

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XL.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1908.

ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.*

GENERAL J. G. HALLIDAY IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

ELECTION.—Miss Gwendoline Crewdson was elected Associate.

The following paper was read by the Author :—

RESEMBLANCES BETWEEN INDIAN AND JEWISH IDEAS AND CUSTOMS (with lantern slides). By Colonel T. HOLBEIN HENDLEY, C.I.E.

THE subject of the present paper is rather of a miscellaneous character. It treats of resemblances between a number of Indian ideas and customs and similar ones which are mentioned in the Bible, whether they relate to the Jewish nation or to the people beyond their borders, with whom the Hebrews were brought in contact, but which are alluded to in the Scriptures. I am aware that many such Biblical ideas and customs have been compared with those of other countries both ancient and modern. Of most of these, however, I do not intend to speak, but I have thought it might be useful, and might lead to interesting discussion if I brought together a few notes upon the subject with special reference to such matters as have come within my own knowledge. It is, perhaps, necessary to state that my own experience was chiefly gained in North India, although my studies, particularly in relation to Indian jewellery, and in connection with the collection of objects for exhibitions and museums, have led me to make researches and inquiries in all parts of the great peninsula, and of the East. I will commence with some remarks upon land.

Love of the land, and especially of hereditary possessions, as well as a keen desire to own it, are common to all agricultural

* Monday, 25th January, 1908.

people. The Jew was no exception to this rule, nor is the Hindu. "Zan, zer, zamin" is a Panjab proverb which means that from "Women, gold, and land" arise all evils. The order of the words should perhaps more correctly be "land, gold, and women." The love of the Rajput for his Bhūm, his earth, his heritage, is not confined to him, but is shared by all classes. Even the shopkeeper clings to his shop and his home. Many years ago, when passing through the town of Sojat in Marwar or Jodhpur, I noticed a number of substantial stone shops and dwellings which were securely fastened up. I was told that some years before, their owners, at the time of a great famine, had gone south into Malwa or Central India in search of food, and that no one would dream of touching their property, because it was certain that, if alive, they would return, or, if not, that news would come of them or proof of death which would enable some near relative to claim the heritage. We are thus reminded of the beautiful story of Boaz and Ruth, and of the right of Elimelech, the father-in-law of the latter, who was driven by famine into Moab, where he and his sons died, yet the right of their heirs to the ownership of the field in Bethlehem was recognized after many years. Hereditary lands and rights are highly prized in India. A Hindu zemindar or landholder, in presence of all his tribe, said to Sir John Malcolm that it preceded his sense of religion. He added, "I would turn Mohamedan twenty times before I would sell my 'Wattan,' or native right," yet it was held to be meritorious to give land in perpetuity to priests, and this was done in such a way that it could not be resumed, for priestcraft is even more powerful in the east than in the west. Villages have been overwhelmed in the savage wars which have prevailed in India, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or have been abandoned, or the population decimated by famine or disease, yet, even after long periods, have revived once more because the people loved them. I was much struck, when recording the names of a number of unfortunate pilgrims who had been taken out of a train at Jeypore, on account of cholera, which had attacked them at the famous holy lake of Pushkar, near Ajmere, to be told, time after time, that such an one had come from such a village where his forefathers had lived for a thousand years, or, as the lawyers say, beyond the memory of man.

Just outside my garden wall there was a little shrine with a rude figure inside it, before which, night and day, burned a small oil lamp, which was kept alive by the villagers who dwelt

close by, because it represented a man whom they revered, as he had died in defence of his rights in the land. He was the Bhumia or freeholder, and some thought that if his spirit had not been propitiated it would have haunted the village to the injury of its inhabitants. In one of the outside walls of the ancient Jain temple at Sanganiir near Jeypore is a huge block of stone which stands in a niche. It represents the Bhumia or original lord of the soil, who had to be recognized, and his name kept alive by being duly propitiated, before the heretic Jains were allowed to build. Examples of this kind are innumerable. The inviolability of land is illustrated by the pains and penalties which were attached to the removal of landmarks. "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance" (Deut. xix, 14) says the Lawgiver. "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbour's landmark," said the people on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii, 17). The Wise Man (Prov. xxiii, 10), says, "Remove not the old landmarks and enter not into the fields of the fatherless," and again, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set" (Prov. xxii, 28), yet Job asks why some remove landmarks, "seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty" (Job xxiv, 10).

In the British Museum there is a group of boundary stones or landmarks which probably belonged to the period that lies between 1300 B.C. and 850 B.C. The inscriptions on some of these stones record transfers of land, and also, in some cases, battles or wars which resulted in the grant of certain privileges which are duly recorded, but there are particular imprecations, in which the gods are made to curse "him that shall remove or destroy this landmark, or who shall raise any dispute concerning the property of the rightful owners." There are also certain astronomical marks regarding which there is some difference of opinion. Landmarks of this kind exist in India, more usually, however, in connection with temples. Outside the temple of Pataliswar, the Lord of the lower world, or, in other words, of Hell, whose toenail (which projects from the Brihm Kār, a cleft in a huge rock on the floor of the shrine) is the object of worship, there is such a mark, with horrible sculptured figures undergoing indignities to which the person who resumes the soil by which the temple is supported will be subjected in this world and in the next. In the latter, it is added, his soul will spend 60,000 years in Hell as a worm in mire. The Sun and the Moon at the top of the tablet, just as in a Babylonian Boundary stone of King Nebuchadnezzar I.

(about 1120 B.C.), illustrated in the Museum catalogue, are figured as eternal witnesses of the grant and of the horrors attached to a breach of it. Such witnesses are commonly carved on the stones which are the memorials of *satis* or of the immolations of faithful wives of Rajputs. They are to be found outside the villages or in the *Mahasatis* or "abodes of bliss," that is, the cemeteries of great chiefs.

Political officers are frequently employed in settling disputes which occur between places on the borders of two states regarding the boundaries of estates or of villages. Crops are sown, it may be, on disputed lands, in consequence of which quarrels arise, ending too often in bloodshed. In former times a raid or a war between the two powers concerned might probably have followed; in these days the Paramount Power steps in and defines the border. The settlement is not always easy. Sometimes the evidence of the village elders suffices. At others, after solemn oaths are taken by such persons, the bounds are walked, but, in whatever way the final conclusions are arrived at, it is necessary to erect boundary stones which from that time are recognized. Removal of such pillars is not unknown, but in these days of accurate maps is not very judicious.

