

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHARITY

IN BIBLICAL TIMES.

Submitted as partial requirement for the degree of Rabbi  
at the HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

Lee Joseph Lovinger.

8  
April 1, 1914.

## CONTENTS.

Preface		page 1
Chapter I	Introduction	2
Chapter II	First Period, Hospitality	8
Chapter III	Development of a Dependent Class	15
Chapter IV	Second Period, Legislative Measures	22
Chapter V	Third Period, Almsgiving	34
Chapter VI	Theological Phase of Charity	40
Chapter VII	Tendencies for Future Development	46
Bibliography		

PREFACE.

The object of this study is a double one: to bring together in one paper all the Biblical material on the subject of charity and to systematize that material from a developmental viewpoint. This is, then, not a theological nor an ethical study, but a purely sociological investigation, an attempt to understand in the light of the general social and economic conditions the amount, methods, and point of view with which charity was administered in ancient Israel. It is an effort to trace one of the social institutions through a development of a thousand years, both for its own sake and for the insight which we may thus obtain into the life of the Hebrew people, especially of those little-known and obscure individuals who are so often referred to as "the poor".

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.

Charity is the means by which a people attempts to solve the problem of poverty. This includes the direct giving of goods and services, which we usually understand by the term, as well as more indirect methods of relieving suffering, and also any efforts to prevent poverty by legal or moral means. Obviously, this is a part of the entire social complex and cannot be considered apart from the general conditions out of which the charity arises. A people living under primitive conditions will have neither the same need nor the same means of satisfying it as a more highly developed and more cultured nation. Now, the Hebrew nation, as reflected in the various books of the Bible, shows a long and complicated course of development, lasting for fully a thousand years under circumstances which we can follow, at least in part; and bringing them from a primitive group of kinship clans to a loose confederacy of tribes, then to a nation, next to two nations, to a period of exile and finally to the situation of a weak and tributary people, held together only by a religious bond. The charity of the people shows a development parallel to that of their life in general.

Charity is dependent, in general, upon three factors for its nature. It depends upon the economic life of the people,--the need for charity. Where there are no economic classes, no contrast between rich and poor, charity in the modern sense cannot exist. Second, it depends upon the ethical and religious tone of the people,--their willingness to give. Some tribes settle the problem of the weak and infirm, the aged or the sickly child, by the rapid but crude means of killing them or exposing them to the elements. Because the Hebrew people did not harbor such ideas, charity became one of their institutions. In the third place, charity depends upon the legal provisions

or the reign of custom under which a people live,--the prescribed method of giving charity. That the three of these factors are shown in very different colors in the various books of the Bible is a well-known fact.

We must trace all three of these determining factors at the same time that we examine the charity which went along with them. That is, the problem of charity, when thoroughly studied, brings us at once to the heart of a people's life, touching upon the political, economic, and ethical phases of their existence.

<sup>i</sup>  
By the definition of the term which I have propounded, I must likewise consider the efforts at prevention of poverty and at the establishment of equality among the people. A number of humanitarian provisions which are not charity in a narrower sense come under this investigation. The great endeavor to protect the condition of Hebrew slaves and to prevent their continual enslavement, and the established custom of redeeming land and maintaining the clan are two cases in point. Moreover, there is a negative phase of charity which is especially prominent in the books of the prophets, consisting of kindness to the poor, not to oppress them nor to take an unfair advantage of their down-trodden state. The laws with regard to interest, revealing a primitive state of culture, show this tendency. A very perplexing problem is the relation of charity to ecclesiastical dues. The two came from the same people, often in a similar way, and were sometimes actually united. At times the "man of God" וְאִישׁ אֵלֹהִים was among the recipients of charity; in a later period, the priesthood absorbed much which had been given to the poor--tithes, sacrifices, etc. If the question receives a somewhat confused treatment in this paper, it is, at least in part, because the Bible shows us no one clear answer and because at many periods the practise of the people must have been a very indefinite one.

The Bible provides us with a great deal of material on the subject of charity, but it is so scattered and fragmentary as to give no clear picture of conditions until very carefully sifted. There are about a hundred and fifty~~xx~~ references to charity, scattered through the entire Bible, and appearing in every book except Canticles, Lam., Ezra, and eight of the Minor Prophets. As these are all small books, written for specific purposes, the argumentum silentium is here quite meaningless. Some type of charitable effort appears all through the history of the Hebrew people. The Biblical references to charity are of three kinds, varying much in value to the investigator. The most specific, but least genuine material is in the legal codes. Here we find many provisions for the poor, some of which are so peculiar and so conflicting with the historical evidence that ~~they~~<sup>1</sup> were probably theoretical and were never practised in the form in which we have them. Another kind of material, rich in amount but lacking specific details, is in the moral precepts, admonishing one to be kind to the poor. At times,<sup>2</sup> this becomes definite and very important. The best material for our purpose is contained in the incidents which reveal the life of the people. Here we see the natural actions and thought of the people brought in incidentally to the main story. We must be cautious here, however, and remember that these references may show the custom at the time the story was written down and not at the time of the incident related.<sup>3</sup> All this divergent material must be brought together and systematized before we can see the ~~con~~<sup>c</sup>ceptions and ~~u~~<sup>d</sup>sages in a clear form. Even so, we may miss much of the motive which animated an Oriental, living three thousand years ago.

-----  
 1. Lev. 25, the Jubile. 2. Is. 58; Job ~~28~~<sup>31</sup>. 3. Ruth 4.7, "this was the custom of olden time."

The terms which are used for the various phases of charity are highly significant. In the first place, the Bible is almost entirely lacking in abstract terms for the subject. There are no Biblical words for charity, hospitality, or alms-giving. In every case the fact is expressed concretely--"Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"<sup>1</sup> --or in general language,--"Oppress not the poor"<sup>2</sup>; "have mercy upon the needy"<sup>3</sup>. The word צדקה, which in post-Biblical literature means charity, in the Bible always has the meaning<sup>4</sup> of righteousness, justification in a court of law, or righteous deeds. In only three places may the word<sup>5</sup> possibly be construed in the sense of "charity", and even in these (which are all very late passages), the meaning is not conclusive, and the usual significance fits into the parallelism almost, if not quite, as well. These are, first, the famous phrase,

צדקה תציל ממוט, "righteousness saves from death", which appears with two opposing clauses; as to this, Cornill is the only one who maintains that the meaning is "charity"; Wildeboer concedes this as possible, and Frankenburg, together with the dictionaries, insist on the meaning of "righteousness". The other passage needs "charity" for an exact parallel, "break off thy sins by alms-giving, and thy iniquities by showing mercy to the poor". Even here the broader meaning is possible, although the late date (B.C.E. 164) makes the post-Biblical usage likely.

Another late passage uses the words מנחת עניים "gifts to the poor"<sup>6</sup>,

1. Is. 58.7. 2. Amos 8.4. 3. Prov. 19.17. 4. Rypins: Charity in Judaism, p. 21. Brown, Briggs, Driver Dict. 5. Prov. 10.2; 11.4. Dan. 4.24. 6. Esth. 9.22.



the sole use of the phrase in the Bible, although in the verb form, "thou shalt give", it is more common. References to begging occur three times in the Bible but in none of these is a technical term employed. These all appear in curses, and are all paraphrased,--"shall come and crouch for a piece of silver and a loaf of bread"; "never have I seen the righteous forsaken or his seed asking for bread"; "let his children be fatherless and ask". We thus have three words used in the same sense,

לֹא־שִׁתְּחוּת, שָׁאָל and אָמַן.

The various laws and practises have all their own terms, which will be noticed when we come to the different subjects. There remain for consideration only the seven words used for the poor, the class to whom charity is to be given, or who are in need of it. The proper word for indigent is אָמַן, which is not the usual word employed. The most common term is 'אָנָּה, which means originally, "one who is humbled", and thus received the meaning of poor, needy, miserable. The word underwent a long evolution, as in the Psalms it takes on the meaning of the poor but pious Israelites opposed to the haughty nations, or the poor within the nation, oppressed by the rich. The last meaning which it took on was that of a religious group, who called themselves "the poor", probably in the sense of the modern politicians who ally themselves with "the common people". It may be possible to identify this group with the Essenes. We must distinguish 'אָנָּה from אָנָּה, which meant, "one who humbles himself" and received the derived meaning of pious or (perhaps) meek. Paterson will not admit the last meaning, even in the one reference to Moses. It is still a moot question whether

1. I Sam. 2.36; Ps. 37.25; 109.10. 2. Driver; art. Poor, Hastings Bible Dict. 3. Wellhausen, Psalms, Polychrome Bible. Cf. Ps. 18.27. 4. Driver, art. Poor 5. Paterson, art. on Poor, nyc. Biblica. 6. Num. 12.3.



the two were originally different words, or were distinguished by the Massoretes. In several places, they are interchanged, that is, if we assume that the distinction is a thoroughgoing one. It is notable that <sup>1</sup>עני is never used in opposition with <sup>2</sup>עשיר; the usual word in such a situation is עני, although two other words, <sup>3</sup>דל and <sup>4</sup>פני are also used at times. All four of these terms are used interchangeably in parallelism. The original meaning of <sup>3</sup>דל is thin, feeble, reduced, thus coming to the signification of poor. <sup>4</sup>פני meant in want of anything, and thus took on the two shades of poor and miserable. Its later meaning, like that of <sup>5</sup>עני was a party, the Ebionites, who receive some mention in the New Testament and also in rabbinic literature. Three rare words are used for poor in late works; <sup>1</sup>פסנ seems to be an Assyrian loan-word. <sup>2</sup>הלל is very doubtful, both in origin and exact meaning, and appears in but one psalm; while <sup>3</sup>עני means stripped, destitute, and then poor. The verb <sup>4</sup>עני is used in two forms <sup>5</sup>עני, <sup>6</sup>עני to mean the impoverished. This elaborate list of terms for the poor shows beyond any doubt that the people were familiar <sup>with</sup> seeing and to thinking about the poor, while on the other hand, begging must have been practically unknown.

