

legitimate power of our kings, in England by the legitimate power of the kings and of the people. . . . A man because he is noble or a priest is by no means exempt from paying certain taxes here. . . . The peasant's feet are not bruised with wooden shoes, he eats white bread, he is well-dressed, he doesn't hesitate to increase the amount of his live-stock or to put tiles on his roof for fear his taxes will be raised the following year. . . . Commerce which has enriched English citizens has helped make them free and that very freedom has increased commerce in its turn, thence the greatness of the state. In France any one who wishes may be a marquis and any one who comes to Paris from the most remote corner of a province with money to spend and a name in *ac* or *ille* may talk about "a man like me, a man of my stamp," and thoroughly despise a merchant; the merchant himself hears his profession so often spoken of with scorn that he is foolish enough to blush for it; nevertheless I do not know which is the more useful to a state, a well-powdered nobleman who knows precisely at what hour the king gets up and goes to bed and who assumes grand airs playing the role of slave in the ante-chamber of a minister, or a merchant who enriches his country, gives from his office orders to Surat and Cairo and contributes to the happiness of the world. . . . [Newton's] great good fortune was not only to be born in a free country The poetical genius of the English is thus far like a bushy tree, planted by nature, sending out hap-hazard a thousand branches and growing irregular and powerful. It dies if you try to force its nature and prune it after the manner of trees in Marly garden. . . . In England people in general think and letters are more honored than in France. This advantage is a necessary consequence of the form of their government. It seems to me that the English have philosophers who should be the teachers of mankind. . . . Addison in France would have belonged to some academy and might have obtained, through the influence of some woman a pension of twelve hundred *livres*. In England he was Secretary of State."

THE SOCIAL BASES OF JUDAISM.

BY H. OSCHEROWITZ.

THE history of Israel offers a picture of manifold social development. When the Jewish tribes had settled in Canaan, Israel had reached the stage of social unity. At that time there existed no single social need. Conditions harmful to the life of a people

had not yet developed. The early position of the Jews gave rise to but few social conflicts. The Jews could boast of no world empire, as could the Egyptians and Babylonians; there were no oppressed classes in Israel, no rulers who could enjoy the luxuries produced by the toil of their slaves.

The foundations of the social life in Israel were well laid. The reverence which was shown to the elders and the ancestors was at the bottom of Jewish national power. Thus we can see in ancient Israel a natural political unity, resting upon ties of blood. While all of the modern states in their present form are overwhelmingly a product of historical occurrences, of migration and of conquests, Israel alone can boast of the natural ties of common descent which hold her people intact. The original ties of blood-relationship taken in and by themselves do not justify Israel's existence as a nation, for in the Book of Genesis itself we find the story of the common ancestry of all peoples and of all nations of the earth.

National existence is founded primarily on the free and supreme will of God. The Jewish state also has absorbed the principle of nationality, the natural laws of state formation into its basis of existence. The Jew, however, does not regard nature in itself, but the supernatural divine will as the main factor in the formation of his nation.

Israel is not a state resting upon a voluntary contract relationship between its members, but rather an organism created by a divine being. The Jews do not compose their nation through their collective voluntary agreement, but they are the component parts of an organism without which they as Jews are non-existent. If Israel is an organism created by divine power, then there must be certain intervening parts combining the individual elements into a single entity. These intermediaries in themselves must consequently be living organisms with individual existence. We may look upon the state as a body composed of separate component parts in the form of tribes, of families or homes.

The tribes in particular owned individualities whose existence was dear to the hearts of the entire people (Judges xxi. 6-17), and the possession of which was sacred to them (Judges xxi. 3). The tribes are in turn separable into families. Outside of this classification we have to reckon with another category, the several houses of ancient lineage composed of several degrees of kinship, called *Mischpachaus* or *Alaphim*. These patriarchal houses or families in turn do not consist of separate atoms in any peculiar order, but may be said to comprise the separate families, in the narrow sense of the

term. The family, again, is not a voluntary union, but rests ultimately upon matrimony as its basis. Marriage ties, however, are regarded as natural and moral bonds woven by God in his divine providence. Here we are confronted by the same moral element which even in modern society is recognized as a wholesome foundation of the political organism. In a concentric mode of life a social unity inevitably arises. The social organism is divisible into individual integral parts. This decomposition in the case of ancient Israel was not based upon an external, politically practical theory, but proceeded along an internal natural order. Let us then turn to the narrower social question. Besides these natural demarcations in ancient Israel were there not others of an artificial character? Were there further social differentiations within the above-mentioned categories? These questions can only be answered by an unconditional "No."

