ANIMAL ETHICS AND THE NONCONFORMIST CONSCIENCE

Philip J. Sampson

The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series

Series Editors
Andrew Linzey
Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics
Oxford, UK

Priscilla N. Cohn
Pennsylvania State University
Villanova, PA, USA

Associate Editor
Clair Linzey
Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics
Oxford, UK

THE PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Animal Ethics Series

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the ethics of our treatment of animals. Philosophers have led the way, and now a range of other scholars have followed from historians to social scientists. From being a marginal issue, animals have become an emerging issue in ethics and in multidisciplinary inquiry. This series will explore the challenges that Animal Ethics poses, both conceptually and practically, to traditional understandings of human-animal relations. Specifically, the Series will:

- provide a range of key introductory and advanced texts that map out ethical positions on animals
- publish pioneering work written by new, as well as accomplished, scholars;
- produce texts from a variety of disciplines that are multidisciplinary in character or have multidisciplinary relevance.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14421

Philip J. Sampson

Animal Ethics and the Nonconformist Conscience

palgrave
macmillan

Philip J. Sampson
Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics
Oxford, UK

Series Editors' Preface

This is a new book series for a new field of inquiry: Animal Ethics.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the ethics of our treatment of animals. Philosophers have led the way, and now a range of other scholars have followed from historians to social scientists. From being a marginal issue, animals have become an emerging issue in ethics and in multidisciplinary inquiry.

In addition, a rethink of the status of animals has been fuelled by a range of scientific investigations which have revealed the complexity of animal sentiency, cognition and awareness. The ethical implications of this new knowledge have yet to be properly evaluated, but it is becoming clear that the old view that animals are mere things, tools, machines or commodities cannot be sustained ethically.

But it is not only philosophy and science that are putting animals on the agenda. Increasingly, in Europe and the United States, animals are becoming a political issue as political parties vie for the 'green' and 'animal' vote. In turn, political scientists are beginning to look again at the history of political thought in relation to animals, and historians are beginning to revisit the political history of animal protection.

As animals grow as an issue of importance, so there have been more collaborative academic ventures leading to conference volumes, special journal issues, indeed new academic animal journals as well. Moreover, we have witnessed the growth of academic courses, as well as university posts, in Animal Ethics, Animal Welfare, Animal Rights, Animal Law, Animals and Philosophy, Human-Animal Studies, Critical Animal

Studies, Animals and Society, Animals in Literature, Animals and Religion—tangible signs that a new academic discipline is emerging.

'Animal Ethics' is the new term for the academic exploration of the moral status of the non-human—an exploration that explicitly involves a focus on what we owe animals morally, and which also helps us to understand the influences—social, legal, cultural, religious and political—that legitimate animal abuse. This series explores the challenges that Animal Ethics poses, both conceptually and practically, to traditional understandings of human-animal relations.

The series is needed for three reasons: (i) to provide the texts that will service the new university courses on animals; (ii) to support the increasing number of students studying and academics researching in animal related fields; and (iii) because there is currently no book series that is a focus for multidisciplinary research in the field.

Specifically, the series will

- provide a range of key introductory and advanced texts that map out ethical positions on animals;
- publish pioneering work written by new, as well as accomplished, scholars, and
- produce texts from a variety of disciplines that are multidisciplinary in character or have multidisciplinary relevance.

The new Palgrave Macmillan Series on Animal Ethics is the result of a unique partnership between Palgrave Macmillan and the Ferrater Mora Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics. The series is an integral part of the mission of the Centre to put animals on the intellectual agenda by facilitating academic research and publication. The series is also a natural complement to one of the Centre's other major projects, the *Journal of Animal Ethics*. The Centre is an independent 'think tank' for the advancement of progressive thought about animals, and is the first Centre of its kind in the world. It aims to demonstrate rigorous intellectual enquiry and the highest standards of scholarship. It strives to be a world-class centre of academic excellence in its field.

We invite academics to visit the Centre's website www.oxfordanimalethics.com and to contact us with new book proposals for the series.

Oxford, UK   Andrew Linzey
Villanova, USA   Priscilla N. Cohn
                                                              General Editors

Preface

This book aims to introduce the reader to a little known Christian literature of animal-human relationships, and its continuing importance as a source for contemporary animal advocacy. I have chosen to refer to this literature as 'nonconformist' although a number of other terms could have been used, including Puritan, Dissenting, Evangelical or even, simply, Reformed. Indeed, in earlier essays dealing with particular issues, I have myself spoken of it as 'Evangelical' literature in the spirit of the pioneering usage of Martin Luther, but this term has become so charged with other meanings that I now prefer to avoid it.

I shall be concerned with a feature of this literature which can already be discerned in the term 'Evangelical', and in the fact that much of it began life as sermons or commentaries upon the Bible. The literary intent is not just to inform the reader, but to change lives; this gives nonconformist texts what Keeble (1987, 135 and 146) calls their 'distinctive literary persona'. They intend to do something to readers, to touch their conscience; to make them wiser, not simply more knowledgable. Moreover, nonconformist literature has a public face, for transformed readers are in turn to do something for others; the nonconformist conscience seeks to reform the way people live together, to make a better world. The focus of this book is the impact of this reforming conscience on the way humans talk about, and treat, animals.

The earliest texts included in my discussion are those of the Magisterial Reformation, in particular of Martin Luther and John Calvin. However, the majority are in English, and date from the seventeenth century; these

are supplemented by the subsequent literature of the Evangelical Revival and the Clapham Sect, as well as some nineteenth-century texts by Calvinistic, Presbyterian or Methodist preachers and Bible commentators. A more detailed rationale for these choices of literature will be found in Chapter 4. Overwhelmingly, the authors are white men; many of them are related in familial, intellectual, ecclesiastical or social networks, and they interact to a striking degree with one-another, or one-another's texts. All of them constantly draw upon the canonical texts of the Protestant Bible, and often implicitly or explicitly quote it. I have tried to illustrate this by citing the more obvious pericopes.

In this sense of 'nonconformist', its literature has been studied from a variety of aspects, most obviously as theology of a Calvinist hue. However, others have approached it in its social, economic and political contexts, yielding engrossing and informative studies. Whilst recognising the importance of the wider social, historical and technological transformations which enabled these texts to be written, and which frame the nonconformist conscience, my own approach is to try to elucidate what they *say* about animal-human relationships; I do not attempt to go behind their statements, or offer an account of why they make them. This approach is rooted in both my personal biography and in the striking influence that this body of nonconformist literature has had on animal advocacy over a period of some three hundred years. The latter, alone, warrants its study.

The way we treat animals has concerned me for many years and that concern has played an increasing role in practical decisions about how I live. However, I did not begin studying the subject systematically until about 20 years ago when I happened across some early modern texts while researching *Six Modern Myths* (Sampson 2001); these cast doubt on the received opinion that animal-friendly attitudes are a modern sensibility. I discovered a rich and little studied language of animals which in some ways anticipated modern animal advocacy discourse; indeed, it appears that it directly influenced many efforts at reform before the twentieth century.

Image and word are more closely related than their venerable opposition allows, but it remains true that nonconformity is better known for its texts than its art, for its literacy than its icons. Certainly the primacy of the Word, and the representation of the world as a Book of Nature, appealed especially to the writers of books. Thomas Boston (1720 [1964], 52) contemplated the exquisite pleasure enjoyed by Adam, not

at simply seeing the newborn world, but 'while his piercing eyes read the book of God's works, which God laid before him, to the end he might glorify Him in the same'. Robert Bolton (1631, 385–386), emphasises that words, by their very nature, point beyond themselves as mere marks on the page; so also does the Book of Nature. 'In this great Volume of Nature, round about us, wee may runne and reade, the deepe Prints and large Characters of kindnesse and love, which His mercifull and munificent hand hath left in all Places, in every leafe, and Page, and line of it'. Thomas Adams (1630, 120–121) laments the blindness which stops at the wonders of creation, the marks on the page, without seeking its author or publisher: it is 'the argument of a dull and non-intelligent man, to see an excellent work without minding it; as negligent readers run over books, and never think of the authors art or the printers'.

Thomas Adam's reference to the printer's art is a reminder of the then relatively new and marvellous technologies which permitted so many books to be circulated. The Magisterial Reformers of the sixteenth century preached sermons and wrote books, and their nonconformist heirs did the same, producing a large and distinctive literature. The printed form was dominant throughout the period treated in this book, and it was deliberately fostered by nonconformist authors, who not only produced texts for scholars and the libraries of the rich, but also cheaper editions and pamphlets for a wide range of readers. Theirs was a literary culture, and we now know them by their works (Keeble 1987).

I am not the first to have noticed that this literature treated of animal-human relationships, but other accounts have either focused upon the broader topic of environmentalism, or have situated it as a minority tradition within changing attitudes to animals more generally. Few have looked in detail at the images of animal life which it paints, or the ethic of animal-human relationships which it promotes. Before embarking on the complex task of exploring the conditions in which nonconformist discourse influenced changing attitudes to animals, it is helpful know precisely what that discourse said. That is the task this book sets itself.

Some of the texts quoted in this book date from a time before the standardisation of spelling and grammar. I have modernised typography, including the use of *thorn* derived abbreviations, but have otherwise generally retained the spelling and punctuation of the English texts. I have occasionally annotated archaic meanings in square parentheses. In the case of continental European sources, the spelling reflects the date of translation. For the sake of brevity, I shall refer to non-human animals

as 'animals' or, when referencing early modern sources, as 'beasts'. Similarly, when referencing my sources, I shall use the term 'man' and its cognates where we would now say 'human'; and 'he' where we would now prefer a gender neutral term. I am aware of the difficulties entailed in these choices, but any other course appears to me to bring more troubles than it relieves. In tracing nonconformist discourses of animals, I often use their own language and phraseology; this should be understood as the voice of my sources and not necessarily my own.

Over the years, many friends and colleagues have contributed to my thinking on this subject, either as collaborator or by sharpening my thought on the stone of challenge; I am grateful to them all. In particular, I would mention the participants at the Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics Summer-schools. My greatest debt is to my wife, Dr. Miriam Sampson whose support and positive criticism have been invaluable. Finally, I express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Andrew Linzey, without whose encouragement this book would not have seen the light of day. Naturally, all remaining shortcomings are my own.

Portsmouth, UK   Philip J. Sampson

Bibliography

Adams, Thomas. 1630. *Works*. Vol. 3. London: John Grismand.
Bolton, Robert. 1631. *Instructions for a Right Comforting Afflicted Consciences with Special Antidotes Against Some Grievous Temptations*. London: Imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Weaver.
Boston, Thomas. 1720 [1964]. *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*. London: Banner of Truth.
Keeble, N. H. 1987. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century England*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
Sampson, Philip J. 2001. *6 Modern Myths*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Contents

Speaking of Animals

The human use of animals, especially of their bodies for food or clothing, has often generated ethical debates in a way that harvesting vegetables has not. These debates draw on the linguistic resources available in the prevailing culture (Maasen and Weingart 2013; Derrida 2001, 360). Thus, the use of animals as 'pets' draws upon a language usually reserved for humans, especially children within families, in order to discuss how we should treat them. Indeed, pets are sometimes said to be 'part of the family'; they are to be fed when hungry, and taken for treatment when ill, just like other family members. It is easy to see how such language makes it natural to claim that beating or starving Fido is cruel, and that cruelty is ethically reprehensible.

Thus pet lovers talk about their dog or cat in a distinctive way, with its own lexicon and syntax. Pets are referred to as 'him' or her', and may be given gendered personal names; their 'owners' speak of Fido or Moggie as though they have their own personalities, preferences and favourite meals. Pets often have their own eating bowls labelled with their personal name, have special toys to play with and their own pet beds. A family pet is often 'included' in special occasions by being given gifts, or may even 'give' presents in their personal name; in both the UK and the US, over half of all family dogs receive a Christmas present. This language can become quite nuanced in emphasising the affinities between human and 'pet', depending upon the speaker's view of animals more generally. Thus, 'companion animal' may be preferred to 'pet', using the language

of human friendship to highlight the relationship formed. Others might prefer 'human keeper' or 'guardian' to 'owner', accenting the fact that an animal is not a thing, let alone chattel (Linzey and Cohn 2011). Encoded within this way of talking about 'pets' is the ethical decision not to eat them, just as we do not eat other members of our family. This is so, even though 'pets' are 'owned', and humans are usually free to eat their property if it is edible (or even if it isn't). All culturally adept speakers tacitly understand these things.

But this is a specialised and relatively recent way of talking about animals. There are others. The most common is, and probably always has been, *a pragmatic discourse* of using animals for human survival and, more recently, human progress. When we wish to eat animals, wear their skin or experiment upon them, we usually choose different linguistic resources from those framing 'pet' discourse. These resources have their own vocabulary and grammar. Thus food animals are rarely addressed as independent sentient beings, and are usually referred to by a number or as 'it' rather than as 'he' or 'she' (Linzey and Linzey 2017, v). To speak of them having their own personalities or preferences does not promote industry productivity. The exception to depersonalisation is the language of abuse and often obscenity revealed by undercover filming in industrial animal facilities. Female food animals perceived as recalcitrant or deliberately uncooperative are typically addressed with a lexicon drawn from the language of misogyny, a particular instance of the gendered discourse of the meat industry (Adams 2010). Moreover, food animals do not have personal toys, eating or sleeping arrangements; indeed, environmental deprivation is an issue in many facilities. When ill, a strict cost-benefit calculus determines whether they are healed or killed. As Michael Pollan (2002) has noted, the linguistic resource drawn upon here is that usually used of industrial products or machines: 'To visit a modern CAFO (Confined Animal Feeding Operation) is to enter a world that, for all its technological sophistication, is still designed according to Cartesian principles: animals are machines incapable of feeling pain.'

Resources and Meanings

The resources we draw upon when we talk about animals affect the meaning we assign to them, and their place in our world. They create particular forms of significance for the native language user which generate and reinforce forms of animal-human relationships (Bernstein 2003, 93f).

These different ways of speaking often coexist, and each uses its own vocabulary and grammar to express ethical responses to animals. For any particular culture at any one time, there is no single way to make sense of the animals in our world; rather, there are plural, contested ways of speaking which shift historically and culturally; a field of meanings imposed by humans on the creatures surrounding us, generating what we call 'animals' (Derrida 2002, 408f). Each language is suited to its purpose. Language about 'pets' is suited to talking about human-pet interactions, and tacitly assumes a shared experience and knowledge of 'pets' among speakers. It indexes mutual understandings which remain unspoken. Such language is readily accessible to experienced pet owners, although some outside the pet-owning community might find it inappropriately anthropomorphising, even mawkish. By contrast, language about food animals is suited to culinary enjoyment, and is highly unsuitable to talking about pets. We sharply distinguish Fido from the pig whose 'bacon' we eat for breakfast; this makes it hard or even impossible to say of Fido what we find it easy to say of the nameless pig: that it was succulent and tasty.

The language of 'pets' uses the obvious similarities between humans and other animals to provide a foundation for kinship. 'Pets' may enjoy the same ethical consideration as family members: to be fed when hungry, protected from cold, treated when ill. In many ways, they are guest members of human culture. However, this is a human choice. If we wish to eat the animal or wear her skin, it would not be desirable to speak of 'it' as gendered or as a member of the family. So we usually use a language which tacitly emphasises human uniqueness rather than the features we share with other animals. The potential ethical difficulty of eating a family member is thereby avoided. Within each discourse, our ethical choices are coded within the tacit meanings of the language itself, so that they appear to be natural rather than chosen. But there is no 'natural' or neutral way to talk ethically about animals. Meaning is made, not found.

STRATEGIES OF SEGREGATION

Commonly, a number of incompatible ways of talking about animals coexist in public discourse, and the potential for ethical conflict is minimised by clear boundaries between them. But as there are so many similarities between 'pets' and food animals, the boundary which separates animals we love from animals we love to eat, is prone to fail. In

January 2018 a red Limousin beef cow staged 'a miraculous escape' on her way to slaughter in Poland and dived into Lake Nysa to gain sanctuary. She briefly won international fame as an 'icon of freedom', variously described as 'heroic', a 'celebrity' and 'valiant'. Food animals are not usually portrayed in this way. When they are, we find it harder to eat them, and soon a campaign began to save her from slaughter. A breakdown in segregation can affect our behaviour, although in this case it proved ineffectual as the terrified cow died of stress on being recaptured.

Skilled native speakers have a variety of segregation strategies to minimise inconvenience, and most people are adept at switching from one discourse to another without evoking a sense of dissonance. Most people know not to ask what Fido tastes like. But close daily contact with food animals is liable to make segregation harder, and its failure more distressing. If you don't detach yourself from the animals, observed one farmer, 'you'd go off your head'. Another family farmer described the 'emotional trauma of sending for slaughter two lambs that were so *pet-like* they followed her into the trailer'. She felt she had betrayed their trust, a virtue usually reserved for interactions with other humans (Wilkie 2010, 152 and 150, my emphasis).

Animals can appear in discourses other than those of 'pets' and food. For example, in March 2018 a puppy called Kokito was taken aboard a plane in an animal carrier but, as luggage must be stowed in the overhead compartments, the flight crew decided that this was where the carrier be placed. By the end of the journey, Kokito was dead. Kokito's appearance in the two incompatible discourses of *luggage* and *pets* affected the way speakers perceived her, with serious consequences for all concerned.

In the discourses of experimental science, the human-animal boundary becomes an important distinction, and manipulating it can conceal or generate cognitive dissonances which may even affect our perceptions. Thus, in the literature on animal modelling for human medical research, similarities are emphasised between humans and the experimental animal 'model' in order to give the research plausibility. Sometimes conflict arises. For example, a researcher may be concerned to document similarities between his experimental animal and humans, whilst asserting that an experiment which would be unethical on a human is justified on an animal because the 'model' is different from humans. Particular

difficulties arise when the experimental model is a dog or cat which naturally evokes the language of pets, overly blurring the animal-human boundary and heightening the discomfort of dissonance.

The strategy of avoiding giving personal names to food animals is especially important for children who may be less skilled than adults at maintaining a segregating boundary between a live animal and livestock. Rhoda Wilkie (2010, 156) describes the young son on a family farm who was told that they were eating one of their own pigs for Sunday lunch. He asked which one, and the conversation developed:

> *Mother*: "Ophelia"
> *Son*: "Which leg are we eating? Is it a front one or a back one?"
> *Mother*: "A back one, I think"
> *Son*: "Is it the left leg or the right leg?"
> 'At that point', says Wilkie, 'the mother gave up on her Sunday lunch'.

The contents of the mother's plate did not change, but once segregation failed, her perception of it did.

Perception is an active not a passive process, and depends upon the public frame of meaning we bring to what we see. As Patty Born Selly (2014, 4) notes, 'when it comes to animals and our human relationship to them, words have meaning and power to influence our perceptions'. In Wilkie's account, the meaning of Ophelia's leg shifted, and spilled ethical scruples into the quotidian reality of culinary pleasure. Once the mother's perception changed, so did her behaviour. She stopped eating Ophelia. The public language we use affects not only our perceptions of animals, but the range of ethical choices available to us, and our behaviour in choosing one.

The public discourse of food animals was here accidentally subverted by a guileless child in a private setting. However, skilled native speakers can deliberately subvert linguistic segregation in order to produce changes in public perception and behaviour. For example, meat-eating may be framed using a vegan vocabulary to increase cognitive dissonance; 'meat' becomes 'flesh' or 'body part'. Lexical changes can be supplemented by the use of gendered and personalised language. When we refer to a cow as 'she', or to young non-human animals as 'babies', we describe the animal's experience in terms of our own, and establish a bond of affective kinship. Jeffrey Masson (2009) employed this

technique when he entitled his book 'The Face on your Plate'. The *Go Vegan World* advertising campaign of 2017 featured images with slogans such as: 'Love animals? Stop eating us'; and 'Dairy takes babies from their mothers'. Public discourses concerning animal-human relationships are not just culturally recognised ways of *speaking*; they affect our perceptions, ethics and behaviour. They have been important for the development of human cultures and for the shifting boundary between nature and culture.

LANGUAGE AND CHANGE

Language enables us to say things, to make connections, and the way we do this affects our ethical choices. However, discourses are embedded in their specific cultural, economic and social worlds; these change, and with them, the language we use. When the available linguistic resources change, it may make it harder (or easier) to say certain things or make certain choices. We may even avoid saying, and doing, some things altogether. The links between language and the world 'are not given for once and for all' (Kuhn 1993, 539).

For most people in the UK today, it would be against their conscience to treat a dog in the same way as a food animal. Indeed, few people would be comfortable with even saying that they had baked their dog in the oven, let alone doing it. But it was not always so. In seventeenth-century England, the discursive distinctions which we now routinely make were less pronounced. In 1698, it was possible for a Dorset farmer to write 'My old dog Quon was killed and baked for his grease, of which he yielded 11 lbs', without the same sense of dissonance we might now feel (Thomas 1984, 102). It is not necessarily that he was less attached to Quon than a contemporary 'pet owner' might be, but the range of things he could say, and do, was broader.

These changes over time can have significant legal consequences. In some jurisdictions, the term 'domestic' animals once excluded cats and dogs, resulting in the failure of cruelty cases involving them (Johnson 2017, 66). So long as animals were spoken of as property, an owner could not be prosecuted for abusing them. In the UK in 1790, John Shepherd was prosecuted for tearing out the tongue of his employer's horse; had he owned the unhappy creature himself, he would have been immune to legal redress (Harwood 1928, 312).

Ethical Debate, Modernity and Religion

Technical ethical debates, no less than everyday language, draw on the linguistic resources available in the prevailing culture. In Western Europe, these resources have changed dramatically from the late Renaissance to the present, and the way we speak about nature and animals has changed correspondingly. Nowadays, there are ecological and environmental languages for discussing nature which simply did not exist until recent times; animal sentience, welfare and rights are studied by a range of disciplines founded only since the nineteenth century. These changes have been traced in the history of ideas, especially in literature and philosophy. During the twentieth century, two intellectual traditions attracted particular attention in the development of new portrayals of nature and more compassionate attitudes towards animals: the rational, scientifically based language and humane ethics associated with Enlightenment ideology; and Darwin's evolutionary theory. The change for good flowing from these two sources became the consensus narrative for the origins of environmentalism, and the growth of animal advocacy. Thus Berry (2015, 4–5) says that the 'conventional history' of American environmentalism regards it as 'an essentially secular undertaking' relying upon enlightenment 'modernisation theory'; and Franklin (1999, 5) notes that 'Enlightenment thinkers and the rise of science' are associated with the collapse of religious dominion thought about animals. Richard Ryder (1983, 128) traces the roots of animal welfare reform in the late eighteenth century to 'intellectuals' who discussed it, putting it on the agenda. Industrialisation and subsequent urbanisation locate these intellectual shifts in social and economic history (Thomas 1984).

This narrative of change pictures modernity ushering in gentler, less cruel perceptions and attitudes, culminating in progressive environmental and animal advocacy movements. Animals have entered a moral universe previously seen as reserved for humans. By the late twentieth century, accounts of progress in environmental studies and animal rights were almost always clothed in the attire of Enlightenment humanism and neo-Darwinism. This language is characteristically modern and, where religion is mentioned at all, it is usually in an Enlightenment spirit of treating superstition as an obstacle to progress.

Yet, the pervasive linguistic resource available to discuss animals in Western Europe since the Renaissance has not been secular, but

religious; and specifically Christian. Indeed, such was the major role played by Christianity in Europe until the later nineteenth century that it remained a resource despite the changes inaugurating modernity. Unsurprisingly, then, Christian discourses have often been the principal means for publicly authorising behaviour towards animals. But they do not often feature in accounts of the development of more compassionate public attitudes other than as obstacles. The emphasis on Enlightenment and Darwinian resources has tended to homogenise religious accounts and sideline the Christian resources drawn upon in debates about environmentalism and animal cruelty before the twentieth century (Berry 2015, 4; Attfield 1983, 370 and 376f; Stoll 1997, xi).

The most familiar example of a religious discourse is in authorising pragmatic human uses of animals which might otherwise appear ethically controversial. Such discourse is often deeply conservative, reproducing conventional moralities and silencing the suffering of animals. However, religious discourses have not only been used conservatively. There are other examples, less familiar to the modern reader, which provided innovative discursive resources from the later sixteenth century. This is particularly a feature of the discourses emerging from the Magisterial Reformations in Europe. More, their voice carried an existential imperative. Humans were conceived as having responsibilities which are not satisfied simply by stating them. Responsibilities have to be lived, and in being lived, they generate a sense of duty. This was already evident in the Magisterial Reformation itself, but it came to be called the 'nonconformist conscience' in the late nineteenth century, a term which is often used retrospectively.[1]

Nonconformity and the 'Animal Turn'

Current views of the 'animal turn' from the early seventeenth century have given less weight to these Christian than to secular sources. This book redresses that balance by giving an account of distinctive but neglected sources, originating in early modern theological reflection. It focuses on the internal architecture of these discourses in their own words, framed by adjoining narratives of animal cruelty, diet and perceived human benefits such as hunting or vivisection. I draw principally upon English language sources from the sixteenth to the late nineteenth centuries which would now be regarded as theological. However, current boundaries between disciplines were more permeable before the

twentieth century, and the debates often encroach on what would now be considered the provinces of social, ethical or philosophical study.

The vision of animal-human relations which emerges from these sources is systematically articulate, and demonstrates that animal advocacy is not exclusively the product of the secular enlightenment or of Darwinian ideology. Indeed, it may not be their product at all, except insofar as they trade on earlier nonconformist discourses. I examine the categories created by the nonconformist conscience, and the dynamics of their contributions to the changing language of animal advocacy.

Whilst recognising the importance of the wider social, historical and technological changes which frame the nonconformist conscience (Franklin 1999, 1f), this book focuses specifically upon its internal linguistic architecture. The picture which emerges is now unfamiliar, and illustrates the innovative possibilities for animal-human relations outside the contemporary modern consensus. Moreover, the nonconformist conscience was nothing if not an outward imperative, influencing the social practices, institutions and laws of its day. Its impact may be traced in public and parliamentary debate, the language of law reform and the statutes of organisations such as the SPCA (later, the RSPCA). Indeed, traces are still visible in the debates and practices of animal advocacy in the early twenty-first century. Discourses of the nonconformist conscience *did* something as well as *saying* something: they had a performative as well as a descriptive function. Moreover, what it is to be *human* has often been constituted in implicit or explicit contrast with what it is to be a (non-human) *animal-other*. As a result, reflection on 'animality' in recent decades has also seen a renewed interest in the 'human', and traces of religious discourse persist there also.

This book comprises eight further chapters. Chapters 2 and 3 set the scene by discussing the two main contemporary narratives of change in the way we talk about animals from early modernity to the present. Chapter 2 describes an account claiming that a more humanitarian animal-human relationship had to await the demise of Christian 'dominion thought' (Franklin 1999, 5) which gives humans the right to use animals for their own ends. Chapter 3 sets out the parallel narrative of the rise of a more compassionate, Enlightenment ethic. Chapter 4 argues that the changing discourses of animal-human relationships are more complex than these narratives suggest; in particular, there were other animal-friendly ways of speaking from the late sixteenth century. This

will set the scene for an investigation of nonconformist contributions to changes in the way we talk about animals.

Chapters 5–7 are the kernel of the book. They explore the heritage of nonconformist language for our conception of animals and their interests, using the tripartite framework of Creation, Fall and Redemption. These three motifs were identified by the Dutch philosopher Herman Dooyeweerd (1969, vol. 1, 506–508) as driving discourses such as that of nonconformity which prioritise the biblical canon.

The final two chapters are concerned with practical implications in contemporary animal advocacy. They treat the complex relationships between the world generated by nonconformist discourse and the world given to us in Western societies. An immediate consequence is the possibility of alliances between secular and religious language, drawing in those who are alienated by either a solely secularist or religious emphasis respectively.

Note

1. The term 'nonconformist conscience' was coined in the context of political debates from the 1870s when it largely referred to narrow issues of personal morality. Retrospectively, it has been applied to groups in the UK tracing their heritage to the Magisterial Reformations in Europe. The term 'nonconformists' is discussed in Chapter 4.

Bibliography

Adams, Carol J. 2010. *The Sexual Politics of Meat.* New York: Continuum.

Attfield, Robin. 1983. "Christian Attitudes to Nature." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44 (3) (July–September): 369–386.

Bernstein, Basil B. 2003. *Class, Codes and Control.* Vol. 1. London: Routledge.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism.* San Francisco: University of California Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 2001. *Writing and Difference.* Translated by Alan Bass. London: Routledge.

Derrida, Jacques. 2002. "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)." Translated by David Wills. *Critical Inquiry* 28 (2): 369–418.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. 1969. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought.* Translated by David H. Freeman and William S. Young. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Franklin, Adrian. 1999. *Animals and Modern Culture: A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity*. London: Sage.

Harwood, Dix. 1928. *Love for Animals and How It Developed in Great Britain*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Johnson, Lisa. 2017. "On the Suffering of Animals in Nature." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 63–77.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1993. "Metaphor in Science." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 534–542. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linzey, Andrew, and Clare Linzey. 2017. "The 'It' in Our Midst." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): v–vi.

Linzey, Andrew, and Priscilla Cohn. 2011. "Terms of Discourse." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 1 (1) (Spring): vii–ix.

Maasen, Sabine, and Peter Weingart. 2013. *Metaphors and the Dynamics of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Masson, Jeffrey. 2009. *The Face on Your Plate*. New York: Norton.

Pollan, Michael. 2002. "An Animal's Place." *New York Times Magazine*, November 10. http://michaelpollan.com/articles-archive/an-animals-place/.

Ryder, Richard D. 1983. *Victims of Science—The Use of Animals in Research*. London: National Anti-Vivisection Society.

Selly, Patty Born. 2014. *Connecting Animals and Children in Early Childhood*. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Stoll, Mark. 1997. *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Nature in America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Wilkie, Rhoda M. 2010. *Livestock/Deadstock*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Animals, Language and Ethics

The discursive resources available in a culture qualify 'the limits of acceptable speech', what it is publicly possible to say without finding it hard to get a hearing. Sometimes, some things are simply rendered unsayable (Butler 1997, 34). In this sense, public debates about animals (and humans) are constructed within those resources. Even 'nature' is not naturally given; the 'nature' we speak of now is not the same 'nature' inherited from scholastic theology by the Magisterial Reformers; nor is it that of the Romantic Movement (Crowther 2010, Ch. 5; Cronon 1996, 20f). Moreover, our language frames both our thinking and our action (Bono 2001, 217 and 227). Familiar ways of speaking induce us to make ethical decisions as though the world were shaped in the way we are accustomed to talk about it. When the discursive resources change, the way we speak about animals as ethical subjects also changes, and with it the distribution of likely choices.

Such changes are not, of course, sudden, monolithic or uncontested. Semantic shifts in words such as 'animal' or 'beast' accumulate, producing family resemblances rather than a single meaning (Wittgenstein 1992, I. para., 65–71). The word 'animal' is now commonplace but it was rarely used until the later seventeenth century; for example, it does not appear in the King James version of the bible (1611) whereas 'beast' occurs nearly 300 times. Nowadays 'beast' has acquired a more specialised, sometimes pejorative range of meanings.

It is not only words that change. Different linguistic resources create semantic variation, each generating a differently inflected discourse of animals (Hasan 2009). Fragments and remnants of diverse uses co-exist, each bearing the traces of their linguistic journey. New discursive contexts may change the sense of terms which carry a surplus of meanings from their origin elsewhere. This 'nomadic' nature of discourse features continuities and stabilities over time as well as lacunae and 'new shades of meaning' (Maasen and Weingart 2013, 2–4). By framing our discussion of an animal within a new discourse, we can significantly alter the ethical choices which seem natural, and thus the reality of the animal's life.

Changing Animals into Food

Most people find it natural to speak of animals as animate and sentient creatures, if not rational ones. But when we use animals for human ends, this way of talking may foreground uncongenial ethical questions. So we learn to speak of them differently, usually over a period of time. For example, in the West, we have developed everyday pragmatic language about animals into an increasingly nuanced language of food animals to avoid ethical reflection. To do so, we have drawn extensively from discourses of technology, science and business, blunting ethical reflection.

Of course, some linguistic segregation of live animals from meat has a long history. In English, the living animal even has a different name from the animal on the plate. A pig becomes 'pork'; cows become 'beef'; a chicken turns into a 'capon', calves into 'veal', and sheep into 'mutton'. These French-derived terms reflect the power of the Norman conquerors (who ate the flesh) over the native English (who cared for the living animals). The language of conquest segregates living from dead flesh, blunting the ethical issue of eating a sentient creature.

By the twentieth century, many more linguistic resources had become available than that of conquest. It had become natural to speak of animals as 'meat units', 'produce' or 'commodities'. Indeed, food animals are not usually referred to as 'animals' at all, but as 'live-*stock*', the assets of a business for use or sale. The growth of this passive and impersonal language facilitated the objectification of livestock from living creatures into packages in the freezer. Livestock do not live in family groups but are housed in facilities; they do not walk but are herded or driven; they do not eat, but receive 'feed'. A group of living animals is a group of individuals: dogs, cows, pigs and so on. But to think of their flesh on

the plate as the flesh of an individual may be uncomfortable, so meat becomes generic. There is no plural to beef or pork, because beef or pork is not even a singular individual; indeed, in an age of mechanically recovered meat, it may represent numerous individuals.

Traditional animal 'husbandry' carries traces of its origin in the peasant farmer's (*husband's*) stewardship of beasts; industrial animal 'production' has made a different linguistic journey. Ruth Harrison (1964) was the first to systematically explore the way we speak of animals as machines for converting fodder into human food in factory farms; this has since become commonplace. 'The breeding sow', advises one corporate manager, 'should be thought of, and treated as, a valuable piece of machinery whose function is to pump out baby pigs like a sausage machine' (Regan 2005, 96). This discourse brings its own problems, as everybody knows that animals are not insensate machines. Consequently, this way of speaking 'depends on a suspension of disbelief' on the part of employees and 'a willingness to avert your eyes on the part of everyone else' (Pollan 2002).

If animals cannot be spoken of as machines or commodified into a product, ethical reflection can still be minimised if the animals can be 'vegetised'. In this case, we talk about the *living animal* as *living*, but not as *animal*. This can be done by blurring the language used to produce and maintain the distinction between animals and vegetables. For example, a syntax and lexicon drawn from arable farming exploits the fact that eating vegetables rarely attracts the ethical debate that killing animals does. Thus animals are not slaughtered or butchered but thinned, managed, harvested, and bagged, just like vegetables. Eleonora Gullone (2017, 38) suggests that this language is especially used by hunters and trappers to 'dissociate from their infliction of pain and rationalize their killing behaviour'.

These various strategies of segregation have been produced and reproduced by the meat industry, and qualify the way we speak about animals as ethical subjects. Other institutions may also qualify what an 'animal' is said to be. If the legal system classifies an animal as property, she cannot suffer a 'legally cognisable injury', nor has she legal redress (Johnson 2017, 65). As Matthew Scully (2016) notes, the experiences of farm animals in the United States is controlled simply by disqualifying them as 'animals': 'in America, farm animals were excluded from the very definition of "animal" in the protections provided in our federal Animal Welfare Act'. An act ostensibly intended to further the interests of animals excludes most of them from having an interest.

This language of food animals has emerged over time and drew upon discursive resources such as technology and business as they became available. There is an obvious continuity with the pragmatic way of speaking which has dominated whenever humans wished to use animals for their own purposes. However, there has been another change in the way we speak about animals since early modernity which appears to break with such pragmatism, and is much harder to explain; namely, the development of a language of animal advocacy. It is not immediately obvious what interests such a language would serve, or which discursive resources were drawn upon to form this more humanitarian way of speaking.

CHANGING ANIMALS INTO FRIENDS

There is widespread agreement that the landscape of animal-human relationships has changed for the better since early modernity, and that a gentler, kinder way of talking has become available for at least some animals. Montaigne's sixteenth-century moral horror at animal cruelty is well known precisely because it stands out in a landscape which generally reserved ethical debate for humans. But by the twentieth century, a public language had become available which includes animals in our ethical universe. We now routinely talk about animals as ethically qualified beings in a variety of contexts from food to their experimental use. In the UK, this 'animal turn' is reflected in public attitudes, private perceptions, legislation and the emergence of animal welfare organisations from the RSPCA to Animal Aid.

There is no obvious continuity between this modern language of animal advocacy and that of pragmatic use. Indeed, the two seem in many ways opposed. Certainly, the institutions concerned with the human use of animal bodies and products are not known for promoting humane language; some even oppose advocacy organisations. How did a language which appears not to serve pragmatic human interests arise?

Dix Harwood (1928) appears to have been the earliest to seriously raise this question, but Keith Thomas (1984) was the first to subject it to systematic enquiry. Since then, a broad consensus narrative about the emergence of animal advocacy discourse has emerged. Within this consensus narrative of humanitarian change, three major sources for more humane attitudes have been identified. Firstly, the transforming role played by Enlightenment and Darwinian ideology; secondly, social and economic changes; and thirdly, the shift from a religious to a secular world view.

Enlightenment, Darwinism and Secular Change

The most common way of talking about animals has always been pragmatic, emphasising the human ability to make use of their bodies and labour. In so far as this was considered an ethical issue before modernity, it was discussed using the categories then available, largely drawn from Christian sources. According to the consensus narrative of humanitarian change, the eighteenth century proved a turning point (Harwood 1928, 75) when these Christian sources were challenged by 'Enlightenment thinkers and the rise of science' (Franklin 1999, 5; see also Ryder 1983, 128). Secular ideologies gained a public voice, and were associated with humanitarianism, emancipation and progress. Darwin's work subsequently added the status of scientific truth to modern ideology. Peter Singer (2009) has especially emphasised the language of Darwinism in articulating an ethic for animal rights.

