7.

MUSIC IN COMMON THINGS.

PART FOURTH.

MUSIC IN SPEECH

AND

SPEECH IN MUSIC

TWO LECTURES BY

THE EUING LECTURER ON MUSIC,

ANDERSONIAN UNIVERSITY, GLASGOW.

DELIVERED DURING THE SESSIONS 1868-9-70.

Semper sane mihi vehementer, illud Chrysostomi placuit; "Fundamentum nostrae philosophiae esse humilitatem." Magis etiamnum illud Augustini. "Quemadmodum inquit, Rhetor ille rogatus. Quid primum esset in eloquentiae "preceptis? Respondit *Pronunciationem;* quid secundum? *Pronunciationem:* "quid tertium? *Pronunciationem.*"—CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, BOOK II., SEC. XI.

GLASGOW:
DAVID BRYCE & SON, BUCHANAN STREET.
GEORGE GALLIE, BUCHANAN STREET.
R. DONALDSON, ST. VINCENT STREET.

LONDON:
THE TONIC SOL-FA AGENCY, 8 WARWICK LANE, E.C.

1870

MUSIC IN COMMON THINGS.

PART FOURTH.

MUSIC IN SPEECH

AND

SPEECH IN MUSIC.

TWO LECTURES BY

THE EUING LECTURER ON MUSIC,

ANDERSONIAN UNIVERSITY, GLASGOW.

DELIVERED DURING THE SESSIONS 1868-9-70.

Semper sane mihi vehementer, illud Chrysostomi placuit; "Fundamentum nostrae philosophiae esse humilitatem." Magis etiamnum illud Augustini. "Quemadmodum inquit, Rhetor ille rogatus. Quid primum esset in eloquentiae "preceptis? Respondit *Pronunciationem;* quid secundum? *Pronunciationem;* "quid tertium? *Pronunciationem.*"—CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, BOOK II., SEC. XI.

GLASGOW:

DAVID BRYCE & SON, BUCHANAN STREET.
GEORGE GALLIE, BUCHANAN STREET.
R. DONALDSON, ST. VINCENT STREET.

LONDON:

THE TONIC SOL-FA AGENCY, 8 WARWICK LANE, E.C

1870.

TO THE

REV. JOHN CURWEN,

WHOSE METHOD OF TEACHING VOCAL MUSIC HAS FULLY DEMONSTRATED
THE GREAT PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH ALONE IT CAN BE TAUGHT;
AND WHOSE METHOD OF NOTATION
SUPPLIES THE SIMPLE, TRUE, AND PERFECT MEANS OF EXPRESSING
ALIKE THE SINGING AND THE SPEAKING VOICE;

These Pages

ARE RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED BY

THE LECTURER.

PREFACE.

THE Notation of the VOICE OF SPEECH has hitherto been considered an impossibility.

The most recent treatise upon the subject (Mr Hullah on The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice, London, 1870), states at page 49, that "Attempts have been repeatedly made to *note* the inflections of the speaking voice; but they have necessarily proved altogether unavailing in reference to sounds so vague and so fleeting."

The impossibility will, I believe, be found to exist not in the *voice*, but in the *notation*, by which all such attempts have hitherto been made.

Certainly it is impossible to note the voice of speech in the ordinary Stave Notation.

First, because of its radical imperfections; secondly, because of its cumbrous complications; but chiefly because nothing can be written upon the stave at all till the cleff and signature of the key are added to it—in other words, till the pitch is fixed.

In a paper recently read by Mr. A. J. Ellis, F.R.S., before the Society of Arts, he remarked regarding this notation that "It is ill adapted even to the present fingerboard and tuning of the piano and organ. But for singing it presents such difficulties that amateur singers at sight were practically unknown. It also presents great difficulties in the theory of harmony, while it is helpless to represent just intonation."

Mr. Hullah in his treatise goes on to state that "Possibly something akin to the *Neuma* Notation of the middle ages might be devised which would serve to *remind* the reader as that did the singer—of inflections, with which he had already been made acquainted. But it is idle to hope for a notation which should enable two skilled speakers—as musical notation will enable two skilled singers—to declaim without previous concert a given passage with the selfsame varieties of time and tune."

I believe that whatever can be done for the singing voice, can also be done for the speaking voice. But it must be observed

that the grand stumbling-block in the way of noting the latter has ever been the endeavour to reduce it to the pitch of the various keys of music. Here lies the impossibility—for in speaking, voices are as various in pitch as they are in character; and every voice has within its range a constant variety of pitch; which by no possibility can be represented on any stave, or by any number of key signatures.

Hence the speaking voice must be noted without any regard to fixed pitch—and solely by the principle of key relationship.

The music master of the eleventh century, who first demonstrated the principles by which alone vocal music can be successfully taught, left us as the means of doing so his invention (however imperfectly developed) of both the Stave and the Sol-fa Notations.

The whole labours of Guido Arretini are founded upon the great fact of the Tonic; which involves the principle that "ALL KEYS OF MUSIC ARE NATURAL TO THE HUMAN VOICE." This it is which enables us to *read* music.

The music master of the nineteenth century has given to the world the hitherto unknown boon: a notation not only perfect in its simplicity, but perfect also in scientific truthfulness, and in its adaptation to the notation of music.

He also has enunciated the second great principle in music, "THAT EVERY SOUND IN THE SCALE HAS ITS OWN PECULIAR AND CHARACTERISTIC MENTAL EFFECT." This it is which enables us to *write* music, and it will be found equally applicable to the writing or notation of speech.

For further elucidation of these truths, the reader is respectfully referred to the following pages, which contain two lectures upon the subject addressed to the students of the Andersonian University during the Sessions 1868-9-1870.

Their being printed as they were spoken will, it is hoped, be considered as a sufficient apology for any peculiarity in style, or abruptness in the mode of statement. It was thought better not to alter them in any way, but to present them to the reader just as they were delivered, in the belief that thus they might prove more generally interesting and serviceable.

C. B.

ANDERSONIAN UNIVERSITY,
GLASGOW, *November, 1870.*

MUSIC IN SPEECH,

AND

SPEECH IN MUSIC.

Speech is man's prerogative.

