

"Jarman Ocean." But the same thing happens to a crowd of Teutonic proper names, as Derby, Berkeley, Berkshire, Bernard, Bertram, and others. In these names the original Old-English vowel is "*eo*," the modern spelling and the different modern pronunciations are mere approximations, just as when the vowel is the French or Latin *e*. One has heard "Darby" and "Durby," "Barkeley" and "Burkeley;" and though the *a* sound is now deemed the more polite, yet I believe that fashion has fluctuated in this matter, as in most others. And fashion, whether fluctuating or not, is at least inconsistent; if it is polite to talk of "Barkshire" and "Darby," it is no longer polite to talk about "Jarman" and "Jarsey." But in all these cases there can be no doubt that the *a* sound is the older. The names of which I have spoken are often spelled with an *a* in old writers; and the *a* sound has for it the witnesses of the most familiar spelling of several of the names when used as surnames. "Darby," "Barclay," "Barnard," "Bartram," all familiar surnames, show what sound was usual when their present spelling was fixed. Tourists, I believe, talk of the "Durwent" (as they call the Dove the "Duv"); but the Derwent at Stamford bridge is undoubtedly Darwent, while the more northern stream of the name is locally Darwin, a form which has become illustrious as a surname. Now in words of this kind, while British use is somewhat fluctuating, I believe that America has universally decided for the *u* sound. But there can be no doubt that, whether in England or in America, the sound of "Durby" or "Burtram" is simply an attempt to adapt the sound to the spelling, while "Darby" and "Bartram" are the genuine traditional sounds. I see another instance, not quite of the same kind, of the influence of the

schoolmaster, in the name which in some parts of America is given to the last letter of the alphabet. This in New England is always *zee*; in the South it is *zed*, while Pennsylvania seems to halt between two opinions. Now *zed* is a very strange name. Has it anything to do with Greek *zeta*? or does it come from the old form *izzard*, which was not quite forgotten in my childhood, and which I was delighted to find remembered in America also? (*Izzard* is said to be for "*s* hard," though surely *z* is rather *s* soft.) But anyhow *zee* is clearly a schoolmaster's device to get rid of the strange-sounding *zed*, and to make *z* follow the analogy of other letters. But the analogy is wrong. *Z* ought not to follow the analogy of *b*, *d*, *t*, but that of *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, and above all of its brother *s*. If we are not to have *zed*, the name should clearly be, not *zee* but *ez*. But it is a comfort that, besides *izzard*, I also found "ampussy" and "—I hardly know how to write it—remembered beyond the Ocean. I may very likely be called on to explain on this side, "Ampussy and," that is, in full, '*and* per se, *and*,' is the name of the sign for the conjunction *and*, &, which used to be printed at the end of the alphabet. May I quote a riming nursery alphabet of my own childhood? The letters have all done their several services towards the apple-pie that was to be divided among them:

Then AND came, though not one of the letters,
And, bowing, acknowledged them all as his betters;
And, hoping it might not be deemed a presumption,
Remained all their honours' most humble conjunction.

The "humble conjunction" seems to have fared yet worse than Lord Macaulay's chaplain, and to have got no apple-pie at all.