

by the supposition made, the only means of nutrition would lie in vegetable matter.

The threatening of death, upon a violation of the easy test of obedience, seems very clearly to imply, that the subjects of this law had a knowledge of *what* death was; otherwise, they could not have known what the threatening meant. The idea of their having had set before them, as the penalty of violating the law, an unknown and undefined suffering, does not seem congruous to the wisdom and dignity of legislation.

It would next be proper to ascertain whether there are any passages of Scripture which affirm, or imply, that the animals inferior to man were created in a state not liable to death. This, if supposed, would involve the necessity of all being herbivorous; and further, that there were no minute and even invisible animals, inhabiting the leaves and fruits of plants, and which the feeders on vegetables must kill by myriads. I must own that I know of no such passage.

If, however, any should contend that an insuperable difficulty lies in the occurrence of pain and death to animals, irrespectively of moral evil, I humbly think that they ought to satisfy themselves with the spirit and principle of our Lord's reply to a not dissimilar question; "His disciples asked him, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but [this was appointed] that the works of God should be manifested in him."*

It is indeed an essential part of revealed truth, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" and that thus "by man came death."† But it appears to me a fair interpretation of these passages, and a

* John ix. 2, 3.

† Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 21.