

MAN'S LANGUAGE TO ANIMALS.

From the Literary Digest of August 2, 1902.

It is a curious fact that in every language there are certain words that are used only to animals. More than this, special words are often appropriated to particular species. E. A. Matthews, who contributes an article on the subject to *Popular Science News* (July), notes that the dog is almost the only animal for which we have no special call or word of command—perhaps because of his almost human intelligence. Some of the words that we use to animals, Mr. Matthews tells us, are the names by which our ancestors called the animals themselves. He adds:

"Some are Sanscrit, or early Indian words, some are Greek, some Latin, some Teutonic, some Old English words, long since obsolete. Max Muller, in 'Chips from a German Workshop,' says: 'The commands we give to the horse and our call to the cow are the same used by the prehistoric men of our race. In all probability, the Arab calls to his camel in the same words now as in the days of Abraham or Noah.'

"In talking to the horse we find the word *ho*, or *whoa*, used alike all over the world. It is supposed to be the interjection '*ohe*' of the Greeks and Latins, a simple call to attract attention, another form of which was from Sanscrit '*yu*,' meaning to hold back. '*Ho*' is Old English for hold, and is still used in that sense in many countries, and is considered to be also the Aryan word stop. The words that guide the reins are different in many languages, because the teamsters do not always guide alike. The Englishman and American say *gee* and *haw*, but as in Great Britain the horse must keep to the left, their meanings are reversed. The German says '*hott*' and '*hist*,' the Frenchman '*hue*,' and '*dia*,' the Spaniard '*cho*' and '*ven aca*,' the Italian '*gio*' and '*veney*,' all meaning about the same, but of different origin. But when the farmer's boy says '*cope*,' he uses an old Sanscrit word which means come.

"The whistle to the horse is the same in every race and also calls the cows. The child who pets her calf and calls it '*bos*,' or '*bossy*,' uses the Latin name of its race, almost the same in Greek, but when she says '*co-bos*' she uses the Sanscrit verb '*gu*,' meaning to low as a cow. The milker says '*sob*' to the cow, which comes from the Sanscrit '*sagh*' or '*sah*,' meaning to remain, or keep still.

"The shepherd calls '*ca-day! ca-day!*' as he enters the field, and the sheep come, bleating and stumbling, to answer him. This call comes from the Old English '*cade*,' a lamb, meaning also tame or gentle. It is curious that this call, like many others, is meant for the very young of the flock.

"The primitive name of the hog, in early English at least, is *chuck*, hence *wood-chuck*, or *wood-hog*. This is used in some countries as a hog call, but is not universal. The old-fashioned Western and Southern cry '*Pig-ooy! Pig-ooy!*' has no ancient tradition, but is again a call for the young. *Pig* is a word found in the Teutonic languages, meaning the young of all animals, so when the mother repeats the nursery rhyme, '*This little pig goes to market*,' she means, although she does not know it, '*this little calf*,' or '*this little colt*,' just as much as the small

member of the pork family. The queer exclamation '*st'boy*,' is used all over the world to drive away the hogs.

"The fowl call, '*chick!*' '*chick!*' is as old as the chicken itself, being the Sanscrit '*kuk*,' the name of the domestic fowl, clearly imitated from the older verb, '*kak*,' to crow, or cry, from whence the word *cackle*. When the little country girl cries '*shoo*' to scare away the chickens, she uses the same word as did Penelope, that model of Greek housewives, and she inherited it from her Sanscrit forefathers, who said '*su*,' meaning to hurl, or drive.

"We must not omit the old-world and world-wide names given by children to the cat or dog, when they say '*the meow-meow*,' and '*bow-wow*.' These names were given by the oldest races and continue unchanged to-day. The word *puss* is said to be an imitation of the spitting of the cat, from the Hebrew '*phis*.' *Kit* is but a variation of the word *cat*, and the word of command, '*scat*,' is a combination of the *hist* and *cat*. Some authorities, however, say it is from the Sanscrit *skat*, meaning, to scatter.

"This is a subject that grows upon one, and it is to be hoped that some Max Muller of the animals will one day tell us more about it. We know that in the pastoral days, when man and his flock lived together, and the camel and ass were counted as children, they understood each other, and had a mutual affection, almost unknown to-day. Yet these dumb creatures share our mortal lot; '*the whole creation travaileth together*.' The language that unites us should be full of interest to every human being."

+ + +

THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLE OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

Louis F. Post in a Symposium on Municipal Ownership and Operation, Which Appeared in *Moody's Magazine* for October.

In every political unit, whether national, State or municipal, there are two kinds of social activity. One kind is in its essential character personal; the other is in its essential character governmental. It is upon this essential difference that the question of public or private ownership turns, in so far as political and business principle, in contradistinction to political and business empiricism, is permitted to decide. Curiously enough, this essential difference in social function is ignored by two diametrically opposite types of mind. Socialists ignore it when they demand public management of social utilities that are personal; conservatives ignore it when they demand private management of social utilities that are governmental. Yet the difference between these utilities is demonstrable by abundant actual instances, and the differentiating test may be easily applied.

