SOME NOTES ON THE LETTERS i, j, u AND v IN SIXTEENTH CENTURY PRINTING.

WE can regard with equanimity the statement in Watt's 'Bibliotheca Britannica'[1] that Louis Elzevier, 'who printed at Leyden from 1595 to 1616, . . . was the first who made the distinction of u from v and i from j; which was shortly after followed by the introduction of U and J among the capitals, by Lazarus Zetner of Strasburg, in 1619'; for the work of Watt, excellent as it was in its own day, has in many points long ago been superseded. When, however, we find this statement cited in the New English Dictionary,[2] apparently as the latest and most authoritative dictum on the subject, we may naturally feel some surprise, even though the citation is accompanied by evidence which shows that it cannot be accepted as a true presentation of the case. And yet if we were asked to what work of more recent date we would refer an enquirer who had noticed that the use of these letters in the early part of the sixteenth century was very different from what it is now, and who wished to know how and when the change came about, we might be hard put to it

[1] Vol. i., p. 336a. [2] In the article on the letter j.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

for an answer. There are notes on the subject here and there; Herbert has several in his edition of Ames's 'Typographical Antiquities'; but, so far as I have been able to learn, the last attempt to deal with the question at all fully was early in the eighteenth century, in a 'Dissertation sur le tems auquel les imprimeurs ont introduit l'J & l'V consonnes,' which is to be found in the 'Continuation des Mémoires de Littérature et d'Histoire' of P. Desmolets, vol. vii.[1] This article, though a good piece of work within the limits which it prescribes, naturally says nothing about what is of most interest to us, namely, the history of these letters in England.

To deal with the subject exhaustively would, of course, require much time and the systematic examination of a large number of books; for, with the exception of Herbert, few bibliographers—at least of those who have dealt with sixteenth century printing—seem to have been interested in the letters and characters themselves, or to have noticed peculiarities in their use. An exhaustive treatment is, however, far from my intention. I wish merely to bring together a few more or less disconnected notes bearing upon the matter. They will at least show that Watt was grievously in error.

It is well known that until the sixteenth century i and j were, as a general rule, regarded as merely

[1] The article is said to be by Philibert Papillon, see Goujet, 'Bibliothèque Françoise,' 1741, etc., vol. i., p. 43. The 'Continuation des Mémoires' appeared in 1726-31, but I have only seen what I presume is a reprint, in which vol. vii. is dated 1749. In this the article, which is not signed, occupies pp. 217-29.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

two forms of the same letter, the like being the case with u and v. Such differentiation as there was in their use was merely a matter of calligraphy; either letter of the pair could stand equally well for a vowel sound or for a consonant. Indeed the complete separation of the letters is of quite recent date, for until the last century was well advanced, the i- and j-words were arranged together in dictionaries, as were also those beginning with u and v. The particular point which I wish to discuss is the change which took place between about 1520 and 1630,[1] by which j and v from being merely graphic variants of i and u came to represent different sounds, the change, in short, by which it came about that the Latin words which in 1500 were commonly written 'inijcere' and 'vua' had by 1650 taken the forms 'injicere' and 'uva.' The fortunes of the two pairs of letters in question were not identical, but were sufficiently similar to allow of their being treated together. The slight gain in clearness which might result from taking each pair separately seems to be outweighed by the tediousness of narrating a great part of their story—a dull one at best—twice over.

The practice of the earliest printers, which they presumably took over from the scribes of their time and country, with regard to the letters under discussion was as follows:

(1) There was an upper-case letter approximating

[1] According to information kindly given by Mr. Robert Steele the modern use of these letters in English Proclamations dates from September, 1637, and this may be taken as marking their final triumph.—ED.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

in shape in Gothic founts rather to the modern J than to I, but serving indifferently for either.

(2) An upper-case letter approximating in shape in Gothic founts to U, and serving for U and V.

(3) A lower-case i, serving for both i and j.

(4) A lower-case j, used for the second of two i's in words like 'perij,' and in Roman numerals as 'viij.'

(5) A lower-case u, serving for both u and v, but only used medially or finally.

(6) A lower-case v, serving for both u and v, but only used initially.

