

A Brief History of Lyric Diction Pedagogy

PART II—SHIFTING PARADIGMS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Matthew Hoch



Matthew Hoch

This is the second article of a two-part series in which associate editor Matthew Hoch explores the history of lyric diction pedagogy from its formal twentieth-century beginnings to the present day. Part I addressed the establishment of lyric diction courses in the academy through examination of the first textbooks, accreditation standards, revision of the International Phonetic Alphabet, and emergence of a three-line format for transcriptions and translations. Part II will explore twenty-first-century developments and highlight lingering challenges that persist for instructors and practitioners of lyric diction pedagogy. The article will conclude with thoughts on the future of the discipline.

By the turn of the twenty-first century, the study of lyric diction—and acknowledgment of the importance of it—had firmly established itself in both the academic classroom and private studio. Music programs in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) were required to offer instruction (usually via prescribed coursework) in foreign-language pronunciation.

At this time, singing teachers and coaches now had multiple textbooks from which to choose. These resources, however, featured various strengths and weaknesses and were inconsistent in their pedagogical approach, often contradicting one another. Additionally, while resources abounded for the “big four”—English, Italian, German, and French—many students graduated without any proficiency beyond these languages. However, this would soon change, as an abundance of new publications and electronically available resources were about to instigate major pedagogical shifts in the teaching and learning of lyric diction. The opening decades of this century have also brought into focus aspects of pedagogy that have not yet been resolved.

This second and final article in this two-part series on the history of lyric diction pedagogy explores these developments and will be divided into three parts: (a) twentieth-first-century developments, (b) lingering challenges for students and teachers of lyric diction, and (c) thoughts on the future of the discipline.¹

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

Beyond the “Big Four”: A Language Explosion

One of the most obvious shifts encountered in lyric diction pedagogy as it entered the twenty-first century was the burgeoning number of publica-

tions that ventured beyond the traditional languages of the lyric diction classroom—namely the “big four”: English, Italian, German, and French. The roots of this trend began prior to the year 2000. Latin was the earliest low-hanging fruit for diction practitioners; as early as 1975, John Moriarty and Robert Hines published their respective pronunciation guides.² Harold Copeman followed in 1990 with his own book, *Singing in Latin*.³

Russian and Spanish were also early priorities for lyric diction pedagogues due to the rich repertoire of art song and opera—in the latter’s case, zarzuela—associated with these languages. In the 1990s Jan Piatek published one of the earliest Russian textbooks to utilize the Intentional Phonetic Alphabet with *Russian Songs and Arias: Phonetic Readings, Word by Word Translations* (1991); Nico Castel’s *A Singer’s Manual of Spanish Lyric Diction* (1994) established itself as a classic textbook that was also future-looking in its recognition of nuances and variations with respect to Spanish pronunciation in various countries and regions.⁴

Leyerle Publications pioneered early explorations of Scandinavian song repertoire with publications by Bradley Ellingboe (Norwegian and Danish) and Annette Johansson (Swedish).⁵ Joseph Dechario’s two-volume *Timeless Jewish Songs: Hebrew, Yiddish, and Ladino Texts with IPA Transcriptions* (1994) represents an underdiscussed landmark publication.⁶

The number of books written by language specialists increased significantly throughout the 2000s and 2010s. In 2001, Timothy Cheek’s *Singing in Czech: A Guide to Czech Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* was a landmark publication, making arias from the operas of Smetana, Dvořák, and Janáček significantly more accessible.⁷ Anton Belov and Emily Olin added to the academic discourse with discussions pertaining to Russian diction.⁸ Suzanne Draayer edited a six-volume series of nineteenth-century Spanish songs and Patricia Caicedo edited similar anthologies focused on Latin American song repertoire; these resources included detailed pronunciation guides.⁹ Caicedo, in the spirit of Castel a generation before her, also published a diction book devoted to the varieties of Spanish heard on both sides of the Atlantic.¹⁰

For Leyrele, Paula Boire published a two-volume anthology of Romanian art songs.¹¹ Mei Zhong released two anthologies of Chinese selections—one focused

on folksong repertoire and the other on art songs.¹² Rowman & Littlefield publishers inaugurated a lyric diction series that has produced full-length monographs devoted to languages as diverse as Brazilian Portuguese, Polish, Greek, and Mandarin.¹³

Research on Scandinavian song experienced a fecund decade in the 2010s. Anna Hersey’s 2016 textbook, *Scandinavian Song: A Guide to Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish Repertoire and Diction* built upon Ellingboe’s and Johansson’s earlier works; this updated one-volume resource made Scandinavian transcriptions more accessible to teachers and performers via the first widely distributed North American publication devoted to the topic.¹⁴ Kathleen Roland-Silverstein also published her own anthology of Swedish songs with a guide to pronunciation.¹⁵ The Finnish Academy of Music produced English-language lyric diction resources for Swedish and Finnish, although these books were challenging to obtain in the United States.¹⁶

Under Leslie De’Ath’s associate editorship of the “Language and Diction” column in the *Journal of Singing*, articles devoted to IPA transcription of a wide variety of off-the-beaten-path languages were published, including Brazilian Portuguese, Ukrainian, Icelandic, Japanese, Hungarian, Finnish, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Czech, Welsh, Slovene, Afrikaans, Russian, and Dutch.¹⁷ With all these resources available to modern singers, one can reasonably question whether the traditional academic paradigm of the “big four” languages of the Western operatic and art song tradition will continue to persist as classical music and the song recital enters the mid-twenty-first century.

A New Generation of Scholarship

The first part of this article discussed the establishment of the first and second generation of lyric diction textbooks that were widely implemented in the classroom and studio.¹⁸ While the use of some of these titles persisted into the twenty-first century (particularly Moriarty’s and Wall’s), new textbooks were also published, many of which built upon the work of twentieth-century scholars—often directly applying the rules established by those seminal textbooks.¹⁹

This application and expansion is most keenly exemplified in Cheri Montgomery’s *Lyric Diction Workbook* series.²⁰ The hallmark of this series is the publication

of individual workbooks (in the spirit of Wall—albeit greatly evolved and expanded) devoted to all the major languages of classical singing.²¹ These workbooks were designed for use in the classroom with copious practice exercises provided for homework assignments and in-class discussion.²² Each volume is based on the scholarship of previously published language specialists: English, for instance, is based on the work of Madeleine Marshall, German on William Odom and Benno Schollum’s scholarship, and French on the research of Thomas Grubb.²³

Authors of lyric diction resources have always had to manage the balancing of specialized resources with more practical—often “all-in-one”—textbooks (e.g., Grubb or Colorni versus Moriarty). In this respect, Montgomery’s publications provide the best of both worlds: the expertise of specialists funneled into general resources for use in the classroom. A favorite feature of these volumes among educators is also a practical one: teachers of lyric diction no longer need to “reinvent the wheel” by developing their own worksheets for use in the classroom—Montgomery provides everything one needs for a comprehensive curriculum. Her *Lyric Diction Workbook* series has continued to evolve; subsequent workbooks devoted to Latin, Russian, and Spanish are now available and additional supplemental textbooks and other resources for students of singing also have been published.²⁴ For all these reasons, Montgomery’s series has seen wide adoption in colleges and universities.

David Adams, whose 1999 book was discussed in the first part of this article, has continued to publish new editions with substantive revisions; his volume is now in its third edition.²⁵ Several other important textbooks made their debut in the twenty-first century: Eileen Davis’s *Sing French: Diction for Singers*, published in 2010, is a worthy successor to Grubb’s magnum opus.²⁶ Amanda Johnston’s *English and German Diction for Singers: A Comparative Approach*, originally published in 2011, is now in its third edition and offers important and necessary revisions to Odom and Schollum.²⁷

In 2022, Timothy Cheek and Anna Toccafondi published *Perfect Italian Diction for Singers: An Authoritative Guide*, which is the most significant one-volume resource for Italian published since Colorni.²⁸ Additional textbooks from major publishers have also contributed

to academic discourse.²⁹ These resources are noteworthy for thoroughness and refinement of lyric diction study in the vein of the traditional, four-language curricular approach established by NASM.

