


UC-NRLF



LB 257 552



271
P. 93

138-139

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

GOOD SPEECH

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Crown 8vo, 392 pp. Price 4s. 6d.

THE SOUNDS OF SPOKEN ENGLISH

With Specimen Passages in phonetic transcription.

Crown 8vo, 64 pp. Price 1s. 6d.

ENGLISH SOUNDS

For English Boys and Girls.

Size: 30 by 30 inches. Price, unmounted, 2s.; mounted on linen, 5s.; with rollers, 7s.

THE SOUNDS OF ENGLISH

A Chart of the Phonetic Symbols representing English Sounds.

Crown 8vo, 183 pp. Price 2s. 6d.

A FIRST ENGLISH BOOK

For Boys and Girls whose mother-tongue is not English.

Crown 8vo, 175 pp. Price 2s. 9d.

A SECOND ENGLISH BOOK

BY PROF. DANIEL JONES

Crown 8vo, 447 pp. Price 7s. 6d. net.

AN ENGLISH PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY

GOOD SPEECH

AN INTRODUCTION TO
ENGLISH PHONETICS

BY

WALTER RIPMAN



LONDON & TORONTO
J. M. DENT & SONS LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

1922

FIRST PUBLISHED . . . *August 1922*
REPRINTED *October 1922*

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

THE recent report of Sir Henry Newbolt's Committee on "The Teaching of English in England" contains, among much that is of pressing importance, an earnest plea for the cultivation of good speech, and it insists on the value of phonetics for attaining this end. It is satisfactory to know that this report has had an extensive sale; and among its readers there are probably many who have little idea of what "phonetics" means and how it can help them. They may be a little frightened at the technicalities with which many treatises on phonetics abound, and the script usually employed may seem to them a more formidable difficulty than it really is.

A simple presentment of the principal features of our spoken language, based mainly on standard speech, but paying some attention to dialect sounds, will probably be welcome to many teachers and perhaps even to a wider public. The attempt has been made in the following pages to provide a popular introduction to what will prove an interesting field of study in which many more workers are needed. To speak clearly and well is a social duty; and it is more particularly the duty of the teacher. This book, from its very nature, can do no more than set the student on the right path; it is in no sense exhaustive. Those who wish to pursue the

subject farther may be recommended to work through the *Sounds of Spoken English*, with specimen passages in phonetic transcription, and to use Prof. Jones's *Pronouncing Dictionary*, books which have appeared in this Series.

The great interest which is being taken in our living speech encourages the hope that we are about to effect a great improvement in our schools, giving all our boys and girls the power of using standard speech for general intercourse and for the purposes of artistic speech; and this should before long lead to clearer and better speech generally. I should be happy to think that this little book served to further so excellent a cause.

WALTER RIPMAN.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. HOW WE LEARN TO TALK	I
II. THE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH	6
III. BEAUTIFUL SPEECH	11
IV. SPEECH AND SPELLING.	17
V. THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF SOUNDS	22
VI. CONSONANTS: STOPS AND NASALS	27
VII. CONSONANTS: CONTINUANTS.	32
VIII. VOWELS	43
IX. CONNECTED SPEECH; STRESS	55
X. INTONATION	59
XI. TWO PASSAGES ANALYSED	68
XII. SPECIMENS IN PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTION	75

1873

1874

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1873
1874

GOOD SPEECH

Chapter I. How we learn to talk

BEFORE we consider how the well-educated grown-up person talks it is well to pay a little attention to his earliest stages as a talker, which leads us back to babyhood; and a simple study of the way in which we learn to talk will throw light on some later developments.

The earliest sounds a baby utters are not speech sounds at all. Its cries serve to show that it is hungry or otherwise uncomfortable. After a time the baby gives signs of pleasant sensations: it smiles, it likes to wave its arms and kick. It finds that it can make noises with its mouth, and makes all sorts of meaningless sounds, just for the pleasure of making them; we call this "cooing" or "lalling." Some of these sounds it will use later; but there are others which it ceases to make after a time. Thus when it is teething and producing much saliva, it will often make a lip trill, which most grown-up people find it hard to imitate; and when it lies on its mother's lap, with head thrown back, it will produce a trilled r with the end of its soft palate. (Stand with your back to the window, open your mouth well, hold a mirror so that light is thrown into your mouth, and see how the far end of the palate is shaped.) This also is a sound that many of us find it difficult to produce consciously; when

for some reason we lose consciousness (as when we are under an anæsthetic), the end of the soft palate hangs loose, and our breath makes it trill, just as it does with the baby.

It is not till the baby begins to attach a meaning to the sounds it makes that we can regard them as speech sounds; and the age at which this takes place varies greatly. One of my children had eighty words at eleven months; another hardly spoke before two years. The former learnt to walk quite late; the other did so long before speaking. Probably it is a general rule that talking and walking do not proceed simultaneously.

The earliest words are mostly attempts to reproduce words that have been often repeated in connection with a certain action or object; and the child utters them because it wants that action to be performed, or that object to be given to it. These early attempts at speech have a certain charm for us; they betoken the awakening of intelligence, and appeal to us by their very imperfection. "Baby language" is so delightful indeed, that many adopt it themselves in speaking to the little one; but this is a very mistaken sign of affection, for it retards the child's progress. The little one can learn to speak well only by hearing many times the common words of our speech well pronounced.

Even so, it is a slow process. The vowel sounds are generally acquired with success, at an early age, but many of the consonants are troublesome.

They require rather delicate adjustments of the tongue, and often they are very similar in sound. Take your mirror and watch what happens when you say "raw." See how the front edge of the tongue is turned up for the *r*; that takes some time to learn, and babies substitute other sounds for it before they hit on the right tongue position. For *z* and *s* also the position is somewhat difficult, and children are inclined to substitute various kinds of what is known as "lispings." The "th" sounds (as in "this" and "thing") sound very much like *v* and *f*; and no wonder, for they are made in much the same way: for *v* or *f* the breath passes out between the upper teeth and the soft, fleshy lower lip, and for *th* it passes out between the upper teeth and the soft, fleshy tongue. Most children find it easier to make the *v* and *f*, because the necessary action is more easily perceived by the eye.

Combinations of consonants also present difficulty, and babies generally simplify them, saying "tocking" for "stocking," etc. In doing so, they behave just as we do when we refrain from pronouncing the *m* of "mnemonic" or the *k* of "knee."

When the speech of the grown-up people who talk to the child is uniform and clear and the child is normal, it gradually acquires their form of speech. It may be a child of different nationality, whose parents spoke quite another language: if it comes to a foreign country young enough and hears only the language of that country, its speech will not differ in any way from that spoken by children whose

parents are natives. The child has no inherited aptitude for speaking any particular language.

In acquiring speech, the child learns to use only the sounds that occur in the language it commonly hears. Now every language has its own peculiarities: no two languages have just the same set of sounds. One prefers sounds produced more forward in the mouth than another; one favours diphthongs, another long vowels; one calls for vigorous use of the lips, another does not; one requires the use of certain muscles, the other leaves them unused.

In its "lalling" days the baby made all kinds of sounds. In learning to speak its mother tongue it finds that some of these are not wanted, and discards them; others have to be acquired. As a result, speech habits are formed: by dint of very frequent repetition, the child learns to make certain movements of the tongue, lips, etc., very easily, while others—intrinsically no more difficult—are not made, because they are not wanted.

It is important that the speech habits should be good, and that faulty speech habits should not be overlooked or even encouraged. To allow a child to go on saying "vis" or "vat" for "this" or "that" is to do it a very bad service; every child can be shown how to pronounce a proper *th*. To let a child go on lisping, "because it sounds so sweet," is foolishness. These early bad habits may handicap the speaker in later life; and the more firmly established they are, the more trouble it will give to eradicate them. Most so-called "defects of speech" are merely bad habits.

It follows from what has been said that a sound which to us seems easy, may appear difficult to a foreigner, and *vice versa*. To us who have pronounced thousands of *l*'s, that sound presents no difficulty; but it gives trouble to a Japanese who has no *l* in his mother tongue. Our *th*, again, is a stumbling-block to many foreigners. On the other hand we find difficulty in pronouncing correctly the sounds of French *u* and *eu* (German *ü* and *ö*), while even the little children of those countries produce them perfectly. The problem presented by the pronunciation of a foreign language consists in the necessity of acquiring a fresh set of speech habits.

In this book, however, we are confining ourselves to the sounds of the mother tongue, and our concern will be to consider what speech habits our children should acquire. English is spoken in many different ways; which is the form that we should prefer?

Chapter II. The varieties of English

WE all know that language tends to change: words acquire new meanings, grammatical forms and constructions are not what they were, sound yields to sound. Imagine primitive conditions: people living in isolated villages as self-contained communities, without the need or desire to communicate with each other. Their language changes, but not in the same way in each community; after a time the differences may be very marked. A comparison shows that the speech of these communities had a common origin; but they no longer have a common speech. We say they speak dialects of the same language.

There are many books on the history of our language which show how English is related to other languages, forming one of the Teutonic group, which is a member of the great Aryan family of languages. We learn from them also that at the earliest stage of English known to us there were dialects, and these we find still prevailing to-day. If we go into the country and talk to a farm-labourer, we hear a language which is still recognisable as English, but differs greatly from ours and from the speech of the squire or parson in the same district.

Dialect has its fascination and its profound interest for the student of language, and our dialects have received far less attention than they deserve. As a general means of communication, however, dialect has its grave drawbacks. Its use

is confined to a limited area. It will only serve us if we make up our minds to spend our lives within that area and to have dealings only with those who inhabit it. That might be natural in a far distant, primitive age; the conditions of present-day life are much more complex. We can no longer live in relative isolation. The improvement in our means of transport, the needs of commerce, our interdependence have brought all parts of the English-speaking world much closer together. Even if our life-work does not make it necessary for us to travel, we are yet brought into frequent contact with people from other parts. As a consequence, we need a kind of speech that is not peculiar to one little section of those who speak English and that is generally intelligible and acceptable.

The need for a literary language that all English people could read and understand made itself felt early, and it was the dialect of London, in the main, that came to be regarded as the standard. A book written in English is as readily intelligible in Melbourne, New York or Montreal as in London. From a very early date, too, the spoken language of the educated in London exerted its influence; and it has done so in ever increasing measure.

What forces have helped to spread it so widely? Much has been done by the great boarding schools for boys, taught by men of good family educated at one of the older Universities. Much is due to the great progress in the education of women. The teachers in girls' high schools and secondary schools

belong to a good social class; girls as a rule are quick to imitate the speech sounds of their teachers and to recognise the social advantage of good speech. Later, as mothers, they transmit this speech to their children. The future teachers in elementary schools spend a number of years as pupils in secondary schools, and at training colleges receive (or should receive) a grounding in English phonetics; and thus they are able to furnish good models for the elementary school children. Moreover, in many cases, the early teaching of reading is based on the sounds of the spoken language, and more or less successful attempts are made to impart the sounds of standard speech.

Beside all this, the needs of general intercourse have an unconscious, but none the less noticeable, effect on the speech of many. A dialect speaker, finding that a word he uses is not understood when he has left his native town, substitutes a word from the literary language which he is sure all Englishmen will know. He finds that when he pronounces some words in his natural way, people do not understand him and he has to repeat them; to prevent this, he adopts another pronunciation which will give no trouble. Often the change is made quite consciously, because the speaker is anxious to speak in the way common to most educated speakers he meets.

It is not everyone who succeeds in freeing his speech from dialect features. In rural districts, where social life is simply ordered, we find standard speech and dialect side by side, as was said above. But in our large towns society is very complex, and

there are many steps in the social ladder. We find standard speech among the well educated, and we may find something like pure dialect among the lower classes; but there are many intermediate stages where something more or less like standard speech is spoken; this we may call "modified standard."

This "modified standard" is neither one thing nor the other, and we are justified in calling "incorrect" those features of it in which it falls short of the "received standard." On the other hand, when we are faced with genuine dialect, we must guard against the error of calling it "wrong." Even a child can be taught to appreciate the difference between a speech that is local and a speech meant for general intercourse, and to realise that he will be at a disadvantage when he is grown-up if he cannot speak like the majority of educated people. He can be told that in writing he must use words that all will understand, wherever they may live, or else he will give them unnecessary trouble; that his handwriting must be such that his words can be read easily, or else he will give unnecessary trouble; and that similarly he should speak in such a way that all can readily understand what he means.

Although repeated mention has been made of "standard speech," it has not yet been defined. It is indeed not easy to define; but, for the purposes of this chapter, it may suffice to describe it as a form of the spoken language that contains nothing that would jar on the ear of an educated speaker of

southern English. It would almost be possible to omit "southern," were it not for some minor points in which educated northern English shows divergence.

It may be objected that even among educated speakers of southern English there is no complete agreement on all points. We may sometimes hesitate about the pronunciation of a word, knowing that some pronounce it one way, and some another. This state of things is undoubtedly regrettable. It is doubtful whether there is ever an advantage in having two spoken forms of the same written word; and it would be a good thing if a recognised authority were established for putting an end to these useless divergencies. But their number may easily be exaggerated; and the fact remains that on most points there is complete agreement, so that we are fully justified in using the term "standard speech."

For the purposes of general intercourse in the English-speaking world, as well as for foreigners who learn our language, a standard speech is essential. It is not enough that the written language should be a common possession; we must also be able to communicate by word of mouth in a manner that does not estrange. We can all remember instances when we had difficulty in understanding the speech of one who was speaking some form of English to which we were not accustomed; we could not take in what he said without being constantly disturbed by his way of saying it. And when the foreigner is learning our language we ought to be able to tell him which form of it he would find most profitable to learn.

Chapter III. Beautiful speech

So far we have dealt with the practical every-day purposes for which a standard speech is required; but man does not live by bread alone. Even for ordinary intercourse we may demand that a man's speech be not only readily intelligible, but agreeable. When we hear an orator or an actor, we expect speech in its finest form; even when one who is not a professional recites or reads aloud, we expect something different from what may well pass muster in the drawing-room or the office. We know and appreciate beautiful speech when we hear it.

Is there anything in the standard speech about which we spoke in the last chapter that is intrinsically beautiful? Is English, at its best, a beautiful language? Is one language more beautiful than another? It is not easy to answer these questions. If we hear two languages spoken neither of which we understand, one may seem to us more melodious than another; but it may be because it contains more sounds with which we are familiar or sounds that we particularly like, or because the speaker has a sweeter voice. If we are to judge of our own language, we are continually letting the meaning of the words influence our judgment; we say that a line of poetry is beautiful in sound, when really the beauty may lie rather in the ideas evoked. Similarly, we may be tempted to say that a word sounds ugly when there is nothing wrong with the

individual sounds at all. If we hear "lady" pronounced so as to rhyme with "tidy," we shudder; but what jars on us is not the sounds, but the fact that in this word the educated class to which we belong uses another diphthong in the first syllable, and "lidy" suggests the pronunciation of a social class that we consider inferior.

It would, then, be difficult to maintain that there is any intrinsic beauty in the sounds of standard speech. It is quite possible to speak correctly, without speaking really well. Even among educated speakers there are great individual variations. Not all, for instance, observe the golden mean between the pedantic and the slipshod.

The pedantic speaker is one who, with more or less definite intention, tries to improve on standard speech; he "goes one better" than the ordinary educated speaker. He utters certain vowels in what we call a "mincing" way; he dwells on certain consonants (the *h* in "forehead" or the *t* in "often") which are usually silent. His attitude is one of superiority to us common mortals, and that is offensive, anti-social.

