

contradicted: for after enumerating a list of noble arts and useful feats he says, "these are arts to be thankful for, and we could not chose but respect them." This certainly implies that if they were arts, worthless or bad, he could chose to not respect them. And why should he labour to teach us to change from worse to better, and how to become good, and great, or successful, and condemn the practice of making ourselves appear great by "exclusion," by "egotism," by hurrah and bragg," [one might think he had been acquainted with Geikie hearing him refer to these.] He told us "Nature utilises misers, fanatics, &c., but that we must not think the better of them for that." Geikie says, "Christianity has the response of our bosoms in hanging up a deathless crown before him who seeks after righteousness." This may have the "response" of Geikie's heart no doubt, but compared to what Emerson taught—"We should do that with respect to the *excellence* of the work and *not its acceptableness*,"—it is low, mean, it is like holding out a lump of sugar to a spoiled child.

What cultivated mind does not at once see the greatness, and agree to Emerson's rule, yet in reality it condemns what Geikie's heart responds to, and what he says Christianity does. He says, "Pautheism scoffs at the idea of mediation"; and well it might, for it is absurd in the sense that Christians use it. The only sense in which it is possible, is between us and other finite beings—angels and men, and between man and man &c., But he says, "hnmanity by the fire or ten thou- alters craves it, and Christianity offers it." These fires and alters— though we may not have used these words—we have shewn to be a mode of worship, or efforts to gain favour direct from the gods, or God, and has no reference to mediation. He says Emerson "offers no code, no rule for our guidance towards God and our neighbour." We only need to quote still again, that great principle and rule, to prove this statement wrong, and defy Geikie to offer a "code, or rules of action" either "towards God or our neighbour," superior to it. Though he im- bodies with the thirty and nine *articles*, all the creeds, and codes, and rules of all the sects, we think he will come short of it—To think and act, "with the respect to the *excellence*" of the thought or deed, &c. But the idea of a code of rules for our guidance towards God, is ridicul- ous in the extreme. There is a code of *perfect* laws, [and therefore ought to be, and are immutable,] for our guidance to happyness, and if we violate them, it is our own business, we alone are responsible. God neither rewards or condemns us. But these matters—mediation &c.— are of not much consequence to these men, [Emerson &c.] as touching themselves, because they are happy with or without the belief— being reconciled— being convinced, to be good is to live *well*—is to live aright—to live aright is to be happy.

They are above the plane of reward, which looks to them like being hired to live well. To them "virture is its own reward." He says, "It

is a st  
so ut  
Now  
tinklin  
word  
people  
heard  
has b  
ism u  
fore.  
to do  
down  
for all  
itself  
criteri  
and th  
their  
their l  
of it.

But  
in an

He  
dom i  
are !  
wisdo  
mock  
Thou  
happi  
shado  
all, c  
oil yo  
librar  
Geiki  
ing."  
books

And  
is it  
it can  
we ca  
dersta

He  
suckli  
God h  
by Em