Of course, these aspects of intellectual history occurred within a broader context of industrialisation and urban growth (Thomas 1984; Franklin 1999). City dwellers came to have a very different relationship with animals from their rural forebears.The experience of pet ownership contrasted with that of having working animals, and the more intimate, domestic setting increased empathy between animal and human. Scientific enquiry revealed the various abilities of animals, and encouraged interest in them for their own sake. Agricultural expansion and woodland management made it possible to speak of 'wild' areas such as forests as 'romantic', where they had previously been the dangerous lair of wild animals and brigands. These changes provided the social and economic context for a more compassionate language to develop.

Secular World View

These ideological and social changes will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, but the consensus narrative places them within a common framework: the revolutionary shift from a religious to a modern, scientific and secular way of talking (Singer 2015, 217f). Dix Harwood (1928, 75 and 14) argued that the rise of more humane attitudes towards animals is correlated with the shift from a religious to a secular understanding of the universe. Humanitarianism, he observed, is not to be expected in a period dominated by the church's teaching 'that the world was made for man, the centre of the universe'. Whether

or not he is correct in not expecting humanitarianism before the eighteenth century, it is certain that a less *religiously* anthropocentric way of speaking emerged from about that time. 'Man in his arrogance', wrote Charles Darwin in his notebook, 'thinks himself a great work, worthy of the interposition of a deity, [it is] more humble… to consider him created from animals' (Gruber 1974, 452). Discourse about animals, it is claimed, had to break free of Christian sources before it could become more humble, humanitarian, scientific and compassionate. As befits a modernist account, this liberation from Christian constraints was phrased within the wider metanarrative of human progress and emancipation.

The Demise of Dominion Thought

Harwood's view that more humane attitudes towards animals had to await a secular understanding of the universe was anticipated by Henry Salt (1914, 2) who had condemned Christianity for long repressing animal friendliness. This view was frequently endorsed in the subsequent literature of the twentieth century. Christianity was criticised for being less merciful than other religions in failing to champion animals (Ryder 1983, 126); John Austin Baker (1992, 9) concluded that it 'has on the whole the blackest record among religions'. 'No creed in Christendom' says Edward Westermarck (1971, 388) 'teaches kindness to animals as a dogma of religion'. Peter Singer (2015, 226) regards the teaching of Christianity as a principal obstacle to more humane treatment of animals. Nor is this restricted to the technical literature. The BBC wildlife presenter Chris Packham (2014) commented that Christians believe that 'we're made in God's image so everything is there to be exploited by us. It doesn't help people's attitudes'. The RSPCA vice-president, Bill Oddie (2013), remarked that the 'church has a "dreadful record" on animal welfare'.

This bleak consensus rests principally upon a reading of the Genesis creation narrative 'as offering a carte blanche of environmental exploitation' (Salisbury 1994, 7; cf. Preece and Fraser 2000). Few authors draw on discourses of the Fall or of Redemption. In particular, it rests upon a reading of Genesis 1.26: 'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.' Two closely related inferences are drawn from this pericope and, whilst they have

substantial overlap, it is worth treating them separately to identify narrative themes which will recur throughout the following chapters.

a. Humans, made in the 'image of God', have a unique ontological status. Christians, as Peter Singer (2015, 226) puts it, maintain that we are 'the special darling of the entire universe'.
b. Humans are not only ontologically unique, we also have a unique position in relation to animals as we have 'dominion' over them; we are at the centre of the universe, a belief sometimes referred to as christian anthropocentrism.

Plainly, these two motifs are closely related, the second depending upon the first. For convenience, I shall refer to both collectively as 'dominion thought', following Adrian Franklin (1999, 5).

THE STRUCTURE OF DOMINION THOUGHT

During the twentieth century, a consensus emerged that this account of the creation narrative is broadly characteristic of Christianity; it represented the 'continuity of the Christian tradition' (Leiss 1974, 33), was 'Christian theological orthodoxy' (Franklin 1999, 11), and constituted the 'Christian tradition' (White 1967, 1206). I am not concerned here with the possible theological deficiency of this reading of the Genesis pericopes or its historical accuracy (Linzey 1994; Cohen 1989). In due course, I shall contrast dominion thought with the reading of Genesis characteristic of nonconformity. At this stage, however, I want to focus on its internal structure as a key component of the twentieth-century *consensus narrative of the emergence of more humanitarian views of animals.*

The Image of God

Genesis 1.26 tells us that humans, unlike the rest of creation, are made in the 'image' and 'likeness' of God. The consensus narrative frames this as the 'Christian dogma of man's transcendence of… nature' (White 1967, 1206): that humans have a unique ontological status. Humans literally have a godlike superiority over nature, 'a kind of arrogant self-proclamation of our special moral status' (Singer 2009) which makes us 'contemptuous of it [nature], willing to use it for our slightest whim' (White 1967, 1206). Animals and the natural world are desacralised or

disenchanted: 'Christian belief segregates the sphere of sacredness from the natural environment' (Pattberg 2007, 5).

Within this narrative, a particular feature of human superiority is that humans possess a soul, while animals do not. Henry Salt (1894, 10) identified this as furnishing a justification for acts of cruelty to animals and tending 'strongly to lessen their chance of being justly and considerately treated'. Animals, lacking a soul, may also be devoid of consciousness and feeling, a view often associated with Descartes although it is uncertain whether he held it himself (Cottingham 1993, 15f).

Lynn White (1967) especially developed this idea into an influential critique of Christian theology. In a striking reversal of the Enlightenment's celebrated claim to have given priority of physical facts over religious superstitions, White asserted that this priority was actually a consequence of Christian dominion thought. Moreover, the priority of facts brought oppression, not Enlightenment emancipation. He argued that, 'by destroying pagan animism, Christianity had made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects' (1967, 1205). 'Orthodox Christian arrogance toward nature' (1967, 1207) replaced pagan veneration: to 'a Christian a tree can be no more than a physical fact' (1967, 1206). The natural world was transformed from a sacred realm into material to be exploited or, worse, 'an enemy to be defeated' in the name of progress (Pattberg 2007, 6). The desacralising of nature is attributed especially to the doctrine of creation which emerged from the Magisterial Reformations in Europe. Luther's supposed materialist conception of the world as 'a repository of goods and services' for man destroyed its sacredness which had previously acted as a 'safety valve' protecting nature from exploitation (Northcott 1996, 53; Pattberg 2007, 6). White's thesis has attracted substantial criticism, but remains widely influential (LeVasseur and Peterson 2017).

White's narrative is striking because, while presented as a critique of Christian dominion thought, it actually argued that a materialism of mere facts leads to exploitation. The growth of ecological awareness had previously been narrated as a scientific achievement, but White foregrounded religious motifs such as sacredness and a spiritual respect for nature. This was the first serious recognition that something is wrong with the consensus narrative of the growth of humanitarian views towards nature and animals.

Dominion Over the Creatures

The transcendent status attributed to humans as 'image of God' is reinforced by 'dominion over the animals' to place humans at the centre of the universe; all purpose and meaning revolve around man, a doctrine known as Christian 'theological anthropocentrism' (Franklin 1999, 12). The 'world was made for man', says Harwood (1928, 14), 'the centre of the universe'. For Ian Bradley (1990, 2), the Western churches have been 'almost totally anthropocentric' especially since the Reformation. Lynn White's (1967, 1205) assertion that Christianity is 'the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen' illustrates the lexicon of binary extremes adopted as this story is told. Terms such as 'unlimited' or 'absolute' occur with striking frequency.

Thus the narrative emphasises that the Bible provides a 'mandate of unlimited dominion' (Stuart 2006, xxi), foregrounding both the extent and exclusivity of human authority over animals. 'God transfers his unlimited authority over all the living creatures of the world to Man, making him the "Lord of nature"' (Pattberg 2007, 5); it is this 'absolute power… which essentially separates man from other created things' (Leiss 1974, 31). We have 'rightful mastery' over animals (White 1967, 1206; Pattberg 2007, 6). Adrian Franklin (1999, 11) agrees that humans have carte blanche: it was Christian orthodoxy 'that God had given humans absolute rights to use animals as they saw fit' (see also Young 1999, xvi). Matt Cartmill (1993, 46) tells us that for 'traditional Christians', humans owe animals 'no duties of justice or even charity'. As Arnold Toynbee (1974, 141) summarises: 'According to the Bible, God… [chose] to license Adam and Eve to do what they liked with [the world]'.

But if everything revolves around man who can do as he likes with no duties to animals, then an instrumentalist view is not far away (Northcott 1996, 220). It is a 'Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man' says White (1967, 1207 and 1205): 'no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve man's purposes. Indeed, Christianity 'insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends' (White 1967, 1205). In a book highly commended by the influential polymath Lewis Mumford, Ian McHarg (1969, 26) observes that, in its insistence upon the 'dominion and subjugation of nature', the Genesis creation story 'encourages the most exploitative

and destructive instincts in man… Indeed, if one seeks license for those who would increase radioactivity, create canals and harbours with atomic bombs, employ poisons without constraint, or give consent to the bull-dozer mentality, there could be no better injunction than this text'. Again, we see the adoption of a language of binary extremes as this story unfolds.

A particular consequence of an instrumentalist view of nature is to empty animals of value. An animal created for the benefit of man has 'no intrinsic value in God's eyes', to 'traditional Christians, the beasts are merely part of God's stage machinery' (Cartmill 1993, 46). As early as 1914, Henry Salt (1914, 53) had claimed that 'the most fatal cause of man's inhumanity to the animals is the notion that they are… "sent" by a beneficent Providence for man's pleasure and recreation'.

According to this consensus narrative, dominion thought could scarcely have had more radical implications for the way we talk about animals; there is a near unanimity of voice with a curious lack of reserve. It is an anthropocentric narrative in which humans have unlimited authority, an unrestricted right to do as we wish, and animals are merely instrumental stage machinery with no intrinsic value in God's eyes. If this is an accurate and complete account of Christianity's contribution to our perception of animals, then 'Christianity bears a huge burden of guilt' (White 1967, 1206).

Recent years have seen an increasing recognition of the historical diversity of Christian discourses about animals, and in subsequent chapters I will be specifically contrasting the consensus about dominion thought with the nonconformist tradition. I shall argue that, far from simply authorising conventional morality towards animals and silencing their suffering, some nonconformist texts vigorously challenged that morality and subverted conventional authorisations of animal cruelty. In 1675, Thomas Hodges (1675, 27–29) preach a sermon about the goodness of the creatures and the mercy towards them required of the good man. The righteous man, he told his congregation, provides appropriate food for his animals when required, gives them shelter, sympathises with them, grieves with them in their distress, intercedes before God on their behalf when he cannot alleviate their distress himself; he 'does not load, or ride, or drive them beyond what they are able to bear', defends the weak against the fierce, and recovers the lost. As we shall see, his was not a lone voice, and it is not obvious how Hodge's ethic is compatible with the portrayal of Christian dominion described

above. As Keith Thomas (1984, 152) observed, Harwood was simply mistaken in saying that 'humanitarianism' towards animals did not pre-date 1700.

The Enlightenment Metanarrative

Twentieth-century accounts of dominion thought were cast within a bigger story about the contribution of scientific, Enlightenment ideology to the growth in humanitarian views of animals. This grand narrative recounts that humans are not 'special darlings of the universe' but animals like any other—part of the natural world. Humans have no special ethical status given by God, nor any automatic right to exercise our power over other animals. We can claim no transcendent attributes such as a 'soul' or 'spirit', but share the common fate of all living creatures. This is, it is argued, a more modest, compassionate and scientifically accurate view.

This modernist metanarrative was not, of course, available before the late eighteenth century. This alone should give us pause. When the word 'use' appears in early modern texts, we should be cautious about reading it in the Enlightenment sense of 'instrumental use'; indeed, its meaning was still in flux as late as the mid-eighteenth century (Preece 1995, 30). When the modern account of dominion thought understands an animal's value as either intrinsic to the creature or extrinsically derived from man, it is worth bearing in mind that public debate well into the late nineteenth century spoke of an animal's value deriving from a third source: creation motifs (Hansard 1879, 430–431). Indeed, the very notion of anthropocentrism references a debate which envisaged Galileo's lone stand against the church dogma that the earth is the centre of the universe; but the terms of this debate did not crystallise until the nineteenth century (Sampson 2001, Ch. 1). Moreover, by beginning with dominion, however we interpret it, the twentieth-century narrative of dominion thought put humans at the start of the story. In doing so, it neglected christian discourses which started with God, not man, and which regarded Creation as only the first chapter of a bigger narrative. Such considerations suggest a more complex picture than the growth of a more humanitarian view of animals from the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and the demise of dominion thought.

This is not to say that the Enlightenment can be discounted. It cannot, for it certainly authorised innovative secular discourses, but evidence that animal advocacy before the twentieth century spoke its

language is scarcer than might have been expected. For example, neither an Enlightenment nor a Darwinian lexicon is prominent in law-reform debates of the later nineteenth century. This had changed by the twentieth century, when public discourse about humanitarian attitudes towards animals invariably spoke the language of Enlightenment modernity. Moreover, it understood its humanitarian voice as having a secular origin. The next chapter investigates this perception.

Bibliography

Baker, John Austin. 1992. "Foreword". In *The Duty of Mercy*, by Humphrey Primatt, 9. Fontwell, Sussex: Centaur Press.

Bono, James. 2001. "Why Metaphor?" In *Science Studies: Probing the Dynamics of Scientific Knowledge*, edited by Sabine Maasen and Matthias Winterhager, 215–234. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Bradley, Ian. 1990. *God is Green*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.

Cartmill, Matt. 1993. *A View to a Death in the Morning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, Jeremy. 1989. *Be Fertile and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Cottingham, John. 1993. *A Descartes Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cronon, William. 1996. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Crowther, Kathleen M. 2010. *Adam and Eve in the Protestant Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Franklin, Adrian. 1999. *Animals and Modern Culture: A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity*. London: Sage.

Gruber, Howard E. 1974. *Darwin on Man*. London: Wildwood House.

Gullone, Eleonora. 2017. "Why Eating Animals Is Not Good for Us." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 31–62.

Hansard. 1879. *Cruelty to Animals Bill*. HL Deb. 15 July 1879: Series 3, vol. 248, cc419–36. London: Hansard.

Harrison, Ruth. 1964. *Animal Machines*. London: Vincent Stuart.

Harwood, Dix. 1928. *Love for Animals and How It Developed in Great Britain*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Hasan, Ruqaiya. 2009. "Semantic Variation." In *The Collected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan*, vol. 2, 41–72. London: Equinox.

Hinde, John R. 2000. *Jacob Burckhardt and the Crisis of Modernity*, 10–11. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness as They Came Out of Gods Hands, and the Good Mans Mercy to the Brute Creatures, Which God Hath Put Under His Feet.* London: Tho. Parkhurst.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, Lisa. 2017. "On the Suffering of Animals in Nature." *Journal Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 63–77.

Leiss, W. 1974. *The Domination of Nature.* Boston: Beacon Press.

LeVasseur, Todd, and Anna Peterson, eds. 2017. *Religion and Ecological Crisis: The "Lynn White Thesis" at Fifty.* New York: Routledge.

Linzey, Andrew. 1994. *Animal Theology.* London: SCM.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1989. *The Postmodern Condition.* Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Maasen, Sabine, and Peter Weingart. 2013. *Metaphors and the Dynamics of Knowledge.* London: Routledge.

McHarg, Ian. 1969. *Design with Nature.* New York: Natural History Press.

Northcott, Michael S. 1996. *The Environment and Christian Ethics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oddie, Bill. 2013. "Welby Too Busy to Be RSPCA Patron? But They Don't Do Anything, Says Vice-President Bill Oddie." John Bingham in *The Telegraph*, August 18. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/environment/10250923/Welby-too-busy-to-be-RSPCA-patron-But-they-dont-do-anything-says-Vice-President-Bill-Oddie.html.

Packham, Chris. 2014. "Stop Spending Money 'Chasing Cures for Cancer' and Spend It on Helping Wildlife Instead, Says BBC's Chris Packham." Emma Glanfield in Mail Online, May 20. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2633631/Stop-spending-money-chasing-cures-cancer-spend-helping-wildlife-instead-says-BBCs-Chris-Packham.html.

Pattberg, Philipp. 2007. "Conquest, Domination and Control: Europe's Mastery of Nature in Historic Perspective." *Journal of Political Ecology* 14: 1–9.

Pollan, Michael. 2002. "An Animal's Place." *New York Times Magazine*, November 10. http://michaelpollan.com/articles-archive/an-animals-place/.

Preece, Rod, and Lorna Chamberlain. 1995. *Animal Welfare and Human Values.* Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier Universety Press.

Preece, Rod, and David Fraser. 2000. "The Status of Animals in Biblical and Christian Thought: A Study in Colliding Values." *Society and Animals* 8 (3): 245–263.

Regan, Tom. 2005. *Empty Cages.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Ryder, Richard D. 1983. *Victims of Science.* London: National Anti-Vivisection Society.

Salisbury, Joyce. 1994. *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages.* London: Routledge.

Salt, Henry S. 1894. *Animals' Rights Considered in Relation to Social Progress*. New York: Macmillan.

Salt, Henry S. 1914. *The Humanities of Diet: Some Reasonings and Rhymings*. Manchester: The Vegetarian Society.

Sampson, Philip J. 2001. *6 Modern Myths*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Scully, Matthew. 2016. "Unthinkable Today, Obvious Tomorrow: The Moral Case for the Abolition of Cruelty to Animals." *National Review*, December 19. http://www.nationalreview.com/article/443161/animal-welfare-standards-animal-cruelty-abolition-morality-factory-farming-animal-use-industries.

Singer, Peter. 2009. "Darwin and the Animals." *The Ideas Festival, Bristol*. http://animalrightskorea.org/essays/peter-singer-darwin-and-the-animals.html. Accessed June 6, 2014.

Singer, Peter. 2015. *Animal Liberation*. London: The Bodley Head.

Stuart, Tristram. 2006. *The Bloodless Revolution*. London: HarperPress.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Toynbee, Arnold. 1974. "The Religious Background of the Present Environmental Crisis." In *Ecology and Religion in History*, edited by David and Eileen Spring. New York: Harper.

Westermarck, Edward. 1971. *Christianity and Morals*. New York: Routledge.

White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1992. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.

Young, Richard Alan. 1999. *Is God a Vegetarian?* Chicago: Open Court.

A Modern Story of Animal Advocacy

The narrative of 'dominion thought' discussed in the last chapter has become commonplace as an explanation for the failure of an animal advocacy discourse to emerge while religious opinion remained influential. According to this story, the modern environmental and animal advocacy movements had to await a more secular age before they could flourish and a new language of 'animal rights' emerge. However, the mere waning of Christianity as a public voice fails to account for the specific features of animal advocacy language such as compassion, valuing animals for their own sake, or the recognition of rights. The sources for this substantive content must lie elsewhere, and three main possibilities have been suggested: Enlightenment and Darwinian ideology; social and economic changes; and shifts in ethical and philosophical worldview. The result is a narrative of the emergence of more compassionate views of animals, in which all three possibilities play key roles. This narrative forms part of the wider modern story of material and humanitarian progress associated with the Enlightenment (Sampson 2010).

However, it is hard to reconcile this narrative with another common account of the change modernity has produced in animal-human relationships. Despite the assertion that animal friendliness has increased in the twentieth century, the evidence is mixed, especially in the case of animals used for food or experimental purposes (Franklin 1999, 2). Technology has achieved total power over animal bodies, and this distinctively modern development has been amplified by the demands of

urbanised populations and economic growth. Derrida (2002, 394f) speaks of the development over the past two centuries of an unprecedentedly violent subjection of 'the animal' which people do everything they can to hide from themselves. He suggests that modern cultures 'organise on a global scale the forgetting or misunderstanding of this violence that some would compare to the worst cases of genocide', whilst noting that, unlike human genocide, animals are overproduced so that ever-increasing numbers experience the same violent suffering. As Philipp Pattberg (2007, 7) observes, 'any attempt to transform the world into a more loveable, friendlier, lighter and safer place' must take into account the international ideology of conquest, domination and control of nature. But taking this binary opposition between man and animal into account simply adds to the difficulty in understanding how modernity could have contributed to the undoubted growth of animal advocacy discourse.

This chapter looks in more detail at modern discourses of animal-human relationships, and suggests that the picture is complex, with surprisingly little evidence that less cruel attitudes to animals are distinctively modern.

Modern Estrangements

Within modernity, animals appear as part of the natural world in a way that humans do not. The way we talk about our relationships with animals is built upon this modern binary opposition between the human subject and natural object (Oelschlaeger 1991, 93f and 284). Each has its own language, generating 'two cultures'; the human sphere of meaning and values, on the one hand; and that of explanation and the natural sciences on the other (Snow 1959 [1998], 15). This dualism drives modernity and its ideology of progress (Dooyeweerd 1969; Goudzwaard 1979).

The 'nature' generated by modern discourse is understood as, at best, indifferent towards humanity. At worst, it is hostile: for Lisa Johnson (2017, 71) 'our estrangement from our natural environment might be said to be the primary driver behind humanity's war with it.' This discourse of conflict frames the modern account of human history which is written as a progressive emancipation from the fear of impersonal natural forces, and mastery over them. Humans transform nature; in Jacob Burckhardt's felicitous phrase, 'man' can use his understanding to bend

nature to his 'optimistic will' (Hinde 2000, 10–11), a trope which directs attention to the gendered structure of animal-human relationships in modernity (Adams 2011). Opinions differ as to how well this history of emancipation has been realised (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002; Foucault 1984). The advent of the Anthropocene marks the apotheosis of this process, even if the reality is not quite what the modern mind had anticipated (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000).

Animals and Humans

Within this framework of opposition between humanity and nature, human language imposes a first meaning on animal communities through the construction of an animal-human boundary. Where this had formerly been fluid, with talk of a kinship between people and the rest of creation, modern dualism established a consensus which divides human uniqueness from animal multiplicity (Gilmour 2014, 20). Humanity is characteristically said to consist of diverse but singular individuals. By contrast 'animality' is 'the general singular', the figure 'that is simply opposed to humanity', aggregating all animals under the one homogeneous category: 'animal' (Derrida 2002, 415). Our behaviour towards animals both sustains this boundary and is inflected by it. Indeed, Tester (1992, 51) suggests that some cruel practices, from blood sports to vivisection, might function not only to give pleasure or generate knowledge, but also to reinforce human identity as unique, and animals as interchangeably other. We treat 'the animal' as we do because it is not human. Where we treat humans cruelly or enslave them, we treat them, and often speak of them, as animal.

Within this modern dualism, man is the privileged being who speaks of himself as separate from nature; the being whose ascendancy is marked by the fact that he names, and animals cannot talk back (Derrida 2002, 384f). Thus we can speak of juxtapositions of humans and animals, of culture and nature, of individual animal and ecological context, or of domestic and wild, confident that we will not be contradicted (Peterson 2013). Humans appear as persons with their distinctive attributes. In modernity, animals are part of nature, constituted by a deficit of the rationality, language or morality of the human subject; they are 'separated from man by a single indivisible limit' (Derrida 2002, 415). This invites isolating opposition rather than harmonious relationship; for humans, it privileges 'us' over the 'other'.

This modern language has made it easy to speak of animals instrumentally, serving human needs and interests. Modernity refined the everyday, pragmatic narrative of practical utility to create something new: instrumental utility. Animals are, observed Kant (1784 [2001], 213), 'man's instruments', we have no direct duties towards them as each is not an end in itself. Animals, argues Adrian Franklin (1999, 3), 'figured in the modern project principally as a resource for human progress' and fulfilment. In pursuing progress, animals were not deliberately treated cruelly, but neither was avoidance of cruelty a priority in the use of animal labour and bodies. Modern industrial economies relied on the use of animals; there was simply no advantage to a language which recognises animals as having moral value or meaning. Regrettably, there was a price to pay for progress, and it was better that animals rather than people pay that price.

ACCOUNTING FOR CHANGE

This way of speaking about animals seems an unlikely source for the ethical humanitarianism of modern animal advocacy. In fact, the Enlightenment language of humanity and instrumentality struggled to extend emancipatory language to animals; this had to await the later twentieth century. However, when it did emerge, it certainly spoke the humanitarian language of the Enlightenment. This was supplemented by neo-Darwinism's re-insertion of humans into nature, establishing a continuity between us and our animal cousins. By the twenty-first century, this vocabulary had become almost universal, with a widespread consensus that progress had occurred. But there was less consensus about how this had happened or which specific sources had been drawn upon; and little discussion of why it had been so long delayed. Plainly, whatever discursive resources had allowed this new language to emerge, they must have been very different from the instrumental discourse of modernity outlined above. Various accounts have been offered, identifying a range of contributing factors. A number of key issues emerge from this debate with particular clarity.

Secularisation

The most common explanation for progress in animal ethics is the demise of 'dominion thought' as discussed in the previous chapter. Enlightenment instrumentalism, it is argued, had drawn from the well

of Christian theology and, once freed from this tainted source, humanitarianism flourished. According to this secularisation thesis, scientific progress and humanitarianism emerge once religion has faded away. Such explanations raise two major difficulties.

Firstly, narratives which see progress arising naturally once religion has waned have become less plausible since the mid twentieth century (Taylor 2007). Release from the self-imposed tutelage of religion may be a condition for progress as Kant (1784 [2009]) suggests, but it is the use we make of our new freedom which shapes what progress looks like. Moreover, the Enlightenment story itself is not myth-free (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002). Uncritically founding human emancipation in reason may itself have a dark side: striving towards rational certainty has led to oppressive regimes of order and power, of system and control. In particular, Enlightenment emancipation has extended technological power over both nature and society with little recognition of ethical constraint (Northcott 2007, 24). Max Weber famously used the metaphor of an 'iron cage' to characterise the rationalisation generated by modernity (Baehr 2001). The domination over nature emerging from the Age of Reason arose from the internal logic of scientism, not simply from the theological doctrine of dominion (Preece and Chamberlain 1993, 28–29; Levinas 1969).

Secondly, it seems implausible that the mere absence of dominion thought can give rise to strong ethical assertions. Most people in the UK today find it almost impossible to doubt that kindness to animals is a virtue; even those who regard animal advocacy as sentimentalism concede that the routine cruelties of other cultures and times are out of place in a modern Western society. This strong ethical stance is constructed from a network of deeply held secular beliefs about animals, suffering and human existence. It surely needs to be understood on its own terms, rather than as the mere absence of religion (Taylor 2007). The modern discourse of animal advocacy is a distinctive language with multiple sources, not the remnant after religion fades.

The hypothesis that the mere absence of dominion thought is an explanation of the growth of animal advocacy discourse is fatally flawed, yet it remains important by drawing attention to the oppressive tendencies of instrumental reason without values. In particular, Lynn White's (1967) contribution, perhaps unintentionally, has opened debate to the contemporary relevance of religious sources. I shall discuss this further in the next chapter.

Humanitarianism

The inadequacy of mere religious decline as an explanation for the emergence of a new compassionate language about animals was recognised in some early twentieth-century accounts which supplemented it with a lexicon of 'humanitarianism'. Dix Harwood (1928, 75) identified the 'humanitarianism' ushered in by the eighteenth-century Enlightenment as a key source for the language of change, and Henry Salt (1914, 2) likewise traced a 'humanitarian ethic' from ancient philosophers, through the 'literature of the Renaissance' to the eighteenth-century 'school of "sensibility"' associated with Rousseau; in the nineteenth century, he says, the 'humanitarian movement' 'began to assert itself as a system'. Humanitarianism, it is argued, ameliorated the instrumentalism of Enlightenment reason. Many have since endorsed their view, adding the claim that modern, scientific understandings of animals also made essential contributions to humanitarian progress. This account seeks positive sources for animal compassion, not merely the absence of religious dominion thought.

It is certainly true that the harsher aspects of modernist narratives were ameliorated before the twentieth century, and this was often due to a tacit sense of 'humanity' which precedes the dictates of reason.

Immanuel Kant, philosopher of the German Enlightenment, argued that we owe animals no direct duties as they lack the capacity for reason necessary for inclusion in his ethical universe. However, his humanitarian sense that cruelty to animals is 'demeaning to ourselves' implies an indirect duty: if a man is cruel to an animal, he harms 'the kindly and *humane* qualities in himself". Similarly, for David Hume, we owe no justice to non-human species, but we are bound by the 'Laws of *Humanity*' to give 'gentle usage' to them (Kant 1784 [2001], 212; Hume 1751, 45, my emphases).

These ameliorations of Enlightenment instrumentalism arise from tacit notions of humanity as a proto-ethic, not from their internal logic. But, in a famous footnote, Jeremy Bentham (1789 [1970], 282–283) integrated humanitarian concern about animal suffering with his ethical reasoning; he proposed as the criterion for an ethic the animal's capacity to experience pleasure or suffering, not its ability to reason. This consolidated ethical concern about animals as part of the liberal conscience's concern for freedom from tyranny; indeed, he envisaged a day when they would acquire rights which have been withheld by the 'hand of tyranny'.

Bentham's insight, perhaps unintentionally, makes 'humanitarianism' less intuitive and more empirical. A rational person is able to doubt animal suffering in a way that human suffering cannot be doubted, so Bentham's criterion generates an enquiry into animal sentience; but it is an enquiry in which the human adjudicators have a vested interest. Bentham opened the possibility of a wider world of meanings, of sharing an animal's pleasures and responding to its agonies. But he did so by transforming the screams of a tormented animal from a demand into an object of enquiry. Furthermore, rational debate about animal capacities deprives us of more intuitive existential fellowship with creatures (Balaska 2016, 11). As we shall see, in these important respects, the liberal differed from the nonconformist conscience which recognised the active demands animals make upon us.

Until the twentieth century, such ameliorating language remained isolated in a hostile landscape, with no communal unity or institutional authority to delimit it (Foucault 2002, 44f). In particular, there is little evidence that it inspired legislative reform. Moreover, Enlightenment humanitarianism authorised a greater pragmatic continuity with earlier human uses and abuses of animals than is sometimes assumed. For example, Bentham's footnote is often cited, but few observe that the same footnote contains reasons to kill and eat animals as a natural good.

Rights

Arguments from 'humanitarianism' became less common during the twentieth century, with increasing attention to rights discourse. Henry Salt's *Animal's Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress* of 1894 is usually regarded as the first systematic treatment, and he consistently draws upon Enlightenment language as the title suggests. This tradition holds it 'self-evident' that human persons are 'endowed with certain inalienable rights', and the liberal conscience developed this language especially in relation to freedom from tyranny. However, the possession of such rights by animals remains heavily contested; certainly, it is not 'self-evident'.

In this tradition, access to rights is through being a person. To enter an ethical realm normally reserved for humans, other entities must become persons. This can occur, for example, through a legal fiction, as when a collectivity such as a corporation exercises a right of legal

standing in court. However, it is more common for an animal to acquire rights by possessing capacities which characterise personhood, such as the ability to form relationships, communicate or to suffer. Criteria derived from human experience are applied to animals in a process of ethical anthropomorphism. This language struggled to gain purchase during the twentieth century, but in recent years there has been some progress towards granting legal personhood to some animal species; they can thereby gain access to fundamental rights such as bodily liberty and bodily integrity.

There can be no doubt that rights language is currently influential in the animal advocacy movement, and that it is proving effective in influencing Western legal systems. However, it is difficult to see how a discourse which has only recently gained a foothold could account for the growth of animal advocacy in the twentieth century, especially as the prevalent language was welfare rather than rights oriented. Moreover, the anthropomorphism entailed in an animal acquiring rights modelled on human attributes has the effect of draining animals of inherent rights which are independent of humans. Animals start outside the ethical universe, and try to gain access by emulating those inside who control the rules of membership. There is no foundation here for animals themselves to make demands of humans. In Chapter 5, I shall discuss an earlier nonconformist understanding of rights which did not rely upon anthropomorphism.

Darwinism

Both humanitarian and rights approaches have drawn upon neo-Darwinism as well as the Enlightenment for a language to positively foster compassion. Darwin's reinsertion of humans into the family of all living things is said to have provided a language of compassionate kinship with our animal cousins; a kind of 'family values'. Richard Ryder (1983, 132, 5 and 2) summarises the argument, saying that Darwin's *Origin of the Species* was 'a bombshell which blasted man's arrogant assumption that he was in a superior and separate category to all other animals', blowing to pieces 'one of… [the] main pretexts for abusing them'. He identifies the 'logic of Evolution' as the continuity between humans and other animals: since all are on 'the same biological continuum', they are also on the same '*moral* continuum' [emphasis original]. According to Rod Preece and Lorna Chamberlain (1993, 37), most animal welfare

supporters believe that Darwin's book *On the Origin of Species* presaged 'a revolution in human thinking about our relationship to other animals'.

There is indeed evidence that Darwin's work was a source for the growth of animal advocacy. For example, Henry Salt, co-founder of the Humanitarian League, drew on a Darwinian language of common origins to underpin his understanding of 'humanity'. In 1894, he wrote that 'we must get rid of the antiquated notion of a "great gulf" fixed between them [animals] and mankind, and must recognize the common bond of humanity that unites all living beings in one universal brotherhood' (Salt 1894, 8). More than a century later, Peter Singer (2011, 64) observed that the basis for our assumption that 'humans and animals are utterly different kinds of beings' was 'undermined by Darwin's discovery of our origins and the associated decline in the credibility of the story of our divine creation in the image of God'.

The language of evolutionary continuity is here used to bridge the gulf between humans and other animals perceived in modernity; continuity implies kinship and shared interests. However, there is a difficulty. The 'family values' assumed by Salt were inherited from the prevailing Christian tradition. He took it for granted that 'the one universal brotherhood' of all living beings would care for one-another and show compassion. His argument founders on the quite different values of the Darwinian 'family': competition and survival of the fittest. As Richard Dawkins (Pollard 1995, 19) observes, the 'Darwinian world is a very nasty place: the weakest go to the wall. There's no pity, no compassion'. Indeed, compassion is a 'thoroughly unDarwinian' thing. The world needs no divine authority to kill an animal, because the very principle of the struggle for survival is predation and death. Now this does indeed revolutionise our understanding of the human relationship with animals, but not in a way that most animal advocates would welcome.

Henry Salt (1914, 51) was aware of this difficulty, and he elsewhere regarded Darwinism as a marker of a scientific age which is indifferent to animal suffering. Indeed, Darwinism is so far from grounding gentler attitudes towards animals that it makes it natural for humans to kill and eat them as 'part of our evolutionary heritage' (Pollan 2002, 9). Peter Singer and Jim Mason (2006, 186) report a young vegetarian who abandoned her ethical objections to eating meat when she learned that 'in the natural world there's this thing called survival of the fittest and it's OK to eat animals'.

Darwinism is double-edged, replacing theological with 'zoological anthropocentrism' (Franklin 1999, 179). Humans are the most highly evolved animal on earth, whose fitness to survive has allowed us to dominate the natural world. From the late nineteenth century, this evolutionary ideology was used to justify as natural and ethical the hunting and killing of animals; indeed, it was also used to scientifically authorise the superiority of some humans over others (Sampson 2001, 65f). As Rod Preece and Lorna Chamberlain (1993, 40) note, it was fortunate for animals that the later nineteenth century saw the development of humane societies 'predicated predominantly on evangelical ideas' as a counterbalance to the Darwinian ideas of competition and survival of the fittest.

As an explanation for the growth of humanitarian animal advocacy, the influence of Darwinism is at best equivocal; its role is rhetorical rather than historical (Preece 2003). However, it does foreground an ethical issue: how the stronger should use their power over the weaker. (Emmanuel Levinas 1988, 172) observes of the Darwinian struggle for life that 'there is something more important than my life, and that is the life of the other. That is unreasonable', he says, but man 'is an unreasonable animal'. I shall return to this in Chapter 7.

Postmodern Turn

Although the narrative that animal advocacy grew from Enlightenment and Darwinian sources became almost universal in the twentieth century, it was not without criticism. The enquiries inspired by Enlightenment rationality drew attention to the frailty of its own rationalist base: humans are not rational animals, but are driven by economic, social and unconscious forces. Darwin (1881 [1959], 285) had himself confessed 'the horrid doubt… whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy.' Moreover, post-structuralism has raised new questions about the status of the human and the otherness of animals which the language of Enlightenment man took for granted. Contemporary criticisms from deep ecology to eco-feminism reject anthropocentrism and the otherness of nature (Oelschlaeger 1991, 317; Merchant 2005). The materialism and individualism of modernity weakened 'social capital and our capacity to care', impoverished our understanding of human life, and failed to provide a spiritual foundation for social reform (Gullone 2017, 43). In

the twentieth century, the human spirit showed itself capable of extraordinary violence, which some have seen as characteristic of the totalising drive of modernity itself (Levinas 1969). These various pressures have led to scepticism about the grand narrative of modernity and progress (Lyotard 1979). A more fragmented discourse of animal advocacy has emerged, one drawing upon multiple sources. Adrian Franklin (1999, 35) has described this as the transformation of modern instrumental anthropocentrism into the 'increasingly empathetic, decentred relationships' of postmodernity.