The slipshod speaker is one who speaks with the least expenditure of effort; he makes only just enough movement of his tongue to suggest the sounds. He drops sounds and even whole syllables; "did you know her?" becomes "Genoa." His attitude is one of indifference or contempt, and that, too, is offensive and anti-social.

It is not enough, however, to avoid these extremes.

Even if we speak ordinary standard speech, there are considerable possibilities of variation. We can make our sounds with varying degrees of exactness; we can articulate cleanly and precisely, or loosely and feebly. How to make our sounds so as to produce the most musical result or tone has been the special aim of teachers of diction or "elocution,"—a term they have often preferred and which has come to imply something not altogether desirable. Too many of these teachers have, in the past, gone far beyond what seems to most of us legitimate, especially in the matter of intonation and gesture, but also in pedantry of enunciation; and their published works have often been spoiled by florid verbiage and disfigured by manifest ignorance of phonetics. But the really sound teachers concerned with the use of the voice in public speaking have done good service. We have learnt from them the importance of good breathing, and of a wide range of mouth-opening for the vowels; the benefits to be derived from vigorous lip action; and the danger of drawing the tongue too far towards the back of the mouth. They have taught valuable lessons as regards the production of pure tone.

All this is the essential groundwork if the voice is to be pleasing, and there is no reason why everyone should not learn to speak in a pleasing way. Even if all did so, some voices would still be more beautiful than others, for reasons that are beyond human control. Some of us have a mouth so formed as to be specially fitted for the production of beautiful sounds; but the shape of our palate, like the

nature of our vocal chords, is as much a natural gift as a fine forehead or a Grecian nose.

Even the perfect voice is not all: the speaker requires intelligence and feeling if he is to do justice to the noble prose and splendid lyric and dramatic literature in which we are so rich. He must speak with due expression, knowing when to pause, for breath as well as effect; raising or lowering his voice according as it is required by the meaning, not in a conventional manner; capable of suggesting tenderness and pity as well as indignation and scorn. He will adjust his voice to his audience, conscious that what is suitable in a large hall is out of place in a schoolroom.

It has been said that "every teacher is a teacher of English," and no teacher should be indifferent to what is at once a privilege and a responsibility. Every member of a school staff must take his part in securing that our boys and girls shall express themselves well in speech and in writing. Everyone should strive to make his speech careful and clear, so that it may be a model to pupils who out of school hours may hear only what is far removed from standard speech. The chief duty rests on the teachers of English. They must be equipped not only to serve as models of good speech, but also to detect and correct the mistakes of their pupils; they must struggle unceasingly to overcome bad speech habits. They must be able to read aloud finely, and to make their pupils appreciate the

beauty of literature that lives through the spoken word, and they must teach them how to read with expression. Then, when they read silently themselves, the printed page will mean beautiful sounds to them, and they will be far better able to appreciate our great heritage.

This is the way to better speech. It cannot be said that we have yet gone far towards that goal. There are beautiful speakers on the stage, in the pulpit, even (I am told) in Parliament; but there are not many. Still, it would be vain to deny that most of us can recognise beautiful speech when we hear it; and that one of the requisites is that standard speech of which we have spoken. That is appreciated everywhere. A good company acting Shakespeare uses the same standard speech whether it be acting in London or in Edinburgh, in Washington or in Cape Town. Though most of the audience perhaps speak a dialect, it is not their dialect they expect or want to hear.

And if they did, would any dialect serve the purpose of beautiful speech equally well? Is it not reasonable to suppose that the form of the language that has so long been used for artistic purposes has gradually become best fitted to serve this end? Examine any dialect you please, and you will find some speech habits associated with it that are unfavourable to the production of good tone. The development of dialect is in accordance with its use as a means of conversational intercourse; it is not ordinarily used for public speaking.

Its introduction on the stage occasionally serves to add interest to a character; a flavour of it will sometimes add a passing attractiveness to a speaker; it has its little place in literature. But viewing our language as the great bond of union that holds together millions, as the vehicle of the world's finest prose and poetry, it is the standard speech of our day that we must learn and teach. It may not be more beautiful than any other language; it may even be less beautiful than the English of Chaucer or of Shakespeare; but it is the language that appeals most to us. And, to our ears at least, it can sound beautiful.

Chapter IV. Speech and spelling

WHEN you come to think of it, writing is a wonderful invention. It is tempting to retrace its history, but for that we have no space. Our way of representing sounds is a comparatively late form of spelling, the principle of which is simply this:

Ascertain what significant sounds there are in the language, and to each sound assign a distinctive symbol (letter).

("Significant sound" means a sound that affects the meaning of words. In English "t" is significant; its presence differentiates "tall" from "all." On the other hand, although we have two kinds of *l*, there are no two words that differ only in having one or the other of these; therefore only one letter is required for *l*. In Russian a word ending in one of these *l*'s has a different meaning from a word ending in the other *l*; here both *l*'s are significant, and two letters are needed.)

Most languages have from thirty to forty significant sounds; we may say that ours has forty. An alphabet sufficient for our needs would have that number of letters; ours has far less. That in itself would lead us to expect something imperfect; but, as we know, it also suffers from redundant letters and from inconsistency. The shortcomings of our spelling have been dwelt upon too often and are too obvious to need enumeration here. They have their historical interest, of course; but the opponents of spelling reform are not to be found

among those who have earnestly studied the history of the language. Indeed their statements generally afford convincing proof that they have not even a nodding acquaintance with it.

For our present purpose it is not necessary to fight the old battle over again; for that there are other fields. It is, however, important to point out what disadvantages arise from spelling our language irrationally, non-phonctically.

A rational spelling would be a record of correct pronunciation; anyone who had learnt to speak correctly could at once spell correctly; and this would be a powerful incentive to teach standard speech at the outset of school life. In our spelling there is no such close connection between the spoken and the written word. Attention has been devoted to the teaching of spelling, to the neglect of speech: spelling mistakes are easy to detect and to correct, and this has absorbed the attention that should have been given to the correction of faulty speech. Incorrect spelling has come to be regarded as evidence of illiteracy — only in comparatively recent times, especially since elementary education became compulsory.

Our spelling affords no sure guide to the pronunciation, nor can we be confident that we can write correctly a word of which we know the pronunciation. As a consequence many words do not enter our spoken language, because we do not know how they should be pronounced; and in writing we are tempted to substitute a second-best word when we are uncertain as to the spelling of the really appro-

priate word. "A synonym," said the boy, "is the word you write down when you are not sure of the spelling of the other word."

By our spelling we may be actually misled into a wrong pronunciation. We have all come across people who at some time of their lives pronounced "misled" as "mizzled." The *w* sound heard in "conquest" is a "spelling pronunciation"; some say it also in "conquer" ("conkwer"), which should not shock us any more than the noun. A recently deceased country clergyman always pronounced the *l* in "could," "would" and "should."

We may pass over the lamentable effects on the reasoning powers of children who at the outset of their school life meet with what is so eminently unreasonable, and the obstacle we stupidly set in the way of the spread of our language throughout the world; but reference must be made to the curious effect it has had on many otherwise quite well educated people. They often speak of the spelling as of something almost sacred, intimately associated with our literature; they cannot conceive of any change in it that would not entail "the scrapping of all existing books," the virtual destruction of our past; they ascribe to it an honoured age,—which makes the true student of language grin or grind his teeth. Holding the spelling in such high honour, they imagine that when they spell differently they speak differently. You say incidentally to such a one, that "maid" and "made" are identical in sound. He objects strongly. You ask him to pronounce the two words. He does; and

you assure him that you hear no difference. He simply replies: "Well, of course, if your hearing is as bad as all that,——" and you have sunk considerably in his estimation, while he goes on believing that the difference in spelling "maid" and "made" has its counterpart in the pronunciation.

That may appear to be an extreme case; but we must all be on our guard not to let the written form of words influence us when we are listening to sounds. If you say "He asked me a question" and then ask how many sounds you uttered in pronouncing the verb, most people will say "four" (a-s-k-t), even though you did not pronounce the *k*,—an omission probably usual in your speech. It is only when your attention has been drawn to it that you notice that in "next station" the *st* is generally pronounced only once (as it were: "nek-station").

Bad as the spelling is for ordinary purposes, it is quite useless for the scientific representation of sounds. Some of the consonant letters, such as *k*, *f*, may serve, because they have a generally accepted value. But what value are we to attach to the *a* of our alphabet? Does it stand for the *a* of "fat" or of "fate" or of "father"? It is of course possible to say that we mean the "fat" *a* or the "fate" *a* or the "father" *a*; but this is a clumsy expedient.

For convenience in referring to sounds we shall here adopt an alphabet which is very simple and is extensively used; it is that of the International Phonetic Association. The consonant letters will

give very little trouble, for most of them are familiar and have the value we naturally associate with them, viz.:

b, p, m	d, t, n	g (as in "get"), k
w	v, f	z, s
		r, l
		h

The following consonant letters will be new to you:

ŋ represents the *ng* in "song."

ð represents the *th* in "this," θ that in "thing." (Do you realise that *th* stands for two different sounds?)

ʒ represents the sound of *s* in "leisure."

ʃ represents the sound of *s* in "sure."

The letter *j* represents the sound of *y* in "yes,"—not that of *j* in "jet."

The vowel letters will give you more trouble; the nature of the sounds concerned will become clearer when you have read the chapter on vowels. They are:

i: as in [bi:d] "bead"

u: as in [bu:t] "boot"

ɪ as in [bɪd] "bid"

ʊ as in [pʊt] "put"

e as in [bet] "bet"

oʊ as in [boʊt] "boat"

ei as in [beit] "bait"

ɔ: as in [hɔ:l] "hall"

ɛə as in [beə] "bear"

ɒ as in [hɒt] "hot"

æ as in [bæt] "bat"

ɑ: as in [fɑ:ðə] "father"

ʌ as in [hʌt] "hut"

ə: as in [hɜ:t] "hurt"

ə as in [betə] "better"

The sign ː after a vowel shows that it is long.

Words in the phonetic transcription are enclosed in square brackets.

Chapter V. The different kinds of sounds.

BEFORE we proceed to consider the sounds of English speech in detail we must get some general idea of how they are produced.

We speak by means of the breath as it passes out from the lungs. In normal breathing it passes through the nose; in speech it usually passes through the mouth, sometimes through the nose.

If the mouth passage is such that the breath passes through it freely, the result is a *vowel* sound. The passage may be wide, as when we say [a] with the mouth well open; or rather narrow, as when we say [i]. (Use your mirror to verify all such statements.) The vowel sounds will be treated in Chapter VIII.

When the breath has to pass through a very narrow opening, as when we utter [f], we get a consonantal sound. This sound can be sustained as long as the breath lasts, and it is therefore called a *continuant*. Continuants will be treated in Chapter VII.

When the breath meets with something that completely closes the passage, and bursts through, as when we utter [p], we get another kind of consonantal sound; this we call a *stop*. When so much breath bursts through that we can hear a distinct *h* sound after the stop, we call the stop an *aspirate*. When we say emphatically: "I did not say 'eight' but 'ten' !" the [t] of "ten" is a distinct aspirate.

When the breath is stopped somewhere in the mouth passage, but is able to pass out through the

nose, as when we utter [m] or [n], we get a *nasal consonant*. Such a sound may be sustained as long as the breath lasts.

In the throat we have a very delicate apparatus, the *vocal chords*, which you cannot see with your mirror. There is no need here to give a detailed description; it must suffice to say that they are not "cords" like the strings of a violin, but may better be compared with the lips, the opening between which (called the "glottis") runs from the front of the throat to the back. They can be held wide apart, which is their natural position when we breathe. They can be pressed together, just as the lips are pressed together when we utter [p]. When the air then bursts through, we have a "glottal stop" (symbol [ʔ]), an exaggerated form of which we produce in "clearing the voice." The vocal chords can also be placed more lightly in contact; then when the breath passes through them they vibrate, just as we can make a trill with the lips. This vibration of the vocal chords is called "voice" in the narrower sense of the word.

The addition of "voice" to a sound makes a noticeable difference, which is most easily observed if we utter such sounds as [f, v], [s, z]. Say alternately a long [f] and a long [v], a long [s] and a long [z]; you will observe a kind of buzz in the case of [v] and [z], which becomes particularly noticeable if you press your hands over your ears at the same time. Say a very long [v] and make sure that the buzzing is steady and uniform. Then compare

[p, b], [t, d], [k, g]; here there should be a little vibration in the case of [b, d, g]. If it is absent you are not producing these sounds properly.

Sounds accompanied by vibration of the vocal chords are called *voiced*, those without it are called *voiceless*.

Vowels are generally voiced; when the mouth passage is adjusted for the production of a vowel sound, but the vocal chords do not vibrate, the breath passing through the mouth produces a variety of [h]. Say [a], [i], [u] in a whisper (during which the vocal chords do not vibrate) and observe the nature of the resulting sounds.

We must next consider the vocal organs concerned in the production of speech, and what movements they can perform. Watch them as far as possible with the mirror.

The *lips* can be wide apart (as for [a]), or near together (as for [w]), or closed (as for [p]). They can be rounded (as for [u]), or assume a long narrow shape (as for [i]). It is possible that your lips do not normally change their shape much; say [i] [a] [u] before the mirror, making as much difference as possible in the shape of your lips.

The *lower jaw* can drop and rise. For [a] it should be at its lowest, for [i] and [u] at its highest. Say [i], [a] with your teeth together and then with a proper [a].

The *tongue* can assume a great variety of shapes. See in the mirror how it behaves when you utter [i], [a], [g], [r], [l].

Say [t]: the extremity which touches the gums

behind the upper teeth is the "point" of the tongue. Notice how it curls up a little when you say [r] as in "raw." The part of the tongue just behind the point is called the "blade."

Say [i]: it is the "front" of the tongue that is raised.

Say [u]: note how the "back" of the tongue rises.

Say [g]: the "back" of the tongue touches the palate.

Say [l]: here the "tip" touches the palate, but the breath passes out at the sides.

The *soft palate* is movable. In ordinary breathing it hangs down loose, leaving behind it a free passage for the air to the nose. If we say [m] it is in the same position. If we utter a vowel, leaving the nasal passage open, we get a nasal vowel, as in the French word "dans," which is a nasal [ɑ̃]. Nasal vowels do not occur in English standard speech.

Say [ɑ̃mpɑ̃], taking care to pronounce the sounds very distinctly, but without allowing breath to escape after the [p]. You will then feel how the soft palate is closed at the end of the first [m], in order to stop the breath passing through the nose, as this is not required for the [p].

You will find it useful to exercise your vocal organs so as to make them supple. See, for instance, whether you can produce

voiceless [l̥], for which the symbol is [l̥]: put the tongue in position for the [l] and let breath pass through the mouth, without any vibration of the vocal chords.

voiceless [w], for which the symbol is [ʍ]: put the lips in position for [w] and let breath pass through.

bilabial [f], for which the symbol is [ɸ]: make an *f* sound by letting the breath pass between both lips, not between the upper teeth and lower lip.

untrilled [r], for which the symbol is [ɹ]: dwell on the *r* of "raw," then give the sound without the vowel, but do not "roll" it.

trilled [r], for which the symbol is [r̥]: try to produce this with a long, uniform trill.

