

by the Hebrew people that the prohibition of blood is also a Sanatory law, in other words that blood-eating is forbidden on account of the baneful effects of the practice, physically. And we hold that sufficient intimation of this is given in the sacred volume itself, irrespective of what may be contained on the subject in the Talmud and other authoritative sources. That the practice is really a bad one in a sanatory point of view, we think is shown, 1st, by the Scriptures; 2ndly, by the commentators; and, 3rdly, by other authorities.

1. *The effects of blood eating are shown to be physically bad by the Scriptures.* We shall quote a few passages only, thinking they are sufficient to show that the fact is clearly intimated by inspiration. It is *clearly conveyed in the whole of the ceremonial law*, which, we presume it will not be denied, was intended to promote the physical as well as the moral well being of the Hebrew. The practice is spoken of as one that defileth. And in the prophets it is also spoken of as a practice of baneful effects; one passage will perhaps suffice. In the book of the prophet Isaiah ch. 49, v. 26, God in denouncing his heavy judg-

already given our ideas on this subject.] Perhaps so, but it shows that there are in the Hebrew, distinct words signifying the life, the soul, and the blood, things quite distinct, however closely related to each other they may be. [We agree here *in toto* with the writer, and hence our humble attempt above to show that what meant soul did not mean life, as according to his views of "nefesh," it must needs do.]—And more that with respect to the reason for the prohibition of the eating of blood, Mr. De Sola is labouring under a mistake. [We can scarcely consider this remark written with that fairness which it is due to state our critic has throughout displayed. We have as yet merely given not as our own opinion, but as the opinion of celebrated Christian and Jewish authorities, *some* of the reasons assigned for the prohibition. Had our remarks on the prohibition of blood been at end, we might then be justly charged with overlooking those reasons of most import, and more immediately having reference to the Sanatory Institutions of the Hebrews. As will be presently seen, we have by no means overlooked these reasons. Our critic continues.] David did not when he said, "elecha adonai nafshi essa," unto Thee O Lord I lift my "nefesh," surely intimate that he offered only his life's blood as a sacrifice to the Lord." Thus far our critic. We think that David as an Israelite might and really did use the word as signifying life. And without reference to that theological dogma involved by raising this question, and upon which the writer and ourself necessarily differ, we may be permitted to say that David may convey that in this word he offers to God all he could, and which we should all offer him—the undivided earnest, devotion of our "nefesh," that is of our life—a mode of expression, as common to the Hebrew, as to the English language, conveying all the functions, the source, and energies of life. But as we are disqualified here from entering into questions of a dogmatical controversial character, we must beg to take a friendly leave of our critic, and in so doing, must apologise to our readers for detaining them so long from our main subject, which we have done only because we have been assured they were concerned in the important questions this note involves.