The study of the whole field of Biblical charity discloses three distinct kinds of charity which were prevalent in three periods. These epochs overlapped, but are still to be clearly seen in our Biblical books. The first is the primitive period, when hospitality is the only form of charity. Then comes a long growth, bringing the rise of a dependent class, and the second period of charity, that of legal provision for the poor. In the third period, after the Exile, alms-giving first appears and became soon the prevalent mode of charitable action.

1. Eccl. 4.13; 9.15. 2. aterson, rt. on Poor. 3. Ps. 10.8, 10, 14.  
4. Ps. 102.7. 5. Lev. 25.25, 25, 39, 47; 27.8.

## CHAPTER II. FIRST PERIOD, HOSPITALITY.

Primitive charity consisted of hospitality. Society did not present any gradations of wealth and poverty; the clan was a unit in the economic, political, and social sense; no member of the clan could be in want when any other member had enough to eat. While the Hebrew people at the time of the Judges were by no means a primitive people, having already had considerable history and some contact with the ancient civilizations, still, they possessed many of the primitive social institutions. The most important of these, and the best preserved in any parts of the world even today, is the clan or gens. This was founded, usually, on kinship, but could be increased by covenant as well. It was the all-important unit of life, and was carried over from the nomadic to the agricultural stage with hardly any alteration. The wandering clan became a stationary village, while the relations of the members remained the same. "Industry, religion, marriage, and nearly the whole social life of the people, came under the surveillance of the clan. Property rights were vested in the clan, and only the clan had any legal existence practically."<sup>1</sup>

As far as we can see from remnants in Biblical literature, the early Israelites had already advanced to the stage when the land nearer the village was regarded as the permanent possession of one family within the village community, while that farther away was used to apportion by lot at regular intervals in order to maintain the equality of the various branches of the group. Analogous practises are fairly common,

---

<sup>1</sup> Day: Social Life of the Hebrew, p. 25.

being found among the Russian villagers (the mir), and other peasant s.

"The North American Indians, the Peruvians, the Chittagong Hill Tribes, the Borneans, and the South Sea Islanders, all appear to have cultivated in common and to have possessed common rights ~~of~~<sup>1</sup> in the produce."

W.J. Sumner reports the same practise in the Yakuts of Siberia, together with occasional redistribution of the land among the families of the sib.<sup>2</sup>

Buhl tells us of a modern Palestinian custom to cast lots annually for the various fields of the village, which are to be cultivated for the year by the different householders. He refers to the frequent expression,

"to cast the lot with", as in Micah 2.5 and Jer. 37.12. The importance of this custom will come back to us again in the redemption of the land for the clan and the attempt through this to restore the early equality whenever lost.

Inside the clan, then, no such thing as charity could exist. Every householder had his own plot; widows were provided for by the institution of the levirate marriage, or by receiving an allotment of land for themselves (as in the case of Naomi, Ruth 4.5); minor children belonged to the clan. One would share with another should accident come upon any. But the man who for the moment is away from his clan is in a far different situation. Even though he carried his own provisions with him, he might at any moment be in want or danger. Therefore hospitality becomes a prime duty to all primitive peoples. The savage has a double attitude toward the stranger; he is feared and honored,--that is, he is taboo, either as being under the protection of the deity or as having strange spirits clinging to him. Ratzel, speaking of the South Sea Islanders, remarks<sup>4</sup> "The custom of treating strangers as enemies, under a

1.H.L.Roth, in Source Book of Social Origins, p.100. 2.Ibid.p.86,87.  
3.American Journal of Theology, Vol.I., p.731-40. 4.In Source Book of Social Origins, p.780.

superstitious fear of misfortune and sickness, was a great hindrance to expansion...If strangers belonged to a neighboring island they were not treated altogether as strangers, since they were not regarded as uncanny.<sup>1</sup> Still, unless actually hostile, most strangers are at once received with complete hospitality by primitive peoples. "If a man entered an Indian house, whether a villager, a tribesman, or a stranger, it was the duty of the women of the house to set food before him... This law of hospitality and its universality, implies, first, the existence of common stores, and secondly, wherever found it implies communistic living in large households." Even trade among such peoples expresses itself entirely in the form of gifts of hospitality, which are exchanged until both parties are satisfied.<sup>2</sup> This trait of hospitality is a well-known<sup>one</sup> among the Semites, especially among the Arabs. To the Arab it means partaking of food, usually bread and salt, after which each party is sacred to the other for two days and a night.<sup>3</sup> While by no means always adhered to, it is most highly commended in the Koran and in Arab poetry, and attested by many romances and actual incidents.<sup>4</sup>

The early agricultural villages of the Hebrew settlers in Canaan persisted in their desert virtue of hospitality. It was practised toward fellow-Israelites, proselytes, and foreigners, and was likewise received from all these classes of the population. The early writers, E. J., the authors of many stories in the Books of Judges and Samuel, + the Deuteronomist laid great stress on it. It must therefore have reflected the prophetic standpoint, as a part of their great program to maintain the simple virtues and the strong manhood of the early times. A list of the most conspicuous examples of hospitality follows:

1. L. H. Morgan, in Source Book of Social Origins, p. 864. 2. C. Buecher, in Ibid. p. 114, 127. 3. Margoliouth: Hospitality (Arabian), Hastings Encyc. of Religion and Ethics. 4. Koran xc. 14; xi. 73; more on almsgiving.

1. Abraham entertaining the angels. Gen. 18. (J)
2. Lot receives them, while the men of Sodom threaten them. Gen. 19. 3-10 (J)
3. Rebecca gives water to Eliezer and his camels; Laban receives them into his home. Gen. 24. 17-20; 31-33. (J)
4. Jacob and his family received in Egypt. Gen. 43. 32; 46. 34. (J)
5. Jethro receives Moses in his flight. Ex. 2. 20. (J)
6. Rahab receives the spies and hides them. Josh. 2. 1-22. <sup>1</sup>
7. Gideon offers food to the angel. Jud. 6. 18-20. (J)
8. Manoah wishes to give food to his heavenly messenger. Jud. 13. 15 (J)
9. Samuel entertains Saul. I. Sam. 9. 22. (early, perhaps J).
10. David on his flight is received by Ahimelech the priest of Nob, who gives him even of the sacred show-bread. (E) I. Sam. 1. 1-6.
11. David is aided and entertained by the king of Moab and by Achish, king of Gath. I. Sam. 2. 3; 27. 3.
12. The witch of Endor forces food upon Saul. I. Sam. 28. 31-25. (J)
13. David takes Ishbosh into his house. II. Sam. 9. 1-13. (J)
14. Shobi and Barzillai bring food to David on his flight before Absalom. II. Sam. 17. 27; 19. 2.
15. An old prophet of Bethel, eager to offer hospitality to the man of God from Judah, even lies to him to induce him to stay. I. Kings 13. 11-22. <sup>2</sup>
16. The widow of Sarephath gives Elijah of her oil and flour. I. K. 17. 9-16. (8th cent.)
17. Obadiah hid 100 prophets and fed them. I. K. 18. 4. (8th century).
18. The Shunammite woman arranges a regular room for Elijah. II. K. 4. 8-10. (8th cent.)
19. A man from Baal shalish brought food to the prophetic band. II. K. 4. 42. (8th cent.)
20. Menemias fed 150 at his own table when governor. Men. 5. 18. (authentic memoirs.)
21. Hospitality is claimed by Job as one of his virtues. Job 31. 17. (about 700)

-----  
 1. A difficult passage to date; Kittel, J; Steuernagel, E; Bennet, Holzinger, JE; Cornill, Rd; Driver, JE plus Rd.  
 2. A late passage, probably post-exilic, according to Cornill and Steuernagel.



In addition to these, we find the following instances of international hospitality.

1. Solomon entertained the Queen of Sheba. I.K.10.1-13.
2. The Pharaoh received Hada of Damascus. I.K.11.17-22.
3. Hezekiah entertained the ambassadors of Berodach-baladan of Babylon, and was reproved by Isaiah for showing them his treasures. II.K.20.12-19.

Hospitality was thus to be extended to anyone, but was especially to be given to those under the protection of God, angels, prophets, and the like. All strangers were to some extent under this same protection. Most of the references are in early sources, although there are enough later ones to show that hospitality did not die out in the later time, but merely became less important as the one means of extending charitable aid. We know, indeed, that hospitality is still a method of giving charity in many of the rural districts of our own country. But in these cases very often the favor was not to the one receiving entertainment, but to the one bestowing it. We note how eager Abraham was that the angels should eat, or the witch of Endor that Saul should partake of food, or the prophet of Bethel in ~~the~~ #15 above. The reason for this was that hospitality still held the ancient character of a covenant. All wanted to covenant with the prophets, and through them with God. As Trumbull remarks, "Crossing the threshold is itself a covenant in early India." The Arabs welcome guests with bread and salt, which make them temporary members of the clan and inviolate, or by pouring out the blood of a kid or a lamb. This must have been the sentiment of the hospitality which we find in the Bible.

1. Trumbull: Threshold Covenant. p.5;22.



Hospitality, however, was not always practised. Several instances of its denial occur.

1. Joseph pretends to consider his brothers as spies. Ge n.42.9(J)
2. Edom and the Amorites refuse roadway and water to the Israelites on their way to Canaan. Num.20.17;21.22. (E)
3. Jael gives Sisera food and strikes him down while drinking. Jud.5. This would not be a violation of hospitality. The later story, in Ch.4 represents her as killing him when asleep, hardly a thing for which to praise her so highly.<sup>1</sup>
4. Succoth and Peniel refuse food and shelter to Gideon, who punishes them later. Jud.8.5-9; 15-17. (J)
5. Men of Benjamin violate the sanctity of a Levite and his concubine who are lodging among them, and are punished by a confederacy of all Israel. A very late story on an early basis. Jud.19 and 20.<sup>2</sup>
6. David is refused a gift by Nabal and intends to take vengeance; Abigail dissuades him. I.Sam.25.4-23. (J)
7. Hanun of Ammon dishonors the ambassadors of David, who punishes him by war. II.Sam.10.4; 12.31. (J)
8. In the parable of Nathan, deceit occurs, as in the story of the prophet of Bethel. II.Sam.12.4; I.K.13.11.

