be necessary. Lineage or pedigree would be registered and would give rise to the genealogies. Thus there resulted a transition to endogamy, or marriage within the tribe, or tribes having the same totem. Professor Brockwell strongly endorses this view and states that in his opinion the transition from exogamy to endogamy with father kinship was closely associated with the change in the theory of property. He cites the present movement among the inhabitants of Travancore, Southern India, where the head of the clan is the mother's brother and through whom the property is equally divided among all the members of the family, to break from the

past custom and adopt the system of father kinship.

There has come a time when progeny has become numerous and the continuous division of property forces a change.

Robertson Smith is convinced that back of the custom of tracing descent through males there was a time when the Semites traced it through females. Professor Barton is of the opinion that a rule which reckons blood-kinship only through the mother is simply the natural and necessary expression of the kind of relations between the sexes which were universal in old Arabia wherever women did not leave their people to follow a husband abroad. "We need an older system of kinship through the mother", says Barton, "to supply the conditions for the rise of male kinship through ba'al polyandry".

The evolution may be simply and briefly explained in the following manner. The word for "flesh" in the Old Testament (Genesis) is "וְעַרְוָה" "Thou art our bone and our flesh", therefore means "Thou art our kinsman". If nursed at the same breast it was denoted by 'milk-kinship'. Then again the word "בֶּטֶן" womb (with which "אֶרֶץ" foot is thought by some to be connected), is the most general word for kinship, and pointed to a primitive kinship when all of the same womb were reckoned brothers. Very frequently it will occur that the boys when grown up will attach themselves voluntarily to the mother's tribe. As a result the fear that the sons would choose their

mother's clan led men who were wealthy to marry within their own kin. Even to the present time a man's maternal uncle is considered of closer relationship to him than his paternal uncle. It will be remembered that though Joseph was a member of the house of Israel, his sons born of Egyptian mother were not regarded as kinsmen till formally adopted (Gen. 48:5).

Abraham married his paternal sister, and Tamar might have been the legal wife of her half-brother Ammon, the relationship being on the father's side.

In the Arabic genealogical tables metronymic groups are still found, and in the Aramaic inscription found at Hegra metronymic clans appear. Noldeke observed that in the life of the Mandaens a man is characterized as "the son of his mother" which to him indicated female kinship. Wellhausen has also noted that in the genealogies of the Pentateuch, what is called the J document traces descent through the mother while the P document reckons descent through the father.

While Robertson Smith lays emphasis upon matriarchy as an earlier state of kinship he does not mean the dominion of the mother in the household, but rather that arrangement of family - and clan - relations in accordance with which the relation of the children to the mother was regarded as by far the more important, that to the father being of quite subordinate moment. The wife is not under the power of her husband, but under the guardianship of her male relations.

In Arabia to-day these clans have their sheik and are often grouped into tribes, each tribe having its sheik and becomes a larger unit of organization in the community. Giddings in his Principles of Sociology (page 258) observes that the clan system has existed in all parts of the world, and is recognized by sociologists as the simplest and earliest form of social integration. Some sociologists believe that the nucleus of the clan was an actual group of brothers and sisters who formed a totemic kindred and constituted a household (Giddings page 270). This forms an economic group, who aid one another in obtaining food and in redressing wrongs. The kinship of such families is usually reckoned through the mother and not through the father. A strange thing will frequently occur. Other clans hit upon the same 'totem' so they reason that these must be brothers and sisters since they are kindred to the same totem. Hence the 'phratres' or brotherhoods are enlarged under the one name.

Professor Marrett of Oxford in his recent work on "Anthropology" makes reference to totemism in the specific form that has to do with this subject of Kinship and states that it means that a social group depends for its identity on a certain intimate and exclusive relation in which it stands toward an animal-kind or a plant-kind, or very rarely, something that is individual and not a kind or class at all. Such a

totem, in the first place, normally provides the social group with its name. He instances the present use of this ancient method applied to different patrols in the Boy Scouts' organization, when they are called Foxes, Peewits, Owls and so on. According to the same author this name, thus derived, tends to be the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace that, somehow flowing from the totem to the totemites, sanctifies their communion. They are "all-one-flesh" with one another because they are "all-one-flesh" with the totem.

In Kinship and Marriage, Chap. VII, Robertson Smith gives some proof of Semitic totemism. He enumerates certain cases (1) stocks named after plants and animals; (2) the prevalence of the conception that the members of the stock are of the blood of the eponym animal, or are sprung from a plant of the species chosen as the totem; (3) the ascription to the totem of a sacred character which may result in its being regarded as the god of the stock and so venerated that that animal will not be used for food. He also refers to a few Biblical traces like Leah, Rachel, Caleb; and in Isaiah 66:17 and Ezekiel 8:10 are to be found traces of an old animal worship.

Isa. 66:17. "They that sanctify themselves and purify themselves in the gardens, behind one tree in the midst eating

The head of the family is not the father but the maternal uncle, who has supreme authority over the mother and her children.

In Eliezer's negotiations for Rebekah it is not her father Bethuel but her mother and brother who receive the presents and carry on the transaction (Gen. XXIV).

According to the genealogies it would appear that the formation and development of tribes was held to have taken place under the dominion of the patriarchal system. We have already stated that according to the earliest Hebrew records this system was prevalent. The head of the family was the man; the woman passed over to the clan or tribe of her husband, who was master both of herself and of her children.

Much stress is placed on this practice by the later writers who seek to establish the father-kinship theory, i.e. that kinship, tribe-connection, inheritance, etc. are determined by the man. /

From these observations we may conclude that kinship among the Hebrews was neither more nor less than the bond by which the social and political units - their clans and tribes - were held together in the older historical period. By kinship they could trace their genealogy back to a common ancestor; and their "tribe" consisted entirely of blood relations. This relationship meant more than mere physical descent for we find

that by adoption kinship was made effective. So also was the relation by blood covenant. Robertson Smith cites the case of two men actually opening their veins and mixing their blood, and he refers to the incident narrated in Exodus 24, where the people and the altar of Yahweh were sprinkled with the same blood. Among the Hebrews kinship was participation in the common blood which flows with equal fulness in the veins of every member of a family circle. There will be no high and low caste - no blue blood. This is best illustrated in the case of blood-revenge, where the duty falls upon every member of the clan to which a murdered man belonged, to seek vengeance on every member alike of the murderer's clan. It must be admitted, however, that from the earliest times referred to in the Biblical record the Hebrew people were distinguished by the energy of their family feeling, and as time advanced, and the limits of society widened the primitive idea of blood kinship referred to above grew weaker. The conception of 'near of kin' as we understand it was confined to a very narrow circle. The clans or tribes comprised several 'kindred' groups. These groups were designated 'mispahōth' — (מִשְׁפָּחֹת) and in still earlier times 'hai' (הָיָה) because of the roaming character of these clans when they all lived and moved together. Under conditions like these security was alone found in the individual or family being strongly supported by a powerful

group of kinsmen. By the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan there began a disintegrating element which, though not appearing during the early years of their occupancy, led to a complete change in the tribal divisions. Though all Israel continued to pride themselves in their common ancestry, they became changed into local communities and territorial unions, with the patriarchal leadership of the elders becoming insufficient as a governing power. The new circumstances called for the "petty" kings as found in the Judges and this in turn proved the transition period before the establishment of a united monarchy.

— * * * * *

GENEALOGIES.

Genealogy may be said to be the art of the
i.e. of him who records the births and
family and reckons descents and generations. Hence it is
often used of the document containing the names as set down.
In Hebrew the term for genealogy or pedigree is סֵפֶר דּוֹרֹת
וְהַיְחָשׁ or סֵפֶר תּוֹלְדוֹת "the book of the
generations"; and its application to the whole book is shown
in the case of the Gospel of Matthew, where "the book of the
generation of Jesus Christ" includes the whole history of Christ
contained in that gospel.

Gen. 2:4: "These are the generations of the heavens and
of the earth". There are numerous other examples of the same
usage, and these passages almost indicate the existence of
other historical fragments from which the book of Genesis
was compiled. This is not peculiar to the Semites for the early
histories of the Greeks were in Genealogical form. The
hereditary principle among the Hebrews, and its desire for
genealogies is in entire accordance with the manners and
tendencies of their contemporaries. Layard proves that among
the Arabs there was a strong passion for genealogies, so does
Robertson Smith in Kinship and Marriage, p. 6 ff. Among the
Hebrews it was heightened by several peculiar circumstances.
The promise of the land was given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob

successively, and the separation of the Israelites from the Gentile world; the promise and expectation of the Messiah as coming from the tribe of Judah; the exclusively hereditary priesthood of Aaron with its dignity and emoluments; the long succession of kings in the line of David; and the whole division and occupation of the land upon genealogical principles by tribes, families and houses of fathers, gave a deeper importance to the science of genealogy among the Jews than perhaps in any other nation apart from the Mohammedans.

