## MISCELLANEOUS.

## ORIGIN OF OUR NAMES.

Up to a certain point in the world's history the number of people was suf-ficiently small and communities were far enough apart to avoid confusion of single names, but as the population increased, and communication became more frequent and practicable, the supply of names was not sufficient to meet the demand, and the result was that Toms, Dicks and Harrys were in danger of becoming mixed up with one another. It was this condition of affairs which gave rise to the adoption of surnames, not only as a means of obviating the embarrassments occasioned by a multiplicity of similar names, but for the purpose of distinguishing families. Many years be-fore surnames were finally adopted the use of sobriquets had become custom ary—that is, names given to individuals as a special mark of distinguishment. These names were generally founded upon some personal trait or some incident in the life of the person, or re-ferred to the place of his rativity, as Richard the Lion Hearted, Edward Richard the Lion Hearted, Edward Longsharks, John Lackland, Judas Is-cariot. But these sobriquets applied only to the individuals and died with them, and did not, therefore, serve the purpose of family names.

It is impossible to determine definitely when surnames first came into existence, for, like nearly all human existence, for, like nearly all human customs, the adoption of family names was the result of circumstances, and was of slow and gracual growth; but it was probably somewhere in the neighborbood of the year one thousand that they were first officially recognized and

used to any extent. The term "surname" is supposed by some to be derived from the French surnem, meaning "overname," be surnem, meaning "over-name," be-cause a person's family name was for-merly written above instead of after the baptismal name. It is just as likely, however, that the term was originally "sirname" or "sire-name," as the first family names were these derived from the name of the father. Instead of referring to a man as John, the scn ol Jacob, in order to distinguish him from John, the son of David, or William, or Robert, as had long been customary, the appellation was shortened to John, Jacob's scn; and this, in turn, became simply John Jacobson, and all of the children and descendants of this particular Jacob thereafter bore the name of Jacobson. In the same manner the family names of Johnson, Davidson, Williamson, Robertson, Thomson, Lawrencescn, Peterson, Duncanson, Stephenson and others of a like kind came into existence. Many of the Scotch and Irish sur-

names originated in the same way; the word "mac" (son of) being plefixed 10 the name of the father, and from this source we have the McArthurs, Mac-Donalds, McHenrys, McMichaels and many more that will occur to the reader. The old Normans prefixed to the paternal name the word "fitz," probably a corruption of the French "fils," meaning son, and ircm them we have the names Fitzpatrick, Fitzgerald,

. 1

51 m<sup>4</sup> D

an stand

primitive custom of distinguishing a peron as the son of his father by the use of the word "ap." Thus, David, the son the of Howell, was known as David ap Howell. Very frequently, however, this was not a sufficient distinction, and it became necessary to add the names of the grandfather and great grandfather, and sometimes several ancestors be-yond, so that an individual carried his pedigree in his name. It was, therefore, not unusual to hear such combinations as Evan ap Rice ap David ap Adam ap Roger, and so on to the seventh and eighth generation back.

A story is related of an Englishman who, riding among the mountains one dark night, heard cries of distress issu-ing from a deep ravine. "Help, master, help!" came a voice from below. "Who are you?" asked the traveler, peering in to the darkness. "Jenkin ap John ap Robert ap William ap Richard ap Owen," replied the voice. "Lazy fel-lows that ye be," cried the Englishman, setting spurs to his horse, "to lie a-toll-ing in that ditch, half a dozen of yet Why in the name of common sense don't we belo one another out?" help!" came a voice from below. "Who don't ye help one another out?'

To this curious custom, however, we are indebted for the names of Fugh, Pritchard, Powell and Price, which are simply modifications of ap Hug Richard, ap Howell and ap Rice. Hugh ap w hen the Welsh finally adopted a simpler system of patronymics they made use of the paternal name in the possessive case. Thus, Griffith, the son of Robert, instead of being called Griffith Robert son, was known as Griffith Robert'sthe son being understood. The possessive form was soon abandoned, how-ever, and the sunname became reduced to the simple one of Griffith Roberts Many of our most familiar names are derived from this source; and we are at once reminded of Williams, Hughes, Richards, Andrews, Harris (Harry's), Adams, Phillips, Owens, Rogers, How-ells, Daniels, Reynolds, Matthews. Jen-kins, Edwards and our old friend Jones, which is marking a modification of the second is merely a modification of which John's.