In Prov.25.1-3 we read a warning against hospitality, "Be not desirous of hisainties, seeing they are deceitful meat." Different opinions<sup>1</sup> therefore prevailed about it at the time when the author of Proverbs wrote, but in the earlier period from which most of the foregoing examples come, hospitality was practically inviolate and was most highly honored.

1. Day: Social Life of the Hebrews, p.55. 2. Cornill ascribes this to J<sup>1</sup> and the final form to R<sup>2</sup>; Steuernagel, to H<sup>1</sup>e, then to R<sup>2</sup>d, and finally R<sup>2</sup>p; Bennett and Adeney, Ch.19, JE, and 20, R<sup>2</sup>p on the basis of JE.

The method of hospitality appears clearly in many of our examples. It was customary to meet the guest, to provide water for the feet, rest, food and drink, housing and feeding of his animals, and lodging for the night. Guests were inviolate at any price (Gen. 19.8; Jud. 19.22). Abraham accompanied his guests on their way. No remuneration was accepted, but gifts were often received (Gen. 24.53; 43.11. Job 42.11., etc.).

There seem to have been stations between Egypt and Palestine where rest and water were provided for the traveller. Cf. Gen. 42.27; 43.21; Ex. 4.24; Jer. 9.2; Num. 20.19; Deut. 2.27. These indicate that a regular traffic must have been going on and that the law of hospitality was even carried into the wilderness, and applied not only to a man's own house or tent.

The sources from which most of our references to hospitality come are early, the greater part of them coming from the eighth and ninth centuries. The very oldest is that of Jael, where hospitality took a secondary place to national feeling, but most of the others have a different point of view. The prophets or other "men of God" - אנשי האלהים - were favorite recipients of hospitality at all times, up to the present day, in fact. For they were always welcome, respected, often feared, and always in need. While the priests had a regular share in the sacrifices and the oracles, the prophet had often neither (although Samuel, for one, received pay for reading the oracle). The professional prophets lived, in great part, on charity, received in the form of hospitality.

But in the codes we find another kind of charity, different from the preceding, and soon to supersede it in general practise. This was legal measures of relief, which presuppose the existence of social classes and the evolution of a dependent class among the people.

### CHAPTER III. DEVELOPMENT OF A DEPENDENT CLASS.

During the early agricultural stage of the Hebrew people, there existed no dependent class, no begging, and no alms-giving. Rich and poor were very nearly equal, all tilling the soil alike, and all living in substantially the same way. Boaz and Nabal, rich men as they were, lived and worked and rejoiced with their hirelings. Saul, even after his election as king, ploughed with oxen in the field. Hired servants were rare, for the free peasants tilled their own plots of land, or assisted the large land-owner for a return in kind; slaves were few in number and seem to have been practically members of the household. (See the account of Eliezer, which, although fictitious, had a basis in the customs of the time. Gen. 24). The situation was by no means idyllic, as the absence of poor meant rather the absence of rich; famines occurred, comforts were few in number; still, such as life was, it was enjoyed in substantial equality. J., by far our richest source for hospitality, knows no social discriminations and no class conflict.

This factor first entered the nation at the time of Solomon, when trade became for the first time an occupation of the Israelites. As Wellhausen remarks,<sup>1</sup> "Commerce was in the old time followed exclusively by the Canaanite towns, so that the word 'Canaanite' was used in the sense of 'trader'. By and by Israel began to tread in Canaan's footsteps (Hosea 12.8,9). The towns grew far more influential than the country; money notably increased; and the zeal for piety was quite unable to arrest the changes which set in. The kings, from Solomon onwards, were the first to set the bad example; they eagerly sought to acquire suitable harbors, and in company or in competition with the Tyrians entered upon large commercial transactions. The extortions of the corn

1. Wellhausen: History of Israel and Judah, p. 73.

market, the formation of large estates, the frequency of mortgages, all show that the small peasant proprietorship was unable to hold its own against the accumulations of wealth; the wage-receiving class increased, and cases in which Hebrews sold themselves into slavery were not rare."

The turning point in this expansion was the reign of Solomon. At this time began a four-fold tendency. It was marked by the rise of cities, commerce, a class of skilled laborers, and the growth of luxury. In this connection the growth of poverty was an inevitable fact. The first tendency is the growth of cities. This began in the time of David, when the rude kingdom of the hills for the first time established a genuine capital in the Canaanite city of Jerusalem, then newly captured.<sup>1</sup> It is true, we find a group of dissatisfied even before this time, in the adherents of David at the Cave of Adullam (I Sam. 22.2) and later, in those of Absalom (II Sam. 15.1-6). But this tendency did not fully develop until later, ~~when~~ Together with the rise of city life goes the growth of trade. The trade of Solomon, of which so much has been said, was probably not genuine international trade. It was rather an importation of luxuries and materials for the splendor of the court; these could not be paid for, and had to be compensated by ceding to Hiram of Tyre 20 cities in Galilee as well as paying him in wheat and oil. (I K 9.12) Some trade, however, must have begun; we read of relations with Phoenicia (I K 5.1-12; 16.31; Amos 1.9) and with Egypt (I K 3.1; 10.28; Gen. 37.25; 43.11); while Ezekiel gives a list of the products of Tyre in chapter 27. The chief exports seem to have been spices, nuts, and honey. In I K 20.34 one of the conditions of the treaty between Ahab and the king of Damascus is that the former might have bazaars in the fairs at Damascus.

-----  
1. Wallis: Sociology of the Bible. p.120 ff.



Skilled laborers as well as their products were imported by Solomon. The only trades of which we hear before that time are those of potter and smith, while after this eleven trades are mentioned, such as bakers, weavers, fullers, carpenters, stonecutters, masons, barbers, and silversmiths.<sup>1</sup> That is, articles of luxury were now being manufactured and used; the primitive poverty and simplicity of the earlier time was disappearing. This luxury was strongly denounced by the prophets, who are our greatest source of information about it, and by the Rechabites, who stood for a return to the earlier mode of life, the rigor and stern morality of the desert (Jer. 35.2-10; IIK 10.15). This development, which began about 970 with the reign of Solomon, continued progressively through the following centuries and we find it in full fruition in the 8th century at the time of the first literary prophets.

Amos recognizes the problem in the famous words, (2.6,7; 8.4-6) "Because they sold the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes. They pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor." (5.11,12) "Your treading is upon the poor, and ye take from him burdens of wheat...they turn aside the poor in the gate of justice." (4.1) "Hear ye king of Bashan, that are in the mountain of Samaria, that oppress the poor, which crush the needy, which say unto their lords, Bring and let us drink." A few years afterward, Hosea attacks Israel (12.7), "He is a trafficker, the balances of deceit are in his hands, he loveth to oppress." Amos tells us likewise of the luxury of the wealthy class, -- "Ye that lie upon beds of ivory, and that stretch themselves out upon their couches; that eat the lambs out of the flock, and calves out of the midst of the stall; that sing idle songs to the sound of the viol; that devise for themselves instruments of music like David; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments." (Amos 6.1-6)

1. Paton: The Reign of Solomon, Biblical World, Vol. 10; p. 24.

If the countryman Amos in the eighth century found conditions bad, we must expect to note the same attitude on the part of Micah, who came from the same group a <sup>half-</sup> century later. Micah reports, (2.2) "They covet fields and take them by violence...so they oppress a man and his heritage." Isaiah, living in Jerusalem in the <sup>eighth</sup> ~~seventh~~ century, reports the same condition.--(3.14,15)"Ye have eaten of the vineyard, the spoil of the poor is in your houses. What mean ye that ye crush my people and grind the faces of the poor?" (10.2)"To turn aside the needy from judgement, and to take away the right of the poor from my people; that widows may be their prey, and that they may rob the fatherless." (32.7)"He deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, when he speaketh against the poor in judgement." He asks for a different course of conduct (1.17,20)"Relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.".."Your princes do not judge the fatherless". The Messianic time shall see a different state of affairs, (11.4)"But with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth". (14.30,32)"And the firstborn of the poor shall feed, and the needy shall lie down in safety." Finally he becomes specific with regard to one practise, that of monopolizing the land and with it, the right of citizenship, (5.8-10)"Woe to them that join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the ~~first~~ earth." The gravity of this comes to us when we note how the life of the nation was bound up with the free <sup>2</sup> tenure of the soil, how only land-owners were full citizens, and how the paternal estate was not to be alienated. The whole trouble between Ahab and Naboth had occurred because the latter would not sell his vineyard, "The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee"(I K 21.3 ff.).

1. Driver, authentic; Cornill, the same; Sternagel considers this post-exilic. 2. Buhl: Sozialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten, p.45,46.



That this situation of the eighth century was continued in the seventh is shown in the writings of Jeremiah, with his realistic picture of Jerusalem before its fall.--(5.2)<sup>28</sup>"They judge not the cause of the fatherless,..and the right of the needy do they not judge." Among a list of crimes, he enumerates,(7.6)"If ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow". In the last hours of the siege, he tells the people,(22.3,16)"Do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow"."Thy father judged the cause of the poor and needy, then it was well. But thine eyes and thy heart are but for thy covetousness,.. and for oppression and for violence" Ezekiel in the early days of the Exile speaks in the same tone(16.7-17;22.7,12,29;45.9)"Remove violence and spoil..take away your exactions from my people." He shows a beginning of a new tendency at the same time,"He hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with his garment; he hath not given forth upon usury." Here justice,certain legal regulations, and the arising spirit of almsgiving are listed together. The same note recurs after the Exile as well,--(Lev.19.9,10)"Oppress not the stranger, nor the widow, nor the fatherless, nor the poor." (Mal.3.5)"Those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless,and that turn aside the stranger."

The prophets thus took the side of the poor continually. But they were not social agitators with a program for the reconstruction of society. Their plan seems to have been to arouse the old virtues of the simple life and to bring back the pure worship and pure morality of that earlier time. They did not realize that the worship of their day was by far the purer of the two, and that the evils of which they complained were the inevitable accompaniment of a growing civilization. They did see, as none of their contemporaries did, that these evils were certain to bring the down fall of the state which gave them free rein.