Professor Cheyne says: "To form a correct estimate of the nature and worth of O.T. genealogies we must remember that the terms of relationship are used in a wider sense among the Semites than with us. When two or more clans have a traditional sentiment of unity, and regard each other as brothers, this may be a survival from a time when the groups formed one; on the other hand, a historical tradition of a common ancestor does not always necessarily follow, since, according to Semitic custom, any covenant relation makes men brothers. In *Kinship and Marriage*, 6 ff. we get some idea of the wide sense in which the terms "father", "mother", "son" and "daughter" were used. The members of any guild or clan were frequently referred to as "sons". That this is still the case may be shown from the pen of a recent author. Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull gives an interesting illustration of the fact that persons not at

all related to each other by blood are reckoned in the East as members of the same family. In his published work "The Blood Covenant" he writes "My two travelling companions were young men, neither of them being a relation of mine. This fact was well understood by our Egyptian dragoman, but when we first met old Shaykh Moosa, who was to convey us from Cairo to Sinai, the three were presented to him as Mr. Trumbull and his two sons! At this I touched the dragoman and said, quickly, "Not my sons, but young friends of mine!"

"That's all right", said the dragoman, 'he wouldn't understand anything else!'

"Then I found that each travelling party was known as a 'family' of which the senior member was the father. So it was simply a choice in our case, whether I should be called the young men's father, or one of them should be called mine; one of us must stand for the father of the other two. In view of this alternative, I, from that time on, passed as the father of the 'family' until the desert was crossed".

Though so many hundreds of years have passed, one thing is sure, those who live in Semitic lands, and who use Semitic forms of speech, have also retained Semitic customs. If this is kept in mind all the statistical and genealogical data will be always intelligible. Robertson Smith gives a

lucid exposition of the Arabian genealogies. In "Kinship", Chap. 1, he shows that the conception of the formation and division of clans and tribes in the Semitic world is seen in the genealogical schemes of the Arabs. It was commonly assumed by them that all groups were patriarchal tribes formed by sub-division of an original stock on the system of kinship through male-descent, and that each tribe bore the name or cognomen of the common ancestor. After a while, it was supposed a tribe would break up into two or more divisions, each embracing the descendants of one of the sons of the great ancestor and each taking its name from him. Similarly, says Dr. Cheyne, in Israel every man by virtue of his being a member of a clan or tribe was able to point to Jacob, the father of all the tribes, as his great ancestor. The great concern regarding the genealogical registration seems to have arisen during the exile. The great majority of the O.T. genealogies are found only in post-exilic writings. They, no doubt, feared lest the continuity of the race should be broken; they desired to be written in the register of the 'house of Israel', hence it happened that the man who could claim descent from the exiles in Babylon was considered to be a member of the community rather than a native of Judaea.

The Biblical Genealogies place Adam and Eve - a man and a woman at the head of the race, and a series of seven

names carries mankind down to Lamech Gen.4: 1-24.

In Gen. 10 we have a conspectus of the surrounding nations showing the supposed relation of the Hebrews to the other nations of the earth, and Gen. 11 presents the line of descendants of Shem, and by a list of seven names brings us to Terah, Abraham's father. From Abraham onwards a number of old genealogies are given. Jacob and Esau are brothers, Moab and Ben-Ammi are sons of Lot, and the relationship presumed between Israel, Edom, Moab and Ammon points to the belief in having had at some time a common ancestry.

From this time the genealogical tree is confined to Jacob and his descendants.

Gen. 35: 22-26 gives us a formal account of the sons of Jacob, the patriarchs of the nation, and it is repeated in Exod. 1: 1-5.

In Gen. 46 we have an exact genealogical census of the house of Israel about the time of Jacob's death in Egypt. When the Israelites were in the wilderness of Sinai, in the second month of the year of the Exodus, their number was taken "after their families, by the house of their fathers" and the number of each tribe is given "by their generations, after their families, by the house of their fathers, according to the number of names, by their polls" (Numbers 1:3). This census

was repeated thirty-eight years afterwards, and the names of the families added, as found in Numbers 26. It was according to these genealogical lists that the land was parcelled out amongst them.

It is almost certain that many were incorporated into the lists who had not the right by birth. For example in the genealogies containing the names of Caleb, Joab, Segub and the sons of Rephaiah (I. Chron. 3:21) it is maintained that birth was not the ground of their incorporation into their respective tribes. Birth, however, continued to be the foundation of all Jewish organization throughout their whole national course.

According to the traditional view, when David established the Temple services on the footing which continued till the Christian Era, he divided the priests and Levites into courses and companies each under a chief. The singers, the porters, the trumpeters and the players on instruments were all thus genealogically distributed. In 2 Chron. 12:15, we have reference to the work of Iddo concerning genealogies in the reign of Rehoboam. When Hezekiah re-opened the Temple, and restored the Temple services which had fallen into disuse, he reckoned the whole nation by genealogies.

In the reign of Jotham, King of Judah, who was an energetic as well as a good king, we find in I Chron. 5:17,

a genealogical list of the Reubenites.

At the restoration when Zerubbabel brought back the captivity from Babylon, one of his first cares was to take a census of all the people, and to settle them according to their genealogies (I Chron. 9; Nehemiah 11).

In Ezra 2:61 and Neh. 7:63, we have an illustration of the great care that was taken to keep the pedigree pure, or according to some modern scholars, the great effort was made by these social reformers to stamp out any trace of female kinship. The family in question were descendants of a priest who had married a daughter of Barzillai, a Gileadite who had been a great friend of David the King. David had stipulated that the sons of Barzillai should receive consideration at the hands of the government because of heroic services rendered. The fact that the priest had adopted the name of his wife's father did not avail to further the cause of the descendants in the enrolment and the decision recorded is as follows: "These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found: therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood."

Nehemiah, in like manner, labored zealously to promote the national restoration and gathered together the nobles, and the rulers, and the people, that they might be reckoned by genealogy (Neh. 7:5; 12:26). There is evidence that the

Jews continued the genealogies through the Maccabean period as seen in many passages in the Apocryphal literature, as I Macc. 2, 1-5; Tob. 1:1. In the New Testament we have incidental proof that the Jewish genealogical economy was still recognized in the fact that when Augustus ordered the census of the Empire to be taken, the Jews in the Province of Syria immediately went each one to his own city, that is, to the city to which his tribe, family, and father's house belonged. In the Gospels of Matthew and Luke we have two forms of the genealogy of Jesus Christ and three brief references in Luke 1 and 11,- the mention of Zecharias as "of the course of Abia", of Elizabeth as "of the daughters of Aaron", and of Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, as "of the tribe of Aser" - are further indications of the continuance of the registration of pedigree.

Modern scholarship has given much time to the consideration of the many apparent discrepancies in the various genealogies given in the Bible but much of the work is hypothetical and while elucidating many of the references to pedigrees, it cannot be taken as authoritative.

CIRCUMCISION.

Circumcision was a custom among many Eastern nations of cutting off part of the prepuce as a religious ceremony. In Gen. XVII, II, we learn that it was adopted by the Jews through Abraham, as a sign of a covenant with Jahweh, and was the abiding symbol of covenant obligation, and of consequent covenant rights. It was prescribed, not only for all born males in Israel, but also for all who were received into their houses as slaves (Gen. 17:12-27).

The operation was performed on the eighth day and no doubt became a badge of the ending of the unclean period. There is abundant evidence to show that the rite was performed among other nations. Indeed the passages quoted from Genesis presuppose an acquaintance with it.

The Egyptians practised circumcision to a very large extent, if not wholly throughout the nation. Later under Persian and Greek rule it fell into disuse. The historical origin of the rite among heathen nations, however, lies in obscurity. It is almost certain that it was a custom of great antiquity among some nations of Western Asia and Africa. It has been discovered in use among the Colchians and Ethiopians as also among the savage Troglodytes of Africa.

The examination by French commissioners of some Egyptian mummies establishes the fact of Egyptian circumcision.

In the present day the Coptic church continues to practise it, and the Abyssinian Christians do the same. Prichard, in *Physical History of Man*, p. 287, refers to the Kafirs in South Africa as observing the custom, and believes that the practice is a relic of ancient African customs of which the Egyptians partook in remote ages.

It is not known how far the rite had extended through the Syro-Arabian races. References in the Epistle of Barnabas (9th Section) lead us to believe that the practice was common among "all the Syrians, and the Arabians, and the idolatrous priests: and even the Egyptians". The Philistines, Phoenicians and many of the early Canaanites were not circumcised. That the Midianites had no fixed rule regarding the custom is seen in the story of Zipporah (Exod. 4:25). From Josephus (Ant.1:12) we learn that the Ishmaelite Arabs, inhabiting the district of Nabathaea, were circumcised after their thirteenth year; this would always be connected with the tradition of the age at which their forefather Ishmael underwent the rite.

St. Jerome informs us that in his day all the tribes around Judaea and Palestine, and especially the Saracens were all circumcised.

How far the rite of circumcision spread over the southwest of Arabia, no definite record states. Abulfeda asserts

that the custom is older than Mahomet, who did not regard it as a religious rite. It has, nevertheless, extended itself with the Mohammedan faith as though it were a positive ordinance.