The gate sockets of ancient Babylon, some of which date as far back as 4500 B.C., though not exactly boundary marks, serve as records of the dates of erection of the buildings of which they form part. As a proof of the antiquity of practices in the East, I might note here that some of the doors of the old Garden House of a former Prime Minister, the Nathani-ka-bagh, in which I resided in Jeypore, moved on such sockets as that which supported the gate of Entemena, Governor of Shirpula or Lagash in ancient Babylonia about 6,400 years ago, and which is now in the British Museum. The most common cases of litigation amongst villagers in Malwa, says Sir John Malcolm, are about boundaries and claims to land. "Oaths, ordeals, and every mode is resorted to, to accommodate or decide these disputes." An account is given of a boundary settlement. Each side in turn had driven cattle to graze over the disputed fields. Each chief had piled up small heaps of stones at the most distant line from his own village to indicate the tract he claimed. It was agreed that each side should produce five men acquainted with the local merits of the case to decide a true line by taking a solemn oath. Each side walked its own line. After this failure the parties agreed to accept as the line that which should be traced by a respectable man wearing the hide

of a newly killed buffalo. He took a new line and this was accepted. That was the most solemn appeal which can be made in such cases. The man, however, is watched, and also his family for several days, and if anything which was healthy at the time dies before the fixed period, the man is disgraced, and the settlement rendered null and invalid. This practice is common in East and West Malwa. In native rule a Panchayet or Council of Elders of the neighbourhood usually settled the matter. In our time Political officers act or supervise. In Rutlam this duty is deemed hereditary, and one principal resident or *Mukh* was so respected that his house became a sanctuary for criminals.

Land of any kind which will grow anything edible by men or animals is of value, but for permanent habitation a well is almost a necessity, though not absolutely so, because there are many places in the extreme west of Rajputana which depend almost entirely during the dry months upon the water reserved from the rainy season of the year. In such places, even where there are wells, they are some hundreds of feet in depth. Bikanir water, for example, is as much as 300 feet below the surface, but is then abundant in most cases. Wells are, therefore, most valuable possessions, and many are the quarrels which arise in connection with them. The Philistines, envying the prosperity of Isaac, filled up the wells which his father Abraham had excavated, and the new ones which his servants digged were the subject of strife with the herdmen of Gerar, who said, "the water is ours."

In those parts of Rajputana in which the water lies at a great depth, a well is often the property of a number of men, perhaps as many as sixteen and even twice that number, each having his share. It is easy, therefore, to see how readily disputes may arise if one of the partners endeavours to use more than his share for the irrigation of his field. In more favoured countries the value of a well is not so highly appreciated. It is said that one of the great wells in the city of Bikanir may cost as much as a lakh of rupees or £6,666. The water of such a well as this is too expensive to use for irrigation, so that the people must depend for their crops upon the seasonal rains, which are often very scanty. Abraham and Lot were compelled to separate because their herdmen strove when the land was not able to bear them; in other words when there was not enough water. In like manner, the scarcity of water in the regions to which I have referred in the Western tracts of India, drives many young

men into the ranks of the Native Army, and thus the pressure on the wells is relieved.

We have, in the regulations of the year of Jubilee, full recognition of the inviolable heredity of land, under which every man came into his own again. It would be fortunate if land in India could be redeemed in a similar way, as the Jubilee regulations were wonderfully well adapted to check the improvidence and extravagance of Orientals, who, in times of scarcity or of difficulty, or in order to meet their views of the demands of honour, or more correctly speaking pride, at times of marriage or for funeral feasts and such like emergencies, will mortgage or sell nearly all they possess in order to raise money. Improvidence of this kind is too often encouraged by the money-lender, and not unfrequently under British law ancient families are ruined, and, it is to be feared, are often rendered disloyal, because they attribute their downfall to the Government, which, in the East, is held responsible for everything. The real blame is, of course, due to the causes which I have mentioned, and to the cleverness with which our laws are worked by the unscrupulous. Under native administrations the money-lender dare not claim too much, and in one state, with which I am acquainted, he is checked by the existence of a regulation that will not allow him to recover from the heirs of an estate, on the death of its owner, more than a certain proportion of its value, I think about 5 per cent. A year of Jubilee would certainly make it impossible to obtain heavy loans, especially when the year of redemption drew nigh, and would put an end to much extravagance. The Sabbatical year of the Jew had, moreover, much the same effect as a rotation of crops of allowing land to lie fallow at suitable intervals. In India the village system of agriculture has much the same results.

Very little is said in the Bible about house property, but there is a curious text in the Book of Job which interests me. Amongst the wicked are those of whom it is said, "In the dark they dig through houses, which they had marked themselves in the day time: they knew not the light." (Job xxiv, 16.) One day I went into a picture-dealer's shop, and found him in great trouble. He said he had been robbed of all his savings and of much of his stock, and he pointed to the back wall through which a great hole had been dug by which the thieves had entered. Surgeon-General Bellew tells us that this is a common practice in Afghanistan, and that if, as sometimes happens, the thief is caught while he is entering the room

backwards through the hole, his comrades outside cut off his head, if it is possible to do so, lest he should be recognised, and his family disgraced.

The subject of idolatry and images is a very large one. I shall say very little about it, but some things which I have noted seem worthy of record. Perhaps the best description of the making of an idol is that which is given in the 13th Chapter of the Book of Wisdom in the Apocrypha. We there read as follows: "When he giveth it the semblance of the image of man, or maketh it like some paltry animal, smearing it with vermilion (rouge in the margin) and with paint colouring it red, and smearing over every stain that is therein, and having made for it a chamber worthy of it, he setteth it in a wall, making it fast with iron." While this description is correct in all points, especially as regards the shrine or niche, which is often far more handsome than the image which is placed in it, I am particularly impressed with the mention of the colouring.

In the Jeypore Museum and its corridors we had the greatest difficulty in preventing visitors from smearing with vermilion any old piece of carving which bore semblance in any way to an idol, even if it were a Buddhist or Indo-Scythic king, and then from bowing to it in veneration. The desire to adore something tangible seems to be inherent in the minds of all Hindus of the lower classes. The higher and more learned explain that the symbol is nothing without an elaborate ceremony of consecration with much ritual, in which the deity is respectfully invited to take up his residence temporarily in the image, or it may be permanently. Chapter 14 of the same Book of Wisdom, describes how, "when men could not honour their princes from afar, they made a visible image of the king whom they honoured, that by their zeal they might flatter the absent as if present." In many Indian courts the portrait of the chief is so honoured to this day, being placed on a dais, not as a mere representation of him, but to be revered by an obeisance as if to himself, as if he were present in person. The ritual of Hindu worship is extremely elaborate and burdensome.

