

enough, and could at all events do no harm. They therefore took this precaution, and, in every instance in which I could learn the result, with the most complete success. To their own astonishment, their families enjoyed perfect immunity, whilst all their neighbours' children were down with the measles. That these instances of escape may not have been *propter hoc* is granted; still, they have their significance. In fine, all things considered, I venture to predict that twenty or thirty years hence no decently nurtured family will have the measles. It will be as shameful to get this "straw fever" as to catch the itch.

BIBLE HYGIENE, OR THE MOSAIC CODE OF SANITATION.

EXTRACTS FROM A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE JEWISH CLUB AND INSTITUTE, BY ERNEST HART ("SANITARY RECORD").—CONCLUDED.

Dietary Laws.—In respect to the dietary laws, a great variety of details are prescribed, some of which have no obvious sanitary relation, but apparently a purely religious or sacrificial object. Time will only allow me to touch briefly on this part of the subject.

It is one of the most modern of our laws of sanitary police in this country, to prohibit the consumption of the flesh of any animal which has died from disease. This modern sanitary regulation is also part of the wisdom of Moses.

From this prohibition to the establishment of a ritual regulation by which defects in a carcase indicative of mortal disease should be held to be a bar to its consumption as food, was but a short step, and the religious authorities fixed eighteen defects, which were alleged to have been pointed out by God to Moses, and which, if discovered at the examination of the slaughtered animal, were supposed to bring it under the category of impure food and to render it unlawful for food; inasmuch as they were deemed sure to cause its death within one year. These defects were perforated gullet, torn windpipe, perforated membranes of brain or ventricles of heart, broken spine or ligaments thereof, liver or lungs defective or injured, stomach, gall-bladder, or any abdominal viscera perforated, etc. . . .

The distinction between clean and unclean animals is repeatedly noted with impressive emphasis. The animals reckoned as clean, says Dr. Kalish, were the ox, sheep, goat, hart, roebuck, fallow deer, wild goat, bison, and chamois: cloven feet and chewing the cud being the criterion. Vegetarianism, we may note, finds no scriptural sanction. 'Every moving thing that lives shall belong to you for food; just as the green herb, I give you all things.'—Genesis ix. 3. All carnivorous birds were forbidden as well as those that fly by night, and amongst fish those without scales or fins were not allowed. Now, from the sanitary point of view, I have only to say as has been said by others, that while all the clean animals were good and wholesome and many of the unclean animals were unwholesome, some of the prohibited class do not appear to be open to any dietetic reproach. Such, for example, were the hare and the coney. In respect to the