The Biblical Record introduces the rite in the following words: "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you" (Gen. 17:10,11). This was appointed as an ordinance of perpetual obligation, and the neglect of it entailed the penalty of being cut off from the people. Abraham who at the age of 99 years had complied with this ordinance, saw that the rite was attended to in the case of Ishmael at 13 years, and on the birth of his son Isaac. It continued to be observed by his posterity, and distinctively to characterize them from the people amidst whom they dwelt. (Gen. 34: 14,15). The usage was formally enacted into law by Moses (Lev. 12:3). That the custom fell into disuse during the wilderness journey is shown in Josh. 5: 2-9, when we learn that on their entrance to Canaan all the males of the congregation were circumcised and the reproach of Israel rolled away. From this time forward it became the pride of the nation to observe the ordinance; on all those peoples who did not observe it they looked down with

contempt, and in some cases abhorrence. Judges 14,3; 2 Sam. 1,20; Ezek. 31,18. In New Testament times we find it gradually falling into disuse among the Christian Jews. The rule proclaimed was "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature". (Gal. 6,15; Col. 3,11). Much contention arose among the leaders about the question, and at times it became most acute where it was found that attempts were made to impose the rite upon the Gentile converts (Acts 15,1). However, we find that Paul caused Timothy to be circumcised to avoid offence to the Jews, his mother being a Jewess; but we cannot mistake the spirit of the early Christians in their aversion to this external rite.

Bensinger says regarding the practice of circumcision: "In general it is to be regarded as a ritual tribal mark". By all nations it seemed that the uncircumcised were looked upon as unclean, and that where circumcision was not practised other tribal marks were used, such as - teeth filing, special tattooings, and other still more drastic mutilations.

If, as some contend, circumcision as practised so extensively among the nations was an expedient to promote health, to facilitate cleanliness, and prevent painful afflictions, why is it not possible to believe that it was lifted up before the Jewish people as a sign of God's readiness to make them

"a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people", and that it should be a sign of a covenant on their part of devotion to their God.

In the Christian Era we are not without similar adaptations. The use of the Cross as a symbol of Christianity is plainly the use of a common instrument of torture. The ordinance of Water Baptism^{was} adapted from the common use of the water provided for the customary ablutions.

The Holy Communion is celebrated with the bread and wine - common elements of material and physical provision - employed to impress higher truths, and used in exactly the same sense of special spiritual covenant relations.

Circumcision was never considered a vehicle of sanctifying force, as it made no inner demand upon the recipient; concerning whom nothing more is understood than that he is of Israelitish descent, or if heathen born had been incorporated in the national union of Israel. It must be admitted, however, that the rite made certain ethical demands on him who received it. It bound him to obedience to God and to a blameless walk (Gen. 17,1). It was therefore the symbol of renewal and purification of heart. The lack of this moral relation, and a want of devotion to the Divine messages from their religious leaders was referred to as "uncircumcision of heart (Jeremiah 9,25; Ezek. 44,7). On the other hand the purification of the heart by which it becomes capable of executing God's will, is called circumcision of the heart (Deut.10,16; Jer. 4,4).

MARRIAGE.

The Biblical representation of marriage is that it did not spring from blind impulse but from divine institution.

The first reference to the relation of man and woman is found in Gen. 1;27: (אִתּוֹ וְאִתּוֹתָא וְאִתּוֹתָא וְאִתּוֹתָא)

"Male and female created He them", and the twenty-eighth verse of the same chapter states: "And Elohim blessed them, and Elohim said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish ye the earth, and subdue it". This is the primitive form of society and is the basis from which all other forms of human society arise, and for which man gives up any other association. The original form of marriage as regarded by some was monogamy, and is illustrated in the lives of the first patriarchs, Abraham, Nahor and Isaac. The strong desire to possess offspring led to the taking of concubines, in some cases being arranged at the expressed wish of the wife herself. In Gen 4, we observe that polygamy is tolerated, but is not sanctioned. Exod. 21,10, and Deut 21, 15 ff, provide against the hardships that are readily attached to it. Bigamy as forced upon Jacob was afterwards forbidden by law (Lev. 18,18).

In the later writings of the Old Testament there is evidence to show that monogamy was predominant in Israel. The author of Proverbs gives a description of a wife in Chaps. 12, 4; 19, 14; 31, 10 ff.

Throughout the prophets, emphasis is laid upon the relation that marriage implies, for they represent the covenant between Jahweh and the people as involving fidelity on the part of the spouse. That the people were represented as depending upon Jahweh for the blessing of children is seen in the early pages of Genesis. Eve obtains her first born from Jahweh; it is Jahweh who gave Seth in the room of the murdered Abel; it is Jahweh who makes a mother fruitful or unfruitful, and who will be entreated for the blessing of children. Gen.29,32; Gen.30,17,22. Childlessness was looked upon as an evidence of divine disfavour, as a dishonour to a woman, and a misfortune to a home. This was so imbedded in their national life that the royal psalmist pictures the fruitful wife and a group of joyous thriving children as the very crown of earthly joy.

Gen. 38,9 treats as an abomination worthy of death any attempt to hinder progency.

After examining conditions among the other nations surrounding Israel, as represented by Robertson Smith, Spencer and other authorities it is very significant to find that in ancient Israel there is no trace of the custom of infanticide as it was known among other Semites.

The marriage relation is in a general way represented by different Hebrew words. There seems to be no single word for the estate of marriage, expressing wedlock or matrimony.

The concluding of a marriage is generally supposed to have rested on a contract made between the parents of the bride and bridegroom, in virtue of which a price had to be paid to the father of the bride for his daughter.

The father very often suggested to his son where he should find his wife, though the son might be strongly inclined in other directions, and 'grief of mind' was caused if the parental prerogative was violated (Gen. 26,35). That the negotiations could be carried on through a trusted agent is shown in the fact that Abraham's deputy concluded the arrangements for Rebekah's betrothal.

The marriage price was regarded as a compensation due to the parents for the loss of service which they sustained by the departure of their daughter, as well as for the trouble and expense which they incurred in her education. This mohar did not require to be paid in money. Hence, as in Jacob's case it could be paid in service.

According to others this mohar meant the gift that was sent to the bride by the bridegroom, to which were added other gifts (מִנְחָה) for the kinsfolk of the bride. In seeking to substantiate this view, appeal is made to the complaint of the daughters of Laban that their father had sold them to Jacob in exchange for his services, thus treating them as strangers, and in addition had wrongly robbed them of their (money) rights. However, it may be explained that Rachel and Leah are seeking to prove to Laban that, having accepted the services of Jacob, all rights over them should be relinquished, and that having been duly paid for, it is now time for them to depart. This of course was but one side of the case. Laban was not in their debt.

Under Mosaic enactments the foregoing usages remained in force. The father's power over his children was paramount. He was at liberty to sell them for debt, and indeed they could be seized for debt as they were considered his property. 2 Kings, 4,1; Job 24,9; Exod. 21,7.

Caleb offered his daughter Achsah as wife to any one who would conquer Kirjath-Sepher. Saul promised his daughter to the man who would kill the Philistine, and bartered his daughter Michal for bloody trophies of the Philistines. Ibzan took thirty wives for his thirty sons because of the fact that their husbands had fallen in war. Judges 12,9.

With regard to age, no restriction is mentioned in the Bible. Early marriage is, however, approved. No explicit civil or religious forms seemed to have been used in connection with the celebration of marriage. The contract at betrothal formed the bond which united the espoused parties. It is generally accepted that there was an ancient custom of celebrating the consummation of the marriage by a feast of seven days duration. On that occasion the parents of the bride invited thirty young men to honour the nuptials, and we are told that Samson in connection with his marriage, entertained them by proposing riddles. That the marriage ceremony became more elaborate we can gather from different parts of the Biblical record. Cant.3,11, and Isaiah 61,10 state that the bridal pair were adorned with crowns made of various materials - gold, silver, myrtle or olive - varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the parties. The bride wore gorgeous apparel, and for her ornamented appearance derived the name 'Kallah' the adorned one. Thus attired, the bridegroom and

bride were led in joyous procession through the streets, accompanied by bands of singers and musicians, and saluted by the greetings of the virgins in the place, they proceeded to the house of the bridegroom or that of his father. Here the feast was prepared, to which all the friends and neighbors were invited, and at which most probably that sacred covenant was concluded which came into practice in later times. In the case of Samson's betrothal, the marriage nuptials were celebrated in the wife's home.

It was in accordance with ancient custom for a man to look for his wife in the circle of her own family or clan. Such endogamy was not the original method of marriage. It is supposed by many that marriage by capture was the earlier form. To give away one's daughter into another tribe was equivalent to sending her beyond the protecting influence of her own family, and a wife married within her own clan might naturally be expected to enjoy a better position than one going abroad. (Gen. 29,19) "It is better that I give her to thee, than that I should give her to a strange man".

Marriage outside (exogamy) was discouraged, for the coherence of the tribe depended on the sense of kinship. Moses did not exactly violate this law for he was a fugitive and took refuge in another tribe.

The many marriages of kinsfolk during the patriarchal

period show that different views obtained in later times. It is stated that Abraham married his half-sister on his father's side. Moses was the fruit of marriage between nephew and paternal aunt (Num. 26:52). Then we also find in Judges 3:6, that the Israelites contracted foreign marriages by giving their daughters to be wives and taking the daughters of the foreigners for wives.

In 2 Sam. 3:3, we are told that David the King married a daughter of a foreign potentate, and I Kings 11:1 asserts that Solomon entered into matrimonial alliances with the daughter of Pharoah and also with princesses from the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites.

Ahab married the Phoenician princess Jezebel (I Kings 16:31). The life of Joash was taken at the hands of sons of foreign wives, II Chron. 24:26.

