

SPEECH AS AN EXPRESSION OF PERSONALITY.*

BY T. H. PEAR.

(From the Department of Psychology, University of Manchester.)

- I.—*Psychology cannot justifiably neglect speech and personality.*
- II.—*Personality distinguished from character.*
- III.—*Speech a high-grade skill of rapidly increasing importance.*
- IV.—*Absence of satisfactory criteria of effective speech.*
- V.—*Criteria of voice and speech.*
- VI.—*The functions of speech.*
- VII.—*Criticism of written and spoken words.*
- VIII.—*Matter or manner?*
- IX.—*Suitability of voice and speech to their subject-matter.*
- X.—*Effective speaking should be taught in schools.*
- XI.—*The social importance of effective speaking.*
- XII.—*Conclusions.*

I.—PSYCHOLOGY CANNOT JUSTIFIABLY NEGLECT SPEECH AND PERSONALITY.

As I drafted this paper, three hard sayings pushed into my mind, took possession and rankled. The first was "Anthropology, like charity, should begin at home oftener than it does"; the second, "Until recently psychologists seemed to be interested in anything but human beings"; the third, "Give a psychologist a rat and a graph and you will get about the last word on the philosophy of education in the machine age."

Two of those remarks are English, one American. I have pondered them often, wincing. I feel that their authors would not disapprove my paper's title. I feel less sure of sympathy from English psychologists. Yet nowadays many thinkers are dissatisfied and suspicious about any description or explanation of the human mind which ignores the fact of personality, however well it may deal with some "single" power of the mind. As I write this sentence, the physical wave of sound reaching my ear is compounded from thousands of placid ripples breaking on the shore, and one child's happy crooning. I—not my ear, by the way—perceive

* Substance of paper read to the Psychology Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Centenary Meeting, London. September, 1931.

this wave-front in two patterns, an impersonal sea and a personal child. For the psychologist no amount of good physics, bad metaphysics or microscopically detailed and depersonalized "sense-physiology" can destroy the distinction between those patterns.

II.—PERSONALITY DISTINGUISHED FROM CHARACTER.

Once you admit that personality is to be a chapter in your programme of study, you will find yourself importuned, as at a Continental railway station, by people all anxious to guide you, but with very different credentials. Many of them state dogmatically what personality is. Others, confident that psychology ought to economize in terms (why, I have never discovered), achieve simplicity and opacity by using the same word to mean different things. They do not argue, they know. Personality, they say, is the same as character. A sub-class of this type urges, "What 'X' calls personality I call character . . ." One must reluctantly decline most of their services, imposing though the badges on their caps may be. Yet, for the purpose of this paper, a distinction must be made between personality and character. The definitions of which are offered here, though a liberty has been taken in re-phrasing them, are suggested by the writings of Dr. C. G. Jung and Professor William McDougall respectively.

Personality is defined as the effect upon others of a living being's appearance, sounds, behaviour, etc., so far as they are taken to be distinctive signs of that individual. Personality, therefore, can be expressed by physique, colouring and odours—all these may be completely natural or artificially modified—by clothes and behaviour. Behaviour, of course, includes gait, gestures, manners, voice and speech.

There are overlappings in this classification. Awareness of the factors of personality is not essential, and its degree varies in different persons, as anyone who has known an actor will attest. The possessors of marks of personality may be clearly aware, dimly aware or unaware of any of these effects, of their causes, or of the means by which they are produced.

Character is defined as the comparatively stable structure of a person's mind, wrought by abilities (habits, techniques, skills), sentiments, and by their integration into a relative unity. A personality-trait may produce an effect rapidly, as for instance, sixty seconds of Charlie Chaplin's uproariousness; real judgment of character cannot be immediate.*

* I have given detailed evidence for the utility of this distinction in Chapter IV of *Voice and Personality*, London, 1931. Cf. also "Stimme und Persönlichkeit," *Charakter*, Heft 1, pp. 40-44, Berlin, 1932.

