THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MUSIC.

BY CHARLES KASSEL.

As poetry and prose are the language of thought so music is the language of feeling. It is sound grown eloquent. Painting—sculpture—nay, even the printed page with its record of the tragic and the pathetic—less powerfully sway our emotions. Who has not observed how magically our moods transform when wrought upon by a strain of melody? As to something talismanic our spirits yield to its touch, changing from grave to gay, and from gay to grave, with every change of the spell; now stirred with martial ardor, now softened with the tenderness of a lullaby,—at one moment lifted high by a strange sense of hope or triumph, at another subdued and awe-struck by a solemnity as of cathedral devotions.

In all times, too, music has been the solace of the sorrowing. The heart torn by grief finds in a beautiful air a balm which no book, no discourse, no friendly voice can give. Lost in the maze of chord and cadence the mind forgets its haunting thoughts and the whole being is soothed and calmed.

"Music is the most emotional of all arts," says Theodule Ribot in that highly thoughtful and suggestive work The Psychology of the Emotions (Scribners', 1900, page 103). "No art has a deeper power of penetration, no other can render shades of feeling so delicate as to escape every other medium of expression." On this subject, too, and this alone, Herbert Spencer—that master thinker in the realm of the material—drops the phrases of the scientist and adopts the language of the mystic. "Music," he exclaims, "arouses dormant sentiments of which we had not conceived the possibility and do not know the meaning; or, as Richter says, 'tells us of things we have not seen and shall not see.'" So Darwin, when his pen touches upon the power of melody over our natures, forgets his accustomed sobriety of statement and seems moved by a strange sense of mystery. "The sensations and ideas thus excited in us by
music or expressed by the cadences of oratory,” he remarks in Part 3, Chapter 19, of *Descent of Man*, “appear from their vagueness yet depth like mental reversions to the emotions and thoughts of a long past age.”

This subtle power of sound, however, to please and to move has long defied the knife and probe of science. About it theories beat and break like waves about an ocean-girt rock. It has been the despair of our boldest thinkers. “As neither the enjoyment nor the capacity of producing musical sounds,” says Darwin, “are faculties of the least use to man in reference to his daily habits of life, they must be ranked among the most mysterious with which he is endowed.” (*Descent of Man*, Part 3, Chapter 19). Spencer, too, seems impressed by the elusiveness of the problem. After setting forth, in his essay on *The Origin of Music*, a theory of his own which has since been largely discredited, he says, half-helplessly: “Those who reject the answer here given are bound to give another. What can it be?”

Wherein, we may ask, lies the witchery of melody? In what consists the spell of pealing chord and melting cadence? Why does one strain oppress with a vague sense of dread, and another suffuse the cheek with tears?Wherefore do we feel a quivering and a quickening and an impulse to leap to our feet when a swelling measure, a-swing with rhythm, breaks upon the ear, and whence is it that a dirge-like note throws a somber shade over the liveliest spirits and sobers mirth into stillness? Listening to the laboring pipes of a cathedral organ, how our sinews knit as the tide of sound deepens and rises; and as the rolling thunders mount one upon another, and climax piles on climax, how tense the breath becomes and how strangely the body seems to lift! These experiences are familiar ones; yet this influence of modulated and measured sound upon mind and body has baffled, seemingly, the most daring of philosophers. Darwin’s great mind brooded earnestly upon the mysterious play of music upon the emotions, and the varying expression of our moods in song, yet the riddle defied all his cunning to explain. “The whole subject,” he observes, “of the difference of sounds produced under different states of mind is so obscure that I have succeeded in throwing hardly any light upon it; and the remarks which I have made have but little significance.” (*Expression of the Emotions in Man and the Animals*, Appleton & Co.’s edition, 1899, page 88).

It would be impossible within the compass of a paper to explore the whole subject of music, even did it lie within the powers of the
present writer to do justice to the task. That field of speculation is beset with many gnarled problems which must be left for other and abler minds to treat. In so far, however, as the discussion may be narrowed to the immediate inquiry suggested by our questions and quotations,—namely, the effect of music upon the emotions,—the subject may safely be entered upon; for, as we believe, there is an all-important view-point which has been neglected hitherto, and approached from which the mystery resolves itself and the mind's eye beholds Music, and its twin-sister Language, in a new and truer light.