There are a few instances in which Israelitish women married men of other nations, no doubt this was done with the condition that the husband should adopt Israel as their country. 2 Sam. 11:3 tells of the Hittite Uriah. David's sister Abigail married Jether who was an Ishmaelite (I Chron. 2:17). Hiram or Hiram the Tyrian artificer, whom Solomon sent for, was the son of a woman of the tribe of Naphtali (2 Chron. 4:11).

Bensinger observes that in the later writings there seems to have entered a change in which marriage is allowed

with foreign women taken in war, but marriage with Canaanites was prohibited because of the fear that they might turn their husbands to idolatrous worship. This, he says, might have arisen under the monarchy; friendly tolerance and suggested alliances having been gradually superseded by fierce antipathy - a certain particularistic narrowness.

BARS TO MARRIAGE.

In Leviticus XVIII there are a number of prohibitions regarding marriage. It begins by referring to Egyptian conditions which they must not copy, and forewarns them of the degraded state of the Canaanites among whom they expect to dwell. It is not an exhaustive code of laws on the matter of marriage, but is intended to form part of the 'Law of holiness' warning them against unchaste living. An iniquity very common in Egypt was the incestuous union with a sister or half-sister having the sanction of royal custom from the time of the Pharoahs down to the time of the Ptolemies. In a recent book published by Professor Sayce 'mother kinship' was the practice among the Egyptians in early times. "Therefore after the doings of the land of Egypt shall ye not do". So also the unnatural alliance of a man with his mother, or the wife of his father was strictly prohibited. Union with an aunt by blood or by marriage is regarded as unclean. The code also

provided against marriage with a brother's wife. The later Deuteronomic law made an exception in the case of the death of a brother dying without children. The brother might marry the widow "to raise up seed to his brother." This was known as the Levirate Law. Any alliance with a woman and her daughter, or union with a sister-in-law in her sister's life time (R.V.) was prohibited. This no doubt aimed a blow at polygamy, yet may only have had reference to the heart-burnings and jealousies which were bound to arise between two sisters. A notable example is given in the painful and humiliating dissensions between Leah and Rachel. Also I Sam. 1,6. (וְלֵוָה); and the case of Sarah and Hagar.

After a reference to the sin of adultery among companions, the lawgiver utters a vigorous protest against the abominable immolation of children. Molech worship as exhibited in passages as 2 Kings XVII,31; Jer.VII, 31, XIX, 5, distinctly tell us that it meant the actual offering up of the innocent children as "burnt-offerings". It is described as a "profanation" of the name of Elohim in that it represented Him as requiring such a cruel and unnatural sacrifice.

The prohibition of verses 22, and 23, of this code are to be taken as referring to the inconceivably unnatural crimes connected with the idolatrous worship of (a) Astarte or Ashtoreth, (b) the he-goat at Mendes in Egypt, as the symbol

of the generative power in nature. The hideous perversion of the moral sense involved in these crimes, is illustrated by the fact that men and women thus prostituted to the service of false gods, were designated by the terms 'qadesh' and 'qadeshah' "holy". Is it any wonder that the sacred writer brands their awful crimes as "confusion".

In Deuteronomy VII, 3,4, the marriage with the sons or daughters of the surrounding nations is prohibited on the ground that "they will turn away thy son from following Me, that they may serve other gods". So also found in Exod. XXXIV, 16.

The marriage of Solomon is frequently spoken of as having been clearly contrary to the Mosaic law. The texts usually referred to, as prohibiting such alliances (Exod. XXXIV, 16; Deut. VII, 3,4) do not clearly apply to the case as their terms are specifically limited by the context to the several Canaanitish nations which occupied Palestine. With these the Israelites were prohibited from forming any alliances; but this law did not extend to Gentile nations living at a distance, as is fully proved in the case of the Gibeonites. The object of this law, as well as its terms, renders the application of it to distant Gentiles very doubtful.

George Smith, F.A.S. confirms this position when he states that the object of this law was specially intended to guard the Hebrews against intermarriage with a people who were,

by the judgment of God, doomed either to be driven out or destroyed, and with whom matrimonial connections, from the proximity of their idolatrous rites, would have been most dangerous.

In II Chron. 1, 7-10, we learn that soon after his marriage to the daughter of the king of Egypt, Solomon arranged a state function and invited all the chief princes, captains and officers to meet him at a solemn sacrifice before the tabernacle at Gibeon. Here we are told the king offered a thousand burnt-offerings, and worshipped before the Lord. In that night God appeared to him and in the language of the text a conference took place in which God is represented as graciously approving of the king's conduct, and assured him that as he had not asked long life, riches, honour, or the life of his enemies, but wisdom and knowledge, these should be given, with riches and honour beyond all his predecessors had enjoyed, or what any of his successors should realize.

The marriage of an heir with the widow is described in the Coran as "the hateful marriage". The custom was widespread in Arabia in both branches of the Arabs race, at Medina as well as Mecca. There is no doubt that at one time this was usual not only throughout Arabia but in all parts of the Semitic world, when the husband was the wife's baal.

This explains the conduct of Reuben with Bilhah and the

anger of Ishbosheth at Abner (2 Sam. 3.7).

Absalom as David's heir appropriated his father's concubines (2 Sam. 16;22) without causing any opposition in Israel. When Adonijah asked the hand of Abishag he was in fact claiming a part of the elder brother's inheritance (I Kings 2:22, also verses 15,16).

Such unions were common in the time of Ezekiel (22:10), but became very offensive to the higher morality of the prophets, and Robertson Smith tells us that this formed the subject of the only law of forbidden degrees in the law book of the prophetic party in the 7th century B.C., which purports to be the original Deuteronomic code (Deut. 22:30).

After the exile the Hebrew genealogist seems to have used the marriage of a son with his father's wife as one device for throwing the relations of clans and tribes into genealogical form, I Chron. 2:24.

.....

MARRIAGE CONTRACT AND DIVORCE.

Among the Hebrews of the Old Testament the sentiment was against divorce, yet the Deuteronomic law made it easy to obtain; and there is abundant proof that throughout all its history divorce was so common, a matter of "to-day or to-morrow" that women were compelled to have a marriage contract in which provisions regarding divorce were incorporated. In the recently discovered Assouan Papyri (Doc. C) this is quite evident:

"If to-morrow or any later day my daughter shall divorce thee, and leave thee, she shall have no power to take it, etc. If thou shalt put her away from thee, one half of the house shall be hers to take, etc."

It has been found that there existed, and in some quarters in Arabia there still exists, a system of marriage brokerage. These 'brokers' arrange, for a small fee, temporary wives. The espoused parties appeared before the Kadi and registered terms of contract. They were at liberty to renew the contract, or if they desired separation then commutation money is paid by the separating party.

The transitory character of marriage, and the frequency with which men took new wives made it almost certain that most of them would be of other families and perhaps of other clans. The discarded wives would no doubt return to their own kindred

and would there find protection, support, and, in time, other alliances. As the period of life in which a woman would be desired for marriage is much shorter than the corresponding period in the life of a man, many of these women must have been left with their kindred, and their children would be considered the perpetuators of their clan.

In temporary marriages four conditions were possible.

1. The wife may live with her husband's kindred while married, and return to her own when divorced, he retaining the children.
2. She may live while married with her husband's kindred but on returning to her own take the children with her.
3. She may live in her own clan whither her husband goes to live with her, she retaining the children when he leaves.
4. She may reside in her own clan and the husband in his - simply visiting to and fro - in which case the children remain with her.

In the first of these conditions the children are reckoned in the father's clan, in the other three the children belong to the mother's clan.

There are two words used for "divorce" in Hebrew. The first is "garash" to expel, referring to the person divorced, and possibly to the act of divorcement. Lev. 21,7 prohibits the marriage of a priest to a divorced woman (gerusha), and

Jeremiah 3,8, refers particularly to the document of separation - (sēpher Kerithutheyah). It is quite probable that divorces were used among the Hebrews before the Mosaic legislation. Reference is made in the New Testament to the permission given by Moses by reason only of the hardness of their hearts; that is to say, because they were accustomed to this abuse, and to prevent greater evils. Abraham expelled Hagar, on account of her insolence and because of the urgent request of his wife Sarah. Samson's father-in-law took advantage of his temporary absence that he had forsaken his wife and gave her to another (Judges 15;2). In Judges 19 we have the story of the unfaithful wife, who forsook her husband and returned to the house of her father and would not have returned had the husband not gone in pursuit of her.

One of the charges of the prophet Micah is that they had "cast out their wives from their pleasant homes, and taken away the glory of God from their children forever" (Micah 2;9).

Malachi commends Abraham for not divorcing Sarah, though barren; and reproaches the Jews who had abandoned "the wives of their youth". (Mal. 2;15).

In case of the repudiation of a wife the husband must give a bill of divorcement, in which were set forth the date, place and cause of her divorce, and a permission was given by it to marry whom she pleased.

It was further stipulated that the husband might receive the repudiated wife back in case she had not in the meanwhile married another person; but if she had been thus married, she could never afterwards become the wife of her first husband.

When we come to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah we find that they compelled a large number of the Jews to dismiss their foreign wives, whom they had married contrary to the law (Ezra 10,11; 12,19).