While Leslie De’Ath’s column made many forays into less-often-sung languages, numerous articles continued to be written within “big four” tradition, delving more deeply into English, Italian, French, and German.³⁰ Other *Journal of Singing* articles focused on elocution, nuance, and other expressive elements of language.³¹ The scholarship of pedagogy itself also became a new topic of inquiry; in addition to authoring textbooks, scholars of lyric diction began writing articles about best practices in the studio and classroom.³²

One cannot say that the *Journal of Singing* has neglected the subject of lyric diction in recent decades; with pedagogical challenges continuing to linger on the horizon—some of which will be discussed below—the possibility of future articles on these topics and others seems both likely and limitless.

More Widespread Use of the International Phonetic Alphabet

Use of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) has continued to pick up steam over the past several decades, both within the academy and in society writ large. Wikipedia, for instance, now utilizes IPA as its primary phonetic tool, as does the Oxford English Dictionary.³³ The wide availability of IPA symbols available in the Unicode encoding standard has made digitizing phonetic transcriptions in articles, presentations, and book manuscripts an easily achieved reality for academics and educators. We have come a long way since the era of Berton Coffin, who in his first lyric diction book was forced to write in IPA symbols (as well as diacritical marks) in pencil!³⁴ Perhaps most significant, the tacit endorsement of IPA by virtually all professional music organizations, including NATS, the American Choral Directors Association (ACDA), the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), and the Pan American Vocology Association (PAVA) has resulted in the system’s regular appearance in peer-reviewed research, choral octavos, and books.³⁵ This universal gravitation toward IPA by music educators is surely the result of lyric diction becoming an NASM standard, thus familiarizing

a younger generation with IPA via their undergraduate and graduate coursework.³⁶

The academic theater community—represented by the Voice and Speech Trainers Association (VASTA) and their journal, the *Voice and Speech Review*—has embraced the system in the teaching and performing of accents and dialects.³⁷ IPA is also utilized in areas of research and pedagogy that fall outside of the lyric diction arena. Acoustic pedagogy, for example, has seen an exponential expansion in scholarship since the turn of the century; it is now common practice to label and discuss vowels in this context via the use of IPA symbols.³⁸ This pedagogical use of the system to facilitate acoustically based technical work in the studio is a hallmark of twenty-first-century pedagogy.³⁹

Within lyric diction discourse itself, the adoption of IPA has been so universal that the few published pronunciation guides that do not make use of the system have made few inroads into the voice pedagogy community and thus have had a more limited impact upon teachers and singers.⁴⁰

Inroads and Synergy with the Choral Community

Singing teachers and coaches would do well to remember that we are a small cohort compared to choir directors and avocational choral singers. Virtually every public school and church in the United States has representatives of the latter group in their ranks, not to mention the numerous community choirs and other singing groups that can be found in cities large and small.

Perhaps the biggest coup that has occurred over the last several decades is a younger generation aging into becoming educators and conductors—all of whom took diction courses in their studies and have facility with the International Phonetic Alphabet. This was not the case in decades past. A generation ago, pronunciation guides in the front matter of choral octavos were almost always orthographic in nature; now, IPA transcriptions are the norm.

Within the ACDA community, several important books have been published signaling this shift toward IPA transcriptions.⁴¹ The *Choral Journal*, the official publication of ACDA, also exclusively utilizes the system.⁴² While choral professionals perhaps jumped onto the proverbial IPA bandwagon later than the voice pedagogy community, they are now undeniably on board.

Online Resources and the Self-Publishing Space

The shift from hard-copy resources to electronic ones is a trend that began more than two decades ago, and there is no facet of academia that has remained untouched by this phenomenon, including the study of lyric diction. While Gen Xers like me remember our teachers reminding us of the importance of owning specific foreign-language dictionaries and “doing our own translations and transcriptions” with them, Gen Z students’ first instinct is to go online, accessing fast, free, and multilingual resources as opposed to weighty hardcover tomes like *Garzanti*, *Langenscheidt*, and *Le petit Robert*.⁴³ Many of these online dictionaries, like Pons, also utilize IPA across all languages, making them ideal online resources for lyric diction students.⁴⁴

This departure from physical resources also marks a shift away from the book-form published transcriptions (most notably Leyerle) that proliferated in the late 1990s and 2000s. Instead of doing their own transcription or going to the library to look one up, the contemporary student’s first instinct invariably will be to look for one online. In recent years, IPA Source has emerged as the most comprehensive and frequently utilized reservoir of online transcriptions.⁴⁵ Even more recently, AI transcription generators have taken things one step further by generating IPA (Unicode) transcriptions based on any text entered by the user.⁴⁶ This movement toward AI-driven tools within the cyberspace realm is sure to continue—there will almost certainly *not* be a move back toward printed books and physical libraries.

While self-publishing has always been an option for authors—dating back to the nineteenth century when Walt Whitman (1819–1892) famously published his first book of poetry after there was no interest from publishers—this independent entrepreneurship has never been easier or more accessible; there are many online options available to authors who wish to disseminate their ideas via book or (e-book) format.⁴⁷ While major publishers—which in the case of lyric diction scholarship would include Leyerle, Oxford, Schirmer, and Scarecrow/Rowman & Littlefield—have played a major role in the history of lyric diction pedagogy, these traditional venues arguably can be viewed by some as “gatekeepers” who tend to favor authors who hold academic positions while excluding other voices who may work in the performance sphere or private studio context.⁴⁸

Self-publishing is intrinsically inclusive, allowing all voices—both academics and those outside of the academy—to make their work readily available. The past decade has seen the emergence of a variety of interesting and important self-published lyric diction resources.⁴⁹ This trend is sure to continue and expand in the coming years.

While there are numerous self-published works of high quality, it is important to remember that the lack of a peer-review process means these publications are not vetted in the same way as works from reputable publishers and journals; choosing wisely among these resources requires a certain degree of discernment. However, it should also be pointed out as a counterargument that the lack of gatekeeping (and the possible muting or censorship of “outside-the-box” ideas by reviewers) grants the self-published author complete academic freedom over their research and scholarship.

LINGERING CHALLENGES

A Pedagogical Shift

As stated previously, the most significant development since the inauguration of lyric diction courses in the late twentieth-century has been the proliferation of published transcriptions that are now available to teachers and performers. Most of these resources also include translations cast in the standardized multiline format originally established by Leyerle (and now almost universally adopted).

While there is significant educational value and intellectual reward in doing one’s own translations and transcriptions, this practice is no longer engaged in by the vast majority of performers and lyric diction students. Students of singing—always pressed for time due to the heavy course loads and rehearsal schedules placed upon music majors—overwhelmingly seek out transcriptions (often online) instead of doing their own.

Accepting this reality raises pedagogical questions that should be carefully considered by instructors of lyric diction. To what extent does one still need to “know the rules” (and exceptions) with respect to various languages studied? To what degree are transcription skills still necessary? Certainly some understanding and internalization still has value simply because these are important skills of the discipline; students studying

engineering in college still take courses in mathematics despite owning calculators.

Coaches and teachers of singing need to understand the basic rules of pronunciation for each language so they can adequately instruct their pupils “in the moment” without having to consult reference works. However, at this point in the history of the discipline it seems safe to conclude that knowledge of and facility with the International Phonetic Alphabet is a skill far more fundamental to the arsenal of twenty-first century educators and practitioners than the art of transcribing from scratch.

