acquainted with nearly fifty varieties” (*Missionary  
Records*, p. 11).  
 How strong the resemblances here! If the one be a  
literal tree, so is the other.  
 “But how can one tree stand in three different places?  
How can it be in the midst of the square, and on both  
sides of the river?”  
 Two replies may be given.  
 1. Its nature is like that of the banyan tree of India,  
which spreads over an immense space, having, not one  
stem, as with us, but many: each bough sending down  
fibres, which after awhile become fresh trunks of the  
tree.  
 2. The word used in the original is a singular one.  
It signifies generally “timber.” It probably designates  
a *kind* of tree, not one individual specimen of it.  
 The tree of life was of old “in the midst of the  
Garden” (Gen. ii. 9; iii. 3). That is its place still.  
The tree is in the midst of the square, and the square  
is in the midst of the city.  
 The soul of man not only loves the society of the city,  
but God has made him also to find delight in the beauty  
of the country.  
 The herb, then, will no longer be man’s food. The fruit  
of the tree was originally appointed to supply him. But  
sin came in, and then, in order to compel toil, the Most  
High made the herb to be his support. How small the  
proportion of food that wheat contains, as compared  
with an apple-tree? The apple-tree needs not ploughing  
and sowing, harrowing and weeding. Year by  
year it yields its unlaboured crop. Baron Humboldt  
found that, from a plot of ground, which, when planted  
with wheat would support but two, fifty might be fed,  
if planted with the banana-tree. Now the tree is  
again destined to supply men. The staff of life is no  
longer a reed, but a tree. The tree of life is restored