As wives were considered the property of their husbands, they did not possess any equitable or reciprocal rights. Josephus expressed the opinion that women were not permitted by law to divorce themselves from their husbands. He believes that Salome, sister of Herod the Great, was the first to put her husband away, and also states that Herodias dismissed hers. (Antiquities 15;7; 18,7). In the first of the references, Salome gave a bill of divorcement to her husband Costobarus, as the result of a quarrel with him. Salome chose to follow the law of her own authority and so renounced her wedlock. She reported the matter to her brother Herod, giving as the reason that Costobarus had been associated with persons who were seeking to raise sedition against the King.

In Document G of the Assouan Papyri we learn that Mibhtahyah had the right to stand up and divorce her husband As-Hor. Under such conditions she must weigh out for As-Hor

the sum of five or six sheckles in silver. If As-Hor drives his wife away from his house he shall pay her the sum of 20 . Kebhes. It is conjectured by some scholars that it is only under 'mother-right' or female-kinship that woman may take the initiative, and under such conditions there are evidences of unstable relations. In the Document referred to the expression "If to-day or to-morrow", so frequently repeated, substantiates the view of the instability of the marriage bond.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LAND LAWS.

The physical basis of society is the land which it inhabits, which must be sufficient in size and quality to provide food, clothing and shelter, and if that society becomes enlarged, it is quite clear that the proper distribution of the land among the people is one of the most important elements of their welfare. How the land shall be divided among the people has always been the problem. Who has the right to the land?

Some contend that land, like water and air, belongs to the race and ought not to be the exclusive right of any individual. It must, however, be observed that uncultivated land is of very little use for subsistence, and that, with productive land, the element of labour must be reckoned.

With the air - who can improve it?

The difference between savagery and civilization is cultivation. Man's commission "to till the earth and subdue it" is a matter of toil for successive decades and generations. The amount of time, trouble and talent expended by any family or tribe has some right to recognition, and it will be at once admitted, to protection also.

The laws relating to land among the Hebrews, are said to have arisen under various circumstances recounted in the history of the people at Sinai and in the desert before the

people came into Canaan. Most laws have been an evolution during the unfolding of a people's history, and the people's needs have demanded a system of regulations.

While this must have entered into the experience of the children of Israel to some extent, we have excellent authority for believing that the Hebrews were not ignorant of existing laws among other people. We have a real estate transfer recorded in Gen. 23:20 where Abraham is said to have purchased a plot of ground from the children of Heth, the field is described and located and the cave and trees on the borders; no doubt there was a written deed of conveyance.

Additional light, on existing laws of other nations, has been shed from the recent discovery at Susa (in 1901) by M. de Morgan and party. It consists of three fragments of an enormous block of black polished marble thickly covered with cuneiform inscriptions. It is a diorite stela about ten feet long, and is now in the Louvre Palace in Paris. The stela is the acknowledged work of Hammurabi who according to the Babylonian chronology was the contemporary of Abraham. This slab affirms that it was set up in the public place of the city that the people might read the laws of the land. The domestic relations take about one-third of the space of the tablet, professional ethics, specially of medicine nearly another third, and various contract forms, some for the conveyance of land,

complete the laws on this stela. It is not impossible that Abraham saw and read the Code of Hammurabi before Terah emigrated.

Then again, Moses their great leader and lawgiver was well versed in the lore and laws of Egypt, and he was conversant with the land regulations imposed by his august predecessor, Joseph, prime-minister of that realm. Hence during the Hebrews' long itinerary through the desert Moses had time to use all his knowledge, experience, wisdom and foresight in formulating laws, and planning for the proper distribution of the land of Canaan. Thus the principle of scramble was avoided by agreeing beforehand, that when they took possession of the new land, they would divide it equally by lot among the people. The census of the people described in the closing chapters of the book of Numbers was a careful one, according to their families, by their fathers' houses. At its close Moses is thus directed by Jahweh: "unto these shall the land be divided for an inheritance according to the number of the names, the land shall be divided by lot according to the names of the families of their fathers".

Instances are noted where the law might apparently work injustice, particularly in cases where the father has died, and there is no son to succeed. Thus the family of Zelophehad is related, and will be referred to later.

A special case was made of Caleb's inheritance because of his deeds of valour, and he obtained his heritage from a warlike mountain clan.

The distribution of the land was made on the principle of numbers rather than the strength of individuals. "Ye shall inherit the land by lot according to your families. To the more thou shalt give the more inheritance, to the fewer thou shalt give the less inheritance, to every one according to those that were numbered of him, shall his inheritance be given, wheresoever the lot falleth to any man, that shall be his".

This plan devised beforehand was carried out by Joshua as soon as possible after his assuming the leadership of the people. In the book which bears his name, chapters XIII to XXII recount the division of the land among the tribes and families, and may well bear the title "the book of deeds" - the real estate record. After a general statement of the boundaries of the land to be divided, and an indication of the limits of the territory which had already been allotted to the two tribes and a half on the east side of Jordan, Joshua and Eliazar, having first assigned Hebron to Caleb, proceeded to divide the western territory, giving portions, first of all to Judah, Ephraim and half of Manasseh (XV - XVII), and then, after the setting up of the tabernacle at Shiloh, to the remaining tribes except Levi, a special inheritance being set apart to

Joshua himself. The cities of refuge and the Levitical cities are designated (XX - XXI) and the two tribes and a half are sent home to their own territory with an injunction to maintain faithfully the national religion (XXII).

This division was somewhat interfered with by the serious rupture between the North and South. When Jereboam formed the northern kingdom and as a piece of wise state policy to keep the people from going up to Jerusalem he set up a corrupting worship to Jahweh at the northern and southern boundaries of his kingdom and in consequence lost many of the very best of his people, who left their homesteads in the Northern tribes and emigrated to the Southern kingdom.

As the land became prosperous under the thorough cultivation promoted by many small estates, the tendency to form large estates became stronger, and, restive under legal restraint in many cases they cast off all restraint. The rich purchased where they could, and held as long as they could and waxing in power they forced the poor to sell without the possibility of redemption, and there arose, as a result, a powerful landed estate class which the prophets time and again denounced as land grabbers. Such a class could only exist by setting aside the laws fostering small estates, by throwing over the whole policy established in the original gift of the promised land. Hosea cries out against those who removed the landmarks and crushed judgment. Micah in the Southern

Kingdom said of this class "They covet fields and seize them and houses and take them away, they oppress a man and his house, even his heritage". Isaiah said "Woe to them that join house to house and field to field to dwell alone in the land, till there be no room for others".

The point of law regarding property land marks is given in Deut. XIX:14. "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance". This law was universally recognized by the people and its violation was covered with a curse to which the people had given common public assent. Deut 27:17, "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbour's land mark. And all the people shall say, Amen".

An important Hebrew law differentiating them from other peoples was the provision that the land should remain uncultivated every seventh year, and the seventh Sabbatic period should be of two years duration during which the ground should not be tilled.

— —

THE LAW OF INHERITANCE AND THE GOEL.

After the father's death the first-born son is the head of the family, and therefore in family registers he is often referred to as such, Num. 3:12 ff. By the law in Deut.21:17, the provision that the first-born son is to receive a double inheritance is confirmed, and therefore the care of the mother and sisters would, doubtless, be incumbent upon him. This was a very old custom, for Jacob followed it when he gave the inheritance of a double tribe to Joseph, who, in the place of Reuben, was invested with the right of the first-born. For the rest, the rule of inheritance was apparently that the other sons inherited equally. If an Israelite left behind him only daughters, they inherited the father's property. If he had no daughter, his brother would inherit. In want of a brother then the brother of his father; and if he had none, the nearest blood relation (Num. 27:8-11). But to prevent land from passing into the possession of another tribe, daughters who were heiresses might, according to law, (Numbers 36) only marry men of the tribe of their father, or, if the language in verses 6 and 8 were taken in the narrow sense, then restriction must be made to men of their father's house. No doubt the limitation would be to as close a relationship as was admissible, as in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad mentioned in Numbers 36,

who took the sons of their father's brother for husbands.

Side by side with this ordinance stands the Levirate law which rested on very ancient custom, Gen. 38, and was sanctioned as law in Deut. 25:5-10. The main provision is as follows: "If brethren dwell together and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry outside unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her. And it shall be that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel". If the brother is unwilling to do so, he could only be released from the obligation by undergoing a species of indignity and insult (Deut. 25:9). This is illustrated in the case of Ruth, (Ruth, Chaps. 3 and 4) where, however, as an estate is involved Boaz is styled the Goel (גֹּאֵל - an [?]avenger). From Lev. 21:13 it would appear that the High Priest was free from this law, and there must have been other exceptions as in the case of aged persons.

The law, however, only extended to a brother living in the same city or country, not to one residing at a greater distance. Nor did it affect a brother having a wife of his own. It could only affect those who were unmarried. In the case of Boaz, when the nearer kinsman rejected the proposal to marry Ruth, he though unacquainted with his future wife, agreed to

become her husband. That the Levirate law was in force in the beginning of the Christian Era is shown by Matt 22:24 ff. and parallel passages of Mark and Luke. Among the Jews of the present day the Levirate law does not operate. In the marriage contracts of the very poorest people among them it is generally stipulated that the bridegroom's brother shall abandon all those rights to the bride to which he could lay claim by this law. This reference, however, shows that the law was known.

