



**PENTECOSTAL**  
**CHURCH OF ZION**

DOES IT MATTER  
WHAT YOU EAT?

# DOES IT MATTER WHAT YOU EAT?

Often referred to as the law of the clean and the unclean, the commandments concerning food may be the most buried point of Biblical doctrine in modern times. Unfortunately, this has been erroneously deleted from pastoral teaching for many years. Let's explore the topic through a Biblical lens and see if it is possible to answer the question: "Does it matter what you eat?"

Most of protestant Christianity today is the result of many persecuted Christians who have spent centuries pulling away from the Catholic church. The goal of these noble souls was to once more preach, teach, and live the doctrine taught by the apostles in the New Testament. This doctrinal migration still comes with baggage, however. When the Roman Catholic church came into being, it was so encompassing, as a huge body of people and laws combining elements of pagan worship with certain elements of Christianity, that very little of the doctrine of the Apostle-era church was preserved. Even prior to the formalization of the Catholic church, late first and second-century beliefs were shifting and changing and were not consistent between assemblies, with great schisms forming between Rome and Antioch. Although many men and women over time have been severely persecuted or martyred as they would try to preach and teach a return to Scriptural authority when it comes to doctrine, even today much of the truth is still unknowingly suppressed by many.

We can't please God and continue to choose a doctrine that merely fits neatly with what we already believe or have previously been taught, but rather by careful study and consideration of the Holy Scriptures. Careful study of scripture is what this teaching seeks to accomplish. Remember the reason for much error is not solely the fault of the believer, but it is even more the fault of ones in the ministry of Jesus Christ who have not thoroughly endeavored to find and teach pure truth, but rather teach passed down doctrines still contaminated by many who in distant history elevated the teachings of men over the teachings of the scripture.

Many of us were raised from childhood on familiar Bible stories such as Noah and the ark. We were taught that there were two of each kind of animal that went into the ark, The scripture in chapter 6 of Genesis tells us this.

**Gen 6:19 And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female.**

**Gen 6:20 Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive.**

However, upon further investigation, we see that the Lord gave more specific instructions.

**Gen 7:1 And the LORD said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.**

**Gen 7:2 Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female.**

**Gen 7:3 Of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.**

God intended Noah to take more of the clean animals on the ark because the clean animals could be used as a food source whenever Noah and his family came out of the ark. We can learn about this distinction between clean and unclean animals in Leviticus 11:1-10.

**Lev 11:1 And the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying unto them,**

**Lev 11:2 Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, These are the beasts which ye shall eat among all the beasts that are on the earth.**

**Lev 11:3 Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, and cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that shall ye eat.**

**Lev 11:4 Nevertheless these shall ye not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof: as the camel, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you.**

**Lev 11:5 And the coney, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you.**

**Lev 11:6 And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you.**

**Lev 11:7 And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be clovenfooted, yet he cheweth not the cud; he is unclean to you.**

**Lev 11:8 Of their flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch; they are unclean to you.**

**Lev 11:9 These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters: whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat.**

**Lev 11:10 And all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the waters, and of any living thing which is in the waters, they shall be an abomination unto you:**

Teaching on clean and unclean fowls is here in Leviticus 11:13-23.

**Lev 11:13 And these are they which ye shall have in abomination among the fowls; they shall not be eaten, they are an abomination: the eagle, and the ossifrage, and the ospray,**

**Lev 11:14 And the vulture, and the kite after his kind;**

**Lev 11:15 Every raven after his kind;**

**Lev 11:16 And the owl, and the night hawk, and the cuckow, and the hawk after his kind,**

**Lev 11:17 And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl,**

**Lev 11:18 And the swan, and the pelican, and the gier eagle,**

**Lev 11:19 And the stork, the heron after her kind, and the lapwing, and the bat.**

**Lev 11:20 All fowls that creep, going upon all four, shall be an abomination unto you.**

**Lev 11:21 Yet these may ye eat of every flying creeping thing that goeth upon all four, which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth;**

**Lev 11:22 Even these of them ye may eat; the locust after his kind, and the bald locust after his kind, and the beetle after his kind, and the grasshopper after his kind.**

**Lev 11:23 But all other flying creeping things, which have four feet, shall be an abomination unto you.**

Leviticus contains descriptions of which animals are considered clean or unclean. This definition informs us that the distinction was relevant to consumption. Clean animals are food, and unclean animals are not. We have also discovered that the distinction between clean and unclean animals existed long before Moses. Moses recorded for us the information that Noah already knew because Noah knew the difference between a clean and unclean animal, otherwise, he could not "take" into the ark the proper number of animals. Can we find in scripture where this distinction was repealed? The answer, simply, is there are none. However, there are a handful of scriptures, which many mistakenly use out of context to try to prove that in the New Testament church, it is okay to eat unclean animals. Let's go over a few of these often-misapplied scriptures.

