

ter very much indeed, very much more than any words of mine can express, what *we* were—how we thought, and felt and acted. It requires no very long experience and no very deep philosophy to teach us that happiness itself, which is, if some influential leaders of modern thought are to be believed, at once the starting point and the goal of all human effort—that happiness itself comes after all, if it comes at all, from the within and not from the without. In a word, all the springs of life's joys and sorrows, of its high hopes and its crushing responsibilities, of its perpetual influences and its deathless energies, have their hidden source in those mental and moral qualities and habits which make up the distinctive manhood and womanhood.

The character as it is at any given point of time may be shewn to be the resultant of two forces, both constantly operative from the first moment of conscious life. The one is the outcome of what is innate in the individual; the other, of the influences under which the original germ is unfolded and matured. Each is the product of an infinite series of infinitely complex causes. But while those causes, or rather the little sections of them which might come within the scope of scientific research, are in the one case buried with the dead, unalterable past, and so utterly beyond the reach of any controlling or modifying power, even of Jove himself, as Horace would say (*Carmen* III., 29, 45), they belong, in the other case, to the living and flexible present, and are pliable to every touch of circumstance and volition.

Philosophy has no more interesting, philanthropy no more important, study than that of the formation of the individual character. It is profoundly interesting to the philosopher because of the wondrous complexity and subtlety of the agencies at work. It is

preëminently important to the philanthropist because it includes, directly or implicitly, everything relating to the well-being of society and the progress of the race, in so far as such well-being and progress are dependent upon causes within the reach of human knowledge and influence. There are, it may be, a thousand millions of human beings on our earth, and yet no two exact *fac-similes* in bodily form and feature; no two, certainly, without easily discernible differences in those mental and moral traits, those habits of thought, speech and action, which make up the form and features of the soul. Beneath each exterior—rough or polished, coarse, commonplace or refined—there lives and breathes a mysterious entity, endued with a self-hood which stamps its possessor as an individual with a character, a duty and a destiny all its own, absolutely and eternally distinct from those of every other in the broad universe.

The first of the two forces which determine the individual character, that which results from elements which each of us, without his own volition or knowledge, brings with him into the world, is evidently as I have indicated, beyond our reach. At any rate any attempt to investigate it would carry us too far beyond the limits of the demonstrable and the practical. True, he who would search out all the complicated springs of thought and feeling and volition, in order that he may the more effectually touch each at will, might be greatly helped if he could learn to distinguish accurately between what is natural and what the result of environment, in any character at a given stage of development. He would be the better also for knowing, were it possible to learn to what extent the purely innate is subject to change or modification, or, in other words, how far a law of persistency holds sway in regard to inborn