The dependent class received its greatest recognition in the great code of the seventh century, Deuteronomy. Here we find the different groups enumerated in the prophetic spirit, the widows, the orphans, the stranger, and the poor, with legal provision for their maintenance. At the same time this code brings a new class of poor, who are to share in the charity of the people. The priests of the "high places" are no longer to officiate there and to receive a share of every slaughtered animal as their pay for sacrificing it. According to Deut. all worship is to be conducted at the Temple at Jerusalem. The priests of the "high places" can either come to the Temple and share in its functions( <sup>1</sup> a privilege which seems to have been denied them), or are to be supported by the charity of their own district. Deut. thus has a considerable charity problem to face in its legislation.

We cannot imagine a genuine commercial society even at this time, however. Money was lent, but from the prohibition of interest we see that there was no conception of capital; all lending was for present needs, and for that reason interest would be hardship. The people consisted mainly of two classes, rich and poor, with a small group of handicraftsman and a rapidly decreasing class of small land-owners. In the time of Menachem a tax of 50 shekels fell on 50,000 <sup>2</sup> ~~50,000~~ large land-owners, in Ephraim. Nebuchadnezzar took away from Jerusalem in <sup>3</sup> 597 7000 such men and 1000 smiths. After the last deportation only the proletariat were left in the land "to be vine-dressers and husband-men"(II K 25.12). In the post-exilic period a dependent class was continuous. We hear references to it in Nehemiah, in Proverbs, and in Psalms. It appears even in works which have little interest in such a problem, in Daniel(4.25), Esther(9.19), and Ecclesiastes(5.8). The poor were never again to be overlooked.

<sup>1</sup> Deut. 18; II K 23.9. <sup>2</sup> II K 15.19 ff. <sup>3</sup> II K 24.15.

The development has thus come to its second stage. The primitive structure of society has passed and with it primitive hospitality as well. The social structure was now more complex, with classes of rich and poor clearly marked. The cry of the moral teachers is always for more justice for the poor, for no oppression of the weak and needy, for fair dealings so that the poor of the land may live as well as the more favored ones. The next step was the codification of this demand for justice, an attempt to restore the former equality, at least in part, and to provide for the poor by levies upon the rich. For this purpose the Deuteronomic code built upon the meager foundation in the earlier Book of the Covenant. The latter was compiled shortly before the time of Amos and the <sup>former</sup> ~~latter~~ during the life of Jeremiah--published 621-- and thus show two stages in the social evolution as they expressed themselves through prophetic thought and institutions.

The fundamental principle of the Deuteronomic poor-legislation is the sentence (Deut. 15.11) "For the poor shall never cease out of the land. Therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt surely open thine hand to thy brother, to thy needy, and to thy poor, in thy land". That is, the author has no Messianic expectations; he considers the division of society into rich and poor as natural <sup>and permanent</sup> phenomena; and for that reason he enjoins an elaborate system of relief for the poor. The later breaking down of the whole Deuteronomic system involved the failure of this part of it with the rest, and a new method of relief, almsgiving, was then brought to the fore and became popularized.

#### CHAPTER IV. LEGISLATIVE MEASURES.

The prophetic spirit of humanitarianism had its fruit in laws which aimed, not to make a philanthropic attitude, but to enforce charity and to protect the poor through law. In Deut.10.18 we read that God is "the maker of justice for the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment."<sup>1</sup> The Jews are commanded to be kind to the stranger because they have been in his place when in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> The land belongs to God and therefore He has the right to order the produce shared by all--this may be the remnant of a former system of communal ownership.<sup>3</sup> Charity was not a matter of free will, which might or might not be given; it was to be binding on all members of the community and was expressed in terms of a general human obligation in which even the non-Jew, the "ger," was to share the fruits.

Several of the charity laws of the codes make use of the taboo ordinances. Various things were forbidden to some people and allowed to others. When the owner was forbidden to use them, they might be given to the priests, to the poor, or left to whoever happened to need them at the moment--or might be left entirely unused. The spirit of the prophets was always to give as much as possible to the needy. Moreover in certain things private ownership was abolished by the taboo; anyone might share with the owner himself on equal terms.

1. A striking example of this appears in certain sacrificial feasts, although this is rather a late usage in the Bible. In Deut. 16.11,14, where the festivals are enumerated, the Feast of Tabernacles and the Feast of Weeks are to be enjoyed by the Levite, stranger, fatherless and widow together with the family, in Jerusalem. In a later passage (P) in Ex.12.43-49, the same is extended to the Passover, with

1. Dt.10.18, according to Driver and Carpenter; Ps. Steuernagel.

2. Dt.10.19. 3. Dt.11.10.

the require<sup>ent</sup>~~ment~~ that only one who is circumcised may take part and that a ger must undergo the rite before becoming eligible. The sacrifices were eaten either by the priests or by those who offered them, or were entirely burnt.<sup>1</sup> A qualifying fact is that in the earlier time, when every slaughtering was a sacrifice, the rule of hospitality included all comers. See likewise the tithe(Deut.14.22-27) treated below.

2. Another taboo law is that the corners of the field shall not be reaped entirely, but a little shall be left standing which is to be enjoyed by the poor and the stranger.(Lev.19.9,10;23.22, These passages are both in the Holiness Code and are therefore late, perhaps Exilic. The common practise<sup>of many peoples</sup> to leave a little for the god of fertility is here altered so as to have a humanitarian meaning.

3. A very similar ordinance is associated with this to the effect that gleanings shall not be carefully gathered, but if anything falls it shall be left for the poor and the stranger. This is referred to in both the passages cited from H and also in D(Deut,24.19-22). Here the law is further specified; the farmer shall leave the gleanings of grain, of the olive tree, and of the vineyard, for the poor. By the law in Deut.25.24-5 anyone is allowed to pick grapes or corn from a field to eat and satisfy his hunger, but is not allowed to use the sickle or to take any away, a privilege that is reserved for the owner. Buhl considers this, not merely a taboo law, but a remnant of communal ownership,<sup>2</sup> which permitted anyone to share in the produce of the land. A beautiful illustration of the practise of gleaning exists in the Book of Ruth, where Ruth gleanes in the field of Boaz as a matter of course, but where he gives her some of the reaped barley as a special, personal favor. Ruth 2.2-18, This custom is still in existence in Palestine.

1. Eaten by giver, Lev.17.1-7; Deut.14.22-27; by priests, Lev.2.3;7.30-34, and many others; burned entirely, Lev.1, etc.

2. Buhl: Sociale Verhaeltnisse, p.105.



An analogous case, which, peculiarly, has no connection with charity, is that of fruit trees, treated in H(Lev.19.23-25). The law here states that for the first three years a tree shall be regarded as uncircumcised and the fruit shall not be eaten; the fourth year it is to be devoted to God, and on the fifth year the owner may begin to eat the fruit. One would expect this to be treated like the cases of the corners of the field or the grain of the Sabbatical year, but no mention is made of such a custom.

4. One of the most important regulations and one of the oldest is that of the Sabbatical year, or year of release,  $\gamma\omega\psi, \mu\alpha\omega\eta\alpha\omega$ . This is mentioned in the Book of the Covenant, Ex.23.10,11, by D, in Deut.15.1-3, and by H, in Lev.25.3-7, 17-22. The three codes differ in regard to details but in essentials they are the same. C says, "For six years thou shalt sow thy land and gather its produce; but the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie fallow that the poor of thy people may eat; and what they leave the beast of the field shall eat. Likewise shalt thou do with thy vineyard and thy olive trees." In the version in Deut, only debts are mentioned, which shall be released to Israelites, but not to foreigners. No mention is made of land; as interest was not permitted in Deut, this must mean a remission of all debts and not merely their suspension for a year. This opinion is justified by v.9, which expressly orders the Jew to lend, even if the seventh year is at hand. The passage in H reverts to the matter of land, and states specifically that there shall be neither reaping nor sowing on the seventh year. "And the Sabbath of the land shall be meat for you, for your slaves, male and female, and for your hired servant, and for the sojourner with thee." Here the produce is to be eaten by the owner with the poor, while in C it is reserved for the poor. The idea is that of a Sabbath--the land shall rest-- and also has a charitable content. It is still a moot



question whether the law was absolute, setting a certain date for the whole country, or whether it worked rather as a sort of rotation of different fields. The former is probable, both by reason of the analogy often drawn with the Sabbath(Lev.25), and because of the explicit language of Deut(15.9), "Behold, the seventh year is at hand, the year of release... thou shalt surely open thy land to thy brother, to thy needy and to thy poor in thy land." On this year all the differences between Israelites shall disappear; rich and poor, land-owners and hired laborers alike shall <sup>1</sup>return to the nomadic state in which they were at first.

It is very doubtful to what extent this law was observed. It is referred to in Deut.31.10 in passing. The late Book of Chronicles mentions it as the resting of the land(II Chr.36.21), "until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths, for as long as she <sup>lay</sup> ~~kept~~ desolate she kept Sabbath, to fulfill seventy years." Here a denial is made that the law of the seventh year had been observed. Neh. pledges the people(Neh.10.32) to observe the seventh year in the remission of debts. In I Macc.6.49,52 we are told that the people were without provision for a ~~stage~~, "it being the seventh year, when the land was not ~~known~~". All this in spite of the promise in Leviticus that the produce of the sixth year would prove enough for the seventh and for the beginning of the eighth year as well.

5. The last of the taboo ordinances is that of the tithe<sup>†</sup>, which is of great interest and not a little perplexity to us. The relation between the first fruits and the tithe is a subject into which we need not enter in this discussion. An annual tithe is exacted in Deut,14.22-27, which is to be eaten in Jerusalem with the Levites as the guest<sup>5</sup> of the family. How the entire tithe can be consumed at once, and yet the remaining nine-tenths be sufficient for the year, is not explained. In

1. Buhl: Soziale Verhältnisse, p.63. 2. Lev. 26.34,43.

addition to this, or as another mode of administering it, the tithe of every third year is to be devoted to the poor, including the Levite, the widow, the orphan, and the stranger. (Deut.14.28,29; 26.12,13.) We can hardly tell at this time whether the Israelites actually gave a fifth of their income in this way every third year, which with the enforced rest of the Sabbatical year would mean about one fourth of all their income <sup>for</sup> of the seven year cycle. The triennial tithe is not to <sup>be</sup> used at once, as the annual tithe, but was to be kept, "So that the poor may come and eat and be <sup>a</sup> satisfied." According to D (Deut.12.17-19) all vows and offerings should be eaten at the central sanctuary in company with the Levite, so that this legislation is all the more remarkable.