"dark" [ɫ], for which the symbol is [ɮ]: say "all" with the tongue drawn as far back as possible; then say it without the preceding vowel.

aspirate [p^h, t^h, k^h]: say [p^hɑ, t^hɑ, k^hɑ] with as much explosion of breath as possible, then say [pɑ, tɑ, kɑ] in such a way that no *h* sound is heard after the stops.

awkward consonant combinations: say as distinctly as possible, and practise until you can say quite quickly, [stlɑ], [ptɑ], [ʃtʃɑ], [zdɑ], [kna], [vwa], [θsa] and [akts], [alph], [azðz], [altʃf], [amskt].

Chapter VI. Consonants: Stops and Nasals

THE stops present little difficulty: we all know how to produce the voiceless [p, t, k] and the voiced [b, d, g]. The following points, however, deserve notice:

[p, t, k] are generally a little aspirated; when the *h* sound is distinctly noticeable, it is very unpleasant.

It is to be observed that in "lamp post," "coat tail," "black cap," we do not pronounce two separate stops: the effect of [pp, tt, kk] is produced by lengthening the interval between closing the breath passage and opening it. There is no explosion of breath after the first *p* of "lamp post."

[b, d, g] are often pronounced without any "voice" like [p, t, k], but with the lips more gently pressed together. This makes it difficult for the ear to distinguish [b, p], [d, t], [g, k], which is rather serious owing to the large number of pairs like "bear, pear," "den, ten," "got, cot." It is true that in such cases the context generally helps us to make out which word is intended; nevertheless, correct articulation requires that [b, d, g] should be distinctly voiced.

In some dialects the [t] between vowels, as in "water," "butter" is omitted and a glottal stop is often inserted in its place.

When three consonants come together, there is a strong tendency to drop one of them,—generally the

middle one, and usually a stop. This is accepted as correct in many cases, e.g. the omission of *t* in "chestnut," "castle," "listen," of *d* in "handkerchief," of *p* in "empty," of *c* in "muscle," and of the *k* sound in "anxious"; in other cases careful speakers incline to retain what is often omitted in ordinary conversation, e.g. the *t* in "postman," and the *d* in "grandfather." The omission of *t* in "facts," "insects" is generally condemned; in "presents" it is very often left out. In quick speech the final sound of "old," "must," "can't" is often omitted when the next word begins with a consonant, as in "old fellow," "I must go," "I can't see it."

Some combinations of two consonants at the beginning or the end of a word are felt to be awkward, and one is dropped, e.g. the *k* in "knee," the *g* in "gnaw," and the *p* in "pneumatic," "ptomaine," "psalm." To pronounce the *p* in "psychology" is an affectation. Final groups have been simplified, e.g. in "dumb," "hymn," "diaphragm."

The dropping of the last sound when a word ends in two consonants is, however, less extensive in standard speech than in dialects, where, for instance, the *t* is regularly omitted from "fact," "correct," "last," etc.

Sometimes a voiced sound will make a neighbouring voiceless sound voiced, or *vice versa*. Thus in "cupboard," "raspberry," the voiced [b] has changed the preceding [p] into [b]. Similarly, "I used to . . ." [ai ju:zd tu] has become [ai ju:z tu]. This is known as *assimilation*.

There are three nasal consonants, [m], [n], [ŋ], corresponding to the stops we have just considered. They are generally voiced. If we have the lips closed as for [m], and breathe out through the nose without letting the vocal chords vibrate, we have a voiceless *m* [m̥], which sounds like [h]. What in books is often written "ahem" is really [m̥m].

Nasal consonants vary in length. — The [m] of "ham" is longer than that of "hammer" and the [n] of "man" is longer than that of "manner." The [n] in "bend" is longer than that in "bent."

In "I'm moving," "a fine needle" we have not two separate nasal sounds. In the former case we do not part the lips after the first *m*. We indicate the second *m* by a little fresh pressure of breath.

Assimilation frequently affects the nasal consonants: thus [n] becomes [ŋ] before a [k], as in "ink," "handkerchief," "tranquil." In quick speech "I can't go" becomes [ai kɑŋ gou], and "second" [sekŋ], and [oupm ðə dɔ:] is often heard for "open the door." While many assimilations of nasal consonants are generally accepted, it is well to avoid such pronunciations as "ping cushion," "Capm Smith," and even "ingcome," although this has become very common since there has been so much talk about income tax.

The so-called "dropping of *g*" deserves special mention. The term is applied not to the omission of any sound, but to the substitution of [ɪn] for the very common ending [ɪŋ]. This change is usual in dialects, and was frequent in educated speech

one hundred years ago. Increased respect for the spelling has reinstated it, and although "talkin'" and "singin'" may be heard in the speech of children and "ridin'" and "drivin'" in certain social circles, the only correct form of *-ing* is [ɪŋ]. It may be noted, however, that very many people who would bitterly resent the charge that they "dropped their g's" do so regularly in the common expression "I'm going to . . .," where [ŋ] changes to [n] owing to the following [t], by assimilation.

In some dialects the desire to speak correctly leads to the faulty use of [ɪŋ] instead of [ɪn], "certing" being said for "certain," "ruing" for "ruin," etc. Elsewhere final [ŋ] is pronounced [ŋg].

The letters *ng* represent not only [ŋ], as in "sing, singer," but also [ŋg], as in "linger, longer."

There is a common mispronunciation of "warmth" as [wɔmpθ]. Here the nose passage has been closed before the lips were separated, and the sound produced has been made voiceless through the influence of the following voiceless [θ]. Similarly "dreamt" may be heard as [drempt], "something" as [sʌmpθɪŋ]. Parallel to this pronunciation of "warmth" is that of "length" as [lenkθ].

Another mispronunciation is [lenθ] for [lenθ]. This is a case of assimilation: [n] is nearer to [θ] than [ŋ] is.

The combination [nʃ] in "inch," "bench" may be heard with a [t] inserted, e.g. [ɪntʃ], [frentʃ]. This is best avoided. It is common in American English, where a [t] is also inserted in [ns], e.g. in [ənʌnts], "announce."

French has no [ŋ], but possesses another nasal consonant which is written *gn*, and of which the symbol is [ɲ]. This occurs in such words as "vignette," where we substitute [ɲ], and "Boulogne," where we have [n]. It cannot be regarded as a sound of our standard speech, and English speakers find some difficulty in pronouncing it easily. While for [n] the tip of the tongue is lifted up, for [ɲ] it hangs down and the passage is closed by raising to the palate a part of the tongue behind the tip.

The English sounds we have considered in this chapter may be tabulated as follows:

<i>Closure made by</i>	<i>Lips</i>	<i>Point of tongue</i>	<i>Front or back of tongue</i>
Voiceless	p	t	k
Voiced	b	d	g
Nasal	m	n	ŋ

Chapter VII. Consonants: Continuants.

THE sound [w] as in "well," "water" is voiced. Its pronunciation does not as a rule present any difficulty.

Words beginning with *wh* are variously pronounced. The spelling is misleading; once it was not *wh* but *hw*, and many good speakers pronounce [hw], i.e. they utter an *h* sound before the voiced *w*; this is generally recommended by teachers of diction. But there are many educated speakers who do not utter this [h], and who make no distinction between "which" and "witch."

The sound [h] is normally voiceless, and if the vocal chords are a little late in starting to vibrate, the beginning of the [w] will be voiceless. In some dialects the whole of the [w] is voiceless; the symbol for this is [ʍ]; the initial [h] then disappears, or is sometimes replaced by an *f* sound. Say "what" with [ʍ]; it gives the impression of a "breathy" *w*.

The pair [f, v] is familiar. These sounds are sometimes called "lip-teeth" or "labio-dental"; a glance at the mirror while you utter one of them will show you the reason.

When [v] stands at the end of a group of words, before a pause, we incline to let our vocal chords stop vibrating before we separate the lower lip from the upper teeth; in other words, the [v] is first voiced and then voiceless. Say "when you arrive" and compare the nature of the last sound with the [v] in "arriving."

As has been said above, the combination *th* may stand for either of two sounds, the voiceless [θ] in “thing, think, thistle” or the voiced [ð] in “this, that, them.” Which of these have we in “breath, breathe, through, though, rhythm, rhythmical, loathsome”?

Young children often substitute [f, v] for [θ, ð]; and this is also found in dialects. It is easy to teach the *th* sounds: “put the tip of your tongue between your teeth and blow” is the simple rule. Look in the mirror and see whether your tongue actually shows between your teeth when you utter a *th* sound. (For this purpose it is better to say a little sentence, *e.g.* “is this true?” than the sound by itself.)

The sounds [s, z], as in “seal, zeal,” require a somewhat delicate adjustment of the tongue, shaped in such a way that the breath passes through a very narrow channel formed by lowering the middle of the tongue near the front of the mouth. Watch the shape and movement of the tongue when you say “easy.” In saying these sounds some people have the point of the tongue higher than others; this has no noticeable effect on the sound. But many pronounce the sounds wrongly (in various ways), and this we call “lispings.” Sometimes the tongue touches the teeth, and the *s* sounds more or less like a *th*. If you watch the tongue position of a “*th*” lisper, you can observe this; and if, by means of an orangestick or some similar mechanical means, you prevent the tongue from misbehaving, you can get him to say “see” with very little trouble. Then

try *s* and *z* before other vowels; then between vowels, as in "icy," "easy," at first in two parts "i-cy," "ea-sy"; then finally, as in "ice," "ease." The newly acquired sound will give most trouble when combined with other consonants, as in "sticks." The commonest mispronunciation of [s] is one that makes it sound like [θ]; others substitute for it sounds akin to [ʃ] or to voiceless [l] (see p. 39).

The ordinary spelling often has *s* for the sound [z], and this obscures some interesting facts. Thus we do not have the same consonant in the noun "use" as in the verb "use"; this will remind you of "breath" and "breathe," and you may also compare "half" and "halve."

The last sound of "cats" is not the same as that of "dogs"; you note that in the former we have two voiceless sounds together, and in the latter two voiced ones,—a case of assimilation. The same thing may be observed in "he hits" and "he bids"; in "Jack's dog" and "Tom's dog"; in "Jack's here" and "Tom's here"; in "Jack's done it" and "Tom's done it."

Sometimes even *ss* stands for the voiced sound, as in "dissolve," "hussy."

When [z] is at the end of a word, before a pause, the vocal chords cease to vibrate before the tongue drops. As a result, the sound which began with voice is voiceless at its end. Say "if you please" and observe this for yourself.

The letter *x* generally stands for [ks], as in "extra," "exercise." But when a stressed vowel immediately

follows it, as in "example," "exist," we have the voiced [gz]; and when, as occasionally happens, x is at the beginning of a word, as in "Xenophon," we simplify the [gz] to [z], dropping the first consonant as in "psalm."

The sounds voiceless [ʃ], as in "sure," and voiced [ʒ], as in "leisure," are very similar in formation to [s, z], but there is not the same narrow channel for the breath; the breath passes through a broader opening between the tongue and the hard palate and gums. In many cases we now pronounce [ʃ] in place of an old [sj], as in "passion," "nation" (cp. the pronunciation of the French word), "ocean," "anxious"; and [ʒ] in place of an older [zj], as in "measure, vision." We frequently hear something of the kind in the pronunciation of "this year" as "this^h year," and of "as you like" as [æʒ ju laik].

In words borrowed from French long ago, g or j are pronounced [dʒ], as in "general," "journal"; but in recent borrowings we have [ʒ], as in "rouge, bijou."

The c of "association" is pronounced [s] or [ʃ] in standard speech; but in "associate" the [ʃ] is normal, and [s] seems pedantic. In "negotiate," "propitiate" [-sɪ-] is clearly wrong.

In some words there is considerable uncertainty in standard speech; thus "issue" is [ɪsju] or [ɪʃu], "crozier" is [krouzjə] or [krouzə]. Those who have frequent occasion to use such a word as a rule have the pronunciation with [ʃ, ʒ].

The sounds at the beginning of "chat," "jet" may be regarded as [tʃ] and [dʒ] respectively, although some consider them simple sounds, not combinations of two sounds. Is the *tch* of "wretched" produced in exactly the same way as the *tsh* of "nightshirt"?

In a number of cases [tʃ] and [dʒ] have been developed from [tj] and [dj]: consider the pronunciation of "creature," "soldier." Similarly, in quick conversation, "don't you know" may become "don'tcher know" [dountʃənou] and "do you know her" may sound like "Genoa" [dʒənouə]. One hundred years ago this change was more common than now, in good speech: "odious" was pronounced "ojus," and "education" with a distinct "-dju-." We allow the spelling to influence us more than our grandfathers did; and some teachers of diction now go so far as to object to the [tʃ, dʒ] sounds in "creature," "soldier" and similar words (see p. 40). Do you pronounce *-dia* in the same way in "India" and in "India rubber"?

The letter *r* appears much more frequently in our written language than the sound does in standard speech; indeed we now pronounce *r* only when it is followed by a vowel. It is silent in "better" and "arm." In standard speech "morning" and "dawning" rhyme (as they actually do in Swinburne), "stalk" sounds like "stork," and "fought" like "fort." There are, however, many forms of English in which this is not the case; and such rhymes as "sought" and "court" (Kipling) are called "cockney

rhymes." This loss of *r* before consonants and at the end of words may be regarded as a defect in standard speech, and it is quite possible that efforts may be made to restore it.

When a word ending in *r* is followed without pause by a word beginning with a vowel, it is pronounced. Thus it is silent in "he is my father," but pronounced in "he is the father of those children"; silent in "more paper," pronounced in "more ink." Even in such cases there is nowadays a marked tendency to omit the *r*; this should be resisted except where there is another *r* as in "Emperor of Germany." Two *r*'s close together are troublesome, as in "itinerary," "supernumerary." In quick conversation "temporary" tends to lose one *r*, and "February" may often be heard without its first *r*; but this is avoided by educated speakers.

The fact that a word like "dear" may have its *r* pronounced or not leads to the wrong addition of an *r* sound in "the idea-r of it"; and similarly the fact that "more" has two pronunciations leads to the mistake, common in dialect speech, of adding *r* to "saw" in "I saw it."

The normal *r* in standard speech is produced with the front of the tongue curled up a little; see in the mirror what happens when you say "raw." Dwell on the sound; it is a voiced continuant. Sometimes, to produce a special effect, we may "roll" or trill the *r*. Not everyone can do this easily; but it is good practice to produce a long, uniformly trilled *r*.

When the tongue is curled back rather far, we get a sound that is heard, for instance, in Devon-

shire and in some forms of American speech. In other dialects, instead of a vowel followed by *r*, we have the vowel produced with the point of the tongue not hanging down, but curled up as for *r*; we then get a peculiar type of vowel which we call "coronal." Try to pronounce [ɑɪ] in this way; also [əɪ].

When the tongue is not curled up at all, we may get something rather like *r*; but it is not a true *r*. After [k] or [g], as in "crown" or "green," some people produce such a sound; try to pronounce it, being careful not to let the front of the tongue curl up. Then utter "red," "ring," with this sound; if, as is often the case, you do not separate the lips much, you will have something very like a *w*. You are familiar with this way of mispronouncing *r*.

The curling up of the tongue is rather a delicate movement, and for those who have got into the way of pronouncing some substitute for the true *r* it is not always easy to acquire it. Young children will often get the right sound very quickly, when they have been allowed to hear a long untrilled *r*. With older people it may be necessary to assist the tongue artificially to the right position. Sometimes success comes quickly if the learner is told to utter a long [ʒ], and then to do it again with his teeth about an inch apart: the result will be no [ʒ], but something very near to [r]. Or he may be told to try to utter [ð] with a knuckle between his teeth.