No fewer than sixteen different *upacharas* or ceremonies are performed at the worship at a temple, morning, noon, and night. These are as follows:—

- Avahanam*. Respectful invitation of the god to be present.
1. *Asanam*. Offering a seat and flowers.

2. *Svágatam*. Welcoming: offering fresh fruit.
3. *Pádyam*. Washing the feet.
4. *Argham*. Pouring water over the head of the image.
5. *Achamaníykhám*. Giving the idol water to sip.
6. *Madhuparkam*. Offering curds, honey, and clarified butter with water to sip.
7. *Snánam*. Bathing with water, milk, curds, clarified butter, honey, sugar, and again water; with perfumed oils and powders, and once more pure water, and with perfumed water, sandalwood paste and flowers, concluding with carefully wiping the image.
8. *Wasanam*. Offering clothes and rich dresses.
9. *Abharanani*. Offering gold ornaments, jewellery, etc.
10. *Gandham*. Offering perfumes and sandalwood paste.
11. *Pushpam*. Offering flowers, garlands, etc.
12. *Dhupam*. Burning incense before the image.
13. *Dipam*. Offering a lamp fed with clarified butter.
14. *Naivedyam*. Offering food.
15. *Vandanam*. Obeisance before the image.
16. *Pradakshinam*. Turning round and round the image.
Namaskárah. Obeisance and respectful homage, and *Wisargah*, or giving leave or sending away the deity to its place.

In a permanently consecrated image, because the deity is supposed to be always present, neither respectful invitation nor dismissal are required. I have often seen aged Indian friends performing these ceremonies with the aid of a Brahman priest, rising at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, and taking two or more hours for the service, working out their salvation with fear and trembling, at all seasons of the year, thus setting us all a great example in devotion.

No Jewish ritual was so severe as this, even in the great temple itself. One of the greatest attractions of Christianity to such people as the Hindus should surely be the simplicity of our normal services.

The Roman ritual seemed at first to commend itself to the Hindus of South India, but, in most cases, the practice of the Christians of that church in those districts appears to have become as formal and as little impressive as are the ceremonies of Hinduism itself. Such are the dangers which are apparently inseparable from all elaborate forms of worship. One point to be commended in the case of the Hindu priest is that he devotes all his efforts to his god and its shrine. As far as my

observation goes, he does not seek to glorify himself, or his office, by the use of gorgeous vestments or ornaments for his own person. On the contrary, he divests himself of such adventitious and superfluous assistance. It may be asked whether the belief in idols and in their religion by Hindus is sincere? There can be no doubt of it in many cases, and their beliefs seem often to be strengthened by events as, for example, when Sultan Mujahid, Shah of Gulbarga, slew a number of Brahmans, who took refuge in a shrine of Hunuman (the favourite monkey god), he himself struck the image in the face with his battle-axe, mutilating its features, whereupon a dying Brahman, with his last effort, rose up and exclaimed, "For this act you will never see your kingdom again, and will not return to it alive," a prophecy which proved to be only too true. The late General Brooke told me that, when he first went to Mount Abu, fifty or sixty years ago, an Englishman, on being informed that no kine could be killed upon the sacred hill (*Arbudha*, the Mount of Wisdom), defied what he considered to be foolish prejudice, and caused a calf to be slain in his own grounds. That night there was an earthquake, and the dome of the great Jain temple at Dilwara on the mountain, which had stood more than 900 years, cracked across, because the cow on which the earth rests was angry.

The officer fled for his life. This was certainly an extraordinary coincidence, though some might think it was the work of the devil, who was permitted long ago to display his power in the case of Job.

Just before I went to Jeypore the priests of one of the principal sects persecuted their rivals who had long been in power. The former succeeded in turning out the latter, and they left the city headed by their pontiff. That personage, who was a priest of Vishnu, solemnly cursed his Sivaite enemy, saying that, although he would be enriched as he wished to be, he would die of hunger and thirst. This curse so weighed upon the mind of the unfortunate Brahman that he imagined that he was always full of food and drink, and feared to take any more, and in the end he died of starvation, a prey to his own superstitious fears.

Is belief in idols incompatible with modern education? Not even generally so perhaps. The present High Priest of Kali in Calcutta had an English education up to University standards, and wrote a useful pamphlet on plague, in doing which he afforded much valuable assistance to my department in allaying the fears of his countrymen. On the other hand

every one knows that in this priest's shrine enormous numbers of animals are sacrificed to the goddess Kali or Bhavani, the favourite deity of the Bengalis.

I think that many of our ideas connected with sacrifice are erroneous. As ordinarily practised it is devoid of cruelty. The head of the victim must be cut off with a heavy sword at one blow. I have several times seen goats sacrificed at Amber, the ancient capital of the Jeypore state. At the appointed hour the person who made the sacrifice stood in front of the image sword in hand. The goat was then led in by an attendant. It was usually decked with a garland of flowers, and was happily eating some food. It was placed in the proper position, and then suddenly, with a single blow of the sword, its head fell, and with the blood, which was dexterously caught in a bowl, was placed before the idol. The rest of the body was taken away to be used as food. At the Durga Puja, or Festival of the goddess Durga or Kali, on one of the principal days many animals are slain. The young Rajput nobles show their prowess before their chief by cutting off the heads of buffaloes. Any man who fails to sever the head of the huge beast at one stroke, spoils the sacrifice, and disgraces himself. Perhaps no other mode of killing an animal is so devoid of cruelty. There are, however, cruelties attached to sacrifice amongst the wild tribes, as to the manner in which it is done, and there are also, in all parts of the country, objectionable ideas connected with it, as, for example, human sacrifice, which was common enough when Hinduism was unchecked; and the familiarity with blood which accompanies the universal practice of the rite is in itself most harmful. It must not be forgotten that Mohamedans also sacrifice on certain occasions.

I now turn to the scape-goat. We are familiar with the Jewish ideas on the subject. There is a general belief that disease is the result of (1) a man's own sins in the present life, (2) of his sins in a previous birth, and (3) of the sins of his parents. With the position of the physician in respect to these opinions I shall have more to say later on. Associated with the subject there are, however, two further ideas, viz., that a disease of the body, and the sin which caused it, may be transferred to an animal which becomes a scape-animal—usually a bull or bull-calf—or secondly, that it may pass into some other object through which it may be transmitted to some other being.

