



ON
ADDRESS
OR
ABSTINENCE

FROM THE
FLESH OF ANIMALS AS FOOD,

DELIVERED IN THE
METHODIST-EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

Philadelphia, June 8th, 1840.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF
The Board of Publication of the Church.

1840.



Rare Collection

204
P19s
no.11



L. Tom Perry Special Collections
Harold B. Lee Library
Brigham Young University

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY



3 1197 22950 0191

2010
204
P. 20
11

37

BIBLE TESTIMONY,

ON ABSTINENCE

FROM THE FLESH OF ANIMALS AS FOOD;

BEING

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED IN THE

BIBLE-CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

NORTH THIRD STREET, WEST KENSINGTON, ON THE EIGHTH OF JUNE 1840.
BEING THE ANNIVERSARY OF SAID CHURCH.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM METCALFE.

PHILADELPHIA.
J. Metcalfe & Co. Printers, back of No. 112, Walnut Street.

•••••
1840.

Philadelphia, June 10th, 1840.

TO THE REV. WM. METCALFE.

Rev. and Dear Sir—In accordance with a resolution adopted by the members of the Bible-Christian Church, organizing the undersigned Committee as a Board of Publication, we are requested respectfully to solicit copy of the ADDRESS delivered by you on Whit-Monday, June eighth, 1840. “On the Bible Testimony on abstinence from the flesh of animals as food”—in order that the same may be printed. By complying therewith you will greatly oblige

Yours in the bonds of Christian Fellowship,

JAMES WRIGHT,
JAMES BROOKS,
HENRY TAYLOR,
JOSEPH METCALFE,
JONATHAN WRIGHT, } Committee.

Philadelphia, June 11th 1840.

GENTLEMEN,

In reply to your letter containing the wish of the Bible-Christian Congregation, I have merely to say that if the views of my address are deemed of sufficient importance to be made public by the Congregation, it is at their disposal. The Address was written amid many and pressing duties of a different character, and I only regret it is not more worthy of the good opinion of the Bible-Christian Church and of the subject on which it treats.

Very Respectfully,

Yours Truly in the Lord,

WILLIAM METCALFE.

TO JAMES WRIGHT, &c. Committee.

ADDRESS ON ABSTINENCE.

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

It is with feelings of peculiar pleasure that I meet with you on each returning Sabbath in this place,—a house, which we have consecrated to the worship of Almighty God, and in which we have periodically assembled each returning Sabbath, for a series of years, to worship and honor, and magnify his Holy Name. But it is with the utmost gratification that I have the pleasure of meeting you here to-day, to celebrate once more the anniversary of our Church in this, the land of our voluntary adoption.—Twenty-three years ago, a few of us landed at this city, strangers, in a strange country, far from those scenes and associations that had been dear to us from childhood, and widely separated from our relatives and former friends. Poor and unknown were we to all whom we beheld around us, and there were none from whom we had any especial reason to anticipate the sympathies and consolations of friendship. We were not, however, discouraged by what we beheld, nor cast down by our seemingly disconsolate condition. Our motto was “The Lord will Provide.” Like Abraham of old, we had left the land of our nativity, to accomplish an important work. Our purpose was nothing less than to introduce principles of religion and knowledge

among a free people, which we believed to be essential to the happiness of all men here, and indispensable to their peace and everlasting salvation hereafter. With such ends and purposes in view we crossed the waters of the mighty deep; with such views we disembarked on the shores of this fertile land, and the blessing of the Father of all Spirits has been on our every religious effort. Our labours, though not attended with that display which some Christian professors have experienced, have yet been crowned with signal success, and with the Psalmist we can truly say, in relation to our progress, "It is the Lord's doings, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

It has been customary with us in commemorating these Anniversaries of our Church, to address you on some one, or more, of those peculiar doctrines which we entertain as Bible-Christians, and by which we are distinguished from other denominations; and it is my intention, this morning, to pursue the same course, and to present to your serious and Christian consideration, the Scripture Testimony, so far as I may be enabled of the Divine Mercy to do so, on one of these subjects wherein we deviate, both in theory and practice, from the great body of our Christian Brethren,

You are all aware that the propagation of tenets of a peculiar nature, or the adoption of habits that are singular or unique, has a tendency to attract the attention of inquisitive minds, and will often lead them to enquire into the origin and foundation of such deviations from the prevailing opinions and practices of men. In these cases it is a duty incumbent on the adopters of such peculiarities, whether in faith or practice, or in both, to be "Always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh the reason of the hope that is in them." These are precisely the circumstances then, in which we are placed; we differ from others, and should be ready to point out the cause; hence the duty of searching after truth devolves upon us imperiously, not

only that we may be able to display our views with clearness and perspicuity, to the edification of our brethren, but also that we ourselves, by our efforts to benefit others, may progressively approximate to the perfection of that wisdom which is in CHRIST JESUS OUR LORD.

As a religious community we have adopted a mode of life, in regulating the appetites and fulfilling the physical and organic laws of the body, altogether different from the practices of other Christian professors. We have long discontinued the very fashionable habit, of feeding on the flesh of butchered animals, and have confined ourselves wholly to vegetable productions. We have long resisted the allurements of the intoxicating bowl, and have been contented to satisfy our thirst from the limpid stream. The system of temperance which we thus religiously practise, furnishes us with strength and activity sufficient to support the most laborious occupations, secures one of the all important blessings of life, the possession of health,—and qualifies us for the enjoyment of a more perfect mode of being and intellectual delights, than ever falls to the participation of the “Wine-bibber or the glutton.”

Deeply impressed with the importance of the doctrine that “It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine,” and knowing it to be the duty of a minister of the Word of GOD, faithfully to communicate to his congregation, whatever information he may deem requisite “to build them up in the faith,” to assist them to understand the Divine Record, and to remove every probable objection to the truth, the credibility or the practicability and usefulness of his doctrines, I purpose on this occasion, the annual assembly of our Church, with Divine Assistance, to present you with such a developement of the doctrine of the Bible, in relation to abstinence from the flesh of animals as it is to be hoped, will go far to satisfy you of the correctness of a vegetable diet, and of its consistency with enlightened

reason and harmony with the laws of our nature, and the plain testimony of the Word of God.