The essential parts of speech are *Pronunciation* and *Articulation.*

These are the *Primary* elements of speech.

The *Secondary* elements are—

Intonation,—By which I mean the pitch of sound, or the tones in which we speak.

Time.—The rhythm or measure we use in speaking.

Accent.—The force of syllables in words, or of feet in time.

Emphasis.—The force of voice, or stress given to particular syllables in a word, or words in a sentence, so as to bring out the meaning we wish to express.

Expression is to speech what light and shade are to a picture—contrasting sentence with sentence—giving character to our utterance, suited to the subject or sentiment.

In connection with Music, Speech comes before us in a twofold aspect—

Music in Speech, and

Speech in Music,

we shall consider these shortly in order.

The use of the musical scale in the speaking voice, is a subject which, so far as I can learn, seems never to have been fully apprehended.

The subject is to a great extent quite new, and as I have been gradually finding out its principles, and been endeavouring to systematise them, I shall be thankful for all help, and hope for fair and lenient criticism.

Various works on the human voice and elocution refer to the matter in general terms—such as the pitch and range of the voice in speaking—the use of rising or falling inflections; but I am not aware that the fact of the use of the diatonic scale by the *Speaking Voice*, being identical with the use of it by the *Singing Voice*, has ever been fully demonstrated. This is the object of my paper.

Pronunciation we have to a large extent in common with lower animals.

In *Articulation* they share to but a limited extent.

Pronunciation has reference to the vowel sounds in speech.

Articulation to the consonants.

Four Vowels of the alphabet express all the simple sounds by which we can speak or sing. These are e a o u or oo, and may be used in their long or short, open, broad, or shut sounds.

They are the basis of *Pronunciation*. Without a vowel no syllable can be formed.

ē long as in "me."
ĕ short „ "pin" (Latin).
ê open „ "met."
ë broad as in the Greek η "eta."
ā long as in "age."
ă short „ "man."
â open „ "father."
ä broad „ "call."
ō long „ "no."
ŏ short „ "not."
ö broad and open, generally used as a dipthong aw, au, ou,
ū long as in "full."
ŭ short as in "but."

In addition to these we have the compound vowels—

ī long as in "time."
ū long „ "use."
ȳ long „ "try;"

and *w* or *oo*, always used before another vowel or aspirate, or as a dipthong.

Consonants are the basis of *Articulation*, but as their name implies, they are merely transitional sounds, which can only be used along with vowel sounds.

They are the means by which words and sentences are formed, so that our thoughts and sentiments are made intelligible to others.

They may be reduced to the following forms:—

B is the soft, and *P* the hard form } of the same sound.
D is the soft, and
T the hard sound.
C hard as in call, and
K are the same sound.
Q is the same sound in a compound form, being always followed by *ē-oo—kē-oo.*
G as in go is the soft form of the same sound.
G as in George, and *J* are the same sound. } Not simple but compound *D J.*
F is hard, and
V the soft sound.
H is an aspirate or breathing.
L M N are separate simple sounds.
R is a rolling sound.
S the hard, and *C* as in civil, } are the same sound, of which
Z is the soft form.
X is compounded of *K S*, and
W & Y have been already treated as compound vowels.

The vowels from short u to short a are naturally used for the lower sounds of the scale, and from long a to long e for the upper.

If we sound in a natural tone of voice the vowels in succession upwards, from short u to long e, we shall find that we gradually ascend the musical scale throughout the whole octave, and, perhaps, to a still higher range.

Long i when sounded slowly, we find to be composed of short a and long e *ă ē*, in sounding which, we naturally rise a major third *d : m ;* we cannot pronounce this compound sound otherwise, than by the glide of a musical interval.

So in pronouncing the English long u, we find it composed of *ē, oo*, in pronouncing which slowly, we naturally glide downwards a major third | *m : d.*

While in sounding the vowel y, we find it is a triple compound *oo, ă ē*, in sounding which, slowly and naturally, we must use the first three tones of the scale, | *d : r : m* | in a glide.

This is the highest range that I know to be necessary in pronouncing any single syllable, and is the most complicated sound I am aware of, excepting one to be found on page 20, and the

the mew of the cat whose cry is *: m ē | ă : o : oo*, which embraces all the four vowel sounds; gliding over a third or a fifth of the scale, or even the whole octave, according to her humour.

Her usual cry is, I think, *m r m fe s*, or *l s l t d'*, in a gradual glide.

I must here refer to the various vowel sounds not known to the English language, but constantly used in Scotch, French, German, Spanish, Italian, and other languages, such as broad *ë*, and the various forms of the vowel *u*.

The Scotch sounds in "puir cretur" are unpronouncable to an English tongue, while the Gaelic, Laogh, or Laoidh, is a perfect Shibboleth even to a Lowland Scotch one.

Bailie Nicol Jarvie's proverb, "It's nae mair ferlie to hear a lassie greet, than to see a guse gang barefit," gives us in "ferlie" a good example of the broad *ë*, and in guse and barefit, two characteristic sounds of *u*.

The French feu, German Goëthe, Scotch cuif, shoon, give us further examples of the peculiarity of this vowel sound.

The contrast of two sounds of the same vowel in a sentence is sometimes very effective, as in the Newhaven Fishwife's cry,

Cal - ler - a - eu	Cal - ler - a - oo
| s : — . l : s | r^1 : — :	| s : — m : s | d^1 : — : —

The two sounds of *u* are on different musical tones—one being upon the supertonic, the other on the tonic.

No better example of broad sounds of vowels can be given than in the dialogue between a worthy Scotch matron and a shopman, from whom she wished to purchase some woollen garment. Taking it up in her hands, she asked—*Q.* ä oo? *A.* ay ä oo. *Q.* ä æ oo? *A.* ou ay, ä æ oo. All wool? Yes; all wool. All one, or the same wool? Oh yes; all one wool.

Be it observed, this conversation was carried on without the use of a single consonant, and with the fewest words possible. It would be unintelligible, even to a Scotchman, except for the variety of intonation, or its musical tones. These we shall consider by and bye. (*See page* 14.)

W sounding *oo* is in itself a simple vowel, but in English is never used as such. Commencing a word it is commonly used in connection with another vowel, or with the aspirate h, as *when, where;* the vowel *oo* being heard before the aspirate. It is also

often silent as when commencing such words as "wrath," "wrong," "write," &c.

