


thong *v* ; for, as I observed, we have not Ch. 3.
in English the genuine sound of that
vowel. Then, with respect to consonants,
the *c* is an ambiguous character ; for it is
sometimes sounded hard as the *k*, and
sometimes soft as the *s* ; and the *t* is of-
ten sounded as *sh*. And in the combi-
nations of consonants in syllables, we do
not always give them the same sound ; for
the *th* in *thing* is a much stronger aspirate
than in *then* or *though*.

C · H A P. IV.

*Of the antient accents.—That they were real
notes of music, distinct from the quantity
of the syllable.—What accent in English
is ?*

I Come now to the analysis of the second Ch. 4.
part of the matter of language, of
which I proposed to treat, viz. the *Prosody*.
And here I am to speak of a thing so little
understood in modern times, that some e-
ven deny the existence of it ; I mean, the
melody of language, as the antients called
it ;

Ch. 4.  it; which, as we shall shew in the sequel, made a considerable part of the beauty of their composition. For the better understanding it, it will be necessary to go back to that higher genus which I mentioned in the beginning of this book, namely, *sound*. For melody, as I have already observed, belongs not to language, as articulated voice, but as sound, being common to it with music.

Sound is defined by antient authors to be a percussion of the air, perceivable by the sense of hearing *. Now sound simply without articulation, may be considered in a threefold view. For it is louder or softer;—it is higher or lower, as to musical modulation, or, in other words, is acuter or graver;—or, lastly, it is of shorter or longer duration. The first of these differences does not belong to the art of language, (except so far as concerns the pronunciation of syllables in English, of which I shall say more hereafter): for men speak, and make other noises, loud or soft, as occasions require, which are too many and various to be comprehended by

* *Ψοφος μὲν ἵστί πλῆρη ἄερος ἀισθητὴ ἀκρόν. Αἰνμον. εἰς τὸ περὶ ἑρμηνείας, fol. 25.* See also *Euclid, sect. Can.* in initio.

rules. But the other two make part of the grammatical art, at least in the antient languages. Ch. 4

The first of these, as I have said, is called *prosody*; a word which I observe is frequently applied very improperly to quantity *; for *προσῳδία* in Greek exactly answers to the Latin word *accentus*, and denotes that tune or melody which is annexed to, or accompanies speech †: and it is of the analysis of this melody that I am now to treat.

* In the common Latin grammars, it is used to signify that part of grammar which treats both of quantity and accent; and it is so used even in the learned Vossius's grammar.

† This is the sense in which the word is constantly used by Dionysius the Halicarnassian, in his most accurate treatise of Composition, so often quoted, particularly in *sect.* 25. where he expressly distinguishes it from quantity; for speaking of the accidents of words, he mentions *ἐκτασεις τε καὶ συστολας, καὶ προσῳδίας*. The learned Theodorus Gaza, in his grammar, speaks the same language, *Προσῳδία ἐστὶ τασὶς ποία τῆς φωνῆς ἐγγράμματι πρὸς ἑυραμίαν τῷ ὅλῳ λόγῳ*; and then he proceeds to define *τῶνος*, as that of which the *προσῳδία* was composed. And Demetrius Triclinius, an antient grammarian, gives the same *ratio nominis* that I have given; for speaking of the marks of accents and spirits, he adds, *Ἅ δὲ καὶ προσῳδίας ὀνομάσαντες ὡς πρὸς τὴν ῥῆσιν καὶ τὴν ἐκφάνησιν τῶν συλλαβῶν συντελεσθῶσιν*. *Prefat. ad Aristophan.*

Like

Ch. 4.

Like every other melody it arises from a combination of sounds, and is resolvable into what is called *φθογγος* in Greek, and in English a *note*, which is defined by Aristoxenus, an antient writer upon music, to be “one stretch or extension of the voice *;” that is, as I understand it, a continuation of the voice in the same tone, without stop or interval, and without change.

A note may have all the three qualities of sound above mentioned: for it may be loud or soft; long or short; acute or grave. But it is of this last quality only that I am now to speak †.

And first it is apparent, that acuteness and gravity are relative qualities, as well as length and shortness: for it is impossible to conceive a sound either acute or grave, but in relation to another sound; and in general there is in music nothing absolute,

* Φωνης πτωσις ἐπὶ μίαν τασιν. *Harmonic. lib. 1. p. 15.*

† Those who are entirely ignorant of music, may imagine, that loud and acute, grave and soft, in sounds, are the same. But they are quite different; for the sound of a cannon is one of the gravest sounds that can be made, and at the same time one of the loudest.

but

but it is altogether a science of ratios and proportions. But the question is, What is it that makes this acuteness or gravity in sounds? And for solution of this question, we must go still a little higher than we have hitherto done, I mean, to an idea more general than even that of *sound*, viz. *motion*: for all sound is motion; and if all things were at rest, there would not, as Euclid says, be either sound or voice *.