There were no doubt exceptions to the general rule: it has been stated that certain of the German printers used j for the consonantal sound of i from the earliest times,[1] and the two letters were distinguished in Spanish printing[2]: but the practice of the great majority of the German, Dutch, and English printers until the end of the sixteenth century was in general as stated—in the case of black-letter printing almost invariably.

In books printed in the roman character there is, however, from its first introduction, some fluctuation in usage. Not indeed in the majuscules, for the roman I and V served precisely the same double purpose as the black-letter 𝔍 and 𝔘, but in the lower-case letters, where u seems to have tres-

[1] See N. E. D., art. j. I have not come across these printers, but have no reason to doubt the truth of the statement.

[2] Thus, in books printed by Friedrich Biel at Burgos in 1485-7 we find mejor, trabajos, viejo, etc. In Spanish the letter j stood, as it does now, for a guttural aspirate. It is said to occur as distinct from i in Catalan MSS. of the fourteenth century ('Grand Encyclopedie,' 1887, etc., art. j).

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

passed to some extent on the province of its companion v. Thus in the first book printed in Italy, the 'Lactantius' of 1465, we find u instead of v initially in such words as 'uita,' 'uero,' and 'unus,' where in Germany printers would have spelled 'vita,' 'vero,' 'vnus.' Indeed, neither j nor v seems to be employed in the book at all.[1] This practice of using u initially seems to have been followed by the majority of the Italian printers; Jenson, for example, in his roman type seems not to employ v at all, save in the roman numerals. In his black-letter work he, however, followed the German practice, though with some irregularity, probably due to the compositors' knowledge of both systems. The Italian use of u soon spread outside that country, and in the sixteenth century was very commonly followed by those printers who printed chiefly in roman type, especially at Basel and Paris, while in North Germany, Holland, and England, the older system of using v as the initial letter was generally adhered to, both in roman type and in black letter.

So far, the letters of each pair have been regarded as differing merely in form; the use is purely a matter of appearance: but even in Roman times it had been noticed that the letter u or v, whichever form it took, represented two different sounds, the same thing being true of i, though of course in neither case was the pair of sounds the same as it was at the period with which we are now dealing. Probably in all ages attempts have

[1] Even in Roman numerals we have u, as 'lu,' 'xuii,' etc.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

been made by enthusiasts to cause the written language to represent with greater accuracy the spoken sounds, but the only early one which seems to have met with even temporary success is that of the Emperor Claudius, who proposed to use the digamma in such words as 'servus' and 'vulgus.'[1]

It is indeed not until well on in the sixteenth century that we find any serious and sustained effort to discriminate in writing between the two sounds represented by each pair of the letters under discussion. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the first printed books in which the differentiation is observed were the works of the Italian poet Giangiorgio Trissino (1478-1550), who attempted to introduce a reformed method of spelling of which this innovation is a part. Trissino's 'Epistola de la vita che dee tenere una Donna vedova,' printed by Lodovico de gli Arrighi Vicentino and Lautitio Perugino at Rome in 1524, has the modern use of u and v throughout, both in lower-case and majuscules, besides certain other new letters with which we need not concern ourselves, but does not distinguish i and j. The like is true of two other small works of Trissino, issued by the same printers in the same year, but an undated pamphlet apparently first printed to accompany these books, namely the 'Epistola de le Lettere Nuovamente aggiunte ne la Lingua Italiana,' further distinguishes the conso-

[1] See Quintillian, 'Inst. Orat.' i. 4. 8, and the commentators thereon. The letters of Chilperic, often referred to in conjunction with those of Claudius, do not seem to have included a v or j (Greg. Turon., 'Hist. Franc.,' v. 45).

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

nantal sound of j.[1] The j is, however, used much less frequently than in the author's later work. Trissino had also devised a kind of sloping line to serve as a majuscule J, but there seems to be no example of its use.