The sound of [l] is produced by letting the tongue touch the middle of the top of the mouth while the

breath passes out at the sides. Now in doing this we can let the tongue touch the upper teeth, or the gums above them, or some part of the hard palate; we can let the tongue assume various shapes (flat, raised in front, raised behind). Make as many such sounds as you can. You will notice that, while all may be described as [l], they vary considerably. We distinguish "clear l" and "dark l," and you will have no difficulty in determining which of the l's you produce is "clear" and which is "dark"; and a little experimenting will show you that "darkness" is due to raising the back of the tongue. Probably the very "dark" varieties will not please you; and they are indeed better avoided. In standard speech we have a "clear" l, e.g. in "willing," and a fairly "dark" l, e.g. in "will." The final l is always rather "dark"; very much so in certain dialects, where sometimes the tongue ceases to touch, and the l disappears altogether. Some speakers allow a great deal of the tongue to touch the roof of the mouth, which makes the l sound very thick; and some even substitute [ŋ] for it.

You will have noticed that many l's have disappeared between vowel and consonant, just as is the case with r: we do not pronounce the l in "half," "calm" any more than the r in "cart," "arm." Sometimes the raising of the back of the tongue has affected the vowel, as in "chalk, talk."

When a voiceless consonant comes before l, as in "clear," "plain," the vibration of the vocal chords may not start at once when the tongue has

assumed the *l* position. Then the beginning of the *l* is voiceless. Say "clear" with a mainly voiceless *l*; the word does not sound well like this, and it is better to make the *l* voiced all through. The Welsh *ll*, e.g. in "Llandudno," is a voiceless *l* [l̥].

For the sound at the beginning of "you" the phonetic symbol is [j]. Say "you" and watch the first position of the tongue. This sound is voiced. When a voiceless consonant comes before it, as in "hue," "tune," the vibration of the vocal chords may not start at once when the tongue has assumed the *j* position. Then the beginning of the [j] is voiceless; for this the symbol is [ç]. Accordingly "hue" will be [hçju:], and the initial combination is often simplified by dropping the *h*. Similarly "tune" is pronounced [tçju:n], and this often becomes [tʃu:n]. Compare the colloquial form of "don't you know" (p. 36). In "nature" and similar words many prefer [-tçə] to [-tʃə] or [-tjə].

This voiceless [ç] is the sound of *ch* in German "ich," "nicht," etc.

The sounds [j, ç] are produced when the breath passes through a narrowing of the mouth passage formed by raising the front of the tongue. When the narrowing is a little farther back, the voiceless sound [x] is produced. This you may have heard in "loch" as pronounced in Scotland; it is also the sound of *ch* in German "ach, doch." It does not occur in standard English speech.

In some dialects we find a continuant pronounced

still farther back. Here the narrowing is between the back of the tongue and the uvula. This is the little round end of the soft palate, which you can see in the mirror if you open your mouth well and keep the tongue flat. It has the shape of a "little grape" ("uvula" is the Latin word for this). The sound produced is similar to that of the "tongue *r*" [r], and it is called the "throat *r*" or "uvular *r*," and may be trilled (with vibrating uvula) or untrilled. This is the Northumbrian "burr," and it is heard in French and in German; but it does not occur in standard English speech. Occasionally, however, it is found in the speech of individuals as a substitute for "tongue *r*."

The sound of *h* may be described as the voiceless form of a vowel. When we say "half" the tongue is in position for the [aɪ] before the vocal chords vibrate, and the breath passing through the mouth produces the *h* sound.

In French the sound of *h* was dropped very early, and is now never pronounced in ordinary speech. Many words borrowed from French ("herb," "humble," etc.) had an initial *h* in the spelling, which was never pronounced in French, and long remained silent in English. As a rule, however, we pronounce the initial *h*; and so the spelling of "herb," "hospital," "humble" has led to a change in their pronunciation. In these words we now pronounce the *h*; but the spelling has not been powerful enough to make us pronounce the *h* of "hour," "honour," "heir." In the case of "humour"

both pronunciations may be heard; that with *h* is becoming more common.

When *h* stands at the beginning of the second part of a compound word, it is not pronounced; for instance in "shepherd," "forehead." It is, however, now sometimes heard in "hedgehog," and generally in "neighbourhood." In most cases the *h* has been restored,—another instance of the influence of the spelling. This is still more marked in "Lewisham": a few people still call it [lʝʊɪsəm], but the normal pronunciation is [lʊɪʃəm], the *s* and *h* that originally belonged to different words being regarded like the ordinary *sh* of our spelling that represents [ʃ]. The same sort of thing is happening to "Grantham," in which some now pronounce the *th* as [θ].

The English sounds we have considered in this chapter may be tabulated as follows:

<i>Passage narrowed at</i>	<i>Lips</i>	<i>Teeth and lip</i>	<i>Point and blade</i>	<i>Palate and</i>	
				<i>Front of tongue</i>	<i>Back of tongue</i>
Voiceless continuant	m	f	θ s ʃ	ç	x
Voiced continuant	w	v	ð z ʒ	j	

We have also had:

ɹ: point of tongue curled up.

r: point of tongue trilled.

l: point of tongue touching palate, breath issuing at sides.

ɫ: the same, with back of tongue raised.

h: breath passing through mouth.

ʔ: glottal stop.

Chapter VIII. Vowels

WHEN the breath makes the vocal chords vibrate and passes through the mouth without let or hindrance, we obtain one of the many vowel sounds that we can produce. The quality of the vowel depends on the shape of the passage through which it passes. Watch in the mirror what happens when you say "he," "ha," "who": the tongue has a different shape for each, and that means a different shape of the mouth passage. Remember that if your tongue moves while you are uttering a vowel, that vowel is not uniform: you are passing from one vowel to another. Say "hare"; notice the dropping of the tongue from the first to the second part of what we may call a diphthong.

It is the position of the tongue that is of the greatest importance. Hold a pencil between your teeth and utter "he," "hair," "ha," "haw," "who." Now remove the pencil and utter the words as clearly as possible: the space between the upper and lower teeth increases as you pass from "he" to "ha" and decreases again in passing from "ha" to "who." The lowering of the jaw is not essential; but it makes more distinction between the sounds, and so improves speech.

Again, say "he," "hair," "ha," "haw," "who," without moving your lips; and then say them with as much lip action as possible. (Watch in the mirror!) The opening between your lips forms first ("he") a long narrow opening, then ("ha") it

becomes a large, slightly flattened circle, and finally ("who") a much smaller circle. This lip movement is not essential; but it makes more distinction between the sounds, and so improves speech.

The moral is: if you want to produce clear vowels you must move your lower jaw and your lips.

The vowel sounds in "he," "ha," "who" represent the extreme positions: for the first the front of the tongue rises as high as possible, for the second it is flat, for the third the back of the tongue rises as high as possible.

We will consider first the vowel [ɑ] as in "father," "hard." It is almost always long; but it is not quite so long in "heart" as in "hard," compare also "half" and "halve." It is a rule that before a final voiceless consonant a vowel is a little shorter than before a voiced consonant. We sometimes hear a short [ɑ] in unstressed syllables, for instance in a common pronunciation of "translate."

In dialects we find various substitutes. One of these is a "dark" [ɑ], the tongue being slightly drawn back; then "ha" will sound a little like "haw." We use [A] as the sign for "dark" [ɑ]. This [A] is a feature of low-class London speech; some, in their fear of it, go too far in the other direction, and push the tongue a little forward, beyond the proper [ɑ] position. This gives us a "clear" [ɑ] which sounds a little like the vowel in "hat." We use [a] as the sign for "clear" [ɑ]. Say [fAɪðə], [fɑɪðə], [faɪðə]. In some dialects the tongue is moved still more forward and the vowel

of "hat" (symbol [æ]) is used; say [fæɪðə]. Practise these four sounds.

In some forms of English we find [aɪ] used in "calm" and other words, but before one of the sounds [f, θ, s] clear [a] or even [æ]: e.g. in "laugh," "path," "last." This is not standard speech.

The vowel [æ] in "hat" is our usual "short *a*." It varies in length: it is a little longer in "bag" than in "back," in "tab" than in "tap"; and it is much longer in the adjectives "bad," "glad," "mad," "sad" than in "bat," "mat," "sat."

In dialects there is a tendency to raise the tongue too much, so that [æ] becomes [e], the vowel in "men." In standard speech this is allowed only in the word "many"; observe that the change is not found in "manifold." In dialect we may hear "Jenuary," "redish," "thenks."

When the front of the tongue is raised a little higher than for [æ] we get the vowel [ɛ] which we have at the beginning of "air." Say "at" and "air" and notice the slight difference. This vowel is always followed by another vowel sound, a rather vague sound, the "neutral" vowel [ə] which we have met at the end of "father." The combination [ɛə] represents *air* or *ere* in the spelling. When the *r* is not pronounced, as in "fair," the [ə] is quite clear; when the *r* is pronounced, as in "fairer," it is less distinct. We may indicate this by writing these words [fɛə] and [fɛ^ərə].

For the vowel [e] the front of the tongue is raised a little higher than for [ɛ]. It is always short in

standard speech; but it is a little longer in "bed" than in "bet," in "beg" than in "deck." In some forms of English [ɛ] is substituted for [e].

The vowel [ɪ] in "hid," "hit" is not the shortened form of the vowel [i] in "heed," "heat." Dwell on "hid," making the vowel long; you will find the result quite different from "heed." The tongue is looser for [ɪ] than for [i]. Place your thumb against the place where your lower jaw meets your throat, and you will feel a pressure against it when you say "heed" that you do not feel when you say "hid." We may call [ɪ] a "lax" vowel, and [i] a "tense" vowel.

When the spelling has *ear* or *eer*, we have a lax [ɪ] followed by the neutral vowel; thus "dear" is [dɪə], and "dearer" is [dɪ^rrə]. This is also true when an [ə] follows that was not once an *r*; "really" should be [rɪəlɪ], not [rɪəlɪ] or [rɪlɪ], which are found in some dialects. Similarly "theatre" is [θɪətə], "museum" [mju:zɪəm].

We now have to consider some diphthongs. You are doubtless familiar with this term, which literally means "two sounds." Be careful not to use "diphthong" of two *letters*; there is no diphthong in "head" or in "heart."

We have a diphthong in "high." Notice how the tongue moves: it starts with "clear" [a] and rises to [ɪ]. If you utter the diphthong slowly, you will observe that it consists of a series of sounds, not merely of two; but for convenience sake we may call it a diphthong, and indicate it by writing the

first and last vowels of the series. The usual symbol is [ai], as for ordinary purposes it is unnecessary to mark the distinction between [ɪ] and [i].

This diphthong is usually long; it is rather shorter in "height" than in "hide," in "strife" than in "strive."

Some incline to start with [a], and in dialects the tongue may be withdrawn even more, so that "life" sounds like "loife." In standard speech the diphthong starts with [a].

The word "hay" also contains a diphthong. Here the first position is that of [e], from which the tongue rises to [ɪ]. The usual symbol is [ei]. Say "hay" three times, [heiheihei], and watch the movement of the tongue.

This diphthong is usually long; it is rather shorter in "late" than in "laid," in "safe" than in "save."

In dialects we find various other pronunciations. In some there is a uniform long vowel [ei]; in others there is a diphthong in which the tongue starts lower and ends lower, so that we get either [ɛe] or even [æe]. Often, too, this vowel is nasalised: not only where a nasal consonant brings this about, as in "time" pronounced [tɪ̃em] (the mark ~ indicates nasalising), but even in other cases, e.g. "life" pronounced [lɪ̃ef].

The long [iɪ] is by some pronounced as a uniform long vowel; but in standard speech it is more often a diphthong. Pronounce "he" three times; you will probably notice that the tongue moves slightly

each time; at any rate, you will observe a slight movement of the lower jaw. If this happens, you will know that you are uttering a diphthong.

This diphthong is slightly shorter in "heat" than in "heed," in "cease" than in "seas." When owing to absence of stress it is considerably shortened it becomes [i]: thus, unstressed "he" becomes [hi]. Notice the difference between the first vowel in "he did it" [hi did it] and the other two; also the difference between the first and second vowels of "reiterate" [riitəreit].

We have now dealt with all the English front vowels, which may be arranged as follows:

ii	i	
		I
ei	e	
		ε(ə)
		æ
ai	a	

We may regard [ɑ] as being neither a front nor a back vowel. The first back vowel will then be the "dark" [A] of which we have spoken above; but this is not recognised in standard speech.

When the tongue is drawn farther back than for [A], and the lips are a little rounded, we get the vowel sound of "hot," for which the sign is [ɔ]. This sound is short; it is a little longer in "fob" than in "fop," in "rod" than in "rot."

In dialects it is sometimes lengthened excessively; there is a very objectionable pronunciation of "God" and "dog" as [gɔɪd] and [dɔɪg].

Before the consonants [f, θ, s] this vowel used to be longer than is now customary in standard speech. "Officer," "coffee," etc., were pronounced with [ɔɪ]; and some still have a long vowel in "off," "cross," "lost," "cloth." In all such words the short vowel is to be preferred.

There are several dialect forms of this sound. On the one hand, the tongue may be too low and drawn too far back, which produces an ugly, "throaty" sound, not uncommon in southern English; on the other, it may be pronounced without lip action, in which case it sounds like a variety of [ɑ]. In standard speech the tongue is not too far back, and is slightly raised, and there is distinct lip action.

The long vowel [ɔɪ] is the sound heard in "caught," "court," "stalk," "stork." In standard speech no difference is made in these and similar pairs of words; but they are of course not identical in dialects which preserve the sound of *r* before a consonant. Speakers of those dialects naturally dislike such rhymes as Swinburne's "morning" and "dawning" or Kipling's "sought" and "court"; the term "cockney rhymes" is sometimes applied to them. The loss of *r* may be a cause for regret; the fact remains that in standard speech, owing to its loss, the rhymes given are good. Of course there are many who are misled by the spelling into honestly believing that they pronounce the *r* before a consonant, although they have never done so in their lives.

The *-aun-* words ("launch," "paunch," etc.) are

now all pronounced with [ɔ], the only exception being "aunt" [ɑnt].

In some dialects a distinction is made between "morning," "for," "horse," etc., and "mourning," "four," "hoarse," etc. In "morning," etc., the normal pronunciation with [ɔ] is used, but in "mourning," etc., a different *o* sound (the [o] mentioned below) followed by [ə]. This distinction is not made in standard speech.

A sound akin to [ɔ] is that heard in "come," "sun," for which the symbol is [ʌ]. Here, too, the tongue is raised at the back, slightly; there is no rounding of the lips. The sound is short; it is a little longer in "cud" than in "cut." It is often spelled *o*, as in "constable," "comfort"; in some cases the spelling has influenced the pronunciation. We now usually pronounce "comrade" with [ɔ]; in "combat" both [ɔ] and [ʌ] may be heard.

The sound [ʌ] only occurs in syllables that have some stress. We have it in "cup" [kʌp] and in "teacup" [ti:kʌp], where the second syllable has some stress. But though we have it in "come" [kʌm], we do not in "welcome" [welkəm], which no longer suggests "well come," and in which the second syllable is consequently unstressed.

In dialects various vowels occur in place of [ʌ], for instance [ɑ], [a] and [u]. "Elocutionists" seem particularly liable to change it, saying, for instance, [lɑv] for [lʌv] and even [dʒɔdʒ] for [dʒʌdʒ].

The highest back vowels are closely parallel with the highest front vowels.