Peter's Vision:

**Act 10:1 There was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band,**

**Act 10:2 A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway.**

Cornelius was a gentile who was a proselyte to the Jewish faith. Otherwise, he would not be described in scripture as a devout man who feared God. This means that Cornelius and his household would not be eating unclean animals.

In a vision Cornelius had, God told him to send for Peter. Cornelius sent two of his servants to request that Peter come to him. In the meanwhile, Peter went on a housetop to pray. Peter became hungry and while the meal was being prepared, he fell into a trance. Here is Peter's vision in Acts 10:11-16.

**Act 10:11 And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth:**

**Act 10:12 Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air.**

**Act 10:13 And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat.**

**Act 10:14 But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean.**

**Act 10:15 And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.**

**Act 10:16 This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven.**

Please read the rest of this chapter, it is a wonderful story in which Cornelius, a Gentile, was filled with the Holy Ghost, along with all those who heard Peter preach, and they were baptized in the name of the Lord. You see, Peter did go to see Cornelius, and all was well. However, what about Peter's vision? Does this vision address the law of the clean and unclean?

We find in verse twenty-eight of the same chapter that the interpretation of the vision Peter had was not that all animals could be eaten, but something else entirely. The vision had nothing to do with food, but was spiritually, rather than carnally, interpreted. Look at Acts 10:28.

**Act 10:28 And he said unto them, Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.**

You see, God was breaking down any prejudice that was lingering in Peter against the Gentiles, and Peter listened. The Apostle Peter tells us this was the meaning of the vision. Notice also, in verse fourteen, of Acts chapter ten, that Peter had never eaten anything unclean. We know that the New Covenant had been in effect for some time here. God chose Peter to deliver the message on the day of Pentecost to tell the plan of the "new birth." Jesus gave Peter the "keys of the kingdom." Yet, we see that in the practice of his life for the Lord, Peter did not eat unclean animals. He knew they were not for us to eat, and he understood that the vision sent by God simply had nothing to do with eating unclean animals. Also, the last scripture in chapter 10 says that they asked Peter to stay a certain number of days with them. There was no need for Peter to be concerned about what might be on the table to eat since Cornelius was already abiding by the law of the clean and unclean.

It is also important to understand what a common animal was. Common is synonymous with defiled. A common animal was always a clean animal. To put it very simply, a common animal was a clean animal that was kept with an unclean animal. Jews at the time of the New Testament believed a clean animal could be defiled and become unfit to consume based on its close association with an unclean animal. A cow kept in a pen with a horse, for example. Beef sold in a market next to Pork. It is important to note that this doctrine is not contained anywhere in scripture but rather was part of the oral tradition of the Pharisees. God tells Peter not to call his clean things common. This spiritual interpretation is that God has people among all nations, and does not call them defiled based on their ethnicity. However, for those who still wish to carnally interpret Peter's vision, let's be very clear: at no time in this vision did God ask Peter to eat an unclean animal.

Now we will look at other scriptures, which are used many times, out of context, to try to prove that now it is acceptable to eat unclean animals.

**Ti 4:1 Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;**

**1Ti 4:2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;**

**1Ti 4:3 Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.**

**1Ti 4:4 For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:**

**1Ti 4:5 For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.**

As always, we must view all scripture in context. Chapter four starts by saying that these things would happen "in latter times." In other words, Paul was speaking of something that was not yet going on among them. Verse three cannot be talking about people abiding by the law of the clean and unclean because people had, undisputedly, been doing that since the first part of the Old Testament. Verse two calls these teachings mentioned in verse three "doctrines of devils" which were going to be preached in the latter (later) days. It would not be consistent with any of Paul's writings for him to be calling the law of the clean and unclean animals a doctrine of devils. We all know that this law was given by almighty God, whether or not we agree on its modern consequence. If you contend that verse three is referring to people who teach that we should abstain from eating unclean animals, then you must be saying that this law given by God is a "devil's" doctrine.