Social Modernity and Change

So far, we have looked at the proposed ideological sources for modern animal advocacy discourse. However, modern ways of talking about animals have drawn on a range of discourses besides those of Enlightenment humanism or Darwin's theory of animal origins. Concrete social, economic and technological changes have also been sources for shaping and inflecting the language of animal-human relationships (Pattberg 2007, 2; Leiss 1974, xii and 19). In turn, animals have played a significant role in the emergence of social modernity, as sources both of labour and as materials. Indeed, the modern categories of 'human' and 'animal' were constructed within the imaginative space provided by the commodification and industrialisation of animal bodies. The way we talk about animals expressed the very social modernity it helped legitimise and control. The remainder of this chapter will trace the trajectory of language about animals, charted by changes in material conditions rather than ideology.

Animal Commodities

In pre-modern England, animals were usually cared for by the families who owned them, even sharing the same accommodation in severe weather, and they were essential for communal survival. Village markets balanced cattle or sheep distributions according to the ability of the land to sustain them, and breeds were adapted to local conditions. As part of family and community life, animals developed emotional and social bonds, materially expressed as people cared for the animals they also depended upon. All this changed from early modernity. Better roads and regional markets enabled small farmers to sell surplus animals and their

products. From the mid-eighteenth century, selective breeding produced animals with specialised functions rather than adapted to location: sheep for wool, cattle for beef, cows for milk, chickens for eggs. In due course, this became increasingly scientific and industrialised, leading to contemporary animals whose specialised functions can actually compromise their general health.

The breeding of animals living apart from family or community, repositioned them as commodities valued for their exchange value as well as their use; they became commercial tokens, and then industrial units. With urban growth, the ownership and care of animals were also increasingly separated. Drovers were employed to drive herds of cattle, pigs or sheep through cities for slaughter. Demand for hired drivers of dog-traps, carriages and carts grew with the rapid increase in urban transport of people and goods. However, hired hands did not necessarily have the same interest in the well-being of their animals as the small farmer or landowner, and complaints grew about the daily sight of horses cruelly beaten in the streets. The welfare of commodified animals became a public scandal. In response, the language of the ownership and use of animals began to change.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, says Franklin (1999, 3) human relationships with animals 'were dominated by human needs and interests, modernization was a project which was attached to the goal of progress and animals were merely resources to be used on the path towards human fulfilment.' This extended and enriched the pragmatic language of ownership and use by drawing upon the technologies involved. The industrialisation of animal bodies produced a space where living creatures could be spoken of as commodities, investments, products and instruments of human progress.

The use of an animal in a pre-modern family or village had not been merely instrumental; it also involved emotional, social and religious bonds. It might even share the family living space. The modern language of 'use' as instrumental use, transformed this earlier sense. Indeed, the very Enlightenment language of instrumentalism itself, the separation of means from ends, emerged in a context of the separation of industrial labour (the means) from the end product. This new way of speaking about animals generated tensions. An animal may be a commodity, but it was one that could suffer. Such commodities may require different treatment from other household goods, and a new language to calibrate such treatment. Eventually, it would require new laws.

Animal Industries

The specialisation of function among animals paralleled the social division of labour among humans, a change which Marx (1844 [1963], 72) criticised as depressing men to 'the condition of a machine' whose welfare was commodified into use-value. In the case of animals, the metaphor reached full expression as they were reified into machines for manufacturing meat, milk, leather or grease. This inflected the language used. Farms became factory farms or industrial facilities. The hen-house became a battery of identical cages, so named by analogy with the cells of an electrical battery, itself named after a battery of cannon. A slaughter *house* had formerly been an outbuilding used to slaughter animals that could not be overwintered; it was now an increasingly industrialised dis-assembly line. Industrial farming was cemented into the social landscape by the demand for food by both industrial workers and by the very animals who maintained those industries, both through their labour and as raw material.

The demand for meat in the growing cities required centralised, industrial slaughter. Commodified animals were processed on dis-assembly lines informed by the division of labour in the factory system. In due course, the dis-assembly line of the Chicago slaughterhouses would become the model for industrial car production, marking the inter-changeability in modernity of animal bodies and industrial components. The advent of refrigeration allowed slaughterhouses to move out of city centres; animals were now killed on the periphery. No longer driven through city streets, they were now out of sight, invisible; in the twenty-first century, agricultural gagging ('ag-gag') laws even prevented their being photographed.

From the late nineteenth century, the function of animals specialised still further as their use for labour and transport diminished with the invention of steam technology and the internal combustion engine. Working animals were no longer seen on city streets. Urbanisation divorced most people from their formerly daily contact with animals; even in the countryside, tractors replaced labouring animals. Animals became raw material for industry, rather than its source of power or means of transport. Humans related to animals less as living, breathing creatures, and more as body parts, leather, lard and increasingly the anonymous contents of manufactured products. As animal bodies were industrialised, modernity drained animals themselves of intrinsic value,

and it gradually became possible to talk about them as though they mattered only instrumentally to serve humans ends (Oelschlaeger 1991, 94). This language of animals drawn from industrial technologies became the foil for animal advocacy in the twentieth century. As we shall see, it contrasted sharply with nonconformist ways of talking about animals as creatures of God.

Animal Science

Scientific knowledge facilitated the modern uses of animal bodies, their selective breeding and industrial processing. From the nineteenth century, this extended from agriculture to the new, experimental sciences. Medical progress became reliant upon animals for testing drugs and procedures; and the armaments industry perfected their weaponry on animal flesh. But science not only acted *on* animal bodies; animal bodies were also intimately involved in the very production and cataloguing of the knowledge upon which science itself depends. Experimental science begins, not with instrumentality, but with the modern gaze, which looked upon the animal and adopted the privileged position of examining, cutting apart, classifying, naming, interpreting and controlling. The scientific eye does not expect the observed to observe; it begins with the 'immense disavowal' of the fact that animals also look. The animal is seen, not seeing; passive, not active (Derrida 2002, 382f). This became so much the norm that animal advocates have only recently begun to challenge the passive language used of animals.

Once generated, scientific knowledge was recorded, including that extracted from animal bodies by the public cruelty of vivisection. Before the twentieth century, the scientist wrote with a quill, 'the birds once wind-stiff joy' (Williamson 2011, 84), dipped in an inkwell made of animal horn, on pages bound between covers made from an animal's skin. The pages themselves were held together by glue boiled from animal bones, and by threads made from their sinews. Once dumb, animals now carried the very words of the scientific revolution. Science is not just a human creation.

In all these features of emergent modernity, human behaviour towards animals might have been modelled on Kant's (1784 [2001], 213) judgement that we owe them no duties. It is difficult to see how it could have contributed to more humanitarian views.

Technologies of the Body

The modern language used of animals is generally segregated from that used of humans, but sometimes the boundary becomes porous. A language derived from the application of technology to animal bodies may also be used of people.

Just as animal bodies bear the marks of industrialisation into commercial units, so also can humans. Eleonora Gullone (2017, 37) has observed that the language now reserved for animals is 'strikingly similar' to that formerly used of slaves, including that their instrumental use is beneficial to them, brings contentment and is economically necessary. The practice of branding was a symbolic language devised to mark the ownership and commercial value of animals. Human slaves were branded to indicate ownership, and prisoners of totalitarian regimes were tattooed. We now speak of a commercial brand making a lasting impression upon the customer's mind as it once made an impression on a living body.

More generally, humans treated cruelly or enslaved were said to be a lower species, or to have relinquished their humanity to become savages, a category as undifferentiated as that of 'animals' (Leiss 1974, xiv). Those killed in genocides were de-humanised as animals, often as vermin. J. M. Coetzee (2007) has compared the language and technologies used in concentration camps to those used to transport and 'process' food animals; from cattle trucks to the systematic, and task-specialised, killing first trialled in Chicago slaughter houses of the nineteenth century. As Max Horkheimer (2004, 72) observed in his 1946 denunciation of the language of instrumental reason used for totalitarian ends, the 'history of man's efforts to subjugate nature is also the history of man's subjugation by man.'

A Lost Language of Animal Advocacy

Animal advocacy discourse speaks a radically different language from that of animals as subservient to human interests and as resources for human progress which has characterised modernity. Yet it thrived in the twentieth century. The consensus narrative of how this happened suggests several possible sources for the new language, from humanitarianism and Darwinism to a rights language in the Enlightenment tradition. I have argued that these proposals fail, but they do raise 'humanitarianism',

'rights' and 'value' as important issues which any such account must address. They also neglect, as a possible source, the substantial animal-friendly discourse which existed before the twentieth century in the nonconformist tradition. The next chapter sets out to identify that source more precisely.

Bibliography

Adams, Carol J. 2011. *The Sexual Politics of Meat*. New York: Continuum.

Baehr, Peter. 2001. "The 'Iron Cage' and the 'Shell as Hard as Steel': Parsons, Weber, and the Stahlhartes Gehäuse Metaphor in the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism." *History and Theory* 40 (2) (May): 153–169.

Balaska, Maria. 2016. "What Guides Moral Considerations?" *Journal of Animal Ethics* 6 (1) (Spring): 10–19.

Bentham, Jeremy. 1789 [1970]. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. London: Athlone.

Coetzee, J. M. 2007. "Exposing the Beast: Factory Farming Must Be Called to the Slaughterhouse." *The Sydney Morning Herald*, February 22. http://www.smh.com.au/news/opinion/factory-farming-must-be-called-to--slaughter-house/2007/02/21/1171733846249.html.

Crutzen, Paul J., and Eugene F. Stoermer. 2000. "The 'Anthropocene'." *Global Change Newsletter* 41: 17–18.

Darwin, Charles. 1881 [1959]. *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*. New York: Basic Books.

Derrida, Jacques. 2002. "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)." Translated by David Wills. *Critical Inquiry* 28 (2) (Winter): 369–418.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. 1969. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*. Translated by David H. Freeman and William S. Young. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Foucault, Michel. 1984. "What Is Enlightenment." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow, 32–50. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Franklin, Adrian. 1999. *Animals and Modern Culture: A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity*. London: Sage.

Gilmour, Michael J. 2014. *Eden's Other Residents: The Bible and Animals*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Goudzwaard, Bob. 1979. *Capitalism and Progress*. Toronto: Wedge.

Gullone, Eleonora. 2017. "Why Eating Animals Is Not Good for Us." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1): 31–62.

Harwood, Dix. 1928. *Love for Animals*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Hinde, John R. 2000. *Jacob Burckhardt and the Crisis of Modernity*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Horkheimer, Max. 2004. *The Eclipse of Reason*. New York: Continuum.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hume, David. 1751. *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*. London: A. Millar.

Johnson, Lisa. 2017. "On the Suffering of Animals in Nature." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 63–77.

Kant, Immanuel. 1784 [2001]. *Lectures on Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, Immanuel. 1784 [2009]. *An Answer to the Question "What Is Enlightenment?"* London: Penguin Books.

Leiss, W. 1974. *The Domination of Nature*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1988. "The Paradox of Morality". In *The Provocation of Levinas: Rethinking the Other*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and David Wood, 168–180. London: Routledge.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Marx, Karl. 1844 [1963]. "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts." In *Karl Marx, Early Writings*, edited by T. B. Bottomore, 67–134. London: C. A. Watts and Co., Ltd.

Merchant, Carolyn. 2005. *Radical Ecology*. New York: Routledge.

Northcott, Michael. 2007. "A Moral Climate." *Third Way*, October: 22–25.

Oelschlaeger, Max. 1991. *The Idea of Wilderness*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pattberg, Philipp. 2007. "Conquest, Domination and Control: Europe's Mastery of Nature in Historic Perspective." *Journal of Political Ecology* 14: 1–9.

Peterson, Anna. 2013. *Being Animal: Beasts and Boundaries in Nature and Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pollan, Michael. 2002. "An Animal's Place." *New York Times*, November 10.

Pollard, Nick. 1995. "The Simple Answer." *Third Way*, April: 15–19.

Preece, Rod. 2003. "Darwinism, Christianity, and the Great Vivisection Debate." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (3) (July): 399–419.

Preece, Rod, and Lorna Chamberlain. 1993. *Animal Welfare and Human Values*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Ryder, Richard D. 1983. *Victims of Science—The Use of Animals in Research*. London: National Anti-vivisection Society.

Salt, Henry S. 1894. *Animal's Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress*. New York: Macmillan.

Salt, Henry S. 1914. *The Humanities of Diet: Some Reasonings and Rhymings*. Manchester: The Vegetarian Society.

Sampson, Philip J. 2001. *6 Modern Myths*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Sampson, Philip J. 2010. "Humans, Animals and Others." In *Intersections in Christianity and Critical Theory*, edited by Cassandra Falke, 120–134. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Singer, Peter. 2011. *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singer, Peter, and Jim Mason. 2006. *Eating*. London: Arrow Books.

Snow, C. P. 1959 [1998]. *The Two Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Charles. 2007. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tester, Keith. 1992. *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights*. New York: Routledge.

White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.

Willett, Cynthia. 2014. *Interspecies Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Williamson, Craig. 2011. *A Feast of Creatures*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Innovation and Religious Discourses

The last chapter described modernist discourses of animals, including the consensus view that the Enlightenment, supplemented by Darwinism, countered dominion thought to yield a new humanitarian approach which thrived in the twentieth century. I suggested that the latter narrative failed as an account of change. In this chapter I propose a corrective to that consensus narrative, arguing that it has flattened out religious discourses, fashioning a foil for secular accounts. As a result, the contributions of earlier religious discourses have been neglected, making it harder to understand the emergence of animal advocacy.

Significantly animal-friendly discourses existed long before the twentieth century, influenced everyday language and behaviour, and were used to justify legislative change. However they rarely spoke the language of the Enlightenment. Moreover, these discourses articulated a metanarrative which was quite different from the Enlightenment vision of progress against a background of a binary opposition between the human subject and the natural world. This chapter sets out to investigate those discourses, their sources in Protestantism, and specifically in English nonconformity. Subsequent chapters will analyse the innovative categories generated by nonconformist language about animals, and the dynamics of their contributions to the changing ways of talking about animals in the modern world.

Rediscovering Religious Discourse

Since twentieth-century discussions of animal advocacy regarded Christian dominion thought as part of the problem, they naturally treated it as playing little part in the development of more humanitarian attitudes. Consequently, studies have paid more attention to Enlightenment than to religious discourses. This situation changed in 1967 when Lynn White published a seminal article called *The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis.* This became so frequently cited in secular environmental debate that Keith Thomas (1984, 23) somewhat ironically observed that it had become 'almost a *sacred* text for modern ecologists' [my emphasis].

White wrote at a time when the material achievements of modernity were evident to all, and its language dominated public debate in the West as religion had done two centuries earlier. Indeed, White (1967, 1206, my emphasis) referenced the earlier religious tradition to achieve emphasis, saying that 'both science and technology are *blessed* words in our contemporary vocabulary'. Religion may have been disavowed, but its language remained available to frame the ascendency of science. However, this ascendency was equivocal; it was also a time of growing scepticism, even incredulity, about the Enlightenment's ability to achieve the social and ethical progress it had promised (Lyotard 1979). Environmental concern was a major locus of this scepticism, although White's (1967, 1203) own assessment that this had reached a 'crisis' in 1967, 'mounting feverishly' seems overstated.

White (1967, 1204–1205) suggested investigating the instrumentalist 'presuppositions that underlie modern technology and science'. By this he meant the fundamental way that humans 'think about themselves in relation to things around them'. He concluded that, despite modernity's ostensible secularism, these presuppositions are religious, specifically Christian, and bear a 'huge burden of guilt' for exploitative attitudes towards nature. This was widely read as another twist in the consensus narrative of dominion thought, and a further nail in the coffin of Christian theology. However, embedded in White's essay was a novel revival of the voice of religion which had been silent for a generation. Secularisation theory had regarded religion as a superstitious relic which would fade away with scientific progress. White suggested putting it back at the centre of analysis (LeVasseur and Peterson 2017, 2). As Leiss (1994, 29) points out, regardless of whether we agree with White's

specific conclusions, he does highlight 'our religious heritage' as 'a vital source for interpreting the intellectual mosaic of mastery over nature'.

White made religion the very root of the modern technological progress which the Enlightenment had celebrated as its own, deconstructing the modern vision. In White's essay, the Enlightenment hope of progress was undone by the very lexicon of instrumentality which formerly proved it. Moreover, White (1967, 1207) also envisaged a redemptive role for religion, though not for orthodox Christianity. 'Since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious', he wrote, 'the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not'. He suggests as possible curatives Buddhism, and the teaching of St Francis, White's (1967, 1206) sole exception to dominion thought in Christianity.

White's essay generated a renewed debate about the relationship between environmentalism and religious world-views (Bradley 1990, 2f). In particular, his reference to Buddhism chimed with the times in the late 1960s. Indeed, in the early 1970s Arnold Toynbee (Clark 1998, 123) used White's argument to reach an even more radical conclusion:

> A right religion is one that teaches respect for the dignity and sanctity of all nature. The wrong religion is one that licenses the indulgence of human greed at the expense of non-human nature. I conclude that the religion we need to embrace now is pantheism… and the religion we now need to discard is Judaic monotheism… [together with Christianity which believes] that mankind is morally entitled to exploit the rest of the universe for the indulgence of human greed.

As noted in Chapter 2, White's rather monolithic account of Christianity was quickly challenged, and more nuanced debate followed. However, he had opened the door to religion as a continuing cultural force and part of the social imaginary. This has more recently been explored in detailed studies of the role of religion in the environmental movement, especially in the U.S. Their findings have not supported White's conclusion.

Environmental Evidence

Robin Attfield (1983, 369f) noted the influence of White's essay, but argued that the consensus interpretation of dominion thought as adverse to environmentalism had misrepresented Christian sources, at times by

exaggeration and the 'selective use of evidence'. More recently, Evan Berry (2015, 60) has argued that the 'conventional historical narrative about the emergence of environmentalism … offers a rather dismissive appraisal of the significance of religion.' Berry (2015, 5–6) notes that the attention that has been paid to the affirming role of religion continues to be 'sporadic', and Mark Stoll (1997, xi) that there is a 'persistent blind spot' towards religious sources. Recent studies are remedying this neglect, with striking re-evaluations of the relationship between religion, science and nature even though this still 'sounds odd' against the secular consensus (Dunlap 2004, 4; see also Lane 2011; Merchant 2013; Worster 1993).

Evan Berry (2015, 5) rejects a 'convenient framing of environmentalism as an essentially secular undertaking', arguing that religious sources, not the Enlightenment, played a central role in developing a conceptual language for the modern environmental movement in the U.S. He rejects White's flattening of Christian theology into dominion thought, and finds at the root of the environmental movement a Christian conception of nature as 'morally salient, both as an object of intrinsic value and as a means of advancing human moral goods.' Most authors have identified this Christian influence in specifically *Protestant* sources which, says Donald Worster (1993, 185–186) have contributed 'astonishing echoes' to modern environmental ethics. Indeed, Belden Lane (2011) subtitled his study 'the *surprising* legacy of Reformed spirituality' [my emphasis]. Mark Stoll (2006, 54) concludes that, prior to 'the second world war, American and European Protestants very nearly monopolized ecological theory'. Specific sources have been labelled as Protestant, Reformed, Puritan, Presbyterian, Nonconformist and Dissenting. Indeed, Mark Stoll (2006, 54) is quite specific in saying that 'ecology as a science crystallised mainly out of the Calvinist Puritan tradition that planted Congregationalism and Presbyterianism in America'.

These conclusions result from explorations of religious discourses in environmental history, but with a genealogical rather than theological eye. Evan Berry (2015, 13, 5 and viii) investigated not fixed doctrines but family resemblances, 'theological vocabularies, especially those relating to salvation, and to the goodness of creation [which] provided the basis for an emergent environmental imagination'. He identified in this language one of environmentalism's 'central conceptual ingredients', and

concluded that the formation of the American environmental imagination was 'deeply shaped' by these religious sources.

The discovery that religious ideas played a fundamental role in the emergence of environmentalism is the very reverse of the earlier consensus narrative. It raises the possibility that there has been a similar neglect in accounts of the growth of animal advocacy. The conservative use of Christian language is well known; but perhaps there is a second, more radical discourse which transformed and valorised what it means to be an animal. If so, it might it be worth looking at the specific Christian traditions identified above. The remainder of this chapter investigates the evidence for such a possibility.

The Christian Heritage of the West

For millennia in Western Europe, most people, most of the time, spoke about animals in the same pragmatic way that most people speak about them today. Animals were necessary for human survival, and useful for the community to prosper. There is little evidence of moral or religious reflection when yoking an ox or feeding the chickens. 'Pests', 'vermin' and 'wild' animals were as summarily disposed of in the past as they are today without requiring any justification other than utility. This was part of the unquestioned natural order of things, not requiring further debate about sentience or suffering. People living in near-subsistence conditions were concerned with practical matters of utility and survival, not ethical or religious questions about the animal's place in the cosmos or relationship with humans.

However, there are occasions when awe or horror break into the quotidian. These include important family or community events such as a birth or death; but also activities such as hunting or blood sports which make it harder to avoid ethical questions. Such occasions point beyond themselves to beliefs about animal-human relationships within a wider universe of values. Thus rituals of birth and death may involve feasting, festivals or cultic activities where animals possessed a surplus of meaning beyond the pragmatic. The questions of meaning and ethics raised by such events were discussed in the language available which, in the West, has been overwhelmingly Christian until very recently (Fudge 2017).

Discourse about animals drawing upon these Christian sources was frequently conservative; it authorised and reproduced current perceptions of animals, and the human use of them. Keith Thomas (1984) has illustrated the dominance of this discourse in ethical debate from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. The language itself drew upon both traditional sources (church fathers, Biblical commentary) and theological, mostly Thomist, scholastic literature. Vestiges of this discourse sometimes resurface. As recently as 1990, John Selwyn Gummer, then British Minister of Agriculture and member of the Church of England Synod, observed that the 'Bible tells us that we are masters of the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field, and we very properly eat them' (Linzey 2004, 357). However, there is widespread agreement that a minority voice emerged in early modernity which was less easily co-opted to the pragmatic daily round.

Radical Ways of Talking

Bruce Boehrer (2011, 26) identifies the 'growth of a widespread, organised body of belief' from the sixteenth century which 'encouraged sympathetic identification with the suffering of animals'. A few authors date its origin earlier, while those informed by the consensus narrative of the last chapter see the eighteenth century as the turning point; but most find its roots in the sixteenth century, accelerating during the seventeenth (Berry 2015, 26; Harwood 1928, 71). Several candidates have been suggested as sources for this new language.

Some have suggested religious but not Christian sources. In the sixteenth century, new trade routes and early colonialism increased contact between European and Asian civilisations; this introduced non-Christian texts and traditions to Western scholars. Jeremy Bentham (1789 [1970], 282–283) noted 'the Gentoo and Mahometan religions' (sic) as possible resources for promoting the 'interests of the rest of the animal creation', but he did not claim they had actually been drawn upon in the West. Some 250 years later, Lynn White (1967, 1206) proposed Buddhism as a source for ecological care but, as with Bentham, did not suggest that, in fact, it had been. Indeed, his thesis was rather the opposite; the environmental crisis had occurred because such theological sources had not been mined. More recently, Tristram Stuart (2006) has explored the contribution of Indian sources to the origins of vegetarianism, but there

is little evidence that any influence extended to discourse about animals more generally.

Others have suggested classical sources, rediscovered during the Renaissance. Certainly, these texts offered novel literary and philosophical world-views, including some with a more sympathetic response to animal suffering. Peter Edwards (2011, 76) notes the more vocal criticism of animal cruelty in the sixteenth century, and Bruce Boehrer (2011, 26) argues that a 'sympathetic identification with the suffering of animals' is a 'distinctive product of the Renaissance'. Perhaps the best known instance is Montaigne's horror at animal cruelty, but his humanist opinions are well known precisely because they are so rare. Moreover, Boehrer includes Reformation sources under the rubric of 'Renaissance'. Indeed, he concludes that the reaction against animal cruelty is largely 'sectarian in nature', by which he seems to mean nonconformist. Keith Thomas (1984, 180) notes that the Old Testament was more often cited than classical sources, and that certain 'clerics' led opinion, not classics scholars.

The most common source for the new way of talking about animals was from the Biblical canon, not Buddhist, Hindu or classical texts. The European reformations had made the Bible more readily available in the sixteenth century, and their doctrine known as *sola scriptura* self-consciously emphasised the canon's primary authority over tradition, classical sources, and other religious traditions. Thomas Manton spoke for many nonconformists when he rejected the idea 'that the traditions of men should be made equal in dignity and authority with the express revelation of God [in the bible]' (Keeble 1987, 33).

This renewed attention to the canonical text made biblical doctrines, images and narratives into sources for popular and scholarly discourses. Vernacular translations, from Luther's German edition to the version authorised by King James in England and Scotland, made the biblical texts part of everyday language and life. In particular, they introduced both clerical and lay people to a different source of language for talking about animals.

The numerous dissenting groups of the Radical Reformation included strikingly counter-cultural views of animals, especially in relation to meat eating. Roger Crab, John Robins, and Thomas Tryon among others, were noted for their advocacy of a Pythagorean ('vegetarian') diet. But their highly individual perspectives and lack of an institutional base

generated fragmented discourses unable to sustain a wider narrative. A more systematic and public animal advocacy discourse emerged from the literature of the Magisterial, not the Radical, Reformations.

In the international culture of the sixteenth century, the Magisterial Reformations proved both a literary and social force (Lindberg 1996). In the UK, John Calvin was especially influential, both through his own voluminous works, and through the return of the Marian exiles who had taken refuge in Geneva where Calvin was senior pastor and regularly preached at St. Peter's. The resulting discourses were adopted by the nonconformist movements in the UK who came to share 'a remarkable density' of interconnections across doctrines, values and symbols in their family, communal, literary, business and institutional life (Keeble 1987, 123–126). This nonconformist imaginary provided new ways to represent and reproduce social existence, and significantly challenged the meaning of everyday relationships, including those between animals and humans. New meanings spread through vernacular tracts and sermons, in devotional Bible readings and commentaries, by hearing weekly Prayer Book services and textual expositions, as well as by scholarly works with untranslated Hebrew, Greek and Latin.

The new discourse of animals was not restricted to theology. Erica Fudge (2017, 3) cites an Essex vicar whose diary of 1652 records that all his cows had 'calved well through mercy'. She notes that this signified more than biological reproduction and family well-being; it affirmed a 'broader universe, in which cattle are a sign from god'. The specific linguistic contours of this 'broader universe' in which cows calve 'well through mercy' and 'meaning can be made with a pig', point towards a rich and diverse way of talking about animals. It reached far beyond pragmatic concerns to generate what Michael Gilmour (2014, 7) calls 'triadic sites of revelation', 'moments when animals, humans and God meet in Biblical narratives'. The textual traditions represented at these triadic sites can be identified in sufficient detail to constitute a working archive.

Nonconformists and Animal Advocacy

Keith Thomas' seminal (1984) *Man and the Natural World*, nicely summarises in its title the binary discontinuity between humans and nature in modernity. Yet Thomas was also among the first to note that the campaign against animal cruelty grew from a 'strongly religious', not a classical or Enlightenment discourse. He identified a '(minority) Christian

tradition' of texts: 'an essential role was played by Puritans, Dissenters, Quakers and Evangelicals' (Thomas 1984, 180). Thomas (1984, 153) finds little historical development in this discourse, and refers to it as 'one single, coherent and remarkably constant attitude [which] underlay the great bulk of the preaching and pamphleteering against animal cruelty between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries'.

When Thomas speaks of a minority 'tradition' or 'attitude', he does not, of course, mean that all members of these various groups shared more compassionate views of animals. Such homogeneity is not to be expected; nor is it found. Indeed, it is clear that many adopted pragmatic views. Rather, I take it that he is referring to an underlying code of presuppositions, both reflecting and shaping animal-human relationships, to form a recognisable community or 'tradition' (Littlejohn et al. 2017, 390f). Many may not have lived consistently, switching discourses as it suited them; but those who were consistent are of particular interest. They did not necessarily share an ideology of animals, although some may have done; rather, in drawing on the Biblical canon, they generated specific examples of new things to say about animals (Foucault 2002). In particular, it is within this 'tradition' that we find pioneering views against animal cruelty and the promotion of welfare legislation, not among revolutionary humanists of eighteenth-century France, or the Aufklärung elite of the German states.

As with the environmentalist literature discussed earlier, there is widespread agreement about the range of 'traditions' involved. Almost all the 'discursive influences' (Beirne 2015, 2) promoting change have a Protestant pedigree, and Philip Almond (2008, 123) endorses Thomas' one 'coherent and constant attitude'. Other traditions identified include strong Protestants and Methodists (Thomas 1984, 154), 'evangelicals' (Preece and Chamberlain 1993, 38), 'several non-conformist groups' and the Clapham Sect (Velten 2013, 9), and a 'significant Puritan influence on the modern development of animal rights' (Lane 2011, 33). Even authors who emphasise other sources observe that the seventeenth-century growth of kindness towards animals involved numerous 'early modern theologians' (Fudge 2006, 102); was largely 'sectarian in nature' (Boehrer 2011, 26); that the 'kindest words' for animals in the Christian tradition are from 'sectarians, Quakers and Methodists' (Westermarck 1971, 389); and that 'the pious pronouncements on animal care' of the Cromwellian Protectorate derived from 'Calvinist-inspired sermons' (Beirne 2015, 2). This closely mirrors the

range of Protestant religious sources identified in pioneering environmentalism discussed above.

As references to the Clapham Sect and Methodism suggest, these linguistic resources continued to inform animal advocacy discourse long after the seventeenth century. Even late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century reform was less influenced by Enlightenment or Darwinian discourses than is often supposed. As Preece and Chamberlain (1993, 38) argue, 'almost all the publications and pamphlets put out by the early SPCAs and Humane Societies… have a very strong evangelical Christian bent… Ironically, it was those who repudiated Darwin's elevation of the status of animals who, in practice, did most to protect the interests of animals.' Indeed, by the eighteenth century, evangelical Anglicans and nonconformists were so much in the vanguard of animal advocacy that the general public commonly associated compassion for animals with Methodism or evangelical nonconformity. Horace Walpole is said to have remarked in 1760 that a certain man was known to be 'turning Methodist; for, in the middle of conversation, he rose, and opened the window to let out a moth' (Thomas 1984, 180). John Lawrence (1796, 126), writing against animal cruelty from an Enlightenment perspective, was worried that he would be dismissed to 'a snug corner in the holy temple of Methodism' by his more unsympathetic readers. By the late eighteenth century, kindness to animals had spread far beyond nonconformity; Thomas Young (1798, 81) could write that he believed 'the greater part of the clergy' shared his antipathy to the cruelties of hunting. Yet, it remained most prominent in nonconformity. Thus Preece (2005, 10) argues that the protagonists for nineteenth-century reform 'make a great deal of reference to scripture', on the whole taking the literal approach characteristic of nonconformity. As late as the evangelical Welsh revival of 1904, it was said that a converted miner could always be recognised because his pit pony did not flinch when he raised his hand (Matthews 2004, 55). Pioneers included some familiar names: Clapham Sect and evangelical Anglicans such as William Wilberforce, Hannah More and Lord Shaftesbury; Methodist leaders such as John Wesley; nonconformist hymn writers such as William Cowper (*Amazing Grace*) and Augustus Toplady (*Rock of Ages*); and popular preachers such as the calvinistic Baptist C. H. Spurgeon. Many others, well known in their own day, are now forgotten.

Moreover, it was this discourse which subverted conservative views and generated a language for legislative reform. 'I would if it were possible put a stop to the rage of brutish Men', declared Thomas Hodges

(1675, A2) of those cruel to their beasts. From the piecemeal Puritan initiatives of seventeenth-century England to the more co-ordinated reforms pioneered by evangelical Christians from the late eighteenth century, it was the language emerging from the Magisterial Reformations which framed debate. It provided a new way of speaking, and its vocabulary facilitated new relationships between humans and other animals. Nineteenth-century parliamentary proponents of animal welfare reform explicitly drew on biblical narratives such as Balaam's ass; their opponents objected that Methodists and Puritans were telling Englishmen to 'go home and read their Bibles' and 'to pass their time in chaunting (sic) at conventicles' (Woodfall 1800, 354; 1802, 298, 300 and 309). Christianity and 'in particular Evangelicalism' was the driving force behind reform, and the 'rhetoric' of the animal advocacy movements in Europe was 'imbued with religious [especially evangelical] values' (Tonutti 2009, 98). D. W. Bebbington (2014) identifies these nonconformist traditions as 'Old' and 'New' Dissenters, an historical partition marked by the turn of the eighteenth century; N. H. Keeble (1987, 3f and 38f) discusses the other terms which have been used since John Wycliffe's fourteenth-century affirmation of the authority of the Biblical canon. I shall refer to this discourse collectively as 'nonconformist', qualifying this term as the context requires.

The SPCA (later the RSPCA) and antivivisection societies drew on this language (Sampson, forthcoming). The First Prospectus of the SPCA (1824) declared that it was motivated by the 'great moral and Christian obligation of kindness and compassion towards the brute creation', and its Minute Book records that 'the proceedings of this Society are entirely based on the Christian Faith and on Christian Principles' (Linzey 2000, 74). This language remained significant in animal welfare debate as late as the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876. Among the wider public, its influence continued through novelists such as Anne Brontë, whose concern for animal suffering derived from biblical sources endorsed by her nonconformity; and Anna Sewell whose evangelical Anglican background informed her influential novel *Back Beauty* of 1877 (Gilmour 2014, 20–24).

Rod Preece and Lorna Chamberlain (1993, 38) found it ironic that evangelicals did most to protect the interests of animals in nineteenth-century Britain; but this appears 'ironic' only because of the current consensus belief that Christianity was adverse to helping animals. I suggest a different irony: that the 'humanitarianism' attributed to the

Enlightenment in fact drew on prior nonconformist discourse. This has been elided because, as Evan Berry (2015, 4 and 63–64) argues in respect of the conventional history of American environmentalism, 'theistic language and religious underpinnings' have been displaced by a modernist narrative, leading to the neglect of religious themes.

Neglect and Disparagement

Few scholars have made a systematic study of the nonconformist genealogy of animal ethics in the UK, either of its discursive structure or its thematic contributions. Even fewer have explored the way that this religious discourse persists in contemporary animal studies debates, including vestiges of the theological vocabulary itself.

The very language of modern debate has sometimes contributed to this neglect. For example, general categories such as 'Renaissance' tend to absorb and sideline the more specific 'Reformation'. Moreover, ambiguous descriptors such as 'pious', 'pietistic', 'puritan', 'protestant moralists' or 'sectarian' have not assisted clarity; all are terms capable of precise denotation, but they also carry pejorative connotations in modern culture. These connotations can be used to disparage or even mis-represent a religious imaginary. This process is not a recent innovation.

Thomas Macaulay (1849, 159) acknowledged the opposition of Puritans to bear-baiting, but sought to distinguish it from the animal welfare reform of his own day by claiming that Puritans disliked, not cruelty, but the pleasure of the spectators. Despite numerous refutations, this perception persists as representing 'the dark side of Puritanism' (Fraser 1975, 474; Sampson 2001, 84). Dix Harwood (1928, 64f and 74) spoke Macaulay's language when he called animal-friendly Christians before the eighteenth-century 'protestant moralists' who disliked 'worldly pleasures'. They were, he adds, 'the cranks and freaks of their day with virtually no influence'. Among these 'cranks and freaks', Harwood includes William Perkins. Perkins was, in fact, a distinguished Cambridge scholar with an international reputation and influence, and a leader of Elizabethan Puritanism. Moreover, Perkins' prestige was no exception; among nonconformist animal advocates were some of the most distinguished scholars and public figures of their day. Yet this rich and varied literature has received very little systematic attention.

The Nonconformist Conscience

The self-interrogation of the conscience was a central part of nonconformists' spirituality, reflected in the voluminous 'cases of conscience' such as those of William Perkins (1606), Joseph Alleine (1672) or Richard Baxter (1673). This was often a private matter, but from the early puritans on, it also had a public face. By the late nineteenth century, the application of faith to reform in public life had become known as the 'nonconformist conscience', although the term has been retrospectively applied to the earlier period also. Unlike the liberal conscience, nonconformists were not principally interested in the sovereign individual's right to liberty in the face of tyrannous coercion, but in the discovery of God's will and their duty to follow it. It had both an epistemological and existential aspect. They regarded conscience, like any sense, as fallible, and liable to confusion, lack of instruction or even insensibility (1 Tim. 4.2); like a clock, it has to be set if it is to give an accurate judgement. The standard measure for 'setting' conscience was 'God's Word', the Bible. Existentially, conscience seeks change for the common good, which may include public matters (Calvin 1559 [1845], 4.x.3f). Bebbington (2014) notes its collapse in the early twentieth century into private individualism.

The nonconformist conscience called into question the individual's freedom to do as they please and affirmed a willing obligation to the other; conscience is, as Levinas (1969, 100) observes, the 'welcoming of the Other'. In a reversal of 'dominion thought', the nonconformist dominion over animals places demands upon us from outside ourselves, demands which represent the good will of God and are to be gladly satisfied. Indeed, the voice of conscience at our treatment of animals may judge the authenticity of Christian faith itself; animal cruelty is simply incompatible with a righteous life (Prov.12.10). Speaking against hunting for sport, Phillip Stubbes (1583 [1877–1879], 182) doubted that a man could be a Christian 'that delighteth in blood', a sentiment echoed some 400 years later by C. H. Spurgeon (1873, 335) when he preached that 'no person really penitent for sin can be cruel' to animals; and again by Anna Sewell's (1877 [1994], 52) assertion that a person's religion is a sham if it 'does not teach them to be good and kind to man and beast'.

The nonconformist conscience shaped a way of talking about animals, generated novel practices in animal-human relationships (such as hymns

calling upon animals to praise God), and framed new modes of social and political action such as welfare societies and legal reform.