It is not however the intention of your speaker to enter into any illustration of the subject from Anatomical or Physiological facts, though this might be done very effectually, if here requisite or proper. Looking on the subject however in a religious light, we propose to treat it as such and to be guided in our labors by the Sacred Scriptures. They are confessedly the foundation of all moral, and of all religious principle. It is in them we have presented to our contemplation an unlimited source of knowledge. In them is recorded, for our edification, a Revelation of the will of the Almighty. Here we find those Sacred Precepts according to which we are commanded to regulate our lives, so that we may become the children of God. Here we have unfolded to us the astonishing work of Creation, and the still more wonderful operation of Redemption and Salvation for all that believe. Here also we are taught to know aright the nature and divine attributes of the Creator, and the Immortality of our own Souls. Here is presented to us a display of the end of our existence—the proper means by which to preserve that existence, and how to perpetuate our health, prolong our days and participate of the happiness intended for us by our Maker. To the evidence of the Sacred pages therefore on the proper food for sustaining life, in accordance with the will of God—on preserving health and enjoying “A sound mind in a sound body”—and at the same time on progressively gaining more, and more of heavenly wisdom, our enquiries will this morning be particularly directed.

At the very commencement of the book of Genesis we find this plain and important commandment prominently set forth, as one of those laws of direction, essential to the health and happiness of new-created man:—“*Behold I have given to you, even every herb bearing seed which is upon*

the face of the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for food." This primeval law of Divine Revelation was undoubtedly given to direct the families of mankind in the selection of their appropriate food. That food, according to the precept, was to be wholly vegetable. The productions of the earth alone were to be to them for meat. These, the Creator of all things deemed fully sufficient to sustain his new formed creature, man. And who will presume to be wiser than the Omniscient? Were not the regulations of this original Law such as were calculated to preserve the health, to support the vigor, sustain the power, and secure the physical happiness of the human race? Have after ages ever disputed the reality of the enjoyments of the primitive race of men, especially whilst they continued in their integrity? Encompassed as they were, by the lovely scenes of Paradise, and guided and influenced by the mild principles of this divine law, whether they contemplated the glorious vault of heaven, or their eyes reposed on the beautiful verdure of the earth;—whether they listened to the sweet music of the murmuring brook, or they wandered in pleasing reflections amid the umbrageous solitude of the forest, their enjoyments would doubtless be more intellectual, more spiritual, and every way superior to any thing experienced in our day by degenerated human nature. So entirely have men, in all subsequent times been persuaded of the truth of this view of the subject, that the period has been emphatically denominated the *Golden Age*.

“Men of the Golden Age, who fed on fruit,
 Nor durst with bloody meals their mouths pollute;
 Then birds, in airy space might safely move,
 And tim'rous hares on heaths securely rove;
 Nor needed fish the guileful hook to fear—
 For all was peaceful and that peace sincere.”

What then, Christian Friends, shall we say more con-

cerning this original Law—this first Revelation of the will of the Creator of all things, relative to the diet of his creature man? Shall we be justified in concluding that it was intended only by its all-wise Author, to be applicable to Adam, and that merely during his continuance in Paradise? In so judging we should undoubtedly err; we should be putting a partial construction on the Divine Record, when we are most unequivocally assured that the “Scriptures are of no private interpretation,” but that “all Scripture is given for our edification and to make us wise.”—Hence the law we are considering, is for us, as well as for those to whom it was first given; its principles, whether dietetic, or spiritual, or both, concern us all, and it is for us to apply those principles, according to their fair and reasonable interpretation, to the regulation of our lives, the government of our appetites and the subjugation of all our unhallowed propensities. It appears indeed to be an incontrovertible fact, that till after the deluge, or for a period of over sixteen hundred years, mankind were sustained wholly by vegetable food; it is also clear from the nature of the Law as recorded in the text before us, that man was originally *intended to live upon vegetables only*; and as no change appears to have been made in the organic structure of men’s bodies after the flood, nor any extraordinary alteration in the vegetable world, to render its productions less nutritive than they were before, it is not probable that any change was made, or intended to be made in the nature of their food. An illustrious expounder of the Sacred Scriptures has justly remarked; “Eating the flesh of animals, considered in it itself, is something *profane*; for the people of the most ancient time never ate the flesh of any beast or fowl, but only seeds, especially bread made of wheat, also the fruits of trees, esculent plants, milk, and what is produced from milk, as butter &c. To kill animals and to eat their flesh was *unlawful*, and seem-

ed as something **BESTIAL** ; they only sought from them *services and uses* ; but in succeeding times, when man began to grow fierce like a wild beast, yea, fiercer, then first they began to kill animals, and to eat their flesh." The diet at first prescribed was declared by Infinite Wisdom 'to be very good,' and it would be derogatory to his character to suppose he had erred. We cannot otherwise believe therefore, but we are justified in concluding that the dietetic principles presented to our consideration, in this first law of God to man, are adapted to our nature, preservative of our health, calculated to prolong our days upon earth, to give vigor and energy both to our physical and mental faculties, and are worthy of all acceptance.

Were we to judge of the opinions of some of our fellow Christians however, by the manner in which they speak and write on this subject, we could come to no other conclusion than that our Heavenly Father had found it necessary to abrogate one of his first laws to mankind as *imperfect*, and had seen good to substitute another in its place, of a nature wholly different to the former. Strange as it may appear, there are, nevertheless, those to be found among professors of Christianity who have seemingly thus judged of the ways of the Almighty. Professing to believe in Revelation and in the immutability of its Author, they yet contend, particularly when reasoning in support of the carnerous habit of feeding on the mangled bodies of butchered animals, that an error, of a most serious nature, must have been committed, when man was directed to sustain his physical existence by mere vegetable food ! "Morbid debility" say they, "induced by an often unfriendly state of the atmosphere, together with the labor of cultivating the ground, would necessarily require a higher, and more stimulating nutriment than the vegetable kingdom could supply." This imaginary error is supposed to have been "found out" about the time of the deluge, and as soon as

God had made the momentous discovery, he is represented by them as having promulgated a new law, as if in order to counteract the effects of the unfortunate error attributed to him. "*Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you.*" "Here," say such reasoners,"—"we have indubitable proof that it is now lawful to eat flesh! Oh! how very gracious is our God! How comforting the information contained in this indulgent law! Is it not as plain as language can express it, that we are here allowed to eat of *every moving thing that liveth*, without any restraining self denial, or any needless mortification of our bodily appetites!"