If these definitions be accepted, voice and speech are increasingly important signs of personality in a civilized society. The study of their significance is valuable for individual, and invaluable for social psychology, a truth illustrated by the fact that in the British Foreign Office, and in the higher ranks of the Church, Army, and Navy, few persons speak with a "dialect" or "accent" indicating the geographical locality of their birthplace.

The problem of the connection, if any, of the voice with character must await more knowledge of the rôle of voice and speech in creating an impression of personality.

III.—SPEECH A HIGH-GRADE SKILL OF RAPIDLY-INCREASING IMPORTANCE.

The voice can be considered apart from speech, as when we judge a voice to be friendly, not knowing the language it is using. Yet this is seldom done in practice, except by little children and dogs. In the last eight years, broadcasting, the increased use of the telephone, and improvements in the sound-film and gramophone have sharply focussed the importance of personal characteristics in the voice. Speech, until lately, affected one person or a small group, while oratory was a technique used by only a few. Speech may now affect millions simultaneously. Psychologists will therefore have to consider it as a high-grade skill of increased and increasing importance. This skill has had to be modified recently to meet the new requirements of the microphone, to a degree unappreciated by the ordinary private or public speaker. Mr. Vernon Bartlett, one of the most successful broadcasters, on that difficult subject, international relations, writes :* " I doubt whether the average professor or politician can be converted into a good broadcaster," and gives reasons.

Broadcast speech, in fact, bursts upon us as a serious rival to the printed word. The seriousness may be measured by the degree of acidity with which its success has been recorded by certain upholders of print. This rivalry, and its background will suggest many new problems to those students of psychology and education who are exempt from the three chidings quoted in the opening paragraph of this article.

IV.—ABSENCE OF SATISFACTORY CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVE SPEECH.

The first problem is suggested by the present dearth of effective public criticism of speech. How could such criticism be initiated? One might examine the effectiveness of speech for its momentary purpose; a life's programme since hundreds of different purposes are conceivable

* *Radio Times*, 5 February, 1932.

now broadcasting and the talking films have arrived. Its beauty could be considered, though concerning this question there are local and social partialities. One might examine its various art-forms,* their development and the reasons, conscious or unconscious, for choosing them.

After twenty years of listening to different kinds of public speaking, I feel that it might be very much better. We badly need informed, unprejudiced criticism of the effectiveness and beauty of public speaking, of which voice-production is only one aspect. Progress awaits the appearance of such criticism.

In England there exists an interesting taboo upon criticizing, even mentioning a person's voice or speech. I write as one who has experienced the consequences of breaking it. Professional critics freely express views upon a person's style in writing, painting, music, sculpture, or sports, yet how seldom does one hear criticism, apart from indiscriminate praise or "guying," of voice or speech?

If I were to mention in detail serious defects noted in speakers, all of them invited to address and therefore, if ineffective, to waste the time of large audiences, I should break this taboo. To mention names would at present be unthinkable. This fact in itself is interesting, since if they had been writers they would have been criticized by name.

I will try to present, in abstract, some of these defects: †

Inaudibility, dropping the voice at the important parts of a sentence, saying nothing in many words, prefacing controversial statements by "of course," waiting for the inspiration of the moment (justifiable if and when it comes), reciting series of general statements without illustrative concrete examples, giving concrete examples without indicating the truth which they are meant to illustrate, not observing the effect of one's speech upon the audience, ignoring the type of audience to whom one wishes to appeal, using the wrong pace—too fast, too slow, or in broadcasting, insufficiently varied—assuming one's audience to be at a fever heat of expectation when (or because) one begins to speak—these are a few flaws.

If any should object that these faults concern not the psychologist but the teacher of voice-production or of elocution, it may be pointed out that the preparation and presentation of the material for the special purpose to the special audience is of intense psychological interest,‡

* Cf. the remarks on the lecture, the lesson, and the talk, in the writer's *Art of Study*, London, 1929.

† Let us assume, for politeness sake, that any one of the drawbacks mentioned below is the only flaw in an otherwise perfect presentation. Actually two or more defects are conceivable in the same speech.

‡ Professor Overstreet in *Influencing Human Behaviour* has demonstrated this strikingly.

since nowadays it concerns an extremely subtle behaviour-relation between the speaker and any number of persons, between one and ten millions.

