

possess a striking example, in the creation of four closely allied dialects, proceeding from the Latin—French, Spanish, Italian, and Provençal or Langue d'oc.

That, as the result of the mixture between conquerors and conquered, mixed languages might be created, as for instance, French, English and German, there is equal evidence; for it is easy to recognize in each of these the elements borrowed from its neighbors.

But nothing of this kind exists in America. The idioms, however divided, are perfectly distinct as to their vocabulary, and if one of the principles of their grammar appears to be common to all, it does not govern them equally and with the same intensity; several of them do not acknowledge it, and others know nothing about it.

Further, each of these idioms presents in itself a firm logical foundation, admirable by the multitude of locutions and the justice and appropriateness of its words; a proof that the brutalized, fallen and savage nations who speak them have not created them; still less that these languages could have been the painful product of wars of violence and internal divisions, as we have elsewhere proved.

Then, in concluding that the division of the American language has arisen in America, Galatin meant only to speak of the dialects; he must admit by implication that the idioms have been imported from elsewhere. If by American languages are understood the idioms themselves, such as the Esquimaux, the Déné-Dindjié, the Algonquin, the Iroquois, the Quichua, the Maya, etc., we must, to be logical, rational and in agreement with the premises already laid down by the scholar now quoted, admit without subterfuge one of two

things,—either a spontaneous creation in America—an opinion which cannot be sustained and to which we believe we have done justice—or else *a second diffusion of language, by a second judgment brought by God on a nation accursed and given up as a prey*, as De Maistre says, to serve as an example of divine justice. But I doubt whether certain persons would decide to admit the last horn of this other dilemma. The autochthony, pure and simple, of the Americans, and, consequently, a schism with Genesis, would appear to them preferable. In turn, we are not ready to acknowledge what we consider as conformable neither to the truth ascertained nor to the truth revealed.*

We must then, as a last analysis, have recourse to the Asiatic immigration, and place those who contradict the Bible face to face with the Babel of Genesis, unless they seek for the second American Babel, which we have just presented; for, to whichever side we turn, we find a God, Creator and Providence, who disposes of men and nations at His will, and makes them concur—here openly, there secretly—in the designs which His wisdom proposes, and against which theories and opinions vainly struggle.

* At the moment of going to press, I have had the honor and satisfaction of conversing with a priest of the Foreign Missions, who had spent twelve or fifteen years at Thibet, and who is returning there—l'Abbé Fage, well known to the readers of the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*. This intrepid and learned missionary manifested the greatest astonishment when, on hearing me speak the Déné-Dindjié language, he recognized in it a great number of words identical with the Thibetan, or which are very nearly similar. I will mention here only the words, *earth, water, house, bear, west, father*. Besides, the articulations and the grammatical process of these two languages present numerous similarities.