CREATION, FALL, REDEMPTION

Animal-human relationships are mediated through the language available; from the sixteenth century, that language was extended, revised and shaped by the nonconformist conscience. The nonconformists had inherited from the medieval church a way of talking about animals which was often used conservatively to authorise practices which might otherwise appear ethically reprehensible. They also inherited a popular bestiary tradition, illustrated compendia of natural history which drew a moral lesson based on allegorical meanings of animals. The priority they gave to the Biblical canon challenged both these legacies. It generated a more realist understanding of animals which paid attention to their experience, and their meaning within a richer ethical universe; it also affirmed the biblical theme of learning in creation's school while rejecting the reduction of animals to their mere symbolic value.

Whilst the nonconformist discourse of animals is intimately related to the social and economic realignments which enabled it to challenge pragmatism, any study of these relationships requires first a clear understanding of the discourse itself. The next three chapters set out to provide this. They explore the structure and dynamics of the nonconformist conscience using the framework of Creation-Fall-Redemption identified by Hermann Dooyeweerd (1969) as the intrinsic driving motifs of discourse prioritising the Biblical canon.

This threefold motif generated the world of which nonconformists spoke, akin to the musical world created by an orchestral performance. Musicians speak of inhabiting their world of chords, rhythms and harmony; nonconformists spoke of living within the world generated by their religion, of walking in 'newness of life' (Rom. 6). Just as the Enlightenment drive for emancipation through reason required no further warrant or legitimation in modernity, so this threefold motif required none in nonconformity.

As the nonconformists wove both human and animal life into this triadic structure, they generated a discourse which asked how animals were created to worship their God, how they were affected by the Fall, and what they could expect at the restoration of all things. This shared life-world, an ethically qualified system of meanings, shaped their way of talking about animals, their perceptions of them and even their

behaviour towards them. Always a minority voice, it nevertheless proved sufficiently robust to contest Enlightenment conceptions of instrumentality and vernacular ideas of use. Crucially, by rejecting modernity's banishment of animals to the realm of nature, nonconformity conceived of them as cultural beings, participants along with humans in the networks of meaning which generate both animal and human experience; in particular, animals have moral standing as co-actors with humans in the theatre of God's glory.

Bibliography

Alleine, Joseph. 1672. *Divers Practical Cases of Conscience Satisfactorily Resolved … to Which are Added Some Counsels & Cordials.* London: Nevill Simmons.

Almond, Philip C. 2008. *Adam and Eve in Seventeenth Century Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Attfield, Robin. 1983. "Christian Attitudes to Nature." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44: 369–386.

Baxter, Richard. 1673. *A Christian Directory, Or, A Summ of Practical Theologie and Cases of Conscience Directing Christians How to Use Their Knowledge and Faith, How to Improve All Helps and Means, and to Perform All Duties, How to Overcome Temptations, and to Escape or Mortifie Every Sin : In Four Parts …* London: Robert White.

Bebbington, D. W. 2014. *The Nonconformist Conscience: Chapel and Politics 1870–1914.* New York: Routledge.

Beirne, Piers. 2015. *Hogarth's Art of Animal Cruelty.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bentham, Jeremy. 1789 [1970]. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.* London: Athlone.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism.* San Francisco: University of California Press.

Boehrer, Bruce. 2011. "The Animal Renaissance." In *A Cultural History of Animals in the Renaissance*, edited by Bruce Boehrer, 1–26. Oxford: Berg.

Bradley, Ian. 1990. *God Is Green.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Calvin, John. 1559 [1845]. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Clark, Stephen R. L. 1998. "Is Nature God's Will?" In *Animals on the Agenda*, edited by Andrew Linzey and Dorothy Yamamoto, 123–136. London: SCM.

Dooyeweerd, Hermann. 1969. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought.* Translated by David H. Freeman and William S. Young. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Dunlap, Thomas. 2004. *Faith in Nature: Environmentalism as Religious Quest.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Edwards, Peter. 2011. "Domesticated Animals in Renaissance Europe." In *A Cultural History of Animals in the Renaissance*, edited by Bruce Boehrer, 75–94. Oxford: Berg.

Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Fraser, Antonia. 1975. *Cromwell: Our Chief of Men*. London: Panther.

Fudge, Erica. 2006. "Two Ethics: Killing Animals in the Past and Present." In *Killing Animals*, edited by The Animal Studies Group, 99–119. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Fudge, Erica. 2017. *Re-enchanting the Farm*. Available at https://strathprints. strath.ac.uk/62183/1/Fudge_2017_Re_enchanting_the_farm.pdf. Accessed December 1.

Gilmour, Michael J. 2014. *Eden's Other Residents: The Bible and Animals*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Harwood, Dix. 1928. *Love for Animals*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness as They Came Out of Gods Hands, and the Good Mans Mercy to the Brute Creatures, Which God Hath Put Under His Feet*. London: Tho. Parkhurst.

Keeble, N. H. 1987. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century England*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Lane, Belden C. 2011. *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawrence, John. 1796. *A Philosophical and Practical Treatise on Horses and on the Moral Duties of Man Towards the Brute Creation*. Vol. 1. London: Longman.

Leiss, William. 1994. *The Domination of Nature*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

LeVasseur, Todd, and Anna Peterson, eds. 2017. *Religion and Ecological Crisis: The "Lynn White Thesis" at Fifty*. New York: Routledge.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lindberg, Carter. 1996. *The European Reformations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Linzey, Andrew. 2000. *Animal Gospel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Linzey, Andrew. 2004. "The Theological Basis of Animal Rights." In *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment*, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, 355–360. London: Routledge.

Littlejohn, Stephen W., Karen A. Foss, and John G. Oetzel. 2017. *Theories of Human Communication*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. 1849. *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz.

Merchant, Carolyn. 2013. *Reinventing Eden: The Fate of Nature in Western Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Matthews, David. 2004. *I Saw the Welsh Revival*. Belfast: Ambassador.

Perkins, William. 1606. *The Whole Treatise of the Cases of* Conscience. Cambridge: John Legat.

Preece, Rod, and Lorna Chamberlain. 1993. *Animal Welfare and Human Values*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Preece, Rod. 2005. *Immortal Animal Souls*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Sampson, Philip J. 2001. *6 Modern Myths*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Sampson, Philip J. Forthcoming. "Evangelical Christianity: Lord of Creation or Animal Among Animals?" In *The Handbook of Religion and Animal Ethics*, edited by Andrew Linzey and Clair Linzey. New York: Routledge.

Sewell, Anna. 1877 [1994]. *Black Beauty*. London: Penguin.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1873. "A Word for Brutes Against Brutes." *Sword and the Trowel* 3 (June): 332–338.

Stoll, Mark. 1997. *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Nature in America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Stoll, Mark. 2006. "Creating Ecology: Protestants and the Moral Community of Creation." In *Religion and the New Ecology*, edited by David M. Lodge and Christopher Hamlin, 53–72. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.

Stuart, Tristram. 2006. *The Bloodless Revolution*. London: HarperPress.

Stubbes, Philip. 1583 [1877–1879]. *Anatomy of the Abuses in England in Shakspere's Youth*. London: N. Trubner.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Tonutti, Sabrina. 2009. "Cruelty, Children, and Animals: Historically One, Not Two, Causes." In *The Link Between Animal Abuse and Human Violence*, edited by Andrew Linzey, 95–105. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press.

Velten, Hannah. 2013. *Beastly London: A History of Animals in the City*. London: Reaktion Books.

Westermarck, Edward. 1971. *Christianity and Morals*. New York: Routledge.

White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.

Woodfall, W. 1800. *The Parliamentary Register*. Vol. 2, House of Commons, 2 April 1800. London: John Stockdale.

Woodfall, W. 1802. *The Parliamentary Register*. Vol. 3, House of Commons, 24 May 1802. London: John Stockdale.

Worster, Donald. 1993. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, Thomas. 1798. *An Essay on Humanity to Animals*. London: Cadell and Davies.

Creation: What on Earth Are Animals for?

Beasts 'are good creatures in their own nature and kind, and made to set forth the glory and magnificence of the great God…' (Trapp 1657 [1868], 484).

In the harsh and sometimes unforgiving conditions of pre-modernity, the spectre of scarcity or even famine haunted most people in rural England. The dominant way of talking about animals was pragmatic, focused on human survival. Farmers simply could not afford to value animals for 'their own nature and kind'. Yet by the mid-seventeenth century, John Trapp did just that. Naturally, many nonconformists shared the dominant, pragmatic view of the culture around them, but Trapp's was not a lone voice. This chapter explores the nonconformist language which pioneered a radically new discourse of animal-human relationships inspired by the biblical creation narrative.

The Consensus Narrative

The perennial question "what are animals for?" has been debated with renewed vigour since the mid-twentieth century. Contemporary debate employs a secular language, and where it engages with religious answers to this question, commonly considers them conservative and anthropocentric. Peter Singer (2015, 226) is blunt but not atypical: 'It can no longer be maintained by anyone but a religious fanatic that man is the special darling of the whole universe, or that other animals were created

to provide us with food'. This view colours the public imagination as well as ethical debate.

As discussed in earlier chapters, this consensus narrative begins with 'dominion thought' and draws primarily on the Creation motif; we read little of either the Fall or Redemption. Moreover, the consensus narrative is structured by the modern binary opposition of humans against nature, using an Enlightenment language of instrumentality. Animals appear as our property, to use as we wish; we owe them no duties, nor do they have any intrinsic value. Animals exist solely for the sake of humans.

This Enlightenment language is common now, but it was rarely available to most of the nonconformists discussed in this book. Moreover, if the nonconformist account of creation was indeed structured by theological anthropocentrism, it would make it difficult to understand its contribution to animal ethics discussed in the last chapter.

Nonconformists and Dominion

By beginning with human dominion, however we understand it, the consensus narrative puts humans at the start of the story. The nonconformist imaginary characteristically starts with God, not man: 'In the beginning God' (Gen. 1.1). Dominion comes at the end of the creation narrative, not its outset. Moreover, nonconformists regarded Creation as only the first chapter of a larger work.

In nonconformist discourse, animals acquire an excess of meaning over the pragmatic or utilitarian from the places they occupy in biblical texts. From the late sixteenth century, these had become increasingly familiar from sources such as vernacular translations of the Bible, and the Book of Common Prayer (1549–1662). This brought no new empirical insights into the capacity of animals to reason, communicate or suffer, but it did provide a new language to express what it is to be created an animal; and what it means to exist before the face of God prior to human creation, let alone dominion (Gen. 1.24–6). Animals were included in a world of meanings within biblical texts, including ethical meanings we now more usually reserve for humans. The nonconformists read of the experience of animals, whether of pleasure or suffering; of their desires, whether those be for food or to praise their creator; and of their ethical standing before God. Human qualities of kindness or cruelty towards animals had a discursive, not an epistemological origin, restoring animals to our social world and to existential fellowship with us.

For example, Erica Fudge (2017, 2) suggests that the seventeenth-century practice of godparents bequeathing a lamb to a child points beyond pragmatic interests to the symbolic meaning of lambs in the baptismal liturgy of the prayerbook and in the gospel of John in the Authorised Version of the Bible (1611). In caring for their bequeathed lamb, the godchild learned about shepherding and followed the example of Jesus the Good Shepherd, becoming more like him. The language of the prayerbook and the gospel were sufficiently familiar to people in seventeenth-century England to sustain a way of talking about lambs which is about 'much more than small businesses'. More than two centuries later, Anne Bronte drew on these same sources rather than 'philosophical and scientific discourse' for her 'vision of the proximity between animals and humans' (Gilmour 2014, 20).

I shall argue that the nonconformist lexicon of 'dominion' derived from such sources was distinctive, and should not be identified with modern understandings of ownership and instrumentality which emerged in the eighteenth century. This will clear the way for an evaluation of the contribution of the nonconformist motif of creation to animal advocacy.

Anthropocentrism in the Consensus Account

Dominion thought is said to have a very broad scope, embracing both Catholic and Protestant traditions. Thomas Aquinas is most often cited as the source of theological anthropocentrism in the Catholic tradition, especially his enduring natural right justification of 'use'. Although medieval writing on animals was varied and complex, with many animal-friendly voices, there is force to the view that Aquinas became the most authoritative voice in the late medieval period. However, Aquinas' teaching cannot simply be equated with eighteenth-century Enlightenment instrumentalism. Rather, it is a complex synthesis of mainly biblical and Aristotelian sources. For example, Aquinas (1955–1957, III.112.13) endorses the biblical prohibition of 'cruelty against brute animals', whilst reading it within an Aristotelian framework which makes human interests paramount.

While Aquinas' influence has remained strong in the Catholic tradition, the nonconformists gave clear priority to the Biblical canon over Greek philosophy. Yet Richard Young (1999, xvi–xvii) considers that 'Aristotle's hierarchical system where animals exist for the sake of humanity' 'passed into Christian theology through Thomas Aquinas and

is seen in such writers as John Calvin, who says that the universe was made especially for human use and enjoyment'. Nor is he alone. Others also assert that the theology of Luther and Calvin 'can appear to be radically anthropocentric' (Santmire 1985, 124). Luther's doctrine of creation, says Hendry (1980, 17), 'reduced the whole world of nature to a repository of goods for the service of man'. As for Calvin, he is said to be 'firmly anthropocentric' (Thomas 1984, 154), to adopt 'an openly anthropocentric stance' (Edwards 2011, 76), 'an anthropocentric view of creation' (Attfield 1999, 50), and an 'anthropocentric and instrumentalist view of nature' (Northcott 1996, 220). In this, Calvin is typically taken as representative of the nonconformity in which his texts were seminal.

The view that Calvin was anthropocentric is striking as it is so rare outside the literature of animal-human relationships. Calvin is far more often regarded as radically theocentric, so much so that Calvinistic nonconformity is characteristically said to de-centre mankind in theology, even to demote the significance of being human at all. To understand the unusual view of Calvin as anthropocentric, we need to look in more detail at some of the texts concerned.

Nonconformists and Anthropocentrism

The sixteenth-century European Reformations self consciously distinguished themselves from both traditional church teaching, and Renaissance humanism. The latter drew upon classical Greek and Roman sources which depicted the gods creating the world to serve themselves. Thus, men supplied animal flesh for the Banquet of the Gods; women served the gods' sexual appetites. These were popular subjects in Renaissance art and literature from the early sixteenth century.

The Christian church had long rejected this classical view of creation serving the needs of the gods; theologians cited Paul's Athenian address which asserted that God 'is not served by human hands, as if he needed anything' (Acts 17.24–25). 'God did not create under stress of any compulsion, or because he lacked something for his own needs; his only motive was goodness…' says Augustine (1972, XI.24). Some 800 years later, Aquinas (2013, II i Q. 102, Art. 3, Obj. 1) concurred: 'God has no needs'. The resurgence of classical myth during the Renaissance prompted theological re-affirmation that the earth was not created for the benefit of God.

Thus George Walker (1641, 50) asserts that the world was created 'only for us, and for our benefit, who live under time'. When read with Enlightenment spectacles, this appears to be a clear endorsement of theological anthropocentrism. But Walker is speaking in a world of gods and men, not Enlightenment instrumentalism. He continues: 'and not for the eternal God, to adde any good, or any blessedness to him, who was all-sufficient and most blessed in himselfe from all eternity…'. Thomas Watson (1692, 66–67) likewise affirms that God made the world for man, not himself, adding 'he did not need it, being infinite'. 'When God created the sunne', says John Calvin (1583, 877, Col. 2) 'it was not to lighten himself, but to give light to us'.

The Westminster Confession (1647, 2.2), the foundation for most subsequent nonconformist confessions of faith, summarised nonconformist belief when it meticulously asserts that: 'God has all life, glory, goodness, blessedness, in and of Himself; and is alone in and unto Himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creatures which He has made, nor deriving any glory from them, but only manifesting His own glory in, by, unto, and upon them…'.

God has no necessary needs which creation might satisfy. But humans do. When we read 'for our use' or 'for our sake', it points not to human centrality, but to our dependence and need: our *lack* of autonomy. Outside the Reformation orbit, other early modern Christians sceptical of the Thomist tradition shared similar views. For example, René Descartes (2012, 85) says that 'from a moral point of view, it may be a (good and) pious thought to believe that God created all things for us, since this may move us all the more to love him and to give thanks to him for so many blessings [but] … it is in no way likely that all things were made for us in the sense that God had no other purpose in creating them'.

This language of dependence and provision is the converse of the consensus dominion thought narrative with its binary opposition of animals and humans, and its discourse of instrumental use. In fact, nonconformists rarely had access to a language of instrumentalism, which did not reach maturity until the eighteenth century. Indeed, as late as 1751, to speak of 'use' did not necessarily imply Kantian instrumentalism, as though an animal is only a means to an end; it may simply refer to 'customary treatment' (Preece and Chamberlain 1993, 30).

As Descartes suggests, to say that God made everything for our sake also affirms God's parental care for humans in their need. But we shouldn't suppose from this that God provides only for human needs.

Animals share dependency with humans; and God cares for them also, as Stephen Charnock (1864, 102 and 24–25, my emphasis) affirmed in the mid-seventeenth century. At the creation, God 'put the waters into several channels, and caused the dry land to appear barefaced for a habitation for *man and beasts…*'; showers were appointed 'to refresh the bodies of living creatures', and rivers as 'vessels for drink for the living creatures that dwell upon the earth.' John Ray (1721, 36) similarly considered that mountains are for 'the entertainment of the various sorts of Animals, which God hath created, some whereof delight in cold, some hot, some in moist and watery, some in dry and upland places'. Thomas Adams (1629, 1117) affirms that God prepared food for the use of man, but not only man: 'He creates beasts, but first hee made herbes and grasse to feed them.' Adams, Charnock and Ray were no more zoocentric than Calvin was anthropocentric.

The End of the World

To affirm that God provides for human (and animal) needs, is not say that this is the end or purpose of creation. John Ray (1714, 175–176) regarded it as 'a generally received Opinion, That all the visible World was created for Man; that Man is the end of the Creation, as if there were no other end of any Creature, but some way or other to be serviceable to Man.' He rejects this view as common but ignorant, intertexting Prov. 12.10 to argue that 'if a good Man be merciful to his Beast, then surely a good God…takes pleasure that all his creatures enjoy themselves, that have Life and Sense, and are capable of Enjoyment.' Ray's discussion differs from the instrumentalism which would emerge later in the eighteenth century in that he here distinguishes between the 'end' or purpose of creation, and the needs of creatures to live and enjoy themselves. The world may provide for human and animal needs rather than God's, but this was not the *end* for which God created the world.

Jonathan Edwards (1765 [2010], 2.1) carefully distinguishes between human and animal dependence upon creation, and the world's purpose or 'end', which is God's glory. The world may supply our needs (and those of animals), but 'God made himself… the supreme and last end of all things', the 'alpha and omega'. 'Ultimately and terminatively', says Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 160) all things 'were made for God.' 'The End, why all is made, is for the glory of the Maker', says Thomas Adams (1629, 1118), not 'as if God would purchase a glory he had not

before' but to manifest it to us. The 'supreme end was his owne glorie; the inferiour and dependant, our benefit and comfort'. God made the world for both humans and animals on account of their dependence and need. But the end for which he made the world was his glory, not out of need but out of goodness and superabundance.

The nonconformists found in the biblical sources that 'this great and beautiful frame of the world' has a meaning which exceeds its pragmatic use (Bownde 1608 [1817], 52); it *manifests* its end, the glory of God. The Westminster Confession (1647, 4.1) says God created the world 'for the manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom, and goodness'. For many nonconformists, this is especially apparent in its beauty and harmony. Adams (1629, 1118) argues that the prelapsarian goodness of creation stands in 'the comeliness and beauty of the creature; a rare glory shining forth in the form and constitution of it'; in 'the excellency of the virtue infused to it; as every one was made for some special end, so endued with special virtue to accomplish that end'; and in 'the harmony of their obedience to God, and the commodious and delightful benefit of them all to man; when no herb, no flower was wanting; whether for ornament or use, for sight, or scent, or taste.' This is no pragmatic instrumentalism of 'use'. 'Look into the air', exhorts Thomas Watson (1692, 3) 'the birds, with their chirping music, sing hymns of praise to God… Every beast doth in its kind glorifie God.' The literary culture of nonconformity finds 'glory stamped on every creature' as N. H. Keeble (1987, 255) puts it. And in glorifying God, animals also reveal Him.

For John Calvin (1559 [1845], 1.v.1), the the glory of God is engraved on each of his works so brightly, distinctly and illustriously that it is as if 'God for the first time was arrayed in visible attire when, in the creation of the world, he displayed those glorious banners, on which, to whatever side we turn, we behold his perfections visibly portrayed'. The world is 'God made visible in his works' (Walker 1641, title page); 'thou seest him in his creatures' (Abbot 1613, 107).

This nonconformist language of glory and disclosure is struggling to escape a Greek lexicon of being, and to grasp creation as meaning, pointing beyond itself to God (Dooyeweerd 1969). God, says Calvin (1559 [1845], 1.v.1), 'daily places himself in our view, that we cannot open our eyes without being compelled to behold him'. This is the very opposite to the desacralisation which Lynn White identified in dominion theology; all creation has become sacred. Anyone who seriously believed such

things would simply not look upon animals in the same way as does the modern gaze. It is a different language of both animal existence and animal experience.

The Existence of Beasts

The 'divine wisdom', affirmed Stephen Charnock (1864, 21) in the mid-seventeenth century 'stepped forth in the creatures to a public appearance, as if it had presented itself in a visible shape to man, giving instructions in and by the creatures, to know and adore him.' We must attend to the school of God's creatures for instruction; but as real animals in all their particularity, not as allegory or anagogy in the medieval bestiary tradition. As animals and humans teach one-another, so their mutual existence is enriched with meaning, not reduced to a symbol.

An Ontology of Care

The nonconformist language of animals was realist without being simply pragmatic. In particular, animals are not vegetables or things; they suffer and bleed. Philip Sydney (1580 [1999], 225) pleads of the hunter: 'Thou art of blood; joy not to make things bleed. Thou fearest death; think they are loath to die. A plaint of guiltless hurt doth pierce the sky.' The vegetising and reifying of animals discussed in Chapter 3 is simply not possible within this discourse. This proved sufficiently robust to support forthright denials that animals are merely insensate automata in the Cartesian tradition. John Ray (1714, 55–56 and 176) denied that beasts are automata or machines without sense of pleasure or pain, arguing both that we see their suffering, and that Prov. 12.10 implies that human wickedness can be cruel 'towards Beasts, which, were they meer Machines, it could not be'. To regard animals as 'Machines or Puppets' is, he says, contrary to experience and 'unworthy of the Majesty, Wisdom, and Power of God.' Robert Boyle (1647–1648, line 50–56) similarly affirmed that animals feel pain and it is wrong to make them endure it; and John Wesley (1771 [1872], para. 1 and 2.1.4–5) that animals are capable of pleasure or pain, of happiness or misery, sharing many capacities with humans.

In revealing God, animals acquired an ontological weight of glory through their existential meaning. This applies to hens as much as lions. The biblical creation narrative begins when 'the Spirit of God moved

upon the face of the waters' (Gen. 1.2). John Wesley (2017, 9) finds here, at the very outset, an avian trope disclosing God's care: the Spirit moved 'as the hen gathereth her chicken under her wings, and hovers over them, to warm and cherish them… and fluttereth over her young.' A brooding hen, in all her fluttering particularity, carries an 'immense weight of glory' as she reveals God (Calvin 1559 [1845], 1.v.1). 'Every lineament of her [creation's] face', says Thomas Adams (1630, 124–125) 'yields many wonders; an innumerable variety of beasts, worms, herbs, flowers, seeds, plants, fruits, appear. What pile of grass is there wherein we may not read the finger of God?'.

As Wesley intimates, this was not the being of greek philosophers but an ontology of signifying care (Marion 2012). God cares for animals individually, just as he does humans: '[In Ps. 104.27] it is said that the goodnesse and mercie of God extendeth to all the beastes of the earth. It is not said onely of men whom God hath made after his owne image and likenesse: but the beastes are comprised therein as well as they' (Calvin 1583, 877).

Both Matthew's and Luke's gospels record that Jesus of Nazareth was somewhat caustic about a commodification of sparrows which values them interchangeably at two a penny, discounted to five for twopence (Matt. 10.29f; Lk. 12.6f). By contrast, he asserts that God cares for each specific sparrow. 'Each of the creatures in particular is under his hand and protection, so that nothing is left to chance', argues John Calvin (1845, 10.29) pointedly distinguishing this ontology of care from a Greek heritage of impersonal 'fate' or 'a complicated chain of causes'. God governs not by 'a kind of general motion in the machine of the globe as well as in each of its parts, but by a special providence sustaining, cherishing, superintending, all the things which he has made, to the very minutest, even to a sparrow' (Calvin 1559 [1845], 1.xi.1).

Creation reveals an immense weight of glory, and that glory is ethically qualified as cherishing care. The correlate of God's care of creation is creation's innocent goodness, something which the Genesis narrative repeats some seven times: 'the creature was made substantially glorious, essentially exceedingly good' (Homes 1654 [1833], 291). All manner of creatures whatever, says George Walker (1641, 159) 'were created perfect and approved by God as good'. This goodness, declared six times before humans even existed, is independent of humans.

Creation is good, pure and innocent. John Calvin (1848, 344) derives this from God's ownership: 'If the fulness of the earth is the Lord's, there is nothing in the world that is not sacred and pure.' *Pace* Lynn

White, this is the *sacralisation* of the whole world, not its desacralisation. Creation may groan as a result of human sin, but its prelapsarian being is unchanged, however blemished: the 'curse is accidental to the creature, and not of the essence of it' (Homes 1654 [1833], 291). Animals remain innocent and determined to fulfil their calling to worship God, even if humans do not. As we shall see, this opened a space for a remarkable reversal in ethical language. Mark Stoll (2006, 58), speaking of the non-conformist contributions to environmentalism in the US, observed that 'Calvinists regarded nature as the pure, ongoing creation of God, whose innocence was a foil to human corruption. Thus they gave nature a sort of moral standing'.

This innovative creation discourse proved flexible. It enabled them to affirm with love and thanksgiving that God made animals for our sake, just as Aquinas had taught. Yet it also enabled them to assert that animals are good in themselves, just as humans were initially created to be. But the *good-in-itself* of animals, whether human or not, is not autotelic in the modern sense of existing 'for their own sake'. Rather, animals, human or not, point beyond themselves to their creator, whose glory they were made to declare, and whose nature to reveal. Moreover, they do so as a harmonious whole.

The Harmony of Existence

Perhaps surprisingly, the nonconformists drew on theatrical language to express this unity. Creation is 'a glorious theatre', which should give us joy (Calvin 1559 [1845], 1.v.8). Animals are no longer part of the backdrop, but actors along with their fellow creatures, humans. All the world's a stage, but not just all the men and women players: 'every creature in it hath a part to act, and a nature suited to that part and end it is designed for; and all concur in a joint language to publish the glory of the divine wisdom, they have a voice to proclaim the glory of God (Ps. xix.1,3)' (Charnock 1864, 26). The goodness of creatures is not only particular and individual but also communal. They stand in 'the harmony of their obedience to God' (Adams 1629, 1116). 'All creatures are as members in the great body of the world', says Stephen Charnock (1864, 23), 'proportioned to one another, and contributing to the beauty of the whole, so that if the particular forms of everything, the union of all for the composition of the world, and the laws which are established in the order of nature for its conservation, be considered, it would ravish [enrapture] us with the admiration of God.'

Whereas the Thomist tradition mediated creation's praise through man in a natural hierarchy, the nonconformists were closer to the Augustinian view that 'it is the nature of things considered in itself, without regard to our convenience or inconvenience, that gives glory to the Creator' (Augustine 1972, XII.4). Creation's praise is independent of human agency or our assessments of value. 'True devotion not only hears the praises of God in the sweet song of feathered minstrels, but even discovers it in the croaking from the marsh, or in the buzz of "the blue fly which singeth in the window pane"' (Spurgeon 1885, Ps. 148.10). Indeed, Spurgeon (1885, Ps. 148.7) declares that the creatures which do not serve men, all the better praise God. The earth 'is to be made vocal everywhere with praise. Ye dragons, and all deeps…. Terrible beasts or fishes, whether they roam the earth or swim the seas, are bidden to the feast of praise. Whether they float amid the teeming waves of the tropics, or wend their way among the floes and bergs of polar waters, they are commanded … to yield their tribute to the creating Jehovah. They pay no service to man; let them the more heartily confess their allegiance to the Lord.'

However, humans can have their place in this harmony, working together for the good of the whole. Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Ps. 104.19–30 and Rom. 8.17–25) comments that the works of God 'are all made in wisdom, for they are all made to answer the end they were designed to serve, the good of the universe, in order to the glory [sic] of the universal Monarch'. He notes that the world is a single, complex, interacting unity, 'the compages [a unity of many parts] of inanimate and sensible creatures' with 'harmony and mutual dependence' 'all constitute and make up one world'. 'All creatures', says Stephen Charnock (1864, 22), 'are as members in the great body of the world, proportioned to one another, and contributing to the beauty of the whole…'. This 'confluence of many good things' (Adams 1629, 1116), what we would now call symbiosis, includes earth, beasts and humans. God has thus 'tied them [creatures] to himselfe' (Abbot 1613, 608).

Of course, this biblically renewed vision was uneven, often borrowing the hierarchical Greek 'chain of being' to elaborate biblical harmony and creational kinship. Thus John Bulwer (1653, B6) declares it unlawful 'to destroy any one species of God's creatures, though it were but the species of Toades and Spiders, because this were a taking away one linke of Gods chaine, one note of his harmony', nicely combining hierarchy and harmony motifs from classical and biblical sources respectively.

Nevertheless, it was a sufficiently different vision to enable new things to be systematically said about the existence and inter-relationships of animals. Santmire (1985, 127 and 132) notes that the Reformers portray human solidarity with the rest of nature; and Keith Thomas (1984, 278) observes that the 'modern idea of the balance of nature' was generated by theological discourses before it gained a scientific basis.

Nonconformist discourses not only generated novel ways of speaking about animal existence; it did the same for animal experience.

THE EXPERIENCE OF BEASTS

According to Brock (2016, 5), '…virtually all writers in premodern times never looked at the question [of animal sensation] from the viewpoint of animals.' If so, the nonconformists were the exception. In the harmony of praise, each creature is a centre of experience according to its kind. George Walker (1641, 155) speaks of the beasts own 'pleasure and delight', and John Ray (1714, 175–176, 122) of their ability to 'to enjoy themselves'; animals are born in Spring 'when there is proper Food and Entertainment ready for them'. This was a man who had seen spring lambs leaping in the field as well as oozing on the plate.

For Jonathan Edwards (1723 [1998], 45), God has provided for 'all the necessities, but also for the pleasure and recreation of all sorts of creatures, and even the insects'. Indeed, John Bunyan imagines the experience of a spider, its freedom and happiness, its integrity in keeping the rules of its creation (Murray 2010, 130). Commenting upon Psalm 84.3, George Abbot (1651, 383) contrasts human and sparrow experience: 'I envy the happiness of the very irrationall creature, the poor birds, for that they have a priviledge far beyond me, they can dwell in thy land amongst thy people, the sparrow and swallow have their freedom there, harbour themselves and make their nests where they will, in view of and near to thy very Altar.'

This way of talking does not model sparrow experience on supposed human attributes such as reason, language and so on. Indeed, unlike humans, they are 'irrationall' creatures but not therefore instinct driven beings, lacking the autonomy supposedly characteristic of humans. Rather, sparrows (and spiders) are cultural beings with their own world, with their own 'privilege', which is 'far beyond' (postlapsarian) humans.

Indeed, the nonconformists identified a wide range of animal experience and capacities. As already noted, animals experience pleasure, recreation and delight: a 'beast tasteth as much of the sensitive sweetness of his food and ease as you do', observed Richard Baxter (1670, 184–185). Conversely, observed Hannah More (1840, 224) through her fictional spokesman Tom White, 'having the gift of feeling, [a horse can] suffer as much as human creatures can do'. They also experience joy, language, choice, dreams, moral goodness, benevolence, and an ability to 'take knowledge … when they heare the voyce of musicke'. Some even 'take delight in their furniture and ornaments' affirmed George Abbot (1613, 453): 'I thinke that I do not abuse the word, to say, that some of them in some things, have a kind of fellow feeling with us' (see also Wesley 1771 [1872], 2.1.4–5. Spurgeon, n.d., 371). Thomas Adams (1630, 160), Richard Baxter (Keeble 1987, 258) and John Flavel (1674) called them 'preachers' of his divinity: 'The irrational … as well as rational creatures, preach unto man the wisdom, Power, and goodness of God.' Animals, it seems, are ministers in their own religion. C. H. Spurgeon (1885, Ps. 148.7) quotes Godfrey Goodwin with approval: 'It should seem that … there may be a religion beneath man, the religion of dumb creatures. For wheresoever there is a service of God, in effect it is a religion'.

The Soul of a Beast

In humans, such capacities are associated with possessing a soul, and the nonconformist imaginary opened a discursive space for animals also to have souls. However, the nonconformists struggled to reconcile their return to the biblical canon with the language of the soul they had inherited from medieval tradition. The latter was informed by Greek thought, especially Aristotle, for whom an animal soul is indissolubly tied to its body, and ceases at death. Within Aristotelian philosophy, it simply did not make sense to ask about animal survival of death. Thus John Owen (1691, preface), schooled in the Greek tradition, argues that the 'Soul of a Beast cannot be preserved in a separate Condition, no not by an act of Almighty Power, for it is not; and that which is not, cannot live. It is nothing but the Body it self in an act of its material Powers.' The nonconformist language of animal capacities contrasted sharply with this Greek view when restoration motifs were debated, and it was here that distinctive discourses of the soul emerged most clearly. I shall return to this in Chapter 7.

Animal's Rights

In the twentieth century, the language of rights became prominent in debates about human-animal relationships. Both advocates and critics of animal rights generally agree that this language has emerged from an Enlightenment tradition in which it is 'self-evident' that humans are 'endowed with certain inalienable rights' to life and freedom. However, this is not self-evident in the case of animals; whether they also have rights is heavily contested, the argument in favour commonly resting on an anthropomorphic comparison of human and animal capacities.

Few nonconformists had access to this modern language, and most were critical of a Thomist natural right tradition. However, there was a different language of rights available to them, one which had especially developed in England and Scotland during the conflicts over subjection and sovereignty from the late sixteenth century. Some nonconformist authors applied this discourse to animals. For them, an upright or rightful claim rested less in a capacity of the bearer of a right, than in a just or lawful claim arising from God's covenant. Such a claim is not anthropomorphically modelled on human rights, but is theocentric; both animals and humans have rights equally before God. Thus grass is the covenant right of animals, their 'property' given to them by God before man was created; and animals have a right to rest because of the sabbath law in the Mosaic covenant (Ex. 20.10). Moreover, a fly or toad has as much right to happiness as a canary bird since God made them all; neither the attributes of the creature, nor our own aversions or preferences make any difference (Primatt 1776, 152–153, 198, 269–270). John Calvin (1583, 775) warns that, though it might seem to us that 'uprightnes [is] to be used but among men', God requires us to use it of animals also, even of small birds which appear of no value to us.

Thus framed, humans have no natural right to claim lordship over animals. Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 160) uses the language of gift: 'Man was but a fellow-creature with the rest of the world, and could not challenge a lordship over them [animals] by his own right, without God's free gift. …'. Nor is a 'free gift' a license to do as we wish. Manton continues: 'Now that which necessarily dependeth on the gift of another, must be used for the end to which it is given; … all these things should be used to his glory.'

It is sometimes argued that Henry Salt created an 'epistemological' break in 1892 by proposing that animals should have rights (Taylor

2009, 62). Salt was certainly the first to do so systematically from an Enlightenment perspective. But by the eighteenth century, a language of the 'rights' of nature was not unusual, and it derived in part from these nonconformist sources (Worster 1993, 195). For example, Humphrey Primatt (1776) mentions the rights of animals some 20 times, grounding them in God's creation and the Law rather than Enlightenment philosophy. As late as the nineteenth century, the Bishop of Peterborough, *opposing* the prohibition of vivisection, conceded in a parliamentary debate that 'the lower orders of the creation had rights as against us, inasmuch as they, like ourselves, were God's creatures' (Hansard 1879, 431). I shall return to the language of an animal's rights in the next chapter.

Animal-Human Relationships

As discussed in Chapter 2, the consensus narrative of theological anthropocentrism grants humans an unlimited and absolute right to do as we wish with animals. This way of speaking has little in common with the existence and experience of animals described above. It draws rather upon a modern language of ownership as absolute possession, which authorises us to use our property as we wish to achieve whatever end we desire, and is indifferent to the experience of chattels. Animals are, observed Kant (1784 [2001], 213), 'man's instruments'.

But few of the nonconformists discussed in this book had ever heard of Kant; not least because they were mostly dead by the late eighteenth century! Moreover, before the Industrial Revolution, there was no consensus about rights of ownership; many different patterns co-existed, each with its own authorisation of use. The nonconformists drew upon these resources as they struggled to reconcile the biblical canon with the pragmatic language of animals which they had inherited from the medieval church. In particular, they wrestled with the frequent Biblical pericope that 'the earth is the Lord's and everything in it' which explicitly denies human ownership of anything (Lev. 25:23, Deut. 10:14, I Chron. 29:11–12, Ps. 24:1, Isa. 66:1–2, I Cor. 10:26). This produced a more complex and nuanced understanding of dominion than the consensus narrative of theological anthropocentrism suggests.

