

mean the sum total of what we know of the laws of nature, does not reveal her secrets by a voice from heaven, but she yields them only to the patient and laborious investigator. Language was a discovery, not a gift. But while these writers deny the divine origin of language in any special sense, most of them admit divine supervision and providence in endowing man with the needful faculties, and surrounding him with the needful materials and motives for speech. In a word, as man provided himself with shelter, food and clothing, so he provided himself with language.

To account for the beginnings of speech from an exclusively human source, there are two received theories, in fact three, if we include that of Farrar which attempts a reconciliation of these two. They have respectively received, each from the opponents of the other, the somewhat felicitous nick-names, the "ding-dong" and "pooh pooh" or "bow-wow" theory. One theory holds that speech is the result of a spontaneous and unconscious effort, the other, just the opposite, that speech is a voluntary conscious contrivance, a means to an end. One holds that man was never in a savage state of mutism, the other that he slowly, after a long pupilage, emerged from such a state. The ding-dong theory denies that there was any conversation or argument among men whereby certain sounds were accepted as the signs of thoughts and things; and it affirms that thoughts and things echoed in sounds distinctively intelligible to primeval man. The bow-wow theory rejects this notion, that sounds of themselves express sense, and maintains that by hearing and imitating sounds in nature, and by instinctive cries, men came to a mutual understanding by which they accepted certain sounds as signs for purposes of communication.

The ding-dong theory owes its present form to Prof. Heyse of Berlin, as published since his death by Dr. Steinthal. It has been elaborated in the works of Dr. Stein-

thal and warmly defended by him. This is essentially the theory of Max Muller, Bunsen, and appears in the speculations of Dr. Bushnel, and others.

The theory is stated thus by Max Muller in his *Science of Language*, first series. "There is a law which runs through nearly the whole of Nature that everything which is struck rings. We can tell the more or less perfect structure of metals by their vibrations—by the answers which they give. Gold rings differently from tin, wood rings differently from stone; and different sounds are produced according to the nature of each percussion. It was the same with man, the most highly organized of nature's works. Man in the primitive and perfect state was endowed not only, like the brute, with the power of expressing his sensations and his perceptions by onomatopœia; but he possessed likewise the faculty of giving more articulate expression to the rational conceptions of his mind. This faculty gave to each conception as it thrilled for the first time through the brain a phonetic expression." Farrar expresses the theory more literally as follows. "At the origin of humanity the soul and body were in such natural dependence that all the emotions of the soul had their echo in the body, principally in the organs of respiration and in the voice. This sympathy of soul and body, still found in the infant and in the savage was intimate and fruitful in the primitive man. Such an intuition awoke an accent or a sound." As thus stated it will be seen how aptly the theory is styled the ding-dong theory. It represents man as originally a bell, and when an idea struck him he naturally rang. "We wonder," says Prof. Whitney, "it was not added that, like other bells, he naturally rang by the tongue."

When carefully examined, this is but the old Platonic theory in a new dress. Words are regarded as types of objective realities; not only as signs of things, but as in some way partaking the nature and