Every man in Israel occupied the same social position as his fellow-man. There were no hereditary family privileges and distinctions, and likewise no professional class enjoyed social advantages superior to those of all the rest. Israel's political and social order was wholesome throughout, comprising all the members of society and suppressing all revolutionary tendencies in the embryo. In this order, personal liberty and dignity were guaranteed by the state to every individual. Israel regards itself as a people of brethren. Liberty, equality and fraternity, with a retention of the natural differentiation and excluding all unnatural leveling or democratization that is the condition whose creation and perpetuation was the goal of the Old Testament law.

There existed in Israel not even the least gradation of rank particularly with reference to the rights and duties of citizenship. We know here of no division of the people into nobles and common people, patricians and plebeians. Even the power which goes hand in hand with the right of private property was from the very beginning carefully guarded and held in check by means of an adequate legal code. In order to prevent the growth in property rights of a few individual families it was enacted that the "sale of real property" should consist of a lease for a maximum period of forty-nine years, and that after the term fixed by the lease had expired the original owner should again come into absolute possession of his property; and that the sum paid on the account should be accounted as rent for the duration of the lease. Only the Eternal possessed an absolute title to the property and absolute control over the affairs of the state in Israel. Throughout the entire evolution of Jewish

law-making runs the principle, that the land is the common heritage of all the people; the belief that all were entitled to utilize this gift of the Almighty. On this point the Scriptures are unmistakable: "The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Leviticus xxv. 23).

In the year of the Jubilee all returned to the land which formerly was possessed by their families.

"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a Jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family" (Leviticus xxv. 10). These are the precepts as laid down in the law of Moses.

A sale of the land and unconditional transfer of real estate, using these terms in the modern sense, was thus absolutely forbidden. Every sale of land was in its very essence only a sale of the products of the land for a term extending to the next Jubilee year. The price was of course proportionate to the number of years remaining between the year of the sale and the return of the Jubilee, when all obligations hitherto incurred were automatically invalidated.

Even within the Jubilee period the vender reserved for himself the right to regain possession of his land. When any one in his family regained the means to redeem the land thus sold, he could exercise that privilege. In that case the buyer of the land had to be content with the refund of the purchasing price paid from which could be deducted the full value of the harvest which the possessor had reaped during the period of his possession. But, on the other hand, in order to guard the legitimate interests of the purchaser, the redemption of the land could not take place until the latter had reaped two full harvests.

This statute of the Mosaic law is expressed in these words: "And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land. If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away some of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold. And if the man have none to redeem it, and himself be able to redeem it, then let him count the years of the sale thereof, and restore the surplus unto the man to whom he sold it, that he may return unto his possession" (Leviticus xxv. 24-28).

The poor laws of Israel show in every respect the tendency to arouse and to cultivate even in the poor a feeling of self-respect and individual liberty, and to guard these virtues from the depressing and paralyzing effect of humility and slavish abnegation. Since the

feeling of inferiority almost inevitably develops in a society in which one class is economically dependent upon another, and since those unfortunates who had to sell their property anticipated a return to their lands during the next Jubilee year, it was essential to cultivate this positive self-feeling. This made Israel a society of free men instead of slaves. Those parts of the harvest, therefore, which were set aside for the poor did not bear the stamp of alms, but were symbolical of a legitimate right of the poor.

In order to make it impossible for shiftlessness and squandrous habits on the part of an individual to condemn his family to eternal poverty, it was decreed that even those lands which had been given to others as gifts should return to the original owner in the year of the Jubilee.

Of great social and economic significance was also the institution of the "Sabbath Year," which recurred every seven years. During that year it was forbidden to sow the fields or to prune the vineyard (Leviticus xxv. 3-7). "That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed: for it is a year of rest unto the land. And the Sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that sojourneth with thee" (Leviticus xxv. 5-6).

Thus the fields were to lie idle every seventh year, both to increase the fertility of the soil and to be a benefice to the poor and needy.

Lest in the seventh year there be hunger or famine throughout the land, special provisions were observed to prevent want. The land was divided into districts. The Sabbath year did not occur simultaneously in all the districts, but it was so arranged that only a part of the entire number of districts should observe the Sabbath year at any given time.

The impelling motive prompting all of the land-reform laws was to protect all of the members of the nation forever from want and misery. The state considered it its duty to guarantee the individual's inherent and legitimate rights to the products of the natural source of production: the land.