I was present with Maharaja Takht Singh of Jodhpore during the performance of many such ceremonies which took

place in the last few days of his life in 1873. Amongst them was that of Vrishotsarga.

A young bull-calf was brought into his bed-room and was waved over the dying chief with certain rites, and was then removed, to be allowed to wander about unmolested and unappropriated, to become what Englishmen call a "Brahmani bull." The Maharaja, thinking I was surprised, said, "I am afraid it will not do much good. It was different some years ago when I was very ill. At that time a strange *Sunyasi* or devotee appeared on the stairs, and demanded to be waved over my head because he was prepared to take my disease upon himself. It was done, and he disappeared, and I recovered. He was never seen again." "Who was it?" said I. "Men said it was the god Siva," he replied. These animals often become dangerous. They help themselves to corn and vegetables at the shops, fight together in the streets and sometimes gore and even kill people. So troublesome had they become on one occasion in Jeypore, that the chief caused them to be confined in an enclosure where they were well fed. Unfortunately, little rain fell that year, and the people murmured that it was due to the impious act of their Maharaja, who had to yield to the popular clamour and set free the beasts. According to the original idea the animal was set free in the *jangal* or wilderness.

The second idea is, that if garlands are placed for a time round the neck of a sick person, and are then removed, and are thrown into a public place, preferably at cross ways, passers-by may pick them up or tread upon them, and in that way the disease may be transferred. As this is done in small-pox cases, for example, even if the disease is not passed on, the intention of the persons who are interested is most abominable.

It will be seen that there is a difference between the Jewish and the Hindu scape-goat. In the former case it was an atonement for the whole people, but the goat was unclean, and the person who led him away required purification. The Hindu ceremony is for the benefit of a single individual. In numerous places in the Bible reference is made to disease being sent by God as punishment, as for example in certain of the Egyptian plagues, which He promised "should not afflict the Israelites if they did that which was right and hearkened to his voice." Miriam, Gehazi, and Uzziah were struck with leprosy as a punishment for sin. Jehoram was smitten with an incurable disease on account of his wickedness. Job, the righteous, was, however, afflicted in order to test his upright-

ness. The connection between disease and sin, and the general belief in that view are, perhaps, more exactly expressed in the case of the blind man in St. John's Gospel. The disciples asked Jesus, saying, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" Hindus believe, as I have already observed, that disease is usually the result of sin in the sufferer or in his parents, or again in the individual in a previous birth—so that we have ideas of personal wickedness, of heredity, and of transmigration of bodily as well as of mental defects. The practical result is the same. The priest comes before the physician. As priest he must endeavour to propitiate an injured deity by charms and ceremonies, in the hope that he will heal the patient, thus showing his forgiveness of him. If these measures fail, it may then be considered that the disorder may not be wholly due to sin, in which case the physician may at last prove useful. Even while he is treating the case his efforts are likely to be frustrated by the intervention of the priest.

The Mosaic laws regarding disease and its treatment point to the priest taking the first, if not the only, place in the treatment of disease.

The New Testament seems to give some place to the more modern conception of the use of a physician, although the Apocrypha in Ecclesiasticus shows that in earlier times he was held in some honour, and that his medicines were valued. It will be remembered that the Asclepiads, the descendants of Asklepios (*Æsculapius*) the Greek God of medicine, were priests as well as physicians, and amongst them was Hippocrates, the father of medicine himself.

The cities of refuge for him who killed his neighbour ignorantly were of great importance in Jewish times, and similar places to which men might flee for protection under analogous circumstances, were provided by the Church in Europe in lawless times. The Broad Sanctuary in Westminster is a reminder that here in London the need and remedy remained until quite recent times. There are certain holy places, such, for instance, as the tomb of the Persian saint, Imam Reza, at Meshed and its vicinity, where sanctuary is still afforded in Mohamedan countries. In India, in Rajputana, and in Malwa every noble claimed and, until recently exercised the right of *sirna* or sanctuary, and it was much needed in many cases, for blood feuds were common, and the avenger was often on the track of the homicide. Amongst the Afghans or the Pathans of Kabul and the Panjab, however,

such feuds were more common and were pursued more bitterly, until sometimes it was hardly safe in a village for men to plough the fields, and they always did so with weapons in their hands, and there were convenient towers in which they could take refuge when the alarm was raised.

Domestic slavery was another recognized institution amongst the Jews, and even a Hebrew bondman could remain as a permanent servant if he should say, "I will not go away from thee, because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee," and he submitted to have an awl thrust through his ear. The book of Leviticus, moreover, indicates how much more stringent the laws concerning foreign bondmen were than those which applied to such as were Jews. Domestic slavery in India partakes rather of the character of the latter class. Sir John Malcolm, in his *History of Malwa, or Central India*, sums up the case for that country and indeed for Rajputana also.

He says:—"Slavery in Malwa and adjacent provinces is chiefly limited to females, but there is perhaps no part of India where there are so many slaves of this sex. Few Rajputs, Brahmans, and even few merchants are without such slaves. Male slaves are rarer and never seen but with men of some rank or property, with whom they are usually the confidential servants. Many of these slaves date their condition from a famine or scarcity. In the famine of 1813-14 Amir Khan of Tonk formed a battalion of children and youths of this class chiefly from Marwar in Rajputana. They were sold by their parents on account of the oppression of the Mahrattas, as they often are in famine not only to save their children but themselves.

"Rajputs may, under stress, sell their children by slaves. An enquiry is usually made as to their tribe, and the Gwarriahs, who import them, or the Brinjaras, usually say they are Rajputs or Brahmans. They are not usually treated with cruelty. It is not the master's interest to be so, because escape is easy." The practice of infanticide of female children amongst Rajputs in North India led to such a scanty supply of women that many men were glad to purchase children from the dealers to serve as wives for their sons, and would ask no questions about their origin. Such alliances avoided the heavy expenses attending marriages which were the true cause of the evil for which purchase was a substitute. Happily reforms are taking place in this matter. In every Rajput family there are *chelas* (an euphemism for male slaves as the word means

a disciple or pupil) and *bāndis* or female slaves or hereditary domestics, whose fortunes are bound up with those of the family in which they serve. When a daughter of the house is married young *chelas* and *bāndis* accompany her to her new home, and are married at the same time as herself to the handmaids and boys who are in a similar position in her husband's family. It must be remembered that in an Indian conjoined family the pleasures and sorrows, the feastings and the privations are shared by all, and thus the evils attending the condition of the servants are much modified or mitigated. Allowing for differences of rank and position in those respects all were very much alike.