John's. In times gone by nearly every name had its corresponding nickname or diminutive, just as today we still have our Dick, Jack, Billy, Frank and Hatry. Many of these nicknames and nursery forms were also drawn upon for sur names, so that a single name was olttimes the source of half a dczen different cognomens. Thus, from John, we not only have Jones and Johnson, but Jenkins, Jenkin, Jennings, Jackson, Janson and Hanson. From Arthur, we have McArty, A'kins and Atkinson From Robert we have Roberts, Robert-son, Robinson, Robson, Dobson, Hobbs and Hobbson. Dennis is responsible for Dennison and Tennyson. Hawkins, Harris and Harrison come from Henry. Richard has given us, in addition to Rich-ards and Richardson, Dick, Dickens, Dixon and Dickinson Anderson and Henderson are derivatives of Andrews, and to William we are indebted for Wilson, Willis, Willis, Nilkes, Bilson, Wilkins, Wilkinson, Willitson Wilcox, Willett, Willard and Billings, besides Williams and Williamson.

one of the more common early names that is not now borne by some family. In addition to the many familiar ones which will at once come to the mind of the reader—as Thomas, George, James, Owen, Henry, Francis, Charles, Lewis —there are several others which may, perhaps, not be recognized as baptismal names, by reason of the fact that their use as such has to a large evicet being use as such has, to a large extent, been abandoned, and they are now generally regarded as family names only; among these are Reynold, Ellis, Godwin, Goodwin, Randal, Rice, Sampson, Morgan, Martin, Giles, Cuthbert, Baldwin, Bry-ant, Barnard, Howell, Arnoid, Rupert and Meredith.

In addition to thus immortalizing their Christian names, our ancestors have left to the world an undying record of their trades and occupations in the shape of another class of family names, the foremost among which is the abundant one of Smith. Some of the members of this numerous family have, however, sought for a different and more ancient origin, than that represented by a village smithy, and to this end they have convinced themselves that they are the direct descendants of Shem, the son of Noah and the father of the Shemites, whose progeny through the exercise of some graceful ortho-graphical jugglery, became transformed into Smith in the following manner: Shem, Shemite, Shemit, Shimit Smith.

At the time of the adoption of sur-names every artisan whose work required the striking of blows on metalwas known as a smither or smith, aod the comunity, therefore, had its black-smith, whitesmith, goldsmith, silver-smith, arrowsmith and several others of smith, altrowsmith and several others of the same character. The number of Smiths at the present day may, there-tore, be readily accounted tor, when we remember that each of the different kinds of smiths was as much entitled to the use of his trade name for a cognomenas any other artisan. John, the black-smith and John, the coppersmith, were both known as John, the smith, an ap-pellation which naturally resolved itself into the family name of John Smith. In the same way Peter, the Carpenter be-came Peter Carpenter; and John the miller, was the founder of the family of Miller. In this manner the various trades and callings became the source trades and callings became the source of surnames, and are to this day repre-sented in those of Baker, Shoemaker, Tyler, Chandler, Mason, Cutler, Carter, Sadler, Slater, Butcher, Draper, Thatch-er. Fletcher (arrowmaker), Hooper, Sadier, Slater, Bucher, Draper, Thatch-er, Fletcher (arrowmaker), Hooper, Cheeseman, Turner, Joiner, Cooper, Gilder, Mercer, Skinner, Coleman, Sawyer, Tanner, Spicer, Cook, Sutor (shoemaker), Miner, Driver, Weaver, Gardner, Merchant, Porter, Wainwright, Taylor, Shepherd, Glover and a num-ber of others ber of others.

Such names as Hall, Stair, Garret, Kitchen, Chambers, also record the occupations of our forefathers, who, in these cases, were engaged in the households of the nobility and had charge of such apartments as the names suggest. Others again held higher offices, and from them we have the surnames, Page, Butler, Proctor, Forester, Steward (and its modified forms of Stewart and Stuart), Bailey, Fowler, and Woodward and Hayward, the keepers, respectively of the forest and cattle.

Fitzsimmons (son of Simon). Until within a comparatively recent time the Welsh people adhered to the