On the primeval Diet of Man; Arguments in Favour of Vegetable Food; On Man's Conduct to Animals, &c. &c.

Man be humane.' It is thy first duty. Can there be any wisdom without humanity.' Rousseau.

FOURTH EDITION.

W. Craig del.

Bromley sc.

Published July 1819. by George Nicholson. Stowmarket.

ON THE

CONDUCT OF MAN

TO INFERIOR

Animals;

ON THE

PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN;

ARGUMENTS FROM SCRIPTURE, REASON,

FACT AND EXPERIENCE,

IN FAVOUR OF A

VEGETABLE DIET;

ON THE EFFECTS OF FOOD;

ON THE PRACTICE OF NATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS;

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED;

&c. &c.

Stourport,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY G. NICHOLSON.

Sold by

SHERWOOD, NEELY & JONES, LONDON,

and by all Booksellers.

PREFACE.

NOTWITHSTANDING many readers are so violently prejudiced in favour of common-place subjects, that the mere title of a book often causes it to be shut to them for ever, there exists a better class, who have no prejudices; who ingenuously search after the truth; who are inclined to examine whatever subject appears of importance. Such readers take the advice of St. Paul, trying all things, proving all things, and holding fast to that which is good. They never decide on any question until they have weighed the best arguments on both sides. Nor do they ever surrender that reason which God has given them. They investigate carefully and make an impartial decision. The former of these classes are enveloped in a cloud so dense, that reasoning, clear as the sunshine at noonday, cannot break through it. They can neither hear nor understand. With the

latter, the all-pervading power of fact has instantaneous effect. These adopt principles indeed with great caution, but when adopted, they proceed to act in conformity to them.

The publisher dedicated the former editions of this small work "To the generous, enlightened and sympathizing FEW, whose opinions had not been founded on vulgar acceptation, or influenced by maxims which are either unmeaning or false." Those "few" have increased to a numerous and decided body. He does not presume that they have thus enlarged through his efforts; yet, when it is considered that not less than three editions of this work have been received by the public, consisting, in the whole, of five thousand copies, the cause has been wretchedly pleaded, if *no effect* has been produced. Both retrenchments and additions have been made in bringing it a fourth time before the public.

During the circulation of those editions, the publisher has received numerous congratulatory letters; and, recently, one from Mr. W. Elliot of the patent-office, at the city of Washington, who says, "It is about two years since I left off animal food. I conceive this change has had a very favourable effect both on my body and mind. There are others in this country who are disciples of this humane system. Mr. Thomas Mitchel of Charleston, South Carolina, is very remarkable for his active and disinterested conduct in bringing it forwards."

The publisher has enjoyed also the pleasure of reading the able and important reasonings of a Lambe, a Newton, a Ritson and others, as contemporary advocates in the same cause.

The publisher may not expect to be pardoned for adding his own case to the egotism of this preface.

The powers of his digestion had always been weak and imperfect. He suffered under frequent and severe attacks of constitutional dispepsia, which could not be corrected by medicine. In his twentieth year he unfortunately induced an inveterate dry habit, by wearing a flannel waistcoat next his skin, during about twelve months; flannel, at that time, being pronounced a defence against colds, and a strengthener of the animal frame. This experiment superinduced a disagreeable affection, to which he has ever since been subject.

In the year 1793 he read Rousseau's Treatise on Education, which contains Plutarch's Essay on Flesh-Eating. [This essay appears at p. p. 125—129, of this work.] His sensations would not permit him to eat animals any longer, since the action appeared to include in it an outrage both against Nature and Nature's God.

During his adherence to a vegetable regimen, the publisher was most agreeably surprised in finding his indigestion and flatulency wear off, and, at length subside. The state of his health was never so perfect as at the present time. He suffered much from the tooth-ach, which discontinued when he left off eating animals; and if his teeth had then been sound, he believes they would have been so at this hour.

He brought up one of his children on a vegetable diet to his fourteenth year; and the other to her sixth. Two healthier or stouter children, at these ages, could not be found. Various circumstances, which are not necessary to be detailed, estranged them, as associates in his favourite diet. He contemplates, with peculiar pleasure, the good fortune of Mr. Newton (author of "A Return to Nature; or

a Defence of the Vegetable Regimen") whose wife, children and even servants, all voluntarily adhered to his salutary and humane diet.

The designs of several ingenious men, of forming a compact, in this fertile island, of genuine christians, humane peace-makers, philanthropists and reasoning beings, practising the arts of agriculture and rural life, is highly commendable. The publisher exclaims with St. Pierre, "May God prosper such a plan! which is worthy the most glorious period of ancient wisdom!" But he cannot join with Cowper, in crying,

"O for a lodge in some vast wilderness,
"some boundless contiguity of shade!"

A little cot would form his heart's desire,
a summer garden and a winter's fire;
a small retreat, which he might call his own,
no longer scar'd by Fortune's angry frown;
with leisure left o'er Nature's book to pore,
and turn the varied leaves of science o'er.
Nor should his mind e'er cease to know
the charm which converse can bestow;
for, to a dinner sav'd by frugal care,
should friendship often come, and freely share.

No; he cannot detach himself from the social communities of life, which are numerous and endearing. Nor yet can he make a sacrifice of justice, propriety and humanity, at the shrine of erroneous, tho' popular, habits. Nothing could be returned to compensate for the loss of that satisfaction which arises from a consciousness of acting right: nothing could be offered as a substitute, which would leave the mind satisfied with itself.

Tho' providence has not bestowed on the publisher the "envied lot of wealth," he deems himself

fortunate in having had a father who was a bookseller; who qualified him for conducting the business of a printing-office; who inspired him with a desire to augment his slender stock of knowledge; and made him proprietor of an apparatus, the most powerful which exists, for the purpose of diffusing enquiry and eliciting the truth. Through the medium of the press, he has often seen the influence of fact and argument, and the claims of reason and justice, admitted; while imbecility of mind has shrunk under the lash of common sense.

The Rev. T. F. Dibdin, in his remarks on the character of Wynkyn de Worde, says, "The business or profession of a printer, under the guidance of sound principles and a correct taste, may rank in utility and general pleasure with any other that is cultivated by human beings."

This concession, from a man of classical erudition and laborious research, is highly complimentary.

In the retrospect of life, those who have passed a large portion of it, in literary pursuits, can truly say, that those hours have constituted the only substantial sweets which have rendered existence of any value. Even Chesterfield, than whom no man ever attended more to the triflings of fashionable society, has said, "I am never more in company than when alone."

The publisher is far from intending, by those quotations, to assume any importance; for in the scale of intellect, how trifling are our petty attainments! and however displayed, when they are compared with the immense extent of science, they are very insignificant. Man always appears little when he attempts to put on, either consequential or haughty assumptions. The publisher would rank with those, who,

conscious of their weakness, perceive the faults of others and *feel* their own. It has often been said, "pride was not made for man." It may be added, neither were vanity or ambition made for him!

Freely as quotations have been made, in this edition, from Dr. Lambe's "Additional Reports on Regimen," they form but a few scattered rays, emanating from a luminous body of well-digested facts, to which are superadded the most impressive, and yet candid deductions.

George Nicholson.

Page 121.

CONTENTS.

ON THE PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN.

NEVER by primeval man, were violated the rights of hospitality; never, in his innocent bosom, arose the murderous meditation; never, against the life of his guests, his friends, or his benefactors, did he uplift the butcher-axe. Sufficient were the fruits of the earth for his subsistence; and, satisfied with the milk of her maternal bosom, he sought not, like a preverse child, to spill the blood of nature. Such were the feasts of primeval innocence, such the felicity of the golden age. Long since, alas! are those happy days elapsed. That they ever did exist, is a doubt with the depravity of the present day; and so unlike are they to our actual state of misery, that the story of primal bliss is numbered with the dreams of visionary bards. That such a state did exist, the concording voice of various tradition offers a convincing proof; and the *lust of knowledge*, is the fatal cause to which the indigenous tale of every country, attributes the loss of Paradise, and the fall of man. [The felicity of the golden age is still, at certain intervals, celebrated in the East Indies, at the temples of Jaggernat and Mamoon. During those seasons of festivity the several casts mix together indiscriminately, in commemoration of the perfect equality that prevailed among mankind in the age of innocence.]

The merciful Hindoo makes humanity to animals apart of his religious duties. No nation, equally un-

merous, exists, which acts with equal propriety and justice. The generous and enlightened Hindoo, diffuses over every order of life his affections; beholds, in every creature, a kinsman; rejoices in the welfare of every animal, and compassionates his pains; for he is convinced, that the essence of all creatures is the same, and that one eternal First Cause is the Father of all. Hence the merciful Hindostan is solicitous to save every species of animal, while the cruel vanity and exquisite voraciousness of other nations are ingenious to discover in the bulk, or taste, or smell, or beauty of every creature, a cause of death, an incentive to murder. The religion of the Hindoos is the most extensive and ancient of all religions now existing, a religion of the most polished, improved, and populous of the eastern nations. The accounts we have of it, in its present state of declension, are such as engage our esteem and reverence, tho' conveyed to us through very polluted channels. The followers of Brama are, for the most part, meek and patient sufferers under savage and bigoted Mahometans; who, in their turn, are oppressed by cruel, tho' not bigoted Christians: so that our accounts of the Hindoos come from plunderers, who receive them from those whom they immediately oppress. It therefore requires great precision, to determine what degree of credit ought to be given to informations thus derived. We may be well assured, that no misrepresentation takes place in *favour* of the ancient and oppressed followers of Brama.

Sir William Temple, in his Essay on Learning, says that "Their moral philosophy consisted chiefly in preventing all diseases or distempers of the body, from which they esteemed the perturbation of mind in a great measure to arise; then in composing the

mind, and exempting it from all anxious cares; esteeming the troublesome and solicitous thoughts about past and future, to be like so many dreams, and no more to be regarded. They despised both life and death, pleasure and pain, or at least thought them perfectly indifferent. Their justice was exact and exemplary; their temperance so great, that they lived on rice and herbs, and upon nothing that had sensitive life. If they fell sick, they counted it such a mark of intemperance, that they would frequently die out of shame and sullenness; but many lived a hundred and fifty, and some two hundred years."

It appears from the Mosaic records, that for more than 1600 years, even till after the deluge, mankind lived on vegetable food only; they exercised a gentle dominion over the brute creation, and did not use their flesh for food. They had indeed a prescribed regimen. "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 meat."—Genesis i, 29. That nothing but vegetable food was eaten before the flood, appears from the command to Noah, relating to provisions to be laid up in the ark. "And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten, and thou shalt gather it to thee; and it shall be for food for thee, and for them. Gen. vi. 21. The ancient Greeks lived entirely on the fruits of the earth.—See Porphyrius de Abstinentia, book 4, par. 2. The ancient Syrians abstained from every species of animal food.—See ibid. b. 4, par, 15. By the laws of Triptolemus, the Athenians were strictly commanded to abstain from all living creatures. — See Porphyr. Even so late as the days of Draco, the Attic oblations consisted only of the fruits of the earth.—See Potter's Antiquities of Greece, vol. i. p. 188

Cow's milk, which is still in most general use, was included among the principal articles of diet, in very remote ages. Homer mentions a nation who principally lived on cow's milk.

ON THE CONDUCT OF MAN TO INFERIOR ANIMALS.

Long after habitual cruelty had almost erased from the mind of man every mark of affection for the inferior ranks of his fellow-creatures, a certain respect was still paid to the principle of life, and the crime of murdered innocence was, in some degree, atoned by the decent regard which was paid to the mode of their destruction.

> ———Gentle friends,
> let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully;
> let's carve him as a dish fit for the Gods,
> not hew him as a carcase fit for hounds:
> and let our hearts, as subtle masters do,
> stir up their servants to an act of rage,
> and after seem to chide them.—*Shakespere.*

Such was the decency with which, at first, the devoted victims were put to death. But when man became perfectly civilized, those exterior symbols of opinions, with which he was now but feebly, if at all, impressed, were also laid aside. Animals were formerly sacrificed with some decorum to the plea of necessity, but are now with unceremonious brutality destroyed, to gratify the unfeeling pride or wanton cruelty of men. Broad barefaced butchery occupies every walk of life; every element is ransacked for victims; the most remote corners of the globe are ravished of their inhabitants, whether by the fastidious gluttony of man their flesh is held grateful to the

palate, whether their blood can impurple the pall of his pride, or their spoils add a feather to the wings of his vanity: and while *agonizing* nature is tortured by his ambition, while to supply the demands of his perverse appetite she bleeds at every pore, this imperial animal exclaims, 'Ye servile creatures! why do ye lament? why vainly try, by cries akin to the voice of human woe, to excite my compassion? Created solely for my use, submit without a murmur to the decrees of Heaven, and to the mandates of me; of me, the Heaven deputed despot of every creature that walks, or creeps, or swims, or flies; in air, on earth, or in the waters.' Thus the fate of the animal world has followed the progress of man from his sylvan state to that of civilization, till the gradual improvements of art, on this glorious pinnacle of independence, have at length placed him free from every lovely prejudice of nature, and an enemy to life and happiness through all it's various forms.—Oswald.

Proud of his superiority in the scale of existence, imperious man looks down with silent contempt on certain animals which he deems inferior and meaner objects. Sovereign despot of the world, Lord of the life and death of every creature, with the slaves of his tyranny he disclaims the ties of kindred. He subdues by art and cunning the ferocious lion, the tyger, and the wolf, and is tributary to their dead bodies for his accoutrements of war. In this instance he acts without disguise and is consistent. His brutal ferocity returns, disdainful of the habit and controul of refinement. He prowls malignantly the woods; destroys the carnivorous animal of the desert; with the spoil he renders his person formidable to his fellows; and becomes also a murderer, by profession, of the human race. Were the ferocity of man *thus*

circumscribed, it would appear temperate and the retaliation just; but he destroys also those which are exceedingly inferior to him in strength, which are far remote from his dwelling, and which never injured him. The sable and martin are murdered for the unfortunate adornment of their furs; and the civet and musk, for the superiority of their perfumes.

While the feathers of the ostrich are seen to wave in pensive pride, to decorate, with graceful blandishments, the smiles of beauty; while the vital threads of the silk-worm, attenuated, almost beyond visual perception, to give the playful fold it's soft transparency, to shade, not cover, the female form; the wearer does not reflect on the practice of destroying the latter in their chrysalis state, by boiling water; or think how painfully severe the sufferings and death of the first. Were reflection admitted a place among the delicacies and softnesses of women, the feathers, the silk, the fur, and skins of animals, (obtained by outrages against nature and by abandoning every impression of compassion, sympathy, feeling, sensibility and humanity) would be cast aside, and the guiltless vegetable preferred.

When a man boasts of the dignity of his nature, and the advantages of his station, and thence infers a right of oppression of his inferiors, he exhibits his folly as well as his depravity. What should we think of a strong man, who should exert his pride, his petulance, his tyranny, and barbarity on a helpless innocent and inoffensive child? Should we not abhor and detest him as a mean, cowardly, and savage wretch, unworthy the stature and strength of a man? No less mean, cowardly, and savage is it, to abuse and torment an innocent beast, who cannot avenge or help himself; and yet has as much right to happiness in

this world as a child can have; nay, more, if it, be his only inheritance.—Dean's "Essay on Brutes."

Of all rapacious animals, man is the most universal destroyer. The destruction of carnivorous quadrupeds, birds and insects, is, generally, limited to particular kinds; but the rapacity of man has scarcely any limitation. His empire over other animals, which inhabit this globe, is almost universal. He subdues or devours every species. Of the horse, and dog, he makes domestic slaves, and tho' he does not eat them, he either compels them to labour or keeps them for amusement. The ox, the horse, and the ram, he changes from their natural state, by a barbarous and cruel operation, and after receiving the emoluments of his labour and fertility, he rewards them with death, and then feeds upon the carcase! Many other species, tho' not commonly used as food, are daily massacred in millions, for the purposes of commerce, luxury, and caprice. Myriads of quadrupeds are annually destroyed for the sake of their furs, their hides, their tusks, their odoriferous secretions, &c. His sagacity and address has domesticated turkeys, geese, and various kinds of poultry. These he multiplies without end, and devours at pleasure. Others he imprisons in cages, to afford him the melody of song. Neither do the inhabitants of the waters escape the rapacity of man. No element can defend its inhabitants from the destructive industry of the human species.—Smellie's Philos. of Nat. Hist, i, 375. See also Buffon's Hist. of the Horse.

Mankind are no less, in proportion, accountable for the ill use of their dominion over creatures of the lower rank of beings, than for the exercise of tyranny over their own species. It is observable of those noxious animals which have qualities most powerful

to injure us, that they naturally avoid mankind, and never hurt us, unless provoked or necessitated by hunger. Man on the other hand, seeks out and pursues even the most inoffensive animals, on purpose to persecute and destroy them. Montaigne thinks it some reflection on human nature, that few people take delight in seeing beasts caress or play together, but almost every one is pleased in seeing them lacerate and worry one another. I am sorry this temper is become almost a distinguishing character of our own nation, from the observation which is made by foreigners, on our beloved pastimes, bear-baiting, cock fighting, and the like. We should find it hard to vindicate the distroying of any thing that has life, merely out of wantonness; yet, in this principle, our children are bred up, and one of the first pleasures we allow them, is the licence of inflicting pain upon poor animals; almost as soon as we are sensible what life is ourselves, we make it our sport to take it from other creatures. I cannot but believe a very good use might be made of the fancy which children have for birds, and insects. Mr. Locke takes notice of a mother who permitted them to her children, but rewarded or punished them as they treated them well or ill. This was no other than initiating them betimes into a daily exercise of humanity, and improving their very diversions into virtue.

In man ingratitude you find,
a vice peculiar to the kind.
The sheep, whose annual fleece is dy'd,
to guard his health, and serve his pride,
forc'd from his fold and native plain,
is in the cruel shambles slain.
The swarms who, with industrious skill,

his hives with wax and honey fill,
in vain whole summer days employ'd,
their stores are sold, the race destroy'd.
What tribute from the goose is paid!
does not her wing all science aid?
does it not lovers' hearts explain,
and drudge to raise the merchant's gain?
What now rewards this general use?
he takes the quills and eats the goose!—Gay.

There are animals which have the misfortune for no manner of reason, to be treated as common enemies, wherever they may be found. The conceit that a cat has nine lives, has cost at least nine lives in ten of the whole race of them; scarcely a boy in the streets but has in this point outdone Hercules himself, who was famous for killing a monster which had but three lives. Whether the unaccountable animosity against this domsetic may be any cause of the general persecution of owls (who are a sort of feathered cats) or whether it be only an unreasonable pique the moderns have taken to a serious countenance, I shall not determine; tho' I am in inclined to believe the former; since I observe the sole reason alleged for the destruction of frogs is because they are like toads. Yet, amid all the misfortunes of these unfriended creatures, 't is some happiness that we have not yet taken a fancy to eat them: for should our countrymen refine on the French ever so little, 't is not to be conceived to what unheard-of torments, owls, cats, and frogs may be yet reserved.—Alex Pope.

How will man, that sanguinary tyrant, be able to excuse himself from the charge of innumerable cruelties inflicted on unoffending subjects committed to his care, formed for his benefit, and placed under his

authority by their common Father, whose mercy is over all his works, and who expects that his authority should be exercised not only with tenderness and mercy, but in conformity to the laws of justice and gratitude? But to what horrid deviations from these benevolent intentions are we daily witnesses! no small part of mankind derive their chief amusements from the deaths and sufferings of inferior animals; a much greater, consider them only as engines of wood, or iron, useful in their several occupations. The carman drives his horse, and the carpenter his nail, by repeated blows; and so long as these produce the desired effect, and they both go, they neither reflect, nor care whether either of them have any sense of feeling. The butcher knocks down the stately ox, with no more compassion than the blacksmith hammers a horse-shoe; and plunges his knife into the throat of the innocent lamb, with as little reluctance as the tailor sticks his needle into the collar of a coat.

If there be some few, who, formed in a softer mould, view with pity the sufferings of these defenceless creatures, there is scarcely one who entertains the least idea, that justice or gratitude can be due to their merits or their services. The social and friendly dog is hung without remorse, if, by barking in defence of his master's person or property, he happens unknowingly to disturb his rest; the generous horse, who has carried his ungrateful master for many years with ease and safety, worn out with age and infirmities, contracted in his service, is by him condemned to end his miserable days in a dust-cart, where the more he exerts his little remains of spirit, the more he is whipped to save his stupid driver the trouble of whipping some other less obedient to the lash. Sometimes, having been taught the practice of

many unnatural and useless feats in a riding-house, he is at last turned out, and consigned to the dominion of a hackney coachman, by whom he is every day corrected for performing those tricks which he has learned under a severe and long discipline. The sluggish bear, in contradiction to his nature, is taught to dance, for the diversion of a malignant mob, by placing red-hot irons under his feet: and the majestic bull is tortured by every mode which malice can invent, for no offence, but that he is gentle, and unwilling to assail his diabolical tormentors. These, with innumerable other acts of cruelty, injustice, and ingratitude, are every day committed, not only with impunity, but without censure, and even without observation; but we may be assured that they cannot finally pass unnoticed or unretaliated.—Guardian.

Where pain and pleasure, happiness and misery, are concerned, there the obligations of morality are concerned; and a man who is not merciful to the animals in his power, whatever his pretensions may be to reason and religion, is, in truth, of a narrow understanding, and of a bad heart. What shall we say, then, of that morality, that religion, and that policy, which admits of the cruelties we see daily exercised on creatures, we derive benefit and pleasure from every moment of our lives?—The Rev. D. Williams's Lectures.

CRUELTY OF A CARTER. There is nothing argues so dastardly a spirit, as taking a diabolic satisfaction in the oppression of weakness; in directing barbarity against inoffensive beings, which have not the power or disposition of defence. Men's minds glow with resentment at a slight injury done to themselves, but they have no sense of the injustice which they commit on domestic animals. In passing through

a farm-yard, in the neighbourhood of his residence, the compiler of these pages witnessed a worse than savage brutality of this kind. The farmer's labourer was employed in adjusting some part of an empty cart, which stood without horses. A heifer approached familiarly the place, seemed amused by looking at the fellow, and stood some minutes without being perceived by him. At last, the man cast his eyes on it, which immediately beamed enmity, accompanied with, "Oh, dama you! are *you* there? what do you want?" At the same instant he seized a very heavy hedge-stake, which lay at his feet, smote the poor heifer on the side, with great force, and broke into a loud horse laugh. The stroke resounded, and the pain inflicted may be easily conceived. On asking him what motive induced such unfeeling and unjust barbarity, he answered, with an oath, "the heifer had no business there." This heifer would have been less than an animal, if, after such a rebuke, it ever again approached man with affability. It is by such treatment that most of our domesticated animals avoid the human form.

CART HORSES. In the country, as well as in towns, one may witness, almost every day, treatment, the most abominable, of aged or emaciated horses, by low carters, who purchase them for a trifle, to "work up," as they term it. Among these wretches he is the cleverest fellow who can wield a massy whip with the least fatigue. Their business is literally that of hewing living flesh. Almost every neighbourhood contains some of this description of infernal monsters. Even among country farmers, if the carter be offended at the condition or figure of a horse, which his master has purchased, his whip is perpetually laid on him, his name only is continually vociferated; for

him there is no remission, or mercy, or feeling, or compassion. He is made to sustain considerably more than his proportion of labour; his limbs forced to be continually on the stretch, while the rest of the team are allowed to be exercised moderately. At feeding times, the coarsest provision is selected, and to prevent him from reaching the corn, his head is barbarously tied up to the rack. Many such unfortunate animals have dropped down dead in the stable, from excessive labour and want of sustenance.

The excellent temper and usefulness of many a valuable horse has been ruined by the conduct of our petty tyrants of the whip. The manœuvres of "Come hither who-o," &c. are inculcated so obdurately by dint of torture, that the spirit of the horse is absolutely broken; whence ensue stubbornness and desperation. At one instant the horse is whipped for holding too close to the driver, at the next, for bearing off too much; now, for going too quickly, then for going too slow; by and by, for stopping; afterwards, because he did not stop. In this manner the faculties of the poor beast are totally confounded, and caused to degenerate into an inert and stagnant state of insensibility, instead of making a progress in that ratio of improvement, of which he is highly capable.

It appears that the Dutch settlers in the interior of southern Africa quicken the exertions of their labouring oxen by cutting them with large knives! Mr. Barrow has minutely detailed this shocking cruelty in his Travels into that country. "Even in the neighbourhood of the Cape, where, from a more extended civilization, one would expect a greater degree of humanity," he says, "several atrocious acts

of this kind are notorious. One of the inhabitants, better known from his wealth and his vulgarity, than from any good quality he possesses, boasts that he can at any time start his team on a full gallop by whetting his knife only on the side of the waggon. In exhibiting this masterly experiment, the effect of a long and constant perseverance in brutality, to some of his friends, the waggon was overturned, and one of the company, unluckily not the proprietor, had his leg broken. Hottentot's Holland's kloof, a steep pass over the first range of mountains beyond the promontory of the Cape, has been the scene of many an instance of this sort of cruelty. I have heard a fellow boast that, after cutting and slashing one of his oxen, in this kloof, till an entire piece of a foot square did not remain in the whole hide, he stabbed him to the heart; and the same person is said at another time, to have kindled a fire under the belly of an ox, because it could not draw the waggon up the same kloof." page 183. It is remarkable that the Dutch writers exaggerate the cruelty and vices of the Portuguese colonists, as an apology for depriving them of their settlements.

Humanity shrinks with horror at the idea of a Dutchman, in Africa, kindling a fire under an ox; but it is a crime which England is not exempted from. About the year 1767, the Rev. J. Bailey, of Guiseley, near Otley, Yorkshire, witnessed a similar act of atrocious barbarity, in a servant of Mrs. Sanderson, of the same place, widow. The wretch was employed in carting dung out of a farm-yard, from which there was a difficult ascent. The load was exceedingly beyond the horse's strength. Whipping, and kicking, and hewing, were recurred to, but failed to extort additional exertions. The horse fell, un-

able again to rise. The carter then deliberately put straw under his belly, and set fire to it. This also failed. The horse had strained every nerve, and was so much exhausted, that fire produced just as little effect as if it had been put to a log of wood. Mr. Bailey ran and dashed away the blazing straw with his foot. The horse died the same day; and the perpetrator of this barbarity met with no other punishment than a dismissal from service.

On the Practice of mutilating Animals. "What an affecting sight," says the humane author of a "Letter to the Hon. Wm. Windham, on his Opposition to the Bill to prevent Bull-baiting," "is it to go into the stable of some eminent horsedealer, and there behold a long range of fine beautiful steeds, with their tails cut and slashed, tied up by pullies to give them force, some dropping blood, some corruption, and some blood and corrupt matter mixed, suffering such torture, that they frequently never recover the savage gashes they have received; and for what is all this? That they may hold their tails somewhat higher, and be for ever after deprived of the power of moving the joints of them as a defence against flies. It is true," he adds, "I am sometimes obliged to purchase horses that have been thus treated, because there are scarcely any sold which have not undergone the operation, but in my whole life I never permitted it to be performed. I am both happy and concerned to say, that in no nation but England is this horrid custom of nicking horses tails practised." "I believe the barbarous custom came into use within this century," says Mr. Gilpin, "and has passed through various modifications, like all other customs, which are not founded in nature and truth. A few years ago the short-dock was the only

tail (if it may be called such) in fashion, both in the army and in carriages. The absurdity however of this total amputation began to appear. The gentlemen of the army led the way. They acknowledged the beauty, and use of the tail as nature made it. The short-dock every where disappeared; and all dragoon horses paraded with long tails. The nag-tail however still continued in use. Of this there are several species, all more or less mutilated. The most deformed one is the nicked-tail; so named from the cruel operation used in forming it. The nag-tail, is still seen in all genteel carriages. Nor will any person of fashion ride a horse without one. Even gentlemen of the army, who have shewn more sense in the affair of horse-tails, have been so misled, as to introduce the nag-tail, into the light-horse; tho' it would be as difficult to give a reason now for the nag-tail, as formerly for the short dock. Two things are urged in defence of this cruel mutilation, the utility, and the beauty of it. Let us briefly as possible, examine both. To make an animal useful is no doubt, the first consideration: and to make a horse so, we must necessarily make him suffer some things, which are unnatural, because we take him out of a state of nature. He must be fed with hay and corn in the winter, which he cannot get in his open pastures: for if he be exercised beyond nature, he must have such food, as will enable him to bear it. As it is necessary likewise to make our roads hard and durable, it is necessary also to give the horse an iron hoof, that he may travel over them without injuring his feet; but all this has nothing to do with his tail, which is equally useful in a reclaimed and in a natural state.

Yes, says the advocate for docking, as it is neces-

sary for the horse to travel, to hunt, and to race, it is useful to lighten him of every incumberance. And as it is necessary for him to travel through dirty roads, it is useful to rid him of an instrument, which is continually collecting dirt, and lashing it over himself and his rider.

To ease your horse of every incumberance in travelling, is certainly right. You should see that his bridle and saddle, (which are his great incumberances) are as easy as possible: and that the weight he carries, or draws, be proportioned to his strength. But depend on it, he receives no incumberance from nature. It is a maxim among all true philosophers, that nature has given nothing in vain: and there can be no reasonable doubt, but that nature has given the horse his tail to balance, and assist his motions. That this is the case, seems plain from the use he makes of it. When the animal is at rest, his tail is pendent: but when he is in violent action, he raises and spreads it, as a bird does in the same situation. Would the swallow, or the dove be assisted in their flight by the loss of their tails? or the greyhound in his speed by docking him? For myself I have no doubt, but if the experiment were tried at Newmarket, the horse, with his long tail, however the literati there might laugh at him, would not be in the least injured in his speed; and would certainly answer better, in all his sudden turns, to the intention of his rider. He would extend, and spread his helm; it would steer his way; and we should seldom hear of his running out of his course, or on the wrong side of the post. Besides, his tail probably assists him even in his common exertions, and balances his body, when he trots, and prevents his stumbling. I have heard a gentleman, who had travelled much in

the east, remark that the Turkish, and Arabian horses rarely stumble; which he attributed, and with much appearance of truth, to their long tails.

But whatever use the tail may be to the horse in action, it is acknowledged, on all hands, to be of infinite use to him, at rest. Whoever sees the horse grazing in summer, and observes the constant use he makes of his long tail, in lashing the flies from his sides, must be persuaded, that it is a most useful instrument: and must be hurt to see him fidget a short dock, backward and forward, with ineffectual attempts to rid himself of some plague, which he cannot reach.

As to the objection against the tail, as an instrument, which is continually gathering dirt, and lashing it around, if there be any truth in what I have already observed, this little objection dissolves; especially as the inconvenience may with great ease be remedied, when the road is dirty, either by knotting up the tail, or by tying it with a leathern strap. But whatever becomes of utility, the horse is certainly more beautiful, we are told, without his dangling tail. What a handsome figure he makes, when "he carries both his ends well!" This is the constant language of horse-dealers, stable-keepers, and grooms; and such language, tho' originating in tasteless ignorance, and mere prejudice, has perverted the sense, and understanding of men. It is inconceivable, how delusively the eye sees, as well as the understanding, when it is fascinated, and led aside by fashion and custom. Associated ideas of various kinds give truth a different air. When we see a game-cock, with all his sprightly actions and gorgeous plumes about him, we acknowledge one of the most beautiful birds in nature. But when we see him armed with steel and

prepared for battle, we cry, what a scare-crow! A cock-fighter, however, with all the ideas of the pit about him, will conceive, that in this latter state, he is in his greatest beauty; and if his picture be drawn, it must be drawn in this ridiculous manner. I have often seen it.

Let jockies, and stable-boys, and cock-fighters, keep their own absurd ideas, but let not men, who pretend to see and think for themselves, adopt such ridiculous conceits. In arts, we judge by the rules of art. In nature, we have no criterion but the forms of nature. We criticise a building by the rules of architecture; but in judging of a tree, or a mountain, we judge by the most beautiful forms of each, which nature hath given us. It is thus in other things. From nature alone we have the form of a horse. Should we then seek for beauty in that object, in our own wild conceptions, or recur to the great original from whence we had it? We may be assured, that nature's forms are always the most beautiful; and therefore we should endeavour to correct our ideas by her's. If, however, we cannot give up the point, let us at least be consistent. If we admire a horse without a tail, or a cock without feathers, let us not laugh at the Chinese for admiring the disproportioned foot of his mistress; or at the Indian, for doting on her black teeth, and tattooed cheeks. For myself, I cannot conceive, why it should make a horse more beautiful to take his tail from him, than it would be to clap a tail, as an addition of beauty, to a man. The accidental motion also of the tail gives it peculiar grace; both when the horse moves it himself, and when it waves in the wind. The beauty of it, to an unprejudiced eye, is conspicuous at once; and in all parade, and state-horses, it is acknowledg-

ed: tho' even here there is an attempt made to improve nature by art: the hair must be adorned with ribbons; and the bottom of the tail clipped square, which adds heaviness, and is certainly so far a deformity.

The same absurd notions, which have led men to cut off the tails of horses, have led them also to cut off their ears. I speak not of low grooms, and jockies; we have seen the studs of men of the first fashion, misled probably by their grooms and jockies, producing only cropt-horses.

When a fine horse has wide, lopping ears, as he sometimes has, without spring or motion in them, a man may be tempted to remove the deformity; but to cut a pair of fine ears from the head of a horse, is, if possible, a greater absurdity, than to cut off his tail. Nothing can be alleged in it's defence. The ear neither retards motion, nor flings dirt.

Much of the same ground may be gone over on this subject, which we went over on the last. With regard to the utility of the ear, it is not improbable, that cropping may injure the horse's hearing: there is certainly less concave surface to receive the vibrations of the air. I have heard it also asserted with great confidence, that this multilation injures his health; for when a horse has lost that pent-house, which nature has given him over his ear, it is reasonable to believe the wind and rain may get in, and give him cold.

Few of the minuter parts of animal nature are more beautiful than the ear of a horse. The contrast of the lines is pleasing; the concavity and the convexity, being generally seen together in the natural turn of the ear. Nor is the proportion of the ear less pleasing. It is contracted at the insertion, swells in the middle, and tapers to a point. The ear of no

animal is so beautfully proportioned. That of some beasts, especially of the savage kinds, as the lion, and pard, is naturally rounded and has little form. The ears of other animals, as the fox and cat, are pointed, short and thick. Those of the cow are round and heavy. The hare and ass's ears are long, and nearly of the same thickness. The dog and swine have flapping ears. The sheep, alone has ears, which may be compared with those of the horse. The ear of the horse receives great beauty also from it's colour, as well as form. The ears of bay and grey horses are generally tipped with black, which melts into the colour of the head. But the ear of the horse receives it's greatest beauty from motion. The ear of no animal has that vibrating power. The ears of a spirited horse are continually in motion; quivering and darting their sharp points towards every object which is presented: and the action is still more beautiful, when the ears are so well set on, that the points are drawn nearly together. But it is not only the quivering motion of the horse's ears, that we admire; we admire them also as the interpreters of his passions, particularly of fear, which some denominate courage; and of anger, or malice. The former he expresses by darting them forward; the latter, by laying them back.

Tho' nothing I can say on the subject, I am well persuaded, can weigh against the authority of grooms, and jockies, so as to make a general reform; yet if, here and there, a small party could be raised in opposition to this strange custom, it might, in time, perhaps obtain fashion on it's side." This reasoning will apply with equal force against the mutilation of dogs and other animals.

Of Travelling Post. There is another species of inhumanity, which all ranks, except the poor and indigent, stand chargeable with; which is the custom of travelling post. How often the trembling chaise or coach-horse, panting for breath, every limb shattered by the hardness of the roads, arrives in the inn-yard, spent to the last under extreme exertion. His sides wreathed or bleeding with the lashes or spurs of his unfeeling driver, and every muscle and tendon quivering with convulsive agony! In vain is he offered food; his mouth is parched with thirst and dust. He cannot eat, and water is denied, because it would endanger his existence, which is to be preserved for future torment. In such cases, it not unfrequently has happened that the postillion has been tipped an extraordinary gratuity, for which he would, at any time, flog the horses till they nearly expired under torture and fatigue. Inhuman custom! barbarous propensity! the dreadful effect of polished manners! Such is the misery that a boasted demi-god bestows on his inferiors. On a smaller scale of cruelty, a horse is frequently lashed with the most savage fury, by a gentleman's coachman, during the time of moving the length of a street, for no other reason than that he has, accidentally, stumbled, trod in a hole, or slipped through bad shoeing, and frequently ignorant for what he is corrected.

The following case of cruelty was in the year 1799, proved on oath by Lord Robert Seymour, before the magistrates in Bow-street. His lordship stated, "That he saw in Oxford-street, a coachman unmercifully whipping, from his box, two half starved and perfectly exhausted horses, which were endeavouring to draw from the channel an empty hackney coach. The driver, after so treating the horses, alighted, and

seizing the near, or left hand horse, beat him for a considerable time with the butt-end of his whip; he then proceeded to the right hand, or off horse, the outer shoulder of which was perfectly raw and excoriated, exposing a sort of pipe hole in it's centre, which hole appeared to have been formed by a rowel. The coachman then proceeded to punch repeatedly the raw surface of the shoulder, and deliberately worked the butt-end of the whip into the said rowel or pipe-hole. His lordship intreated him to desist, reminding him of the utter incapacity, on the part of the horses, to move. The coachman's reply was, "If he, his lordship, interfered any further on the part of the horses, he would kill them with a knife which he had in his pocket!"

Lord Erskine said, in his speech to the House of Peers, "I can assert, with the greatest sincerity, that nothing has ever excited in my mind greater disgust, than to observe, what we all of us are obliged to see every day, horses panting —— What do I say? literally dying under the scourge, when on looking into the chaises, we see them carrying to and from London, men and women, to whom or to others it can be of no possible signification whether they arrive one day sooner or later, and sometimes indeed whether they ever arrive.

THE BUYING UP OF HORSES, is an evil which exists under the deliberate calculation of intolerable avarice. This practice takes place at a time when past their strength, from old age or disease, upon the computation of how many days of torture and oppression they are capable of living under, so as to return a profit, with the addition of flesh and skin, when brought to one of the numerous houses appropriated for the slaughter of horses. If this practice,

says Lord Erskine, only extended to carrying on the fair work of horses, to the very latest period of labour, instead of destroying them, when old or disabled, I should approve instead of condemning it; but it is most notorious, that with the value of such animals, all care of them is generally at an end, and you see them (I speak literally, and of a systematic abuse) sinking and dying under loads, which no man living would have set the same horse to, when in the meridian of his strength and youth. This horrid abuse, which appears at first view to be incapable of aggravation, is, nevertheless, most shockingly aggravated when the period arrives at which one would think cruelty must necessarily cease; when exhausted Nature is ready to bestow the deliverance of death. But even then, a new and most atrocious system of torture commences, which has been proved to my satisfaction, and that of my friend Mr. Jekyll, on the information of a worthy magistrate, who called our attention to the abuse. It is

THE TRAFFIC OF THE NAGGERS, as it is called; a hideous practice which still exists. Among the immense number of letters which Lord Erskine received from persons of great respectability, in favour of the animal protection bill, his lordship referred to one where the particulars of this common but horrid practice were detailed. The traffic consists in buying up old horses for dogs' meat. These horses are kept without food, until there be a demand for the commodity. This correspondent informed Lord Erskine, that he had frequently seen these wretched animals devouring the remains of their dead companions, and even eating their own dung, to allay the gnawing pains of hunger.

OF IMPOUNDING ANIMALS. The diabolical infamy and stupidity of men who keep animals without adequate food to support their strength, or even their existence, has been feelingly adverted to by Lord Erskine;" I have had complaints of this abuse from all parts of the country. The notice to the owner is seldom served, and thus the poor innocent animal is left to starve in the pound. As far as an animal is considered merely as property, this may be all very well, and the owner must find him out at his peril, but when the animal is looked to, the impounder ought to feed him, and charge it to the owner, as part of the damages."

"Can no law," says Miss Williams, "succour that wretched horse, worn to the bone from famine and fatigue, lashed by his cruel tyrant into exertion beyond his strength, while he drags, in some vile vehicle, six persons, besides his merciless owner? For myself, I confess, that at the view of such spectacles, the charm of nature seems suddenly dissolved, to me the fields lose their verdure, and the woods their pleasantness; nor is my indignation confined to the unrelenting driver of these loaded machines; I consider the passengers who tacitly assent to the pain he inflicts, as more than his accomplices in barbarity."

Bloomfield beautifully contrasts the case of Dobbin, the Farmer's Horse, with that of the Post Horse; in the following lines, from his "Farmer's Boy."

Short-sighted Dobbin! thou canst only see
the trivial hardships that encompass thee:
thy chains are freedom and thy toils repose.
Could the poor Post-horse tell thee all his woes;
shew thee his bleeding shoulders, and unfold
the dreadful anguish he endures for gold:

hir'd at each call of business, lust, or rage,
that prompts the traveller on from stage to stage.
Still on his strength depends his boasted speed;
for them his limbs grow weak, his bare ribs bleed;
and tho' he groaning, quickens at command,
their extra shilling in the driver's hand
becomes his bitter scourge; 'tis he must feel
the double efforts of the lash and steel;
'til when, up hill, the destin'd inn he gains,
and, trembling under complicated pains,
prone from his nostrils, darting on the ground,
his breath emitted floats in clouds around:
drops chase each other down his chested sides,
and spatter'd mud his native colour hides;
through his swoln veins the boiling torrent flows,
and every nerve a separate torture knows.
His harness loos'd, he welcomes, eager-eyed,
the pails full draught that quivers by his side,
and joys to see the well-known stable door,
as the starv'd mariner the friendly shore.
Ah! well it were, if here his sufferings ceas'd,
and ample hours of rest his pains appeas'd;
but rous'd again, and sternly bade to rise,
and shake refreshing slumber from his eyes,
ere his exhauted spirits can return,
or through his frame reviving ardour burn,
come forth he must, tho' limping, maim'd and sore,
he hears the whip: the chaise is at the door;
the collar lightens and again he feels
his half-heal'd wounds inflam'd; again the wheels,
with tiresome sameness, in his ears resound,
o'er blinding dust, or miles of flinty ground.
Thus nightly robbed, and injur'd day by day,
his piece-meal murderers wear his life away.
What sayest thou, Dobbin? what tho' hounds await

with open jaws the moment of thy fate,
no better fate attends his public race;
his life is misery, and his end disgrace.
Then freely bear thy burden to the mill;
obey but one short law,—thy driver's will.

O barbarous men! your cruel breasts aswage;
why vent ye on the gen'rous steed your rage?
does not his service earn your daily bread?
your wives, your children, by his labours fed!
Gay's Trivia.

The Asiatics, in general, but particularly the Arabians, have been long renowned for their kind and merciful treatment of beasts, rarely or never correcting their horses, either with whip or spur; but treat them as animals which they perceive are endowed with a large portion of the reasoning faculty.

Some of the most beautiful passages, by ancient writers, are those in which the animal creation is mentioned. Few readers have escaped tears at the affectionate address of Mezentius to his horse, 10Æn. 861, which is one of the most pathetic strokes in Virgil. No part of Homer is more remarkable than the art with which that great poet rivets attention in favour of the horse of Achilles, in opposition to poetical truth; yet such is the beauty of the passage that the frigid propriety of fact is lost in the magic of the poetry.

In Jacob Guther de Jure Manium, published in 1671, there are some curious instances to be found of the fondness which the ancients had for their animals, and which they carried to a most ridiculous excess.