It is therefore evident, that acuteness or gravity in sounds must be certain modifications of the motion which produces them. And Aristotle has told us, that when the sound is acute, there is much motion in little time; when it is grave, it is little motion in much time †. This is

Ch. 4.

* *Euclid. sect. Canonis, in initio.*

† Euclid has said the same thing, but at more length, in the beginning of his *sectio Canonis*. His words are, Τῶν δὲ κινήσεων αἱ μὲν πυκνότεραι εἰσι, αἱ δὲ ἀραιότεραι καὶ αἱ μὲν πυκνότεραι ὀξύτερες ποιοῦσι τῆς φθογγῆς, αἱ δὲ ἀραιότεραι βαρυτέρες. Ἀγαγκαιὸν δὲ τῆς μὲν ὀξύτερης εἶναι, ὅτι ἐκ πυκνοτέρων καὶ πλεονων συγκαταί κινήσεων τῆς δὲ βαρυτάτης (*lege βαρυτέρης*) ἑπταπὺρ ἐξ ἀραιωτέρων καὶ ἐλασσονων συγκαταί κινήσεων. From whence it appears, that Euclid knew in substance the doctrine of our modern philosophy concerning sounds, though I am persuaded he never made experiments such as that German philosopher made, who discovered that a string of such a length and such a thickness, and stretched by such a weight, made so many vibrations in a second.

Ch. 4. truly said, but shortly : it therefore needs to be explained ; and the discoveries of our modern experimental philosophy have enabled us to do it.

For it is now found out, that the percussion of the air, by which the antients defined sound, is caused by the percussion of some elastic body, whose vibrations, thereby produced, being communicated to the air, and by the air propagated to the ear, produce the sensation of hearing. A string or wire, stretched, has been found the most proper subject for such experiments. If the vibrations of this string are greater or less, that is, occupy more or less space, then is the note louder or softer ; if there are more or fewer vibrations in the same time, then is the note acuter or graver ; and, lastly, if the string continues to vibrate for a greater or less time, without any sensible variation of the sound, then is the note longer or shorter : so that here we have the threefold division of sound above mentioned.

That there are all these differences in music, no man will deny who has only a natural ear, though he never was taught the art ; and that two of them, at least, take

take place in language, is as impossible to deny. The only question therefore is with respect to the third, viz. the distinction of acuteness and gravity, whether it applies to language. Nor was even this disputed till of late. But Mr Foster, in his essay above mentioned *, has made the matter so perfectly clear, that I will not say a word upon the subject. And indeed it appears to me, that nothing but absolute ignorance of the nature of the antient languages, or the most violent prejudice, can induce a man to be of another opinion. One reason, perhaps, that may have led some people into it, is the improper use above mentioned of the word *prosody*, by applying it to quantity, and not to accent. This, I imagine, has made Isaac Vossius, among others, believe, that quantity and accent were the same, or at least that the long syllable always was accented †. An-
other

* This essay did not fall into my hands till I had begun to write upon this subject, and had formed the opinion which I was glad to find so well supported by Mr Foster. His essay is indeed full of excellent grammatical learning, and has furnished me with several authorities, of which I have made use.

† The work of Isaac Vossius I refer to, is what he
M m 2 has

Ch. 4. other probably has been, that there is no accent such as the Greek and Latin accents, in any modern language, as I shall afterwards shew. And, lastly, the impossibility for us, that are not accustomed to it, to sound those antient accents, has persuaded many people that it was as impossible for the antients to do it.

Taking it therefore for granted, that this antient prosody was, as the name imports, applicable to language; the next thing to be considered is, how it was applied. And we are informed, by the antient writers, that it was applied to syllables; that is to say, that different syllables of the same word were pronounced with tones differing in acuteness and gravity, and sometimes the same syllable, as shall be afterwards more particularly explained.

But, in the *first* place, it is to be observed, that this syllabic tone is very different from the general tone of a language; for each language has a particular tone with which it is spoken. But this

has written, *De viribus rythmi, et cantu pœmatum*; a work written in such excellent Latin, that I read it with pleasure, though I could find no sense or matter in it of any value.

national

national tone, as it may be called, affects Ch. 4.
the whole tenor of the speech, not words
only, and much less syllables.

2dly, It is also to be distinguished from the tones of passion or sentiment, by which the feelings of the mind are expressed ; for these belong to words or sentences, not to syllables.

And, *lastly*, It is likewise to be distinguished from the variation of loud and soft in discourse ; for we may raise our voice in speaking, or sink it, without any variation of the tone. And in this way we may alter our voice, not only upon words and sentences, but upon syllables ; which, as I shall shew afterwards, is what we call *accent* in English.