The Priestly Code (Num.18.21-24; Lev.27.) ignores a tithe for the poor, but diverts it all to the priests and Levites, by that time distinguished from each other. The Levite was to get a tithe of the national income, of which a tithe was to go to the priests. Beside this, the latter were to obtain the heave-offering, the firstlings, and various other donations. Ezekiel (45.13 ff.) likewise disregards a legal provision for the poor, and gives a regular income to the priests. By his time almsgiving was already beginning to supplant the law as a mode of charity.

6. The Sabbath also seems to have had a humanitarian purpose. We find reference to this in Ex.20.8-10 (E), in Ex.23.12 (C), and in Deut.5.12-15.(D). The phrase of special significance is "That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." The connection of the Sabbath and the Sabbatical year is a definite one, both in intent and in effect. Both were, like the humanitarian legislation generally, under prophetic inspiration.

7. The rules of loans, interest, and pledges were so adjusted as not to bear too heavily on the poor. The Book of the Covenant has a regulation that no money is to be lent on interest,<sup>1</sup> and that, if the garment has been taken as a pledge, it shall be returned before sundown that the poor man may sleep in it (Ex.22.25-27). We can imagine how miserably poor the borrower must have been by this ordinance of humanity.<sup>2</sup> Buhl holds that this would be meaningless if it meant pledge, but that it must refer to the penalty exacted on non-payment of a loan. We meet the word ערבן which means pledge, in Gen.38.17 and Neh.5.3. Neither interest nor pledge were customary, while a penalty seems to have been so. Deut.(15.7-11) commands the wealthy to lend to the poor without regard to the approach of the year of release. It further (23.19-20) forbids the taking of interest from a Hebrew, while allowing it from foreigners.<sup>3</sup> Evidently the idea still maintained its original force that nobody would borrow money unless he needed it for present necessities. The creditor had the power to enter the home of the delinquent debtor, seize that which he wanted, or even sell the debtor or his children as slaves in order to collect his loan. For that reason we see the injunction (Deut.24.14) "not to oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of the stranger that is within thy gates."

The rule of pledges was not to take a millstone as pledge (or as penalty), (Deut.24.6), nor to take a widow's raiment (Deut.24.17), not to enter the house to take it, but to let the debtor bring it out, (Deut. 24.10), and not to sleep with the pledge, but to return it (Ex.22.25; Dt. 24.12). That rules of this kind were necessary is shown by several passages in other books. Amos (2.8) says, "They lay themselves down

1. This may, however, be a gloss. 2. American Journal of Theol. I. p. 728 ff.  
3. H. Lev. 25. 35-38.

beside every altar on goods taken in pledge." (Job 22.6 also). In II K 4.1 a woman, wife of a prophet, came to Elisha, saying that her husband had died and the creditor had come to sell her two sons into slavery. (See I Sam.22.2) The law of wages was that wages must be given each day before sundown that the laborer might not suffer (Deut.24.15). This is repeated in H (Lev.19.13).

<sup>1</sup> The laws of interest and pledges seem not to have been enforced. Jer.(15.10) remarks, "I have not lent on usury, neither have men lent to me on usury, yet every one of them hath curse me." Ezek.(18.13) lists among the crimes, "Hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase." Neh. found that the people had taken usury and that many of the poor were to be sold as slaves (Neh. 5). The famous reforms of Neh. were based upon these provisions of the Deuteronomic law. He brought it about that the fields were restored to their former owners and the debts remitted, thereby re-establishing the community upon a stable economic basis. 1/3 of the personal property likewise was restored and the law against interest once more fixed in the minds of the people. Is.58.2 (a late passage) has the phrase, "rich and poor, him that taketh usury with him that giveth usury"; and Ps.15.2 lists this among the highest virtues. "He that lendeth not his money upon usury." Evidently economic law was stronger than humanitarian sentiment, at least with many of those who had money to lend. The prohibition against usury recurs constantly with the positive precepts to care for the poor.

8. Slavery was an institution of the Hebrew people, as of all antiquity, and with regard to non-Hebrew slaves there were no limitations upon it. But the right over Hebrew slaves was strictly limited. The earliest code treats this question (Ex.21.2-11), allowing the Hebrew

1. Gatten, in Biblical World, Vol.13; p.158-60

2. Except women captured in war and used as concubines. Deut.21.10-14.

slave to serve for six years and go free in the seventh, though not with a wife or children whom he may have acquired during his period of slavery. If he preferred, his master should bore his ear with an awl to the door-post, and he would then be a slave for life. Female slaves, who had been concubines, were not to be sold, but must be kept in that position or set entirely free. If a man maimed <sup>his</sup> a slave, he at once became free. <sup>1</sup> The law of Deut. repeats this ordinance for the male slave <sup>and extends it to the female</sup> (15.12-18), that at the end of six years of service he is to be released unless he wishes to remain a slave for life. When he is released, the master is to give plentifully to him, remembering that the whole nation had been slaves in Egypt and had been saved by God, and also that "To the double of the hire of a hireling hath he served thee for six years." The escaped slave was not to returned to his master (Deut.23.15,16), and any one <sup>illegally</sup> enslaving a fellow-Israelite should be punished with death (Deut.24.7)

Children were sometimes sold as slaves (II K 4.1; Is.50/1) and the slave must have worked rather hard. Still, his lot was not very bad, at least in the ~~earlier~~ period. The stories of Eliezer (Gen.15.2;24), of Saul and his slave (I Sam.9.1-9) show that the slave was practically one of the family, that he had money and could inherit. Jer.(34.8-16) gives us a dramatic picture during the ~~siege~~ of Jerusalem when the recently promulgated law of Deut. was invoked and the slaves freed to help in the defense. When the danger was over, however, <sup>2</sup> the law was disobeyed and the slaves were forced back into slavery. Nehemiah did not attack the institution of slavery, but freed those poor Jews who were in danger of falling into that condition. The clause in <sup>3</sup> the early law providing that a slave may choose to remain with his master showed the comparatively happy lot of the slaves at that epoch.

1. Ex.22.26,27. 2.Neh.5.1-19. 3.Batten, in Biblical World, V.10.p.397.



Another regulation of slavery is made by H (Lev.25.39-55). This is associated with the Jubile year. All Hebrew slaves are to be released at the year of the Jubile, whenever that may come; thus there is to be no slavery, but instead service for from one to 49 years. A Hebrew who was sold to a non-Israelite may be redeemed by himself or by one of his kin for a price reckoned according to the years of service until the next Jubile. Leniency was enjoined in the treatment of these slaves, while, on the other hand, non-Hebrew slaves were permanent property and could be sold at will. This seems to have been purely theoretical legislation, the circumstances of which were the post-exilic situation, when many non-Israelites dwelt in the land and might have some wealth.<sup>1</sup> A specially meritorious work of later times was to redeem Jews captured in war and sold(I Macc.3.41;II Macc.8.11).

9. Another means of avoiding the severest phase of poverty and of maintaining the old clan organization so far as might be was the redemption of land. This must have been an old practise, as we find it in Jer.(32.6-9), in Ruth(4.323), and in Ezek. (46.16-18), as well as in a mixed passage of H and P in Lev.25. Jeremiah, when he hears that the field of his uncle in Anathoth was to be sold bought it at once, as he says, according to custom. In Ruth it appears that the right of redemption, as well as the duty, belonged to the next of kin, but could be passed on by him to a more distant kinsman by a public act. This is exactly the case with the levirate marriage( Deut.25.5-10), when the brother is to marry his brother's widow and raise up a son to carry on the name of the deceased. According to the law of P (Num,36.1-12) land is to be kept permanently within the tribe by the marriage of heiresses always to a fellow-tribesman. Ezekiel has the same idea; land

1. Nowack;Hebraeisches Archæologie.p.176-180.



is not to be alienated" in order that my people be not scattered, every man from his possession." At this late time the conception began to be prevalent, not merely that land belonged to the clan and should be kept by it, but that it had been apportioned by divine mandate (as in the book of Joshua) among the different tribes and clans, who should retain their share until the end of time. Ezekiel expresses this in his division of the land of the nation into equal parts--quite impossible, as the land of Palestine varies in fertility--and his assigning them to the tribes. Lev. 25--the Priestly Code--works out another theoretical adjustment, already referred to in a different connection, the year of the Jubile. The idea is that every fifty years a grand readjustment of all the land shall bring each section back into the hands of its original owners,--that is, its original clan. No land shall be alienated. Land is to be rented for periods of from one to forty-nine years, but not sold. The price of the sale shall vary according to the year of the Jubile. At any time the seller or his kin may redeem land, paying a proportionate price varying with the years of the Jubile. A city dwelling--not being an ancestral possession in the same sense--could be redeemed only within the year, but the houses of the Levites came under the same rule as the lands of other tribes. That the alienation of land was an actual evil appears from such passages as Is. 5.8-10; I K 21.3 ff.

10. Regulations were likewise made, not only for internal administration, but also for the humanitarian treatment of enemies and of non-Israelitish strangers in the land. The regulation of war in Deut. 20 and in 21.10-14 is a unique expression of the humanitarian spirit, not paralleled until our own days. Any man who has built a new house, planted a vineyard, or betrothed a wife, or who is of faint heart, is not to enter the battle. In actual conflict the enemy shall be given first an opportunity to yield and serve the Hebrews. In sacking a city, the

men only should be killed and the women, children, and booty should be taken. This last rule is the usual one in ancient warfare, but was not always followed by the Israelites( I Sam.<sup>1</sup>15). A different spirit is seen in the final part of the chapter, with its prohibition of cutting down fruit trees even in a siege. Women who are captured and married shall be treated, not as slaves, but as Israelitish wives.