The present Maharaja of Jeypore, who in his early days was far from prosperous, told me that when he himself suffered many privations, his *chelas* never felt them. It was a point of honour to ensure their comfort before his own. The position of men of this class is similar to that of Eliezer, the steward of Abraham, "in whose hands were all the goods of his master." Amongst the Mohamedans there were dynasties of slave kings as, for example, that which ruled from 1206 to 1287 at Delhi from Kulb-ud-din-Aybak, the general of Mohamad Ghori, onwards; and in the time of the Bahmani kings in the Deccan, who were dispossessed of part of their dominions by the descendants of one Bidar, who sprang from a Georgian slave. They ruled from 1492 to 1609. Are not also most of the Sultans of Turkey the sons of slavewomen? In Persia we have the Tahirids of Khorasan who were of slave origin. In that country many men of the slave class still arrive at great honour. The position of slavewomen everywhere is by no means so satisfactory, nor does it appear to have been much better amongst the Jews. In India, however, it is comparatively easy in our time for all persons of this class to escape if they wish to do so. Josephus notes a common cause of slavery. He says that if a man could not pay the fine to which he was condemned for stealing cattle, etc., he became servant to him to whom he was adjudged to pay it for six years. If he had a son by a woman servant in his master's house he might, if he willed, remain servant still until the year of Jubilee, when he could also take away his wife and children.

One of the most persistent of all beliefs in the East is that of firm confidence in the existence and powers of witches, wizards, charmers, and astrologers. The following are some of the Biblical texts which relate to the subject. (Exod. xxv, 18):

“Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.” (Levit. xix, 26): “Neither shall ye use enchantments or observe times.” (Deut. xviii, 10-12): “There shall not be found among you. . . an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer, for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord.” We are all aware that in our own country, until quite recent times, such beliefs dominated the minds of men; how in the days of James I. five hundred women are said to have suffered for raising the storm which delayed the landing of the wife of that king when she was coming from Denmark to these islands, and how even such great men as Francis Bacon, Lord St. Albans and Sir Matthew Hale shared in the popular credulity.

We must not be surprised, therefore, when we are told by Sir John Malcolm that Zalim Singh, the famous Regent of Kotah, who preserved that state when all others round it were suffering from the cruel oppression of the Mahrattas at the close of the eighteenth century, in only thirty years had put to death a thousand women who were said to be *dākans* or witches. Not fifty years ago the officers of the Meywar Bhil Corps at Kwairwarra were not able to prevent a poor woman from being tortured at the instigation of a *Bhopa* or witch-finder. Red pepper was put into her mouth and eyes, and she was swung, head downwards, from the tree. This was done at the other side of a stream in flood which the officers could not cross. A few years later I met an old man fishing in a river close to Khairwarra, who said that he was an outlaw as a suspected *Bhopa*, who could no longer get employment, and was discredited. Times had indeed changed since, on the word of such a man as he, women could be tortured as I have described or flogged with castor oil plants, or tied in a bag and thrown into a pool to see if they would sink or swim. The belief still remains in witches and in other mediæval practices—such as the evil eye, or in the power to cause disease or death by thrusting pins through the wax model of an enemy, and in many similar abominations, and would be carried into action if the restraining arm of the law were not feared. It is well known, I believe, to most students of Hinduism, that even worse practices, such as Sati for instance, would soon be universally revived if British influence were withdrawn. I think, therefore, that I am justified in dwelling upon the persistency of ancient ideas in the East. Custom is indeed wonderfully persistent even in small matters. It is said that it occurred to someone quite recently to enquire why

a sentry was posted in the midst of a lawn in front of one of the Czar's palaces. At last it was ascertained that more than a century ago, if I remember correctly, the great Empress Catherine happened to notice that a snowdrop grew on that spot, and told some one to see that it was not trodden upon. A sentry was placed in order that it might be preserved, but a guard was still posted in our own days to carry out a duty which for so many years had been impossible. Naushirvan the Just, King of Persia at the time of the Emperor Justinian, in whose days Mohamed boasted that he had been born, refused to permit his followers to take a handful of salt from a village lest it should become a custom, and so the place be ruined. His fame, on account of this and similar acts, is still known throughout the East.

About forty years ago the wife of a sick officer who lived at the capital of a native chief expressed a wish to have a pet rabbit sent to her to the hills from her home in the plains. The prince at once ordered that her wish should be complied with, but long after she had left the world a yearly box of rabbits went up to the same place by special messenger, though who received them I do not know. It was the interest of someone to keep up the custom. A tax denominated Ghora-berarwa was first levied by Madhoji Sindiah from the country of Meywar to remunerate him for the price of one of his favourite horses that died within the limits of that province. This amount was long afterwards assessed as a part of the revenue. (Malcolm.)

In 1805, when Jaswant Rao Holkar was in pursuit of Lieut.-Colonel Monson's Corps, the death of numbers of his gun bullocks led him to levy a contribution of one bullock each from many villages. The tax did not cease with the emergency, but it was commuted for money, and for many years was still paid by each of these villages under the head of *Top-khanah-karich*, or charge for the train. It may be paid to this day. Dastur or custom is, and always was, a ruling principle in the East, and applied to the Jew and to the ancient nations as much then as it does now to their descendants.

The Jews were forbidden to observe times and seasons and consult soothsayers. It is hard to distinguish the latter from astrologers. Many references to the stars in the Bible are undoubtedly astrological, as for example, when the Lord is represented as saying in Job, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion" (Job xxxviii, 31). In Isaiah xlvi, 13, the daughter of Babylon is

asked whether the astrologers, the stargazers, and the monthly prognosticators could save her from the things that should come upon her. The forbidden practices were the fashion and belief in our own Middle Ages. Are they neglected now? All through India the horoscope is the guide in life for every Hindu. Marriages are fixed by it. No journey is undertaken without consulting the stars, or the omens being taken. *Thags* or professional stranglers, and *Dakaitis*—or highway robbers, took the omens or consulted the stars before they started on their expeditions. Every action in life for many people in the world depends upon astrology. The horoscope of a chief or noble or great man, may be 20 or 30 feet long, and should be constantly kept up to date. Trial by ordeal was not unknown amongst the Jews, as in the case of the jealous husband. In Malwa appeal to it by an accused person, was allowed. Generally, according to Malcolm, "this required putting the arm into boiling oil or water, or having a red hot iron placed in the hand, the leaf of the sacred pipal tree (*Ficus religiosa*) being first bound upon it. If the man was scalded he was guilty. By art or collusion escapes sometimes occurred." Many of the minor Levitical regulations, as for instance, on sanitation, ceremonial cleansing, or the marriage laws, might be discussed and parallel illustrations given from Indian practice amongst not only Brahminal Hindus but Mohamedans; but the subject is too wide for the present paper.