But the antient accents are real notes of music, or variations of the tone, by which the voice is raised higher, with respect to musical modulation, upon one syllable of a word, than upon another : and this syllable is said to have an acute accent, while all the rest of the syllables are pronounced with what is called a *grave accent* ; that is, they are pronounced upon a level with the rest of the discourse, or in that key in which the discourse is taken

up

Ch. 4. up *. For it is an invariable rule of accenting, both in Greek and Latin, that only one syllable of a word, how many soever there be, has an acute accent; for it seems they thought, that the raising the tone upon more than one syllable of the word, would have made the pronunciation of common speech too various and complicated, and too like chanting.

There is a third accent in those languages, called the *circumflex*, which is composed of the other two. This happens when the tone is both raised and depressed upon the same syllable, which never can be but when the vowel is long; for a long vowel in Greek and Latin was sounded like two short vowels of the same kind; and it was so written, according to the

* That this is the true notion of a grave accent, is evident from a passage of Dionysius Thrax, in his short but elegant treatise of Grammar, published by Fabricius, in the 7th volume of his Greek library. He defines accent to be, *Φωνῆς ἀπληχσις ἰναρμονιῇ, ἢ κατ' ἀνατάσιν ἐν τῇ ὀξείᾳ, ἢ κατ' ὀμαλισμῶν ἐν τῇ βαρεῖᾳ, ἢ κατὰ περιπλάσιν ἐν τῇ περισπωμένῃ*. So that the grave accent is the fundamental or ordinary level of the speech; and therefore the mark of it is never used, except upon the last syllable of a word; and then it denotes not the grave, but the acute accent. For what reason this strange practice has been introduced, I never could learn, nor do I see any reason for marking two accents, more than for marking two spirits.

antient

antient Latin orthography *. Such a syllable therefore might be considered as two syllables, upon one of which the tone was raised, and upon the other depressed †. And thus we see that those languages had in this matter, all the variety that the nature of the thing will admit; for every syllable among them had either an acute accent, or a grave accent, or both.

But how much was the tone of the voice to be elevated in founding the acute accent? or was it left to the arbitrary will of every speaker, to raise his voice more or less, as he thought proper? If that was

* See what Mr Foster has very well said upon this subject, in his Essay, pag. 38.; to which I will only add, that in some of the antient Roman monuments, particularly the laws of the Twelve Tables, instead of writing the character double for the long *i*, they wrote a great character thus, *I*. There is reason to think, that the Greeks wrote in the same way, before they invented different characters to express some of their long vowels. Plato, in the Cratylus, pag. 282. if I understand him rightly, says, that they wrote two *epsilons* in place of the *eta*, and the figure of the *omega* is plainly the two *omicrons* joined together.


† In this way the circumflex accent is explained by Scaliger, *De causis linguæ Latinæ, lib. 2. cap. 60.*; and it is in this sense we are to understand the antient authors who speak of the circumflex, as being a *middle* between the acute and grave.

Ch. 4. the case, it is plain, that the antients, in speaking, must have often run into cant; for an elevation and fall of the voice, to a certain degree, will make a kind of singing. But neither, in this respect, was the Greek language defective; for in it the boundaries were fixed betwixt the melody of speech and musical modulation. This appears from a passage in Dionysius the Halicarnassian's treatise, upon Composition, that I have so often quoted; which passage, if it had been rightly understood by those who have argued against the Greek accents, it is impossible, I think, that they could have been of that opinion; for it not only proves the existence of such accents, but explains most accurately the nature and measure of them. I will therefore give the passage rendered into English; but before I do that, I will, for the sake of those grammarians who know nothing of the principles of music, explain a little of the nature of musical tones; because I suspect it is the want of knowledge of these which has made Mr Foster's adversaries not give sufficient attention to this passage.

The Greeks used the same scale of music

fic that we use, viz. the diatonic scale, which rises by certain intervals or degrees, from any given pitch of the voice, called, in the language of music, the *fundamental*, to that note which is known by the name of *octave*; and the degrees or intervals by which the voice rises to the octave, are measured by numbers. And as the rise is chiefly by what is called *tones*, the scale has from thence the name of *diatonic*. The interval of a tone is as 8 : 9, if it be a greater tone; or of 9 : 10, if it be a lesser tone: and there is a smaller interval still, called a *semitone*, which is as 15 : 16. By these intervals of tones, greater and lesser, and semitones, making all together seven notes, besides the fundamental, the voice rises in a natural and easy ascent to the octave above mentioned, which has that name from its order in the scale, being the *eighth* note, including the fundamental, to which it is in the ratio of 2 : 1.