Commencing a syllable followed by another vowel, it always forms a compound sound, excepting when followed by the vowel *oo*—"We were walking with a woman." In the first four words the sounds are compound, forming a glide of the intervals of a major second or third, while in the last word "woman" the sound is a monotone, being merely the continuation of the same sound *oo oo*, as in "wool."

All dipthongs, in which the two vowels are sounded, require two tones of music; and all words in which two vowels follow each other, as separate syllables, require a musical tone for each, as "Laodicea," the music of which is

| m : r : d | r : — : d, *or* | m : r : m | r : — : d.

In the natural voice of speech, every simple vowel sound can be expressed upon one musical tone.

Every compound sound requires two or more tones properly to express it.

When one vowel follows another the music *glides* gradually from tone to tone; but when an articulated consonant intervenes the musical intervals are distinctly marked.

In a glide what we have to observe is the two extremes of the interval. In this continuous gliding the music of speech differs much from the music of singing, and renders it at first difficult for the ear to catch the exact tones; but observation and practice soon make it quite easy.

Ignorance of the natural laws and powers of the voice, and inattention to proper pronunciation and articulation in speech, are not only the cause of much ineffective and disagreeable speaking, but are also a fruitful source of injury to the voice, throat, and other organs of speech.

A good speech goes for nothing when the voice is not used in a plain, natural, and distinct manner.

No one speaking naturally will do so in a monotone—it becomes a drone or drawl, and shows a want of clear comprehension of, or of heart and interest in, the subject read or spoken

Many a fine discourse is lost in this way—turned into a sleeping potion by a weary drawl in its delivery. One is too often saddened by hearing much learning, research, and good matter thrown away through no other cause than the want of following nature and common sense in the utterance of it.

Dr. Rush of Philadelphia published, about 35 years ago, an elaborate treatise on the "Philosophy of the Human Voice." It shows that he grasped the subject in its general bearings, in so far as any one could do so, who did not thoroughly understand the musical scale. He uses generally a staff of 3 lines and 2 spaces, with a set of symbols like large commas with their tails turned up or down, to mark the rising or falling inflection.

His work, however, is so complex and elaborate, that it is difficult to follow out the details of his system.

The "Music of Nature," by William Gardiner, London, 1832, dedicated to Thomas Moore, is a most valuable and interesting treatise.

Though he has not detected the identity of the scale in the speaking and singing voices, he has come very near it.

He says (Chap III. p. 17) :—

"If we listen attentively we may hear the intervals of the 3d, 5th, and 8th in speaking; but they are so slightly glanced upon, and pass with such rapidity, that it requires a nice ear to detect them."

"The cries in the streets are invariably composed of these tones, and naturally speaking our voices are limited to these few notes. There is not a voice, however, stubborn, but what may be rendered sufficiently pliant to perform with accuracy the notes of the diatonic scale."

Mr. Gardiner evidently thought that this was an artistic or artificial acquirement, and seems never to have discovered the simple fact that the tones of the human voice, whether in speaking or singing, are the necessary and natural expression of the diatonic scale.

So also Mr. Melville Bell, whose researches in this department are well known, writes in 1852 :—

"The simple inflexions (of the voice) are capable of great variety, both in *radical pitch* and in *extent* of inflexion. The rise or fall may be made through any of the musical intervals, and with an almost endless variety of radical pitch. The following diagram shows a rise from a uniform pitch through each of the intervals within the octave."

The diagram referred to consists of eight parallel lines at the intervals of the tones of the scale, with a row of commas upon the lowest line or key note with tails turned upwards, extending to the various intervals of the scale from a semitone to the whole octave.

Mr. Bell adds, "Our *notation* of the inflexions represent *four* "*degrees*, which (without any attempt at musical accuracy) may

"be taken to correspond generally with the harmonic intervals of "the second, third, fifth, and octave."

Here also with regard to inflexions is an approximation to the truth, without detecting the principle which explains it in all its fulness of application.

The commonly accepted view of the matter seems to be, that while in the speaking voice occasional intervals of the scale may be heard, especially in inflexions and cadences, yet that the ordinary intervals of speech are smaller than the tones of the musical scale, and generally too minute to be detected or noted.

The position I assume is this—that next to the air we breathe, the musical scale is one of the commonest gifts we enjoy. We inhale a breath of fresh air as each second of time passes; we use the musical scale every time we employ the powers of speech. In other words, the tones and intervals of the diatonic scale are used by us in the speaking voice, as truly as in the singing voice.

This fact I must now proceed to demonstrate:—

In ordinary conversation we usually keep within the range of a major third, *do* to *me*, occasionally using the semitone te_1 *do* — when we have sad news to tell or are speaking mournfully, we fall to the la_1 or minor third below.

When we speak louder, or with more animation, we frequently rise to the fifth above, or *so* : and when we declaim or speak so as to be heard at a distance, we use the full range of the octave.

Sometimes, as in the case of a Highland minister addressing thousands upon a hill side, we hear a still wider range of voice, perhaps, from lower la_1 to upper re^1 — being an octave and a fourth ; but as this involves the use of the singing, or full chest voice, it belongs to a different department of the subject.

If speaking upon a monotone is a drone—speaking upon the variation of a single tone is a drawl.

Who does not remember the old familiar sound of the repeating of hymns in our school-boy days—word after word drawled out with painful carelessness—showing little comprehension of the lesson, and less love for it —

Oh! hap - py is the man who hears,
: d | r : r | r : r | r : r | r

In - struc - tion's warning voice ;
: r | r : r | r : r | d

And who ce - les - tial wisdom makes
: d | r : r | r : r | r : r | r
His ear - ly on - ly choice.
: d | r : r | r : r | d

The last line sometimes varied to

: d | r : r | m : r | d

Or, perhaps, we may have something a little more musical, as :

How doth the lit - tle bus - y bee
: r | m : m | m : r | m : m | m
Improve each shin - ing hour?
: m | m : m | r : d | r
And ga - thers hon - ey all the day
: r | m : m | m : r | m : m | r
From ev - ery open - ing flower.
: d | r : r | m : r | d

Or, perhaps, we may hear a little fellow reciting

John Gil - pin was a cit - izen
: r | m : m | r : r | d : d . d
Of cre - dit and re - nown;
: r | m : m | r : d | r
A trained band Cap - tain eke was he,
: d | r : r | r : d | r : d | r
Of fam - ous Lon - don town.
: d | r : r | m : r | d

One of my little boys often amuses me by declaiming John Gilpin, Æsop's fables in rhyme, &c., and I am much interested in observing the tones and cadences of his voice.