The 'Epistola' was reprinted by Tolomeo Janiculo da Bressa in 1529. A preface informs us that much criticism had already been directed against the new letters, and the writer complains that excellent as the system is, the critics 'con la invidiosa nebula de la loro eloquenzia hanno quasi adombrato la incredibile utilità di essa.'[2]

From 1524 to 1548 at least Janiculo printed a number of works in the new spelling. Most, however, if not all, were either by or connected with Trissino, and it is not clear that the innovation had much success. The attitude of the majority towards it is exemplified by the republication in 1583 of Trissino's translation of Dante's 'De Vulgari Eloquentia,' 'di nuovo ristampato, e dalle lettere al nostro idioma strane purgato.'[3]

At about the time when Trissino was attempting to introduce his new letters in Italy, were beginning in France those spelling controversies which occupied so much of the attention of the

[1] In such words as 'ajuto.' The sound indicated is of course the true consonantal sound of i, as in 'Hallelujah,' not the sound usually associated with j in English.

[2] I do not follow Janiculo's spelling in all its details.

[3] It may be said in passing that Trissino's scheme of spelling reform was both simple and valuable. It distinguished between close and open e and o, and between the dz and ts pronunciation of z—things which have worried all who have ever tried to learn Italian since.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

learned world throughout the century. Curiously enough, however, in the earlier writings on the subject, though the double value of the letters under discussion was of course recognized, the idea of making use of v and j to represent the consonants does not seem to have been suggested. For example, the work of J. du Bois, written under the name of 'Jacobi Sylvii Ambiani in Linguam Gallicam Isagoge,' 1531, distinguishes the consonantal sounds as i- and u-, as in 'i-e,' 'Au-ril,' 'receu-oir,' but Du Bois does not seem to intend the hyphen to be used in ordinary script; it is no more than a diacritic for scientific purposes. Similarly the leader of one of the most important schools of spelling reform, Louis Meigret, in his 'Traité touchant . . . l'escriture Françoise,' 1545,[1] recognizes that i and u each represents two distinct sounds, and would have them differentiated. He approves Claudius' idea of writing 'une ſ renversée' for the consonantal sound of u, but the obvious idea of using a v does not occur to him. In this work he keeps to the old practice as regards both u and i.

In a later book, however, 'Le tretté de la Grammere Francoeze,' 1550,[2] though he still follows the old practice of using v always initially and u always medially, we find a change as regards i. He now writes i for the vowel and j for the consonant

[1] There was an earlier edition in 1542, which I have not seen.

[2] It is interesting to note that this was printed at Paris by C. Wechel, whose successor Andreas Wechel was, as we shall see, the printer who had most to do with bringing about the change in practice.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

according to the modern practice, having 'je,' 'ajouter,' etc. Either he or his printer, however, found it somewhat difficult always to remember the new letter, and we often find an i used instead. Exactly the same rule, u and v according to the old fashion, i and j according to the new, is to be found in another work published in the same year, the 'Dialogue de l'Ortografe e Prononciation Françoese' of Jacques Peletier du Mans, where we have 'je,' 'majesté,' 'déjà,' etc., but in this work the use is somewhat more consistent.

In most of the works of the spelling reformers the changes proposed had been too numerous and elaborate, and had given to the print too great an air of oddity and extravagance for them to have much chance of success; but this cannot be said of the next work which we need notice, the 'Grammatica' of Pierre de la Ramée, or Ramus, first published in 1559. Though its author was later to propose most thorough-going reforms in the spelling of French, in this Latin grammar there were no departures from the current orthography save as regards the i and u, and the intrinsic importance of the work was sufficient easily to outweigh any slight strangeness which there might be in the use of these letters. It is not surprising that the authority of the writer and that of the printing-house of Wechel at Paris and Frankfurt, from which this and many of Ramus's other works issued, should together lead to the ultimate triumph of the new method.

Of the first edition of the 'Grammatica' I have been unable to see a copy, but so far as regards the

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

matters with which we are now dealing, it is said to be identical with the third, published in 1560 by Andreas Wechel at Paris. In this we have not only the modern use of i and j, u and v throughout, but a majuscule J and U[1] of approximately modern form. Indeed the only departure from the practice of to-day seems to be in the case of the italic *v*. Wechel uses the ordinary curled italic *v* for the consonantal sound initially, but probably disliking the appearance of the letter within a word, he substituted a roman v medially. He had no italic majuscule I, but used a roman letter instead.