The attitude of consideration toward the ger has been noted in other documents, but is quite as prevalent in the codes. The ger seems to have been a non-Jew who had been taken under the protection of a clan or individual,<sup>2</sup> not the ordinary foreigner, who was called 'גר (See Deut.14.21) In the Book of the Covenant there are two injunctions for kindness to the stranger(Ex.22.21; 23.9), "A stranger shalt thou not oppress, for thou knowest the heart of the stranger, seeing thou wast a stranger in the land of Egypt." Deut.always associates the stranger with the native poor, the fatherless, the widow, and the Levite.<sup>3</sup> God is spoken of as "the one who loveth the stranger." Although the stranger is not to be a genuine member of the congregation until the third generation, (Deut.23.2 ff.), still the Priestly Code imposes upon him many of the duties of the Israelite, especially as to forbidden foods(Lev.17.12,15; 18.26). This attitude is one which prevailed especially during the prophetic time; in later epochs, when the influence of the prophets was not so direct and the foreigners dwelt in Palestine in greater numbers and with more influence, they were more hated and less favored than during the time of the independent monarchy.

The different codes exhibit very different attitudes on the problem of charity. The earliest,C, while very crude, is at the same time

1.See,however, I K 20.31. 2. Buhl:Soziale Verhaeltnisse,p.48-50.  
3. Deut.10.18; 16.13; 24.16,17.

in the prophetic vein. It gives the care of the stranger, and the poor, as well as the regulations of the seventh year and the limitation of slavery. Deuteronomy, which was published about 150 years later, has the most highly developed system of poor relief in any ancient code. Here are the laws of interest and pledges, the seventh year as a remission of debts, the law of ~~gleanings~~ gleanings, the triennial tithe for the poor, and a law of slavery. After this, the interest of the people was turned in another direction. With the breaking down of this code, its various provisions were adopted in other forms or neglected entirely. Therefore, the Holiness Code, written shortly afterward, has the law of the corners of the field, of gleanings, the Sabbatical year, and slaves. Ezekiel, a little later, in his great constitution, has no charity laws whatever, attempting to solve the entire problem by a distribution of the land among all the clans which would obviate any poverty. This is the attitude of the Priestly Code, about 450. Here the dues formerly given to the poor are diverted to the priests. The only regulation for the poor is the Jubile, which was probably never put into practise, by which the clan should retain its land and no family ever become permanently impoverished. As for the poor, in the intervening period between the Jubiles, a new method of caring for them had become popular; they were to be cared for, not by legal regulations but by the ~~aims~~ alms of the pious. Almsgiving was now a practise, favored by the piety of the priests and conditioned by the needs of the time.

## CHAPTER V. THIRD PERIOD, ALMSGIVING.

The disuse of the Deuteronomic law brought great difficulty into the situation of the poor. In the Captivity the Jews owned no land, had little surplus wealth, and were in no position to follow the commands to leave the gleanings, release the slaves, or share their sacrificial feasts with the poor and needy. The charity laws in the Holiness Code are, in all probability, from an earlier time and were merely written down at this period. At any rate, they resemble the laws of Deuteronomy in a great many respects and bear the earmarks of the earlier time. But a new method of caring for the poor was becoming more and more prevalent; the old custom of hospitality was being extended to include the giving of all necessities wherever they are needed. Almsgiving, never once mentioned in any pre-Exilic passage, is spoken of in every book of the Bible (with a very few exceptions), beginning with Ezekiel and II-Isaiah and continuing to Daniel and Esther. It is dominant in the Apocrypha and New Testament, is overshadowed in the Mishna by legal methods, although still given a great deal of attention, and is the chief mode of Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan charity until modern times. Even now it is only slowly being replaced by institutional charity in its many forms. Alms therefore deserve a chapter in this survey of Biblical charity. They seem to have risen under the priestly influence which diverted all the dues of the people from the poor to the priests and which favored the new theology which went with the giving of alms. Alms are logically a direct development from hospitality, so soon as the needs are greater than food and a night's lodging, and in simple peoples alms are often given by receiving the poor man into the house of the donor, but there is a distinct difference in that the idea of charity is now uppermost, and that the aid is now voluntary, to be given or withheld at will.



In this connection we may mention that the only references to begging in the entire Scriptures ( <sup>1</sup> three in number) occur in post-Exilic works, and that not one of the writers before the Exile ever mentions the giving of alms. This is especially noticeable in the prophets, whom we would expect to see praising the voluntary bestowal of one's property upon the needy. The fact is, however, that the prophets, with all their defense of the poor, always speak of justice, of not oppressing the weak, but never of gifts or of support for those who need/ it. The nearest we come to almsgiving in that epoch is in some of the instances of hospitality, which are still under the old idea of service due to the stranger and not ~~the~~ <sup>under</sup> the new one of merit to the giver by his voluntary act. For example, the demand of David for gifts from Nabal ( I Sam.25) is not asked as a favor, but rather demanded as a right. In the same way, the care of the prophets is a pious duty which received its acknowledgements and reward, but not in the sense in which later charity was regarded. But in the Exile almsgiving is first mentioned; if it was known at all before, it was certainly not conspicuous and never gained entrance into the literature. Logically a development from hospitality, historically it was the successor of a great legal arrangement which could no longer be maintained and needed some successor to cover the field of charity.

The prophets of the Exile mention almsgiving. Ezekiel speaks of it in connection with the older methods of relief,--"He hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment; he that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase"<sup>2</sup>. This is in one respect typical of the whole succeeding period- almsgiving, however prevalent it became, never entirely superseded the legal mode of relief, but was always parallel with it. Deutero-Isaiah, in speaking I.I Sam.2.36; Ps.137.25; 109.10. 2. Ezek.18.7-8; 12-13; 16-17.



of the true fast unto the Lord, says, "Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?" (Is. 58.6,7.) In these two places the giving of alms is put among the cardinal virtues, where it was destined to remain in the future growth of Judaism and of the religions springing from it.

The great post-Exilic works, Job and Proverbs, make the value of alms still greater. Job, dating from the fourth century, combines the prophetic and priestly virtues toward the poor, justice and the bestowal of alms. The refusal of these are several times enumerated among the crimes of which Job accuses Bildad (26.2-4), of which Zophar accuses Job (20.10,19), and of which Eliphaz accuses Job (22.6-9). Moreover, Job includes it among the sins which are often unpunished, (24.2-11). The most interesting of these passages is that in chapter 22, -"Thou hast taken a pledge of thy brother for naught, and stripped the naked of thy clothing. Thou hast not given water to the weary to drink, and thou hast withheld bread from the hungry. Thou hast sent widows away empty and the arms of the fatherless have been broken." This comes up even in the speeches of Elihu (34.28; 35.9) in much the same manner. The greatest exposition of charity in the whole Bible, both from the point of view of motive and of execution, appears in Job in his two speeches, 29.12-16 and 31.13-32. Here charity rises to its greatest triumph and its highest beauty, -"I was eyes to the blind and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the needy, and the cause of him that I knew not I searched out." "If I have withheld the poor from their desire, or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail; or have eaten my morsel alone, and the fatherless have not eaten thereof; if I have seen -----  
1. A disputed question; Cornill, 250; Battenwieser, 400-350; Driver, Cheyne, Davidson, Exilic; Steuernagel, c. 250; Dahm, Kautsch, 300; etc.

any perish for want of clothing, or that the needy had no covering; If his loins have not blessed me, and if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep; if I have lifted up y hand against the fatherless because I saw my help in the gate; then let my shoulder fall from the shoulder blade and mine arm be broken from the bone."

Proverbs, from the same general period,<sup>1</sup> has the same point of view. It seldom mentions the matters of interest or pledges, which took so much attention before, occasionally speaks of justice to the poor, but devotes its strongest panegyrics to alms. That the plight of the poor was a familiar one at this time is shown by such remarks as "The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender." (22.7) There occurs, moreover, the famous phrase, "Righteousness delivers from death", where the sense of "charity" is admitted as being possible. (10.2; 11.4) We find the familiar precepts regarding monopoly (11.26), landmarks (23.10, 11), justice (29.7, 24),<sup>(also 31.9)</sup> and oppression (30.14), but usually with a theological accompaniment, such as was rare in the pre-exilic era. "Remove not the old landmark, and enter not into the fields of the fatherless, for their redeemer is mighty." "The king that faithfully judges the poor, his throne shall be established forever." "He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him, but blessing shall be upon the head of him that sells it." Previously this was a rare mode of concluding an injunction, as we shall note in the next chapter.

The Proverbs contain likewise a number of precepts on the theme of alms, on some of which the date is disputed. According to Driver, part of the book is pre-exilic in origin, and alms are therefore known before the Exile. If, however, we follow Cornill, Steuernagel, Bennett and Adeney or Toy, all these references are after the Exile and most of them very late after it, from the fourth to the third century.

1. See next paragraph for a discussion of this.

These are neither so explicit nor so poetical as those from Job, but still possess much importance. "He that despiseth his neighbor sinneth, but he that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he."(14.20,21,31) "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his maker."(17.5) "He that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches and that giveth to the rich..." "Rob not the poor, for the Lord will plead their cause." "He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed, for he giveth of his bread to the poor."(22.9,16,22,23) "If thy enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink, for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and God shall reward thee."(25.21,22) "He that by usury and gain increaseth his substance, gathereth it for him that will pity the poor...He that giveth to the poor shall not lack."(28.8,27) The virtuous woman "stretcheth out her hands to the poor, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy."(31.20) Finally occurs a passage reminiscent of Deut.15.7-11, "Say not to thy neighbor, Go and come again, when thou hast it by thee."(3.27,28). This, like the passage in Deut. seems to refer, not so much to alms as to lending without interest when a person is in need. "Thou shalt surely open thy hand <sup>to thy brother,</sup> to thy poor, to thy needy in thy land."

The Psalms mention alms approvingly several times. "The wicked borroweth and payeth not again, but the righteous showeth mercy and giveth."(37.21) "All the day he dealeth graciously and lendeth, and his seed is blessed."(37.26) "Well is it with the man that dealeth graciously and lendeth;...he hath dispersed, he hath given to the needy."(112.5,9) "They slay the widow and the stranger, and murder the fatherless."(94.8,13) Most of the notice given to charity in the Psalms is purely theological, and as such will be treated in the next chapter.

