Interlectal Awareness as a Reflex of Linguistic Dimensions of Power: Evidence from Greek

Brian D. Joseph

Abstract

Modern sociolinguistic research has demonstrated that speakers are aware of different varieties of their language. Moreover, such "interlectal awareness" can affect linguistic usage and can involve issues of power in relation to language. In the context of Greek, for example, normative pressures promoting the use of standard (roughly, urban) as opposed to nonstandard (roughly, rural) varieties of the language correlate with the low stylistic status accorded many words, generally of regional dialectal origin, containing the sounds ts *or* dz. *In addition, Greek shows an extension of "interlectal awareness" involving the recognition of non-native forms, as is evident in the way English is providing a new type of learnèd plural in Modern Greek and is thus enjoying a power in Greece not accorded to other foreign languages.*

1. *Introduction*

At the heart of modern sociolinguistic thinking is the notion that a "language" is not a monolithic unitary entity but rather is the union of a number of distinct linguistic patterns that are used by the speakers of a speech community in different settings. These patterns, often referred to collectively by the neutral term "varieties" (so Trudgill 1979: 17), represent the ways in which speakers respond to differences in what may be loosely characterized as the social context of language use, i.e., who the participants in a conversation are, how well they know each other, what their status is relative to one another in terms of age, class, gender, ethnicity, and the like, what the topic of discussion is, what the speakers' attitudes are, etc. What is clear about the existence of numerous linguistic varieties is that individual speakers, in order to function adequately in a speech community, must be at least passively aware of several varieties—regional dialect differences, dif-

Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Volume 10, 1992.

ferent styles or registers, the usage of non-native speakers, and so forth—even if they do not actively command all the distinctions. In short, speakers show what may be termed an "interlectal awareness."[1]

Such interlectal awareness on the part of individual speakers involves more than just cataloguing, as it were, the linguistic features that differentiate varieties. Speakers often attach a value to varieties or to particular features that characterize a variety. As Wald (1985: 123) puts it: "It is the universal experience of linguists and anthropologists to discover that, in every speech community, there is general agreement among its members that certain forms of language are positively valued as 'good', or words to that effect, and other forms of the same language are 'bad'."[2] These values, whether positive, according prestige to the feature, or negative, stigmatizing the feature, bring issues in the sociology of language, i.e. sociolinguistics, into contact with questions of the ways in which language and power intersect.

In this paper, I discuss two types of interlectal awareness and their relevance to a consideration of the linguistic manifestations of power relations in Greek society. In particular, the normative pressures concerning standard versus nonstandard dialects are examined, as are the values attached to native versus non-native forms. In each case, I argue that there is a tension in Greek with regard to these dimensions of language/power interactions, both concerning usages proper to a standard dialect versus those belonging to various nonstandard dialects and concerning the use of native linguistic elements as opposed to non-native or foreign ones.

2. *Standard versus nonstandard tensions*

The issue of defining what constitutes the "standard" dialect is far from easy for any language, and is certainly difficult as far as Greek is concerned.[3] Nonetheless, the characterization given by Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 2)—basically the same as that found in Mackridge (1985: vi, 12)—can be adopted here as a starting point, namely that "standard modern Greek" is essentially "the roughly dimotiki variety of Greek found in everyday use in the capital and biggest city of Greece, Athens."[4] The dominance of Athens—and thus of Athenian Greek—within Greece today means that there is the potential for a tension between standard, i.e. Athenian, Greek and any nonstandard, i.e. non-Athenian, variety.

A general indication of the presence of such a tension comes from the occurrence of hypercorrections. Hypercorrection may be defined as a tendency of speakers to alter their speech habits exces-

