

without the physician's aid, suffice adequately, it must be admitted, in preventing contagions both to the individual himself and to his fellow-creatures. The average layman would find it both troublesome and expensive to cleanse his hands with alcohol, oxalic acid, and other such disinfectants and antiseptics, although it is certainly in the line of the medical man. But, what will even the medical man say against pure, clean water and a towel?

Lastly, but not least, is acknowledged the fact that the preventive medicine of that dreaded scourge, leprosy, is wholly contained in the Bible. And the injunctions, that have been meted out by Moses, are admitted by all modern physicians to be the best that have so far been devised. The preventive medicine of leprosy was in full force during the Israelitish *regime*, but nowadays it has been abandoned by the Jews. And, again, the rite of circumcision, far from being barbarous, is being practised by modern surgeons for the cure of phimosis and paraphimosis. And, without plunging into the moral protection that the circumcised individual indirectly enjoys (for this is outside the scope of this essay), the protection against these two affections certainly justifies this custom—performed on the eighth day after the birth of the child. And, besides I have never seen (or heard of) a child dying as the result of being circumcised at the hands of a rabbi.

It would be quite in order, I believe, to mention here, that infective diseases among the Jews are comparatively mild and, in some specific disorders relatively rare, or absent. Still more is this wonderful since (as the world knows) the Jew is notoriously an inhabitant of the slums, on account of the weighing persecutions which he was subject to (and is, even to day, in some so-called civilized countries). I say, it is a wonder that he is not the paramount harbinger of disease. Writers have ascribed this—very accurately, it will be seen—to their habits and modes of living. It is for this reason that I have brought this matter up to have due and fair consideration for its practical application to Public Hygiene.

Now for the second part of this system. Everybody is aware of the fact that the orthodox Hebrew abstains from the use of pork. The layman ridicules this custom—not unlike the way in which his contemporaries ridiculed Paracelsus. But will the learned man of medicine follow such a lay example? One of the very first agents known to be the cause of digestive troubles is the ingesting of undigestible, or comparatively undigestible food. We know that pork, on account of the superabundance of inter-fibrillar fat, is noted for the difficulty of its digestion. This fact