We shall not stop to dwell on the inconsistency, nor to enlarge on the blasphemy of representing the Omniscient as capable of erring, or of finding out a mistake in his legislation, which had continued undetected by his Infinite Wisdom for sixteen hundred years! But we shall bespeak your serious and unbiassed attention whilst we enquire a little more minutely into the correctness of the generally received acceptance of this new law—this supposed indulgent grant to feed on "*every moving thing that liveth.*"

In the first place, then, it appears to us evident from the history and experience of all ages and of all nations, that "*every moving thing that liveth*" has never been considered as fit for meat, by any one class of people on the face of the whole earth; even the ferocious cannibal of the forest, who would feel no compunction at feeding on the flesh of a fellow mortal, would shrink from the odious practise of eating "*every moving thing that liveth.*" True it is, mankind, in the aggregate, have treated the animal part of creation, much after the manner that the poet has represented the Mahometans as treating their Prophet's mysterious charge, in relation to a certain portion of the swine, that no good Musselman may taste;—

“With sophistry their sauce they sweeten,
Till quite from tail to snout 'tis eaten.”

So, one man will eat beef, but not pork, another will eat mutton, another fish, another bear's-meat, and perhaps another may be found that would not object to a dish of frogs, or snails; but no where can the man be found that will eat “every moving thing that liveth.” Can we then reasonably believe that the Maker of all things, ever gave forth such a precept?

In the second place, the commonly accepted interpretation of this law is not in agreement with the declarations of the context: “*Flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof shall ye not eat; for surely your blood of your lives will I require, at the hands of every BEAST will I require it, as at the hands of MAN.*” The most inveterate devotee to the fashionable habit of flesh eating, will not surely contend that God, in this text, commanded men to eat flesh, and yet accompanied that precept with a clause in which he declares he will require the “*blood of your lives*” for every beast slain? If he had intended us to feed on flesh would he have accompanied the grant with such a clause?—Would he, as our Creator, have implanted in our bosoms a feeling of commiseration so hostile to his purpose?—Sympathies so potent for the suffering victim? Could he intend that we should eat our food with perpetual compunction, and unceasing disquietude—that every morsel should be purchased with a pang, and every meal empoisoned with remorse;—and to increase our consternation to the utmost, would he have imperatively declared he would require the *blood of every slain beast at our hands*, and have inspired his Prophet to announce unto us most solemnly that “*He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man?*” Yet all these interrogatories must be admitted affirmatively, if God has commanded us to eat “*every moving thing that liveth.*”

To justify the common interpretation of this law, however, and to avoid the force of what we have already advanced, it is contended by some who have undertaken to comment on the Scriptures, that the term in the Hebrew Bible translated *beast*, implies, not only an animal, but that it is also applied to an *uncivilized*, or *ignorant* person, or to such as were in a state of Gentilism; in support of which they refer us to the Prophet Jonah (Chap. iii.) where not only the citizens of Ninneveh were commanded to repent but even the *beasts* also were directed, by the proclamation of the King, to *spread out their hands and cry mightily to the Lord!* Admitting the propriety of this appeal to the Hebrew text; not disputing for the present, the correctness of the interpretation for which they contend; grant it all,—and does it prove that God has here allowed man the privilege of feeding on flesh with impunity? We think not. We will appeal in our turn, to the import of the original in connection with such facts as will not fail, if we are not too sanguine in our conclusions, to convince all minds, untrammelled by the traditions of men, or unslaved by the chains of appetite, that the law under consideration, as given to Noah, has no reference whatever to eating reptiles, snakes, snails, or any other creeping thing of an animal nature, all of which are expressly prohibited or forbidden in the Levitical code (Chap. xi. v: 41.) but that it relates wholly to the productions of the vegetable kingdom;—that it is only an extension, a fuller illustration, a more particular specification of the principles comprehended in God's first law to man. If we were called on to give a translation of what is rendered *every moving thing*, we would say rather "*Every Creeper.*" But there is a great variety in the kinds of creepers. There are vegetable creepers, as well as animal ones. "The Vine" says the intelligent author of the Wonders of Nature and Art, "is a noble plant of the *reptile* or *creeping* kind."—

Animal Creepers, we have already seen, were expressly forbidden as articles of food. The Creeper of which Noah was by this law *allowed* to eat, was, in our apprehension the vine ; or grapes, *of every kind*, IN COMMON, or for food, *even as they did the green herb*, which fruits, the antediluvians had probably used only for sacred or religious purposes. In corroboration of this view of the subject, and as if designed to prevent any misapprehension as to the nature of the *Creeper* meant in this text, it is expressly written in the very same chapter, that “Noah planted a vineyard, that he drank of the wine, and that he was satisfied.” There is, moreover, a further provision in the context of the law, that deserves our notice ; by this they were mercifully prohibited from using the fruit of these creepers, when *the FLESH with the BLOOD*—that is, the *pulp* with the *juice* had acquired a *life* or *spirit* by standing together in a crushed state, till they had spontaneously fermented, and in consequence of this process, had actually become inebriating wine—alike injurious to the physical and moral life of man.

Such my Christian Friends is the plain unvarnished sense of our understanding of the law before us ; a sense which neither militates against the wisdom, nor the immutability of God ; a sense in perfect harmony with the first dietetic law given to mankind.

Our views, then, on the subject of a vegetable diet, as being that regimen designed for man by his Creator, so far, at least, as relates to the antediluvian world, or for a period of more than sixteen hundred years, are acceded to, without disputation, as being correct, and as borne out both by the natural and revealed laws of God ; and though the supposition has been exceedingly prevalent, particularly among modern professors of Religion, that the Noahic Dispensation commenced with a grant, or precept, directing men to “kill and eat,” we trust, the exposition of the

testimony we have here given, will go far to impress your minds, if not fully to convince your understandings that they have “foolishly imagined a vain thing”—that they have suffered their judgments to be biassed rather by the influence of appetite, and the power of habit, than their minds to be convinced by the testimony deducible from the works and the Word of God. In brief, Christian Friends, we think it must be no difficult matter to see that the superstructure erected in defence of gratifying an unnatural, inhuman, and carnivorous appetite is built on a “sandy foundation” and cannot stand ;—already, in fact, it is shaken to its very basis, and in a few more revolving years, as the light of moral, physiological and religious truth becomes more general on the subject, it must inevitably sink into its merited oblivion, and become a mere matter of history, at which to wonder.

We come next to the examination of that part of the Sacred Oracles which primarily related to the People of Israel. It is a portion of Scripture of deep, and often of thrilling interest to the Christian mind, evincing the Providence of God, as exercised over that peculiar people for good, and we are persuaded, with the Divine Blessing, you will be led to agree with us, that on the subject of our present enquiry there is much also recorded that tends to corroborate our principles in relation to diet.

