

ART. XLVIII.—*Observations on the Sanatory Institutions of the Hebrews as bearing upon Modern Sanatory Regulations.* By the Rev. ABRAHAM DE SOLA, Lecturer on Hebrew Language and Literature in the University M'Gill College, &c.

(Continued from page 468.)

WHAT has just been remarked as to the convictions and usages of the Hebrew people with reference to the Prohibition of Blood, mainly applies to their abstinence from the flesh of such animals as are pronounced by the Scriptures and their ritual code to be טמא (tameh) unclean, אסור (assur) prohibited, or טרפה (terefa) torn. As will be presently seen, their traditions and authoritative writing ascribe moral, as well as hygienic, reasons for the Mosaic distinction of animals, and for the institution of those directions and enactments which lead them to reject as impure and unhealthy, such species of animal food as are commonly and unhesitatingly received by other nations, as ordinary and acceptable articles of diet. We have already made slight allusion to the fact, that as early as the days of Noah, a distinction of "clean beasts" and "beasts which are not clean" was made and known. But we shall not stop now to discuss at all that very debatable question, whether the distinction of animals here referred to, is identical with that made in Leviticus, † and if so, being known and observed, equally

* "A remarkable instance of circumlocution," says Raphall, "cited as a proof of the extreme purity of mind of the sacred author, who uses these three words to avoid saying טמא (tameah) which in the Hebrew, does not simply express the negation of clean, as do the corresponding negatives in other language, viz: the Greek *akathartos*, the Latin *impurus*, the French *immonde*, the Spanish *immundo*, the Italian *immondo*, the German *unrein*, the Sweedish *oreen*, the Danish *orchn*, the English *unclean*, the Polish *enicznyte*, &c., but has a positive meaning, the counter-sense of טהורה (tehorah) *clean*, and the extreme counter-sense of קדוש (kadosh) *holy*; and denotes a moral as well as physical state, which in any other language, we want an analogous single word to express."

† We learn that Noah "took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar." This circumstance has much to do with the origin of the opinion respecting the use and meaning of the term "clean," as applied thus early to animals, though it would seem to furnish a powerful argument against the assumption that it refers to such animals only as were used for sacrifices; since from this passage we are almost obliged to conclude that the distinction was known to Noah, before he made his sacrifice, for which he *selected*. Philipson (Apud De Sola and Raphall's Translation of the Scriptures) seems to incline to this opinion, when he says: "It is natural to make a distinction between animals proper to be offered as a sacrifice to the Deity, and such as are improper for that purpose, including all that are carnivorous. This distinction we find established among all ancient nations."