"Give me the portion of goods that falleth to me"
in many societies the law of inheritance represents:

1. One of the most faithful means of dispute between members of the same family. The law of inheritance determines the right of members of the family to a share in the fortune or the property of the family. In some societies all the members of the family have an equal share in the property. In others only males have a right to a share. In others only the eldest male child has such a right while the other children only have a right of maintenance from the family property but not a right of ownership.

2. Closely associated with this right is the time when the right becomes vested in the individual who has it. In most societies the right only becomes vested when the head of the family has died. During his lifetime the successors in title only have the right of ultimate vesting. They cannot claim the right during the lifetime of the head of the family. To make such a claim amounts to a death wish — wishing the death of the head of a family and is regarded as particularly outrageous — indeed criminal.

3. Without use of the law of inheritance to illustrate the law of God indicates how that the kinship bond is the closest analogy to the relationship between God and Man. In view of the great variety of laws of inheritance the inference which this parallel makes on people comes from society to society. In a society in which children have an equal right of inheritance, the
Request of the young son the juice the goods that face to him does not sound as outriggers as it would be in a society where the only child entitled to inherit is the eldest son. In Townsend society for example, the eldest son is the only one who could have made a request like this. No young son could have made such a request because he would have been told that there is no portion of goods that fall to him. Except the Townsend reading this passage is struck also much by the subsequent prodigality of the younger son but by the fact a father allowed him to get away with that did not belong to him in any case. Thus his principle in Townsend was that it belongs to the youngest son but the portion of the younger son. The need of the father lay not in his figuring of a son who bad wanted his substance in various types, but in figuring a son who bad wanted what did not belong to him in this way.

Nowhere in that society nobody ever takes property away from the family establishment. Family property is handed down from generation to generation and belongs to the family as a whole and not to anyone individually. The individual can by his individual effort add to it but he cannot take it away. That the younger son in my text claimed increased what she was not entitled to but she removed it from where it was supposed to be. To the average Townsend it is not surprising that he did