I shall only advert to a few points. In our Bibles we read that "the newly married man shall not go to war, neither shall he be charged with any business for a year, but he shall be free at home for one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken." The faint-hearted were also told to stay at home. Josephus, however, in his book against Apion, has a slightly different version, as he couples the two classes together. He says, "Leave in wartime was given to continue in their own country to several classes of men, amongst them being those who have betrothed or lately married wives, lest they have such an affection for these things that they be too sparing of their lives, and by reserving themselves for those enjoyments, they become *voluntary cowards*, on account of their wives!" I had a striking proof that this practice is in accord with Indian views.

My brother, being on active service in Burmah when his future wife arrived in India to join him, the Maharaja of Jeypore, on hearing of his dilemma, asked me why he could not come, because, he said, "it is the invariable

custom amongst us to grant leave at least for a year under such circumstances."

Josephus also, in the second book against Apion, refers to the care which was taken by the Jews for decent burial of the dead without extravagant expense for funerals, and without the erection of any illustrious monuments for them. The nearest relations should perform the obsequies, but all that pass by should accompany the funeral and join in the lamentation. However, in his "Antiquities of the Jews" he narrates the particular care of Archelaus that the procession of the body of his father, Herod, to his sepulchre should be very sumptuous. "Accordingly he brought out all his ornaments to adorn the pomp of the funeral. The body was carried on a golden bier, embroidered with very precious stones of great variety, and it was covered over with purple, as well as the body itself; he had a diadem upon his head, and above it a crown of gold; he had also a sceptre in his right hand."

The bodies of Hindus, with certain exceptions, such as particular classes of *Sanyasis* or devotees, and children who die of small-pox, are cremated; but there is a funeral procession to the cremation ground, at which as many as possible attend. In the case of a great man or a chief nearly the whole population will be present. The bodies of deceased rulers, and sometimes those of priests, are carried upright, as Herod's apparently was, in a chair of state, and are decked with jewels. It was in this manner, arrayed as if yet alive, that I saw the body of Maharaja Takht Singh of Jodhpore, borne for the last time down the slopes of the rock fort of his capital. Priests, with their hair unbound, ran before the corpse; bards proclaimed his titles; and the people of the city went with the throng to the old capital of Mandore where he was burned. On this occasion every Marwari trader from Zanzibar to Hong Kong, and in all parts of India, shaved in honour of the deceased. A native gentleman heard of his father's death in a distant town in which he was chief priest to a small raja. He was unable to be present, but was kept fully informed by telegram of all that transpired. At one telegram he was much incensed, because the family insisted in having the departed carried in a sitting posture in the funeral procession, on the ground that the chief himself would be present. My friend objected to the increased cost, which he said was due to the foolish pride of his relatives, pride from which he himself was emancipated, and because they did not reflect that the extra expense would fall upon him. Judges amongst the Jews were

specially warned against gifts or bribes, "For a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous." The proverb also says, "A wicked man taketh a gift out of the bosom to pervert the ways of judgment." It is hardly necessary to notice the universal prevalence of this vice in the East, but, perhaps, it may be worth mentioning that many years ago I was told that a certain judge in a Native State showed bad form in this respect, because he kept the gifts of both parties in suits in his courts, whereas the etiquette was to return that of the defeated party. There were said to be only three persons in that state who never took gifts. The custom was universal as we know, even amongst Europeans in India, as it was in their own countries. Of the Portuguese Viceroy, Dom Vasco da Gama, Conde de Vidigueira (1524), however it was said that "many persons went to him with offerings, such as it is customary to make to governors when they arrived; he would not take anything from Christian or Moor, and still less from this city (Goa), which we all look upon as extraordinary, as it is the custom for all to be accepted."

It was formerly customary, as it was amongst the Jews, in British India, and it is so still in the Native States, for officials and servants, and for inferiors, to present gifts to those who were above them, or to those whom they wished to propitiate. The superior, as a rule, returned far more than he received, either in the form of a *Khilat*, or dress of honour and ornaments, or in pecuniary gifts on marriages or on other similar occasions, but the British Government, finding that much money was wasted on what were really ceremonies, though they might be mistaken or even abused by some, and because such gifts were burdensome, put a stop to the custom. It is still permissible, however, to offer gifts of fruit and flowers, but even this old world practice is gradually falling into disuse. There is, however, one rather interesting survival. The native officer in our army at a *levée*, or on a similar occasion, still presents his sword to his superior, thereby indicating that his services and his devotion are at the disposal of his king and his representatives. The weapon is touched in token of approval and acceptance of the offer. The Indian chief accepts gold and silver coins at *Durbars*, and keeps them, because they are an acknowledged portion of his revenue.

The Oxford *Helps to the Study of the Bible*, under the head "Adoption," observe that St Paul, in his use of the word (Rom. viii, 15; Gal. iv, 5), probably refers to the Roman custom, whereby an adopted child stood to his foster-parents

in precisely the same relation as a child born of a man's marriage. Adoption in this full sense was unknown amongst the Jews. It is precisely in the former sense that adoption takes place in India. It is necessary that there should be a son in order to perform certain funeral rites, or to deliver the soul of the deceased man from the hell called Pūt; hence if a man has no son, he adopts one from amongst his kin. It is in this way many great families, especially those of ruling chiefs, have been perpetuated. Although there is, therefore, no direct succession in most of the great chieftainships of India according to our ideas, there is, for the most part, the certainty that the blood of the founder of the family will generally be on the throne. If by any chance there should be an intrusion, there is still a strong tendency to revert to the natural line. It will easily be understood that if a throne can be passed on by adoption, ordinary land and possessions would go to the adopted; as to the natural son. So truly is an adopted child regarded as a lawful one that, in the event of a true heir being born, the rights of the former are not easily set aside, and he must be provided for in an adequate manner. This difficulty, and the belief that an adopted son may not have the same feeling as a natural one, and that he, or his friends, may even endeavour to make certain what may be set aside, often leads to the postponement of the selection of an heir for so long that it cannot be effectually performed. The omission may be rectified by allowing the widow to adopt, under certain conditions, but it is not so satisfactory. If it had not been for the grant to the native princes of the right of adoption, in my own time a large proportion of the Native States in Rajputana would have become British. St. Paul, indeed, attached the highest value to our adoption as sons, and comparison between Roman and Indian practice in this important matter shows how great the privilege really was—and is.