Curricular Constraints

Although the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) now lists proficiency in foreign language pronunciation for singers as an accreditation standard at both the undergraduate and graduate level, it remains up to individual institutions to determine how this requirement is implemented into respective curricula.⁵⁰ Although NASM does not collect and collate specific data on the number of semesters each accredited institution uses to facilitate the lyric diction requirement, conversations with NASM administrators and general data reviewed for this article suggest that two consecutive undergraduate courses is a common arrangement.⁵¹ This poses serious challenges for the teacher or coach tasked with instructing these courses, which in an ideal world would devote a semester to each language.⁵²

Even if the teacher limits themselves only to English, Italian, German, and French (comprising the traditional course content), how can one structure the material within this constraining model? Putting “Italian and English” in the first semester seems doable (and is, in fact, what many institutions ultimately do), but this sets up an impossible task for the second semester, which squeezes German and French into fifteen weeks. “Italian/German” and “English/French” seems slightly better but is still a maddening amount of material to disseminate within a short timeframe.

In my own experience teaching within this straight-jacketed two-course model, I found that eliminating English altogether (admittedly not ideal) and beginning with Italian (the language the fewest number of IPA symbols to learn) was the lesser of evils and allowed for more curricular “breathing room.”⁵³ This placed

“Italian/German” in the fall and allowed for a full semester of French in the spring. However, even this arrangement seemed to shortchange German. It is thus this author’s opinion that the minimum curricular setup to adequately teach the fundamentals of classical lyric diction is three semesters: “Italian/English” followed by two full semesters devoted to German and French, respectively. Unfortunately, three semesters of lyric diction is a privilege many accredited music programs do not have the luxury of enjoying.

Admittedly, *any* of these arrangements leaves little time for the application of IPA to other languages; as America becomes more diverse and multilingual, it seems shortsighted not to offer some coursework in Spanish pronunciation (to cite merely one prominent example). However one structures their curriculum, one could argue (once again) that the most important goal is for the student to emerge from their lyric diction coursework with a basic proficiency and command of the International Phonetic Alphabet. This skill above all others will equip them with the facility to interpret the many song and aria transcriptions that have become widely available in recent decades.

Standardization of Terminology

One area that remains unresolved among diction pedagogues is agreement on terminology in the classroom and studio. This is an issue that extends far beyond lyric diction but nevertheless includes it.⁵⁴ Perhaps the most prominent topic of discussion is the “close versus closed” debate with respect to vowel quality. Early diction textbooks—most prominently those by Moriarty and Grubb—favored “closed” (presumably to describe the opposite of “open”).⁵⁵ However, this descriptor is not accurate in the acoustic sense, as the vocal tract is never fully occluded—regardless of one’s oral cavity shape or tongue position.⁵⁶ Indeed, it is not possible to phonate if the resonators are “closed.”⁵⁷

The International Phonetic Society has long advocated instead for “open versus close” terminology with respect to vowels.⁵⁸ This practice is also well engrained among linguists, as evidenced in language-based public resources like Wikipedia.⁵⁹ Within the realm of literature for singing teachers, Kenneth W. Bozeman’s writings on acoustic pedagogy were among the earliest to adopt the

shift to “close.”⁶⁰ Adams made this change in 2022 with the third edition of his textbook.⁶¹

Although old habits die slowly and “closed” is still widely used in practice, these respected publications offer evidence that this shift is beginning to occur. In addition to being standardized among linguists, voice pedagogues should reasonably agree this is a more accurate, science-informed change for the better.⁶²

Another terminological area that is ostensibly easy to fix—but nevertheless “all over the map”—is the simple standardization of the names of IPA symbols.⁶³ Unfortunately, as of the writing of this article, few textbooks provide students with this terminology, resulting in wide verbal inconsistency among teachers, coaches, and performers. As an example (and in the author’s own personal experience), I have heard the upsilon [ʊ] called an “open *u*,” a “big *u*,” a “flying *u*,” and even a “horseshoe”! Montgomery avoids the issue altogether by not disclosing the names of symbols in her workbooks, instead labeling each by phonetic descriptors.⁶⁴

Again emulating the International Phonetic Association, the author advocates for a more direct approach by simply adopting the names that have been standardized by the International Phonetic Association.⁶⁵ Several textbooks have already moved in this direction, and it is the author’s hope that this simple choice will evolve into standard practice in the coming decades.⁶⁶

Consistency across Resources

Closely related to the discussion above, there is also presently much variation, comparatively speaking, with respect to various lyric diction resources. One merely needs to examine a sampling of the books cited in this two-part article to note major inconsistencies between the respective rubrics laid out by Marshall, Colorni, Moriarty, Grubb, Odom and Schollum, Wall, Adams, and Johnston.⁶⁷ This *mélange* is further complicated by linguistic resources (i.e., dictionaries), as individual publishers tend to curate their own preferred (and unique) transcription systems; even those that utilize IPA may not agree with one another on methodology or use the same symbols to transcribe the same words.

Achieving consistency is even more challenging when contemplating lyric diction resources for singers, as sung language in the classical tradition may or may not reflect spoken pronunciation; Italian and German may

indeed be similar, but the same cannot be said of French and English. Until a third party—perhaps a professional organization such as NATS—comprehensively examines the current resources available and makes recommendations for standardization, this current predicament is likely to persist.⁶⁸

Balancing “Correctness” with Practical Pedagogy

As pronunciation rules are grounded in the conventions of spoken language, lyric diction is a discipline that is therefore fundamentally built upon a slippery foundation. The moment words are sung, adjustments have to be made—particularly if one is singing in a Western classical style. Even at the most basic level of singing and voice teaching, the sociocultural tradition of TBB singers singing mostly in their lower registers—and, conversely, trebles primarily in their higher registers—sets up a scenario in which the same IPA transcription will apply differently even if respective treble/TTB singers are singing the same text.

This intersection of acoustic pedagogy and transcription can present complications for the novice teacher who may be skilled in matters of lyric diction but less comfortable in the arena of acoustic pedagogy. Every singing teacher or coach will encounter a teaching situation in which, for example, a soprano will be required to sing a close vowel above their second passaggio, motivating the instructor perhaps to suggest, “I don’t care what the ‘correct’ vowel is or what the diction rule says—sing the vowel [a] on that note instead.”⁶⁹

In his many groundbreaking transcriptions for Leyerle in the 1990s and early 2000s, Nico Castel was sensitive to these necessary adjustments, taking it upon himself to open or close certain vowels—usually an unaccented *e* and *o* in Italian—depending on the context of the musical passage and (more important) the range in which the note was sung. As an undergraduate diction student, I found these choices perplexing. Even now, with a better understanding of acoustic pedagogy, I still disagree with some of Castel’s choices and would prefer to make those decisions on my own—both as a singer and as a teacher.

Most pedagogues have now agreed on the common practice of transcribing texts according to the rules laid out by lyric diction resources while reserving the artis-

tic license to modify certain vowels in certain registers. In other words: *learn the rules first, make adjustments later* (after you know the rules). One of my colleague’s mantras is, “it’s much better to know the rule you’re breaking than to break it unintentionally.”⁷⁰ This is also good advice for lyric diction pedagogy.

The schwa [ə] is also a matter in which a transcription only tells part of the story. Although a schwa occupies the place of a vowel, the fact that it is unaccented—and in speech not sustained—means that it is also imprecise.⁷¹ Compounding matters further, the color of the schwa varies slightly depending on the language being spoken (or sung). Moreover, the longer a vowel is held while singing, the more necessary it becomes to infuse the schwa with a specific vowel color; imprecision is not an option—or even good advice for the student—if the unaccented syllable is set on a half or whole note, for example.⁷² In these instances, solutions may differ depending on both personal preference and the language being sung.