V.—CRITERIA OF VOICE AND SPEECH.

Some qualities of voice and speech are desirable for all general purposes. Such for example are clearness, articulateness, and emphasis upon important words, though for artistic (e.g., dramatic) purposes all these qualities may have to be modified.

Perhaps the quickest, and at present the best, way to ascertain such qualities would be to ask those who select voices for broadcasting to record, in order of importance, the criteria which they employ. These lists might then be correlated.

Yet one or two points must be noticed here. Many decisions may be made upon a basis of factors of which the judge himself is not clearly aware. Such an everyday occurrence as an unconsciously noted resemblance between one voice and another biases our estimation. Some considerations important to judges of voices for the microphone may, for our present purposes, even be secondary or irrelevant. Such are the speaker's personal knowledge of, or responsibility for discovering his facts, his fame in spheres other than that of broadcasting or the quality or suitability of his "script," apart from the question of its authorship. Again, execrable speakers would presumably not be given, or would not pass, a preliminary microphone test. Few judges, perhaps, are likely to have studied their demerits with tender care. Yet a knowledge of the lower limits of badness may be indispensable to a psychologist who wishes to study standards of criticism.

VI.—THE FUNCTIONS OF SPEECH.

This is no place for a diversion to consider the functions of speech in modern civilization, or the terror which the word "language" seems to produce in persons who are not philologists. Yet the three chief functions of speech discussed by Professor Grace de Laguna* may usefully be kept in mind. Speech conveys emotion, it issues commands, and it communicates news concerning which no immediate action need be taken. The last-named type of communication has been developed to a high art by European university lecturers.

To begin his work the critic might ask how effectively the speech fulfilled its special function. Was it audible, pleasant to hear, did it deliver its message, did it offer unnecessary difficulty?

* *Speech*, Oxford, 1927.

I am unable to sympathize with the view that no talk or lecture which does not, in some unspecified way, cost the listener pain or pains, can be "educational." To scale a mountain entails exertion. Yet the glorious well-earned ache of one's muscles is not comparable to the plaguy rubbing of a badly-fitting shoe, especially if it has been bought in a famous and expensive shop. This is a parable, comprehensible to those who have thought rebelliously that certain school lessons and university lectures, unnecessarily difficult, elusive or dull, are unjustifiably defended by asserting that they are "educational."

VII.—CRITICISM OF WRITTEN AND SPOKEN WORDS.

Since words form the stuff of speech, it might seem that its future critics should be sought amongst the judges of written matter. I doubt the wisdom of this. The flickering sulphurous jets of light some writing men have thrown, from rakish angles, upon broadcasting makes one doubt their competence to deal with the spoken word. One critic, reviewing a book about the voice and broadcasting, filled up much of his allotted space by a list of his special qualifications for the task. They included a dislike of commercial enterprise, of America, of wireless receivers, and of popular education. He ended by admitting that he had "no passion for radio." This confirmed a suspicion the reader might have formed. A partially deaf man, incapable of moving rhythmically, who disliked impartially Palestrina, Beethoven, Mozart, Stravinsky, Hindemith, and Noel Coward would not to-day be an editor's first choice as a musical critic. Why then . . . ?

There is, however, one type of writer who would begin the test of speech-criticism with an advantage instead of a handicap. This is the person who writes for the reader's "inward ear." To realize his importance we must make some clumsy demarcations. Let us try to consider, apart from each other, writing for the reader's eye, for the hearer's ear, or for the intelligence of either, without considering the sense-organ to which the words will eventually be addressed. "Writing for the eye" may involve (1) choosing words which in print will be pleasing or striking, (2) writing to evoke visual images in the reader, or (3) writing to appeal especially to the "eye-reader," who grasps whole phrases at once, neglecting their auditory rhythm. One famous writer, whose delightful tail-chasings are easy for the eye, often difficult for the ear, was adversely criticized as a radio-talker for this fact.