The whole post-exilic time knows almsgiving, and praises it

most highly. This appears even in the most indifferent of books, which were written for quite other purposes. Ecclesiastes tells us, it is true, "If thou seest the oppression of the poor, marvel not at the matter." (5.6) But he also says, "Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days." (11.1) Chronicles tells us repeatedly of the giving away of food and drink in celebration of great festivals, either using an old tradition, or reading back into former times the practises of their own day. Daniel has the phrase "Break off thy sins by righteousness<sup>1</sup> and thy iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." (4.27) Esther, perhaps even later than Daniel in origin, ordains the feast of Purim, "a good day, and of sending portions one to another, and of gifts to the poor." (9.19,22)

Almsgiving, arising last of all the Biblical methods of charity, became associated with certain theological ideas which gave it its deep appeal and its firm hold on the people. The need of the poor continued; legal aid became less and less important, and the merit of giving to the poor was more and more proclaimed. In the New Testament especially it has a unique position among all the virtues. In Matt. 25.31-46, the sheep and the goats are separated on the basis of their charity, in the form of alms and of personal service. Jesus is represented as saying (Mat. 19.21) "Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me." The Koran has such teachings as, "Fear God with all your might, and give alms for your own weal". (XCIII, 16) "Let the good which ye bestow be for parents, and kindred, and orphans, and the poor, and the wayfarer... Bestow what ye can spare." (XII, 211) In fact, the three cardinal disciplines of the Christian, Mohammedan, and Jewish churches throughout the Middle Ages are alms, prayer, and fasting. But this brings us to theology, the subject of the next chapter.



## CHAPTER VI. THE THEOLOGICAL PHASE OF CHARITY.

With a people such as the Israelites every phase of life had its religious aspect; law was ecclesiastical law, government was theocratic, and charity was religious. In several instances we have noted the theological aspect when considering the different methods of charity. This chapter is to be a summary of that side of the question, bringing out the conceptions of God and his relation to man which made the modes of charity so acceptable and so widely practised during their periods of dominance.. The chief ideas which are expressed throughout the field of Biblical literature are that God, as owner of the land, claims his share for the needy, and that the wealthy are personally responsible<sup>1</sup> for their poorer brothers. These ideas are brought out in such passages as Deut.15.10,11,--"For the poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee... open thy hand to the poor." The land belonged to God, who had given it to His people, Israel. They were duty-bound to share the produce with the whole mass of the people when in need, whether by such devices as the triennial tithe or the gleanings, or by the later method of giving alms. Charity is not a matter of free will, but of obligation; charity is righteousness, as the later use of the word צדקה would signify. Although charity is not included in every series of the virtues, it appears in a number of them, from the burses of Deut. 24.19 to that of Job 31. It is, moreover, a human obligation, applying also to the non-Jew and even, in some regards, to the animal.

According to the usual ethics of the Bible, charity is to be rewarded by blessing.(Deut.24.13; Prov.21.13; Ps.41.1) "Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble." Virtue is rewarded by material prosperity, as appears in -----  
1. K.Kohler, in Jewish Encyclopedia. art.Alms, Charity,Poor.



Ezekiel 18, the great announcement of individual retribution. Here the various sins for which punishment is to be given are enumerated at some length~~thk~~, including the taking of usury, the refusal of alms, and the oppression of the poor. This ethics is often thoroughly materialistic, but it does include the important conception that God is the friend of the poor, will protect him, and will reward the man who aids the poor.

In the early time, the <sup>e</sup>priod of hospitality, the chief theological conception is that the stranger is under divine protection. The "man of God" especially was received and aided in ~~many~~ ways. He found entertainment wherever he went, out of respect for his mission and for his powers of blessing ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> cursing. Charity was in no sense optional, during either this period or the one of legal measures of relief; it was an obligation on the part of the giver, a right on that of the recipient. The optional nature of charity began with the spread of the custom of giving alms. In the earlier times it was as much a duty as to abstain from theft or to support<sup>o</sup> the temple and the priests.

For that reason the taboo laws operated for the benefit of the poor as well as of the priests. Both were under the protection of God. So soon as an object, --first fruits, tithes, vows, or whatever it might be, was forbidden to the owner, it became the proper possession of the class who were under God's special care. In some cases, the law of property was merely withdrawn for the time being, as in the case of the sabbatical year, and all alike were to share in the produce of the fields and vineyards. The different objects which were taboo provided an excellent fund for the needy, of whom the land must have contained a large number.

In accordance with this, ~~many~~ of the festivals were accompanied by feasts in which the poor could take part. The Deuteronomic law

provides that all sacrifices are to be eaten at the sanctuary at Jerusalem with the servants and the poor, and that at the festivals of Booths and Weeks in particular the poor, the Levites, and the widow, are to be invited.<sup>1</sup> In II Sam.6.19, when the ark is brought to Jerusalem, David gave to each of the people "a cake of bread and a good piece of flesh and a flagon of wine." Nehemiah observed the same custom, (Neh.8.9-12) "This day is holy.. eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions to them for whom nothing is prepared." Chronicles mention the custom three times, (I Chr.16.3; II Chr.30.24; 35.7-9) with regard to David, Hezekiah, and also the great Passover in the eighteenth year of Josiah. Both kings and princes are represented as giving much food to the congregation that all might rejoice adequately in the festivals. Finally, this is ordained as one of the chief methods of observing the holiday of Purim (Esther 9.19,22). All of these instances of the custom are post-exilic, with the possible exception of the one in II Sam., which is disputed.<sup>2</sup>

The prophetic denunciations of oppression and injustice was always carried on in the name of God, as the protector of the poor and the supreme arbiter of moral standards. "For three transgressions of Israel, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they sold the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes." (Amos 2.6,7) "With righteousness he shall judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth." (Is.11.4) "Is not this the fast that I have chosen: to loose the bonds of wickedness...Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house?" (Is. 58.6-8) All righteousness is taught

1. Deut. 12.17-19; 16.9-15.

2. Driver considers this passage late, but Cornill and Bennett and Adeney ascribe it to J, and Steuernagel to Sa (probably), equivalent to J.

in the name of God, and especially charity, for He is "a God that loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment." (Deut. 10.18)

God is continually represented as caring for the whole people and in especial for the poor. "The Lord will destroy the house of the proud, but he will establish the border of the widow." (Prov. 15.25) "Thou hast been ~~as~~ strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress." (Is. 25.4) "He preserveth ~~not~~ the life of the wicked, but giveth right to the poor." (Job 36.6, 15) A number of citations of this kind occur in Psalms, with the added difficulty, however, that the word "poor" as used there often signifies the pious Israelites, or the entire community of Jews, or even a party or sect of the people. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to say in any particular case just which meaning should be given to the word. On the other hand, whatever precise meaning may attach to the term, in general it means poor in any case, because the pious were very often the poor, and the word when applied to the Israelites refers to them as poor in contrast to their oppressors. Therefore the theological significance of the term is not altered by its special uses.

The Psalmists are very strong in their expressions of God's care for the poor. "For the needy shall not always be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever." (Ps. 9.18; see also Ps. 10.2-18; 12.5; 109; 16, 22, 31) "He raiseth the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the needy from the dunghill; that he may set him with princes, even with the princes of his people." (Ps. 113.7, 8; see also I Sam. 2.8; Ps. 107.36, 41) "He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor." (Ps. 72.2-4, 12-13) God is "A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows." (Ps. 68.5, 10; 69.33; 132.15; 140.12; 146.7-9)

This is brought into many a prayer addressed to God. -- "Forget not the congregation of the poor forever." (Ps. 74.19, 21; 82.3, 4.)

"Bow down thine ear, O Lord; hear me, for I am poor and needy." (Ps. 86.1) It comes into many a rebuke of the people, as well in the Psalms and Proverbs as in the speeches of the prophets. "Ye have shamed the counsel of the poor, because the Lord is his refuge." (Ps. 14.6) In all of this the great principle of morality stands out very clearly,--God is the protector of the poor; in like manner shall ye protect the poor. God will requite him who has mercy upon His beloved poor. Imitatio dei is the chief principle of morality in the Bible and applies more directly to mercy and charity than to most of the precepts of the prophets and the codes. It is summed up in the great sentence, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth to the Lord, and that which he hath given will He pay him again." (Prov. 19.17)

This is the final moral principle of charity in the Bible, as Job represents the final development of the idea of charity in application. Future methods and principles of charity cannot transcend these two passages for loftiness of conception and for purity of purpose. One more development, however, came to the conception of charity in the Bible, this a purely theological one. In Daniel 4.27 the king is told, "Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor!" Charity has been given value as atonement. This is not found in any other Biblical book, where the only methods of atonement are the ritual ones,--sacrifice, scapegoat, and the like,--and the pure morality taught by the prophets as the only means of atonement with God. But with the ever greater respect accorded to almsgiving it finally was given a mechanical efficacy as great as that of sacrifice. This was a fertile conception in the hands of later thinkers and writers. The Book of Tobit tells us (12.8), "Good is prayer with fasting and alms and righteousness. Alms doth deliver from death,

and it shall purge away all sin." Ben Sirach contains the same doctrine, "Be not fainthearted in thy prayer, and neglect not to ~~give~~ alms." (7.10) The New Testament speaks often of this, as in the well-known passage in Acts 10.2-4, "Thine alms and thy prayers are gone up for a memorial before God."

A great development proceeded from the Biblical ideas and practises of charity, a development participated in by three religions. This development was in two directions, the one glorifying the poor and doing everything to increase their number and to magnify their virtue, the other making for institutional charity and the relief of the poor without emphasizing his condition or the virtue of his benefactor. Unfortunately, the latter tendency was by far the smaller; the entire mediæval system of charity was a deliberate manufacture of paupers. Only as preserved by the Jews, and not always among them, did the other tendency survive. Biblical charity is superior in its motives, its methods, and its results to most of the charity, both Jewish and Christian, which succeeded it.