The reform, although as we have seen earlier attempts towards it had been made, was at the time and generally afterwards associated with the name of Ramus,[2] the letters j and v being even called 'consonnes Ramistes,'[3] but Ramus himself does not seem to have claimed to be the inventor of the new system. Indeed his references to the matter, which are somewhat vague, point rather to Andreas Wechel, or some other printer, as the originator of the modern usage. Ramus does not indeed name him, but in his French grammar of 1562 he says with reference to the letter v, 'nous avons mis en latin vau suivant l'autorité de Varron

[1] The majuscule U employed by Wechel and other sixteenth-century printers resembles in form our u, but it is, nevertheless, I think, incorrect to regard it as being merely a lower-case u of a larger fount. When it is possible to compare a majuscule U with a true lower-case u of the same size, the letters will usually be found to differ slightly, the majuscule being as a rule somewhat broader.

[2] See, for example, the 'Monumentum' of Freigius [*c.* 1585], p. 24.

[3] 'Nouv. Biog. Générale,' art. Ramus.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

et de nos imprimeurs. La raison en est semblable en notre langue,'[1] and in his 'Scholae in liberales artes,' 1578, col. 29, l. 36, he says: 'Typographi vero nonnulli tacito consensu figuram vav consonae hanc v nempe, pro digamma illo Aeolico induxerunt.' Both these passages seem to attribute the change to the printers, but before 1562, at any rate, no printer in northern Europe seems regularly to have adopted the modern usage as regards v, nor does Wechel himself seem to have followed it in work earlier than Ramus' own 'Grammatica.'[2] The problem should be easily solved by those familiar with foreign printed books of the middle of the sixteenth century, but it is on the whole of little importance, for whether or no Ramus was the instigator of the change, it is certain that it was the weight of his name and the fact that the new system was from 1560 onwards regularly adhered to in his works which gave it its whole chance of success.

We need not follow the further progress of the change in continental printing. At first it is found chiefly in the works of Ramus and his followers, and it cannot be said to have made any great progress until towards the close of the century. From about 1620 it seems to have become the usual thing, but books may be found as late as the middle of the seventeenth century, in which the old practice is followed.

[1] 'Gramere,' p. 24. I do not follow Ramus' reformed spelling.

[2] The two books by Ramus which Wechel printed at Paris shortly before the 'Grammatica,' namely, the 'Ciceronianus' in 1557, and the 'Liber de Moribus Veterum Gallorum,' 1559, both conform throughout to the old practice as regards the letters under discussion.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

When we turn to the use by English printers of the letters under discussion we find a perplexing story. There seem to have been several attempts to introduce the modern usage, and before 1600 a good many books had appeared in which it was followed, but they are the work of a number of different printers, and seem to have little connection one with another. We cannot point to any particular men as active promoters of the new system, and even those printing houses from which were issued several works in which the letters in question had their modern values, seem generally to have returned again to the old practice. The reform, though one would think it ought to have attracted some attention, seems to have passed almost unnoticed, and there is, so far as I have seen, no single contemporary reference in any printer's preface or elsewhere to the change of style. We are, in fact left without other information about it than can be derived from the books themselves.

Long ago Herbert remarked that J. Banister's 'History of Man,' printed by John Day in 1578, was the first book wherein he had seen the v and j 'properly used,'[1] and I cannot learn that an earlier English example of the new practice has been found since. In this work we have on the title-page '*objurges*,' '*Privilegio*,' '*Majestatis*,' and the modern usage is similarly followed in some Latin quotations in the preliminary matter, and in a Latin letter on *1[v], in such words as 'Invidia,' 'livor,' 'ut,' etc. In the work itself, however, the old use is retained

[1] Ames, 'Typog. Antiq.,' ed. Herbert, 664 note.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

both in the English and in such Latin words as occur in it, *e.g.*, 'vena caua.'