To the lax [ɪ] of "hid," "hit," corresponds the lax [ʊ] of "hood," "foot"; and to the long [i:], generally diphthongal, of "heed," "heat" corresponds the long [u:], generally diphthongal, of "mood," "root." Say "who" several times, and you will probably find that your lips move as you say the vowel; which shows that it is not a uniform vowel, but a diphthong.

Just as in "dear" we have lax [ɪ] followed by [ə], so in "poor" we have lax [ʊ] followed by [ə]. "Poor," "poorer" is [pʊə, pʊərə]. Some let the tongue sink much lower, to [ɔ:]; the pronunciations [pɔ:] for [pʊə], [ʃɔ:] for [ʃʊə] may often be heard. Similarly, a common form of "your" is [jɔ(r)], and of "yours" [jɔ:z]. It is, however, only in the words "door" and "floor" that this pronunciation has come to be generally accepted.

The letter *u* is often pronounced [ju:] or [jʊ], as in "tube," "regular." There is a tendency to change [tju] to [tʃu] and [dju] to [dʒu], as was mentioned on p. 36.

After some consonants [ju] is inclined to become [u]. After [l] usage varies a good deal: "luminous," "absolute," for instance, are now commonly pronounced with [lu:], but "lute," "lurid" probably more often with [lju:] and [ljʊə]. When another consonant precedes, as in "blue," "flute," only [lu:] is allowable in standard speech, but [lju:] persists in some dialects. In "suit," "news," "duke," etc., [ju:] is preferred. In "enthusiasm, -astic" [u:] is quite common.

In dealing with the front vowels we noted the diphthongs [ai], [ei], [iɪ]. We now have to deal with three diphthongs parallel to these.

The diphthong [au] starts with the tongue in the [a] position and it then rises to [u]. It is slightly longer in "loud" than in "lout."

In dialects it is often begun more forward than in standard speech. To begin it with "clear" [a] is not offensive; but as soon as the tongue rises to [æ], the result is very unpleasant to an educated ear. The faulty diphthong may be [æu] or [æo], or we may hear [æou]; and sometimes the sound is nasalised. Another dialect variation of [au] is [aɪ] or [aɪ̃].

The diphthong [ou], as in "road," "wrote," begins with an *o* sound which has the tongue more raised than [ɔ]. It does not normally occur by itself in standard speech; but sometimes we find it when [ou], occurring in an unstressed syllable, is reduced to [o], as in the first syllable of "poetic," "November."

In some dialects a uniform long [oɪ] is found in place of the diphthong; in others the tongue starts lower and ends lower, the diphthong being [ɔɔ] or something like it.

It has been pointed out above that [uɪ] is generally slightly diphthongal in standard speech, like [iɪ].

A further diphthong is [ɔi], as in "boy." Some speakers start from [o] rather than from [ɔ], but this cannot be regarded as standard speech.

The diphthongs may also be followed by [ə]; thus we have "fire" [faɪə], "player" [pleɪə], "flower" [flaʊə], "sower" [souə], "employer" [ɪmplɔɪə]. In the case of [aɪə] and [aʊə] care must be taken not to let these be reduced to [aə] or [ɔə]; such pronunciations as [baʳən] for "Byron," [fləʊz] for "flowers" are often heard.

Attention may be drawn to a special pronunciation of the back vowels, due to the whole body of the tongue being moved forward. We sometimes hear a deprecating "oh no" uttered in this way; this diphthong (symbol [öü]) strikes us as affected. Persons of "culture" sometimes pronounce "poet" with this [öü].

The vowel [ü] may be heard in unstressed syllables, such as the first syllable of "July"; and it is not uncommon in dialects. In some forms of London speech all *u*'s are of this type. Pronounce [uɪ] with the tongue as far back as possible, then with the tongue advanced more and more; do the same with [oɪ] and [ou].

Mention has been made of the neutral vowel [ə]. As you will see in the mirror, the tongue position is similar to that of [ɑ], but the mouth is not opened so much, and the tongue is raised a little. This sound occurs long in "fern," "fir," "fur," "word," "heard," "myrrh"; it is a little longer in "herd" than in "hurt," in "serve" than in "surf."

The letters *er* once stood for [ɛr], which in certain cases changed to [ɑr], later [ɑɪ]. In some words the spelling changed to *ar*, as in "farm," "marvel"

(cp. the French "ferme," "merveille"). As a rule, the spelling remained *er*; and either the [ɑ] pronunciation was kept, as in "clerk," "sergeant," "Derby," or the spelling led to the pronunciation [ə] as in "serve," "clergy" (at one time pronounced "sarve," "clargy").

The short [ə] is common in unstressed syllables, as in "father"; but not every *e* in an unstressed syllable represents [ə]. Often it is pronounced as a lax [ɪ]. Thus, both in "daisies" and in "dazes" we have this [ɪ]; also in the first syllable of "because," "endure." On the other hand, the letter *i* in an unstressed syllable is sometimes pronounced [ə]: thus the unstressed ending *-ity* is generally [ətɪ], for instance "utility" [jutɪlətɪ]. Notice that "the" is [ðə] before a consonant, [ði] before a vowel; we say [ðə kaʊ], but [ði ɔks].

The following table shows the vowel sounds and combinations that occur in standard speech:


	iɪ			uɪ	
ɪə		ɪ		ʊ	ʊə
eɪə	ei	e		ou	oʊə
		ɛə	ʌ	ɔ	ɪə
			æ	ə	
aɪə		aɪ	a	ɑ	ɑʊ
				ɒ	ɒə

Chapter IX. Connected speech ; stress


So far we have dealt with the individual sounds; we must now consider words and groups of words, such as we use in connected speech.

We may regard the sound as the smallest unit in speech. A word consists of a number of sounds. It may consist of one or more syllables; "on" is one syllable, "honour" has two, "honesty" three. What is a syllable?

⟨Sounds have varying degrees of carrying power, or sonority.¹ A vowel is more sonorous than a consonant, a voiced sound more sonorous than a voiceless one, [l], [m], [n] more sonorous than the other consonants. In "honour" [ɔnə] we have three sounds; we may represent the amount of their sonority like this:




Similarly we may represent "honesty" [ɔnəstɪ] thus:



When a sound is more sonorous than those beside it, it is "syllabic," it forms the main part of a syllable.

Now in "honour" the [n] is less sonorous than its neighbours; but if we take a word like "buttons" [bʌtnz]:



the [n] is more sonorous than its neighbours, it is therefore "syllabic." Note that we do not drop the tongue from the palate between the [t] and the [n]; there is consequently no vowel between these two sounds.

In "bottles" [bɒtlz] we have syllabic [l].

The syllables of a word are not all pronounced with the same force or stress. In "bottles" it is the first syllable that is stressed, in "prevail" the second. Our spelling does not show which syllable of a word is stressed, and this explains why in some cases there is diversity even among educated speakers, and why stress is liable to change.

We no longer stress "compénsate," "balcóny," "arístocrat," as was commonly done one hundred years ago. We say "Julý," which comes from "Július," and "Aúgust," which comes from "Augústus." We say "démonstrate," but "remónstrate." Some stress "laboratory" on the first syllable and some on the second.

That mistakes should often be made is only natural, for instance "exquísite," "formídable."

It is impossible here to give any guidance to the stressing of words; for this a modern dictionary

must be consulted. But there are some aspects of stress that we may profitably consider.

In many words it is the most important syllable that receives the chief stress; and in native English words this is generally the first syllable, as in "baker," "bakery."

In a sentence we stress the words that are most important. In "He wrote a letter when he had returned home," we give the chief stress (') to "letter" and "home" and a secondary stress (,) to "wrote" and "returned." The remaining words are unstressed. We might wish to emphasise "he" or "had," in which case these would receive a strong stress; and note that in this case they would be pronounced differently.

We have in English a large number of words that have what we call "strong" and "weak" forms, according as they are stressed or unstressed. Thus "are" is [ɑ:] when stressed, as in "We *are* going"; but unstressed: [wi ə], or, usually, [wi ə]. "Jack *has* done it" with [hæz]; but unstressed it is [həz] or [əz] or [s]. The demonstrative "that" is [ðæt], because owing to its meaning it is naturally stressed; but the conjunction is usually [ðət]. The right use of strong and weak forms, especially in reading or reciting good prose or verse, is of great importance. The excessive use of weak forms gives a careless, slipshod effect; but too many strong forms may also be detrimental to the beauty of a passage, by spoiling the rhythm. The ordinary spelling here again leaves us in the lurch: it recognises the existence of only a few extreme forms such

as "'s" for "has" and "'d" for "had." The study of suitable phonetic texts can be very useful here.

Stress also serves to show that a group of words is closely connected: the last important word receives the chief stress. When we say "buy 'bread and 'butter" we stress the two nouns equally; but when we say "I want some ,bread and 'butter" we give "butter" the chief stress, because by "bread and butter" we here mean "battered bread." The same reason accounts for the stress in "good 'morn-ing," "bill of 'fare," "not a 'bit," "Member of 'Parliament."

Some compound expressions have "even stress": both parts are uttered with equal force, as in "'lead 'pencil," "'mince 'pie." A "'black 'bird" is not necessarily a "'blackbird."

The stress of some words may vary for reasons of rhythm. We say "he 'knows Chi'nese," but "a 'Chinese 'lantern"; "an 'outside 'blind," but "he 'went out'side." It will be noticed that we like to let stressed and unstressed syllables alternate. The stress of "Trafalgar" used to be on the first or third syllable; if now we stress the second, the change may well be due to "Tra'falgar 'Square."

There are many words which, when used as nouns or adjectives, have the stress on the first syllable, but on the last when they are used as verbs; for example, "absent," "conduct," "permit," "torment." A few, when used as nouns, have the stress on the first syllable, but on the second when they are used as adjectives; for example, "compact," "minute."

Chapter X. Intonation

THOSE who desire the general acceptance of a standard pronunciation are sometimes met with the objection that if all persons spoke alike it would be monotonous. If that were so, we might well hesitate in our efforts to establish a standard. But it is not so.

Even if all learnt to use the same pronunciation, their voices would lose none of their individuality, and there would still be great difference in expression. A sentence has a certain meaning, but it may not bear the same meaning for all persons or in all circumstances. "It is raining" may be a mere statement of fact, of no great importance to me; but if the rain is going to prevent a pleasant outing to which I had been looking forward, I shall say that sentence with a note of disappointment.

In the reading of a poem, the thoughts expressed will mean more to one reader than to another. One may have keen sensibilities, a rich experience of life, warm human sympathies; he will be the better able to enter into the feelings of the poet and his reading will be far more expressive than that of one whose outlook is narrower, who has lived on the surface, or who has acquired the habit of reserve and of expressing his feelings in a conventional way.

The good speaker and the good reader have various resources for bringing out the meaning of their words. They can make use of stress, of pauses,

of a reduced or increased rate of utterance; but the chief means of expression is the musical quality of speech, its varying pitch, and this we now have to consider.

Once more, the ordinary representation of speech fails us: the spelling gives no indication of pitch. This is not surprising, because of its great variety; nor is it regrettable, for here there can be no standard. There can be good or bad intonation; but there can be no rules that would govern all cases, least of all in the higher forms of prose and verse, where a standard interpretation would mean that the readers had standardised souls,—all feeling the same emotions on reading the same words.

The more commonplace the words, and the more frequently used, the more likelihood there is of similarity of intonation among educated speakers. Words which in no way bear any deep meaning for us, the ordinary small talk of everyday life, afford the most convenient material for a first approach to the study of a subject that is of no mean importance, but has hitherto received scant attention.

Say fairly slowly, but in a natural tone of voice:

“He went out. He bought a book.”

Hum each sentence after saying it. In both the voice falls. You have made two statements, which show no signs of being connected.

Now say:

“He went out, and bought a book.”

The voice rises for “out”; the first sentence is felt to be connected with the second. Say only “he

went out," with this rising intonation. It sounds incomplete; you expect something to follow.

Say: "one, two, three, four, five."

Four times the voice rises, because there is something more to come; on "five" it falls, as you have reached the end.

Definite statements have a fall at the end; for instance "That's all." "Full stop." "It can't be done." The matter is settled; there is nothing more to be said.

Similarly in commands, such as "Do what I tell you!" "Shut the door!" "Silence!" "Sit down!"

But a statement may not be quite so definite; the speaker may imply some reservation. I can say definitely "it isn't bad," with a fall. But while saying the same words, I may suggest "but it might be better" by letting the voice first fall a little in "bad" and then rise.

In the same way, if I wish another to do something, I may say so in a peremptory way, with a fall, as in the words given above. But I may also make it rather a request than an order. "Sit down!" sounds quite friendly, if I raise my voice at the end; for it implies "if it is convenient to you." It leaves it free to the person addressed to do otherwise.

Questions are of two kinds: those which contain no questioning word and to which the answer is "yes" or "no"; and those which contain a questioning word (such as "who," "when").

In "yes or no" questions the voice rises, e.g. in "Has he come?" "Is it late?" In longer questions,

such as "Would you mind opening the window?" the beginning is often a little higher than the middle, but not so high as the end. Sometimes what looks like a question is really a command, for instance "Will you do as you're told!" Here, as in other commands to which no reply is expected, the voice falls. Notice how your voice acts when you read the words "'Are you happy?' he asked": the rise extends beyond "happy" to "he asked," although this statement should have a fall.

When a question submits two or more alternatives, as in

"Is it red, or black, or blue?"

we have a rise on the earlier ones and a fall on the last.

When a question contains a questioning word, the voice generally falls, as in "Where is my book?" "Who made that noise?" A small rise at the end is, however, not excluded. Thus "Where are you going?" with such a rise suggests personal interest, making the question more friendly.

If in a sentence there is some word to which we attach special importance, one that we wish to make more prominent than the rest, we may utter it with more force; but the regular way of singling it out is not by greater stress, but by difference of pitch.

Say: "There were nine.—Five, did you say?—No, *nine*."

Compare the pitch of the first "nine," of "five," and of the second "nine." See how the voice starts

higher on "five" and still higher on "nine," and how in each case there is a fall, the greater fall being on the more emphatic word.

Say: "Is he leaving to-morrow? No, he's *coming* to-morrow."

The question has the usual rise; in the answer the first syllable of "coming" is high, the second low.

Say: "Is he coming to-day? No, he's coming *to-morrow*."

In the answer the voice rises until it reaches the second syllable of "to-morrow," from which it falls.

The greater the fall, the more prominence the word has. I can say "no" on one note only; but when I make a passionate denial, the "no" passes through a number of notes, from high to low.

If in addition to the most important word there is one of secondary importance, this will have a rise.

Say: "I sprained my ankle yesterday."

Here we may make only "ankle" prominent, letting the voice fall from its first syllable to the end of the sentence. We may also wish to attach some importance to "yesterday"; then there will be a rise on this word. Note that in such a case we have a rise at the end of a statement which does not imply that it is incomplete. The old rule that "the voice falls in statements and rises in questions" has probably before this struck you as being rather inadequate to explain the diversity of English intonation.

In colloquial speech exaggeration is common. "Awfully" is used for "very," "priceless" or

“stupendous” for “great,” and “never in all my life” for “never.” The same dissatisfaction with the ordinary means of expression may lead to excessive variation of pitch. “Oh dear no,” itself an unnecessarily lengthened “no,” then becomes almost a tune in itself, and “I’m simply thrilled,” a rhapsody.