The nonconformists were clear that God had given humans dominion over the animals, but they overwhelmingly emphasised that dominion is not a right, it does not imply ownership, and we cannot use animals as we see fit. Dominion is a gift, we cannot claim it merely because

we are 'animated dust' (Primatt 1776, 104). Thus George Walker (1641, 227) argues that man has 'limited lordship and delegate dominion', not 'to doe with the creatures what he will, and to use them as hee listeth; but only to make them obey and serve him so farre as the superior Lord doth thinke them fit and convenient for his use.'

Limited Lordship and Delegate Dominion

The limited lordship of creation made Adam, as Martin Luther (1958, Vol. 2, 132) puts it, 'a gentle master of the beasts'. The nonconformists restricted and qualified the language available to them to try to do justice to this. Intertexting Lev. 25 and Deut. 15, Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Gen. 1.9–13) refers to humans as 'tenants to, and dependents upon' God, emphasising that even natural products belong to God: 'not only the earth is the Lord's, but *the fulness thereof,* and he is the rightful owner and sovereign disposer, not only of it, but of all its furniture'. Matthew Hale (1677, 370), as befitted a Lord Chief Justice, used a variety of legal qualifications on use including 'vice-roy', 'steward, villicus, bayliff' and 'usufructuary'. John Rawlinson (1612, 46) says that beasts are ours 'in fruit and use', yet not as possessions but as 'fellow servants' of the 'one Lord, whom all things serve'. Augustus Toplady (1794 [1825], 462) goes further; 'animals are not only our fellow-creatures', he says, 'but …our elder brethren: for their creation was previous to ours'. John Dod and Robert Cleaver (1612, 141) speak of creatures as 'loans' by God of what is not ours. John Calvin (1583, 877) uses this discourse of ownership to reprimand the wicked man who excuses his cruelty by claiming, 'tush I care not, for it is but a brute beast'. 'Yea', says Calvin, 'but it is a creature of God'.

A particular 'use' often mentioned by the consensus narrative of theological anthropocentrism is that 'other animals were created to provide us with food' (Singer 2015, 226). But the nonconformists overwhelmingly rejected this. Animals and humans alike were created to eat a vegetable diet, not one another; 'all kinds of fruit in abundance for the supply of food', as John Calvin (1559 [1845], 1.xiv.2) puts it. 'When we see herbs and suchlike things to grow, we are given to understand thereby, that God is the purveiour for the whole world, even for the beasts of the earth, and for the birdes, and for al things' (Calvin 1583, 877). Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Gen. 9.3) tells us that this was the majority nonconformist view in the seventeenth century. Moreover, even though such

food was usually considered inferior peasant fare, John Calvin (1578 [1847], 100) regarded it as a Michelin Starred diet: 'It is not to be doubted that this [diet of herbs and seeds] was abundantly sufficient for their highest gratification. …[God] promises a liberal abundance, which should leave nothing wanting to a sweet and pleasant life' (see also Walker 1641, 234; Luther 1958, Vol. 1, 72).

Just as God cares about animals, so should humans as we image God in the created world. For Thomas Boston (1720 [1964], 49), dominion makes man 'God's deputy governor in the lower world, and this his dominion was an image of God's sovereignty.' Human dominion must therefore mirror God's. Indeed, Keith Thomas (1984, 180) summarised the nonconformist tradition as 'that man should take care of God's creation'. The modern language of 'stewardship' is often traced to this ontology of care, and, according to Mark Stoll (2006, 59), John Calvin was the first to formulate it. Stewardship was certainly a significant theme, but in the sense of a call to accountability rather than in the modern sense of an ethic for environmental development. The nonconformist discourse of dominion was theocentric and far richer than modern stewardship (Withrow King 2016, 101). Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Gen. 1.9–13) emphasises that animals must be used to God's 'service and honour'. Andrew Willet (1632, 18) rejects language which gives man 'free use of all creatures': 'the gift must be used according to the mind of the giver'. John Calvin (1583, 558–559) is characteristically clear: 'in christ we are given all things to use' but 'we must use them in such wise as he may be glorified by them'; 'we should use his creatures purely, and that we should have leave of him, so as every man take not leave to doe what he listeth, but what Gods word permitteth us to doe'.

The prelapsarian language of creation spoke of human dominion as an expression of harmony rather than onerous obligation. Thus, says William Hinde (1641, 31), the 'creatures were first of all at peace amongst themselves, all very good in themselves, and good for the use of man'. Human dominion was modelled on God's: 'God made them and preserves them and is good to them' and we should do likewise (Dod and Cleaver 1612, 140–141). The creatures, says Richard Baxter (1678, 214), are a 'love-token from our dearest friend'. The language of duties arises mainly when this harmony is disrupted, as we shall see in the next chapter. In the prelapsarian picture, humans had a distinctive role; to orchestrate the praise of the world in an antiphonal call-and-response. Creation was made to glorify God, and in man's innocency,

human-animal relationships served that end. The nonconformists regularly prayed the prayer Jesus of Nazareth taught his disciples; that the kingdom of God might come on earth where animals will be able to live as God intended.

Nonconformist Dominion and Reform

These nonconformist understandings of the ownership and use of animals have obvious implications for animal advocacy. If an animal is not personal property, and the 'owner' cannot do as he wishes, then it becomes possible to envisage a law which would penalise an individual for abuse of his 'own' beast. 'I confess', wrote Thomas Hodges (1675, 33), 'that I have often wished that some law might be made for the ease of these poor Beasts, even to bind their Masters to their good behaviour towards them: Good reason I think there is, as that he that steals his Neighbour's Beast should be punished, so, that he that slays his own Beast, making it a sacrifice to his passion, madness or folly should not escape unpunished'. However, English law was slow to adapt. In his magisterial summary of law, William Blackstone (1753 [1893], 304–305) intertexts 'the earth is the Lord's', but asserts that it is the emerging modern sense of property rights which applies to animals, and not nonconformist innovations: 'Whatever airy metaphysical notions may have been started by fanciful writers upon this subject… The earth… and all things therein, are the general property of mankind… from the immediate gift of the creator'.

The radical nature of the nonconformist discourse is apparent in the Parliamentary debate of 1809 about Lord Erskine's Bill to legislate against animal cruelty. Erskine highlighted the need for a (nonconformist) language of dominion, arguing that it is a moral trust and implies duties to animals extending beyond law. Opposing the Bill, William Windham argued that the only basis for opposing cruelty is if it prejudiced human interests; in line with Blackstone's judgement, he disdained the proposer of the Bill as 'the first who had stood up as the champion of the rights of brutes'. He continued by denying that there is any implication that 'we ought to treat them [animals] with humanity' in the 'maxim' of dominion. For Windham, the nonconformist creation discourse was contrary to his pragmatic maxim of dominion, lacked support in precedent and was tantamount to championing the 'rights' of brutes, a term which recalled the revolutionary events in France (Hansard 1809, 1030–1032). The Bill was subsequently lost.

Some 70 years later there were signs of change. In a parliamentary debate on vivisection, James Holt (Hansard 1876, 903f) argued that 'we have not merely to ask ourselves what suits our own convenience, or hurts our feelings, but, what are the terms on which the Creator has placed the animal world in our power'. This language could no longer be so easily dismissed.

Revising Discourses of Use

The nonconformist struggle to express these new insights of creation within the inherited medieval language of pragmatism led to uneven results. Often, canonical biblical discourse formed an uneasy synthesis with the inherited traditions of the Church. Nevertheless, where the canonical discourses gained the upper hand, a distinctively new way of talking about animal-human relations emerged. Animals acquired an ontological solidity and moral standing, and a prelapsarian harmony with humans. 'Ultimately and terminatively', animals are not made for humans, we have no natural right to their use; they are to glorify God, not aggrandise man. This theocentric understanding of animals reframed discourses of use, revising and refining the various concepts of property relationships available to them. Human dominion was modelled on the just king, the good shepherd, not the tyrant. The voice of conscience spoke in an enlarged moral universe which included animals. As we shall see in the next chapter, this voice grew even louder in a fallen world.

Bibliography

Abbot, George. 1613. *An Exposition Upon the Prophet Jonah*. London: Richard Field.

Abbot, George. 1651. *Brief Notes Upon the Whole Book of Psalms*. London: William Bentley.

Adams, Thomas. 1629. "Meditations Upon Some Part of the Creed." In *The Workes of Thomas Adams, Being the Summe of His Sermons, Meditations, and Other Divine and Morall Discourses,* 1087–1240. London: John Grismand.

Adams, Thomas. 1630. *Works*. Vol. 3. London: John Grismand.

Aquinas, Thomas. 1955–1957. *Summa Contra Gentiles*. New York: Hanover House.

Aquinas, Thomas. 2013. *Summa Theologica*. New York: Cosimo.

Attfield, Robin. 1999. *The Ethics of the Global Environment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Augustine. 1972. *The City of God*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Baxter, Richard. 1670. *The Life of Faith in Three Parts*. London: Nevil Simmons.

Baxter, Richard. 1678. *A Christian Directory*. Vol. 1. London: Nevil Simmons.

Blackstone, William. 1753 [1893]. *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Bownde, Nicholas. 1608 [1817]. *The Unbelief of Saint Thomas the Apostle*. London: Nichols, Son & Bentley.

Boyle, Robert. 1647–1648. "Manuscript." In "The 'Beame of Diuinity': Animal Suffering in the Early Thought of Robert Boyle," edited by Malcolm R. Oster. *British Journal for the History of Science* 22: 151–180.

Brock, Sebastian P. 2016. "Animals and Humans: Some Perspectives from an Eastern Christian Tradition." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 6 (1) (Spring): 1–9.

Bulwer John. 1653. *Anthropometamorphosis*. London: William Hunt.

Boston, Thomas. 1720 [1964]. *Human Nature in its Fourfold State*. London: Banner of Truth.

Calvin, John. 1559 [1845]. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1578 [1847]. *A Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by John King. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1583. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: John Harison.

Calvin, John. 1845. *Commentary upon Matthew*. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1848. *Commentary upon Corinthians*. Vol. 1. Translated by John Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Charnock, Stephen. 1864. "Discourse on God's Wisdom". In *Works*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: James Nicol.

Descartes, René. 2012. *Principles of Philosophy*. London: Kluwer Academic.

Dod, John, and Robert Cleaver. 1612. *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Eleventh and Twelfth Chapter of the Proverbs*. London: Thomas Man.

Dooyeweerd, Hermann. 1969. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*. Translated by David H. Freeman and William S. Young. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.

Edwards, Jonathan. 1723 [1998]. "The Spider". In *The Works Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 16. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Edwards, Jonathan. 1765 [2010]. *A Dissertation Concerning the End for Which God Created the World*. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale.

Edwards, Peter. 2011. "Domesticated Animals in Renaissance Europe." In *A Cultural History of Animals in the Renaissance*, edited by Bruce Boehrer, 75–94. Oxford: Berg.

Flavel, John. 1674. "Epistle Dedicatory." In *Husbandry Spiritualized*, edited by John Flavel. London: Robert Boulter.

Fudge, Erica. 2017. *Re-enchanting the Farm*. Available at https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/62183/1/Fudge_2017_Re_enchanting_the_farm.pdf. Accessed December 1.

Gilmour, Michael J. 2014. *Eden's Other Residents: The Bible and Animals*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Hale, Matthew. 1677. *The Primitive Organisation of Mankind Considered and Examined According to the Light of Nature*. London: William Shrowsbery.

Hansard. 1809. *House of Commons Debate, 13 June 1809*, vol. 14, cc1029–32.

Hansard. 1876. *House of Commons Debate, 9 August 1876*, vol. 231, cc886–931.

Hansard. 1879. *House of Lords Debate, 15 July 1879*, vol. 248, cc419–36.

Hendry, George Stuart. 1980. *Theology of Nature*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Henry, Matthew. 1710 [2008]. *Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendickson.

Hinde, William. 1641. *A Faithful Remonstrance of the Holy Life and Happy Death of John Bruen of Bruen-Stapleford, in the County of Chester, Esquire*. London: Philemon Stephens, and Christopher Meredith.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness as They Came Out of Gods Hands, and the Good Mans Mercy to the Brute Creatures, Which God Hath Put Under His Feet*. London: Tho. Parkhurst.

Homes, Nathaniel. 1654 [1833]. *The Resurrection Revealed*. London: Simpkin & Marshall.

Kant, Immanuel. 1784 [2001]. *Lectures on Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keeble, N. H. 1987. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Luther, Martin. 1958. *Works*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing.

Manton, Thomas. 1684 [1870]. *The Complete Works*. Vol. 12. London: James Nisbet & Co.

Marion, Jean-Luc. 2012. *God Without Being*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

More, Hannah. 1840. "History of Tom White, the Postboy." In *The Complete Works of Hannah More*, Vol. 1, 224–231. New York: Harper.

Murray, Shannon. 2010. "A Book for Boys and Girls: Or, Country Rhimes for Children: Bunyan and Literature for Children." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bunyan*, edited by Anne Dunan-Page, 120–134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Northcott, Michael S. 1996. *The Environment and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Owen, John. 1691. "Preface to the Reader." *In Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ*, by John Owen. London: B.A.

Preece, Rod, and Lorna Chamberlain. 1993. *Animal Welfare and Human Values*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Primatt, Humphrey. 1776 [1992]. *The Duty of Mercy and the Sin of Cruelty*. Fontwell, Sussex: Centaur Press.

Rawlinson, John. 1612. *Mercy to a Beast: A Sermon Preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke 1612*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Ray, John. 1714. *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation*. London: William Innys.

Ray, John. 1721. *Three Physico-Theological Discourses*. London: William and John Innys.

Santmire, H. Paul. 1985. *The Travail of Nature*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Sidney, Philip. 1580 [1999]. *The Old Arcadia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singer, Peter. 2015. *Animal Liberation*. London: The Bodley Head.

Spurgeon, C. H. n.d. *Collected Works*. Vol. 3. London: Wesleyan Methodist Bookroom.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1885. *The Treasury of David*. London: Marshall Bothers.

Stoll, Mark. 2006. "Creating Ecology: Protestants and the Moral Community of Creation." In *Religion and the New Ecology*, edited by David M. Lodge and Christopher Hamlin, 53–72. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.

Taylor, Angus. 2009. *Animals and Ethics*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Toplady, Augustus. 1794 [1849]. "Speech Delivered at the Queens Arms." In *Collected Works of Augustus Toplady*, edited by J. Cornish, Vol. III, 459–466. London: Baynes.

Trapp, John. 1657 [1868]. *Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*. Vol. 2. London: Dickinson.

Walker, George. 1641. *God Made Visible in His Works, or a Treatise of the External Works of God*. London: John Bartlet.

Watson, Thomas. 1692. *A Body of Practical Divinity*. London: Thomas Parkurst.

Wesley, John. 1771 [1872]. "The General Deliverance." In *Sermons on Several Occasions*, vol. 2. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

Wesley, John. 2017. *Wesley's Notes on the Bible*. Vol. 1. Woodstock, ON: Devoted Publishing.

Willet, Andrew. 1632. *Hexapla in Gensin*. Vol. 1. London: Thomas Man, Paul Man, and Jonah Man.

Withrow King, Sarah. 2016. *Animals Are Not Ours*. Eugene: Cascade Books.

Worster, Donald. 1993. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford Universety Press.

Young, Richard Alan. 1999. *Is God a Vegetarian?* Chicago: Open Court.

Fall: Animal Suffering and Human Agency

…have our sinnes in Adam brought such calamities upon them [animals], and shall we add unto them by cruelty in our owne persons? (Dod and Cleaver 1612, 142)

For much of the period I am discussing, and for most people, there was no advantage to being able to recognise that animals suffer. Indeed, such a recognition might inhibit or even prevent the pragmatic use of animal bodies upon which most people's lives rested. It is therefore striking that nonconformists developed an ability to talk about animal suffering which made sense to their hearers. Moreover, they cared about it sufficiently to try to do something about it. This chapter analyses that discourse.

The 'Shock and Ruin of the World' (Calvin 1551 [1851], 11.6)

Animal suffering had always been evident in nature, and is in obvious conflict with the picture of a theatre of God's glory described in the last chapter. Animal fierceness raises questions for the doctrine that animals are innocent. When a fox takes the chickens, it seems to show that some animals are more innocent than others. Moreover, humans are not the 'gentle masters' of Eden envisaged by Martin Luther (1958, vol. 2, 132).

Human cruelty has been all too clear for millennia in farming practices and blood sports. But from the seventeenth century, new, and newly

visible, forms of cruelty appeared with improved transport, urbanisation and the rationalisation of farming. By the eighteenth century, this had become endemic to town life. William Hogarth's *Four Stages of Cruelty* (1751) portray a variety of cruelties towards animals including urban youths torturing animals, a driver flogging a carriage horse, a drover flogging sheep and bull baiting. The pictures were, he tells us, 'engraved with the hope of, in some degree, correcting that barbarous treatment of animals, the very sight of which renders the streets of our metropolis so distressing to every feeling mind' (Hogarth 1833, 65).

In this new cultural and social context a novel way of speaking about animal suffering consolidated, and systematic pressure for legislative change grew. This new discourse certainly drew upon the ontological value and ethical standing of animals in the nonconformist discourse of Creation. But it was their doctrine of the Fall which provided a language for understanding the animal cruelty everywhere visible around them; and for identifying human culpability. Human beings had fallen from their original state, and 'humanness' is deeply riven and transgressive; this, they argued, has had an impact upon animal creation.

Animal Suffering

In early modernity, the pragmatic use of animals for human survival did not usually attract ethical debate. Where it did, animal suffering was commonly framed within a Thomist tradition. It is normal; the higher have a natural right to use the lower. Moreover, the bestiary tradition encouraged an allegorical understanding of animal behaviour, pointing to a moral precept. The nonconformists found little support for any of this in the biblical texts. Instead, they discovered a way of speaking about animal suffering as real but *abnormal*, a distortion of the Creation order produced by the Fall. Just as Creation discourse favoured a realist understanding of animals rather than the hermeneutic of the bestiary tradition, so Fall discourse favoured a realist understanding of their suffering. In place of the natural right tradition, nonconformists found that the biblical texts spoke of suffering as part of the 'groaning' of creation, absent from the beginning and to that extent *un*-natural (Rom. 8).

The desire to give the biblical canon priority led many to reform the tradition they had inherited, with varying degrees of success. Despite the uneven results, they generated a distinctive discourse of animal *suffering* and human culpability. Appearances aside, animals are innocent, including inconvenient or troublesome ones (Santmire 1985, 125). The animal

fierceness which would say otherwise was re-read as the groaning of the Creation order, abnormal and unjustifiable. Animal creation desires to fulfil its purpose of praise, and struggles against its human abusers.

Most contemporary discussions of Christianity and animals focus upon creation discourse, although some environmental historians note that the language of the Fall played a part in early ecological concerns (Stoll 2006, 58/9; Dunlap 2004, 167; Berry 2015, 28). In the animal advocacy of the nonconformists, there is no doubt that discourses of the Fall played a major role, probably more than that of creation, for they place responsibility for animal suffering squarely at the feet of humans. Animals, says George Walker (1641, 160–161), 'by our transgression are made subject to vanity and corruption, under which they groane together with us.' George Abbot (1613, 452) says animals suffer and sorrow for human sin, and Jeremiah Burroughs (1654 [1992], 174) that the 'whole world is put under vanity through man's sin'. For Thomas Boston (1720 [1964], 69), animal suffering is part of a violent world reminiscent of Darwinian survival of the fittest. 'Since Cain shed the blood of Abel', he says, 'the earth has been turned into a slaughterhouse; and the chase has been continued since Nimrod began his hunting; on the earth, as in the sea, the greater still devouring the lesser.' Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 347) argued that human sin had destroyed the joy of both God and creation: Had man been true to his obligations, 'God would then have rejoiced in his works… [and] his works would have rejoiced in the honour of answering [their calling]'. By contrast with human sinfulness, animals still 'continue innocent in themselves, they are often imployed in Gods service, alwaies praysing God in their owne kinde, and never incurre the breach of his law, but are patient, notwithstanding our immoderate and inordinate abuse' (Goodman 1622, 29). 'No creatures, except the fallen angels and man, ever transgressed the law or disobeyed the word of their Creator' (Venning 1669, 75). In short, human agency is the cause of cruelty, with human complicity at the very origin of suffering; animals remain innocent.

A 'Fiend Incarnate'

This way of speaking about animal suffering has obvious implications for the ethical status of humans in comparison with animals. Since humans are intended to conduct creation's great song of praise (e.g. Ps. 148), cruelty to animals subverts what it is to be distinctively human. Speaking of the cruelty he witnessed on nineteenth-century roads, Charles Bridges

(1865, 121) complained that the 'brutal habits …, the coarse words, inhuman blows, and hard tyranny on the public roads is disgraceful to our nature.' Adam Clarke (1831, Prov. 12.10) went further: it makes us, he says, 'human fiends': 'The hell is yet undescribed, that is suited to such monsters in cruelty'. For John Tillotson (1700, 129–130) animal cruelty 'is devilish, this is the temper of hell, and the very spirit of the destroyer.'

C. H. Spurgeon (1873, 332) similarly viewed animal cruelty as subversive of human identity, describing it as 'a diabolical refinement of cruelty which makes us blush to belong to the race of man': a man cruel to animals is a 'demon' and 'a fiend incarnate'. He commends the lines of the poet Martin Tupper who, pleading for an ill-treated horse, wrote that 'The Angel of Mercy stoppeth not to comfort, but passeth by on the other side, And he hath no tear to shed, when a cruel man is damned'. Spurgeon's endorsement of so severe a judgement of animal cruelty is striking, for he would certainly have taken the implications of these lines with absolute seriousness. Animal cruelty is an obstacle to salvation.

Very few people like to be thought wicked, let alone demonic; and the nonconformists did not take such matters lightly. The fact that distinguished divines used such extreme language would have been very disturbing to them. When John Calvin (1583, 770) warned his farming congregation in 1555 that 'God will condemne us for cruell and unkinde folke, if we pitie not the brute beasts', we may suppose that animal welfare standards around Geneva rose. In a parliamentary debate on vivisection some 300 years later, the Earl of Shaftesbury (Hansard 1876, 1022 and 1024) refers to one practitioner as a 'demi-fiend', and to those trained as vivisectors as 'a set of young devils.' Nowadays we might be inclined to hear this as rhetoric, but it is worth recalling that in the mid-sixteenth century, to be condemned by God was the worst thing that could happen to a person; and nineteenth-century evangelicals like Shaftesbury spoke of devils with dread.

Riotous Eaters of Flesh (Prov. 23.20)

In early modern Europe, killing animals was a routine part of good stock management when feed scarcity prevented their overwintering; as a bonus, their flesh provided food when other sources were unavailable. But for nonconformists, animal slaughter had a meaning which exceeded pragmatic survival.

Most nonconformists believed that it was human sin which had so degraded creation as to make the vegan diet of Eden impossible. We 'could not [now] live on the fruits of the earth alone' if we could not eat flesh, says Martin Luther (1958, vol. 2, 133). Andrew Willet (1632, 18) argued that flesh eating was an immediate consequence of the fall, but most agreed with John Calvin (1578 [1847], 1.28) that the turning point was the narrative of Noah's flood: 'For they judge prudently who maintain that the earth was so marred by the deluge, that we retain scarcely a moderate portion of the original benediction. Even immediately after the fall of man, it had already begun to bring forth degenerate and noxious fruits, but at the deluge, the change became still greater' (also Luther 1958, vol. 1, 71; Trapp 1662 [1867], vol. 1, 21). The flood, says Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Gen. 9.1–7) 'having perhaps washed away much of the virtue of the earth, and so rendered its fruits less pleasing and less nourishing, God now enlarged the [vegan] grant, and allowed man to eat flesh, which perhaps man himself never thought of, till now that God directed him to it, nor had any more desire to than a sheep has to suck blood like a wolf'.

'It Was Sin That Made Us Butchers'

To eat animal flesh was to be reminded that they were sinners, that they had betrayed the dominion entrusted to them. For Adam, says Luther (1958, vol. 2, 134) 'it would have been an abomination to kill a little bird for food'. Thomas Adams (1630, 137) laments that 'if man had not sinned, no beast should have been killed'. This should, he says, motivate compassion: 'let this temperate our authority from unmerciful tyranny; it was sin that made us butchers, and taught the master to eat the servant'. Richard Baxter (1691, 39) seems almost to give this symbolic function of meat eating greater emphasis than nutrition: 'God allows us to take away the lives of our fellow creatures and to eate their flesh, to show what sin hath brought on the world, and what we deserve ourselves'. Nor was he alone. George Abbot (1613, 448–449) noted that when 'we see the seriousness of slaughter, we recall our own sin which deserves no less'. Taking his cue from the Mosaic law, Andrew Bonar (1846 [1966], 27) also regards slaughter as 'a testimony against sin'. He compares it with the execution of Jesus of Nazareth, and is especially struck by 'the awful violence done to one so pure, so tender, and so lovely. We shrink back from the terrible harshness of the act, whether it be plunging the knife

into the neck of the innocent lamb, or wringing off the head of the tender dove.'

In a curious anticipation of modern scientific findings, some referred to the inferiority of a meat diet compared with the veganism of Eden. George Walker (1641, 234) claimed that neither 'fish nor flesh, nor all the dainties and forced dishes of the world … can so nourish and strengthen a man, as herbes and fruit'. Luther (1958, vol. 1, 72) anticipates that a flesh diet would bring corruption of the appetite, and injury to human health: 'leprous obesity'. This did not amount to a prohibition of eating flesh, which would anyway have been perceived as 'popish' legalism, seeking to gain merit by 'works' of abstinence (Babington 1604, 92–93). Nevertheless, it does mark grave disquiet at a meat diet. 'I am convinced', wrote the elderly Richard Baxter (1691, 39), 'that to eate flesh is lawful, and yet all my daies it hath gone, as against my nature, with some regret; which hath made me the more contented that God hath made me long renounce it through the necessity of nature, in my decrepite age.'

'DISCORD AMONG THE CREATURES OF GOD'

Not only was human diet affected by the Fall and subsequent flood, but disharmony spread to all creation. In particular, some animals became fierce and began to eat the others. The Fall had triggered the transformation of the kinship of creation into a Darwin-like 'family' of competition and struggle for survival. John Calvin (1551 [1851], 11.6) was obviously exercised by the cruelty he observed in the natural world, and sought an account consistent with the biblical canon:

> Whence comes the cruelty of brutes, which prompts the stronger to seize and rend and devour with dreadful violence the weaker animals? There would certainly have been no discord among the creatures of God, if they had remained in their first and original condition. When they exercise cruelty towards each other, and the weak need to be protected against the strong, it is an evidence of the disorder which has sprung from the sinfulness of man.

Even the most venomous creatures were originally 'created harmless', says Walker (1641, 163); they 'should not have been hurtfull, if man had not fallen by his transgression' (Willett 1632, vol. 1, 16).

Creatures Grieve to Serve Us

If the nonconformist discourse of the Fall transformed the meaning of animal violence from a normal to an abnormal feature of nature, it also affected the way they talked about the animals themselves. Creation had given animals an absolute ontological and ethical status, but the Fall raised a new aspect: their relative status to human beings. Animals are innocent; humans are not. Animals struggle to praise God against human resistance. Animals suffer unjustly at human hands and can call upon God to right their wrongs. This way of talking about animals gave them an agency which had few comparisons before the late twentieth century. Animals don't just groan passively; they are agents of groaning.

Animal suffering appears in nonconformist discourse as real and caused by humans, both immediately and in its origins. But animal suffering has a further meaning: it diminishes God's praise in the world, and this adds to their suffering, for the innocent animals remain determined to fulfil their calling to worship God. Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 161–162) reflects that the creature does not serve 'wicked men in their lusts' willingly, for 'the first institution was for God's glory and the benefit of man'. He suggests that for the creatures, 'it would be a grief to serve God's enemies [i.e. men], and to such vile uses as they abuse them.' Man's sin, says Jeremiah Burroughs (1654 [1992], 174), 'is a burden to heaven and earth, to all creatures'. According to Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 347) human dominion had become not just a burden to animals, but a stain on their 'honour' when they were 'debased to serve the lusts of a traitor'; this was 'vilifying the creature'.

'Cry to God for Revenge'

To modern minds this is surprising enough, but in nonconformist animal discourse animals may also hold us to account. If they are innocently suffering the consequences of human sin, they have ground for complaint against humans to the God of justice. God hears the cry of the ravens, which 'though they cried not unto the Lord, as the men did, yet they cried after their usage' (King 1594 [1864], 235), 'and he that hears the young ravens, may hear them, for "he is gracious"' (Trapp 1662 [1867], Prov. 12.10).

It is, they considered, the character of God to hear complaints and to vindicate the innocent. This is doubly so if we humans exacerbate our

fault by deliberately increasing the suffering of the innocent; if we add to their groaning. Ralph Venning (1669, 74) has animals lamenting: 'O sinful sin! I was freeborn and though under dominion, yet not under bondage. Once I served men freely but now from fear (Gen. 9.2). Every creature which is under the power of man may say to him, I did nothing of myself to make me liable to bondage, but being your goods and chattels, I suffer a part of the penalty of your treason. If you had not sinned, I would not have suffered. But now I groan and wait to be delivered from the bondage of your corruption. O sinful sin!'.

Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 165 and 182) envisions that, as a consequence of human injustice, unmercifulness and oppression, the creatures 'will cry to God for revenge…': 'the creature groaneth against us; because of the slavery we put them unto they groan for vengeance and destruction; not in fellow feeling with thee, but in indignation against thee, if thou be a wicked man… [It is] a groaning by way of accusation and appeal, for revenge against those who have wronged us. We have abused the creature; the groan of a worm in the ear of the Lord of Hosts will be heard…' 'In the day of judgement, the groans of the creature… shall be brought forth as witnesses against us… the very creatures which sinners abused will be brought in testimony against them to their conviction and condemnation'. Edward Topsell (1599, 195) pictures all the beasts bellowing, bleating, barking, neighing and howling, 'calling in the eares of God for vengeance against man'. In a letter of support to the London Anti-vivisection Society, C. H. Spurgeon (1899, 128) protested against 'the inhuman practice of vivisection': 'How it must excite the righteous indignation of the all-merciful Creator!'

For Joseph Alleine (1672, 119–120), the creatures are in 'unsufferable' bondage, 'abused by the ungodly, contrary to their natures, and the ends that the great Creatour made them for'; Alleine speaks of their unwillingness to serve sinful men, and pictures God's 'poor beast' seeking permission to exact vengeance. Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 165) seems to envisage the abused animals actively participating in judgement: those 'that put a burden on the creature shall have the creature's burden put on them. By your sin they are subjected to vanity, and by their vanity you are subjected to wrath; they are ready to revenge God's quarrel if he do but hiss for them (Isa. 7.18)… the creature shall be delivered; but those that abuse the creature shall not.'

This language appears to attribute a degree of agency to animals which is rarely found elsewhere. Some were evidently uneasy about this,

and were torn between the familiar, pragmatic interpretation of these pericopes as figurative, and a more direct reading such as we have seen above. George Abbot (1613, 454–455) notes that, when cattle are said to cry to God for help, they cannot do so with understanding such as men have, 'and yet the Lord…respecteth all their cryes, and taketh many of those cryes as a kind of calling on him. We need not feare to speake that, which the Spirit of God hath spoken.' He refers to the young ravens crying to God (Ps. 147.9), and considers that to treat this metaphorically is to be 'more scrupulous then (sic) neede is'.

Animals were made to praise God and, as Alleine put it, humans abuse them contrary to their nature and 'the ends that the great Creatour made them for'. Creation is sickened by such behaviour. Some nonconformists were very outspoken about this, intertexting pericopes such as Lev. 18.25, Mic. 2.10, Jer. 9.19 and Rom. 8.19–22 to develop a language which is now unfamiliar, even shocking, to most Christians. The land, says John Trapp (1647, 178), is 'burdened' with humans, and 'longeth for a vomit to spue us out, as the most unthankfull and unworthy people that ever Gods Sun shone upon, and Gods rain fell upon'. Jonathan Edwards (1741, 13) agrees: 'Were it not that so is the sovereign Pleasure of God, the Earth would not bear you one Moment; for you are a Burden to it; …God's Creatures are Good, and were made for Men to serve God with, and don't willingly subserve to any other Purpose, and groan when they are abused to Purposes so directly contrary to their Nature and End. And the World would spue you out, were it not for the sovereign Hand of him who hath subjected it in Hope'. This is very far from anthropocentrism, and few modern ways of speaking would enable such things to be said. An exception might be some attempts to view humans from the point of view of other species which have also generated tropes of sickness in which humans feature as a disease (Foreman 1991, 57).

But if animals can call on God for judgement of the cruel man, they can also intercede for the kind man. Thomas Adams (1630, 175–176) pictures animals saying: 'Having dealt kindly with us on earth, may God deal mercifully with thee in heaven.'

This active language of complaint, judgement and even intercession is the precise opposite of the passive modern discourse conventionally used of animals and discussed in Chapter 3. The meaning of what it is to be an animal within this nonconformist discourse is incompatible with the modern vision. New perceptions of their ethical relationship with

humans arose not from new-found knowledge about their capacities, but from the relationship itself. The extremity of animal suffering is brought starkly to our attention as a contrast with their creational ability to praise which so far exceeds our own. Balaska (2016, 12) has recently explored this relational aspect of ethical discourse.

HUMAN DUTIES
AND THE NONCONFORMIST CONSCIENCE

The few contemporary discussions of Fall discourse and nature treat it as a 'partial loss' of human dominion (Leiss 1994, 31). Nonconformist opinions about the impact of the Fall on human dominion varied but, as already indicated, were characteristically far more pessimistic. George Abbot (1613, 451) spoke for many when he observed that 'mans dominion is scanted, and drawne into a narrow roome'; the 'name and word "dominion" [is] as a mere title, but the substance itself has been almost entirely lost' (Luther 1958, vol. 1, 67). Looking about them, they saw not dominion, but tyranny; in response they spoke of 'stewardship', but as a call to accountability rather than in the modern sense of an ethic for managed development.

'Deem It No Gloire to Swell in Tyranny'
(Sidney 1580 [1999], 225)

The earlier nonconformists did not have access to a modern language of rights, but they did speak of *rightful* dealing. This was a duty arising from God's covenants, not a matter of individual 'rights' based upon the possession of human capacities. All duty therefore carries the same obligation, whether towards humans or animals. As Calvin (1583, 877) insists: '… as we deal rightfully with men, so we should use the like duty even towards the brute beasts, which have no reason, nor understanding, nor cannot complain of the injuries which are done unto them'.

Although 'rights' discourse did not exist in the modern sense, the language of lordship and tyranny was current, and fresh in the minds of those who had lived through the English civil war and interregnum. This provided an apt way of talking about human behaviour towards animals as a result of the Fall. John King (1594 [1864], 235–236) anticipated later nonconformists in his striking sermon of human government over the animal realm:

We have changed our government into tyranny, and are not content with the rule, unless we seek the spoil, nor with the use and commodity, unless we work the ruin and wreck of our poor bond-servants. …But we, the nocent [guilty] wretches of the world, workers of all iniquity, deserving not rods but scorpions, cause innocency itself to be scourged for our transgressions. But that the providence of God restraineth them, it is a marvel that they break not their league, and shake off their yoke of obedience towards us, and with their horns and hoofs, and other natural artillery, make war upon us as their unrighteous lords, whom it sufficeth not to have used their service alone, unless we plunge them besides into such indeserved vengeance.

King's intertexting of the messianic pericope of Is. 53.5 ('scourged for our transgression') in relation to animals would not have been lost on his contemporaries. But King is not alone. 'We are Lords over them, 'tis true; but we must not play the Tyrants over them', preached Thomas Hodges (1675, 26) nearly a hundred years later. Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Gen. 9.1–7) comments in respect of slaughter and eating: humans 'must be lords, but not tyrants; they might kill them for their profit, but not torment them for their pleasure, nor tear away the member of a creature while it was yet alive, and eat that.' God 'would not have tyranny exercised on them', say Dod and Cleaver (1612, 141).

In modernity, animal *rights* are debatable in a way that human rights are not. An animal's differences from humans tend to be perceived as deficits and obstacles to extending human rights to them. Indeed, an animal is more likely to be accorded rights on the basis of some similarity with human capacities (such as language or reason) than by a difference (such as a more acute sense of smell). But for nonconformists rightful dealing arises, not from a right based in a human-like capacity, but from God having made man and animal as the creatures they are. The duty of rightful dealing towards an animal is no more to be doubted than that towards a human. When humans elevate themselves above animals on account of their supposedly superior attributes, then 'we abuse the other creatures, because we forget our selves to be creatures', says Thomas Adams (1629, 1119). Humans, as fellow creatures, have a duty of stewardship. A good man will be merciful to his beast, comments Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Prov. 12.10), 'because it is *God's* creature… The beasts that are under our care must …in no case be abused or tyrannised over'. Man can have 'no natural right to abuse and torment a beast' simply because humans are more intelligent or have abilities animals lack

(Primatt 1776, 12 and 18). To deny rightful dealing on the ground of a difference in capacities is tyrannous. Nature did not intend distinctions between creatures 'for right of tyranny or oppression'.

