

Thesis

Victory Laws of the Bible

Alexander Lyons

H.U. College 1891.

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO
LIBRARY

Mic. Nov. 1978

Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Dietary Laws.....	9
Purpose of the Dietary Laws.....	56
Benefit of the Dietary Laws.....	63
Conclusion.....	70

Introduction

There arose in Germany about sixty years ago, a progressive movement in Jewish thought which originated in Judaism what we now term Reform. The causes for this movement were so natural and are now so familiar as to call for a mere passing notice. For many centuries, during its development as a religious body, the Jewish people had fostered customs, rites and observances such as were essential for the circumstances and time. Very many of these so-called religious practices were due to Eastern manners and civilization and bore a strong circumstantial coloring. When, however, the Jews were compelled to seek a retreat from the sword and oppression

2

tion of tyrannical and bigoted nations, or when their increasing numbers and the desire to better their material welfare led, they forsook their Oriental habitations and in great immigrations sought the West. Thus the Jew ^{found} a new home in this country, a land rapid in its growth of new ideas. Whatever was Oriental in new comers found fatal obstruction in practice called for modification or radical change. Self-preservation is of first importance and whatever opposes this must be put away. This led to the introduction and spread of Reform. It was but a concession and conformation to unyielding necessities of time and place.

3

Besides, the Jewish mind in its spirit of culture is quick to gain the idea of progress. This was soon manifest for an adaptation and progressiveness in thought ^{and} action became noticeable throughout the different phases of Jewish life. There was the rise of a new direction to reason ^{and} one that wandered far from ways long trodden in Oriental homes. The cosmopolitan spirit of the Jew quickly showed itself and as a step in that direction forms and customs of religious observance quickly received a searching discrimination. Most of the externals of religion which were Eastern in origin were discarded and there resulted a form of Judaism adapted to

surroundings and purified of the dross that had settled upon it during several centuries.

The outer and unessential coverings that fell away from the inner germ of true religion were such as had found a purpose in various directions of life. At home, in daily practice and in synagogical worship there were many old and traditional characteristics which, one by one, rapidly dropped away. There were many little practices of a religious coloring that had sanctified the day, but in the rush of daily life these soon passed. In home life where religion had ever given sanctity, forgetfulness became manifest.

25

Dining worship no longer continued, what it was but fell into neglect and received a sad tribute of indifference. Such ~~was~~ ^{were} the far reaching effects ^{attending} of Reform. This advance of reason, this conformation to press of circumstances has, however and unfortunately, not stopped with smaller and apparently insignificant matters; great institutions have been shaken and crumbled in this progressive march. And yet, no one can say where it will stop. Many feasts of worthy significance are almost unnoticed, the observance of our greatest ones is too often kept under protest; the impressive ideas of Passover are scarcely noticed, and the deeply sacred import of the Day of Atonement

ment is rapidly passing away. Circumcision is threatened with abolition, and the most fundamental observance of the Jewish religion, that of Sabbath, is tottering and Sunday service is fast pressing upon its heels.

With all these reforms & changes some good, some bad & others indifferent; there is none so important yet so slightly treated as that of the observance of what are known as the Dietary Laws. On the principle universally accepted, *mens sana in corpore sano*, there is to my mind no more important provision in the Mosaic Code than that which enjoins the observance of the Dietary Laws. These Dietary Laws are so important because they are destined to

form the physical and necessary basis of the lofty Mosaic, moral & religious, code.

True it is that true Reform does not come to destroy wantonly but equally certain is it that indirectly much has been lost. There has been a laxity engendered by the spread of Reform for this is evident in a disregard for the wisest measures. Such do we insist upon as applicable to the Dietary Laws.

Are they beneficial, should they be retained and observation are the questions for our treatment. To answer these it will be necessary to find the intrinsic worth of these Laws and then the probable motive with which they were enjoined.

In our treatment of this

subject we shall try to apply the judgements of science with the decision of reason, and determine, where possible, why and where these Laws deserve to be enforced or rejected.

It is a question somewhat difficult of treatment since the general mind today has received such bent as to be unable to approach it without prejudice.

When ecclesiastical authority no longer prevails and the temptations of dainty food are at every hand we are guided by no greater considerations in the choice and use of food than the whims of appetite and desire. In our treatment of this subject we shall endeavor to examine facts as we find them in the light of ^{truth} research.

