This article was downloaded by: [Princeton University]
On: 16 August 2014, At: 11:12
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered
Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41
Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

The Pedagogical Seminary

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vzps20>

A Preliminary Study in the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership

Lewis M. Terman^a

^a Clark University, USA

Published online: 30 Aug 2012.

To cite this article: Lewis M. Terman (1904) A Preliminary Study in the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership, The Pedagogical Seminary, 11:4, 413-483, DOI: [10.1080/08919402.1904.10534107](https://doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1904.10534107)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1904.10534107>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness,

or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

A PRELIMINARY STUDY IN THE PSYCHOLOGY AND PEDAGOGY OF LEADERSHIP.

By LEWIS M. TERMAN,
Fellow in Psychology, Clark University.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. Scope of the Subject,	413
II. Leadership among animals,	417
(a) So-called imitation and suggestion,	417
(b) Sentinel posting and allied phenomena,	419
(c) Group chieftainship and dominance,	419
III. Leadership among primitive races,	422
(a) Initiations,	422
(b) Qualities desired,	423
(c) Influence of religion,	423
(d) Influence of war,	424
(e) Club-like organizations,	426
IV. Leadership among children,	427
(a) Experimental,	427
(b) Questionnaire returns.	433
1. Leaders,	434
2. Outcasts,	444
3. Bluffers,	447
(c) Children's ideals,	450

I. SCOPE OF THE SUBJECT.

Leadership is interesting from many points of view. In the first place there are two opposite poles of thought with regard to what it counts for in the progress from savagery to civilization. Some credit only the leaders as a factor in race progress, others only the masses.

The former tendency, of which Carlyle is a good exponent, has been most common in the past. Until recently, histories were little more than chronicles of wars and court intrigues. In reading such histories we forget that there were in those days other people than generals, kings, and nobles, with here and there a philosopher or religious reformer. Emerson viewed all institutions as "the lengthened shadows of one man." Carlyle defines history as "nothing but the biographies of a few great men."¹

In a different form, the question of leadership is the crucial question of economics. We are infinitely better provided with material comforts than was primitive man. The task here is

¹*Vide* Mallock: *Aristocracy and Evolution*, 1902.

to decide what factors have contributed most to this advance. Thereon depends the justness or oppression of the distributive process. If the masses are powerless in themselves to accomplish anything, then we should welcome any evidence in favor of the "Subsistence Theory." On the other hand, Karl Marx and his followers assert that the *laborers* create everything, and that the captain of industry is truly a captain of exploitation.

Again, to express our thoughts, we use an intricately complicated set of symbols which none of us could have invented. We employ them without serious or sudden alteration. We fashion our clothes, our houses, and even our politics and religion after patterns which are already given. On such consideration, it is evident why Tarde, having asked the question, what is society, should have answered it thus, briefly, "c'est l'imitation." On the other hand it must be remembered that without something original to imitate, there can be no advance. As James puts it, there are two legs on which society walks: invention and imitation.

Though this study cannot concern itself with the details of the psychology of imitation or invention, and much less with their broader historical, economical, and sociological relations, it may yet be of value to take a bird's-eye view of some of the larger aspects of the subject.

If Tarde's claim for an "Inter-psychology" is warranted,¹ a large share of the work devoted to it must, either nearly or remotely, concern leadership. Broadly conceived, so as to include every form of attraction and repulsion, it is the chief fact of social life. Each member of society is both a leader and a follower, though predominantly, either one or the other. It comes, consciously or unconsciously, into every case of human relation.

At the beginning of every such relation there is an incipient duel, fought silently, but none the less decisive. It may be the remnant of an old instinct once of vital importance to the life of the anthropoid, namely, the tendency to evaluate instantly and accurately as regards possible injury or service every other animal happened upon. Does not this very thing survive in our relations with one another? We "take the measure" of every man we meet. We "size him up," or "plot his curve," and whether or not we like to own it, to a certain extent we regulate our actions toward that one accordingly. If we judge ourselves superior, conduct takes on characteristic forms according to the occasion and our own nature: for example, haughtiness, imperiousness, condescension, the air of self importance, the instructive tone, etc. On the other hand, if we

¹Vide *International Quarterly*, 1903. Inter-Psychology.

judge ourselves inferior there is present a feeling of timidity, a less confident heart-beat and less steady gaze. The voice becomes hollow instead of commanding or assuring. Spoken sentences are given a rising and questioning inflection.

It would seem that such data as this study deals with ought to be the beginning place for the study of sociology. In these days of evolution and genetic methods of study generally, sociology ought not lag behind. The biologist no longer confines himself to the morphology of adult forms. He studies germination, embryology, growth, sports, and rudimentary organs. Like the historian, he must interpret the present and foretell the future through a study of the past. The political economist draws illustrations freely from the facts of savage society. The psychologist, in order to interpret the adult mind with its multiplicity of instincts, reflexes, feelings and ideational elements, watches their development from childhood and even calls to his aid the mental unfolding in the phylogenetic series. The same is true in psychological detail. If we are concerned with a so-called double personality, the important thing is to get a snap shot of the incipient bisection. If with a fixed idea, the primary shock is of more interest and importance than many later details. The same must be true, if possibly to a less degree, of the facts with which sociology deals.

Turning to another aspect of leadership, one of the burning questions in education is, how to transform the exact, demanding, harsh, domineering, rule-of-thumb, dry-as-dust, or on the other hand the weak and invertebrate teachers into real leaders of children. In the United States, as well as in Japan and certain other countries, it is largely a question of systematization versus personal leadership. The faithful work of the primitive oriental teachers, and the excellent influence of some of our best church colleges in America, show where the advantage lies when other factors are equal.

And just as the noblest and most fruitful element in teaching is personal leadership, it is just as true that the preacher, since he is no longer regarded as a mediary between God and man, has little left him except to make himself a personal leader in all affairs that touch the moral side of life. In morality and religion, even more than in politics, we are in a sense undemocratic. We prefer to weigh voices rather than to count them. If we decide to do the *best*, we will not allow the majority to decide what is best. Idols precede ideals.¹

Religion, being so largely a creature of the feelings, offers one of the richest fields for a study of leadership. Hierarchies of leaders exist in all the great religions. The religious em-

¹ Binet and Vaschide: *Monist*, March, 1904.

pires are the most extensive the world has ever seen, and the most stable. The fingers of one hand count the chief ones of Asia, Europe, and America. They view the birth, rise, and decay of nations. Of what sort were the great religious leaders, who in their own field *actually accomplished* so much more than the imagination and ambition of Napoleon ever *conceived* of doing in the world of politics. What, for example, must have been the nature of the electrifying and enchanting influence of a Jesus or a Buddha, that those who heard him should forsake all in order to follow him in his wanderings?

In government, unlike religion, we have passed, or rather are passing, through an important transformation. In primitive society *qualitative* values, that is *personal* elements, were predominant. At present the hereditary limited monarchy and democracy have undermined the hero and his qualitative value. The ideal of democracy is to bestow upon its leaders a purely quantitative value.¹ The effects and counter-effects of this momentous change would make interesting and legitimate subject matter for psychology.

In brief, there is room for many concrete studies in leadership, such as will concern the educator, the philosopher of religion, the historian and political scientist, as well as the psychologist. Every kind of political organization from the primitive to the modern, every sort of dominance, intrigue, revolution, abdication, war, and what not, that we find in the adult world, is paralleled in the personal and social relations of school children. It is not only probable that much light would be thrown on the former by the latter, but such cross sections of child society as are pictured in our returns are of importance in themselves. They are the foreshadowing of the political and religious organizations that will hold forth a generation or so hence. They are the *Alpha* of which a future government, or religion, or revolution, will be the *Omega*.

At the very outset, however, we meet a very great difficulty. Leadership resolves itself into many questions. It may be treated from the standpoint of the child, the savage or civilized man. But if we thus once begin to break up the subject where are we to end? Shall we not have to regard as fairly distinct from each other, political leadership, military, religious, ethical, musical, scientific, etc.? Will not the problem depend on whether we have in mind the poor or the rich, the ignorant or the learned, the emotional or the deliberate, the good or the degraded, the self-reliant or suggestible, and so on forever?

To an extent the implication is legitimate. The qualities of persons no doubt affect us a little as do colors or forms. This

¹Vide Binet and Vaschide: *loc. cit.*

need not mean, however, that it will be useless to try to make out the qualities of leadership. Perhaps a last analysis will sometime reveal that above and beyond these species of leadership there is a genus; or, to change the figure, that a least common multiple of the many types exists.

II LEADERSHIP AMONG ANIMALS.

Very little is known about leadership among animals. Most of the observations so far made are by persons of little scientific training. No one has employed experimentation or even careful observation. There are several difficulties in the way of such a study. In the first place, the observations would have to be of long duration in proportion to the results gained. In the second place, it is doubtful if the artificial environment of captivity would call forth whatever phenomena might be frequent in the normal state. Moreover, the activities involved in leadership are not simple, and the component factors must first be studied separately before much light can be thrown on the psychical complex as a whole. These related and preliminary facts are not yet fully determined. To illustrate, it is evident that the question of animal leadership is largely coincident with that of imitation. But it is not certain just how much and what sort of imitation exists among animals.

Keeping this in mind, we may use the term leadership in a broad sense, so as to include most of the facts of imitation, suggestion, sentinel posting, and group chieftainship. The following are a few of the observations, of varying degrees of reliability, coming under these headings.

I *So-called Imitation and Suggestion.*

Morgan¹ states: "If one of a group of chicks learns by casual experience to drink from a tin of water, others will come up and peck at the water and will themselves drink. A hen teaches her little ones to pick up grain and other food by pecking on the ground and dropping suitable material before them, the chicks seeming to imitate her actions." "A little pheasant and guinea fowl followed two ducklings . . . and seemed to wait upon their bills, to peck where they pecked and to be guided by their actions." "If a group of chicks have learned to avoid cinnabar caterpillars, and if one or two from another group are introduced and begin to pick up the caterpillars, the others will sometimes seize them though they would otherwise have taken no notice of them." Morgan also cites a quotation to the effect that if pigeons are reared exclusively on small grain they will starve before eating beans. But when

¹ *Habit and Instinct*, pp. 166-182.

they are thus starving, if a bean-eating pigeon is put among them, they follow its example, and thereafter adopt the habit. Again, "I have often observed that in broods of chicks brought up under experimental conditions by themselves, and without opportunity of imitating older birds, there are one or two more active, vigorous, intelligent, and mischievous birds. They are the leaders of the brood; the others are their imitators. Their presence raises the general level of intelligent activity. Remove them, and the others show a less active, less inquisitive, less adventurous life, if one may so put it. They seem to lack initiative." In agreement with this, Dr. Wesley Mills found that when he introduced his mongrel pup to the society of the other dogs, its progress was extraordinarily rapid.

Dr. Kinnaman, in experimenting with his two Rhesus monkeys, found very many examples of imitation similar to those mentioned by Morgan, and in addition to the cases that might be classed as instinctive imitation, at least two cases which he would class as intelligent imitation. These were both imitations of the male by the female.¹ In one case the female had several times completely failed at removing a plug fastening and had quit "in disgust." "At this juncture the male was turned out of his cage. He went immediately to the box, she following some four feet away. Knowing the trick perfectly, he seized the end of the plug with his teeth and removed it. I set the box again. This time the female rushed to it, seized the plug by the end as the male did, and procured the food. This she repeated immediately eight times in exactly the same way." The other case was similar. There were also numerous cases where one monkey followed the other when it jumped onto the table or into the window.

Mill² states that suggestive action began with his puppy from the fortieth day. He thinks that suggestive action accounts for a large part of the dog's activity, such as sheep worrying, etc. Morgau noticed that when he approached the bars with his three puppies, one went through at once and the two others followed apparently through imitation. Hobhouse quotes a similar case of three stags trying to get over a fence.

We need not enter into the much disputed question as to whether such activities are really imitative. Whether we adopt the liberal interpretation of Hobhouse and Mills, or, on the other hand, agree with Thorndike in altogether denying intelligent imitation to animals below the primates, the objective results are the same. We have an animal doing a thing which it would not have done but for perceiving its performance by

¹*The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. XIII, p. 121 ff.

²Animal Intelligence, p. 163.

another. The above examples are given as representing leadership and suggestion reduced to their lowest terms. It may be that such activities can be denominated "leading" and "following" only in an objective sense. It is an undoubted fact, however, that many animals act from the stimulus of a like or similar activity in another.

2. *Sentinel Posting and Allied Phenomena.*

Rocky Mountain sheep live together in small bands, posting sentinels wherever they are feeding or resting, who watch for and¹ give warning of the approach of enemies. Hobhouse² quotes from Mr. Cornish, describing the maneuvers of wild geese when they alight on a field of grain. "They post a sentry who either stands on some elevated part of the field, or walks slowly with the rest, never, however, venturing to pick up a grain, his whole energies being employed in watching." Espinas³ and Brehm⁴ cite many similar instances as regards antelopes, termites, and many species of birds.

What are the mental activities involved in these well known habits of sentinel posting? The response given by the individuals to a sentinel call is easy enough to explain, being only a special case of instinctive reaction. But the conduct of the sentinel is harder to understand without crediting the animals concerned with a knowledge of the purpose they are fulfilling. The older observers did not hesitate to make this assumption. Perhaps no single explanation will suffice. As a special adjustment to the needs of gregarious life, the activity may be partly instinctive, partly traditional, and partly intelligent. We certainly cannot speak of a "social system" among the animals, or regard the functions of the sentinel as especially set apart and delegated with human forethought to one member of the group.

3. *Group Chieftainship and Dominance.*

Some observations indicate that among certain of the higher animals there is a more genuine form of leadership than we have so far discussed. It may rather vaguely be denominated chieftainship or dominance over a group. For example, "Birds in their long flights keep together, often with definite leaders who seem to discover and to decide on the course of flight for the whole of the flock."⁵ Espinas⁶ says that llamas used in South America to carry heavy burdens over the mountains are

¹ David Starr Jordan: *Animal Life*, p. 165.

² *Mind in Evolution*, p. 272.

³ *Les Sociétés Animales*.

⁴ *Thierleben*.

⁵ D. S. Jordan: *Animal Life*, p. 166.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*, p. 499.

allowed to go loose in groups, each group led by a single male richly caparisoned. Brehm says that among elephants a male usually leads the herd. When the leader is shot down, the rest usually flee at once. Darwin, speaking of the semi-wild cattle of the La Platte, says they are easily counted, since they group themselves in bunches of 40 to 100. The owner has only to see if the leader of each group is present.

Brehm¹ states that among monkeys, the strongest or oldest, that is, the most capable member of the group, puts himself up as leader. "This respect is not accorded to him by common consent, but only after obstinate struggle with other ambitious ones. The longest teeth and strongest arms decide. The ones that will not willingly submit are brought to time by bites and slaps."

Seton-Thompson's Lobo, Pacing Mustang, and Silver Spot, the crow, are more fanciful examples of like kind. For these and many of the former stories religious allowance must be made. Silver Spot, for example, is depicted as acting dutifully the part of general-in-chief, chief justice, and schoolmaster to his fellows for many years.

Every farmer boy has observed the fights and quarrels of domestic horses and cows for individual and group supremacy. Several incidents of this sort have been related to me. Also as a boy on a farm where 15 to 20 horses and 30 to 50 cattle were kept, I witnessed many of these contests for supremacy. Among either the cattle or horses there was usually one whom the others allowed to have his own way in every respect. He drank first at the trough, grazed where he pleased, and ate from whatever box he took a fancy for. The dominance was generally settled once for all in a few lively encounters. After that the subdued ones showed only mild protests or none at all. If the make-up of the group remained unchanged the dominant member usually retained his superiority. When a strange individual was admitted his relative rank in the group was pretty definitely fixed before many days.

On the other hand, there were certain ones that might be designated as outcasts. These had to stand aside for all the others. They seemed timid, lacked spirit, and showed no inclination to try to better their condition. Their lot was sometimes a hard one. In going to and from the pasture, they were chased and horned by all the others. At the trough they were the last to drink. Sometimes another who had drank his fill would still stand guard over the water and prevent the outcast from drinking for some minutes.

There were all degrees between these two extremes of rank.

¹ Vol. I, p. 48.

Each individual had his position relative to all the others and only in rare cases did he try to better it. If attacked by a superior he gave way, with little show of fight. Now and then, however, bitter encounters took place, a reversal of rank sometimes resulting. Neither with the cattle nor the horses did the dominance seem to depend much on size, and not altogether on actual fighting ability. A quick show of courage, and readiness to attack seemed more essential. In some cases I was quite sure that certain members could easily have improved their group rank if they had only tried. As a specific instance, one peppery little mare of only 4 or 5 years was "boss" over about a dozen other horses most of whom were both older and larger. She attacked quickly and delivered her blows or bites in such rapid succession that opposition was soon scattered. Among animals, as will be seen also among children, the very consciousness of superiority or inferiority goes far to make the superiority or inferiority real. The bluff is perhaps even more effective with them than with human beings.

Among the most reliable observations reported, bearing on this study, are those of Francis Galton on the wild ox of South Africa.¹ They cover an extended period of time, and the report is based altogether on Mr. Galton's own experience. The herds were found very hard to manage, as no individual could be persuaded to go first in any desired move, each one backing to give place to his neighbor. For this reason, fore-oxen were highly prized, and there was great difficulty in securing good ones. "The ordinary member of the herd is wholly unfitted by nature to move in so prominent and isolated a position." Breakers watch assiduously for those who show self-reliant nature by grazing apart or ahead of the rest. "The born leaders are far too rare to be used for any less distinguished service than that which they alone are capable of filling. The mass are essentially slavish and seek no better lot than to be led by one of their number who has enough self-reliance to accept the position."

It must be supposed that leadership among animals is an offshoot, or example, of the traits denominated by the term "gregarious instincts." The whole question must be viewed in its biological setting. Leadership in certain individuals implies a want of self reliance in the others. This want is fostered by the very fact of gregarious living. The conditions of life have made a want of self reliance a necessity to most of the herd. If each animal had the qualities of a leader they would graze apart, defenseless, and easily surprised. As Galton states, "The wild beasts trim and prune every herd into compactness,

¹Human Faculty, p. 68 ff.

and reduce it to a closely united body with a single leader." A member of the troop tends to acquire a certain supremacy for the simple reason of his greater independence, activity, and capability. A very little intelligence operating on the hereditary tendency to follow and imitate will suffice to fix the habits in question.

But the full extent and significance of animal leadership will only be determined by studies made under rigid experimental conditions.

III. LEADERSHIP AMONG PRIMITIVE RACES.

Among most primitive races the chief has to be brave, strong, cunning, and enduring. As Carlyle reminds us the king is literally the *man who can*, the *könning man*. The office is not generally hereditary, but goes as a prize to the deserving, either through common consent or formal election.

Ordinarily he must prove that he has useful qualities before he can become chief. If he has proved his valor and skill in exploits of war and in dangerous hunts, well and good. But if his metal is yet untried, initiations are sometimes resorted to as a test.¹ The Columbian Indian tribes impose a long fast, and later the older ones apply vigorous lashes with a whip till the candidate is covered with stripes. If he allows the least complaint to escape during this rude preliminary test he is dishonored and rejected. If he courageously persists, he is then covered with stinging ants. As a final test, he is suspended in a hammock over a fire of leaves so that he feels the heat and is suffocated by the smoke. Tyler states that among certain savage tribes he is chosen as chief who can lift the largest beam and carry it longest. For the work that savages have to do, the immediate usefulness of the qualities thus brought out is evident, though wisdom and moral courage tend gradually to replace cunning and physical endurance.

The following quotations give an idea of a few of the qualities sought for in chiefs: Schoolcraft² says Indian chiefs are as a rule a manly, intelligent body of men, with a bold and independent air and gait, and with good powers of oratory. "Their repose of character and ease of manners cannot fail to strike one; but what is still more remarkable is to hear one of them, when he rises to speak, fall into a train of elevated remarks which would often do honor to a philosopher."