Grubb suggests that most of the schwas appearing in French transcriptions be replaced with the *o-e* ligature [œ] for a rounder color and more accurate execution.⁷³ In English things become a bit more complicated and situational: in prefixes—such as in the first syllable of the word “before”—a small capital *i* [i] is a good choice, but in a final syllable—such as in the word “broken”—sweetening the schwa with a hint of epsilon [ɛ] may yield good results.⁷⁴ German becomes even more nuanced, with scholarly opinion varying on how to handle the schwa.⁷⁵ The bottom line in all these situations is this: regardless of the language, it is not the transcription that changes. The schwa is still there—it is the *singer* who makes the subtle adjustment.

Moving Past a “One-Size-Fits-All” Approach

In the introduction to her landmark 1953 book, *The Singer’s Manual of English Diction*, Madeleine Marshall wrote:

In this manual, there is presented a neutral, standard English, free of regional accents, intelligible to any audience. It is an English that has long been accepted as a norm on the stage and in other public usage. Our aim is to sing one English.⁷⁶

As a pioneer—arguably *the* pioneer—of lyric diction as an academic discipline, Marshall is deserving of our

respect. Her approach was the accepted approach, at least among classical singing teachers, throughout the twentieth century.⁷⁷ However, seventy years later, it benefits us to reevaluate the philosophy that inspired her to write her treatise. Is it still—or, for that matter, was it ever—our aim to sing *one* English? Should the language of an American art song be transcribed under the same rubric as a Handel oratorio aria, an Appalachian folk-song, or a musical theater selection?

Most singing practitioners would agree that the “one-size-fits-all” approach suggested by Marshall would be absurd in the twenty-first century, especially when one considers the many styles, cultures, eras, and locations represented through the English language and regularly encountered by the coach or teacher of singing. The concept of a “transatlantic” diction—popularized in the early twentieth century by Katharine Hepburn (1907–2003) and other stage and film actors—is now recognized as a dated approach and no longer practiced by theater professionals.⁷⁸ And yet Marshall’s shadow is a long one; many diction resources courses are still influenced by her monolithic approach.⁷⁹

Theater performers have long taken advantage of IPA transcriptions in their training to refine dialects and accents. Perhaps it is time for singers to consider these nuances in transcriptions as well.⁸⁰ Although Marshall-based resources still seem to dominate the higher education landscape, some scholars have acknowledged the need for a bifurcated approach to teaching English lyric diction (i.e., British versus American).⁸¹

At the very least, students of singing should begin to observe the obvious (and myriad) differences between British and American pronunciations. With the Oxford English Dictionary and Merriam-Webster both offering free apps for any smart phone, referencing and double-checking these distinctions has never been easier.⁸²

The need for a more nuanced approach extends beyond English. Spanish, for example, has long been parsed into two categories: European Spanish, or “Castilian,” and Latin American Spanish. As early as 1994, Castel advocated for even more distinctions that he believed singers should observe.⁸³ In the wake of the historically informed performance (HIP) movement, Germanic Latin (as opposed to church Latin) has become the norm for works by composers of German and Austrian heritage.⁸⁴

Practitioners of early music also acknowledge English, French, and Franco-Flemish pronunciations of Latin.⁸⁵ Elizabeth Brodovitch, Lori McCann, and Matthew Markham have engaged in the transcription of European folk dialects to consider when performing the works of Eben and Canteloube.⁸⁶ Charles Anthony Moore has explored transcription of the Jamaican dialect of English.⁸⁷ Merriam-Webster has also begun to acknowledge regionalisms as valid pronunciation options.⁸⁸ A scholarly foundation has thus been laid to explore these nuances and complexities via IPA transcription.

There is, of course, a strong pedagogical rationale for learning something “one way” before expanding to other options. To paraphrase what was stated previously: *one should learn the rules before breaking them*. Native speakers of any language (including English), for example, should assiduously study standard pronunciation in order to become more aware of regionalisms they unintentionally may be bringing into their singing.

Choral performance also requires modifications not observed by soloists, such as the extreme minimization of diphthongs, substitution of script *a* [ɑ] for turned *v* [ʌ] to brighten and “match” vowels across the ensemble, and the virtual elimination of all turned (i.e., “American” or retroflex) *r* [ɹ] sounds. But this speaks to the author’s overall point: flexibility within the system is preferable to a dogmatic, one-size-fits-all approach to lyric diction.

It is up to instructors to find the “sweet spot” on the spectrum that exists between a teaching standardized approach and acknowledging and accounting for these subtleties.

Continued Engagement with Analog Resources

The shift from physical to electronic resources over the past several decades has affected and changed almost every aspect of our lives. Academic libraries in particular have undergone a transformational shift away from paper-based journals and books. No doubt we are in a transitional phase; as one generation gives way to the next, it is probable that one hundred years from now there will be no area of scholarship that cannot be accomplished remotely and entirely by electronic means.

However, we are not yet at that point. There are still many invaluable lyric diction resources that have not yet been digitized. Most significant are perhaps the publications of Leyerle, whose entire (vast) library exists

only in book format.⁸⁹ Transcription of proper names is also something that cannot yet be accomplished via a free online dictionary; *Siebs* and *Dudens* should still be on every singer's shelf and *Warnants* remains the gold standard to determine whether "Carmen" or "Poulenc" follow the standard rules of French pronunciation; (spoiler: they do not).⁹⁰

Other classic resources have yet to make their appearance on the digital landscape. At the time of the writing of this article (in the final days of 2024), for instance, there does not yet exist a Kindle edition of Pierre Bernac's book *The Interpretation of French Song*, still my go-to guide to double-check liaison. Students of lyric diction—particularly the tech-savvy millennial and Gen Z cohorts who have begun their impressive ascent through the ranks of our profession—should be reminded that not everything that is valuable presently exists online; sometimes a trip to the library (or their teacher's bookshelf) is time and energy well spent.

CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF LYRIC DICTION PEDAGOGY

This two-part article has been deliberately ambitious in its scope. However, there are still many topics pertaining to lyric diction that remain unresolved or have yet to be explored. Phonetic versus phonemic transcription is a worthwhile and complex topic for a future article, as is an exploration of important philosophical questions: For example, who should teach diction—the singing teacher or the coach? Do pianists and singers bring different perspectives to our discipline, and if so, what are they? How can we better collaborate with one another? What changes should occur in how we structure curricula? Should an "articulatory phonetics" course in the freshman year precede or replace Italian diction? The answers to these questions remain largely unexplored in our pedagogical discourse.

The "Science-Informed Voice Pedagogy Resources" unveiled by NATS at the 57th National Conference in 2022, were the result of two summits and four working groups.⁹¹ The collective experts assembled to create these materials began their discourse in 2015 and included many of the most erudite thinkers and pedagogues in our profession.⁹² The recommendations made and resources provided as a result of their efforts is having an

enormous impact on higher education music programs and transforming the teaching and learning of voice pedagogy. However, there has not yet been a similar colloquium on lyric diction, leaving teachers of this important discipline with little guidance with respect to course and curriculum structure, the balancing of course content, agreement on transcription rubrics, and best practices in the classroom.

It is time we address these issues. Before the end of the decade, I call upon NATS to facilitate a summit for singing teachers and coaches who specialize in the scholarship and pedagogy of lyric diction with the goal of compiling recommendations and resources parallel to the pedagogy resources unveiled in 2022 in Chicago. The time is ripe for such a colloquium. This endeavor would be a landmark event and a fitting next chapter in the history of lyric diction pedagogy.