Among those important commandments, promulgated by JEHOVAH from Mount Sinai, for the edification not only of the Children of Israel, but of generations yet to come, there is one with which we shall commence our remarks on this part of the Scripture Testimony :—“*Thou shalt not kill*” is the precept to which we allude. If we can succeed in satisfying you that this has any bearing upon the subject under investigation, or that the Great and Merciful Author, designed it to be understood as extending to “the cattle upon a thousand hills,” we shall not fear, in such

case, to persuade you, that eating animal food constituted no part of the Divine Economy with the House of Israel.

But it will be said, this law is not commonly looked upon, by the orthodox portion of the community, as having any reference whatever to the subject of our enquiry; that its obvious design was only to prevent the murder of human beings, or to deter man from imbruing his hands in the blood of his brother; and that any interpretation beyond this must be foreign to the intentions of the Author. We will attempt to meet this conclusion by and by; in the meantime we cannot overlook the fact that the history of all nations, in all ages that are gone by, abundantly evinces that this precept has had a very inefficacious effect in regulating and directing the conduct of mankind. Wars have existed between man and man, and between nations of men. Individuals have been, and still are trained up, educated, and supported by the public, for the very purpose of murdering their fellow beings; and wars and desolation, blood and carnage have covered the earth. If we ask of History, where is her Babylon?—If we enquire where is Persepolis, where is Phœnecia, Tyre, Sidon, Jerusalem, Thebes or Athens? We shall be answered they are desolated by the sword. Where the remnants of their glory? Wasted by the ravages of an invading army. The sword has devoured them: Even the very weeds that wantonly spring up around their ruins, owe their luxuriance to the blood of their murdered citizens. In a state of war, this precept, and indeed every similar institution of God, are entirely superceded by the murderous declarations of man. Theft is no longer stealing. Killing, in such case, is not murder. In national warfare it is declared to be *just* and *honorable* to plunder and to kill, and he who proves to be the most barbarous and successful, acquires the greatest share of renown. What then is the influence which the commandment before us has had in staying man from murder?—

The poet has given us a powerful, eloquent and just picture of man's reckless disregard of this Divine Law :

* * * * " 'Twas man himself
 Brought Death into the world : and man himself
 Gave keenness to his darts, quickened his pace,
 And multiplied destruction on mankind.
 With joy Ambition saw, and soon improved
 The execrable deed. 'Twas not enough
 By subtle fraud to snatch a single life :—
 Puny impiety ! Whole kingdoms fell
 To sate the lust of power : more horrid still,
 The foulest stain and scandal of our nature,
 Became its boast. *One* murder made a villian ;
Millions a hero. *Warriors* were privileged
 To kill, and numbers *sanctified the crime.*"

But, to come again to the import of this commandment. What certainty have we, Christian Friends, that not to kill men is the only true and proper sense, morally speaking, in which it ought to be understood? It is certain they could not eat flesh without killing. You will observe that the language of the precept however is altogether indefinite. 'Thou shalt not kill'—what? Who has authority or presumption to limit this precept to killing men? Is it not recollected by my hearers that we are peremptorily enjoined "not to add to the law, nor yet diminish ought from it." May we not reasonably believe that its application was benevolently intended to reach the animal creation? "The cattle upon a thousand hills are mine," saith JEHOVAH, and not even a single sparrow falleth to the ground without the knowledge of your heavenly Father." Would not the principles of mercy, and the sympathies of the human heart lead our judgments to such a conclusion? For our own part, we believe most sincerely, that this law was engraven not only on the table of stone on Mount Sinai, but that the finger of God *has written it also on our hearts* ; that there hence exists within us, whilst uncorrupted by the world, a repugnancy to killing animals, and also

an aversion to feeding on their flesh! Had God intended us so to live, he would not have imparted the milk of kindness to our bosoms. He always adapts his *means* to his *ends*:—He would rather have filled us with unfeeling ferocity—given us hearts incapable of humanity, of sympathy or mercy, and armed us, as he has done the hyena or the tiger, with fangs and claws, to lacerate and tear; *without remorse or compunction*, the palpitating limbs of agonizing life.

“Ah! then refrain the blood of beasts to spill,
And, till you can create forbear to kill!
Unthinking man! renounce that horrid knife
Nor dare to take for food a creature's life.”

But we rest not here alone. We pass on to the consideration of other facts, recorded in the history of this remarkable People;—facts, which in our apprehension evince in the most unequivocal manner, that it has been the will of the Author of our nature at all times that his creatures should derive their subsistence from the productions of the vegetable kingdom; and that they should not imbrue their hands in the blood of innocent creatures for food. It is recorded in the Bible that while this people were sojourning in the Wilderness, they were daily fed, by the bounty of their Heavenly Father with *Manna*, and that this display of his providential and paternal care was exercised over them, for forty years in succession; nor did the *Manna* cease to fall till the people began to eat of the fruits of the Promised Land. It will not be denied that the same Omnipotence, exercised in the continuous production of the *Manna*, had it pleased the Divine Being so to employ his power, could have furnished, with equal facility, *flesh* for his people in the Wilderness. But it was obviously the will of the Great Furnisher that his people should be sustained by bread. “Behold,” says he, “I will rain *bread* from Heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them,

whether they will walk according to my law or no." In what way could JEHOVAH have given a plainer indication of his intentions respecting the food of this, his peculiar People?

The land of Promise was represented to the Israelites as a land flowing with milk and honey—a land of wheat barley, figs, pomegranates, and other rich vegetable productions, without even once mentioning any kind of animal food, or depicting the country as adapted to the purposes of grazing, with the view of fattening cattle. The promises made to them as the blessings of obedience were "the dew of heaven and the fatness of the earth;" and it is, my Christian Friends, an important and remarkable fact, though neither generally known nor acknowledged, that whenever JEHOVAH *prescribes* or *appoints* a diet for mankind he never mentions the flesh of animals as constituting any part of that which "is good for food." We would wish you, Christian Friends, to particularly note—we say, *prescribes* or *appoints*. We are not here speaking of what he *permits* a sinful nation to do. He appointeth one thing, and yet, under certain circumstances, he permitteth another that is opposed to his appointment. We will illustrate our meaning:—He appointed from the beginning "that man should leave his father and his mother, and should cleave unto his wife, so that they twain should become intimately one;" but "because of the hardness of their hearts," a law was given by Moses *permitting* the Israelites to put away their wives, by giving them a writ of divorcement. He *appointed* from the beginning that mankind should live on vegetable food alone, but when the people of Israel in their disobedience to God's will, and in the wickedness of their hearts *lusted* for FLESH, and longed to return to the flesh-pots of Egypt, he *permitted* them to eat flesh, and this permission, the Bible tells us, was extended not merely for one day, nor two days, but