One evening lately he read Mary Howitt's poem of "The Garden"—

I had a garden when a child,
I kept it all in order;
'Twas full of flowers as it could be,
And London pride its border.

The intonation was as follows:—

: d | r : r | r : d | r : r | r
: r | d : t_1 | d : r | m : d |
: r | m : m | m : r | m : m | m
: m | r : d | t_1 : l_1 | s_1 : d |

This contains the elements of true melody—imitation, contrast, and reply—both in the theme and in the cadences; a fact to me the more striking, inasmuch as the little fellow, though seven years of age, has never been able to sing a single strain of a tune —any attempts at which that I have heard would lead me to suppose that he was destitute of musical gifts.

Observation shows that a fact like this, however unexpected, is nothing unusual. A well-known and most popular minister, who cannot tell one psalm tune from another, and who is utterly destitute of singing power, has at the same time so much variation in the tones of his voice, that no one who ever heard it can mistake, or forget it.

The wide range he passes over, and the remarkable cadences he uses, strike every one as being singularly unmusical; the cause is, that while he uses all the tones of the scale correctly, he does so in an *unmusical manner*—the effect being disagreeable to a musical ear. For example—

And so on to the end of the chap - ter.
: m | s : f : f . f | m : f . f | t_1 : — : d

The scale, instead of being, as some authorities tell us, a human invention (generally ascribed to Guido), is in reality the natural expression of the human voice. Any one observing the sounds of the voice of an infant who cannot speak a word, will find them all within the scale.

Lately watching a little one amusing itself, while lying in its cradle, by chattering little sounds in a half-crowing voice—I was struck by the cadences, two of which were—

: s | s : l.t | d^1
: f | s : l.t | d^1

So soon as an infant begins to lisp words—*pa pa, ma ma, ta ta*—its voice forms distinct intervals of the scale—

| r : d — | m : d — | s : d

showing how unnatural it is to speak words even of two syllables in a monotone.

The key to the philosophy of this subject is to be found in the characteristic mental effects of the different tones of the scale—*do, re, me*, are the usual tones of speech; *re* the rousing tone, is the natural speaking tone; *do* is the resolving tone, or tone of rest *me*, the gentle tone, is constantly used to give variety; *fa* is the

grave or solemn tone, and *so* is the bright one—the tone of motion or of inquiry—*so* asks a question, *do* answers and resolves it; *la* is the weeping or sad tone; *te*, when used in an accented manner, is the tone of surprise or petulance. When we get a start or are alarmed we use it. Fire! fire!! would certainly be cried—

$$\overset{<}{|\ t\ :\ -\ :\ d^1}\quad |\ \overset{<}{t\ :\ -\ -\ d^1}$$

In using the scale when speaking, we do so chiefly by diatonic motion. Intervals greater than a third are seldom used, except when we speak in a loud or excited manner, in which case larger intervals are freely used; but we commonly find a speaker passing through the range of the octave by diatonic motion.

Another peculiarity (which I have explained in a former lecture as the natural explanation of all transitions from key to key) is that the voice in a rising cadence naturally uses the upper tetrachord of the scale, involving the acute 7th | *s : l : t* | d^1, and in a falling cadence as naturally uses the lower tetrachord involving the 4th or grave 7th | *s : f* | *m : r* | *d :*

These general principles I shall illustrate by examples.

The Mus - i - cal Scale.
: d | d : r . m | d : —

Music in Speech and Speech in Mu - sic.
| d : t_1 : d | r : — : r | m : — : r | r : — : d.

Or, | m : r : m | s : — : s | s : — : m | r : — : d.

In asking and answering a question we use different cadences.

Did you nev - er see it? No, never.
| d : r | d : m | r : s | r : r. d.

The asker rises to the dominant or moving tone of the scale. The answerer resolves it on the tonic, or tone of rest.

The same words may ask or answer a question, merely by changing the music (*see note A, page* 28)—

Never? Never.
| r : s | r : d

Q. A' oo'? *A.* A' oo. *Q.* A' ae oo? *A.* A' ae oo.
: r | s : — | r : d : — : m | r : — : s | m : — | r : d —

In asking a friend, gently,

Where are you go - ing, Sir!
| d : r : m | m : r : d

we would speak within the range of a major third; but in calling authoritatively to a trespasser, we would use different tones, and the effect would be very different—

Where are you go - ing sir?
| d : r : m : | r : m : s

Mr. Cur - wen's ex-ten-ded mod-u - la - tor.
: r.d | t_1 : — | d : d | r : r | m : r | d : — . d

Whenever we use a word of four syllables, as modulator, we use the three accents of strong, medium, and soft, though in different orders of sequence as

Not - with-standing. | d : m | r : d

Nev-er - the - less. | d : r : m | d : —

Am - ia - bil - ity. | d : r . m | m : r . d

Mod - u - la - tor. | m : —, r | m : —. d

An - der - son - ian Un - i - ver - sity.
| m : r | m : fe.s | s : f | m : r.d

Or in better method,

| l : s | l : t.d^1 | $^{d'}$s : f | m : r.d

In the last we have the change of tetrachord, showing the acute seventh in rising, and the grave in falling.

Addressing an audience we would use different tones, as we require to be heard at a more limited or extended range.

La - dies and gen - tle - men.
| d : r : m | m : r : d
or, | m : fe : s | m : r : d
in better method, | l : t : d^1 | ^{1}m : r : d

Reading such a sentence as, "To be or not to be? That is the question," a schoolboy would read—

1. : d | r : r | r . r : r | f : r . r | d : d ||

A more intelligent reader would probably use—

2. : d | m : —. m | r : d. d | m : r . r | d : d ||

Speaking with a louder voice, so as to be heard by a larger audience, the cadences would be still more musical.