Of these seven notes all our music is composed, as all the words of our language are composed of the four and twenty elementary sounds. For though in music we go far above the eighth note, it is by the same intervals; so that all further

 Ch. 4. progression upwards, is but a repetition of the first seven notes, the octave serving always for a new fundamental. This way we proceed upwards to a second, third, or fourth octave, or as far as any voice or instrument will go *.

This scale, though it has been found convenient to divide it into the intervals above mentioned, yet is capable of being divided into intervals very much smaller. And accordingly, in some specieses of the antient music, the scale was divided not only into tones and semitones, but likewise into third parts of tones, and even the fourth parts of tones, which last they called *διεσις*. But in their diatonic scale, they proceeded, as we do, by tones and half-tones. This progress we mark by numbers 2, 3, 4, and so on, reckoning the fundamental always one. And in like manner the antients proceeded; but what we call a *fourth*, they called the *διατεσσαρων*; because

* It is a curious problem, How it comes to pass that the power of nature can go no farther in musical modulation than an octave? The fact is undoubtedly so; but I do not know that it ever has been demonstrated, though I think it might easily be so, if this were the proper place.

it went through four degrees, including Ch. 4.
 the fundamental, viz. two tones and a
 half above the fundamental. And the next
 note, which we call the *fifth*, consisting of
 three tones and a half above the fundamen-
 tal, they for the same reason called διαπεντε.
 And the octave, which goes through all
 the notes of the scale, they called διαπασων.
 The other steps of the progress they mark-
 ed by words, as we do, expressing their
 order. Thus the first degree above the
 fundamental they called διτονον, as we call
 it a *second*.

This being premised, I come now to
 the passage before us, in which the Hali-
 carnassian, after having laid it down, that
 the beauty of composition consists in the
 melody, rhythm, variety, and, lastly, what
 is proper or suitable to the subject; and
 after having told us, that the composition
 of words, even in prose, is a kind of mu-
 sic, differing from singing or instrumental
 music only in the quantity, that is, the
 more or less, not in quality or kind;
 and that words have their melody, rhythm,
 and other things above mentioned, as well
 as music; he proceeds to explain the me-
 lody of words as follows.

Ch. 4.

“The melody of common speech,” says he, “is measured nearly by one interval, that namely which is commonly called the *διαπεντε*. Nor does it rise beyond three tones and a half towards the acute, nor is it let down further towards the grave. But every word has not the same tone; for some are founded with an acute tone, some with a grave, and some have both. Of these last some have the acute and grave blended together, in the same syllable, which are called *circumflexed syllables*; others have them on different syllables, each of which preserves its own proper accent, whether grave or acute, distinct and separate from that of any other. In the dissyllables of this kind, the one is grave and the other acute, and betwixt these there can be no middle; but in words of many syllables of whatever kind, there is but one which is accented acute, while all the rest are grave. This is the melody of speech; but vocal and instrumental music use more intervals, not the *διαπεντε* only; for beginning with the *διαπασων*, they go through the *διαπεντε*, the *διατεσσαρων*, the *διατορον*, or (as it ought to be written) “the

“ the διτονον, the ἡμιτονιον, and, as some think, Ch. 4.
 “ even the διεσις *.”

This passage not only shews, as I have said, that the Greek accents were really notes of music, but also gives us the measure of them, and further marks the difference betwixt the melody of speech and music: which he makes to consist in two things; *first*, That the melody of speech does not rise above a fifth, whereas music goes to an octave, or much higher; *2dly*, The degrees or intervals in music, either

* The passage is in the 11th section of the treatise of Composition. It is too long to be here transcribed. There is no difficulty in it to those who understand the language and the subject; nor was it possible that the author could have used clearer words to express that the accents were musical tones. I shall only observe, that when he says ἡ μὲν ἅπαντα γὰρ ἡ λέξις, ἡ καθ' ἐν μοριον λογι ταττομένη, τῆς αὐτῆς λεγεται τασίως, the addition to the word λέξις, of the description of ἡ καθ' ἐν μοριον λογι ταττομένη, is only to remove the ambiguity of this word in Greek. For λέξις signifies either the whole style and composition, or a single word or part of speech, in which last sense it answers exactly to the Latin word *dictio*. In each of these senses I observe it used by the same author in the third section of the same treatise. I have therefore translated it simply by *word*, which in English is not ambiguous, without the addition that Mr. Foster makes of “ that is placed in a sentence,” pag. 142. which appears to me foreign to the sense of the author.

below

Ch. 4. below or above the fifth, are exactly marked. But that was not the case in speech; for the voice did not rise exactly to a fifth on the acute accent, but near to it, (ὡς ἐγγιστα), so as sometimes to be above it, and sometimes below it; and in falling to the grave, they did not pitch exactly upon the fourth, third, or any particular note below it. And this must necessarily have happened, as the voices of the speakers were of greater or less compass, or their ear more or less just.