This kind of thing may be pardoned when it is the mere exuberance of youth; at other times it strikes us as affectation and gets badly on our nerves. The opposite extreme is more common, but equally objectionable: it consists in a really “monotonous” intonation, with hardly any variation of pitch. This suggests a lack of interest, of human sympathy. It may be the outcome of shyness, when it is easier to excuse; it may be due to contemptuous indifference or haughty reserve.

Good speakers in uttering ordinary statements about everyday affairs will use much the same intonation. Just as they will avoid making themselves conspicuous by pronouncing words in an unusual way, so they will avoid excessive or insufficient variation of pitch, or indeed any deviation from what may be considered normal in standard speech.

The customary intonation of the various dialects has hardly been studied at all. We recognise that they differ from the standard; sometimes a dialect appears to us to have a “sing-song” effect, because of the recurrence of some “musical phrase” that is not usual in standard speech. We sometimes meet with a speaker whose pronunciation is quite accord-

ing to standard, and who retains of his dialect only the intonation; and this slight reminiscence of his home may be a not unpleasing feature,—so long as he is speaking of ordinary things.

When we pass from ordinary to literary English, the question of intonation takes on a different aspect. If in reading aloud or in public speaking of any kind we confine ourselves to the inflections of the voice habitual in conversation we are in danger of making the sublime appear commonplace. What we read may, of course, be a conversation; what we recite may be in colloquial English; what we act may be a modern society play. Then normal intonation will be appropriate—at least where the talk is about ordinary things. But if it be historical or descriptive prose, or a lyric, or a tragedy, if there be any appeal to the intelligence or the emotions, every-day inflections will no longer serve us, and we are often justified in departing entirely from the ordinary rules.

There are a few common mistakes, bad habits, to which beginners in reading and reciting seem to be specially liable, and which may be mentioned with advantage. A few lines of verse will help to show what is meant. Take:

The way was long, the wind was cold,
The Minstrel was infirm and old;
His wither'd cheek, and tresses grey,
Seemed to have known a better day.
The harp, his sole remaining joy,
Was carried by an orphan boy.

These simple introductory lines from the *Lay of*

the Last Minstrel, of which the phonetic transcription is given on p. 36 of my *Specimens of English*, can be badly read in several different ways:

(a) The metrical scheme may be over-emphasised by excessive stressing, even "was" in l. 2 and "by" in l. 6 being fully stressed. The effect is very wearisome. Meaning is sacrificed to mechanism.

(b) The voice may start high and full and descend in pitch and decrease in force, in each wordgroup. This is a very common mistake in reading prose as well as in verse. The ever recurring *decrescendo* soon becomes monotonous.

(c) There may be a rise on the last syllable of every wordgroup. Rises and falls on a single syllable are common in conversation, and in artistic speech they occur also; but they are less common. In the six lines quoted, it is better to give the rhyming words, as well as "long" in l. 1 and "cheek" in l. 3, only on one note.

(d) Some reciters have a "pet note" which they give to the first full syllable of every breathgroup, e.g. in the above lines the syllables "way," "wind," "Min-," "with-," "tress-," "seem-," "harp," "carr-," are all uttered on the same note.

(e) Others incline always to emphasise epithets at the expense of the nouns they qualify, e.g. "*withered* cheek," "*better* day."

(f) In the desire to be distinct, the reader may indulge in an excessive number of strong forms (see p. 57). Probably no reader would give "the" its strong form [ðɪ]; but strong [ænd] in l. 2, and strong [hæv] in l. 4 are almost equally objectionable.

On the other hand the weak form of "to" [tə] in l. 4 would have an unpleasant effect; and it is indeed a good rule in artistic speech to use only the form [tu].

(g) The passage is a simple one; yet some reciters will never do anything simply. They are obsessed with the idea that they must "make the most" of everything. It is true that the excessive use of gesture is generally discredited; the reciter no longer deems it essential to put his hand to his ear whenever the word "hear" occurs, or to look to heaven when he says "God." But he is still inclined to overdo his intonation effects. Such a one will put a quite unnecessary depth of meaning into "long" and "cold"; will quaver with pity at "infirm and old"; and his voice will thrill with rapture over "joy." This unabated stream of emotion defeats its own object. We need the relief of simple passages in order to appreciate those that stir our feelings deeply.

Chapter XI. Two passages analysed

It will be useful to consider two short pieces, one in prose and one in verse, with a view to recapitulating what has been said about pronunciation, stress and intonation. For the pronunciation use is made of the symbols employed in earlier chapters; [i] is used for both the lax and the tense sounds, similarly [u]; and [r] represents the untrilled sound. | indicates a short pause, || a longer one, |—| the longest. The stress mark (ˈ) precedes the stressed syllable. The numbers indicate the intonation; for this passage we may be content with distinguishing three notes: 1 represents what we may call the "level of indifference," the note on which we utter words to which we attach no special importance; 2 is a higher note, 3 higher still. 3-1 will indicate a fall from 3 to 1.

The following passage is from Leigh Hunt's "A Few Thoughts on Sleep."

3-1(a) 1 1 2 1 1 1-2(b) 1 1-2(b)

"Blessings," exclaimed Sancho, "on him that first
 'blesɪŋz | ɪks'kleɪnd(c) 'sæŋkəʊ | ɔn 'hɪm ðæt 'fɔɪst

2 2 2 2-3(b) 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2

invented sleep! It wraps a man all round like a
 ɪn'ventɪd 'slɪp |—| ɪt 'ræps ə 'mæn 'ɔɪl 'raʊnd | 'laɪk ə

2-1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 - 3(d) 3

cloak." It is a delicious moment certainly—that
 'klaʊk |—| ɪt ɪz ə dɪ'liʃəs 'mɔʊmənt 'sɛɪtɪnli || ðæt

(a) fall on the prominent word. (b) rise on words of secondary importance. (c) or [eks'kleɪnd]. (d) rise, because there is something to follow.

2 2 2 2 2 2 2-3(d) 2 3 3 I I
 of being well nestled in bed, and feeling that you
 əv(e) bi:ŋ 'wel 'nesld in 'bed | ænd(g) 'fi:liŋ | ðæt(h) ju

I 2 2 2 2 2-3(f) I 2 2 2 3
 shall drop gently to sleep. The good is to come,
 ʃəl 'drɒp 'dʒentli tu(i) 'sli:p |-| ðə 'gud iz tu(i) kʌm|

3 3-2 I 2 I I 2 3 3 3
 not past: the limbs have been just tired enough
 'nɒt 'pɑ:st || ðə 'limz həv bi:n(k) 'dʒʌst 'taiəd(l) i'nʌf|

I 2 2 I 2 2 2 I 2 2 2 2 3 2
 to render the remaining in one posture delightful:
 tu 'rendə | ðə ri'meiniŋ in 'wʌn 'pɒstʃə(m) di'laitfl(n)|

I 2 2 I I 3 2 I I 2 2
 the labour of the day is done. A gentle
 |ðə 'leibər(o) əv(e) ðə 'dei iz 'dʌn|-| ə 'dʒentl

2 2 I I I 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
 failure of the perceptions comes creeping over
 'feiljər(o) əv ðə pə'sepʃənz | 'kʌmz 'kri:piŋ 'ouvə

2-3(d) I 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
 one, the spirit of consciousness disengages itself
 wʌn || ðə 'spirit əv 'kɒnʃəsnis(p) | disin'geidʒiz itself

(d) rise, because there is something to follow. (e) weak form; when there is much between two stresses, we pass over it more quickly, and prefer weak forms where available. (f) The rise here makes the clause "and feeling . . . sleep" more closely parallel to "that of . . . bed"; but a fall would also be appropriate. (g) Strong forms are as a rule used at the beginning of a wordgroup. (h) In this case, although "that" is at the beginning of the wordgroup, we prefer the weak form, because there is much before the first stress and we pass over it quickly; hence also the weak [ʃəl]. (i) better here than [tə], see p. 67. (k) [hæv bi:n] would sound heavy. [bi:n] is only used when "been" has more than its usual value, as in "I have been there." (l) not two separate *t* sounds, but a pause between closure and opening. (m) or [pɒstʃə]; see p. 40. (n) or [-ful]. (o) The [r] should be carried on. (p) some prefer [-nes].

2 2 2-3 I 2 2 2 2 2 2-3
 more and more, with slow and hushing degrees,
 'mɔɪr ənd(q) 'mɔɪ | wɪð 'sləʊ ənd(r) 'hʌʃɪŋ dɪ'grɪz
 I I 2 I I 2 I I I-2 I I I I
 like a mother detaching her hand from that of her
 'laɪk ə 'mʌðə dɪ'tætʃɪŋ hə 'hænd | frəm(s) 'ðæt əv(e) hə
 2 2 2-I I 2-3 I I I I 2 2
 sleeping child; the mind seems to have a balmy
 'sli:pɪŋ 'tʃaɪld || ðə 'maɪnd | 'sɪmz tu(i) hæv ə 'bɑ:mɪ
 2 2 2 2 - 3 3 3 3-2 I I - 2 2 2
 lid closing over it, like the eye;—'tis closing; 'tis more
 'lɪd 'kləʊzɪŋ 'əʊvər ɪt | 'laɪk ðɪ 'aɪ || tɪz 'kləʊzɪŋ || tɪz 'mɔɪ
 2 - 3 3 3 - I. I 2 3 3 3 3 I
 closing; — 'tis closed. The mysterious spirit has
 'kləʊzɪŋ || tɪz 'kləʊzd |—| ðə mɪs'tɪəriəs 'spɪrɪt | hæz
 2 2 2 2 2 2 2-I
 gone to take its airy rounds.
 'gɒn tu(i) 'teɪk ɪts 'eəri 'raʊndz |—|

Attention may be drawn to the division into wordgroups. When preparing a passage to be read it will often be found that the punctuation does not always provide groups of reasonable length; and it is well to break a long series of words into shorter lengths, indicating them by an upright pencil line.

The intonation given above is not meant to indicate the only possible one; it merely represents my way of reading it. The student may well write the passage out and supply numbers to indicate his own intonation and then compare it with the one

(q) the ordinary pronunciation of this expression has [ən], not [ənd]. (r) when two ideas are closely connected, the coupling "and" is [ənd]; so in "house and home," "bread and butter," "stocks and shares." (s) or [frəm].

given above. He may find that the three notes given are not sufficient for him; he is at liberty to use higher numbers in order to indicate a wider range of pitch. As far as this simple passage is concerned, three notes seem adequate for my rendering.

For a verse passage I also draw on Leigh Hunt, choosing his well-known poem "Abou ben Adhem and the Angel."

3 2 2 3 2 1 1 2 1 2(a)
 Abou ben Adhem—may his tribe increase!—
 'aɪbuɪ(b) ben 'aɪdem | 'meɪ hiz 'traɪb ɪn'kri:s(c) |

1 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 3
 Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
 ə'wɒk | wʌn naɪt(d) | frɒm(e) ə 'di:p 'dri:m əv(f) 'pi:s |

1 3 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2
 And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
 ænd(e) 'sɔ: | wɪðɪn ðə 'mu:nlaɪt ɪn hiz 'ru:m(g) |

1 1 1 3 1 1 1 3 2 2 3(h)
 Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
 meɪkɪŋ ɪt 'rɪtʃ | ənd(i) laɪk ə 'lɪli ɪn 'blu:m |

(a) For parenthetical statements like this the pitch is usually lowered. (b) In oriental names (Kubla Khan, Samarcand, etc.) the clear [a] generally produces a better effect than [ɑ]. (c) not [ɪŋ'kri:s]. (d) not two separate *n* sounds, but indicating the second *n* by an increase in the force of the breath; see p. 29. (e) strong form (not [frəm]) at the beginning of the wordgroup. (f) better the strong form; when there is little between two stresses we make the most of it. (g) The pronunciation [rum] is common, but [ru:m] is to be preferred here on account of the rhyme. (h) If the words "and like a lily in bloom" were read with the intonation 1 3 1 2 2 1 3 it would mean "like in bloom to a lily"; the connection of two words may often be shown by giving them the same pitch. (i) I prefer the weak form here, as I do not stress "like" and consequently there is so much before the first stress of the wordgroup is reached.

1 4-2(*k*) 2 1 1 1 3 3 3-1
 An angel, writing in a book of gold.
 ən 'einzəl(*l*) | 'raitɪŋ in ə 'buk əv(*f*) 'gould |—|

2 2 2 2 1 1 2 2 2 2-3
 Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
 ik'si:diŋ(*m*) 'pi:s | həd(*n*) meid ben 'a:dem 'bould |

2 2 2 3 3 2 2 2 2 3
 And to the presence in the room he said:
 ænd(*e*) tu(*o*) ðə 'prezns in ðə ru:m hi sed |

2 2 3 4 (*p*) 1 2 2 2 2 2
 "What writest thou?" The vision raised its head,
 '(h)wɒt(*q*) 'raitist(*r*) ðəu || ðə 'vizn 'reizd its 'hed |

1 1 1 3 2 2 2 3 3 3
 And with a look made of all sweet accord,
 ænd wið ə 'luk | meid əv(*s*) 'ɔ:l 'swi:t ə'kɔ:d |

2 2 1 2 2 3 2 3 3 3-1
 Answered: "The names of those who love the Lord."
 'ɑ:nsəd | ðə 'neimz əv 'ðəuz hu(*t*) 'lʌv ðə 'lɔ:d |—|

1 1 2 2 - 3 - 4(*u*) 3 3 2(*v*)
 "And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay, | not so,"
 ænd iz 'main 'wʌn | sed 'a:bu: |—| 'nei | 'nɒt 'sou |

2 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 1 1(*w*)
 Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low,
 ri'plaid ði 'einzəl |—| 'a:bu: 'spouk 'mɔ: 'lou |

(*k*) The most prominent word of the first five lines. (*l*) Some say [eindʒəl], and some "elocutionists" say [eindʒel] as well as [devil]. (*m*) or [ek-]. (*n*) the weak form preferred for the reason given in note (*i*). (*o*) Note how bad [tə] would sound here. (*p*) The conversational intonation of "What are you writing?" would be falling, and "What writest thou?" might be said in this way; but it would not sound so well to my ear. (*q*) see p. 22. (*r*) the old endings *-est* and *-eth* are pronounced with [ɪ] or [e] or [ə]. (*s*) the weak form seems preferable, as with [əv] there would be three [ə] sounds close together. (*t*) the relative "who" is usually short, the interrogative long. (*u*) for the rise carried beyond the question, to which alone it is really appropriate, see p. 62. (*v*) Compare this intonation with that of the conversational equivalent of the words, "oh no." (*w*) Here the lowering of the voice is imitative of what the words mean.