At the threshold of our subject, however, we are confronted by the need of clearing away a number of misconceptions, prevailing even among musicians, regarding the science as distinguished from the art of music. It is a common notion, for example, that the diatonic scale, which forms with us the alphabet of music, is the perfect scale of nature, growing inevitably out of fixed natural laws; and so deeply rooted is this idea that we refuse to recognize as true music any combination of sounds which we can not reproduce in the notes of our own scale. This belief, however, rests largely in fancy. Helmholtz long ago remarked the fact that our scale is an artificial creation, and William Pole, in his *Philosophy of Music*, has unfolded the teaching of Helmholtz in clear and happy style. Moreover, our scale, even when viewed as artificial, is not the ideal instrument of musical form we had dreamed, for as C. Hubert H. Parry has explained, in that profoundly instructive work, *The Evolution of the Art of Music*, our fifth is less in tune than in many other systems, and there is wholly lacking the gamut of quarter-tones which makes the Persian scale, in the language of this writer, "theoretically the most perfect ever devised"; nor do we note without interest the statement of the same author that our scale in its present form is but a hundred and fifty years old and "was resisted by some musicians even till the present century." So, too, harmony, or the chorded blending of many notes into one and the interplay of related melodies, is a modern development, and was wholly unknown to the ancient musicians. Our musical perceptions, therefore, in so far as they have been molded and fixed by our scale of twelve semi-tones, are purely the result of cultivation.

Music, indeed, like all other arts, and the sense of musical beauty, like all other faculties, are the outgrowth of evolution. The giving forth of musical or semi-musical sounds as tokens of emotion and sensation is natural to all animals. The dog that beholds the approach of his master gives vent to his delight in a yelp—the
swine feeding at the heaping trough evinces his satisfaction in a grunt—the cock with his shrill clarion utters his greeting to the new-born day and gives note of his triumph over a foe.

This truth applies as well to human beings as to the lesser animals. Nor is the reason far to seek. The earliest and the strongest instincts of mankind were those which centered about the mating of the sexes and the fostering of the offspring, and those which drew together into bands, whether for prey or defense, the primitive human creatures. Sundered by chance, the power of emitting sounds with the voice afforded a ready means of recalling the mates to each other, as, now, in the case of bird and beast. So, the same instrumentality was useful in summoning the offspring to the parent's side,—as with the hen, to-day, when she discovers a crumb or a worm with which to feed her brood; and on the part of the offspring served to bring the parent to its defense in moments of danger. Again, when prowling together in quest of food, a like signal would tell the rest that one of the band had caught sight of quarry,—as the yelp of the hound now, when he scents again the trail he had lost, is a reminiscence of the time when his wolf forefathers hunted in packs and knew by a quick bark from the leader that prey was ahead and that all must keep together.

Nor could the primitive cry-language have been as limited in its intelligibility as at first blush might be thought, though but a system of inarticulate sounds merely varying from one another in the elements of tone. In our own day we gather distinct ideas from the various cries of the dog: we know the yelp of pleasure with which he greets his master, the idle bark at the passerby, the low growl upon the entry of an intruder, and the plaintive whine when begging for food or entrance through the door; all of which in their characteristics differ from his bay in the chase, his howl when struck, his mournful wail in the lonely hours of night. Little less expressive is the language of the barnyard fowl. "Ray observed," says Romanes, in his *Mental Evolution in Man* (Appleton & Co., 1898, page 96), "the different tones used by the common hen and found them uniformly significant of different ideas or emotional states; therefore we may properly regard this as a system of language, though of a very rudimentary form. He distinguishes nine or ten distinct tones which are severally significant of as many distinct emotions and ideas,—namely, brooding, leading forth the brood, feeding, food, alarm, seeking shelter, anger, pain, fear, joy, or pride in having laid an egg. Anzeau, who independently observed this matter, says that the hen utters at least twelve significant
sounds." The like appears to be true of the monkey in his native home. "In Paraguay," says Darwin, in Descent of Man, "the cebus azarae, when excited, utters at least six distinct sounds which excite in other monkeys similar emotions."