NOTES

1. Matthew Hoch, "A Brief History of Lyric Diction Pedagogy: Part I—Twentieth Century Beginnings," *Journal of Singing* 81, no. 4 (2025): 419–28.
2. John Moriarty, *Diction: Italian, Latin, French, German . . . the Sounds and 81 Exercises for Singing Them* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1975); Robert S. Hines, *Singer's Manual of Latin Diction and Phonetics* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1975).
3. Harold Copeman, *Singing in Latin* (Oxford: Harold Copeman, 1990).
4. Jean Piatak, *Russian Songs and Arias: Phonetic Readings, Word by Word Translations* (Redmond, WA: Pst, 1991); Nico Castel, *A Singer's Manual of Spanish Lyric Diction* (New York: Excalibur Publishing, 1994).
5. Bradley Ellingboe, *Forty-Five Songs of Edvard Grieg*, corrected ed. (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 1988); Annette Johansson, *Thirty Songs of Wilhelm Stenhammar* (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 1999).
6. Joseph Dechario, *Timeless Jewish Songs: Hebrew, Yiddish, and Ladino Texts with IPA Transcriptions*, 2 vols. (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 1994).
7. Timothy Cheek, *Singing in Czech: A Guide to Czech Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2001).
8. Anton Belov, "The Sounds of Russian," in *Twenty Arias for Baritone*, ed. Anton Belov, 151–63 (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 2005); Emily Olin, *Singing in Russian: A Guide*

- to *Language and Performance* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2011).
9. Suzanne Draayer, ed., *Canciones de España: Songs of Nineteenth-Century Spain*, 6 vols. (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005); Patricia Caicedo, ed., *The Latin American Art Song: A Critical Anthology and Interpretive Guide for Singers* (Barcelona: Tritó, 2005); Patricia Caicedo, ed., *Latin American and Iberian Art Songs by Women Composers*, vol. 1 (Barcelona: Mundo Arts, 2020); Patricia Caicedo, ed., *Brazilian Art Song Anthology: 25 Pieces for Voice and Piano* (Barcelona: Mundo Arts, 2021); Patricia Caicedo, ed., *Latin American and Iberian Art Songs by Women Composers*, vol. 2 (Barcelona: Mundo Arts, 2022).
 10. Patricia Caicedo, *Spanish Diction for Singers: A Practical Guide for the Pronunciation of the Peninsular and American Spanish* (Barcelona: Mundo Arts, 2019).
 11. Paula Boire, *Romanian Art Songs*, 2 vols. (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 2004).
 12. Mei Zhong, *Newly Arranged Chinese Folk Songs* (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 2005); Mei Zhong, *Traditional and Modern Chinese Art Songs* (Geneseo, NY: Leyerle Publications, 2009).
 13. Marcia Porter, *Singing in Brazilian Portuguese: A Guide to Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017); Benjamin Schultz, *Singing in Polish: A Guide to Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015); Lydía Zervanos, *Singing in Greek: A Guide to Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015); Katherine Chu and Juliet Petros, *Singing in Mandarin: A Guide to Chinese Lyric Diction and Vocal Repertoire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020).
 14. Anna Hersey, *Scandinavian Song: A Guide to Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish Repertoire and Diction* (2016); Ellingboe, *Forty-Five Songs of Edvard Grieg*; Johansson, *Thirty Songs of Wilhelm Stenhammar*.
 15. Kathleen Roland-Silverstein, *Romanser: 25 Swedish Songs with Guide to Swedish Lyric Diction* (Stockholm: Gehrmans Musikförlag, 2013).
 16. Carita Rosenberg-Wolff with Gustav Djuosjöbacka, *Singing in Swedish: A Manual for Singers and Vocal Coaches* (Helsinki, Finland: Academy of Finnish Art Song, 2011); Eugene Holman with Gustav Djuosjöbacka and Donald Adamson, *Singing in Finnish: A Manual for Singers and Vocal Coaches* (Helsinki, Finland: Academy of Finnish Art Song, 2005).
 17. Stela Maria Brandão, "Brazilian Lyric Diction: A Discussion of the *Bachianas brasileiras* no. 5 by Heitor Villa-Lobos," *Journal of Singing* 60, no. 2 (2003): 173–80; Marcos Krieger, "Portuguese Diction in Brazilian Vocal Music," *Journal of Singing* 60, no. 5 (2004): 479–85; Martha Herr, Adriana Kayama, Wladimir Mattos, "Brazilian Portuguese: Norms for Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 65, no. 2 (2008): 195–211; Marcel Ramalho, "Issues of Lyric Diction of Brazilian Portuguese as Applied to José Siquiera's *Otto canções populares brasileiras*," *Journal of Singing* 78, no. 5: 363–73; Leslie De'Ath, "Ukrainian Vocal Repertory and Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 61, no. 3 (2005): 279–89; Judith Gans, "Music from the Land of Vikings: Singing in Icelandic," *Journal of Singing* 62, no. 4 (2006): 437–51; Margaret Ozaki-Graves, "Japanese Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 65, no. 1 (2008): 63–71; Leslie De'Ath and Andrew Rethazi, "Hungarian Vocal Music, with an Introduction to Hungarian Lyric Diction, Part 1," *Journal of Singing* 66, no. 3 (2010): 303–13; Leslie De'Ath and Andrew Rethazi, "Hungarian Vocal Music, with an Introduction to Hungarian Lyric Diction, Part 2," *Journal of Singing* 66, no. 4 (2010): 437–45; Alisa Jordheim and Wencke Ophaug, "Transcribing Scandinavian Song Texts into IPA. Challenges When Aiming for a Higher Degree of Uniformity in the IPA Transcription of the Three Scandinavian Languages: Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish," *Journal of Singing* 71, no. 4 (2015): 473–88; Tellervo Kähärä, Finnish Lyric Diction, *Journal of Singing* 67, no. 1 (2010): 53–59; Anna Hersey, "An Introduction to Swedish Diction," *Journal of Singing* 68, no. 3 (2012): 301–12; Anna Hersey, "Singing in Danish: A Guide to Repertoire," *Journal of Singing* 70, no. 4 (2014): 449–57; Anna Hersey, "Singing in Danish: A Guide to Diction," *Journal of Singing* 70, no. 5 (2014): 573–84; Anna Hersey, "Johan Kvandal's *Norske Stevtoner*, op. 40: A Performance Guide," *Journal of Singing* 77, no. 3 (2021): 381–95; Amalia Francalancia, "Dvořák's Biblical Songs, op. 99: A Concise Guide to Performance," *Journal of Singing* 74, no. 5: 547–54; Leslie De'Ath, "The Welsh Language and Vocal Music," *Journal of Singing* 73, no. 2 (2016): 183–90; Rachel Schutz, "Singing in Welsh: A Guide to Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 76, no. 5 (2020): 567–78; Rachel Schutz, "An Introduction to Welsh Solo Vocal Literature," *Journal of Singing* 77, no. 1 (2020): 73–80; Pia Brodnik and Leslie De'Ath, "Slovene Song and Phonology," *Journal of Singing* 77, no. 5: 663–78; Pia Brodnik and Leslie De'Ath, "Slovene Musical Stage Works," *Journal of Singing* 78, no. 2 (2021): 235–45; Christian Bester and Bronwen Forbay, "An Introduction to Afrikaans Art Songs: A Guide to Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 78, no. 4: 497–506; Mikhail Smigelski, "Phonetics of Unstressed Russian Vowels in Singing," *Journal of Singing* 78, no. 5 (2022): 615–24; Leslie De'Ath, "Dutch Lyric Diction and Repertory," *Journal of Singing* 79, no. 5 (2023): 639–49.
 18. Madeleine Marshall, *The Singer's Manual of English Diction* (New York: Schirmer, 1953); Evelina Colomi, *Singer's Italian: A Manual of Diction and Phonetics* (New York:

- Schirmer Books, 1970); Richard G. Cox, *The Singer's Manual of German and French Diction* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1970); Moriarty, *Diction*; Richard F. Sheil, *A Singer's Manual of Foreign Language Dictions* (Farnham, Surrey: Palladian Publishers, 1975); Thomas Grubb, *Singing in French: A Manual of French Diction and French Vocal Repertoire* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1979); William Odom and Benno Schollum, *German for Singers: A Textbook of Diction and Phonetics* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1981); Joan Wall, *International Phonetic Alphabet for Singers: A Manual for English and Foreign Language Diction* (Redmond, WA: Pst, 1989); Joan Wall, *Diction for Singers* (Redmond, WA: Pst, 1989); Marci Stapp, *A Singer's Guide to Languages* (San Francisco: Teddy's Music Press, 1991); David Adams, *A Handbook of Diction for Singers: Italian, German, French* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
19. Ibid.
 20. STM Publishers, accessed December 27, 2024, <https://www.stmpublishers.com>.
 21. Cheri Montgomery, *English Lyric Diction Workbook*, 4th ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2019); Cheri Montgomery, *Italian Lyric Diction Workbook*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2009); Cheri Montgomery, *German Lyric Diction Workbook*, 5th ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2014); Cheri Montgomery, *French Lyric Diction Workbook*, 4th ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2014); Cheri Montgomery, *Advanced French Lyric Diction Workbook* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2014).
 22. Instructor editions of all workbooks (with answer keys) are also available directly from the publisher.
 23. Marshall, *The Singer's Manual of English Diction*; Grubb, *Singing in French*; William Odom and Benno Schollum, *German for Singers*.
 24. Cheri Montgomery and Matthew Hoch, *Latin Lyric Diction Workbook* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2016); Cheri Montgomery, *Russian Lyric Diction Workbook* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2021); Cheri Montgomery, *Spanish Lyric Diction Workbook* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2022); Cheri Montgomery, *Phonetic Readings for Lyric Diction: An Enunciation and Transcription Workbook That Employs Frequently Occurring Words from English, Italian, German, French, and Latin Lyrics*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2015); Cheri Montgomery, *Phonetic Transcription for Lyric Diction: A Graded Method of Phonetic Transcription That Employs Frequently Occurring Words from Italian, German, French, and Latin, and English Lyrics*, expanded version (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2016); Cheri Montgomery, *IPA Handbook for Singers*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2019); Cheri Montgomery, *A Sketchbook Atlas of the Vocal Tract*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2024); Cheri Montgomery, *The Singer's Daily Practice Journal—Volume I* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2018); Cheri Montgomery, *The Singer's Daily Practice Journal—Volume II* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2018); Cheri Montgomery, *The Singer's Daily Practice Journal—Volume III* (Nashville: STM Publishers, 2020); the STM website also features numerous online resources for students, including a free guide Ukrainian lyric diction, <https://www.stmpublishers.com>, accessed December 27, 2024.
 25. David Adams, *A Handbook of Diction for Singers: Italian, German, French*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022).
 26. Eileen Davis, *Sing French: Diction for Singers* (Columbus, OH: Éclairé Press, 2010).
 27. Amanda Johnston, *English and German Diction for Singers: A Comparative Approach*, 3rd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2024). While Johnston's revisions were numerous, the most important correction was perhaps the turned *a* [ɐ] replacing the decidedly incorrect inverted (and *French*) small capital *r* [ʀ] that has persisted in various resources due to its continued appearance in Odom and Schollum. Odom ultimately conceded to this change in the third and final update of his book, which was published shortly before his death in 2024. William Odom, Benno Schollum, and Christina Balsam Curran, *German for Singers: A Textbook of Diction and Phonetics*, 3rd ed. (San Diego: Plural Publishing, 2023).
 28. Timothy Cheek and Anna Toccafondi, *Perfect Italian Diction for Singers: An Authoritative Guide* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2022).
 29. Jason Nedecky, *French Lyric Diction: A Singer's Guide* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2023); Valentine Lanzrein and Richard Cross, *The Singer's Guide to Herman Diction: Das Handbuch der deutschen Aussprache für Sänger* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); Brenda Smith, *Diction in Context: Singing in English, Italian, German, and French* (San Diego: Plural Publishing, 2019).
 30. David Adams, "Aspects of Consonant Articulation in Italian Diction," *Journal of Singing* 59, no. 3 (2003): 247–52; Andrew Adams, "Unstressed E's and O's in Italian Lyric Diction: A Comparison of Diction Texts," *Journal of Singing* 59, no. 4 (2003): 333–39; Leslie De'Ath, "Perspectives on Italian Lyric Diction," *Journal of Singing* 61, no. 5 (2005): 503–15; Wencke Ophaug and Gullveig Cecile Guleng, "Devoicing Voiced /z/ in German Lyric Song—Good or Bad Diction?," *Journal of Singing* 69, no. 4 (2013): 451–61; Martin Néron, "Coarticulation: Aspects and Effects on American English, German, and French Diction," *Journal of Singing* 67, no. 3 (2011): 313–25.
 31. Gerald L. Phillips, "Diction: A Rhapsody," *Journal of Singing* 58, no 5 (2002): 405–9; Leslie De'Ath, "Phonemics and

- Lyric Diction,” *Journal of Singing* 62, no. 5 (2005): 549–61; Leslie De’Ath, “Linguistic Lingo and Lyric Diction I—The Phoneme,” *Journal of Singing* 67, no. 2 (2010): 187–93; Leslie De’Ath, “Linguistic Lingo and Lyric Diction II—Syllabification,” *Journal of Singing* 67, no. 4 (2010): 427–35; Leslie De’Ath, “Linguistic Lingo and Lyric Diction III—Pronunciation Contrasts,” *Journal of Singing* 68, no. 3 (2012): 179–90; Leslie De’Ath, “Linguistic Lingo and Lyric Diction IV—The Phoneme,” *Journal of Singing* 69, no. 2 (2012): 179–190; Leslie De’Ath, “Linguistic Lingo and Lyric Diction V—Phrasal Juncture,” *Journal of Singing* 69, no. 5 (2013): 577–88;
32. David Adams, “On Teaching an Italian Diction Class,” *Journal of Singing* 61, no. 2 (2004): 177–83; Leslie De’Ath, “Materials for Teaching a Lyric Diction Class, Part One,” *Journal of Singing* 62, no. 1 (2005): 61–73; Leslie De’Ath, “Materials for Teaching a Lyric Diction Class, Part One,” *Journal of Singing* 62, no. 1 (2005): 61–73; Leslie De’Ath, “Materials for Teaching a Lyric Diction Class, Part One,” *Journal of Singing* 62, no. 2 (2005): 179–98; Cheri Montgomery, “The Dynamic Diction Classroom,” *Journal of Singing* 68, no. 1 (2011): 53–60.
 33. Wikipedia, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.wikipedia.org>; Oxford English Dictionary, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.oed.com>; Merriam-Webster, notably, has not yet adopted IPA and still employs an orthographic system at the time of the writing of this article. Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com>, accessed December 28, 2024.
 34. Berton Coffin, *Phonetic Readings of Songs and Arias* (Boulder, CO: Pruett Press, 1964).
 35. National Association of Teachers of Singing, <https://www.nats.org>, accessed December 28, 2024; American Choral Directors Association, <https://acda.org>, accessed December 28, 2024; National Association for Music Education, <https://nafme.org>, accessed December 28, 2024; Pan American Vocology Association, <https://pavavocology.org>, accessed December 28, 2024.
 36. The history and development of the NASM accreditation standard for lyric diction is detailed in part I of this article.
 37. Voice and Speech Trainers Association, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.vasta.org>; Phil Thompson. “Phonetics and Transcription: The Deep Case for Phonetics Training,” *Voice and Speech Review* 5, no. 1: 349–58; Eric Armstrong, “Efficacy in Phonetics and Training for the Actor,” *Voice and Speech Review* 10, no. 1: 36–52.
 38. Kenneth W. Bozeman, *Practical Vocal Acoustics: Pedagogic Applications for Teachers of Singing* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2022); Kenneth W. Bozeman, “The Case for Acoustic Registers,” *Journal of Singing* 79, no. 2 (2022): 181–87; Kenneth W. Bozeman, *Kinesthetic Voice Pedagogy 2: Motivating Acoustic Efficiency* (Gahanna, OH: Inside View Press, 2021); Scott McCoy, *Your Voice: An Inside View*, 3rd ed. (Gahanna, OH: Inside View Press, 2019); Kenneth W. Bozeman, “The Pedagogic Use of Absolute Spectral Tone Color Theory,” *Journal of Singing* 74, no. 2 (2017): 179–83; Ian Howell, “Parsing the Spectral Envelope: Toward a General Theory of Vocal Tone Color” (DMA diss., New England Conservatory of Music, 2016); Kenneth W. Bozeman, “The Role of the First Formant in Training the Male Singing Voice,” *Journal of Singing* 66, no. 3 (2010): 291–97.
 39. Bozeman, *Practical Vocal Acoustics*; Bozeman, *Kinesthetic Voice Pedagogy 2*; McCoy, *Your Voice*; Bozeman, “The Pedagogic Use of Absolute Spectral Tone Color Theory”; Bozeman, “The Role of the First Formant in Training the Male Singing Voice.”
 40. Ron Jeffers, *Translations and Annotations of Choral Repertoire—Volume I: Sacred Latin Texts* (Corvallis, OR: Earthsongs, 1988); Olin, *Singing in Russian*.
 41. Anna Wentlent, *Alfred’s IPA Made Easy: A Guidebook for the International Phonetic Alphabet* (Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Publishing, 2014); Duane Richard Karna, ed., *The Use of the International Phonetic Alphabet in the Choral Rehearsal* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012); Christian Grases, *IPA Alphabet: The Vocal Music Resource for Pronunciation* (Anaheim, CA: Pavane Publishing, 2011); Richard Cox, *Singing in English: A Manual of English Diction for Singers and Choral Directors* (Oklahoma City: ACDA, 1990).
 42. “Choral Journal,” American Choral Directors Association, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://acda.org/publications/choral-journal>.
 43. *Il grande dizionario Garzanti della lingua italiana* (Milan: Garzanti, 1987); *Langenscheidt Standard Dictionary: German* (Stuttgart: Pons-Verlag, 2017); *Le petit Robert de la langue française 2025* (Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2024). Other physical dictionaries widely used and recommended among teachers and coaches include *Collins Italian Dictionary Complete and Unabridged*, 4th ed. revised (New York: HarperCollins, 2020); *Collins German Dictionary Complete and Unabridged*, 9th ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 2019); *Collins Le Robert French Dictionary Complete and Unabridged* (New York: HarperCollins, 2025).
 44. Pons, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://en.pons.com/translate>.
 45. IPA Source, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.ipasource.com>.
 46. EasyPronunciation.com, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://easypronunciation.com/en/>.