I 2 2 2-3 3 3 3 2 3 3
 But cheerily still; and said: "I pray thee, then,
 bʌt(x) 'tʃiʳili 'stil | ənd 'sed | ai 'prei ði: 'ðen |

4 4 2 3 3 3 3 - I
 Write me as one that loves his fellow-men."
 'rait mi(y) æz wʌn | ðət 'lʌvz hiz 'feloumen |—|

I 2 2 2 I 2 I I 2 2
 The angel wrote, and vanished. The next night
 ði 'einʒəl 'rout | ənd 'vænɪft |—| ðə 'nekst(z) 'nait |

I 2 2 2 I I 3 3 3 3
 It came again with a great wakening light,
 it 'keim ə'gen(A) | wið ə 'greit 'weikəniŋ(B) 'lait |

2 3 3 3 3 3 3 4-3 2 3
 And showed the names whom love of God had blest,
 ənd 'ʃoud ðə 'neimz | hum 'lʌv əv 'gɔd hæd 'blest(C) |

2 5 4 5 5 4 3 2 - I
 And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.
 ənd(D) 'lou | ben 'aɪdemz 'neim | 'led 'ɔl ðə 'rest |—|

(x) The two *t* sounds must be indicated by the pause between closure and opening of the mouth passage. (y) unstressed and short; see p. 48. (z) Particular care must be paid to the articulation of such groups of consonants as [kstn] here, and [stθ] in "writest thou" above. When they seem unmanageable it is best to make a very slight pause between the words. (A) [ə'gen] is here preferred to [əgein], because [ei] occurs three times in the line as it is. At one time the pronunciation of "again" and "against" was [əgein] and [əgenst]; then [əgen] and [əgenst] became common. Some use [əgein] at the end of a wordgroup, and [əgen] elsewhere. (B) The ordinary pronunciation is with syllabic *n* (see p. 56) after the [k]. (C) This wordgroup is "spaced out," spoken more deliberately; hence the strong forms of "of" and "had"; even "whom" might be long here (see note (f)). (D) or [ənd]; before a very emphatic word a weak form is often used to make it appear all the stronger.

Chapter XII. Passages in phonetic transcription

THE passages contained in this chapter provide opportunities of considering various features of connected speech, such as the division into groups of words (often much smaller than those indicated by the conventional punctuation), the use of strong and weak forms, and the stressing of words. Different styles are represented, ranging from light narrative prose to epic verse.

The transcription should be read critically; there are sometimes other ways of distributing the stresses or grouping the words than are here given. A good exercise is to make an independent transcription of the text and then compare it with the one provided.

The symbols used are those with which the reader is by this time familiar. The signs for lax *i* and *u*, viz. [ɪ, ʊ], have been retained, although in "broad notation" this is not always done; but [r] is used for the ordinary untrilled *r*, not the strictly correct symbol [ɹ]. [(h)w] is written for *wh*, to indicate that some speakers prefer [hw] and others [w]. [ən(d)] indicates that the omission of [d] is optional.

The sign [ˈ] indicates half-length.

The stress-mark [ˈ] precedes the stressed syllable.

FROM "THE PICKWICK PAPERS"

"WE are about to partake of a plain dinner at the Blue Lion, sir; we hope you and your friends will join us."

"Of course," said Mr. Wardle, "among our friends we include Mr. ——," and he looked towards the stranger.

"Jingle," said that versatile gentleman, taking the hint at once. "Jingle—Alfred Jingle, Esq., of No Hall, Nowhere."

"I shall be very happy, I am sure," said Mr. Pickwick.

"So shall I," said Mr. Alfred Jingle, drawing one arm through Mr. Pickwick's, and another through Mr. Wardle's, as he whispered confidentially in the ear of the former gentleman:—

"Devilish good dinner—cold, but capital—peeped into the room this morning—fowls and pies, and all that sort of thing—pleasant fellows these—well behaved, too—very."

There being no further preliminaries to arrange, the company straggled into the town in little knots of twos and threes; and within a quarter of an hour were all seated in the great room of the Blue Lion Inn, Muggleton—Mr. Dumkins acting as chairman, and Mr. Luffey officiating as vice.

frəm ðə 'pɪkwɪk 'peɪpəz

wɪ ər ə'baʊt tə pɑ:'teɪk | əv ə 'pleɪn 'dɪnə | ət ðə 'blu:
'laɪən | 'ʃəɪ || wɪ 'həʊp | 'ju: ən(d) jʊə¹ 'frendz² | wɪl
'dʒɔɪn əs |—|

əv 'kɔɪs | sed mɪstə 'wɔɪdl | əmʌŋ əwə 'frendz wɪ
ɪn'klʊd mɪstə || ənd hɪ 'lʊkt təɪdz³ ðə 'streɪnzə |—|

'dʒɪŋgl | sed ðæt 'vəɪsətəɪl 'dʒentlmən | 'teɪkɪŋ ðə
'hɪnt ət 'wʌns |—| 'dʒɪŋgl | 'ælfɪd 'dʒɪŋgl ɪskwaɪə |
əv 'nou hɔɪl | 'nou(h)wəə |—|

aɪ fl bɪ 'veri 'hæpɪ | aɪ əm 'fʊə⁴ || sed mɪstə
'pɪkwɪk |—|

'sou fəl 'aɪ | sed mɪstər 'ælfɪd 'dʒɪŋgl | drɔɪŋ 'wʌn
aɪm θru: mɪstə 'pɪkwɪks | ənd ə'nʌðə θru: mɪstə 'wɔɪdlz |
æz hɪ (h)wɪspə'd kɒnfrɪ'denʃəlɪ | ɪn ðɪ 'rər əv ðə 'fɔɪmə
'dʒentlmən ||

'devlɪʃ gud 'dɪnə | 'kəʊld bət 'kæpɪtl | 'pɪpt ɪntə ðə
'rʊm⁵ ðɪs 'mɔɪnɪŋ | 'fəʊlz ən(d) 'paɪz ənd ɔɪl 'ðæt sɔɪt
əv 'θɪŋ || 'pleznt 'feləʊz 'ðɪz | 'wel bɪ'heɪvd 'tu: |
'veri |—|

ðeə bɪŋ 'nou 'fəɪðə prɪ'lɪmɪnərɪz tu ə'reɪnz | ðə
'kæmpəni 'stræɡld ɪntə ðə 'taʊn | ɪn 'lɪtl 'nɒts əv 'tu:z
ən(d) 'θɪrɪz || ənd wɪ'ðɪn ə 'kwɔɪtər əv ən 'əwə | wər
'ɔɪl 'sɪɪtɪd | ɪn ðə 'ɡreɪt 'rʊm | əv ðə 'blu: laɪən 'ɪn |
'mæɡlɪn || mɪstə 'dʌmkɪnz æktɪŋ əz 'tʃeəmən | ənd
mɪstə 'lʌfɪ ə'fɪʃeɪtɪŋ əz 'vaɪs |—|

(1) or jɔ. (2) frenz is common. (3) or tuwɔɪdz. (4) fɔ: is com-
mon. (5) or rʊ:m.

There was a vast deal of talking and rattling of knives and forks, and plates: a great running about of three ponderous-headed waiters, and a rapid disappearance of the substantial viands on the table; to each and every of which items of confusion, the facetious Mr. Jingle lent the aid of half-a-dozen ordinary men at least. When everybody had eaten as much as possible, the cloth was removed, bottles, glasses, and dessert were placed on the table; and the waiters withdrew to "clear away," or in other words, to appropriate to their own private use and emolument whatever remnants of the eatables and drinkables they could contrive to lay their hands on.

Amidst the general hum of mirth and conversation that ensued, there was a little man with a puffy Say-nothing-to-me,-or-I'll-contradict-you sort of countenance, who remained very quiet; occasionally looking round him when the conversation slackened, as if he contemplated putting in something very weighty; and now and then bursting into a short cough of inexpressible grandeur. At length, during a moment of comparative silence, the little man called out in a very loud, solemn voice—

"Mr. Luffey!"

Everybody was hushed into a profound stillness as the individual addressed, replied—

"Sir!"

"I wish to address a few words to you, sir, if you will entreat the gentlemen to fill their glasses."

CHARLES DICKENS.

ðeə⁶ wəz ə 'vaɪst_ˈdi:l əv 'tɔɪkɪŋ | ənd 'rætɪŋ əv
 'naɪvz ən(d) 'fɔɪks ən(d) 'pleɪts || ə 'greɪt 'rʌnɪŋ ə'baʊt |
 əv 'θɪrɪ 'pɒndərəs hedɪd 'weɪtəz | ənd ə 'ræpɪd dɪs-
 ə'prɪərəns | əv ðə səb'stænsɪl 'vaɪəndz ɔn ðə 'teɪbl || tu
 'i:tf ənd 'evrɪ | əv (h)wɪtf 'aɪtəmz əv kən'fju:zɪn | ðə
 fə'sɪfəs mɪstə 'dʒɪŋgl 'lent ði 'eɪd əv 'haɪfəðlʌzn 'ɔɪdɪ-
 nərɪ⁷ 'men ət 'lɪst |—| (h)wen 'evrɪbɒdɪ hæd 'i:tn əz
 'mʌtf əz 'pɒsɪbl | ðə 'klɒθ wəz rɪ'muɪvd | 'bɒtlz 'gləɪsɪz
 ən(d) dɪ'zəɪt | wə 'pleɪst ɔn ðə 'teɪbl || ən(d) ðə 'weɪtəz
 wɪð'dru: tu | 'klɪər ə'wei | ɔr ɪn 'ʌðə wəɪdz | tu ə'prou-
 prɪeɪt tu ðeər⁸ 'oun 'praɪvɪt 'ju:z ənd ɪ'mɒljumənt |
 (h)wɒt'əvə 'remnənts əv ði 'i:təblz ən(d) 'driŋkəblz |
 ðeɪ kəd kən'traɪv tə 'lei ðeə⁶ 'hændz ɔn |—|

ə'mɪdst ðə 'dʒenərəl⁹ 'hʌm | əv 'mə:θ ən(d) kɒn-
 və'seɪfn | ðət ɪn'sjuɪd | ðeə⁶ wəz ə 'lɪtl 'mæn | wɪð ə
 'pʌfɪ | sei 'nʌθɪŋ tu mi ɔr aɪl 'kɒntrə'dɪkt ju | 'sɔɪt əv
 'kaʊntɪnəns | hu rɪ'meɪnd 'veri 'kwaiət || ə'keɪzənəli
 'lʊkɪŋ 'raʊnd hɪm | (h)wen ðə kɒnvə'seɪfn 'slæknd | əz
 ɪf hi 'kɒntəmpleɪtɪd | 'pʊtɪŋ 'ɪn 'sʌmθɪŋ 'veri 'weɪtɪ ||
 ənd 'naʊ ən(d) 'ðen 'bɔɪstɪŋ ɪntʊ ə 'ʃɔɪt 'kɒf | əv ɪnks-
 'presɪbl 'grændjə |—| æt 'leŋθ | dʒuərɪŋ ə 'moumənt əv
 kəm'pærətɪv 'sailəns | ðə 'lɪtl 'mæn 'kɔɪld 'aʊt | ɪn ə
 'veri 'laʊd 'sələm 'voɪs ||

'mɪstə 'lʌfɪ |—|

'evrɪbɒdɪ wəz 'hʌft ɪntʊ ə prə'faʊnd¹⁰ 'stɪlnɪs¹¹ | əz
 ði ɪndɪ'vɪdʒʊəl ə'drest | rɪ'pləɪd |

'səɪ |—|

aɪ 'wɪf tu ə'dres ə 'fju: 'wəɪdz tu ju | 'səɪ | ɪf ju wɪl
 ɪn'tri:t ðə 'dʒentlmən | tu 'fɪl ðeə 'gləɪsɪz |—|

(6) or ðə. (7) ɔɪdnəri is common. (8) or ðər. (9) dʒenərəl is
 common. (10) or prə'faʊnd. (11) or -nes.

ON LETTER-WRITING

A PLEASANT letter I hold to be the pleasantest thing that this world has to give. It should be good-humoured; witty it may be, but with a gentle diluted wit. Concocted brilliancy will spoil it altogether. Not long, so that it be not tedious in the reading; nor brief, so that the delight suffice not to make itself felt. It should be written specially for the reader, and should apply altogether to him, and not altogether to any other. It should never flatter—flattery is always odious. But underneath the visible stream of pungent water there may be the slightest under-current of eulogy, so that it be not seen, but only understood. Censure it may contain freely, but censure which, in arraigning the conduct, implies no doubt as to the intellect. It should be legibly written, so that it may be read with comfort; but no more than that. Calligraphy betokens caution, and if it be not light in hand, it is nothing. That it be fairly grammatical and not ill spelt, the writer owes to his schoolmaster, but this should come of habit, not of care. Then let its page be soiled by no business; one touch of utility will destroy it all. If you ask for examples, let it be as unlike Walpole as may be. If you can so write it that Lord Byron might have written it, you will not be very far from high excellence.

ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

on letəraitɪŋ

ə 'pleznt 'letə | ai 'hould tu 'bi: ðə 'plezntɪst 'θɪŋ |
 ðæt 'ðɪs 'wə:ld hæz tu 'gɪv |—| It fʊd bi: 'gʊd'hju:məd¹ ||
 'wɪtɪ it 'meɪ bi: | bæt wɪð ə 'dʒentl di'lju:ɪtɪd 'wɪt |—|
 kən'kɔktɪd 'brɪljənsɪ | wɪl 'spɔɪl It 'ɔɪltʊ'geðə² |—| 'nɒt
 'lɔŋ | sou ðæt It bi: nɒt 'ti:dʒəs In ðə 'rɪ:ɪdɪŋ || 'nɔ: 'brɪf |
 sou ðæt ðə dɪ'lait sə'fais nɒt tu 'meɪk Itself 'felt |—|
 It fʊd bi 'rɪtn 'speʃəli fɔ ðə 'rɪ:ɪdə | ænd fʊd ə'plai 'ɔɪltʊ-
 geðə² tu 'hɪm | ænd 'nɒt ɔɪltʊ'geðə² tu enɪ 'ʌðə |—|
 It fʊd 'nevə 'flætə || 'flætəri iz 'ɔɪlwəz³ 'ɔʊdʒəs |—|
 bæt ʌndə'nɪθ ðə 'vɪzɪbl 'stri:m əv 'pʌnzənt 'wɔɪtə |
 ðəə 'meɪ bi: ðə 'slaitɪst 'ʌndəkʌrənt əv 'ju:lədʒɪ | sou ðæt
 It bi: nɒt 'sɪn | bæt 'ounlɪ ʌndə'stʊd |—| 'sensə | It meɪ
 kən'teɪn frɪlɪ | bæt 'sensə (h)wɪtʃ | In ə'reɪnɪŋ ðə 'kɔn-
 dækt | ɪm'plaɪz 'nou 'daut æz tu ðɪ 'ɪntələkt |—| It fʊd
 bi 'ledʒɪblɪ 'rɪtn | sou ðæt It meɪ bi 'red wɪð 'kʌmfət ||
 bæt 'nou 'mɔ: ðæn ðæt |—| kə'lɪgrəfɪ bɪ'touknz 'kɔɪfn |
 ænd If It bi nɒt 'laɪt In 'hænd | It Iz 'nʌθɪŋ |—| ðæt It
 bi: 'fæli grə'mætɪkl | ænd 'nɒt 'ɪl 'spelt | ðə 'raɪtər 'ouz
 tu hɪz 'skʊɪlmɑ:stə || bæt ðɪs fʊd kʌm əv 'hæbɪt | 'nɒt
 əv 'keə |—| 'ðen | let Its 'peɪdʒ bi 'sɔɪld baɪ 'nou
 'bɪznɪs⁴ || 'wʌn 'tʌtʃ əv ju'tɪlətɪ⁵ wɪl dɪ'strɔɪ It 'ɔɪl |—|
 If ju ʌsk fɔr r'gʒɑ:mpɪlz | let It bi: æz 'ʌnlɑɪk 'wɔɪlpoul
 əz 'meɪ bi: |—| If ju kən 'sou 'raɪt It | ðæt lɔɪd 'baɪ'rən
 mɑɪt həv⁶ 'rɪtn It | ju wɪl 'nɒt bi: 'veri 'faɪ | frɒm⁷
 'haɪ 'eksələns |—|

(1) ɟju:mə is common for "humour"; see p. 40. (2) observe the stress. (3) ɔɪlwɪz, ɔɪlweɪz are common. (4) or -nes. (5) rarely -ɪlətɪ. (6) or əv. (7) or frəm.