Now, the language of the dog, of the hen and of the monkey can but symbolize for us the first rude language of our own kind,—the language of that stage of our development when we could not as yet have acquired the peculiar vocal apparatus which made possible the uprise of articulate speech. Indeed, we have in the language of the babe a reminder of that dim epoch in the racial story. "We know," says Romanes in the work from which we have already quoted (p. 104), "that the infant makes considerable advance in the language of tone and gesture before it begins to speak," and Darwin, we are told, "at the age of eleven weeks in the case of one of his children, and a little sooner in another, observed that the nature of their crying changed according to whether it was produced by hunger or suffering, and this means of communication appeared to be very early placed at the service of the will."

The human mother, however low in point of intellect, readily interprets the accents of her infant,—the crowing sound which evidences its contentment as it rocks in the cradle or on its parent's knee—the little cries of delight when played with or danced in the arms—the scream of pain—the plaintive note of fear with which, upon awakening in the stillness of night, it seeks the shelter of the maternal arms. So, the child itself, though too young to know the meaning of words, appears to grasp instinctively the significance of sounds. It distinguishes readily between the voice of threatening or anger, on the one hand, and friendly or loving tones on the other. It seems, moreover, an unconscious recognition of the infantile capacity for gathering impressions from variations of tone, that, in caressing the babe in arms, adults—and particularly women—fall into a singing style of utterance, with every word drawn into long cadences, the voice ordinarily dropping to low pitch when wishing, in play, to arouse a mild fear, and rising to the higher ranges of tone when seeking to evoke childish ecstacies of delight.

Taken altogether, therefore, we believe it may be safely assumed that the language of earliest mankind, in which they communicated to each other their simple emotions and sensations, was a language of cries or vocal sounds merely differing from each other in their musical characteristics. Darwin himself, in Expression of the Emotions in Man and the Animals, p. 87, gave a passing hint of this thought when he observed, "I have been led to infer that the
progenitors of man uttered musical tones before they acquired the powers of articulate speech; and that consequently when the voice is used under any strong emotion it tends to assume, through the principle of association, a musical character,” and again in Part 3, Chapter 19, of the Descent of Man, “We may go further than this, and, as remarked in a former chapter, believe that musical sounds afforded one of the bases of language.”

How vast the stretch of time from the inarticulate cry of the anthropoid brute to that magnificent vehicle of expression which thunders in the mighty pages of Carlyle and peals like organ pipes in the great lines of Milton! But all the splendor and beauty of language which we find there is the flower and offspring of that homely original. “Language,” says Spencer, in his Synthetic Philosophy, “can be traced down to a form in which nouns and verbs are its only elements.” Even that form, however,—when as yet mood, tense and person were not, and adjective, adverb and article had yet to be,—was a signal advance over the language of sounds; for it marked the perfection of the larynx which made possible the true vocable or spoken word, and evidenced, at the same time, a growing power of associating ideas and giving them names. So it was that the language of sounds varying from one another in their musical elements gave place to verbal speech, which was in time to become the familiar instrument of thought.

The musical tang, however, as we may infer, clung to the new born language of words and served as its background. The old impulse toward expressing emotion in this manner was strong, and men fell back into it under excitements which called up the sensations of the old time. Poetry—which of old, as now, dealt chiefly with love and valor, naturally awoke these hereditary sentiments, for the memories of courtship and of the fray were bound up with the creature’s first instincts; and so we find that, among all nations of antiquity, poetry was chanted. Prayer, too,—which in its earliest beginning was but the wild cry in moments of terror to a dimly felt Providence,—has ever expressed itself, particularly among inferior peoples, like the negroes, in a quavering utterance.

Indeed, our common speech, to-day, owes more of its expressiveness than we realize to its musical adjuncts. Give ear to an orator or tragedian, and note the changes in pitch of voice, and in measure and volume of tone, as the sentiment changes. No elocutionist recites the death of Little Nell in the same tone, nor with the same rapidity or loudness of utterance, as when describing a battle; and in conversation we condole with a friend in grief in a
voice differing in its every characteristic of sound from that with which we greet a long-absent acquaintance.