The Dietary Laws

The main code of Dietary Laws which we now propose to consider ~~are~~ laid down in Leviticus Chap. XI, supplemented by other injunctions here^{and} there in the other books.

Leviticus Chap. XI opens with the words, "these are the animals which you are to eat of all the living things of the earth" criteria are given, by which all living creatures may be judged as being permissible or objectionable for food. With reference to beasts the principle is laid down, "whatsoever hath the hoof divided and cheweth the cud, you may eat (v. 3). Of creatures that live in

the waters the division is made, "all that have fins and scales you may eat (v. 9).

Of the birds no specific distinction is made, but those that are prohibited are enumerated with the most careful exactness and detail, and seem restricted to birds of prey (v. 13-19).

Of four footed insects that fly; those which legs are longer behind and used for hopping, as the grasshopper, these alone are permitted to be eaten (v. 21).

Of "creeping things that creep upon the earth" such as the mouse, the lizard, the mole, the crocodile and others of like kind are forbidden but no distinctive reason assigned (v. 29-30).

11
The meat of an animal that died, even
an animal otherwise allowed, is forbidden
not only for food but even to be touched
-40/.

All creeping things are an abomination,
in whatever goeth upon the breast, hath
many feet or traileth on the ground is
likewise disallowed (v 42).

In other parts of the Bible we have here^{er}
these other laws stated or implied, upon
which many dietary ordinances were
formed. We shall first select these dif-
ferent passages before proceeding to their
individual consideration and special
prohibition.

In Leviticus Chap XIX v. 26. it is Command

ed, "you shall eat no blood"

Deuteronomy XIV 21 Commands, ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself.

Exodus XXI 31 enjoins, ye shall not eat any flesh that is torn of the beast in the fields.

Exodus XXIII 19 gives a mysterious and doubtful injunction but which in deference to Rabbinic opinion we shall for the present include under Dietary Laws: thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.

These embrace in principle all laws of the Bible pertaining to food and upon these all others may be founded. The question now arises, were these

laws given for sanitary and hygienic purposes, or with some other motive? To answer this it is first necessary to examine the principle involved in each law and then determine whether in all there is a common principle with an ultimate purpose.

To begin with these prohibitions in the order already mentioned we have the law, "whatsoever hath the hoof divided, is cloven-footed, and cheweth the cud you may eat." Here the essential for permissible animals is chewing the cud and parting the hoof. Following this prohibition are a few instances given seemingly to illustrate

the principle involved. The camel that cheweth the cud but divideth not the hoof is much as to you. The Coney and hare are similarly classified. The swine is then mentioned as divideth the hoof but as not chewing the cud.

Now, scientists maintain that the separation of those animals from the rest is not scientific but arbitrary and as it seems to no purpose. It is a principle laid down by Cuvier, that "all ruminants have the foot cleft, and they alone have it." From this we may infer that the distinctions made by Moses are not fundamental

and in error? The camel which is acknowledged by Scripture to be a ruminant must according to Linnaeus be cloven-footed, but this fact is denied. The same faulty division is made with regards to the hare, the coney, and the hog. The hare which is represented by Scripture as chewing the cud is proven by science to be no ruminant at all. The Hog which is no ruminant and for this reason should not divide its hoof, is attributed with this last characteristic by Scripture, but incorrectly. The Hog does not divide its hoof; that which appears to be a division is now scientifically considered but a mere separation of the toes.

Now, since Moses or the Bible is wrong in the division of these four mentioned animals as distinguished from those having cloven feet and said to be ruminants, may we not suppose that it was a purposed error for the sake of emphasis? Is it reasonable to say that one making laws so eternally ^{true} can make exceptions so plainly wrong? We must seek for an internal reason in these exceptions which shall account for their emphatic exclusion.

The ^{characteristic} quality of ruminant in an animal is an essential one for rendering its flesh fit for food. Ruminating animals are possessed of as many as four stomachs, and in passing

through these the food becomes so well masticated that it is best prepared for absorption and assimilation by the system and blood. From this it may be inferred that the flesh of non-ruminating animals contains little nutritive juices, is coarse, and therefore unfitted and unwholesome for food.

The camel fulfills both requirements of cloven foot and ruminant, but since it is particularly forbidden there must have been another reason for its exclusion. According to Herodotus, the camel was eaten by the Persians and many Arab tribes, and to the Mohammedans it was also permitted. It was forbidden to the

Hindoo, Arabi, Egyptians, and many other Eastern nations; it is still disdained by the Copts of the present day. The flesh of the camel was held to be heating, to-m-
greater cruelty and revengefulness.