The Two Kinds of Social Utilities.

A social utility of the personal sort, is one which is of such a nature that anybody may undertake it unless government prohibits it; whereas a social utility of the governmental sort, is of such a nature that nobody can undertake it unless government permits it.

Any competent person, for instance, may engage at his own will in storekeeping, manufacturing,

transportation on open highways, fishing in open waters, and so on. He does not need governmental permission. And this is in the nature of things. Unless government first arbitrarily restricts his undertaking such a form of social service, his own will and competency determine the matter. It is, therefore, a social utility of the personal sort.

But nobody can engage in levying and collecting taxes, unless he is empowered by the government to do so. This is obviously true, also, of administering justice. Reflection will show it to be equally true of opening and maintaining highways, whether the highways be dirt roads, railroads, or city streets. It is likewise true of piping oil across mountains to the sea, or water or gas through the streets of a city, and of operating street cars. No person can engage in any such business without permission from government. The fact that franchises or licenses are under all circumstances indispensable, proves it. This permission is needed not because government has arbitrarily conditioned the business so as to require a franchise or license, as might be and often is the case with storekeeping, manufacturing, etc.; it is needed because in the very nature of the business itself, as with taxation or judicial administration, the function cannot be performed unless it is authorized by government. These businesses, therefore, are social utilities of the governmental sort.

Such businesses, if they are done at all, must be done by the appropriate government through its own officials, or be farmed out by the government for performance by private persons or corporations. Consequently, whenever specific problems of public ownership arise, the test question is not whether government should take over a private business; it is whether government should continue to farm out a public business.

Evolution of Government Ownership.

Once it was customary to farm out the public business of collecting taxes. Tax farmers naturally resisted the abrogation of this custom; but tax collecting as a private business has so completely past away that few persons now would advocate a return to private management of this public function. The administration of justice, also, has been in greater or less degree farmed out in the past; but who would advocate it now? Our problems with reference to public or private administration of social utilities no longer relate to fiscal or judicial functions. But the same problems in principle confront us in relation to such social utilities as the distribution of oil, water, gas and electricity, and the operation of street car and railroad systems.

These social services are practically inseparable from the highways—whether rail highways, pipe highways or wire highways—by means whereof they are rendered. It is therefore impossible, from the nature of the case, for any willing and competent person or persons to perform them in the modern manner without permission from government. The services belong, consequently, in the category not of private but of public utilities; and the question of public or private ownership regarding them raises the issue of farming out public functions for private operation. To farm them out is to do with these public functions what was once done with judicial

and fiscal functions. To abolish the prevailing practice regarding any of them, so far from being a step in the direction of establishing government ownership of private business, is a step in the direction of abolishing private ownership of government business.

The Government Should Conduct Its Own Affairs.

This step is often denounced as "socialistic," a term which has of recent years been substituted for "communistic," by objectors who prefer what they regard as offensive epithets to sober argument in discussions of this character. In so far, however, as the term "socialistic" may be used descriptively instead of epithetically, the difference between such social utilities as are essentially personal and such as are essentially governmental, is doubtless overlooked. In view of this difference, public ownership of such social utilities as are afforded by street-car, railway, water, oil-pipe, gas and electric systems, is not socialistic. If we governmentalize social utilities regardless of whether they are public or private in their essential character, we do tend toward socialism; but on the other hand, if we turn over to private ownership and operation such utilities as are governmental as well as those that are personal, we tend toward anarchism. For the fundamental difference between the goal of socialism and the goal of anarchism is this: that socialism would governmentalize all social utilities, whereas anarchism would governmentalize none.

It is only when we adopt the policy of having government leave private functions to private management and resume public management of public functions, that we tend toward that ideal of American democracy which demands a people's government for the administration of governmental affairs, and leaves every individual in freedom but without governmental privileges regarding his personal affairs.

+ + +

CLEVELAND'S FARM COLONY.

Cleveland's new farm colony of 1,500 acres, on which are being grouped in separate villages the city workhouse prisoners, the infirmaries wards and the tubercular patients, represents an innovation in municipal affairs that is bound to attract the attention of every city in the United States.

The population of this city farm, already numbering into the hundreds, will ultimately reach 2,000. The present area will likely be increased to 5,000 acres when all the city's penal, sanitary and philanthropic institutions shall have been moved from the busy streets far into the country. The new plan represents a philanthropy, and is in the interest of economy. The site of this new city farm is some ten miles from the central part of Cleveland, near the little rural town of Warrensville. It formerly comprised twenty distinct farms, and includes a high plateau which separates the Chagrin and Cuyahoga valleys, and which is 600 feet above Lake Erie, in fact the highest point in Cuyahoga county. The air here afforded is said to be good for tubercular patients, and the land produces the crops which are most needed in the maintenance of city institutions. While, in addition to farming occupation for the prisoners, there are stone quarries of goodly dimensions. A mile of electric railway has been built by