for a whole month;—and now mark the dreadful consequences resulting from the permission of this disobedient people to gratify their sinful desires—“While the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the judgment of the LORD was against the people, and they were afflicted with a great plague.” So great, indeed, was the fatal effect of this transgression, that the place was subsequently denominated “the sepulchre of the lusts!”—These instances of Scripture Testimony will enable you to understand our meaning in relation to the *appointments* of JEHOVAH in contradistinction to the *permissions* of his Providence; We repeat the observation then, hoping we are now understood, that whenever JEHOVAH *prescribes* or *appoints* a diet for his people, that diet is always vegetable, without any admixture of the flesh of animals. “He maketh the grass to grow for the cattle, and the *green herb for the use of Man.*” The writer of the book of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix. 26.) in describing those few things that are requisite for man’s welfare, says “The principal things for the whole use of man’s life are, water, fire, iron and salt; flour of wheat, honey, milk, and the blood of the grape, and oil and clothing.” There can be no reasonable doubt but that such was the light in which the subject was viewed by the faithful among the ancient Israelites. The refreshments David received at different times, for the support of himself and his six hundred faithful followers, from Abigail, from Ziba and Barzillia, and likewise what was brought to him at Hebron indicate very decidedly that such was the case. The provisions furnished on the various occasions I have named consisted of *bread and wine, wheat and barley, and flour of each kind, beans, lentiles, parched corn, raisins, summer fruits, dried figs, honey, butter of kine, and cheese of sheep and oil.* These were furnished in quantities sufficient to supply David and his army. The testimony of *Judith*, (chap xi.) though not considered canon-

ical, is yet admitted to have such claims to authenticity as to give importance to whatever is found in that ancient record. Judith then declares most unequivocally that the flesh of animals was expressly forbidden to the Israelitish Nation. In her interview with Holifernes she says "Our Nation shall not be punished, neither can the sword prevail against them, except they sin against their GOD ;—But they have determined to lay hands upon their CATTLE, and purposed to consume all those things that GOD *hath forbidden them to eat by his laws !*" Such were the declarations of one of the most eminent and pious females of the Jewish nation in her day. And can any one presume to doubt her apprehension of the nature and extent of the Divine Prohibitions ?

The noble example of Daniel and his companions, who refused to eat the meat from the King's table and to drink the wine, and who solicited *pulse* to eat, and *water* to drink, is also strongly corroborative of our views. It appears indeed from the narrative of the facts as recorded in the first chapter of his Prophecy, that vegetable food is not only the most nutritive,—“for their countenances were fairer and fatter in flesh than all those that eat the portion of the Kings meat ;—but that it contributes exceedingly to strengthening the intellectual faculties of man, for “ in all matters of wisdom and understanding they were found by the King, ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in his realm.” In a work published by Paxton, entitled “Illustrations of Scripture,” the author declares that the ancient Jews like the modern Hindoos abstained entirely from the use of flesh ; and the justly celebrated Dr. Lightfoot informs us that even in the days of JESUS CHRIST, the Pharisees taught that it was unlawful to *eat flesh* or to *drink wine*.

Before proceeding to the evidence of the Gospel on the subject of our enquiry, we propose briefly to meet one or

two of the many and various objections that will probably be brought forward in opposition to this system of abstinence from the flesh of animals, which we are feebly attempting to advocate. The first we shall notice is one that has the appearance of much plausibility : it is founded on the distinction between *clean* and *unclean* animals as described in the Levitical Law. We apprehend the nature of the distinction in that law has been generally misunderstood. The prohibitions there given are respecting the animals that give milk, not fit for the use of man. In consequence of such animals not ruminating, their milk is crude and unwholesome ; hence they were not to be *touched* in the operation of milking, nor should they be domesticated for such a purpose. Strange as it may appear to men of our times, it is nevertheless an important truth, in relation to the People of Israel, that the *milk* and the *fleece* were the principle objects for which herds and flocks were kept by them, and the Patriarchs who preceded them. Hence it is that we find a charge delivered by Solomon to this end : “Take heed that thou have goats milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household, and for the maintainance of thy maidens.” Paul also reiterated the like sentiment : “Who” says he “planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof ? Or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the *milk* of the flock ?”

My hearers will doubtless remember that we read in the Bible of a law having been given to man, almost immediately after his creation, prohibiting him from “eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil ;” from which we at once infer, without any difficulty of apprehension, that he was not to eat of the *fruit* of that interdicted tree. Now we understand and interpret this law rightly, and that for this very simple reason ;—We have not been accustomed either to eat *wood*, or the *branches* of *trees*, or to see our fellow beings doing so. But when we read of certain ani-

mals being allowed, and others interdicted, we do not so clearly see, nor with such facility understand that we are thereby prohibited from eating, or allowed to eat their *fruit* or produce, that is to say, their MILK. The cause of this "slowness of heart to believe," and unwillingness to admit the force of this important truth is obvious;—in the present depraved state of human appetite and human feeling we behold mankind every where around us, like so many *beasts of prey*, tearing and devouring with the greatest avidity, the mangled limbs of butchered animals; but had we been placed in community with the Brahmins of Hindostan and imbibed from infancy their mild and humane principles, we should never have believed ourselves tolerated, by the recorded distinction between the clean and unclean in the Livitical Law, to feed on the *bodies* of a portion of animated existence. For it is unquestionably true that as in the case of "the tree of knowledge," the *fruit* of the tree was meant, so in that of the allowed and forbidden animals, the *milk* of the clean was allowed, but that of the unclean interdicted.

Were it here requisite, or if time permitted we might reason in a similar manner in relation to those animated existences comprehended in the law that do not come within the limits of the preceding remarks; but our time will not allow us to go into all the details of the matter. Reasons, however, equally potent, and consistent with our views of the vegetable character of the aliment of the human species, can readily be assigned, for all the distinctions enumerated.