Alexander the great, had funeral rites performed on the death of his horse Bucephalus.—Pliny, lib. viii,

cap. 42. Augustus erected a tomb to the memory of a favourite horse. At Athens, those horses which had thrice conquered at the Olympic Games, were always buried with those who had fallen in battle. —Ælian, lib. xii. Lucius Verus erected a golden statue of a favourite speedy horse, during his life, and on his death made a tomb for him in the Vatican.— Capitolin. in Vero. Adrian was so fond of horses and dogs, that he erected tombs for them.

ON THE TREATMENT OF THE ASS. Such is the depravity of the human race, that because this poor animal is meek and patient, beyond all comparison, it is subjected to excessive labour, the most barbarous treatment, and the coarsest food. It's humble appearance, size, and want of spirit, subjects it to become the property of the most abject and brutal of the human kind. The common lanes and high roads are it's nightly residence; where it becomes the sport of debased children, who have been early initiated in unfeelingness and the arts of wanton cruelty.

The ass has many and superior claims to protection and kind treatment. His countenance is mild and modest, expressing a languid patience; his deportment simple and unaffected; and his pace, tho' not swift, is uniform and unabated. His service is indefatigable and unostentatious, and he is content with the most indifferent food. He is said to be immoderately fond of plantane, and nice only in the choice of water, drinking that which is clear. The inimitable Sterne has endeavoured to render the ass respectable, and that this patient useful animal is not so in this country, is a proof of the wretchedly unfeeling and barbarous disposition of it's inhabitants.

STRIPPING OF GEESE, as practiced in the fens of Lincolnshire, reflects an odium on the name of

man. Mr Pennant calmly describes this more than savage custom, as follows. "The geese are plucked five times in the year: the first plucking is at Lady-day, for feathers and quills; and the same is renewed, for feathers only, four times more between that and Michaelmas. The old geese submit quietly, to the operation, but the young ones are very noisy and unruly. I once saw this performed, and observed that goslings of six weeks old were not spared; for their tails were plucked, as I was told, to habituate them early to what they were to come to. If the season prove cold, numbers of the geese die by this barbarous custom."

ENTOMOLOGY. The Entomologist or Collector of Insects, practises the most unrelenting cruelties on flies, moths and spiders. The papilionaceous race are impaled for days and weeks on corking pins. The libellutæ, or dragon-flies, are killed by squeezing the thorax, or with the spirit of turpentine.

Naturalists, of some feeling, find it difficult to kill the largest kinds of Moths and Sphinxes. The corking pin, on which they are impaled, is usually dipped in aquafortis, pierced through the body, then withdrawn and a drop of the aquafortis put into the wound. Should this prove insufficient, the point of the pin is put through a card and held in the flame of a candle till it be red hot. Fumigations of sulphur are said to destroy the beauty of the insect; and do not always succeed; not even when exposed under a glass with burning sulphur for half an hour. The Libellutæ tribe are destroyed by a red hot wire being run up the body and thorax.—Donovan on the Management of Insects.

Science may certainly be improved, and learning increased without the practice of such barbarities.

' T is a worthless science which is acquired at the expense of that humanity which is highly necessary in our journey through life. The cruelty, not to say ingratitude, of gibbeting or impaling alive, so many innocent beautiful beings, in return for the pleasure they afford us in the display of their lovely tints and glowing colours, is abominable.

"Could the figure, instincts, and qualities of birds, beasts, insects, reptiles and fish be ascertained," says Sir William Jones, "either on the plan of Buffon, or on that of Linnæus, without giving pain to the objects of our examination, few studies would afford us more solid instruction, or more exquisite delight: but I never could learn by what right, nor conceive with what feelings, a naturalist can occasion the misery of an innocent bird, and leave it's young, perhaps, to perish in a cold nest, because it has gay plumage, and has never been accurately delineated; or deprive, even a butterfly, of it's natural enjoyments, because it has the misfortune to be rare and beautiful: nor shall I ever forget the couplet of Ferdausi, for which Sadi, who cites it with applause, pours blessings on his departed spirit.

Ah! spare yon emmet, rich in hoarded grain;
he lives in pleasure, but he dies with pain."

Teignmouth's Memoirs, v. ii, p. 356.

The Preserving of Birds and Animals, has, of late years, become a trade, among the commonest mechanics, whose employment it is to destroy them for the purpose of disposing of their bodies, after they are fitted up in boxes with glass before them. Many have been thus savagely curious in purchasing great numbers of them to decorate rooms, which they take pleasure in exhibiting to their friends.

Some obtain birds by finding their nests, and then,

some day afterwards, advance cautiously to the places and put over them a hand-net. In this manner they frequently take both the parents; or, by taking one of them, they generally obtain the other with a gun! Such is the progress which men make in barbarity, while they are complimented as ingenious! They may indeed be ingenious, but they are ingenious in crime, and merit the title of Ingenious Monsters.

ANATOMISTS. Among the inferior professors of medical knowledge, is a race of wretches whose lives are only distinguished by varieties of cruelty. Their favourite amusement is to nail dogs to tables and open them alive; to try how long life may be continued in various degrees of mutilation, or with the excision or laceration of the vital parts; to examine whether burning irons are felt more acutely by the bone or tendon; and whether the more lasting agonies are produced by poison forced into the mouth or injected into the veins. It is not without reluctance that I offend the sensibility of the tender mind, but since they are continually published with ostentation, let me be allowed to mention them, since I mention them with abhorrence. Mead has invidiously remarked of Woodward, that he gathered shells and stones, and intended to pass for a philosopher. With pretensions much less reasonable, the anatomical novice tears out the living bowels of an animal, and styles himself *physician!*

What is alleged in defence of these hateful practices, every one knows; but the truth is, that by knives, fire, and poison, knowledge is not always sought, and is very seldom attained. The experiments which have been tried, are tried again; he that burned an animal with irons yesterday, will be willing to amuse himself with burning another to-morrow. I

know not that by living dissections, any discovery has been made by which a single malady is more easily cured: and, if the knowledge of physiology has been somewhat increased, he surely pays too much for knowledge when he learns the use of the lacteals at the expense of his humanity.

The faithful dog (whose attachment and gratitude are exemplary and worthy the imitation of man, when with a farmer or country 'squire, is well fed, and has no great cause of complaint, except on account of the loss of his ears and tail, which were lopt off to improve nature; and on account of now and then a bruise or broken rib, from gentle spurns: but if the poor quadruped falls into the hands of a tanner, an anatomist, or experimental philosopher, alas! of what avail are his good qualities? These canine unfortunates are frequently tortured for the *good of mankind!* Some have their throats cut to prove the efficacy of a styptic, others are bled to death for a philosophical effusion, and many animals resign their breath in the receiver of an air-pump. Unfortunate animals!

It is impossible to read the experiments made by Browne Langrish, read before the Royal Society, and published in 1746, under the title of "Physical Experiments on Brutes," without sensations of horror. After the injection of various corrosive menstruums into the bladders of dogs, they were hung, for the sake of examination; but others died in the most dreadful convulsions. The stomach of a dog was cut out while alive, in order to try whether the liquor *Gastricus* would be coagulated by it. But the most dreadful of his experiments are those made on dogs, to ascertain by what means the fumes of sulphur destroy an animal body. He cut asunder the wind-

pipes of dogs, so that the fumes could not reach the lungs, and then, fixing the head through a hole in a wainscot, he proceeded to the most wanton of experiments. The miserable creatures foamed at the mouth, roared hideously, or died in excruciating torture. This author, in the winding up of one part of his work, talks of the *pleasure*, variety, and usefulness of his experiments! In this manner these privileged tyrants sport away the lives and revel in the agonies and tortures of creatures, whose sensations are as delicate, and whose natural right to an unpainful enjoyment of life is as great as that of man.

The monthly reviewers, after examining a new physiological theory, contained in "Experiments on the Cause of Heat in living Animals, &c. by John Caverhill, M. D. M. R. C. P. F. R. S." add, "we claim no small degree of merit, with our readers, in having, for their information, read the numerous and cruel experiments related in this pamphlet throughout; the perusal of which was attended with a continual shudder at the repeated recital of such a number of instances of the *most deliberate* and *unrelenting* cruelty, exercised on several scores of rabbits, in order to ascertain the truth of a strange and extravagant hypothesis. At every page, we read of awls stuck between the vertebræ, [joints of the back bone] and into the spinal marrow of living rabbits, who exhibit, at the time, every symptom of exquisite pain, and live ten, twelve, and even nineteen days afterwards; their bladders sometimes bursting, in consequence of their losing the power of expelling the urine accumulated in them, unless when the unfeeling operator, not out of tenderness, but to protract the miserable life of the suffering animal, as long as possible, in order to render the experiment more

complete, thought proper to press it out, from time to time, with his hands. But we spare the sensibility of our readers, which must be already hurt by this brief relation of these *immoral* experiments, for surely there are *moral* relations subsisting between man and his fellow-creatures of the brute creation; and tho' by drovers and draymen neither attended to nor respected, it becomes not philosophers, much less physicians, thus flagrantly to violate them."—Mon. Rev. Sep. 1770. p. 213.

The experiments of Spallanzani are multifarious, indeed, and perhaps valuable, but many of them were attended with circumstances of disgusting and unpardonable cruelty.

When one anatomist, affects to speak in a light and pleasant manner of the patience displayed by a hedge-hog while dissected alive, relating that it suffered it's feet to be nailed down to the table, and it's entrails to be cut in pieces, without a single groan, bearing every stroke of the operator's knife with a more than Spartan fortitude; [See Pennant's British Zoology, Art. Hedge-Hog.] and when another professes to have been amused with the noise of a grasshopper, excited by tortures; [See Phil. Trans. for 1793. part 1, art 4.] when, I say, such expressions meet the eye, a disposition to cruelty, and not the good of mankind, is evidently the predominant spring of action.

Were an ancient physician to rise from his grave, and take a step into an anatomical theatre, the implements of the art, and the dexterity with which they are managed, might confound him: but when the learned professor throws his scalpel aside and bursts forth in all the elevation and splendor of physiological oratory, the venerable ancient would turn with

disgust from the flimsy and consequential harangue.

DESTROYING BEES. The commonwealth of the bee is admirably governed. Regularity, skill and common toil support it. Every appetite is checked and every private interest suppressed for the public good; and, in the winter months, they exhibit a pattern of frugality and temperance. Mankind, in general, make a bee-hive an object of attention and care; admiring the persevering industry of this insect, and yet he will deliberately suffocate twelve thousand beings (the number of which a hive usually consists) for the sake of seizing a store, the produce of many an anxious toilsome summer's day.

Ah see! where robb'd, and murder'd in that pit
lies the still heaving hive! at evening snatch'd
beneath the cloud of guilt-concealing night,
and fix'd o'er sulphur; while, not dreaming ill,
the happy people in their waxen cells,
sat tending public cares, and planning schemes
of temperance; for winter-poor, rejoic'd
to mark, full-flowing round, their copious stores.
Sudden, the dark oppressive steam ascends,
and, us'd to milder scents, the tender race,
by thousands, tumble from their honeyed domes,
convolv'd, and agonizing in the dust.
And was it then for this you roam'd the Spring,
intent, from flower to flower? for this you toil'd,
ceaseless, the burning Summer-heats away?
for this in Autumn search'd the blooming waste,
nor lost one sunny gleam? for this sad fate?
O Man! tyrannic lord! how long, how long
shall prostrate Nature groan beneath your rage,
awaiting renovation? When oblig'd,
must you destroy? Of their ambrosial food
can you not borrow, and, in just return,

afford them shelter from the wintry winds?
or, as the sharp year pinches, with their own
again regale them on some smiling day?
See! where the stony bottom of their town
looks desolate and wild, with here and there
a helpless number, who the ruined state
survive, lamenting, weak, cast out to death.
Thus a proud city, populous and rich,
full of the works of peace, and high in joy,
at theatre or feast, or sunk in sleep,
(as late, Palermo! was thy fate) is seiz'd
by some dread earthquake, and convulsive hurl'd
sheer from the black foundation, stench involv'd,
into a gulph of blue sulphureous flame.

Thomson's Autumn.

This business of murder and robbery united, is unpardonable, because nearly the same quantity of honey can be procured without the crime of such outrages. See Huish's Treatise on Bees, 8vo; Isaac's General Apiarian; Willich's Domestic Encyclopædia, article Bee; Encyclopædia Britannica; and other Encyclopædias. A sympathizing person, will disdain to partake of a sweet, purchased by the combined crimes of murder and robbery. To retain a conscience free from the imputation of being an encourager of crime, is to him of infinitely greater importance than the temporary gratification of sense.

The Business of Butchery. Among butchers, and those who qualify the different parts of an animal into food, it would be easy to select persons much further removed from those virtues which should result from reason, consciousness, sympathy, and animal sensations, than any savages upon the face of the earth. In order to avoid all the generous and spontaneous sympathies of compassion, the office of shed-

ding blood is committed into the hands of men who have been educated in inhumanity, and whose sensibility has been blunted and destroyed by early habits of barbarity. Thus men increase misery in order to avoid the sight of it; and because they cannot endure being obviously cruel themselves, or commit actions which strike painfully on their senses, they commission those to commit them who are formed to delight in cruelty, and to whom misery, torture, and shedding of blood is an amusement. They appear not once to reflect, that WHATEVER WE DO BY ANOTHER WE DO OURSELVES.

When a large and gentle bullock, after having resisted a ten times greater force of blows than would have killed his murderer, falls stunned, at last, and his armed head is fastened to the ground with cords; as soon as the wide wound is made, and the jugulars are cut asunder, what mortal can, without compassion, hear the painful bellowings intercepted by his blood, the bitter sighs, which speak the sharpness of his anguish, and the deep sounding groans, with loud anxiety, fetched from the bottom of his strong and palpitating heart. Look on the trembling and violent convulsions of his limbs; see while his reeking gore streams from him, his eyes become dim and languid, and behold his strugglings, gasps, and last efforts for life. When a creature has given such convincing and undeniable proofs of terror, and of pain and agony, is there a disciple of Descartes so inured to blood, as not to refute, by his commisseration, the philosophy of that vain reasoner?

The manner of slaughtering oxen in this country is barbarous. The writer of this passage has seen an ox receive five different blows, and break from it's murderers each time. The description of a head so

shattered is too painful to dwell on. Lord Somerville, took a person with him to Lisbon, to be instructed in the Portuguese method of slaying oxen, or, as it is there termed, "of laying down cattle." It is done by passing a knife through the vertebræ of the neck into the spine, which causes instant death. His lordship has proposed to have our slaughterers instructed in the practice, but with all the stupidity and prejudice which belongs to them, they have refused. The customs of the Jews, and from them the Mahometans, in respect to killing those animals which their laws allow them to eat, merits applause, when compared with the cruelty of Christians. The person appointed for this purpose is obliged to prepare a knife of a considerable length, which is made as sharp as the keenest razor, the utmost care being taken, that the least notch or inequality may not remain upon the edge; with this he is obliged to cut the throat and blood vessels at one stroke, whereby the painful method of knocking them down, which often requires several barbarous blows, and stabbing them in the neck with a blunt knife, is avoided. Every beast mangled in killing, is accounted unclean.

There is not one man in a hundred, if not brought up in a slaughter-house, but who will own, that of all trades he could not be a butcher; and I question whether ever any person so much as killed a chicken, without reluctancy, the first time. Some people are not to be persuaded to taste of any creatures they have daily seen and been acquainted with, while they were alive; others extend their scruples no farther than to their own poultry, and refuse to eat what they fed and took care of themselves. Yet all of them will feed heartily, and without remorse, on beef, mutton, and fowls, when they are bought in the market.

We might fill a volume, were we to collect and enumerate the various acts of damnable infamy practised by this set of men and tolerated in this country of assumed tenderness and sensibility; but an instance or two must suffice.

It is customary with butchers, (horrid name! but justly significant) to tie two calves together by the legs and to throw them across a horse, in which manner they are suspended for two or three hours together, and still longer, if the inhuman wretch has business on his way home, or if invited to lounge at a favourite alehouse.

It is the constant practice of these wretches to bleed calves to death, for the purpose of whitening the flesh; and the process is worthy of professed and hired murderers. An incision is made in the throat, and the animal is then hung up by the heels, while yet alive and convulsed with pain. One end of a short iron hook is at the same time stuck into the body near the tail, and the other end in the mouth, for the purpose of bending the neck, and opening the wound. In this state the miserable animal is left to linger several hours!

It is not uncommon with these professed murderers, in driving a number of sheep, when any one is untractable, to break it's leg.

A butcher driving a flock of sheep, one of them having broke away from the others, the monster drew his knife, and, with shocking barbarity, cut out the poor creature's eyes. In that condition he turned him to the rest of the flock. Such barbarous inhumanity raised the indignation of all who saw it, except the executioner, who being asked the motive which had induced him to such an act of cruelty, replied, with unconcern, that "he was accountable to no

person for what he did, and that he would use his own property according to his own mind."—Gentleman's Mag. vol. xxiv, p. 241, 255.

A number of wretched calves, with almost useless limbs, from an inactive position and the jolting of a waggon, are continually thrown down upon the stones of Smithfield, while unconscious, and worse than brutal spectators, are amused, even to expressions of rapture, in proportion to the severity of the falls and injuries of these distressed animals. Were a few of these feeling advocates for the practice of Christianity precipitated in like manner, such an amusement would suggest the convenience of a slide and a truss of straw, or some other gentle means of effecting the same end.

Cooks are a species of butchers. R. Mant, M. A. author of a "Sermon on the Sinfulness of Cruelty to Animals," preached at Southampton, Aug. 16, 1807, says, page 18, "I have been credibly informed that the following anecdote of a nobleman of high rank, lately deceased, is true. His attention being one day forcibly arrested by cries of distress, proceeding from the kitchen, he enquired the cause; and was told that they were uttered by a pig, which the cook was then whipping to death, that it might furnish a more exquisite delicacy for his grace's table. It would be injustice to omit, that his grace expressed much horror at the enormity, forbade it's repetition, and dismissed the servant who had been guilty of it."

"It is a miserable thing," says Mr. Newton, "to observe the low estimate which is made of the qualities of the ill-fated sheep. In his wild state, he is as respectable for strength and courage, as his size entitles him to be. I lately saw a ram in Piccadilly,

much taller than the common ones, measuring nearly three feet four inches, to the top of the head, exclusively of the horns, covered with hair, every where strong and coarse, but long and shaggy at the mane. The lad in attendance rode upon his back, across the room, without any apparent inconvenience. At the sight of this I could not help reflecting that by domesticating the sheep, and applying it to our cruel purposes, we load it with fat till the slightest exertion puts it out of breath; so that we even render it liable to roll over and be cast, as the shepherds call it, there often to lie upon it's back till the crows pick it's eyes out, or until it perishes from inability to regain it's legs. It is indeed no just matter of surprise that the domesticated sheep can never recover it's wild state. After robbing the unfortunate creature of it's own warm clothing, it is kept ready for the knife in a state of incipient rot, and then we exclaim, what a dull, sluggish, stupid looking animal is this! I shudder at the thought which forces itself on my mind. Tell me, reader, is that originally noble creature man, more, or is he less deteriorated?"

Gibbon, speaking of the tartarean shepherds, says, "the ox or the sheep are slaughtered by the same hand from which they are accustomed to receive their daily food; and the bleeding limbs are served, with very little preparation, on the table of their unfeeling murderer." This assersion is applicable to almost every servant in a large english farmhouse.

A tolerably correct conjecture may be formed of the enormous carnivorous propensity of the English, from the daily devastations which are uniformly committed on the various kinds of domestic animals in London. Lord Townsend in the year 1725, assured the King of Prussia, at Herenhausen, which is

confirmed by exact registers, that one day with another, the number amounted to 1200 oxen; besides which, above 20,000 sheep, and 12,000 hogs and calves, are consumed there every week. According to Maitland's calculation for the same year, there were destroyed in London, 98,244 oxen, 711,123 sheep and lambs; 164,760 calves, and 186,932 hogs; and a proportionable quantity of fish and fowl."— Keyster's Travels.

The consumption of sheep and lambs, in London, during the last 12 months, amounted in number to 1,062,700. The number of horned cattle slaughtered, was 164,000. By the inspectors, return, it appears that the number of horsehides produced at Leadenhall-market, amounted to 12,900!—"The News," Oct, 26, 1818.

The following new method of destroying field-mice is seriously given in a modern publication, as an ingenious invention. "Catch, by means of traps, or any other method, ten or a dozen field mice, alive, and confine them in a box without food. They will be driven by hunger to destroy and devour each other. The single conqueror and survivor of the rest, will, by this means, have acquired an unnatural and ravenous thirst after the blood of his own species, and when turned out into the fields, from which he was taken, he will go into their holes, and destroy both young and old, in order to satiate his newly acquired appetite." Could any wretch less infamous than a professed butcher, be the inventer of so diabolical a method?—Cited by the Rev. L. Richmond, in his Appendix to his Sermon on Cruelty.

Instances are not wanting, in which men have first eaten human flesh from the pressure of extreme hunger, and afterwards indulged in it from wanton-

ness, and depravity. An eminent Portuguese naturalist is the author of the following extracts on this subject. A copy of the paper containing them was given by him from his own manuscript, never published, to Dr. G. H. Langsford, physician to Prince Christian of Waldeck at Lisbon, on the 5th of January 1798, who translated it into German, and sent it to Professor Voigt of Jena. [See his "Magazin. für den nuesten zustand der Naturkunde," vol. 1, p. 3.] "During a dreadful famine in India, which destroyed more than a hundred thousand persons, when the roads and streets were covered with dead bodies, because people had not sufficient strength to inter them, I saw several have the resolution to preserve their lives by this disgusting food; but some of them, tho' not many, found it so delicious that, when the famine was at an end, they retained such an irresistible propensity to eat human flesh that they lay in wait for the living in order to devour them. Besides others, there was a mountaineer who concealed himself in a forest near the highway, where he used to cast a rope, with a noose, over the heads of the passengers, whom he afterwards cut to pieces to gratify his unnatural appetite. He had killed many persons in this manner, but was at length caught and executed. At the same time, and owing to the same cause, a woman used to go out for the express purpose of carrying away children who had strayed from their homes. She stopped up their noses and mouths with clay, that they might not call for assistance, and by these means suffocated them. She confessed the fact on being taken, and some salted human flesh was found in her habitation. My servant having entered it, observed a girl of four or five years of age, who had been suffocated in this manner, and who

was lying, wrapped up, half dead, in a mat. By employing proper means she was however restored to life."

We read, in different works, both ancient and modern, that many nations, in various parts of the world, have killed men, not on account of famine, but of the delicious taste of human flesh, which they not only fed on but publicly sold.

That people eat their deceased relations, by way of shewing them honour, seems to be as romantic as it is repugnant to nature; yet there are many authors, from Herodotus, the father of history, down to modern times, who assert that this practice has prevailed among various nations.

"There is a law in Cochinchina, that all rebels, when convicted, shall be executed, and that their flesh shall be devoured by the king's loyal subjects, and, in particular, by those who are nearest his person. At the time I resided in that country several executions of this kind took place. The men were beheaded, but the women were stabbed. After the execution, the soldiers who guarded the palace, flocked around the bodies, and each cutting off with a pocket knife, a small piece, dipped it in the juice of an unripe lemon, and in that manner swallowed it. But as the size of the morsel is not determined by the law, and as most of the people have an aversion to such food, many suffer the bit of flesh to drop through their fingers and swallow only the lemon.

"At the time when the Cochinese were at war against the Mois, a people who inhabit the mountains to the west, and who often make incursions into their territories, the Cochinese general marched with an army towards the mountains; but as he was not able to get at the enemy, on account of their inacces-

sible situation, he ordered two prisoners, whom he had taken, to be put to death, and their flesh to be devoured by his soldiers.

"In the year 1777, being on board an English ship of war in Turon harbour, in order to return from Cochinchina to Europe, a party arrived there who had joined a powerful rebel named Nhae. This leader and his party had taken some of the king's confidental friends, and one in particular who had formerly done him a great deal of injury. The latter they put to death; and in order to gratify their revenge, they tore out his liver and ate it. The Cochinchinese, in general, when violently incensed against any one, are accustomed to express a wish that they may be able to devour his liver or his flesh."

Where is human reason and humanity when inclination is unrestrained? It is evident there is no bounds to the tyranny of man. He lords it equally over his own kind and over those he denominates brutes. Nay, there are of the race of man, who exhibit human flesh as a marketable commodity. See "Modern Universal History," vol. 16 passim, but particularly pages 350, 448.

WAR is the butchery of man by man; a practice in direct opposition to the plainest principles and and express precepts of Christ. It were loss of time to produce quotations. The whole tenor of the doctrines of the New Testament inculcate love, charity, forbearance, meekness, gentleness, and good will. It is only by outrages against all that is delightful in social converse, and beautiful in moral and divine principle, that the heavenly doctrines of our Saviour are perverted and destroyed. Scenes of brutality, drunkenness and gambling are deemed the proper seminaries for those qualities which distinguish the soldier.

If men will shoot and kill each other, or if they will hack and hew one another to pieces, they cannot be christians, nor can their employers be christians. Christianity inculcates the very reverse. What custom of the most barbarous nations is more repugnant to the feelings of piety, humanity, and justice, than that of deciding controversies between nations by the edge of the sword, by powder and ball, or the point of the bayonet? What other savage custom has occasioned half the desolation and misery to the human race? And what but the grossest infatuation, could render such a custom popular among rational beings?

A war between two nations is generally produced by a small number of ambitious, unthinking, or unprincipled individuals; while the great majority of the nation have no voice in the measure. The more people are enlightened, the greater is their aversion to war.

Duelling is a horrible custom, but war is much more horrible, as it is more desolating and ruinous. War is a species of national duelling, attended by this dishonourable circumstance, that those who give and accept the challenge, call together a multitude of seconds, to whom they pay money to do their business, having not the magnanimity to risk their own lives, but involve their seconds in a bloody contest, while they stand remote from danger, as spectators, or directors of the awful combat; or, probably, after issuing their bloody mandate, they indulge in their accustomed pleasures, totally regardless of the sufferings of others.

War does not decide the justice of any question. It only determines which party is the most ferocious and savage. Virtuous but weak nations, have been

reduced to the greatest subjection, without even a charge of offence or injury. War-makers thus resemble the wild beasts of the forests, who devour the innocent and unoffending.

"The profession of a soldier is in all respects, so contrary to every principle of reason and justice, that it admits of no vindication. Power has sanctioned it, but nothing can change the eternal nature of things, and make the murder of innocent victims either just or honourable; for in every instance, in which war has been undertaken, the men, who, by their ambition and intrigues, have pushed things to extremities, have decided the contest by means of those who were innocent of the quarrel, and finally unconcerned in the event; by men whom ignorance or necessity had compelled to be their dupes, and to betake themselves to fighting, because they were vicious, or indolent, or could find no other employment. Let any man coolly and impartially examine the history of the past and the present times, and say, whether every dispute between nations might not have been settled by negociations, if the parties had been disposed to listen to common sense, to reason, and justice; and whether every thing should not be resorted to, rather than force; for whoever is the cause of shedding man's blood, except positively to save his own life, is guilty of murder. The fact, however, is, that mankind have been so long accustomed to this barbarous mode of decision, that they think not of any other. Yet, notwithstanding the force of custom, the appearance of necessity, the sanction of time, the power of example, the danger of delay, the strength of our enemies, and the urgency of the case, no war can be justified by that party which has not exhausted every means of conciliation, and proposed every scheme of

settling differences, without resorting to the sword. To what purpose is it to educate a young man in the principles of generosity and humanity; to make him accomplished, enlightened, and virtuous; and to give him ideas of philanthrophy, benevolence, and affection for his species, if they are all to be obliterated by the horrible inconsistency of making him a licensed robber, or a murderer by profession? Such an education ought to tend rather to banish the sentiments of hatred and hostility, and enforce those of peace and benevolence; for surely all these things are not requisite to murder with greater dexterity, or destroy an enemy with a surer and more certain aim. The end of such an education is inconsistent with it's principles; and while the profession of a soldier continues in society, let those, who are intended for it, remain, as they ought to be, savage, ignorant, and uncivilized, for while wars continue, civilization is not complete."—Burdon's Materials for Thinking, p. 264.

Philo, speaking of the Christians of his own time, says, "None can be found among them who manufacture darts, arrows, swords, helmets, breast-plates, nor even such weapons as might be converted to bad purposes in the time of peace; much less do any of them engage in those arts which are useful in war." It is evident, then, nay the conviction compels us to acknowledge the fact, that the people who now assume the name of Christians, are generally impostors, possessing scarcely any thing of the spirit and practice of christianity; nor do some of those professors stop here, they are profound hypocrites; "they profess to know God but in their works deny him."

"A highwayman is as much a robber, when he plunders in a gang, as when single; and a nation, which

makes an unjust war, is a great gang.' Franklin's Phil. Papers, p 182.

Dr. Prideaux, in his Connections, vol i, p. 489, has forcibly depicted the inexpressible mischief done to mankind, by mercenary poets and historians, who praise heroes or princes for conquering countries, thereby inciting others to imitate them.

Blessed are the poor in spirit; for their's is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God. —JESUS CHRIST.

The son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.—Luke ix, 56. Why then do not preachers, who pretend to promulgate the doctrine of Christ, inveigh vigourously, in the name of God, against the ambition of potentates; against the sacrilegious laws of war; against the decoration of our churches, dedicated to mercy and charity, with banners won, by shedding the blood of nations? With what face of consistency can they give their benedictions to the standards around which our sanguinary soldiers assemble? Let them refuse their ministrations to every one who contributes toward the increase of human wretchedness. Let them make to the powers who would engage them to consecrate the the instruments of their politics, the reply which the priestess Theano made, to the people of Athens, when they endeavoured to persuade her to pronounce a malediction on the profane Alcibiades: "I am a priestess for the purpose of offering up prayers and imploring blessings; not for execrating and devoting to destruction."—St. Pierre's Works, vol iv, p. 264.

I record, with great pleasure, that the Rev. R. Warner, a very accomplished clergyman of the established

english church, has had the boldness and virtue *to* espouse the cause of Christ, by preaching at St. James's Church, Bath, on May 25th, 1804, (being the day of the general fast,) a Sermon on the Inconsistency of War with Christianity. Published by Robinson, London. The following is an extract.

Put up again thy sword, into it's place; for all they who take the sword, shall perish with the sword. —Matt. xxvi, 52.

"However specious the sophistry may be, which stimulates nations to plunge into the horrors of warfare, or induces them to protract their hostilities against each other; however brilliant the successes are with which their arms shall be crowned; whatever acquisitions of territory conquest may unite to their ancient empire; whatever new triumphs shall swell their former fame, or victories enlarge the list of their heroes; it may, notwithstanding, be considered as an incontrovertible axiom, (an axiom confirmed by the history of past ages, and the events of modern times; by the sad appearances of Christendom, and the rueful experience of ourselves,) that WAR is the GREATEST CURSE with which a nation can be afflicted; and that in comparison with the ills and sufferings, the dangers and distresses, the difficulties and privations, which it heaps upon the great mass of the society of a country, all it's imaginary present advantages, or future contingent benefits, are but as "dust in the balance," and as "chaff before the wind."

"If we view this "foul fiend," as trenching apon the rights and claims of *humanity*; as obliterating, on the one hand, all the lovely charities of natural feeling, and dissipating, on the other, all the felicities of private life; we shall regard the scourge with increased disgust and confirmed abhorrence. Man,

from the circumstances of his temporary being, subject inevitably to much evil, both physical and moral; dependent and helpless; entirely insufficient to his own defence and support; is furnished by his all-merciful Creator with principles which may remedy, in some degree, this imperfection of his nature, and provide for wants and deficiencies that solitary effort could not supply. He is made a *social* being; gifted with feelings which link him to his fellow-creatures in the chain of social harmony; and endowed with a broad benevolence, that includes the desire of reciprocating kindnesses with "all his brethren in the world." To the very root of this natural feeling War directs it's pernicious axe. It's existence depends upon the destruction of this principle. It commences with narrowing the sphere of philanthropy; in it's progress it freezes up all the genial charities of our nature; it's maturity is marked by the extinction of every liberal sentiment; and when it quits the land over which it has exercised it's malignant influence, it leaves the social character of the country barren of all that is amiable and virtuous, benevolent and humane.

But still more distressing (because more personal) is the havock which war exercises on the happiness of private life. Here, no pen is able to describe, no mouth is competent to utter, the various forms of sorrow that mark it's presence, and pursue it's march. "Tho' the whole race of man be doomed to dissolution, and we are all hastening to our long home, yet at each successive moment, life and death seem to divide betwixt the dominion of mankind; and *life* to have the largest share. But it is otherwise in War. Death reigns here without a rival, and without controul. War is the work, the element, or rather

the sport and triumph of Death, who glories not only in the extent of his conquest, but in the richness of his spoil. In the other methods of attack; in the other forms which death assumes, the feeble and the aged, who at the best can live but a short time, are usually the victims; but here it is the vigorous and strong. It is remarked by the most ancient of poets, that in peace children bury their parents, but in war parents bury their children; nor is the difference small. Children lament their parents, *sincerely* indeed, but with that moderate and tranquil sorrow, which it is natural for those to feel, who are conscious of retaining many tender ties, and many animating objects. Parents mourn for their children with the bitterness of despair. The widowed mother loses, when she is deprived of her children, every thing but the capacity of suffering. Her heart withered and desolate, admits no other object, cherishes no other hope. It is Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they are not."—Hall's Reflect. on War.

"Transport yourselves but in imagination, for one moment, into the field of battle; and into the wretched countries which are the theatre of war; and surely, if your hearts be not seared to all the impressions of mercy, loving-kindness, and compassion, they will weep tears of blood for the woes which ye will there see accumulated upon suffering humanity. Behold whole ranks of human beings stretched out upon the earth, maimed and mutilated, dying and dead. See peaceful villages reduced to heaps of ruins; fair cities wrapt in flames; and "fruitful lands made desolate." Listen to the mingled din of shouts and shrieks; the yell of the victor, the cry of the vanquished, the groans of the wounded, and the screams

of the violated. Contemplate, I conjure you, these horrible circumstances, and, if ye have not lost the feelings of nature, ye will lift up your hands and hearts in agonized petition to the MOST HIGH, to remove from weeping Christendom a monster bringing in it's train such unspeakable horrors.

"Let it not be forgotten, however, that the influence of war is equally fatal to the morality, as to the happiness, of a country. The habits which a state of warfare necessarily introduces, into a nation, are every way unfavourable to virtue, and encouraging to vice. The authority of the laws, and the sanctions of equity, which peaceful times and a quiet order of things preserve in their strength and purity, are weakened, loosened, and too often overturned, when the military spirit has once seized upon the national character. The restraints which virtue and decency impose upon the conduct, it then becomes fashionable to neglect and despise. A large part of the community are necessarily withdrawn from their accustomed habits of industry, and their natural domestic relations, and transplanted into a new line of life, and a different set of connections; a life, whose tenour and leisure quickly sow in them the seeds of debauchery and vice; and connections, whose society as rapidly unfolds, matures, and brings these seeds to perfection. People of this description, mingling with the other classes of their fellow-citizens, impart to them also the blemishes which they themselves have acquired. Increasing communication produces wider contagion; immorality gradually enlarges her borders, till she obtains, at length, undivided dominion, and entirely obliterates from the national character all the becoming features of order, decency, and virtue. So much for the consequences produced

by war on the *internal* manners of a country. As it affects the *external* moral sentiment, or the public feelings of right and wrong, with respect to other nations; it's tendency is to obscure all the obligations of natural justice, and to dissolve all the principles of reasonable, proper, and equitable action.

"Hence the morality of peaceful times is so directly opposite to the maxims of war. The fundamental rule of the first is to do good; of the latter to inflict injuries. The former commands us to succour the oppressed; the latter to overwhelm the defenceless. The former teaches men to love their enemies; the latter to make themselves terrible even to strangers. The rules of morality will not suffer us to promote the dearest interest by falsehood; the maxims of war applaud it, when employed in the destruction of others. That familiarity with such maxims must tend to harden the heart, as well as to pervert the moral sentiments, is too obvious to need illustration. The natural consequence of their prevalence is an unfeeling and unprincipled ambition, with an idolatry of talents, and a contempt of virtue; whence the esteem of mankind is turned from the humble, the beneficent, and the good, to men who are qualified, by a genius, fertile in expedients, a courage that is never appalled, and a heart that never pities, to become the destroyers of the earth. While the philanthropist is devising means to mitigate the evil and augment the happiness of the world, a fellow-worker together with GOD, in exploring and giving effect to the benevolent tendencies of nature; the warrior is revolving, in the gloomy recesses of his capacious mind, plans of future desolation, terror, and ruin. Prisons crouded with captives, cities emptied of their inhabitants, fields desolate and waste, are a-

mong his proudest trophies. The fabric of his fame is cemented with tears and blood; and if his name be wafted to the ends of the earth, it is in the shrill cry of suffering humanity, in the curses and imprecations of those whom his sword has reduced to despair!"—Hall.

The conjecture of Dr. Lambe is neither visionary nor romantic, that if all mankind confined themselves for their support to the productions of the earth, war, with it's miseries and horrors, might cease to be one of the scourges of the human race.

SAVAGE AMUSEMENTS AND SPORTS.

HORSE-RACING has been promoted by royal encouragement, and is followed by the nobles of the land, and by professional sharpers, for the purpose of obtaining money according to a code of laws, which honesty has no concern with, called *the laws of honour!* This sport is as little connected with humanity as with honesty. The horse is a most useful, willing, noble animal; so tractable, that no person under the influence of reason, can ever think of misusing a creature so distinguished. Yet, there is scarcely a man possessed of a good horse, who fails, either for sport or profit, to push it's goodness to it's destruction, instead of prudently husbanding his good fortune. If a horse can trot ten miles an hour, it is not long before a wager is laid that he trots twelve miles; if this should be accomplished, so much the worse for the excellent beast; higher wagers succeed under an increase of task, till his spirit and powers sink at last under the whip and spur. The Christian savage calculates only what is the difference between the bet and the price of his nag. As to the inhuman-

ity of the action, that consideration never enters his stupid brain. It is certain that horses are far more noble, and more valuable animals in *this* world than five out of ten of their masters.

From a catalogue of cruelty and abuse practised on this beautiful animal, I will adduce only the following.

"A young jockey, who rode for various employers, described, very feelingly, the painful situation in which he then found himself; he had ridden the horse of a gentleman, who kept several in training, and of whom he had received many favours; but tho' he had exerted all his skill with one horse, he found it impossible to win. He was engaged to ride the same horse again. He represented to his employer the impossibility of winning. His reasoning, however, was not calculated to make any impression on the flinty heart of this Smithfield sportsman. He abused the lad for his tenderness, and his orders were to "Make him win, or cut his entrails out. Mark, if you do not give him his belly-full of whip, you shall never ride again for me. I'll find horse, if you'll find whip and spur!" The generous animal ran three four-mile heats without flinching, with such an excess of exertion, that his eyes seemed ready to start from their sockets, but he was unsuccessful. I saw him, with an aching heart," says our humane author, "literally cut up alive, from his shoulder to his flank, his sheath in ribbands, and his testicles laid bare. To my great mortification, no one rebuked the thick-headed miscreant, who was the author of this useless piece of cruelty, except his jockey; who swore he would perish for want, rather than repeat such a business of blasted infamy."—Laurence on Horses.

ON EXTRAVAGANT BETS OR WAGERS. "I maintain," says Lord Erskine, "that no man, without being guilty of wilful premeditated and wanton cruelty, can put the strength and indurance of his horse, upon this uncertain and mercenary die, whether in races against time, or rather journeys of great distances within limited periods, the exertions very far exceed the ordinary power which nature has bestowed on the unhappy creature, thus wickedly and inhumanly perverted from the benevolent purposes of their existence —Speech, May 15, 1809.

"Two horses started, April 16, 1793, at Whitechapel-church, to proceed 100 miles, that is, to the fifty mile-stone Colchester and back again, in twelve hours. On their return, one of them died at Boreham, the 32d mile-stone, having performed 68 miles of the journey. The other crawled through Chelmsford, with a lad on his back, and died at Widford, the 27th mile-stone, falling short 23 miles." Sherborne Weekly Entertainer, May 27, 1793.

Mr. W——'s mare, Tuneful, who has bolted every race she ever ran before, was Tuesday last rode at Newmarket, in winkers, with her tongue tied with whipcord, &c. Salisbury and Winchester journal, April 13, 1801.

At the Harlow Bush fair on Wednesday, a poney, about twelve hands high, was engaged for a wager to run 100 miles in twelve hours. The little animal went sixty miles in six hours, but at the 80th it's heart broke, and it fell down dead." Bell's Messenger, Sep, 21, 1801.

On monday last, a great number of people, from various parts, assembled on the road between Bridgwater and Bristol, being the spot fixed on for determining a wager on the exertions of a horse, which

was to go in a gig one hundred miles within the space of sixteen hours. The day was remarkably hot and sultry; notwithstanding which the poor animal performed the merciless task in thirteen hours without eating one grain of corn!—Bath Chronicle, June 18, 1807.

Such are the amusements which, in this age of polish and refinement, are denominated, *genteel and noble!*

HUNTING. It is surprising that Hunting should be termed a manly exercise, for "poor," wretchedly poor, "is the triumph o'er the timid hare!" It should rather be called a wild passion, a brutal propensity, or any thing that indicates it's nature. To give it any connection with reason would be to make a union between black and white. Manliness implies some mode of action, that becomes a man. Hunting might, formerly, have been a manly exercise, when the country was overrun with boars and wolves, and it was a public service to extirpate them; but to honour with the name of manliness the cruel practice of pursuing timid animals, and putting them to death, for amusement, is to pervert the meaning of words. In countries where the inhabitants are harrassed by ferocious animals, there may be some plea for converting the destruction of them into a sport, and a test of courage to accelerate their extirpation; but in this island hunting loses all dignity, and degenerates into mean cruelty. It is, in fact, real cowardice, because there are none but the most inoffensive and timid of creatures to pursue. The fox is the most troublesome animal we have, and is, of course, the least exceptionable object of the chase; but, even in this instance, our sportsmen cannot assume the merit of *vermin-killers*: for tho' some thanks may be due

for destroying them, when very offensive, yet none when gentlemen stock the country again, which is the case, on purpose to renew their savage amusement. There are many ways surely of using manly exercise, at least as healthful and far more innocent, and less expensive and dangerous, than galloping over hedges, gates and ditches. If the manliness of the action lie in the risk you run of breaking your neck for no end, it would still be greater manliness to jump down a precipice. The destruction of an animal is esteemed amusement! strange perversion of feeling! There are persons who take delight in knocking down an ox: if hunting be a more genteel amusement it is certainly a more cruel one.

Detested sport!
that owes it's pleasure to another's pain!
that feeds upon the sobs, and dying shrieks
of harmless nature!—Cowper.

Those practices, barbarous enough to be derived from the Goths, or even the Sythians, are encouraged, in some instances, even by Ladies, and the compliment passed by our huntsmen on those of quality who are present, is truly savage. The knife is put into the lady's hand to cut the throat of an exhausted, helpless, trembling, weeping creature.

After referring to this practice, Mr. Ritson, adds, "The tender feelings of these elegant fair-ones, never induce them, it seems, to reject this office They contemplate, with equal satisfaction, the poor heron, with it's wings and legs broken, and it's bill stuck in the ground, a living prey to the savage hawk. "Ladies of quality," quotha? rather Gorgons and Furies!"