In the 'History of Man' no italic v or j was used, but in another book printed in the same year, also by John Day, the 'Catechismus parvus pueris primum Latiné qui ediscatur, proponendus in scholis,' we have, according to Herbert,[1] the lower-case letters i and j, u and v, employed according to the modern usage both in roman and italic. It was, however, impossible, for want of the necessary type, to carry out the same rule in the majuscules in which the Creed, Commandments, etc., are printed, and a lower case j or u are consequently substituted for the upper-case letters. In one respect the printer adhered to the older custom, for he has 'Filijs,' 'Officijs,' etc. A similar system seems to have been followed in a third book printed by Day, namely, the 'Christ Jesus Triumphant' of 1579. Herbert[2] has a note upon this work, from which it might be inferred that Day had now a majuscule J, but his language is somewhat obscure, and I have not been able to see a copy of the book.

The other productions of Day's press both at this time and later seem all to have followed the older practice as regards the letters in question, and we next meet with the modern usage in the work of Henry Middleton. In the years 1575-9 Andreas Wechel had printed at Frankfurt a Latin Old Testament in four parts, translated from the Hebrew and annotated by Emmanuel Tremellius and F. Junius. In this work he had throughout

[1] Ames, Typog. Antiq.,' ed. Herbert, p. 665.
[2] *op. cit.*, p. 668.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

conformed to the same rules with regard to j and v as he had followed in the 'Grammatica' of Ramus.[1] This Old Testament was reprinted in England by Henry Middleton in 1579-80, and a New Testament, also by Tremellius, was printed to range with it by Vautrollier. In Middleton's part we find the modern use of lower-case v and j throughout, both in roman and italic, and we also find a majuscule J and U in the roman founts in which the text and notes are printed. There is no italic *U*, a roman U being used instead. For the italic J the *J* is used.[2] The New Testament, printed by Vautrollier, follows the old practice, with the exception of a few words in the preliminary matter. Possibly this was printed by Middleton, whose device appears on the title-page of this part as of the others. The whole work was reprinted in 1581; again, the Old Testament, by Middleton, follows the modern usage, the New Testament, by Vautrollier, the old one. The same is the case with the edition of 1585, save that in this the New Testament, as well as the Old, is printed by Middleton. In the first few pages of this New Testament the printer seems to have made an attempt to follow the modern style, but it is soon abandoned, and Vautrollier's text is followed letter for letter. The fourth English edition of the work, however, printed by G. Bishop, R. Newbery, and R. Barker, in 1592-3, follows the new practice throughout.

[1] He seems only to have had italic majuscules of U and J in one fount, a large one used in the preface to the second part of the book. Elsewhere roman majuscules are used instead.

[2] I am indebted to Mr. W. W. Greg for calling my attention to Middleton's practice in this Bible.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

Though we cannot give Middleton any particular credit for originality, as he was but following his copy letter for letter, he seems at any rate to have introduced the majuscule U and J into this country—unless, indeed, the latter had been used by Day before—and to that extent may be regarded as a pioneer. He does not, however, seem to have made as much use of the new letters as we might have expected and in most of his later work he reverts to the old system. I have indeed only come across two later works of his in which the modern practice is followed, namely, the 'Epistola de Dialectica P. Rami' of William Temple in 1582, and the 'Animadversiones in Dialecticam P. Rami' of J. Piscator, 1583. These had, of course, a special claim on the new method as being concerned with Ramus, and we find it also followed in the 'P. Rami Dialecticae Libri Duo, Scholiis G. Tempelli Illustrati,' printed at Cambridge by T. Thomas in 1584.[1]

The next printers to take up the reform seem to have been Ninian Newton and Arnold Hatfield, who in 1584 printed two works for John Wight, namely, Edmund Bunny's 'Sceptre of Judah,' and the same writer's edition of R. Parsons' 'Book of Christian Exercise,' together with his own 'Treatise of Pacification.' Both these works, so far as the lower-case letters are concerned, follow the modern

[1] In the Latin-English Dictionary which Thomas compiled there is some attempt to discriminate between u and v, and sometimes between i and j, at any rate in the editions of 1592 and 1596, printed by Legate. I have not seen that which Thomas himself printed. His 'Grammatice Latine . . . liber secundus,' 1587, may perhaps also follow the modern style, see title in 'Typog. Antiq.,' ed. Herbert, p. 1418.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

practice, but the printers evidently had no J or U. In another edition of the 'Book of Christian Exercise,' printed for Wight by J. Jackson and E. Bollifant in 1586, i and j, u and v, are, according to Herbert, 'properly used' in the roman, but not in the italic. This edition I have not seen.