But there is another difference betwixt the melody of speech and of music, observed by Aristoxenus *, and other antient writers upon music, That the melody of speech is συνεχής, or continued, while musical melody is διασηματικός, or distinguished by intervals; by which is meant, that in speech the notes succeed one another so quickly, that the intervals can hardly be perceived; whereas the intervals in music are easily distinguishable, the different

* *Aristoxen. Harmonics, pag. 9.* in the Collection of Meibomius. See also Gaudentius, another writer on music, contained in the same collection. His words are, Ὅτι μὲν ἐν τῇ λογικῇ, καθ' ἣν ἀλλήλοις διαλεγόμεθα, φθόγγοι συνεχῆς ἑαυτοῖς τὸν τόπον τῦτον διεκέρχονται, ῥύσθαι τινι πεπονθότες παραπλήσιον, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄξύ, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν, ἢ ἐπὶ μιᾷ ἰσάμενοι τάστω.

notes being more exactly marked, and the voice resting longer upon them. And therefore, says our author, the language of passion is more musical than common speech; because, when we are affected by passion, we generally dwell longer upon the same note. Ch. 4.

It appears therefore to be exactly just, what the Halicarnassian says, that the melody of speech differs from musical modulation only in degree, not in kind *.

The

* The account I have here given of the antient music, is taken from the authors in the collection of Meibomius. As we are upon the subject of analysing language, it may not be improper to observe how wonderful the discovery was of this analysis of musical sounds, and of the application of numbers to measure the tones of a voice or instrument. I think it a greater discovery than even that of the analysis of speech into its elemental sounds; because there was there no application of numbers; and besides, that analysis itself appears to me more easy and obvious. The discovery is ascribed to Pythagoras, by those writers upon music, and the authors of his life, who tell a blundering story about his making experiments with a string, stretched by different weights. And it is said, he discovered that the tones were in the ratio of the weights, *ceteris paribus*; whereas the fact is, that they are as the square-roots of the weights. But the custom of Pythagoras's scholars was, to ascribe to him as discoverer every thing he taught them. And we may as well suppose that his geometry, theology, and every

Ch. 4. The chief objection that I believe many people have to this account of the accents, is

every other science, taught in the school, was of his invention. The truth therefore, I believe, is, that he brought this science of music with him from Egypt, along with other sciences, (for that he was the first who taught it to the Greeks, and gave them the use and knowledge of the octave, which they had not before, I have not the least doubt). Nor do I think such a discovery could have been made, except in a country such as Egypt, where there was a class of men set apart for the study of the sciences. And besides this advantage, a nation must have lasted a long time, and advanced far in other sciences, before they could have made such a discovery. Further, we know very well that music was very much practised, not only in their religious ceremonies; but, as Plato informs us, it was made a part of the education of their youth, and regulated by law. And he speaks of pieces of music of their goddess Isis many thousand years old, but which were still preserved in his time. *See Plato de Legibus, lib. 2. p. 789. and 790. edit. Ficini.* Now I cannot conceive how they could have been preserved for so great a number of years, with that religious exactness which Plato supposes, unless they were noted, or some way or other put in writing. And if they had a notation of music, as well as of speech, it is evident that they must have made the analysis of the one as well as of the other.

The antient art of music appears to me to be less known to the moderns, than any other antient art; and accordingly they have fallen into great mistakes concerning it. I will venture to say, that we have not even an idea of their excellence in that art, because we know nothing of two kinds of their music which were the most excellent:

is the impracticability of them. For how, Ch. 4.
will they say, is it possible that the voice
should

excellent : for we know nothing but the diatonic music, which they knew also ; but it was among them the music only of the vulgar ; whereas the other two kinds, viz. the *chromatic* and *enharmonic*, were the music of the learned, and the connoisseurs. Now the music of these two kinds, proceeded by intervals so small, as a third or fourth part of a tone, of which we have no practice, nor hardly an idea, except what we may get from an Æolus harp, or the music of the birds. And the later antient writers upon music tell us, that those two kinds of music were much disused in their time, and that hardly any body could be found that was able to practise them. And Plutarch, in his treatise of Music, says, that even as early as his time, the enharmonic, which was the music most esteemed and practised of old, was quite neglected ; the intervals of it not understood ; and they even went so far as to deny that the division of the semitone, which they called *diezeis*, was perceptible by the sense, *edit. Froben, p. 558.* And there is a fragment preserved of Longinus, where, speaking of music, he applies to it this verse of Homer, κλέος οἷον ἀκούμεν, ὕδρι τι ἴδμεν : “ We only “ hear the fame of it, but know nothing of it.”