Although, on the one hand, the Sabbath year prevented the owners from extracting the maximum of products from the soil and thereby decreased the accumulated stores somewhat, on the other hand, a permanent right of redemption and the ultimate restoration of the land to its original owner during the Jubilee year, made it possible for any individual in the long run to add to his real estate.

The well-to-do could of course rent a considerable area of land for a number of years, but they could never obtain a title to the land which was so possessed by them. In ancient Israel the law made the permanent concentration of the land in a few hands impossible. Captains of industry, speculators and princes of commerce were prevented from converting their quickly acquired capital into real estate and thus the creation of a landed aristocracy was forestalled. One other very important regulation was affected by these measures. The moneyed classes were not allowed to exploit their poorer fellow men by getting hold of the latter's property at sacrifice prices at times when money was scarce. The building up of great estates that pass from father to son was thereby made impossible—as long at least as the people held to the precepts of their sacred laws.

When, therefore, "The Joining of Houses," which, at least in the urban communities, did not constitute a direct breach of the letter of the law, is regarded as a violation of the spirit of the law, we are not surprised to hear the prophet exclaim: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field till there be no room (Isaiah v. 8) in order that they alone may possess the lands of the earth who use force" (Mishna ii. 2).

In our own day it has become one of the chief problems of political economy to further the acquisition and tenure of individual property rights in real estate for the sake of national welfare, and to devise ways and means of furthering the interests of large-scale land owners. The Old Testament which tried to work in a directly opposite direction, was perhaps not able to avoid poverty entirely, but at least offered effective resistance to those who wished to accumulate great stores of wealth.

The beneficial effects of the ancient Jewish agrarian system consisted in the fact that on the one hand there was no propertyless proletariat and on the other hand no plutocratic group able to manipulate the affairs of the entire people. It is of course not altogether an established fact that the Biblical laws were always carried out to the letter, but this much is certain, that the basic principles of this agrarian legislation were enforced over a period extending far beyond the division of the Jewish kingdom. For how could we otherwise explain the fact that during this period, which extended over several centuries, we find evidence of not a single case of concentration of power in a few families and the oppression of other family groups.

In connection with these social regulations, there existed certain

other statutes concerning money lending, interest, bonding, and pawning. Since agriculture was the main source of wealth in ancient Israel, the necessity for loans was not great. Only in cases of emergency did one borrow from another and then only under the regulations of the law. It was illegal to speculate for gain or to practise usury. The taking of interest for the use of capital which is nowadays regarded as a matter of course business practice, was absolutely prohibited. When a debtor was unable to repay his creditor the borrowed capital he could contract himself into bondage. At the bottom of this provision lay the tendency to prevent idleness and to offer the industrious an opportunity to gain their livelihood to be freed again in the Sabbath year. In the meanwhile the weak were guarded from the ill effects of unemployment. This arrangement constituted a sort of unemployed insurance which even to-day is an unsolved problem of no mean importance in the majority of our modern states.

The credit laws, though often misused, had the purpose of not only preventing complete poverty but also to ameliorate the condition of the poor and impoverished.

This then brings us to the poor laws of ancient Israel which command the attention even of modern reformers. In ancient Israel as well as in modern times the care of the poor rested upon legal enactment. In the former, however, the law was divine law, while in the latter the poor laws were laid down by men. While in our day the precepts of the law are enforced by police power, in the days of the Old Testament God was the one who avenged the violations of His law. Instead of the police, morality makes for the enforcement of the poor laws in the ancient Jewish state. In our society the case of the poor rests upon the state or some particular organization, while in ancient Israel every individual bore his share. The care of the poor in our day may be more systematic and formal, but in the Old Testament days there is room for individual action whereby the deed is lifted into an ethical sphere. While in our times the poor receive aid, only under certain formal conditions, in ancient days every needy person was entitled to support. Our system guards of course against abuse, but the ancient system not only provided for individual cases of extreme need, but also did much toward preventing extreme poverty and want. Furthermore, in ancient Israel the poor were spared from the offensive inquisitorial methods, which are so common to-day, but they were also free from the embarrassment due to the publication of poor lists, which is an objectionable part of our present-day method.

