

violated the laws of physical life? Now, we do not contend that the consequences involved in both cases are of equal importance, but the *principle* is the same in *kind*. In ethics, "principles have no magnitudes"—"unjust in little, unjust in much."

Again, it is thought quite unreasonable that there should have been a "tree of life," the fruit of which had power to renew the wasted energies of man's body—unreasonable that man, by partaking of that tree, would have "lived forever" had he not been "sent forth from the Garden of Eden." Now I would ask our prosing objectors, if not only fruit, but grain and food of every kind has not in itself, to a certain extent, the very power to which they object? While the suckling draws the life-sustaining elements from its mother's breast, the youth is strengthened by his appropriate food day by day. The tired laborer, the fainting traveller, and the jaded soldier, receive food and are strong. There is then confessedly something in food that, in some degree, to this day, renews our lives. This certainly blunts the edge of objection: for if God can sustain life for twenty years by means of what is eaten he could do the same for a thousand years—forever. Ask that large, learned, and very respectable portion of community—the medical Faculty—if thousands of plants have not strong medical qualities even yet, as if to *commemorate* the former existence of the "Tree of Life." Here again Nature deposes in favor of the Bible. The objection is trifling and unworthy a man of the commonest capacity.

But hear again, says the sceptic, 'It cannot be that we are to be responsible at all for our conduct; for we are so constituted that it is far easier to do what is called wrong than obey the so-called moral law—surely if God intended to reward us according to our works, He would have made it as easy at least to do right as wrong.' To this we respond, such was the case in the beginning. In man's primeval state there was no predisposition to sin; but when a man violates the laws of his being, physical or moral, the violation deranges and sickens the entire system: it is then not as easy to be well as to be sick—then jargon is more to be looked for in the system than uniform, regular action: and the whole head *is* sick, the whole heart *is* faint; how then could man be expected to be virtuous without a struggle?

But let *me* put a question to our *opponents* "which if they answer *me*," by the same logic I also will answer them. Why do the most noxious weeds in the garden and cultivated fields grow spontaneously and even in spite of our efforts to destroy them, while it requires much vigilance and arduous toil to bring to maturity such productions as grains, fruits, and all edible vegetables? Here Nature speaks out with her ten thousand tongues and declares in language not to be misunderstood, that she has the same apparent difficulties and inconveniences as are found in the domains of God's moral government. He who rejects the Bible is certainly very inconsistent if he rejects not Nature too. Such an one is not only without hope, without the Bible, without Nature, and without God,—but is an inheritor of ignorance and emptiness. The truth is, *sia* has cursed, not only the earth till it brings forth "thorns and thistles," but also the heart of man, which