

cial, and seldom productive of results which the student is prepared to appreciate.

Voice-building, of which I have been speaking, constitutes the most important part of the elocutionist's work. But, in addition to this, he must give instruction in gesture and emphasis. The meanings and methods of gesture can be taught in a few lessons to any diligent pupil who is not positively deformed. To teach emphasis is more difficult. But no one, I think, can teach either this or gesture who has not made a special study of the principles underlying each subject, and of what is required in putting them into practice. I have known of a theological professor who, for twenty years, had been asking all his friends who were not elocutionists, what was wrong in his delivery, and had never obtained a correct answer. An ordinarily intelligent elocutionist could have given him a true diagnosis in three minutes, and possibly cured him in three weeks. Faults of emphasis may result from a wrong use of the elements either of time, pitch, volume or force, and that too in very subtle matters, like the habitual application of the most force at the beginning, the middle, or the end of a syllable. How can a man of inexperience be supposed to be able to perceive the source of a fault like the latter, or to know what kind of exercises can overcome it? The same question may be asked with reference to faults less difficult to analyze. A very common one among those who are called natural speakers and who, too, when schoolboys, usually carry off the prizes for declamation, consists merely in ending every sentence of a speech in a manner appropriate for its concluding sentence. Where the fault is manifested, an audience can listen for five or ten minutes, perhaps, without becoming wearied, but generally not longer than this. The manner, irrespective of the matter, begins, after that, to make them feel disappointed, because the speech does not end. I have never heard of an uninstructed critic who could even detect, much less who could correct a fault like this. I speak from an experience of many years, in which I have watched the effects of the training of some of the very brightest of students upon each other, when I say that what this kind of a critic often does is to make a mistake in his diagnosis, and to cause those whom he criticises to cultivate unduly, often by way of imitating himself, certain elements of emphasis to which their attention should never have been directed. The effect produced is artificiality, which, in speaking, invariably results from paying attention, and therefore giving importance to something that is of little or no importance.

Just here, I am aware that I am treading upon disputed ground. The one reason why some object to elocutionary training is that they suppose that elocutionists, rather than those of whom I am now speaking, cause artificiality. Might it not be more sensible to attribute