We will examine the true meaning of these scriptures. Paul is speaking about those who will depart from the faith. They will command people to abstain from meats, which God created to be received as food. Verse five goes on to say, "For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." God tells us in His word (Leviticus the eleventh chapter) which animals are sanctified. Nowhere in God's word are the unclean animals ever "cleaned up" or sanctified to be used for food. The meats referred to in these verses in Timothy are most definitely from clean animals. We are supposed to follow our Lord Jesus' example and pray over our food and give thanks to Him, even though we are eating holy, sanctified food. However, we cannot pray over an unclean animal and expect it to become holy, because it is not "sanctified by the word." It would go against God's word for that animal to be holy only by prayer.

Throughout the entirety of the Bible, unclean animals are never referred to as food or meat. There are a few spiritual examples of something "unclean" being called food, such as John 6:53-55, where Jesus says His Blood is drink and his Flesh is meat. Jesus was not teaching cannibalism, of course, but rather speaking of the spiritual. Another example would be Psalm 74:14, regarding the breaking of the heads of Leviathan for the people in the wilderness. Again, spiritual language, and a fascinating study for another time. The point stands, however, when speaking of things that people ate, unclean animals are not even considered to be in the same category as food.

Another point to consider is this, if we generalize "creature" in verse four (1 Ti 4:4) to mean every creature, clean and unclean, then we must include humans. The scripture instructs us to preach the Gospel to "every creature" (Mark 16:15). Jesus was talking about humans here in Mark. I don't think anyone believes that cannibalism is an acceptable practice in the church of Jesus Christ. So it follows that, unsurprisingly, we must not divorce scripture or parts of scriptures from their proper context.

Hundreds of years after the start of the church at Pentecost, there did arise those who gave heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. These people incorporated pagan beliefs into Christianity. The doctrine of a celibate priesthood and the doctrine of Lent were both doctrines that can be found in ancient Mesopotamian religions. They were indeed doctrines of devils. Verse three speaks specifically of these two doctrines incorporated into the Christian movement by the Roman Catholic Church. The doctrine of a celibate priesthood has been Satan's tool to promote sexual perversions, as we have seen over and over again in current events.

As far as Lent is concerned, there is some insight in the text of scripture that deals with a mourning period practiced by ancient Mesopotamian cultures. In Ezekial chapter eight, we find the phrase "weeping for Tammuz." Without getting too far off-topic, Tammuz referred to historically as Dumuzi, was a pagan deity whose death and resurrection were thought to be associated with winter to spring seasons. During the Lenten season, Catholics are commanded to abstain from meats, which are clean to eat. We also know that even now, many Catholics refrain from eating beef or any meat other than fish on Fridays. The apostle Paul warns us of these false doctrines, that certainly came to pass after the lifetime of the Apostles.

Another scripture that people use to justify eating everything (at least the unclean animals that are popular as food now) is found in I Corinthians.

**1Co 10:25 Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake:**

**1Co 10:26 For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.**

**1Co 10:27 If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake.**

Shambles is defined as a butcher's stall or meat market, and Paul said not to ask questions, but, about what? Paul answers that question in verse twenty-eight. If we generalize the statement in verse twenty-seven to mean any type of flesh, then we must include humans. Cannibalism is still practiced in the world today. Would we be obeying the scripture to sit down with people from these cultures and eat the remains of a human being, simply because it was offered to us? I think many would agree that would be wrong. Read on and you will see what Paul is talking about in the next verse.

**1Co 10:28 But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:**

If verse twenty-seven means that we should eat anything that is set before us, then that is immediately contradicted in verse twenty-eight. Once again, context is king. There could be any number of reasons not to eat what is "set before you." You could have a food allergy, you could be too full, you could be on a diet, you could simply not like it, or it could be an unclean animal. Paul does not contradict God's dietary laws in verse twenty-seven, but rather, he tells us how we should regard clean meats that have been sacrificed to idols. Let's conclude our discussion of this chapter by looking at I Corinthians 10:31.

**1Co 10:31 Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.**

How can we eat flesh to the glory of God, if God has said that it is an abomination to eat of that flesh? Once again, Paul is not telling the Corinthian church that it is acceptable to God to eat unclean animals. In the eighth chapter of I Corinthians, there is additional instruction concerning clean meats sacrificed to idols. We are thankful this is not yet a concern in the

United States today. We will now turn our attention to Romans 14:2-4 and the last part of verse 6.