The dictionary we daily consult offers us a striking illustration, not only of the extent to which the musical element lingers in our speech, but as well of the wide variety of meanings a single cry in the old time might have acquired. The vocalization "Ah,"—which is the primary vowel-sound, being the most readily pronounced, and which we may therefore assume to have been the first and oftenest employed by man,—is defined in Webster's International Dictionary as "an exclamation expressive of surprise, pity, complaint, entreaty, contempt, threatening, delight, triumph, etc., according to the manner of utterance." So, the expression "ha" is defined thus: "an exclamation denoting surprise, joy or grief. Both as uttered and as written it expresses a great variety of emotions, determined by the tone or context. When repeated "ha, ha," it is an expression of laughter, satisfaction or triumph, sometimes of derisive laughter; or sometimes it is equivalent to "Well, it is so." "Aha," which is but a combination of the two former—all, indeed, turning upon the same primary vowel-sound—is defined as "an exclamation expressing by different intonations triumph mixed with derision or irony, or simple surprise."

The sound "Oh," which, being a vowel like the former, must have preceded the use of consonants in the early attempts at speech, expresses shades of meaning different from the foregoing, and the sound of double o, as in the word "food," so often used by children to indicate moderate pain, as when plunged in a cold bath, or as denoting mild surprise or fright, is another example. The ill-bred urchin expresses derision or defiance by a long-drawn enunciation of a short-a vowel-sound in a rasping voice,—a clear harking back to the primeval; and such exclamations as "ugh!" "ouch!" and the like, heard with such frequency about us, can hardly be more than an inheritance from the cry-language of our early ancestors.

The power of emitting sounds varying in their musical characteristics, having become measurably perfected by use, was not lost, we may suppose, when the birth of verbal speech began to supersede it as the common means of communication. The enlargement of brain which could make possible the upgrowth of a spoken language, however imperfect, was token of unfolding faculties which should shortly crave expression in the esthetic. Hitherto, man had experienced hunger and satisfaction, pain and pleasure, sorrow and joy, and the other sensations of which his undeveloped nature was capable; but, being as yet without self-consciousness, he could not
reflect upon these feelings. He lived in the objective and was incapable of introspection. To borrow the lucid phrases of Edwin Miller Wheelock, in that prose-poem of Evolution which we know as *Proteus*, "he could not turn round in his track and face himself. He knew but did not know that he knew. He saw but did not see that he saw. He could not think back over his own thoughts." Now, however, his powers of thought had expanded and he could lift himself into the subjective and from the pinnacle of memory look down upon his own emotions and meditate upon the associations they recalled. He remembered the sights and sounds whose impression upon his faculties had been strongest and most lasting:—the great ocean rolling in long measured swells at his feet or hurling its black masses with frightful sound against the skies—the forests, gloomy and fathomless, now still as death, now moaning disconsolately, now groaning beneath the hurricane—the moving airs of heaven, at one time soft and pleasing and laden with a thousand odors, at another terrible in their shrieks of rage! As in painting and sculpture he began tracing in a rude way the objects which had aroused his fears, his joys, his pains and pleasures, so in music—which then took birth as an art from the same power of vocal utterance that had hitherto served a different use—he strove to reproduce the sounds which had most impressed him in nature, in order that he might feel again the emotions and sensations with which they had always been associated, and which now he could contemplate, as it were, from afar. The brush and chisel have since wrought marvels as hard to link with man's first steps in those arts as it would have been difficult to find in the primitive speech of nouns and verbs, of which Spencer tells us, the potentialities of expression which in the lapse of ages gave us the pages of Shakespeare. Music, equally, has since attained a power and beauty which make us forget its humble birth; but all these arts alike—painting and sculpture, language and music—trace back their homely origin to that dim epoch and to those first impulses of man toward the esthetic.

"The natives of Australia," says Parry at page 48 of the work already mentioned, "are described by a French traveler as beginning a howl on a high note and descending a full octave with semitones: and the Caribs are described by an English traveler as doing the same thing;" The writer of the fine work from which this quotation is borrowed ventures no theory which will cast light upon the origin of this primitive and savage type of music; but whoever will remember the shriek of the hurricane about a rocky coast, and recall the high, shrill wail that marks the storm at its highest, and the
gradual fall to a low moan as the force of each gust subsides, can not fail to see that the howling chant of the Australian and the Carib is but the borrowed music of the tempest.