Among the Iroquois³ the rank of chief was personal. It was gained by the character and achievements of the individual and

¹Letourneau: Political Evolution, p. 16.

²Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge, Vol. V, p. 152.

³Hale: Iroquois Book of Rites, p. 68.

died with him. Among the Omahas¹ the chief must enjoy a good reputation and have given feasts to the poor and orphans. The leaders of the Columbian Indians² "are always men of commanding influence and often of great intelligence. They take the lead in haranguing the council of wise men, who meet to debate on matters of public moment." The head man among the Indians of Guiana³ is generally the most successful hunter, who without having any formal authority obtains a certain amount of preference. His order to go anywhere or to do anything is implicitly obeyed. Among other Indian tribes⁴ the hunters union comes to possess more power than the chief and his council. They are the tribe's stomach. If the chief does not show special hunting ability he may be left at home to manage the affairs of the women and children and weaklings, or in some cases his power reduced to that of determining the time of the hunt. Among the Australian tribes⁵ there is no recognized head, whether king or chief, but men of preponderating influence are those distinguished for courage, strength, and force of character. These, in connection with the elders, generally advise as to public actions, settle internal disputes, and enforce obedience to traditional law. Among certain African tribes⁶ the most wealthy and liberal chief is reckoned the best. In most cases, however, it is the one with greatest knowledge and skill, especially in matters of war. "The family stock also has a leader, usually the eldest, but apart from warfare, his influence is little. Moreover, the chief's nearest relatives have a certain ascendancy, and thus we find them already striving to give a more oligarchical character to their government." The Polynesian chieftain⁷ derives his power from his age, personal influence, and yet more from his wealth. As with the Indians, pecuniary inequality engenders political inequality. It is said that among the Esquimos, the most successful weather prophet is often chosen leader.

It is an oft noted fact that the power of the chief is greatly strengthened in many cases by alliance with the priesthood. Ratzel states that conversion to Christianity has almost always destroyed the power of native chiefs, by killing the influence of their magic. Morris emphasizes⁸ this point. "In fact, it seems to have been through the influence of religious ideas that men first rose to power and became supreme over their fellows."

¹ Letourneau: *loc. cit.*, p. 46.

² Bancroft: Vol. I, p. 275

³ Thurn: *Indians of Guiana*, p. 211.

⁴ Ratzel: *History of Mankind*, Vol. II, p. 135.

⁵ John Matthew: *Australian Aborigines*, p. 93.

⁶ Ratzel: *loc. cit.*

⁷ Letourneau: *loc. cit.*, p. 71.

⁸ *Man and his Ancestor*, p. 191 ff.

There is a tendency to regard the chief who leads in acts of public worship as the representative of the divine ancestor, and as such a tribe develops into a nation, its chief adds to himself the power and position of high priest. In America it was true everywhere that the head of the established religion became the head of the nation. Thus, Montezuma was high priest and derived his power largely from that position. Such rulers become autocrats in a double sense, supreme lords of body and soul. The powerful monarchs of Assyria led their armies to conquest in the name of the national deity, whose vice-gerents they claimed to be. The autocratic emperors of Rome went so far as to claim in some cases to be themselves Gods. The emperor of China still holds the position of father of his people, the representative of the original ancestor and high priest of the nation. Even in modern Russia, the emperor derives some of his dignity from his position as head of the national church.

War, as well as religion, has played a great part in the leadership of primitive men. Among many tribes it gives rise to a special leader whose office is separate from that of peace chieftain. In some cases, the tribe is divided into two separate divisions, a war group and a peace group, each with its own head. Other tribes have usually only a peace chieftain and elect a war captain only as occasion requires. Not infrequently the peace chieftain simply adds the duties of war captain to his own, making himself supreme. When the tribe habitually has separate leaders for peace and war, the former generally inherits his office while the latter seldom does. The position of war captain is so vitally important that it comes only as the reward of highest merit.

The following quotations illustrate the practices among a few primitive races. When the Patagonians form a confederation against an enemy,¹ they choose a chief from among the most renowned warriors. But always the power of the war chiefs is transitory. It expires with the occasion that gave it birth. In New Zealand,² if a war or other enterprise is about to be launched, a man is chosen chief who has already proved his bravery and prudence. But the expedition over, the improvised chief is again lost in the crowd. Among the Pueblos, each tribe or village has a chief to whom a certain degree of respect is conceded. His influence is maintained chiefly by his oratorical powers or military skill. In war, his authority is recognized, but in time of peace his rule is nominal.

Bancroft³ also states that the Comanches of New Mexico vest little authority in the chief during peace, but on the war path

¹Letourneau: *loc. cit.*, p. 56.

²Cook's *Voyages*, Vol. VIII, p. 103.

³Bancroft: *loc. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 547.

his commands are implicitly obeyed. It also happens that chiefs are sometimes chosen to lead some particular war or marauding expedition, their authority expiring immediately on their return home.

According to Schurtz,¹ the contrast between the war and peace groups shows plainest with the American tribes. The sachem was the peace ruler and his office was hereditary. His duties were limited entirely to affairs of peace. His relations touched chiefly the gens whose official head he was. The war chief was chosen for his bravery in war, his wisdom in matters of diplomacy, or his talkativeness in council. His relations touched chiefly the tribe. The head of the clan had to do with the narrow self-satisfying ways of the clan; the war chief, with the tribal union and the state building powers. Among the Delawares, for example, the peace captain had very little power. Imperial manners did not become him. He had rather to seek the submission of his subjects through liberality. The war chiefs were not exactly elected, but gathered a following through personal influence.² Small wars were sometimes undertaken by the war chief independently, but important ones with the consent of the peace chieftain. The inhabitants of New Pommeronia have a hereditary peace ruler, and also a war captain, whose influence rests strictly on personal qualities. Between these two heads there is continual strife, which, strange to say, is usually unfavorable to the war chief. The La Platte tribes, the Cherokee, the Iroquois, the South Sea peoples, the Maori, the New Guineans, and, as Miss Kingsly thinks, all the true negroes offer close parallels to the above described forms. However, among some, as for example the inhabitants of Tonga, the war chief has succeeded in pressing the king entirely into the background. This recalls the *Hausmeier* of the Frankish kings, or the overshadowing of the Mikado by the Shogun. On the other hand, the opposite tendency has usually prevailed in Africa, the war chief taking a back place or being chosen in case of necessity only. The shepherd tribes of Messai in peace are ruled by patriarchs, but in war a common leader is chosen to take charge till peace is re-established. Likewise among the Arabs, the *scheich*, or peace patriarch, gives way in war to the *Argyd*, who is chosen from the ranks of the bravest men.

¹To whom I am indebted for much of the following information. See his *Altersklassen u. Männerbünde*, Chapters 2 and 4.

²"Sie erwarben sich durch ihre Thaten das Zutrauen der Krieger, nachdem sie in der Regel zuerst durch einen Traum zu dem Entschluss gekommen waren, einen Kriegszug zu unternehmen und dazu freiwillige um sich zu versammeln: glückten einen solchen Freischarenführer seine Unternehmungen mehrmals, so erkannte man ihn allgemein als Kapitän an, hatte er Unglück so war es mit seinem ergeizigen Plänen zu Ende."

As Schurtz points out, the same general facts hold with the ancient peoples of Europe. The Germans during the migration period were under the double leadership. The *Fürst* was originally the head of a family, or family group. Opposed to him was the *Herzog*, or war chief. The activity of the former was directed within, and rested on patriarchal authority. The latter represented the spirit of aggressiveness. Sometimes one, sometimes the other, had the upper hand in the same people. The Franks during their migration were under the *Herzogen*, but after they had won permanent homes, the kingdom was handed over to the Merovingian family.¹

We see, therefore, that the institution of war chiefs, though temporary in the beginning, tends in the long run to the organization of a régime more or less monarchical, and the tendency is greater the more frequent are the wars. Morris² says: "The head man became a war chief and the war chief a king. Success made him a hero to his people. He grew to be the lord of conquered tribes; into his hands fell the bulk of the spoils. . . . War was the great agent in this evolution. It might have emerged slowly in peace, it came with startling rapidity in war." We may say, in short, it happens universally that leadership is intensified in times of emergency. War, conflict and adventure are its fertile soil. It grows directly with the need of concerted action, this point coming out time and again in the questionnaire returns.

The club-like organizations described by Schurtz and others also give occasion for the phenomena of leadership among primitive races. Though existing in many parts of the world, they are perhaps most numerous among the Malay tribes. To reach highest rank in the clubs one must have money, means of life, and wine. "One who has reached highest rank is really a great man and bears the title of *Wetuka* as though he had attained heaven." Without his permission no one can be advanced a single rank.³ The clubs have 3 or 4 to as high as 18 grades, or degrees. The members of each grade wear an insignia. Some of the clubs are democratic and embrace nearly all the people, while others are aristocratic and admit only a few of the leading persons.

It is noteworthy that few clubs of this kind among primitive races are conducted by women, and such as they do have are

¹ "Hier ist das Bild, das sich bei so vielen Naturvölkern im Kleinen zeigt, einmal in mächtigen Zügen ausgeführt, die durch alles Beiwerk und alle verhüllenden Kultureinflüsse deutlich hindurchschimmern." Schurtz: *loc. cit.*

² Man and his Ancestor, p. 199.

³ Schurtz: *loc. cit.*

only weak imitations of those found among men.¹ We thus have the strange paradox that woman, regarded as the founder of society, has less of the purely social tendency than man. The solution, of course, lies in the fact that we must distinguish between the purely social instincts and the sexual instincts. Schurtz takes the view that the former are not an outcropping of the latter, and that therefore the family may not be the primary social grouping. Woman's weakness in the purely social relations, coupled with her devotion to family life, makes it seem reasonable that the two instincts are not interdependent, and that they may not even have a common origin. As will be seen later, the questionnaire returns also bring out strongly both quantitative and qualitative sex differences in leadership.

IV LEADERSHIP AMONG CHILDREN.

(a) *Experimental.*

The following experimental study was made. It is in part a repetition of some work done by Binet.² It seemed, however, that the study should embrace a much larger number of pupils³ and should also be made more intensive. That is, facts concerning the pupils should be gained from other sources than the tests.

One hundred pupils of the Bloomington, Indiana, public schools acted as subjects. They were distributed as follows:

Grade 2,	12 boys and 12 girls.
" 4,	12 " " 12 "
" 6,	8 " " 12 "
" 8,	8 " " 8 "

In addition, 8 boys and 8 girls, in the colored school, ranging from the 5th to the 8th grade, were tested separately.

The general aim was to discover those pupils who might be termed "leaders" of their fellows, and to ascertain the qualities whereby they held this ascendancy. It is evident that without long personal acquaintance with each pupil, and without opportunity for long and careful observations of their actions during work and play, the outcome of the study must be meagre

¹ "Die Frauen nur selten unbefangen mit einander befreunden. Im gegentheile sie ein gewisses Mistrauen und selbst Übelwollen gegen ihres gleichen nicht leicht überwinden. . . . Ein Blick auf die Zustände des wirklichen Lebens lässt denn auch die geringe gesellschaftsbildende Kraft des Weiblichen Geschlechts in überzeugender Weise erkennen" Schurtz; p. 48.

² La Suggestibilité, p. 330 ff.

³ Binet used only 24.

enough. The results are not claimed to have a high degree of absolute value.

The tests were as follows: On a heavy cardboard about 16 x 24 inches were fastened pictures and objects, to the number of ten. The pupils were withdrawn, four at a time, to an unoccupied and quiet room. To throw them off their guard they were told that they were to engage in a memory test. It was further explained that the cardboard would be turned so that they could view for ten seconds the objects and pictures pasted on the other side. After the removal of the cardboard from sight they were to answer a number of questions concerning what they had seen. They were given to understand that we would record the reply of each pupil and the order in which it was given. They were therefore urged to reply both quickly and correctly. The answers were given with loud voice. The instructions were always repeated till they were clearly understood.

Binet used only three pupils in each group. On consideration, it seemed best to have more. Groups of five were first tried but the order of the replies being too difficult to get, the number was reluctantly reduced to four. Binet also chose one member of each group to act as chairman of that group, allowing him to read the questions, to record the answers, and at the same time to act as subject himself. To say nothing of the relative disadvantage thus thrown on such pupil, it appeared that even so slight an exhibition of preference on the part of the experimenter would likely affect the group spirit. Accordingly all were allowed to stand on equal footing, either myself or an assistant asking the questions while the other kept the records. The girls and the boys were tested separately. Moreover, except in the colored school, the pupils of any group were chosen from a single grade.

Twenty-three questions were asked concerning the objects and pictures, 11 of which were catch questions; that is, they asked about things which were not on the cardboard. These were intended to serve as a test of the pupils' suggestibility. It was found somewhat difficult to hit upon the right sort of catch questions and to locate them properly in the series. Two extremes were to be avoided. The traps must not be too glaring, else the suspicions of the subject would be aroused. Neither must they be so easily led up to that none would escape them. Usually they were separated by fair questions, and the more obvious ones were placed toward the latter part of the list, since we hoped by that time to have won the confidence of the pupils.

When all the 100 subjects had been thus tested in groups of 4, a second series was begun in an exactly analogous

way, with a new set of objects on the cardboard and a new set of 23 questions, 9 of which were catches. 80 of the former 100 pupils participated. For this series of experiments the former groups were broken up and new ones formed. In the latter, the pupils were intentionally so chosen that each group would contain at least one pupil who had shown himself a leader, and one who had appeared to be an automaton in the previous tests. It could thus be determined whether the rank of a pupil in any group of the first series had wholly a relative, or to some extent an absolute meaning.

In elaborating the results the following points were noted for each pupil:

1. The number of times his reply was first, second, third or fourth.
2. Originality; 3. The number of times each pupil of a group imitated each of the others.
4. Total number of imitations made by each.
5. Total number of times each pupil was imitated, by all the others.
6. Suggestibility, as measured by the number of times the subject fell into the trap.

The arbitrary use of some of the above terms must be explained. "Originality" means that the answer could not have been influenced by the answer of any other pupil. This does not, however, preclude its being suggested by a trap question. The "originality" can be shown in two ways: First, by answering before all the others; second, by giving an answer which, though not first, differed from the preceding answers in such a way that it could not have been influenced by them. Here, it must be acknowledged, there was often room for doubt, since it was not always possible to calculate just how far contrary suggestion was at work. "Suggestibility" was computed in per cent. If the pupil fell into all the traps his "suggestibility" was reckoned 100%. If into 4 out of a total of 8, 50%, etc. The other items will be made clear by the following illustration: Suppose that in answer to a question the same reply was given by all, A, B, C, and D, in a group. If A answers first, he is "original." B answers second, and since his answer is the same as A's, he is credited with one "imitation." C answers third and therefore "imitates" A and B once each. D answers fourth and therefore "imitates" A, B, and C once each. That is, A makes no "imitation," B makes one, C makes two and D makes three. A was "imitated" three times, B twice, and C once.

As expected, certain of the pupils answered first nearly always, while others were generally last and were content to re-

peat exactly or with slight variation the answer of another. For example, in one group,

	FIRST.	SECOND.	THIRD.	FOURTH.
A answered	1	4	8	10
C " "	9	6	5	2

It soon became evident that not always could those who answered first be called "leaders." Fifteen times it occurred that the group rank of pupils in quickness and in number of times "imitated" differed radically, *i. e.*, by as much as two places. Here, we have an unmistakable exhibition of personal preference. Those who have not the initiative for framing an answer of their own, will prefer to repeat the answer of one pupil rather than that of another. The first reply is a stimulus which always tends to result in an activity of the other pupils suggested by it or imitative of it, but in the above fifteen cases the tendency was generally overcome by some inhibition. It likewise happened several times that the quickest were not the most "original." With twelve pupils there was a wide divergence between the group rank in "originality," and that in number of times "imitated." Another, and perhaps more significant result was the fact that low "originality" often accompanied low "suggestibility," and *vice versa*. In fact the average "suggestibility" of the *leaders* was slightly greater than that of the *automatons*, the percentage being 62 and 59 respectively. Their comparative "originality," however, was 13.4 and 5.6, out of a total of 23 questions answered. This fact may have been due to the intense desire of the leaders to answer first, though the subjects were repeatedly reminded that it was as important to answer correctly as to answer quickly.

A greater number than expected, namely, 19 out of 80, obtained in the second series of tests a radically different rank from what they had gained in the first series. Of 22 leaders in the second series, 12 had been leaders in the first series, and five had occupied very low rank. Out of 32 automatons in the second series, 18 had been so in the first series, and 7 had occupied very high rank.

The following table shows the grade and sex differences for "originality." Each number represents the number of original answers out of the total set of 23.

GRADE.	2	4	6	8	COLOR.	AVERAGE FOR EACH SEX.	
boys	8.50	8.33	9.25	10.12	9.50	9.14	} Series I
girls	7.16	6.91	8.	10.62	9.62	8.50	
boys	9.85	7.25	8.	10.	7.12	8.44	} Series II
girls	6.37	5.87	8.	9.62	8.87	7.75	
Average for each grade }	7.97	7.09	8.31	10.09	8.78	8.45	

The following table shows the percentage of "suggestibility."

GRADE.	2	4	6	8	COLORED.	AVERAGE FOR EACH SEX.	
boys	50	77	77	45	73	64 +	} Series I
girls	66	76	77	52	77	60 +	
boys	72	76	91	45	78	72 +	} Series II
girls	86	97	90	55	61	78 -	
Average for each grade }	68.5	81.5	83.7	49.2	72.2	68 +	

The second part of our task was to get further facts about the pupils that would throw light on the cases of leadership among them. This the teachers were kind enough to furnish by answering 22 questions in regard to each pupil. They are as follows:

1. Age? 2. Size, in relation to grade? 3. Dress? 4. Is dress gaudy? 5. Any physical peculiarity or deformity? 6. Health? 7. Are parents wealthy or otherwise prominent? 8. Is it an only child? 9. Quality of school work? 10. Notable for boldness or daring? 11. A leader in games or pranks? 12. If so, is it by forcing others or by natural attraction? 13. Liked or disliked by other pupils? 14. Why? 15. Fluent of speech in conversation? 16. Any dramatic qualities? 17. Looks? 18. Reads much or little? 19. Timid or forward? 20. High tempered or amiable? 21. Selfish or considerate? 22. Emotional or deliberate in temperament?

Questions like 2, 3, and 9 were graded on a scale of five. To illustrate, 1 = very large, 2 = large, 3 = average, 4 = small, 5 = very small. Questions like 16, 18, 19, and 20 were graded similarly on a scale of three. Some of the most important results are summed up in the following table.

	Grade.	2	4	6	8	Col- ored.	Aver- age.
Age in years.	Leaders	7 $\frac{2}{3}$	10 $\frac{3}{4}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	14.75	14.	
	Automatons	7 $\frac{2}{3}$	10 $\frac{3}{4}$	12.60	14.80	14.60	
Size, on scale of five.	Leaders	2.16	2.62	2.33	3.20	2.	2.48
	Automatons	3.11	3.	2.80	3.	3.	2.98
Dress, on scale of five.	Leaders	2.50	3.28	1.83	1.80	2.50	2.38
	Automatons	2.70	3.25	2.40	2.	2.60	2.59
Quality of work, scale of five.	Leaders	2.40	2.14	2.50	2.20	3.	2.41
	Automatons	2.50	3.50	2.60	3.	2.60	2.84
Looks, scale of three.	Leaders	2.25	1.62	1.50	1.20	2.	1.72
	Automatons	2.11	2.12	2.20	1.75	2.20	2.09
Selfishness, scale of three.	Leaders	2.20	1.56	2.	1.20	2.25	1.84
	Automatons	2.	2.	2.	2.25	2.	2.05

Several of the questions do not furnish data to show any-

thing clearly. To sum up the chief results, the pupils who were leaders in the tests are larger, better dressed, of more prominent parentage, brighter in their school work, more daring, more fluent of speech, better looking, greater readers, and less selfish than the automatons. It was found that a surprising number of times the leaders were graded on size, dress, and school work either as 5 or 1. To illustrate, in grade 4 the leaders are graded on school work as 1, 1, 5, 1, 1, 5, 1. The automatons of the same grade received the following ranks on the same question: 3, 4, 3, 3, 4, 3, 5, 3. This indicates that possibly there is a tendency for children to be influenced by what is unusual; that they are on the lookout for striking qualities of whatever sort; anything to get clear of tiresome mediocrity.

