

their ideal or archetypal form in the mind, whereas cries of pain are common to the lower animals which are incapable of thought. Hence it must follow that we can by no means consider such cries as the starting point in language. But, then, it is of trifling concern to us what may have been the form of the language of man in his primeval state, since of this much we have certitude, that it was rude in the extreme, though containing potentially all that was required to constitute language in the thoroughly organized form in which we find it to-day.

Sacred History tells us (and the truth of this account cannot be questioned) that all men spoke one tongue until the confusion of Babel. Then sprung up those dialects, as we may call them, from which the languages of our day have taken birth either directly or remotely. But since the days of Babel how immeasurably have the languages of the different races of mankind changed! Going back in English to the time of Chaucer, which of us would find conversation with him, the father of our poetry, practically possible? If, then, the change wrought in the short span of six centuries has been so great, how can we estimate the development in universal language that has been effected in the thousands of years since the check was given to man's presumption at Babel?

From what has been said thus far it will be inferred that language is the result of an evolution. Being such, it must have followed the common laws of evolution. The primitive germ, whatever it may have been, in coming "down the grooves of change" has had what was in a merely potential condition brought into a state of actuality. Nothing essentially new has been added, for everything necessary to the integrity of speech was present in the pristine tongue; it required only time and the progress of the human mind to perfect its organization.

And now the question suggests itself—what was the *modus operandi* of the evolution? Darwinists tell us that the existing species of animals, which are "the survival of the fittest," were evolved in "the struggle for existence." This theory has a perfect analogy in the development of language. The existing material of speech is the survival of the fittest for the present stage in the