This language has immediate practical implications for the nonconformist conscience which must prepare itself to give an account to God. This might not carry much weight nowadays, but the nonconformists took it very seriously indeed. Stewardship is a call to accountability. Thomas Hodges (1675, 37) agrees that animals 'may be our servants' but, he says, they are 'Fellow-creatures with us, yea our Fellowservants to the great Lord of Heaven and Earth… And [we] must give an account when our Lord Christ comes, if he find us beating our fellow-servants…'. This, as John Calvin (1559 [1845], 3.x.5) explains, should regulate our behaviour: 'Scripture declares that [earthly blessings] have all been given us by the kindness of God, and appointed for our use under the condition of being regarded as trusts, of which we must one day give account. We must, therefore, administer them as if we constantly heard the words sounding in our ears, "Give an account of your stewardship."'

This understanding of stewardship is more specific than the modern sense of an ethic for managed development, and owes much to pericopes such as Matt. 5.14f, Lk. 12.42f, 16.1f, and 1Cor. 4.1f which emphasise accountability and consequence. In 1879, Lord Shaftesbury gave a speech in parliament, in which he referred to a harrowing description of the vivisection of a dog. He commented: 'And that was the use they made of the creatures committed to their charge! that the account they would render of their stewardship!' (Hansard 1879, 430).

Good stewards are not tyrants, and the most obvious tyranny over animals is cruelty.

Horrid Cruelty

To speak of the world mechanistically has an ancient lineage, and Calvin (1559 [1845], 1.xvi.1 and 9) was as opposed to the image of creation as a 'machine' as strongly as he was to the idea that events are fortuitous. In early modern Europe, the application of such language to animals is especially associated with Descartes, although it is debatable whether his view entailed rejecting an animal's capacity to feel (Cottingham 1993, 16). If an animal is an automaton, its screams are the 'noise of breaking machinery' and may be ignored (Mahaffy 1880, 181). As we saw in the last chapter,

the nonconformists rejected this view, and spoke of animal suffering as real; they are not automata. They are capable of pleasure or pain, and it is wrong to make them suffer. Christian people must not, says Thomas Manton (1684 [1870], 180), be like those who 'have no ear to hear these groans' of animals in 'great misery… while they serve sinful man'. Again, this does not depend upon our perceptions of an animal's capacities or significance: birds 'may seem of no value to us', says Calvin (1583, 775), 'but God will tolerate no cruelty to them'. Cruelty is wrong because it is the antithesis of God's care for his world. There is, says John Tillotson (1700, 129), 'nothing more contrary to the nature of God' than animal cruelty. Dod and Cleaver (1612, 141) concur; God made animals and 'preserves them and is good to them', so we 'shew our selves unlike unto him, and hurtful to his, if we offer abuse and wrong unto them'.

The most common occasion for animal suffering was, and still is, slaughter. Many nonconformists understood the exsanguination provisions in Gen. 9.4 as intended to reduce cruelty at slaughter; draining the blood from an animal before dismemberment or cooking ensures it is dead. It is, notes Albert Barnes (1884–1885 [1996], Gen. 9.4), to 'prevent the horrid cruelty of mutilating or cooking an animal while yet alive and capable of suffering pain. …[it is a] restraint from savage cruelty.' John Gill (1763 [1811], Gen. 9.4) agrees: an animal 'should not be devoured alive, as… might be by riotous flesh eaters, before the flood;… The design of this [exsanguination] was to restrain cruelty in men'. Henry Ainsworth (1627 [1843], Gen. 9.4) also concludes that this law against eating flesh with the blood 'seemeth to be against cruelty, not to eat any part while the creature is alive', and he points out that the 'Hebrew Doctors make this the seventh commandment given to the sons of Noah which all nations were bound to keep'. By the eighteenth century, restraints upon cruelty during slaughter had spread far beyond nonconformity (Parker 1735, 48).

That Fearful Brand

Blood sports such as cockfighting and bear-baiting were common activities until the nineteenth century, and nonconformists used the language developed above to oppose them. They are 'unlawful because the ground of them is the enmity of the creature, which was the punishment for sinne' (Cooper 1615, 106).

The 'Antipathie and crueltie, which one beast sheweth to another, is the fruit of our rebellion against God', says William Perkins (1606, 589), so it is egregious wickedness to exacerbate it. 'Have our corruptions bin a cause of that fierceness that is in many of them one against another, and shall we solace our selves in seeing them execute it?' ask John Dod and Robert Cleaver (1612, 142), emphasising that this is a matter of conscience: 'when men make a sport of making them [beasts] miserable; when it is a pleasure to put them to paine: when it is a pastime to behold their torment and tearing. This proceedeth not from a tender heart'. Hinde (1641, 31/2) is clear: 'I think it utterly unlawfull for any man, to take pleasure in the paine or torture of any creature, or delight himselfe in the tyranny, which the creatures exercise one over another, or to make a recreation of their brutish cruelty which they practise one upon another'.

Intertexting the gospel warning that we will be judged according to the measure by which we judge others (Matt. 7.2), they taught that such wickedness invites judgement by the same measure as we use for the animal's suffering. 'If thou pitie not… thy beast', reasons John Rawlinson (1612, 27), 'what dost thou else, but teach God not to pardon, but punish thine offences'. If we participate in cruel sports, comment John Dod and Robert Cleaver (1612, 142), 'it may justly returne upon our selves, their teeth, or hornes, or pawes assaulting us, or else Gods owne hand by some other means, revenging their wrongs'. During a Parliamentary debate on bull baiting in 1802, Sir Richard Hill references this language of 'cruelty towards the brute creation', citing Balaam's ass which 'through the immediate power of the Almighty, rebuked the cruelty of his owner' (Woodfall 1802, 296 and 8).

The nineteenth-century historian, Lord Macaulay, was aware of the prevalence of nonconformist language in debates about animal welfare reform, but he found it uncongenial. He is often quoted as denying that there was a genuine desire to protect 'beasts against the wanton cruelty of men': 'The Puritans hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Indeed, he generally contrived to enjoy the double pleasure of tormenting both spectators and bear'. This is witty but false (Sampson 2001, 84).

Radical Animal Advocacy

The nonconformist discourse of the Fall generated a distinctive and coherent language of human complicity in animal suffering rarely found elsewhere before the twentieth century. Bible commentaries and sermons displayed a sometimes extreme outspokenness, even describing animal cruelty as demonic in an age which took demons more seriously than we do today. Christians were taught that they will be required to give an account to God if they are cruel to animals. To the modern mind this prospect may not be of great concern, but numerous nonconformist spiritual biographies confirm that they took it very seriously indeed. It is difficult to know how commonly preachers spoke about cruelty as most sermons have been lost, but such sermons were sufficiently common to be referenced in Parliamentary debates, and for Methodists and Puritans to be perceived as ringleaders of animal advocacy with their 'fanatical doctrines'. Fall discourse was used by animal advocates such as Lord Shaftesbury, Richard Hill and C. H. Spurgeon, and from the eighteenth century was preached widely outside the nonconformist community.

If the discourse of the Fall taught christians not to be tyrants, then discourses of Redemption pointed to a better way of living with animals, and will be the subject of the next chapter.

Bibliography

Abbot, George. 1613. *An Exposition upon the Prophet Jonah*. London: Richard Field.

Adams, Thomas. 1629. "Meditations upon Some Part of the Creed." In *The Workes of Thomas Adams, Being the Summe of His Sermons, Meditations, and Other divine and Morall Discourses*, 1087–1240. London: John Grismand.

Adams, Thomas. 1630. *Works*. Vol. 3. London: John Grismand.

Ainsworth, Henry. 1627 [1843]. *Annotations on the Pentateuch*. Vol. 1. Glasgow: Blackie and Son.

Alleine, Joseph. 1672. *An Alarme to Unconverted Sinners*. London: Nevil Simmons.

Babington, Gervase. 1604. *Comfortable Notes upon the Bookes of Exodus and Leviticus*. London: Printed by H. Lownes and T. Purfoot for Thomas Chard.

Balaska, Maria. 2016. "What Guides Moral Consideration?" *Journal of Animal Ethics* 6 (1): 10–19.

Barnes, Albert. 1884–1885 [1996]. *Notes on the Whole Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Baxter, Richard. 1691. "The Poor Husbandman's Advocate to Rich Racking Landlords." In *The Reverend Richard Baxter's Last Treatise*, edited by F. J. Powicke, 1926. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism*. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Bonar, Andrew. 1846 [1966]. *A Commentary on Leviticus*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.

Boston, Thomas. 1720 [1964]. *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*. London: Banner of Truth.

Bridges, Charles. 1865. *Proverbs*. New York: Robert Carter.

Burroughs, Jeremiah. 1654 [1992]. *Evil of Evils*. Ligonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Press.

Calvin, John. 1551 [1851]. *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1559 [1845]. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1578 [1847]. *A Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by John King. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1583. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: John Harison.

Charnock, Stephen. c1660 [1864]. "A Discourse on the Goodness of God." In *Works*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: James Nicol.

Clarke, Adam. 1831. *Commentary on the Bible*. New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh.

Cooper, Thomas. 1615. *The Art of Giving. Describing the True Nature, and Right Use of Liberality: And Proving That These Dayes of the Gospell Have Farre Exceeded the Former Times of Superstition in True Charitie and Magnificence*. London: T. Pavier.

Cottingham, John G. 1993. *A Descartes Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dod, John, and Robert Cleaver. 1612. *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Eleventh and Twelfth Chapter of the Proverbs*. London: Thomas Man.

Dunlap, Thomas. 2004. *Faith in Nature: Environmentalism as Religious Quest*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Edwards, Jonathan. 1741. *Sinners in the Hand of an Angry God*. Boston: S. Kneeland and T. Green.

Foreman, Dave. 1991. *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*. New York: Crown.

Gill, John. 1763 [1811]. *Exposition of the Entire Bible*. London: William Woodward.

Goodman, Godfrey. 1622. *The Creatures Praysing God*. London: Felik Kingston.

Hansard. 1876. *HL Deb 22 May 1876*. Vol. 229, cc1001–34.

Hansard. 1879. *HL Deb 15 July 1879*. Vol. 248, cc419–36.

Henry, Matthew. 1710 [2008]. *Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendickson.

Hinde, William. 1641. *A Faithful Remonstrance of the Holy Life and Happy Death of John Bruen of Bruen-Stapleford, in the County of Chester, Esquire*. London: Philemon Stephens and Christopher Meredith.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness, as They Came Out of God's Hands*. London: Tho. Parkhurst.

Hogarth, William. 1833. *Anecdotes of William Hogarth, Written by Himself*. London: J. B. Nichols and Son.

King, John. 1594 [1864]. *Lectures upon Jonah*. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Leiss, William. 1994. *The Domination of Nature*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Luther, Martin. 1958. *Works*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing.

Mahaffy, John Pentland. 1880. *Descartes*. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood.

Manton, Thomas. 1684 [1870]. *The Complete Works*. Vol. 12. London: James Nisbet & Co.

Parker, Benjamin. 1735. *A Second Volume of Philosophical Meditations*. Derby: T. J. Warren.

Perkins, William. 1606. *The Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience*. Cambridge: John Legat.

Primatt, Humphrey. 1776 [1992]. *The Duty of Mercy and the Sin of Cruelty*. Fontwell, Sussex: Centaur Press.

Rawlinson, John. 1612. *Mercy to a Beast: A Sermon Preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Sampson, Philip J. 2001. *6 Modern Myths*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Santmire, H. Paul. 1985. *The Travail of Nature*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Sidney, Philip. 1580 [1999]. *The Old Arcadia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1873. "A Word for Brutes Against Brutes." *Sword and the Trowel* 3 (June): 332–338.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1899. *Spurgeon's Autobiography*. Vol. 4. Cincinnati: Curts and Jennings.

Stoll, Mark. 2006. "Creating Ecology: Protestants and the Moral Community of Creation." In *Religion and the New Ecology*, edited by David M. Lodge and Christopher Hamlin, 53–72. Indiana: University of Notre Dame.

Tillotson, John. 1700. "The Mercy of God." In *Works*, vol. 7. London: Ralph Barker.

Topsell, Edward. 1599. *Times Lamentation: Or an Exposition of the Prophet Joel*. London: George Potter.

Trapp, John. 1662 [1867]. *Commentary on the Old and New Testaments.* London: Dickinson.

Trapp, John. 1647. *A Commentary or Exposition upon the Four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles.* London: John Bellamie.

Venning, Ralph. 1669. *Sin, the Plague of Plagues.* London: John Hancock.

Walker, George. 1641. *God Made Visible in His Works.* London: John Bartlet.

Willet, Andrew. 1632. *Hexapla in Gensin.* Vol. 1. London: Thomas Man, Paul Man, and Jonah Man.

Woodfall, W. 1802. *The Parliamentary Register.* Vol. 3, H.C. May 24. London: John Stockdale.

Redemption: Hope, Love and Restoration

> It can hardly be thought that God made the world to be, a little moment after he had reared it, sullied by the sin of man, and turned from its original end, without thoughts of a restoration of it to its true end, as well as man to his lost happiness. (Charnock, c1660 [1864], 347)

Ethical debate about the humane treatment of animals usually includes discussion of the relief of suffering, and Preece (2005a, 4–6) has drawn attention to the inevitable self-disclosure which occurs in writing about this. The norms of academe demand objectivity; yet to speak of horrors with detachment already misrepresents them by distancing us from pain. It also risks subverting the very kernel of ethics, which is not just to conceptualise the good, but entails an imperative to promote it. Conversely, passionate advocacy may sacrifice objective accuracy, and undermine its own case; ethics collapses into sentiment. This tension between objectivity and subjective experience is part of a wider twentieth-century debate. The early social sciences sought objective knowledge of the human world using a positivist, Newtonian model of science. The later twentieth century rediscovered an understanding of human life involving empathy, interpretation and action (Giddens 1976). This discovery enriched the study of *human* social life, but the natural world, including animals, remained the province of *objective* science rather than subjectivity and meaning. This preserved the modern binary opposition between man and nature. As Kay Peggs (2017, 98) has noted, animals are excluded from study in many areas of social thought, except as objects.

This binary opposition became especially problematic in the environmental imagination which drew on objective scientific studies, but was driven by a subjective passion for nature. Modernity lacked a language to encompass both. Evan Berry argues that this dichotomy was bridged using an explicitly Christian language of salvation, redemption and spiritual progress. This, not dispassionate science or Enlightenment progress, 'grounded the environmental movement's orientation towards nature' in the U.S. (Berry 2015, 5). Soteriological themes open a space for an 'ecological motif' (Santmire 1985, 122 and 126). Human sin may make creation groan, but the world remains the 'theatre of God's glory' and awaits restoration; this hope implies an ethic of care in the present tense (Schaeffer 2011, 79).

Whilst 'theological vocabularies' (Berry 2015, 13) related to salvation are being explored in environmental studies, there is little discussion of Christian redemptive motifs in contemporary animal advocacy outside a specifically theological context (Linzey 1994; Clough 2012; Webb 1998). Rather, the focus on creation motifs foregrounds dominion thought, the Christian 'ideology of mastery over nature' which has 'the basic perception of nature as an enemy to be defeated' (Pattberg 2007, 6). The nonconformists used a different language; nature is only an 'enemy' to humans in as much as it is a faithful servant of God while we are not. Moreover, as Thomas Goodwin (c1655, 24) put it, creation 'doth groan for a restitution and the restitution of it is the world to come' when all things shall be subject to Christ. Restitution inspired a new way to talk about animals.

A Soteriological Language

The religious discourses which emerged from the European Reformations grappled with the dual human experience of rational objectivity and existential engagement in its own way. The Magisterial Reformation and its children produced no shortage of systematic accounts, yet even John Calvin, its principal systematiser, was adamant that true religion is experiential or, as it came to be known, 'experimental'. As John Elias (2006, 27) observed in the early nineteenth century, to have an 'experimental knowledge' of Christianity 'means to try it, to possess it, and to enjoy it ourselves… an experimental knowledge of Him [Christ] is to prove, see, and feel what you have read and heard about Him'. Truth should be conceptually well founded, but is never detached or impersonal.

The Restoration of Animals

However, this nonconformist discourse was not principally ethical. Rather, it was soteriological (concerned with God's salvation of the world), with an associated eschatology (concerned with God's establishment of the new heavens and earth). The connection between creation and redemption is Christocentric, not anthropocentric:

> Salvation is the Lord's. It is the argument of both the testaments, the staff and supportation [sic] of heaven and earth. They would both sink, and all their joints be severed, if the salvation of the Lord were not. The birds in the air sing no other note, the beasts in the field give no other voice, than … Salvation is the Lord's. (King 1594 [1864], 189)

John Calvin (1551 [1851], 11.6) observes that 'Christ having come, in order to reconcile the world to God by the removal of the curse, it is not without reason that the restoration of a perfect state is ascribed to him', and Thomas Goodwin (1655, 22) says the restored world is 'ordained for Christ', by whose atoning work it is made new. Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 348) sees the creatures' future securely within this Christocentric framework: animals 'have an advancement at present, for they are under a more glorious head, as being the possession of Christ… And afterwards they shall be elevated to a better state, sharing in man's happiness, as well as they did in his misery'.

Calvin (1551 [1851], 65.25) is clear that this office of reconciliation is no less extensive than the ravages of sin. When animals hurt humans or fight against each other, 'we should attribute this to human sin, because (the) disobedience (of Adam) overthrew the order of things. But it is the office of Christ to bring back everything to its condition and order'.

This has immediate consequences for animals. Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 348) makes what we would now call a conservationist argument: 'Hence all creatures are called upon to rejoice upon the perfection of salvation, and the appearance of Christ's royal authority in the world, Ps. xcvi 11, 12, xcviii 7, 8. If they were destroyed, there would be no ground to invite them to triumph. Thus doth divine goodness spread its kind arms over the whole creation'.

This language is quite unlike either pragmatic instrumentalism or the modern binary opposition of man and nature. Objective truth about salvation accompanied often passionate self-disclosure, an imperative to action and a sense that the proclaimed 'Word' had prophetic force.

This invited censure, even ridicule, drawing epithets such as 'enthusiast', 'puritan', 'precisionist' and 'fanatic', and scoffing at the 'Nonsensick Raptures' and 'Fulsome, Amorous Discourses' of puritan preachers (Lane 2011, 101). Of course, nonconformist discourses did not employ modern categories of 'subjectivity' and 'objectivity'; they drew on the language of their time. The result proved flexible, able to accommodate a critique of both Cartesianism and Enlightenment rationalism.

The Nonconformist Conscience

Nonconformist 'experimental' or 'heart' religion generated discourses of both Christian subjects and the 'godly' life they sought to live; the two were linked by the conscience. The content of religious doctrine, what religion says, is important, but the form of words is not enough. It has to be lived, and in being lived it generates a sense of duty. As Michael Gilmour (2014, 14) observes, the 'transformative potential' of religion is only realised existentially; mere 'ink on paper' has little impact.

What religious discourse does, is as important as what it says; it is *performative* as well as *descriptive*. 'Would a painted fire content you in a cold winter?', asked Anthony Burgess (1652, 128), adding; 'No more should the meer doctrinal part of Religion, without the practical part.' To borrow a metaphor from Søren Kierkegaard (1975, 519), the nonconformists resisted attempts to detach truth from subjective experience by insisting that Christians live in the building constructed by their own doctrines. Moreover, nonconformist religion carried an imperative to promote and advance God's kingdom, although salvation could not be earned through good works but only received by grace alone. This dual imperative of truth and action formed a nonconformist conscience which aimed to realise the world of which it spoke.

Private Transformation, Public Face

'Experimental' religion is most familiar today in the individualism of religious conversion which has made 'evangelical' a synonym for proselytisation. But nonconformist 'heart religion' was not so limited; it was concerned with authentically living out a 'righteous' life, and this involved both self-transformation and the restoration of the world. However, nonconformists did not believe, in the modern idiom, that they had to save the planet. There was no need, as God had already done

that in Christ. Rather, they considered it their responsibility to walk in 'newness of life', anticipating the restoration of creation (Rom. 6). This was no passive activity and, among other things, entailed opposing the wickedness of animal cruelty (Prov. 12.10).

In conformity with the modern consensus that anthropocentrism is integral to 'dominion thought', it is sometimes argued that religiously motivated kindness to animals was not because animals deserve it, but was self-interested: it would have advantages for humans; or its neglect might lead down the 'slippery slope to the abuse of humans' (Fudge 2006, 102; Stuart 2006, 106; Edwards 2011, 76–77). There is no doubt that such a language was inherited from Thomism, and can be found in some nonconformist discourse. However, it is not distinctive of the way nonconformists spoke about their actions; their discourse cannot simply be identified with the Enlightenment view that we should be kind to animals only to avoid harming our own kindly and humane qualities. Characteristically, nonconformists favoured a more direct relationship between action and heart-felt speech, not one structured by an intermediate consideration such as their own self-interest. Ethical action for advantage or reward was known as works-religion, and was regarded as antithetical to the gospel of grace. Indeed, by comparison with the standards of the time, nonconformists were known for the straightforward integrity of their affections (Keeble 1987, 89–92). Thus the righteous man's mercy to animals must be the outward manifestation of an 'inward affection' (Rawlinson 1612, 2), a 'right feeling' (Bridges 1865, 121); their suffering should 'moove us to mourne' (Perkins 1606, 589). It 'hath often grieved my Soul', lamented Thomas Hodges (1675, A2), 'to see how the poor bruit Beasts have been used, or abused rather, by their inhumane, merciless, absurd and unreasonable cruel Masters'. Thomas Draxe (1613, 26–27) preached the same: 'if the poor dumbe creature, (bird or beast) bee in any paine and miserie, let us …be sorry for it'. We should be kind for 'love to the creature, or him that made it' (Dod and Cleaver 1612, 141). '[O]ut of the heart are the issues of life', comments Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Rom. 6.1–23), 'and there is no way to make the stream sweet but by making the spring so'. This is a heart-felt, not self-serving, passion for kindness.

As we have seen, animal cruelty arising from a hard heart can even cast doubt upon the authenticity of Christian confession. Spurgeon (1873, 335) suggests it may actually foreclose the very possibility of redemption: 'no man who feels the love of God shed abroad in his heart', he

says, 'can find pleasure in giving pain, and furthermore that wanton cruelty to an animal may be that last deadening deed of ill which may for ever leave the heart callous to all the appeals of law and gospel'. In view of the nonconformist insistence upon the efficacy of grace, this is a striking warning which his congregation would have taken with utmost seriousness. It makes cruelty to animals an unforgivable sin. Of course, righteous actions may have benefits associated with them; moreover, the Hebrew hermeneutic of *qal va-homer* enabled them to argue from the *lesser* example (cruelty to animals) to the *greater* (cruelty to humans). But to act out of a desire for these benefits would be 'works-religion', not grace; nonconformists rejected salvation by works.

Robert Bolton (1634, 156–157) nicely summarises the transformation characteristic of the righteous man:

> Now the best Divines hold, that enmity among themselves [i.e. animals] was a fruit of our rebellion against God…. Which miserie coming upon them by our meanes, shouldst rather breake our hearts, and make them bleede, than minister matter of glorying in our shame, and vexing those very vexations which our impiety hath put upon them. Alas, sinfull man! What an heart hast thou, that canst take delight in the cruell tormenting of a dumbe creature! Is it not two [sic] much for thee to behold, with drye eyes, that fearfull brand, which only thy sinne hath imprest upon it, but thou must barbarously also presse its oppressions, and make thy selfe merry with bleeding miseries of that poore harmlesse thing.

A century and a half later, William Cowper (1785 [2013], 121–122) lamented of hunting that it 'owes its pleasure to another's pain… feeds upon the sobs and dying shrieks Of harmless nature, dumb, but yet endued With eloquence, that agonies inspire, Of silent tears and heart distending sighs!'. Neither Bolton's nor Cowper's words are those of an instrumental language which regards kindness to animals as self-serving to human interests. Nor, indeed, are those of the other nonconformists cited above. Solomon, says Thomas Adams (1630, 4) intertexting Proverbs 12.10, 'stamps this mark on the good man's forehead, that he is merciful to his beast'.

This unity of inner love and outer kindness provided both a language and a passion for animal advocacy and legal reform. Sir Richard Hill, speaking in a Parliamentary debate against bull baiting, appeals to both compassion and doctrine; like Adams, he cites Prov. 12.10 where, he

says, Solomon contrasts the righteous and the wicked by whether they are cruel 'towards the dumb creatures' (Woodfall 1802, 296).

Nonconformists sought the transformation of the self, but this was coincident with the transformation of society; it had a public face. Good works could not earn a Christian salvation, but they were nevertheless strongly warranted for a righteous life.

Hope and Reconciliation

In the seventeenth century, the public aspect of nonconformist discourse was robust enough to authorise revolutionary change. Nor did it end with the eclipse of 'godly society' in 1660, but can be seen in the pioneering social activities of John Wesley's Methodism, the Clapham Sect, and nineteenth-century evangelicals from the Anglican Lord Shaftesbury to the Calvinistic Baptist C. H. Spurgeon. This passionate engagement was not simply a pious hope. Their belief that Christ is reconciling all things to himself (Col. 1.20, 2; Cor. 5.19) gave them assurance that they would overcome; God would use them to establish his kingdom. Like Dr. Martin Luther King in the mid-twentieth century, whose famous 'I have a dream' speech intertexted several Bible passages promising hope and reconciliation, they found in the Bible's message of restoration a call to action and a vision for change, rooted in the promises of God himself.

Nonconformists were not animal advocates because they were what are now called 'animal lovers', but because they sought the restoration of the world. Like Karl Marx (1969, 15), they considered it inadequate to only interpret the world; 'the point is to change it'. And, like Marx, they believed that history was on their side—not as 'historical necessity' but as the providence of God establishing his kingdom on earth (Murray 1971).

The social impact of the nonconformist conscience did not stop at kindness to animals; reform was a positive good for the sake of the animals themselves. John Dod and Robert Cleaver (1612, 140) would have them experience Godly dominion as a comfort in distress: 'As all creatures doe taste of, and live by the aboundant liberality and bountifulnesse of Gods hand, so he would have them to feele by sense, though they cannot discerne it be reason, that there is also care for them and compassion in his children.' God's 'goodness in redemption extends itself to the lower creation', as Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 346) put it; ultimately, all creation would be restored to its true end, which is to worship God.

Nonconformity not only provided a language for animal advocacy and legal reform; it also provided an imperative to do something about animal suffering, and an assurance that God would establish their labours (Ps. 90.17; 1 Cor. 3.7). Creation groans, but it also has an expectation of being 'delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God' (Rom. 8:21).

Three aspects can be identified in nonconformist redemptive hope. God's will made known through his revealed attributes (or character); through his commandments; and through prophecy.

God's Tenderness

God's attributes include love, mercy and justice, and we should emulate God who 'made them [animals] and preserves them and is good to them' (Dod and Cleaver 1612, 140–141), 'who is very pitiful, and of tender mercies!' (Tillotson 1700, 66), and who 'himself careth for oxen' (Clarke 1831, Prov. 12.10). The righteous man is kind to his beast because our heavenly Father cares for his whole creation: 'Must not then his children reflect his whole image of love? And is not the want of any feature of this image a mark of doubtful relationship to him?' (Bridges 1865, 121).

God's sustenance is individual, compassionate and loving; ours should be likewise. Spurgeon, discussing the entry into Jerusalem (Matt. 21) notes that Jesus rides a colt, and asks why the mother ass was also there. 'This appears to me to be a token of his tenderness: he would not needlessly sever the mother from her foal. I like to see a farmer's kindness when he allows the foal to follow when the mare is ploughing or labouring; and I admire the same thoughtfulness in our Lord. He careth for cattle, yea, even for an ass and her foal. He would not even cause a poor beast a needless pang by taking away its young; and so in that procession the beast of the field took its part joyfully, in token of a better age in which all creatures shall be delivered from bondage, and shall share the blessings of his unsuffering reign' (Spurgeon 1886 [1971], 518). The 'man who truly loves his Maker', says Spurgeon (1873, 333), 'becomes tender towards all the creatures his Lord has made. In gentleness and kindness our great Redeemer is our model'. Hannah More (1840, 226) wrote a didactic story of a postboy who was cruel to his horses until his evangelical conversion, after which he 'could never bear to see a wanton stroke inflicted. Doth God care for horses, said he, and shall man be cruel to them?'

'There is a mercy', says John Trapp (1660, 48: Prov. 12.10) 'to be shown to these dumb creatures'. In contemporary animal ethics, the dumbness of the animals is often understood as a deficit, a lack of those capacities, whether rationality or language, which generate criteria for moral consideration among humans. Dumbness also presents a practical obstacle to moral consideration as it prevents animals from making demands of us. But for the nonconformists, the dumbness of animals is itself a demand requiring our response. It is not so much that animals are simply voiceless as that their cries are not heard; they are dumb in our fallen culture, not inherently, before God.

In prelapsarian Eden, the harmony of creation ensured mutual sensitivity of feeling in human-animal relationships; each could hear the other's voice. But this was lost with the Fall. In order to respond righteously now, humans need to develop empathy towards animals. We should not go to them with our own categories of human attributes, but seek their own identity, and listen to the demand made on us by the suffering of the other. As Alexander Maclaren (1908, 160) puts it, 'It is a part of religion to try to enter into the mysterious feelings of our humble dependants in farmyard and stable'. To ignore the demand of the dumb is a mark of the wicked. 'A young bird hath no tong to crave reason at our hands', says John Calvin (1583, 775 and 770), yet we are to behave uprightly towards them'. 'A beast cannot speak to move us to pitie and compassion; and therefore we must go to him of our own good will, though we be not moved or requested thereunto'. In an 1802 Parliamentary debate on bull baiting, Sir Richard Hill, probably intertexting Prov. 31.8, said he spoke 'in behalf of a race of poor friendless beings who certainly cannot speak for themselves' (Woodfall 1802, 295).

The usual order of things sacrifices the lower for the higher; the nonconformists reversed this. At the centre of their gospel was God in Christ sacrificing himself for the world. Sacrificial mercy is an attribute of God, and we should emulate it. In the vivisection debates of the 1870s, pro-vivisectionists assumed, as now, that it is legitimate to sacrifice 'lower' animals for humans; indeed, Darwin regarded it as an evolutionary duty to do so. Shaftesbury long maintained an absolutist position that rejected this assumption, affirming a mercy which sacrificed self-interest. Andrew Linzey (2009, 20f) has recently argued for a special moral status for animals which increases our obligation towards them as we cannot understand their language; like Calvin above, he argues that

we must go to them since they are never able to give or withhold consent for what we do to them.

The Law of Tenderness

The second way that God makes his will known is through the law, and the nonconformists found there practical guidance for animal-human relationships. For example, the equal yoking of oxen, feeding labouring animals and sabbath rest were all required of righteous men. As the modern scholar Mary Douglas (1999, 68) has shown, there is in the Levitical law an 'extreme sensitivity to bloodshed and loss of life, human and animal'. In the contemporary world, animals are routinely mutilated by castration, amputation, tooth and horn surgery, and so on, typically without anaesthesia. Few people like to put what happens into words, so metonymy and euphemism are widespread. 'Trimming' and 'docking' replace 'amputation', and 'toe clipping' is used of the practice of amputating part of an animal's paw to identify it for scientific purposes. The Levitical requirement that only an animal without 'spot or blemish' can be ritually slaughtered would make all these practices unlawful.

Although mere obedience to the law in works of mercy or kindness can have no soteriological potency for nonconformists, such works were strongly mandated and the righteous man does not neglect them (Primatt 1776, 206). However, mere compliance with the law missed the point. It was a matter of conscience; the righteous man has the law written on the heart.

In nonconformist discourse, the law is transformed from external constraint to the cultivation of tender-heartedness: 'Under the old law this tenderness was inculcated by those precepts, which forbade the taking of the mother-bird with her young, and the seething of a kid in its mother's milk. Why were those things forbidden? … God would have his people tender-hearted, sensitive, and delicate in their handling of all things' (Spurgeon 1886 [1971], 518–519). William Cowper (Ryder 1983, 129) was known for taking this to extremes: 'I would not enter on my list of friends (though graced with polished manners and fine sense yet wanting sensibility) the man who needlessly sets foot on a worm'. Few nonconformists applied these principles consistently, but there is evidence that some made a start. From banning the practice of plucking wool rather than shearing it (1635), to the condemnation of baiting practices to tenderise meat (1835), nonconformists pioneered reforms against the tide

of public opinion. 'I was convinced', wrote Shaftesbury, 'that God had called me to devote whatsoever advantages He might have bestowed upon me to the cause of the weak, the helpless, both man and beast, and those who had none to help them… Whatever I have done has been given to me; what I have done I was enabled to do; and all happy results (if any there be) must be credited, not to the servant, but to the great master, who led and sustained him' (Linzey 1994, 36).

Eden's Tenderness Restored

Finally, God's will is made known through his prophets. This both described the restored world as a peaceable kingdom (Hos. 2.18; also Ezek. 34.25–29, Is. 11.1–9, 34.14–17, 65.17–25, Job 5.22/3, Zech. 14.20), and also gave them the assurance that they were sailing with the tide of history, not rowing against it.

As Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 347–348) reminded his readers, 'The last time is called not a time of destruction, but a "time of restitution["], and that "of all things", Acts iii.21', when the 'fierceness' of creatures among themselves will vanish. 'The world shall be nothing but a universal smile. Nature shall put on triumphant vestments'. He looked not to progress, but to redemption.

Comparisons between this restored world and Eden are common. For Nathaniel Homes (1654 [1833], 279), the animals will enjoy a renewed estate, reflecting their original perfection. George Abbot (1613, 450) anticipates that the creatures shall 'returne to that beautie wherein they at first were established'; and Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1865], 483) sees 'the satisfaction of Christ procuring the restoration of that which Adam forfeited.' For Thomas Goodwin (1655, 25–26), the restored world will have a glory exceeding that known to Adam. John Calvin (1551 [1851], 11.6 and 65.17) sums it up, saying: 'Christ will come to drive away everything hurtful out of the world, and to restore to its former beauty the world which lay under the curse'. Straw, he says, 'will be the food of *the lion* as well as of *the ox*; for if the stain of sin had not polluted the world, no animal would have been addicted to prey on blood, but the fruits of the earth would have sufficed for all, according to the method which God had appointed (Gen. 1.30)'. Human diet would also return to its vegan beginnings: just as 'in the state of innocency man had no power over living creatures to kill, and eat them', so at the restoration 'men shall not kill and eat up beasts nor beasts one another' (Walker 1641, 232–233).

Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 347) emphasises the harmonious combination of the new heavens and earth which will enable the glory of God to be seen and contemplated in the creatures: 'When all the fruits of redemption shall be completed, the goodness of God shall pour itself upon the creatures, "deliver them from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God"; they shall be reduced to that true end, and returned to their original harmony'.

Robert Bolton (1631, 4) considered that this harmony is foreshadowed when 'the heavenly beames of Gods pleased countenance begin to breake out upon a man… Heaven and Earth, and all the Hosts of both are everlastingly reconciled unto him, and become his friends;… All the creatures then, pull in their hornes, retire their stings, bite in their poyson…'. Most nonconformists, however, would have regarded this as an over-realised eschatology.

Animal Souls

The language of the restoration of animals opened a space to discuss animal souls anew (Preece 2005b, 15). If God cares for animals individually, and if animals will be restored, what happens to their soul at death? After all, 'God saves man and beast' (Ps. 36.6); there is no parallel promise to plants or mountains.

Keith Thomas (1984, 138–139) was among the first to recognise that a discourse of animal souls emerged in England during the early seventeenth century from biblical pericopes concerning the restoration of all creatures. Some 'early Protestant writers', he notes, 'put forward the novel view, previously held only by a few isolated commentators, that by "creatures" [in Rom. 8.21] was meant all living animals, birds and plants…'. These 'early Protestant writers' were mainly nonconformists, and they linked pericopes of *renewal and restoration* (Hos. 2; Ezek. 34, Is. 11 and 65, Acts 3, and Rom. 8) to challenge the inherited Thomist view of animal souls. Increasingly, they came to believe that Aquinas was no more reliable a guide here than elsewhere.

Nathaniel Homes (1654 [1833], 292) clearly gives Rom. 8 priority over the scholastic tradition: 'all the creatures of the whole creation shall partake of the same liberty [as the sons of God], so far as they are capable. They shall be delivered from the corruption and fading that adheres to their nature; from the violence done to them by men, as also from their

abuse; and they shall be delivered to their right owner, viz. to the second Adam, and his posterity, who shall only use them well. How plain then is this text, of the restauration of the creation, to them that will understand!'

For the first time, we find concepts of animal soul and immortality discussed largely within the setting of the biblical canon, not greek philosophy. The possibility of animal survival of death became *thinkable*, as it had not been in medieval Thomism. This enabled them to ask whether 'the *creature itself also* shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God' (Rom. 8.21); will animals be found on the new earth as Isaiah affirms (Is. 11, 65) and the apostle Paul implies in the pericope intertexted by Homes?

For some, this proved a step too far, and they continued to draw upon the greek tradition (Owen 1691, preface; Boston 1720 [1964], 319). Some cautiously integrated the new insights into the received tradition. Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Rom. 8.17–25), intertexting Ecc. 3.18–21, commented: 'What becomes of the souls of brutes, that go downwards, none can tell. But it should seem by the scripture that there will be some kind of restoration of them'; restored animals will declare the wisdom, power and goodness of their creator.

Thomas Wilson (1614, 588) is more confident, and speaks of the animals changed into a 'better estate', restored to their 'first perfection'. Stephen Charnock (c1660 [1864], 347–348) affirmed that the restoration of the world in the coming of Christ 'is intimated in Is. xi.6–9. As he "came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it", so he came not to destroy the creatures, but to repair them; to restore to God the honour and pleasure of the creation, and restore to the creatures their felicity, in restoring their order.' David Dickson (1659, 21) affirms that there is 'hope of the Creatures, that they may bee freed from that servitude into a state proportionable to the future glorious condition of the Sons of God'. Andrew Willet (1611, 366) cites the authority of Calvin that 'though they shall not be partakers of the glorie, yet they shall have a more perfect estate', explaining that 'as for mans cause they were enthralled, so for mans cause they shall be enlarged'.