Finally, the same pupils, excepting those in grade 2, were allowed to answer the following questions:

What one of your schoolmates would you rather be like if you were not yourself? Why? Several other questions were asked calling for ideals, but the answers were so scattered that no well defined tendency could be made out. Above all it was desired to find out how much oftener, if any, those pupils stamped as leaders by the experiments would be chosen consciously as ideals by their mates, than would the automatons. The results show that they were chosen $4\frac{1}{2}$ times as often. The fact is important as indicating the validity of the method of experimentation and the great importance of suggestion and imitation as elements in leadership.

Summary of Experimental Results.

1. A large number maintain a well defined rank either as first or last in the groups.
2. The leaders in the tests were twice as often mentioned by the teachers as being leaders, and further were chosen $4\frac{1}{2}$ times as often by their mates as ideals.
3. Suggestibility, as measured by these tests, rises from the second to the fourth grade and then falls rapidly in the succeeding grades. The naïveté with which the smallest children gave correct answers to the catch questions was remarkable. It reminds one of the old story of the king who thought to appear in procession before his people in a magic garment, visible to all except the wicked, and whose nakedness was denounced only by a little child.
4. The pupils show marked choice in imitating the answers of others. Circumstances favor the quickest, but not always are these the most imitated.
5. The leaders have a high average suggestibility. This may indicate that there is some truth in the assertion, often

made, that to be a leader it is more important to lead the way than to be right.

6. The group rank of many pupils in the second series was radically different from what it had been in the first. This does not seem to be due to a wide divergence between the average reaction time or "originality" of the second group as compared to the first. It is the group spirit as mirrored in the consciousness of each pupil. In one group a certain pupil *feels* himself inferior; he follows, therefore, the answers of the others. In another group the same pupil may *feel* himself superior, and be so regarded by the others. This recalls Emerson's words: "Who has more soul than I, masters me, though he should not raise his finger. . . . Who has less, I rule with like facility."

7. The leaders in the tests, according to the testimony of their teachers, are on the average larger, better dressed, of more prominent parentage, brighter, more noted for daring, more fluent of speech, better looking, greater readers, less emotional and less selfish than the automatons.

8. As regards the reasons given by the pupils for choosing certain of their schoolmates for ideals, intelligence increases in importance rapidly from the second to the eighth grade and goodness as rapidly falls.

9. According to the opinion of the teachers, such pupils are preferred most often for the following qualities, given in order of their importance: intelligence, congeniality, liveliness, and goodness.

10. The data were not suited to bring out race differences in the qualities of leadership.

B *Questionnaire Returns.*

The following questionnaire was sent out.

1. What are the causes and reasons of strong likes and dislikes among children, or for great respect and contempt?

2. Describe cases of excessive dominance of one boy or girl over one or more others or over a group, always giving sex and age. Give concrete cases with details and illustrations. Describe the leader.

3. How much is due to (a) size, (b) strength, (c) skill or feats and what, (d) good looks, (e) good disposition, (f) good and kindly manners, (g) mental superiority and rank in studies, (h) natural kindness and helpfulness, (i) wealth and social station, (j) dress, (k) superior age or maturity?

4. Give cases of boys and girls generally disliked or neglected or even outcast, and state causes, whether the opposite of the above.

5. Is unpopularity the obverse of popularity? Does this differ at different ages? Can you intimate any differences between the age from 7 to 12, 12 to 16, and from 16 to 20 or 25?

(a) Can you describe a case of great influence by a young person who desired not to have this power?

(b) How far is it unconscious and how far striven for, and if the latter by what devices?

(c) Can you give cases of failure or exposure on the part of those striving for leadership?

(d) Can you give cases where a leader has grown weary of power, and abdicated? Lost prestige by taking too much, or sought to transfer it?

6. Can you describe individual or collective revolts against a leader?

7. Give cases where dominance has benefited the followers, fag or henchmen, and state how.

(a) Cases of moral, mental or physical injury resulting from such dominance.

(b) Cases of the good or evil effects of matches, friendships, cronyisms between those equal or unequal in independence or influence.

8. (a) How can leadership be utilized in the school? (b) How can persecution or unpopularity be mitigated? (c) Does this differ in boys and girls?

9. Describe briefly a bluffer, as to scholarship, courage, honesty, frankness. Must bluffing have spectators? Describe bluffing as a form of ostentatious intimacy; effect of it on other children and their reactions to it, imitation, criticism, sympathy, etc.; how far was it genuine and how far affected?

Questions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9 were the most fruitful. The others will not be taken up for treatment here. 305 returns were received. In addition to these about 100 had previously been collected from a questionnaire slightly different from the one given above. In all about 600 leaders were reported and described more or less fully. Almost exactly two-thirds of these were girls. This is due to the fact that the returns were from normal school students in the eastern states, most of whom were females. For this reason the cases of leadership among the girls are no doubt more accurately described than those among the boys. The same fact also necessarily distorts the sex differences.

Unfortunately a large number of those answering failed to state the age either of the leader or the followers. This study can therefore throw little light on the development of leadership and its age differences, though this phase of the subject is of the utmost importance.

We may glance first at the qualities most often mentioned as elements of leadership. The numeral represents the percentage of cases in which the particular quality was mentioned.

		GIRLS.	BOYS.
Group 1	{ Good looks,	19.5%	17 %
	{ Neatness and dress,	13.5	8.
	{ Politeness, good manners, etc.,	10.8	8.
Group 2	{ Wealth and social station,	13.5	16.
Group 3	{ Age,	10.	17.
	{ Size,	10.	19.
Group 4	{ Strength,	5.	20.
	{ Activity, quickness, skill in devising and playing games, etc.,	21.5	39.

		GIRLS.	BOYS.
Group 5	{ Kindness,	7.	5.
	{ Helpfulness,	4.	3.
	{ Generous, considerate, unselfish,	9.	2.
	{ Peaceful, peacemaker, etc.,	2.5	
	{ Sympathetic,	2.	
Group 6	{ Protected the younger,	.5	
	{ Loyalty,		2.
Group 7	{ Honest, frank, just, etc.,	2.	6.
	{ Jolly, lively, ready for fun, etc.,	8.5	4.
Group 8	{ Courage, boldness,	4.5	5.
	{ Brightness, scholarship, etc.,	10.5	18.
Group 9	{ Good judgment,	1.	
	{ Tact,	1.5	2.
	{ Cunning,	1.5	
	{ Originality,	2.	
	{ Musical ability,	2.	1.
Group 10	{ Bribery, flattery, and coaxing,	3.	1.
Group 11	{ An "only" child,	2.5	1.
	{ Used to having own way at home,	3.5	
Group 12	{ Strong willed,	4.5	1.
	{ Self confident, decided manner,	4.	6.
	{ Boastful, conceited, etc.,		2.
Group 13	{ Domineering, bossy, a bully, etc.,	5.5	6.
	{ Inspires fear,	2.	2.
	{ Sharp tongued, sarcastic, etc.,	5.	2.
	{ Haughty,	1.5	
Group 14	{ Good disposition and temper,	13.5	8.
	{ Friendly, pleasant, gentle, attractive, amiable,	4.	1.
	{ Unaffected, natural, unobtrusive, meek,	2.5	1.
Group 15	{ Strange,		1.
	{ Greater experience,	1.5	7.
	{ Coarse,	1.	2.
	{ Uses slang,	.5	
	{ Mischievous,	1.	2.
	{ Smoked,		1.
	{ Wit,		3.

It seems therefore that girls, in order to be leaders, stand more in need of such qualities as are mentioned in groups, 1, 7, 10, 11, and 14 than do boys. The boy leaders on the other hand are more likely than girls to have the qualities of groups 3, 4, 6, 8, 15, and brightness of group 9. The other qualities are not very unequally divided. Their values may readily be seen from the table.

The returns are not adapted to bring out the relative frequency of leadership with boys and girls. The fact, however, that one-third of the leaders described are boys, although almost all the returns were written by young women, would indicate that it is probably more common with boys. Several of those answering state this as their opinion. From the returns it appears also that leadership is more intensive with the boys.

The group spirit is stronger with them and they are less likely to revolt against their leader. The girls show more of a tendency to divide up into small groups. Jealousy more often comes in as a disturbing element than with the boys. Personal resentment is aroused more readily and is not so easily allayed. They show less of the give and take spirit than do boys. If it be objected that the phenomena of leadership are more common among the boys only because of the group games and rough out-door sports in which boys engage, it may be replied that this very fact is only an additional proof that girls do not have the inherent social tendencies that boys have. The differences here mentioned are in line with the differences in social tendencies already noted between the males and females of primitive races. They are also paralleled by the common observation of men and women in civilized life. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that there is no sure means of ascertaining just to what extent the observed differences everywhere are a mere artifact produced by social environment. If any one is so radical as to claim that all the apparent differences can be thus explained away, there is no way utterly to refute him. The conclusive experiment cannot be made.

In so far as ages are given, the qualities that increase in frequency with increase of age are those of groups 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 15. Those that decrease with age are the qualities of groups 5, 7, 10, 13 and 14. The other qualities mentioned do not show striking change with increase of age.

The bulk of the returns show that in the first three or four years of school life there is little real leadership. The relationships are personal and not of the group kind. Several may play together, but when they do, they act independently of each other. Whatever phenomena of leadership are found at this period are less permanent and more partial than later. A marked change comes in the pre-adolescent stage of 10 to 12 years. Friends are chosen on account of personal attraction and admiration rather than for purely accidental reasons. Concerted action begins to replace individual play. These tendencies become more and more accentuated until by 15 to 18 years the group spirit becomes strong, personal attachments are made in accordance with subjective ideals, and a large proportion of the total number of boys and girls could instantly be classed either as popular or unpopular among their fellows. There is also plainly evident a tendency to evaluate themselves as inferior or superior to others. Domineering acts are now due to conscious self-assertion and no longer to childish egoism. A new diffidence appears, very different from the bashfulness of childhood.

Perhaps few persons except teachers realize the great extent

to which certain children influence others. Most of us have forgotten the influences that gave color to our childhood, and we do not usually take note of the subtle suggestions that pass among children. The following condensed returns show the length to which leadership and dominance often go.

Girl of 12. Had great influence over her schoolmates. At one time she became angry at one of her mates and persuaded all the others to be "mad" at her also. For several weeks no one spoke to that girl. Due to social standing, "smart" manners, and skill in games.

Boy. Persuaded 35 or 40 boys to come together for military drill. He acted as captain. Through his efforts an entertainment was given and money raised to buy linen suits.

Boy of 12. Always proposes the games. He is selfish and inclined to be bossy. The pupils often say so and yet at the same time do everything he wishes. He is extremely large of his age, courageous, and so mischievous as to be a constant source of worry.

Boy of 10. Leader of a large group. Once persuaded all the boys to stay away from school an entire day. Later he begged the teacher's pardon and made all the others do so. He was above the average in size and physical strength. Was homely, pug-nosed and freckled.

Girl of 14. If she was absent, disputes were not settled till her return. We played no games that she disapproved and talked to no girls whom she disliked. Reasons, musical skill, good looks, dress and neatness.

Boy of 14. The other boys followed him in every respect. One day the school boys had proposed to take away the wood which an old colored lady had piled up in her back yard. This boy came in and persuaded the others to chop her wood for her instead of removing it. They did not stop till it was finished.

Boy of 9. Domineers excessively over his companions in a pleasant way. They do as he does. He has only to begin a game to have them follow. If they are playing and he quits, the game soon breaks up.

Girl. Was leader in everything we did. She always proposed our games. It seemed we could have more fun when she planned things. Others had greater mental ability, but all of us stood aside for her to move first. She was much larger than the rest of us and a little older. She had beautiful manners.

Girl 12. Jolly, and full of ideas for our play. She always headed the mischief. Whenever we had a party we consulted her as to whom we should invite. Often she persuaded us not to study, and for that reason part of the grade failed to pass. Certain girls whom we very much disliked we tolerated because she liked them. Due to her skill, ability to suggest, and good temper.

Strong Irish girl, with sharp tongue. On one occasion, when kept in by the teacher, she led her group right out of the schoolhouse.

Girl of 16. For four years has absolutely ruled all the other children in the country school she attends. Hardly know how she does it. She is used to her own way at home, being an "only" child.

Girl of 9. We would play no game till she had consented. When her regular seat mate was absent, we all wanted to sit with her. We took care not to wear clothes that she did not like. Due to good looks, manners, social station and clothes.

Girl of 12. If she was absent from school, the others would not decide anything that came up till she returned. She was leader of all our games. All of us wanted to walk arm in arm with her from school. Due to her size, skill in games, musical ability and fine appearance.

Girl of 12. Had a strange power over all of us. She made us play

just the games she wished. In the spring she came to school one day without her coat and we at once did the same. Was good looking and could manage the games.

Girl. We were abject slaves to her. She planned all our games. She was independent and expected us to follow. She would be no "bestest" friend to any of us and yet offended no one. She was from New York but was not "stuck up" and we liked her for that.

The following are examples of the bossy, domineering, selfish type:

Boy, 12 to 16. Would not have a friend he could not lead. Always managed to have his own way, except now and then, when he had nothing to lose, he would give in to his followers with a show of generosity. Was selfish and deceitful, yet pleasant. Was older than followers.

Boy of 12. Not attractive, but rules his schoolmates absolutely. He is selfish, rude, cruel, and inspires fear. He is inventive and clever.

Girl of 13. Tried hard to be the leader of her class. Strove for all the good offices. Her devices were cunning and flattery. Her leadership lasted but one year at the end of which time she saw herself in disfavor and resigned her position. Her failure made her ill.

Girl of 14. Larger than rest of us and with actions like a boy. She whistled and had a coarse, loud voice. Domineering by nature. We really did not like her and yet she exerted a great influence over us.

Girl of 15. Always assumes the attitude of leader. She likes to name her home as the place to congregate, and those who are not agreeable are not allowed to come. She is dictatorial and strong willed.

Girl of 10. Leader of all her schoolmates. Through her influence every girl who was ugly or lacking in neatness was kept from her set. She hated a Tom-boy and caused all the others to drop the rough sports they had been fond of. High social standing.

Girl of 11. Ruled the boys and girls alike. One of the wealthiest girls in the village was her slave. She could make us do as she wished before we knew what was up. She was good looking, daring, skillful in holding her own, and older than the rest of us.

Girl. From childhood to womanhood ruled over her sister, two years younger. She led in the play and treated all ideas and suggestions of the younger sister with contempt. The latter grew timid, and lacks force in putting forth her ideas. The older is more active and original.

On the other hand, some children seem fitted by nature with the very qualities that attract others spontaneously. They make no conscious effort to rule and yet their every hint is carried out by those around. The following returns represent this type:

Girl of 12. All the girls wanted to walk home with her. When school was out there was always a perfect rush to get close to her. The other pupils often quarrelled over her. Skill in games, good disposition, wealth and dress.

Girl of 16. Leader of five others, all of the same age. An "only" child, fashionable, skilled in music, and of beautiful manners. She is popular with both boys and girls. When she decided to learn to dance, all her schoolmates caught the craze.

Girl of 10. Leader of boys and girls. Never alone, but always a

horde following. Jolly, off-handed, extremely resourceful, aristocratic looking. In our dramatic plays was always composer and "leading lady."

Girl. Leader from the age of 9 to 20. We all liked her and would do anything for her. If she was ill, we preferred to stay at home with her rather than go out without her. She still leads her crowd. "Only" child, very attractive and stylish, and kindness itself. She was skillful in arranging a good time, always knowing what to do next.

Girl. Led the boys and girls. The boys were always polite and gentle in her presence, showing their deference in many ways. Her look or word could influence the whole school. Larger, beautiful, composed, fascinating, and old in her ways, always having been her mother's companion.

Boy. Matured early. Charming personality, and skill in athletics. Could always understand the demands of the moment. Strong, good hearted, yet in many ways different from what you would expect.

Boy. Was a leader through grammar school, high school, and college. Most popular student I ever knew. Very bright, magnetic, strong will, natural kindness. The teachers always forgave him more readily than they did the other boys and yet his mates did not dislike this.

Boy of 14, in country school. Was small, but ruled those larger, older and stronger. High ideals, scorned a coward, protected the smaller boys, natural gentleman. Could see both sides and judge quickly and justly.

Jonie, 15. Leader of "Jonie's crowd." Is tall, strong, jolly, good-looking. Two years older than his followers. Once got his crowd to set off on an Indian tramp. They walked four miles, camped out in an old mill and ate their dinner. Then they marched back, hollering "hurrah for Jonie's crowd!"

Although skill in games and ability to perform feats are prominent features in many of the above examples, they are especially so in the following.

Girl of 10. Had great influence over me because of the fact that she could walk the board to which the fence pickets were nailed. Several of us envied her for this reason. She was also very strong.

Girl of 12. Leader of all the rest of us. We always followed her willingly. No matter what game we played, she was "it." Could run, jump and climb fences better than any of the other girls. She was never at a loss in thinking up new games.

Girl of 14. Rules the girls with absolute sway. She makes new games, assigns parts, settles disputes and enforces commands. Keen sense of justice, ability to think quickly, and ready expression.

Girl of 12. Because she knew stories and could dramatize them was leader of about 15 children. Was also skillful in athletic feats.

Girl. Leader throughout grammar school and high school. A few disliked her out of jealousy, but even these acknowledged her leadership. Whether it was a dialogue, game, party, or something else, she was always the one to get it up. Good looking and had a delightful manner.

Boy of 12. Planned our play and conducted it. Could tell stories and illustrate them with drawing. Could do all kinds of tricks and make pretty toys. Older and larger than the others. Read much.

Boy of 13. A "ring leader." Broader experience than the others. Had been in town schools. Always had a scheme to interest others. Not truthful or honest, but polite, good in games, and very bright. Was younger than his followers.

Boy 15. Big and well formed. Could run, jump, spin a top better than anybody else. We thought there was nothing impossible for him to do.

Boy of 14. Led all his associates. They carry out whatever he suggests. Once he persuaded them to "chip in" and build a club house. Many difficulties were met but all were overcome through his encouragement. Younger than his followers, but has a very practical mind.

Boy of 13. Strong, well built, good looking, and outspoken. Once he got the other boys to break up our game. Often he would perform feats of agility while the other boys stood by and watched. None of them could equal him in feats and games.

Boy in high school. A leader of boys and a favorite of girls. Tall and strong. Captain of all the athletic teams and leader in all sports. Skillful performer on the piano. Everybody liked him so I decided I would not. Later we became fast friends.

Girl. Leader even among the boys. Larger and willing to be "it." Could run as fast as any of the boys. Daring and full of fun. Good natured and athletic.

A good many examples were given bordering on the criminal and "gang" type. A few of these may be given.

Boy of 14. Leader of five boys in the grammar grade. Oldest of the group. Daring, not afraid of any one. Was able to get the boys to do anything he said. Used to play truant for days at a time with one or two of his companions. Police had difficulty to catch him. Large for his age, strong, untidy, and swaggering appearance.

Boy of 15. Leader of a group of seven. The very embodiment of depravity. Younger than his followers. They were a gang of thieves. All smoked cigarettes. Some of the boys were from good homes.

Boy of 16. Eight followers. They were led into lying, cheating and stealing. He got one of the boys to steal several hundred dollars from an uncle. The leader took a large share and divided the rest among the other boys. He smoked, drank and knew "wild west" stories.

Boy of 11. Remarkable influence over his playmates. Bought cigarettes and persuaded the boys to smoke them. On one occasion he got the other boys to help him in vexing a substitute teacher.

Boy of 14. Leader of a crowd of half criminals. Large, fine physique. Is a bully, walks with slovenly gait and hat over one eye. Gives "smart" answers and vexes his parents and teachers almost beyond endurance.