Further, there are persons among us so ignorant, as to doubt, and even to deny, that the antients knew and practised music in parts. The contrary of this may be proved by many passages in antient authors. I will mention only two or three that I think have not been taken notice of. The first is from the *Sophista* of Plato, *pag. 177. edit. Fic.* where, speaking of letters, he says, some of them join together to make syllables, and some of them do not. Then he asks, to what art it belongs to know what will join or will not join with what ? The answer is, to the grammatical art. Then follows, *Τι δὲ περὶ τῶν τῶν ὁ-*

Ch. 4. should start at once up to a fifth, from one syllable of a word to another, and of-
ten

ζῶν καὶ βαρὺν φθόγγος; ἀρ' οὐ ὕψος; — ὁ μὲν τὰς συγκατασκευαίας τε καὶ μὴ τέχνην ἔχων γινώσκουσιν, μουσικός· ὁ δὲ μὴ συνίης, ἄμωσος. The meaning of which is, that as the grammarian knows what articulate sounds will mix together, and what will not; so the musician knows what notes of music will mix together, and what not. Now this mixture of sounds, like that of letters in a syllable, can be nothing else but what we call *harmony*. The next passage I shall mention is from Plutarch, in his *Quæstiones Platonicæ*, where he very particularly describes the way in which the acute and grave sounds mix together, and the effect which that mixture produces. The words are, Ὁξύς μιν γὰρ ὁ ταχύς γίνεταί, βαρὺς δὲ ὁ βραδύς· διὸ καὶ πρότερον κινῶσι τὴν αἰσθησιν οἱ ὀξεῖς· ὅταν δὲ τύτοις ἤδη μαραινόμενοι καὶ ἀποληγομένοις οἱ βαρεῖς ἐπιβάλλωσιν ἀρχόμενοι, τὸ κραθεὶν αὐτῶν, δι' ὁμοιοπαθείαν, ἰδούνην τῇ ἀκοῇ παρέρχεν, ἣν συμφωνίαν καλοῦσιν. Here we have harmony, or symphony, as Plutarch calls it, and the effects of it upon the ear, very well described. For, if I am not much mistaken, it will be found by experience, that the acute strikes the ear first with a quick impulse, and that we do not perceive the mixture of the grave, till the acute begins to die away. The third passage I shall mention, is from Longinus, *De Sublimitate*, sect. 28. where, speaking of the figure called *periphrasis*, he says, it is, with respect to the proper expression, what the accompaniment in music is to the melody or air, as it is commonly called. The words are, ὡς γὰρ ἐν μουσικῇ διὰ τῶν παραρῶντων καλυμμένων ὁ κύριος φθόγγος ἡδίων ἀποτελεῖται, ὕψος ἢ περίφρασις πολλάκις συμφέγγεται τῇ κυριολογίᾳ, καὶ εἰς κόσμον ἐπιπολὺ συνηχῆ. Here we have a concert described as exactly as is possible. The κύριος φθόγγος is the proper expression for the air or melody, which is or ought to be predominant through the whole piece; and if one were to translate into Greek *accompaniment*, one could

ten upon the same syllable, and then be
let down again as many degrees, and as
suddenly? Ch. 4.

could not find a more proper word to express it than *παράφωνη*. And it may be observed, that in order to make out the simile, and apply the case of the periphrase to the concert, he uses the word *συνηχῆ*, which precisely denotes *consonance*. The last authority I shall mention, is from the above-mentioned treatise of Plutarch, concerning Music, where he gives the reason why the small intervals of the enharmonic were not practised in his time, namely, because they could not make a harmony which suited them, *pag. 558. edit. Froben.* When we join these authorities to those commonly quoted from Aristotle, *De mundo*, and Seneca, it makes the matter, in my apprehension, absolutely clear; and indeed the very definition they give of consonance, or *symphony*, as they call it, decides at once the question, *συμφωνία δὲ ἴσι*, says Ælian the Platonic, quoted by Isaac Vossius, in his treatise, *De viribus rhythmi*, *δυσιν ἢ πλειονων φθογγων ὀξύτητι καὶ βαρυτητι διαφεροντων κατὰ τὸ αὐτο πτωσις καὶ κρασις*: than which the Greek language affords no words clearer to express what we call harmony, and to distinguish it from melody, or music by succession. To all these authorities may be added what our late travellers into the South sea tell us, of the music of the New Zealanders in their concerts, which they say, to the best of their judgement, was in parts. This is a fact in which our travellers, though not learned in music, could hardly be mistaken. And if those barbarians have such music, how can we suppose that the Greeks and Romans had it not?

