

this: the Bible is divine, because the Bible says so; [which is the almost universal mode of argument used by its defenders as such; yet the Bible *don't* say so;] but in the formation of his sentence he places them so that the one appears distinct from the other; perhaps this is to give the *appearance* of argument. If he had reversed his statement thus "to the want of *any* spirit" he would have expressed much truth; the multifarious forms of belief and creeds, the virtues and the vices, that this so-called Revelation of Jehovah countenances, testify to its capability of doing so. The good spirit that loves, may quote its authority, but so do the bad; the spirit that would rob his fellow-man of his liberty—his all—goes there too for its "want:" and fires have been kindled in a thousand piles, by this use made of it, in which human souls have been cast, and the quivering flesh burned from their bones, and their bones to ashes.

He says that Emerson's theology is, that "man is to himself, law, savour, &c.;" and why should it not be a part of it? it is truth. What *is* law to man, if he is not law to himself; is it the law of Angels? No; for in as much as they are not the same as we are; *their* laws are not appropriate for us, on the same principle that the law of a sheep is not the law of a lion, and in presuming the law of sheep to be the law of lions, we notice the result thus: first, the nature of the lion would be gone, annihilated, the result of this, that he would no longer exist, be, for he could no longer devour his prey, nor even kill it, or catch it, nor could he eat grass, or ruminate; but, in as much as they are both alike, as both require air to breathe, and food to eat, &c., the law of the one is the law of the other, so in the other case. This clearly demonstrates that man must be a law to himself, or cease to be *man*, [of course, the higher the being the higher the law.] Then if the law of angels is a little too high, on the whole, for man, how stupidly absurd it is to say that the law of God is that of man, or to man. So only in as much as the one is like the other, are the laws of the one the laws of the other. MAN CAN ONLY BE INFLUENCED OR GUIDED BY WHAT MAN CAN CONCEIVE TO BE THE HIGHEST GOOD, and it is a law of his being to seek it. But all beings, all species of existences, on any particular plane, or degree of development, may be influenced—inspired, by those, on the plane above, and *is*, ever has been, and ever will be. It is on the same principle that the better class of society imbres the other with a helping influence or that one individual may another, but unless the communication be such as that the lower can appreciate—except that it be only so far in advance of his own views, or conception, as to link in with them, as it were, or strike him as if he had almost arrived at it himself before, or be in some degree apparent to him—it will be as useless to him as Geikie's latin to a goose. This helps us to see better the beauty and truthfulness of Emerson's saying: "The good reader makes the good book," &c. Reader, this is the great developing principle. The