Boy of 14. A kind of lawless fellow. Leads a gang of his friends whom he has caused to begin stealing. They do as he says because they dread his ridicule. Is daring and skillful at feats.

Wealth, dress and social station have little influence till well toward the adolescent years, but at this period they become an important factor, especially with the girls. A few examples illustrate the type:

Girl of 13. Sets the fashions for all her followers. They model their luncheons after hers. She is beautiful, polite, and perfectly adored by her friends. She chooses the games and settles disputes.

Girl of 11. Her great influence over us was due to the wealth and prominent position of her parents, and to her fine clothes. She used to wear silk dresses at play and this made us think she must be very rich. Her mother was stylish and haughty.

Girl of 10. Her leadership depends entirely on the prominence of her parents and on her beautiful clothes. She is selfish, not good looking, and not at all bright in her studies, yet she has the other girls completely under her control. Whatever she does, they follow suit.

Girl of 16. A leader in everything. She is one of the oldest of her set, has prominent parents, and dresses handsomely. Will have nothing to do with anything unless she manages it. As this is about her only fault, the others readily give up to her.

Boy of 12. Leadership due altogether to his prominent social standing and to the fact that he has travelled. The boys adopt every plan he proposes. They imitate even his dress. He used to go around much without a hat and all the other boys got into the same habit.

Boy in a private preparatory school. Was looked up to and allowed to have his own way because he was the son of the college president. He was too conceited for any one to like him, but he was followed for sake of policy. This lasted also through his college life.

Girl. Leader through grammar grades and high school. Was poor in her studies, and of hateful disposition. Owing to her prominent family, good looks, and flattering ways, however, she had great power over us.

Several different sorts of leadership can be made out from such miscellaneous returns as the following:

Girl of 12. Whenever she talked to a girl she made her feel that she was her very best friend. Yet she often talked about some of the girls. Her charm was so great that they still clung to her even after they knew of it. Always went with younger girls and was happy and jolly. Really not true to any one.

Girl. Leader in the grammar school. Led nearly all the parties. Once got a half dozen of us to "bolt" school, although we knew we should be punished for it. She was a dunce in her books, but good looking, and full of fun.

Girl. Gentle, winning way. In the game of "house" she was always chosen "mother." She guided us in nearly everything we did. Some did not like her simply because she was a leader.

Girl. She had so much influence over us that when she refused to obey the teacher we usually refused also. Whenever the teacher could persuade her to do a thing there was nothing to fear from the rest of us. Force of character and ability to give others a good time.

Girl of 12. Was always wanted to lead. Could always bring her followers to time by threatening to leave them. Dressed well and was able to manage things. For a time a new girl joined the group and she also wanted to lead. There was always trouble when the two were together, but if one or the other was at home everything went along peacefully.

Girl of 10. Leader of a group in school. When they play school she is teacher. She manages the games and assigns the parts. It is very rarely that her wishes are opposed. Two years older than her followers.

Girl of 14. Had a way of making you feel your own way of doing a thing inferior. A confident air and good power of expression.

Girl. Leader in the grammar school. More mature in her ways than the others were. Her mother was dead and she had long had the care of the home. Bright and studious.

Girl of 15. Her opinion was always sought. Three things worked together to make her a leader. She was of wealthy family, had great personal charm, and had always been used to having her own way at home.

Girl of 10. Some of her followers are older by two or three years. She is small, active, impulsive, and ranks well in all her school work. She has several faults, but her followers overlook them.

Girl of 10. Leader of quite a number. She seems to know just how to act when her friends are around. They play few games that she does not suggest and manage. After they had organized a "society" one day, she suggested that they have a "fair." This they did. Good looking, dressed well, and had wonderful natural tact in getting along with her playmates.

Of three boys I know one is decidedly the leader. He is two years older than the others, larger, stronger, and has seen more of life. He knows just what he wants to do and goes right ahead with his orders. There is nothing for the others to do but "fall in."

Boy of 9. An "only" child and used to having things his own way at home. At school he is domineering. When he can't get boys of his age to obey him he joins a group of smaller boys whom he can "boss."

Boy of 14. Leads an entire class of nine boys. He is selfish, but full of tact. If they won't do as he wishes he will bribe them. He is oldest and is captain of their foot ball team.

Boy. Good student, poor, but handsome, frank, and ambitious. A high sense of honor. He was a leader through the common school, high school, and is now the president of his senior college class. He has always been distinguished for his natural manly qualities.

The term leadership has such a broad application and is described by so many general and indefinite adjectives that it is impossible to judge the real significance of all the cases given. We must, for instance, carefully distinguish the "general favorite" from the actual leader. The former may be only a "clever fellow," "nice boy," "sweet girl," or a "jolly good companion," etc. Yet after liberal allowance has been made for unconscious exaggeration and for inaccuracy of description, there still remains much interesting evidence of the potency and direction of leadership among children and youths.

The group activities of the playground and street are crowded with object lessons that sink to the marrow. They show their influence on the character long after the memorized text book has been forgotten. It would be hard to say how much of one's total *effective* education is gained from this personal contact, with its accompanying conflict, dominance, and submission. It must, however, be considerable. The Duke of Wellington declared that the battle of Waterloo was won on the play ground of Eton. It has been also said¹ that whatever field of human leadership one ransacks, it is found largely Etonian. From the history of a few representative schools it does seem that they develop the qualities of character suitable for leadership. At least it is one of the problems of the school to give free and healthful play to the instinct of leadership, while at the same time so controlling conditions that no injury may result to those of more timid disposition.

¹Dr. W. H. Burnham. Unpublished lecture.

Among many there is a real passion for leadership. Of those sending returns, twenty-one state that at some period in their lives they were leaders of their playmates. Several others mention a desire to lead, and some recall the envy with which they regarded others who were readier in activity and exerted more influence. Others consciously plan how they may acquire greater influence. The same is borne out by the fact that few cases of unconscious leadership were given. Several state that so far as they have observed, all such leaders are conscious of the influence they possess even though in many cases they do not strive for it.

There were several examples of evil resulting to the character of timid followers. One girl tells how her older sister had such sway over her and such a contemptuous way of treating her suggestions that she came to lack all confidence in herself. In her opinion she has not yet outgrown the evil effects.

It seems that initiative and leadership are sometimes matters of habit. The habit, however, will develop only when nourished by self confidence. If one is too early made conscious of one's weakness and shortcomings by stronger friends, the chances are that a chronic timidity will make the person for life a follower and hanger-on instead of a leader. It is essential to the healthy development of any youth that in something or other he should feel himself superior to any one around him. If leadership does not develop in youth, it is never likely to appear, or if it does, only in narrow lines.

To many children, whatever is strange or new has an aura of mystery and superiority about it that takes them off their feet. Their own possessions, their own games, their own thoughts, all things they are accustomed to and know, are inferior to what they see others busied with. This is especially true when the other person is a new comer or stranger. Several returns show that the child who leaves one school and enters another is likely to be either very popular or very unpopular from the first. Very unpopular if his ways clash too much with those of his new comrades. If his ways do not positively offend, he is likely to have marked influence, at least until his ways have become familiar and trite. Each feels that the possessions of the strange child are more precious than his own; that the experience of that one renders his own trivial. Training should counteract this tendency. As it is, the trait often does not disappear even in adult life, though it is a menace to happiness and success. As Emerson points out, one of the most difficult steps to self reliance is to discern the true value of the *right here* and *right now*.

About a dozen of the leaders are mentioned as only children. This is significant, considering that the questionnaire does not

suggest the influence of this factor. It must be supposed, therefore, to have been operative in many cases in which no mention was made of it. About a dozen others were described as children who were allowed to have their own way at home. Such children are much like the only children. Both classes are likely to show a domineering attitude toward the other children. If the character of such a one is striking he becomes a leader. If not, he is disliked, quarreled with, and in some cases becomes an outcast. Sometimes, if unable to rule among his equals, he associates himself with the smaller boys, over whom he can domineer more easily. In this connection it should be mentioned that of the 269 only children studied by Bohannon, 134 got along badly with others, 54 fairly well, and in only 81 cases were their relations normal. The reason given is the desire to rule.

Most of the revolts described were due to a single cause, *i. e.*, the too conscious assumption of power. In one case it was said the leader was deposed because he boasted that he could make the others do anything he wished. This is typical. Children don't object so much to leadership, but they dislike that any one should assume it with show of authority. Other examples were given of children bringing ridicule upon themselves because of too evident striving for influence.

Outcasts.

The opposite of the leader is the outcast. 259 cases were described in the returns. 208 were girls; 51, boys. Such qualities as teasing, domineering ways, quarrelsomeness, selfishness, bad disposition, etc., received mention with 33% of the girl outcasts, and 50% of the boys. Slovenliness, ugliness, filthiness, etc., with 26% of the girls and 14% of the boys. Dullness, ignorance, stupidity, slowness, with 24% of the girls and 30% of the boys. Complaining, fault-finding, sulkiness, spitefulness, tale-telling with 17% of girls and 28% of boys. Haughty manner, egotism, conceit, pride, with 21% of girls and 16% of boys. Timidity, lack of spirit, weakness, tendency to cry easily, with 9% of the girls and 16% of the boys. Social standing and poverty with 10% of the girls and none of the boys. Other qualities receiving more or less mention are the following: bluffing, braggadocio, crankiness, queeriness, forwardness, inquisitiveness, bad manners, rudeness, bad temper, cruelty, dishonesty, jealousy. Twelve girls were outcasts because they were the teacher's pets. Five girls and two boys were avoided because of the influence of leaders who disliked them. Ten girls and three boys were mentioned as only children. The following very much abbreviated returns illustrate most of the types described:

Boy of 10. Only child, babied, selfish, and ill-mannered. Others drove him from the games.

Girl of 12. Shunned by all the other girls. Boastful, intruding, talks of her dress. Yet is obliging and not malicious. Is good to her mother and liked by older people.

Boy. Avoided by his classmates. The cause was their jealousy. Teachers and elders take great interest in him. Is shy and retiring. Went to college at 16 and became very popular.

Girl. Bold, forward, domineering, shabby, "smart," petted by the teacher.

Girl. Good, bright, pretty and neat. Outcast because she was at outs with a powerful leader. She would not run after people.

Girl of 8th grade. Wealthy, bright, pretty, and haughty. Always tried to make us see her superiority.

Girl of 12. Was outcast because she was untidy. The teacher persuaded us to take her into our play. All of us agreed but one girl, then the latter became an outcast.

Boy. Selfish, spoiled, over-bearing. Was an only child.

Boy. Outcast because he was girlish and did fancy work.

Girl of 10. Unbearable disposition. Yet she was the brightest in the class and was well dressed.

Girl. Disliked by all the pupils. Was the teacher's favorite. Always telling tales and getting others into trouble.

Boy. A negro child.

Boy. His father a saloon keeper.

Boy. A braggart and coward. The dislike followed him throughout school and out into the world.

Boy of 11. An only child of good parentage. Was cowardly, unresponsive and troublesome.

Girl of 16. Very pretty, over-dressed, vain, cruel to animals, ill-mannered, wanted to be babied. Yet was quite attractive at first meeting.

Girl. Queer ways made her a target for persecution. Could only get others to walk with her by bribing them with candy. She always had money. Mentally deficient. I was sorry for her, but could not befriend her for fear of losing popularity.

Girl. Became an outcast because of incurring the enmity of the leader.

Girl. Always neglected and scorned. Had no spirit, never became angry, was thoroughly despised.

Girl. No one would talk to her. She was laughed at and plagued. Not very bright and was larger than her class.

Boy. Exceedingly polite, never in scrapes like the other boys, would not play games and went around dressed up.

Boy of 12. Most unpopular I ever knew. Untidy, ill-mannered, rude, selfish, spoiled, sneaking. A cry-baby.

Boy of 10. When he came near, the others always stopped their game to keep him from joining. Conceited and cowardly.

Girl. Unpopular for several years. Older than her class. Bad appearance and ugly manners. Slovenly. Could not articulate distinctly.

Girl. Very poor and slovenly. No one noticed her. She walked the yard alone.

Girl of 10. A tell-tale. We called her "C. T.," which meant "cranky tattler."

Girl. No one in the class cared for her. They would not even sit near her in class. Very homely and untidy. She wanted to be a leader.

Girl of 12 or 13. Very unpopular. Slow in school work. From a low family, immodest, immoral, and rude. Was much older than her class.

Girl of 10. Forever whining. Such a bore that none of the other girls would have anything to do with her.

Girl of 12. Had a queer looking face. The other girls were to blame for not liking her.

Girl of 11. Disagreeable, contrary-minded, always correcting other people's faults. Would not join in the games.

Girl. Disagreeable and "stuck up." Calls the other girls "common people." Selfish.

Girl. Large and fat, sour looking, quarrelsome, a tell-tale.

Girl of 14. A social outcast because her mother was a washerwoman. Later, in high school, we liked her and regretted the way we had treated her.

Girl. Through dishonest work received good marks in her lessons. The rest of us hated her for this.

Girl. Exceedingly timid, soft whining voice. All tormented her and avoided playing with her.

Girl. Disagreeable and reticent. We would always abandon a game if she came to play with us. She was homely, poor, and impolite. We would not go to a party to which she was invited.

Girl. Some would always refuse to play in a game with her. She was ugly, stupid, and of poor social station.

Girl in high school. Always tried to boss and be a leader. When our teacher chose her for class prophet we sent in a petition to have her removed.

Boy of 15. Disliked by boys and girls. "Was made up chiefly of etiquette." Was almost hated by children of his age but fairly well liked by older people.

Girl of 6th grade. Much disliked and neglected because she was stupid, awkward, mean and deceitful.

Girl of 13. Boastful of her possessions. Would hardly talk of anything but herself and her family. Full of conceit. We always stopped our game whenever she came to play with us.

Outcast children offer a difficult problem to the teacher. Great tact is required in trying to help matters. Several returns show that the teacher often only makes matters worse by going to extremes in befriending the outcast. The mode of procedure must depend upon the cause. If the outcast child is disliked because of timidity, backwardness, ugly features, poor clothes or poverty, the strong teacher can certainly do something to inspire more humanity in the other pupils. On the other hand if the outcast is extremely unlovable in disposition the problem is much harder. An effort should be made to improve the character and disposition of the outcast. If this cannot be done, little may be expected beyond preventing the other pupils from exhibiting their dislike in overt acts of retaliation. Likes and dislikes are as passionate with children as with adults and are far less easily controlled. It is in many cases useless to endeavor to arouse much love and sympathy for the outcast. Every case must, however, be dealt with on its own merits, at the same time keeping the general moral tone of the school the highest possible.

Many cases given are altogether ephemeral and accidental. One or two pupils begin teasing another, and the others join with them, virtually making the pupil an outcast for a few days. If certain influential ones neglect a pupil, the others are likely to take a little pride in "cutting" him. The teacher should keep on the lookout for such cases to prevent them from becoming more serious. A word or two will generally be sufficient to make the pupils realize the injustice of their treatment.

Bluffers.

Bluffing may or may not be an element of leadership. About 420 bluffers were described in the returns. Most of the descriptions were very similar. The following condensed replies illustrate the common type with its main variations:

Girl. Reads her lesson only once and bluffs her way in recitation. She makes a good showing except on examination. Is bold and generally frank.

Boy. Lazy. Used to copy his lessons from the others, and in class would ask many questions to make the teacher think he was interested.

Girl. Not very bright in her studies, but with a certain frankness that "took" she used to make her way pretty well.

Girl. Bright but depends on bluff instead of hard work to carry her through. On the whole is frank and courageous.

Boy. Went entirely through school on his bluffing. He never studied. Was exceptionally quick, and good at guessing.

Boy of 12. Does not study, but manages to answer in such a way that the teacher will think he has.

Girl. Is scholarly and full of mock courage and frankness.

Girl of 18. Not a very good scholar, but recited by talking a good deal in a decided tone of voice. Courageous and frank.

Boy. Used to talk all around the question. Generally received good marks on examination because he was able to cram. Not very frank, although he pretended to be.

Girl. Genuine bluffer. Volunteers much in recitation and says much not to the point.

Boy in high school. Our class historian. Went through the whole course on bluff. Would skim through, get a faint idea of what the lesson was about, and then fill in from his fertile imagination. Pretended great honesty. He was a born bluffer and certainly exerted a very bad influence.

Girl of 14. Worst bluffer I ever saw. In the Latin recitation she always tried to hide behind free translations. If cornered she usually escaped by turning the question upon the teacher.

Girl of 14. Pretended to her schoolmates that she never studied her Latin lesson. Yet her lessons were always perfect. We disliked her for this.

Boy in high school. Knew very little, but in recitation would rise with an air of "this is too easy." Would then hem and haw, and end by asking the teacher an irrelevant question. Had little courage or honesty, but talked big about what was "square."

Boy of 17. Never knew his lesson, but had more to say and suggest in the class than any one else. After recitation he often boasted to the others of his "game of bluff."

Girl of 16. Bluffs in all her lessons. I think she knows we understand her and that she bluffs just for the sake of doing it. She talks as though she were honesty itself. I don't think she can help her bluffing.

Girl. Typical bluffer. Never knew her lesson but always recited. If the teacher did not approve her recitation she would say the same thing over again in different words. She disgusted us by boasting of how she bluffed the teacher.

Girl. Known throughout the school as a bluffer. In recitation she never stuck to her topic. Daring and courageous. Ridiculed by the class and not trusted.

Girl. Bluffed her way through the high school. In recitation always kept her hand raised. Never owned that she did not know. Always agreed with the teacher. Agreeable manners.

The composite of the descriptions given above would be something like the following:

The bluffer is courageous in attitude, appears frank, and yet is dishonest in varying degrees. He is keen-minded and alert for clues. Though his knowledge is usually superficial and well scattered, he is at the same time glib-tongued and able to express more than he knows,—able to cover up ignorance with words. His frankness throws people off their guard. Courage is his deepest virtue for he must be courageous to bluff. For the most part he has an exaggerated faith in himself. The latter is no doubt in some cases acquired. From a beginning in fear and trembling, the habit, if successfully continued, involves necessarily the keeping in consciousness of one's strong points and the forgetting of one's weaknesses. This is the prime condition for the development of conceit.

As to the moral effects of bluffing in the school:

Bad effect on other children. Their ideals are lowered when they see success can be won by deception.

The bluffer is a nuisance. The teacher is slower to find him out than the pupils are. Bad reaction on them.

The successful bluffer makes the other children discontented. In despair they are sometimes tempted to try it themselves.

Bluffing ruins the bluffer. The influence is bad also on others, as it makes them think they too should get through without work.

The teacher is often slow to find out the bluffer, and unless he does, he is soon lowered in the eyes of the pupils.

A single bluffer, if successful, will breed discontent, dishonesty, and carelessness in the work of the entire school.

Successful bluffing discourages the other pupils. They either take to bluffing in self-defense or else they dislike the teacher and think her unjust.

Bluffing is always discovered by the pupils first and the effect is demoralizing. The teacher soon loses the respect of the pupils.

Bluffing is disliked by the most of the children, and yet the successful bluffer is more or less imitated. It must not be tolerated.

Children learn to bluff by being in school. It gets worse all the way up. There is more in the high school than the grammar school, and still more in the normal school. It increases because teachers countenance it.

Several of the above suggestions, and particularly the last mentioned, are serious indictments of the teacher and the school. For the most part bluffing is acquired. Very few cases are mentioned under 11 or 12 years of age. Yet in the higher grades the bluffers are so common that few schools are without one or more. Only a very few of our correspondents have not come in contact with them.

Do our schools breed the bluffing spirit? From a careful reading and re-reading of these 420 replies I am thoroughly convinced that they do. The teacher herself too often sets the example. Misled by a false idea, she is timid about owning her own ignorance of anything. She acts as if she knew everything, and the pupil soon learns to do likewise. Moreover our monstrous method of recitation in the lower grades is perfectly adapted to the development of an artificial atmosphere between teacher and pupil. Children of 8 or 10 years are given a half-hour or hour to study (!) and then the teacher takes a half hour to have them tell over what they have learned. The one who talks the most, and with the most knowing air is praised. The one who is bothered by the complex relations of the subject, and is too honest to pretend to any knowledge which he only half possesses, is too often scolded as lazy. The former pupil soon becomes a full-fledged bluffer. The latter at first despises him for it. Later he learns to locate the fault more correctly and despises the teacher instead. There is then nothing left for him to do but to learn the game in his own defense.