## CHAPTER VII. TENDENCIES FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.

Most of the charity of the post-Biblical epoch, up till modern times, was founded upon almsgiving as its model. The Mishna and Talmud show a very elaborate development, but alms is always the basis and pattern of the entire system. The Mishna, it is true, discusses and decides very carefully all the legal questions that arise under the law for the poor, such as the amount that must be left at the corners of the field, and the way of giving the tithe~~y~~, but most of this discussion was purely theoretical, as the destruction of the Temple and the exile of the Jews from Palestine forced the law into disuse. On practical topics, the matter of charity is divided into two parts, *צדקה* or almsgiving, and *חן נתינת* or deeds of kindness. These were not divided by any hard and fast line, and the latter included much that was almsgiving, combining it with personal service. The fact is that even the personal element, desirable as it is in all charity, does not destroy the nature of almsgiving and change it into something else.

Almsgiving is given a high place in all the literature of Talmudic times. It is praised with the hyperbolic metaphors of the Orient, showing that the~~y~~ Torah begins and ends with works of benevolence, from God's clothing of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden to his burial of Moses in the valley of Mt. Pisgah. The whole field of benevolent action, including both alms and deeds of kindness, is divided into seven main branches of charity, of which some are included in each subdivision, while some are mentioned in either at will. These seven are almost all founded on Biblical precedents, were elaborated by the Essenes, and are enumerated (for the most part) in the New Testament (Matt. 25.35-39). They are; feeding the hungry and giving drink to

the thirsty, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, burying the dead, redeeming the captive, educating the fatherless, and providing dowries for poor maidens. These were the fundamental observances of charity for the Jew during the long centuries of exile and oppression, and some of them, such as the ransom of captives, had only too much occasion for exercise.

The general policy of both synagog and church was to give alms at every possible opportunity. It was the universal desire to find pious men who would take alms from the pious who, by some good fortune, was worldly enough to have alms to give. Charity was no longer a right of the recipient; he had nothing to do with it. Charity was now a source of merit in the giver, a means of atonement, a road to heaven. The poor was valued because through him there was a way to attain eternal bliss. The phrase, "Righteousness saves from death", was now read, "charity saves from death" and inscribed on the charity-boxes. The method of giving, it is true, was often unobjectionable; giving was best in secret, according to the New Testament and the Talmud as well; personal contact made giving very often a valuable factor to both giver and recipient, but the general tendency was one whose fruits show in later times in the beggars once so common in the Jewish community, and still to be found in numbers in places, like Italy and Turkey, where the old religious conception of charity as being a good thing for the giver (ignoring whether it helps or harms the receiver) still holds sway. The final effect may be judged from the words of Prof. C.H. Henderson,<sup>1</sup> "The methods which the Church employed in relieving destitution were such that they often aggravated rather than remedied the

-----  
1. Modern Methods of Charity, p. 166, 167.

evil... The motive of such giving was the Church's inculcation of the doctrine that almsgiving was a means of grace to the giver." This point of view is summed up in the well-known passage (Matt. 4.19-20; Luke 12.33,34) "Sell that you have and give alms; make for yourself purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens, that faileth not, where no thief draweth near, neither moth destroyeth." This obviously is based on such texts as Ps. 85.12; Is.58.8 and Prov.11.30. At the same time it comes more directly from the story which is told of Queen Helen of Adiabene and her son<sup>1</sup> (Tosefta Peah 4.20; Baba Bathra 12a). When reproached for sending money to Jerusalem for the poor during a famine, the king said, "My fathers gathered treasures on earth; I shall gather treasures in heaven. My fathers gathered treasures where thieves can lay hands on them; I, where no man can take them; my fathers have gathered treasures that perish, I, for a world that does not perish." The idea is beautiful that by thought for the necessities of the needy one may aid his own salvation; the outcome was not worthy, in that it led to promiscuous giving and to charity merely from a selfish motive and without thought of the ultimate results.

A different development the world owes to the Jew as well, which did not grow as it should during the mediaeval period, but is springing into fruitage today, the movement toward organized charity. This movement aims solely for the benefit of the recipient without regard to the pleasure or the advantage of the giver of relief. It is impersonal in its motives, although it must be personal in the highest degree in practise that it may have worthy results. This movement is<sup>1</sup> certainly of Jewish origin, and probably sprang from the sect of Essenes,

who managed, among their pietistic prayers and baptisms, to do some things which still remain as a monument to their genuine religious fervor. Their institutions were adopted by the Jewish communal organizations and afterward by the Church, so that their devotion and originality bore rich fruit. The two chief of their institutions for the poor, which, although supported by alms rather than by regular dues, were administered in somewhat different fashion, were the *תבנית* or charity box, and the *המזון* or charity bowl (as we should call it now, soup-kitchen). The former was in charge of two pious men, of the most respected in the community, and was used for the permanent support of whatever poor were dependent on the congregation. Anonymity was thus assured to both giver and recipient, and support was attended to at the same time with self-respect. The charity bowl was in charge of three men, and was used to collect food from the house-wives, which <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ applied to immediate needs of the hungry. It was especially used on Friday evening, when the average household had a better meal than usual and when even the poor should have a right to the rejoicing of the Sabbath.

A third institution which owes its origin to the Essenes is probably the hospital, or temporary shelter-house for the poor or for travellers. This was called *בית הליסורב' אורח' בית צני'ם*, while in late mediaeval times it received the name of *הקרש*. Strangers were received here and housed for the time being, while the dependent could always find a shelter. In later times this was usually next to the synagog and at times was even a part of the same structure. Jerome acknowledges the indebtedness of the Christian Church to the Jews for this institution when he calls it "a branch from Abraham's terebinth". In addition to these we find a number of societies, *חברות*, for the purpose of earning merit in charitable works of various specialized kinds, such as those already listed as the chief works of charity.

The final tendency which found its basis in the Bible was the Ebionite movement, with its glorification of the lot of the poor. This shows first in the Psalms, then in such passages as Matt.10.9,10.42 (see Luke 9.3-5;10.4-8; Mark 6.8-10), where Jesus instructs the disciples to depend on charity during their wanderings, or on the one in Luke 20.6 (Matt.5.3), "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven." The idea now became, not merely that it is good to give charity, but also that it is meritorious to receive charity. The legitimate successor of this was the vow of poverty demanded by the church of its ministers, and the begging friars who were completely dependent upon alms as they wandered about the country. The old conception, that riches are the reward of merit, was now completely reversed, and the saying was always how hard it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.

A special phase of this, and one which was short-lived, is the communism which we meet in the fourth and fifth chapters of the book of Acts. The situation there is not at all clear, as three divergent statements of the situation are given, that all the property was put at the disposal of all the brethren (Acts 4.32), that there was a general sale of property and a common fund (4.34; 2.45), and that there was voluntary sale wherever a man with property so desired (5.4; 4.36). It appears probable that communism was never practised for long by the early Christian church, although they were undoubtedly Ebionites.

As Biblical charity, in its three great periods, is dependent on the social and economic condition of the nation, so in the post-Biblical epoch we have church-charity, in both the Christian and Jewish religions, and its method depends on doctrine as well as need. Although it was on a lower basis than the charity of the Bible, it did great work under its different circumstances and led to the differing conditions and the different remedies of the present day.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The Bible.

Apocrypha.

New Testament.

Koran.

Bleek, A.F.                      Einleitung in das Alte Testament.

Bennett, W.H. & Adeney, W.F. A Biblical Introduction.

Cornill, C.                      Intro. to the Canonical Books of the Old Test.

Driver, S.R.                      Introduction to the Literature of the Old Test.

Stenemann, C.                      Einleitung in das Alte Testament.

Cappenter, J.E. & Harford-Battersby, G.

Composition of the Hexateuch.

Frankenburg                      Hand/ Kommentar, Proverbs.

Wildeboer                      Sprueche, Kurze Handkommentar.

Toy, C.H.                      Proverbs, International Critical Library.

Briggs, C.A.                      Evolution of the Psalter, " " "

Duhm, B.                      Psalmen, Kurze Handkommentar.

Wellhausen, J.                      Psalms, Polychrome Bible.

Buhl, F.                      Die Sozialen Verhaeltnissen der Israeliten.

Cornill, C.                      History of the People of Israel.

Day, E.                      Social Life among the Hebrews.

Bergmann, J.                      Mildthaetigkeit, in Soziale Ethik im Judentum.

Koerberle, J.                      Soziale Probleme in Alten Israel.

Kohler, K.                      Historical Development of Jewish Charity.

"                      Juedische Wohlthaetigkeitspflege.

Kuebel, F.E.                      Gesetzgebung des Alten Testaments.

Nowack, W.                      Hebraeische Archeologie.

Rypins, I.L.                      Charity in Judaism (H.U.C. thesis, 1889.)

Smith, S.G.                      Religion in the Making.

- Smith, W.R.                      The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.
- Wallis, L.                       Sociological Study of the Bible.
- Wellhausen, J.                  History of Israel and Judah.
- Thomas, W.I.                    Source Book for Social Origins.
- Trumbull, H.C?                  The Threshold Covenant.
- 
- Jewish Encyclopedia, E. Kohler      Alms, Charity, Poor.
- Encyclopedia Biblica, W.E. Addis    Alms.
- A.C. Paterson    Poor.
- Hastings Dictionary of the Bible.   S.R. Driver      Poor.
- V.H. Stanton    Almsgiving.
- Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
- W.A. Spocner    Biblical Charity.
- Morris Joseph   Jewish Charity.
- W. Cruickshank   Semitic Hospitality.
- D.S. Margoliouth: Arabian Hospitality.
- 
- F. Buhl                          Observations on the Social Institutions of the Israelites.  
American Journal of Theology, Vol. 1, p. 728.
- L.B. Batson                      Social, Industrial, and Political Life of Israel between  
950 and 621 B.C., Biblical World, Vol. 10, p. 24.
- L.W. Batten                      Social Life of the Hebrews from Josiah to Ezra.  
Biblical World, Vol. 11, p. 397; Vol. 13, p. 150.
- C.F. Kent                        Social Life of the Jews, 444-160 B.C.  
Biblical World, Vol. 13, p. 369.
- F. Perles                        Soziale Gerechtigkeit im/ alten Judenthum.