In view of this law for the assurance of continuity among families provision was made for the preservation of the property on which the subsistence of the family depended. As far as possible, the inheritance was to be preserved entire. Lev. 25:23 proves that the principle of theocracy was rigorously applied to questions of proprietorship. "The land is mine; for ye are strangers and foreigners with me" - that is God, the King of the people, is the real proprietor of the land and He gives it to the people "in trust". "Each family apart" forms an integral part of that theocracy and the inheritance given to it for its subsistence was, as it were, a feudal holding carrying with it inalienable rights.

This throws light upon Naboth's refusal(I Kings 21:3) and gives a reason for the strong language of the prophets against the efforts of the rich to enlarge their possessions by adding to their own lands the inheritance of others (Isaiah 5:8ff)

When an Israelite is compelled by poverty to alienate his inheritance, this was only for a time; the purchaser of the inheritance must, by Lev. 25:23-27, return it as soon as the former possessor, or his nearest relation, redeems it again ($\text{וְיָשָׁב הָאֲדָמָה אֶל הָאֲדָמָה}$); hence the general legal principle, verse 23f, "The land shall not be sold ($\text{לֹא תִמָּכַר אֲדָמָה בְּעוֹלָם}$) to extinction" - that is, in such a way that the possession is forever forfeited by the original owner - "but in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption ($\text{וְגִאֲלָתֶם אֶתְּכֶם בְּכָל אֶרֶץ הַיְּשׁוּבָה}$) for the land". In virtue of this his duty to redeem the land, the nearest relation bears the name of —

At the redeeming of the land, the value which the purchaser has had from the use of it year by year is to be taken from the purchase money - that is, the land itself is never to be actually sold, but only what it bore, and that for a certain time. In the year of jubilee, however, every possession is to return to the family to which it originally belonged, without redemption.

The idea expressed by the verb ga'al is, according to Driver to assume a claim or right, which has lapsed or been forfeited, to reclaim, re-vindicate, redeem (redimo - to buy back). The word came to refer to one who was willing to perform the kinsman's part and redeem from trouble, exile, death and false accusations. Job 19:25, "my vindicator", refers to

the vindication of his innocence, either from the false statements that have been made, or from an unjust death.

The great principles involved in the system of the "goel" was the desire to keep the rights of the family intact; and this included life and property. Hence the 'go'el had-dam' or avenger of blood is the man who vindicates the rights of one whose blood has been unjustly shed. Any one of the members of a family or clan may be called upon to discharge the duty of avenger of blood, but naturally the responsibility falls upon his nearest relations, and one of these becomes the avenger. 'Blood revenge' is essentially connected with the family or clan; and is found chiefly in communities where the clan-system is fully developed and clan-sentiment strongly felt. Its aim was to protect the honour and integrity of the clan. This being the case, the whole clan, on each side, is implicated, and a remorseless and protracted blood-feud between the two clans may be the consequence of a murder, until the penalty which the custom demands has been exacted.

The Mosaic law, Numbers 35:31, expressly forbids the acceptance of a ransom for the forfeited life of a murderer, although it might be saved by his seeking an asylum at the altar in the tabernacle in case the homicide was accidentally committed. The remoteness of a place where blood has been shed made the chances of escape to the tabernacle well nigh impossible. For

the momentary safety of the murderer, laws were enacted establishing centres whither might flee the man who unwittingly had slain any one. These refuges were six in number - three on the east, and three on the west side of Jordan. There must be good cause for admitting a fugitive, and soon after, the trial was proceeded with. It formed part of the duty of the 'goel' to seek justice on behalf of the family when one belonging to it had been killed. It is quite evident, therefore, that in very early times justice is taken out of the hands of a private avenger. The old custom of blood revenge with its abuses was hereby checked by the right of the fugitive to claim protection and to have his case investigated. There is some ground for the belief that the Hebrew custom may have been a development from some imperfect primitive modes of life. In Egypt there was such provision, and the Canaanites learning so much from Egypt, may have afforded such protection.

The laws of Moses prevented abuse of evading justice. The man who killed another was guilty before God. No one with homicidal intent could possibly be shielded by law. The evidence in trial must show that there was intention. The nature or size of instrument used often decided the matter - the existence of any hatred, the premeditation of such an act all entered as strong condemnatory evidence.

From Josh. 20:4, the Statutes laid down that a man-slayer

+ the absolute word.

must state his case to the elders (וְיָדָבֵר בְּאָזְנוֹ זִקְנֵי) at the gate, but the real trial if he had been admitted would be by the (וְיִשְׁפָּטוּ קְצֵתָהּ בֵּיתֵךְ) (Numbers 35:24) "the congregation", no doubt some judicial court representing the tribe within whose territory the crime had been committed. It was also necessary that there be two witnesses. (לְפִי עֵדִים) (Numbers) עַל-פִּי שְׁנַיִם עֵדִים אֶחָשׁ לַשָּׁה עֵדִים (Deut. 17:6)

One peculiarity in the law was the term during which the man-slayer must stay under such protection. His life is under danger during the life-time of the high priest. Only by the death of the high priest could the official registration of the pollution be put away, so far as the sacredness of the land was concerned.

Hebrew legislation was very precise in its directions on the subject of retaliation.

1. The wilful murderer was to be put to death without permission of compensation. In later times the king appears to have had the power of restraining the license assumed by the authorized avenger (I Kings 2:31,33).
2. The law of retaliation was not to extend beyond the immediate offender (Deut. 24:16).
3. All roads leading to the six cities of refuge, whither the involuntary shedder of blood might flee, were to be kept open and in good order.

4. Tradition states that in order to deprecate the anger of the Almighty (Deut. 21:1-9), if a person were found dead, the elders of the nearest city would meet in a rough valley untouched by the plough, and, washing their hands over a beheaded heifer, protest their innocence of the deed.

Very little is said in Mosaic literature with regard to woman's rights by inheritance. The code of Khammurabi contained minute directions about the wife's share in the estate left by her husband. The dowry she brought with her at marriage reverts to her; the property settled upon her by her husband is secured to her, and along with her children she has a claim to the usufruct of the rest of the estate. In case there was no marriage settlement, she obtains a share of the estate equal to that of each of the children. If the widow marries again she loses the property settled upon her by her first husband, and if her children are still under age, she and her second husband are required to support and educate them. This phase of the question is entirely unknown in the Mosaic law; even the dowry brought by the wife was unknown. The fact is rendered more significant by a notice in the books of Joshua and Judges, which shows that though the gift of the dowry was not prescribed by the Mosaic law, it was known in Canaan down to the moment of the Israelitish invasion. When Caleb gave his daughter in marriage to Othniel, upon the capture of Kir-jath-sepher

she moved him to ask of her father a field. The Israelitish woman under the Mosaic law did not enjoy the same measure of independance as the Babylonian women did.

There is a case noted in Tab^{er}i's great commentary and quoted by Robertson Smith that illustrates the legal relation between parties bethrothed. In Jahiliya, when a man's father, or brother, or son, died and left a widow, the dead man's heir, if he came at once and threw his garment over her, he had the right to marry her under the dower (mahr) of her deceased sahib or to give her in marriage and take her dower. But, if she anticipated him and went off to her own people, then the disposal of her hand belonged to herself.

This symbolic act is similar to what we find in the Book of Ruth; when the young widow asks the kinsman Boaz to spread his skirt over her and so claim her as his wife.

The meaning is quite clear. Marital rights are rights of property, which can be inherited and which the heir can sell if he pleases. But the right lapses if the proper legal symbolism is not used to assert it, and in that case the woman is free by placing herself under the protection of her own kin.

As late as A.D. 1 as revealed in the Nabataean Inscriptions (Cooke page 220) we have a distinct case of property passing through female possession. Reference is made to a tomb made by Kamkam, the daughter of Wailat, daughter of Harann, and her

MAINTENANCE OF SOCIAL ORDER

Benevolence and Justice.

(a) BENEVOLENCE.

The Jewish Social system provided protection by law for the stranger, the blind and deaf, the aged, and the poor.

(1) A stranger was one whether Israelite or foreigner who had no home, though in some cases so far as the Israelite stranger was concerned he might have purchased houses at one time. The lawgiver enforced the duties of kindness and humanity towards them by reminding them that they had once been strangers in Egypt (Lev. 19:33,34). Strangers could be naturalized by being circumcised, and renouncing idolatry.

(2) For the aged (Lev. 19:32) provided "before the hoary head thou shalt stand up, and shalt reverence the aged".

Lev. 19:14 prohibits any wrong being done the deaf or the blind; and Deut. 27:18 denounces with a curse him who misleads the blind.

Regarding the poor, various humane regulations were made. The rich were exhorted to assist the needy Israelite with a loan, and not refuse, even though the Sabbatical year drew nigh (Deut. 15:7-10).

During harvest, the owner of a field was prohibited from reaping the corn that grew in its corners, or the after-growth; and the scattered ears, and sheaves carelessly left on the ground, equally belonged to the poor. After a man had

once shaken his olive-trees, he was not permitted to gather the olives that still hung on them; so that the fruit, which did not ripen until after the season of gathering, belonged to the poor (Lev. 19:9,10; Ruth 2:2-19).

Whatever grew during the Sabbatical year, in the fields, gardens, or vineyards, the poor might take at pleasure, having an equal right to it with the owners of the land. They were also entitled to the second tenths, and second firstlings. (Deut. 12:5-12; 14:22-29).

JUSTICE

One of the instruments for the maintenance of social order is the dispensing of justice in case of evil doers. The punishments mentioned in the Biblical Record may be divided into two classes, non-capital and capital.