3. : d | s : — . s | m : r . d | r : m . r | d : d ||

4. Or perhaps, | s : m . r | d : d ||

The music would be raised on the accented syllable. Instead of the emphasis being laid upon the word *is* as in No. 3, it might be upon the word *that* as in No. 4, or the last word, *question*, might be emphasized, as—

5. : d | s : — . s | m : r . d | r : r . r | m : d ||

The intonation is constantly changed by the varied emphasis. Some speakers might still more vary it as follows :—

: d | s : — . s | m : r . d | m . f : — . r | m : d
or | s : r . f | m : d

How different are the musical readings of the following sentence?

A horse! a horse! My kingdom for a horse.

: r | t : : r | t : : r | m : r . d . r | t

or : s_1 | r : : s_1 | r : : s_1 | s : — . f : m . r | d

In the many treatises to be met with upon elocution and the human voice, though the musical scale is frequently referred to in connection with cadences, and the range of the voice; and though many rules are given for rising and falling inflections, no one of the authors seems to have detected the continuous and necessary use of the scale in the speaking voice, and the key it affords to the nature of these inflections, and to the cause of them.

So also, rhythm in speech has been the subject of many treatises, such as that of the Rev. Richard Roe of Dublin, published by the Royal Irish Society, 1823.

Here this subject is illustrated at length, and musical notes are used to indicate time, and rhythm in speech, to an extent far beyond what is necessary.

Examples are also given of the method by which musicians

adapted music to the rhythm of words, but, strange to say, Mr Roe never detected the constant employment of the musical scale in the tones of the speaking voice.

In a note, (page 191,) he comes very near it, and states a truth which he evidently did not understand, when he says, "the practice of music might, at all times, have assisted the ear in ascertaining the extent through which the voice rises or falls in the accents, or slides, of spoken language; but when Quinctilian says, *nec citra musicen, grammatica potest esse perfecta, cum ei de metris rhythmis que dicendum sit*, I cannot conceive how music, as it subsisted in his time, could promote the knowledge of these particulars."

Quinctilian was evidently aware of the identity of rhythm in speech and music; but neither the ancient, nor the modern author seems to have discovered that their identity extends also to intonation.

Mr. Roe's treatise is unnecessarily elaborate, as well as in some respects imperfect and erroneous; but it is interesting and well worthy of perusal.

He multiplies varieties of feet and measures so as much to complicate the subject. It appears to me that all the necessities of rhythm and time in speech as in music, can be met by the use of the simple accents—

strong | medium ¦ soft :

in all their varied applications to common, and triple time; say 2, 4, and 3 measure; and adapted to words, whether Spondaic, Pyrrhic, Trochaic, Iambic, Dactylic, or Anapaestic, with the Caesura.

In metre, of course, the feet are within narrow limits, and regular in their order; but in prose the time is necessarily broken, the feet come irregularly, and may be mixed up together in any order, sometimes in common, sometimes in triple time; but it will be always found that the possessor of a musical ear will so arrange words and form sentences, that they will close in satisfactory cadences; while speakers, deficient in a sense of rhythm, will use words devoid of true musical measure and cadence.

In this lies the great secret of effective or non-effective, pleasing or unpleasant, speaking.

The prose of Addison or Johnson flows like a stream, and can almost be scanned like blank verse, while such writers as Carlyle are characterised by such abruptness of style, and general defect in

rhythm, as to render the reading of them, easily or intelligently, extremely difficult.

The remarkable power of Dr. Guthrie's eloquence arises very much from the use he unconsciously makes of musical tones and cadences. He seems to say common things as no other man can. I have heard it alleged of him that he can make his audience laugh with one side of their faces, and weep with the other—so rapid are the transitions from gay to grave, and from sad to bright, in his eloquence.

The secret lies in his mastery of intonation and rhythm. Though I believe he is not musical as a singer, in speaking he uses musical tones not only in a musical manner, but in singular sympathy with the subject of his address. At one time his voice rapidly ranges over the bright and rousing tones of the scale, *do me so re*, then suddenly passing to the solemn *fa* or weeping *la* or changing from a major to a minor mode, he produces an effect which is quite wonderful.

No doubt the same was the cause of Whitefield's power of address. It was the secret of the effect of Wilberforce's eloquence. We are told that his voice was not strong, but it was sweet and musical; it calmed the noisy populace in the castle-yard of York; and when he addressed the House of Commons, however stormy or excited, the magic tones of his voice gave him an influence and power that seemed like oil cast upon the troubled waters.

The philosophy of good and effective speaking seems very much to consist in our using the natural tones of the voice in a natural manner.

Every phrase or sentence we utter has its musical construction, upon the correctness of which depends very much the meaning we convey.

The primary elements of Speech are Pronunciation and Articulation; the secondary elements are Intonation, Time or Rhythm, Accent, Emphasis, and Expression. Faulty Pronunciation, and imperfect or incorrect Articulation in utterance, always injure, and often render ridiculous, language, which, if properly spoken, would have been effective or even beautiful.

Defective speaking arises—*First*, from incorrect pronunciation; that is using one sound of a vowel for another, such as *a* long for *a* short, or *vice versa*—or substituting one vowel sound for another. as *a* for *e*, *i* for *o*, &c., &c.

For example, the article THE. This familiar word has two

sounds, long e and short e, and yet we seldom hear it purely pronounced. It is constantly perverted into broad e a or aw, or sounded like short u; indeed some of our modern orthoepists state that e in "the" is to be sounded like u in "but:" why it should be so sounded they give no reason, and I can see none, any more than that he, she, and me, should be treated in the same manner. The sound of e in "the" has been characterised as "the indefinite sound" of the vowel, but strict examination will show that in correct speaking or singing the indefiniteness arises from the shortness of the sound in rapid speaking, and not from any confusion of sounds. It has also been called "the obscure" sound, and certainly too commonly it is obscure enough. But in speaking, and still more markedly in singing, the more purely we can pronounce this vowel the more chaste and beautiful will be the effect. It is amazing how much the faulty pronounciation of this little word has done to vulgarize the speech and song, especially the church song of our country.