Some, with Nathaniel Homes, confidently affirmed the biblical language. John Wesley (1771 [1872], 2.III.4) preached that animals 'shall enjoy happiness suited to their state—without end', and C. H. Spurgeon (1886 [1971], 518) that they 'shall share the blessings of his [Christ's] unsuffering reign'. Augustus Toplady, on being asked if he thought that

all the animal creation would go to heaven, replied 'with great emphasis "Yes, all, all!"' (Wright 1911, 213).

Once this new way of speaking became possible, it was increasingly adopted by others. Keith Thomas (1984, 137f) illustrates the burgeoning discourse on animal souls with a very broad range of sources. From the eighteenth century, animal souls were widely debated, and Rod Preece (2005b, 10) notes that the protagonists 'make a great deal of reference to scripture' as was the practice of the nonconformists. Augustus Toplady (1794 [1825], 461–462) drew animal advocacy implications from 'the immortality of brutes': 'I firmly believe, that beasts have souls; souls, truly and properly so called: which, if true, entitles them, not only to all due tenderness, but even to a higher degree of respect than is usually shown them'.

It was no longer unthinkable that animals will be found in heaven. And if so, as we have seen, they might either commend us to God for our kindness, or bring charges against us for the wrongs we have done them.

The Persistence of Language

This language of restoration, restitution and judgement in which animals play a prominent role has little parallel in the modern world. Contemporary animal advocacy puts human progress at the centre of the story; ultimately, animal suffering is inevitable in nature and marks the lasting binary opposition between nature's survival of the fittest and human culture. There are, however, some overlaps between the nonconformist and modern vision. Both foster the growth of compassion and law reform; both move from denial of injustice to consciousness of wrong. This often involves breaking down discursive segregation which prevents us from recognising animals as the beings they are. Few contemporary animal advocates would see this as a prophetic calling as did the nonconformists, but they might not entirely reject the notion of bringing new ethical insights to contemporary culture. Certainly nonconformist language persists in the twenty-first century, not least as mediated through the welfare organisations and legislation they pioneered. This will be the subject of the next chapter.

Bibliography

Abbot, George. 1613. *An Exposition upon the Prophet Jonah*. London: Richard Field.

Adams, Thomas. 1630. *Works*. Vol. 1. London: John Grismand.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism*. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Bolton, Robert. 1631. *Instructions for a Right Comforting Afflicted Consciences with Speciall Antidotes Against Some Grievous Temptations*. London: Thomas Weaver.

Bolton, Robert. 1634. *Some General Directions for a Comfortable Walking with God*. London: John Legatt.

Boston, Thomas. 1720 [1964]. *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*. London: Banner of Truth.

Boyle, Robert. 1647–1648. "Manuscript." In "The 'Beame of Diuinity': Animal Suffering in the Early Thought of Robert Boyle," edited by Malcolm R. Oster. *British Journal for the History of Science* 22: 151–180.

Bridges, Charles. 1865. *An Exposition of the Book of Proverbs*. New York: Robert Carter.

Burgess, Anthony. 1652. *Spiritual Refining*. London: Thomas Underhill.

Calvin, John. 1551 [1851]. *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1583. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: John Harison.

Charnock, Stephen. c1660 [1864]. "A Discourse on the Goodness of God." In *Complete Works of Stephen Charnock*, vol. 2, 275–399. Edinburgh: James Nicol.

Charnock, Stephen. c1660 [1865]. "A Discourse of God's Being the Author of Reconciliation." In *Complete Works of Stephen Charnock*, vol. 3, 336–500. Edinburgh: James Nichols.

Clarke, Adam. 1831. *Commentary on the Bible*. New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh.

Clough, David L. 2012. *On Animals*. London: T&T Clark.

Cowper, William. 1785 [2013]. *The Task and Select Other Poems*. London: Routledge.

Dickson, David. 1659. *An Exposition of All St. Pauls Epistles Together with an Explanation of Those Other Epistles of the Apostles St. James, Peter, John & Jude*. London: Printed by R.I. for Francis Eglesfield.

Dod, John, and Robert Cleaver. 1612. *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Eleventh and Twelfth Chapter of the Proverbs*. London: Thomas Man.

Douglas, Mary. 1999. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Draxe, Thomas. 1613. *The Earnest of Our Inheritance*. London: George Norton.

Edwards, Peter. 2011. "Domesticated Animals in Renaissance Europe." In *A Cultural History of Animals in the Renaissance*, edited by Bruce Boehrer, 75–94. Oxford: Berg.

Elias, John. 2006. *The Experimental Knowledge of Christ and Additional Sermons of John Elias*. Edited by Owen Milton. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books.

Fudge, Erica. 2006. "Two Ethics: Killing Animals in the Past and Present". In *Killing Animals*, edited by The Animals Studies Group, 99–119. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1976. *New Rules of Sociological Method*. London: Hutchinson.

Gilmour, Michael J. 2014. *Eden's Other Residents: The Bible and Animals*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Goodwin, Thomas. 1655. *The World to Come*. London: s.n.

Henry, Matthew. 1710 [2008]. *Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendickson.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness as They Came Out of Gods Hands, and the Good Mans Mercy to the Brute Creatures, Which God Hath Put Under His Feet*. London: Tho. Parkhurst.

Homes, Nathaniel. 1654 [1833]. *The Resurrection Revealed*. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

Johnson, Lisa. 2017. "On the Suffering of Animals in Nature." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 63–77.

Keeble, N. H. 1987. *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century England*. Leicester: Leicester Universety Press.

Kierkegaard, Søren. 1975. *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*. Vol. 3, No. 3308. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

King, John. 1594 [1864]. *Lectures upon Jonah*. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Lane, Belden C. 2011. *Ravished by Beauty: The Surprising Legacy of Reformed Spirituality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linzey, Andrew. 1994. *Animal Theology*. London: SCM.

Linzey, Andrew. 2009. *Why Animal Suffering Matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maclaren, Alexander. 1908. *The Books of Esther, Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes*. Vol. 17. New York: A C Armstrong.

Marx, Karl. 1969. "Theses on Feuerbach." In *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, vol. 1, 13–15. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

More, Hannah. 1840. "History of Tom White, the Postboy." In *The Complete Works of Hannah More*, vol. 1, 224–231. New York: Harper.

Murray, Ian H. 1971. *The Puritan Hope*. London: Banner of Truth.

Owen, John. 1691. "Preface to the Reader." In *Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ*, John Owen. London: B.A.

Pattberg, Philipp. 2007. "Conquest, Domination and Control: Europe's Mastery of Nature in Historic Perspective." *Journal of Political Ecology* 14: 1–9.

Peggs, Kay. 2017. "What Have Animals to Do with Social Work?" *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1): 96–108.

Perkins, William. 1606. *The Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience*. Cambridge: John Legat.

Preece, Rod. 2005a. *Brute Souls, Happy Beasts and Evolution*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Preece, Rod. 2005b. *Immortal Animal Souls*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Primatt, Humphrey. 1776. *The Duty of Mercy*. Fontwell, Sussex: Centaur Press.

Rawlinson, John. 1612. *Mercy to a Beast: A Sermon Preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke 1612*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Ryder, Richard D. 1983. *Victims of Science—The Use of Animals in Research*. London: National Anti-vivisection Society.

Santmire, H.Paul. 1985. *The Travail of Nature*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Schaeffer, Francis. 2011. *Pollution and the Death of Man*. Wheaton Illinois: Crossway.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1873. "A Word for Brutes Against Brutes." *Sword and the Trowel* 3 (June): 332–338.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1886 [1971]. "The Lowly King", Sermon No. 1861, June 25, 1885." In *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, vol. 31, 517–528. London: Banner of Truth.

Stuart, Tristram. 2006. *The Bloodless Revolution*. London: HarperPress.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Toplady, Augustus. 1794 [1849]. "Speech Delivered at the Queens Arms." In *Collected Works of Augustus Toplady*, edited by J. Cornish, vol. III, 459–466. London: Baynes.

Trapp, John. 1660. *Annotations Upon the Whole Bible*. Vol. 3. London: R. W.

Tillotson, John. 1700. 'The Mercy of God.' In *Works*, vol. 7. London: Ralph Barker.

Walker, George. 1641. *God Made Visible in His Works, or a Treatise of the External Works of God*. London: John Bartlet.

Webb, Stephen H. 1998. *On God and Dogs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wesley, John. 1771 [1872]. "The General Deliverance". In *Sermons on Several Occasions*, vol. 2. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

Willet, Andrew. 1611. *Hexapla in Romans*. London: Leonard Greene.

Wilson, Thomas. 1614. *A Commentarie Upon the Most Divine Epistle of St Paul to the Romanes*. Barbican, London: W. Jaggard.

Woodfall, W. 1802. "House of Commons Debate, 24 May 1802." In *The Parliamentary Register, 1801–2*, vol. 3. London: John Stockdale.

Wright, Thomas. 1911. *The Lives of the British Hymn Writers*. Vol. 2. London: Farncombe and Son London.

A Persistent Language

I have argued that we find in nonconformist discourse a self-consciously developed, systematic and institutionally authorised challenge to the pragmatic way of talking about animals. The language of Creation, Fall and Restoration entered the public sphere and influenced public perceptions, legislation and organisations such as the SPCA (RSPCA from 1840). A substantially new lexicon transformed the pragmatic language of animals inherited from late medieval culture. An animal could no longer be spoken of as a material possession without risking the rebuke 'Yea, but it is a creature of God' which was created to praise him and not for human gratification (Calvin 1583, 877). An animal could no longer be abused without some 'busy, meddling spirit' warning that God would hold the abuser accountable for his stewardship (Woodfall 1800, 355). Some even insisted that animals would be restored in the kingdom of God, and may demand justice for their suffering.

The existential imperative in the redemption motif of nonconformity demanded that the novel things which could now be said should be said. When Enlightenment instrumentalism threatened to entirely subordinate animals to human interests, the nonconformist lexicon was able to assert that both are subordinate to God's Word. As animals were increasingly commodified as units of meat production, or objectified in scientific experimentation, nonconformist discourses proved sufficiently robust to support legislative reform, even favouring an abolitionist view of vivisection. However, this discourse finds few adherents today outside

theological communities. Most people are not interested in this tradition, even if they are aware of it. Yet the literature of environmentalism suggests that it may be more persistent than initially appears

THE PERSISTENCE OF DISCOURSE

Lynn White (1967, 1205) was the first to systematically argue that religious influences continue to frame the way we talk about the natural world: we 'continue today to live, as we have lived for about 1700 years, very largely in a context of Christian axioms'. White's main example is his claim for the baleful influence of dominion thought. However, since White wrote in 1967, Protestant creation motifs have been traced in pioneering contributions to environmental ethics (Dunlap 2004; Stoll 1997). Specifically redemption themes have also been identified in the belief that communing with nature and wilderness has restorative power:

> 'Theologically derived concepts of salvation, redemption, and spiritual progress have not only provided the basic context for Americans' passion for nature but have also established the horizons of possibility within the national environmental imagination'; 'shaping ideas about the natural world, establishing practices of engagement with environments and landscapes, and generating new modes of social and political interaction'. (Berry 2015, 5)

This contrasts with the animal advocacy literature which has largely agreed with White's finding that Christian theology has been an obstacle to progress. Those moral fragments which survive today as remains of a Christian tradition are, for the most part, dismissed as discredited and irrelevant traces of an earlier time. Erica Fudge (2017, 3) argues that, in the past, 'immaterial meaning of livestock was found in their relationship to an external divinity', but the world-view in which animals carry theological meanings has now gone. She concludes that, if we wish to re-enchant the modern perception of farm or laboratory animals, we need the historian's art to understand what is lost. Few identify theological motifs or tropes as positively shaping the current debate, and ethicists and theologians alike have sought a new language more adequate to the task.

However, the evidence from environmental studies suggests that there may still be vestiges persisting in communal memory and language which retain cultural significance. Complex nonconformist discourses

which once drove animal advocacy may have been transformed into a one-dimensional narrative of theological anthropocentrism in the post-Enlightenment world, yet partially effaced traces of its own gene-alogy remain: what Evan Berry (2015, 13) refers to as 'shards and remnants' of religious traditions in contemporary life. And, like any archeological site, we also see the outline of foundations, the traces of buildings long gone. As it lost its place in a 'Christian' culture, noncon-formist discourse became nomadic in modern discourses, where its pres-ence bears traces of its origins and carries an excess of meaning over that usually available in its adoptive domain (Maasen and Weingart 2013, 3f). These fragments and remains are scattered throughout the land-scape of public debate; they lie around us as a cloud of witnesses to a largely lost tradition. If we follow the career of a lexical term or segment, we find that the tradition of animal advocacy has a religious depth built into its own genealogy.

Traces and Meanings

As discussed in Chapter 7, the redemptive motif in nonconformist dis-course generated an existential imperative; we make an ethic our own by practising what we preach, including in the public sphere. This was evi-dent in the media of nonconformist rhetoric which included numerous sermons, commentaries, pamphlets and, from the eighteenth century, public meetings. Their passion for disseminating and promoting their views is a feature shared with modern animal advocates who are well known as 'enthusiasts', even 'fanatics' or 'puritans'—soubriquets applied to nonconformists in their day. We also find parallels in the specific way animals are spoken about.

Among the important insights of animal advocacy is that, in contrast to animal ecology, it emphasises the value and significance of the indi-vidual creature rather than the species. This excess of meaning over an animal's pragmatic significance as food or experimental subject parallels that which led the nonconformists to campaign for legislative change. The EU directive (2010/63), giving priority to the individual animals over their experimental value, is grandchild to the Earl of Shaftesbury's view of vivisection as an 'idolatry of the day': 'that everything was to be sacrificed to the image of science' (Hansard 1879, 426). Animals are said to be 'innocent' in advocacy literature, just as we saw in Chapter 6 that they are innocent by contrast with humans; indeed, some authors make

the animal's 'innocence' a key driver of humanitarian treatment of them (Rémy 2003, 59–61). Activists 'rescue' animals from cruel mistreatment and restore them to health, just as they are rescued from 'groaning' in the nonconformist narrative of restoration. In modernity, 'immaterial meaning' is found in the animals themselves, in their sentience (Fudge 2017, 3). But the animal sentience literature remains both haunted and vivified by echoes of 'soul' inherited from earlier strata of discourse.

However, valuing each animal as an individual does not mean that each is isolated from the other; quite the opposite. Ecology is a twentieth-century discipline, yet as Keith Thomas (1984, 278) has observed, its language carried a theological heritage before it acquired a scientific one.

As discussed in Chapter 3, a plank of modern animal advocacy is that Darwin showed we are all kin, so we owe family duties to our animal cousins. It is said that this way of speaking breaks down the barrier between humans and all other animals, recognising all in one universal brotherhood. Yet this narrative draws heavily upon the nonconformist language of a harmonious kinship of all creation in which animals, created at peace with themselves and in co-operative obedience to God, work together for the good of the whole; they desire nothing more than to unite in a harmony of praise. The family of all living things which is said to break down the barrier between humans and animals speaks this language, though of course without God. In doing so, it resists the less congenial Darwinian 'family' of *nature, red in tooth and claw*, a phrase which, according to Richard Dawkins (1989, 2), 'sums up our modern understanding of natural selection admirably'. Much contemporary animal advocacy, although ostensibly using the language of Darwinism, in fact draws upon the heritage from nonconformity. The evolutionary language of natural selection, red in tooth and claw, is elided as it is less well adapted to talk about the kinship of creation. The resultant discourse is able to express something about the care humans owe to other species which Darwinism is unable to articulate. This raises the possibility that other resources might also be available from the same source to express meanings not readily available elsewhere in the modern world.

Ethical insights of animal advocacy such as the importance of the individual or the kinship of creatures are usually taken as axioms requiring, or perhaps having, no deeper justification. But without warrant, ethical insights are vulnerable in a culture which does not share them. The tacit nonconformist heritage of these insights gives access to another cultural tradition of culpability, guilt and forgiveness which is still

evident in the modern world. This language was drawn upon in 2018 by a PETA advertisement; the actor James Cromwell plays a priest hearing the confession of a meat industry executive who has invented a language of euphemisms to disguise cruelty. Cromwell's priest, shocked at the confession, says there is no forgiveness as 'we have to draw the line somewhere'. As Daryl Booth (2018) observes, this narrative relies upon contemporary fragments of a Christian heritage for its cultural force.

Nomadic nonconformist discourses enrichen contemporary debates about animals. Tracing their trajectories illustrates other areas where they could contribute meanings to animal advocacy not readily available elsewhere.

Lords, not Tyrants

If animals are sentient, even more if they have souls and kinship relations, 'ownership' becomes more problematic than if they were furniture. Sixteenth-century jurists inherited a pragmatic language of ownership—animals were chattel possessions, and their owner could do what he wished with his personal property. As discussed in Chapter 5, the nonconformists discovered another way of talking about animals in the biblical canon; both animals and humans are *creatures of God* who exist to glorify their creator. Animals do not belong to humans, and we may not treat them as if they were property. Thomas Hodges (1675, 26) exhorted his congregation: 'Say not in your hearts, Our Beasts are our own, who is Lord over us? May we not do what we will with our own?'. We have dominion 'only with subordination to himself [God] and his Laws', says Hodges. 'We are Lords over them, 'tis true; but we must not play the Tyrants over them'. PETA's headline formula that 'animals are not ours' tacitly indexes centuries of nonconformist debate about ownership. Indeed, Sarah Withrow King (2016, 3) recently recognised her own Christian heritage in PETA's slogan, and re-appropriated it.

The nonconformist language of creatureliness subverted the lexicon of ownership, and ascribed to animals a value independent of human existence. Those who treated an animal as personal property became, not owners, but tyrants. It allowed the emergence of a concept of duty, and even of rights, foreign to the language of possession (Primatt 1776). This was apparent in early attempts to prevent cruelty, but culminated in the legislation of the nineteenth century which mandated prosecution for cruelty to various domestic animals, and attempted to regulate

vivisection. In the twentieth century, this discursive space was colonised by discourses of 'stewardship', 'welfare' and 'rights'. Yet, even as nonconformist language was absorbed by modern idioms, excess meanings not usually available in secular discourses remained latent within it. Mark Stoll (2006, 59) argues that 'John Calvin first formulated the modern notion of stewardship of the earth.' Within secular environmentalism, the 'modern notion of stewardship' principally means an ethic of managed development; but Stoll is right that it also carries an excess meaning of accountability within an ontology of care, inherited from its Calvinistic genealogy. Recent debate about the consequences of climate change and the unsustainable use of resources has, for some, accented accountability as a moral force incommensurate with the dispassionate rationality of managed development. It is this passionate concern, characteristic of animal and environmental activism, which is sometimes labelled 'extreme' by those who do not share it, those who have lost the latent sense of horror at abusing a creature of God. Outrage should not replace reasoned advocacy, but few are likely to advocate rationally without it. The Animal Aid member's magazine is called 'Outrage' for a reason.

In the last chapter, I traced the complex journey from seventeenth-century 'rightful' action before God, to the modern language of 'animal rights' which now bears an excess of meaning over its Enlightenment heritage. Like the language of stewardship, this excess of meaning can drive practical action.

RIGHTS AND TYRANNY

'Rights' language is now cast within an enlightenment narrative, but lies at the end of a long line of discursive transformations, extending back to the vigorous Puritan debates of the seventeenth century. For nonconformists, the distinctive basis for an upright or rightful claim was vested less in a capacity of the bearer of a right, than in a just or lawful claim arising from God's covenant with creation. Thus animals have a right to nourishment and care, not because they share capacities such as sentience with humans (although they do), but because they are God's creatures. Rule arises when the ruler can exercise power over the ruled, but *just* rule is according to God's covenant law (Rutherford 1644, 87). Upright, rightful or righteous justice is subject to God's law revealed in Christ's merciful reign. 'Justice without mercy is not justice but tyranny', says

Rawlinson (1612, 16). Where we might now speak of animal rights arising from anthropomorphic capacities, the nonconformists spoke of righteousness and tyranny.

Animals, observed Martin Luther (1958, 132), in contrast to the dominion of Eden, are now 'subjected to man as to a tyrant who has absolute power over life and death'; hence 'animals are dominated by fear and dread of man'. We were given dominion over the animals but, says John King (1594 [1864], 236), 'we have changed our government into tyranny, and are not content with the rule, unless we seek the spoil, nor with the use and commodity, unless we work the ruin and wreck of our poor bond-servants'. This is, asserts King, undeserved misuse of harmless creatures; to describe postlapsarian animal-human relationships as tyrannous is to rebuke, not to defend, still less to authorise. Intertexting the exsanguination command of the Noahic covenant (Gen. 9), John Trapp (1660, 48) makes it clear that tyranny is contrary to the will of God: the 'restraint that was of eating the blood of dead beasts, declared that he [God] would not have tyranny exercised on them while they are alive.' 'No man', wrote Nathaniel Ward in the Massachusetts Colony *Body of Liberties* (1641), 'shall exercise any Tirranny or Crueltie towards any bruite Creature which are usuallie kept for man's use.' Ward was a Puritan dismissed from his ministry in 1633 for his beliefs; he emigrated to Massachusetts the following year, and echoes of his phraseology are found in Thomas Wentworth's Act (1635) in Ireland to protect sheep and horses (Preece 2005, 235–236). At that time, nonconformist attempts to protect animals from cruelty moved in a trans-Atlantic culture.

By the eighteenth century, the lexicon of tyranny had extended beyond nonconformity. Alexander Pope (1713) argued that men are 'accountable for the ill use of their dominion' as 'for the exercise of tyranny over their own species'; and in his famous footnote, Bentham (1789 [1970], 282–283, emphasis original) hopes that the 'day *may* come when the rest of the animal creation may acquire those rights which never could have been withheld from them but by the hand of tyranny'. When Andrew Linzey (1994, 126) drily observed that the herb eating dominion of Genesis 1.29 'is hardly a licence for tyranny', he stood at the end of a rich heritage.

In Enlightenment discourse, rights language references the capacities which entitle the rights bearer, and has been used in Western jurisdictions to protect animals; the Nonhuman Rights Project has pioneered

this approach with significant success. But the nomadic presence of non-conformity within rights language provides a tacit sense of rightful action for which we may be held to account in more than a technically legal sense. Moreover, the redemption motif integrates rightful action with the restoration of right relationships such as kindness and compassion. It is this excess meaning over what is usually available in statute law which inspires pioneers such as Steven Wise (2000) to devote time and energy to 'rattling the cage' of legal complacency in the hope of a gentler more compassionate world for animals.

This excess over secular meaning includes animals themselves protesting against tyranny and demanding vengeance as we saw in Chapter 6. Humans and animals share creatureliness but animals are innocent while humans are not; they have justice on their side. This has been obscured by the transformation of nonconformist rights language within Enlightenment discourse which has emphasised human privilege founded, usually, in reason. But nonconformist rights language spoke of the animal's privilege of innocence which demands justice, giving an active role to animals. This latent meaning of rights language recognises that animals have an interest in freedom from tyrannous domination, and authorises listening to their demands. Giroux (2016) and van Dooren (2014) have both explored ways in which animals might realise a more active role in their own emancipation.

Vestiges of the language of accountability and tyranny may be seen in assumptions now taken for granted in the way we make use of animals. A fundamental aspect of nonconformist stewardship for which we will be held to account is to avoid cruelty. The most common occasion for cruelty was then, as it is now, killing food animals. That slaughter should precede butchery is a commonplace in modern discussions of 'humane' killing in the meat industry; yet it was not always so, and the contemporary ethic was focused through the lens of nonconformist commentaries on exsanguination in the Noah narrative (Gen. 9). The requirement to drain blood from an animal before butchery begins is a straightforward and usually foolproof method of ensuring that slaughter and butchery are two distinct activities. We must not, says Thomas Hodges (1675, 26–27) quoting Acts 10.13, 'eat of living Creatures, while the life was in them, but that they should first kill them, and pour out their blood before they eat them. *Arise, kill, and eat.* Kill first, and then eat'. As we have seen, John Trapp regarded cruelly killing animals for food as tyranny.

The distinction which is here drawn between slaughter and butchery rests on an animal bearing meanings which exceed their pragmatic use: animals belong to God who will not suffer their tyrannous use. These meanings were applied to animals which could not be over-wintered in the pre-modern era, but they have made their way through to the ameliorative assumptions of industrialised slaughter of animals in the twenty-first century. Of course, this does not justify the latter, but it could provide a toe-hold for other meanings also drawn from nonconformist origins. I shall discuss this possibility in the final chapter.

The Sacrifice of the Higher for the Lower

The above examples illustrate nonconformist discourses which have lost their position in the contemporary world to become nomadic in modernity. Traces persist and provide an excess of meaning over that to be expected from contemporary secular language. The case of 'sacrifice' illustrates a different form of persistence, one that retains a symbolic force detached from its context in nonconformity, but now expresses a quite different meaning.

In contemporary speech, 'sacrifice' commonly refers to a deference to the other over oneself, often to the weaker over the stronger. Thus a parent sacrifices herself for her child, a soldier for unarmed civilians or wounded comrades, or a doctor for her patient during a contagious epidemic. In the West, this sense of sacrifice often draws upon christian symbolism which retains cultural force.

The nonconformist gospel emphasised this sense of sacrifice. Indeed, the narrative of the life, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth was at its heart. In the nonconformist paradigm of sacrifice, God in Christ sacrifices himself for humans, the good shepherd for his sheep (John 10). Indeed, the entire soteriological scheme of nonconformity is rooted in this radical paradigm of sacrifice. The parallel between God in Christ sacrificing himself for humans, and a human shepherd sacrificing himself for an animal, only works if it makes sense to sacrifice human interests to those of animals. This radical understanding of sacrifice structured nonconformist relationships, including those with animals. It provided a space to question the pragmatic assumption that an animal's interests were always to be sacrificed to human interests. In the vivisection debates of the 1870s, it enabled evangelical christians such as

Shaftesbury to obtain a hearing for abolitionism, a stance which otherwise appeared contrary to common sense (Sampson, forthcoming).

The symbolic force of 'sacrifice' as a religious motif persists in the discourse of contemporary scientific research, but the nonconformist trope has been inverted. In scientific reports, animals are commonly said to be 'sacrificed' at the end of experiments. Birke et al. (2007, 60) note that this formalised language of sacrifice endows 'symbolic importance, as though the animal were sacrificed for some greater good'. In this, we recognise the nonconformist motif of Christ's sacrifice for the 'greater good' of the salvation of the world. However, the structure of nonconformist sacrifice has been inverted. Instead of God sacrificing himself for humanity, the almighty creator for the powerless creature, it is the animal which lacks power who is sacrificed for the humans who possess it. The symbolic force of a religious motif persists, but has been transformed into its opposite as it is incorporated into the modern discourse of science.

The once radical nonconformist sense of sacrifice has here been made docile, and is now entirely compatible with a pragmatic use of animals for human ends. It takes for granted the legitimacy of sacrificing the less powerful (less rational, evolved, sentient, etc.) for the more. This is a tradition we already see in Galen's squealing pig experiment in second-century Pergamon, and which received scientific backing from Darwinism from the late nineteenth century. But now the Christian trope of sacrifice adds symbolic force, affirming an otherwise ethically dubitable act as commendable. Practical ethical questions are consequently reduced to a pragmatic calculus of suffering to warrant the sacrifice of 'lower' animal species for human benefit.

As we shall see in the next chapter, this detachment of the symbolic force of a trope from its content leaves a trace behind. Something of the distinctive nonconformist grammar remains, and opens a space for ethical reflection upon a different meaning of sacrifice.

POSTMODERN ARCHEOLOGY

We live in an age of postmodern suspicion of grand theories which celebrates authenticity and narratives. The way we talk about animals is in flux, with many discourses available as resources for animal advocacy. Within this cultural context, exploring the remnants of nonconformist language in modern discourses is of more than academic interest; it can

provide unexpected resources and insights for the critical review of inherited understandings. Such 'intellectual archeology' (Berry 2015, 13) can both enrich and inform contemporary animal advocacy through what Duncan Forrester (2005) has happily termed 'theological fragments'. The final chapter will suggest some ways in which this might be done.

Bibliography

Bentham, Jeremy. 1789 [1970]. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. London: Athlone.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism*. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Birke, Lynda, Arnold Arluke, and Mike Michael. 2007. *The Sacrifice: How Scientific Experiments Transform Animals and People*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Booth, Daryl. 2018. *Hearing the Confession of the Meat Industry*. Sarx Website: http://sarx.org.uk/articles/animal-issues/hearing-the-confession-of-the-meat-industry/.

Calvin, John. 1583. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: John Harison.

Dawkins, Richard. 1989. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunlap, Thomas R. 2004. *Faith in Nature: Environmentalism as Religious Quest*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Forrester, Duncan. 2005. *Theological Fragments: Essays in Unsystematic Theology*. London: Bloomsbury.

Fudge, Erica. 2017. *Re-enchanting the Farm*. Available at https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/62183/1/Fudge_2017_Re_enchanting_the_farm.pdf. Accessed November 1, 2017.

Giroux, Valery. 2016. "Animals Do Have an Interest in Liberty." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 6 (1): 20–43.

Hansard. 1879. *House of Lords Debate 15 July 1879,*. vol. 248, cc419–36.

Hodges, Thomas. 1675. *The Creatures Goodness, as They Came Out of God's Hands*. London: Tho. Parkhurst.

King, John. 1594 [1864]. *Lectures upon Jonah*. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Linzey, Andrew. 1994. *Animal Theology*. London: SCM.

Luther, Martin. 1958. *Works*. Vol. 2. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing.

Maasen, Sabine, and Peter Weingart. 2013. *Metaphors and the Dynamics of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

MacIntyre, Alistair. 1981. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth.

Pope, Alexander. 1713. "Against Barbarity to Animals." *The Guardian*, No. 61, London, May 21.

Preece, Rod. 2005. *Brute Souls, Happy Beasts, and Evolution*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Primatt, Humphrey. 1776 [1992]. *The Duty of Mercy*. Fontwell, Sussex: Centaur Press.

Rawlinson, John. 1612. *Mercy to a Beast: A Sermon Preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke 1612*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Rémy, Catherine. 2003. "Une Mise à Mort Industrielle 'humaine'?" *Politix* 64: 51–73.

Rutherford, Samuel. *1644: The Due Right of Presbyteries*. London: Richard Whittaker and Andrew Crook.

Sampson, Philip J. Forthcoming. "Evangelical Christianity: Lord of Creation or Animal Among Animals?" In *The Handbook of Religion and Animal Ethics*, edited by Andrew Linzey and Clair Linzey. New York: Routledge.

Stoll, Mark. 1997. *Protestantism, Capitalism, and Nature in America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Stoll, Mark. 2006. "Creating Ecology: Protestants and the Moral Community of Creation." In *Religion and the New Ecology*, edited by David M. Lodge and Christopher Hamlin, 53–72. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Trapp, John. 1660. *Annotations upon the Whole Bible*. Vol. 3. London: R. W.

van Dooren, Thom. 2014. *Flight Ways: Life and Loss at the Edge of Extinction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.

Wise, Stephen. 2000. *Rattling the Cage*. London: Profile Books.

Withrow King, Sarah. 2016. *Animals Are Not Ours*. Oregon: Cascade.

Woodfall, W. 1800. "House of Commons Debate, 2 April 1800." In *The Parliamentary Register*, vol. 2. London: John Stockdale.

Nonconformist Bricolage

I argued in the last chapter that contemporary animal advocacy bears traces of its religious origins. As in any archaeological site, we can recognise both 'shards and remnants' (Berry 2015, 13); and the outline of foundations, the traces of structures long gone. These surviving vestiges are often dismissed as the discredited and outdated remains of a pre-Enlightenment world. Nonconformist religion as a significant cultural force has certainly gone, but its remains persist. Moreover, they are part of public discourse in our culture. As such, they require no further justification to become constructive sources for a more just and compassionate treatment of animals.

The Postmodern Turn

The relationship between contemporary animal advocacy and modernity is ambivalent. On the one hand, modern scientific rationalities have provided a language to vigorously challenge traditional abuses. Yet, as a metanarrative of progress, this same language also provides justifications for the systematic cruelties to animals which are found everywhere in the modern, scientific world. Moreover, the two great ideologies of the Enlightenment and neo-Darwinism which frame animal ethics, are themselves in unstable union. The Enlightenment, above all a humanism, rooted itself in a dualism: the self-evident truth of what it is to be 'Man' rather than 'animal'. But neo-Darwinism made the human-animal

boundary porous, undercutting this humanistic dualism. Sigmund Freud likewise questioned the rational autonomy of human consciousness which was central to the Enlightenment project. Post-humanism has since identified many other points of tension, including the social construction of human identity and its relationship to structures of power (Berger and Luckman 1967; Foucault 1982). The human, which had once seemed essentially fixed, now appears less so. This instability of the human has been further intensified by animal studies which have enriched our understandings of 'animal' existence.

This destabilising of the human developed within a general scepticism towards the Enlightenment project of bending nature to 'man's' 'optimistic will' (Sampson 1994; Lyotard 1989). Humans have indeed bent the natural world, but few remain optimistic about the shape it is taking. Humans have shown themselves to be destructive towards nature, especially towards other species. The very category of *the human*, once the pride of humanistic ideology, now appears rapacious, even toxic (Gray 2015, 1.3) The optimistic bending of nature for man's good has become a deformation which extended human power over animal bodies, and the power of some humans over others.

Not only did the great modernist ideologies impose what turned out to be a fragile order on reality, they also provided an illusion of harmonious progress as humans extended their domination. Science, the site and source of technological power, legitimated modernist exploitation of the natural world (especially animals) by claiming that it was also the locus of truth. In the twenty-first century, disenchantment with this modern narrative has led to the exploration of assertions previously taken for granted, especially of the human-animal boundary. Attention has shifted from grand narratives to the specific, from the general to particular or local issues. For example, the late nineteenth century campaign to reform vivisection law put expert oversight at its centre; however, animal advocates quickly came to regard the ostensibly reforming Act of 1876 as a vivisectionist's charter (Hansard 1879, 426). Contemporary campaigns are more likely to focus on the public gaze than on expert inspection. Specific, concrete changes such as banning the testing of cosmetic products on animals, CCTV in slaughterhouses and bans on cages or live export are displacing trust in professional veterinary supervision.

By the early twenty-first century, animal advocacy had mushroomed into a diversity of discourses. These incorporate fragments quarried from earlier Western strata which are already in the public sphere, as well as

those imported from other cultures. A manifold universe of meanings contribute to the debate, including animal suffering, deep green ideology, the environmental impact of animal use, health, climate change, and the revival of pantheist and animist spiritualities.

Ethical Bricolage

This 'postmodern turn' in advocacy has left its mark on contemporary animal discourses. In the twentieth century, these had endeavoured to unify insights such as Darwin's theory of origins and the Benthamite criterion of 'suffering' into a systematic, rights-based paradigm in the modernist tradition. Ethical theories were engineered by breaking problems down into basic components using analytical machinery specially constructed for the purpose (Singer 2015; Regan 2004). As befits grand-theory making, the theory homologously mirrored the structure of its subject matter: the modern industrial facilities which break down animal bodies into basic components using machinery specially constructed for the purpose. These dominant modernist discourses sought to give a unified account, to achieve a universal secular viewpoint. As they perceive religious beliefs as problematic or irrelevant, modern accounts were reluctant to draw on religious sources.

The modernist tradition of animal ethics achieved some striking successes, not least by putting the subject on the agenda. The postmodern turn has seen this drive to engineer ethical theories replaced by a broad criss-crossing of disciplines, with diverse foundations, including contributions from outside Western cultures. This suggests that we need to revisit the way we use sources in constructing our ethical understandings of the world.

Jeffrey Stout (1990, 74f and 109f) suggests a strategy which draws upon all the resources available, rather than discourses specifically engineered in the modernist tradition. He references Lévi-Strauss' description of the *bricoleur* who uses whatever language comes to hand, what we already find in the culture around us. Jacques Derrida (1978, 360) similarly draws upon Lévi-Strauss to argue that we are all bricoleurs now: 'If one calls *bricolage* the necessity of borrowing one's concept from the text of a heritage which is more or less coherent or ruined, it must be said that every discourse is *bricoleur*'. Rather than seeking to construct theories mirroring the structure of its subject matter, bricoleurs subvert that structure by situating animals and their bodies in a wider universe

of meanings. Where modernity narrowed the meaning of animals to 'things' in a commercial setting, bricolage explores multiple dimensions of the relationships between animals and humans, including those christian meanings characteristic of pre-modern husbandry.

Resources, Fragments, Meanings

The wide range of resources now available to animal advocacy are shot through with fragments and traces which have become detached from the religious discourses to which thy originally belonged. As Leiss (1994, 31) points out, the 'received imagery of their faith' provided the innovators of modernity with 'some ready made categories', and religious connotations still cling to them. Whilst religion no longer occupies the position of influence it once did, these traces can bring to contemporary animal studies an excess of meaning, what Leiss (1994, 28) calls a 'magical aura', over secular usage. Present in the public sphere, such traces are already recognised as public truth, requiring no further justification to demand a hearing.

