

former case, one's Teutonic back in the other, is put up. Did he who first wrote "armor" fancy that "armor" was a Latin word like "honor" or "color?" By all means let *armatura*, if anyone chooses, be cut short into *armure*; but let us be spared such a false analogy as *armor*. 'Arbor' for "arbour" brings out more strongly the delusion of those who, having a Latin tree on the brain, doffed Teutonic "harbour" of its aspirate. But the most unkindest cut of all is when Old-English "neahgebur," which, according to the universal rule of the language, becomes in modern English "neighbour," is also turned into "neighbor." Did anybody, even a printer or a dictionary-maker, really fancy that the last three letters of "neighbour" had anything in common with the last three letters of "honour"? It is surely hardly needful to say that Old-English *u* is in modern English consistently represented by *ou*; "hús" becomes "house;" "súð" becomes "south;" "út" becomes "out"—and "neahgebur" becomes "neighbour." American printers too have some odd ways in other matters, specially as to their way of dividing words when part of a word has to be in one line and part in another. Thus "nothing" will be divided, not as "no-thing," but as "noth-ing," as if it were the patronymic of a name "Noth." Yet surely even a printer must have known that "nothing" is "no-thing" and nothing else. So again "knowledge" is divided as "knowl-edge," suggesting rather the side of a hill than the occupation or condition of one who knows. It is really quite possible that the *d* may have been thrust into "knowledge"—better written "knowlege" from some thought of a *ledge*. Anyhow one suspects that very few people know that *ledge* in "knowledge" and "lock" in "wedlock" are one and the same ending. "Wedlock" at least is safe from being divided as "wedl-ock,"

because everybody thinks that it has something to do with a lock and key.

It would be easy to pile together a far longer list of differences of usage in matter of speech between England and America. But I have perhaps brought together enough to illustrate my main general positions. I have tried to show that so-called "Americanisms" are not to be at once cast aside, as many people in England are inclined to cast them aside, as if they were necessarily corruptions of the common speech, as if it proved something against a form of words to show that it is usual in America, but that it is not usual in England. Abuses of language undoubtedly arise in America, just as they do in England. It is hardly worth while trying to count up and find out in which country they are the more common. Possibly the go-ahead side of the younger English land may win for it the first place. But, if so, it is merely a difference of degree, not of kind. I fancy that "racial" is American; but "sociology" is undoubtedly British. On the other hand, the conservative side of the American character has led to the survival in America of many good English words and phrases which have gone out of use in England, and which ignorant people therefore mistake for American inventions. In other cases, again, differences of usage between the two countries are fully explained by differences of circumstances between the two countries. In some cases, again, usages which cannot be called correct, but which differ from mere abuses of language, have been brought in—in either country—through mistaken analogies or other processes of that kind. In these different ways there has come to be a certain distinction between the received British and the received American use of the common English tongue, a distinction which commonly makes it easy to see from