What vulgarism may we expect to see advocated next? * Perhaps that a final r would be a great improvement to all words ending in a—as Dianar, Mariar, and also that the prefix of an h would complete such words as hidear, Hemmar, &c. Such improvements may appear in our future grammars and dictionaries; and may be insisted upon as being correct, because they are sometimes used by the literary constellations, who star it in the provinces giving public readings.

Familiar examples of faulty pronounciation may be given in any number. Every district of our country has its own peculiarities, and no one can cast stones at his neighbour without soon finding out that he lives in a glass house.

One reverend D.D. of the old school commences worship in the forenoon by giving out the Hundredth Psawm.

A very fine young divine, of the lavender kid glove school, in the afternoon announces the Fëŭst Sĕmm.

---

* Since this lecture was read Mr. Hullah has supplied the required example in his work on "The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice," where at page 57 he says—"The natives of some parts of Great Britain still distinguish by a slight "guttural sound such words as *which* from *witch*, *whether* from *weather*, &c. "(excepting, however, a required distinction between *wholly* and *holy*), but the "practice is provincial, and would sit awkwardly on one not 'to the manner "born,' who adopted it in principle."

The practice of *not* distinguishing such words in speaking "*is a provincialism*," the centre of which will be found within range of the sound of Bow Bells.

So in the same way one authority sounds man mawn, another men.

Awsk,	ask,	esk.
Humm,	him,	heem.
Churrach,	church,	cheüch.
Würraship,	worship,	weüship.
Shups.	ships,	sheeps.
Forrum or förm,	form,	fawm.
Ruvver,	river,	reever.
Sun,	sin,	seen.
Stull	still,	steel.
Ut us	it is,	eet ees.
Burrads,	birds.	béüds.
Skyull,	skill,	skeel.
Doo,	due,	dyaou.
Grass,	grace,	gress.
Wull,	will,	weell.
Note,	not,	nut.
Come, coom,	command,	commaund.

And so on *ad infinitum*.

You, yow or yaou—do good, dou gowd—town, téün—goat, goët.

A common perversion of pronounciation in Scotland is to change long ā into broad ë, as in the Greek Βητα, so called from the bleating of a sheep.

same as sëme or sääme,
nation, nëtion, näätion,

and sometimes one's gravity is sorely tried by hearing the reader call the old dragon, either the old dräägen, or the old dragoon.

A Glasgow man calls oil, ile, and boil, bile—while an Irishman does the very opposite, fine is foine, old Ireland is ould Oireland, sir is surr, been is bin, and seen, sin, &c.

An Edinburgh man is at once detected by calling a fellow, fellee, Calcutta, Calcuttee, and his own beloved town, Edinburree.

But in this matter, which is of endless application, neither Englishman, Irishman, nor Scotchman, can first throw a stone, for all have their flagrant faults, and every separate county and district its vulgarisms and provincialisms.

A Londoner, for No, says në-oo; dáy, dā-eē; baby, bāē-bēe; cow, kē-ā-ō-oo. This last is very interesting, as it embraces the sounds of all the vowels—and in speaking, is, so far as we know unique. (*See page 7.*)

A *second* cause of faulty speaking arises from incorrect and

defective articulation, that is, from the improper use of consonants. Errors of this kind are as common as those of pronounciation, or the faulty use of vowels.

Every district has its own peculiarities, but unfortunately from the nature of the sounds it is impossible to describe them. Errors in the use of vowel sounds can generally be expressed in writing; but not so in consonants, for they are merely transitional sounds.

Faulty articulation arises sometimes from using the soft sound of the consonant for the hard, or the hard for the soft; sometimes from using a consonant where there should be none; or leaving out one which ought to be sounded. Also, from thickness or imperfection in utterance, as the North of England burr—the inability to sound the letter *r* in that district cannot be understood till it is heard—no one can write *run*, *rum*, *rusty*, as a Northumberland or Cumberland man speaks these words

The letter *r* is in England generally imperfectly pronounced, excepting always and curiously enough, when it occurs after final *a*, where it has no right to be heard at all.

We consequently find that voice trainers strive to get their pupils to exaggerate this sound, so that they too often acquire the vicious habit of doubling the syllable in which this consonant occurs.

I lately heard the line—

"Asunder burst the gates of brass," sung
"Assunderra burrast a tha gates of a burrass!"

On asking the singer how he got into such a vicious habit of pronounciation, he told me that he had been for twenty months under charge of a Professor of Music, who had come from London, and set up as a voice trainer, and charged high fees for his instructions.

He was told he must sing in this manner, "because all artistes did so." Neither the voice trainer nor his pupil seemed to know that the perfection of art is to be natural, and that whatever is vicious in language is also hurtful to good music.

Nothing detracts so much from the effect of a good voice as vicious pronounciation in singing.

A Musical Journal recently gave the following reply to a correspondent:—"Guard against their faulty pronounciation—*e.g.*, 'Yeara moia prayera' for 'Hear my prayer;' Moy a har-rat eand moy fleash' for 'My heart and my flesh.' Choirs often murder the vowels."

I lately heard a popular song thus enunciated by a professional singer :—

"Tha minsturrel bo-hoy to tha wa a-har as gone,
In tha ranks of de-e-heth youill foind im.
His father's sworrud e as gurrded on,
And is harrup ee as hu-hu-hung behoind im." *

Singing in this style not only destroys the language, but also the music; for every doubled or added syllable requires, as we have seen, added notes to the melody, thus introducing the numberless appoggiaturas and grace notes we find grafted upon our beautiful national melodies. (*See Note B, page* 28.)

Those who do so have failed to discover that the simplicity of these melodies is one of their choice beauties, and that the attempt to improve by embellishments such melodies as "Robin Adair," or "The Land o' the Leal," is a task as hopeless as

"To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To throw a perfume on the violet;
To smooth the ice, or add another hue
Unto the rainbow."

Who can listen with patience to

"Bonnie young Jessie tha flow-our o' Dumblane,"

or—

"Ee-ar-a shee-aroulk lies, poo-ar Tom Bo-howling,
Tha darlink of is crew."

And one only laughs at an exquisite who sings,

"Good-ee-bye, Sweet-a-heart-ee, good-ee-bye."