OUR GERMAN DESCENT

THE English are not aboriginal—that is, they are not identical with the race that occupied their home at the dawn of history. They are a people of German descent in the main constituents of blood, character, and language, but most especially in connection with our subject, in the possession of the elements of primitive German civilisation and the common germs of German institutions. This descent is not a matter of inference. It is a recorded fact of history, which those characteristics bear out to the fullest degree of certainty. The consensus of historians, placing the conquest and colonisation of Britain by nations of German origin between the middle of the fifth and the end of the sixth century, is confirmed by the evidence of a continuous series of monuments. These show the unbroken possession of the land thus occupied, and the growth of the language and institutions thus introduced, either in purity and unmolested integrity, or, where it has been modified by antagonism and by the admixture of alien forms, ultimately vindicating itself by eliminating the new and more strongly developing the genius of the old.

WILLIAM STUBBS.

auə 'dʒəimən dɪ'sent

ði 'ɪŋɡlɪʃ α¹ 'nɒt æbo'ridʒɪnəl | ðæt ɪz | ðei α¹ 'nɒt
 ai'dentɪkl wɪð ðə 'reis | ðæt 'ɔkjʊpaɪd ðeə 'houm | æt
 ðə 'dɔɪn əv² 'hɪstəri |—| ðei ɑr³ ə 'pi:pl əv 'dʒəimən
 dɪ'sent | ɪn ðə 'meɪn kɒn'stɪtjʊənts⁴ | ɔv 'blɑd | 'kær-
 ɪktə⁵ | ənd 'læŋɡwɪdʒ | bət 'moust ɪ'speʃəli ɪn kə'nekʃən
 wɪð auə 'sʌbdʒɪkt | ɪn ðə pɒ'zeʃn⁶ əv ðə 'elɪmənts əv
 'prɪmɪtɪv 'dʒəimən sɪvɪl'zeɪʃn⁷ | ənd ðə 'kɒmən 'dʒəɪmz
 əv 'dʒəimən ɪnstrɪ'tjʊɪʃnz |—| ðɪs dɪ'sent | ɪz 'nɒt ə
 'mætər əv 'ɪnfərəns |—| ɪt ɪz ə rɪ'kɔɪdɪd 'fækt əv²
 'hɪstəri | (h)wɪtʃ ðəʊz kærɪktə'rɪstɪks⁵ 'be⁸r 'aʊt | tʊ
 ðə 'fʊlɪst dɪ'ɡri: əv 'səɪntɪ |—| ðə kɒn'sensəs⁸ əv
 hɪ'stɔɪrɪənz | 'pleɪsɪŋ ðə 'kɔŋkwɛst ənd kɒlənɪ'zeɪʃn⁹ əv
 'brɪtɪn | baɪ 'neɪʃnz əv 'dʒəimən 'ɔrɪdʒɪn | bɪ'twɪn ðə
 mɪdl əv ðə fɪfθ | ənd ði 'end əv ðə 'sɪksθ 'sentjəri¹⁰ |
 ɪz kən'fəɪmd baɪ ði 'eɪvɪdəns | ɔv ə kən'tɪnjʊəs 'sɪ⁹rɪz
 əv 'mɒnjumənts |—| ðɪz 'fəʊ ði ʌn'broukn pɒ'zeʃn | ɔv
 ðə 'lænd 'ðʌs 'ɔkjʊpaɪd | ənd ðə 'ɡrouθ əv ðə 'læŋɡwɪdʒ
 ənd ɪnstrɪ'tjʊɪʃnz 'ðʌs ɪntrɒ'dju:st¹¹ | aɪðər ɪn 'pju⁹rɪtɪ¹²
 ənd 'ʌnmɒlestɪd¹³ ɪn'tegɪtɪ¹² | ɔ: | (h)we⁹r ɪt hæz bɪn
 'mɒdɪfaɪd baɪ æn'tæɡənɪzəm | ənd baɪ ði æd'mɪkstʃər¹⁴
 əv 'eɪljən 'fɔɪmz | 'ʌltɪmətli 'vɪndɪkeɪtɪŋ ɪtself | baɪ
 ɪ'ɪmɪneɪtɪŋ ðə 'nju: | ənd 'mɔ: 'strɔŋli dɪ'veləpɪŋ ðə
 'dʒɪnʃəs əv ði 'əʊld |—|

(1) *or* ə. (2) *or* ɔv. (3) *or* ər. (4) *or* kən-. (5) *or* kærək-. (6) *or* pə-. (7) *or* sɪvɪlɪ-. (8) *or* kən-. (9) *or* kɒlənɪ-. (10) *or* sentjʊrɪ. (11) *or* ɪntrə-. (12) *or* -ətɪ. (13) *or* 'ʌnmə-. (14) *or* -tʃə; see p. 40.

THE TWO PATHS

ASK yourselves what is the leading motive which actuates you while you are at work. I do not ask what your leading motive is for working—that is a different thing; you may have families to support—parents to help—brides to win; you may have all these, or other such sacred and pre-eminent motives, to press the morning's labour and prompt the twilight thought. But when you are fairly *at* the work, what is the motive which tells upon every touch of it? If it is the love of that which your work represents—if, being a landscape painter, it is love of hills and trees that moves you—if, being a figure painter, it is love of human beauty and human soul that moves you—if, being a flower or animal painter, it is love, and wonder, and delight in petal and in limb that move you, then the spirit is upon you, and the earth is yours, and the fullness thereof. But if, on the other hand, it is petty self-complacency in your own skill, trust in precepts and laws, hope for academical or popular approbation, or avarice of wealth—it is quite possible that by steady industry, or even by fortunate chance, you may win the applause, the position, the fortune that you desire: but one touch of true art you will never lay on canvas or on stone as long as you live.

JOHN RUSKIN.

ðə 'tu: 'paɪðz

'aɪsk juəsəlvz¹ | (h)wɒt ɪz ðə 'li:dn̩ 'moutɪv | (h)wɪtʃ
 'æktʃueɪts ju | (h)wɑɪl ju ɔr ət 'wɜ:k |—| aɪ 'du: nɒt
 'aɪsk | (h)wɒt juə 'li:dn̩ 'moutɪv ɪz fə 'wɜ:kɪŋ | 'ðæt
 ɪz ə 'dɪfrənt θɪŋ || ju meɪ hæv 'fæmɪlɪz tu² sə'pɔɪt |
 'peərənts tu² 'help | 'braɪdz tu² 'wɪn || ju meɪ hæv
 'ɔɪl 'ði:z | ɔr 'ʌðə sɑtʃ 'seɪkrɪd ənd prɪ'eminənt 'moutɪvz |
 tu 'pres ðə 'mɔ:ɪnɪŋz 'leɪbə | ənd 'prɒmt³ ðə 'twɑɪləɪt
 'θɔɪt |—| bɑt (h)wen ju ɑ 'fæʌlɪ 'æt ðə 'wɜ:k || (h)wɒt ɪz
 ðə 'moutɪv | (h)wɪtʃ 'telz əpɒn 'evrɪ 'tɑtʃ əv ɪt |—| ɪf ɪt
 ɪz ðə 'lʌv | əv 'ðæt (h)wɪtʃ juə 'wɜ:k reprɪ'zents || ɪf |
 bɪɪŋ ə 'læn(d)skeɪp peɪntə | ɪt ɪz 'lʌv əv 'hɪlz ən(d)
 'tri:z ðæt 'muɪvz ju || ɪf | bɪɪŋ ə 'fɪgə⁴ peɪntə | ɪt ɪz 'lʌv
 əv 'hju:mən⁵ 'bjʊ:ɪtɪ | ənd 'hju:mən 'sɔʊl | ðæt 'muɪvz
 ju || ɪf | bɪɪŋ ə 'flaʊər ɔ: 'ænɪml peɪntə | ɪt ɪz 'lʌv | ənd
 'wʌndə | ən(d) dɪ'lɑɪt ɪn 'petl ənd ɪn 'lɪm | ðæt 'muɪv
 ju || ðen ðə 'spɪrɪt ɪz ə'pɒn ju | ənd ðɪ 'əɪθ ɪz 'ju:z |
 ənd ðə 'fʊlnɪs⁷ ðeərəv |—| bɑt 'ɪf | ɔn ðɪ 'ʌðə hænd |
 ɪt ɪz 'petɪ 'selfkəmpleɪsnɪ ɪn juər 'əʊn 'skɪl | 'trʌst ɪn
 'prɪsɪpts ənd 'lɔ:z | 'həʊp fɔr ækə'demɪkl ɔ: 'pɒpjʊlə
 əprə'beɪfn | ɔr 'ævərɪs əv 'welθ || ɪt ɪz 'kwɑɪt 'pɒsɪbl |
 ðæt baɪ 'stedɪ 'ɪndəstrɪ | ɔr 'i:vn baɪ 'fɔ:tʃʊnɪt 'tʃɑ:ns |
 ju meɪ 'wɪn ðɪ ə'plɔ:z | ðə pɒ'zɪfn | ðə 'fɔ:tʃʊn⁸ | ðæt ju
 dɪ'zɑɪə || bɑt 'wʌn 'tɑtʃ əv 'tru: 'aɪt | ju wɪl 'nevə 'leɪ |
 ɔn 'kænvəs ɔr ɔn 'stəʊn | æz 'lɒŋ əz⁹ ju 'lɪv |—|

(1) *hardly* ju:— in careful speech. (2) *always* tu in careful speech. (3) *not* prɒmt. (4) *the usual form*; fɪgə is rare. (5) *often* çju:mən; see p. 40. (6) *better a slight pause than to pronounce the r in both words*. (7) *or* -nes. (8) fɔ:tʃʊn *often in conversation*. (9) *or* æz.

ON FIRST LOOKING INTO CHAPMAN'S
HOMER

MUCH have I travelled in the realms of gold,
 And many goodly states and kingdoms seen;
 Round many western islands have I been
 Which bards in fealty to Apollo hold.
 Oft of one wide expanse had I been told
 That deep-browed Homer ruled as his demesne:
 Yet did I never breathe its pure serene
 Till I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold:
 Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
 When a new planet swims into his ken;
 Or like stout Cortez, when with eagle eyes
 He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
 Looked at each other with a wild surmise—
 Silent, upon a peak in Darien.

JOHN KEATS.

FROM "THE PASSING OF ARTHUR"

AND slowly answered Arthur from the barge:
 "The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
 And God fulfils himself in many ways,
 Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
 Comfort thyself: what comfort is in me?
 I have lived my life, and that which I have done
 May He within himself make pure! but thou,
 If thou shouldst never see my face again,
 Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer

ɔn 'fəɪst 'lʊkɪŋ ɪntʊ 'tʃæpmənz 'həʊmə

'mʌtʃ hæv ai 'trævlɪd ɪn ðə 'reɪlmz ɔv ¹ 'gould |
 ænd 'meni 'gʊdli 'steɪts ænd 'kɪŋdəmz 'sɪn ||
 raʊnd 'meni 'westəɪn 'aɪləndz hæv ai bɪn |
 (h)wɪtʃ 'baɪdz ɪn 'frɪltɪ tʊ ə'pɒləʊ 'həʊld |—|
 'ɔft ɔv ¹ 'wʌn 'waɪd ɪks'pæns² 'hæd ai bɪn 'təʊld |
 ðæt 'dɪɪpbraʊd 'həʊmə 'ruɪld æz hɪz drɪ'mɪn ³ |
 'jet dɪd ai 'nevə 'brɪð ɪts 'pʃʊə sɪ'rɪm |
 tɪl ai həv 'tʃæpmən 'spi:k 'aʊt 'ləʊd ænd 'bəʊld |—|
 'ðen 'felt ai laɪk sʌm 'wɒtʃər ɔv ⁴ ðə 'skaɪz |
 (h)wen ə 'nju: 'plæɪt 'swɪmz ɪntʊ hɪz 'ken |
 ɔ: laɪk 'stʌt 'kɔ:tez | (h)wen wɪð 'ɪŋl 'aɪz |
 hɪ 'stæd æt ðə pə'sɪfɪk | ænd 'ɔɪl hɪz 'men |
 'lʊkt æt ɪtʃ 'ʌðə wɪð ə 'waɪld sə'maɪz ||
 'saɪlənt | əpɒn ə 'pi:k ɪn 'deəriən |—|

frɒm ðə 'paɪsɪŋ ɔv 'aɪθə

ænd 'sləʊli 'aɪnsə'd 'aɪθə frɒm ⁵ ðə 'baɪdz ||
 ðɪ 'əʊld 'ɔɪðə 'tʃeɪnzɪθ ⁶ | 'jɪldɪŋ 'pleɪs tʊ 'nju: |
 ænd 'gɒd ful'fɪlz hɪmsɛlf ɪn 'meni 'weɪz |
 lest 'wʌn 'gʊd 'kʌstəm ʃʊd kə'rʌpt ðə 'wəɪld |—|
 'kʌmfə't ðaɪ'sɛlf | '(h)wɒt 'kʌmfə't ɪz ɪn 'mɪ: |—|
 aɪ həv 'lɪvd maɪ 'laɪf || ænd 'ðæt (h)wɪtʃ aɪ həv 'dʌn |
 meɪ 'hɪ: wɪðɪn hɪm'sɛlf 'meɪk 'pʃʊə || bʌt 'ðəʊ |
 ɪf 'ðəʊ ʃʊdst 'nevə 'sɪ: maɪ 'feɪs ə'gen ⁷ |
 'preɪ fə maɪ 'səʊl |—| 'mɔ: 'θɪŋz ə 'rɔɪt baɪ 'preə |


(1) rather than əv. (2) or ek-. (3) the rhyme forbids the other pronunciation drɪ'mɛɪn. (4) -ər əv ðə wəʊld nɒt saʊnd wɛl. (5) frɒm wəʊld be ɪntɒlə'reɪbəl. (6) or -eθ. (7) rather than əgeɪn, to əvɔɪd eɪ ɪn θri: kɒn'sekjʊtɪv sɪlə'bəl's.

Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
 Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
 For what are men better than sheep or goats
 That nourish a blind life within the brain,
 If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
 Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
 For so the whole round earth is every way
 Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

ALFRED TENNYSON.

ðæn 'ðɪs 'wɔ:ld 'dri:mz ɔv |—| '(h)wæəfɔ let ðai 'vɔɪs
 'raɪz laɪk ə 'fauntɪn ¹ fɔ: mi | 'nait ənd_ 'deɪ |—|
 fɔ '(h)wɒt ɑ 'men 'betə ðæn 'ʃi:p ɔ: 'gəʊts |
 ðæt 'nɑ:ɪf ə 'blaɪnd 'laɪf wɪ'ðɪn ðə 'breɪn |
 ɪf | 'nəʊɪŋ 'gɒd | ðeɪ 'lɪft nɒt 'hændz ɔv 'præə |
 'bəʊθ fɔ ðəm'selvz | ənd 'ðəʊz hu 'kɔ:ɪl ðəm 'frend |—|
 fɔ 'səʊ ðə 'həʊl 'raʊnd 'əɪθ ɪz | 'evrɪ 'weɪ |
 'baʊnd baɪ 'gəʊld 'tʃeɪnz | əbaʊt ðə 'fi:t ɔv 'gɒd |—|

(1) fauntein *is terrible*.



YB 01592

498127

Reynian

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