The relationship between rich and poor was in many other respects relatively exemplary. The creditor was subject to a courteous restraint in the face of his debtors. He was not allowed to enter the dwelling of the debtor, but had to await at the outside the pawn which the debtor might bring to him. Above all, however, the creditor was prohibited from extorting as security those chattels regarded as the barest necessities of life; for instance: handmill, millstone, necessary clothing, etc. (Exodus xxii. 24-26; Deuteronomy, xxiv. 10-13). This was a legal provision which certainly has left its mark upon the laws of to-day.

When the law permitted, as has already been stated, a debtor to sell himself into slavery or bondage for a certain period, the reason underlying it was to caution against the careless creation of debts. But when the relationship of master and slave had once arisen between creditor and debtor, the law commanded of the former a "brotherly treatment" of the slave.

Theoretically one may speak of "omnipotent competition," as the liberator of the workingman from the yoke of the employer; in practice, however, we often find that the converse is the case. The lack of mobility on the part of the worker, the static conditions of the industrial establishments, the well-meant and in itself praiseworthy provision on the part of many industrial establishments of furnishing their employees dwelling places—naturally however, for only as long a period as they are connected with that particular mine or factory—all these conditions may lead to the establishment of ties between the employee and his place of work which are as firm and indestructible as were the bonds between master and slave of Old-Testament days, though the latter were much more beneficent and moral than are the bonds existing to-day.

The Old Testament serf, not to speak of the thralls among other peoples of antiquity, was in many respects better off than is the modern laborer. All shared in the labor, in the life and in the rest which the day brought. The slave partook of the same pleasures, of the same festivities, of the same fate as did his master. When decrepitude or accident overtook the worker, the employer could not simply repudiate the contract which bound him to what had become a human wreck, he could not leave a faithful worker who had served him for years stoically to his fate without offering adequate compensation.

The occupation of the people, as it found expression in the laws of the land, was by no means predominantly active trading or commerce. This is shown by the subnormal development of the

ancient Hebrew money and banking system, which is so manifest as to make it indeed difficult to determine the money-values and standards of those days.

The Scriptural law seems to have held industry in higher regard than commerce. The craftsmen "Bezalel and Aholiab who knew how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary" (Exodus xxxi, 2, 6) were regarded as "wise hearted men, in whom the Lord put wisdom and understanding" (Exodus xxxi. 6). As is well known, however, it is not only the skilled artist who is called to exercise his talents in the service of the sanctuary, but also the unskilled common workman. Consequently industry, of the higher as well as that of the lower type, forms a substantial element in the economic life of ancient Israel.

The Biblical law does not regard financial enterprise in as high and favorable a light as it held agricultural undertakings. The latter were ever preferred to the former, as a wholesome economic basis for society. The Old Testament perceives in an extended financially organized society certain inevitable moral and social evils. True, the Jewish law does not put a ban on commerce and industry, but it also does not select them as the main levers in the economic machine, but rather assigns them a position of secondary importance.

When we recognize the fact that the laws of ancient Israel directed or rather narrowed the occupation of the people to agriculture, it is easy to understand why the law was so careful to conserve the right of individual land ownership and why the national welfare was considered inextricably interwoven with national promotion of agriculture. The Scriptural law wished to restrict the egotism, the feverish gain spirit, which even to-day is promoted by men of integrity and reputation in the name of liberty and democracy. Under the Hebraic law, it was just as *impossible* to hoard up great wealth, to produce and acquire the many luxuries of to-day, as the demand for these luxuries in our day is *unjustifiable*. Then again the laws of Israel prevented the excessive and lamentable poverty which to-day in spite of our increased national wealth is so evident in our industrial centers.

The legal regulations with reference to the treatment of domestic animals were extremely humanitarian. Just as carefully as the Mosaic law guarded the welfare of the worker, so did it accord its aid to animals. It did not nullify man's privilege of utilizing the service of domestic animals—yea, the law even allowed their killing for sacrificial purposes. But in other respects the law prescribed tender treatment within certain limits. It may well be said that the

law made Israel a great "Humanitarian Society." The provisions of the law were quite detailed and were promoted with tender forbearance toward animals.

The Sabbath or rest day was accorded to the animals as well as to man. If the rest day is necessary for man on every seventh day, how much more is it necessary for the domestic animal which has none of the liberties of man, and which cannot choose a period of rest according to its own desire. This was the principle underlying the Mosaic law.