47. Some of the most common self-publishing platforms include Amazon KDP, accessed December 28, 2024, https://kdp.amazon.com/en_US/; Barnes & Noble Press, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://press.barnesandnoble.com/>; IngramSpark Publishing, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.ingramspark.com/>; Lulu, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://www.lulu.com/>; and Apple Books, accessed December 28, 2024, <https://authors.apple.com/publish>.
48. Leyerle Publications, accessed December 29, 2024, <https://leyerlepublications.com/>; Oxford University Press, accessed December 29, 2024, <https://corp.oup.com/>; Rowman & Littlefield, accessed December 29, 2024, <https://rowman.com/>; ECS Publishing Group, <https://www.ecspublishing.com/brand/EC-Schirmer-Music-Company>.
49. Eric Weimer, *Singing Recitative: Guiding Young Singers in Italian Diction* (Eric Weimer, 2024); Matteo Dalle Fratte, *The Melofonetica Method: A Complete Guide to Clear and Expressive Italian Diction for Singers* (London: Lyric Arts Press, 2023); Sri Silva, *Latin Pronunciations for Singers: A Comprehensive Guide to the Classical, Italian, German, English, French, and Franco-Flemish Pronunciations of Latin* (Sri S. Silva, 2020); Kenneth R. Griffiths, *Russian Diction for Singers and Coaches* (North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace, 2015); Gary Cox, *Gary's Guide to Russian Diction for Singers* (North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace, 2014). **The author would be remiss not to point out that STM Publishers (the distributor of Cheri Montgomery's workbooks and other resources) is essentially a self-publishing venture, and these are perhaps the best-selling diction resources in the United States.**
50. See part I of this article for an in-depth background discussion regarding the NASM lyric diction accreditation standard and the evolution of its wording.
51. Author's personal correspondence with NASM, October 17–19 and November 19, 2024.
52. **The Blair School of Music at Vanderbilt University has implemented this four-semester sequence into their curriculum. Montgomery recalls there were four semesters offered at Belmont University in the 1970s under Archie Kliewer's tutelage. (Author's personal correspondence with Cheri Montgomery, October 16, 2024.) The author was unable to find other examples of this four-semester model in his preparatory research for this article.**
53. My rationale for the (albeit reluctant) elimination of English was based on several considerations: (a) English is a complicated language with which to start because there are so many symbols and (five) diphthongs that are not used in the other languages of study; Italian seemed to make more sense because there are the fewest number of IPA symbols, most of which can be applied to German and French; (b) students tend not to transcribe their English-language songs into IPA, so on this basis alone transcription of English seemed to be a lesser priority; (c) students tended to struggle when transcribing English; most of them were native speakers and didn't speak things the way Madeleine Marshall thinks they should, and even the remaining students (i.e., nonnative speakers) had tremendous difficulty recognizing English words from Marshall-based IPA transcriptions; (d) many English diction books (like Marshall's) provide rules for one "correct" way to pronounce English and do not make allowance for distinctions between British and American standard pronunciations; I simply do not agree pedagogically with this "transatlantic" approach and prefer a bifurcated methodology. (The author did, however, invite the students to download the free apps offered by Merriam-Webster and Oxford so they could compare British and American pronunciation of words, an activity they found to be engaging and enjoyable.)
54. Standardization of terminology was one of the four core priorities of the "Science-Informed Voice Pedagogy Resources" project undertaken by NATS from 2020 to 2022 and unveiled at the 2022 national conference in Chicago. See "Science-Informed Voice Pedagogy Resources," National Association of Teachers of Singing, accessed December 29, 2024, https://www.nats.org/cgi/page.cgi/Science-Informed_Voice_Pedagogy_Resources.html. See also Matthew Hoch and Mary J. Sandage, "Working toward a Common Vocabulary: Reconciling the Terminology of Teachers of Singing, Voice Scientists, and Speech-Language Pathologists," *Journal of Voice* 31, no. 6 (November 2017): 647–48.
55. Moriarty, *Diction*; Grubb, *Singing in French*.
56. It should be noted that Colorni used "close" as early as 1970 in *Singer's Italian*. However, she seems to have been the lone exception; her preference was not replicated in other published lyric diction resources from that era.
57. As an exercise, try phonating while closing the mouth and pinching the nose so that no air escapes. One will immediately experience that singing is not possible in this configuration.
58. International Phonetic Association, *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Geoffrey K. Pullum and William A. Ladusaw, *Phonetic Symbol Guide*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
59. "Close Vowel," Wikipedia, accessed December 29, 2024, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Close_vowel.
60. Bozeman, *Practical Vocal Acoustics*; Bozeman, "The Case for Acoustic Registers"; Bozeman, *Kinesthetic Voice Pedagogy 2*; Bozeman, "The Pedagogic Use of Absolute Spectral Tone Color Theory."