I agree, with the last quotation above, that it gets worse in the higher classes. In the country school that I attended I can think of one or two. In the high school, a half dozen at least; while I would not even venture a guess at the number I have known in normal school and college. Even in college I have seen the affair reach the critical point of being a kind of hide and seek game between the instructor and his students, or rather a kind of dodge and parry duel, the chief aim of either side being to keep the other from discovering a weak point.

Dr. Hodge¹ finds this spirit the most serious obstacle to the introduction of dynamic biology in the high school. The subject is so boundless, and one brushes so easily against the present limits of human knowledge, and especially of the *teacher's* knowledge, that the teachers dread to have to say continually "I don't know."

The same dread appears everywhere else, in perhaps less intensity, and everywhere makes teaching stilted and artificial. The inevitable effect on the character of the bluffer is too obvious to require emphasis. The demoralizing effect on the

¹Dynamic Biology, *Ped. Sem.*, 1904, pp. 381-404.

school cannot be doubted. Teachers should bathe themselves in the simplicity of Socrates. They should adopt the practice of hounding the bluffer till he consents to appear in the open and fight fairly. Under such a teacher bluffing will disappear.

(B.) *Children's Ideals.*

Studies of children's ideals are all interesting when viewed in connection with leadership. Estella M. Darrah, Earl Barnes, Catherine Dodd, Will Grant Chambers and others have allowed several thousands of school children of different sex, age, and environment, to answer some such question as the following: "What person of whom you have ever heard or read would you most like to resemble, and why?" The results of all are broadly similar. The total result seems to be that nearly as many girls as boys take the purely virile type as their ideal. In the primary grades, goodness, possessions, and marvellous powers are most often named as ideal attributes. In the grammar grades the last two attributes are largely supplanted by courage, freedom, wisdom and honesty; while at the beginning of the high school age, altruism, patriotism and ability to lead take a more prominent place. Girls name a larger proportion of writers, artists, musicians, philanthropists and literary characters; while boys select more soldiers, adventurers, financiers and inventors. Usually the girls lead in naming moral and altruistic qualities. Degrading ideals are almost wanting. When such are named it is usually on account of some quality or power which in itself is not bad.

Kratz¹ investigated the preferences shown by children for their teachers. He finds that dress, personal appearance, patience and politeness come in for a surprising amount of mention. In a study by J. R. Street,² the voice, dress, manners, good looks and religious activity are the qualities of the teacher most often named by the pupils as having appealed to them.

Haskel, in a report on imitation among school children,³ says there is always a reaching out for the conditions of those who are larger, stronger, more regarded, and freer in their activities. F. G. Bonser⁴ finds that environment is more decisive than temperament in determining the choice of youthful friendship. A large percentage of the reasons given for the selection of chums indicate only an *occasion* of the friendship and not any special source of attraction. The results of the work of Barnes, Shaw, O'Shea and others on the interests of childhood, indi-

¹ Characteristics of the best teacher, *Ped. Sem.*, 1895.

² Moral Ed., *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. V.

³ *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. III.

⁴ Chums; a Study in Youthful Friendship, *Ped. Sem.*, 1902.

cate that children are particularly interested in action, and that this is more true of boys than of girls. Bohannon, in his study of "peculiar and exceptional children,"¹ finds that those with advantageous traits are either strong, courageous, large, deft, agile, beautiful, clean, generous, pathetic, buoyant, orderly or obedient. 427 children are reported in his returns as popular among their mates for one or more of the above reasons. 448 were disliked because they were either ill-tempered, whining, cruel, selfish, ugly, deformed, birth-marked, untruthful, small, dirty, timid, disorderly, disobedient, gluttonous, nervous, clumsy, spoiled or possessed of sense defects. 126 are classed as neutral. These are the buffoons, the frank, the loquacious, the imaginative, the dignified, the teasers, the silent and the dainty.

Objection may be raised to citing studies in ideals as bearing at all on the question of leadership. It depends on what active power our ideals have over us. Do we really control a person's life when we control his ideals? Or is leadership dependent altogether on some indefinable personal magnetism that may even be embodied in a most unideal person? The question is important. It must be supposed that children, like adults, often have vague longings to be things which they do not soberly expect to be. It may further be true that while thus vaguely holding a lofty ideal in the background of consciousness they yield to the leadership of persons they do not entirely respect. In general, however, it can be seen that such person is a leader, on account of the possession of some really admirable trait. As one author states it, it is not the cruelty and dishonesty of Jesse James, but his bravery and dash, that appeal to boys.

This study was begun in the autumn of 1902, at the suggestion of Prof. E. H. Lindley, of Indiana University. I desire to express my very great obligations to him for assistance in planning the experimental tests and for numerous suggestions. I am indebted to Pres. G. Stanley Hall and the other members of the Clark University faculty for valuable criticism.

My thanks are due to Supt. Beck and the teachers of the Bloomington public schools for their co-operation in making the tests, and to Mr. Claude Price, Mr. E. R. Ray, and Mr. J. A. Linkie of Indiana University for valuable assistance. I desire also to express my indebtedness to all those who have contributed questionnaire data, and to Mr. Louis N. Wilson and his library assistants.

¹ *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. IV.

STUDIES OF A CHILD. II.

By ALEXANDER F. and ISABEL C. CHAMBERLAIN.

OUTLINE.

- Introductory.
- I. Agglutination, etc.
- II. Analogy.
- III. Caressive Repetitions, etc.
- IV. Comparison.
- V. Definitions.
- VI. *Father and Mother*.
- VII. Favorite Phrases, etc.
- VIII. Negation.
- IX. *Obiter Dicta*.
- X. Order of Words.
- XI. Parareduplication.
- XII. Plural-forms.
- XIII. Poetry and Rhythmic Speech.
- XIV. Prefix.
- XV. Preterite-forms.
- XVI. Reduplication.
- XVII. Reproduction of Nursery-Rhymes.
- XVIII. Spontaneous Language.
- XIX. Word-Forms differing slightly from the Adult.
- XX. Word-Groups.
- XXI. Words "Original" or "Invented."
- XXII. Words Pseudo-Primitive in Form.
- XXIII. Words with Special Meanings, etc.

This second chapter is made up chiefly of linguistic data of psychological and pedagogical interest. The material here recorded covers several aspects of child-speech concerning which the evidence hitherto published has been by no means exhaustive or convincing. Detailed discussion of some of the points involved will take place later. The period concerned is practically the speaking epoch of R.'s life up to the present time (she is now in her 40th month).

The appearance of another "spontaneous language" deserves special notice. The series of "definitions" exhibit the influence of a changed environment. The parareduplicative and pseudo-primitive forms of many child-words invite further research. The section on the words for "father" and "mother" reveals a rather unsuspected variability in such terms. Other sections treating of the constituent elements of language contain new data. Where phonetic spelling is employed the consonants have their ordinary English sounds, the vowels the

continental (E is the indefinite vowel of the phoneticians). Otherwise the ordinary English speech is given, as previously. On the whole, R. now shows a good command of the chief machinery of conversational English, with the usual *naïve* "breaks" and "inventions."

I. *Agglutination, Holophrasis*, etc. When R. began to use English fluently, after her fashion, she "cut" many words, ran several together in a manner analogous to that of the speakers of certain primitive (*e. g.*, American Indian) languages. Thus, while using *táther*, *máma* for "father" and "mama," she would often "reduce" these, as in the following phrases: *Ta'*, don wite zat aden (Dec. 16, 1903). *Tā'*, don wite any mōa (Dec. 16, 1904). *M'-hap-a buil'* 'ose pools (Oct. 8, 1903). *M'*, put tumpy else on ne'a (Oct. 8, 1903). *M'* dott-a wite aden (Oct. 8, 1903). At the same time she cut 'bēbī to 'bē. On the other hand (Oct. 8, 1903), she several times called her mother *mīmī-máma-mótha*. At this period she often cut *let* to *lē* and *leave* to *lī*. Of more complicated "cutting" and agglutination these examples may be cited: We are *dōn-da-watsh* dises (March 9, 1904). *Máma háp-a-hab'* at patton (Oct. 8, 1903). *M'háp-a-buil'* 'ose 'pools (Oct. 8, 1903). *M' dōtta-wite'* den (Oct. 8, 1903), etc. Her speech abounded in the agglutinated: *In-ne* (in the), *in-a* (in the), *tome-a* (some of), *alla-a* (all of), *on-a* (on the), *a-lot-a* (a lot of), *tor-a* (for the), *op-a* (off the,) *det-a* (get-the) and the like. Worthy of special note are: *Dit-a* (this is the), *zat-a* (that is the), *nē-a* (in there; in here), *nen* (and then). Here belongs also, perhaps, *mwoom*, apparently for "in the (other) room." In the summer and fall of 1904 she was prolific in such expressions as "plummy," "peachy," "manary," "apple-y," "walk-y," "lappy," "go-out-y," etc. At present (Sept.-Oct., 1904) she says "I am peachy," "I am manary (banana-y)," etc., but formerly it was oftener "I *feel* peachy." On August 20, 1904, she was recorded as saying "I'm a *plummy* girl; I *feel plummy*." In September-October, 1904, she was fond of using expressions of the following sort: I'm go-out-y, I'm drink-y-water-y, I'm back-yard-y, I'm get-y-down-y, I'm tather-lappy (*i. e.*, I want to get into father's lap), I'm tather-carry-y (*i. e.*, I want father to carry me). The *y* is doubtless from analogy with "thirsty," "sleepy," "naughty," etc. In jesting fashion, apparently, she also says "I'm one-y," "I'm two-y," etc. On November 11, 1904, she said "I'm candy-y," and later in the month she was still using a few terms of this sort,— "Are you tea-y, tather? Do you feel coffee-y?" etc.

II. *Analogy*, etc. Of the following additional examples of analogy, transferred meaning, etc., some are of very special interest. Among these are *warm* = "timothy," *water-melon* =

"flowers of steeple-bush;" "*crumbs* of light;" *ginger-ale* = "foot asleep." The chief instances follow:

1. *Ice-cream*. Sometime during the fall of 1903 she said the clouds in the sky were "like *ice-tream*."

2. *Bath-tub*. On June 29, 1904, she called the railroad turn-table at Portland, Me., a "bath-tub." This name she also applied, a little later in the summer, to the wood and coal bin of the cottage at Bayville.

3. *Warm*. On July 3, 1904, she brought two spears of timothy to her mother, saying "Here are tome *warms*!" She had not by the end of October ceased to use the word in this way. Moreover, she now applies it, also, to certain other tufted and feathered grasses.

4. *Duster*. When out in the woods, on July 2, 1904, she called some long-stemmed ferns *dusters*. When asked where she had seen "dusters," she said "at Barnard's" (*i. e.*, Barnard and Sumner's store in Worcester, Mass.) These were probably feather-dusters.

5. *Crumbs*. On the evening of July 4, 1904, seeing the sparks, etc., from Roman candles and other fireworks at Bayville, Me., she exclaimed: "Tee the *trumbs* of the light!"

6. *Hot water*. On July 4, 1904, she called the sea with foam "hot water."

7. *Christmas-tree*. At the present time (Oct., 1904) she still calls firs, pines and all kinds of evergreens "Chris'm trees," from analogy with her Christmas tree at home in 1903. During the summer, while in Maine, she divided trees into "Trisam trees" and "leaf-trees."

8. *Butterflies*. On July 19, 1904, she said to her mother: "Are n't *mothies* (*i. e.* moths) butterflies?" When her mother replied that they were not butterflies, but were something like butterflies, R. observed: "Oh! they are tomethin' like butterflies."

9. *Fan*. On July 22, 1904, she said that the capital letter Q on her building blocks "looks like a *fan*."

10. *Sail-boat*. On July 24, 1904, she said that the figure 4 at the top of a page of the magazine she was "reading" to herself was "a tail-boat."

11. *Mud*. On August 1, 1904, seeing the fog clouds, she exclaimed: "That's *mud* up inne ty!" About the same time she called the droppings of horses and cows "horse-*mud*" and "cow-*mud*" respectively.

12. *Tide*. In the summer of 1904, while at the seashore, she called the "float," to which boats were tied, "the tide." It is possible that she confused her the *tide* and the *tying* of the boats. She said that she liked to see "the *tide* 'dance.'"

13. *Water-melon*. On Aug. 5, 1904, she said of the flowers

of the steeple bush (*Spiraea tomentosa*) that they "looked like water-melons." Evidently from the reddish or pinkish color of cut slices of water-melon.

14. *Iron*. On July 8, 1904, when told that her bath tub was made of galvanized iron, she asked, "How did they *iron* it?"

15. *Lettuce*. On July 23, 1904, she picked a handful of bayberry leaves and brought them to her mother saying: "I've dot tome *lettuce* who pells (smells) good."

16. *Ginger ale*. On Sept. 3, 1904, her foot "went to sleep." Feeling of it, she said "It's just like *ginger-ale*." She had tasted some ginger-ale several months before and remembered the effect of it upon her throat, etc.

17. *Feet*. On Sept. 7, 1904, noticing that some stones had been placed the night before under the over-ground water-pipe near the cottage, she said "Who put feet under the pipe?"

18. *Rose*. On July 11, 1904, it is recorded that she was calling wood-lilies roses and water-lilies pond-roses. The former she also called "wood flowers."

19. *Buoy*. While out sailing on Sept. 6, 1904, she noticed the red buoys marking the navigable waters, and was told what they were. Soon after, seeing a rather large one, she said that it was "a red *man*."

20. *Pipe*. On Sept. 22, 1904, she spoke of "the long pipes who stick up," meaning thereby the telegraph poles alongside the streets and roads.

21. *Gnats*. During the summer of 1904 (*e. g.*, July 1) she called ants, in which she seemed to take a great deal of interest, *nats*. She had become acquainted with "gnats" some months before at her home in Worcester.

22. *Bathing-hat*. On October 27, looking at a picture of the Madonna and Bambino, she pointed to the halo of the latter and said: "I want one of those little things—*bathing-hat*."

23. *Braid*. On October 30 she said of some twisted doughnuts, "What are those *braid* things?"

24. *Skin*. The same day, looking at her tray on which some of the paint had come off, leaving the tin exposed, she said "The *skin* has come off my tray." A little later she said of a dark spot in the ceiling caused by a water-leak, "The *skin* has come off the ceiling."

III. *Caressive Repetitions, Playing with Words and Phrases*, etc. When newly in the possession of certain words and phrases, she often took delight in repeating them over and over again, applying them often to many persons and objects of her environment, sometimes using them as caresses, at other times as "playthings" almost. Following are examples:

1. *How do you do?* In the spring of 1903, (April 16, she is recorded as saying: Dáda hau dū, hau dū dū?) She became

possessed of her version of "How do you do?" which, at first, she seems not to have used very extensively. On April 5, and also few months later (May 2), she had a "fit" of using this phrase: *Hau dū máma?* *Hau dū pápa?* *Hau dū bébé?* *Hau dū dóti?* *Hau dū títi* (Kitty)? *Hau dū Chlēdi* (Sadie)? *Hau dū tō* (toe)? *Hau dū pápa tō?* *Hau dū bōbō* (bottle)? *Hau dū débdæ* (cork, literally, "cover"). When taken out on the street she would say "hau dū?" to passers-by, especially, children, dogs, horses, street-cars, etc. On the evening of July 2, before being put to bed she said, "Tì mán-i-mūi" (I want to see the moon), and, when taken to the window, looked up at the moon and called out "Hau dū mán-i-mūi?" and, immediately afterward "Hau dū tǎæ (star)?" to which she added "Tǎæ wau tǎæ (turn round, star)."

2. *Good girl.* Early in January, 1903, (*e. g.*, Jan. 6) she used to say to herself repeatedly "dood, dood dirl," a phrase she would also employ sometimes in answer to the questions "Who is baby? Who is Ruth?" It was, perhaps, in answer to a question of this sort that she began to use the phrase.

3. *A little bit o' baby.* During the summer of 1904 (*e. g.*, July 6) she was very fond of referring to herself as "a little bit o' baby," "a little wee bit o' baby," "a little tiny bit o' baby," which she would sometimes repeat in succession, "I'm only a little bit o' baby," etc.

4. *A big girl.* During the summer of 1904, even while using the phrase noted next above, she was fond of saying also on occasions "I'm a big dirl now," which, later on, in the fall and winter, became a favorite repetitive exclamation.

5. *I love you.* On July 6, 1903, she is recorded as having many times, that day and for some time previously, put her arms round her mother's neck and exclaimed "I love you, I love you, I love you," etc., etc. Her repetition here had a sort of rhythm about it. On July 11, she used in similar fashion "I like you, tather!"

6. *Who will take care of me?* In the spring of 1904 (*e. g.*, May 26), she used in this repetitive-caressive fashion "Who will take tare of me?" This sentence was employed often when she was alone by herself, also when she heard her father or her mother speak of going out of the room or out of the house.

7. *Eeny, miny, mo!* On April 13, 1903, it is recorded that she was "repeating again and again, as if it were some charm of her own," *eeny miny mo*, representing the "eeny, meeny, miny, mo" of the counting-out rhyme recited to her by her parents. On April 16, while "talking" to her dolls, she said several times "inī mǎiní mō."

8. *Dooly-ooley-oo!* By June 2, 1903, she had come to be very

fond of repeating again and again "dūlī ūlī ū," a popular song refrain taught her by her parents and a friend.

9. *Poor pápa*, etc. In February, 1903 (as *e. g.*, in particular, on Feb. 24), she was very fond of repeating the phrases "pūr pápa," "pūr máma," "pūr Djak," "pūr títi" "pur dáda" (dolly), etc.

10. *Too tired!* Early in June, 1903, she was very much taken with the phrase "tu táíē!" which she repeated caressively and sympathetically *ad lib.* Thus: Bē tu táíē! Pápa tu táíē! Máma tu táíē! On June 8, 1903, seeing the dog Jack sitting down in the field she said "Dja' tu táíē! Dja tu téíē! and, the same day, seeing, from her window, a horse standing in the street, she observed "yat hā tu táíē!"

IV. *Comparison.* A few more sentences involving comparison may be cited here. On August 25, 1904, comparing two of her walking-sticks she said, "Is this *mostly a bigger one?* (apparently, "Is this much bigger than this?") and "Is this *high enough* for this?" (*i. e.*, "Is this as high as that?"). On Sept. 22, she used the expression "yes I are, *either!*" On July 20, when in her bath-tub, she ended a long soliloquy by "singing:"

O the brightest day!

O the brightest day!

When going home from the direction of the University in Worcester there is a short cut from Downing to Shirley streets, and for some time past (*e. g.*, Oct. 1904), R. always said, when she reached it: "Let's go the *short* way mama!" or "I don't want to go the *long* way round!"

On Oct. 18, 1904, she said, looking at a horse in the street, "That poor horse has been standing there *so long!*" On Oct. 23, she asked her mother, "Am I heavy, mama?" And after her mother's answer, she said "So is tather heavy." During the month of October she has been very fond of "awful" in such fashion as "awful lovely," "awful nice," "I had an *awful* good time (Aug. 5, 1904), etc.

On Aug. 20, 1904, she said: "If tather had a window up there, he could see *real much better.*" On Aug. 27 she said "I'm not warm *quite yet,*" and on July 17, "This isn't *so quite sweet* enough for me" (*i. e.* "not quite sweet enough"). About the same time she more than once made use of "gooder," although she was acquainted with "better" long before then.

While on the road from Bayville to Boothbay Harbor, Sept. 5, 1904, she saw a brown caterpillar, and, on the way home, another brown and black at each end. She said; "The one on the bridge was n't *brown and black black*, but *brown by itself.*" For "brown by itself" she used also "brown all over." She says, however, "My hands are *all black,*" when they are dirty,

and "Coal is *all black*, isn't it?" On November 13, 1904, she said "I did *pretty most* of it."