Writing for the microphone offers special problems, since the author must keep in mind that sound alone can affect the listener. On him all supplementary, complementary, or compensatory gestures, experiments,

lantern slides, or "business" are wasted. To plan in advance speech which needs no visual help* and, as in good radio-drama, may even benefit by this lack, requires a special technique, developing in a manner which is of first-rate psychological interest.†

It is significant that Mr. James Johnston's interesting book *Westminster Voices* says comparatively little about the voices of Parliamentary speakers, but much about their choice of words, phrases, and visual supplements.

The regular appreciator of microphone speech-style has not yet been very articulate. One may, however, assume provisionally that his pleasure is derivable from the following sources, amongst others. He may enjoy the mere sounds, as for instance, those of the Abbey Players. This pleasure is comparable to the naïve enjoyment of Rimsky-Korsakov's music by a listener who knows no theories of tone-colour and orchestration. The words may be pleasant because they remove the listener mentally from his immediate surroundings, as the cinema does for the middle-West farm-hand, the slum-dweller, or the blasé Bloomsburyian. Sounds may please because they are "distanced," in space or time. Some ex-soldiers find more fun in the tones of the sergeant-major nowadays than when they were privates. A few radio listeners welcome the marking-off of certain programmes as Regional, because then they can use their "receiver" as a magic carpet.

VIII.—MATTER OR MANNER?

Some people demand that every picture shall tell a story and all music shall say something definite. Similarly, there are listeners who, so long as a speaker says "something," do not criticize the way in which he says it. It is an excellent thing that speakers should be encouraged to say something, yet a talk in which every sentence conveys a fact will probably do more good if one reads it in print. Insensitive hearers do not always realize, for example, that to be serious a speaker need not be solemn. It seems incredible that a broadcaster who last year gave a series of weekly talks on "People and Things" was judged by some to be an elegant trifler.

The musical executant and the mere music-lover not only appreciate a performance in different ways, but sometimes quarrel concerning the propriety of those ways. Similarly the gulf between a listener whose

* T. H. Pear, "Radio-Drama, Seeing with the Mind's Eye," *Radio Times*, XXXI, No. 392, April, 1931; *Voice and Personality*, 61, 89f, 95f, 105f.

† Cf. Tyrone Guthrie, "Squirrel's Cage and two other Broadcast Plays"; L. du Garde Peach, *Radio Plays*, London, 1931.

own profession requires public speaking and the "mere" listener may be wide. Many lecturers enjoyed the boyish gusto in Sir William Bragg's voice as, in the broadcast Faraday lecture, he called up for us the days when physics still emitted an odour of humanity. Yet conceivably some scientific researchers whose exposition consists only in reading papers to a visible audience of understanding colleagues who need no warming-up, no irksome explanations of simple concepts, no guiding away from the quagmires of misunderstanding, might not have appreciated the lecturer's art.

This example of a lecturer whose matter and manner are both supremely good is rare in these days. Critical listeners to music now demand, and successfully, that excellence in musical material shall not atone for badness in manner, and *vice versa*. Until public speaking is regarded similarly, we shall continue to suffer as we do now.

IX.—SUITABILITY OF VOICE AND SPEECH TO THEIR SUBJECT-MATTER.

A semi-musical listener might vaguely note something unfitting if he were to hear Debussy played on the harmonium. So might a university professor who beheld his robed colleagues preparing to walk in procession to the strains of a mandolin band. (Though the first example is imaginary the second is not.) Any criticism would indicate the perception of an apparent incongruity. Yet some types of voice and speech are just as unsuited to their subject and to their audiences. I have heard a ponderous voice reading from a manuscript, with pedantic exactitude, a talk entitled "In Lighter Vein." This fitness of delivery is important if we consider the different effects produced upon listeners by a person who talks intimately, either "straight" or through the microphone* and one who speaks in public, to audiences of different sizes and possessing different educational backgrounds. The success of these various effects upon the listener possibly necessitates the previous action, in the mental "producing apparatus" of the speaker, or writer of the manuscript, of some processes corresponding, or correlated, to those produced in the hearers. I wish to avoid any risk of suggesting that the producer's mental processes necessarily resemble the listener's. Some apt phrases are lightly launched from slips greased with midnight oil.