Let us not therefore believe, that the antients were so ignorant of this fine art, as to know only music in succession, not in consonance. I believe, indeed, their harmony was not so complicated as ours, in which the air or melody is often lost; but was more simple, so that not

Ch. 4. suddenly? But a very ordinary singer finds no difficulty in this; and I am persuaded that any man who has the least ear or voice for music, could, by custom from his earliest youth, be brought to do it with the greatest ease even in common speech. Because therefore we have not a musical language, we ought not to conclude that the Greeks or Romans had none such. The Chinese, at this day, we are

only the air was preserved, but the words sung to it were distinctly heard. No body can doubt but that this was the case of the songs of the chorus in tragedy. And I am persuaded, that when Horace's odes were sung both to lyre and pipe, which he tells us was done, *Epod. 9.* the poetry was not for that lost. So that in the musical compositions of the antients, there was joined together the force of melody, harmony, and poetry; and the more antient the music was among them, the more simple it was. This Horace tells us of the music of the theatre:

*Tibia, non ut nunc, orichalco juncta tubæque
Æmula; sed tenuis simplexque foramine pauco
Aspirare et adesse choris erat utilis, atque
Nondum spissa nimis complere sedilia flatu.*

Ars Poët.

And Plutarch, in his treatise of Music, gives this simplicity as the characteristic of the antient music. His words are, τὴν γὰρ ὀλιγοχορείαν καὶ τὴν ἀπλοτητα, καὶ τὴν σιμνοτητα τῆς μουσικῆς παντελῶς ἀρχαϊκὴν εἶναι συμβεβηκεν. *Opuscula Moralia*, pag. 551. edit. Frobenii. Where we may observe the word ὀλιγοχορεία, which, as I understand it, denotes a simple harmony, or small accompaniment.

assured,

assured, have a language of that kind; for they give different tones to their monosyllables, of which their language entirely consists, and by this difference of tone, they make the same word to signify nine or ten different things. So that it would appear they have a greater variety of accents than even the Greeks, infomuch that strangers among them think they are singing rather than speaking. Ch. 4.

Another objection is, That it is impossible to reconcile this accent with quantity, unless we were to lay the acute accent only on long syllables. And accordingly Isaac Vossius, in his treatise above quoted, *De viribus rhythmi*, maintains, that it is an error to lay it any where else, and that in this respect the accentuation of our Greek books is altogether wrong. But it is he that is in an error, not the books, and a very shameful error for a learned man, proceeding from his not distinguishing accent and quantity: for in the sequel of the passage above quoted from the Haliarnassian, speaking of the violence which the musicians of his time offered to the prosody of the language, he gives an instance from a chorus in the *Orestes* of Euripides,

Ch. 4. Euripides, where, in the word ἀποπροβατε, instead of giving the acute tone to the syllable προ, (which undoubtedly is a short syllable), the musician who set it to music, or *fecit modos*, according to the Latin expression, brought it down to the fourth syllable of the word, sciz. -εα-; and this, by the way, is of itself evidence, if Dionysius had said no more, that the accent was a real tone of music. And besides, Vossius ought to have known, that in a Latin dissyllable there would, according to his rule, have been no acute accent at all, if the first syllable was short, because the Latins never acuted the last syllable. Now it is an invariable rule of accenting, that there is an acute accent somewhere upon every word, unless it be an enclitic, or used as an enclitic.

It is therefore most certain, that a short syllable will bear an acute accent, as well as a long; and the fact truly is, that the acute note, by its quick movement, as above explained, tends rather to shorten than lengthen the syllable. And accordingly, in some Latin words, when the syllable would be otherwise long by position, it is shortened by being acuted, as in *ὀπ-
time*,

time, sérvitus, pérvelim, Pámphilus, where Ch. 4.
 the antepenult syllables being acuted, are
 thereby shortened where they would other-
 wise be long *. It is indeed true, that
 according to our method of pronunciation,
 (of which I shall say more afterwards), it
 is very difficult, if not impossible, for us to
 acute a syllable, without making it appear
 long to our ears; but we ought not from
 thence to infer, that it was impossible for
 the Greeks or Romans to do so. I am
 informed by a person whom I can be-
 lieve †, that the learned among the Greeks
 do, at this day, in their pronunciation,
 make the distinction betwixt accent and
 quantity. It is certain that they both
 speak and write the antient language; and
 it is not at all improbable that they may
 have likewise preserved the pronunciation
 of it, with the assistance of those accentual
 marks, which surely are not of modern

* This is an observation of Bishop *Hare*, quoted by
 Mr Foster in his essay, pag. 279. where there are other
 quotations upon the subject worth reading.

† Dr Turnbull, who was long in the East, and much
 among the Greeks, having married a Greek woman,
 and is a man of learning, as well as worth. He is now
 in Florida, with the colony of Greeks that he carried
 thither.

invention

Ch. 4. invention *. And Sir John Cheke, who lived in the time of Henry VIII. says, in one of his letters †, that he, and some of his learned friends, spoke the Greek according to the antient pronunciation, and particularly according to the antient prosody, observing both accent and quantity.