These statements are not decisive as to the cause of the prohibition of the meat of the camel, and therefore unsatisfactory.

We would suggest another and humane reason, quite in keeping with the tenor of ^{the} Mosaic code.

It is well known what an important part the camel occupies in the life of Eastern and nomadic tribes. It has been well termed the "ship of the desert" The camel alone is fitted

for long journeys through the desert, because of its endurance and power to do for a long time without drink. Without the camel travel in the desert would have been impossible. Since the animal was so useful, since it filled a place in the needs of men which no other animal could supply, was it not entitled to the most humane consideration, almost to affection?

Were the camel not held in such fishing, what would have been the result? It would soon fall a prey for food. As animal food the camel is said to be as good as any other. In the desert where those traveling hordes were often overcome by hunger and thirst, the

first available object would have fallen
 to their desires. We know that in extreme
 cases of thirst the camel has had to
 succumb in order to furnish a num-
 ber with water from its paunch. But,
 unless the case were an extreme one where
 almost anything must subserve human
 life, the camel ought to have been spared.
 Moses seems to have recognized this
 principle and forbade the destruction
 of the animal although it was well
 suited for food. Then again, sup-
 pose that the camel had not been pro-
 hibited as food, it would not have
 taken long before its tribe became
 diminished and man ^{impoverished} ~~depressed~~

his already needful state. Thus then we may find a reason other than hygienic in one prohibition although such cause can be assigned to it from the custom of other nations where it is forbidden on hygienic grounds.

The hare is now mentioned and specified as a ruminant without cloven foot. We have already mentioned the falsity of this characterization. The Persians considered the hare the most unclean of all the beasts. Its flesh is soft and tasteless and was shunned by the Turks, Armenian Christians and ancient Britons. According to Pliny it engendered thick blood, and elsewhere

we learn that it was subject to loathsome disorders.

The Conee, or rockbadger, or whatever that exception was, for it is no longer certainly known, is forbidden as unfit for food because of a nature similar to that of the hare.

Last and noteworthy of the excepted quadrupeds is that filthiest of scavengers, the hog. It is scarcely necessary, except in emphasis, to dwell upon the nature of the hog for it is so generally known. Moses places the hog among his four exceptions and ascribes to it only ^{one} of the two requisites viz; the cloven-foot. In truth the hog

has no cloven foot and does not ruminate. Since aside from its natural objectionableness Moses saw fit to give it special exclusion it must have been for emphatic purposes. From the prohibition of the hog with its reasons so vivid and so many extend its principle to the three other exceptions with which it is placed. Objections to the flesh of the hog are serious and scientific. The deadly trichinae are well known; once developed, myriads may infest a single individual. Their growth may be of interest. The female is provided with as many as 2000 ova which are developed and spread at the end of about sixty days when the individual

finds himself in the agony of intensest pain that is irremediable and fatal. These trichinae mostly affect the intestinal canal. When the young come to life they work their way through the walls of the intestinal canal, thence spread themselves through the body and become imbedded in the muscles and other parts of the system. This results in vomiting, spasms, gastric disorders, affections of the muscles, debility, and stiffness similar to gout and rheumatism. Their consequences are shown in chronic maladies and very often in violent death. The fatality in pork has been well expressed that, the pork-packer has killed more people than

all the great generals of history combined. Although it is maintained that pork may be so prepared as to render it harmless for food, the precaution is not taken. The ordinary heat of boiling, about 212° , is not sufficient to destroy the spores containing the trichinae germs. Hence the great danger attending the use of this meat under ordinary circumstances.

The hog was forbidden to many ancient nations. The Egyptians, Arabians and Mohammedans concur in an aversion for the hog as food. In Eastern countries where leprosy has its home it was essential to the existence of a people that a

possible cause of so direful a maledy to wiped out. Both ancient and modern physicians affirm that persons indulging the flesh of hog for food are very susceptible to leprosy and other skin diseases. In this Country the climate is for the most part unfavorable to the development of leprosy, but there are the most virile skin diseases in consequence of the consumption of the flesh of hog. It is only by the interdiction of this meat that malignant types of skin diseases can sometimes be cured. There are other and as serious objections from hygiene for the exclusion of the meat of the hog. At our time of general enlightenment it is unnecessary to discuss the question more fully; its neg-

nition is widespread. Laws are now enforced for the examination of pork ^{and} lard. The Seventh-Day Adventists wholly forbid its use, while a vast number of persons of different nationalities and creeds intelligently refuse it as food. Hence it is evident that the wise exclusion of the hog was a hygienic law.