Another objection will probably be raised on the misapprehended testimony of the Bible respecting the sacrificial worship of the Jews. It will perhaps be contended that the Jews, by the command of JEHOVAH, offered animals in sacrifice, and eat of their religious offerings. We are ready to admit that they offered sacrifices, and ate of that

which was thus consecrated. But we have a few remarks which forcibly tend, if we are not much mistaken, to show that flesh-eating can derive no sanction, from the Bible account of sacrifices especially when we are willing to listen to a rational and consistent interpretation of these Jewish ceremonies. Every one will be apt, on the first thought, to wonder how so horrible a rite,—an ordinance so repugnant to some of the finest and the strongest feelings of human nature, as that of sacrificing innocent animals, could ever have been tolerated among mankind, and especially by the then most civilized portion of them, for a single moment : much more, how it could have been so extensively and constantly practised among the various nations of antiquity, as history seems to indicate was the fact. We are of the number of those who do not believe that the Israelites, in their integrity, ever offered living animals in sacrifice, or that JEHOVAH commanded any such rituals ; and we think our principles are borne out by Scripture Testimony.—A satisfactory theory of the origin and nature of sacrificial worship is among the great *desiderata* of modern religious science ; and surely it must be agreeable to every intelligent and candid mind, to contemplate so curious a subject in a light which invites and gratifies the understanding rather than excites feelings of horror } To enter fully however into inquiries necessary to such an investigation would require a volume of itself ; a mere sketch, chiefly for the purpose of supporting our statements is all that we can here offer.

We will first see what the Scriptures say in relation to animal sacrifices being *commanded* by JEHOVAH. I need scarcely say the prevailing opinion upon this subject is that they were instituted by Divine Appointment. But David says “Thou desirest *not* sacrifice ; else would I give it : thou delightest *not* in burnt-offerings, *the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit : a broken and a contrite heart,*

O GOD *thou wilt not despise.*" The Prophet Hosea represents JEHOVAH as saying "I desired *mercy* and not *sacrifice*; and the *knowledge of God* rather than *burnt offerings.*" So also in Jeremiah "I spake *not* unto your fathers, nor *commanded* them; in that day I brough them out of the Land of Egypt, concerning *burnt offerings* and *sacrifices*; but this thing I commanded them saying, obey my voice and I will be your God and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in the ways that I have commanded you that it may be well with you." Here we infer that animal sacrifices were not of divine appointment; on the contrary, as a portion of the fruits of their wickedness and hostility, to the Divine Will, it is emphatically declared "I gave them also *statutes that were not good*, and judgements by which they ought not to live." In other words he permitted these statues and rituals because of the hardness of their hearts.

Authority equally perspicuous is susceptible of being produced, in proof, that the Jews, during their faithfulness to the commandments of their God, did not sacrifice living animals in their worship,—did not imbrue their hands, nor stain their altars with the blood of innocent beasts. Let us simply consider the Bible account of the dedication of the Temple;—let us view the narrative, not according to our prejudices, but in the light of impartial reason, and after maturely reflecting on all the circumstances let us solemnly ask ourselves whether popular opinion on this subject can possibly be right? Who can tell us how *one hundred and twenty thousand sheep*, and *twenty two thousand oxen*, could possibly be *butchered* and *burned* in one day in the temple then just built by Solomon? Who can tell us how such a number of animals could all be consumed on an altar of small dimensions, made of wood, and overlaid, with thin plates of metal? Whence came all these sheep and oxen, and the fuel necessary for the con-

sumption of their bodies ? The very act of numbering the animals mentioned here as given by King Solomon at this consecration, at the rate of one-hundred and twenty each minute would occupy full *nineteen hours and three quarters* ! How then, we again enquire, could they all be butchered and consumed in a single day ? What kind of conceptions we would also ask, must those persons have who entertain the vulgar notions in relation to sacrifices, respecting the Great JEHOVAH, who seem seriously to believe that he was delighted with the butchering of sheep and oxen ; and fancy that the stench of burnt flesh was a sweet smelling savour in his nostrils ? Who can conceive that the beautiful structure raised by Solomon, and consecrated to the worship of JEHOVAH could not be deemed an appropriate place for the manifestation of the DIVINE PURITY, until it became filled with the fumes of burning victims and defiled with the filth, and blood and garbage which must obviously be the concomitants of such butchery ? Would such a scene as the Temple must have presented, if living sacrifices were really made, be calculated to inspire a congregation with devotional feelings ? Would it not rather produce abhorrence and disgust ? But we cease. It could not be so. The sacrifices of the Jews were no doubt widely different from that view which has been palmed on the world through the darkness of human tradition. We have in this address only time to say, that in the Scriptures the names of *animals* are applied to vessels made of their respective skins ; to *monies*, stamped with their appropriate figures ; to *pastry images* of them, made of fine flour and other ingredients as specified in the Levitical law ; to *human beings*, and to individual spirits or *societies*, seen above by Prophets, Apostles, and other Holy men of old, enveloped in bestial spheres. We merely add, that the sheep and the oxen, offered by Solomon at this consecration were doubtless pieces of money of

the value of the animal with whose image they were impressed, and by whose name they were designated.

We come now to the testimony as it is recorded in the Gospel Dispensation in relation to the subject of our investigation. And here my Christian Friends, let us not deceive ourselves by imagining as some have done, that **JESUS CHRIST**, *the Author and Finisher of our Salvation*, came into the world, to abrogate or destroy the law or the Prophets, as given under a previous dispensation. “I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.” Neither let us erroneously conclude, that the Gospel develops a system of legislation, differing in any of its essential principles from that order instituted by Infinite Wisdom from the very creation of the world. “With him there is no variable-ness nor even a shadow of changing.” He never departs from the laws of Divine order, which he immutably established at the beginning. The Gospel, in our apprehension, is simply the manifestation of those means, always provided of the Divine mercy of the **LORD**, by which the children of men, degenerate as they had even then become, might be restored to that felicity, which, through transgression, they had unhappily lost; that they might be re-exalted to that estate, from which, through sin, they had lamentably fallen. The effect of those means, in the renewal and restoration of Human Nature, are fully exemplified in the history of the Redemption and Glorification of *that nature* by **JESUS CHRIST**. “He came that he might save, and that he might save unto the uttermost.” But you will call to mind that in the renovation of our nature, which he assumed, he observed the Law, he fulfilled even that primitive law first given to man. “He was a Nazarite from the womb.” “Butter and Honey shall he eat” says the Prophet, “that he may know to choose the good, and to reject the evil.” If such is the kind of testimony presented in the Gospel, is it not the duty of his followers to

walk in his footsteps, and imitate with all their ability, his bright and glorious example? His Forerunner, John the Baptist, the messenger to prepare his way before him, lived on locusts, (the fruit of the locust tree,) and wild honey, and yet it is emphatically said of him that "of those born of woman there has not arisen a greater than John." "Be ye wise as serpents," says our Redeemer, when instructing his disciples, "and harmless as doves." The Serpent is described by Naturalists as one of the most watchful of all animated existences; and the Dove as an innocent and inoffensive creature, that feeds only on the productions of the vegetable world. Such then it appears to us, should the followers of the meek and humble JESUS be;—such the *circumspection* of character, and such the *dietetic conduct* of all his faithful followers.