V. *Definitions.* For comparison with the definitions previously recorded the following obtained at one sitting (Aug. 27, 1904) at Bayville, Me., will be of interest as showing the influence of a seashore environment. They were spoken in answer to the question "What is — for?" and are given in the order asked and received.

1. *Boat.* To go sailing in. If the boat should tip, all the people would go in the water.

2. *Sea.* It's to sail sail-boats in. It goes up and down. Then the boats will come after the bridge [*i. e.*, wharf, float].

3. *Steamboat.* It's to sail.

4. *Island.* It's to go on.

5. *Rock.* It's to go on. Nasty rocks!

6. *Path.* It's to walk in. (Here she asked: "What is a road for?")

7. *Row-boat.* To row in.

8. *Horse.* To drag. And a pony's to drag.

9. *Cow.* It's to say moo!

10. *Dog.* It's to say bow-wow!

11. *Bee.* It's to bumble-bumble. It's to say vū vū!

12. *Fly.* It's to fly around.

13. *Mosquito.* It's to bite you all up.

14. *Ant.* It's to crawl around.

15. *Spider.* It's to spider around.

16. *Moths.* When this question was asked, she said: "Mama, what are mothies?" and then observed; "They are to crawl around."

17. *Butterflies.* To butterfly around.

18. *Hornets.* To sting you.

19. *Snakes.* To not sting. They're to crawl around.

20. *Frogs.* Crawling around.

21. *Toads.* Here she understood "toadstools" and answered: "Toadstools are to look at."

22. *Clams.* They are to dig.

23. *Shells.* They are to look at. To bring up (*i. e.*, from the shore to the house). After answering she asked "What are tail-shells (snail-shells)?"

24. *Grass.* It's to walk in. I'll show you (here she walks in the grass).

25. *Stone.* To throw in the water.

26. *Blueberries.* To eat.

27. *Blackberries.* They're to eat too.

28. *Raspberries.* To eat too.

29. *Huckleberries.* Ar'n't good to eat.

30. *Bunch-berries.* Ar'n't good to eat.

31. *Ferns.* They're to smell.

32. *Oak-tree.* To go in, and make a house, make a fire (she played "house" in a hollow oak-tree).

33. *Rose.* It's to look at, to pick.

34. *Fire.* To fire the fire in the gas-stove.

35. *Oil.* To put in that little stove.

36. *Hammock.* To twing in. To get in.

37. *Chair.* To sit down.

38. *Table.* To sit by.

39. *Couch.* To lie down.

40. *Lamp.* To put a light on.

41. *Flag*. To put on the roofs of the houses.
42. *Chimney*. Chimneys are on the houses.
43. *Window*. To look out of.
44. *Door*. To shut up.
45. *Piazza*. To have hammock on. To walk on too.
46. *Wood*. To put in the fire.
47. *Water*. To go in twimming.
48. *Mud*. To have horses walk on.
49. *Ball*. To play golf ball.
50. *Base ball*. It's to play base ball.
51. *Bird*. To fly and fly around, and eat crackers (she fed the birds on the piazza). They go up in trees and fly.
52. *House*. To go in.
53. *Bed*. To go fast asleep.
54. *Well*. To fish up water. (The same day she said: "Is tather going to the well to well up some water?")
55. *Books*. To look at.
56. *Shears*. To cut.
57. *Fork*. To eat with, meat and papatoes.
58. *Glasses*. To drink water of.
59. *Sand*. To dig in.
60. *Ribbons*. To put on your hair. Right there (pointing to her head).
61. *Basket*. To put clothes in,—big ones.
62. *Fences*. To climb over.
63. "*Indian Pipe*" (the plant). To not blow, to look at, to take home.
64. *Ropes*. To tie the boats.
65. *Letters*. To put envelopes in.
66. *Stamps*. To put on envelopes.
67. *Papers*. To look at.
68. *Money*. It's to pay candy.
69. *Seals*. To seal up.
70. *Jelly-fish*. To see, to look at.
71. *Sea-weed*. To look at.
72. *Soup*. To eat.
73. *Boys*. To gō'd around.
74. *Girls*. They're to gō'd around too.
75. *Boynton* (a boy friend). To play around.
76. (*Naphtha*) *launch*. They're to launchy around.
77. *Salt*. To put on papatoes.
78. *Pepper*. To pepper on your papato, and salt.
79. *Sugar*. To put in your tea.
80. *Lemons*. To lemon up, to eat up.
81. *Handkerchief*. To blow your nose.
82. *Mirror*. To look in.
83. *Camera*. To take pictures.
84. *Grapes*. To eat.
85. *Candles*. To candle.
86. *Shoes*. To put on you.
87. *Tree*. To tree around.
88. *Leaves*. To leave.
89. *Rubbers*. To put on you.
90. *Skunk*. To skunk around.
91. *Grasshoppers*. To come on the porch.
92. *Fishes*. They're to fish up.
93. *Rings*. To put on your fingers.
94. *Watches*. To watch around. To time. My clock's three o'clock.

95. *Nose.* To t(w)eeze.
96. *Tongue.* To lick.
97. *Ears.* To ear.
98. *Chin.* To "in." To chin.
99. *Teeth.* To chew.
100. *Eyes.* To look.
101. *Hair.* To put ribbons on.
102. *Neck.* To neck around.
103. *Hands.* To hand around.
104. *Feet.* To feet around.
105. *Knee.* To knee around.
106. *Stomach.* To 'tummy around.

Of these definitions Nos. 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 23, 51, 63, 94 contain items, in addition to the meaning given, which reveal her activities, observations, etc. In connection with her definition of the sea, may be cited her remarks on July 18, 1904. In reply to the question "What is the sea?" she said: "Why it's the big water. Why, it does (dôz) 'way out there. It's to twim in, I thlink. Way out there! That's it does (dâz)! There are lots of houses over there, if you do (go) there. Right atross there, there's lots of water there!" In No. 5 she remembers the rocks after the tide has fallen. The "vũ vũ" of No. 11 is her own imitation of the noise made by the bee. Nos. 15, 17, 76, 80, 85, 87, 90, 98, 102-106, are due, wholly or in part, to a sort of linguistic "cussedness," prevalent for the time being. Her fondness for looking at things reveals itself in Nos. 23, 33, 55, 67, 71. The negative form of Nos. 19, 29, 30, 63, is worth nothing. Facts of her close-at-hand observation are the basis of Nos. 6, 13, 21, 23, 24, 26-33, 45, 49, 50, 51, 63, 70, 71, 91. Taken altogether, these 106 answers obtained from a girl three years old, at one sitting, must exhibit some of her linguistic worst as well as some of her linguistic best, for it was no small ordeal for one so young to be put through unexpectedly.

VI. "*Father*" and "*Mother*." The record of R.'s progress in naming her parents is of considerable interest. By March 5, 1902 (eighth month) she was using in a general and indefinite manner and with no clear application to her parents, the sounds "pápapápa" (often whispered), "pápa," "apápa," "bábábáb, babábába," etc. On March 9, while looking into the mirror she said "pápa pápa." On March 8, when apparently desiring to call some one, she used "pápa pápa," and possibly applied it also to her father(?) In the morning, after waking up, she would say "pápa, pápa," as if to call some one. A day or two later she seems for the time to prefer the form "pápa" over "pápa pápa," and to whisper both of these rather than to utter them loudly. On March 12, however, she spoke "pápa pápa" loudly and seemed to address it to her father. On March 17, she was using "ma-ma-ma," when hungry, or

desiring like attention. By May 4 she was using "pápa," somewhat infrequently, a period of quiescence in its employment having occurred just previous to that time. But on the afternoon of that day she suddenly began to use "pápa" and "máma" with reference to her parents. By May 18 it was noticed that she was using "máma" for calling her mother more readily than she did "pápa" in reference to her father. On Sept. 28, pointing to her bath-tub she said "máma, dē bā!" By November 22 she was using *bab-mā* for "father," while employing *máma* for "mother,"—*bab-mā* has possibly some connection with *baba*, which at this time she commonly used to designate her own reflexion, etc., and also for "baby." On Dec. 19 it was observed that she applied *máma* to her father, using *pápa* rather seldom. At this time she seemed to be using also *dādā* with reference to her father. Her words for mother and father were affected by a tendency to prefix a- or ā prevalent at this period, and she used, with apparent pleasure, *amáma* and *apápa*. On Jan. 5, 1903, she was still calling her father *máma*, although applying it at the same time to her mother. A week later, she seemed to be trying hard to select *pápa* for "father" as against *pába*, *bába*; she also called him *máma*, *bā'-ma*, *pā'-ma*, etc. On January 22, she saw her mother in the street and shouted *máma! máma! máma*. By Feb. 15, she was using *pápa* for "father" quite readily and easily again, and *máma* for "mother" seemed well established for some time past. On March 6 she called her father *bōpa*, a stray variation, doubtless. On June 8 she said "pāp pōk" (father's pocket), although using *pápa* elsewhere; also "máma bē" (mother's bed), in like fashion. Long after *pápa* and *máma* became her usual terms she seems to have not been quite satisfied with them. During the summer and fall she was making the acquisition of the *father* of her adult environment.

Difficulty in the pronunciation of *f* and *th* evidently hindered her control of this word, but the early fall saw her in the possession of "tāthē," selected after considerable previous experimentation with "tāda, tāta, tādē, tāze, tādze," etc. The word *mother* she acquired rather easily. For some time, however, she would use quite often "pápa-tāthē" and "máma-mēthē" instead of the simple terms. The use of "tāthē" and "mēthē," was, of course, largely due to parental initiative, and R. kept her older *pápa* and *máma* as well. In the beginning of October it was observed that she not infrequently "clipped" her words for father and mother into *tā* and *mā* (or even *t'* and *m'* in sentences), a practice continuing for several months. On October 8, 1903, she called her mother *mīma-máma-methe*, which showed that the old order of things had not altogether passed away. Next she was fond of "tāthē dīē" and *máma dīē*,

which terms of endearment she used with evident delight. By July 9, 1904, it was recorded that generally called her father "tāthē" or "tāthē diē," quite often also "pāpa." The same day she suddenly took to using *fāidi* for "father," which was probably a result of her experimentation with the letter *f*. This, however, she used for a day or two; it was probably a premonition of "father," which in the middle of the summer (1904) she could, but did not use, not being encouraged to abandon the picturesque "tāther." On July 11, she had a spell of calling her father "tata" and "pāpa-tāthē," lasting a few days. At the same time she took to calling her mother "nana" and "mama-mēthē." On July 27 she was practicing, evidently, with *f*-words, for she used repeated "fāthē," besides "fish," "fēn," etc. Early in August she was using often for "father" *pāpa*, and for "mother," *nāna*. At the same time she employed occasionally "dādi" for "father," probably caught up incidentally from her adult environment. On August 11 she had a caressive spell in which she called her mother "mīma, mīma, mīma, māmā," also *nana*. About August 20, she began to say "I want you to *pāpa* me," meaning, thereby, that she wanted her father to take her up in his arms and hug her. A few days later she had a spell of "pāpa, bāba, wāpa," etc., with which she seemed much amused and contented. On Sept. 3, she was profuse in her expression of: "Come and *mother* me," "Mama I want you to *māma* me," "I want *pāpa* to *tāther* me." A day or two before this she had exclaimed: "When I was a little girl, I called you *pāpa*, and now I am a big girl, I call you *tāthē*." On June 6, 1904, in answer to the question "What is father for," she said: "He's a man. He's a tather."

Early in November, 1904, she still used occasionally, with a certain predilection, "tāzer" and "tāda" for "father." Having not been influenced to say father, which, of course, she can pronounce, she continues to use "tāther."

VII. *Favorite Phrases*, etc. Under this rubric may be listed a number of phrases which seemed to be her favorites and to be used by her with a great deal of satisfaction. Examples of such are the following:

1. *Hello, mama!* etc. On March 11, 1903, she is recorded as using frequently the phrases: "Hello, māmā! Hello, pāpa! Hello, Teddy (a dog)!" After practicing it some little time, she dropped it, using it very seldom. At present (Oct., 1904), she uses it occasionally as a greeting.

2. *Good morning.* By April 25, 1903, she had come to be fond of saying "Dood mōni, pāpa," "Dood mōni, māmā," etc. This phrase she had learned from her parents who encouraged her to use it.

3. *That way here.* On April 5, 1903, she is recorded as using frequently and with gusto the phrase "dat wē hix" = "this way."

4. *All gone.* About the same time she was fond of using the phrase "all done" in response to such questions as "Where's your dolly?" "Where's the kitty now?" and the like. She would often repeat it over and over again, after something had passed out of her reach or her sight.

5. *Right here!* On April 5, 1903, it was noted that she used very often with predilection the phrase "wai hix!" in answer to the question, "where's Baby." This soon developed into the "right here!" which she still employs. On April 10, she answered, "Wai hix Wū!" i. e., "Ruth is right here!"

6. *Making the river Dee.* During the summer of 1904, (e. g., July 6), while at Bayville, Me., she was fond of digging alongside the veranda, where the rain dropped from the eaves. This she called "making the river Dee," which phrase had its origin from the fact that her mother sang to her for some time previously "The Miller of Dee."

7. *Some day.* While in Maine in the summer of 1904, when she saw a new path or walk in the woods, a new road, bridge, wharf, etc., she would exclaim "We'll do that way tome-day!" In this she took great satisfaction. For "tomeday" she occasionally used "tome time" (in the early summer of 1903 she was using "tēm taim").

8. *Other day.* This, in the summer of 1904, was her favorite expression for "some other day," "some other time," "yesterday," "in the past," etc. When she recognized a familiar path in the woods, etc., she would say "We went there other day, did n't we?" or "Other day I was there, mama."

9. *All the time.* At the present time (October, 1904) she is still fond of using (she began employing it often during the summer) the phrase "all the time" in the sense of "for a long time," which expression she, of course, also knows. On Aug. 17, 1904, she said "I want to 'tay here all the time," meaning thereby "a long time," or "perhaps as long as I like." She uses this phrase when in her bath tub, or visiting (sometimes, "I want to stay a long, long time"). When she wishes to be very emphatic, she says, when asking for something: "Can I keep it *all all* the time?"

10. *Like a good father.* During the summer of 1904 this phrase was in constant use (she still employs it occasionally) by her when wishing her father to do anything. On Aug. 16, e. g., she said "Tather, tome this way, like a dood tather!"

11. *What did you tay, tather?* Her familiar inquiry during the summer of 1904, when she had failed to catch something her father had said, was "what did you tay, tather?" At one

time she was repeating it, almost automatically, whenever spoken to. She still uses not infrequently "what did you say, tather?" In corresponding fashion she employed and employs "what did you tay (say), mama? This expression, "what did you tay (say)?" she very seldom indeed used to other people than her parents.

12. *Fast as I can.* During the summer of 1904 (*e. g.*, July 9) she would call out, as she ran along, "I'm tomin', tather, *fast as I tan.*" She was very fond of this phrase and used it with much expression.

13. *Two Dollars.* In the spring of 1903, she was fond of using the expression "tu dölē," which she had picked up from an item of parental expenditure. She would employ it when she played shopping, church-fair, etc., and generally in reply to the question "How much?" On April 22, while her parents were discussing the cost of a new table-cloth, R. volunteered the information that it would cost "tu dölē."

VIII. *Negative.* An interesting sentence was recorded Aug. 20, 1904: "Will you *won't* do it, mama?" *i. e.*, "you won't do it, will you, máma?" On October 29, 1904, she said: "Are they *aren't* there?" Two days afterward: "You always *don't* sometimes, mama." On May 27, 1904, she said "I guess I won't surely come to dinner."

IX. *Obiter Dicta.* Other sayings of hers worth recording here are as follows:

1. *I'm busy.* Said July 1, 1904, when asked something while eating her dinner.

2. *Flies won't hurt you, mama!* Said when her parents were speaking about the flies in the house (July 8, 1904).

3. *Mama would n't do that way.* Said in criticism of her father, July 8, 1904.

4. *Im titting out here to det tome air.* Said July 9, 1904, while out on the piazza on warm day.

5. *Dis is a lovely place, I think.* Said July 9, 1904, as she came out of a new drug store at East Boothbay.

6. *No! I'm a dreat big dirl now!* Said July 9, 1904, when asked if she wanted to be carried, after having walked for some time.

7. *Tome of 'em 'll have to walk.* Said, several times over (July 10, 1904), when in imaginative play she had brought together a large number of people. In reference to the stage which carried passengers to and fro from Boothbay Harbor and Bayville.

8. *Why don't you have blue eyes, tather?* Said, July 10, 1904, when color of eyes had been spoken of by her parents.

9. *You don't take tare of me.* Said, in a reproachful tone to her father, July 11, 1904.

10. *I like you in your white tsoes (shoes), tather.* Said, July 11, 1904. The same day she said, also, "That's a nice toat you have on, tather."

11. *Little tigers don't bite.* Said (*e. g.*, July 12, 1904), frequently by her, even now (October, 1904), with much expression.

12. *I'm such a little bit o' baby, I want a rattle.* Said July 13, 1904, as she was about to go to sleep in the hammock.

13. *Does the tun (sun) make the water blue, mama?* Said July 14, 1904, while walking through the woods in sight of the sea.

14. *I want to be breezed a little bit.* Said July 16, 1904, as a breeze was making itself felt.

15. *I want a little boy to play with.* Said July 16, 1904.

16. *"Keh!" That's what the parrot said.* Said July 18, 1904. To this she added soon afterward "that's what all the birds say." This is a reminiscence of a parrot across the street from her home in Worcester.

17. *Bumble-bees tan't wite (write.)* Said July 18, 1904, after she had said laughingly, "I'm witing to the bumble-bee."

18. *Tather, tan you tay butterfly—butterflv—butterfly?* Said July 19, 1904, while in the woods on the road to Boothbay Harbor.

19. *No! Wait till it dets Worcester time.* Said July 20, 1904, in reply to the question, "Do you want to go back to Worcester, now?"

20. *Look at my charming face!* Said July 20, 1904, as she covered her face up with the skirt of her dress.

21. *Divin' my tweet little toes a clean.* Said July 20, 1904, while in her bath-tub.

22. *Isn't any hair on my toe-nails.* Said on the same occasion as No. 21.

23. *No! I'm bad for it.* Said July 28, 1904, when asked if she was not sorry for something she had done.

24. *What tall I do now?* Said (e. g., July 30, 1904), in a sort of *ennuyé*-fashion, when tired of playing, etc. She often would add, "I'm tired o' doin' this."

25. *There comes Mr. wind.* Said Aug. 10, 1904, as a breeze began to blow. The "Mr." she picked up from her father.

26. *My, how good that corn is!* Said Aug. 12, 1904, while watching her mother eating some sweet corn.

27. *How good it pells (smells) here!* Said Aug. 12, 1904, while in the woods on the road to Boothbay Harbor.

28. *I twimmed out to the vasty deep.* Said, with the introductory remark, "Did n't I have a lovely time in the water?" on Aug. 18, 1904, after a sea-bath. The "vasty deep" she had heard her father use.

29. *Never mind your work, tather!* Said Aug. 18, 1904, when she wanted her father to go with her somewhere outside the house. She had heard him speak of his work quite often.

30. *Don't I look funny in Boynton's coat?* Said Aug. 18, when she had on the coat of a boy playmate.

31. *Tather, I want to be buried.* Said Aug. 4, 1904,—she added immediately, "and sarried." Possibly she caught up this word *buried* from some one in her environment and used it with no sense of its real meaning. Her mother thinks, however, that she meant *berried* (she was very fond of picking berries). In that case the analogy would lie with such expressions as "I want to be tathered," "I want you to mother me," and the like. On Aug. 23, she said several times in succession "I want you to bury (berry) me!"

32. *Oh heavens!* On Aug. 24, 1904, she is recorded as using this exclamation several times. Also, "Oh dear!" "Well! well!" etc., which she was already acquainted with for some time.