So far in our consideration of the dietary laws we have in general characterized as healthy those animals that are ruminants and have cloven feet; in particular we have examined the camel, the hare, the coney, the swine as exceptions. While with the camel we may find a humane principle at work it is possible with

all four to account for their exclusion in obedience to hygienic law.

We next take up the law regarding the inhabitants of the waters. Here the principle is laid down, "whatsoever hath fins & scales, these shall ye eat"

The Mishna with implied criticism comments on this; "all fishes with scales have fins, but fishes with fins have not always scales." The distinction made by the biblical law has been questioned just as the division among beasts was subjected to scientific criticism. Science teaches that fins are imperfectly developed organs and indispensable to all fishes. Thus by saying,

"it is questionable if any fish exist altogether devoid of median fin rays". Hence we see that the distinction made in the Bible is not scientific and, perhaps, purposely so. As with previous exceptions noted, here also Moses may have wished to impart a certain emphasis. Probably it was his intention to impress the people with the necessary condition of visible fins & scales on fish since these indicate the highest organisms of the species. As we descend in the scale of fish creation, fins become less perfectly formed and scales more indistinct, indicative of a rude organism. It must have been

the idea underlying the prohibition of
Moses in the present case to subscribe
only to such living organisms as rep-
resented the highest and most per-
fectly formed types since these
naturally furnish the best food.
Fish without scales afford a heavy
and dangerous food, and in Egypt
was forbidden. Scales are a useful
protection to the body of the fish since
they prevent the absorption of certain
gases from the water which would
render flesh noxious. Clarke in his
Commentary tells us, and we believe with
good foundation, that those fish having
fine and scales are the most nourishing.

those without scales are in general very hard to digest.

The law regarding fish has been extended to exclude shell fish of different kinds as, the lobster, the crab, the shrimp, and the oyster. It is doubtful that these were known to Moses. If they were, they would probably have been included among creeping things, "whatsoever goes on the stomach, whatsoever goes on four or many feet"

The same reason that might be assigned for shell fish of various kinds in explanation of their exclusion may be applied to all other creeping things. It is a matter of fact that the ap

pearance of these creeping things is in general unpleasant to the sight and repulsive to the mind. Worms of various kinds, lizards, snakes, snails and the like would scarcely be eaten by persons of ordinary tastes and sensibilities. Even the crab, the shrimp with its many crawlers and feelers, the oyster with its peculiar unpleasantly suggestive appearance, are abominated by many persons of susceptible sensibilities. Are these animals objectionable from a hygienic view? The like of the crab, the shrimp and the lobster are recognized as very difficult of digestion. The oyster con-

termed as it is, is, what it has well
 been called, a scavenger of the deep.
 Eaten with its impurities but imper-
 fectly digested and assimilated it
 cannot but serve as a means for the
 introduction of impurities into our sys-
 tem. Yet, with proper preparation the
 oyster may be turned to a very nu-
 tritive food and as such is often pre-
 scribed by physicians. It was ^{once} ~~enun-~~
 ciated, he whose sensibilities are
 not repulsed at their sight may
 use these aquatic animals for food.
 This principle embodies a great truth,
 The effect of mind on body is
 well known. To eat that which the

eye loathed would be to invite and foster illness. It is plain that there is a sanitary measure ascribable to the prohibition of certain fish & other aquatic animals.

The next law concerning food that is mentioned in this eleventh Chapt. of Leviticus is that relating to fowl. Here no distinctive criteria are laid down but each that is forbidden receives individual mention. There is a principle that applies ^{to} these birds that are mentioned, the fact that they are birds of prey. The food they feed upon is of different nature from that consumed by domestic fowls, and renders their

flesh unfit for man's use. In illustration we mention the ossifrage; which, as its name conveys, subsists on flesh of carcass and the marrow of bones. This nature of the ossifrage is common to all birds of prey. Consider, too, the rapacity and bloodthirstiness of these birds and it is sufficient to render them repulsive to the human mind and therefore ill-fitted for food.

Creeping things are now mentioned and forbidden, as we have assumed, because of their repulsive appearance. Still, what is desirable in them for food?

