

deems requiring particular notice, and here he seems ironically to ask, whether the blood be dependent upon the life, or the life upon the blood? "Surely," he exclaims. "the exposition of Haramban (*i. e.* R. Moses ben Nachman) which is 'but the flesh with its life *which is its blood, &c.*' and which opinion makes the life (*nefesh*) to be identical with the blood, is a very erroneous one, and not for a moment to be entertained." It is with regret that we find ourselves unable to subjoin the exact language of Nachmanides, but must reserve our quotation from him, for an appendix. It seems, however, from Arbarbanel's own words, that he merely asserts what Rashi and Aben Ezra, nay, the sacred penman himself, seems to assert, viz., *the vitality of the blood*; and in such case, his opinion does not deserve censure, since it has met, during the last two centuries, with many deeply learned advocates, who, however, merely reiterate to a great extent, what Jewish exposition and tradition have maintained centuries before them.*

The learned Dr. Townley in his translation of a portion of the "Moreh Nebuchim" (Guide of the Perplexed) of Maimonides, says:—

"The doctrine of the vitality of the Blood, thus suggested by the Laws of Moses, does not appear to have been avowed by Medical Writers before A. D. 1628, the time of the celebrated Harvey, the discoverer, or the reviver, of the doctrine of the circulation of the blood, who, in his writings, maintained the opinion, but was never much followed, till Mr. Hunter, Professor of Anatomy in London, defended the hypothesis with much acuteness and strength of argument in his *Treatise on the Blood, Inflammation, &c.*, London, 1794, 4to. The arguments of Hunter were vigorously attacked by Professor Blumenbach, of Gottingen, who fancied he had gained a complete victory over the defenders of the vitality of the Blood. But his translator, Dr. Elliotson, in the notes he has added to the Professor's *Institutions of Physiology* (Sect. vi. p. p. 43, 44, London, 1817, 2nd ed. 8vo.) thus sums up what he regards as the true state of the question:—'The great asserter of the life of the

* Hence the groundlessness of the following remarks in Wood's Mosaic History. It would appear that Mr. Wood had never studied the Talmud, or read Jewish commentators. We will not dwell here on the incongruity of his assertion that Paul (and therefore no doubt the Hebrews of that day) knew well and taught this doctrine, and yet, that (a somewhat gratuitous assumption we conceive) "it was 3600 years before it arrested the attention of any philosopher." Mr. Wood, perhaps, forgot that even before Paul, and long before Harvey or John Hunter, there were philosophers among the Jews who did direct attention to it. And yet Mr. Wood continues: "This is more surprising, as the nations in which philosophy flourished, were those which especially enjoyed the divine oracles in their respective languages." It is yet more surprising that Mr. Wood at "one fell swoop" taketh from Cæsar what belongeth to Cæsar and by this *ipse facto* assertion shows his utter want of information on the subject. We repeat, it would appear that Jewish tradition and commentary, like other small matters, had not troubled much the, in other respects, learned Mr. Wood. This, however, is not surprising.