Still more are our feelings outraged when we hear such faults in the praise of the sanctuary—

All pee pal that on er-rath do do-well.

destroys not only the sense of the line, but the music, which would necessarily be—

: d | d : t_1 | l_1 : s_1 | d : d | r : r | m

making the music a line of five feet, while the words are only four.

---

* A Musical Journal recently states: an impudent critic says "The Last Rose of Summer" was sung at the New York Beethoven Centennial as follows :—

'Tis ze las rose of zummare,
Leff pluming alone;
All ees luffly gampanyuns
Are fated um cawn.

The careless pronounciation of compound consonants is a very frequent error—such as arm, arrum; dwell, do-well; depths, strength, &c.

So also inserting a vowel between two consonants—That *a* thou; What *a* right; This *a* man. This fault is most common in pulpit elocution.

So also changing words of one syllable into two—as fear, fee-ar, or hear, hee-ar, or near, nee-ar. Additional syllables always add additional notes to the music, and generally a strong discord to the harmony.

I know of a congregation whose music is often made painful by a young man, with a strong voice, who always sings such words as hear, near, &c., in two syllables, to the great discomfort of his fellow-worshippers.

Every offence of this kind in pronounciation or articulation affects the music injuriously.

Another fruitful cause of error is the insertion of needless consonants. No more extraordinary or inexplicable examples of this can be given than the uses of *h*, *w*, *v*, and *r* in some parts of England.

Punch is the great illustrator of such subjects, and spares no country nor province.

The remark of the barber, "The cholera is in the hair, Sir," was well fitted to rouse the wrath of the crusty old gentleman who came to get his hair cut, and led to the immediate explanation, "It was not the 'air of the ed' I meant, Sir, but the 'hair of the hatmosphere.'"

So when Sam Weller was giving his evidence in the celebrated Pickwick trial—

"'What's your name, Sir?' enquired the judge.

"'Sam Weller, my lord,' replied that gentleman.

"'Do you spell it with a V or a W?' enquired the judge.

"'That depends upon the taste and fancy of the speller, my lord,' replied Sam: 'I never had occasion to spell it more than once or twice in my life, but I spells it with a V.'

"Here a voice in the gallery exclaimed aloud, 'Quite right, too, Samivel; quite right. Put it down a We, my lord; put it down a We——'"

The true point of this dialogue seems to be, that old Tony Weller's explanation leaves the matter darker than ever.

In Lanza's well-known "Elements of Singing," he makes the following observations :—

"When the pupil begins to sing the solfeggios very quick, great care must be taken not to run into the following very prevalent errors of articulating :—In sounding

Do,	don't	make	it	Dow, nor	Dor.
Re,	,,	,,		Ree, ,,	Rayee, (Rye).
Mi,	,,	,,		Mā, ,,	Mayee, (My).
Fa,	,,	,,		Faw, ,,	Far.
Sol,	,,	,,		Soul, ,,	Sor.
La,	,,	,,		Law, ,,	Lar.

and when two syllables follow quickly, as mi re, do not sound them as me-a ray.

"It is from not taking particular care to avoid these defects that many singers sound the notes through the teeth, or the nose, or from the throat—the worst qualities a singer can have."

It startles one to hear a congregation singing with all seriousness—

"On hashes hair and usks we dine,"

or to be told from the pulpit that—

"We are sinful dust and hashes."

Inability to pronounce the letter *r*, as in Northumberland, or various sounds of *u*, or *ch* as in Loch, or *th* in thee, or any other vocal defect may be understood; but the strange habit of misplacing consonants is a freak of speech for which I can find no adequate reason. Can any one explain how such a custom arose?

A well-known London divine lately preaching in this city (Glasgow,) quoted the text—

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

and read it as follows—

"Ee that ath hee-ars to ee-aw, let im ee-aw."

His words would likely be spoken in the following tones—

m r d m d r m d r r m d*

Here the division of three words of one syllable into two syllables each, introduces three intervals of major thirds, *m d*, which entirely

* Curiously enough, when reading these words in this manner, to the Tonic Sol-Fa College in June last, my London audience at once named the preacher.

destroy the continuity and rhythm of the sentence; by bringing the music of every measure to the tonic, and thus resolving it.

The same sentence spoken in true intonation would have a very different effect upon an audience.

To find the true music we must first mark the accents—

| He that hath | ears to | hear | let him | hear.

Next, we must find the time—

He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

| — : V : V | — : — : V | — : — : | — : V | — : —

This shows us that the first three measures are in triple (3) time—the last two in common (2) time—the change in time being such as greatly to add to the force of the sentence if well spoken.

Reading it gently we should probably use the following intonations:—

| m : r : d | m : — : r | m : — : | r : r | d : —

Speaking with a louder voice we might use the following:—

| m : r : d | s : — : m | r : — : | r : r | m : —

The intonation and emphasis of course may be various according to the special meaning we intend to convey; but whatever is correctly spoken will be pleasing when sung.*

Trying tones spoken, and tones sung, in this way brings out the close connection—the identity between correct speaking and good music. In this is to be found the key to the subject of recitative, which is just speaking with the chest or singing voice.

Erroneous barring is to music what misplaced accent is on a syllable, or wrong emphasis on a word, or false punctuation to language. In the passage—

He shall feed his flock

: s | s : — : f | m : — : r | d : — : —

the false accents on the first word show that Handel was a foreigner.

---

* Putting the above to this test, the following harmony was dictated by the Andersonian students, and sung from the black board. It will be found to be pleasing as a musical fragment:—

m : r : d	s : — : m	r : — :	r : r	m : —
d : t_1 : d	d : — : d	t : — :	t_1 : t_1	d : —
s : s : s	m : — : s	s : — :	s : s	s : —
d : r : m	d : — : d	s_1 : — :	s_1 : s_1	d : —

If we try to arrange the first reading of this sentence in this way we shall find that the accent, time, and music are all destroyed, and the effect to be anything but satisfactory.

Examples of this kind are innumerable; but I can best bring out the nature of such errors by a few quotations. We see the absurdity of them more easily in speech than in music. For instance—

"Wanted a woman, to wash and dress and milk, a cow.

"Wanted, a general servant immediately, in a small family, where two cows are kept. *One* of good character. A Baptist preferred. Apply to B. C."

