

generally call *wild beasts*. I may mention here that the term **חיה** (*Chayyah*) only means a *living animal* according to its derivation, although this term no doubt is generally applied to *wild beasts* in contradistinction to **בהמה** (*Behemah*), *domestic animals*. Hence we find that term sometimes qualified as **חיה רעה** (*Chayyah räah*), "an evil beast," Genesis xxxvii. 33 ; or **חיה קנה** (*Chayyath Kaneh*) "a beast of the reeds," i.e., such as lurks in the reeds, as the crocodile—Psalm lxviii. 31. But the Hebrew term does not actually imply any voracity in the nature of these animals, and it is therefore very probable that at the time of their creation, and before the fall of man, although these animals no doubt were endowed with different natures, some being more or less adapted to be brought under the control of man, still, I say, there is nothing in the signification of the Hebrew word which would imply that they were at that time as fierce and ravenous as they are at present. Indeed, the fact that even the most ravenous of the wild beasts may be tamed, at least to a certain extent, if not entirely, strongly argues in favour of their not having possessed that fierceness from the beginning.

Hence, Isaiah, in his vivid prophetic declaration, ch. ix., 6-9, speaking of the happy time that shall be ushered in when sin shall have ceased again from man, paints that happy time as one of universal peace and amity between beasts and beasts, and beasts and man, implying as it were, that the same amity shall again reign as existed before sin entered the world.

We come now to the crowning act of the creation, namely the creation of man. And here, I may remark, that although it may be convenient for naturalists to class man with the animal kingdom, it is plain the sacred writer has not done so. Man, as far as the structure of his body is concerned,