The psychology of composing can only be hinted at here, yet the predominant mental imagery of a person who, with dictaphone, pen, or typewriter, is preparing the manuscript of a talk will influence greatly his choice of matter and of manner. Many psychological questions are raised

* "Mr. Baldwin," writes a friend, "puts his feet in your fender"; "Viscount Snowden waggles an admonitory forefinger."

by the use, in such compositions, of the very short sentence, or of the "loose" as opposed to the "periodic" sentence.

So far as I know, few persons have discussed a matter of increasing importance in these days when philosophy, ethics, economics, and psychology are topics of common conversation. How many successive general statements unilluminated by concrete examples may be uttered profitably by a broadcaster, subject, if he is tedious, to instant invisible dismissal? I believe that listeners show considerable individual differences in this respect, and that these variations are well worth exploring. As for myself, if I listen to a long recited series of abstractions from a visible or invisible speaker, I find that I am thinking of something else. My conscience is lulled by the convenient excuse that such important matter will surely be printed so that I can read it at a later date, though actually, of course, it may not be printed in full, or at all, and almost certainly I shall forget to read it. Probably there are thousands of such lamentable listeners with minds of lowly organization, craving concrete examples to illustrate, even to verify phrases in the grand verbal fugue which rolls majestically from the speaker. If so, they are worth consideration. For what if that elusive person, the average listener, should be one of them?

To at least one listener it seems that a broad general statement can seldom be examined, except in the light of several specific examples. This, perhaps, explains why in one university broad generalization in common-rooms becomes a cultivated technique, while in another the generalizer's course is apt to be stayed by an interjected wad of concrete and opposed examples from experimental science.

I have read only one analytic printed criticism of a broadcast lecture which, by the way, was given long ago. The article is carefully filed. It may be a long time before another appears, since the lecturer recovered from the bite; the paper it was that died.

Lest any reader may be shocked at the audacity of criticizing a lecturer, it may be pointed out that, presumably, the speaker had occupied the time of thousands of listeners. Of these I was not one, and therefore can only quote the critic.

According to him, the lecture lacked originality, distinction, and charm of presentation. It heavily emphasized one side of a controversy and did not hint at the other. It recommended for further reading only four books, all of them old, all text-books, and all expounding the lecturer's own point of view.

I feel that even in admitting cognizance of such flagrant bad taste I am breaking a taboo. Yet why not criticize lectures? Music and cricket are discussed frankly in our newspapers. Sir Thomas Beecham,

conducting a famous Vienna orchestra at Salzburg last summer, interpreted Mozart in a characteristically personal way. His manner was frankly, enthusiastically criticized. A great team which plays safe dull cricket is reminded of this fact in the papers. Nobody who matters is shocked at the writer's bad taste.

From time to time criticisms of lectures by competent judges have been recorded. There is, I believe, a classic complaint about a lecturer who in his day decoyed adolescents from the sunshine into a classroom, to dictate to them extracts from a book which he refrained from publishing. This type of lecturer seems to possess survival-value, for secondary and indirect reasons.

Criticism at first will naturally be crude. It seems fair to demand that in its early stages it should be closely reasoned, so that it can be met by a denial of certain points, or by a justified statement of preferences in other directions. I do not know if fixed canons of speech-criticism exist; if they do, broadcasting will make hay of them. Yet vigorous destructive criticism of bad lecturers might perform the useful function of encouraging the others.

It cannot be gainsaid that during the last thirty years the prestige of oratory has declined, and with it criticism of public speaking of all kinds may have lost what edge it had. These facts have made it difficult for some of my older friends to embrace the belief that if a few reforms were made a Golden Age of Speech might arrive, since speech is so important nowadays and will count for more in the future. It is confusing to compare speaking with oratory, which seems to be related to modern effective speaking as ballet-dancing is to effective walking, running, and jumping, or as the terrific high-dives of the professional swimmer are to the neat six-foot swoops which we can see any summer's day.