"Matches! Please buy matches; from an old man made of foreign wood."

"A man going to sea (see) his wife, desires the prayers of the congregation."

"And he said, saddle *me* the ass, and they saddled *him*."

"When we remember the days of old Moses, and the prophets."

These are new reading of old sentences; and here we find an old friend in a new attitude—

"Cæsar entered upon his head, his helmet upon his feet, armed sandals upon his brow, a cloud in his right hand, his faithful sword in his eye, an angry glare."

Who would have thought that the misplacement of a comma could effect such a travestie on this well known passage, and clothe the old hero in such ridiculous guise.

Every want of coincidence between the accent and rhythm of words and music, must do violence to one or other, or to both—this is a constant cause of offence—so, also, is bad adaptation, by which sometimes the sense is destroyed; sometimes the words are turned into ridicule; sometimes words of a bright character are sung to a mournful tune, and sometimes the opposite fault is committed. Often words and music are unsuited to each other, as when a repeating tune is used to sing—

We'll catch the flee,
We'll catch the flee;
We'll catch the fleeting hour.

or, when to the tune of Caroline is sung the following line—

We bow be - fore the king.
: t | $\underline{d^1}.l$: $\underline{t}.d^1$ | $\underline{r^1}.t$: $\underline{d^1}.r^1$ | m^1
We bow - ow - ow - ow be - fore the king.
: r^1 | $\underline{d^1}$: $\underline{t}$. $\underline{l}$ | $\underline{m^1}$: r^1 | d^1 : t | l : -- ||

Examples of these faults may be had in any number.

In vocal music the words are of primary consideration—the

music only secondary—being intended to give force and expression to the words.

Too often the opposite seems to be the rule—give us the music—let it be as sensational as possible—let the words be a matter of no consideration.

This may sometimes be allowable in secular music, but in sacred it is unpardonable.

Our songs and psalms are commonly sung so that no one can by any means hear, or understand the words—they are often turned, twisted, and distorted in such a way that all their meaning is lost.

I am sorry to find that some who profess to be voice trainers, deliberately set themselves to inculcate a style of singing, vicious in itself, and repugnant to all good taste.

So also teachers of elocution seem to know little of the principles upon which all good and effective speaking is founded. A better knowledge of these principles would soon cause a revolution in the practice, and greatly facilitate the study of language.

Every thing seems to be taught in our schools and colleges, but the science and art of using aright our own language.

It would be a great boon conferred upon our students were chairs established for instruction in this most important subject.

As it is—people are expected to learn the use of language as cuckoos learn to sing, or dogs learn to bark. There can be no greater mistake, for these creatures have only two or three notes in their voices, so that they cannot go wrong; but man, who has several thousands of changes in the wonderful instrument of voice with which the Creator has endowed him, requires the most careful instruction and training in the art of using it aright.

To fill such a chair efficiently would require one who is not merely a man of refined and cultivated taste, but at the same time a musician and a scholar.

NOTES.

Note *A*, Page 14.

A gentleman from New Zealand, who heard this paper read in London, gave, as an interesting illustration, a question asked by a native woman, and answered by her husband, in the Maori language, the cadences of which were $| r^1 : s^1$ and $| r : d$, being another proof that however various the languages of the world may be, the language of music is one.

Note *B*, Page 22.

(Extract from a Letter by Dr. Benjamin Franklin, *on* "Absurdities in Vocal Music.")

"Do not imagine that I mean to depreciate the skill of our composers here; they are admirable at pleasing *practised* ears, and know how to delight one another, but in composing for songs, the reigning taste seems to be quite out of nature, or rather the reverse of nature, and yet, like a torrent, hurries them all away with it—one or two, perhaps, only excepted.

"You, in the spirit of some ancient legislators, would influence the manners of your country by the united powers of poetry and music. By what I can learn of their songs, the music was simple, conforming itself to the usual pronunciation of words, as to measure, cadence, emphasis, &c., never disguising and confounding the language, by making a long syllable short, or a short one long, when sung. Their singing was a more pleasing, because a more melodious manner of speaking; it was capable of all the graces of prose oratory, while it added the pleasure of harmony. Most modern songs, on the contrary, neglect all the proprieties and beauties of common speech, and in their place introduce its defects and absurdities as so many graces. . . . Now, I reckon among the defects and improprieties of common speech the following":—(and still more in singing)

"1. *Wrong-placing the accent or emphasis,* by laying it on words of no importance, or on wrong syllables.

"2. *Drawling;* or extending the sound of words or syllables beyond their natural length.

"3. *Stuttering;* or making many syllables of one.

"4. *Unintelligibleness;* the result of the three foregoing united.

"5. *Tautology;* and

"6. *Screaming* without cause.

"7. I may mention *Inarticulation* among the defects in common speech that are assumed as beauties in common singing. But as that seems more the fault of the singer than the composer, I omitted it in what related merely to composition. The fine singer in the present mode stifles all the hard consonants, and polishes away all the rougher parts of words that serve to distinguish them from each other; so that you hear nothing but an admirable pipe, and understand no more of the song than you would from its tune played on any other instrument. If ever it was the ambition of musicians to make instruments that should imitate the human voice, that ambition seems now reversed, the voice aiming to be like an instrument. Thus, wigs were first made to imitate a good natural head of hair; but when they became fashionable, though in unnatural forms, we have seen natural hair dressed to look like wigs."

But what is the
Muse of Herodotus
Who places the accidents
on these 5 fictions were
a native or an alien
neither one
[illegible]

MUSIC IN COMMON THINGS.

PART FIRST.

MUSIC IN FIGURES.

Extract from Lecture by A. S. HERSCHEL, ESQ., *Professor of Natural Philosophy, Andersonian University, Glasgow.*

"I have derived much assistance and instruction from this little work, and I can heartily recommend it to my class as containing a new, clear, and interesting demonstration of the Musical Scale."

PART SECOND,

(IN PREPARATION). WILL CONTAIN

TRANSITION, MODULATION, AND THE MINOR SCALE.

PART THIRD,

IN PREPARATION.

PART FOURTH,

MUSIC IN SPEECH AND SPEECH IN MUSIC.

PART FIFTH,

WILL CONTAIN

MUSIC IN STREET CRIES, &c.