The subject of charms, amulets, and jewellery is of some interest. I will therefore give a general description of some of the ornaments which are referred to in the Bible, and especially in the Old Testament. I do this because many of the actual examples, and certainly many of the types exist to this day in the East, and particularly in India, in which the customs, practices, and arts of all the nations with which that huge country comes into relation, are absorbed, though, no doubt, they are modified and given a peculiar Indian stamp.

Eliezer, the steward of Abraham, when he first met Rebekah, put upon her a golden earring of half a shekel weight,

and two bracelets for her hands of ten shekels weight of gold. Madden, in the *Cambridge Aids*, says, "it is generally believed that rings and jewels were the currency of the time. The spoil taken by the children of the Midianites included jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets. The Ishmaelites wore earrings; and the Amalekites adorned the necks of their camels with gold chains. Judah wore signets and bracelets. Men wore also official chains." The best list, however, is that which is given in Isaiah iii, 16-23. "The daughters of Zion are haughty," the prophet says, and also "they walk with stretched-out necks, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet." There are many such tinkling ornaments, especially the *Paizeb*, or foot chains of many links and drops; the *Jhan jhans* or hollow anklets filled with small pieces of metal: the *Gugris* or anklets with hawk-bells and sets of *Karas* or small thin anklets which clank together as the legs are moved. The Indian poets speak of the gait of a fine woman as being like that of an elephant. This refers to the enormous weight of her anklets. A great queen or *Pat Rani*, may wear as much as forty pounds weight of ornaments, and as heavy a load of gold lace upon her skirts, and thus adorned, she may only be able to move with the assistance of her handmaids.

Isaiah goes on to say in the old version of the Bible, "In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon, the chains, and the bracelets, and the mufflers. The bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs, and the headbands, and the tablets, and the ear-rings. The rings and nose jewels." I possess portraits of different periods in which ladies are decked out with nearly all these ornaments. They belong to different ages and countries in the East, but they all prove the universality and the antiquity of those ornaments which are mentioned by the prophet. Two portraits of noble women from Palmyra, which are reproduced from their busts which are now in the British Museum, are especially noteworthy. A lady from the Panjab, and another from Oudh, and others from Rajputana will be shown on the screen. The forms of ornaments, such as armlets, bracelets, rings, anklets, necklaces, ear-rings, nose-rings, and other head ornaments are as endless in the East as are their names. Many are symbolic; others are peculiar to certain tribes, castes and districts; others are worn by children, married women, or girls, or by widows, if the latter wear any ornaments at all. Others are used by certain sects

only. Even ascetics have those which are worn only by them, and men wear ornaments to denote their caste, their religion, or their office.

In all, however, there is usually some meaning attached to every ornament, and something to be read in it of history, of art, or of custom. Thus the subject of jewellery is to all orientals one of extreme interest, whether it be for its intrinsic value as capital, or from its beauty, or from its significance as marking position or wealth.

The *Oxford Glossary* says the bracelets and anklets of the Hebrews were never jewelled. Saul had a bracelet which was on his arm. The splendid ornaments found amongst what is known as the "Treasure of the Oxus," are the earliest actual examples of such regal ornaments. They date from about the fifth century before Christ. One or two specimens of modern Indian form, such as are worn by Maharajas, are shown on the screen, and also a few portraits of chiefs who are decorated with them. In Rajputana it is a mark of the highest nobility to have the right to wear an anklet of gold or of enamelled gold. The person, who is so ornamented, is a Tazimi sardar, one for whom the chief rises when he comes into the Durbar Hall. Saul also wore a crown upon his head. Indian chiefs of the present day do not ordinarily wear crowns, though the late Maharaja of Rewah used to do so; but the ancient images of the Hindu God, Vishnu, and also of Surya—the Sun-god especially—are often represented with the head adorned with magnificent crowns. There are fine figures of this kind in the British and Indian Museums, and similar magnificently jewelled head-dresses are still kept in the Madura temples. Moreover the Emperor Jahangir describes a truly regal crown which belonged to the regalia of the Moghuls in his time. The signet ring is, amongst Mohamedans, often their only ornament. As in ancient times our own Indian Musalman soldiers often wear suspended from their necks their signet rings with which they mark the pay rolls. Hindus of rank more frequently have a seal which they do not wear, but keep in some safe place.

Cauls or networks for the head are not common in India, but very elaborate chains and pendants are worn, and old pictures show a kind of network of stars which covers the hair. Round tires or head-dresses are common in the form of plates, jewelled or otherwise, which are round, moon-shaped, or crescentic, such as the Arab Karz or the Hindu Suraj or Sisphul. The new version of the Bible has indeed "crescents" instead of "tires" like the moon.

Chains, or, as the margin says, sweet balls, which I cannot understand, are common enough. Mufflers, said to be spangled ornaments, are worn on the dress, shoes, etc., in great profusion. The bonnets are described in the new version as being head tires, which have already been described. The headbands may be seen in the portraits of the Palmyra ladies; in Etruscan; and even in modern African jewellery, and perhaps in the head covering or Mathabana of Parsi women.

The earrings are attached to all parts of the ear, and very heavy specimens are supported by chains which cross the head, or they are simulated by pendants which hang over the ear. Rings are worn from both nostrils, and even from the cartilage between them. The nath or nose-ring is sometimes four inches in diameter. It is the sign of a married woman whose husband is alive. Tablets, or "Houses of the Soul," as the margin has it, are amulet cases. They are of many forms, as cylindrical cases or flat boxes in which are placed written papers with some protective holy sentence or cabalistic writing upon them. They are worn from the neck or arms. The Jews must have been very familiar with them, as they were used by the Egyptians in particular in enormous quantities, as well as by all the nations of antiquity. The charms are supposed to protect against every ill, bodily as well as spiritual, as, for example, against diseases and the evil-eye, which is devoutly believed in all over the East.

The new version of the Bible differs somewhat from the old. Pendants take the place of chains; this is immaterial, because pendants of several kinds are in common use, especially in the form of amulet cases. Ornaments of the legs are called ankle chains, and the head-bands "sashes," which is hardly an improvement. Perfume boxes and amulets take the place of tablets and earrings. Many of the so-called charm boxes are indeed perfume boxes, as they are frequently perforated and contain cotton-wool which is saturated with some strong oil or essence as of sandalwood or roses.

Jeremiah says, "Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire?" Isaiah says, "He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride decketh herself with her jewels." How well these words are understood in the East.

