

Writing by some "very legible shorthand rithn three times as fast as ordinary long-hand." Dr Mackay givs good reasons for amendment. He is a hard but fair hitter.

MOTT'S PHONOLOGY AND PHONOTYPE, a Treatis on English Sounds, with a Distinct Letter for each, by John M. Mott, fonetic publisher, Chicago. Paper, 160 pages 8vo, 25 cents.

This has about 100 pages of mater, the others being a face-to-face reproduction in New Speling with 24 consonants and 8 vowel-pairs distinguisht by a circumflex (as *i*, *i*, *ê*, *e*, *â*, *a*, *ô*, *o*, *û*, *u*, etc.) thruout. It is dedicated to scool teachers, and is likely to prove a useful tool for clas purposes and for home use. As to orthoepy, a crucial point, vagaries ar not indulged in. Such work then is necessarily eclectic. At least one (it is claimd) of the standard dictionaries justifies evry pronunciation. It is questionabl if Funk & Wagnalls dictionaries realy allow "bilivur" for *believer*. The first sylabl is markt by a brev under under it, the last by a turnd brev; now

The mark *~* under an unaccented vowel indicates that in colloquial use the vowel varies toard *i* in pity. The mark *~* under a vowel indicates that in colloquial use the sound varies toard *u* in but, burn—Key to Pronunc'n, p. xx. Becaus a vowel *tends* to weak *i* (our *i*) or weak *ə* (our *ə*) in colouquy, does that warrant such wholesale change of *e* to *i* or *u*?—especialy as good authorities ar quoted (pp. 38 to 43) in favor of "careful, formal speech . . . in preference to quik, careles, slurring pronounc'n herd in colloquial utterance." Each sound is described and folod by a wordlist. Six new consonants ar uzed. Mott wud allow comon digraf substitutes for them; this with removal of circumflexes (except *i*, *ê*) leavs a rational New Speling of posibl acceptance by moderats. This is a special merit in Mr M's work: as redy extension or contraction as a telescope, fairly-ful fonetics or New Sp. "while yu wait." The diferentials of *c*, *s*, *z*, ar like coresponding ones in Bell's World English, but beter becaus on top in line of vision. *Z*'s diferential shud begin *z*. *D* and *t* hav diferentials (for *ð*, *th*) not deserving continuance. Altogether we hav a treatis on orthoepy in aproximat New Sp. "Acnelejments" on p. 129 go to sho that it is largely a consultativ product of the Chicago scool of reformers.

NEOHELLENIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, Three Lectures at Oxford, by Platon E. Drakoules. Paper, viii + 70 pages 12mo B. H. Blackwell, Oxford.

Neohellenic or modern Greek, miscalld Romaic, is, according to this nativ of old Ithaka, not a desendant of Attic or clasic Greek, but of the Greek of Alexandria (a meeting-place for the spirits of Palestine, Egypt, India and Greece) into which the Scvaty translated the Old Testament (3d

cent. B. C.) It is not and never has been a ded language. Koraês (= Coraïs, 1748 to 1833) establisht its literary form—a remarkabl solution, to which we hope to recur, of a problem like one in our own tung. We rite and print Tudor-English of the 16th century (cradled in the eastern midland counties), but speak British-American of the 20th. Our paralel problem is to reconcile these in a harmonios resultant of the varios literary forces at work.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE FUTURE.

[Last year, before the British Aso'n, Italian's claims as a world-speech wer urged, becaus its use wud not stir up international jelosies and its gramar and vocabulary ar easy. Its mother-Latin and, before that, Greek wer world-tungs in the then known western world. The claims of Dr Zamenhof's Esperanto ar pusht by Mr Stead in his Review of Rev. in and after December.—Ed.]

Ther ar equally valid objections to German, French, Greek, Chinese, Turkish, Russian, Spanish or English. This language of the future must be the one that combines all qualities of the strongest languages of the ages, and none that we no of, not French, not German, not Spanish, nor even English, can compare with American, spoken by 70,000,000 Germans, Spanish, French, Italians, Russians and English, all of whom gladly, hapily and unresentfully accept as their own the free and independent language that we delight to uze, a language symbolic of our citizenship. Any good word from any source finds acceptance in and cordial welcome to our alredy rich vocabulary. It is a language of asimilation; and just as our citizenship is composit, a survival of all that is fittest in two hemisferes, so is our language a wel constructed organic thing that suffices for all the needs of man past, presnt and future. Then let us hear no more of Volapük, German, Italian, French or English. Ther is but one tung, American pure and undefiled, easy to lern, sometimes too easy to speak, always significant, vigoros and impressiv.—Editor of *Harpers Weekly* (25th Oct., 1902.)

MISUSE OF PRIMARY VOWELS.

In New Speling primary vowels shud not ocur in weak sylabls, as in them vowels tend toard and comonly reach secondary or weak forms. Primary ones require medium to strong stres. Conversely, a primary shows medium to strong stres, guiding the reader and suplying an admitted deficiency in orthografy as compared with orthoepy. Lately we hav seen "partikyulār" for *particular*. Now *ā* has maximum vowel latitude. At mc *ˆ*, secondary a or o (*ˆ* or *˚* in colouquy) wu . be herd, according to which vowel-syster the speaker uzes.