

speak is in this sense our own work, the remaining twentieth should be thought to be otherwise. Farrar endeavors to show, and it must be admitted, with much success, that almost all words may be thus explained. It is granted, however, that some words expressive of our moral convictions and psychological states cannot thus be explained. The remaining twentieth, as Prof. Whitney states it, is to be accounted for. It is essential to a true theory in science that it include *all* the facts; and as this does not, it is still to be regarded as but tentative.

It is conceded that there are certain elements of speech out of which all languages have come; that the changes have been simply of form. The number of these elements appears to remain constant, being neither increased nor diminished. No new radical has been added, so far as we can perceive, any more than new matter has been added to the universe. Language in its perfected product is wrought out of these elemental forms. When Prof. Whitney says that "the power to develop is one in essential nature with the power to originate," his critics reply that the power is not the same. To mould and form material is one thing, but to create the matter is quite another.

The bow-wow theory, like the ding-dong, does not meet the requirements of science. Men come into the world *in* *infants*—speechless. A child speaks only as it is taught. A French child reared in an English family speaks English, not French. Language is acquired when taught. This is the only method of which we have any knowledge. What reason have we for thinking that there was ever any other method? It is only upon the assumption that there was no one to teach the first infant. Was there no being capable of teaching primitive man?

It is unscientific to believe that man was once in possession of the faculty of speech creation, but has now lost it; and it is equally unscientific to believe that man, as he now is, untaught by a su-

perior intelligence, learned of himself by his own unaided efforts to frame words and sentences.

Science takes the facts as they are. She asks, how did man learn to speak so far as known. The answer is, only as taught by a superior. Has any one ever been known to begin in any other way? No. The inference, then, is that the first man did not.

Now it has been urged by some scholars that, as there was no superior man, God took it upon himself to be his teacher. This, is supernatural; but the difficulty is *dignus vindice nodus*. If baldy stated, they say, that God revealed language, that in a voice from heaven he told man what to say, there would be reluctance to assent to the theory thus expressed; but if put in another form it may be true. God made man capable of speech, and placed him amid sights and sounds designed to furnish the materials of speech. He taught man to use his faculty, gave him the genius of language and assisted him to connect words and things, as a father assists his child.

In this brief discussion we have endeavored to indicate the present state of the question of the origin of language. In the recent advancement made in the science of philology, we may hope that a closer approximation to the solution of this most important problem may yet be attained. There are, however, eminent philologists who frankly admit that linguistic research can never reveal the actual beginnings of speech. So competent an authority as Ernest Renan places it among the things ante-historical, and he affirms that it must ever remain so. All philologists, of whatever school, confess that the origin of language has not yet been discovered.

G. M.

CIVIL LIBERTY.

Perhaps the statesman has to deal with few problems more important than that of personal liberty in its relation to the gen-