

to that blood which issues at the time of slaughtering, or drawn while it yet retains its red particles; to that blood which has entered the heart, and to that which results from phlebotomy, and yet issues forth; but that which issues at the beginning of the bleeding, and that which appears when the flow begins to cease, these do not cause the penalty of excision, but are in this respect like the blood of members, since that which flowed through the bleeding, was the vital blood. § 4. The substantial blood and blood of the members, such as of the spleen, kidneys, &c., of eggs, and that found in the heart at the time of slaughtering, as also blood found in the liver, does not create the penalty of excision, and he who eats thereof, even a quantity equal to an olive, incurs according to the divine law the penalty of castigation, for it is said ‘ye shall eat *no* blood.’ And with reference to the penalty of excision, the text saith, ‘for the life of the flesh is in the blood,’ implying that excision is only incurred by eating of that blood with

and afterwards eats.” Thus writes Maimonides. Another celebrated Jewish Doctor Menasseh Ben Israel, whilst engaged in the days of Cromwell to secure the return of his people to England, in adverting to the ignorant and fanatic prejudice which had been raised against them for “using human blood to make their Passover cakes,” says, (*Vindiciæ Judeorum* sec.1. See Samuels, “Jerusalem,” by Mendelsohn, vol. 1. p. 5.) “And more than this, if they find one drop of blood in an egg, they (the Jews) cast it away as prohibited; and if in eating a piece of bread, it happens to touch any blood drawn from the teeth or gums, it must be pared and cleansed from the said blood, as it evidently appears from *Shulchan Aruch* and our ritual book, &c.

§ We have seen with as much surprise as regret, that an able writer should descend to treat lightly a question which has had for its supporters so many master minds—advocates as pious and amiable as they were learned; of course we can have but little to say to remarks conceived in such a spirit, but this much we would observe. To select the Canadian *habitants* with whose unrestrained addiction to blood-eating we are sufficiently acquainted, as a proof of the non-injuriousness of the practice, we deem singularly unfortunate, though not for our assertion above made with reference to its effects, mentally. We only speak, as we can only speak, be it remembered, of the testimony afforded by nations after the lapse of a long period of time, say of centuries, and thus it will be perceived that we only speak of blood-eating as being an element—how powerful, who shall say when it is so announced and condemned by inspiration—of decay and destruction in a nation. With individual cases the question has nothing to do—we will not, nor did we ever maintain that with reference to these, the practice is a bad one; but to return. The Canadian *habitants* are doubtless, a worthy, happy, contented, and so far as creature comforts, and perhaps business transactions are concerned, an acute people, yet few would charge them with too much intellectuality, enterprise, or with a too free spirit of inquiry either in matters spiritual or secular. Of course with other nations there may be, and indeed are, other causes and agencies, educational especially, to counteract this serious error in diet; just as it has been shown other dietetic substances may counteract the ill effects of eating blood, in the individual system.