Miles and Milestones (6th S. i. 17, 185).—The mile is not an original English or Teutonic measure of length, but was borrowed from the Romans, with a considerable amount of latitude in its application. All our native land measures start with the perch. This has been fixed by statute at 5½ yards, but originally it differed in various parts of the country. The Lancashire perch was 7½ yards, the Cheshire perch 8 yards, the Irish perch 7 yards. Forty of these on end constituted a "furrow-long," or furlong, and 8 furlongs were a mile. Taking the standard perch at 5½ yards, this makes the English mile 1,760 yards.

The acre of land was of universal application. All our native land measures start may account for the great variety in the length of the mile all over Europe, no two countries being alike in this respect, but all adopting some approximation, in name at least, to the Roman "mille passum." The mile was fixed at 1,760 yards by a statute of Elizabeth. In Ireland, however, where the perch of 7 yards had prevailed, the furlong was 260 yards, instead of 220 as in England, and the mile 1,960 yards, being to the English mile as 7 to 5½, which it continues to the present time. If I mistake not the old "lang Scots measure" was about the same length. Although the English statute mile has superseded all provincial measures, the square measures still vary, the Cheshire acre containing 10,240 square yards, the Lancashire acre 9,000, against 4,840, the statute acre. The diversity of the unit from which land measures start may account for the great variety in the length of the mile all over Europe, no two countries being alike in this respect, but all adopting some approximation, in name at least, to the Roman mile.

J. A. PICTRC.

Sandyknowe, Wavertree.

The Pronunciation of "Anthony" (6th S. i. 19, 123).—In pronunciation the h no doubt is properly silent, but may I, as an interested party, protest in your columns against the unfeeling remark of Dr. Kreiss, that "the h ought to be eliminated? I humbly submit that Anthony is the proper English form of the Roman name Antonius, and that the letter h has won for itself a prescriptive right to a place in the word by the continuous usage of centuries. I do not believe that the added h had anything to do with an imaginary Greek derivation or a Greek θ, nor do I think that Miss Yonge is right in attributing the inserted letter to Dutch influence. In the correspondence of James IV. of Scotland, A.D. 1505, letter vii. (written in Latin), the form Anthonius constantly occurs (see Royal Letters, Richard III., &c., Rolls Series, No. 24, vol. ii. p. 199).

ANTHONY L. MATHEW.

Oxford.

Curious Christian Names (5th S. x. 106, 196, 376; xi. 58, 77, 198; xii. 138, 237, 492; 6th S. i. 66, 125).—Ezekiel is not uncommon, but I have a neighbour here so called who is younger brother to an Ishmael. I have seen an entry in the baptismal register of St. Nicholas, Whitehaven, of "Jolly, son of Jolly and Ann Bacchus," and in that of Thornthwaite, Keswick, of "Crispin, son of Crispin Pharaoh." Again, in a Bethnal Green parish there appears, "Tobias, son of Tobias Philpot." I remember seeing in the Times, some thirty years ago, notice of a Hampstead incumbent's marriage to a lady of the name of Oozoolong. I saw, a few years since, at the village of Cadnam, New Forest, a man named Maher-Shelal-Hash-baz. Near the same village is a well-known roadside inn, yept the "Bell," and immediately opposite stands the "Dragon." Having seen them, I can answer for this not being apocryphal, though these are not Christian names.

C. M. C.

Somerset.