61. Adams, *A Handbook of Diction for Singers*.
62. However, the binary nature of “close versus closed” is still imperfect, as there are various degrees of “closeness” among vowels; these labels do not work as a once-size-fits-all solution. This complexity is further compounded by the lack of consistency and clarity in the various official charts published by the International Phonetic Association. This represents yet another lingering challenge that is still in need of future discussion and resolution.
63. Pullum and Ladusaw, *Phonetic Symbol Guide*, xi–xvi.
64. For example, Montgomery refers to the *sound* of the upsilon as a “short open back u” as opposed to naming the symbol itself. This descriptive approach admittedly transmits valuable (albeit different) information to the student. See Montgomery, *English Lyric Diction Workbook*, 45; Montgomery, *German Lyric Diction Workbook*, 57.
65. Pullum and Ladusaw, *Phonetic Symbol Guide*, xi–xvi.
66. Johnston, *English and German Diction for Singers*; Cynthia Vaughn and Meribeth Dayme, *The Singing Book*, 4th ed., ed. Matthew Hoch (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2024).
67. Marshall, *The Singer’s Manual of English Diction*; Colorni, *Singer’s Italian*; Moriarty, *Diction*; Grubb, *Singing in French*; Odom and Schollum, *German for Singers*; Wall, *Diction for Singers*; Adams, *A Handbook of Diction for Singers*; Johnston, *English and German Diction for Singers*; Montgomery’s publications were deliberately omitted from this list as her workbooks are directly based on some of these primary sources.
68. The author acknowledges this would be a monumental task that is easier said than done.
69. Every situation is contextual, and this fictional scenario only presents one possibility. Some teachers may prefer suggesting [ɔ] or [ʌ] depending on the specific song or aria, quality of the voice, or even personal aesthetic preference. The author’s point is that allowances need to be made for occasional departure from vowels prescribed by a transcription to meet the technical demands of the repertoire being sung.
70. Robert McCormick, unpublished organ improvisation workshop handout (2024). McCormick’s quotation refers to the rules of tonal voice leading while improvising, but the principle can be applied equally well in other contexts—including lyric diction pedagogy.
71. The term “schwa” comes from a Hebrew word, transliterated as *sheva* or *shewa*, meaning “nothingness.” Johnston, *German and English for Singers*, 174.
72. One could philosophically argue that a composer should not set a schwa on a longer note; however, they routinely do (especially in choral music), and when this occurs singers will need advice and assistance from the instructor.
73. Grubb, *Singing in French*, 47–53. Grubb only recommends use of the schwa [ə] with final “-e,” “-es,” and “-ent”; all others should be transcribed as an *o-e* ligature [œ].
74. Matthew Hoch, “A Brief Introduction to Anglican Choral Diction,” *Journal of the Association of Anglican Musicians* 29, no. 4 (April 2020): 1–6.
75. Moriarty, for example, instructs the use of the epsilon [ɛ] for the German prefixes “be-” and “ge-,” which is a unique choice and certainly a minority opinion in lyric diction scholarship—not to mention contradictory to reputable German dictionaries. (Moriarty, *Diction*, 234). Johnston has coined the term *vocalic chameleon* to describe the German schwa; although she (unlike Grubb) retains schwa [ə] symbol, in her transcriptions, she suggests “the color [of the schwa] is “directly related to the quality of the vowel immediately preceding it.” (Johnston, *German and English for Singers*, 174)
76. Marshall, *The Singer’s Manual of English Diction*, 3.
77. Lloyd Pfausch, *English Diction for Singers* (New York: Schirmer, 1971); Dorothy Uris, *To Sing in English: A Guide to Improved Diction* (New York: Boosey & Hawkes, 1971).
78. “Transatlantic and Other Old Movie Dialects,” Paul Mayer Dialect Services, accessed December 30, 2024, <https://www.paulmeier.com/2024/07/01/episode-78-transatlantic-and-old-movie-dialects/>.
79. Montgomery’s *English Lyric Diction Workbook*, for example, is based on the rules prescribed by Marshall. Johnston’s *German and English for Singers* also advocates a transatlantic philosophy.
80. Thompson. “Phonetics and Transcription”; Armstrong, “Efficacy in Phonetics and Training for the Actor.”
81. John Blizzard, *Singing American English: Textbook for Diction for Singers*, 2nd ed. (Morrisville, NC: Lulu Press, 2012); Kathryn LaBouff, *Singing and Communicating in English: A Singer’s Guide to English Diction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Leslie De’Ath, “Lyric Diction and the Concept of Standard English,” *Journal of Singing* 61, no. 1 (2004): 65–78; Geoffrey G. Forward, *American Diction for Singers* (Van Nuys, CA: Alfred, 2001).
82. Oxford English Dictionary; Merriam-Webster.
83. Castel, *A Singer’s Manual of Spanish Lyric Diction*.
84. Matthew Hoch, “Getting Comfortable with Germanic Latin: When to Use It and Why,” *Choral Journal* 57, no. 4 (2016): 53–59.
85. Timothy J. McGee, ed., with A. G. Rigg and David N. Klausner, *Singing Early Music: The Pronunciation of Euro-*

pean Languages in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance (Bloomington Indiana University Press, 1996); Silva, *Latin Pronunciations for Singers*.

86. Elizabeth Brodovitch and Lori McCann, "Singing in Dialect: Phonetic Transcriptions of the *Chants d'Auvergne*," *Journal of Singing* 76, no. 2: 185–94; Matthew Markham, "Petr Eben's *Pisne z Tesinska*: A Guide for Singers, Teachers, and Coaches," *Journal of Singing* 71, no. 3 (2015): 339–46.
87. Charles Anthony Moore's transcription can be found in Vaughn and Dayme, *The Singing Book*, 46.
88. Merriam-Webster.
89. See endnote 54 in part I of this article.
90. Theodor Siebs, *Deutsche Aussprache*, revised ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984); *Dudens Aussprachewörterbuch* (Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 1990); Léon Warnant, *Dictionnaire de la prononciation française*, 4th ed. (Paris: Éditions J. Duculot, 1987). These proper nouns both deviate from the prescribed rules of French pronunciation: they are pronounced [karmen] and [pulĕk].
91. "Science-Informed Voice Pedagogy Resources," accessed February 6, 2025, https://www.nats.org/cgi/page.cgi/Science-Informed_Voice_Pedagogy_Resources.html.

92. Amelia Rollings Bigler and Katherine Osborne, "Voice Pedagogy for the 21st Century: The Summation of Two Summits," *Journal of Singing* 78, no. 1: 11–28.

Matthew Hoch is professor of voice at Auburn University. Prior to this appointment, he spent six years as assistant professor of voice at Shorter College/University. Hoch's students have gone on to successful careers in both classical and musical theatre genres and have won awards from the Metropolitan Opera National Council (MONC), NATS, MTNA, ACTF, the Vann Vocal Institute, and others. He has appeared as a soloist with the Oregon Bach Festival, the Santa Fe Desert Chorale, the Vox Consort, Harmonie Universelle, the Hartford, Rome, and Nashua symphony orchestras, the Atlanta Baroque Orchestra, and the United States Coast Guard Chamber Players. Hoch is the 2016 winner of the Van L. Lawrence Fellowship, awarded jointly by the Voice Foundation and NATS. He is the author, coauthor, editor, or coeditor of ten books and his articles have appeared in numerous academic and professional journals. In addition to his role as associate editor of the voice pedagogy column in the *Journal of Singing*, Hoch currently serves as chair of the NATS/Rowman & Littlefield editorial board. In 2018, he presented performances and master classes in the United Arab Emirates as was awarded the Auburn University College of Liberal Arts Teaching Excellence Award. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9145-921X>



INTERMEZZO

News Clips
for the
Singing Profession

Intermezzo is a weekly compilation of news clips about the singing profession, in addition to NATS news, that is delivered to each member's inbox. **Intermezzo** tackles today's most relevant issues, gathered from sources like the Associated Press, the *New York Times*, *Financial Times*, and the leading industry publications. It is delivered to the inboxes of teachers of singing in the United States, Canada and more than 35 other countries.



BROUGHT TO YOU BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SINGING