What glory, what emolument is gained by persecutions so mean, where the completion is so unequal

that the most puny and base of the human kind can bear away the prize?

The reverend sportsman, instead of slaying the innocent and peaceful tenants of the fields and woods, ought to declaim against such inhumanity and murder in the pulpit, and practice the doctrine *himself*; but how can this be expected when many hundred thousand lives have been sacrificed in contentions concerning the tenets of christianity?

Oh, laugh or mourn with me the rueful jest,
a cassock'd huntsman!
He takes the field. The master of the pack
cries, "Well done, saint!" and claps him on the back.
Is this the path of sanctity? Is this
to stand a way-mark in the road to bliss?—Cowper.

Lord Chesterfield says, Letter 262, that "the French manner of hunting is gentleman-like; our's is only for bumpkins and boobies. The poor beasts are here pursued and run down by much greater beasts than themselves; and the true British fox-hunter is most undoubtedly a species appropriated and peculiar to this country, which no other part of the globe produces."

There are many who quiet the dictates of conscience, by alleging, that "They prefer the business of hunting and shooting, for the sake of exercise, and not for the pleasure of pursuing and destroying animals." The pretence is fallacious, because the exercise of riding may be taken without hunting; and the exercise of walking without shooting. How much superior are the amusements of gardening and agriculture, and how much more innocent are the diversions of bowls, cricket, fives, and such like gymnastics!

Much has been said respecting the propensity of

dogs to pursue and kill various kinds of animals and birds; but it is evident that no *natural* propensity of this kind exists; this is evinced by the accidental friendships between animals intended by man to be at enmity. Dogs are capable of being trained to assist men in their savage sports, and their different qualities and shapes fit them for particular purposes of that kind. A dog after being taught to fetch and carry becomes as passionately fond of that exercise as any dog ever did of hunting, and yet nobody undertakes to say that providence made any dog on purpose to fetch and carry. A person, with whom the compiler was acquainted, had a young beagle, which he restrained from following the pack, in order to ascertain the truth of what he had frequently heard asserted, that that species had a natural propensity to pursue and kill hares. After the dog was completely grown up, he took a young hare and confined them together in a room. For some time they kept as far as possible assunder, but, afterwards, a familiarity and friendship gradually took place.

The practice of agriculture softens the human heart, and promotes the love of peace, of justice and of nature. The excesses of hunting, on the contrary, irritate the baneful passions of the soul; her vagabond votaries delight in blood, in rapine, and devastation. From the wandering tribes of Tartars, the demons of massacre and havoc, have selected their Tamerlanes and their Attilas, and have poured forth their swarms of barbarians to desolate the earth.—Oswald.

Men of refined understanding are never addicted to this vice, and women who delight in the butchery of the chase, should unsex themselves, and be regarded as monsters.

This brutal pleasure claims, as a sacrifice to the

impious crime of ingratitude, the tender body of the timorous stag. Why does he not enjoy the same privilege of the inoffensive sheep, whose death is procured with much less pain and torment by the expeditious knife? Why is this trepidating, timorous, weeping, half-humanized animal, selected to procure, by agonizing pain, testified by almost human tears, joy to hearts which should possess superior sympathy as well as superior dignity. Whence is it that the human heart can be so perverted and unnatural, as to receive emotions of pleasure from causes of pity; repay tears, with slaughter; shrieks of pain with acclamations of joy; duration of misery, with the expectation of hope; and the relief of torment by death?

The kings of England seem to have been celebrated hunters. By this sport, one of them, and the son of another, lost their lives. James 1, according to Scaliger, "was merciful, except at the chase; he was then cruel, and very angry, when he could not catch the stag. When he had him, he would put his arm entire into the belly and entrails of the beast."

"The hunt, on Tuesday last, commenced near Salthill, and afforded a chace of upwards of fifty-miles. His Majesty was present at the death, near Iring, in Hertfordshire. It is the first deer that has been run to death for many months; and when opened, it's heart strings were found to be quite rent; supposed to have been effected by excessive exertion in running!"—General Advertiser, March 4, 1784.

Let those who can feel no sympathy with the heart-rending groans of the victim, join only with the blood-hounds, from whose ravenous fangs the huntsman snatches the prey, in howlings of disappointed brutality. O poverty! if thou art in the enjoyment of

the passions of hunger, thirst, and love, thou art to be adored not dreaded; for thou art debarred these infernal pleasures.

BULL-BAITING. In several counties of England, particularly in Shropshire and Staffordshire; the cities of Chester and Worcester, the towns of Bilston, Wolverhampton, &c. bulls continue to be baited, both previously to being killed and for sport.

The mere tearing off the tongues, ears and tails, of this intrepid animal, by the dogs, is but a small part of the barbarity practiced on these occasions; their horns are frequently broken, and their bodies goaded by sharp irons. Aquafortis, salt, pepper, &c. is then thrown upon the various wounds, in order to enrage him still more. Several dogs are frequently let loose at the same time. In short, they are frequently so completely bruised and mangled, day after day, that they take no food or water, and at length die under an insupportable, and unpitied load of anguish and fatigue. The satisfaction of the baiters is, of course, proportionated to the torment induced and the rage excited.

The following instance of depravity is given by Bingley, in his "Animal Biography." Staffordshire, is said to have had the disgrace of producing this brutality. A monster, in the form of man, laid a trifling wager, at a bull-baiting, that he would, at separate times, cut off all the four feet of the dog, and that after each amputation, it would attack the bull as eagerly as if perfectly whole. He made the experiment, and won the wager. This savage escaped punishment.

But why have recourse to times remote? Recent instances of similar barbarities are numerous. "On the 5th of November, 1801, at Bury, Suffolk, while

a mob of Christian savages, were indulging themselves in the inhuman amusement of baiting a bull, the poor animal (which was, by nature, perfectly gentle, but which had been privately baited in the morning, and goaded with sharp instruments, in order to render him furious enough for public exhibition), altho' tied down with ropes, in his agony and rage, baited as he was by dogs, and gored by monsters in the shape of men, burst from his tethers, to the great terror of his tormentors, and the no small danger of the inhabitants of the place. After this, the poor beast was doomed to become the victim of still greater barbarity. He was entangled again, with ropes, and, horrible to relate, his hoofs were cut off, and was again baited, defending himself upon his mangled bleeding stumps! The magistrates of Bury have repeatedly attempted to prevent such infernal proceedings, but the demons are sanctioned, it seems, by an act of Parliament. Surely such act is highly disgraceful to the period of the world in which we live, to the country in general, and to the character of the British nation."—Monthly Mag. vol. xii, p. 464.

Let it be recorded in the annals of infamy, that George Staverton, by will, dated May 15, 1661, gave the whole rent of his Stains-house, after two lives, to buy a bull for ever; which bull he gave to the poor of the parish and town of Workingham, Berks, being baited, and the offal, hide, and gift money to be sold, and given in stockings and shoes to poor children. It is thus that an affectation of charity is grafted upon base cruelty. What an insult, and perversion of understanding!

BADGER-BAITING is the concomitant sport of bull-baiting, and, if possible, is more brutal and abominable, since the animal has less power to defend itself.

COCK-FIGHTING continues the sport of some of our highest, as well as lowest and meanest ranks of men. This cruel and savage diversion, which is derived from the Greeks and Romans, ranks with the prize-fighting of the latter; but the bloody scenes of an amphitheatre are not tolerated among Christians. The fathers of the church continually inveighed against the spectacles of the arena, and upbraided their adversaries with them. These were more shocking than a main of cocks, but the latter, however, has the very same tendency of infusing a similar ferocity and implacability in the dispositions of men. The cock is not only an useful animal, but stately in his figure, and beautiful in his plumage. His tenderness towards his brood is such, that, contrary to the habit of many other fowls, he will scratch and provide for them with an assiduity almost equal to that of the hen; and his generosity is so great, that, on finding a hoard of meat, he will call the hens together, and without touching one bit himself will relinquish the whole. This bird has been highly esteemed in some countries, and in others held sacred. It is true the Shrove Tuesday massacre is on the decline; and, it is hoped, will soon be in total disuse; but the cock-pit still continues the reproach and disgrace of Englishmen, and of their religion; a religion which, if *practiced* as much as *professed*, would reduce them to the mildest, the most compassionate, the best of men. This barbarity has been dignified by it's abettors, with the title of "*a royal diversion.*" It is certain the cock-pit at Whitehall was erected by a crowned head. There was another in Drury-lane, and another in Javlin-street. Cromwell had the honour of prohibiting them. The King of Denmark, when in England, in 1768, on having been invited to one of

these exhibitions, and after a formal oration addressed to him in their praise, retired with the utmost disgust.

This reproach and disgrace of Englishmen is aggravated by those species of fighting which are called the Battle-royal, and the Welsh-main, known no where else in the world; neither in China, Persia, Malacca, nor among the savage tribes of North America. In the former, an unlimitted number of cocks are pitted, and when they have slaughtered each other for the diversion of their generous and humane masters! the single surviving bird is accounted victor, and carries away the prize. The latter consists, we will suppose, of 16 pairs of cocks; of these the 16 conquerors are pitted a second time; the 8 conquerors of these are pitted a third time; the 4 conquerors a fourth time; and, lastly the two conquerors of these are pitted the fifth time; so that, incredible barbarity! thirty-one cocks must be most inhumanly murdered for the sport and pleasure, the noise and nonsense, the prophane cursing and swearing, of those who have the effrontery to call themselves, with all their bloody actions and inpieties, by the sacred name of *Christians;* nay, by what with many is a superior and distinct character, men of benevolence, morality and virtue!—See Encyclopæ. Perthensis.

"Are these your sovereign joys, creation's lords?
is death a banquet for a godlike soul?"

This sport has received a severe, but very proper and commendable blow, from the resolution of the magistrates of many places, not to grant licences to those inn-keepers who encourage it. By this means bull-baiting in the township of Mitton near Stourport, in Worcestershire has been suppressed.

The tendency of this species of savage barbarity

may be most readily deduced from numerous instances of malignant passions engendered by this custom; of which the following fact, recorded in the obituary to the "Gentleman's Magazine" for April 1789, is an instance. Died, April 4, at Tottenham, John Ardesoif, esq. a young man of large fortune, who in the splendour of his carriages and horses, was rivalled by few country gentlemen. He was very fond of cock-fighting; and had a favourite cock, upon which he had won many profitable matches; but he lost his last bet, which so enraged him, that he had the bird tied to a spit and roasted before a large fire. The screams of the miserable animal were so affecting, that some gentlemen, who were present, attempted to interfere; which so enraged Mr. Ardesoif, that he seized a poker, and with the most furious vehemence declared, he would kill the first man who interposed; but in the midst of his passionate asseverations, he fell dead upon the spot. Such, we are assured, were the circumstances which attended the death of this great pillar of humanity."

SHOOTING. That strange perverseness which induces man to form a principal amusement on the sufferings rather than the happiness of inoffensive animals, indicates a corrupt and vicious habit. Tho' goaded by no necessity, nor actuated by self-defence, he marks the fields with devastation, rejoices at spectacles of blood, smiles over the struggling expiring victim, and, exulting, cries, "what sport is this!" The first of September is a day *licenced* by the legislature for the commencement of destruction, and is announced too fatally by the thunder of the gun. Shooting is an expeditious death and has less of cruelty in it than the sports of the chase, when the stroke is effectual; but the most expert markman frequent-

ly maims without killing, rendering animals a long time miserable; one perhaps has a broken wing, another a shattered leg, and a third left with a broken bill to perish, or, half murdered, to linger out life. A person of unaffected sensibility is an enemy to cruelty, in every shape, and will not carelessly destroy the well-being of the meanest insect. Man regulates his actions towards his fellow-men by laws and customs. Such laws ought to be observed between man and beast, and which are equally coercive, tho' the injured party has no power to appeal.

Persons, accounted goodnatured, will stand whole mornings, by the side of a bridge, shooting swallows, as they thread the arch, and flit past him; others will stand angling for hours together. Such persons should have been bred butchers. What humanity possesses that man, who can find amusement in destroying the happiness of innocent creatures, while sporting during their short summer, or skimming in the air or in the water?

On the coasts of Wales, and other places, where nature has formed rocky barriers against the ocean, sea fowls, of different kinds, frequent them. One whould have thought colonies like these might have been safe from annoy. They are useless when dead, and harmless when alive. It is not however uncommon, with certain savages, to divert themselves with shooting at these birds, as they fly to their nests or return with food for their young! It is not the man's virtue who will wantonly murder a sparrow, which prevents him from murdering a man, his forbearance is the result of effects produced by the penal statutes, those practical essays on morality!

ANGLING. Is the gentleman or lady fond of angling? a station then must be taken beside the mur-

muring stream; and, with the utmost unconcern, a barbed hook forced through the defenceless body of the writhing worm, there to remain, in torture, as a bait for the fish; and if death put a period to it's existence, it is no longer fit for use, and must be succeeded by another sufferer. Can there be a more dreadful torture invented? yet we may be told, with a laugh, it is only a worm. Is pain, then, confined to beings of a larger size? Are not the parts of a worm exquisitely formed? Most certainly

——"the worm, on which we tread,
in corporal sufferance feels a pang as great
as when a giant dies."—Shakespere.

Cruel delight! from native beds to drag
the wounded fools, and spoil their silvery scales
and spotted pride, writh'd on the tort'rous hook,
in sufferance dumb.—Bidlake.

The flaying of eels alive, when a single blow, properly given, would deprive them of sensation, is a well known instance of depraved cruelty.

Much needless torture is practised in depriving shell-fish of life, and the crimping of fish is an execrable practice.

CAGING OF BIRDS. Among the softer dispositions of the female sex, the feathered warblers are imprisoned in a Bastile in miniature; and barred from their peculiar and inherent right of freedom. In these grated prisons, dependent on "unplumed bipeds,' they frequently perish for want of food. A tender mistress, perhaps, gives orders that the eyes of her bird be put out with a red hot knitting-needle, in order to improve his song; the poor bird, in this situation, is fortunate if the friendly cat puts in her paw and drags him through the wires. If the unhappy cap-

tive even escapes any severe improvement of this nature, can it ever be expected he will carol with the same energy as when a tenant of the grove? Can the song of the lark from one vile sod, surrounded by an iron grate, equal in vivacity and melody, that which he was wont to warble when he soared into the sky till his flight became imperceptible?

Be not the Muse asham'd here to bemoan
her brothers of the grove, by tyrant man
inhuman caught, and in the narrow cage
from liberty confin'd, and boundless air.
Dull are the pretty slaves, their plumage dull,
ragged, and all it's bright'ning lustre lost;
nor is that sprightly wildness in their notes,
which, clear and vigorous, warbles from the beech.
O then, ye friends of love, and love taught song,
spare the soft tribes! this barbarous art forbear,
if on your bosom innocence can win,
music engage, or piety persuade.—Thomson.

OF REASON IN ANIMALS.

Animals are entitled to our friendship, in proportion to their sensibility and the reason which they possess. They are by no means either so inferior to the race of man as he has placed them; or so contemptible as he wishes to make them appear.

Inferior animals, as they are called, are endowed with perception, consciousness, memory, will; in these originate love, hatred, fear, fortitude, patience, generosity, obedience, and a limited sense of justice. But if it be allowed that they have a certain proportion of reason, they possess it in common with the human kind; the difference consists only in degree of quantity. "If an animal reason in degree," says

Mr. John Lawrence, "he possesses the reasoning faculty. Because a man is infinitely inferior in the power of reasoning to Socrates, or Hume, does it follow that the portion which he does possess, is not reason, but instinct? If so it may be asserted that the mighty powers of those men were nothing more then a superior degree of instinct.

I have many times," continues Mr. Lawrence," seen a mare walk through droves of young chicks and ducklings to the stable, lifting up her feet, laying her ears, and putting her nose almost to the ground, lest she should tread upon them. The same mare, trotting at full speed, once flew a rood out of her way, that she might not tread upon a child, which was accidentally crossing the road. This was not the effect of starting or shying, to which she was not at all addicted, but evidently the result of thought, or reflection. The same mare once saved herself and her master. He was riding slowly and very heedlessly up the hill upon Epping-forest, opposite a waggon. The mare pricked her ears, at a man and horse, coming full speed down the hill, exactly in her line of direction. At their approach she hung back, and in an instant, with the dexterity of a Harlequin, sheltered herself under the tail of the waggon. A horseman behind him coming up very quickly, received the dreadful shock. One horse was killed on the spot, and the shoulder of the other shattered to pieces. I am thoroughly convinced," he adds, "that this animal acted in these instances, purely from the influence of rational motives."—Treatise on Horses.

Admiral Gantheaume carried with him an african pongo in one of his voyages. This creature is described as the completest sailor on board his ship. When the admiral stretched into a northern climate,

the poor pongo sickened and died, from too constantly and actively doing duty on deck, and in the shrouds. His death was very much regretted.

The beaver seems to excel all other quadrupeds in sagacity, patience, industy, and architectural skill. Having chosen a level piece of ground, with a rivulet running through it, they assemble in communities of two or three hundred, and commence their operations by forming a reservoir, which they effect by making a weir across. Each bears a proportionate share of labour. The side next the water is sloped, the other perpendicular; the ground-work is from ten to twelve feet thick, but gradually diminishes towards the top, to two or three. Some gnaw, with their teeth, trees of great size, to form beams and piles; others roll them to the water; others dive, and, with their feet, scrape holes in order to fix them firmly in at the foot; while others exert themselves in rearing them in their proper places, another party is employed in collecting twigs with which to interlace the piles; a third, in collecting earth, stones, and clay; a fourth, is engaged in beating and tempering the mortar. Others are busy in carrying it upon their broad tails to convenient places; and with their tails also they fill up all the interstices. This bank is raised in proportion to the elevation and supply of water. They avail themselves frequently of water-carriage; swimming with mortar on their tails and pieces of timber in their mouths. If the violence of the water or footsteps of hunters, who pass over their work, damage it in any respect, they immediately set about the business of repairing. When they are persecuted by hunters, they work only in the night. A certain number of strokes with the tail is the signal given by the overseer for resorting to certain places, either for the prosecution

of work, or notice of the approach of an enemy. In this reservoir, near the edge of the shore, they erect their houses. They are built upon piles; are either round or oval, with vaulted tops, resembling an oven or the top of a dome. The walls are two feet thick, made of earth, stones, and sticks, most ingeniously platted together; and the walls within are as neatly plastered as with a trowel. The height of these houses above the water is eight feet. They often make two or three stories in each dwelling. Each house contains from twenty to thirty beavers, and the number of houses in each pond is from ten to twenty-five. Each beaver forms it's bed of moss; and each family forms it's magazine of winter provisions. These they lodge under water, and fetch into their apartments as occasion requires. Sensible, reasonable, and ingenious as these creatures are, no sympathy is excited thereby in the heart of savage man; he commits the most abominable depredations on their curious fabrications and on their lives, for the sake, not as usual, of eating their carcases, but for the sake of adorning his own body with the skins of inoffensive animals, procured by outrage and murder.

Animals, in many instances, are possessed of senses much superior to the same faculties in the human kind. The carrier pigeon is remarkable for the accuracy with which it returns to the spot whence it was conveyed. Lithgow assures us, that one of these birds will carry a letter from Babylon to Aleppo; performing in forty-eight hours, what is to man a journey of thirty days. Every Turkish Bashaw is said to have a number of these pigeons, that have been bred in the seraglio, which, on any emergent occasion, he dispatches to the Grand Vizier, with letters braced under his wings. The camels which travel over

the sandy deserts of Arabia, know their way precisely, and are able to pursue their route, when their guides are utterly ignorant of it. A dog has the same faculty; for if carried from home, hood-winked, and by a circuitous road, to a considerable distance, he will find his way back by the nearest and most direct passage; of which I have heard several well authenticated instances.

Remove a bee-hive into a new situation, the bees, at first, fly round the hive, in short excursions, and return to it from time to time. They gradually however enlarge their rounds, till, at last, they engage in extensive journeys, returning to the hive, from excursions of many miles; yet the eyes of this insect are so convex, that it does not appear capable of seeing beyond the space of a foot.

OF VOLUNTARY OR ACCIDENTAL IMPROVEMENTS IN ANIMALS. A dog, which had been the favourite of an elderly gentlewoman, some time after her death, discovered the strongest emotions on the sight of her portrait, when taken down from the wall, and laid on the floor to be cleaned. He had never before been observed, to notice the picture previously to this incident. Here was evidently a case of passive remembrance, or of the involuntary renewal of former impressions. Another dog, the property of a gentleman, who died, was given to a friend in Yorkshire. Several years afterwards, a brother from the West Indies, paid a short visit at the house where the dog was then kept. He was instantly recognised, tho' an entire stranger, in consequence, probably, of a strong personal likeness. The dog fawned upon, and followed, him with great affection, to every place where he went.—Percival's Father's Instructions.

Mr. Lackington, speaking of his portrait annexed

to the volume of memoirs of his life, says, that before the original painting was finished, Mrs. Lackington called on the artist to examine it. Being introduced into a room filled with portraits, her little dog being with her, immediately ran to that particular portrait, paying it the same attention that he was accustomed to do to the original; which made it necessary to remove it from him, lest he should damage it; tho' this was not accomplished without expressions of dissatisfaction on the part of the dog. Mr. C. Hughes, a son of Thepsis, had a wig which hung upon a peg in one of his rooms. He lent the wig one day to one of his fraternity, and some time after called on him. Mr. Hughes had his dog with him, and the man happened to have the borrowed wig upon his head; but when Mr. Hughes had bid this person good morning, the dog remained behind, and for some time stood looking full in the man's face as he sat in his chair; at last, he suddenly leaped upon his shoulders, seized the wig, and ran off with it. When he reached home, he endeavoured, by jumping, to hang up the wig in it's usual place. The same dog was one afternoon passing through a field in the skirts of Dartmouth, where a washer-woman had hung out her linen to dry; he stopped and surveyed one particular shirt with attention, and presently seized it and dragged it away through the dirt to his master, whose shirt it proved to be.—Life of Lackington, 13th edit. 12mo. p. 339, 340.

In the year 1760, the following incident occurred near Hammersmith. While one Richardson, a waterman of that place, was sleeping in his boat, the vessel broke from her moorings, and was carried by the tide under a west country barge. Fortunately the man's dog happened to be with him: and the sa-

gacious animal awaked him, by pawing his face, and pulling the collar of his coat, at the instant when the boat was filled with water, and on the point of sinking; by which means he had an opportunity of saving himself from otherwise inevitable death.—Annual Register, vol. iii, p. 90.

At the seat of the late Earl of Litchfield, three miles from Blenheim, there is a portrait in the dining room, of Sir Henry Lee, by Johnstone, with that of a mastiff dog, which saved his life. A servant had formed the design of assassinating his master and robbing the house; but, the night he had fixed on, the dog, which had never been much noticed by Sir Henry, for the first time followed him up stairs, crept under his bed and could not be driven thence by either the master or man. In the dead of the night, the same servant entered the room to execute his horrid design, but was instantly seized by the dog, and on the man being secured, he confessed his intentions. There are ten quaint lines in one corner of the picture, which conclude thus:

But in my dog, whereof I made no store,
I find more love than those I trusted more.

It is difficult to form an hypothesis on this fact, but as it is well authenticated, it merits notice.

A shoemaker at Preston in Lancashire, had in the year 1794, a female dog, of the large Water Spaniel species, who, when her puppies were taken from her, attended the bearer of each of them to their places of destination, and then returned home. She was observed, however, to visit them every day, for several weeks, and carry each of them whatever she could cater and spare from the cravings of her own appetite. This conduct she uniformly practised towards every litter.

"In the very severe winter, betwixt the years 1794 and 1795, as Mr. Boustead's son was looking after his father's sheep, on Great Salkeld common, not far from Penrith in Cumberland, he had the misfortune to fall and break his leg. He was then three miles from home, no person within call, and evening approaching. Under the impulse arising from the desperate circumstances of his situation, he folded up one of his gloves in his handkerchief, tied this about the neck of his dog, and ordered him home. Dogs that are trained to an attendance on flocks are generally under admirable subjection to the commands of their masters. The animal set off; and arriving at the house, scratched at the door for admittance. The parents were alarmed at his appearance; and concluding, on taking off and unfolding the handkerchief, that some accident had undoubtedly befallen their son, they instantly set off in search of him. The dog needed no invitation. Apparently sensible that the chief part of his duty was not yet performed, he led the way, and conducted the anxious parents directly to the spot where their son lay. The young man was taken home; and the necessary aid being procured, he was soon in a fair way of recovery.—Gentleman's Mag. Feb. 1795.

During the same winter, as a farmer of Bowbrink in the county of Norfolk was returning home in the evening, he was seized with a drowsiness, which caused him to fall several times. He had, however, sufficient perseverance to rise and continue his journey. But, at last, quite overcome by the effects of the intense frost, he fell, and had no longer power to rise. When he was in this situation, the dog, as if sensible of his master's danger, getting upon his breast laid himself over him. By this means the action of the

lungs was preserved; and the incessant barking which the dog kept up, at length attracting assistance, the preservation of his master's life was thus effectually completed.—Star, Feb. 3, 1795.—Gent. Mag. Feb. 1795.

The following instance of docility and faithfulness in a dog is copied from T. Young's "Essay on Humanity," which is given by the writer on the authority of a friend. It occurred, some years ago, in the part of Scotland which borders upon England, that a shepherd had driven a part of his flock to a neighbouring fair, leaving his dog to watch the remainder during that day and the next night, expecting to revisit them the following morning. Unfortunately, however, when at the fair, the shepherd forgot both his dog and his sheep, and did not return home till the morning of the third day. His first enquiry was, whether his dog had been seen? The answer was, No. Then, replied the shepherd, with a tone and gesture of anguish, "He must be dead, for I know he was too faithful to desert his charge." He instantly repaired to the heath. The dog had just sufficient strength remaining to crawl to his master's feet, and express his joy at his return; and almost immediately expired.

At the moment when the ranks of the Imperialists were broken, at the famous battle of Castiglione, and the heat of the pursuit was in proportion to the obstinacy of the contest, Buonaparte coming up to the spot, where the thickest of the combat had taken place, where French and Austrians lay strewed in horrible profusion, he observed one living object amid those piles of corpses, which was a little barbet-dog. The faithful creature stood with his two fore feet fixed upon the breast of an Austrian officer; his long ears

hung over his eyes, which were rivetted upon those of his dead master. The tumult seemed neither to distract the attention nor change the attitude of the mourner, absorbed by the object to which he clung. Buonaparte, struck with the spectacle, stopped his horse, called his attendants around him, and pointed out the subject of his speculation. "The dog," said Buonaparte, "as if he had known my voice, removed his eyes from his master, and throwing them upon me for a moment, resumed his former posture; but in that momentary look there was a mute eloquence beyond the power of language; it was reproach, with all the poignancy of bitterness." Buonaparte felt the appeal; he construed the upbraidings of the animal into a comprehensive demand of mercy; the sentiment was irresistible; it put to flight every harsh and hostile feeling: Buonaparte instantly gave orders to stop the carnage.—Miss Williams's Sketches of the French Republic, vol. ii. p. 188.

A bet of 20 guineas was made on Monday the 1st of Dec. 1807, between Mr. Arnold, a sporting man, who resides at Pentonville, and Mr. Mawbrey a factor in Fulham-road, that the former did not produce a dog which should be thrown over Wesminster-bridge, at dark, and find it's way home again in 6 hours, as proposed by Arnold. The experiment was tried on Tuesday evening, when a spaniel, the property of a groom in Tottenham-court-road, was produced and thrown over in the centre of the bridge. The animal arrived at the house of it's *humane* master in two hours after the experiment had been made.—Bell's Weekly Messenger, Dec. 7, 1807.

Dr. Darwin has given us many curious facts relating to birds of passage, tending to prove, 1. All birds of passage can exist in the climates where they

are produced. 2. They are subject in their migrations to the same accidents and difficulties, that mankind are subject to in navigation. 3 The same species of birds migrate from some countries, and are resident in others. From these circumstances he infers, that the migrations of birds are not produced by a necessary instinct, but are accidental improvements, like the arts among mankind, taught by their cotemporaries, or delivered by tradition from one generation of them to another.

The nests of birds are not always constructed of the same materials, nor in the same form, which ascertains that they are led by observation.

In the trees of Mr. Levets's house in Litchfield, there are annually nests, built by sparrows, a bird which usually builds under the tiles of houses, or the thatch of barns. So the jackdaw [Corvus monedula] generally builds in church-steeples, or under the roofs of high houses; but at Selbourne, in Southamptonshire, where towers and steeples are not sufficiently numerous, these same birds build in forsaken rabbit burrows. [White's History of Selbourne, p. 59.] Can the skilful change of architecture in these birds and the sparrows above-mentioned, be governed by instinct? Then they must have two instincts; one for common, and the other for extraordinary occasions.

Birds brought up by our care, and which have had little communication with others of their own species, are very defective in acquired knowledge; their song is borrowed from any bird they happen to hear, or from the whistling of boys, and from accidental noises of machines, &c.; they are not only very awkward in the construction of their nests, but generally scatter their eggs in various parts of the room or

cage, where they are confined, and seldom produce young ones, till by failing in their first attempt, they have learnt something from their own observation.

As many ladies are too refined to nurse their own children, and deliver them to the care and provision of others; so is there one instance of this vice in the feathered world. The cuckoo in some parts of England hatches and educates her young; while in other parts she builds no nest, but uses that of some lesser bird, generally either of the wagtail, or hedge sparrow, and depositing one egg in it, takes no further care of her progeny. Ths Rev. Mr. Stafford, walking in Glosop Dale, in the Peak of Derbyshire, saw a cuckoo rise from it's nest. The nest was upon the stump of a tree, which had been some time felled; among some chips that were in part turned gray, so as much to resemble the colour of the bird; in this nest were two young cuckoos; and he very frequently, for many days, beheld the old cuckoo feed these her young, as he stood very near them. The philosopher who is acquainted with these facts concerning the cuckoo, would seem to have very little *reason* himself, if he could imagine this neglect of her young to be a necessary *instinct!*

Instances of Docility in Animals. Each of the foregoing cases indicates reflection, and evinces an active effort to recal to memory, and to draw conclusions, probably of an intuitive kind, from past perceptions. They are proofs also of capacity for observation, and for deriving knowledge from experience. But the wonderful *docility* of animals leaves no room to doubt that they are possessed of such faculties. A raven may be taught to fetch and carry with the address of a spaniel; and some time ago, a canary bird was exhibited in London, that could pick

up the letters of the alphabet, at the word of command, so as to spell the name of any person in company. A tame magpie spontaneously learns from imitation, to pay regard to some of the shining objects which he observes are much noticed. A piece of money, a tea-spoon, or a ring, are tempting prizes to him; and a whole family has been put into confusion, by suspicions concerning the loss of such things, which have been afterwards found in the lurking-hole of this bird. In a state of nature, his observation and experience are sometimes applied to the benefit of others of the feathered race: for when a fowler is stealing upon a flock of wild ducks or geese, the magpie will sound his shrill note of alarm, and rouse them to provide for their safety by immediate flight.—Goldsmith, vol. 5.

The famous parrot which the Count O'Kelly bought for fifty guineas at Bristol, not only repeated all things, but answered almost every thing; and so strong was it's retention, that it sung a variety of tunes with exquisite melody. It beat time with all the appearance of science, and so accurate was it's judgment, that, if, by chance, it mistook a note, it would revert to the bar where the mistake occurred, correct itself, and still beating regular time, go through the whole with wonderful exactness. It sung whatever air was desired, and intimated an express knowledge of every request.

The docility of dogs is remarkable in frequently being the guides of blind men.

Fear, not natural. Fear does not appear natural to animals, but acquired. A hawk or an owl are universally known among small birds as common enemies, but will confidently hop and peck within the reach of poultry, tho' they are much larger in size

than a hawk or an owl. Crows will fearlessly approach a horse, and jack-daws will alight upon the backs of cows and asses to pick insects or hairs, but will not remain within the reach of a fowler.

M. Bouganville relates, that at his arrival at the Malouine, or Falkland's Islands, which were not inhabited by men, all the animals came about himself and his people; the fowls settling upon their heads and shoulders, and the quadrupeds running about their feet. From the difficulty of acquiring the confidence of old animals, and the ease of taming young ones, it appears that the fear which they all conceive at the sight of mankind, is an acquired article of knowledge. This knowledge is nicely possessed by rooks. They know that the danger is great when a man is armed with a gun: at his approach, in the spring, they rise on their wings and scream to their unfledged young, to shrink into their nests from the sight of the enemy. It is extremely probable, that the gentler tribes of animals fear man and avoid him from the tyranny he continually exercises over them, and not from natural instinct, or from the dignity of man's appearance, as some, fond of flattering themselves, have conjectured.

There are many articles of knowledge, which the animals in cultivated countries seem to learn very early in their lives, either from each other or from experience or observation: one of the most general of these is to avoid mankind. Mr. Gmelin, Professor at Petersburg, assures us, that in his journey into Siberia, undertaken by order of the Empress of Russia, he saw foxes, that expressed no fear of himself or companions, but permitted him to come quite near them, having never seen the human form before.

The reason of animals seems to be acquired from

accident and experience, and communicated to future generations by example. The late circumnavigators observed at Duskey-bay, in Newzealand, that numbers of small birds, which dwelt in the woods were so unacquainted with men, that they hopped upon the nearest branches to them, and even upon their fowling-pieces, perhaps viewing the strangers as new objects, with a pleasing curiosity. This fearlessness at first protected them from harm, as it was impossible to shoot them under such circumstances. But, in a few days, it proved the cause of their destruction; for a sly cat belonging to the ship, perceiving so easy an opportunity of obtaining delicious meals, regularly took her walk in the woods every morning and made great havock among the birds, which had before no experience of such an insidious enemy.—Forster's Voyage, with Capt. Cook, vol. 1. p. 128.

Acquired Habits of Animals. "When I see the several actions and designs of my dog, I profess it is impossible to avoid being amazed. His passions are more quick than those of many men. There are some whose joy or grief at accidents, give them so little emotion, and are so dull, as to render it difficult to say which it is that affects them: but, in this honest animal, both are lively and strong. When any of the family return home, he discovers great gladness in caressing and skipping about them, and seems dull and concerned at their going out. But there is one among them whom he distinguishes in a most peculiar manner. When this person goes abroad, he is void of all comfort, and sits in a window crying incessantly, refusing victuals, and watching for his friend's return; who is always welcomed by much rejoicing and noise. If he wants to go out of the room, he puts his fore feet up against one of the com-

pany, and, being taken notice of, runs to the door, rising up against it in the same manner, looking at the person he gave notice to before, till he be let out. If he wants drink, he gives the same notice and immediately runs into a closet, where stands a bottle of water, continuing to run to and from the person till he be served."—Dr. Parson on Animals and Vegetables.

"On the northern coast of Ireland," says Dr. Darwin, "a friend of mine saw above a hundred crows at once preying on muscles; each crow took a muscle up into the air, twenty or forty yards high, and let it fall upon the stones, and thus by breaking the shell, got possession of the animal." Eagles are said to act in the same manner, by the tortoise.

Instances of the sagacity and knowledge of animals are very numerous to every observer, and their docility in learning various arts from mankind, evinces that they may learn similar arts from their own species, and thus be possessed of much acquired and traditional knowledge. It is said, the reason of brutes is stationary, they never improve. This is not true. Individuals of the same species of animals differ in degree of sagacity, in the same manner as individuals of the human race. Their sagacity depends also, like that of the human race, on their situation. The otter, says Abbé Raynal, in Europe, a stupid and solitary animal, has made in America a greater progress in the arts of civil society than the native tribes of Indians. Horses, in this country, are not political animals, but in the deserts of Tartary and Siberia they are political; for, being there hunted by the Tartars, as hares and deer are in this country, they, for self-preservation, form themselves into a kind of community, and take joint measures for saving themselves,

which they commonly do by flight; and that they may not be surprised by the enemy, they set watches, and have commanders who direct and hasten their flight. —Monboddo on Language. vol. i, 231. Even the sheep, when wild, set watches in the night-time against their enemy the fox, who give notice of his approach, and when he attacks them they draw up in a body, and defend themselves.—Ibid.

OF THE FRIENDSHIP OF ANIMALS. That protection which the fostering care of the human race afforded to the cattle of the field, was amply repaid by the fleecy warmth of the lamb, by the rich, the salubrious libations of the cow. Sometimes, too, a tie still more tender, cemented the friendship between man and other animals. Infants, in the earlier ages of the world, were not unseldom committed to the teats of the tenants of the field. Towards the Goat that gave him suck, the fond boy felt the throb of filial gratitude; and the bowels of the ewe have yearned, with maternal tenderness, for the children of men. This is proved not only by solitary and fortuitous examples, but by the practice of whole nations. "The original inhabitants of the Canary Islands are called by Linschoten, and other authors, Guanchos. They were a rude uncivilized people, every one taking as many wives as he pleased. As to their children, they gave them to the goats to suckle." [Astley's Voyages, v. i. p. 5.] Thus educated, together, they were endeared to each other by mutual benefits; and a fond, a lively friendship was the consequence of their union. Their preservation depends generally on the protection of men, while man receives from them the most essential services. "It is not highly unreasonable," says Porphyrius, de Abstin. lib. 3. "to assert, that the rules of justice should be obser-

ved with men totally addicted to their passions, men who sacrifice every thing to lust, barbarity, rapacity, and vengeance; with men, in short, who exceed in cruelty the most ferocious animals; with parricides, with murderers, and ruffians of the most flagitious description; with tyrants, and the ministers of tyranny? and shall justice be denied to the husbandman (αροῦηρα) ox, to the dog educated with us, to the cattle that nourish us with their milk, or with their wool protect us from the cold?" We are undoubtedly bound to animals by the general duties of humanity; there is a natural alliance and commerce, a reciprocal obligation, which ought ever to be acknowledged. But however the affections of animals are attuned to the feelings of the human heart, they are accounted the mere result of mechanic impulse; however they may verge on human wisdom, their actions are said to have only the *semblance* of sagacity. Enlightened by superior reason, man considers himself immensely removed from animals, and, born to immortality, he scorns to acknowledge, with brutes that perish, a social bond. Such are the unfeeling dogmas, which are early instilled into the mind, and which induce a callous insensibility, foreign to the native texture of the heart; such the cruel speculations which prepare us for the practice of that remorseless tyranny, and which palliate the foul oppression that we exercise over our inferior but fellow-creatures. —Oswald.

MAN COMPARED WITH OTHER ANIMALS.

If we turn our eyes on other animals, we find they are supported with bones, covered with skins, moved by muscles; that they possess the same senses, and acknowledge the same appetites; we may hence conclude, from the strongest analogy, that their functions of life are similar to our own. They are capable of anxiety and doubt. They design, compare, and alter purposes, as circumstances require; and, from various means, select that which is best adapted to the end in view. Our sympathy should therefore be strongly and zealously exerted in their favour; we should never violate their rights, never make war against or injure them, compassionate their sufferings, relieve their wants, cultivate harmony and peace, and exchange good offices with them, as humanity, morality and christianity enjoins. Has not nature given, to almost every creature, the same spontaneous signs of the various affections? Admire we not in other animals whatever is most eloquent in man, the tremor of desire, the tear of distress, the piercing cry of anguish, the pity-pleading look, expressions that speak to the soul with a feeling which words can but feebly convey? A dog, on some provocation, bites his master; but no sooner has he done it, than he appears to be moved by repentance: you may perceive him sorrowful, uneasy, ashamed to shew his face, and confessing his guilt, by cringing to the ground. From such similarity of affections, sensations, and propensities, should not mutual love proceed, and the bonds of friendship with man be more cultivated, at least with the milder and more congenial kinds? It is obvious, that man, after all his boasted pre-eminence,

resembles the brutes in his birth, in his growth, in his mode of sustenance, in his decay, and in his dissolution. In these particulars he must be numbered among the animals whom he has reduced under subjection, and whom he often despises as mere animated matter. But man possesses reason, and is sufficiently proud of the endowment. Reason, however, alone will not confer that superiority which he haughtily assumes. Many among the tenants of the air, the water, and the grove, display a degree of reason scarcely to be distinguished from that of man. Neither the microscopic powers of metaphysics, nor the partial medium of human pride, have effected a remote distinction.

Man, in a state of nature, is not much superior to other animals. His organization is indeed extremely happy; but the dexterity of his figure is counterpoised by great disadvantages. Inferior to the bull in force; and in fleetness to the hound; the *os sublime*, or front erect, a feature which he bears in common with the monkey, could scarcely have inspired him with those haughty and magnificent ideas, which the pride of human refinement thence endeavours to deduce.

Exposed, like his fellow-creatures, to the injuries of the air; urged to action by the same physical necessities; susceptible of the same impressions; actuated by the same passions; and equally subject to the pains of disease, and to the pangs of dissolution, the simple savage never dreamt that his nature was so much more noble, or that he drew his origin from a purer source, or more remote than the animals in whom he saw a resemblance as complete. Nor were the simple sounds, by which he expressed the singleness of his heart, formed to flatter him into that fond sense

of superiority over the creatures, whom the fastidious insolence of cultivated ages absurdly styles *mute*.

"Man prides himself on possessing an intellect superior to that of all other animals, and on taking reason for the guide of all his actions, but as far as happiness, or the mere absence of suffering, is the end of action, the reason of man appears to be inferior to the animal instinct. A brutal ignorance debases and enslaves the great mass of mankind. They appear incapable of acquiring knowledge; of perceiving the connection of the ideas, which are laid before them; or the obvious relations of cause and effect. There they are void of all independance of thought or principle; a blind adherence to custom, or a slavish submission to authority, becomes the rule of life; and is substituted for self-government, and a manly obedience to the voice of truth and the dictates of reason.

"The moral traits are as much distorted as the physical. The affections, which should link man to man, and make each human being regard his fellow creature as his brother, are choked, and almost extinguished. Envy, hatred, jealousy, and all the malignant passions, predominate in the human bosom. The infliction of pain on sensitive beings, instead of exciting compassion, is, with the multitude, a source of pastime and merriment. To such a degree are the strongest instincts of our nature perverted, that the first principle of self-preservation is finally destroyed; the hand is raised against the existence of it's possessor; or the parental arm against the life of the offspring.

"Such is an outline, too faithful, of the habitual condition, perhaps of the majority of the human species. I omit the still darker shades of the picture;

the tragedies which perpetually embitter domestic life; our crowded hospitals, from the gates of which, shoals of supplicants are, by necessity repelled; our surgical operations, the very thoughts of which make the blood run cold; and our madhouses, the interior of which presents views, from which sensibility shrinks with horror and affright. Can we avoid asking ourselves, is this enormous mass of evil then necessary and unavoidable? Does it result from the very nature of things, and the primative organization of man, or on the other hand is it not factitious, the consequence of an artificial mode of life, of corrupt habits, or of accidents, which may be avoided?—Lambe's additional Reports, p. 44.

It has been frequently remarked, that the resemblance between the cry of a hare in distress and an infant, is exact. The hare, the stag, and several other animals will weep when they cannot escape, after being pursued. The same has been observed in the turtle, when taken and thrown on it's back.