I have only further to add, concerning the Greek accents, that as there is nothing in that language without art, that can be subjected to the rules of art, not even

* They are said to have been invented by a famous grammarian, Aristophanes of Byzantium, keeper of the Alexandrian library under Ptolomy Philopater and Epiphanes, the first likewise, as it is supposed, that practised punctuation. Accentual marks, however, did not become of common use till about the seventh century, when we find them in manuscripts. It was certainly a useful invention for preserving the genuine pronunciation of the Greek language; I cannot however bestow such an elogium upon the author of it as Mr Foster does, who says, that posterity has been more benefited by his discovery, than by the writings of any one profane author of antiquity, *pag.* 191. It does not appear that the marking of the accents was ever much practised among the Romans. Mr Foster says, he never saw but one Latin book that had the accents marked throughout, and that was *Grammaticæ quadrilinguis partitiones*, by *Johannes Drosæus*. *Paris.* 1544. I have seen another, viz. a Virgil in the possession of the Earl of Hopetoun; but I have forgot where or when it was printed.

† *Epistol. ad Episcop. Vinton.* p. 284.

the

the choice of their primitive words, according to my hypothesis; so there are fixed rules for the accents, which are to be found in the Greek grammars, particularly in that of Theodorus Gaza, who treats it as a material part of the language, and not as a thing of no use, according to the opinion of some among us. I have already observed a great difference betwixt the Greek and Latin, in the matter of accenting; the Latins never putting an acute accent upon the last syllable, which the Greeks frequently did; so that the Romans were all *Εξυπυροί*, which gave to their discourse, and to themselves, the appearance of great gravity, and even of haughtiness and austerity *. But at the same time it gave an uniformity and similarity to their accentuation, which made their language much less sweet and pleasant to the ear; and therefore, says Quintilian, who makes this observation, when our poets would make sweet-flowing verse,

Ch. 4.

* *Olympiodorus in Aristot. μετεωρα, pag. 27.* The passage is quoted by Foster in his *Essay, pag. 290.*; and likewise another to the same purpose, from Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In laudatione Origenis.*

Ch. 4. they adorn it with Greek names *, such was the effect in the judgement of Quintilian of those accents, which modern critics condemn as corruptions of the language.

As to accents in English, Mr Foster, from a partiality, very excusable, to his country, and its language, would fain persuade us, that in English there are accents such as in Greek and Latin. But to me it is evident that there are none such; by which I mean that we have no accents upon syllables, which are musical tones, differing in acuteness or gravity. For though, no doubt, there are changes of voice in our speaking from acute to grave, and *vice versa*, of which a musician could mark the intervals, these changes are not upon syllables, but upon words or sentences. And they are the tones of passion or sentiment, which, as I observed, are to be distinguished from the accents we are speaking of. Nor should we confound with them either the general tone, which belongs to every language, or the particular provincial tone of the several dialects of

* *Lib. 2. cap. 10.* See what Foster says further upon this subject, pag. 286.

the same language. And there is another difference betwixt our accents and the antient, that ours neither are, nor can, by their nature, be subjected to any rule; whereas the antient, as we have seen, are governed by rules, and make part of their grammatical art. Ch. 4.

But what do we mean then when we speak so much of accent in English, and dispute whether a word is right or wrong accented? My answer is, That we have, no doubt, accents in English, and syllabical accents too: but they are of a quite different kind from the antient accents; for there is no change of the tone in them; but the voice is only raised more, so as to be louder upon one syllable than another. Our accents therefore fall under the first member of the division of sound, which I made in the beginning of this chapter, namely, the distinction of louder, and softer, or lower.

That there is truly no other difference, is a matter of fact, that must be determined by musicians. Now I appeal to them, whether they can perceive any difference of tone betwixt the accented and unaccented

Ch. 4. syllables of any word ; and if there be none, then is the music of our language in this respect nothing better than the music of a drum, in which we perceive no difference except that of louder or softer, according as the instrument is more or less forcibly struck.

This sort of accent is, if I am not much mistaken, a peculiarity which distinguishes our language from other languages of Europe, particularly the French, which has no such accents, at least none so strongly marked ; and a British man, speaking French, if he is not a perfect master of the language, discovers his country as much by the emphasis he lays upon particular syllables, as by any other mark. And I am inclined to believe, that in the Latin, from which the French language is for the greater part derived, and likewise in the Greek, there was little or no accent such as ours ; one thing at least is certain, that no antient grammarian speaks a word of it.

Of what use this accent is in our poetry, and that it is by it, and not by quantity, that our verse is made, I shall have occasion afterwards to shew.

CHAP.