Among the winged creeping things
 forbidden, there is exception made
 of the locust in its various kinds.
 Why should the locust be excepted
 when it is as repulsive, considered
 as food, as the rest? The creeping
 insects are injurious to health and
 their exclusion can well be attribu-
 ted to a hygienic measure. Though
 the locust is embraced with the other
 creeping ^{things}, its ^{permissibility} ~~prohibition~~ is no doubt
 to be attributed to a concession which
 Moses necessarily makes to common
 and widespread habit. At that
 time as at the present day, locusts
 were generally eaten in Eastern lands

and homes of the Jews, also in Egypt, Libya, Arabia and Syria. It is likely, however, that this locust of the bible is not the noisy insect of our day which in spring time heralds the approach of night, but rather a more edible object or it would never have gained a place in human food.

Thus far have been considered the chief laws of the Dietary Code of the Mosaic Law. It is evident that in each of them can easily be found a reason on hygienic grounds. The principle involved in the provisions of this eleventh chapter can

be given application, either directly or modified, to other laws respecting food. Such laws are to be found at random here and there in other books of Moses. The motive underlying them as given by Moses we shall later try to discuss; at present we will first try to understand the various other laws which are to be found.

There is a law, slightly understood at best, but which has received much discussion and by long habit and Rabbinic sanction been placed in the Dietary code. This law receives a threefold statement

in the Bible; 'thou shalt not suck a
 kid in its mother's milk' (Ex 23. 19,
 34, 26 Deut. 14. 21) The true meaning
 of this law must be left to con-
 jecture. Is it a law of diet, of human-
 ity, or for another purpose? Either
 alternative can be maintained.
 We do not consider it a dietary
 law since evidence for an alterna-
 tive is preponderating, and we
 would not consider it as such
 if it were not out of respect for
 the opinions of a large number.
 They who find a dietary meas-
 ure in this law attribute it to
 the fact that from it may be

derived the incompatibility of meat and milk as food. Meat and milk taken together as food are said to be difficult of digestion. From this law has come later all the case in Jewish cooking with reference to the separation of meat and milk. Nothing was, perhaps, farther from Moses' mind than to make such distinction. We fear that a preconceived idea was made to fit the law.

Although, Deut. 14. 21 might be urged to establish the present case a dietary law, since here it is in a connection plainly indicating or prompting the supposition of a dietary principle.

Still, connection cannot be accepted as conclusive, since the same law stands elsewhere in entirely different relations (Ex 23. 19, 34. 26). However, it is known that young goats were much eaten in Palestine and considered very wholesome. (Gen. 27. 9. 14.

Judg 6. 19. 13. 15). Of all young quadrupeds the ^{kid} alone was considered fit for consumption on account of its dryness, while the others were avoided because of their excessive humidity. The kid was boiled in milk. A similar practice may yet be found among the Bedouins who boil meat in sour milk.

to render it more palatable. But, nowhere do we find indications of an unhealthy character to this food. This law may also be interpreted to prevent cruelty since we have stated that the kid was much used for food. The verse embodying this law may without force be rendered so as to convey the teaching against cruelty. The translation usually given, "thou shalt not suck a kid in its mother's milk" may be rendered, "thou shalt not suck a kid while in the (use of) mother's milk." The idea here is, that before it is weaned a kid should not be taken from its mother. It also would be to

Coarsen our natures, to crush all
 sympathetic feelings from our hearts.
 It were a perversion of our natures to
 disregard even in animals the rela-
 tion existing for a time between mother
 and young. The connection of this verse
 in its different places encourages
 the belief that it was not primarily
 given as a sanitary law. Belief in
 the humanity of the law appears from
 the words of Philo (*De Humilitate* c. 18)
 who says; 'If any one should desire
 to dress flesh with milk, let him
 do so with inhumanity and with-
 out impiety-----; a man who
 seeths the flesh of any beast

in its own mother's milk, exhibits a heinous perversity of disposition, and an utter want of that feeling which of all others is most indispensable to a rational soul, compassion". It was the Targum Onkelos, the Chaldaic translation of the Bible, commenced a few generations later which gave rise to the objection of using meat and milk together by explaining the verse, 'you shall not eat meat with milk'.

What appears to be the best explanation of this law is that which finds in it an intimation of an old heathen and idolatrous practice.

Accordingly it will prove an injunction against idolatry. It was an ancient custom, that after the ingathering of the fruits and harvests, a young goat, a kid, was boiled in its mother's milk, and this broth sprinkled over the fields, with prayers and incantations, in the hope of securing good harvests the ensuing year. The connection of this law with those of the feasts points to its prohibition at the very time when it would perhaps have been practiced. Its observance would have been an avowed recognition of individual and deified powers and an

irreverence for God with whom alone rests the control Nature's powers.