Soon after the commencement of the Christian Church the Apostles held a council, whence was subsequently promulgated a decree to the Churches, composed principally at that period of Gentile converts. In that important document, the members of the first Christian Council declare, "It seemeth good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burthen than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, (that is, the blood of the grape, in your religious feasts, when rendered intoxicating by fermentation,) and from things strangled"—or, in other words, "which have suffered a violent death." But do not all animals which fall a sacrifice to the butcher's knife suffer a *violent death*? Are we not then, as Christians, enjoined to abstain from eating such things, as a necessary part of our "obedience unto the faith?" The light in which the Apostle Paul apprehended this decree is easily perceived. He was a member of the Council, and subsequently one of those deputed by its authority to deliver the decree to the Churches. He voluntarily took upon him the fulfilment

of the delegated duty, and his declarations to the churches are remarkable. "*It is good, "says he, "neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine."* Did the Apostle of the Gentiles not understand the will of the Council? It will scarcely be contended that in announcing it to be good neither to eat flesh nor drink wine, he transcended his powers or that he misrepresented the sentiments of this primitive Christian Council. Such an inference will not readily find a place in any mind, wishful to see the truth as it is in JESUS.

It is said that Peter, James and John were Fishermen with Zebedee their father; and yet says the justly celebrated *Calmet*, "they never ate, either fish or flesh or fowl." In brief, Christian Friends, there are many testimonies tending to induce the belief that the doctrine for which we are contending, was that maintained by the whole Christian Church for upwards of two hundred years. Philo, accordingly, in writing of the Christians of his own time, says "they not only abstain from eating flesh, but none can be found amongst them that voluntarily engage in manufacturing darts, arrows, swords, helmets, breast-plates, nor even such weapons as might be converted to bad purposes in time of peace; much less do any of them engage in war or its arts."

In opposition to our views, the language of our Redeemer, as delivered to the Pharisees will probably be cited; "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man;" But does any one seriously imagine, and really believe, that our SAVIOUR, by this declaration meant to give full license to gluttony and intemperance, or that his followers might eat or drink any thing with impunity which the Law of GOD had forbidden to be used? The sense in which these words were intended to be understood must be attained by a consideration of the reason and the occasion of their being spoken. The context informs us that the Pharisees, being offended, murmured at the disciples of

JESUS for sitting down to meat with unwashed hands : in answer to their murmuring JESUS said, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth &c." In other words, not any little soil taken into the mouth by eating with unwashed hands can be said to defile the man ; this we apprehend is the plain and obvious meaning of the passage. It is further worthy of remark that these words were spoken about twenty years prior to the Apostolic Decree, to which we have already directed your attention ; and it is not probable the Apostles would make a decree, directly in contradiction to the declaration of HIM whose cause they advocated, and by whose authority they had stood forth as the champions of the Gospel Dispensation.

The vision of Peter as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles is often produced by those who would sustain the flesh eating system, as proof indubitable, that man is sanctioned by the Christian Scriptures in eating flesh. The language recorded, as addressed to Peter on that occasion is—"Rise Peter, kill and eat." But before we acquiesce in such an interpretation, let us first enquire,—if Peter was directed by this vision and this language to kill and eat animals and other reptile existences, did he do as he was commanded ? He certainly did not ; for after being exhibited before him three times in succession, he expressly says, they "were *all* drawn up again into heaven." Let us again enquire whether there is any thing like reasonableness in concluding that living animals, of flesh and blood, were actually let down from Heaven in a sheet, when we are assured that flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven?—Again let us ask, What instruction *did* Peter derive from this vision ? "Of a truth" says he "I perceive that GOD is no respecter of persons : but that in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Thus as the testimony appears to us, Peter learned not to call any *man* common or unclean. He was

taught to look upon the *animal appearances* exhibited to his view, as representatives of the Gentile Nations ; but we have no reason to believe he learned any thing by this vision respecting killing cattle, or eating flesh; or that he was intended to derive any such instruction from the vision.— Peter in common with the rest of the Jews, was prejudiced against the Gentiles ; by this vision his prejudice was corrected, for after it he went in *to eat sacramentally* WITH men that were uncircumcised, on their becoming Christians,—God having in this way taught him so to do. The rendering of the language to Peter is “*Rise Peter consecrate and eat.*”

“O mortals! from the flesh of beasts abstain,
 Nor taint your bodies with a food profane ;
 While corn and pulse by nature are bestowed,
 And planted orchards bend their willing load ;
 While labored gardens wholesome herbs produce,
 And teeming vines afford their gen’rous juice :
 Nor tardier fruits of cruder kind are lost,
 But tamed by heat or mellowed by the frost :
 While kine to pails distended udders bring,
 And bees their honey redolent of Spring :
 While earth not only can your needs supply,
 But, lavish of her store, provides for luxury ;
 A *guiltless* feast administers with ease,
 And *without blood*, is prodigal to please.”