33. *Why can't we have a moon in our house?* Said Sept. 22, 1904, while looking out of the window of her home in Worcester.

34. *This is my favorite kind of grapes.* Said Oct. 18, 1904. She is beginning to use the word "favorite."

35. *Tather, I wish I could work for you!* Said, very expressively, October 24, 1903, just before she went to bed.

Many of these sayings were accompanied by expressiveness in feature, gesture and accent, tone, etc., that cannot be described; sometimes, even, it is hard to believe that conscious wit was not behind them. Her way, *e. g.*, of saying "I'm busy" was quite inimitable. So, too, with Nos. 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 27, 29 in particular. As will be readily seen, some of these sayings are a measure of her ability to pick up the words and phrases of her elders, others have the quaint touch of her own child-personality.

X. *Order of Words.* In the sentences spoken by R. in the period from February to the middle of June, 1903 (31-35 months), considerable elasticity in the order of words appears. On Feb. 24, she said, "mūm, māma" (come into the other room, mama), but on March 6, "tēm, pápa, mūm" (come into the other room, papa). On Feb. 24, "lōl titi" (roll, kitty), but on March 23, "dtiti, lōl." On Feb. 24, "māma ě!" (get up, mama), but on March 24, "ě bēbi" (take baby up) and, on the same day "pápa bēbi ě!" (take baby up, papa) and "tī ě, bēni" (sit up, bunny). At the same time she used both "pu tēĕ ōn" and "pu ōn tēĕ" (put the front on my chair); "títi in" (let kitty in), "pápa, títi in" (let kitty in, papa), "títi in nēĕ" (put kitty in there), "māma, lě títi in," "lě pápa títi in," etc. On Feb. 24, "ōō, pápa" (open it, papa), but on April 19, pápa, bē di tō" (button your coat, papa), and on April 19-21, "pápa, wōk bē tli" (papa, rock baby to sleep). Some of her compound words are of interest here: "Tástēpēpē" (paper-fastener), "hot bottle-water" (hot-water bottle), "blow-bubble-dis" (dish of soap-suds for blowing bubbles). On April 8, 1903, when attempting to repeat "Little Jack Horner" she ended the last line "bói dūd 'mai," making a deliberate change from the "good boy am I" of the original.

XI. *Parareduplication.* This term may, perhaps, be coined here to designate the phenomenon observed in the tendency of young children to reproduce as equi-branched dissyllables many words caught up from their elders, *e. g.*, "mūmū" = "music." Following is a list of some of R.'s words of this type.

Bēbē, "paper;" bēbē, "bacon;" bōbō, "bottom;" būbū, "bunny;" dādā, "dolly;" dēdē, "table;" dindin, "dinner;" Mēmē, "Mary;" Mēmē, "monkey;" mūmū, "music;" ō ō, "open;" títi "kitty;" wāwa, "cracker;" wāwa, "forehead;" wiwī, "ribbon;" wiwī, "window;" wiwī, "scissors."

These words were all used by her during the 18th to the 20th months of her life (Jan.-Mar., 1903), the period when this tendency was at its height.

Another interesting series consists of reduplicative dissyllables representing monosyllables or pseudo-dissyllables of adult

speech. Examples are: Baba, "bear;" dada, "down;" dɛdɛ, "reindeer;" dīdi, "drink;" dōddōd, "dog;" ɛ ɛ, "up;" ɛɛ = swan; ee ee = "ear."

These were recorded in November, 1902, as the results of attempts made by her to reproduce words pronounced to her by her parents.

Some polysyllables attacked by her produced the following (Nov. 1902):

Bɛ lɛ bɛ lɛ = "buffalo;" bɛ lɛ bɛ lɛ = "pretty;" blɛ blɛ = "billy goat;" yɛ yɛ, "elephant."

XII. *Plurals*, etc. While Ruth, at three years (August, 1904), followed generally the plural-formations of the English language as spoken by her parents, she occasionally employed some peculiar plurals: Mans (men), mothies (moths), bathes (baths), teethes (teeth), childrens (children). She uses at the same time the correct form of "ladies," "girls," "boys," etc. On December 16, 1903, she said "Indins mans." Others of her earlier plurals are: Tome eggun (Oct. 8, 1903), "some eggs" (she used also "eggs" at this time); tossingɛ (Mar. 9, 1904 = "sausages"). In September, 1904, she was heard to use "clothies" (clothes) and "waistes" (waists). On July 10, 1904, she said that she had eaten "two mans and five ladies." On Aug. 25 she said that there were "two little Ruthes." On Aug. 27, 1904, she said, "Tan I put a few borax out o' my tub into this bottle?" Also, "How many borax are there in here?" The word *borax* is, seemingly, a plural to her.

XIII. *Poetry, Rhythmic Utterances*, etc. The following examples illustrate further her power of composition in primitive prose and verse:

- I. I love you!
I love you!
I love you!

In July, 1904, she was fond of throwing her arms around her father's neck and uttering this in somewhat rhythmic fashion.

2. On July 9, 1904, when her father said "Twinkle, twinkle, little star," she added, of her own invention: "Mīnī nīnī hɛpɛdar." Here she not only kept the rhythm, but actually made a rhyme.

3. On July 18 she uttered, of her own notion, the following:

There was a man in Tatátchet
Who had a papátchet.

4. Two days after this she delivered, while in her bath tub a long soliloquy, of which the following portion was recorded by her mother:

Divin' my tweet little toes a tlean,
Divin' my tweet little toes a tlean.

Mama, I want my broom.
 Oilan, oilan, oilan.
 Mama and baby tall have a ride.
 Mama dear, mama dear, and tather dear.
 Do that water.
 Tather and mama ridin' in a boat.
 O you will be wet.
 Papa and papa.
 Papa was a papa.
 Kee-ee-ee-wh-ee, I'm was'in' me.
 Do her hair up, to (so) it won't det wet.
 Isn't any hair on my toe-nails.
 O Isabel, Isabel, where are you?
 What are you doin' up there?
 Do it up other way, it won't det wet.
 Mama is doin' to pour tome water on tather's little babbykins.
 There she does (goes.)
 Ladle and ladle and ladle.
 That's dry,

(Sings)

O the brightest day!
 O the brightest day!

Part of this is evidently "poetry," some of the rest rhythmic prose.

5. On August 21, 1904, she got off the following:

All the rakin' awkin down,
 Rakin' up, rakin' down.
 Put the cupta down!
 Enna papas cupas down
 Denna watshis cupis down.
 Couples comin' down.
 The napples cubble down.
 Hoosan dee and hoosan dee,
 Hoosan now, hoosan dowl;
 Hoosan thu, tomethin' real,
 Tome thin call, no, tome thin' nice.

This bit is partly English and partly in her "Chinese."

6. On August 22, while looking at her "Mother Goose-Book," spoke the following:

Those babies are gone to bed.
 He does n't look very well, does he?
 That's a good one, that's a naughty.
 There was a little dirl, with a curl,
 When she was dood she was horrid.
 I always go to bed at five o'clock
 And never make any noise.

This she "sang" as she kept looking at the pictures:

7. On August 25 the following was recorded:

Hoosin dee and hoosin dee,
 Peezin dee and neezin and allin dee.
 Nazin dee and hōlin dōg.
 Nōthin' dōg.
 Tōthan and nōthan, nōthan, nōthan, nōthan, nōthan, nōthan.
 B-o-y wet.
 B-o-y do.

This, again, is part "Chinese." The "b-o-y" she had been taught just before.

8. Soon afterwards, the same day:

Old cat winks,
Old wacks winks.
There's a bag-ful of wags, wags.
It's awful full.
Change my book.
Milk and yuts and chucks and ucks.
Ol' wacks sees.

No nacksum ba goose.

Mother goose.

O this is mother goose.

I'm going to the Harbor.

I hav'n't changed these books yet.

Jest a little bit.

Do it up this way,—that other way!

Come and look at our apples again; [they were cooking on the stove]!

Let the rooster (toy) go to chleep!

Let me go up the banister!

How red my hands are!

The "winks" of this piece came from the nursery-rhyme "Hinx, minx, the old witch winks," which her mother had read to her some time previously.

9. At the table, on Sept. 22, 1904, she "sang" this:

Mama's got some tea!
Mama's got some tea!

10. On October 13, she "sang" the following, *ad lib.*:

The night is dark
And the day is light,
The night is dark
And the day is light.

XIV. *Prefix.* But a single example of her invention and use of a peculiar prefix was noted. On December 19, 1903, she was found to be using with satisfied predilection, an *ā*, placing it before almost all the words she used:

Abé', (bear), ābē (bird), ābābā (baby), ābō (boat), āmāma (mother). This did not seem to be, as might be suspected, the English indefinite article "a" (ě or ē), but a real enclitic particle.

XV. *Preterite-forms*, etc. Even during the last half of her third year and well into her fourth, while using with great accuracy many preterites and past participles in their proper form, she employed also a number of the—*ed* type affected by children. Thus she said: "'s done," "done" (*i. e.* gone) and "went," but also occasionally "goed;" "dave" and "did div'," and "div'd" (*i. e.* gave); "taw," "did tee" and "teed" (*i. e.* saw). These forms were, of course, more common earlier in

her life. Following is a list of some of these: Bited (Aug. 1904), blewed (April 30, 1904), blowed (still in use, Oct., 1904), breezed (July 16, 1904), buyed (still in use), detted (March 31, 1904), div'd (spring of 1904), doed (*i. e.* "did," April 30, 1904), dōed (*i. e.* "went," spring of 1904) drinkt (Aug. 6, 1904), eated (summer of 1904), feeled (*i. e.* "felt," May 20, 1904), fulled (*i. e.* "filled," July 29, 1904), helded (Aug. 12, 1904), hided (Aug. 6, 1904), holded (still in use), rided (*i. e.* "rode," July 20, 1904), shakt (summer of 1904), teed (spring and summer of 1904), tomed (spring of 1904), tookt (Jan. 5, 1904), twimmed (*i. e.* "swam," summer of 1904), twinged (*i. e.* "swung," Aug. 1, 1904), waken (*i. e.* "waked," summer of 1904), winded (July 9, 1904).

In October, 1904, she still used *holded* (and, rarely, *helded*) in such sentences as "I want to be *holded*." On October 24 she employed the very curious form *fullded* = "filled." During this month she also used frequently *done* = "did." On April 22, 1904, she observed "We are n't half *waken* up!" On Dec. 26, 1903, she used the phrase "atraid o' *been eatin' zat*." On July 14, 1904, she said, "I don't need any *tooken* hands."

Her most remarkable achievement in this line, however, is her statement (Dec. 16, 1903), "Zat's where we *wuz are*!" made, when she found again the place she had lost in the book which she was "reading."

XVI. *Reduplication.* The repetitive *ha ha* was first recorded Sept. 24, 1901, and *ě ě* about the same time was much in use, both as vocal exercises. By January 4, 1902, she was employing *ah ah*! In the beginning March (especially 3-6) she used very frequently *bōbōbōbō*, *māmā māmā mā*, *pa pa pa* (whispered), *pāpa* (quite plainly), *apāpa*, *bābabab*, etc. On March 17 she was saying often *gaigaigai*, *yā yā yā*, *mā-mā-mā*, *wā-wā*. On April 24 she was noticed repeating to herself, with evident satisfaction the phrase *dētī dēdī*. About this time also she "talked" a good deal, using sounds like these: *tā tā tā ě ě*; *ā brū lēb lēb*; *dādā blēblū*; *nāna nēna*; *mammamma*, etc. On June 8 she was exploiting *ě ě ě*,—a sort of infinitely diversified grunt, which seems also multisignificant. Early in July she used *da-da-da-da*, without any special signification, and had begun to employ *nēm'nem* or *nēmīnem*, with the sense of "food, I am hungry," etc., uttering it when she was hungry, when she saw her bottle, etc. In August she exploited the word *hello* making out of it *a-lō alō*! On Aug. 24, she was saying *bābā* for "bye-bye," and the reduplicated *māma* and *pāpa* (the use of these words is treated elsewhere) were, by this time, in good use. At this time also she reproduced *pretty* as *pitē pitē*. In December she used not infrequently *dādā* for "father." She also had a spell of *amāma apāpa*, *abāba*. During this period

many parareduplicatives had their origin or period of flourishing. The reduplicative "bōbō," for "chamber-chair," made its appearance in the beginning of January, 1903, while such others as "wāwa" for "cracker," "tsūtsū," "car, train," etc., became common (many of these are listed under the rubric: Parareduplication). In her "talk" to her dolls on April 16, occurred the following more less unmeaning reduplications: Dō dō dō dē; dēm dēm dēm; idldidlldidl, hai hai hai; hīdī hīdī hē; fō fūi fī fō; wī wī wī; fuidi fuidi, etc.

During the summer and fall of 1904 she often used the type of reduplications exemplified by *tather-wather*, *rainy-wainy*, *baby-waby*, and the like, on the one hand, and on the other, by "māma-mother," "pāpa tather," etc. On Aug. 24 she had a spell of "pāpa bāpa wāpa, bēbī wēbī nēbī," etc. About the same time she was fond of addressing her mother by the brief *nāna* and the rather long "mīmā mīmā mīmā māma."

XVII. *Reproduction of Nursery-rhymes.* Under this rubric is recorded what was noted of her attempts to repeat familiar nursery-rhymes as they were said to her by her parents.

1. "*Little Jack Horner.*" On Feb. 24, 1903, was noted her first attempt to reproduce this. Her parents repeated the words of each line until she supplied a word herself. This time she reproduced only the end-words thus: (the text gives the part recited by the parents, and the baby's words as said by her, the last in phonetic transcription):

Little Jack Oēn
Sat in a tō'ēn
Eating his Christmas b'ai.
He put in his dēm
An pulled out a lēm,
And said "what a good boy m'ai!"

She was, however, so eager to speak that hardly had her parents begun the words "Little Jack," before she would exclaim "b'ai" (pie). The "m'ai" (= am I) she always said very emphatically. On April 8, the recital was:

Little Jack Hāēnē
Dā dāēni
Eating a tī pai.
He put in his dēm
And pulled out a plēm,
And said boi dūd' m'ai!

The order of the words in the last line is interesting,—"*boi dūd,*" i. e., "good boy." When reciting it again on April 20, it appeared with less of herself in it.

Little Jack Hōēnē
Sat in a tō'nē
Eating a Christmas pai.
He put in his dēm
And pulled out a plēm,
And said what a good boi m'ai!

On June 9 she was heard saying:

Hâne, lit, ' Djak Hânê
Tit in tânê,
I tis'm pai!

2. "*Mary had a Little Lamb.*" When first recorded on Feb. 24, 1903, this rhyme appears thus:

Mary had a little lamb,
It's fleece was white as nō,
And everywhere that Mary went
The lamb was sure to dō.
It followed her to ū'l one day,
Which was against the ū'l,
It made the children laugh and lē
To see a lamb at ū'l.

She was generally so anxious to go on that she said "nō (snow)" before her parents had more than started the rhyme. She was very fond of the "lē (play)," particularly since she was accustomed to say so often to the cat "lē títí (play, kitty)." Indeed, instead of the "lē" of the nursery-rhyme she would very often insert "lē títí." On April 8, "*Mary had a Little Lamb*" appeared thus:

Mary had a little lamb,
Hwī hwai 'tō,
And everywhere that Mēē wēnt,
The lamb was tū dō.
It followed her to tū' wēn dē,
Which was dēn ū lūl,
It made the dūldē lā plē
To see a lām tū'l.

On April 20, the version ran :

Mē lām,
Phī hwai tō,
An everywhere Mē wē
The lamb was sure to dō.
It followed her to tūē wēn dē,
Which was dēn ū wūl.
It made the tūlē lā plē
To see lām tūlē.

Here, again, the second version is more complete than the third.

3. "*Rock-a-bye-baby.*" As first recorded, Feb. 24, 1903, this ran as follows :

Rock-a-bye bēbī
In the tree tō,
When the wind bō
The cradle will wā,
When the bough bē
The cradle will wē,
And daw
Cradle and ā.

The next version (March 6) was :

Rock-a-bye bēbī
On the tree dō,
When the wind bō
The cradle will wā,
When the bough bē
The cradle will ā,
And down will come bēbē
Cradle and dau.

In the last line of the second version she used "dau (down)," making it run "Cradle and *down*" instead of "cradle and all." This transference of the word was long persisted in.

4. "*There was a little girl.*" The first version of this recorded (Feb. 24, 1903) is thus:

There was a little go'il
And she had a little κ'ε'l
Right in the middle of her wāwa,
And when she was bā
She was very, very good,
And when she was bad, she was āwī.

It was noted that from the first she persisted in making the last word of the fourth line bā (*i. e.*, "bad")—"and when she was *bad*," a distinct departure from the current conception. On March 11, the version was :

There was a little dō'i
Who had a little dε'l
Right on the middle of her wāwa,
When she was dūd
She was very, very dūd,
And when she was bad, she was āwε.

5. "*Ride-a-cock-horse.*" On March 6, 1903, the first version of this rhyme is recorded thus :

Ride a cock ā
To Banbury Cross,
To see a fine lēdlī
Ride on a white ā.
Rings on her dō
And bells on her dō,
She shall make mūi
Wherever she dō.

From the first she would not say "wīwī" (fingers) at the end of the fifth line, but persisted in using "dō (toes)."

On April 20 the following version is recorded :

Rāidi, cock hā
To Bāmbī trā,
To see a tai lēdlī
Ride on hwai hā,
Rings on her fingers,
And bē dō,
She shall make mūmū
Wherever she dō.

6. "*Little Bo-Peep*." As first recorded (Feb. 24, 1903), this ran as follows:

Little Bo pī
Has lost her ī,
And don't know where to vai.
Let 'em ō
And they 'll come ō
Bringing their tails vai.

The next attempt (Mar. 6) resulted:

Little Bo ip
Has lost her ip,
And don't know where to ai.
Let 'em ōn
And they 'll come ōm,
Bringing their tails vain.

The short words of this nursery-rhyme did not afford her so many *points d'appui*, as did some of the others with less monosyllables.

7. "*Little Tommy Tucker*." The first recorded version (Mar. 10, 1903) was this:

Little Tommy DÉdɛ
Sings for his tɛptɛ,
What shall he sing for?
White blɛ blɛbdɛ.

On April 8 she was heard saying to herself

Lɪ'l tɛm tɛ,
Hwai blɛ blɛblɛ.

8. "*Hey diddle diddle*." The first attempt (March 23, 1903) resulted thus:

Hɛ didlidl
The cat and the fiddle,
Kau jumped over the mūi.
The little dog lā
To see such fine pō
And the dish ran away with the pūi.

When she said "lā (laughed)" in the fourth line she would put out her tongue in very characteristic fashion. At this time she was beginning to use gestures and "acting" in recitation.

9. "*The Man in the Moon*." On March 23, 1903, is recorded the first version of this rhyme:

Mán-ī-mūi
Came down at ūi,
And asked the way to Wāwa;
He went by the au,
And burnt his mau,
Eatin cold plum pāwi.

10. "*Jack and Jill*." First version, recorded March 23, 1903:

Jack and íi
Went up the í,
To get a pail of wá.
Jack fell dau'
And broke his au
And Jill came tumbling dau.

Here in the last line she used "dau (down)," as she did in "Rock-a-bye-Baby"¹—the "after" not appealing to her any more than the "and all" did in the other rhyme.

11. "*There was a Man in our Town*." The earliest version of this rhyme, of which she became on first hearing very fond, was, as recorded on March 23, 1903:

There was a man in áuē tau,
And he was wondrous ai,
He jumped into a brámlě bū
And scratched out both his ai.
And when he found his eyes were gǒn,
With all his might and mēn,
He jumped into a brámlě bū
And scratched them in aděn.

In the seventh line she said "brámlě bū" instead of "another bush." The word "brámlě bū" seems to have quite caught her fancy and she was fond of repeating it. This song she would call for as "Māē au tau." The next version is recorded on April 8, as follows:

There was a máñē áuē dáun
And he was wóni wai,
He jumped into a brámlě bū
And scratched out bō ai.
And when he found his ai gǒn,
With all his mai mē 'n,
He jumped into a brámlě bū,
And scratched them in—dēn.