I chose these two examples deliberately. Two generations ago a child who could not dance or swim might have regarded this inability as regrettable, but not as distinguishing him in an annoying manner from most of his fellows. Nowadays, happy is the youth whose first lesson in swimming or dancing came early in life, for modern society takes these skills for granted. It has ceased to regard the absence, or presence in a low stage, of the latter accomplishment as a sign of virility. Yet is not effective speech regarded to-day as an "extra," the possession of which ought to be dissembled, or condoned as a natural gift, lest any might suspect that such a thing could be either desired or learned?

X.—EFFECTIVE SPEAKING SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS.

Why should not the younger generation learn to speak? Their swimming is very good. Can it be said that their speech is good? (I

refer not so much to the sounds they make as to their function in conveying meaning.) When it happens to be good, how much of this goodness do they owe to the schools?

One cannot generalize about schools in England, where the main reason for sending a child to any particular school may have been that it is the antithesis of one in the immediate vicinity. Yet in English schools, at present, with a few exceptions, children are not taught to express their thoughts in spoken English with ease, precision, and in such a way as not to offend hearers who belong to different social or geographical communities in the same country.

It is difficult to discuss the speaking of English without acknowledging the cruel social stratification of speech in England, and I for one do not intend to try. Boys are taught to hold a cricket bat and to kick a ball but not to use their speech mechanism for its most important purpose.*

There are some readers whose minds, at this point, will be drawn off into that whirlpool, the question of "Standard English" versus "dialect." I do not propose to rescue them, but urge them to exert a little skill to extricate themselves, and to exercise more care or intellectual honesty in future. Whether children's thoughts are expressed in dialect or standard English is a matter of secondary importance to that of expressing them effectively. There are thousands of people whose standard English seldom conveys anything worth saying, and not always because they have nothing to say.

In treating the matter of effective speech, I will discuss that section of the community of which I have everyday knowledge. Yet, since my occupation allows of travelling, and of making the acquaintance of different types of Englishmen in various parts of the country, I could perhaps cast my net wider with advantage.

Let us, in discussing the effectiveness of the university student's speech, assume that the universities do not get the less intelligent products of the schools. How many university students, elected to a committee in whose meetings they differ from people whom they wish to retain as friends, can speak with effect but without offence, can describe a difficult subject, arouse enthusiasm for a new topic, discuss honestly, patiently,

* An exception is made in the case of foreign languages. In some schools even this improvement is recent. I have heard broadcast lessons in foreign languages attacked on the ground that they lack the personality of the class teacher. If a personality's contribution is to be the emission of French or German with a pungent Yorkshire, Lancashire, or Essex accent, instead of the purer sounds of the native teacher—and, by the way, *do* the broadcast voices of these French or Germans lack personality?—is it good for the pupils? Is there any virtue, even in 1932, in branding French or German with our national mark? Could not the refulgence of the most brilliant class-teacher be dimmed for thirty minutes once a week?

and in detail, as distinct from debating pyrotechnically, a complicated matter? Debate is a "low" or simple form of verbal skill, depending for its success upon the unconscious co-operation of stupid opponents. Its value is pathetically over-estimated by many undergraduates, encouraged by the newspapers. Would it be kind to tell students of the contempt with which debating is regarded on constructive committees, where to call an argument a mere debating point is usually to annihilate it? Or is it better to say nothing? There are so few illusions nowadays.

It should be noted that many inarticulate university products can express themselves in writing. This is not surprising, since entry to any English university depends upon this skill. To some onlookers it seems not unreasonable to suggest that in the coming reorganization of the various universities' regulations for matriculation some of the time spent in examining the candidate's ability to write his native tongue would be more profitably utilized by ascertaining whether he can speak it. As things are, a few years after matriculation he may be rejected for a post involving public speaking by a committee, containing some of these examiners.* The Laodicean attitude towards speech in the universities adopted by persons who were elected to their own posts because they could speak is describable only by a combination of the analytic insight of Freud with the urbane incisiveness of Anatole France.

XI.—THE SOCIAL IMPORTANCE OF EFFECTIVE SPEAKING.