It will also be objected, especially in regard to *fish*, that our SAVIOUR fed the multitude with loaves and fishes ; that he ate of a broiled fish and a honey-comb, and that several of his disciples were fishermen. To this we reply with all possible brevity. First, that there are various sorts of fishermen, as pearl fishers, coral fishers, fishers of submarine and water-plants of various kinds as well as of the living or animal fish ; and secondly, that the term used for fish in the Gospel does not mean fish in its common acceptation. PARKHURST, in his Greek Lexicon says, and his authority will be duly respected, “It seems not very natural to understand the Greek Word *opsarion*, (John xxi 9) as sig-

nifying fish. It signifies some other kind of provision, of the *delicious sort*, that may be eaten with bread." In short we believe there is reasonable ground for our argument, that the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, do not sanction the eating of either fish, or flesh, or towl. There is, we believe testimony sufficient in them as they are, to raise doubts in enquiring minds, and the Apostle says "He that doubteth is condemned if he eat; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Lastly:—Christianity inculcates *self-denial* as one of the duties of her votaries; a term that denotes a relinquishment of every thing that stands in opposition to the divine commands, or that would be detrimental to their spiritual welfare. She calls upon her followers to deny themselves, and take up their cross daily. She entreats them to mortify the body with its deeds; to shun fleshly lusts; to avoid luxury, intemperance and gluttony, and whatever is done, that it be done in the fullness of faith, without doubting and in the fear of the LORD. She represents the blessings of Eternal Life as attainable only by keeping the Commandments. She exhorts her believers to be humane and merciful, as their Father in the heavens is merciful; to mortify the fleshly mind, which is ever contrary to the mind of CHRIST; to keep the body under subjection to the precepts of the Gospel; not to live to the flesh, but in all things, whether they eat or drink, or whatsoever they do, that it be done to the glory of their Heavenly Father. She calls upon her followers peremptorily to renounce all those pleasures of sense, worldly examples, and unhallowed practices, that are prejudicial to their physical well being, or injurious to the spiritual interests of immortal souls. And shall Christianity hold out to us these blessed truths of our holy religion in vain? Shall we continue rebellious to her purifying and heavenly doctrine of self-denial? Shall we be unwilling to take up our cross; to die daily to an indul-

gence in the pleasures of an over excited sensation, whether arising from *eating flesh* or *drinking wine*? Shall we not be ready "to present our bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God which is indeed but our reasonable service?" Shall we not labor with all diligence, by living according to the order of our nature and the commandments of our God, to attain unto that holiness of Spirit, without which no man can see God; and even strive to prepare our very bodies that they may become appropriate 'Temples of the Holy Spirit?' Shall the voice of Humanity, Reason and Christianity plead with us to no purpose?— Shall we continue to make a god of our appetites, and not turn from following the corrupting example of "riotous eaters of flesh?"

Christian Friends, let us endeavor to impress the importance of this subject upon our minds. Let us ever remember that all religion which does not produce its appropriate effect upon the life is futile and useless— mere vanity and vexation of spirit, instead of life, and peace in the Holy Spirit. Let us never forget that one of the most exalted attributes of the Christian, is that of consistency in practical life, with the theoretic principles he professes. It is this which pre-eminently distinguishes the devout and sincere professor, from the common mass of mankind. Let us bear in mind, that to us, most especially my Christian Friends, the world turns for such an example; that to us pure and undefiled religion calls for such a conduct; to the consistency of our practise with the clemency and humanity of our profession, as believers in the Bible Testimony, that it is good neither to eat flesh nor drink wine, bleeding Christianity looks as her only refuge. Let her not look in vain. Stand for the cause of Truth against all the efforts of those 'who live to the flesh.' Stand as the soldiers of your Redeemer, in the blessed armor of the Gospel, with the shield of faith, and the breastplate of righ-

teousness, having for a helmet the hope of salvation, and girded with the sword of the spirit, which is the **WORD OF GOD**. Yet contend not my Christian Friends in the temper of angry controversy, for the battle is the **LORD'S**, and he demands of us the spirit of meekness and holiness, the spirit of supplication and prayer, the spirit of a diligent co-operation with him, the spirit of benevolence and an affectionate solicitude for the souls of all men. Fear not then, that the rays of this heavenly doctrine, if faithfully mirrored in the lives of our little community, will be wholly lost in the darkness that surrounds us on this subject. In such case we shall know and feel that we have strength and power from on High; and we cannot doubt that the sober wishes of the moral, the intellectual and the virtuous of every creed, will always be with us. We are not indeed to expect that immediate and complete success is to crown our infantile exertions in this self-sacrificing cause. *The storm and the whirlwind* of human prejudices and erroneous sentiments *must first pass by* before the *still small voice* of Christian clemency, meek-eyed mercy and child-like humanity can be beneficially heard. Our aim is not *violently* to snatch the fatal knife from the bloody hands of the butcher, nor ruthlessly to tear the *feast of death* from the teeth of the *riotous eaters of flesh*.— Our high object is to instruct; to correct general sentiment and to determine the principles of public habits so as to cherish universal humanity; believing that in proportion as the minds of the moral and intellectual among our fellow mortals are sufficiently awakened to the importance of the *dietetics* of the Bible, they will withdraw themselves from a system of cruel habits, which involves a portion of the animal creation in needless suffering and untimely death; and which has unquestionably a baneful effect upon the physical existence and the intellectual, the moral and religious powers of man.

In conclusion, my Christian Friends if we would seek to invigorate and expand the principles of our own faith, or be instrumental in effecting the conversion of others, let us not confide in our own strength, but rather look unto HIM who is the author and finisher of our salvation, and who alone knoweth the unruly wills and darkened understandings of sinful men, for his blessing on our feeble labors. Let us remember that the most convincing argument is the spectacle of a pure and consistent example;—that while controversy, uninfluenced by prayer, has a natural tendency to irritate and inflame, to increase the obstinacy of prejudice, and rivet the stubbornness of self-will, devotion will frequently soften, kindness will conciliate, and affection will reclaim.

And now may HIS blessing for the future so guide our course, and prosper our efforts, that we may find cause to rejoice in the extension of pure and undefiled religion, and not only experience its increasing influence within our own souls, but to behold its present growth among our fellow mortals, until every domestic hearth shall have its altar,—until the WORD and Spirit of the MOST HIGH shall govern our country and the world; until carnal-mindedness inhumanity, vice and profanity, intemperance, wretchedness and immorality shall vanish; the whole earth be filled with the knowledge of the LORD, and the period come, when, according to JEHOVAH by his Prophet, “They shall neither HURT NOR DESTROY in all my Holy Mountain.”

HYMN.

Humanity and Religion Pleading against Flesh-Eating.

† “Eaters of flesh!” could you decry
Our food and sacred laws,
 Did you behold the lambkin die,
 And feel yourselves the cause?

Lo! there it struggles! hear it moan,
 As stretch'd beneath the knife:
 Its eye would melt a heart of stone!
 How meek it begs its life!

Had God, for man, its flesh design'd;
 Matur'd by death the brute,
 Lifeless, to *us* had been consign'd,
 As is the ripen'd fruit.

Hold, daring man! from murder stay:
 God is the life in all,
 You smite at God! when flesh you slay:—
 Can such a crime be small?

† *See Prov. xxiii. 20.*