**Rom 14:2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.**

**Rom 14:3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.**

**Rom 14:4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.**

**Romans 14:6 ...He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.**

The "all things" in verse two is speaking about all types of food. For instance; meats, vegetables, fruit, etc... We know this because verse two talks about "another" that excludes everything but herbs. In other words, the weak person doesn't eat all things. Paul's main point in this chapter is that we should not offend our brother. It is illogical to presume that Paul is including certain unclean animals in his "all things" statement. Why stop at just the animals that are commonly eaten in society? Even plants have restrictions in the Bible. Many poisonous substances would be included in this broad interpretation of "all things." Based on the context of things that are food, however, including plants and clean animals, (meat,) the "all things" statement makes perfect sense. Let's look at Romans 14:21.

**Rom 14:21 It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.**

Paul says in I Corinthians 8:13 that he will not eat flesh if it offends his brother. Verse nineteen of Romans fourteen instructs us to "follow after the things which make for peace." Once again, Paul is not saying it is "okay" to eat unclean animals. Instead, he is saying that we should not be an offense to others in the church.

While in Romans, we will look at another misunderstood passage. Look at Romans 14:14.

**Rom 14:14 I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.**

If this scripture means that the law of the clean and unclean no longer applies, can we contain its meaning just to include unclean meats? This scripture could be generalized by some to mean that there is nothing unclean anymore, not even morally unclean. This scripture simply relates to the rest of the chapter. If a brother believes that he shouldn't eat meat, then he should abide by that belief. He will not be lost if he does not eat meat. Some are vegetarians, and it is certainly not a sin for them to refrain from eating meat. There is also another point to consider with this scripture. The Greek word (Strong's number G2839) that is translated as "unclean" is used twelve times in ten verses in the New Testament. Seven times, that word is translated as "common". In fact, common is the first definition for that particular Greek word. The word common is defined as "shared by all" or "ceremonially profane"



Thinking on Paul's statement, his logic is sound. How can something be profaned or defiled with itself? If something is defiled, then it is necessarily some external thing that defiled it. Since Paul was writing about food, common or ceremonially profane would probably be the better choice for Romans 14:14. The Jews would not eat a clean animal that they considered common. Remember that Peter said that he had never eaten anything common or unclean. The regulations that determined whether clean meat was common are not found in the scripture, but they certainly were an issue in Paul's day. Unclean animals were never referred to as common. So, if someone believes that a clean animal is common, (profane,) then to him it is common. We cannot decide what is clean for food since that has already been decided by the scriptures.

Many people believe that the Lord Jesus himself taught against the law of the clean and the unclean. These scriptures are used many times by those who try to prove that they can eat unclean animals! The scriptures in question are found in Mathew 15:10-11.

**Mat 15:10 And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand:**

**Mat 15:11 Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man.**

Recall that at the beginning of this chapter, the Pharisees ask Jesus why his disciples did not wash their hands before they ate, which establishes the context of the question. The Pharisees accused the disciples of breaking the traditions of the elders. Jesus' greater spiritual point does stand, and it's a shame people ignore it to make a specious point about unclean animals. Jesus tells us His disciples in the following verses that the things that come from the mouth originate in the heart. What are some of these things that "come from the mouth?" Adultery, murder, fornication, theft, false witness, blasphemies, evil thoughts. In this way, eating unclean animals is also something that "comes from the mouth," since it is a sin. Jesus then concludes in verse twenty by saying that eating with unwashed hands does not defile a man, concluding with the context that started the lesson originally. The Pharisees were concerned with eating with dirty hands when they should have been concerned with their own sin.

**Mat 15:1 Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying,**

**Mat 15:2 Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.**

The tradition of the "washing" is the tradition the disciples broke. In Mark 7, this same account is written with the word "defiled" used to describe the disciples' hands. The word defiled is the same word used in Romans 14:14 that means common or ceremonially profane. This is what Jesus was speaking about in verses ten and eleven. Let's pick up the account again at Mathew 15:15-20.

**Mat 15:15 Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable.**

**Mat 15:16 And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding?**

**Mat 15:17 Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?**

**Mat 15:18 But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man.**

**Mat 15:19 For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:**

**Mat 15:20 These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.**

The Pharisees believed it was a sin to eat without washing your hands first. Jesus' statements in verses ten and eleven are explained in verse twenty. We are not sinning to eat with unwashed hands. If we try to expand the meaning of verses ten and eleven beyond Jesus' explanation, where do we stop? Can we include harmful drugs that are used today and say that they do not defile because they go in the mouth and what goes in the mouth does not defile? Drunkenness, described in the Bible as sinful, certainly results from something going into the mouth. Once again, the logical outcome of this reasoning is similarly preposterous to our previous examples. The Lord Jesus' explanation does not contradict God's law of the clean and unclean. Also, the apostles understood Jesus because they never ate unclean animals or taught others to do so (as we previously talked about in Acts the tenth chapter).