Probably from this time onwards there was year by year a small production of books in which the rules of Ramus or Wechel were conformed to, but the next examples that I have seen date from three years later. They are the work of Jackson and Bollifant who, as we have seen, had already printed in this style. The first is Richard Bancroft's 'Sermon' of 9th February, 1588-9, printed soon after the date of preaching, by E. B., presumably Bollifant, for G. Seton. In this work the modern usage is followed throughout in lower case, but there is again no J or U. The same may be said of the second edition of La Primaudaye's 'French Academy,' translated by T. B., which was published in this year by G. Bishop, without printer's name. The earlier edition (1586), printed by Bollifant, had followed the old practice throughout.

A third book published in 1589 is J. Lea's 'Answer to the Untruths published and printed in Spain in glory of their supposed victory,' printed by J. Jackson for T. Cadman. Jackson had still no italic *j*, and used roman instead, but otherwise in the lower case he followed the modern practice exactly. Apart from the edition of Parsons' 'Book of Christian Exercise,' 1586, I have not been able to find the modern system in any other work from Jackson's press.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

In this same year 1589 were published a group of Puritan pamphlets belonging to the Marprelate controversy, some being printed on the famous secret press, and others by Waldegrave at Rochelle or Edinburgh. In four of these, namely, Penry's 'View of Public Wants,' 'Some in his Colours,' and the 'Appellation,' and Martin Senior's 'Just Censure of Martin Junior, we find j used as it now is, *e.g.* 'Majestie,' 'subjects,' 'just, etc., but v and u according to the old usage—a strange departure from the practice of other printers of the time, who seem invariably to have treated j and v alike in this respect. The other tracts of the group conform in all respects to the old rule, and we may perhaps suppose that this use of j was the freak of some particular compositor, though there is some difficulty in reconciling the assumed dates and places of printing of the four tracts with their having been all set up by the same man.

From 1589 there seems to be a gap of some years before a fresh attempt was made by any London printer to bring about the reform. The only London works which I have met with between this date and the end of the century in which the new style is followed are the Latin Bible already mentioned and the third edition of La Primaudaye's 'French Academy,' 1594. In this the roman v and j, U and J, are used as at present, but roman j and J are substituted for italic ones. It may be remarked, as an instance of the little headway which the reform was making at this time, that in the second part of the 'French Academy,' published together with the third edition of the first part, the

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

old practice is adhered to, as it is also in the case of the third part published in 1601.

While, however, the old practice seems to have had the upper hand in London, a curious modification of the new was being tried at Oxford. In the year 1587 Joseph Barnes had there printed an edition of the 'Sum of Christian Religion' of Z. Ursinus, in which the old system was followed throughout. In reprinting this work, however, in 1589, he introduced a curious variation in the use of v. He still kept it in all cases as an initial letter, printing 'vs,' 'vntil,' etc., but medially used either u or v according as the letter represents a vowel or a consonant: thus we have 'vniustly,' 'avoid,' 'even,' etc. In the case of i he follows the old practice.

In the next year he took a further step forward, for in his 'Libellus Rogeri Baconi . . . de retardandis senectutis accidentibus,' 1590, we find j used according to the modern fashion in such words as 'ejus' and 'injicere,' though he still retains the old 'alijs,' 'judicijs,' etc. As regards u and v, the same mixture of systems is followed as in the 'Sum of Christian Religion,' 1589, and we have 'movere,' 'vnus,' etc. Barnes did not use his new system in many English books, nor in by any means all of his Latin ones, though he did not entirely abandon it. We find it later at London in the work of Valentine Symmes, who in 1605 followed it in two books, 'The School of Slovenry,' a translation of Dedekind's 'Grobianus,' and the 'Treatise of Spectres,' translated from P. le Loyer. Symmes prints, for example, 'vse,'