In case of accident, the law made aid to the animal imperative. When an animal lost its way, it was to be brought back to its master. Even the ties of blood-relationship among animals were sacredly guarded. When therefore a new-born calf was to be offered as a sacrifice, the calf had to remain for seven days with its mother. The law forbade the slaughtering of an animal on the same day with its young (Leviticus xxii. 28). In the fact that the law prohibited the taking of a mother with her young out of the nest, we can see that the law's protection was not limited to domesticated animals. In this category we may also place the law which forbade the hitching together of an animal with an animal of another species. Thus it was wrong to hitch horse and mule to the same plow. There was one law, however, which received special emphasis in Biblical days, and that was the provision which aimed to guard against the shortening of rations of animals. As the law reads: "Thou shalt not tie the mouth of the laboring ox."¹ These and similar laws show that the Mosaic law regards animals not only tenderly but also looks upon them as a kind of slaves or fellow-servants with human beings. The community of life is enlarged to a community of law. God showed the same mercy to the animals as to men, as is shown by the voice of God as it calls out to the prophet Jonah: "And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?" (Jonah iv. 11).

It is indeed of great interest to know that in their care for the public health the ancient Hebrews were an ideal people. Moses was the first man to enact hygienic laws, and to this day he remains unexcelled in that field. Not only did he give the first impetus to theoretical hygiene, but in practice we meet his spirit in the work of hygienic reform in our own public life. According to the

¹ Deuteronomy xxv. 4: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn."

Scriptural conception, religion, morality, and hygiene are congruous. The bodily health of the individual is held in the same esteem as his spiritual soundness, as his religious constitution. One is inseparable from the other. The strict observance of sanitary measures was best secured by making religion and political law identical. "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy" (Leviticus xix. 2). Holy is God alone. To his holiness, corresponds purity of heart, and in the effort to gain purity of heart, external bodily cleanliness. The old Israelitic law forbade gluttony and intemperance. The use of the flesh of diseased animals or animals which had been killed by beasts of prey, as well as the meat which had not been thoroughly drained of blood was prohibited.

Even at the time of Noah it was illegal to eat meat from a living animal. All kinds of vegetable foods were permitted; as was the meat of herbivorous animals whose digestive organs were best adapted to the assimilation of such food; all kinds of fishes with scales and fins which were capable of a high degree of locomotion, while cartilaginous fishes, which decay rapidly, were not included in the diet. Likewise, the many diseases arising from the consumption of clams, and reptiles, poisoning contracted from eating oysters all argue for the ancient Hebrew law which excluded these delicacies from the table. The ancient Jews were careful in pointing out the dangers of immoderate use of meat as food and especially in calling attention to the presence of trichinas in pork. The use of pork according to Virchow makes men stupid and lazy, while it also makes for a lower degree of intelligence. The spread and contagion of diseases from animals to men, and the decomposition of particles of blood which might remain in the cadaver of the animal are counteracted by the regulation prescribing the "Shchito" and other hygienic measures which rid the flesh of the animal blood in as thorough a manner as is practically possible. By this method two other beneficial results are achieved:

1. The meat keeps fresh for a much longer period.
2. The meat becomes more easily digestible.

In close connection with the food regulations are the measures aiming at bodily cleanliness, through clothing specifications and hygienic and curative baths.

Of great social-hygienic significance is the Sabbath, mention of which has already been made. The Sabbath day not only gave the workers a much-needed day of rest, but also was the source of physical, mental and spiritual recuperation which made the work of the coming week more endurable.

The entire life in Israel was hygienically regulated. Agriculture and the handicrafts were throughout the period of the independence of the Hebrew state the two principal fields of endeavor. All hygienic measures which were taken by the Hebrews were for the benefit and the observance of the entire population and not merely for certain classes as was the case among other nations of antiquity. "A right and a law," this rigid Biblical maxim was also pertinent to the field of hygiene.

The security of the individual, the upholding of the rights of life and property are considered as the prime functions of the Mosaic law. To this end every effort is made to curb egotism, the fundamental cause of all crime. In the law which says: Be ye holy even as is your God, the death sentence is pronounced on all those conditions and practices which might stain moral and spiritual purity and from this axiom we deduce the postulate: "Love thy neighbor as thyself" without the popular appendix to this age-old motto: No one is nearer to you than you yourself.

Just as the moralist subordinates all specific rules to the general, fundamental laws of love, so does the jurist subordinate all technicalities to the universal law of justice and equality. The Biblical law knew no pariahs, no classes, no personalities, no discrimination. All shared equally in the benefits of the common law. Even the stranger is on a basis of equality with the native citizens. "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger as for one of your own country: for I am the Lord your God" (Leviticus xxiv. 22). The women, who among all other peoples of antiquity were held in contempt, the prisoners of war, who elsewhere are the involuntary victims of the victor, the slaves, the poor and the beggars, yea, even the criminal, all are equal before the law. All are watched over with equal care by the scrutinous eye of Justice. The privileges of classes and professions, which were taken for granted among other nations, are scorned by the law of the Hebrews. Before the law at least the individual is secure and his right respected.