Another law pertaining to diet is that which prohibits the use of blood for food. Leviticus 7.26, as other biblical passages, strenuously prohibits the eating of blood. Reason for the law is plainly given in the belief (Lev 17.13, Gen 9.4 etc) that the blood is the soul. Why it is forbidden because it is the soul is not stated, but this we may reasonably infer. The eating of blood would no doubt lead to inhumanity or savagery as we find in the case of cannibals. Such a tendency in the practice appears to

be implied in Ezekiel 33.25.

The belief that the blood is the soul almost leads one to think that the part of blood in the cause and dissemination of disease must have been known. It surely received ample recognition in the Palmsud. The Palmsud teaches, 'the main cause of all disease is blood,' and further, 'much blood, much scurvy'; surely conveying the interpretation that the prohibition of blood was a hygienic law. This is but in keeping with the teachings of modern science. Here we are taught that, of all portions of the body, blood

is most easily decomposed and therefore the soonest unfit for food. The danger arising from this was guarded against by making the blood sacred in sacrifice or when it was not used in religious ceremonies it was buried in the ground.

Next in order to be considered among the Dietary Laws are two which naturally follow the preceding. As a consequence of the strenuous prohibition of blood, we have the prohibition of animals which have died a natural death, called *בבילה* (Deut. XIV 21), and had been torn by beasts, *טרפה* (Ex. XXII 31). The prohibi-

tion of the meat of נבילה is connected with the prohibition of blood because from such an animal the blood had not flow out. An animal that is טרפה was forbidden because on the way of becoming נבילה. As to the motive underlying these two laws there can be no doubt that it was sanitary.

Aside from hygienic grounds sufficient basis can be found for these laws. It were a state bordering on and surely leading to barbarism, in which the use of meat from a carcass or animal that had been torn to pieces, would be allowed and indulged. The sanitary considerations here involved

have already been held by Maimonides, (More Nebuchim III 48, where he tells us that "Nebelah", meat of carcasses is indigestible and injurious as food. To give modern substantiation for the second law pertaining to the meat of animals that had been torn we refer to the researches of an eminent medical authority. Dr Gerlach of Berlin has recently shown in a treatise on the physiological properties of various kinds of flesh, in various conditions that, animals dying in agony are unfit ^{for} food. Their flesh appears to undergo some profound alteration, ^{and}

thus altered becomes unwholesome! Thus it is evident that we have here cases of sanitary law; but to attribute such as the prime motive of the giving would be to involve the giver in great inconsistency and wrong, for the 'Nebelah' and 'Trefah' are permitted to the stranger. He who rejoined regard for the stranger would not permit to him the use of that which for the Israelites was harmful. The difficulty here is great and without solution. If the heathen nations, strangers, indulged such, it was still no ground for countenancing and aiding their use of the

"Nebelah" and "Trefah" since ethics dictates the prevention of harm or injury to others.

Prohibition of fat is now to be considered (Levit. 3. 9, 10, 14). Certain parts as that about the stomach, entrails and kidneys of the animal were forbidden foods but reserved for sacrifice on the altar. The reason of this is given, that the fattest, the richest part of an animal belonged rightly to God. Maimonides, with usual rationality, finds explanation of the prohibition of some parts of the fat in what he states as fact that fat interrupts digestion, produces cold

and thick blood, and is altogether unwholesome in a hot climate like that of Palestine.

There remains to be given but a passing notice to Gen 32.32.

This verse and its precursors have formed the basis for a dietary law founded in the orthodox custom of abstaining from the meat of the animal's thigh. Rationally this is not to be considered a dietary law, having in the first place an unintelligible basis and then intrinsically nothing to commend it. Aside from the indefinite circumstance commemorated by the verse,

it is certainly not known what nerve
in the thigh is referred to by the term
גֵּיד הַפֶּסֶחַ :

All that can be included under
Dietary Laws has been considered.
It has been our aim to learn the in-
trinsic worth of these laws. The aids
of modern science have been used in
test. Whether our standards are a
fair measure of the value of Moses
laws we cannot yet tell, it must
first be decided to what extent
their knowledge of physiology and
hygiene went. It is probably, how-
ever, that such knowledge with
him or others of his time was not

uncertain. The advances of Science
to day in this particular direction
of sanitary law do but confirm the
enactments of Moses and disclose
an astonishing degree of knowledge.
Hence in the truths of these laws, at
which we have arrived, we may be-
lieve to hold in view the very features
intended by their founder or promoter.
It is unreasonable to suppose that
truths so evident to us even after cen-
turies should not have been apparent
and intended by such wisdom
and insight as was that of
Moses.