1. The non-capital or inferior punishments were as follows: (a) Scourging: this was the most common corporal punishment under the Mosaic law. It is frequently mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments; and, in order that the legal number of forty stripes might not be exceeded, it was inflicted with a scourge consisting of three lashes; so that the party received thirteen blows, or "forty stripes save one".

(b) Retaliation, or returning like for like, was the punishment for corporal injuries to another (Exod.21:23-25).

(c) Restitution of things stolen, and for various other injuries done to the property of another person (Exod.21:32,33,34).

(d) Sin and trespass offerings (Lev.4 and 5).

(e) Imprisonment though not in the Mosaic law was practised during the Jewish monarchy and in the time of Christ.

(f) Banishment - introduced after the time of the Captivity.

(g) Instances of prisoners deprived of their eyes. Judges 16:21, and 2 Kings 25:7.

(h) Plucking off the hair, with great violence, was both a painful and ignominious form of punishment. It is alluded to in Neh. 13:25.

(i) Excommunication was a civil as well as ecclesiastical punishment.

II. There were eleven different forms of Capital punishment mentioned in the Bible.

(1) Slaying with the sword. Punishment for murder.

(2) Stoning idolaters, blasphemers, Sabbath-breakers (Lev. 20:2).

(3) Burning alive (Gen. 38:24; Lev.20:14).

(4) Beheading (Matt.14:8-12).

(5) Hanging (In Egypt) Gen.40:22.

(6) Precipitation, or casting headlong from a window or precipice.

(7) Bruising or pounding in a mortar, referred to in Prov. 27:22. Still practised among the Turks.

(8) Dichotomy or cutting asunder was a punishment inflicted in the countries contiguous to Judaea (Dan.2:5; 3:29).

(9) Beating to death used among the Greeks; it was practised by Antiochus towards the Jews (2 Maccabees 6:30).

(10) Exposing to wild beasts was practised among the Medes and Persians (Dan. 6:7). New Testament reference, I Cor. 15:32.

(11) Crucifixion was a punishment inflicted by the ancients upon only the most notorious criminals.

BURIAL AND MOURNING RITES.

By the law of Moses a dead body conveyed a legal pollution to everything that touched it. The furniture and house were polluted for seven days (Numbers 19:14,15,16). This is given as the reason why the priests, on account of their daily ministrations in holy things, were forbidden to assist at any funerals but those of their nearest kinsfolk. Even the dead bones, however long they had lain in the grave, conveyed a pollution to any who touched them; thus King Josiah caused the bones of the false priests to be burned upon the altar at Bethel (2 Chron. 34:5).

When death occurred the first office among the Jews was to close the eyes of the deceased. This was done by the nearest of kin. In Gen. 46:4, we learn that when Jacob took his journey into Egypt, it was promised that Joseph would "put his hands upon his eyes".

The next office was the ablution of the corpse. There is evidence to show that this custom was common to both Greeks and Romans. In Egypt it is still the custom to wash the dead body several times. Loud lamentations attended the decease of friends both at the time of death (Gen. 50:1) and at the time of interment (Gen. 50:10,11). In later times the Jews hired persons, whose profession it was to superintend and conduct

these funeral lamentations (Jeremiah 9:17; 16:6,7; Ezek.24:16-18 and at a still later period minstrels and mourners were hired for this ceremony (Matt.9:23; Mark 5:38).

After the corpse had been washed it was embalmed with costly spices and aromatic drugs, after which it was closely swathed in linen rollers, probably resembling those of the Egyptian mummies now to be seen in the British Museum. This custom was continued to a very late date. In John 11:44, Lazarus seemsto have been embalmed in this fashion; and in John 19:39,40, similar preparation was made of the embalming of Christ.

At the funerals of some Jewish monarchs, great piles of aromatics were set on fire, in which were consumed their bowels, armour, and other things (2 Chron. 16:14; Jer.34,5).

It was deemed a great dishonour to be deprived of burial (Ps.79:2). Burial places were in gardens, fields, and in the sides of mountains. Over the rich and great were erected splendid monuments. A funeral feast is thought to have succeeded the Jewish burials. For example, after Abner's funeral was solemnized the people came to eat meat with him, though they could not persuade him to do so (2 Sam. 3:35). To this custom the words of Jeremiah have been applied (Jer.16:7) where he calls it the "cup of consolation, which they drank for their father

or for their mother"; and so the place where it occurs is called "the house of feasting".

The tokens of mourning, by which the Jews expressed their grief for the death of their friends, were the rending of their garments, putting on of sack-cloth, sprinkling dust upon their heads, wearing mourning apparel, and covering the face and head (Gen. 37;34; 2 Sam 14,2).

Rapid interment was necessary on account of the hot climate, and we may assume that then, as at the present day, in the East, burial usually took place on the day of death. The body was carried to the grain on a 'bier'. In Acts 5, 6-10, we have an instance where Ananias and his wife were buried immediately after decease. Persons of distinction were placed in coffins. Such was used in Joseph's case after being vizier of Egypt. There is good authority for believing that the Kings and other exalted personages in ancient Palestine were buried in coffins of wood or stone, on which as additional marks of honor were placed their insignia when they were carried to the tomb.

During the first few weeks after a burial, the members of a family, especially the women, paid frequent visits to the tomb. This custom still prevails in Eastern lands. Groups of women may be daily seen at the graves of their departed friends, strewing them with flowers, or shedding tears of regret. John 11:31. "She was going to the grave to weep there".

The place into which man migrates is called "sheol". The word is traced to the stem " 3 ̲ ̲ ̲ " to be hollow, hence ravine, or abyss is regarded as the original meaning of the word. There are many poetical references to the time after death and it is thus difficult to take them literally. "The kingdom of the dead", "the depths of the earth", "the land beneath", "the light is as midnight", are some of the expressions. It was also held that the dead are gathered in tribes; hence the meaning of the term in the Pentateuch so often quoted - "to go or be gathered to his fathers", "or to his people".

CONCLUSION.

Social Evolution is a slow process and we must be patient with it while we are working at it, and waiting for its fuller realization. This is one important lesson from the present survey of Biblical Sociology. These great laws and principles enunciated to the human family were intended to show them how to act in their social relationship to one another in all ages. How many milleniums have been engaged in this social process! A careful study of the Prophets will show how easily these laws and principles were unheeded, and how social injustice, oppression, and cruelty were reprovod by these religious leaders.

Dr. Driver says: "The prophets play largely the role of what we should call 'social reformers'. They attack the abuses always conspicuous in an Eastern autnomy; they assert with an earnestness and eloquence which can never lose their spell, the claims of honesty, justice, philanthropy and mercy".

Early Hebrew legislation fully substantiates these claims upon a people's attention, but the prophets develop and apply to entirely new situations, the principles implied in the old legislation, and re-affirm them with fresh energy. Note the words of Amos: "Forasmuch, therefore, as ye trample upon the poor, and take exactions from him of wheat; ye have built

houses of hewn stone but ye shall not dwell in them; ye have planted pleasant vineyards, but ye shall not drink the wine thereof. Seek good and not evil, that ye may live; and so Jahweh, the God of Hosts shall be with you and say: Hate the evil and love the good and establish judgment in the gate (the place where justice was administered), it may be that Jahweh, the God of Hosts, will be gracious to the remnant of Joseph". (Amos 5:11).

Micah speaks similarly: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God (Micah 6:6-8).

Isaiah also cries out against the evils of a debased aristocracy, and shows how they were working the inevitable results by disintegrating their social economy and ministering to their selfish passions.

Jeremiah, the sensitive national patriot denounces them as a people bereft of vision and abandoned to the revolting orgies of Baal-worship and says: "For according to the number of thy cities is the number of thy gods, O Judah".

Malachi attacks the corrupting influences of an immoral priestcraft which had proved a canker in the social organism of Israel. They had broken all social laws and had brought shame upon the priestly class by their unjust and unlawful conduct, and by making this sacred profession a means for personal gain, they had made themselves base before all the

people. He uttered a powerful polemic against foreign marriages, and against looseness in regard to the sacredness of the family life; and refers to the foreign woman as "the daughter of a strange god". Marriage was not a matter of personal caprice or mere temporary convenience; it is a sacred tie because Jehovah hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth". Jahweh hates divorce. The tears of wronged womanhood cry to heaven for vengeance. The man who deals treacherously with the woman who has given herself to him shall be smitten with a curse. The nation that treats marriage as a trivial thing is weakening the very foundation of social order and family bliss. The prophet cries: "Who may abide the day of His coming?" The judgment will be wide in its sweep. Its purpose will be to purify and punish. "He is like a refiner's fire". (Mal.

Israel's great misfortune was their apparent ignorance of their position among the other nations of the earth. To the patriarch Abraham had been said "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed". It seemed hard to interpret this promise in terms of their work as agents of Jehovah. Their early conception of God was that of a superhuman man, with something of a man's imperfections - as the Yahvist writer treats of God - yet presenting a higher ideal than that of the unaided mind. Then with their thought of Canaan as Jehovah's land, and their people as Jehovah's people, and their temple as

Jehovah's abode, their conception of God rises constantly higher; and Proverb, Psalm and Prophecy give abundant evidence of this fact. The exile destroyed for the Israelites this conception of God as confined to one land, to one city, to one temple, or to one people. Jehovah is the Lord of the whole earth, and Deutero - Isaiah instils in the minds of the people lessons as to the mission of the servant Israel to all the nations of the world.