It needs no bold flight of the imagination to conjure up the sounds with which early man was surrounded and to think out the impressions which they must have made upon him. Even during the ages when inarticulate sounds were his only speech, and long before his faculties had grown critical, he had seen how wide the difference between the sounds of phenomena that inspired fear and the sounds of phenomena that pleased. The roar of preying beast or torrent—the howl and shriek of wave and wind—the clap and growl of angry skies—all these filled his soul with terror, for he knew that lurking in the wake of these sounds were peril and bereavement. Mass of sound, therefore, wherever heard, called up within him the emotions of the tragic and the terrible. He noted, too, during the deadly tempests he so much feared, that when the storm and his own dread were at the highest—when the forests bowed lowest before the fury of the winds and the waves broke wildest and oftenest against the rocks—the cry of the hurricane was high and shrill; and that as the creaking forests unbent during a lull, and the lashing waves grew less violent, the note of the wind sank to a low wail, bringing relief and hope for the moment. So rise and fall in pitch of sound became associated in his mind with rise and fall in intensity of emotion.

Now, as he borrowed from the phenomena of the storm his conception of mass of sound as synonymous with tragedy and terror, so from the peace of a summer’s day he drew the idea which identified soft, low sounds with all that is pleasing: On such a day, the break of the surf was gentle, the forests were still, the sighing breezes bore odors to him from scented fields,—all things told of rest and he was soothed and lulled. So slow, gentle sounds came to have for him a meaning quite as distinct as those which marked the tempest.

As he grew in power of observation, animate nature about him deepened these impressions. There the same law was apparent. His cat, when pleased, purred low and softly, but when angry vented its rage in sharp cries. His dog, when roused casually from slumber, gave forth a few barks in a tone of middle pitch, and so when warning an intruder his growl was low, threatening, long-drawn: but when in pain his yelps were quick and shrill, and when impatient for the chase his nasal whine, while subdued, was high in pitch.

In himself, as well, man saw the same principle at work. When
pleased or calm his voice was low and regular in its vocalizations; but when angry his voice was high and his utterances quick. So his cries of pain or terror were shrill, as was his laugh of derision or contempt; but in love he spoke softly and his chuckle of delight was low.

Sound, therefore, came with man to have a psychology of its own,—a psychology which, despite the vast development of music since along lines unrelated to its origin, will even now explain many of the sensations we derive from chored and cadenced sound, for in every phrase and strain, whether consciously or unconsciously, the composer pays tribute to its influence. Whoever will study the score of Wagner’s “Parsifal” must realize how much that marvel of tone depends for its wondrous power over the emotions upon the master’s rare insight into this primary psychology of sound. Everywhere throughout that great creation, we find startling illustrations of this truth. How graphic, for example, is the music which marks the entry upon the scene of Kundry the Demon, and with what surprising art does the composer appeal at this moment to the native racial feeling which in every age has identified the presence of enchanters and wizards with disturbances of the elements and has associated witches with high winds! In the midst of the pathetic melody which tells the sufferings of Amfortas is heard a shrill tremolo from the violins like the cry of the wind. This ushers in a wild theme suggesting by its irregular rhythm and heightening volume the modulations of the storm as its rage deepens, until, finally, the tempest reaches its climax in a piercing shriek—a shrill, fortissimo chord—whence in a series of descending chromatic waves the storm dies away. This is the motive of Kundry the Demon, and we believe its elucidation on the theory we have advanced lies far nearer the idea in the composer’s mind than the explanation suggested by some Wagnerian critics—namely, that the entire phrase is a reproduction of Kundry’s laughter.

Thus, again, in a later stage of the opera, when Parsifal and Gurnemanz have entered the temple, and the chorus of altos and tenors intone the Saviour’s Lament, how faithfully has Wagner followed the primitive music-language which expressed suffering in shrill, piercing sounds! Not only does the composer assign this theme to the tenors and altos, and pitch the voices in their highest range, but to deepen the effect by making the music even more penetrating, he directs that this chorus shall be sung by youths, whose voices are, of course, more piercing than those of adults.

Says Maurice Kufferath, in his Study of Parsifal, recently
translated into our tongue: “These voices, clearer and more penetrating than the former, sing the phrase called the Saviour's Lament. . . . If this melody, remarkable for its descending chromatics in thirds, possesses an inherent character of sadness, it now attains, when taken up by these voices, a strength of emphasis in expressing suffering of which it would be difficult to find the equivalent in music.”