How strangely does man abuse his reason when he attempts to judge and appreciate himself! If he be the King of Animals, he wretchedly debases his subjects, who afford him that subsistence, to which he frequently owes his existence, and many of the pleasures of which life is susceptible. Unable to exert himself without being sensible of his weakness, and reminded, by nature, every instant, of that inferior rank from which he continually labours to raise himself, he endeavours, by lowering the importance and usefulness of other animals to increase the distance which separates them. He maintains that God has made him *after his own image;* he thus makes God human, like himself; and the animals of many different species, who possess the same faculties which

distinguish man, he will not acknowledge to be his equals in such faculties. There is nothing, it seems, worthy of being compared with man, but divinity! If speech be considered as the power of articulating at will different sounds, have not all animals this faculty?

Do not those animals who experience the necessity of procuring to themselves a shelter from the inclemency of the air, partake also this art with man? Nature, which has made nothing in vain, has refused this art to animals who have received at their birth a convenient clothing appropriate to their constitution, to their temperament, and to the climate where they are intended to live and die: those, however, whose blood possesses a sufficient degree of fluidity to preserve the play of their organs from being incommoded by the impression of exterior air or whose exclusive habitation supercedes the necessity of lodging and clothing, have not this art. Man seems destined to inhabit all places, to be exposed to all exterior impressions; and the necessity of protecting himself from them is, without doubt, an imperfection which places him below some animals.

The art most essential, of procuring food, is inherited by all animals: in this respect man is the most silly and inexpert. In a savage state, he knows only how to kill and destroy; for if he finds it necessary to fight, he often proves the weakest in the combat, and requires long experience in order to enable him, by art, to make himself master of his prey, which often escapes him. In a state of civilization, how many men die of hunger; and with what trouble and care, with how many inquietudes, toils, and mortifications do others purchase an unwhosesome meal? Every animal, except man, makes choice of his food,

with prompt sagacity and readiness, while this image of God is incapable of distinguishing that which is not baneful and unwholesome, till after he has analyzed and experimented much, or not till he has brought on himself infirmities, diseases, and torments, which contribute to shorten the natural term of his existence.

Man, in his inventions to procure the indulgencies of life, has often produced a vicious routine of voluntary evils and remedies ill applied. His greatest fault is that of being accustomed to consider the exterior air as an inconvenience, the laws of nature as a burden, and the order which she has established as a bad arrangement, which he must rectify. That this parallel might be carried much farther, makes me blush that I am a *man;* altho' it is counted a title of vast import.

Man says of himself, "I am the only animal capable of conceiving ideas." But of what value is the possession of ideas if they be not weighed and compared? Do not those animals which man has termed irrational possess judgment? and is not their judgment less liable to err, and often more wise, if not more reasonable than that of man? Examples would produce prolixity; but when we observe fidelity in animals which we call *brutes* (an expression used to signify a being precisely the contrary to it's true meaning); when we follow their conduct as it relates to our's towards them; we shall be obliged to confess that it is almost always more consequent, more conformable to their interest, and more analogous to circumstances than our's: that, in fine, they judge, they reason, and frequently think more sensibly than we. They have indubitably the faculty of expressing their thoughts, and of communicat-

ing them to each other; but not from one kind to another, as from them to us. A bird might justly treat us as brutes, because, we imitate their whistling, as a parrot pronounces some of our words; for we comprehend their meaning as little as they do the signification of our odd expressions.

It is certain that the great mass of mankind, even in these refined times, pass through life without any rational acquirements. Their minds groveling, and possessing no arts, not even those most essential to life. Their most serious employment is reading works of imagination; some do not read any thing; and some were never taught to read.

In the present depraved state of mankind, the very worst of inferior animals are but feeble shadows of the degeneracy and corruption which prevails among themselves. "Shew me," says the Rev. John Hildrop, "any one species of animal more ridiculous, more contemptible, more pernicious, more detestible, than are to be found among the silly, the vicious, the wicked part of mankind. Are apes and monkies more ridiculous or mischievous creatures than some who are to be found in the most polite assemblies? Is a *poor dog* with four legs, who acts agreeably to his nature, half so despicable a creature as a *sad dog* with two, who with high pretensions to reason, virtue, and honour, is every day guilty of crimes for which his brother brute would be doomed to hanging? Is a swine that wallows in the mire half so contemptible an animal as a drunkard or a sot, who wallows in the filth and dirt of their own intemperance? What is the rage of tygers, the fierceness of lions, the cruelty of wolves and bears, the treachery of cats and monkies, and the cunning of foxes, when compared with the

cruelty, the treachery, the barbarity of mankind? The wolf and the tyger, that worry a few innocent sheep, purely to satisfy hunger, are harmless animals when opposed to the rage and fury of conquerors, the barbarity and cruelty of tyrants and oppressors, who uninjured, unprovoked, lay whole countries waste, turn the most beautiful cities into heaps of ruins, and sweep the face of the earth before them like an inundation or devouring fire. Their motives are to gratify insatiable avarice and ambition, to extend conquest, to raise an empty fame and a fabric of vanity on the ruins of humanity, virtue, and true honour."

"The monkeys, apes, and baboons of the island of Borneo," says Capt Beckman, "are of many different shapes, but the most remarkable are those called Orang Outangs. These grow up to be six feet high; they walk upright, have longer arms than men; tolerably good faces, handsomer I am sure, than some hottentots that I have seen; large teeth, no tails, nor hair, but on those parts where it grows on human bodies. They are very nimble footed and exceedingly strong. They throw great stones, sticks and billets at those persons who offend them. The natives believe that they were formerly men but metamorphosed into beasts for their blasphemy. I bought one out of curiosity for six spanish dollars; it lived with me seven months and then died of a flux. He was a great thief and liked strong liquors; for if our backs were turned, he would be at the punch-bowl, and would open the brandy-case, and replace it carefully. He slept, lying at length, with one hand under his head. If I was angry with him, he would sigh, sob, and cry, till he found that I was reconciled to him; and tho' he was but about twelve months

old when he died, yet he was stronger than any man." Voyage to Borneo, in 1718, p. 37.

Doctor Tyson relates of his pigmy that "once it was made drunk with punch, but afterwards it would never drink above one cup, and refused to take more than what he found agreed with him. Anatomy, &c. p. 10. After he was taken and a little used to wear clothes, he was fond of them; and what he could not put on himself he would bring in his hands to some of the company for assistance. He laid in a bed with his head upon a pillow and drew the clothes over him like one of the human species.

The Ouran-Outang, has a capacity far superior to other wild animals. Suppose a man born deaf, dumb and blind, as some are; they can, therefore, according to Mr. Locke, acquire no ideas. They are inferior then, in regard to understanding or soul, to this animal. And will you make a superior soul mortal, when an inferior is immortal? Where, then, can you draw the line for immortality? If you say that the Ouran-Outang is immortal, must you not say that the baboon is immortal? If you say that the baboon is immortal, must you not say that the common monkey is immortal also? This argument tends to prove that the souls of the meanest insect is immortal as well as others. If it should be asked can this kind of argumentation be of any service? I answer that it can. It may teach us to treat the lower order of animals with greater humanity than we do. This would be of much more service than aiming to assimulate the human nature to the divine. Man does not need such reasoning to increase his pride. He rather needs arguments to prove that his nature resembles that of the brutes, in order to induce

him to treat them with more humanity. It is accounted as illiberal in a man to inherit a partiality for his country as to wish that it alone, of all other nations, may enjoy the charming sweets of liberty. We ought, it is said, to confess ourselves citizens of the whole world. It is also as illiberal not to treat the brute creation with the same tenderness that we treat mankind. We were all made by the same Almighty power, we breathe the same air, and we tread upon the same earth. We are all of us fellow-citizens of the same universe. For my part, it is the constant custom of my life to spare even the meanest insect. If, by chance, my foot deprives any one of them of existence, that existence is not destroyed without a sigh. The world, as my uncle Toby says, is surely wide enough to hold both me and the fly which buzzes around my head. I shall also think myself happy if this, my book, be the means of rescuing the most insignificant animal from torture. The saving it a single groan will more than comfort me for all the trouble I have received in compiling it; nay, even for the sneers of mankind. The slightest observation on the conduct of mankind to brutes, will shew that the former are devoid of sensation, except in respect to what relates to *themselves*. I have even witnessed the dying groans of an expiring victim imitated, *in mockery!*—Crawford's Dissertation.

On the place which man holds in the scale of animated beings, all naturalists are agreed. There are those, who deem it a sort of degradation, to the human species, to class mankind with monkeys, apes, and baboons; and to shew the analogy of his structure with that of the orang-outang. But misplaced pride and an ignorant misapprehension cannot alter the nature of things. Our very language acknowled-

ges the analogy. *Monkey* can only mean manikin, or little man. It does not follow, however, that man approaches more nearly to the nature of the monkey, than he does to that of the otter, except in the single circumstance of the choice of food. Man is distinguished from the whole tribe of animals by a rational soul. It is only when he divests himself of his reason, and debases himself by brutal habits, that he renounces his just rank among created beings, and sinks himself below the level of the beasts.—Addit. Rep. on Regimen, p. 226

ARGUMENTS FROM SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY.

And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.—Gen. i, 29.

The banana plant is perhaps, the most useful in the world, as it's fruit makes excellent food without cooking, having a most agreeable flavour, and possessing very nutrimental qualities. It produces a cluster of sixty, or four score delicious figs, which come to maturity all at once; and it pushes out shoots of every degree of magnitude, which bear in succession, and at all times throughout the year. It is the king of fruits, not excepting the cocoa. When stripped of it's skin, it has been compared to a large sausage; it's substance and colour to fresh butter in winter; it's taste to a mixture of apple and pear, which melts in the mouth like marmalade. Thousands of families live between the tropics, on this pleasant, wholesome, and nourishing fruit alone.—St. Pierre's Stud. ii, 168, 286.

In India, wheat, rice, barley, and other grain prop-

er for making bread, grow in plenty, and are very good; the wheat especially, is more white and full than the English. The country equally abounds with the choicest fruits; such as pomegranates, citrons, dates, grapes, almonds, cocoa-nuts, and that most excellent plum called the mirabolan; plantains, which grow in clusters like long slender cucumbers; the mango, in shape and colour, like an apricot, but much larger; and the anana, which resembles our pine apple, and has a most exquisite pleasing taste. In the northern parts, they have variety of pears and apples, lemons and oranges. They have excellent musk melons, and water melons, some as large as pompions, which they resemble in shape.—Mod. Un. Hist. vi. 208.

In China, a single acre of land, sown with rice, produces sufficient for the consumption of five persons for a year, allowing two pounds and a half a day to each. An acre planted with cotton, produces sufficient for clothing upwards of two hundred persons. Breton's China, ix, 29.

There is not a single genus of plants, but what, in it's variety of species, presents food to man, in some part or other of the globe.—St. Pierre's Stud. ii, 466.

It is sufficiently evident, that in whatever part of the habitable globe man can exist, there, vegetable nutriment may either be found or be raised; that in no situation fit for the habitation of man, is the earth devoid of prolific power, sufficient to satisfy his wants, and even to gratify his palate.—Dr. Lambe's addit. Reports, p. 224.

Out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food.—Gen. ii, 9.

The plantain alone, says St. Pierre, might have proved sufficient to supply the wants of man in a primative state, for it produces the most healthful food, and it's fruit is evidently intended for human consumption. One of it's clusters forms no inconsiderable load for a man, while it's spreading top presents a magnificent shade and it's long green leaves may be adapted as temporary clothing. It is under this delightful shade, and by means of fruits perpetually renewed, that the Hindoo Bramin leads a life of tranquillity, and, deriving a supply for all his wants from one of those trees, situated upon the margin of a brook, is said frequently to attain the age of one hundred years. They are found throughout the whole torrid zone, in Africa, in Asia, in America, north and south, in the islands belonging to each continent, and even in the most distant islands of the south sea. The flavour of the plantain is such, as to supply the want of butter, sugar, and spices. It supplies what may be called the delicacies of pastry.—Harmon. of Nat. vi, 9, &c.

In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.—Gen. iii, 19.

The peculiar property of the corn plant is that of being produced in some shape or other in every part of the world, from the rice of the Ganges to the barley of Finland. It is, however, very remarkable, that it grows no where spontaneously like other plants, so that providence appears to have devolved altogether on our species, the charge of maintaining and extending it's cultivation. Bread is of all vegetable nourishment the most substantial and durable.

Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.—Isa. vii, 15.

We learn from Mr. Park, that the centre of Afri-

ca produces a tree, resembling the American oak, with nuts like spanish olives, which produces from the kernels of these nuts, by boiling, tree-butter, whiter and finer, and of a richer flavour than that of cow's milk; it will keep, without salt, the whole year.

And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins: and his meat was locusts and wild honey.—Matt. iii, 4.

From this we learn what the diet of John the baptist, the favoured of heaven, and forerunner of Christ, consisted of; i. e. honey and the fruit of the locust tree.

Certain it is, that God, ordaining herbs and fruit for the food of man, speaks not a word concerning flesh for two thousand years. And when after, by the Mosaic constitution, there were distinctions and prohibitions, about the legal uncleanness of animals, plants, of what kind so ever, were left free and indifferent, for every one to chuse what he liked best.

Infants sought the mother's nipple as soon as born; and when grown and able to feed themselves, ran naturally to fruit, and still will chuse to eat it rather than flesh; and certainly might so persist to do, did not custom prevail even against the very dictates of nature. Nor question I, but that what the heathen poets recount of the happiness of the golden age, sprang from some tradition they had received of the Paradisian fare, and their innocent and healthful lives in that delightful garden.—Evelyn's Acetaria, p. 146.

"It is less to be wondered at, that christians should addict themselves to animal food, as they "eat blood, and things strangled," in direct opposition to their own religion, and the express prohibition of God. After the flood, when he declares to Noah and his sons, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat

for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things;" Gen. ix, 3; the gift, however, is upon this immediate condition; "But the flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall you not eat." Again, in the law dictated by God to Moses, he says, "It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations, throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood."—Lev. iii, 17. Again; "moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings."—Lev. vii, 26. "I will even," he declares, "set my face against that soul that eateth blood; and will cut him off from among his people: for the life of the flesh," he adds, is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls."—Lev. xvii, 10, 11. [The original is *lives*, as the *life* of the flesh, not souls, for the Jews of that period did not know that they had souls, nor believed in their immortality.] The same injunction is repeated in two other verses of the same chapter; and again, in Deut. xii, 16, 23, and xv, 25. This prohibition is well known, and the wiser and better primitive christians indeed practised it, but in the modern christians, what a falling off! See Acts, xv, 28, 29, where we are told, in a letter from the apostles, "For it seemed good to the holy ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood."

A righteous man is merciful to his beast.—Prov. xii, 10.

Be not among wine-bibbers, among riotous eaters of flesh.—Prov. xxiii, 20.

He who hath shewed no mercy, shall have judgment without mercy.—James ii, 13.

He who feeds on any kind of meats prohibited by the Mosaic law, with the persuasion in his mind that he may be wrong, is condemned by his conscience, for doing that which he thinks God has forbidden. —Dr. A. Clarke, on Rom. xiv. 23.

The meek and lowly Jesus entered Jerusalem riding upon an ass. Surely this example, might be expected to have some influence on his followers. One might reasonably look for some mercy, being regarded in favour of this patient beast. But, no, the modern christian has no respect for this highly honoured animal. Tho' selected by his Saviour from the rest of animals to bear him, through Jerusalem, he treats this animal with contempt and persecution.

God created all things that they might have being; and the generations of the world were healthful; and there was no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth: but ungodly men, with their works and words, have called it to them, and made a covenant with it.—Wisdom i, 16.

The creator has made man to be good; otherwise he, as the beasts, whose character is designed to be ferocious, would have been furnished with claws, with fangs, with poison, or with some offensive weapon. But he is not, like other animals, provided even with *defensive* armour; undoubtedly with the view of his having constant recourse to the humanity of his fellow creatures, and of extending it to them in his turn. God no more makes whole nations of men jealous, envious, malignant, eager to surpass each other, ambitious, conquerors, cannibals, than he forms nations continually labouring under leprosy, purples, fever, small-pox. If you meet an individual, subject to these physical evils, impute them, without hesitation, to some unwholesome aliment on which he feeds, or

to a putrid air, which infects the neighbourhood. In like manner, when you find barbarism in a rising nation, refer it solely to the errors of it's policy, or to the influence of it's neighbours; just as in a child, to the vices of education or bad example.—St. Pierre's Arcadia. p. 194.

Thou shalt not kill.—Exod. xx, 13.

The Pythagoreans had such a strong sense of humanity that they abstained from shedding the blood, even of animals, and from eating their flesh.

In Cambia, the indians will kill nothing, nor have any thing killed; they consequently eat no flesh, but live on roots, rice, fruits, and milk.—Fitch, in Pinkerton's Coll. vol. ix, p. 408.

Even in our times, under the Russian government, established at Kamtschatka, by an edict of the Empress Catherine, no crime whatever can be punished with death.—Capt. King.

"We christians," says Octavius, in Minucius Felix, "dread the thoughts of murder, and cannot bear to look upon a carcase; and we so abhor human blood, that we abstain from that of beasts." "We are so cautious," says Tertullian, "of tasting blood, that we abstain from things strangled, and even suffocated beasts; and, therefore, when you have a mind to try whether we be Christians, you offer us pudding stuffed with blood." These, it is presumed, were what we now call black puddings; a great luxury with modern christians, in this country, at the anniversary of the birth of Christ; who himself would have disdained the filthy pollution.

In scripture, the names of animals are applied to the vessels made of the respective skins of animals; to money stamped with their appropriate figures; to human beings; and to individual societies. Thus

the bottle or vessel, out of which the ancients filled their wine, being made of an animal's skin, the wine contained in this apparent animal, was called blood, and the pouring out slaughter, as if the beast were then immediately under the operation of being killed.—See Archeologiæ Atticæ, lib. vi. sec. ii, cap. 4.

Marcrobius says, the Egyptians never offered any bloody sacrifices or slaughtered animals to their gods, but worshipped them only with prayers and frankincence.—Saturnal. lib. i. cap. 7.

Some Egyptians, on certain occasions, make figures of swine with meal, which, having first baked, they offered upon the altar.—Heredot. Euterpe, n. 47.

According to the vulgar notion that real animals were killed in sacrifices to God, we can in the language of Dr. A. Clarke, "look on the tabernacle and temple of Jerusalem, only as slaughterhouses, whose victims, blood, and fat, are more proper to inspire disgust than religion."

That the Supreme Being would imperiously require of mankind bloody victims, and even point out the particular animals which were to be immolated on his altar, is to me, says Dr. Geddes, highly incredible.

People must have very gross conceptions of God, to imagine that he is of so cruel a nature as to be delighted with the butchering of innocent animals; and that the stench of burnt flesh should be such "a sweet smelling savour in his nostrils," as to atone for the wickedness of men; and wicked, no doubt, they were, when they had such an atonement at hand. So that the harmless were burnt to save the hurtful; and men, the less innocent they grew, the more they destroyed the innocent beasts.—Christianity as old as the Creation, p. 78.

If the experience of the Prophet Daniel, and the authority of sacred writ may have any weight in favour of the superior nutrition and wholesomeness of a vegetable diet, the following passage, in which the experiment is detailed, will be decisive.

"And the King appointed them, [the children of Israel] a daily provision of his meat, and of the wine which he drank: so nourishing them three years, that at the end thereof they might stand before the king. Now among these were of the children of Judah, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah. But Daniel proposed in his heart, that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank; therefore he requested of the prince of the eunuchs, that he might not defile himself. And the prince of the eunuchs said unto Daniel, I fear my lord the King, who hath appointed you meat and you drink; for why should he see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort? then shall ye make me endanger my head to the King. Then said Daniel to Melzar, [the steward,] whom the prince of the eunuchs had set over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days, and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink. Then let our countenances be looked on before thee, and the countenances of the children that eat of the portion of the King's meat: and as thou seest, deal with thy servants. So he consented to them in this matter, and proved them ten days. And at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer, and fatter in flesh, than all the children which did eat the portion of the King's meat. Thus Melzar took away the portion of their meat, and the wine that they should drink, and gave them pulse. Now at the end of the days

that the King had said he should bring them in, then the prince of the eunuchs brought them in before Nebuchadnezzar. And the King communed with them, and among them all was found none like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah: therefore stood they before the King. And in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the King enquired of them he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in the realm."—Daniel, chap. i.

It appears, hence, that vegetable food not only was more nutritive, but contributed exceedingly to strengthen the intellectual powers.

By what a miserable quibble were the lives of innocent animals explained away among the jews. "The flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."—Gen. ix, 4. How did the jews elude this positive command of a merciful God? Why, they murdered the animal, and pouring out the blood upon the earth like water, devoured the flesh without scruple; and they said, 'We have not violated the law, we have not eaten the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, *for the blood we have poured upon the earth like water!*' "Thou shalt not eat the blood, for the blood is the life; thou shalt pour it upon the earth like water." Deut. xii, 23, 24. In the same manner "the American indians, through a strong principle of religion, abstain from eating the blood of any animal, as it contains the life and spirit of the heart, and was the very essence of the sacrifices which were offered up for sinners."—Adair's Hist. of American Indians, p. 134. By wicked evasions, and perfidious quibbles like these, the Hindoos have also, in some instances, learnt to elude the pious and salutary precepts of

their law. "Whenever a Hindoo has occasion to cross the Carramnassa, or the accursed river, which in the dry season is fordable, he gives a Mahomedan a piece of money to carry him over upon his back, that his feet may not be wet with the accursed river, which is a thing forbidden by their religion. In this, and many other instances, the letter of the commandment is observed, while the spirit of it is lost; for I think, one cannot doubt but that the intention of this law was to keep them within their own provinces."—Letters from the East Indies.

The practice of murder has been persevered in from the influence of superstition and credulity. In evidence, take the following quotation. "I will, *as the Almighty hath commanded*, kill a young lamb. Haste, my love! and chuse the finest flowers to strew the sacrifice. I took the best of my flock; but, my children, it is impossible to give you a description of what I felt, when I went to deprive the innocent creature of life. It tremblingly seized my hand; I was scarcely able to hold the struggling victim, and never could I have brought myself to give it death, *had not my resolution been animated by the express command of the author of life*. The very remembrance of it's endeavours to escape, gives me pain. When I beheld it's quivering limbs in the last moment of it's existence, an universal tremor shook my own; and when it lay before me without sense or motion, dreadful forebodings invaded my troubled soul."—Death of Abel, b. ii. Could any thing besides the express command of a God of terror steel the human heart to an execution so cruel?

The first slaughter of a bullock among the Athenians is related in the following manner by Porphyrius, on the testimony of tradition, and more an-

cient writers: his account is also confirmed by Pausanius in his description of Greece, lib. i. c. 24. In the reign of Erechtheus, a priest named Diomus having placed upon the altar of Jupiter Palieus an offering, consisting of barley and honey, a bullock happened to approach the altar and put his mouth to the offering. Enraged at the bull for tasting and trampling upon the consecrated cake, the zealous priest seized a hatchet and killed the animal by a single blow. No sooner had he perpetrated than he began to repent of the impious action. He buried the bullock, and, impelled by an evil conscience, fled of his own accord to the island of Crete. Soon after, the Athenian territories were afflicted by a great famine. The Athenians sent to consult the Oracle at Delphos, with respect to the means of relieving themselves from this calamity; the Pythian priestess returned them this response, "that there was at Crete an exile who would expiate their afflictions, and that if they would inflict punishment on the *slayer*, and erect in the place where he fell a statue to the *slain*, that this would greatly benefit those who tasted, as also those who had not touched, the dead." Having made search for the exile mentioned by the oracle, the Athenians at length found this Diomus, who thinking to take away the stigma and odium of his crime by communicating it to all, told them the city ought to slay a bullock. As they stood hesitating at this proposal, and unable to decide who should perpetrate the deed, Diomus offered to strike the blow on these conditions, that they would grant him the freedom of their city, and also participate with him in the murder of the animal. Having agreed on these conditions they returned to the city, where they regulated the order of the execution in the

manner in which it is still performed by them at this day. They chose a number of virgins to bring water, in order to whet the hatchet and the knife. When these weapons were sharpened, one man delivered the axe, another struck the bullock, and a third cut his throat. They then skinned the animal, and all those who were present tasted of his flesh. Having done this they sewed up the skin, stuffing it with straw, and setting it up as if it were alive, put a plow to his tail, and placed him, as it were, in act to till the ground. They then called before the tribunal of justice those who had been guilty of the fact, in order that they might justify themselves. The Virgins who brought the water threw the blame on those who had whetted the steel; they who had whetted the steal blamed the person who delivered the hatchet, he threw the blame on the man who cut the bullock's throat, and the latter accused the weapon, which, as it could not defend itself, was found guilty of the murder, and thrown into the sea."—Porphyr. de Abstin. lib. ii. par. 29 and 30.

The first introduction of animal food among the Phœnicians, arose from the following incident, as related by Neanthes Cyzicenus and Asclepiades Cyprius. In the beginning no animal was sacrificed to the gods, nor was there any positive law to prevent this, for it was forbidden by the law of nature. In the time of Pygmalion (a Phœnician who reigned in Cyprus), however, an occasion occurred, in which it was thought necessary to redeem life by life, and an animal was sacrificed and totally consumed by fire. Some time after the introduction of this practice, a part of the burnt offering happening to fall upon the ground, the priest picked it up, and burning his hand in the action, in order to

mitigate the pain, applied his fingers to his mouth. Inticed by the flavour of the flesh, and unable to restrain his eager desire, he eat himself, and gave part of the sacrifice to his wife. When Pygmalion was made acquainted with this atrocity, he caused them both to be thrown down a rock, and gave the priesthood to another: the new priest soon fell into the temptation of his predecessor, and was punished in the same manner. His fate, however, did not deter imitation, and that which was committed by many was soon practised with impunity by all." —Porphyr. de Abstin.

Let the following instances of sympathy, be here recorded, since they prove that the whole human race is not insensible to reason and justice.

At Southampton some humane person has bequeathed a stipend for preaching a sermon, annually, on the Sin and Folly of Cruelty to inferior Animals.

The Rev. Henry Brindley, of Lacock, Wilts, has instituted an Annual Lecture, in the Abbey Church of Bath, the beginning of February, on Humanity to Animals.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF A VEGETABLE DIET, DEDUCED FROM REASON, COMPASSION, SYMPATHY AND FEELING.

"From the texture of the human heart arises a strong argument in behalf of persecuted animals. Mercy is an amiable quality, admired by those who do not practise it. There exists within us a rooted repugnance to the spilling of blood; a repugnance which yields only to custom, and which even the most inveterate custom can never entirely overcome. Hence the horrid task of shedding the tide of life, for the gluttony of the table, has, in every country,

been committed to the lowest class of men; and their business is almost every where abhorred. On the carcase we feed, without remorse, because the dying struggles of the butchered creature are secluded from our sight; because his cries pierce not our ears: because his agonizing shrieks sink not into our souls; but were we forced with our own hands, to assassinate the animals we readily devour, there are some among us who would throw down, with detestation, the knife; and rather than imbrue his hands in the murder of the lamb, consent, for ever, to forego the favourite repast. How is it possible, possessing in our breasts an abhorrence of cruelty, and sympathy for misery, that we can act so barbarously? Certainly the feelings of the heart point more unerringly than the dogmas and subtilties of men who sacrifice to custom the dearest sentiments of humanity.

Had nature intended man an animal of prey, would she have implanted in his breast a principle so adverse to her purpose? Could she mean the human race should eat their food with compunction and regret; that every morsel should be purchased with a pang, and every meal of man be impoisoned with remorse? Can nature have imparted the milk of kindness in the same bosom which should be filled with unfeeling ferocity? Would she not rather have wrapped his heart in ruthless ribs of brass; and, have armed him, with iron entrails, to grind, without remorse, the palpitating limbs of agonizing life? Has nature winged with fleetness the feet of man to overtake the flying prey, or given him fangs to tear asunder the creatures destined for his food? Glares in his eyeballs the lust of carnage? Does he scent from afar the footsteps of his victim? Does his soul pant for the feast of blood? Is the bosom of man the rugged abode

of bloody thoughts; and from that sink of depravity and horror, does the sight of other animals excite his rapacious desires to slay, to mangle, to devour?

Let us attend, for a few moments, to a selected scene of cruelty. Approach, ye men of scientific subtilty, and examine with attention this dead body. It was late a playful fawn, which, skipping and bounding upon the bosom of parent earth, awoke, in the mind of the feeling observer, a thousand tender emotions. The butcher's knife hath laid low the delight of it's fond dam, and the innocent is stretched in gore upon the ground. Does the ghastly spectacle whet your appetite, and are your eyes, delighted with the sight of blood? Is the stream of gore grateful to your nostrils, or it's icy ribs pleasing to your touch? Are ye callous to the feelings of animal sensation? Turn ye from murder with no abhorrence? Or do ye yield to the combined evidence of your senses, to the testimony of conscience and common sense? then cease to persist in persuading mankind that to murder an innocent animal, is not cruel, nor unjust; and to feed upon a corpse, is neither filthy nor unfit.

Why, oh why shouldst thou dip thy hand in the blood of thy fellow-creatures without cause? Has not nature amply provided both for the wants and pleasures of the human race? The banquet is abundant, in which the salubrious and savory, the nourishing and palatable, are blended in proportions infinitely various. Loaded with the produce of the seasons as they pass, and rioting in excess of enjoyment, dost thou still thirst, insatiate wretch! for the blood of the innocent little lamb, whose sole food is grass and his beverage the brook that trickles muddy from his feet? Let the tears of Nature plead for a poor unoffending creature which hath done thee no

harm and of which it is incapable! Spare then, O spare, I beseech thee, to excite the cries of agonizing innocence! See the little victim how he wantons unconscious of coming fate; unsuspicious of harm from man, who should rather be his defender; he views the up-lifted steel, innocent and engaging as the babe that presses the bosom of her in whom thy bliss is complete. Do not kill him in the novelty of life; nor ravish him from the sweet aspect of the sun, while yet, with new delight, he admires the blooming face of things; while to the pipe of the shepherd, his light heart leaps with joy; and, unblunted by enjoyment, his virgin senses sweetly vibrate to the bland touch of juvenile desire! And why shouldst thou kill him in the novelty of life? Alas! his afflicted dam will seek him through all his wonted haunts! Her moans will be returned by the echoing dell, as if nature was moved to compassion; and her cries will seem to melt the very rocks! But on the obduracy of the human heart what can have effect? Can the yearnings of nature? can reason? can argument? Alas! the very attempt induces the ridicule of the mob, the obloquy of the sensual, the sneers of the voluptuary.

Surely the whole human race are highly interested in preventing the habit of spilling blood! For will the man, accustomed to murder, be nice in distinguishing the vital tide of a quadruped from that which flows from a creature with two legs? Are the dying struggles of a lambkin less affecting than the agonies of any animal whatever? Or would the ruffian, who beholds, unmoved, the supplicating looks of innocence, and plunges, pitiless into the quivering flesh of the infantine calf, the murdering steel, would he turn with horror from *human* assassination?

From the practice of slaughtering an innocent animal, to the murder of man himself, the steps are neither many nor remote. This our forefathers were well aware of, who enacted that, in a cause of blood, no butcher or surgeon, should be permitted to sit in a jury.

We are easily brought, without scruple, to devour the animals we have learnt to destroy without remorse. The corpse of a man differs in nothing from the corpse of any other animal; and he who finds the last palatable, may, without difficulty, accustom his stomach to the first. As soon as men became animals of prey, which they were not originally, they fed upon those of their own kind as well as upon other animals. The ancient Germans sometimes rioted in human repasts; and the native tribes of America, feed, with infernal satisfaction, on the bodies of their enemies."—Oswald.

"From the strict rules of natural justice and equity, how any one can justify the taking away the life of a fellow-creature, out of wantonness, luxury, and riot, and not from necessity and self-defence, so long as there may be found sufficient store of vegetable food to carry on the expenses of living, and the more agreeable performance of the animal functions; to give a living creature the greatest pain it can possibly receive, and take from it the only happiness it is capable of, namely, it's life, which none can restore or recompense, merely to scratch callous organs more sensibly; how, I say, to account for this barbarous and savage wantonness on the foot of mere natural religion and natural equity I can by no means conceive."—Cheyne on Regimen, &c. p. 64.

"No beast of prey," adds Ritson, to this passage, "is so wantonly and malignantly cruel as man in so-

ciety, whether he be Christian or Mahomedan; and yet, strange perversion of nature, he has neither the teeth nor fangs of a tyger, nor the beak or claws of a vulture."

"Among other dreadful and disgusting images, which custom has rendered familiar, are those which arise from eating animal food; he who has ever turned with abhorrence from the skeleton of a beast, which has been picked whole by birds or vermin, must confess that habit only could have enabled him to endure the sight of the mangled bones and flesh of a dead carcase, which every day cover his table; and he who reflects on the number of lives which have been sacrificed to sustain his own, should enquire by what the account has been balanced, and whether his life is become proportionably of more value by the exercise of virtue and piety, by the superior happiness which he has communicated to reasonable beings, and by the glory which his intellect has ascribed to God."—Note by Dr. Hawkesworth, in his edition of Swift's works; Gulliver's Travels, p. 94.

It is an axiom universally acknowledged, from the most delicate and sensible, to the most dull and stupid of men, that pain is misery; superiority of rank or station exempts no creature from this sensibility, nor does inferiority render such feelings the less exquisite. Pain is pain, whether inflicted on man or beast; the endurance of it is an evil; and the being who communicates evil, especially to exhibit power or gratify malice, is guilty of cruelty and injustice.

When we are under apprehensions that we *ourselves* shall be the sufferers of pain, we shrink back at the idea: we can then abominate it; we detest it with horror; we plead hard for *mercy;* and we feel that *we can feel.* But when MAN is out of the ques-

tion, humanity sleeps, and the heart is callous. We no longer consider ourselves as creatures of sense, but as merciless Lords of the creation. Pride, Prejudice, Education, Aversion to singularity, and contracted misrepresentations of God and religion, all contribute to harden the heart against it's natural impressions, and the soft feelings of compassion; and when the mind is warped and disposed to evil, a trifling argument serves to stifle conscientious motives. All nature will be ransacked in her weakest parts, to extort from her, if possible, any confession whereon to rest an argument to defend cruelty and oppression. There is no custom, whether barbarous or absurd; nor any vice, however detestible, that will not find some abetters to justify, or to palliate it; tho' the vindication itself be an aggravation of the crime.

In case of *human* cruelty, the oppressed man can complain, and plead his own cause. There are courts and laws of justice in every civilized society, to which the injured man can readily make his appeal. But the suffering brute can neither utter the nature of his oppression, describe the author of his wrong, nor bring an action against the barbarous injustice of unfeeling man. The laws of Triptolemus are buried in oblivion. The priest passeth on one side, the levite on the other, but the samaritan stops, sheds a tear, but can effect nothing, for mankind are combined in the dreadful purpose of promoting misery.

You ask me, says Plutarch, for what reason Pythagoras abstained from eating the flesh of brutes? For my part, I am astonished to think, on the contrary, what appetite first induced man to taste of a dead carcase; or what motive could suggest the notion of nourishing himself with the flesh of animals, which he saw the moment before, bleating, bellow-

ing, walking, a d looking about them. How could he bear to see an impotent and defenceless creature slaughtered, skinned, and cut up for food? How could he endure the sight of the convulsed limbs and muscles? how bear the smell arising from their dissection? Whence happened it that he was not disgusted and struck with horror when he came to handle the bleeding flesh, and clear away the clotted blood and humours from the wounds? Poetical fiction might imagine,

> "The hides still crawling, and the mangled beasts
> half raw, half roasted, bellowing their complaints."

Such a picture might naturally enough, surely, have represented itself to the man who first conceived an appetite for the flesh of a living animal, and directed the sacrifice of the helpless creature, that all the while might stand licking the hand of it's murderer. We should, therefore, rather wonder at the conduct of those who first indulged themselves in this horrible repast, than at such as have humanely abstained from it. And yet the first flesh-eaters, perhaps, might justify themselves, by pleading an act of necessity, and the want of that plenty of other provision of various kinds, which luxury has introduced in our times, and which renders our conduct, in this respect, so much the more inexcusable. 'Happy mortals!' might they exclaim, in addressing the men of our days; 'how highly favoured by the gods, in comparison with your predecessors! How fertile are your fields, your orchards, your vineyards, in comparison with our's! In our unhappy times, the earth and atmosphere, loaded with crude and noxious vapours, were intractable to order, and obeyed not the due return of the seasons. The uncertain course of the rivers broke down on every side the insufficient banks; so that

lakes, bogs, and deep morasses, occupied three fourths of the surface of the globe, while the other quarter of it was covered with woods and barren forests. The earth produced not spontaneously delicious fruits; we had no implements of agriculture; we were strangers to the art of husbandry; and, employing no seed-time, we had no harvest. Thus famine was perpetually at our heels. In the winter, moss and the bark of trees were our ordinary food. The fresh roots of dog's grass and broom were a feast for us; and when, by chance, we found a repast of nuts and acorns, we danced for joy round the hazel and the oak, to the sound of some rustic muse, calling, in our grateful transports, the earth our nurse and mother. Such were our only festivals, such our only sports: all the rest of our lives was made up of nothing but sorrow, pain and misery. At length, when the impoverished earth no longer afforded us subsistence, we were compelled to commit an outrage on nature for our own preservation; and thus we began to eat our companions in misery, rather than perish with them. But, cruel mortals! what motives have you for shedding innocent blood? What affluence on every side surrounds you! How liberal is the earth of fruits! How bounteous are your fields and vineyards! the animals afford you milk in plenty for aliment, and wool to clothe and keep you warm. What can you require more? What barbarous rage induces you to commit so many murders, when already loaded with viands and sated with plenty? Why do you falsely accuse your mother earth of being incapable of affording you nourishment? Why do you rebel against Ceres, the inventress of laws; against Bacchus, the comforter of mankind; as if their lavish bounties were not sufficient for the preservation of the human

race! How can you have the heart to mix, with the delicious fruits of the earth, the bones and flesh of dead carcases, and to eat with the sweetest milks, the blood of the very cattle which afford it you? The lion and the panther, which you call wild beasts, act necessarily, and destroy other animals to preserve their own lives. But you, a hundred times more wild and cruel than they, act contrary to instinct, without any such plea of necessity, and only to indulge yourselves in your barbarous delicacy. The animals which you devour are not those which devour others; you eat not carnivorous animals, but you are careful to imitate their savage nature. You have no appetite but for meek and innocent brutes which hurt nobody, but, on the contrary, fondly attach themselves to your persons, serve you faithfully, and whom you devour in return for such services. Unnatural murderers! if you still persist in contending that you are made to devour your fellow-creatures, creatures of flesh and blood, living and sensible as yourselves, suppress at once that horror which nature inspires against such cruel repasts: kill, yourself, the animals you would eat; I say, kill them with your own hands, without knives or cleavers. Tear them to pieces with your own fingers, as the lions and bears do with their claws: set your teeth into the ox, and pull him to pieces; stick your nails into his hide: eat the tender lamb up alive; devour his flesh, yet warm, and drink up his soul with his blood. Do you shudder? Dare you not hold a piece of living flesh in your teeth? Despicable mortals! you kill the animal first, and eat him afterwards, as if you endeavoured to kill him twice. Nor is even this sufficient; even raw flesh disgusts you; your stomach cannot digest it; it must be transformed by

cookery over the fire; it must be boiled, roasted, and seasoned with salt and spices which entirely disguise it's natural taste. You must be furnished with butchers, bakers, and cooks, with people whose business it is to dispel the horror of murder, and dress up the limbs of dead carcases in such a manner, that the palate, deceived by the artificial preparation, may not reject what is so unnatural, but find a pleasure in the taste of cadaverous morsels, which the eye can hardly look on without horror.—Plutarch's Morals.

Pythagoras seems to have taken from the Hindoos the principles which have distinguished his philosophy. These principles are beautifully expressed in the following passages.

He first the taste of flesh from Tables drove,
and argued well, if arguments could move.—
'O mortals! from your fellow's blood abstain,
nor taint your bodies with a food prophane:
while corn and pulse by Nature are bestow'd,
and planted orchards bend their willing load;
while labour'd gardens wholesome herbs produce,
and teeming vines afford their gen'rous juice:
nor tardier fruits of cruder kind are lost,
but tam'd with fire, or mellow'd 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.
Wild beasts their maws with their slain brethren fill;
and yet not all, for some refuse to kill:
sheep, goats, and oxen, and the nobler steed,
on browse and corn, and flowery meadows feed:
Bears, tygers, wolves, the loin's angry brood,

whom heav'n endu'd with principles of blood,
he wisely sunder'd from the rest, to yell
in forests, and in lonely caves to dwell,
where stonger beasts oppress the weak by might,
and all in prey and purple feasts delight.
O impious use! to Nature's law's oppos'd,
where bowels are in other bowels clos'd:
where fatten'd by their fellow's fat they thrive;
maintain'd by murder, and by death they live.
'T is then for naught that mother earth provides,
the stores of all she shews and all she hides,
if men with fleshy morsels must be fed,
and chaw, with bloody teeth the breathing bread:
what else is this but to devour our guests
and barbarously renew Cyclopean feasts?
We, by destroying life our life sustain:
and gorge th' ungodly maw with meats obscene.
Not so 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.
Whoever was the wretch (and curst be he)
that envy'd first our food's simplicity;
th' essay of bloody feasts on brutes began,
and after forg'd the sword to murder man.
Had he the sharpen'd steel alone employed,
on beasts of prey that other beasts destroy'd,
or man invaded with their fangs and paws,
this had been justified by Nature's laws,
and self defence: but who did feasts begin
of flesh, he stretch'd necessity to sin.
To kill man-killers, man has lawful power,
but not th' extended licence to devour.

Ill habits gather by unseen degrees,
as brooks make rivers, rivers run to seas.
The sow, with her broad snout for rooting up
th' intrusted seed, was judg'd to spoil the crop,
and intercept the sweating farmer's hope:
the covetous churl of unforgiving kind,
th' offender to the bloody priest resign'd:
her hunger was no plea: for that she dy'd.
The goat came next in order to be try'd:
the goat had cropt the tendrills of the vine;
in vengeance laity and clergy join,
where one had lost his profit one his wine.
Here was at least, some shadow of offence;
the sheep was sacrific'd on no pretence,
but meek and unresisting innocence.
A patient, useful creature, born to bear
the warm and woolly fleece, that cloathed her murderer,
and daily to give down the milk she bred,
a tribute for the grass on which she fed.
Living, both food and raiment she supplies,
and is of least advantage when she dies.

How did the toiling ox his death deserve,
a downright simple drudge, and born to serve?
O tyrant! with what justice canst thou hope,
the promise of the year, a plenteous crop;
when thou destroy'st thy lab'ring steer, who till'd
and plough'd, with pains, thy else ungrateful field?
From his yet reeking neck to draw the yoke,
that neck, with which the surly clods he broke;
and to the hatchet yield thy husband-man,
who finish'd Autumn and the spring began!

Nor this alone! but heaven itself to bribe,
we to the gods our impious acts ascribe:
first recompense with death their creature's toil,
then call the bless'd above to share the spoil:

the fairest victim must the powers appease,
(so fatal 't is sometimes too much to please!)
a purple fillet his broad brows adorns,
with flow'ry garlands crown'd, and gilded horns:
he hears the murd'rous prayer the priest prefers,
but undersands not till his doom he hears:
beholds the meal betwixt his temples cast,
(the fruit and product of his labours past,)
and in the water views, perhaps, the knife,
uplifted, to deprive him of his life;
then broken up alive his entrails sees,
torn out for priests t' inspect the gods' decrees.
From whence, O mortal man! this gust of blood,
have you deriv'd, and interdicted food?
Be taught by me this dire delight to shun,
warn'd by my precepts, by my practice won.
And when you eat the well-deserving beast,
think! on the lab'rer of your field, you feast!