The vision of Ezekiel (Chap.9) most impressively depicts the degeneracy of the Jewish nation at the announcement that Jehovah has forsaken them. The flood-gates of immorality seemed to open wide, and social disaster seemed imminent. The man with the inkhorn - Jehovah's scribe - goes through the city and every man that is grieved at the abominations of the city will have a mark placed on his forehead. All who sympathize with wrongdoing and cease to cry out against it, share in the guilt of the social ruin. Lloyd George, speaking a few days ago regarding social conditions in Great Britain, declared that it was as deep a stain on the national flag that it should wave over ill-paid and ill-housed working men and women, as it would be for it to drop over defeat on the field of battle. No nation can tolerate such wrongs in their social organism without sooner or later suffering. In the New Testament the 'Sermon on the Mount' is a compact and comprehensive manifesto of

social life under the New Era, and has been referred to, and adopted, by many Brotherhoods, Unions and Societies of men as constituting a code of practical social principles and laws worthy of recognition. In its larger and modern signification, Biblical Sociology is the counterpart of Biblical Theology; for, while Biblical Theology is concerned with the statement in detail, with all possible fulness of the conception of God, Biblical Sociology dissertates upon the influence that conception has upon man's social relations.

In an age becoming more and more practical, it is claimed that religion should not only imply the worship of God, but minister to the welfare of mankind; and already the sincerity of the recognition and worship of the Divine is judged by the earnestness, wisdom, and efficacy of that social ministry.

The distinctive service that Biblical Sociology is rendering the world is in revealing the fact that the Biblical Literature not merely presents the claims of Divinity on the race, but that the Divine is best served when His will is being carried out amongst men; and that the standards and principles of the Biblical record are intended for the advancement of the race in every possible way.

In the survey of the social conditions of the Hebrews, one is impressed with the amount of space given to the delineation of their social life. It has been stated that

there are ten pages of sociological material to every one page of a theological character. While this may not be accurate, one cannot help but be convinced of the very important place it has throughout all Scripture. The reader of the Hebrew literature will not be less a theologian, but he will be most assuredly a more ardent sociologist; and it will become more and more apparent that the sociological data given in the history and poetry of the Bible is surprisingly large.

It may be too radical a step to hint that a "School of Sociology" is of as great importance as a "School of Theology", but, just as the 'clinic' and 'bacteriology' are to-day absolutely essential in a Medical College, there is every reason to believe that the study of sociology should have a chief place in the Theological Curriculum. They are inseparable; and the great aim of all Social Service is to bring the noblest ideals into the lives of men forming them into a noble society, and as a result, realizing that the Great Father is fostering, fashioning and perfecting a Great Brotherhood.

This implies that the great need of the world to-day is good manhood. A good social order may fail to make men good, but good men will eventually work out a good social order.

Sir Oliver Lodge, Principal of Birmingham University, emphasizes the fact that the Deity does not work without man but through man. That men are His agents to bring things about.

He illustrated his point by reference to the Greek play "Hippolytus", in which the tragedy of Euripides is depicted. One of the characters addressing Hippolytus says: "For that there is, e'en in a great god's mind, which hungereth for the praise of human kind". Sir Oliver observes: "It is three thousand years since those words were written, and to this day some people think more of the praise of God than the service. Modify that sentence and say:- "For that there is, e'en in a great god's mind, which hungereth for the help of human kind". The object of living is the development of healthy, happy human beings.

Any process in social service that will increase the number of healthy, happy human beings justifies its existence. It has frequently been said that the whip of starvation is necessary for progress, that the struggle for existence ought to continue, or the human race will become decadent. To these, modern social optimism says emphatically - No; the struggle for bare existence has done its work in the past. It is the business of all true men to raise the standard of comfort, and to consider this comfort, peace, and progress greater incentives to exertion than the fear of starvation. No longer a blind struggle but a conscious altruistic organism is our standard. Will this altruism implied in Applied Sociology be the antithesis to Herbert Spencer's

doctrine of 'natural selection' already referred to? Spencer deprecates a philanthropy that exaggerates the protection of the weak, thus impeding the law of natural selection; but a wise social policy will not surely kill a man's self-respect by unwise fraternal attention. In all progress there ought to be the elimination of every element that would tend to weaken the social fabric, and the adoption of all forces, elements and auxiliaries that would foster, encourage and stimulate a healthy individual, as well as a robust organic social condition. No social service is complete that does not lead men to realize their oneness with the state in which they live. The visual organ is a part of the human organism. It dare not be separated without disaster. Much that has happened and much that will happen is doubtful but of this men are certain "To-day we are alive together". To this important truth Christ called the attention of His followers when He declared the meaning of kinship as He understood it (Matt.12:48) "Who is my mother - and who are my brethren?" By a few words of wisdom He lifts the idea of kinship from the narrow to the larger and higher sphere of life. "Brotherhood", He would say, "consists not in the mere accidental ties of blood relationship, but in spiritual affinities where soul responds to soul. There and there alone is kinship, brotherhood, in the highest and truest sense".

To the Jewish people this broad scheme was strange,

and in some measure wounding to their national pride. They thought that the coming Messiah would be the Jews' Emancipator, that only sons of Abraham would have the right to claim kinship with Him. Christ with His broad system of thought showed to the world that kinship with Himself was not a matter of tracing descent; that unity with Him meant communion of soul; that it was not a question of the flesh and the blood, but of the possession of the heart qualities that alone can lift a man up to God.

We readily admit, therefore, that the ultimate value of all sociological progress will be the fuller realization of ethical ideals, yet it will be evident that we must have the sociological fabric out of which Ethical perfections may be effected.

In this lies the hope of humanity. Biblical Sociology impresses us with the thought that there is something in a man, an instinct, a gleam, an intuition, a heart chord, that responds to the touch of God. The main idea that runs through the works of Victor Hugo is just this, that you find a man so degraded as to be inaccessible to the good and the true. He shows us in his books, monsters in human form, yet at some act of kindness, some friendly word, some trifling circumstance, there comes a change, and the man is shown as not devoid of the Divine instinct that makes him akin to God. Victor Hugo

recognized it as his mission to prove that no external circumstance, no rude exterior, can forever veil the splendour of the human soul.

For the best interests of man we must cleave to the conception of Jehovah in His revelation to man, and seek to accentuate the principles of social order enunciated so clearly in the Biblical Record, and in that way offset the Marxian maxim:- "No God, no law, no property, no marriage".

It is most interesting to find how the Biblical statement of the great sociological progress of a nation, has been enthusiastically and universally acknowledged as a powerful factor in all social and moral reforms throughout the world; and how, from unbiased sources, men such as Carlyle, Emerson, Ruskin, Ewald, Coleridge, Sir Walter Scott and many others have given their voluntary testimony to the richness of the ideals and the elevation of tone which characterizes the Bible. It has been conceded by many writers of various dispositions that this 'Bibliotheca Divina' has everywhere nourished the best life that has been known on the earth; that it has in point of fact been the spring of the highest aspirations men have cherished and the ripest character they have attained; that in every generation it has served for the healing of the nations, lying at the root of all progress, and insisting upon a finer and purer civilization.

If there is one element which differentiates it in the realm of sacred literature, it is not the supreme and unrivalled excellence of its constituent parts, nor that in it alone, the Divine communicates with the human, but that it is the record of a Divine manifestation culminating in a unique personality whose voice in the Social order - notably in the Sermon on the Mount referred to - has given Christianity its great practical influence in all human relationships; and is destined to harmonize all existing estrangements, and heal all the open sores of the world.

How apt are the words of Lowell:-

"Slowly the Bible of the race is writ

And not on paper leaves nor leaves of stone;

Each age, each kindred, adds to it,

Texts of despair or hope, of joy or moan.

While swings the sea, while mists the mountains shroud,

While thunder's surges burst on cliffs of cloud,

Still at the prophets' feet the nations sit".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

IN ARABIA

- W. Robertson Smith "Kinship and Marriage". [^]
- W. Robertson Smith "Early Semitic Religions". ^{The Religion of the Semites}
- Herbert Spencer "Principles of Sociology".
- Giddings "Elements of Sociology".
- Curtiss "Semitic Religions".
- W.G. Jordan "Prophetic Ideas and Ideals".
- Marcus Dods "Origin of the Bible".
- Maine "Ancient Law".
- Barton "Primitive Social Life".
- Sayce (Oxford) "Monument Facts".
- J.L. Myers (Oxford) "The Dawn of History".
- Marrett (Oxford) "Anthropology".
- S.A. Cooke "Laws of Moses and Hammurabi".
- J.F. McCurdy "History, Prophecy and the Monuments".
- Smiths Bible Dictionary.
- Hastings Bible Dictionary.
- Jewish Encyclopaedia.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica.
- Josephus Antiquities.
- Sociological Papers London University 1904.
- Assouan Papyri ^{Sayer & Co.}
- Elephantine Papyri. ^{Sachau}
- ~~Nabataean Inscriptions~~, G.A. Cooke.
- Solomon's Odes. (?) Which edition?

is arranged
some principles; also it is
quite complete.

S/

Smith p. 64

Smith's Bible

