

04-Apr-2011

Duck Dining—a Defiling Diet!

Dear Brethren,

We have learned much in our past two Friday-evening studies. The question of focus that we have answered was posed to us by Sunday keepers who desired to promote an unrestrained, flesh diet. In citing Paul's counsel of *1Tim four* as a proof text, they thereby repudiate us for condemning the consumption of swine and other Levitically deemed unclean animals. The studies have been placed on the website at *Mustardseedadvent.com* under the heading, *Bible's Clean Diet, Parts I & II*. Be sure to hear part III of this series this coming Friday.

From amongst us, those who celebrate the diet that Christ recommends and the table that He has set, the question has arisen, "can we legally include in our cuisine birds such as duck and geese?" To answer this question, we must refer to the dictionary so as to discern which species of birds to which we refer when we even speak of "duck". This research approach we must do because the word, duck, does not appear in the Bible. Since it is not in the Bible then either the Lord referred to the animal by use of another name or He failed to give counsel for us on the matter. The latter explanation is unlikely because the species that we call "duck" is too pervasive in nearly all lands and cultures. Thus, the judgment of the *mustard seed* is that the duck belongs to the swan family and is prohibited for Israel to consume. A confirming Text will be cited later in this letter. For now, suffice it to say that it is a water fowl, it lives, abides, nests, and swims in bodies of water such as swamps and wet lands. Accordingly, the Bible clearly says, "**These ye shall eat of all that are IN THE WATERS: all that have fins and scales shall ye eat.**" —Deut 14: 9. Also we are told, "**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. 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**" —Lev 11: 9, 10. Our imagination has limited our understanding of these Texts to apply to merely creatures who never leave the water. New light reveals that it applies to all creatures who use water as their habitat. Consider amphibious animals such as frogs, and alligators: Indeed, they too fall under the parameters of this Text for they also abide "in the waters". Ducks likewise abide in the water as their bodies are designed accordingly having, like the frog and the alligator, webbed feet for that very lifestyle.

Regarding these issues we must take great care to be prudent. The Lord has freed us from yesterday's immense burden of vegetarianism; let us rejoice in that. Let us not ungratefully seek to expand the vast list of delicious foods provided for us as if His table was insufficient or contemptible. Also, in our analysis, we must not be theologically egotistical and presumptuous: We must not assume that, because we customarily describe an animal using our terms, the Lord endorses the same descriptive verbiage. When He identified an animal, He did so after Adam's inspiration—not our customary slang and idioms. "**And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof**" —Gen 2: 19. Christ did the creating; Adam did the naming. After reading the Lord's descriptions, we needed to interpret His words into our language. Some words like cattle or chicken or even swine were easy to convert to our language because they were commonly deployed and dominantly present in our historic use of language and in our world culture causing their names to pass through the corridors and curtains of historic communications. Other words, like swan were not as prevalent and consequently not reinforced linguistically; thus, such words faded into obscurity. To illustrate, does anyone know what an ossifrage or a cuckow are? Consequently, since English people define a certain water fowl as "duck", then we as English-speaking people must

Duck Dining—a Defiling Diet!

search our own language to see what we mean by use of that term or the kind of family to which that bird belongs. My research proves that duck and swan are part of the same family, the Anatidae. [Swan : any of various heavy-bodied long-necked mostly pure white **AQUATIC BIRDS** (family Anatidae) that are related to but larger than the geese, walk awkwardly, fly strongly when once started, and are graceful swimmers —Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, Copyright © 1981 by G. & C. Merriam Co.]. Though the duck is by name not mentioned, the swan is indeed forbidden for consumption and defined as unclean in *Lev11* and *Deut 14*. “Of all clean birds ye shall eat. But these are they of which ye shall not eat:...the swan, and the pelican...the stork, and the heron after her kind...” —Deut 14:11-18. Notice in this Text, all the condemned birds are aquatic or birds which move in the waters. Many have sub species, species after their kind, which belong to the same family and which are also condemned as dietary cuisine. The swan belongs to the Anatidae family; the pelican belongs to the Pelecanidae family; the stork belongs to the Ciconiidae family; and the heron belongs to Ardeinae family.

The Lord listed the families and forbade us from eating them or those after their kind. Further logic makes this point more clear. Instead of asking about duck, suppose a different bird became popular cuisine, suppose in some cultures people ate the bird which we call the egret. Like the bird that we call duck, the Bible also does not mention it. With the egret we have a similar issue as we have with the swan, and the Lord condemned their consumption when He forbade the consumption of the heron as they are a variation within that species. Is this not similar to variations within human beings? When the Bible says, “for God so Loved the world”, none say, “what about the Tasmanian people?” All reasonable people automatically recognize that they are people included in the population that the Bible calls, the world. Egrets belong to the heron family as Tasmanians belong to the human family. In order for more clarity, we, in our linguistic growth, have expanded animal identities and created sub categories by calling some herons and some egrets, and this has caused the confusion. The expansion of language has likewise perplexed us regarding ducks duping us into thinking that they are missing from the Lord’s counsel on diet. Apparently, any creature that abides in the water and that does not have fins and scales is unfit for human consumption.

The need to employ the dictionary in research into the Anatidae family was mentioned above. This search has directed me to *Your Dictionary.Com*. Below are several definitions which pertain to swan and duck:

1. [duck - Definition of duck at YourDictionary.com](#)
Any of various wild or domesticated swimming birds of the family *Anatidae*, characteristically having a broad, flat bill, short legs, and webbed feet. ...
2. [waterfowl - Definition of waterfowl at YourDictionary.com](#)
a water bird; esp., any of a family (*Anatidae*, order Anseriformes) of birds consisting of ducks, geese, and swans. wa-ter-fowl...
3. [swans - Definition of swans at YourDictionary.com](#)
pl. swans or swan any of several large-bodied, web-footed waterfowl (family *Anatidae*, esp. genus *Cygnus*) with a long, graceful neck and, typically, ...
4. [waterfowls - Definition of waterfowls at YourDictionary.com](#)
a water bird; esp., any of a family (*Anatidae*, order Anseriformes) of birds consisting of ducks, geese, and swans. Webster's New World College Dictionary ...

One member of our group has searched the “Net” to discern if the SDA church renders duck to be clean. That person reported that, contrary to this the MSA’s findings, they do indeed consider duck to be among the clean flesh that we are allowed to consume. I cannot discern if their finding represents an official, SDA position, and I have no compulsion to search further to validate that research; however, if it is true, it merely manifests the more so that they, like the modern Jews who have reached the same conclusion, have not grown to “choose the good and refuse the evil.” This

The Mustard Seed Advent, 04-Apr-2011

they have not done, because, as admonished by Paul, they have not ‘left the principles of the doctrine of Christ’ —see Heb 6: 1. We do know already, even without this report, that the SDA church, the Angel of Laodicea, is no longer capable to minister to any for their doctrines have proven to corrupt: They pollute us and make us abhorrent to Christ against His petition: “**Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spue you not out. And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nation, which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them**” —Lev 20: 22, 23. Instead, let us immediately integrate this, the *mustard seed’s* findings into our lives. Let us not repeat the sin of Israel: “...*The children rebelled against me: they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgments to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them*” —Ezek 20: 21. Jacob’s call today is to be clean, and it mimics his command to his household yesterday as they prepared to leave Shechem and journey to Bethel. By teaching and living this counsel we will grow even cleaner in the Lord’s sight so that we may welcome His abiding presence.

Sincerely,

Derek