Although most people are neither aware of nor interested in the religious discourses to which these fragments originally belonged, Duncan Forrester (2005, 16) has argued in another context that a modest presentation and exploration of the fragments themselves is 'relevant, true, illuminating, and helpful for just practice'. Grand narratives are neither necessary, nor any longer common in animal advocacy campaigns. Investigating the remains which lie scattered throughout our cultural landscape may both penetrate our contemporary cultural assumptions about animals, offering new ways of thinking, and provide resources to bring the justice which animals demand (Fudge 2017, 3).

Such an archaeological enquiry can enrich and inform contemporary animal advocacy in three ways: fragments sustain and nourish; they offer specific insights; and they unexpectedly integrate diverse perspectives.

FRAGMENTS SUSTAIN AND NOURISH

Much animal advocacy encourages more compassionate behaviour towards animals than we commonly find in industrial farms or the laboratories of the pharmaceutical industry. As Emmanuel Levinas (1969, 150f and 213) has argued, such industrial institutions and systems are concrete instances of modernity's totalising vision, a vision so culturally

familiar to us that it conceals its roots of oppression, and is hostile to the emergence of gentleness and the peaceable welcome of all creatures. Disruption of our complacency towards suffering must come from outside this modern vision.

Nonconformist discourses recognised gentleness and peaceableness as 'fruit of the spirit' (Gal. 5.22–3) which come from 'outside' the fallen world, and require spiritual cultivation to avoid the hardness of heart to which the human condition is prone. *Pace* the consensus narrative about christian dominion thought, nonconformists were radically theocentric and insisted that humans could do nothing without God. We cannot, they argued, take virtue for granted as a human attribute; paradoxically, the pursuit of human kindness entails de-centring the human. Lynn White (1967, 1207) pointed beyond conventional secular solutions when he argued that the roots of environmental despoliation are largely religious, so 'the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not'. White proposed calling on marginalised (Franciscan) or different (Buddhist) religious traditions as a resource beyond the secular. We find echoes of this call for transcendence in the numerous connections between animal advocacy groups and various spiritualities, especially those of a non-Western heritage. But there is already a tradition whose language is part of public discourse and requires only recognition, not further justification. The nonconformist experience points to insights from the periphery as important resources for subverting the totalising vision of modernity.

The nonconformists emphasised spirituality but were never abstract. Congregations sang 'Let every creature rise and bring peculiar honours to our King', exhorting each creature to bring its unique praise to God (Watts 1827, 514). They learned this antiphonal call-and-response relationship as they themselves responded to pericopes such as Ps. 19 or Ps. 148 which speak of creation's praise of God. Nor was their existential ethic abstract. It derived from affective depictions of animals in the biblical canon; and was developed through practical cases, not speculative theory. Particular relationships between individual animals and humans broadened their range of the ethical beyond human interests. When they read of Nathan telling David of the poor man's lamb which lay in his bosom, or of Jesus keeping the mother and foal together on the road into Jerusalem, it was a lesson in God's love of compassion (2 Sam. 12, Matt. 21). When they read of Nimrod the hunter, or of Balaam beating his ass, they discovered the wickedness of animal cruelty (Gen. 10,

Num. 22). As we saw in Chapter 7, this was no rote learning or obedience to abstract rules; mercy to animals is the outward manifestation of an 'inward affection'. Commenting upon 'walking in newness of life', Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Rom. 6.1–23) intertexts Prov. 4.23, 'out of the heart are the issues of life'; 'if the source is clean, so is its issue'. 'We are persuaded', says John Calvin, 'that pity and mercy are virtues' (Wendel 1969, 32). In Calvin's day, it was Stoic philosophy which said otherwise; today those who deride them as virtues claim that pity towards animals is sentimentalism. But whether pity and mercy are being defended against Stoic philosophy or hard-nosed pragmatism, our advocacy must engage rational debate in existential experience.

The nonconformists read in their bibles of real animals, and they looked to real animals to instruct us how we should treat them. John Calvin (1583, 775–776) observed a mother bird with 'such a care of her young, that she forgetteth herself for their sakes'; when birds 'see their little ones, to their seeming they be deerer to them than their owne life'. Therefore, he says, 'we will have pitie and compassion upon the poore birdes, when we see them yeelde their life' for their young. Horatius Bonar (1875, 41) uses his detailed knowledge of the biblical canon to describe real birds praising God as an example to us, 'whether it be "the stork that knoweth her appointed time" (Jer. 8:7), or "the sparrow alone upon the housetop" (Ps. 102:7), or "the raven of the valley" (Pr. 30:17), or the eagle "stirring up her nest, and fluttering over her young" (De. 32:11), or the turtle [dove] making its voice to be heard in the land (So. 2:12), or the dove winging its way to the wilderness (Ps. 105:6)'.

When Rawlinson (1612, 3) reflects on dealing rightfully with animals, he relies not upon a theory of rights such as was later developed in the Enlightenment, but upon an 'inward affection' arising from God's redemptive intervention. The righteous man's 'bowels are so enlarged with pitty, that hee will not wrong, no not a brute beast; nay more, he will be sure to do it right, and the more right, the lesse able it is to right it selfe: and that he might doe it right indeed (as he must if he will be righteous) he is ever ready to afford it such necessary helps, as may any way conduce to the maintenance of life'. Pity and succour, says John Flavel (1820, 186), are 'a due debt' to distressed animals.

The nonconformist imaginary gave priority to the experience of real animals over theories about them, to their meaning in God's universe over their pragmatic use, to our shared kinship in creation over our isolated dominion, and to narratives about them over abstractions. This

existentially based language is incompatible with pragmatic discourse, and had substantial cultural force. It suggests that ethics should begin with practical relationships with individual animals, our shared experience of their lives, their meaning for a flourishing world, and the 'inward affection' which regards pity as both a virtue and a duty (Peterson 2013).

In extending the moral universe to include animals, the nonconformists certainly used rational arguments but always thickened with the existential imperative to have mercy. Maria Balaska (2016) has recently drawn attention to just such an inclusion of narrative and meaning, suggesting that moral consideration for animals rests upon relational criteria of inclusion in the human world of meaning. The life we share with animals may be enriched by scientific enquiry, but cannot be reduced to it.

Cultivating the human heart requires communities of encouragement and mutual challenge to sustain and nourish commitment. For the nonconformists, these communities are creation wide. John Calvin exhorted his congregation to have pity and compassion by recounting the life of a mother bird with her chicks, not through theory. The kinship of creation provides a community of embedded experience for us to learn how we should relate to animals. Such 'proto-conversations' can, argues Cynthia Willett (2014, 89f), 'transmit that ineffable feeling that someone is at home all the way across species barriers' in a way that Enlightenment-era moral theories cannot. Moreover, some conversations can be uncomfortable. Animals make demands on us, they hold us to account, they complain to God. And, as we have seen, the gracious God hears the young ravens when they cry to him (Ps. 147.9).

Fragments Offer Specific Insights

The previous chapter identified a number of fragments from nonconformist discourses which survive in the way we talk about animals today. These can offer new ways to challenge our contemporary assumptions.

All Creatures in Their Kind

There is little incentive to talk about animals used for particular human purposes as though their lives have a value other than that of instrumental use. This is reflected in the impoverished language in which, for example, we speak of a 'food animal' or an 'experimental or lab animal', in comparison with a 'pet'. In the Parliamentary vivisection debates of

the 1870s, nonconformist language provided an excess of meaning over an animal's instrumental value for generating scientific knowledge. Advocates of reform spoke of Balaam's ass rebuking the cruelty of its owner, or of the idolatry of science which would sacrifice everything to its own image (Woodfall 1802, 298; Hansard 1879, 426). Echoes of this richer language of the value of individual animals over an autonomous image of science can still be heard in contemporary legislation such as Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament.

For nonconformists, animals are not simply significant as individuals, they are always innocent, worshipping God according to their kind. 'All creatures in their kind bless God…. They that have tongues, though they want reason, praise him with those natural organs. The birds of the air sing, the beasts of the earth make a noise… the very "dragons in the deep," … sound out his praise' (Adams 1629 [1862], 10). Moreover, as we saw in Chapter 5, the world of praising animals is independent of ours, and judges it: they 'are worse than beasts who do not praise our God….More base than reptiles, more insignificant than insects, are songless men' (Spurgeon 1885, 148.7 and 10). The point here is not a hierarchy of creatures, but that even the least significant insect from our point of view praises God and is thereby greater than songless men.

Such radical differences between an animal's world and our own subverts our tendency to treat animals as though we understood their lives. It points to a more modest evaluation of our abilities, one which challenges the foundations of our relationship with animals and our behaviour towards them.

Images of Sacrifice

Thom van Dooren (2016, 17) suggests exploring the ethical aspect of animal-human relationships through the lens of sacrifice, asking on what grounds 'are the lives of some beings sacrificed for the sake of others?'. In the previous chapter, I argued that the nonconformist trope of 'sacrifice' supplements the discourse of animal experimentation with an excess of meaning over what is usually available in scientific reports. It symbolically implies a reluctant relinquishing of a valued good for some higher purpose; here beneficial or healing scientific knowledge. The symbolic force of the sacrifice trope may rest in the nonconformist tradition but, as was discussed, it is transformed into its opposite.

However, drawing on a religious resource to supplement the secular lexicon of sacrifice in this way also unintentionally opens a way for other meanings to enter unawares. Jonathan Klawans (2006, 40) draws attention to a deep ambivalence about sacrifice in contemporary culture. On the one hand, 'religious' sacrifice is treated with 'disdain in the popular and scholarly mind' as a 'primitive' practice. Yet it retains symbolic force when used in the above context of scientific experimentation; or when we speak of sacrificing food animals for human nutrition. This linguistic ambivalence is homologous with a deep ambivalence towards the place of food and experimental animals in our culture, an ambivalence which may be explored through these conflicting meanings of 'sacrifice'. In particular, by identifying the vestiges of nonconformist discourse in the language of sacrifice, we can open a space for ethical reflection.

Pragmatically, humans experiment upon animals for much the same reason as we eat or hunt them: because we can. We have the power to sacrifice other creatures for our own interests. Justifications for this pragmatic language of sacrifice typically rest upon two premises. Firstly, the existence of a hierarchy of value, with humans at the top. Secondly, a presumption that it is right to sacrifice the less valuable species or individual in the hierarchy for the more valuable. Value is here a human judgement, typically based upon the possession of capacities such as reason, language or supposed sentience; unsurprisingly, hierarchies of value commonly coincides with those of power. Within this framework, a utilitarian calculus of suffering is used to assess how much suffering of how many animals is justified by human interests. This pragmatic language of sacrifice has contributed little to animal advocacy; indeed, such ethical guidance as it does provide rather undercuts protecting the vulnerable (Clark 1998, 129; Cobbe 2004, 103/4).

The nonconformists were acquainted with a different discourse of sacrifice in which the (human) good shepherd gave his life for the (animal) sheep (John 10); this discourse was used by Jesus of Nazareth to exemplify the sacrifice of God in Christ: the creator for the creature. Everybody is now familiar with this ethic of sacrifice, and most people consider it commendable when, for example, parents give themselves for their children. However, the nonconformists were not just familiar with it, they were passionately gripped by it. It focused their worldview, and they emphasised the unconventionality, even irrationality of a transcendent God of love sacrificing himself for a transgressively flawed, temporal being. Christ's sacrifice, says Matthew Henry (1710 [2008],

Rom. 5.6–21), 'is such a mystery, such a paradox, such an unprecedented instance of love, that it may well be our business to eternity to adore and wonder at it'. They celebrated an ethic of sacrificial love which sacrificed the self for those who were unable to help themselves. As they attempted to live by its example, to walk in newness of life, they generated challenges to both of the above premises of pragmatic sacrifice: to both a hierarchy of value, and to the ethic of sacrificing the lesser for the greater.

The premise of a hierarchy of value is easiest to maintain if species do not share what Augustine (388 [1966], 17.59) called a 'common nature' or a 'community of rights'; that is, a community of relationship, affect or interest. Consequently, justifications for sacrificing animals to human interests either deny a common nature or, where this clearly exists, rely upon there being a clear ranking between humans and other creatures. Thus, for example, the sacrifice of non-human primates in laboratory experiments, or of millions of mammals in the meat industry, is most easily justified if they have nothing in common with humans. Where we cannot avoid recognising that they do share with us capacities such as sentience, it may still be argued that their sentience is so far inferior to ours that we may legitimately sacrifice them. The nonconformist discourse of animals subverted the foundations of such justifications by asserting that humans and animals share a common nature in kinship of *Creation*. Moreover, the discourse of the *Fall* blurs, or even reverses, any hierarchy of value as animals are innocent whereas humans are not. Finally, *Redemption* motifs invert the structure of pragmatic sacrifice. I will consider each in turn, beginning with the Creation motif.

Creation
Humans and animals were created on the same day, of the same dust, to inhabit the same earth, eat the same diet, and praise and serve the same God in what Santmire (1985, 130) describes as 'solidarity' between humans and creation. As we have already seen, they are 'companions to us' (Calvin 1539 [1834], Rom. 8.22), and we are 'but a fellow-creature' with them (Manton 1684 [1870], 160), 'onely a fellow creature to the meanest worm', as Joseph Hall (1654, 289) puts it. This allows little space for a creational hierarchy. In the beginning, humans and animals 'lived together in love and concord among themselves' (Walker 1641, 168). In short, there is a creational community of creatures which includes animals in an ethical universe usually reserved for humans.

Moreover 'by the lawes of the grand Creatour, there is.. [an] affinitie betweene man and the beastes' (Abbot 1613, 450). As discussed in Chapter 5, this includes a wide range of capacities; for Augustus Toplady (1825, 464–465), it extends to the soul: 'That beasts are possessed of the five senses we value ourselves upon… in as great, and sometimes much greater perfection than we; is a principle which I look upon as incontestable. Brutes are … as sensible of pain and pleasure, as man. Rub a cat's head and she will purr; pinch her tail, and she will spit. Now I would ask, what is it that feels? …It is the soul… that feels and perceives, through the medium of the senses….' The language of 'souls' is a reminder of what is too easily forgotten, that there is more to living creatures than meets the eye. In modernity, this excess of meaning is found in sentience itself, but this is a notion which sits uncomfortably in a materialist setting. The animal sentience literature remains both haunted and vivified by echoes of 'soul'.

If Creation discourse subverts the secular hierarchy of value, the language of the Fall inverts it.

Fall

This harmony of creation was destroyed by the Fall which generated a hierarchy of power: man had power over the animal kingdom 'to kill, and eat them' which he lacked in the state of innocency (Walker 1641, 232/3). But power must be sharply separated from warrant. Intertexting Gen. 2, Joseph Hall condemns the tyrannous use of power over animals: 'What an insolent usurpation is this, so licentiously to domineer over his fellow dust?' (Hall 1654, 290). For Augustus Toplady (1825, 460), 'all wanton exercise of powers over, and all unnecessary cruelty to, the brute creation, is truly and properly criminal'. The mere fact that humans have power over animals does not warrant its use. Quite the opposite.

Moreover, the Fall generated a second hierarchy in which humans occupy not the uppermost but the lower rungs, for we are a burden to God's innocent creatures who want nothing more than to praise their creator. The faithfulness of animals teaches us humility: 'the obedience of beasts and birds, who in their kinds glorify their Maker'; indeed, God has enabled them to do so 'with strength and comeliness of nature more than ourselves' (King 1594 [1864], 267). Indeed, as we have seen, Jeremiah Burroughes (1643, 67–68) bluntly says animals are now 'more righteous' than men, and Robert Bolton (1634, 156–157) argues that we should not be cruel to an animal which 'in its kind is much more,

and far better serviceable to the creator than thyself". This is a remarkable conclusion: animals are of greater value sub specie aeternitatis than (fallen) humans.

The rejection of hierarchy by the Creation motif, and its inversion by the Fall are, in the absence of an antidote, fatal for a pragmatic understanding of sacrifice. It might be supposed that the dominion narrative would provide a cure, but the redemption motif denies any such restorative by subverting the presumption that the weaker are sacrificed to the stronger.

Redemption

The sacrifice of experimental animals can, as Darren Calley (2017, 23) observes, be justified by 'the principle of saving human life', a soteriological criterion. Since humans have dominion over the beasts, it might be thought that this warrants sacrificing them to save human life. But for nonconformists, this is not how salvation works. As discussed in the previous chapter, loving generosity towards others was central to the nonconformist imaginary and was exemplified in the sacrifice of God in Christ, the stronger dying for the weaker. With this soteriological language, it was possible for some evangelicals in the 1870s to argue for an absolute ban on vivisection, something which simply did not make sense, was indeed a 'crime against mankind', if it was a pragmatic 'duty' to sacrifice the weaker for the stronger (Darwin 1881, 10). This radical paradigm of 'exuberant generosity to others' has inspired modern animal theologies (Gilmour 2014, 4; Linzey 1994, 30f). Generosity motifs also inform vernacular debate, as when Catherine Tate (Bray 2018, 37) argued against over-breeding dogs by 'putting their health and well-being above our desire' for a particular aesthetic appearance.

In the contemporary debate about animal experimentation, the nonconformist paradigm is a reminder that the pragmatic lexicon of sacrifice is not a given; it may be challenged. Moreover, vestiges of the nonconformist paradigm persist; a parent sacrificing herself for her child is already seen as commendable and requires no further justification. An ethical understanding of sacrifice need not echo, but may subvert, the dominant pragmatic paradigm, enabling valid claims for value to emerge which trump human interests and desires.

Fragments Unexpectedly Integrate

Alistair MacIntyre (1981, 1f) has argued that our contemporary moral landscape consists of surviving fragments from earlier traditions. Yet, even in a landscape of vestiges whose original integrity is now lost, we have seen that these fragments may still have practical utility. Moreover, they are not as isolated as they may appear to be on the cultural surface. Foundations may remain which, though often beneath the surface, organise what we see above ground. In particular, the nonconformist discursive formation described in previous chapters survives as a subterranean floor-plan which guides the shape of what we are able to build on its remains. This may sometimes unexpectedly integrate disparate fragments of our postmodern culture.

In the final paragraph of his celebrated *Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin (1897, 403) contemplated the 'grandeur' of the 'endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful', exemplified by the singing birds, flitting insects and crawling worms of a 'tangled bank'. This early glimpse of what is now called ecology was spurred on by Darwin's marvelling wonder (Hagen 1992, 1). Most people recognise this experience of a sense of wonder and beauty at nature's symbiotic inter-dependence. For the nonconformists, both the harmony and the wonder were built upon a common foundation, traces of which remain.

All creation fits together into a whole, says Stephen Charnock (1864, 26) and meets 'in a common centre, the good and preservation of the universe'. 'All are so interwoven and inlaid together by the divine workmanship, as to make up one entire beauty in the whole fabric'. For Thomas Adams (1629, 1116) creation's goodness is its 'comeliness and beauty', every individual part 'enbued with speciall vertue' suited to it's purpose within the whole creation; their harmony in obedience to God 'requires a confluence of many good things', seen in microcosm in Darwin's 'tangled bank'. Matthew Henry (1710 [2008], Rom. 8.19–22) emphasises 'the whole creation, the compages [a unity of many parts] of inanimate and sensible creatures'. This 'harmony and mutual dependence' has, argues Keith Thomas (1984, 278), a strong ecological implication: the 'modern idea of the balance of nature thus had a theological basis before it gained a scientific one'.

As with Darwin's bank, this harmony was a source of great wonder, for it discloses God. We 'cannot open our eyes', says John Calvin, 'without being compelled to behold him', and it is impossible to contemplate the world 'without being overwhelmed by the immense weight of glory' (1559 [1845], 1.v.1). 'If we truly understood the growth of a grain of wheat', writes Martin Luther, 'we would die of wonder' (Santmire 1985, 130). Contemplating the harmony of creation 'would ravish [enrapture] us with the admiration of God' (Charnock 1864, 23).

The nonconformist vision of a harmonious creation which enraptures us with wonder reframed traditional understandings of the community of creatures, opening space for a language of human and animal interdependence in the family of God.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Darwin's reinsertion of humans into the universal brotherhood of all animals cannot sustain an animal-friendly ethic because the norm of that brotherhood is competition and survival of the fittest. Indeed, as we saw, once the evolutionary principle of survival of the fittest colonises animal ethics, the logical consequence is that humans may kill and eat the lower species. The nonconformist kinship of creation provides an excess of meaning beyond evolutionary 'brotherhood', a language of co-operation in common purpose and wonder. C. H. Spurgeon (1885, 148.7) quotes John Everard (1653) approvingly on Ps. 148: The psalmist, by exhorting 'dumb, unreasonable, and senseless creatures to praise God' means 'to set forth the sweet harmony that is among all God's creatures; to show how that all the creatures being God's family, do with one consent speak and preach aloud God's praise'.

In the prelapsarian communion of creatures, humans and animals lived in love and harmony. They were bound together and became what they were by interacting. These bonds were distorted but not destroyed by the Fall: 'sheep, and oxen, and cattle …are tyed and chayned unto us with a straighter bond of analogue or proportion, that as we fare, so in reason they should do, either well or ill' (Abbot 1613, 451). The nonconformists found in the biblical texts a promise that the land would nurture humanity with milk and honey, not threaten them. This is the narrative which modern animal advocates call upon when they resist the evolutionary colonisation of ethics to speak of a universal brotherhood of all creatures, of harmony and dependence. Echoes can be heard in the ethic of interaction and mutual formation; and in the exploration of communal engagement with the lives of animals (Peterson 2013; Willett 2014). Vestiges of this harmony of all creatures provide the tacit content

of Lynn White's (1967) call for an un-romanticised, religiously informed ecology. The communion of creatures remains part of our cultural landscape and can be built upon in a variety of ways, offering new ways of thinking about animals.

When Charles Darwin looked upon his tangled bank, he wondered at the beauty and complexity of the animals living there. His scientific gaze led him to contemplate the 'war of nature', 'famine and death' which produces such a vision. But this would have made a down-beat ending to his book. His invocation of 'the Creator' as a breathing, living agency in the final sentence of later editions of *The Origin of Species* nicely inserts a meaning which exceeds the abstract evolutionary 'laws' he had discovered. Few evolutionary textbooks have had access to this religious language since, and the scientific gaze has become a defining feature of modernity. Nonconformist discourse opens up a space for a different, richer gaze, more like Darwin's sense of wonder.

The Nonconformist Gaze

Animals in modernity are seen, not seeing; passive, not active; silent or inarticulate, they lack a voice. The modern, scientific eye does not expect the observed to observe; it begins with 'the 'immense disavowal' of the fact that animals also look (Derrida 2002, 382). It is humans who gaze, animals who are seen.

Modern diners do not expect their meals to look back at them; the practice of serving dishes at the table with the animal's head attached was largely abandoned at the end of the eighteenth century (Thomas 1984, 300). Modern experimental science began, not with rational instrumentality, but with this modern gaze which looked upon an animal without looking it in the eye, and adopted the privileged position of controlling, examining, cutting apart, classifying, naming and eating (or wearing). In modernity, we do the talking *about* animals; they are silent. Rarely, do we speak from the other side of the gaze, from the viewpoint of the animal who is gazed upon.

But for the nonconformists, animals are not silent. They actively call for and welcome the human gaze, celebrating what they are, creatures who disclose God: 'every worm and flie sayes [to mankind], look on me, and give God the praise of my living, sense, and motion: every bird sayes; hear me, and praise that God who hath given me these various feathers, and taught me these several notes: every beast, while he bellows, bleats,

brays, barks, roars, sayes, It is God that hath given me this shape, this sound…' (Hall 1654, 54).

This celebration is a mutual call and response. As humans gaze in wonder upon animals disclosing God to us, so prelapsarian animals gazed upon humans, naked before them. Thomas Boston (1720 [1964], 51) observes that Adam and Eve had no need of clothes as the air would not harm their 'beautiful bodies', and Martin Luther observes that their bodily nakedness was their 'greatest adornment before God and all creatures' (Santmire 1985, 130). George Walker (1641, 210) pictures the animals' first sight of humans: '… to all living creatures they appeared lovely, and full of beauty, and majestie. It was the creatures delight to see them, and to looke on them; and it was their joy to see the creatures admiring them, and rejoicing in their sight and presence. And therefore there was no cause or occasion for any shame, or of any feare to shew their simple naked bodies, and to have every part and member openly seene'.

This community of sight and presence blurs the boundary between animal and human; both, as it were, in a prelapsarian 'state of nature'.

In his meditation on the animal, Jacques Derrida (2002, 373f) recounts an experience which subverts the place allotted to animals in modernity: being gazed at naked by his nameless little cat. Like Luther and Walker, he emphasises naked presence, observing that, in nature, there is no nudity as there are no clothes. His account disavows the modern theorem that animals are seen, not seeing; it is the gaze of the cat which instigates his reflection on what makes him human.

Despite the ambiguity in his view of animals (Calarco 2004), Emmanuel Levinas (1990, 152) also recounts an experience of being seen by an animal, in this case a dog with a name. Bobby was adopted by Jewish prisoners in a Nazi camp; when they returned from their work detail, Bobby greeted them by 'jumping up and down and barking in delight': 'for him, there was no doubt that we were men', attests Levinas.

In both these cases, we see the interrogation of the human. For Derrida, the cat's gaze questions who he is; for Levinas, Bobby recognised and affirmed the humanness of the prisoners which other humans (the guards) had denied. Both Derrida and Levinas engage explicitly with the traces of biblical texts: Derrida with several pericopes from Gen. 2.20 to Rev. 6, sometimes mediated through modern commentaries; and Levinas with Ex. 11 and 22. They draw upon the remnants of biblical texts in contemporary culture to develop new insights about animal-human relationships.

Discomfort of the Gaze

Derrida observes of his experience that being gazed at, naked, by his cat was disquieting; a disquiet he names as shame. This postlapsarian experience calls to mind the animal's gaze of judgement upon humans discussed in Chapter 6: to be constituted as human by the innocent animal, to be seen naked in spirit (Gen. 3.7), is not always a comfortable experience. There is plenty of evidence that humans feel this gaze, once we recognise it.

Public attitudes to the industrialisation of animal husbandry are deeply ambivalent. Few dining out on their products welcome a reminder of the factory farms and slaughterhouses. We do our best to keep such images in the dark. I have already mentioned that modern diners avoid their meal looking back at them. Indeed, many find it hard to look a 'food animal' in the eye (Salt 1914, 36), and no easier to watch it suffering. Historically slaughter has become increasingly invisible. In Thomas More's Utopia (1516 [1965], 139), animals were slaughtered and butchered by slaves outside the city so that citizens would not be corrupted by the sight; the same device was adopted by Napoleon who moved slaughterhouses outside Paris. Nineteenth-century London adopted the opposite stratagem: it was those who could afford it who moved, leaving the poor to witness the daily cruelty (Moss 1961, 17). The late twentieth century saw the introduction of agricultural gagging laws, making the filming of animals in industrial facilities illegal. Indeed, the meat industry depends upon the consumer's willingness to avert their eyes, and Pollan (2002, 11) contemplates glass walls for abattoirs to make this more difficult (Derrida 2002, 394). Even the slaughtered animal's more recognisable features are concealed by culinary disguises which make invisible the origin of what we put in our mouths (Thomas 1984, 300; Shelley 1813 [1947], 6). This aversion of the eyes applies wherever animals suffer. Hunters avoid the eye of their prey, and abattoir workers the eye of the animals they slaughter (Rémy 2003, 62). Lynda Birke (2007, 331) notes that in some laboratories, animals are kept in opaque cages:

'[the] research scientists felt "disturbed" by seeing the rats in clear cages, "because they kept looking at you". Once they do so, animals begin to cross the boundary from being objective "apparatus". In this sense they become less clearly "other" when they start to watch you—they become individuals, real animals. For these laboratory scientists at

least, there are clearly ethical dilemmas—better not to see that they are animals at all'.

Once we do see, shame at animal cruelty 'makes us blush to belong to the race of man', as C. H. Spurgeon (1873, 332) told his congregation.

In the language of nonconformity, when an animal looks into our eye, we know it as an innocent creature of God. Its welcoming gaze demands justice, and when we turn our eyes aside, stewardship calls us to account. This nonconformist discourse unexpectedly unites with ethical bonds the field of our experience of being seen by animals. More generally, the nonconformist vision of a harmony of creatureliness normed by thankfulness provides an alternative integration point to the Darwinian picture of animals normed by species survival. It allows us to contest the modern primacy of human beings in ethical debate, and it demands a response. As was said of a vivisected dog in the early twentieth century, the 'overwhelming trust', the 'absolute confidence that glistens in the dog's eye' lays upon us 'some obligation' (Lansbury 2007, 312). The nonconformist gaze is first a gaze of mercy, not knowledge, and the mutuality of gaze is sometimes called love.

THE RESTORATION OF THE WORLD

The world of nonconformity fragmented towards the end of the nineteenth century, and lost its intellectual authority; the nonconformist conscience did not long survive it, and had almost entirely disappeared by the first world war (Bebbington 2014). However, I have argued that traces and vestiges remain, that they retain cultural force, and are already part of the cultural landscape requiring no further justification. They are available as a resource for the animal advocacy community to articulate meanings which exceed pragmatic reason and positivist explanations.

Alistair MacIntyre (1981) is pessimistic about our ability to make use of such resources, emphasising the lack of a coherent ethical understanding in postmodern culture; and of course, it would be preferable not to have the specific meanings of nonconformist discourses truncated and reduced. However, we are where we are, and vestiges are better than saying nothing, especially as they are already in the public sphere. Indeed, Jürgen Habermas (2002, 149) has argued that, if we wish to avoid idle postmodern chatter, there is no alternative than to draw on the Western heritage of 'the Judaic ethic of justice and the Christian ethic of love'.

The persistence of soteriological themes in contemporary environmentalism has inspired historical hope that humans can treat the natural world in a less violent and exploitative way (Berry 2015, 180f). Animal advocates can likewise draw on religious resources which have shown a remarkable capacity to express meanings beyond the pragmatic use of animals; an ability to find a bond of solidarity between animals and humans without effacing difference (Levinas 1969, 40); and a soteriologically rooted hope that we humans will treat animals less cruelly in a restored world. Indeed, Jürgen Habermas (1998, 15) denies that 'we, as Europeans, can seriously understand concepts like morality or ethical life,… without appropriating the substance of the Judeo-Christian understanding of history in terms of salvation'.

The nonconformist vestiges which persist in our culture carry meanings which inspired a striking capacity over several hundred years to find value in animal life. Today they can provide distinctive resources for the critical review of inherited ways of talking about animals. They deepen our understanding of animal existence, and enable us to enrich the imagination of both popular and technical animal advocacy. If Habermas is correct, they are indispensable. There is really no other option. If there is anything to the nonconformist prophetic motifs, they also put us on the right side of history.

Bibliography

Abbot, George. 1613. *An Exposition upon the Prophet Jonah*. London: Richard Field.

Adams, Thomas. 1629. "Meditations upon Some Part of the Creed." In *Workes of Thomas Adams*, vol. 3, 1087–1240. London: Nisbet.

Adams, Thomas. 1629 [1862]. "The Taming of the Tongue." In *The Works of Thomas Adams*, vol. 3. London: Nisbet.

Augustine. 388 [1966]. *The Catholic and Manichaean Ways of Life*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Balaska, Maria. 2016. "What Guides Moral Consideration?" *Journal of Animal Ethics* 6 (1): 10–19.

Bebbington D. W. 2014. *The Nonconformist Conscience: Chapel and Politics, 1870–1914*. New York: Routledge.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckman. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor.

Berry, Evan. 2015. *Devoted to Nature: The Religious Roots of American Environmentalism*. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Birke, Lynda. 2007. "Into the Laboratory." In *The Animals Reader*, edited by Linda Kalof and Amy Fitzgerald, 323–335. Oxford: Berg.

Bolton, Robert. 1634. *Some General Directions for a Comfortable Walking with God*. London: John Legatt.

Bonar, Horatius. 1875. *Earth's Morning; Or, Thoughts on Genesis*. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers.

Boston, Thomas. 1720 [1964]. *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*. London: Banner of Truth.

Bray, Elisa. 2018. "Tate Becomes the Ultimate Advocate for the British Bulldog." *i*, March 15.

Burroughes, Jeremiah. 1643. *An Exposition of the Prophesie of Hosea*. Vol. 2. London: W.E. and I.G.

Calarco, Matthew. 2004. "Deconstruction Is Not Vegetarianism: Humanism, Subjectivity, and Animal Ethics." *Continental Philosophy Review* 37 (2): 175–201.

Calley, Darren. 2017. "The Aggregation of Suffering in the Regulatory Context: Scientific Experimentation, Animals, and Intrinsic Value." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 7 (1) (Spring): 1–30.

Calvin, John. 1539 [1834]. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by John Owen. London: L. B. Seeley.

Calvin, John. 1559 [1845]. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Calvin, John. 1583. *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: John Harison.

Charnock, Stephen. 1864. *Discourse on God's Wisdom*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: James Nicol Works.

Clark, Stephen R. L. 1998. "Is Nature God's Will?" In *Animals on the Agenda*, edited by Andrew Linzey and Dorothy Yamamoto, 123–136. London: SCM Press.

Cobbe, Frances Power. 2004. "The Moral Aspects of Vivisection." In *Animal Welfare and Anti-Vivisection 1870–1910*, vol. 1, edited by Susan Hamilton, 99–114. London: Routledge.

Darwin, C. R. 1881. "Mr. Darwin on Vivisection". *The Times*, April 18.

Darwin, C. R. 1897. *The Origin of Species*. London: John Murray.

Derrida, Jacques. 1978. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. London: Routledge.

Derrida, Jacques. 2002. "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)." Translated by David Wills. *Critical Inquiry* 28 (2): 369–418.

Flavel, John. 1820 *Works*. Vol. 5. London: Baynes.

Forrester, Duncan. 2005. *Theological Fragments*. London: T & T Clark.

Foucault, Michel. 1982. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Fudge, Erica. 2017. *Re-enchanting the Farm*. Available at https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/62183/1/Fudge_2017_Re_enchanting_the_farm.pdf. Accessed December 1, 2017.

Gilmour, Michael J. 2014. *Eden's Other Residents: The Bible and Animals*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Gray, John. 2015. *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals*. London: Granta.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *Postmetaphysical Thinking*. Cambridge: Polity.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2002. *Religion and Rationality—Essays on Reason, God and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hagen, Joel Bartholomew. 1992. *An Entangled Bank*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hall, Joseph. 1654. *Select Thoughts*. London: Nath Brooks.

Hansard. 1879. *House of Lords Debate 15 July 1879*, vol. 248. cc419–36.

Henry, Matthew. 1710 [2008]. *Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendickson.

King, John. 1594 [1864]. *Lectures upon Jonah*. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lansbury, Coral. 2007. "The Brown Dog Riots of 1907." In *The Animals Reader*, edited by Lynda Kalof and Amy Fitzgerald, 307–322. New York: Berg.

Leiss, William. 1994. *The Domination of Nature*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1990. "The Name of a Dog." In *Difficult Freedom*, 151–153. London: Athlone.

Linzey, Andrew. 1994. *Animal Theology*. London: SCM.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1989. *The Postmodern Condition*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacIntyre, Alistair. 1981. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth.

Manton, Thomas. 1684 [1870]. *The Complete Works*. Vol. 12. London: James Nisbet.

More, Thomas. 1516 [1965]. *Utopia*. Vol. 4. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Moss, Arthur W. 1961. *Valiant Crusade: The History of the RSPCA*. London: Cassell.

Peterson, Anna. 2013. *Being Animal: Beasts and Boundaries in Nature and Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pollan, Michael. 2002. "An Animal's Place." *New York Times*, November 10.

Rawlinson, John. 1612. *Mercy to a Beast: A Sermon Preached at Saint Maries Spittle in London on Tuesday in Easter Weeke*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Regan, Tom. 2004. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rémy, Catherine. 2003. "Une Mise à Mort Industrielle 'Humaine'?" *Politix* 64: 51–73.

Salt, Henry S. 1914. *The Humanities of Diet: Some Reasonings and Rhymings*. Manchester: The Vegetarian Society.

Sampson, Philip. 1994. "The Rise of Postmodernity." In *Faith and Modernity*, edited by Philip Sampson, Vinay Samuel, and Chris Sugden, 29–57. Oxford: Regnum.

Santmire, H. Paul. 1985. *The Travail of Nature*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. 1813 [1947]. *A Vindication of Natural Diet*. London: C. W. Daniel.

Singer, Peter. 2015. *Animal Liberation*. London: The Bodley Head.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1873. "A Word for Brutes Against Brutes." *Sword and the Trowel* 3 (June): 332–338.

Spurgeon, C. H. 1885. *The Treasury of David*. London: Marshall Bothers.

Stout, Jeffrey. 1990. *Ethics After Babel: The Languages of Morals and Their Discontents*. Cambridge: James Clark.

Thomas, Keith. 1984. *Man and the Natural World*. London: Penguin.

Toplady, Augustus M. 1825. "Speech Delivered at the Queens Arms, Newgate Street, on the Following Question, 'Whether Unnecessary Cruelty to the Brute Creation, Is Not Criminal?'" In *Works*, vol. 3, 459–466. London: Baynes.

van Dooren, Thom. 2016. *Flight Ways: Life and Loss at the Edge of Extinction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Walker, George. 1641. *God Made Visible in His Works*. London: John Bartlet.

Watts, Isaac. 1827. *The Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts*. Edited by Dr. Rippon. Philadelphia: David Clark.

Wendel, François. 1969. *Calvin*. London: Collins.

White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.

Willett, Cynthia. 2014. *Interspecies Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Woodfall, W. 1802. *The Parliamentary Register*, 1801–2. Vol. 3, House of Commons, 24 May 1802, 295f. London: John Stockdale.

Index