Ill customs by degrees to habits rise,
ill habits soon become exalted vice:
what more advance can mortals make in sin,
so near perfection, who with blood begin?
Deaf to the calf that lies beneath the knife,
looks up and from her butcher begs her life:
deaf to the harmless kid, that e'er he dies,
all methods to procure thy mercy tries,
and imitates in vain thy children's cries.
Where will he stop, who feeds with household bread,
then eats the poultry which before he fed? [breath,
Let plough thy steers; that, when they lose their
to nature not to thee, they may impute their death.
Let goats for food their loaded udders lend,
and sheep from winter-cold thy sides defend;
but neither springes, nets, nor snares employ,

and be no more ingenious to destroy.
Free as in air, let birds on earth remain,
nor let insidious glue their wings constrain:
nor opening hounds the trembling stag affright,
nor purple feathers intercept his flight:
nor hooks conceal'd in baits for fish prepare,
nor lines to heave 'em twinkling up in air.
Take not away the life you cannot give;
for all things have an equal right to live.
Kill noxious creatures, where 't is sin to save;
this only just prerogative we have:
but nourish life with vegetable food,
and shun the sacrilegious taste of blood.

Dryden's Ovid's Metamorphosis, book 15.

How sweetly do others, of our most eminent poets, sing in the cause of humanity!

I would not enter on my list of friends,
(tho' grac'd with polish'd manners and fine sense,
yet wanting sensibility) the man,
who needlessly sets foot upon a worm.
An inadvertant step may crush the snail,
that crawls at evening in the public path,
but he that has humanity, forewarn'd,
will tread aside, and let the reptile live.
The creeping vermin, loathsome to the sight,
and charged perhaps with venom, that intrudes
a visitor unwelcome into scenes
sacred to neatness and repose, th' alcove,
the chamber, or refectory, may die.
A necessary act incurs no blame.
Not so when held within their proper bounds,
and guiltless of offence, they range the air,
or take their pastime in the spacious field.
There they are privileged. And he that hunts

or harms them there, is guilty of a wrong,
disturbs th' œconomy of nature's realm,
who, when she form'd, design'd them an abode.
Ye, therefore, who love mercy, teach your sons
to love it too. The spring time of our years
is soon dishonour'd and defil'd in most,
by budding ills, that ask a prudent hand
to check them. But alas! none sooner shoots,
if unrestrain'd, into luxuriant growth,
than cruelty, most devilish of them all.
Mercy to him who shews it, is the rule,
and righteous limitation of it's act,
by which Heaven moves in pardoning guilty man;
and he who shews none, being ripe in years,
and conscious of the outrage he commits,
shall seek it, and not find it in his turn.
Distinguish'd much by reason, and still more
by our capacity of grace divine,
from creatures that exist but for our sake,
which, having served us, perish, we are held
accountable, and God, some future day,
will reckon with us roundly for th' abuse,
of what he deems no mean or trivial trust.
Superior as we are, they yet depend,
not more on human help, than we on their's.
Their strength, or speed, or vigilance were given,
in aid of our defects. In some are found,
such teachable and apprehensive parts,
that man's attainments in his own concerns,
match'd with th' expertness of the brutes in their's,
are oft-times vanquish'd and thrown far behind.
Some shew that nice sagacity of smell,
and read with such discernment in the port,
and figure of the man his secret aim,
that oft we owe our safety to a skill

we could not teach and must despair to learn.
But learn we might, if not too proud to stoop
to quadrupede instructions, many a good
and useful quality, and virtue too,
rarely exemplified among ourselves.
Attachment never to be wean'd or chang'd,
by any change of fortune, proof alike
against unkindness, absence, and neglect;
fidelity, that neither bribe nor threat
can move or warp; and gratitude for small
and trivial favours, lasting as the life,
and glist'ning even in the dying eye.

Cowper's "Task."

Ah! ne'er let man,
glory in wants which doom to pain and death
his blameless fellow-creatures. Let disease,
let wasted hunger, by destroying, live;
and the permission use with trembling thanks,
meekly reluctant: 't is the brute beyond:
and gluttons ever murder when they kill.
Ev'n to the reptile, every cruel deed
is high impiety. Howe'er not all,
not of the sanguinary tribe are all;
all are not savage. Come, ye gentle swains,
like Brama's healthy sons on Indus banks,
whom the pure stream and garden fruits sustain,
ye are the sons of nature; your mild hands
are innocent.

John Dyer.

The wholesome herb neglected dies,
tho' with the pure exhilarating soul
of nutriment and health, and vital powers,
beyond the search of art 't is copious blest:
for with hot ravine fir'd, ensanguin'd man
is now become the lion of the plain,

and worse. The wolf, who from the nightly fold
fierce drags the bleating prey, ne'er drunk her milk,
nor wore the warming fleece; nor has the steer,
at whose strong chest the deadly tyger hangs,
e'er plow'd for him. They, too, are temper'd high,
with hunger stung and wild necessity,
nor lodges pity in their shaggy breast:
but Man, whom nature form'd of milder clay,
with every kind emotion in his heart,
and taught alone to weep, while from her lap
she pours ten thousand delicacies, herbs
and fruits as numerous as the drops of rain,
or beams that gave him birth; shall he, fair form!
who wears sweet smiles, and looks erect on heaven,
e'er stoop to mingle with the prowling herd,
and dip his tongue in gore? The beast of prey,
blood-stained, deserves to bleed; but you, ye flocks!
what have you done? ye peaceful people! what
to merit death? you who have given us milk
in luscious streams, and lent us your own coat
against the winter's cold? And the plain ox,
that harmless, honest, guileless animal!
in what has he offended? he whose toil,
patient, and ever ready, clothes the land
with all the pomp of harvest, shall he bleed,
and, struggling, groan beneath the cruel hands
ev'n of the clown he feeds? and that, perhaps,
to swell the riot of the autumnal feast,
won by his labour! Thus the feeling heart
would tenderly suggest; but, 't is enough,
in this late age, adventurous, to have touch'd
light on the numbers of the Samian sage.

Thomson's "Spring."

I cannot meet the lambkin's asking eye,
pat her soft cheek, and fill her mouth with food,

then say, "Ere evening cometh, thou shalt die,
and drench the knives of butchers with thy blood."

I cannot fling, with lib'ral hand, the grain,
and tell the feathered race, so blest around,
"For me, ere night, ye feel of death the pain;
with broken necks ye flutter on the ground.

'How vile! Go, creatures of th' Almighty's hand;
enjoy the fruits which bounteous nature yields;
graze, at your ease, along the sunny land;
skim the free air and search the fruitful fields:

go, and be happy in your mutual loves;
no violence shall shake your shelter'd home;
't is life and liberty shall glad my groves;
the cry of murder shall not damn my dome.'

Thus should I say, were mine a house and land,
and, lo! to me, a parent, should ye fly,
and run, and lick, and peck, with love, my hand,
and crowd around me with a fearless eye.

And you, O wild inhabitants of air,
to bless and to be blest, at PETER's call,
invited by his kindness, should repair;
chirp on his roof, and hop amid his hall.

No school-boy's hand should dare your nests invade,
and bear to close captivity your young:
pleas'd would I see them flutter from the shade,
and to my window call the sons of song.

And you, O natives of the flood, should play
unhurt amid your crystal realms, and sleep:
no hook should tear you from your loves away;
no net, surrounding, form it's fatal sweep.

Pleas'd should I gaze upon your gliding throng,
to sport, invited by the summer beam:
now moving in most solemn march along,
now darting, leaping from the dimpled stream.

How far more grateful to the soul, the joy,
thus, daily, like a set of friends, to treat ye,
than, like the bloated epicure, to cry,
"Zounds! what rare dinners! God! how I could
eat ye!" Peter Pindar's "More Money," &c.

The following lines form a most pleasing trait in the character which the late amiable Dr. Beattie, has drawn of his young Minstrel.

His heart from cruel sport estrang'd, would bleed
to work the woe of any living thing,
by trap or net; by arrow or by sling;
these he detested, those he scorn'd to wield;
he wish'd to be the guardian, not the king,
tyrant far less, or traitor of the field.
And sure the sylvan reign unbloody joy might yield.
The Minstrel, b. i. v. 18.

Does law, so jealous in the cause of man,
denounce no doom on the delinquent? None.
But many a crime, deem'd innocent on earth,
is register'd in heaven; and these, no doubt,
have each their record, with a curse annex'd.
Man may dismiss compassion from his heart,
but God will never. Cowper's Task, b. 6.

In spite of that general insensibility with which the practice of oppression, and the habits of speculative cruelty, have benumbed the human kind, there are yet some who are affected by the sufferings of other animals; and from their distress are drawn the finest images of sorrow. Would the poet paint the deep despair of the mind, from whose side the ruthless hand of death hath snatched suddenly the lord of her affections, the love of her virgin heart; what simile more apt to excite the sympathetic tear than

the turtle-dove forlorn, who mourns, with never-ceasing wail, her murdered mate? Who can refuse a sigh to the sadly-pleasing strains of Philomela,

"—when returning with her loaded bill,
th' astonished mother finds a vacant nest,
by the hard hand of unrelenting clowns,
robb'd? To the ground the vain provision falls;
her pinions ruffle, and low-drooping, scarce
can bear the mourner to the poplar shade;
where, all abandoned to despair, she sings
her sorrows through the night, and on the boughs
sole sitting; still, at every dying fall,
takes up again her lamentable strain
of winding woe, till, wide around, the woods
sigh to her song, and with her wail resound."

Does the fickle and inconstant maid repress the secret emotions of tenderness, and abandon the humble love-devoted youth to despair; does he quit his native abode of innocence and retire to a lonely hermitage? attend, for a moment, to the beauty and humanity of his reflections; and, for a moment, reader, consult *thy* feelings, whether they be still of the reasoning species of man, or they have degenerated to those of an hyena.

No flocks that range the valley free
to slaughter I condemn;
taught by that power that pities me
I learn to pity them;
but from the mountain's grassy side
a guiltless feast I bring;
a scrip with herbs and fruits supply'd,
and water from the spring.

Goldsmith.

I can scarcely take up a book in which simplicity, innocence, and virtue is pourtrayed, where I do not

meet with appeals to the understanding of the reader in favour of the animals over which man is the tyrant. Campbell, in describing the life which his Gertrude of Wyoming and her lover passed, says,

What tho' the sportive dog oft round them note,
or fawn, or wild bird, bursting on the wing;
yet who, in love's own presence, would devote
to death those gentle throats that wake the spring,
or writhing from the brook it's victim bring?
No! nor let fear one little warbler rouse;
but fed by Gertrude's hand, still let them sing.

If it be allowed that brute animals are more than mere machines, have an intelligent principle residing within them, which is the spring of their several actions and operations, men ought to use such methods in the management of them, as are suitable to a nature that may be taught, instructed and improved to his advantage; and not have recourse to force, compulsion, and violence. Brutes have sensibility; they are capable of pain; feel every bang, and cut, or stab, as much as man himself, some of them perhaps more, and therefore they should not be treated as stocks or stones. It is lamentable to think, that any occasion should be given for remarks of this sort, at a time when the world is possessed of so many superior advantages; when mankind exceed the pitch of former ages in the attainments of science. But the fact is notorious, maugre all the privileges we enjoy under the improvements of natural reason and the dispensations of religious light, cruelty is exercised in all it's hideous forms and varieties. Animals are every day perishing under the hands of barbarity, without notice, without mercy; famished, as if hunger was no evil; mauled, as if they had no sense

of pain; and hurried about incessantly from day to day, as if excessive toil was no plague, or extreme weariness was no degree of suffering. Surely the sensibility of brutes intitles them to a milder treatment, than they usually meet with from hard and unthinking wretches. Man ought to look on them as creatures under his protection, and not as put into his power to be tormented. Few of them know how to defend themselves against him, as well as he knows how to attack them. For a man therefore to torture a brute, shews a meanness of spirit. If he does it out of wantonness, he is a fool, and a coward; if for pleasure, he is a monster. Such a mortal is a scandal to his species, and ought to have no place in human society.—Dean on the Life of Brutes.

Man ought to be guided by reason, but no guide can be more fallacious than the perverted reason of beings, who form the mass of human society. Unmeaning prejudice, passion, whim, fashion, imitation, or an animal propensity to what is savory, are incentives to action. Above all, custom has effected a despotism, over which, will has no controul. How little reason has been consulted in the establishment of the ordinary customs of life, we may judge, from considering that the habits of modern society are essentially the same as have been transmitted from the rude beginnings of civilized society. The manner of living of an european philosopher, absorbed in study and meditation, and of an indian savage, destitute of reflection and of foresight, are essentially the same. In what does the banquet of an english prince differ from the feast of a chieftain of Otaheite, unless in the costliness of the utensils, or the refinements of the cookery? Fish, flesh, and poultry, in each form the favourite materials of the repast, which is finished

by the swallowing of potions of an intoxicating liquor. What share reason has had in the institution of these customs, must be left to their advocates to explain.—Addit. Reports, p. 229.

Miss Margaret Cullen, daughter of the late Wm. Cullen, M. D. of Edinburgh, has produced a novel, in 4 vols. entitled "Mornton," calculated to impress a variety of motives to benevolence and humanity. The precept which would be tedious in a serious discourse, she has prudently thrown into a tale, in hopes, probably, that the claims of reason and justice may arrest the attention of the reader, through a medium where they were least expected.

"Mankind," says Soame Jenyns, "spare neither labour nor expense, to preserve and propagate innocent animals, for no other end but to multiply the objects of their persecution. What name should we bestow on a superior being, whose whole endeavours were employed, and whose whole pleasure consisted, in terrifying, ensnaring, tormenting, and destroying mankind? whose superior faculties were exerted in fomenting animosities among them, in contriving engines of destruction, and inciting them to use them in maiming and murdering each other? whose power over them was employed in assisting the rapacious, deceiving the simple, and oppressing the innocent? who, without provocation or advantage, should continue from day to day, void of all pity and remorse, thus to torment mankind for diversion, and at the same time endeavour, with his utmost care, to preserve their lives, and to propagate their species, in order to increase the number of victims devoted to his malevolence, and be delighted in proportion to the miseries he occasioned? I say what name detestible enough could we find for such a being? yet, with regard to inferior animals, just such a being is man."

I could refer to facts, and give the names of wretches who have beaten their children, becausethey had a natural aversion to the taste of animal food.

Can any one be found who has not relinquished the faculty of reason? Let him look at a young child who is told that the chicken which it has often called to and fed, is to be killed. Are not the tears it sheds, and the agonies which it endures, the voice of nature, crying within, and pleading the cause of humanity? In despight of your wretched customs and depravities, the voice of nature still cries aloud, BUT YOU WILL NOT HEAR.

When Montesquieu was asked which had the greatest right to salvation, a merciful Infidel, or a cruel Christian, he made this reply: "I knew a Turk, a slave on board one of the King's gallies, who had so much sensibility, that he never gave the least pain to his fellows by a vile insinuation; and when, at any time, he possessed a few livres, he would distribute them for the release of poor birds, or any pitiable creature in confinement. On the other hand, his keeper was as cruel as the Turk was merciful. The Turk lived and died as a Christian ought to do; the Christian like the vilest Turk. Which now think you, had the greatest right to salvation?" "The Turk," replied the Priest.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF A VEGETABLE DIET CHIEFLY BY MEDICAL WRITERS.

The principles of natural bodies, according to the chymists, are water, earth, oil, salt, spirit. Arbuthnot, describing the extreme tenuity or smallness of the lymphatic and capillary arteries, observes, "Hence one easily perceives the inconveniency of viscidity which obstructs, and acrimony which destroys the capillary vessels."—Arbuthnot, on Alim, p. 32, edit. 1756. "All animals are made immediately or mediately of vegetables; that is, by feeding on vegetables, or on animals which are fed on vegetables, there being no process in infinitum." "Vegetables are proper enough to repair animals, as being nearly of the same specific gravity with the animal juices, and as consisting of the same parts with animal substances, spirit, water, salt, oil, earth; all which are contained in the sap they derive from the earth, which consists of rain-water, air, putrified juices of plants and animals, and even minerals, for the ashes of plants yield something which the loadstone attracts." Ibid, p. 42. Hence Arbuthnot proceeds to analyze the various parts of the vegetable world, beginning with farinaceous seeds of culmiferous plants, as he terms the various sorts of grain, on which he bestows very deserved encomiums; thence he passes to fruits of trees, shrubs, and thence to the alimentary leaves, of which he says, "Of alimentary leaves, the olera, or pot-herbs, afford an excellent nourishment, among those are the cole or cabbage kind, emolient, laxative, and resolvent, alkalescent, and therefore proper in cases of acidity. Red cabbage is reckoned a medicine in consumption and spittings of blood. Among

the pot-herbs are some lactescent plants, as lettuce, endive, and dandelion, which contain a most wholesome juice, resolvent of the bile, anodyne, and cooling; extremely useful in all diseases of the liver. Artichokes contain a rich nutricious stimulating juice. Of alimentary roots, some are pulpy and very nutricious, as turnips, carrots; these have a fattening quality, which they manifest in feeding cattle."—Idem, p. 52, 53.

"Animal substances differ from vegetables in two things. First, in that being reduced to ashes, they are perfectly insipid; all animal salts being volatile, fly off with great heat. Secondly, in that there is no sincere acid in any animal juice. From the two forementioned differences of vegetable and animal substances, it follows, first, that all animal diet is alkalescent or anti-acid; secondly, that animal substances, containing no fixed salt, want the assistance of those for digestion which preserve them both within and without the body from putrefaction.—Ib. p. 64, 65. Water is the chief ingredient in all the animal fluids and solids; for a dry bone, distilled, affords a great quantity of insipid water; therefore water seems to be proper drink for every sort of animal.—Id. p. 66. The first sort of alimentary substances are such as are of so mild a nature, that they act with small force upon the solids; and as the action and reaction are equal, the smallest degree of force in the solids digest and assimulate them; of such sort is *milk*, &c.—Id. p. 97. Acid austere vegetables, before mentioned, have the quality of condensing the fluids as well as strengthening the solids.—Id. p. 103. Animal substances are all alkalescent; of vegetable substances some are acid, others are alkalescent.—Id. p. 105. An animal with a strong vital force of di-

gestion will turn acids into animal substances, but if it's food be entirely alkalescent, it's juices will be more so.—Id. p. 151. There are vegetables, acid, alkaline, cooling, hot, relaxing, astringent, acrid, mild, &c. useful or hurtful, according to the different constitutions to which they are applied. There may a stronger broth be made of vegetables than of any gravy soup.—Id. p. 180. I know more than one instance of irrascible passions being much subdued by a vegetable diet. Id. p. 186. Plethoric constitutions are subject to fall into this alkaline state of the fluids, which is more dangerous than that which proceeds from acidity—Id. p. 250. No person is able to support a diet of flesh and water without acids, as salt, vinegar, and bread, without falling into a putrid fever."—Id. p. 151.

A constant adherence to one diet may have bad effects on any constitution. Nature has provided a great variety of nourishment for human creatures, and furnished us with appetites of desire and organs to digest them.—Id. p. 178. Animal food overpowers the faculties of the stomach, clogs the functions of the soul, and renders the mind material and gross. In the difficult, the unnatural task of converting into living juice the cadaverous oppression, much time is consumed, much danger is incurred.

Domesticated animals, like men, are subject to diseases. Animal food must therefore always be dangerous. The proper food appointed by nature for animals is easier digested than the animals themselves, those animals that live on vegetables than those that live on animals. There is nothing more certain than that the greater superiority the concoctive powers have over the food, or the stronger the concoctive powers are in regard of the things to be concocted, the finer

the chyle will be; the circulation the more free, and the spirits the more lightsome, that is, the better will the health be."—Cheyne's Essay on Health, p. 27, edit. 1725.

"All crammed poultry and fed cattle, and even vegetables forced by hot-beds, tend more to putrefaction, and consequently, are more unfit for human food than those that are brought up in their natural manner."—Idem, p 73.

"Animal food, and made artificial liquors, in the original frame of our nature, and design of our creation, appear not intended for human creatures. They seem neither to have those strong and fit organs for digesting them, (at least such as birds and beasts of prey have, who live on flesh) nor naturally to have those voracious and brutish appetites which require animal food and strong liquors to satisfy them; nor those cruel and hard hearts, or those diabolical passions which could easily suffer them to tear and destroy their fellow-creatures, at least not in the first and early ages before every man had corrupted his way; and God was forced to exterminate the whole race by an universal deluge.—Idem, p. 91 & 92.

There are some sorts of food which may oppress and load the stomach, and alimentary ducts in the first concoction, which may be very safe and benign in the subsequent ones. For instance, cheese, eggs, milk-meats, and vegetable food, tho' duly prepared, and justly proportioned in quantity, may chance to lie heavy on the stomach, or beget wind in the alimentary passages of some persons. [Drinking of water will generally remedy this inconveniency. No solid food should ever be taken into the stomach without a sufficient quantity of watery menstruum.] But

these neither having their parts strongly united, nor abounding in sharp urinous salts, when they become sufficiently diluted or dissolved into their component parts, and their parts being still smaller than the smallest vessels, and their union constantly less than the force of the concoctive powers, in persons who have any remaining fund of life in them, will thereby yield a sweet, thin, and easily circulating chyle, in the after concoctions become benign and salutary, and afford no materials for chronical distempers; and the wind thence generated, not being pointed and armed with such sharp salts as those of flesh-meats, or the corrosive juices of spirituous liquors, will be as innocent and safe as the element we breathe in.—Idem, p. 120.

The late ingenious Dr. Elliot, in his "Elements of Natural Philosophy as connected with Medicine," has given us, a most incontestible proof, that animals are not the proper food of man. In speaking of fermentation, he expresses himself as follows; "Vegetable and animal substances only are subject to this process. There are several stages of it, all of which vegetable, *but not animal* substances may undergo. By fermentation the particles of the compound suffer a new arrangement, so that the properties of the substance become different from what they were before. If a vegetable juice of grapes, for example, be fermented, it will yield, on distillation, inflammable spirit, which the *must* did not yield before fermentation. This is called the vinous fermentation. If the same liquor be farther fermented it will yield vinegar, which could not be obtained from the liquor before, either in it's original or vinous state. This is, therefore, called the acetous fermentation. The third state of fermentation is putrefaction, by which the sub-

stance is converted into a mucilage, and afterwards into calcareous earth; marine and other acids and volatile alkali, which escaping with a portion of oily matter, occasions the disagreeable smell arising from putrefying substances. Animal substances can only pass through the latter stage (putrefaction), and therefore have probably already undergone the former, that is the vinous and acetous fermentations. Hence we may fairly conclude, that the vinous and acetous fermentations are the means by which the vegetable is perfected into animal. Putrefaction, the abhorrence of animal nature, the only fermentation of which a corpse is capable, seems to be the means that nature employs to reduce a dead body, or rather a body disorganized, to a state susceptible of vegetation. Hence the circle seems to be vegetation, animalization, putrefaction, and again vegetation. Hence the stomach has a double task to perform on a corpse or putrefying substance, viz. to raise it to vegetation, and then to animalization. On vegetable substances the stomach has nothing to do, but to perfect the order of nature by bringing the vegetable to the next stage or animalization."

Those children whose nurses live on animal food, are more subject to worms and the cholic than those whose nurses feed on vegetables. This is by no means surprising, since animal substance, in putrefaction, swarms with vermin, which vegetable substance does not. The indifference which children have for flesh-meat, and the preference they give to vegetable aliments, such as milk-meats, pastry, fruit, &c. evinces that the taste of that kind of food is not natural to the human palate. Why should this primitive taste in children ever be vitiated! Were even their health not concerned, it would be expedient on

account of their dispositions and characters; for it is sufficiently clear from experience, that those people who are great eaters of flesh, are in general more ferocious and cruel than other men. This observation holds good of all times and places.

Milk, tho' elaborated in the body of an animal, is nevertheless a vegetable substance. It's analysis demonstrates this; it turns easily to acid, and far from shewing the least appearance of volatile alkali, as animal substances do, it gives, like plants, the essence of neutral salt. Women prefer bread and milk, and vegetables. The female of the cat and canine species do the same; even wolves browze upon the field. Here we have vegetable juices for their milk. If we consider the quantity, every body knows that farinaceous substances make more blood than animal; they must therefore make more milk. Can it be that a vegetable diet is most proper for the infant, and an animal regimen most proper for the nurse? Much inconvenience has been apprehended from milk turning to curds; this is an idle apprehension, because it is well known that milk always curdles in the stomach. Hence it is that it becomes an aliment solid enough to nourish infants and other animals; whereas, if it remained fluid, it would pass off, and afford them no nourishment at all. [Although the juices contributing to our nourishment are all liquid, it is yet necessary they should be expressed from solid aliments. A working man, who should live only on broths, would soon be emaciated. He would be supported much better on milk, because it curdles, and assumes solidity in the stomach.] We may cook up milk in what form soever we please, mix it with a thousand absorbents, it will be all to no purpose; whoever takes milk into the stomach, will infallibly

digest cheese. The stomach, indeed, is particularly calculated to curdle milk; it is in the stomach of a calf that we find the rennet.—Rousseau.

"The constant use of bread and animal substances excite an unnatural thirst, and lead to the immoderate use of beer and other stimulating liquors, which generate disease and reduce the lower orders of the people to a state of indigence.—Buchan on Diet, p. 7.

Experience has shewn that a diet consisting solely of animal food, excites thirst and nausea, occasions putrescence in the stomach and bowels, and finally brings on violent griping pains with cholera and dysentery. Animal food is less adapted to the sedentary than the laborious, and least of all to the studious, whose diet ought to consist chiefly of vegetables. Indulgence in animal food renders men dull, and unfit for the pursuits of science, especially when it is accompanied with the free use of strong liquors. Idem, p. 10.

I am inclined to think that consumptions, so common in England, are in part owing to the great use of animal food. Tho' the *phthisis pulmonalis* is not, properly speaking, an inflammatory diease, yet it generally begins with symptoms of inflammation, and is often accompanied with them through it's whole progress. But the disease most common to this country is the scurvy. One finds a dash of it in almost every family, and in some the taint is very deep. A disease so general must have a general cause, and there is none so obvious as the great quantity of animal food devoured by the natives. As a proof that the scurvy arises from this cause, we are in possession of no remedy for that disease equal to the free use of fresh vegetables. By the uninterrupted use of ani-

mal food a putrid diathemis is induced in the system, which predisposes to a variety of disorders. I am fully convinced that many of those obstinate complaints for which we are at a loss to account, and find it still more difficult to cure, are the effects of a scorbutic taint lurking in the habit. Improper diet affects the mind as well as the body. The choleric disposition of the English is almost proverbial. Were I to assign a cause, it would be their living so much on animal food. There is no doubt but this induces a ferocity of temper unknown to men whose food is chiefly taken from the vegetable kingdom. There is a continual tendency, in animal, as well as in the human body itself, to putrefaction, which can only be counteracted by the free use of vegetables. The excessive consumption of animal food is one great cause of the scarcity of grain. The food that a bullock affords, bears but a small proportion to the quantity of vegetable matter he consumes."—Idem, page 11 & 12.

"The salutary effect of a vegetable diet, as to it's influence on the bile, (which has been proved by analyzation to be the same compound in all animals having stomachs and intestines) seems to be applicable to the case of men: and perhaps the greater number of persons who suffer from habitual constipation, would experience more relief from a due attention to such a cooling system of diet, judiciously proportioned to other kinds of food, than from any medicine, that has ever imposed on the credulity of the public. Do not degrade and beastalize your body by making it a burial place for the carcases of innocent brute animals, some healthy, some diseased, and all violently murdered. It is impossible for us to take into our stomachs putrefying, corrupting, and diseased animal

substances, without becoming subjected to horrors, dejections, remorse, and inquietudes of mind, and to foul bodily diseases, swellings, pains, weaknesses, sores, corruptions, and premature death; all of which are the necessary and inseparable consequences of unnatural, gross, and inordinate indulgencies, in eating, drinking, and communications.—James Graham, M. D.

It will be found that the vegetable diet is the only congenial food of man, for tho' many nations subsist upon the animal diet, and support a vigorous life, of health and animal powers; the human system is, however, deprived of intellectual capacity, and worn into premature dissolution by the violent heat of a precipitate circulation ossifying the finer ducts. To those nations, 80 years is a period of extreme longevity. Vegetable diet, on the contrary, by keeping the circulation regular and cool, tempers the passions, throws it's congenial and subtle fluid into the nervous ducts, and forms the intimate connection of the mind and body, which leads man to a perfect mode of being, or intellectual existence, consisting of physical and moral health, producing longevity and well-being.

Gibbon, while complaining of the cruelties of the Tartarians, adverts to European refinements, where the ox, or the sheep, are slaughtered by the same hand from which they are accustomed to receive their daily food; and the bleeding limbs are served, with very little preparation, on the table of their unfeeling murderer!—Decline and Fall, iv, 344.

The indifference and in some instances aversion to animal food, even when it has undergone the culinary process, which children have, and the preference which they give to vegetable aliments, such as milk-meats,

pastry, fruit, &c. is a proof that flesh meat is unnatural.

I know not how it is possible to denominate any of the teeth of man canine. Where are his projecting fangs or tushes?

From the tenderness of man's skin, and the great care that is required for many years, to rear him; from the form of his jaws, the evenness of his teeth, the breadth of his nails, and the slightness of both, it is evident that nature has not designed him for rapine.

That man is wholly adapted to vegetable sustenance, is evident from his anatomy, which, especially the form and disposition of the intestines, is very similar to the Orang Outang, which lives on fruits and vegetables in so vigorous a state, that half a dozen men are required to hold him when taken.

The kangaroo has canine teeth, and yet it's only food is vegetables.

It is stated, in books of anatomy, that a change takes place in the contents of the cœcum after they have proceeded into the colon. May not this change be effected by partial absorption? If so, it may be productive of most important consequences to the health, whether the matter absorbed be animal matter or whether it be, as providence has intended, vegetable. It is a fact that the absorption which takes place in the lower intestines is such that a man may be supported several weeks, by means of clysters alone. Is it then too much to assert, that a subtle poison thus continually passing into the frame may profusely account for the ulceration, the abscesses, the thickening of the coats, the cancer, the mortification to which these viscera are liable. The cœcum of children is proportionably larger than that of men.

It seems gradually to shrink from improper diet. And here let me ask, why has every member of the college of physicians contented himself with talking about this new theory? Why has not one of them attempted to answer these doctrines of their colleague? Dr. Lambe's opponents are called on to shew, either that classification in the natural sciences means nothing, or that the human teeth and intestines do not resemble those of the Orang Outang, so as to mark us the first link in the same chain of animals. This is a grievous truth, from which, tho' God himself be the author of it, man turns aside with shame or with scorn. What an habitual reluctance there is in the rogue to acknowledge his poor relations!—Newton's Defence, 18.

When diseased matter has accumulated in the body to a certain degree whether by our own indiscretions, or those of our ancestors, or from both causes, our teeth decay, rheumatic and other pains and aliments ensue, and complaints are superadded until we are relieved by death, which may be considered premature at eighty. The perishing of the teeth is owing to the gums becoming charged with diseased matter, in consent with the general state of the body. The same tooth which decays rapidly in the mouth, requires ages to destroy it when exposed on the earth to all the inclemencies of the weather. From these premises there follows a conclusion of great importance to our sickly species; i. e. that where a certain degree of vigour yet remains in the constitution of the invalid, a total abandonment of the artificial exciting diet, or in other words, a strict perseverance in the use of such food as nature has clearly indicated to be proper for us by our anatomy, will enable the vital principle to make such efforts as shall finally

succeed in expelling from the body, by indispositions gradually less violent, the morbific matter or principle, which is working it's destruction. But if disease shall have already made great and serious ravages within, if the invalid should have permitted too many hours to elapse unheeded, there is little hope from any quarter. Strong medicines may be resorted to, and momentary effects produced, but nothing can save him. He is doomed to be numbered in the tombs of his fathers.—Newton, p. 139.

Dr. Lambe, in his Treatise on Cancers, has sufficiently proved the duty and necessity of distilling water. If this were not sufficient, numerous instances could be produced from the works of John Hunter, Dr. Percival, and others.

The springs of Malvern have proved an efficacious remedy for many obstinate and deplorable diseases, which have resisted the powers of the most useful and appropriate medicines. They have proved very useful in scrofulous cases, in inveterate ulcers, and sores, which have been called fistulous; in obstructed and scirrous glands, and some which approached to the state of cancer; in disorders of the eyes and eye-lids; in nephritic complaints and disorders of the urinary passages; in cutaneous diseases; in coughs from a scorbutic and scrofulous cause; in loss of appetite, and in immoderate evacuations of females. Such is the testimony of Dr. Wall, a physician of great celebrity and unquestionable veracity. See his Treatises on the Malvern Waters published in 1756, 1757, and 1763; or his Tracts republished by Dr. Martin Wall. His evidence has been confirmed by the successive experience of some of the first of the profession; and I know, that at this day, these springs are recommended as a dernier resort, in the most de-

plorable cases, by Sir Francis Millman, an eminent physician in London.

The most careful analysis has not been able to detect in the Malvern Water, any active ingredient whatever to which medicinal powers can be ascribed. It is no more than the uncontaminated element, nearly approaching to the purity of distilled water. As it is, therefore, absolutely destitute of all proper and peculiar medicinal powers, the benefit derived from it's use can be attributed to no other cause, than to the cessation of the constant and habitual application of noxious matter, contained in the water of common springs. When the morbific force is removed, the innate powers of the system are developed and become active, and thus is the body gradually restored to the actions and sensations of health. It is of consequence to observe, that the diseases, in which the pure waters of Malvern have proved beneficial, have no characteristic resemblance, and have not been in the least suspected to be the progeny of a common parent.

The medicinal powers of springs, remarkable only for their purity, have been observed also upon the continent. At Schleussingen, a town in Henningen, a principality of Franconia, are such waters, famed for their utility in chronic diseases, particularly in calculous complaints, in arthritic, rheumatic, and scorbutic affections, and in cases of muscular debility. Near Osterode, a mining town in the Hereynian forest, is a fountain of great celebrity, in which not a particle of mineral ingredients can be detected. Within two miles of Halle, at Lebeg, a spring rises out of the rocks, the water of which is pure and imputrescible. A beer is made of this water, which is used in medicine, of great efficacy in nephritic cases

and in inflammatory habits. Some springs, formed by the melting of the snow on the Rhætian Alps, have been found to possess similar virtues. At Pisa, Tettucci, and Nocera, in Italy, there are also medicinal springs, of great celebrity, which, like our Malvern wells, are destitute of all active ingredients. —Hoffmani Op. t. v, p.206. fol. Geneva, 1740.

We should not be surprised that physicians are governed by their prejudices and habits in favour of animal food; since Doctor Akenside has said, that "in despair of making medicine a science they have agreed to convert it into a trade." From a member of the faculty, this assersion is very extraordinary, because physicians have as much the power of acting uprightly as any other body of men; nor can there remain a doubt of the general utility of medicine, and of it's absolute necessity in the present state of society. Yet the writings of all medical practitioners should be read with caution, for each of them makes his practice bend to his own particular habits; what he deems good for himself he deems good for his patients, or he is warped by an unconquerable inclination to make every thing bend to a favourite hypothesis.

So decidedly do medical writers favour a vegetable diet that we can scarcely open the works of any celebrated physician, without being impressed in favour of Dr. Lambe's theory of diseases. Hippocrates, Galen, Sydenham, Haller, Arbuthnot, Cheyne, all furnish their portion of evidence in it's support.

"It has often been asserted, says Mr. Newton, that a vegetable diet is not so strengthening as a diet of flesh. It is granted that it imparts a temporary increase of strength; so does the rage of a madman. The man whom sir Edward Berry prevailed upon to

live on partridges alone, and who was obliged after the first week to desist on account of the appearance of symptoms of putrefaction, might probably during that week, have been conscious of an accession of strength."

There is no animal so much disposed to disease as man, because no animal lives so contrary to nature.

The Orang Outang is the connecting link in the chain of animal life. This man of the woods, has a similar conformation to the man of towns and cities. Their teeth and intestines are alike. This animal lives on fruits and vegetables; yet he possesses so much vigour, that six civilized men are necessary to hold him when taken.

I have the authority of Mr. Newton in asserting that the superior salubrity of distilled water, as contended for by Dr Lambe, in his "Reports on the Effects of a peculiar Regimen," is far from being a mere phantom, but rests on the firm basis of philosophical conclusions. "I know," says he, "twenty-five persons who are at this time living on a vegetable diet; and of these I have to state, that their health is so good, as to have no occasion for the use of medicine, and without an exception, their indispositions, where they happen, are so trifling as scarcely to deserve the name; altho' they have not yet relinquished flesh, fish, and common water long enough to derive all the advantages which may thence be expected. These persons are of various ages and constitutions; some of them previously in good health, some otherwise; yet with all of them the result has been uniformly favourable.—Newton's Return, 71.

It is well known, that the greater part of diseases are the offspring of civilization, and, in some unknown manner, connected with the arts, which are essential

to this condition. Savage man is almost entirely exempt from their dominion, and he seems to possess a frame, in many points, physically different from that of man in the degree of cultivation, to which he has arrived. In proportion as he emerges from his primæval state, do these furies advance upon him, and would seem to scourge him back into the paths of nature and simplicity.—Dr. Lambe on Constitutional Diseases.

Death, is an evil to which the order of providence has subjected every inhabitant of the earth; but to men it has been rendered unspeakably more an evil than it was designed to be. The greatest part of that black catalogue of diseases, which ravage human life, is the offspring of the tenderness, the luxury, and the corruptions introduced by the vices and false refinements of civil society. That delicacy, which is injured by every breath of air; and that rottenness of constitution, which is the effect of indolence, intemperance and debauchery, was never intended by the author of nature; and it is impossible that they should not lay the foundation of numberless sufferings, and terminate in premature and miserable deaths.—Price on reversionary Payments, vol. ii, p. 115.

It seems certain that animal food predisposes to disease, and even in those kinds, the immediate origin of which may be traced to other causes.

It has been observed that the labouring negroes of the West Indian Islands are almost wholly exempt from the scourge of the yellow fever, which has cut off numbers of other classes of the residents. For the same reason of living much more on vegetables, and being more sparing of fermented liquors, the French are known to have suffered much less from

the ravages of the yellow fever, than the English, who use the same diet, to which they had been accustomed in northern regions. Something of the same kind has been observed with regard to the plague of Constantinople. Timoni, in his account of this disease, asserts that the Arminians, who live chiefly on vegetable food, were far less disposed to it than other people. I have little doubt, says Doctor Lambe, from what I have observed during the course of my own practice, that the common contagious (or, as it is called, the typhus fever) of this country, is greatly exasperated by full living. This fever rarely attacks persons in the better lines of life, because they are little exposed to the exciting causes of it. But when they suffer, it is very apt to be fatal. But among paupers, and in the work-houses, the danger is commonly speaking, very little, and they recover readily in circumstances, under which it is probable that those, who are called their betters, would have sunk. It seems, moreover, highly probable, that the power inherent in the living body, of restoring itself under accidents, or wounds, is strongest in those, who use most a vegetable regimen, and who are very sparing in the use of fermented liquors. This has been observed among the eastern nations. Sir George Stanton says, "It is to be remarked that the Chinese recover from all kinds of accidents more rapidly and with fewer symptoms of any kind of danger, than most people of Europe. The constant and quick recovery, from considerable and alarming wounds, has likewise been observed among the natives of Hindostan. The european surgeons have been surprised at the easy cure of sepoys in the english service, from accidents, accounted extremely unfavourable. I have received the same account from other quarters. These facts

are enough to induce a suspicion that our diseases are much exasperated by our manner of living, and the full diet of animal food, to which we are habituated. They may serve to shew to what may be ascribed, in some degree, the great difference between the mortality, which prevails in great towns, and in the country. Dr. Lambe, in his "Additional Reports on Regimen," has given several instances where constrained abstinence of prisons, and others reduced from affluence to poverty, forced to subsist on hard fare, and to gain their livelihood by daily labour, have exchanged their useless riches for the inestimable treasure of health.—p. 91.

After some instances of the cure of the gout by a vegetable regimen, Dr. Lambe adds, "It is no reproach to the vegetable regimen, that it cannot effect impossibilities; that it cannot restore a constitution worn out with age and disease. Nor are the evils described to be attributed to the diet, tho' vulgar prejudice might reason so; because the same symptoms are the customary course of the gout. It is equally true, that in London, and perhaps every where, children will become diseased and die, who are confined to vegetable food; other causes of disease being in action. But let observations be made on a scale sufficiently large; let an average be fairly taken; and there can be no doubt, that the balance will be in favour of the abstemious, in length of life, in diminution of suffering, and in actual enjoyment—Idem, p. 112.

The kind of abstemiousness contended for, does not cure constitutional disease; but it palliates, where to cure is obviously impossible. British practitioners generally enjoin a rigid abstinence from animal food, in acute diseases, calling it the anti-

phlegistic regimen. No material effect, however, can be supposed to arise from a mere temporary adoption of a vegetable regimen. It might be attended with greater effect by the addition of distilled water. The return to health in such cases must be attributable to other causes.—Id. p. 113—130.

In the Memoirs of the Royal Academy for the year 1730, M. Geoffroy has given a method for determining the proportion of nourishment, or true matter of the flesh and blood, contained in any sort of food. He took a pound of flesh, which he freed from the fat, bones, and cartilages, and boiled it for a determined time, in a close vessel, with three pints of water; then pouring off the liquor, he added the same quantity of water, boiling it again for the same time, and this operation he repeated six several times, so that the last liquor appeared, both in smell, trial and taste, to be little different from common water. Then, putting all the liquor together, and filtrating, to separate the gross particles, he evaporated it over a slow fire, till it was brought to an extract of a pretty moderate consistence. This experiment was made on several sorts of food, the result of which is contained in the following table.

		oz.	dr.	gr.
A pound of beef -	yielded of extract,	0	7	8
veal -		1	1	48
mutton -		1	3	16
lamb -		1	1	39
chicken -		1	4	34
pigeon -		1	0	12
pheasant		1	2	8
partridge		1	4	34
calves-feet		1	2	26
carp -		1	0	8
whey -		1	1	3
bread -		4	1	0

According to this table the proportion of nourishment contained in these foods will be as follow.

Beef - - - -	7	pheasant - -	10
veal - - - -	9	partridge - -	12
mutton - - -	11	calves-feet - -	10
lamb - - - -	9	carp - - - -	8
chicken - -	12	whey - - - -	9
pigeon - - -	8	bread, - - -	33

Hence it appears that common household bread has nearly three times the nutritive quantity of food more than any other species.

A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF ANIMAL AND VEGETABLE FOOD.

I. "Whatever be the true, primogenial, and last principle of bodies, beyond which it is impossible to analyse or divide them, these are incontestibly found in all animal and vegetable bodies. 1, Sulphur, oil or material heat, whence arises spirit and activity. 2, Salt, or hard angular particles highly attractive, and dissolvable in water. 3, Air or small elastic particles. 4, Water or phlegm, from whence alone fluidity. 5, Earth, the base and subtratum of these others. Now it is past all doubt that animal substances of most kinds, possess in a much greater proportion the two first of these principles, viz. salts and oils, than vegetables, which partake more of the last, viz. air, water and earth; but from many undeniable experiments, the two first principles are known to be the most active, energetic, and deleterious, and tend more, by their activity, to the division, dissolution and destruction of the subject, than those others, when they enter in any great proportion. 2.