Purpose of the Dietary Laws

What was the purpose of these laws, was it religious or hygienic? The Pentateuch does not decisively answer this since it was not its province to explain and discuss laws which it gave. We may deduce the answer from intimations scattered here and there. In the first place it must be observed that the Bible starts with the provision in man of a body and soul (Gen. 2. 7). This distinction must be borne in mind. This is probably again recognized in Leviticus XI. 44 and XX 25.6 where we also obtain a knowledge

of the purpose of these laws. Levit XI 44 says: 'I am the Lord your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, neither shall ye defile yourselves [your bodies] with any manner of creeping thing &c. Deut XX 25 says: 'ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast or by fowl &c.' From these two verses which are representative of many similar ones we have a recognition of a positive and radical difference between body and soul, and an evident purpose of Moses to legislate for both. We may hence get an answer to our question, are these laws hygienic or

religions? Undoubtedly, they were both;
 but primarily the religious, secondarily
 hygienic. To Moses the distinction
 between spirit and ^{form} was certainly
 plain, as well as the significance and
 import^{ance} of religion. But, we must bear
 in mind that his was the guidance
 of a nation yet in its childhood ^{and}
 even worse, just recovered from the
 degrading and enervating influences
 of an Egyptian slavery. To this people
 the distinction between form and es-
 sence was not knowable, comprehended
 as it can be only by advanced
 minds. Hence, what to Moses pre-
 sented a twofold aspect of internal

and external application was imposed upon the people in external form as embodying or conveying the internal. From what we have said that, this people was in its childhood, it follows that all its teachings even of religion were enforced in the objective. Accordingly, the dietary laws, as with many other observances, were enjoined as religious measures when this was really only a secondary consequence. These laws really conveyed the germ of possible religious development since their observance implied the recognition of a higher Authority in whose name and Command they were given.

Yet, it cannot be reasonably doubted that
 Moses personally this Dietary code was
 sanitary with hygienic purposes. To him
 it must have been evident as it is to
 us that the proper development of a peo-
 ple into a religious body from the influ-
 ences of long slavery can only be ac-
 complished by strict sanitary legislation.
 To Moses as to us the relation of soul
 and body, and their mutual depend-
 ence was surely apparent. Such sup-
 positions or convictions are not strange
 if we consider the possibilities of a mind
 of such manifest power as that of Moses.
 There is much wisdom in his laws
 and other writings, and the philos-

ophy of the Pentateuch, or those parts
 due to Moses, has not yet been fully
 comprehended. Besides, we have
 further grounds for our belief in
 the sanitary purport of these laws,
 in the common tendency of ancient
 legislation to provide for body and
 soul. Notably Egypt, and other na-
 tions of antiquity, had a dietary code.
 Gymnastics so common to the ancients
 tended in the same direction. Such
 recognition we find expressly in
 Plato who sought to develop an
 individual perfect in mind and
 body. There is additional reason
 for the belief that Moses fostered

such an idea, in the opinion well
 grounded that, he was in many di-
 rections only a-reformer. That which
 was so conspicuous in other codes, as
 that of the Egyptians, with its dietary
 code, would not be discarded by a
 reformer so wise as Moses. To reform
 is no detraction, it is rather creditable
 to accept and reform wisely. Accord-
 ingly we must hold to opinion at first
 expressed, that the dietary are both
 religious and sanitary as given to
 the ancient Hebrews. To the people they
 were solely religious without appeal to
 their purpose; to Moses they were sani-
 tary with a consequence that was religious!

Benefit of the Dietary Laws!

What benefit accrued from the observance of these laws? what results may be noted in consequence?

There is a principle implied in these laws as in other parts of the Bible, though Leviticus in particular, and that is moderation. This was probably foreshadowed in the tree of good and evil where the desires and will of man were put to test. The prohibitions of these laws are always accompanied by permissions. Here we have a wise training of the will in self-restraint. The permitted food of Leviticus is sufficient to enable one to live luxuriously, yet, that which

is forbidden is oftentimes very sweet. The exercise of self control even under commands is surely destined to bring about the happy result of rational desires. To such development during ages of practice may be attributed that temperance and moderation of the Jewish race which is so conspicuous and advantageous. It has been to the Jewish people a preventative of many evils, morally and physically, which are ~~not~~ noticeable with other races.

