

the many various languages of the race so differ that there are some of them which have scarce a dozen of words in common, a linguist who confined himself to the consideration of natural causes would be quite justified in arguing that these languages could not possibly have changed to be what they are, from any such tongue, in the some five or six thousand years to which he finds himself restricted by history, geology, and the inference of Sir Isaac. It takes many centuries thoroughly to change a language, even in the present state of things, in which divers languages exist, and in which commerce and conquest, and the demands of literature, are ever incorporating the vocables of one people with those of another. After the lapse of nearly three thousand years, the language of modern Greece is essentially that in which Homer wrote ; and by much the larger part of the words in which we ourselves express our ideas are those which Alfred employed when he propounded his scheme of legislative assemblies and of trial by jury. And were there but one language on earth, changes in words or structure would of necessity operate incalculably more slowly. Nor would it be illogical for the linguist to argue, that if, some five or six thousand years ago, the race, then in their extreme infancy, had not a common language, they could not have originated as one family, but as several, and so his conclusion would in effect be that of the American naturalist. But who does not see that, though *right* as a linguist, he would be *wrong* as a theologian,—wrong in fact ? Reasoning on but the common and the natural, he would have failed to take into account, in his calculation, one main element,—the element of miracle, as manifested in the confusion of tongues at Babel ; and his ultimate finding would, in consequence, be wholly erroneous. Now, it is perhaps equally possible for the naturalist to hold that two such extreme varieties of the human family as the negro and the Goth could not have originated from common