The jelly, the juice or chyle of animal substances, is infinitely more tenacious and gluey. [See Memoirs of the Royal Academy for 1729, 1730.], and it's last particles more closely united, and separated with greater difficulty, than those of vegetable substances. This is evident from the experiments made with them in joining of wood, and may be made manifest to the senses in the difference between the tenacity of camp-jelly or fish-glue, and that of paste made of flower or barley; or from the strength of ropes or cords made of catgut or leather, and those made of tow or hemp, of the same diameter: and therefore animal food must, much sooner, more strongly, and irremediably make viscidities in animal fluids, and more schirrously obstruct the capillaries and glands, than vegetable substances. 3. But the far more pernicious and destructive part, is the salts and oil abounding more in most animal than in vegetable substances; of which there are so many and convincing demonstrations, that none can have any doubt of it, who has the least acquaintance with natural philosophy: for our blood and juices being nourished and supplied by such substances, as abound most with these active elementary principles, must necessarily be stored and saturated with salts and sulphurs; and these, being always in a state of action, are the true, original, and most adequate causes of the most excruciating distempers. 4. When to these strong, fermented, and spirituous liquors are added as a vehicle, or diluting mixture, and join to the salts and sulphurs of animal substances, not only their inflammable spirits and tartarous salts, but their condensing and hardening quality on the food in the stomach, the digestion is by that means hindered and stopped, and the food not being sufficiently divided and comminuted, but bro-

ken only into gross particles, more quickly and obstinately thickens the juices, and obstructs the glands and capillaries, than vegetable substances. 5. Animal juices and substances, before they were turned into flesh, must have been strained through infinitely smaller and more numerous tubes, such as the last and extreme capillaries, some of which are not bigger than the six hundredth part of a hair; by which means their particles must be rendered extremely smaller and finer, and consequently have a much greater degree of attraction, than those of vegetables, which pass through fewer strainers, and have no other motive powers but the heat of the sun; whereas those of animal substances have, besides the sun the force of muscular digestion, and of the motion of the heart; the flesh of animals, I say, must on this account, necessarily consist of smaller particles, and so be united with greater force, and endowed with a greater degree of attraction, and consequently must, with far greater difficulty, be digested and separated, than vegetable substances possibly can. And hence it is that carnivorous animals are much more deleterious food, being endowed with much finer and more pungent salts and sulphurs, than those animals that live on vegetables only, as both the high savour and deleterious effects of the first abundantly shew. From all which it is plain to a demonstration, that animal substances must naturally and necessarily incrassate the juices, and produce obstructions in the glands and capillaries, and consequently create pains and diseases, much more readily than vegetable substances. 6. It is plain from weight, that the substance of most animal food is specifically heavier than that of most vegetables used for food, sometimes in the proportion of three to two. The fibres and juices of

animal bodies are not only more compact and closely united, and have fewer vacuities than those of vegetables, whereby the digestive powers have less difficulty in concocting and grinding equal quantities of vegetable than animal food; but by the less flavour and savour of vegetable than highly seasoned animal food, the appetite is sooner satisfied, and is under less temptation to excess in the first than in the latter; and it is consequently better and sooner digested, circulated, and secreted, especially by tender and delicate digestive powers, and cannot so readily cause viscidities and obstructions. Lastly, Infinite experiment, and the best natural philosophy, confirm to a demonstration, that those substances which have least of salt and sulphur, of spirit, oil, and hard pungent particles, and most of soft earth, water and air, are the fittest to circulate, and be secreted through animal tubes, create least resistence to the motive powers, tear, rend, and wear out the tubes themselves least, and form less obstinate and powerful obstructions, in the smaller vessels; and consequently, that vegetable substances, which consist of a less proportion of salts and sulphurs, i. e. of pungent and fiery particles, and of a greater proportion of earth, water, and air, i. e. of less active and cooler particles, will be less ready to create diseases, and shorten life, than an equal quantity of animal substances, which have all these in an inverted proportion. In a word, vegetable substances are more rare, less compact, less coherent, more easily dissolvable and digestible, turn into a lighter chyle, have less salt, oil, and spirit, and consequently are less heating and inflaming, than animal substances, and so obstruct and tear animal tubes less. That animal food and fermented liquors will more readily, certainly, and cruelly, create and

exasperate diseases, pains, and sufferings, and sooner cut off life than vegetable food will, there can be no more doubt than in any proposition of Euclid, if reason, philosophy, the nature of things, or experience, have evidence, or force in them." Cheyne on Regimen, p. 56 to 62.

It is a mistaken opinion that flesh-meats afford stronger nourishment than vegetable compositions. Flesh has more matter for corruption, and nothing turns sooner to putrefaction. Having this powerful tendency before eating, the same disposition will exist after it is taken into the stomach. Flesh is of a moist, gross and phelgmy quality, and generates a like nourishment. Flesh promotes imperceptible perspiration and causes drought. Cattle are subject to diseases, uncleannesses, and surfeits; from accident, improper treatment, over-driving, and from various abuses inflicted by inhuman butchers. On the contrary, all sorts of dry food, as bread, cheese, preparations of milk, pulse, grain, fruits and roots are more clean, of a more sound nature, and more easy of concoction.

The MORAL effect of aliment is clearly evinced in the different tempers of the carnivorous and frugivorous animals, the former, whose destructive passions, like those of ignorant man, lay waste all within their reach, are constantly tormented with hunger, which returns and rages in proportion to their own devastation; this creates that state of warfare or disquietude, which seeks, like murderers, the night and veil of the forest, for should they appear on the plain their prey escapes, or, seen by each other, their welfare begins. The frugivorous animals wander tranquilly on the plains, and testify their joyful existence by frisking and basking in the congenial rays of the

sun, or browsing, with convulsive pleasure, on the green herb, evinced by the motion of the tail, or the joyful sparkling of the eyes, and the gambols of the herd. The same effect of aliment is discernable among the different species of man, and the peaceful temper of the frugivorous Asiatic, is strongly contrasted with the ferocious temper of the carnivorous European. "All savages are cruel; and as their manners do not tend to cruelty, it is plain it must arise from their aliments. They go to war as to hunting, and treat their fellow-creatures, as they treat bears."—Rousseau.

Montaigne observes, that "those natures which are sanguinary towards beasts discover a natural propensity to cruelty towards their own species. After they had accustomed themselves at Rome to spectacles of the slaughter of animals, they proceeded to the slaughter of men, the gladiators. It is remarkably obvious that most sorts of flesh and fish act on the body and senses, not in so innocent, brisk, and lively a manner as herbs, grain, fruits, roots, or the various sorts of excellent nutritive foods made of them." Eating much flesh exterminates compassion; encourages surly, cruel, and inhuman dispositions and inclinations; being most proper for soldiers, hunters, and such as would have a savage nature strengthened and increased. On the contrary, vegetable food is pleasant to the eye, more fragrant to the smell, and grateful to the palate; makes the body lightsome and active; generates purer spirits; frees the mind from dullness, care, and heaviness; quickens the senses; clears the intellect; preserves innocency; increases compassion, love, humility and charity.

Tho' the Japanese priests abstain from animal food, the people, according to Kæmpfer, eat a large propor-

tion of animal food, which by imparting strength and fierceness, to unite with the sensibility inspired by the climate, may produce that ferocious, daring, implacable, and bloody disposition for which they are so remarkable, and which runs through their system both of laws and government.

The people of Mexico, who used animal food in a large proportion, and part of it raw, and dwelt at the same time in a hot climate, were of a disposition similar to that of the Japanese, being bold, cruel, and revengeful, as appears by the resistance they made to the Spaniards, and the barbarous manner in which they treated their prisoners, and their human sacrifices. It also argues a disposition extremely savage, in a people who had attained a considerable degree of civilization, to eat the flesh of their fellow-creatures, as they are reported to have done.—Robertson's America, vol. ii, p. 310. 4to. edit

Vegetable diet appears to have imparted a great degree of mildness to religion, and from the same cause. We do not find among such a people any instances of cruelty in religion; of human sacrifices, or of gods delighting in blood, or in the destruction of mankind. It is probable, that the religious toleration which prevails through the Indies, is owing to the same cause. That people although passionately attached to their own religious sect or persuasion, allow still, that future happiness is not confined to their own followers. The people of Siam never dispute about religion. [Forbin's Memoirs.] At Calicut, it is a maxim of state, that every religion is good. [Pirard's Travels, chap. xxvii.] Compare these tenets with those of the Japanese, and even the Mahommedans."—Falconer on Climate, &c. b. v. ch. i. sec. ii. The same writer attributes the cruelties practis-

ed on animals, to the selfish effects of luxury and false refinement. "Luxury," he says, "increases the sensibility of the passions. Luxury is always accompanied by indolence, and is unfavourable to health and renders the body less robust and strong. The custom of giving scope to our desires on every occasion, which is essential to luxury, is apt both to multiply our wishes and our uneasiness at our inability to gratify them. Thus we see children, who are accustomed to be indulged on every occasion, have their wishes thereby much enlarged, and are apt to break out into violent sallies of anger, when the object of their desires cannot be procured to their expectations. The same temper is equally perceivable at a more advanced period of life. This kind of sensibility is merely selfish, and bears little respect to the welfare or feelings of others, or to common humanity. The cruelties practised in the most deliberate and protracted manner, on some brute animals, the devoted victims of luxurious indulgence, evince this position very strongly, even in the present age. And in former times the connection of luxury with cruelty, even toward the human species, appears to have been very remarkable.

Athenæus notices the cruelties of the people of Miletus, and of some of the Scythian nations, which he tells us, was ascribed by the philosophers of antiquity to their luxury. [Athenæi, p. 524, 525.] The same quality, he observed, prevailed among the Ionians, which he derives from the same cause. [p. 625.] The Roman Emperors Vitellius and Elagabalus, while they betrayed the most abject submission to their appetites, astonished the world at the same time with their muliplied inhumanities. Tacitus connects luxury and cruelty together, in the same manner, in

the character of Otho. [Taciti Hist. lib. ii. cap 31.] The same kind of insensibility pervaded the public, as well as private mind. Athenæus tells us that at the period of the battle of Chæronea, and the important but melancholy consequences to the liberty of Greece that attended it, a number of the Athenian citizens, of some rank and distinction, were found so totally insensible to the interests, dangers, and distresses of the country, that they formed themselves into a convivial society, called the Sixty, and employed their time in feasting, drinking, gaming, and in the sprightly and satirical exercises of wit and pleasantry. No public affairs whatever, were considered by them as of consequence sufficient to interrupt their mirth, or disturb their tranquillity. They saw their countrymen arming for battle, and heard of their captivity and death with the utmost indifference. Events and actions of the most serious kind were treated by them with wantonness and levity. [Athenæi, p. 614.]"—On the Influence of Climate, book VI. ch. vi. sec. 1.

Experience has shewn that whoever abstains, for a long time from wine, and seasoned flesh, will acquire an exquisite delicacy and distinguishing sense of taste; the nervous papilæ of the tongue and palate being less oppressed, and their actions left more undisturbed, than by the redundant quantity of the small pungent particles with which flesh, and spicy, hard, and oily bodies so much abound.

A dog fed on raw flesh is much more fierce and rapacious than one which eats that kind of food dressed. From this cause proceeds the great ferocity of butcher's dogs. Wolves, lions, tygers, &c. probably owe their superior fierceness, in a great measure, to their food, which is always raw, killed in the blood

and generally of the wild kind. Most of the savage animals are peculiarly greedy of blood, and, where that is to be had in plenty, never regard the solid part of their prey. The weasel and polecat will kill a great number of fowls at one time, to suck their blood only; and the same is true of the fox. Mankind are, in like manner, affected by eating raw flesh. Pomponius Mela mentions it as a custom of the Scythians, to suck the blood of their enemies killed in battle.—lib. ii, cap. 1. Ammianus Marcellinus gives the same account of the Saracens, lib. xxxi. cap. 16. And Mr. Carver, of some of the American Indians."—Falconer on Climate, b. v. ch. i. sec. 1.

It is a remarkable fact, that at Heimaey, the only Westmann island which is inhabited, scarcely a single instance has been known during the last twenty years, of a child surviving the period of infancy. In consequence, the population, which does not exceed two hundred people, is entirely kept up by emigration from the main land of Iceland. The food of these people consists principally of sea-birds, fulmers and puffins; i. e. Procellaria glacialis, and Alce arctica of Linnæus. The fulmers they procure in vast abundance, and they use the eggs and flesh of the birds; and salt the latter for their winter food. There are a few cows and sheep upon the island, but the inhabitants are said to have no vegetable food.—Dr. Lambe's Addit. Reports, 197.

The difference of the flavour of bacon, when the hog has been allowed to eat any thing, and when carefully reared on vegetables, is generally known. Indeed pork has been so grossly fed as to occasion sickness in the stomach, and violent effects in the bowels. See the description which Boccacio has given of the disgusting excesses of this animal on dead bodies, during the plague at Florence.

At the tower of London, experience has taught those who have the care of the managerie, that feeding monkies on flesh renders them gross and shortens their lives.

"The effects of animal diet are also evidently adverse to the exertions of genius, sentiment, and the more delicate feelings; and also to deep mental researches. This may be accounted for from the plethora and distension of the vessels, which is induced by animal diet, and the load which it lays on the digestive organs and powers of the body, indicated by the indolence, dullness and yawning, which a full meal of animal food almost always brings on. [To eat a large quantity of food, and that of the animal kind, destroys the powers of reason and of reflection, and renders the powers of the understanding more slow and heavy. Theophrast. Philos. lib. 5.] Dogs of the chace that feed much on animal food, raw flesh particularly, lose their accuracy of scent. Perhaps this may be a cause why beasts of prey, in general, have no scent of the animals they pursue."—Idem. b. v. ch. i. sec. 1.

"The natives of the continent of India, according to all accounts, both ancient and modern, have always been mild, tender, and compassionate. But their neighbours, the inhabitants of the islands, are by no means of this description; and the Japanese, who live in the same latitude with a great part of the Indies, are of a cruel, obstinate, and perverse temper. This difference is probably owing to a difference of diet: a conjecture rendered most probable from the analogy of the effects of vegetable food on brute animals. [Diodor. Sicul. lib. ii.—Strabo, lib. xv.—Bernier. tom. ii. p. 140.] Even the fiercest of these, lions, for instance, have had their ferocity greatly a-

bated, and have been rendered tractable and docile, by being fed on vegetable food. Dr. Arbuthnot mentions, in his "Essay on the Nature of Aliments," that several instances had fallen under his own observation, of irascibility of temper, in the human species, being subdued by a vegetable regimen. A vegtable diet, by keeping the passions within due bounds, is an admirable preservative of the purity of morals. It is natural, says Strabo, for people, who live on a moderate and simple diet, to be very regular and just in their conduct. lib. vii.

While the people of the East in general, are immersed in debauchery, profligacy, and all kinds of wickedness, the natives of India are regular in their conduct, and just and merciful in their dealings. Homer extols the justice and virtue of the feeders on mare's milk, which may in a good measure be looked on as a vegetable aliment.

> And where the far-fam'd Hippemolgian strays,
> renown'd for justice, and for length of days;
> thrice happy race, that, innocent of blood,
> from milk innoxious seek their simple food.
>
> *Pope, book xiii.*

See also Strabo, lib. vii—and Ammianus Marcell. lib. xxiii. c. 6.

Dr. Cullen, in his "Materia Medica," observes that vegetable aliment, as neither distending the vessels, nor loading the system, never interrupts the stronger action of the mind; while the heat, fullness, and weight of animal food, is adverse to it's vigorous efforts. That a vegetable diet is favourable to many exertions of the mind, is proved in several practical instances. Gamesters, whose minds must be always alert, and prepared to make calculations, and employ the memory, constantly avoid a full meal of animal food, which incapacitites them; for this reason they

live chiefly on milk and vegetables. Sir Isaac Newton was so sensible of this effect of animal food, that during the time of his writing his treatise on Optics, which is the work wherein his genius displayed itself in it's fullest force, he lived on a vegetable diet only, and that extremely simple and rigid. The same regimen is said to have been followed by several of the greek philosophers distinguished for wisdom, as Pythagoras, Zeno, and others.—Cheyne on Diseases, sec. ii.

"Of all the children, I have known or heard of," says Mr. Newton, "none have disliked fruits, but several have refused to eat flesh. Some have been made sick by it."

Many people have a dislike to fat; some on account of being unfavourable to bilious complaints, and others from inducing nausea. Unfortunately one cannot easily be obtained without the other. This is a powerful argument against the use of flesh in toto. There are few families that can afford to throw away the fat. If the fat be improper, then is the lean improper, for one is attached to the other.

"I once indulged" says M. Marmontel, "in living for six weeks on milk at Compiégne, when in full health. Never was my soul more calm, more peaceful, than during this regimen. My days flowed along in study with an unalterable equality; my nights were but one gentle sleep. Discord might have overturned the world, it would not have shaken me. [Memoirs, b. v.]

In Hart's "Diet of the Diseased," p. 203, there are several instances of persons, who have lived for many years solely on cow's milk. Sheep indeed furnish excellent milk, but in small quantities, and only for a short time. It is a curious fact that in all

the nations where milk constitutes a chief part of their diet, it is eaten in a state of acidity. The Tartars always ferment their milk. The Russians reckon their butter-milk a specific for consumptions. The Caffres keep their milk in sheep skins, which they never clean, in order to preserve the substance which ferments it. They expressed the utmost abhorence, on seeing Europeans drink some fresh milk; and said it was very unwholesome. Even among the poor people of Scotland, and in Ireland particularly, there is more milk eaten in an acessent than in a fresh state.—Sinclair's Code, i, 269, 273, 275.

Grain and other vegetables, with the help of milk, cheese, and butter; or oil, where butter is not to be had, are known from experience, without any butcher's meat, to afford the most plentiful, the most wholesome, the most nourishing and the most invigorating diet.—Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations, iii, 341.

In Barbary, the sheep and goats, as well as cows, contribute to the dairies, particularly in the making of cheese. Instead of rennet, especially in the summer season, they turn the milk with the flowers of the great headed thistle, or wild artichoke; and putting the curds afterwards into small baskets, made with rushes, or with the dwarf palm, they bind them up close, and press them.—Shaw's Travels in Barbary. Thou shalt have goat's milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household, and for maintenance for thy maidens.—Prov. xxvii, 27.

Man, in quitting the nutriment on which alone Providence has destined him to enjoy a state of perfect health, has debased his physical, and consequently his moral and intellectual faculties, to a degree almost inconceivable. It is not man that we have before us; it is but the wreck of him.—Newton, i. 66.

The unwholesomeness of animal food is more evident, if possible, than it's pernicious effects on morals. In works which have been some time before the public, says the learned and scientific Dr. Lambe, I have maintained, on the authority of adduced facts, that, while the predisposition to the various forms of diseased action is congenital, and dependent upon varieties in the radical organization of the frame, the more direct causes are to be looked for in the agency of foreign substances on the body, and principally of those which are used as food and drink. In water, for instance, the putrid or putrescent matter, the animal or vegetable substances, in a state of decomposition, is that which is actively mischievous; it being immediately and directly deleterious. Fish does not impart the strength of animal food; but it is as oppressive to the stomach as flesh; and it is more putrescent, as may be concluded from the nauseous and hepatic eructations of the stomach, after it has been eaten. In every period of history it has been known, that (fruit and) vegetables alone are sufficient for the support of life, and that the bulk of mankind live on them at this hour; the adherence to the use of animal food is no more than a persistence in the gross custom of savage life; and evinces an insensibility to the progress of reason, and to the operation of intellectual improvement.—See Addit. Reports, p, 15, 39, 161, 259, 243.

Dr. Alphonsus Lercy, of Paris, has published an essay on certain diseases of men, which he traces to the animals on which they had fed; and he establishes the doctrine generally, that many diseases with which mankind are afflicted, are communicated by eating the flesh of animals.—Monthly Mag. June 1815, p. 446.

Dr. Lambe has distinctly traced a disease of the stomach, with which several families in Worcester were afflicted, to the quality of the pump water, which was impregnated with the oxyd of lead.

Mr. Newton thinks that the reason that the vegetable diet is not successful in every case, to prevent disease, seems to be, that it's beneficial effects have been in great measure counteracted by the impurity of water. It was Dr. Lambe's good fortune to discover this important fact. Fruits and vegetables, even with the use of common water, would probably prolong life more than animal food; yet as acute and chronic diseases would still supervene, the benefits derived from the antiphlogistic regimen could neither be sufficient, nor sufficiently manifest to produce a a conviction of it's salutary tendency.

Man, does not seem naturally a drinking animal. Fruits supply all the liquid which he stands in need of. It has been ascertained that particular districts have disorders occasioned by the quality of the water. Distillation however is a complete remedy against every aqueous impregnation. Neither the Holywell of Flintshire, nor the spring at Malvern can serve as a substitute for distilled water. Without this precaution, even the vegetable diet will not prevent violent disorders, brought on by the use of common water. It appears from Dr. Kirkland's letter, to Sir John Sinclair, that some Water in Essex, was so bad as to have immediate ill effects on those who used it.—Code of Health, ii, 215.

In distilling water, some of the first which comes off may be thrown away, which often contains some septic matter, and also leave some at the bottom of the still, on account of the filthy residium.

A TEST

of the purity, is a few drops of nitrate of lead, dropped into a glass of water. If the water be properly distilled, it will remain clear; if not, it will be clouded.

To prove the existence of putrid animal matter in water, add to a sufficient quantity of water, a solution of the acetite of lead. If the precipitate be collected and heated with it's own weight of a fixed alkali, a portion of lead will be found reduced. Hence the precipitate must have furnished the inflammable matter necessary to the reduction of the lead.

If fruit and vegetables were adhered to, there would be little occasion for other drink than these afford. Thirst is excited by an unnatural flesh diet, which causes disorders, bodily and mental. The southern climate, in which the heat gives a greater tendency to thirst, has provided the juice of the orange and the milk of the cocoa nut; and where can be found more delicious beverage?

What an elegant table has nature laid for the inhabitants of the West India Islands, which abound with pines, melons, figs, grapes, mangoes, mammees, grenadillos, bell-apples, guavas, strawberries, soursops, sugar-apples, alligator pears, sappadillos, pomegranates, cocoa-nuts, oranges, shadocks, forbidden fruit, &c. &c.

As the Arabs had their excellencies, so have they, like other nations, their defects and vices. Their own writers acknowledge that they have a natural disposition to war, bloodshed, cruelty, and rapine; being so much addicted to bear malice, that they scarcely ever forget an old grudge: such vindictive temper, some physicians say, is occasioned by their frequent feeding on camel's flesh, that creature being

most malicious and tenacious of anger; which account suggests a good reason for a distinction of meats. [Poc. Spec.]

The inhabitants of the most northern parts of Europe and Asia, the Laplanders, Samoides Ostiacs, Tunguses, Burætes, and Kamtshadales, as well as the inhabitants of the most northern and southern promontories of America, the Esquimaux and the natives of Terra del Fuego, are to be reckoned among the smallest, ugliest, and most dastardly and feeble people upon the face of the earth; and yet all these nations not only live almost entirely on animal food, but mostly raw, and without any preparation.

The Burætes, says Mr. Pallas, are not only diminutive and of a feminine look, but are also so weak, that six Burætes, with the utmost exertions of their force, cannot perform so much as a single Russian. Again, if you take one of equal size with a Russian, you will find him much lighter, or less solid and compact than the Russian. Boys at an age, when among the latter, one can scarcely lift with both hands, we may easily, among the Burætes, take them up with one hand from the ground, and hold them suspended in the air. A proportionable lightness is seen likewise in grown persons; for when a Russian has rode his horse quite jaded, the beast will directly set off again, if mounted by a Buræt. And these effeminate, feeble, and light Burætes, like the rest of Siberian pagans, live almost entirely on animal food, the constant unqualified use whereof (as Mr. Pallas likewise thinks), may easily be considered as the cause of this very weakness and unsolidity of the Burætes and their brethren.—Pallas's Mongolian tribes, vol. i. p. 171.

DIET.

If we consider pure nature, we must acknowledge that our food ought to be of such a kind as to require mastication, at least as soon as we are furnished with teeth. This consideration alone is enough to make us suspect, that milk cannot be strictly proper or perfectly suitable to the human constitution. Some have argued, from the custom of giving milk to children, and even to infants without apparent detriment, that it must therefore be perfectly innoxious. Now I see no reason why milk should be reckoned perfectly innocent, because we give it to children; or why a healthy child may not bear deviations from the most natural and proper food, with as much, or even greater safety, than a healthy adult. In such a child, tho' the bodily health be feeble, the vital powers are strong; and indeed they must frequently be much stronger in the child than in the full grown man. It cannot be, but a child, which may have fourteen years of life remaining to it, must be vitally stronger than an adult, who may have nearly finished his race of life; it may be expected to bear injuries better; and, in fact, it generally does. It is however very common for children to die, whose principal sustenance has been milk. From the custom of feeding children with it, then, we can infer nothing with regard to it's salubrity. Milk-eating and flesh-eating, are branches of a common system; and they must stand or fall together. If there were no demand for the flesh of the animal, the milk would not be produced. The real question, taken in the widest extent, is, whether the agricultural system ought not wholly to supersede the pastoral system, as in countries in-

creasing in population, it is constantly doing. The productive power of the soil has confined the possibility of maintaining the domestic animals within such limits, than an abundant population cannot be supplied with a daily moderate portion, either of flesh or of milk; much less can it feed them on these substances. [See Additional Reports, p. 169.] Search the world through, and an example cannot be found of a large society, living on flesh, the produce of it's own soil. The same may be said of milk. Both these are monopolized by those members of the community who possess superfluous property. But this order of men will ever struggle in vain to draw a line of demarcation between themselves and their fellow-men, and to raise themselves above the common lot of humanity. Nature disdains our artificial distinctions and views all her offspring with the same parental eye. Can indeed any notion be so irrational, so monstrous, as to suppose that the creator has formed myriads of human beings, perfect in strength and intellect, and at the same time has made it impossible for them to provide what is necessary to the preservation of animal life? We may safely conclude, then, that what is not necessary cannot be natural. It is easy to go one step further, and say, what is not natural cannot be useful.—Idem, p. 169.

Mr. Newton says, "Our breakfast is composed of dried fruits, whether raisins, figs, or plums, with toasted bread or biscuits, and weak tea, always made of distilled water, with a moderate portion of milk in it. The children, who do not like the flavour of tea, use milk and water instead of it. When butter is added to the toast, it is in a very small quantity. The dinner consists of potatoes with some other vegetables, as they happen to be in season; maccaroni,

tart, or pudding, with as few eggs as possible; to this is sometimes added a dessert. Onions, especially those of Portugal, may be stewed with a little walnut pickle, and other vegetable ingredients, for which no cook will be at a loss, so as to constitute an excellent sauce for all other vegetables. As to drinking, we are scarcely inclined, on this cooling regimen, but when it happens, we take distilled water. Return to Nature, p. 144.

Mr. Newton does not particularize any further his mode of diet, but Dr. Lambe has continued his case up to the time of publishing his "Additional Reports," which is four years beyond the period of Mr. Newton's publication. He announces that Mr. Newton, has continued to follow the same course of diet, and that the result has proved completely satisfactory. "More perfect and even robust health was never displayed among any set of young people. The female head of the family, to whose spirit, independence, and intelligence, much of the emancipation from the yoke of vulgar and destructive prejudices must be ascribed, enjoys an activity of mind and body rarely equalled in her sex. Our feeble and delicate country-women will, perhaps, be shocked, when they learn that this lady, bred up in habits as delicate and luxurious as the most sensitive of themselves, has been enabled, during the course of the present year, to walk thirty miles in one day. She has a high colour, and is full of flesh. Such are the real mischiefs, and such the debility, which are the consequences of a vegetable regimen, when used by persons of sound constitutions."

Dr. Lambe doubts whether artificial preparations of all our vegetable food be necessary. That many sorts are really improved by cookery admits of no

question; but by indiscriminately macerating every thing, we may injure the substance on which we operate, instead of improving it. With us, a parent will correct his child for eating a raw turnip, as if it were poisonous, but the Russians, from the lowest peasant to the highest nobleman, eat turnips several times a day. [Clarke's Trav. in Russia, vol. i. p. 35.] We may be certain, then, there is no harm in the practice. There is every reason to believe, particularly from the observations of the navigators in the Pacific Ocean, that those races of men, who admit into their nutriment a large proportion of fruit, and recent vegetable matter, unchanged by culinary art, have a form of body, the largest, of the most perfect proportion, and the greatest beauty; that they have the greatest strength and activity, and probably that they enjoy the best health. This fact alone is sufficient to refute the vulgar error, that animal food is necessary to support strength.—Addit. Reports, p. 172.

Raw potatoes have been used with advantage in the Fleet, particularly by Mr. Smith of the Triton, who made the scorbutic men eat them sliced, with vinegar, with great benefit. This accords with Dr. Merten's communication to the Royal Society of London. [See Blane's Obs. on Dis. of Seamen, p. 59, 2d. ed.]

It is a fact that almost all our common garden vegetables may be used without culinary preparation; and it is highly probable, that in this natural state they would be more nutritive, more strengthening, and certainly, far more antiscorbutic, than when they have been changed by the fire. On this account it is highly advisable that some portion of fruit, or of fresh vegetable matter should be used daily. Children too should be encouraged in the use of such things,

instead of being forbid them, as is the common practice. If the stomach be so much diseased, that nothing of this kind can be borne, soups made with a large quantity of fresh vegetables may be substituted. They seem to be far preferable to vegetables much boiled. The soup and the vegetables may be eaten together, and are very agreeable to the palate.

I have been asked, repeatedly, as I recommend distilled, in place of common water, whether I think it necessary to use the same kind for boiling vegetables. I regard such nicety as needless. If the matter to be boiled absorbs a large quantity of water, as rice, this attention may be right. In making bread, the same attention should, if possible, be paid. But the quantity absorbed by common culinary vegetables is probably too small to deserve notice. Those who wish to be very exact, may dress their vegetables by steam. Addit. Reports, p. 185.

On the subject of Food, see a compilation by the publisher of this volume, being a system of Cookery without flesh; containing directions for making upwards of one hundred palatable dishes, formed of the most wholesome ingredients. 18mo. 2s. in boards.

AGRICULTURAL STATE.

The following facts have frequently been stated.

Four persons may derive ample support from one acre of ground, if cultivated in the best manner, in the production of grain, pulse, fruits, roots, and leaves.

England and Wales contain about ten millions of inhabitants, and forty-seven million acres of ground; of which, nearly forty millions are cultivated, the

other eight are waste. There are, consequently four acres of cultivated ground to every person and nearly another acre of the uncultivated. Hence, if the ground in England was thus cultivated, it's produce would support a population of one hundred and sixty millions; and, with numerous allowances, at least one hundred millions, or ten times it's present number.

Each person consumes, on an average, in every year, one quarter of wheat, being the produce of half an acre; three bushels of barley in beer, being the growth of the eighth of an acre; one sheep; one eighth of an ox, one third of a lamb, calf, and pig, being the produce of two acres; and in vegetables, the produce of one eighth of an acre. Each individual therefore consumes ten ounces per day, of animal food, or 220 lbs. in the year; which in animal food, is the annual produce of two acres of land. The same two acres, cultivated in potatoes, would yield, on an average, upwards of ten tons per acre, or forty-four thousand pounds weight; which averages one hundred and twenty pounds of potatoes per day.

If cultivated in wheat, the produce of the same two acres, which supply but two hundred and twenty pounds of animal food, would produce four thousand pounds weight of grain; or afford ten pounds of wheat, per day, leaving sufficient for seed. Pease and beans yield in the same proportion. Turnips and carrots are as productive as potatoes. Parsnips double the weight of potatoes.

Mr. Middleton says, "that every acre would support it's man well on *vegetable* food, but let him change his diet to one meal per day, of animal food, and he will require the produce of four acres!"

In England, notwithstanding the produce of the soil has been considerably increased, by the enclosures of wastes, and the adoption, in many places, of a more successful husbandry, yet we do not observe a corresponding addition to the number of inhabitants; the reason of which appears to be the more general consumption of animal food. Many ranks of people, whose ordinary diet was, in the last century, prepared almost entirely from milk, roots, and vegetables, now require every day, a considerable portion of the flesh of animals. Hence a great part of the richest lands of the country are converted into pasturage. Much also of the bread corn, which went directly to the nourishment of human bodies, now only contribute to it, by fattening the flesh of sheep and oxen. The mass and volume of provisions are hereby diminished; and what is gained in the melioration of the soil is lost in the quality of the produce."—Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy." ii, 361.

There is not one of the wants of life which may not be supplied directly from the soil; food, clothing, light, heat, the materials of houses, and the instruments needful for their construction. By it's means not only is population increased to an indefinite extent, but the happiness of each individual is greatly augmented. It multiplies enjoyments by presenting to the organs an infinite variety of new and agreeable impressions; which are of themselves, to an unvitiated palate, abundantly sufficient for the gratifications of sense. Indeed, every truly exquisite taste is afforded by the vegetable kingdom. In what a wretched state of perversion is the digesting organs and palate of that man who has lost his relish for these pure, simple and innocent delights. Agricul-

ture disseminates man over the surface of the soil; it diffuses health, prosperity, joy, society, benevolence; from this source spring all the charities of life, and it makes a common family of the whole human race. If those, who confine themselves to it's precious gifts, cannot, without other precautions, escape diseases, these are at least more mild in their form, and more slow in their progress; longevity is promoted; the final stroke is received with tranquillity, and death is disarmed of it's terrors.

By cultivation, vegetable productions become so abundant, as to be brought within the reach of the mass of mankind, and cheaper than any other substances used for food. Indeed they increase with the demand caused by an increase of population. All apprehension of evil from an over abundance of people, appear, in european countries at least, to be visionary. Death seems very rarely, even in the poorest class of people, to be caused, in ordinary seasons, by a want of food. Excess and the abuse of the gifts of providence, is productive of much more evil.—Dr. Lambe's Addit. Reports, p. 239.

By the art of fencing, a portion of the natural herbage is preserved for winter fodder, and man became enabled to domesticate several tribes of animals, forming a portion of the artificial population of cultivated countries. Over these tribes he has assumed despotic power; he uses their labour, and applies both their milk and their flesh to his own sustenance. By giving life to these animals he confers on many a lasting curse. In order to support his tyranny he mutilates the greatest part of the males. This shocking outrage on the common rights of nature, the cutting asunder a link which connects the individual with his species, cannot be counterbalanced by even a comfortable and easy enjoyment of animal life.

ALLUREMENTS OF VEGETATION.

By sweet but irresistible violence, vegetation allures our every sense, and plays upon the sensorium with a sort of blandishment, which at once flatters and satisfies the soul. To the eye, seems ought more beauteous than this green carpet of nature, infinitely diversified as it is by pleasing interchanges of lovely tints? What more grateful to the smell, more stimulous of appetite than this collected fragrance which flows from a world of various perfumes? Can art, can the most exquisite art, equal the native flavours of Pomona; or are those sordid sauces of multiplex materials, which the ministers of luxury compose, to irritate the palate and to poison the constitution, worthy to vie with the spontaneous nectar of nature?

The living herbs spring up profusely wild
o'er all the deep-green earth, beyond the power
of botanist to number up their tribes:
whether he steals along the lonely dale,
in silent search; or through the forest, rank
with what the dull incurious weeds account,
bursts his blind way; or climbs the mountain-rock,
fir'd by the nodding verdure of it's brow.
With such a liberal hand has nature flung
their seeds abroad, blown them about in winds,
innumerous mix'd them with the nursing mould,
the moistening current, and prolific rain.
But who their virtues can declare? who pierce,
with vision pure, into those secret stores
of health, and life, and joy? the food of man,
while yet he liv'd in innocence, and told

a length of golden years unflesh'd in blood,
a stranger to the savage arts of life,
death, rapine, carnage, surfeit and disease;
the lord and not the tyrant of the world.—*Thomson.*

To this primitive diet Health invites her votaries. From the produce of the field her various banquet is composed: hence she dispenses health of body, hilarity of mind, and joins to animal vivacity the exalted taste of intellectual life. Nor is Pleasure, handmaid of Health! a stranger to the feast. Thither the bland Divinity conducts the captivated senses; and by their predilection for the pure repast, the deep implanted purpose of nature is declared.—*Oswald.*

O rural life! 'midst poverty how rich!
when hunger bids, there thou may'st nobly feast
on what each season for thy use brings forth,
in r ch variety; the plough thy table,
and a green leaf, by way of dish, supports
the meal of fruit. A homely wooden jug
draws up refreshing drink from the pure stream,
which, free from poison, pours out health alone,
and with soft murmur thee to sleep invites.—*Herder.*

INSTANCES
OF LONGEVITY, HEALTH, AND AGILITY,
ARISING FROM A VEGETABLE DIET.

IN NATIONS.

When motives of mercy, compassion, benevolence, humanity, kindness, propriety, justice; when all these have failed, the examples of nations and individuals may have some influence. Take, then, the following historical instances of habitual kindness.

Notwithstanding the narrow, joyless, and hard-hearted tendency of prevailing superstitions, we perceive in every corner of the globe, some good-natured prejudice in behalf of persecuted animals, which the ruthless jaws of gluttony have not yet overcome.

Long after the perverse practice of devouring the flesh of animals had grown into inveterate habit among the people, there existed still, in almost every country, and in every religion, and of every sect of philosophy, a wiser, a purer, and more holy class of men, who preserved by their institutions, by their precepts and their example, the memory of primitive innocence and simplicity. The Pythagoreans abhorred the slaughter of animals: Epicurus, and the worthiest part of his disciples, bounded their delights with the produce of their gardens; and of the primitive Christians, several sects abominated the feast of blood, and were satisfied with the food which nature unviolated brings forth for our support.—*Oswald.*

"Most of the Epicureans, following the example of the author of their sect, seem to have been contented with meal cakes of pottage, and the fruits of the earth."—Porphyrius, lib. i. para. 48.

Just in the very times of the greatest simplicity,

almost entirely on simple pottage; [Pliny, lib. xviii. cap. 7. Aristot. Politic. lib. vii. cap. 10. Goguet, tom. iii. ch. iii. art. 1. Valerius Maximus, lib. ii. ch. ii. 5.] and a similar diet, or even nothing but bad bread, is still the nourishment of almost all the Sclavonian nations in Europe, and of many of the inhabitants of Italy; [Von Taube, tom. ii. p. 64. Sultzer, tom. ii. p. 370. Schintz, tom. i. p. 159.] and yet these people are to be classed with those that are most conspicuous for muscular strength. Tho' the Illyrians feed hardy, dwell in miserable huts, and mostly in marshy and unwholesome regions, and on the whole are a heavy and sluggish race, yet it is no difficult matter for them to bring down the monstrous oxen of their fertile country by repeated strokes of their brawny fists. [Taube ubi supra.]

The nations which subsist on vegetable diet are of all men the handsomest, the most robust, the least exposed to diseases and violent passions; and they attain the greatest longevity. Such are, in Europe, a great proportion of the Swiss. The negroes, doomed to severe labour, live entirely on manioc, potatoes and maize. From the Pythagorean school *Epaminondas* issued forth, renowned for his virtues; *Archytas*, celebrated for his skill in mechanics; and *Milo* of Crotona, for his strength; copying the virtues of their founder, who was allowedly the first genius of his day, the most enlightened by science, the father of philosophy among the Greeks. As vegetable diet has a necessary connection with many virtues, and excludes none, it must be of importance to accustom young people to it, seeing it's influence so powerfully contributes to beauty of person and tranquillity of soul. The children of the Persians in the time of Cyrus, and by his orders, were fed with bread,

water and cresses; and *Lycurgus* introduced a considerable part of the physical and moral regimen of these children into the education of those of *Lacedemon*. Such diet prolongs infancy, and the duration of life. I have seen, says St. Pierre, an instance of it in an english youth of fifteen, who had not the appearance of being so much as twelve. He was a most interesting figure, possessed of the most vigorous health and of a disposition the most gentle. He performed the longest journies on foot, and never lost temper, whatever befel him. His father, whose name was Pigot, told me he had brought him up entirely under the vegetable regimen, the good effects of which he had learned by his own experience. He had formed the project of employing part of his fortune, which was considerable, in establishing somewhere in British America, a society, who should employ themselves in training, under the same regimen, the children of the American colonists, in the practice of all the arts connected with agriculture. May God prosper such a plan of education, which is worthy the most glorious period of ancient wisdom!—Studies of Nature, iv, 357.

Lycurgus obliged all the citizens of Sparta to eat in public; forbade all seasonings and sauces, and did his utmost to prevent luxury. The *Romans* continued their grandeur till tainted with this vice; among them to have eaten three times a day was a thing prodigious. *Seneca*, tho' worth millions, preferred a crust of bread and a draught of water. "The most remarkable quality in the *Florentine Peasants* is their industry; for, during the hottest weather, they toil all day without sleep, and seldom retire early to rest: yet, notwithstanding this fatigue, they live almost entirely on bread, fruits, pulse, and

the common wine of the country: however tho' their diet be light and their bodily exertions almost perpetual, they commonly attain old age especially in the neighbourhood of Carreggi."—Mrs. Starke's "Letters from Italy, between 1792 and 1798." let. 14.

The *Manicheans* were a sect of Christians who believed in a good and an evil principle; worshipped the sun and other glorious objects of nature; had a firm faith in the New Testament, but rejected the Old, which, they said, described the Almighty as unjust; and religiously abstained from all kinds of animal food. For that and some other good-natured practices and opinions, they suffered much obloquy, and were persecuted by the Catholic church. Against this sect St. Augustine indulges himself in a strain of the most indecent, bitter, and illiberal invective.—Vide St. August. de moribus Manichæorum.

That the *negroes* excel almost all the Europeans in bodily powers needs no demonstration; and yet these strong negroes, both in Africa and America, live more on vegetables than either fish or flesh. [Des Marchais, tom i. p. 293. Projart, tom. i. p. 11, 14. De Manet, tom. i. p. 79, 87.] It is the same with the inhabitants of the South Sea islands, and the Marian isles; [Cooke's last Voyage, vol. i. p. 246. Forster's Observations, p. 351. Voyage, i. 315. Gobier, 46, 55.] of whom all the European travellers agree, that they would not choose to try their strength with them. The former, and especially the inhabitants of the Friendly isles, displayed such an astonishing agility and force, in wrestling and boxing, that they presently knocked or threw down the strongest and most expert of the English sailors. E-

ven women took the English under their arms, in order to transport them over deep streams and rivers. With equal strength, the inhabitants of the Marian isles, took every one his man, of the Europeans who had strayed from their brethren, and ran with them to their habitations with incredible ease. The strength of the latter is so extraordinary, that they can throw stones, by the mere force of their arms, deep into the solid trunk of full growing trees.—Gobier, loc. cit

The *Gauries* are the meekest creatures in the world. The *Banians*, who abstain from flesh more strictly, are almost as meek as they. Diodorus mentions a people in the part of Æthiopia above Egypt, whom he calls ὑλοφαγοι, or wood-eaters, as they subsisted entirely in the woods, eating either the fruits of the trees, or when these could not be had, chewing the tender roots and young branches.

The *Armenian* monks, whom Tavernier saw in the road between Nacksiwan and Zulpha, fed on vegetables. [Persian Travels, 17.] Those of the convent of Mount-Carmel were removed from all worldly conversation, and neither ate flesh nor drank wine. [Thevenot's Travels.]