If variation in pitch of music may be explained in the manner we have attempted, then the explanation of the origin of rhythm is not far distant,—an explanation, indeed, which has been suggested by a number of writers and to which we may briefly refer. The enjoyment of physical movement is common to both man and the lower animals, for it is a law of life that we must exercise our members if we would preserve them, and hence nature wisely so orders it that we find pleasure in moderate physical exertion. The puppy and the kitten delight to frisk upon the lawn, and the colt and lamb to gambol in the field. So, the infant in the cradle finds pleasure in drawing up its limbs and throwing out its elbows, and children in moments of ecstatic delight jump upon the ground and clap their hands, and when happy, but in a less extreme degree, they instinctively form into circles and dance about chanting some nursery rhyme. We may readily infer, therefore, that primitive man found pleasure in physical movement, and as it is easier to perform such movements in regular than irregular succession, the dance, which is but rhythmic physical movement, was born. “All dancing” (we quote again from Parry) “is ultimately derived from expressive gestures, which have become rhythmic through the balanced arrangement of the human body which makes it difficult for similar actions to be frequently repeated irregularly.” Now, as it was during the dance that the impulse toward song must have been strongest, we can see how the regularity of movement involved in the dance would give regularity of emphasis to the music, and thus the idea of rhythm in music would be acquired. In the course of time, then, by its traditional association with the dance, rhythm in music would come to suggest a vague sense of pleasure. Hence it is that music which is spoken of as “sensuous” is invariably rhythmic in a high degree, and the same fact will explain the hold of “rag-time” upon the popular mind.

Keeping now in view the psychology of pitch and measure in music, we may grasp the secret of the influence which in every age has been wielded by the orator. It is in the musical beauty of his language—the melting inflections of his voice, the roundness of his phrases, the perfect balance of his periods—that his power
lies over the feelings of his auditors. Give heed for a moment to the moving eloquence of some rarely gifted tongue! See how wondrously the voice, in its every tone and modulation, is swayed by the sentiment the speaker feels. With what a majestic rhythm do the golden phrases roll! Measured as the very pulses that leap in his veins is every utterance! And how deftly the voice, in its varying mass and shades of pitch, ranges through the gamut of the emotions! Soft as a sigh is its breath as the orator tells of sadness, of sorrow, of death; but how its tones ascend, how its volume deepens, as passion, as triumph, as defiance, thunders from his lips! "Cicero long ago observed," says an eminent writer, "that the power of a great speaker often depends, not so much on what he says, as on the skill with which he uses the expressive tones of his voice," and Darwin remarks in the Descent of Man, "The impassioned orator... when, with his varying tones or cadences, he excites the strongest emotion in his hearers, little suspects that he uses the same means by which his half-human ancestors aroused in others the ardent passions during their courtship and rivalry."

Nor is it alone in the eloquence of the platform and the stage that the musical background lends magic to words and phrases. The eloquence of the printed page, as well, finds in the same fact the secret of its charm; for invariably, as we read, we sound the words in thought and the music of the utterance echoes through the chambers of the mind. The poems of Longfellow and Thomas Moore, even when read in silence, suggest a softened sound like the purling of a fountain or a brook; the stately lines of Milton or Tennyson peal through the mind like a swelling anthem through cathedral vaults; and it is chiefly for their surpassing musical beauty that the sonorous phrases of Cicero and Demosthenes have been the delight of scholars through the centuries. On the other hand, writers whose pages bear no charm for the ear make neither a strong nor a lasting appeal to the popular mind. Walt Whitman's verse is notoriously lacking in melody, and the "good gray poet," therefore, with all his wisdom and tenderness, is little known save to the highly intellectual; and the like is true of Browning. So long through the ages has the ear formed the door-way to the brain—so much does the primal psychology of sound still retain its hold upon the mind—so interlinked, indeed, are music and speech,—that words, whether they rise from the lips or from the printed page, must fail of their fullest effect if lacking in measure and melody. The primitive within us craves still that meaning be sung into the ear!
Before relinquishing finally the subject which has engaged our attention, let us pause for a retrospective glance. As the thoughts of our great thinkers with which this paper was opened pass in review before us, we may gather a meaning which we had missed before. We see more clearly now, perhaps, why, in the phrase of Ribot, "music is the most emotional of all arts,"—whence it comes that in the language of Spencer it arouses "dormant sentiments of which we had not conceived the possibility and do not know the meaning,"—and wherefore it is that Darwin could say "The sensations and ideas thus excited in us by music, or expressed by the cadences of oratory, appear from their vagueness yet depth like mental reversions to the emotions and thoughts of a long past age."