If the public speech-performances of English university students are poor, we can scarcely expect the average level of "extra-mural" speech to be higher. Yet one hears the suggestion that these young people, if and when (the "if" is a big one, not unconnected with the general theme of this paper) they give up some of their time to public work, will learn by trial and error to express themselves. The suggester might be asked if he has spent much time on committees, hearing the trials and errors. To the sturdy objection that in 1932 we require deeds not words, the reply is that in 1922 the worship of the great god Output was actuated by that creed, and words of criticism were not wanting even then. It may be regrettable, but the fact is that members of city councils do not communicate across the table by essays, poems, sketches, songs, miming, or by the glissades, entrechats and postures of the ballet. They speak . . . yet at times the hearer may entertain a faint speculation that something more might have been done for them at school.

* Cf. the articles on "What is Wrong with the Modern Universities?" By Professors E. R. Dodds, F. A. Cavenagh, J. F. Duff, and W. M. Tattersall, *Universities Review*, iv, 1 and 2, 1931-2.

I urge that we abandon the belief that public speech ought not to be criticized, because of the risk that the speakers or their teachers may have their feelings hurt. The former often hurt ours ; and the latter when they consider this subject express almost every shade of opinion. Among these opinions, however, one often meets the following, "Leave speech to home influences," "Let well alone," "Do not interfere with the scholar's picturesque, homely expressions." I would reply to those holding these opinions, if they be teachers themselves, "Ask yourself this question, 'Am I intellectually honest?'"

It may be that at present, with some very marked exceptions which I hasten to acknowledge, few persons could teach effective speech, for several reasons. Many university and school teachers have a habit, difficult to break, of talking downwards, seldom upwards and never horizontally. Not every teacher knows how to interest a class which, if it could switch him off, would do so. Many teachers are more accustomed to defend than to discuss their methods.

It may be thought that the times are not favourable for suggesting changes in the subjects to be taught in English schools. Yet the reading of this paper was followed by an encouraging editorial in the *Schoolmaster*. I will therefore conclude by recording this fact, and my belief that these suggestions are useful, educational, cultural, and truly democratic.

XII.—CONCLUSIONS.

In a democratic society, effective speaking is urgently necessary. Present standards of public speaking are low, and criticism is seldom informed or effective. In these days of increased social communication, broadcasting and the talking film, the search for criteria of effective speaking involves many psychological problems of the first magnitude.

RÉSUMÉ.

LE LANGAGE PARLÉ COMME MANIFESTATION DE LA PERSONNALITÉ

Toute psychologie qui néglige la personnalité est prédestinée à la l'impuissance. Des traits caractéristiques qui révèlent la personnalité le langage parlé prend une importance croissante. L'étude du langage parlé comme activité d'ordre supérieur. Il n'existe point encore de critères satisfaisants du langage parlé. Les fonctions du langage parlé. Les critiques du langage écrit peuvent éprouver quelque difficulté à juger du langage parlé. L'adaptation de la voix, de la parole et de la manière à la matière, problème important en ce qui concerne l'amélioration des conférences, des discours de T.S.F. et du film sonore. Variations individuelles de la mentalité chez les auditeurs. L'importance sociale de l'éloquence efficace. On devrait l'enseigner dans les écoles.

ÜBERSICHT.

DIE SPRACHE ALS AUSDRUCK DER PERSÖNLICHKEIT.

Jede Psychologie, die die Persönlichkeit geringschätzt, ist zur Dummheit vorher verurteilt. (Unter den charakteristischen Kennzeichen, die die Persönlichkeit ausdrücken, wird die Sprache immer wichtiger.) Die Untersuchung der Sprache als Fertigkeit ersten Ranges. Bisher existieren keine hinlänglichen Proben der Wirksamkeit der Sprache. Die Funktionen der Sprache. Kritiker von geschriebenen Worten mögen aufgehalten werden, wenn sie wirksame Sprache beurteilen. (Angemessenheit der Stimme, der Sprache und des Benehmens dem Stoff gegenüber als wichtiges Problem in der Verbesserung von Vorträgen, vom Rundfunk und vom Tonfilm.) Individuelle Unterschiede in der Geisteskraft der Hörer. (Die gesellschaftliche Bedeutung einer wirksamen Sprechweise. Man sollte sie in den Schulen pflegen.)