When she had done this time, she pointed to the book-case near by and said "brámlě bū wait nēē," i. e., "the bramble-bush is right here" and then added "brámlě bū bū tē,"—"the bramble-bush is in the book-case."

12. "*Georgie Porgie*." The first version, recorded April 8, 1903, was:

Georgi Pōdi,
Pudding pai,
Kissed the dōil
And mē t 'ai.
When the dōil au plē,
Georgie pōdi
Ran āwē.

13. "*Yankee Doodle*." This is found recorded on April 8, 1903, thus:

Yankee Dūdēl came to daun,
Riding on a bōnī;
He put a lēdī hāēt
And called it māē rōnī.

14. "*Old Mother Hubbard*." Recorded April 20, 1903, as follows:

Old Mother Mēm
Went to the dēbdē,
To get her pūē dō bōn;
But when she got dēē
The dēbdē bēē,
And so the poor dō ō ēn.

These records are of interest and value in connection with the form and variations of nursery-rhymes, counting-out rhymes, and set formulæ generally in folk-speech, etc. The influence of these nursery-songs upon her language was considerable as may be seen from the following notes:

1. *Twinkle-tars*. Although she knew and used the word *tar* for "star" (e. g., May 2, 1903), as a result of hearing the ditty "Twinkle, twinkle, little star," she came to use "twinkle tar" as her common term for "star," and at present (October, 1904) she still employs it in the form "twinkle star."

2. *Lēdlī*. By this term (as noted Mar. 6, 1903) she knew the song "Ride-a-cock-horse," and would ask for its repetition by saying "mōē lēdlī!" On Dec. 17 she spoke of the "Bánbē hās lēdlī." The *lēdlī* is, of course, her catching up of the *lady* of this nursery-rhyme. Early in March, 1903, she would also call out ā (horse) when she wanted this song. *Lēdlī* became afterwards *lēdlī*.

3. *Mēi*. About the same time she called the song "Mary had a little lamb," *mēi*, and, when she wanted it repeated she would say "mōē mēi." From this song she also came to call her toy-lamb "Mēwī lam."

4. *Mēn*. By this name she would call (e. g., March 6, 1903) for the repetition of some verses, made up for her by one of the summer-visitors in Maine. The refrain was: "Sing baby, sing monkey, sing monkey, sing babe." From the *monkey* of this song came her *mēn*.

6. *Mán-i-mūi*. On March 23, 1903, it is recorded that she was in the habit of calling for "The Man in the Moon came down at noon" as "Mán-i-mūi." Familiarity with the song doubtless helped her to adopt "mán-i-mūi," (and also "mūi") as an important word of her vocabulary with a wide range of analogous signification.

XVIII. *Spontaneous Language*. During the summer of 1904 her "Chinese" was seldom in evidence, but a few cases

of its spontaneous use or of its production upon request being recorded. On July 7, 1904, it was noted that she had not used "Chinese" for a long time. The chief facts concerning her more recent spontaneous activities in language-making, etc., are:

1. *Naming.* On July 18, 1904, she named some paper "boys" and "girls" cut out by her mother thus:

Girls: 1. Tākapanānan. 2. Hthākandandānan. 3. Dāndāndān. 4. Bāmbambam. 5. Bambambam. 6. Mānanānan. 7. Māmakain.

Boys: 1. Pābalidli. 2. Fitchindēmbining. 3. Daundēndaun. 4. Tūldēndaun. 5. Hāulindaun. 6. Abāuntindaun. 7. Pāunsindaun. 8. Pāsbinggambindan.

These are in form similar to "names" recorded earlier.

2. "*Chinese.*" On July 20, she almost "sang" the following:

(a) Pafsin bamsin dumsin doo. Hosum dumsin beemsin dime. Howsin doo and hoosin doo. Hoosin hafin doo. Hunum bussum zine. Doojin jun fossum tchumjum jum. Gonjin gonjin gon (*rep.*) am bam an gi an pourin a rain.

At the end she glides into English, "pourin' a rain."

On Aug. 27 she gave utterance to this specimen:

(b) Hoosin doo an hoosin dee an nu an tu tin goo. Doolin doo an pā'un goo an doonin doo an *golf-ball*. Toolin doo and hooligoo an mooni goo. Too-din doo an goo-din an poodin an choom an an nookan an koosan. Toosin dee an noosin dee an chukan an goonan noo. Torda porda forda. Hoonan doo an budjum a dum dubba a tchutchā. Dooba horsa arosa noona soosa. Toosin gum an noolin noo. *Base-ball* gamin doo. Doo man numa choo. *Long ago* and chudahō. *Long ago* an koosa kona noosa. Bodgin doo au doo a pazha. Koosa poosa soomin noosa. Hoosin dee an borda porda gum.

Her insertion of English words here deserves notice as premonitory of the breaking down of her "Chinese" through the influence of such terms.

The same day, when "reading" Scribner's Magazine, she got off the following:

(c) Hoosin doo an noosin doo an poosin doo. Poosin doo an goodan. Doosin doo an hoogin goo. Goodin an boosin doo an poosin doo. Pootin go an boosin doo an putchum maba porchin too. Pootcha boutch. Po atlapin jum an doo. Putchin kam an boosin doo. Putcha babbin butchin dooin habba chutchā. Tchuda a bud an chuchin doo. Putchin dooin a poota pootin doo. Pooda pooda oona fooda oona hoo. Arna tchooda pooda poo. La busha an a saman butcha doo.

This is more after the manner of her earlier "Chinese."

3. "*Skov'n.*" On Sept. 9, 1904, it was noticed that R. seemed to be using a new "language," different from her "Chinese." The following specimen was obtained:

(a) Shov an ov gov an ov. Jov an nov kow ka. Skov an jov an nov. Skov an ov an jov' nov'n. Skov'n nov an jov'n joltin an bov a log. Kov an jov an nov. Jov en nov an nik an jōns. Skun nov an gog an

gains. Kog an gog an kosh an dawlin. Skov an jov an nov an jov. Gov an yov an nokut bov an jawbun. Gov an nol an chaufun nawl an bob an nog. Gok an gok an gok an gatin. O kus gov'n nov. Skov'n nov an jón. Skov'n nov an non. Skov'n vu an nov'n jòds.

When asked, if it was "Chinese" that she was talking, R. replied "No! it's skov'n." It appears to be notably an *o*-language, therein differing distinctly from her "Chinese," which has not such uni-vocalism. When first found using "skov'n" she was almost "singing" it. She did not show great fluency in its employment, and the only other example obtained was this, recorded on Sept. 27:

(b) Krookin frookin an krookin an pookin. Foili nofin neef.

4. The same day, however, she spoke the following, which seems to be a new sort of "Chinese," with affinities with "skov'n."

Poivin dayvin foiving foigin. Cheebin flewblin fullia fuggia diddl'a fooeia báyaychúdda folli. Blayfin doofan doov. Bleefi foo fooayli foori. Heefoun neevun heeford jeevun heefoin veevem *hello* veevum. *Seven* divun djivun heefoid stoospun feekun veevun weethin heefuz leevun. Sleez yayf glayf voif *life*. Vorleefun an evun leefun lovun. Evun eeli an fi vun in. Ai keef an keef an vof an *fight* vooning king peel ta milka kowst.

The last few words of this look like corrupt English, and a few other English words are scattered through it.

XIX. *Word-forms slightly or not very much differing from those in Adult Use.* As examples of words used by her which differ not very greatly from the forms of them in common use by adults, the following may be cited:

1. *Börding-house.* During the summer of 1904, she persisted in calling the boarding-house very frequently "börding-house," giving the first syllable about the same sound as the word *bird*, which may, indeed, have suggested it to her.

2. *Dimp.* During the same period she very often used *dimp* for "dip,"—e. g., "Tan I *dimp* it up?" (July 5, 1904.)

3. *By side.* In the summer of 1904, she employed "by side" for beside. Thus she said (Aug. 29), "a tail-boat *by side* it," and "Tan I tit *by side* tather?"

4. *On-i-ons.* On July 7, 1904, it was noted that she was fond of speaking of "onions" as *Eniëns*.

5. *Apple-tarts.* For some reason or other she was calling in July, 1904, preserved apricots "apple-tarts," i. e., "apple-carts," her corruption of *apricots*.

6. *Rope-boat.* Early in the summer of 1904 she used to say "rope-boat" for "row-boat," probably because the boats were tied to the float with ropes. By July 20, however, she had had come to correctly use "row-boat." *Apple-carts* and *rope-boat* suggest folk-etymology.

7. *Line*. On July 20, 1904, it was noted that in the rhyme "Mother, may I go out to swim?" she would say "hang your clothes on a hickory *line*." The *limb* of this verse was also rendered by her often as *lamb*. This accords with the variations in counting-out-rhymes, etc.

8. *Emergreen*. On October 26-27, 1904, she was found to be using repeatedly "emergreen" for "evergreen." She spoke of "*emergreen* trees," "*emergreen* houses," etc.

9. *Triksit*. Even at present she occasionally employs for "triscuit" (the breakfast food) *triksit*, which was her earliest name for it.

XX. *Word-groups*. The early period at which children partly or wholly grasp certain groups of words, combinatory expressions, etc., is well illustrated in the development of R.'s language. At the dates indicated she was using the following: Au wā (out to walk, Feb. 1903), tsütū tār (choo-choo cars, Mar. 6), au lai (put out light), dat wē hīē (this way April 5), âl gôn (April 5), aut wē (get out of the way, April 5), tēk . . . wē (April 5), lē . . . in (April 6), dôn tli (gone to sleep, April 10), wai hīē (right here, April 13-16), pli, pápa (please, papa, April 13-16), au wínne (out of the window, April 16), gō tli (go to sleep, April 16), plē bâ (play ball, April 19-21), bā dō (back door, April 19-21), man-i-mūi (man in the moon, April 10, 1903), ōn nēm (own name, April 8, 1903), ōn bed (own bed, April 5, 1903), mēk lai (make a light, April, 1903). Other examples will be found under the rubric: Favorite Phrases.

XXI. *Words "Original" or "Invented."* In this category may be classed the following, including a number of terms for which no completely satisfactory explanation as mutilated or made-over words of her adult environment is forthcoming:

1. *Ublē!* A favorite expression (at the age of eleven months) when interested in anything.

2. *Nēm'nēm*. "I am hungry," "I want food," "I want the bottle," etc. When somewhat less than a year old she would commonly use this word when hungry, or when she caught sight of her feeding-bottle. *Nēm'nēm* or *nēminēm* is a word with similar meanings reported by many observers of young children.

3. *Bōbō*. On January 6, 1903, she began to call her "chamber-chair" by this name and has continued to apply it to similar toilet utensils.

4. *M'nē*, "I'm thirsty," "I want a drink," "I want water." This word was used by her in January, 1903. It is just possible that *m'nē* may be her imitation of *drink*.

5. *Wawa*. By Jan. 6, 1903, she was using very frequently *wawa*, "cracker," a word she began to employ in the fall of

1902. Her mother thinks that *wawa* is really her attempt at reproducing *cracker*.

6. *Aigel*. On Aug. 25, 1904, when playing with some joss-sticks, she said that she wanted to cut them up "in little middles and in little *áigels*." A once-word.

7. *Tállibô*. On April 23, 1904, she said of a picture of some parrot-like bird, "That is n't a parrot, its looks like a *tállibô*." A once-word.

8. *Bidzii*. On March 15, 1904, she began to tell a story: "There was a little *bidzii*,—O that is a bad 'tory." This is a once-word, for she never used it again.

9. *Didi*. A once-word, used on May 15, 1904: "There was a little *didi*. I don't know 'bout the west of it."

10. *Rickeness*. Another once-word, used the same day: "There was a little *rickeness*, a little duck with its mouth open."

11. *Piger*. A once-word, used March 4, 1904: "Once upon a time there was a leopard! And a *piger*." In answer to a question, she said: "A *piger* is a dog." The word is possibly modified from *tiger*.

12. *Teets-pamas*. On April 24, 1904, she said that the *teets-pamas* were eating her dolls. On being asked about them she described them as "just like dogs," and showed how they went about on their legs and how they put things into their mouth. She said also "they live in their own barn."

13. *Deety*. On July 8, 1904, when asked if her neck, which she had strained, was still "broke," she replied "No!" and then, in answer to the further inquiry, "Who broke it?" said "*Deety*," adding "*Deety* is a woman." She also vouchsafed the information that "*Deety* would mend tather's neck, when it was broke."

14. *Dunkled*. On Oct. 27, seeing her mother put her shoes in the oven to warm, she said "Don't let 'em get *dunkled* up like the others" (referring to some that had been spoiled by the heat). This word might of course, be a compromise between "crumpled" and "wrinkled," or based upon one or other of these. It is placed here provisionally.

15. *Mimã*. This word for "mother" she used often during the summer of 1904 (e. g. Aug. 11, when she employed it repeatedly). It may be just a variant of "máma."

16. *Báb-mã*. This word for "father" she used around about November 22, 1903. It is evidently a composite of "bába" and "máma," or of their monosyllabic equivalents.

17. *Nána*. A term for "mother" affected by her during the summer of 1904.

18. *Duggle*. On June 5, 1904, she said of the clouds, "Dey dust *duggle* in the ty."

19. *Twiggle*. The same day she said of the sun, "It *twig-gles* iu the ty." Then, as an afterthought, she added,—"'twinkles I mean."

The words of absolute invention are rather few.

XXII. *Words Pseudo-primitive in Form*. In this category may be listed a number of words, which, standing by themselves, with no explanation of their history, might be taken for "original" inventions of the child, so primitive are they in appearance and so suggestive of the vocabularies of savage and barbarous peoples. A few words of this type may be cited from R.'s speech of the early part of 1903:

Běmbē ('pen,' but first = 'pencil'), būmba ('perfumery'), mūmū ('music'), vū ('horse'), vū ('shoe'), wawa ('crackers'), wiwi ('scissors').

Here might belong, also, her 'pitě pitě!', *i. e.* 'pretty, pretty!' with its shifted accent, and perhaps also 'dēbdē' ('cover') and a few other such words.

XXIII *Words with Special Meanings, Special Words*, etc. One very valuable section of her vocabulary consists of those words used by her with special meanings of her own and of words and expression constructed by her upon simple linguistic principles. Of these the following examples may be cited:

1. *Tasten-paper*. In the spring of 1904 she termed brass paper-fasteners 'tasēn-pěpě' (*e. g.*, June 20).

2. *Hot-bottle-water*. About the same time her word for 'hot-water-bottle' was 'hōt-bōtēl-wātě.'

3. *Fish*. On Aug. 27, 1904, she asked, "Is tather going to the well to well up some water?" but defined *well* as "to *fish* up water."

4. *Dinner-ladies*. On July 24, 1904, she called the waitresses at the boarding-house "dinner-ladies."

5. *Horsing*. On May 20, 1904, she said, "I'm doin' out horsing now."

6. *Bunch*. The same day she spoke of "a big *bunch* of tunder (*i. e.*, thunder)."

7. *Half-much*. On July 14, 1904, while on the road from Bayville to Boothbay Harbor, she asked "Have we been walking *half-much* in the Harbor (*i. e.*, *half-way* to the Harbor)?"

8. *Longness*. On June 28, 1904, comparing the length of her own legs with those of her father she said that hers were short because "they tut the *longness* off."

9. *Warmness*. On April 9, 1904, she said "Put some *warmness* on it off your 'tove, mama."

10. *Hard*. On July 8, 1904, looking at a burn on her father's finger she said "It's burned *hard*."

11. *Shut-eyes*. On July 9, 1904, she said "I want tome *tshut-eyes* (*i. e.*, dolly that shuts its eyes when laid down) doll who tan tleep!"

12. *Bumble.* The same day, when asked if she liked bumble-bees she replied: "I like 'em when they *bumble* around." On Aug. 10, while her father was trying to catch a bee in the house, she said "it *bumbles* away, doesn't it?"

13. *Wind.* The same day, when pretending to fan her father, she said "Tather, I'm *winding* you." On July 15, 15, 1904, she observed of the wind, "it *winds* me!"

14. *Get-up horn.* During the summer of 1904, at Bayville, Maine, she called the first horn for breakfast "the *get-up-horn*."

15. *Breeze.* On July 16, 1904, while in the woods on the road to East Boothbay she said, "Mama, this is a nice breeze," then added, "I want to be *breezed* a little bit."

16. *Left.* On July 17, she called the second breakfast-horn, "the *left horn*."

17. *Front.* On July 16, 1904, when her father, speaking of her actions while taking a sea-bath, said that he thought she was on her back, she observed, "No! I was on my *tront*!"

18. *Trolley.* On July 20, 1904, she said of a picture of an electric car, "is it *trolleying* itself?"

19. *Way.* On Aug. 18, she amused herself by turning a number of cents "the Indian *way*," *i. e.*, face up, she having easily come to call the liberty-head "Indin," *i. e.*, "Indian." She also used the expression "letter *way*," when she turned her building-blocks letter-side up. Another expression, meaning the same, was "on the letters." She also said, to like-effect, "pictures up," and "tages (cages of animals) up."

20. *Journal Book.* On August 19, 1904, she is recorded as calling the "Ladies' Home Journal," which she used to "read" long before then, "home ladies' journal book." Some time before this she styled it the "journal book." At present (Oct. 1804), her term for it is the "Home Ladies' Journal."

21. *Fold.* On Aug. 20, 1904, she said of a piece of bread and jam "I want it *folded up*," meaning that she wanted the slice doubled over like a sandwich.

22. *Unfold.* In October, 1904, she would say, "unfold it, tather," when she came to uncut leaves in a magazine, etc.

23. *Corner.* In August, 1904, when turning over the pages of a book or magazine, she used to say, "Wait till I get to the *torner* (*i. e.*, end)."

24. *Moon.* On Aug. 22, 1904, she called half a pilot-biscuit "a moon biscuit," and a few days later began to ask for pilot biscuits as "moon trackers" and, occasionally, "moon wawa."

25. *Board.* On Aug. 25, she said of an orange she was about to eat, "Wait till I'm down to the *boarding*-house and I'll *board* it all up." When asked how, she replied, "I'll

board it up with a spoon." Then she added, "Do you little fellows *board*?"

26. *Middles*. The same day she said, referring to some joss-sticks in her hand, "I want to cut 'em up into little *middles*."

27. *Acorn-tree*. On Aug. 28, 1904, she spoke of the oak, which she called "oak-tree" as "acorn-tree." She had an "oak-tree house" in an old hollow oak in the woods.

28. *Wraggled*. On June 7, 1904, she said: "Dis all *wraggled* up wiz a 'pool o' tread."

29. *Twinkle-Star*. (See under the section relating to Nursery-rhymes.) Still her common word for "star."

30. *Orni-delly*. Her first name for orange, (except a once-word *wanwa* (was "örnī-dēllī, *i. e.*, "orange-jelly," because she heard the word "jelly" often and saw it on the table; also, her oranges were cut up for her and she liked the juice very much. On June 18, 1904, it was recorded that she had begun to call the "juice of the orange "orni-delly."

31. *Butter-tree*. On June 2, 1903, it is recorded that, for some time past, she had been calling the "buttercup" *bətɔ-tī*. The *tī* (*i. e.*, "tree") being used by her in the sense of "grass" and for flowers of the field.

32. *Cold-hot*. On June 8, 1903, she called "ice" *cold-hot*, and about this time would always ask for it by that name.

34. *Worky*. On May 28, 1904, she said: "I tan't do that, 'tause I'm too *worky*."

35. *Summer-day*. In the spring of 1904 (*e. g.*, May 18) she used often the phrases "when *tummer-day* tome, *i. e.*, "when it is summer."

36. *Once-a-while*. In the early summer of 1904 (*e. g.*, (June 9) she used *once-a-while* in the sense of "once," "some time ago,"—for example, "I had a drink *once-a-while*."

The words and phrases under this rubric are some of the most interesting in the whole vocabulary.