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

'abuse,' 'advise.' With regard to i he seems to follow the old practice, though occasionally a j appears. Save in the work of Barnes and Symmes I have come across no other instances of this insistance on the initial v.[1]

The only other work which I need mention lies indeed somewhat outside the limit of date fixed, but is important as being—so far at least as I can learn—the first folio volume in English to employ the new method, namely, Philemon Holland's translation of Plutarch's 'Moralia,' printed in 1603 by Arnold Hatfield. In this we find the modern practice followed throughout, at first, it is true, with a certain number of accidental lapses, but towards the end with great consistency. In the final portion of the book we have majuscule I and J regularly distinguished both in roman and italics. The roman majuscule U is used in most sizes of type except the largest, but the printer seems to have had no italic *U*, nor had he in the type in which the text is printed an italic *j*.

After this date the new practice seems to have spread more and more, though it was not until about 1630 that it became the normal one. A reprint of an earlier work published after that date will generally substitute the modern usage for the old, though there are still exceptions. Sometimes the two spellings are mixed, as they are in Hey-

[1] Certain spellings in the description of the verses 'In Catilinarias proditiones ac proditores domesticos,' 1586, given in the 'Typographical Antiquities,' suggest that this work may offer an earlier example of Barnes's mixed style as regards u and v; but I have not seen a copy of the book, and in such points as this the most accurate transcribers are likely to err.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

wood's 'Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas,' 1637, where we find 'alive,' giue,' 'grieves,' 'deuours,' and the like, at first used indiscriminately, though as the book proceeds the modern practice gets the upper hand. In respect of the majuscules the old spelling is retained throughout. Such mixtures are common at the date.

There are several subsidiary points in the history of these letters which seem to call for investigation, but this paper is long enough already, and in any case I fear that I could do little more than propound queries for others to solve. One would like, for example, to know when j and v first came to be admitted into the alphabet as separate and distinct letters, and how they came to have the names by which they are at present known. As regards the latter point, the evidence of rimes and puns shows clearly that in the Elizabethan period the letter V was called 'you,' and the fact that J often stands for the pronoun I seems to indicate that our present name for the vowel symbol served alike for both letters.[1] Some interesting remarks bearing upon the subject are to be found in A. Hume's 'Orthography and Congruity of the British Tongue,' written *c.* 1620, where, speaking of the letters under discussion he says:

[1] See Gascoigne's 'Council to B. Withipoll' ('Works,' ed. Hazlitt, i., 376), where 'three double *Vs*' rimes with 'stewes.' Also Day's 'Humour out of Breath,' 1608, G 2 (IV., iii.): '*Ass*[*istance*]. How now? who calls? *Hort*[*ensio*]. Why saucie knaue tis J. *Ass.* You, what you? *Hort.* A single *V*, I came in double, but I thanke them, they are gone out, and left me here a single— *Ass.* Foole, and so I leaue you.'

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015

'Heerfoer, for distinctiones of both sound and symbol, I wold commend the symbol and name of i and u to the vowel sound; as, indifferent, unthankful; the symbols of j and v to the latin consonants, and their names to be jod and vau;[1] as, vain jestes; and the symboles y and w to our English soundes, and their names to be ye and we, or yod and wau; as, yonder, wel, yallow, wool.'[2]

Elsewhere, in reference to the teaching of the alphabet in schools, he remarks:

'I would wish . . . the masters teaching their puples to . . . name w not double u, nor v single u, as now they doe; but the last vau or ve, and the first wau or we; and j, for difference of the voual i, written with a long tail, I wold wish to be called jod or je.'[3]

From these passages it seems clear that the modern names for these letters had not yet come into use. Whether Hume himself had anything to do with their introduction I cannot say.

R. B. McKerrow.

[1] The Hebrew names by which Ramus and other spelling reformers generally referred to them; *cf.* Ramus, 'Grammaticæ libri quatuor,' 1560, pp. 9, 10.

[2] Hume's 'Orthography,' etc., ed. Wheatley (E.E.T.S.), p. 13.

[3] *op. cit.*, p. 16.

Downloaded from http://library.oxfordjournals.org/ at New York University on May 21, 2015