

fers to exercise his mind is not Religion, but Philosophy.

The Original Genius is never sufficiently subordinate and amenable to discipline. He is apt to be critical, to startle his easy-going companions with new and seemingly heterodox views. He is the ugly duckling whom all the virtuous and commonplace brood must cackle at ! ! !

I have particularly avoided giving the Biography of any of the writers. It is of little moment to me what a man's name is, or the exact date of his birth. All that, is foreign to our purpose. There is nothing shows the smallness of a man's mind than haggling over a name or a date, instead of taking up the main question at issue, and that is the man's Theory or Doctrine. As, for example, Moses: What do we care a straw whether Moses ever existed or not; or if that was his real name? The question at issue is: That a Theory of the Origin of the Universe and all that it contains, was propounded by a certain party under the name Moses. How does this Theory compare with other Theories advanced, and what Theory seems most feasible to man's mind at the present day? Every man, who is competent, or at least thinks himself competent, claims a right to interpret nature for himself.

In the make up of these Essays, and others not yet published, I have drawn from the class-notes, the class lectures, and from the works since published, of Professors Blackie, Sellar, Kelland, Tait, Fraser, Calderwood, Masson, and S. S. Laurie, all of whom have since passed away, except Fraser and Laurie, whose literary works have made the last half of the