As direct and positive consequences of the observance of the Dietary Laws may be mentioned the cosmopolitanism of the Jews, their general

longevity, the low average of mortality,
 and in particular among children,
 and the general immunity of the
 Jews from contagious and epidemic
 diseases. Dr Minor of England
 has said: "It might once have
 been affirmed & rightly that, the
 Jews were the only cosmopolitan
 people on earth, which thrives
 everywhere and soon becomes ac-
 limated either in North or South."
 He says further: During a terrible
 plague of the Middle Ages, the Jews
 scarcely suffered when Christians
 were led to believe that the Jews
 had poisoned all wells. The

ground for this immunity was their "Mosaic hygienic code." With regard to the immunity of the Jews during time of epidemics some statistics may be instructive. During the cholera of 1832, 47, 49 in Algeria, the proportion of inhabitants to each death was, among the Europeans, 17.7, 16.6, 21.0; among the Jews, 35.5, 24.5, 40.8. The mortality of the Jews was about one half that of non-Jews. A like proportion of in favor of Jews can be shown from statistics of other plagues and epidemics.

With reference to further mentioned

fits of the Dietary Laws we again men-
 tion the authority of Dr. Minor, says
 he: Till recent times the average
 age of the Jews was greater than
 that of Christians, and child mor-
 tality less. During the last fifteen
 years this exemption from sickness
 has disappeared, and today the
 Jew is as much susceptible to ill-
 as his neighbor. What is the cause
 of this? It must undoubtedly be the
 indifference of modern Jews to food,
 the total neglect of the "Mosaic Dietary
 Laws. The result is that as these
 laws fall into neglect, the mortality
 of the Jews increases." Thus does

medical science generally speak of the
 principles of the Mosaic Sanitary Code.
 To this legislation modern scientific re-
 search has accorded the very founda-
 tion of all sanitary laws. But, the
 final word of tribute has not yet been
 said. As Dr. Wise once remarked;
 'modern legislators have not yet
 reached to Sinai's heights.' As the
 need for sanitary measures increases
 with the exigencies of the times, a
 further tribute will be paid to these
 laws and their benefits will be further
 established. The fount of Mosaic
 wisdom will be further drained,
 and mankind, sound in body and

healthful in soul, will bow in grateful
acknowledgement to Israel's God.

What greater proof for the inspiration
of genius than that manifest in these
laws! They may have been founded
on observation and experience, or bor-
rowed and reformed; yet, the stamp
of eternity which has been given them
through an individual genius bears
the mark of a revelation from the Highest
Wisdom.

Conclusion

In our introduction mention was made of the fact that, the lax observance of the Mosais Dietary Laws noticeable at the present time and of late years has been an outcome of Reform. Not that Reform was a cause but rather the occasion for such liberty. Many have revolted from orthodoxy not to substitute something more fitting or agreeable but to lapse into indifference or want of loyalty to any proper standard. Reform does not desire but entails such consequence. As soon as it proclaimed itself the preserver of the spirit and not the letter, the essence and not the form,

this principle received broad acceptance and application. The test for everything religious became a conformation to the individual conceptions of spiritual requirement. Thus the Dietary Laws received as religious and subjected to this individual conception and test were found incompatible and rejected. No recognition of the fact obtained, that these laws must originally have been enforced by Moses for their sanitary merits. Had they been so received and viewed it is probably, in fact certain, that they would now find a general acceptance, good in themselves and independant of anything religious! Today

they can no longer be defended on religious grounds but for intrinsic merit. Aside from considerations of health these sanitary Dietary Laws might obtain from an appeal to pride ^{& concern} in physical perfection of offspring and race.

Reform Judaism, accordingly, owes the duty to itself, its advocates and others, to promulgate the principle on which it acts. The transition from Orthodoxy to Reform has for many not been accompanied with a conception of the difference of spirit [&] form. This must be elucidated with the added requirements of the spirit. Ceremonies should be understood, and put

in proper presentation, and abrogated where necessary or substituted where beneficial. In other instances, as that of the Dietary Laws, it should be the effort of Reformers to obtain their enforcement as a necessary element in highest possible purity and physical perfectness of the race.

Finitis