even need on all occasions for the words to be transmitted to him with deliberate intention, and by a human mouth; sometimes *the child seizes them in the involuntary sounds he utters*, or in the accidental sounds he catches." And he cites a remarkable example from Francis Lieber ("Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge," Vol. 2, p. 18):—

"A member of my own family," says Mr. Lieber, "showed, in early infancy, a peculiar tendency to form new words, partly from sounds which the child caught, as to *woh* for *to stop*, from the interjection *woh* used by waggoners when they wish to stop their horses; partly from symphenomenal emissions of sounds. Thus, when the boy was a little above a year old, he had made and established in the nursery the word *nim* for everything fit to eat. I had watched the growth of this word. First, he expressed his satisfaction at seeing his meal, when hungry, by the natural humming sound, which we might express thus, *hm*. Gradually, as his organs of speech became more skilful, and repetition made the sound more familiar and clearer, it changed into the more articulate *um* and *im*. Finally, an *n* was placed before it, *nim* being much easier to pronounce than *im*, when the mouth has been closed. But soon the growing mind began to generalize, and *nim* came to signify everything edible; so that the boy would add the words *good* or *bad*, which he had learned in the meantime. He now would say *good nim*, *bad nim*, his nurse adopting the word with him. On one occasion he said *fe nim*, for *bad, repulsive to eat*. There is no doubt but that a verb to *nim*, for to eat, would have developed itself, had not the ripening mind adopted the vernacular language, which was offered to it ready made."

M. Taine, though he dwells much and forcibly on the physiological view, including especially the functions of the brain, does not indicate the peculiar light which that study casts on the subject in question. This has been lately done by his countryman, the distinguished anthropologist, Dr. Topinard, in his notable lecture on "The last stages of the genealogy of man," published in his *Revue d'Anthropologie* for May, 1888. After referring to the fact—suggested by an argument of Professor Vogt—that the young monkey is more intelligent than the adult, Dr. Topinard remarks:—"But this greater intelligence of the young is the rule with all animals, including man, if we consider the facts. At this stage the brain is larger, relatively to the body; it is in a manner virgin, more impressionable; it grows extremely fast, and seeks only to absorb, to work, to turn to use the blood which it receives. What is more marvellous than the way in which our children learn to speak, to read, to write! Should we be capable, we adults, of the amount of rapid memory demanded by the mass of words and ideas which we impress upon them?"

It is satisfactory to be able to adduce, in confirmation of the ideas set forth in the preceding paper, these striking facts and arguments, from two of the highest authorities in Europe on questions of mental philosophy and physiology. For the reference to the passage in M. Taine's book I am indebted to the courtesy of Professor Max Müller, who is naturally interested in the results of an