I perceive, says Michaelis, from Russel's Natural History of Aleppo, p. 50, that there the *Jews* and *Turks* never taste the flesh of cattle. See also his commentaries on the Laws of Moses, by Smith, vol. ii, p. 406.

Some Turks, pitiful and good-natured towards dumb creatures, buy birds on purpose to let them fly away, and return to the liberty of the woods and open air.—Smith's Remarks on the Turks, p. 103.

At Aleppo, the inhabitants chiefly subsist on dates, which, together with various other kinds of fruit, they have in great plenty.

At *Sor*, a village and island in Senegal, Adanson was invited to a dinner by the negro governor. The feast consisted of a large wooden bowl full of couscous, a thick pap made of two sorts of millet. He was far from relishing the temperance and simplicity of his host, but after being a little used to the couscous, he found it very agreeable. [Voyage to Senegal, 55, 56.] The ordinary food of the moors of this part of Africa, is milk, either of camels, cows, goats, or sheep, with millet; and very often milk and gum alone is their entire repast, and serves them for meat and drink.—Id. 64.

At *Malemba*, on the coast of Africa, corn, herbs and spring-water are the common food of the people. —Ovington's Voyage to Surat, p. 77.

The religion of Fo or Fo-é prevails in *China* which enjoins that no living creature be killed.—Osbeck's Voyage, i. 280. The people of this country, for the most part, are accustomed to live on herbs and rice, only. With flour, rice, wheat and plain beans, they prepare a multiplicity of dishes, all different one from another, both in appearance and taste.—Grosier's China, ii, 248, 316.

The *Bramins* shed no blood and eat no flesh; their diet is rice and other vegetables, prepared with a kind of butter called ghee, and with ginger and other spices, but they consider milk the purest food, as coming from the cow, an animal for which they have a sacred veneration. "Sketches chiefly relating to the Hindoos, 1790," 8vo. p. 111.

There are certain privileged orders, however, who are allowed to eat animal food; but it is done sparingly. To abstain entirely is considered more virtuous. Sketches, 118.

From shedding the blood, or taking away the life

of any animal, both sexes of the Hindoos are strictly prohibited by their religion. Among the Wallachians, tho' there be no positive institution to the contrary, yet the women never destroy the life of any creature. Whether this custom was founded by some of their ancient legislators, or whether it originated from incidental circumstances, is uncertain; but however that be, nothing can be more suitable to the gentleness and timidity, which form this most engaging part of the female character.—Alexander's Hist. of Women, v. i, p. 366.

The *Egyptians*, a most ancient nation, seem to have abstained entirely from animal food; which was, probably one reason that they abominated the jews, who had continually their fingers in the flesh-pots; the loss of which they lamented when banished out of the country. "The children of Israel also wept again, and said, Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt, freely, the cucumbers, and the melons and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic."—Num. xi, 5.

In confirmation, Diodorus says it was reported, that the Egyptians fed on nothing but roots and herbs, and colewort leaves, which grew in the fens and bogs; but, above all, and most commonly, on the herb agrostis, because it was sweeter than any other, and very nourishing to men's bodies; and it is certain he adds, that the cattle much covet it, and grow very fat with it. book i, ch. 4.

In *Walachia* it is common to meet with whole forests of fruit trees, such as pears, cherries, apricots, &c. The greatest part of the mountain resemble our best cultivated gardens. The Walachians are generally tall, well-made, robust, and of a very wholesome complexion. Diseases are very rare among

them; and the plague, tho' so frequent in Turkey, has never been known, excepting in times of war, when the disease was brought among them by the troops who came from Asia. Volney's Trav. 268. The manners of the Walachians, as far as I have been able to judge of them, are simple, and neither embellished nor sullied by art. Temperate in their repasts, they prefer vegetables to fruits, and fruits to the most delicate meats. p. 271.

The bonzes or *Japonese* priests, abstain from animal food.—Thevenot's Travels, p. 219 And so do the *Jalapoins* or priests of Siam; at least they shed no blood, being forbidden by their religion. [Travernier, Indian Trav. 191. Voyage to Siam, 85. Louberie's Siam, 126. Kaempfer also confirms this account. Hist. of Japan, 124.] And tho' they have but few household, and are generally possessed of many children and great poverty, yet with a small quantity of rice-plants and roots, they live contented and happy.—Id. 415.

In *Minorca*, brown wheaten bread is the principal nourishment of the poor. The general breakfast is a piece of bread, a bunch of grapes or raisins, and a draught of water.—Armstrong's History of Minorca, p. 209.

The inhabitants of the *Canary Islands* subsist chiefly on goffio, a mixture of wheat and barley-flour, toasted; which they mix with a little water, bring it to the consistence of dough, and then eat it. Sometimes they put the goffio in milk, or dip it in honey, or melasses. This is their common food and according to Glass, our countryman, "a most excellent dish." [History of the Canary Islands, p. 201, 208.] When the natives of the Canary Islands, who were called *Guanchos*, wanted rain, or had too much, or

in any other calamity, they brought their sheep and goats into a place appointed, and separating the young ones from their dams, raised a general bleating among them, which they imagined would appease the wrath of the Supreme Power, and incline him to send them what they wanted. [Astley's Voyages, vol. i, p. 549.] To a God of love, how much more acceptable the prayers of the humane Guanchos, mingled with the plaintive cries of their guileless mediators? how much more moving their innocent supplication, than the ruffian petitions of those execrable Arabs, who, imploring mercy, perpetrated murder, and embrued in the blood of agonizing innocence, dared to beseech thy compassion, thou common Father of all that breathe the breath of life!

The *Otaheiteans*, says Bougainville, subsist principally on vegetables and fish. They seldom eat flesh; their children and young women, never any; and this, he says, doubtless keeps them free from almost all our diseases. [Voyage by Forster, p. 248.] This is the case in the other South-sea islands, see Sparman's Voyage to the Cape of GoodHope, ii, 228, &c.

We learn from Ulloa's work on *South America*, that the instances are common on that continent, of persons in good health at a hundred years of age; and not rare, at a hundred and thirty or forty; who are sustained entirely on vegetables.

Tho' the *Indian women* rear fowls, and other domestic animals in their cottages, they never eat them. They will not sell, much less kill them; so that if a stranger, who was compelled to pass the night in one of their cottages, offers ever so much money for a fowl, they refuse to part with it.—Pinkerton's Col. part lviii, p. 519.

In the *East Indies*, the Pegu clergy teach, that

charity is the most sublime virtue, and therefore ought to be extensive enough to reach, not only to the human species, but even to animals; wherefore they neither kill nor eat any; and they are so benevolent to mankind, that they cherish all alike, making no exception on account of religion.—Capt. Hamilton, in Pinkerton's Col. pa. xxxiii, p. 426.

In *Cambia*, the indians will kill nothing, nor have any thing killed; they consequently eat no flesh, but live on roots, rice, fruits and milk.—Fitch, in Pinkerton's Col. v. ix, p. 408.

India, of all the regions of the earth, is the only public theatre of justice and tenderness to brutes, and all living creaturcs; for there, not confining murder to the killing of man, they religiously abstain from taking the life of the meanest animal.—Ovington's Voyage to Surat, 296.

Even the *Hottentots* or inhabitants of the Cape, tho' they have cows, hogs, and sheep, seldom eat any of them, living chiefly on milk, butter, and vegetables. They have a root which serves them for bread. [Voyage to Siam, 5.] The slaves and boshies-men, who serve the farmers, are kept almost entirely with bread and other preparations of meal and flour.—Sparrman's Voyage, ii, 231.

In the island of *Johanna* the natives live in a great measure on rice and the cocoa-nut put together.—Voyage to Surat, 121.

The *South-sea* islanders were handsome and healthy as can be imagined. They lived on fruits and vegetables, till Capt. Cooke conceived that they must be miserable without beef and mutton. He took compassion on them by perverting their natures. They have since lost their former health.—Newton, p. 36.

Those who have travelled in *Spain* are not unac-

quainted that a native attendant will accompany a mule or carriage on foot, forty or fifty miles a day, without any support besides raw onions and bread.

The peasantry of that part of Spain through which Swinburne travelled, seemed poor, and frugal in their diet, bread steeped in oil, he says, and occasionally seasoned with vinegar, is the common food of the country people, from Barcelona to Malaga.—Travels, in 1776, p. 210.

The *Dumplers* are a plain and peaceable sect of Germans in Pensylvania. Their common food consists of vegetables, because they think it is more conformable to the spirit of Christianity, which has an aversion to blood.—Raynal, vii, 296.

The *Irish*, who live chiefly on potatoes and butter-milk, are as strong as any race of man in Europe. They are not remarked as long livers, which may be accounted for, from their propensity to drink whiskey, and take common water.

Dr. Adam Smith has asserted, that Ireland has supplied the metropolis with a race of the finest women and the stoutest men, which are known in the world. The children of the Irish are mostly fed on butter-milk and potatoes. In Lancashire, a county famed for beauty, the same diet is much in use. A judicious observer told me, that the finest family of children he had ever seen, was that of a very eminent surgeon of Liverpool, and that this family adhered strictly to a vegetable diet.

The wild girl who was caught in *Champaigne* climbed trees like a squirrel, and leapt from one branch to another on all four. She became, soon after she was caught, incapable of those exertions of agility; an alteration which she attributed to the gross aliment they had given her, which, she said, had made

her so much heavier than when she lived on wild food. —Monboddo.

IN INDIVIDUALS.

What is more agreeable than to contemplate particular instances of longevity, attained by uniformity of temperance, moderation of desire, and simplicity of life! What more pleasing than to review their examples and examine their precepts!

Instances of the greatest age are to be found among men who from their youth lived principally on vegetables and who perhaps never tasted flesh. The most ancient are the Stoics and the Pythagoreans, according to whose ideas subduing the passions and observing strict regimen, were the most essential duties of a philosopher.

Clement of Alexandria, says of Saint Matthew, that he abstained from eating flesh, and that his diet was fruit, roots and herbs.—Pædagogue, b. ii, c. 1.

Descartes, in conformity to the humane principles of Plutarch, always preferred fruits and vegetables to the bleeding flesh of animals.—Seward's Anecdotes, ii, 171.

Pythagoras was a man of universal knowledge, who flourished about 500 years before Christ, who forbad to kill, much more to eat, living creatures, that had the same prerogative of souls with ourselves, and ate nothing that had had life.—Lucian, Auction of Philosophers. He divided the life of man into four equal parts. From the first to the twentieth year he called him a child, a man begun; from the twentieth to the fortieth, a young man; from the fortieth to the sixtieth, a man; from the sixtieth to the eightieth, an old, or declining man; and after that period he reckoned him no more among the living,

to whatever age he might survive. The Pythagorean diet consisted in the free and universal use of every thing that is vegetable, tender and fresh, required little or no preparation to make them fit to eat, such as roots, leaves, flowers, fruits, and seeds; and in a general abstinence from every thing animal, whether fresh or dryed, bird, beast, or fish. Milk and honey made up part of this diet. Eggs were excluded. Their drink was the purest water; but neither wine nor any vinous liquor. Pythagoras's two meals a day, were for the most part of bread only; but his last meal, which we should call a supper, was abundant. It appears that his regimen was not so strict as that of some of his disciples, for he drank wine, not only in the day time, but at evening in company at table. He made it an article in his religion, that his clothes should be white and extremely clean, and be changed every day. [Diod. Sicu. &c.] He preferred those made of vegetables to those made of animal substances, which he knew attracted moist and unwholesome effluvia. [Apul. Apol. p. 64, and Princ. Jambl. c. 21.—Philostr. Vit. Ap. viii, 3.] He took a great delight in music, and bathed frequently [Jambl. 29] He bought animals and particularly fish, which, after he had examined, he set at liberty or returned them into the water, and was particularly careful not to injure fruit-bearing trees. —Plutarch and Apuleius. Liv. xl. 29. Plin. xiii, 15.

Isocrates, a man of great temperance and modesty, lived 98 years.

Democritus, the friend and searcher of nature, a man also of a good temper and serene mind, lived 109 years; and the frugal but slovenly *Diogenes*, 96.

Xenophilus, a Pythagorean, also lived 106 years.

Apollonius of Tyana, an accomplished man, endowed with extraordinary powers, both of body and mind, who by the Christians was considered a magician, and by the Greeks and Romans, as a messenger of the gods; in his regimen a follower of Pythagoras, and a friend to travelling, was above 100 years of age.

Zeno, the founder of the stoical sect, and a master in the art of self-denial, attained nearly to the age of 100 years; and his immediate successor and disciple *Cleanthes*, his 99th.

The philosopher *Demonax*, a man of the most severe manners and uncommon stoical apathy, lived likewise to 100.

Pindar, who begins his poems by declaring water to be the best liquid in nature, lived to the age of 86.

Sophocles, the tragedian, at 90 years of age, produced his Œdipus, one of the most elaborate compositions of the dramatic kind, that the human genius ever perfected, and lived to near 100.

The philosopher *Gorgias*, who declared he had never eaten or done any thing for the mere gratification of his appetite, lived 107 years.

Hippocrates, the father of physic, lived 100 years.

The amiable *Xenophon*, who had written so much in praise of temperance and virtue, lived above 90.

Plato, one of the most divine geniuses that ever existed, and a friend to rest and calm meditation, lived to the age of 81.

Agesilaus, whose character is so beautifully pourtrayed by Zenophon, led armies at 80, established Nectanabis in his kingdom, and at 84, on his return from Egypt, finished a life adorned with singular glory.

Xenocrates, a severe and rigid moralist, gave numerous proofs of the benevolence and humanity of his disposition towards all creatures. A sparrow, pursued by a hawk, flew to him for refuge; he sheltered it in his bosom, and released it as soon as the danger was over.—Ælian, b. xiii, c. 31.

Cicero, in his treatise on old age, introduces Cato the censor, in his eighty-fourth year, haranguing and assisting with his counsels, the senate, the people, his clients and his friends.

It is surprising to what a great age the Eastern Christians, who retired from persecution into the deserts of Egypt and Arabia, lived healthful on a very little food.

The famous *Lewis Cornaro*, the Venetian, was of an infirm constitution till forty; at fourscore he published his celebrated book, entitled, "Sure and certain Methods of attaining a long and healthy life," and after having passed his hundredth year, died in his elbow-chair without pain.

Aurengzebe, according to Gemelli, from the time that he usurped the throne, never once tasted either flesh, fish, or strong liquors, and died in 1707, nearly 100 years old.

Our happy island, in those instances where the rules of sobriety have been uniformly regarded, can vie with Greece and Rome or any other region, in examples of longevity. Plutarch represents the *Britons*, as living several of them beyond the age of 120; for Diodorus Siculus honours the primitive inhabitants of this isle with this testimony, that they were distinguished for the simplicity of their manners, and were happy strangers to the profligacy and depravity of modern times, that the island swarmed with multitudes, that their food was simple and far remov-

ed from that luxury which is inseparable from opulence.—Diod. Siculus, lib. iv. p. 301. edit. Rhodomanni Hanov. 1604.

Buchanan informs us of one *Laurence*, who preserved himself to 140, by the mere force of temperance and labour.

Spotiswoode mentions one *Kentigem* (afterwards, called St. Mougah, from whom a well in Wales is named) who lived 185 years, never tasting wine or strong drink, and sleeping on the hard cold ground.

Henry Jenkins, fisherman, of Allerton upon Swale, in Yorkshire, died in 1670, at the very advanced age of 169 years. Dr. Robinson says, that his diet was coarse and sour, that is plain and cooling.

We find that it is not those who have lived on flesh, but on vegetables, pulse, fruit, and milk, who attained to the greatest age. Lord Bacon mentions a man of 120, who, during his whole life, never used any other food than milk.

Thomas Parr, of Winnington, Shropshire, died in the year 1635, in the 153d of his age. His diet was old cheese, milk, coarse bread, small beer and whey. In Parr we have a corroborating instance that the life of man, by attention to the laws of nature, might be extended to an unusual length; for, on his body being opened by Dr. Harvey, it was found to be in the most perfect state, the only cause of his death being a mere plethora, brought on by changing a pure air and a plain wholesome diet for the putrid thick air, and luxurious living of London.

Richard Lloyd, a poor labouring man, born within two miles of Montgomery, who lived to the age of 133, and was a strong upright man, could walk well, had a good set of teeth, and no gray hairs;

could hear distinctly, and read without spectacles: his food was bread and cheese, and butter; and his drink, whey, butter-milk, or water, and nothing else; but being, by a neighbouring gentleman, persuaded to eat flesh-meat, and drink malt liquor, he very soon after died.

Hobbes, the celebrated philosopher of Malmesbury, who was as remarkable for the temperance of his life, as the singularity of his opinions, died in the year 1679, in the 92d year of his age.

John Hussey of Sydenham, Kent, died in 1748, aged 116 years. For upwards of fifty years his breakfast had been balm-tea, sweetened with honey; and his dinner, pudding; by which he acquired regular health.

Francis Secardi Hongo, who made distilled water his constant drink, without the addition of wine, or any strong liquor to the last, lived, with remarkably good health, to the age of 115 years.—Med. Tran. vol. i, p. 22.

The father of Mrs. Wright, well known as an ingenious modeller in wax, was esteemed in the part of America where he resided, a very rich but honest man. In the course of his reflections on the nature of things, he perceived that God cannot have permitted men to spill the blood of animals for their daily food. He, therefore, neither ate flesh himself, nor permitted it to be eaten by any one within his gates. His ten children were twice ten years old before they tasted flesh—New Prose Bath Guide for 1778, by Philip Thicknesse, esq.

Henry Welby lived in Grub-street, forty-four years, unseen by any, and in all that space did not taste either flesh or fish.

Robert Cooke, esq. lived near Wexford, the latter

end of the 17th century. He was a rigid Pythagorean, never drinking any liquor besides water, nor eating any food which had ever had sensitive life. He would not wear any thing which had been produced at the expense of the life of any sensitive creature. His clothes, hat, shoes, stockings, bed, &c. were composed of linen. The writer of an account of this gentleman in the European Mag. vol. xlv, p. 252, makes the following comment. "It would be a task to which, perhaps, the most pervading talents are unequal, to attempt to account for those anomalies of the human mind which have appeared, at times, in all ages and nations, from the period of the philosopher who denominated the sect, to the present hour, and which certainly, if we consider our cruelty to the brute creation, and our shameful prodigality of their innocent lives, if it were a fault, was so much on the right side, had such a leaning towards virtue, that Lucullus, Apicius, Heliogabalus, or all the good livers of antiquity, nay all their modern disciples, from Duck or Hoglanes, west; to the Poultry, Fish-street, &c. east, will be inclined to pass a slight censure on his ashes, which, I understand from a medical man, notwithstanding his absurd regimen, were kept out of their *terrene mattress* almost a century; and I am of opinion, that he had the audacity to live in order to confute and dishonour the prognostication which was launched at him, that his abstinence would soon bring him to the grave, or, in the vernacular idiom, that he was killing himself by inches." Tho' it be not easy to understand what this writer means by first confessing that he and his brethren are guilty of cruelty and shameful prodigality in the sacrifice of innocent lives, and then saying that those who avoid such crimes *err* on the right

side; yet, as a flesh-eater, he has made great and liberal concessions.

Dr. Stark mentions a *Mr. Slingsby*, who lived many years on bread, milk, and vegetables, without animal food or wine. He had excellent spirits, was very vigorous, and, from the time he began that regimen, was free from the gout, with which he had been particularly afflicted. *Dr. Knight* followed the same plan with equal success.

In July 1737, was living in St Margaret's workhouse, Westminster, *Mary Patten*, aged 136 years, whose only food was milk.—Gent. Mag. vii. 449.

Joseph Ekins died at Coombe in Northumberland, aged 103; who never knew a week's illness, and subsisted entirely on bread, milk, and vegetables, for the last thirty years.

Mrs. Carpenter of Islington died in 1752, aged 102. She had lived for a considerable number of years on puddings and spoon-meat.

Margaret Hunter of Newcastle, died in 1753, aged 104. Her diet was mostly water and milk, having never drank more than two half-pints of malt liquor.

George Broadbent, of Dobcross, in Saddleworth, Lancashire, lived to the age of ninety-eight years. He had abstained almost during his whole life from animal food, from an opinion of it's pernicious effects on the human constitution, which opinion he inherited from his father. He lived chiefly on milk-meats, kept a cow, and cultivated his own roots and vegetables. Apples, pears, plumbs, &c. were his luxuries. He was very partial to bread made of the flour of beans, and ate garlic very frequently. He always found himself strong and vigorous, and a stranger to disease. At the age of ninety he mowed his grass,

made it into hay, and carried it home upon his back, at the distance of a quarter of a mile. His usual hour of rising was four in the morning. He wrought at the business of woollen-cloth-making to the time of his death, which took place in the year 1753.

Judith Banister, of Cowes, in the Isle of Wight, died anno 1754, aged 108, and was attended to her grave by eighty of her descendants. During the last sixty years of her life she had lived on biscuit and apples, with milk and water.

Elizabeth Macpherson, of the County of Caithness, in Scotland, died in the year 1765, aged 117. Her uniform diet was buttermilk and greens. She retained all her senses till within three months of her death.

Francis Consit, of Burythrope, near Malton, Yorkshire, died in 1768, aged 150 years. He was very temperate in his living, and used great exercise. He occasionally ate a raw new laid egg. He retained his senses to the last.

Lewis Morgan, of Llandrindod, Radnorshire, died in 1785 aged 101. His death was occasioned by a fall. He was in perfect possession of his faculties, lived chiefly on a vegetable diet and drank water.

The philanthropic *Howard*, utterly discarded animal food, as well as all fermented spirituous drinks from his diet. He died of the plague, in 1790.

The Hon. *Mrs. Watkins*, of Glamorganshire, died in 1790, aged 110 years. The year before her death she went to London for the purpose of seeing Mrs. Siddons perform. She mounted, while there, to the whispering gallery of St. Paul's. She was remarkable for regularity and moderation. During the last thirty years she subsisted entirely on potatoes.

Jonathan Hartop, of the village of Aldborough,

near Boroughbridge, Yorkshire, died in 1791, aged 138. He could read without spectacles and play at cribbage to the last. He ate but little and his only beverage was milk.

"*Thomas Wood*, a miller, of Billericay, in the county of Essex, having passed the preceding part of his life in eating and drinking without weight or measure, found himself, in the year 1764, and in the 45th of his age, overwhelmed with a complication of the most painful and terrible disorders. In the catalogue were comprehended frequent sickness at the stomach, pains in the bowels, head-ache, and vertigo. He had almost a constant thirst, a great lowness of spirits, fits of the gravel, violent rheumatism, and frequent fits of the gout, and had likewise had two epileptic fits. To this copious list of distempers were added a formidable sense of suffocation, particularly after meals, and an extreme corpulence of person. On reading the life of Cornaro, recommended to his perusal by the Rev. Mr. Powley, a worthy clergyman in his neighbourhood, he immediately formed a resolution to follow the salutary precepts inculcated and exemplified in that performance. He prudently however did not make a total or sudden change in his manner of living; but finding the good effects of his new regimen, after proper gradations both with respect to the quantity and quality of his meat and drink, he finally left off the use of all fermented liquors on the 4th of January 1765, when he commenced water-drinker. He did not long however indulge himself even in this last-mentioned innocent beverage; for on the 25th of the following October, having found himself easier and better on having accidentally dined that day without drinking, he finally took his leave of this and every other kind

of drink, not having tasted a single drop of any liquor whatever (excepting only what he has occasionally taken in the form of medicine, and two glasses and a half of water, drank on the 9th of May 1766) from that date to the present time. [Aug. 22, 1771.] With respect to solid nutriment, the 31st of July, in the year 1767, was the last time of his eating any kind of animal food. In it's room he substituted a single dish, of which he made only two meals in twenty-four hours; one at four or five in the morning, and the other at noon. This consisted of a pudding, of which he ate a pound and a half, made of three pints of skimmed milk poured boiling hot on a pound of sea-biscuit over night, to which two eggs were added next morning, and the whole boiled in a cloth about the space of an hour. Finding this diet however, too nutritious, and having grown fat during the use of it, he threw out the eggs and milk, and formed a new edition of pudding, consisting only of a pound of coarse flour and a pint of water boiled together. He was at first much delighted with this new receipt, and lived on it three months; but not finding it easily digestible, he finally formed a mess, which has ever since constituted the whole of his nourishment, composed of a pound of the best flour, boiled to a proper stiffness with a pint and a half of skimmed milk, without any other addition. Such is the regimen of diet, which proved as agreeable to his palate as his former food used to be, by means of which, together with a considerable share of exercise, Mr. Wood has disposed of the incumbrance of ten or eleven stone weight of distempered flesh and fat, and, to use his own expression, "has been metamorphosed from a monster, to a person of a moderate size; from the condition of an unhealthy, de-

cripit old man to perfect health, and to the vigour and activity of youth;" his spirits lively, his sleep undisturbed, and his strength of muscles so far improved, that he can now carry a quarter of a ton weight, which he in vain attempted to perform, when he was about the age of thirty, and in perfect health.

We shall mention only two other circumstances in the case of this singular pattern of temperance and resolution. The first is, the extreme slowness and sobriety of his pulse, which Dr. Baker at three different times, found to beat only from 44 to 47 times in a minute. The next and still more remarkable singularity is, that, notwithstanding his total abstinence from drink, and that no liquid is received into his stomach, except that contained in his pudding, a part of which is necessarily carried off through the intestines; yet he daily and regularly makes about a pint and a half of urine. It is observable, that during the most laborious and long-continued exercise, he has very little or no sensible perspiration. We think we may safely conclude that, instead of throwing in any of his perspirable matter to the common mass of air, he, on the contrary, rather spunges on the atmosphere, and robs it of a portion of it's humidity, which we may suppose to be greedily attracted by the mouths of the dry and thirsty absorbents upon the surface of his skin."—Med. Trans. London, vol. ii. artic. 18.

Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swede, who died at London in 1772, was profoundly learned in many sciences, but in the latter part of his life he wrote mystical books on religious subjects, which have produced a sect which regard him as a prophet; but they vary from his principles in the same manner as the followers of Christ depart from his precepts. With

respect to animal food, E. Swedenborg says, "Eating the flesh of animals, considered in itself, is somewhat prophane, for the people of the most ancient time, never, on any account, ate the flesh of any beast or fowl, but fed solely on grain, especially on bread made of wheat, also on the fruit of trees, or pulse, on milk, and what is produced from milk, as butter, &c. To kill animals and to eat their flesh, was to them unlawful and seemed as something bestial; and they were content with the uses and services which these yielded, as appears from Gen. i, 29, 30; but in succeeding times, when man began to grow fierce as a wild beast, yea, much fiercer, then first they began to kill animals, and to eat their flesh." Arcana, n. 1002. He enforced the opinion that eating flesh is profane, unlawful and bestial, by his own practice, for during the last fifty years of his life he wholly abstained both from animal food and every kind of inebriating liquors. These facts are cautiously concealed by the professed teachers of his doctrines.

Dr. *Adam Ferguson*, professor of mathematics in the University of Edinburgh, and historian of the roman republic, lived strictly on a vegetable diet, and attained the age of 93.

Joseph Ritson, Esq. author of "An Essay on Abstinence from Animal Food as a moral Duty," says, page 201, "I was induced to serious reflection, by the perusal of Mandeville's "Fable of the Bees," in the year 1772, being the 19th year of my age, firmly to adhere to a milk and vegetable diet. He says, that he ate eggs, which deprives no animal of life, tho' it may prevent some from coming into the world to be murdered and devoured by others.

The Rev. *William Cowherd*, founder and minister of Christ-Church, Salford, Manchester died in 1816, at the age of 53, of a pulmonary disease, induced by too close application to study, and want of exercise. He was a true champion in behalf of innocent animals. A leading criterion for admitting any member into his church was abstinence from eating flesh. Three hundred of his hearers, under the influence of his example and the authority of scripture, as by him ably explained, were converted to this habit. He preached gratis and supported himself by the practice of medicine. To enter on his scriptural disquisitions, would be a large undertaking, tho' I have listened to them with great interest. I will content myself with one of his physical arguments, by way of specimen. "Let us examine, for a moment," said he, "what the animal man is. He assumes to himself the qualities of sympathy, sensibility, affectionate regards, tenderness, humane motives, &c. All the mildly disposed animals eat vegetables, while the savages of the forest are universally carnivorous. Tell me, then, whether after deliberate experiment, you digest vegetables or the animal fabric, with the greatest facility, and I will tell you whether your animal composition assimilates with the vegetable eating tribes, or with the wolf, which eats sheep." His church was opened in the year 1800, and he expounded the whole of the Old and New Testament in portions, beginning at the first of Genesis. In this manner he had gone three times through the Bible, at the time of his death. In 1807, he built Christ-Church in Hulme, conducted on the same principles as that in Salford. He established an academy near the church, where young men were educated for the ministry. One room in his a-

ademy, contained a printing-office, and at the time of his death, he was about to commence printing a new translation of the Bible, with a commentary. He was buried, according to his desire, under the window of his study, and the following mystical inscription, written by himself, was placed, by his desire, upon his tomb.

ALL FEARED.
NONE LOVED.
FEW UNDERSTOOD.

J. F. Newton, Esq. is a remarkable instance of the salubrious effects of a vegetable diet, of which he has given the following account. "I came, two years ago, into the house, which I now occupy, in Chester-street, London. During the first year of my residence in 1809, the only charge for medicine for seven persons, including the nurse of my children, who, from her own conviction adopted the diet, was sixpence, and for the year 1810, not a penny. The nurse was troubled with a species of acute asthma. The affection of the trachea resembled the croup, and it was always attended with an alarming tone. She has entirely got rid of her disorder. I am persuaded that there is scarcely another instance in this never-ending metropolis of three grown persons and four young children under nine years of age, incurring an expense of sixpence only for medicine and medical attendance in the course of two years. [This fact has been repeated in Dr. Lambe's family, where the children were much older than mine, when they adopted the regimen of vegetables and distilled water.] This result is exactly what would be expected from the remarkably healthy appearance of the young people alluded to, which is so striking, that several med-

ical men, who have seen and examined them, with a scrutinizing eye, all agreed in the observation that they knew no where a family which equals them in robustness. Should the success of this experiment, at the time I write, [1811] of three years standing, proceed as it has begun, there is little doubt, I presume, that it must at length have some influence with the public.—Newton's Return to Nature, p. 76. See a continuation of Mr. Newton's case by Dr. Lambe, p. 184, of this work.

Mr. *John Tweddell*, says, "I no longer eat flesh-meat, nor drink fermented liquors. As for the latter, it is merely because I do not believe that they can ever be good for the constitution, and still more especially with a vegetable diet."—Life, p. 215.

Mr. *G. G. Fordham* has made an interesting communication to Dr. Lambe, which appears in the Addit. Reports, p. 453, dated Sandon, near Royton, Dec. 28, 1814. "About two years ago," says he, "I was very sickly and had little enjoyment of life. My great complaint was general debility, which daily increasing on me, took away all desire and ability for exertion and rendered my mind incapable of attending to any subject for any length of time. Occasionally I was under a considerable stimulus and animation, which were followed by coldness and langour. Sleep did not seem to benefit me; my appetite was craving and seldom satisfied, and once a week, I was subject to a distressing sick headache. My fluids were evidently in an impure state, consequently the solid parts were not nourished; for impurity cannot impart strength, and hence that general debility of which I complained. Having read Mr. Newton's work, and your publications, I resolved to adopt the use of vegetables with distilled water,

and now, after the experience of nearly two years, I can say, with the strictest truth and certainty, that my health has been gradually improving up to the present time. My strength is greater than it ever was before; my painful sensations have left me; I am seldom attacked by head-ache and never with it's former violence. I do not mean to say that I am perfectly well, but I am better in health *now*, than I remember ever to have been in any former period of my life. The comparison is not to be made between me, and any other person, but between what I am now, and what I was before I adopted this regimen. Vegetables are certainly the natural support of man; they recommend themselves by their freshness and purity; and by their sweetness and agreeableness to the palate. They require little trouble in preparation, and are always a nice, clean, and delicate food; while dead animal substances are very offensive to the senses, and it becomes a very dirty and disagreeable task to cook and prepare them for the appetite. The slaughter of animals is also a ferocious and disgusting act, which greatly opposes the growth of benevolent dispositions. Comparative anatomy has clearly proved that man is, in his very construction, an herbivorous animal, which ought to have great weight with every rational mind."

The pedestrian *J. Stewart*, esq. is a remarkable instance of the effect of aliment on the human constitution; the account which he gives of himself is interesting. "Upon a comparative view of constitutions and climates, I find them reciprocally adapted, and offering no difference of good and evil. I then consider the aliment, and tho' on a superficial observation the difference might be supposed wisely adapted to the difference of climate; yet on more critical

investigation, I am disposed to believe the aliment of flesh and fermented liquors to be heterogeneous to the nature of man in every climate. I have observed among nations, whose aliment is vegetables and water, that disease and medicine are equally unknown, while those, whose aliment is flesh and fermented liquor, are constantly afflicted with disease, and medicine more dangerous than disease itself; and not only those guilty of excess, but others who lead lives of temperance. These observations shew the great importance of congeniality of aliment, in the discovery and continuance of which depends the inestimable blessing of health, or basis of well-being or happiness. As my own discoveries in this important subject may be of some use to mankind, I shall relate the state of my own health and aliment. At a very early period I left my native climate, before excess, debauchery, or diet had done the least injury to my body. I found many of my countrymen in the region of India, suffering under a variety of distempers; for tho' they had changed their country, they would by no means change their aliment; and to this ignorant obstinacy I attributed the cause of their disorders. To prove this by my own experience, I followed the diet of the natives, and found no change in my health affected by the greatest contrariety of climate, to which I exposed myself more than any of my countrymen dared to do. This led me to consider the nature of aliment on the human body abstractedly. Anatomy, which discovers the nature and connection of the solids, or material organization of the human body, can give no knowledge of the fluids, or matter in circulation; for these recede from, and are changed or destroyed by all chirurgical operations. These can only be discovered in our bod-

ies, not their cause or nature, but their effect, either latent or manifested in the change or disorder of the functions of life, or the excrement of the body. The ducts or vessels which convey the circulation of the fluids are certainly affected by the quality of the latter, as the banks of a river are broken down or preserved by the regularity of the current. As I possess from care and nature, a perfect constitution, my body may serve as an example which may generalize the effect of aliment on most other bodies. I observed in travelling, if my body was wet and must continue any time in that state, I abstained from all nourishment till it was dry, and always escaped the usual disorders of cold, rheumatism and fever. When I was in the frigid Zone, I lived on a nutritious aliment, and eat much butter, with beans, peas, and other pulse. In the torrid Zone, I diminished the nutritious quality of my food, and eat but little butter, and even then found it necessary to eat spices to absorb the humours, whose redundancy are caused by heat, and are noxious in hot climates. In cold climates nature seems to demand that redundancy, as necessary to strength and health."—Stewart's Travels.

Sir *Richard Phillips*, the editor of the Monthly Magazine and author of various publications, is said, by Mr. Ritson, to be "a lusty, healthy, active, and well-looking man, who in 1802 had desisted from animal food for upwards of 20 years."

Many more instances might easily be produced, where regularity of life, tranquillity of mind, and simplicity of diet, have furnished long scenes of happiness, and blessed the late evening of life with unimpaired vigour both of body and mind. But such instances of longevity are very rarely to be found in

courts and cities. Courts have ever been the sepulchres of temperance and virtue, and great cities the graves of the human species. In the middle stations of life, where men have lived rationally in the humble cottage, whose inhabitants are necessitated to abstemiousness in hermitages and monasteries, where the anchoret mortifies his desires, and imposes abstinence on himself from religious considerations in those sequestered scenes and walks of human life we are to search for those who reach the ultimate boundaries of this life's short pilgrimage. That man who has reached the greatest extent of mortal existence may be considered as the perfection of his race. It is in the power of every one to adopt a plan, accidents excepted, which will secure a long and healthy life. It is next to an impossibility, that he who lives temperately, and selects a plain and wholesome diet, should fall sick or die prematurely. Distempers cannot be produced without causes; and if no cause exist, there can be no sudden or fatal consequence. Good air appears more immediately necessary to well-being than good water and good food; for a person may live several days without the latter, but not many minutes in cases of the deprivation of or improper state of the former. It has been ascertained that the vivifying principle contained in the atmosphere is a pure dephlogisticated fluid; the air we breathe is therefore more or less healthy in proportion to the quantity it contains of this animating principle. This quality exhales copiously from the green leaves of every kind of vegetable, even from the most poisonous; the frequent instances of longevity of country people may hence be fairly deduced. The air of cities and large towns, on the contrary, is daily impregnated with noxious animal effluvia, and

phlogiston. Longevity is frequently hereditary. Healthy long-lived parents generally transmit the same blessings to their children, who perhaps fall into irregularities in meat, drink and exercise, and shorten their natural term of life. Whence is it, if not from these causes and unnatural modes of life, that one half of the children born in cities do not survive their tenth year? Such extraordinary mortality is never found among savage nations or wild animals. Man has defeated the purposes of nature, which destined him to rise with the sun, to spend a large portion of his time in the open air, to inure his body to robust exercises, to be exposed to the inclemency of the seasons, and to live on plain and simple food.

OBJECTIONS TO A VEGETABLE DIET ANSWERED.

Gassendus insists that man is not carnivorous, on account of the formation of our teeth; most of them being *Incisores* or *Molitories:* not proper to tear flesh, such as carnivorous animals are supplied with, but proper for cutting herbs, roots, &c. "*It is an unquestionable fact, that all animals which have but one stomach and short intestines, like men, dogs, wolves, lions, &c, are carnivorous, The carnivorous tribes can by no means subsist without flesh.*" —Buffon's Nat. Hist. vol. 4. p. 193. This assertion is confuted in the most pointed manner; not only by the practice of Hindostan, where many millions of men subsist entirely on vegetables, but even by the example of the peasantry of most countries in Europe, who taste flesh so seldom, that it cannot be supposed to contribute in the least to their welfare.

Dr. Wallis argues, that all quadrupeds feeding on

herbs or plants, have a long colon, with a *cœcum* at the upper end of it, which conveys the food by a long passage from the stomach; but in carnivorous animals such cœcum is wanting, and instead there is a more short and slender gut, assisting a quicker passage through the intestines. In man the cœcum is very visible; a strong presumption that Nature, always consistent, did not intend him a carnivorous animal.

The reflecting reader will not expect a formal refutation of common-place objections which mean nothing; as "There would be more unhappiness and slaughter among animals, did we not keep them under proper regulations and government."—"Where would they find pasture, did we not manure and enclose the land for them?"—"What would become of their young did we not nurse, assist, and protect them?"—"How many would perish did we not secure them within proper bounds."—"How would they fight and murder each other, did we not prevent or interpose in their quarrels?"

It has been said, *Is it not better to aid the designs of providence, by making the animals he has sent us happy, by sheltering and feeding them; and then, while in the vigour of health, deprive them suddenly of life, rather than let them linger in old age and feebleness? We think this a conscientious mode of acting.* The tender consciences of these people remind me of Montmorency, who was constable of France in the time of Francis I. "He never failed to say his paternosters, every morning. In the field, it was his way, if any disorders or irregularities came within his view, while reciting or muttering these paters, to cry, "Take me up such a man; tie that other to a tree; pass him through the pikes instantly, or

shoot them all before my face; cut me in pieces those scoundrels who hold out that steeple against the king; burn this village; set fire to the country for a quarter of a league round;" and he gave these orders without any intermission of his paters, till he had finished them, as he would have thought it a great sin to put them off for another hour, so tender was his conscience.—Brantome.

The lives of animals, in a state of nature, are very rarely miserable, and it argues a barbarous and savage disposition to cut them prematurely off in the midst of an agreeable or happy existence, especially when we reflect on the motives which induce it. Instead of a friendly concern for promoting their happiness, your aim, ye participators of murder, is the gratification of your own sensual appetites. How inconsistent is your conduct with the fundamental principle of pure morality and true goodness (which some of you ridiculously profess,) *whatever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.* You totally disregard this christian precept, this foundation of goodness and morality.

No man would willingly become the food of beasts, he ought not therefore to prey on *them.* Men, who consider themselves members of universal nature or links in the great chain of being, will not usurp power, authority and tyranny, over other beings naturally free and independent, however such beings may be inferior in intellect or strength. An opposite conduct ever bespeaks an unbecoming haughtiness of mind and imperiousness of disposition highly disgraceful, despicable, and beneath a creature possessed of thought and reason.

It is argued, that *man has a permission, from the practice of his fellows, to eat the flesh of animals,*

and consequently to kill them; and as there are many animals which subsist wholly on the bodies of other animals, the practice is sanctioned among mankind. During the degeneracy of the human race, errors have become general, which it is the duty and business of enlightened ages to eradicate. The various refinements of civil society, the numerous improvements in the arts and sciences, and the different reformations in the laws, policy, and governments of nations, are proofs of this assertion. Perhaps in no instance is habitual depravity more strikingly exemplified than in the existing carnivorous propensity. That mankind in the present stage of *polished* life, do act in direct violation of the principles of justice, mercy, tenderness, sympathy, and humanity, in the practice of eating flesh, is obvious. To take away the life of any happy being; to commit acts of outrage and depredation, and to abandon every refined feeling and sensibility, is to degrade the human kind beneath it's professed dignity of character: but to devour or eat any animal, is an additional violation of those principles, because 't is the extreme of animal ferocity. Such is the conduct of the most savage of brutes, and of the most uncultivated and barbarous of our own species. Where is the person who can hear himself, with calmness, compared, in disposition, to a lion, a hyena, a tyger, a wolf, a fox, or a cat? and yet how exactly similar is his propensities! Mankind affect to revolt at murder, at the shedding of blood, and yet eagerly, and without remorse, feed on the carcase, when it has undergone the culinary process. What mental blindness pervades the human race when they do not perceive that every feast of blood is a tacit encouragement and licence to the very crime their pretended delicacy abhors. I say *pre-*

tended delicacy, for that it is pretended is most evident. The profession of sensibility, humanity, feeling, &c. &c. in such persons, therefore, is egregious folly. And yet there are respectable persons among every one's acquaintance, amiable in other dispositions, and advocates in, what is commonly termed, the cause of humanity, who are weak, or prejudiced enough to be satisfied with such arguments and on which they ground apologies for their conduct. Education, habit, prejudice, fashion, and interest, have blinded the eyes of men, and have seared their hearts. The brute having no ideas of an hereafter, present pain becomes it's only evil, and present ease, and comfort, or happiness, it's only good. Death is the period to all it's fears. He must die; and if he be thereby released from the cruelty and tyranny of man, the sooner it takes place the better. It may be necessary to kill an animal to preserve him from future misery; let him be dispatched then suddenly, with the least possible degree of pain, but dare not, "carnivorous sinner," to eat his body.

If we did not destroy the animals around us, we should be over-run, they would eat up all our vegetables. Lordly man knows how to cause animals to increase rapidly and he knows how to cause them to decrease. He is not so silly as this imperfect argument represents him. In plain diction, he could very soon eat up the males, and the rest would follow. He can extirpate any race of domestic animals and, in this country, even wild animals, at his pleasure. There are abundance of animals in the world which men do not kill and eat; and yet we hear not of their injuring mankind, but sufficient room is found for their abode. Horses are not usually killed to be eaten, and yet we have not heard of any country be-

ing overstocked with them. We do not hear that the buffalos of North America overrun the country. The raven and robinredbreast are seldom killed, and yet they do not become too numerous.