Observing the law of the clean and unclean will not save your soul. Only the blood of Jesus Christ can do that. However, observing this law is a matter of holiness before God. Our faith in Christ motivates our obedience. Let's read what God says in Leviticus 11:44-45.

**Lev 11:44 For I am the LORD your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.**

**Lev 11:45 For I am the LORD that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.**

It is just as important to be obedient to the law of the clean and unclean as it is to be obedient to the other laws of holiness. For example, in Deuteronomy 22:5, God said that it is an abomination for a woman to "wear that which pertaineth to a man..." Do we have the authority to obey one law of holiness and disregard the other? Our Lord expects obedience to His word. The apostle Peter, in his first epistle, states again what is recorded in Leviticus 11:45. Look at I Peter 1:15-16.

**1Pe 1:15 But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;**  
**1Pe 1:16 Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.**

Peter had no problems using the scriptures that referred back to God's dietary law. Peter instructs us to be holy in all manner of conversation. This includes what we take into our bodies. Interestingly, in modern language, the word conversation refers to what is spoken, but the Greek word (Strong's G390) means manner of life, conduct, and behavior. To Peter, how we live and what we do demonstrates our holiness before Christ.

Now read these scriptures from Isaiah 66:15-17.

**Isa 66:15 For, behold, the LORD will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire.**

**Isa 66:16 For by fire and by his sword will the LORD plead with all flesh: and the slain of the LORD shall be many.**

**Isa 66:17 They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the LORD.**

In Isaiah's prophecy about the period after the old covenant, it is very clear that eating unclean animals is still an abomination. Also, in Revelation, we have the following scriptures.

**Rev 18:1 And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory.**

**Rev 18:2 And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.**

Now, it is clear that the angel is speaking of forces of spiritual darkness, but some of them are described as unclean birds. If there are no unclean birds, then why would the angel use this terminology?

Now we will return to almost the beginning of our discussion. We know that the clean animals went into Noah's ark by sevens and the unclean animals went into the ark by two. Noah was commanded to gather food to provide for themselves and the animals (Genesis 6:21).

However, when the flood was over, and Noah, his family, and the animals came out of the ark, there was a commandment given to Noah by the LORD. It is found in Genesis 9:3.

**Gen 9:3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.**

Many believe that this scripture means that all meats may be consumed for food. First of all, when we study the Word of God, we cannot take one scripture out of context and use it to confirm our biases, regardless of how it may seem to contradict other scriptures in the Bible. No doctrine can be established on one scripture. In reality, the scriptures are not contradictory, but rather humans are.

So, let's take a closer look at this verse. On the surface, "every moving thing that liveth" would include humans, so that interpretation could not condemn cannibalism. We can reject that interpretation for obvious reasons. If it means that any creature besides humans that lives and moves is given for food, then we must address why God gave us living things that will make us very sick and possibly kill us quickly if we eat them. Some examples are certain jellyfish and poisonous frogs, among many other things.

Does this verse restrict moving things that live to all animals? A key thing to note here is the moving things are food in the same way that the "green herb," or plants, are. As we mentioned before, not all plants are considered food, and a great many of them are poisonous for human consumption. In Genesis 1:29 (long before the Law of Moses,) God defined the herbs that are "meat," (food,) as seed-bearing plants and fruits of trees yielding seeds. God gave Noah animals for food like he gave Adam plants for food, which in context does not include animals or plants that were not considered to be food.

Hopefully, this teaching has aided in your journey to understand the Word of God in a fuller way. Here are some final thoughts that summarize this discussion:

1. Animals were created either clean or unclean from the beginning.
2. The law of the clean and unclean existed thousands of years before Moses.
3. Righteous people are recorded eating many times before the Law of Moses, but no unclean animal was ever eaten.
4. Jesus nor the Apostles ever taught that unclean animals are now food.
5. The Apostles did not eat unclean animals, even years after Christ's ascension.
6. In prophecy, including prophecies after the old covenant period, unclean animals are still present.
7. We cannot create doctrines just to confirm our cultural biases. All doctrine must weigh scripture together in its proper context.