

allegiance to no authority but that of truth. Hence, whatever the coming history of letters may bring to light, I cannot imagine the day when the works of Locke, under proper limitations, will not form noble subjects for academic study.

Men seem to differ little in the impressions they first receive from their senses; and perhaps quite as little in the first abstractions they are by nature led to form. Yet how widely separated is one intellect from another! From the stones of the same quarry one man builds a hovel; another chisels out the breathing image of the human form. It is incontestably true, that men are chiefly distinguished from each other by their habits of combining the same original elements of thought. But, in making these combinations, they are not led on blindly and fortuitously, but in obedience to intellectual laws operating with greater or less force on every rational being. What would be the value of the senses were there no sentient principle within? And where would be the use of teaching were there no inborn capacities in the soul to apprehend and to be acted on? It may be true that we have no innate knowledge; but we have innate intellectual powers: and that they are essentially the same in all men, differing only in degree, is evident from the individual habits, the social sympathies, the civil institutions, and the languages of our race; the common feelings that hurry us into action; the common proofs that gain our deliberate assent.

The distinction between innate ideas and innate capacities is almost overlooked in the work of Locke*. To this cause we must attribute the

* The habit of disregarding the distinction between abstract capacities and their particular manifestations, seems to have led Locke into