It is alleged, *There are some animals obnoxious to mankind; and the most compassionate of men make no scruple of destroying them.* Animals very rarely exert their power on man; they do not inherit his dispositions of malice and tyranny. The strongest and most noxious kinds avoid mankind and never hurt them unless provoked by insult or necessitated by hunger. But man destroys, in cold blood, the most inoffensive; and for one injury received, returns excruciating thousands. What patience is observable on their part, when compared with his provocations! Their strength and swiftness are so much superior to our's, that we might derive from them constant lessons of benevolence, patience and mildness. There are some animals of more fierce natures; but does the want of pity and compassion in them justify similar qualities in men? Because a wolf will seize a man, is a man therefore warranted in inheriting the dispositions of a wolf? If we meet ferocious or noxious animals, let us remove from their path; and if we cannot avoid them, let us defend ourselves; for it is no more a crime than to defend ourselves from the fierce and unrelenting attacks of a villainous man, who would murder us and plunder our property. If I kill the beast in the contest, I am not chargeable with malice or intentional cruelty, provided I dispatch him instantly and do not devour his body. I dread the insect that stings, but I hate him not, for he is beautifully formed. If my own safety interfere and I am necessitated to kill him, I am sorry; I will not however pierce his body or

clip him in pieces, but finish the mortal work with the greatest expedition, crushing him under my foot. Self-preservation may justify a man in putting animals to death, yet cannot warrant the least act of cruelty to any creature. By suddenly dispatching an animal in extreme misery, we act a kind office; an office which reason approves, and which accords with our best and kindest feelings, but which, such is the force of custom, we are denied to shew, tho' solicited, to our species. If thy relation or thy friend should suffer the most excruciating pains of a long and incurable disorder, tho' his writhing contortions evince the acuteness of his pain, and tho' his groans should pierce thy heart, and tho' with strong intreaties and tears, he should beg thy kind relief, yet thou must be deaf to him; he must "wait his appointed time, till his change cometh," till he sinks beneath his intolerable sufferings. We have, indeed, hope of a blessed immortality, when "all tears shall be wiped from our eyes; when there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain;" but brutes are incapable of such hope; all their happiness is in this life; they should therefore be indulged and kindly treated. When they can no longer enjoy happiness, they may be deprived of life. Do not suppose that in this reasoning an intention is included of perverting nature. No; let some animals be, as they are, savage, unfeeling, firm, and resolute, like soldiers and executioners of the law; they are necessary; but let not their ferocity and brutality be the standard and pattern of the conduct of man. Because *some* of them have no compassion, feeling, or reason; are we to possess no compassion, feeling, or reason? Let lions roar, let mastiffs worry, let cocks fight, but let not man who

boasts of the dignity of his nature, the superiority of his understanding, and immortality of his soul, belie himself, by recurring to the practices and dispositions of those he deems the low and irrational part of the creation. Tho' we might, in numerous instances, receive instruction from brutes, it is not necessary that we should too implicitly follow the Apostle's rule, "in becoming fools that we may be wise;" neither is it requisite to become a beast, in order to learn a behaviour becoming the man.

It is objected that *If flesh were not proper food we should not probably be inclined to eat it.* We are not naturally inclined to eat an animal, because in order to eat him he must be killed. Civilized, as we are, unaccustomed to shed blood, we shrink from the task. Depraved habit, only, can overcome this refined aversion. How ill does refinement and savigism assort! The argument of agreeable flavour proves nothing. The Eskimaux delight in rotten flesh; preferring it to roast beef. If taste be admitted as a test, in the present question, how are we to explain the attachment of some Africans to the eating of dirt?

That animal food is eaten, masticated, and digested by, and nourishes the human species, proves nothing. The Gauls fed their oxen and horses with fish, the Paconians, according to Heroditus did the same. Goldsmith asserts in his "Animated Nature," ii, 327, that he saw a sheep which would eat flesh and a horse that was fond of oysters. Is there any one therefore, who will undertake to say that horses, oxen and sheep are carnivorous? A young wood pigeon, which would naturally feed on any thing rather than flesh; has by dint of hunger been brought to relish flesh, so as to refuse every other sustenance.

Gassendus says that a lamb which had been fed on flesh till it was nine months old, on board a vessel sailing among the Greek islands, refused the pasture which was before it when it went on shore, and eagerly sought the hand which held out it's accustomed food.

How infamously does man debase himself when he prostitutes his reason to the wretched custom of murdering animals. He vauntingly says "He did not inflict the torture, his feelings," forsooth, "would not let him." But behold, it was inflicted on his account. What a wretched quibble! what consummate hypocrisy!

It will be urged, moreover, *Shall man, who is indued with an immortal soul, be compared to a beast that perisheth?*" Yes verily, for if he acts like the most wild and barbarous of quadrupeds, the comparison is just, and his boast of immortality the most egregious folly.

It is contended, that *The pleasure of eating is diminished by forsaking animal food.* Many who have been accustomed, for a long time, to a vegetable diet, say, that the smell of animal food, while undergoing the culinary preparation, and even when served up, has nothing in it inviting or agreeable. This may be accounted for from the influence of ideas. A settled dislike to any practice impresses the mind with a repugnance to it in every state, and thus what may be inviting to some is nauseous and digusting to others; so much depends on our likes and dislikes, arising from the influence of opinion or prejudice. To men of temperance and sound judgment, the trifling gratifications of the sense of taste, will weigh extremely light when opposed to the superior object of preserving "a sound mind in a sound body,"

knowing well, that little of any real pleasure can be enjoyed without a competent portion of health. The opinions and habits of the Grecian philosopher, Epicurus, were strictly of this cast, and yet they have been so little understood by the vulgar, as to be thought to contain the precepts of the most abandoned votary of pleasure. With regard to the flesh of animals I am persuaded, says Mr. J. Tweddell, we have no other right, than the brutal right of the strongest, to sacrifice to our monstrous appetites the bodies of living things, of whose qualities and relations we are ignorant. Different objections which struck me, as to the probability of good, from the universality of this practice, held me in indecision. I doubted whether if this abstinence were universal, the animals, which we now devour, might not devour, in their turn, the fruits and vegetables reserved for our sustenance; but I do not believe it; it seems to me that their numbers would not augment in the proportion which was apprehended; if on the one hand, we now consume them with our teeth, on the other, we might then abandon our schemes and inventions for augmenting the means of propagation. Let nature follow her own course with regard to all that lives. I am told that they would destroy each other. In the first place, the two objections cannot exist together; for if they would destroy each other, their numbers would not be excessive. And what is this mutual destruction to me? Who has constituted me dictator of the realms of nature? Why am I umpire between the mistress and her servants? Because two chickens fight till one dies, should I have worried one of them to prevent their engagement? Exquisite and well imagined humanity! On the other hand, let precautions be adopted against famine,

when experience shall have shewn the necessity of them; in the mean while we are not called on to bury in our bowels the carcase of animals, which, a day or two before, lowed or bleated; to flay alive and dismember a defenceless creature; to pamper the unsuspecting beast which grazes before us, with the single view of sucking his blood and grinding his bones; and to become the unnatural murderers of beings, of whose powers and faculties, of whose modes of communication and mutual intercourse, of whose degree of sensibility and extent of pain and pleasure we are necessarily and fundamentally ignorant. The calamity does not appear to me to be sufficiently ascertained, which warrants so barbarous a proceeding, so violent a remedy, on suspicion and by anticipation. That the human body cannot suffer from abstinence I am well convinced; and the mind, I am firmly persuaded, must gain by it.—Life and Remains, p. 215.

It is said, by some, *I cannot exist on a herbivorous or frugivorous diet, it would disagree with me.* It is evident that animal food, morbid and unnatural as it is, by habit, is eaten and no uneasiness produced, and vegetable food may have the very opposite effect. It is a great misfortune to have the feelings of the stomach so completely perverted. Yes, it is possible, that leaving off animal food may cause suffering and uneasy feeling. This is a misfortune, because it betrays a profound ignorance, of the elementary principles of human nature, to mention such things, as serious objections to a vegetable regimen. It is well known that to a person whose digestion is weak, changes of any kind induce uneasiness or pain. Let him change his long accustomed habit of eating a household bread to that which is very fine, and in-

digestion, with it's effects of flatulency, will ensue. By perseverance, the stomach becomes easy, and he digests the fine bread. Let him again change to the coarser household bread, and the same effects, as before, will occur. By resolution, a change of diet from putrid flesh to the salubrity of vegetable productions may be effected, and the former so far from being desirable, will be disliked and avoided. "I must assert," says Dr. Lambe, "that except some uneasy sensation, for a short time, I have observed no ill consequences from the relinquishment of animal food. The apprehended danger of the change, with which many scare themselves and their neighbours, is a mere phantom of the imagination; the danger lies wholly on the other side."—Addit. Reports, p. 134.

In answer to the trite and specious objection that *What suits one constitution may not suit another*, Mr. Newton boldly declares, that if a single instance can be produced wherein the vegetable diet with the use of distilled water, has not produced an improved healthiness, he is willing that the whole system may fall at once to the ground.

It has been said by many old women and old men too, that, *What is one man's meat is another man's poison*" What assertion can be more ill-founded or nonsensical? It cannot deserve a serious refutation. A facetious friend, says, "I can interpret this profound proverb for you. It's meaning is this, what is meat for the patient may, perchance, be poison to the doctor."

I have heard it said, that *The only advantage of a vegetable diet is, that by it excess is avoided; that it is excess which is alone injurious; and excess of animal food is acknowledged to be more so than vegetable.* I answer, that the different effects of excess,

according to the kind of matter employed, shew an essential difference in the operation of these matters on the body. Excess of vegetable matter produces only simple distention: excess of animal matter, an insuperable loathing and disgust, sometimes horrible nausea, and serious illness. These matters then are essentially different, when first applied to the body. They are different also, in their operation on all the functions.—Addit. Rep. p. 139.

There can be no doubt that animal food is unfavourable to the intellectual powers. In some measure this effect is instantaneous, it being hardly possible to apply to any thing requiring thought after a full meal of animal food; so that it has been said of vegetable feeders, that with them it is morning all day long. But the effect is not confined to the immediate impression. As well as the senses, the memory, the understanding and the imagination, have been observed to improve by this diet. In defiance of those palpable facts, it is asked, in a tone of triumph, whether it be possible that the species of food, which has formed a Fox and a Pitt, can be unfavourable to the production of talent. Why did not Dr. Rees, who made this assertion, [See Encyclopædia, art. Man] prove that a plentiful use of the bottle does not injure the intellect? For neither of those illustrious men were remarkable for temperance. Was it ever asserted that the use of animal food extinguishes talent, or affects those who eat it, so that no difference can be observed among those who use it? It might be asked, with much more reason, how happens it, that the families of the whole body of the british nobility could produce but one Fox and one Pitt, to head the contending parties of our senate? How happens it, that the same body has produced not

one man, no, not one, who inherits the talents of these illustrious statesmen? Not one; tho' the prize of successful exertion is the most spendid, that can be proposed to honourable ambition; the offices, the dignities, the honours of the first empire of the world. Surely, a stronger proof cannot be given of the baleful and depressing effects of luxury on the human character. How it benumbs the faculties, and stifles the embryo genius; how much it emasculates the spirit and paralyzes the best energies of body and mind.—Ibid, p. 147—149.

It has been said, that *the great fondness which men have for animal food, is proof enough that nature intended them to eat it.* Are not men equally fond of wine, ardent spirits, and other things, which cut short their days? the Russians are fond of tallow; the Eskimaux of train-oil; and savages, of blood, entrails, and all sorts of garbage; the raw and almost putrid flesh of the seal is the delight of the Pesserais of the Tierra del Fuego, of which the rank fat is deemed delicious. A savage has been seen to gnaw a bone of a human body with as much relish as we suck a bone of mutton, Swift indeed made "a proposal for preventing the children of the poor people in Ireland from being a burden to their parents or country;" i. e. "that a young healthy child, well nursed, is at a year old a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled."—See his works, vol. viii, p. 299.

The palidness and shrinking of the features, which sometimes succeeds the disuse of animal food, is by no means an indication of injury to the constitution. Animal food gives a more succulent habit, a greater fullness and a higher colour to the face. It is the colour which imposes on superficial observers.

The colour is produced by an excitation of all the small vessels of the face, produced by the unnatural use of animal food. It is this which hurries on life with an unhealthy rapidity. We arrive at puberty too soon; the passions are developed too early; in the male they acquire an impetuosity approaching to madness: the females breed too quickly; processes, which ought to be distinct and successive, are blended together and confounded: women, who ought to be nurses, become pregnant, even with the child at their breast: finally, the system becomes prematurely exhausted and destroyed: we become diseased and old, when we ought to be in the middle of life. All this indeed may not be attributed to animal food alone, all the habitual irritations appear to have similar effects on the body; they stimulate to excessive action, to which exhaustion succeeds. If then a body be modified by the action of animal food; if it be enlarged, and bloated, and reddened, it must happen that these effects cease, and appearances the opposite to these will take place. It may safely be asserted, that the florid are less healthy than those who have no colour. Colour is generally regarded as a sign of approaching disease. The way of life which most prevails tends to load the head, and give an unnatural fullness to the face. Many an anxious mother says of her child, that it's face is the only part about it which looks well. Now if, in such a case, by any course of dieting we can strengthen the limbs, cause the chest to expand, and the abdomen to shrink, we should hail these changes as signs of highly improved health. Corpulency is a species of disease, and a certain harbinger of a disease more serious. It is the same in animals. When a sheep has become fat, the butcher knows it must be

killed, or it will rot and decline. Many who are lean on the diet of animal food, thrive on vegetables, and improve in colour.—Addit. Rep. p. 121, &c.

It has been said, yes, truly, in sober seriousness, *What should we do for leather if we had not hides for our shoes?* In answer, I have seen a pair of substantial shoes, worn by a gentleman, the upper part of which was made of thick cotton stuff, and the soles of very thick felt, which had been prepared by saturation in thick boiled linseed oil, while hot. The upper part, he repaired from time to time with an oil varnish. They exhibited a fine glossy black, and he assured me they were, in every respect far superior to leather shoes.

The cruelties of mankind committed on the brute creation are falsely apologized for by utility; forcing them to destructive labour procures the conveniences of life; and putting them to death supplies aliment.

A sympathising mind sees no necessity to violate the life or liberty of an innocent animal, because the aliment of life may be procured from the vegetable world, and that produced by his own labours; and such aliment procures bodily and mental health, by salubriating the humours of the one, and tranquilizing the passions of the other. But what plea can be offered for that preposterous passion, or habit of mind, acquired by custom, of destroying animals, not for the NECESSITY, but the PLEASURE *of destroying them?*

INCONSISTENCES OF FLESH-EATERS.

The inconsistencies of the conduct and opinions of mankind in general, are evident and notorious, but when ingenious writers fall into the same glaring errors, our regret and surprise are justly and strongly excited. Annexed to the impressive remarks by S. Jenyns, p. 142, we meet with the following passage, "God has been pleased to create numberless animals intended for our sustenance; and that they are so intended, the agreeable flavour of their flesh to our palates, and the wholesome nutriment which it administers to our stomachs, are sufficient proofs; these, as they are formed for our use, propagated by our culture, and fed by our care, we have certainly a right to deprive of life, because it is given and preserved to them on that condition." It has already been argued, that the bodies of animals are not intended for the sustenance of man; and the decided opinions of several eminent medical writers and others, sufficiently disprove assertions in favour of the wholesomeness of the flesh of animals. The agreeable taste of food is not always a proof of it's nourishing or wholesome properties. This truth is too frequently experienced in mistakes ignorantly or accidentally made, particularly by children in eating the fruit of the deadly nightshade, the taste of which resembles black currants, and is extremely inviting by the beauty of it's colour and shape. Half a berry is said to have proved fatal, occasioning a deep and deadly stupor. That we have a right to make attacks on the existence of any being, because we have assisted and shewn compassion, tenderness, and affection

to such being, is an assertion opposed to every established principle of justice and morality. A "condition" cannot be made without the mutual consent of parties, and therefore what this writer terms "a condition" is nothing less than an unjust, arbitrary, and deceitful imposition. It is uncertain to what extent in this country the excess of unfeelingness to animals may arrive, or the cultivation of the carnivorous propensity. An ingenious and very respectable modern agriculturist urges the propriety and points out many advantages which, he thinks, would arise from an universal consent to eat the flesh of horses.

The barbarous Europeans teach universal love and yet contract their benevolence to man. In their conduct to animals even generosity is abandoned, and man with all his inflated pride of pre-eminence, humanity, affection, sympathy, feeling, sensibility, &c. &c. is not what he thus professes, but partakes yet strongly of his savage nature, otherwise he would at least be merciful and just; he would receive their assistance and in return alleviate the evils of their state.

"Such is the deadly and stupifying influence of habit or custom," says Mr. Lawrence, "of so poisonous and brutalizing a quality is prejudice, that men, perhaps no ways inclined from nature to acts of barbarity, may yet live insensible of the constant commission of the most flagrant deeds. In the history of the council of Constance, it is recorded, that a certain Neopolitan peasant who lived near a place infamous for robberies and murders, went once to confession; and having told the priest, that on a certain fast-day he had swallowed a draught of milk, he assured the father he could recollect no other sin he had committed. "How," said the confessor,

"do you never assist your neighbours, in robbing and murdering the passengers, in a particular hollow road?" "O yes," said the peasant, "but that is so common with us, that we do'nt make it a point of conscience."

The humane Titus, who exclaimed, on reflecting that he had done no beneficent act, "Alas! my friends, I've lost a day!" did not once advert to the horrid barbarities he was at the same time inflicting on the wretched inhabitants of Judea; nor felt he the least remorse after having destroyed thirty out of forty thousands of Jew captives, in finishing the Coliseum at Rome; nor did he regret the slaughter of tens of thousands of innocent Jews, whom he sacrificed on the altars of vanity at Rome.

The following anecdote, is related by James Pettit Andrews. "When I was a boy," said he, "I was charmed with the tricks, which an itinerant rabbit-catcher had taught to a beautiful white ferret. 'But what means those bloody marks round his mouth?' I enquired. "Why, that is where I sews up his chaps, that he may n't bite the rabbits in their berrys," replied the insensible wretch. 'And how,' added I, 'can you be so barbarous to so tame, so tractable, so beautiful an animal?' "Laud, master," retorted the fool, "a' likes it. A' will hold up his chaps to be sewed!" A cook maid will weep at a tale of woe while she is skinning a living eel. Even women of education, who readily weep while reading an affecting moral tale, will clear away clotted blood, still warm with departed life, cut the flesh, disjoint the bones, and tear out the intestines of an animal, without sensibility, without sympathy, without fear, without remorse. What is more common than to hear this *softer* sex talk of, and assist in, the

cookery of a deer, a hare, a lamb, or a calf (these acknowledged emblems of innocence,) with perfect composure. Thus the female character, by nature soft, delicate, and susceptible of tender impressions, is debased and sunk. It will be maintained, that in other repects, they still possess the characteristics of their sex, and are humane and sympathizing. The inconsistency, then, is the more glaring; to be virtuous in *some* instances does not constitute the moral character, but to be *uniformly* so.

Mankind in general have a natural horror in the shedding of blood, and some in devouring the carcase of an innocent sufferer, which bad habit, improper education, and silly prejudices, have not overcome. This is proved by their affected and absurd refinement of calling the dead bodies of animals "*meat.*" If the meaning of words were to be regarded, this is a gross mistake, for the word meat is an universal term, applying equally to all nutritive and palatable substances. If it be intended to express that all other kinds of food are comparatively not meat, the intention is ridiculous. The truth is that the proper expression *flesh*, conveys ideas of murder and death. Neither can it easily be forgotten that in grinding the body of an animal, substances which constitute *human* bodies are masticated. This reflection comes somewhat *home*, and is recurred to by eaters of flesh, in spite of themselves, but recurred to unwillingly. They attempt therefore to pervert language in order to render it agreeable to the ear, as they disguise animal flesh by cookery, in order to render it pleasing to the taste.

To the general appearance of beauty and happiness among animals the only interruption has arisen from Man. Disposed alike to mar the natural har-

mony of the world, and to delight in moral discord, his malignant pursuits have discoloured the lovely picture with blood and slaughter. It is in vain for mankind to plead that "all things were made for their use." Vaunting superiority! perverse arrogation of fortuitous plenitude! Let them first shew that they understand the true limits between utility, justice, and abuse. A right founded only on power, is an ignominious usurpation.

Conscientious men think it a duty which they owe to God, to beg a blessing on the food which, through his universal bounty they are about to partake. What profanation! what impiety! To beg a blessing on a meal torn from nature by rapine, obtained by disordering the plan of creation, furnished by an abuse of Providence, and by the torture of God's creatures. If the Deity were severe to inflict justice instead of bestowing clemency, he would affix a curse on such proceedings.

ON THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION.

It is of the first consequence in training up youth of both sexes, that they be early inspired with humanity, and particularly that it's principles be implanted strongly in their tender minds to guard them against inflicting wanton pain on those animals, which use or accident may occasionally put into their power.

Montaigne thinks it a reflection on human nature, that few people take delight in seeing animals caress or play together, but almost every one is pleased to see them lacerate and worry each other. I am sorry this temper is become almost a distinguishing character of our nation. Children are bred up in the

principle of destroying life, and one of their first indulgences is the licence of inflicting pain on poor animals.

Mr. Locke takes notice of a mother who permitted her children to have animals, but rewarded or punished them as they treated them well or ill.

Many dispositions have been formed to cruelty, from being permitted to tear off the wings of flies, whipping cats and dogs, or tying a string to the leg of a bird, and twirling it round till the thigh be torn from the bleeding body! It is highly necessary, therefore, for parents to watch, with anxious care, over their offspring, and strenuously to oppose such habits as these (tho' they often arise from mere childish imitations, from a propensity to action, and from the curiosity excited by things that move, rather than from a bad disposition), and stifle in the birth every wish and desire to inflict torture, or even give unnecessary pain. The mean propensity of seeking birds' nests, of tearing them down, of taking the eggs, and of playing with the young ones, should be carefully checked. To say nothing of the lingering deaths of the "callow brood," the exquisite anguish communicated to the parent birds, is evident to the most superficial observer; and it is both astonishing and abominable that parents, who have an affection for their children, appear insensible to the miseries of parental affection in those animals they depreciate by the epithet of Brutes. How infinitely superior would be the amusement, if parents would cultivate it in their children, of knowing the names of birds, and their habits by continual observation, and reference to Natural History. How much more humane and rational the amusement of looking for nests for the sake merely

of observation, and of visiting them from time to time, to notice their progressive advancement, their variety, formation, &c.

"I have known," says Mr. Young, in his "Essay on Humanity to Animals," 1798, p. 58, "an instance of a family of children standing single in this respect, among a whole village, owing to the fortunate circumstance of their father being a man of more humanity than his neighbours. He did not attempt to restrain his children from going to search after nests, but he took frequent occasion to inculcate such lessons of humanity, as effectually prevented the barbarous custom of robbing them." This example is highly worth the imitation of mothers, fathers and tutors, since to teach humanity would add dignity to their characters. We have a right to expect this, particularly from mothers, who feel, or ought to feel, what another may experience in the deprivation or massacre of their offspring. But this tendency to cruelty, so dreadful in its effects, "grows with the growth of children, and strengthens with their strength," till by the arrival of maturity, they have become insensible to those generous and mild perceptions which should dignify man.

"I believe, (says Mr. Ireland in his illustration of Hogarth's Pictures on Cruelty) what are called vicious propensities have their origin in improper education. "Give me a blow, that I may beat it," is an infant's first lesson. Thus early taught, by proxy, can it excite a wonder if a spirit of revenge becomes a part of it's nature? His first reading is The Seven Champions, and Guy Earl of Warwick; and tho' he can kill neither dragon nor dun cow, his admiration of those who could, induces him to exert himself in the extirpation of beetles and earth-

worms. Quitting the mother for the master, he peruses histories of what are called heroes, great in proportion to the nations they have depopulated. The annals of his own country furnish him with a list of Barons bold, who led armies of vassals to the field of death; where brothers butchered brothers; and the arrow, sped by a son, pierced the heart of his father,—to determine the tincture of a tyrant's rose!

Young master must have a horse to ride, and a favourite spaniel to accompany him; these alternately commit what he denominates faults, and because they are his, he is allowed to chastise them as he thinks proper. If the young gentleman be heir to a great estate, the domestics look up to him as their future master, and, if any of them have better dispositions, they dare not displease him; but they are generally his voluntary tutors in inhumanity; by them he is soon initiated into the "art of ingeniously tormenting" all sorts of animals. In this manner is completed a character which is incapable of shame or humanity. So well is he taught to laugh at distress and misery, even among his own species, that the act of driving his phæton over an old woman, too decrepid to move out of the way, becomes an achievement fit to boast of and a subject of mirth! In some places, children are taught to call red butterflies, soldiers; and white ones, rebels. This weak and absurd folly, however, implants in children an inclination for persecution. Prejudice and error have contributed largely towards the persecution of animals. Toads, and the whole tribe of serpents and lizards, are treated as common enemies, because they are thought to be poisonous, and children are generally encouraged to destroy them. Every reasonable parent will, however, allow, that

such opinions are wrong, when it is recollected that the latest, and best informed, naturalists have declared that the viper is the only poisonous animal existing in this country.

The hedge-hog is ridiculously charged with sucking cows, and injuring their udders, whereas a slight inspection into the form of it's mouth will discover that it's smallness renders the charge false and the action impracticable.

Mr. Locke says, "People teach children to strike, and laugh when they give pain, or see others injured; and they have the examples of many about them, to confirm them in it. All the entertainment and subject of history is fighting and killing; and the honour and renown which is bestowed on conquerors (who for the most part are the great butchers of mankind) farther mislead youth, who are thus taught to think that slaughter is the great business of mankind; and the most heroic of virtues. In this manner unnatural cruelty is implanted, and what humanity abhors custom and habit tolerate. Such propensities ought, on the contrary, to be watched and early remedies applied.—On Education, sec. 116.

To check these malign propensities becomes more necessary, from the general tendency of our amusements. Most of our rural, and even infantine sports are savage and ferocious. They arise from the terror, misery, and death of helpless animals. Children in the nursery are taught to impale butterflies or cock-chaffers. As years and strength increase, their sports consist in pursuing, punishing, torturing, and murdering all animals weaker, more defenceless, more innocent, or less vicious than themselves. Thus educated, or permitted to imbibe dispositions and habits from their play-fellows, without remonstrance or

correction, it need not become a subject of wonder that children quarrel and fight with one another, and that the vanquished party is further maltreated and plundered. Dogs receive a disposition to attack each other from this propensity in the brutes of human kind, who teach and urge them to that practice. The school-boy's delight is to prowl among the hedges and woods and to "rob the poor bird of it's young." Grown a *gentle* angler, he snares the scaly fry or scatters leaden death among the feathered tenants of the air. Ripened to man, he becomes a mighty hunter, grows enamoured of the chase, and crimsons his spurs in the sides of a generous courser, whose wind he breaks in pursuit of an inoffensive deer, or timid hare.

Hogarth, who was a most accurate and keen observer of human actions, makes the career of the hero of his four stages of cruelty, to commence with the barbarous treatment of animals, and conclude with murder and the gallows.

"I remember once, says Mr. Ireland, seeing a practical lesson of humanity given to a little chimney-sweeper, which had, I dare say, a better effect than a volume of ethics. The young soot-merchant was seated upon an alehouse bench, and had in one hand his brush, and in the other a hot buttered roll. While exercising his white masticators, with a perseverance that evinced the highest gratification, he observed a dog lying on the ground near him. The repetition of *poor fellow! poor fellow!* in a good-natured tone, brought the quadruped from his resting place: he wagged his tail, looked up with an eye of humble entreaty, and in that universal language which all nations understand, asked for a morsel of bread. The sooty tyrant held his remnant of roll

towards him, but on the dog gently offering to take it, struck him with his brush so violent a blow across the nose as nearly broke the bone. A gentleman who had been, unperceived, a witness to the whole transaction, put a sixpence between his finger and thumb, and beckoned this little monarch of May-day to an opposite door. The lad grinned at the silver, but on stretching out his hand to receive it, the teacher of humanity gave him such a rap upon the knuckles with a cane, as made them ring. His hand tingling with pain, and tears running down his cheeks, he cried *what is that for?* "To make you *feel*," was the reply. How do you like a blow and a disappointment? the dog endured both; had you given him a piece of bread, this sixpence should have been the reward; you gave him a blow; I have returned it, and will put the money in my pocket." Such demonstrative lessons would undoubtedly have the most salutary effect, if inflicted on children who are inattentive to the power of reason and persuasion. A few hairs jerked from the head of a boy, while tearing a fly piece-meal, attended with an explanation of the infinitely more intolerable pain of tearing from the body a limb, and that the divine precept of doing as we would be done unto, should extend to the minutest link of being, has frequently had the most durable effects.

The kindness which mankind condescend to shew to animals will often be found to originate in whim and caprice. Ladies are fond of lap-dogs, squirrels, parrots, monkeys, cats; and it sometimes happens that a sportsman's dog or horse are his bosom friends; but when the horse is grown old or disabled, and the dog has lost his scent or speed, the first is made a drudge, and the latter treated with cruelty and con-

tempt. When a few exceptions, chiefly of this kind, are made, the conduct of man appears a continued scene of oppression, and the existence of his unfortunate vassals reduced to misery. Nor does the ferocity of man stop here, their agonies, whether accidental or inflicted, become his diversion and sport. Man acts as a lion, a tyger, or a swine; delighting in carnage, oppression, hunting, killing and devouring not only those of his own species, but of every other kind of animal. The elements abound with his snares and cruelties. The earth, the air, the sea, cannot preserve their innocent inhabitants from his persecutions and outrages; but all nature is ransacked to gratify his insatiate mind and devouring paunch. Many apparent acts of humanity may be traced to this source. Were a person to see a partridge drowning, he would not rescue it for the sake of preserving it's life, but for the sake of eating it.

Let no one say these are silly unfounded charges; they are daily practiced and within the notice of the most superficial observer, even in a country which boasts of knowledge and morality, of civilization and refinement! The complexion of cannibalism is strong and prevailing. Take one instance out of a thousand that could be produced in proof of this disposition being universally admitted as inherent and honourable. "Last week a gentleman of Lewes shot at and wounded a hare, which he killed with the butt-end of his gun, and put it into his bag. As he was pursuing his sport, some considerable time after, he felt a kicking motion against his side, which led him to suspect the hare he had killed was with young, and near her time of littering. He accordingly cut her open, and took from her three young ones, which he preserved alive and reared,

till lately, when one of them leaped from a box wherein it was kept, and killed itself. The other two are strong and lively, and will, no doubt, be reared to the age PROPER FOR THE SPIT."—Bell's Weekly Messenger, Sep. 21, 1801.

Maugre the wretched depravities of mankind, maugre bad education, and corrupt example, the crying voice of conscience cannot be subdued. This offspring of reason, continues to goad the human heart, when it departs from acting right and doing justice. Even among soldiers, accustomed to hack their brethren to pieces, occasionally impulses of humanity have appeared. The mind of Stedman was not formed for the business in which he engaged, of suppressing the revolted negroes of Surinam. Instances of strong sensibility appear in the "Account" which he published. One day, he was amused by a group of monkies, when one of them, says he, "seeing me near the river in a canoe, the creature made a halt from skipping after his companions, and being perched upon a branch, which hung over the water, examined me with attention and the strongest marks of curiosity, no doubt taking me for a giant of his own species; while he chattered prodigiously, and kept dancing and shaking the bough upon which he rested, with incredible strength and agility. At this time I laid my piece to my shoulder, and brought him down from the tree into the stream; but may I never again be witness to such a scene! the miserable animal was not dead, but mortally wounded. I seized him by the tail, and taking him in both hands, to end his torment, swung him round, and hit his head against the side of the canoe; but the poor creature, still continuing alive, and looking at me in the most affecting manner that can be con-

ceived, I knew no other way of ending this murder than holding him under water till he was drowned, while my heart, sickened on his account; for his dying little eyes still continued to follow me, with seeming reproach, till their light gradually forsook them, and the wretched animal expired." What could induce Stedman to lay his piece, almost involuntarily, to his shoulder, when he saw the inoffensive animal, amused; what but depraved habit?

My friend C—, attacks, with fury, the wretch, wherever he finds him, who is dealing out uncifully blows and urging his animal beyond it's strength. "C—," say I, "how much are you before me in making the monsters feel; and how much behind, in not refusing to eat the limbs of your fellow creatures." "You know," replied he, "that I would not dare to be a beast of prey, but that my wife, will not consent to my leaving off eating animal food; she calls me "little dear," and tells me I am conceited." "Ah! C—," I add, "how unfortunate it is, that your wife is not conceited too!"

Under an improved system of education, children will be brought up to a vegetable regimen, as being the most natural to man. As vegetable diet has a necessary connection with many virtues, and excludes no one, it must be of importance to accustom young people to it, seeing it's influence, both in respect to beauty of person and tranquillity of soul, has been confirmed by accurate observations and stubborn facts.

If parents knew the blessing of never hearing their children restless at night, or of seeing one mouth, or year of vigour, uniformly succeed another, they could not hesitate a moment. "The health of my children,

says Mr. Newton, may be verified by the inspection of any stranger who will take the trouble. And surely it may be presumed that other children will be no less exempt from violent attacks, after two or three years' perseverance in a similar plan; that their forms will expand, their strength increase, in a very different ratio from the ordinary one: that the little family perturbations occasioned by the falls of children, which are in great measure attributable to the want of tone in their fibre, will be almost unknown; that as the fracture of limbs, like the rupture of blood vessels, is more owing to the state of the body than to the violence of the shock encountered, they will be infinitely less liable to such distressing accidents; that their irritability and consequently their objurgatory propensities, will gradually subside; that they will become not only more robust, but more beautiful; that their carriage will be erect, their step firm; that their developement at a critical period of youth, the prematuracy of which has been considered an evil, will be retarded: above all, the danger of being deprived of them will, in every way, diminish; while by these light repasts their hilarity will be augmented, and their intellects cleared, in a degree which shall astonishingly illustrate the delightful effects of this regimen." Return to Nature, p. 74.

"The children of our family can each of them eat a dozen or eighteen walnuts for supper without the most trifling indigestion; an experiment which those who feed their children in the usual manner would consider it adventurous to attempt." Idem, 80.

Examples have the most powerful influence in rousing either the good or bad sympathies; in com-

parison of which, precepts are of little avail. The constant habit, therefore, of destroying animated beings, both for food and for amusement, is one of the most fertile sources of the ferocity and brutality of the human character. Hence we see the moral benefit of any diet, which would diminish, in any considerable degree, this baneful example.—Anon.

Fortunately, a few animals are indebted to the superstitions of mankind for their happiness. The good people of Sweden say that three sins will be forgiven, if a person replace on it's feet a cock-chaffer which has happened to fall on it's back.—Sparrman's Voyage, vol. 1. p. 211. Travellers say, that in Paraguay the married people will not eat sheep, lest they should produce a generation of children covered with wool.

ON THE WANT OF A NATIONAL PROTECTION OF ANIMALS.

We have said that animals should be protected by the legislature, but there exists no statute which punishes cruelty to animals, *simply as such*, and *without* taking in the consideration of it as an *injury to property*. "Had I any influence in the proposal or fabrication of laws," says Miss Williams, "I should be tempted to leave the human race a while to it's own good government, and form a code for the protection of animals. In other countries, laws are instituted for their protection; and fines, imprisonments, and even exile, are pronounced against wretches, who, in the rage of passion, or the wantonness of power, have forgotten the relation that exists between themselves and the objects of their cruelty. At present it is the mode to descant on the superior progress we have made in civilization, beyond that which was

obtained by the ancient republic; but, previous to the introduction of Christianity, the codes of legislators were filled with regulations of mercy in favour of animals. The code of Triptolemus may be cited as an evidence of the estimation in which animals used for labour were held; and the agricultural Roman writers would lead us to think that the laws were more favourable to beasts than to men. We affect at present to look on Spartan manners with contempt; it were well if, in some cases, we studied Spartan humanity. The tribunal which condemned a boy to death for wantonly plucking out the eyes of a bird, pronounced a merciful judgment; animals were no longer mutilated, and infant's sports became less atrocious. If there be any thing in the ordinary occurrences of life which calls loudly for the restraining hand of the legislator, it is the inhumanity with which the animal race is treated."

In the trial of William Parker (July sessions, 1794) for tearing out the tongue of a mare, Mr. Justice Heath said, "In order to convict a man for barbarous treatment of a beast, it was necessary it should appear that he had malice towards the prosecutor." It appears then, that had the mare been the property of this wretch, he had escaped punishment.

In November, 1793, two butchers of Manchester were convicted in the penalty of twenty shillings each, for cutting off the feet of living sheep, and driving them through the streets. The sheep were not their own property or, we suppose, they might with impunity have been allowed to dissect them alive.

A butcher in the same town has been frequently seen to hang poor calves up alive, with the gambril

put through their sinews, and hooks stuck through their nostrils, the dismal bleating of the miserable animals continuing till they had slowly bled to death. Such proceedings frequently struck the neighbourhood with horror. Attempts were made to prevent the hellish nuisances caused by this man, but in vain, for he did but torture *his own* property! Such are the glaring imperfections of the laws of a civilized, a humane, a christian country!

The manners of a people are materially affected by the laws of the government under which they live; an injunction, therefore, from the first authority, in behalf of the innocent and unoffending part of creation would have the happiest influence on the conduct of mankind. But since justice slumbers, why does not universal indignation rise against beings, for whom language has no adequate abhorrent name, to drive them from human society?

The abolition of the monstrous custom of Bull-baiting was attempted by a bill, which was read before the Honourable the House of Commons, on the 18th April, 1800, but rejected, by a majority of two votes, altho' petitions in favour of it were signed by long lists of the most respectable names of the nobility, gentry, clergy, freeholders, and manufacturers, as well as magistrates, within the circles where it is most practised, namely Shropshire and Staffordshire. It was opposed by the Right Hon. William Windham, secretary at war, in an harangue of an hour and a half. Recourse was had, in this speech, to Pagan games, and to the folly of popish festivals, as laudable examples for English protestants; and even the shocking barbarity of Spanish bull-fights was held up to their imitation, while the driveling disposition of that cowardly people gave the lie to

every thing which could be asserted of the bewitching efficacy of cruelty to inspire manliness and martial courage. In this age of superior wisdom it is truly astonishing that bull-baiting should be encouraged by the representatives of a great nation.

On the 15th of May 1809, Lord Erskine addressed the House of Peers, on the second reading of the bill for preventing malicious and wanton cruelty to animals, in an elaborate and excellent speech, in which he gave an impressive view of the most striking arguments in favour of a mild and humane treatment of the inferior creation. "It would be a painful and disgusting detail," said he, "were I to endeavour to bring before you the almost innumerable instances of cruelty to animals, which are daily occuring in this country, and which, unfortunately, only gather strength by any efforts of humanity in individuals to repress them, without the aid of the law. These unmanly and disgusting outrages are most frequently perpetrated by the basest and most worthless; incapable, for the most part, of any reproof which can reach the mind, and who know no more of the law, than that it suffers them to indulge their savage dispositions with impunity.

Nothing is more notorious than that it is not only useless, but dangerous, to poor suffering animals, to reprove their oppressors, or to threaten them with punishment. The general answer, with the addition of bitter oaths and increased cruelty, is, WHAT IS THAT TO YOU? If the offender be a servant, he curses you, and asks, *are you my master?* and if he be the master himself, he tells you that the animal is his own. The validity of this most infamous and stupid defence, arises from that defect in the

law which I seek to remedy. Animals are considered *as property only*. To destroy or abuse them, from malice to the proprietor, or with an intention injurious to his interest in them, is criminal, *but the animals themselves* are without protection; the law regards them not *substantively*; they have no RIGHTS." The whole of this valuable speech was published by R. Phillips, at 9d.

Mr. Windham thought the measure would be productive of more mischief than advantage; and said, it was beneath the dignity of parliament to legislate on subjects of this kind. Mr. D. Giddy opposed the bill on the ground of Mr. Windham. Mr. Stephen, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Frankland, Mr. Jekyl, and Mr. W. Smith, spoke in favour of the bill. The The bill was rejected by a motion for going into a committee, June 15. For the motion, 27; against it, 31.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

After the foregoing portion of clear deductions resulting from fact and experience, in favour of a vegetable diet, and distilled water, it will be said "these men are mad;" yes, verily, Dr. Arbuthnot, Dr. Cheyne, Dr. Elliot, Dr. Buchan, Dr. Percival; nay Hippocrates, Galen, Sydenham and Haller, were all madmen; and Dr. Lambe is a madman; and so is Mr. Abernethy for writing in favour of Dr. Lambe's system; and so are all the adherents of Dr. Lambe; they are all madmen, in the phraseology of the world. Seriously, I am so much accustomed to this slimsy anathema, that I disregard it; for if a man does any thing great, or wise, or good, he is pronounced a madman. Festus accounted St. Paul a madman; Faust, who improved the art of printing,

was held to be in league with satan; Galileo was imprisoned for maintaining the Copernican system; Columbus, Newton, Linnæus, Howard, and Reynolds, have all been called madmen.

I might swell my book enormously, with instances of this kind of miscalled madness.

No, the advocates of humanity, of nature, of God, "are not mad, but speak the words of truth and soberness."

It has been asserted, with great emphasis, that "There is no species of hatred greater than that which a man of mediocrity bears to men of genius. Their reach of thought, their successful combinations, their forcible appeals, their strong deductions, are never forgiven. The eagle cannot soar, but the crows are chattering after him."

A man of limited information has long settled his ideas as to every thing, and every person. He thinks no opinion of any importance but his own; and shuts his ears to whatever opposes it. He sees only "himself and the universe," and will "admit no discourse to his beauty." Lavater has said, "A wise man changes his opinions; a fool never."

From men of imperious temper, inflated by wealth, devoted to sensual gratifications, and influenced by fashion, no share of humanity can be expected. He who is capable of enslaving his own species, of treating the inferior ranks of them with contempt or austerity, and who can be unmoved by their misfortunes, is a man formed of the materials of a cannibal, and will exercise his temper on the lower orders of animal life with inflexible obduracy. No arguments of truth or justice can affect such a hardened mind. Even persons of more gentle natures, having been long initiated in corrupt habits, do not readily listen to sen-

sations of feeling; or, if the principles of justice, mercy, and tenderness, be admitted, such principles are merely theoretical, and influence not their conduct. There are persons who abstain from eating the bodies of their fellow animals for a time, but the power of habit recurs, meets with a feeble resistance, and becomes inveterate; while perverted understandings readily assist in recalling them to their wonted state. But the truly independent and sympathizing mind will ever derive satisfaction from the prospect of well-being, and will not incline to stifle convictions arising from the genuine evidences of truth. Without fear or hesitation, he will become proof against the sneers of unfeeling men, exhibit an uniform example of humanity, and impress on others additional arguments and motives. He will never hesitate in "opening his mouth for the dumb," and, if a Christian in deed and in truth, he will never forget that, not even a sparrow is an inconsiderable object in the sight of God; a reflection, which ought effectually to check, both by example or influence, the shocking barbarities, which unfeeling wantonness or studied cruelty are daily exercising towards many unhappy creatures.

In the present diseased state of society, the prospect is far distant when the System of Benevolence is likely to be generally adopted. The hope of reformation then arises from the intelligent, less corrupted, and younger part of mankind.

INDEX.

PERSONS
MENTIONED IN THIS WORK.