Phylacteries were frontlets of inscribed parchment, wrapped in leather and strapped to the forehead. They are amulets.

Great was the care of the Jew to preserve the purity of his family and tribe. The Hindu is equally solicitous to preserve

his caste. Tobit instructed his son not to "take a strange wife, which was not of his father's tribe." He says, "Noah, Abraham and Isaac, our fathers of old time—they all took wives of their brethren, and were blessed in their children." The difference between the Hindu and the Jew, however, is that the former takes the wife from his mother's, and not from his father's tribe. Tod says, that after one hundred and one generations the marriage of a Rajput might take place in the father's tribe, but, in practice, this means exclusion for ever. The notes on the last Indian census tables contain a great deal of lore upon this subject. I mention it here because it is connected with the practice of excommunication, which was founded upon tradition amongst the Jews, according to the *Oxford Aids*, rather than on definite Mosaic sanction, and was of varying degrees of severity. The Christian community had the right to practise it. In India to be out-casted or "Hukaband," is a far more serious thing, involving complete separation from a man's nearest and dearest friends and relations, as well as prohibition of marriage within his caste; and of participation in all their social pleasures.

As everyone acknowledges, it is the principal difficulty in the way of the conversion to Christianity of individuals, hence some Missions have believed in the efforts for the wholesale conversion of villages rather than in attempts to keep separate individuals from their families.

Sectarian or similar marks are alluded to in Leviticus xix, 28. "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you." Hindus not only have sectarian marks to distinguish the worshippers of one god from another, but persons of high caste make numerous marks upon their bodies with ashes or earth.

The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter on account of her father's hasty oath, is parallel, not only by the case of Iphigenia's daughter, but by the story of a young Indian prince who, having kept back a few minutes to say farewell to his mother, became a victim to the oath of his father who had sworn that if anyone delayed he should be put into a cauldron of boiling oil. Vishnu, the young man's god, is said to have cooled the oil so that no harm was done. There are many such stories in Indian books.

Of miscellaneous matters are the following:—The Jewish prohibition against a man marrying two sisters in the lifetime of both, though not rigidly enforced amongst Hindus, is strongly objected to by many. An old friend of mine, a Rajput

noble, told me that he refused to give a younger sister to a son-in-law, who had already been long married to the elder, on the ground that the latter should not be vexed. The specious reason, which had been given in similar cases, that the two sisters would comfort each other in a foreign country had no weight with him.

The Jewish ideas of defilement in connection with the dead are fully shared by all Hindus, as the following incident will prove.

It was necessary to put up a special notice in the Jeypore Museum warning those who had strict views on this subject, not to touch even the outside of the closed case in which there was an Egyptian mummy, lest they should think they were defiled. I have known a case in which, after seeing a mummy at the end of a long corridor, the spectator went home and washed.

The illustrations which I have been able to give to-day may make us thankful that we are free from many of the obligations which weigh so heavily upon our Indian friends, and with which the nations of antiquity were so grievously burdened.

DISCUSSION.

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY.—I beg to move a vote of thanks to Colonel Holbein Hendley for his interesting paper, the part on Indian jewellery being excellent.

Referring to the paper before us, second half of page 80. The pivot and socket arrangement seems to be referred to in Prov. xxvi, 14, "As the door turneth upon its hinges, so doth the slothful upon his bed." I have lived for a few days in a wooden house in Gulmurg in Cashmere, which had small folding doors, each made of a slab of wood (the width of a tree) with projecting pivots, all in one piece; these worked in wooden sockets. The plan had probably been employed because metal was evidently scarce when the house was built, it was doubtless the same as that adopted in the very ancient small wooden doors from which *afterwards* the gates of Babylon with their metal pivots and sockets must have been evolved.

On page 81, the reference to water reminds us of the method of irrigation in Egypt, see Deut. xi, 10, in which the land is described as watered "with thy foot"; the same method may be seen in the Punjab to-day.

Many of the habits of the East referred to in the Bible, such as those connected with early rising, sun worship, notifying the first appearance of the new moon, dogs as scavengers, hand mills, lamps, skin bottles, etc., are to be observed in India at the present time.

It was an ancient idea that as the sun rises there, the East was considered to be the front, hence in Hebrew "*the right hand*," "*yemen*" was also *the south* (1 Sam. xxiii, 19, etc.). The Sanscrit name "*Deccan*," *right hand*, or *south* is still employed to denote a certain large part of the Indian peninsula.

Colonel Hendley has lightly touched on the idolatry, bribery, immorality, and degradation of women prevalent in India, which have rendered most of the chief men of that land (broadly speaking) incapable of ruling, though there are, of course, individuals of fine character to be found. These conditions are parallel with the abominations of the heathen Canaanites who were dispossessed of their country for their wickedness by the Israelites (Deut. ix, 4, 5).

Though we English are by no means faultless in India, yet justice, order, and righteous dealing are administered. Let us trust that the parallel to the Israelites in Canaan be not carried further by our adopting any false worship from the inhabitants of India. Hitherto we have been preserved from doing so, but of late years a few Europeans have professed to follow the false light of Buddhism.

Mr. ROUSE.—The fact that the final umpire in the boundary dispute, which was so long in being settled, clothed himself, according to agreement, in the hide of a newly killed buffalo, reminds one that the covenant which the men of wealth in Judea made in King Zedekiah's time to let all their Hebrew bondservants go free was made with the solemnity of cutting a calf in twain and passing between the halves, and when the covenant was broken, God said, through Jeremiah, that He would punish with the sword of the Chaldean army, princes, priests, and people who had "passed between the parts of the calf" (Jer. xxxiv, 8-11, 17, 18, 19). And doubtless this form of covenant had been practised in the family of Abraham and nation of Israel ever since Jehovah himself, in making a covenant with the patriarch touching his descendants, had

commanded him to divide a number of slaughtered beasts in a similar way, and had then caused His fire to pass between them (Genesis xv, 8, 9, 10, 13-17, 18). Symbolically this rite (like the besprinkling of the book, and of the people with blood at the making of the Sinaitic covenant) set forth that all solemn covenants were types of God's great covenant with man, to make which effective, as the epistle to the Hebrews shows us, it was needful that the testator or grantor should first die (Exod. xxiv, 5-8; Heb. ix, 16-20).

The story of Dido's building a city at Carthage upon as much land as a bullock's hide would cover, may be derived from a similar covenant for the grant of the needful land, and not, as is usually alleged, simply from the likeness between the Greek byrsa, a hide, and the Phœnician byrsa, a citadel.