As a corollary to these rights of the individual, expressed in diverse places and ways, stand the laws which prohibit and punish any violation or infringement of these rights, of life, liberty and property. They are stated with equal emphasis and expressed in terms of equal rigidity as are the positive laws upon which they are based.

The Mosaic law is especially hostile to the giving of any kind of shelter or protection to criminals whose guilt is known. He against whom there was sufficient evidence to convict him of premeditated murder, could even be led away from the altar to receive

his punishment, or to hear his judgment. In like manner might be treated who swore falsely against his fellow man. He who was guilty of unpremeditated murder was given asylum in some refuge city, but was nevertheless not altogether freed from punishment. Cases of less serious nature such as personal injury through assault and battery were punished by correspondingly severe penalties, in order to make their occurrence less frequent. Kidnapping, which was of frequent occurrence in the world of antiquity, was punishable with death. Encroachment upon rights of property, theft and other crimes were adequately dealt with by the law.

The laws enacted for the protection of the helpless were of great significance. Thus it was prohibited to curse a deaf person, to place an obstruction in the path of a blind person, to denounce any one publicly without giving him adequate notice.

Another group of laws is directed against manslaughter and other less serious cases of neglect and carelessness.

Lastly all measures which pertained to the support and continued existence of the state, the organs of public order, the bodies and officers in the legislative branch of the government, the police, the judiciary and the executive,—all were provided for in a way which did not seriously impair the material welfare of the individual.

The chief power was of course in the hands of Moses. He fills the post of law-giver and regent without remuneration. Later the leadership of the people was confided to a king. That this king should receive his means of support from the people was already regarded by Samuel as a royal right. It is, however, expressly stated that the king does not possess the right of usurping the property rights of his subjects. The manner in which the king was to receive his compensation was strictly indicated by legal provisions, viz., from the people in the form of personal property.

The judicial powers were in the hands of Judges who were elders serving without pay. The police force and executive officials were usually public officers who served also without pay.

In the ancient Hebrew state we do not find any evidence of a school budget. The teachers served voluntarily and without stipend. Public schools were unknown. Whatever the children were supposed to be informed on outside of their practical life's work, namely, the history of their people, the parents were supposed to supply in connection with their religious usages, especially during the numerous holidays. It was one of the duties of the priests to teach the laws unto the people. For this the priests received one-tenth of the crops, but otherwise they served without pay. At the

time of Samuel we see the rise of prophet schools, where a prophet functions as the teacher of young men in the Scriptures, in religious song and often in reading and writing. Out of this group of educated people certain ones might at times have been called into the public service.

About the only public work of which we have knowledge is the building of the tabernacle together with the construction of the sacred vessels and vestments, and the building of roads. The cost of these works and their upkeep was covered by voluntary contribution. In such matters the Mosaic law has few prescriptions, but leaves all to the discretion of the individuals. Many a matter which nowadays is regulated by governmental means was left to private or communal generosity in the days of Moses. Only for religious purposes is ever a single tax levied. This tax called "The Half Shekel" was collected from every male; as the name implies, it consisted of a half shekel per capita. Besides this, the payment of the annual tithe was prescribed by law.

The assessment for the annual tithe which was used for the support of the tribe of Levy, who performed the religious services for the whole people, was determined by the size of the actual income. Every one was rated according to his declaration concerning his financial—or rather agricultural—ability to pay. A modern economist looking at the economic conditions of Israel from the modern point of view, would indeed be tempted to believe that he were looking at a land of dreams.

From this ancient order we may well draw many practical suggestions of great significance, not only we as individuals but also our society as a whole, our modern governments.

I shall close with the words of Kübel:

"Oh happy people! That which is regarded as the greatest achievement of modern times, that which was accomplished in the Occident only after streams of blood had washed away all opposition, after countless crimes had been committed and after enormous sacrifices had been made, that, all that was possessed and enjoyed by the ancient Israelites three thousand years ago. And what lay at the foundation of this liberty, what secured this liberty to that ancient people? Not self-invented theories, not the "good common sense" of the masses, but the law, this same law, which has so often been denounced as barbaric and antediluvian."