sively in favor of some variety felt to be more "correct." Kazazis 1992 (and elsewhere) has documented hypercorrections in Greek triggered by the diglossic situation created by the protracted coexistence of katharevousa and dimotiki, but perhaps of more interest here is the fact that other features in dialectal Greek have been the focus of hypercorrective pressures. For example, the occasional Northern *tha su páro tiléfono* for Southern (Athenian) *tha se páro tiléfono* 'I will give you a call (on the phone)' shows the hypercorrect, and thus technically speaking, incorrect,[5] extension of the indirect object pronoun form *su* into an expression where strictly speaking it does not belong. The new expression thus results from a reversal of the general correspondence of Northern (i.e. non-Athenian and thus nonstandard) *se* for Southern (i.e. Athenian and thus standard) *su,* as in *se díno* 'I give to you' for standard *su díno*. Northern speakers who want to be sure of being "correct" by Athenian standards in their usage have apparently overextended the use of the Southern indirect object form, with the unwanted result of an expression that does not say what the speaker intended. In general, such hypercorrections show the sensitivity of speakers to distinctions of power and prestige that exist among different dialects and different features (forms, pronunciations, etc.) associated with these dialects; as such, these hypercorrections are certainly among the most direct of linguistic manifestations of the intersection of language and power.

Of particular interest is one phonological hypercorrection that has been reported in the literature, for it meshes with other indications that some speakers in the general Greek speech community have attached a stigma to nonstandard forms containing specific sounds. Moreover, it appears that speakers are aware of this stigma, and have allowed the fear of stigmatization to govern certain aspects of their linguistic usage.

The specific case in question concerns the sounds *ts* and *dz*. Newton (1972a: 145) has drawn attention to such dialectal forms in Siátista (Macedonia) as *tigáro* for standard *tsigáro* 'cigarette', and *katíka* for standard *katsíka* 'goat', which apparently were formed by speakers who were aware of a general correspondence of Standard Greek [t] to Siátista *ts/tš,* especially before the vowel [i] (cf. [yatší] = standard *yatí*), and then overapplied the correspondence in the direction of the standard language, thereby creating "incorrect" dialectal [t]'s for standard [ts]'s. Similarly, Kukulés (1923: 290) has pointed out the existence in early 20th century Kythnos of forms such as *papúkia* for standard *papútsia* 'shoes' and *kakiaróla* for standard *katsaróla* 'saucepan', again based on an overapplication of a general Kythnian [ts] to [k] correspondence (e.g. *kótsinos* 'red' for standard *kókinos*) that led Kythnian

speakers to "undo" the [ts] in their own dialect forms in favor of a standard [k]. Such overapplication, whether in Kythnos or in Siátista, must have been based on the greater prestige attributed by local speakers to sounding "standard" in their pronunciation.

Such hypercorrections imply that speakers imputed a sense of "correctness" to standard language forms, so that—by extension—the dialect forms were felt as somehow "incorrect," i.e., stigmatized in some way. What makes these hypercorrections of particular interest is that this sociolinguistic evidence of a focus on the sounds *ts* and *dz* in (at least) Kythnos and Siátista correlates well with other evidence of their having a special systemic status in Greek. In a series of studies over the past several years (Joseph 1982, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1986, 1987, 1991),[6] I have claimed that as far as Standard Modern Greek is concerned, the sounds *ts* and *dz*[7] have a special affective status; that is to say, they lend a certain expressivity and a generally low stylistic coloring to most words they occur in.

There are several factors that give an indication of the special low stylistic status claimed here for *ts* and *dz*. First, these sounds are rare in katharevousa,[8] the once high-style, formal variety of Modern Greek which, while no longer used as such (see Kazazis 1992 for some discussion and references), nonetheless has played a significant role in the sociology of the Greek language in modern times. In that register of Greek, *ts* and *dz* effectively are restricted to proper names such as *Kazandzákis* and loan words such as *tsiménto* 'cement', i.e., words with no particular connotative or expressive value. On the other hand, in standard colloquial Modern Greek, words with *ts* and *dz* are regularly encountered, generally in words with a familiar or popular feel to them (see below regarding the lexical distribution of these sounds).[9]

Even so, though, the frequency of *ts* and *dz* in colloquial Greek is quite low, providing a second type of evidence for a special, in this case marginal, status for these sounds. Several facts indicate their low frequency. For one thing, a consideration of what may be termed the "basic" vocabulary of Greek, drawn from a variety of lists typically used by linguists for identifying such terms,[10] shows a very low rate of occurrence for *ts* and *dz*. In particular, only 3 out of 100 body-part words in Greek have a *ts* or *dz* in them (*matotsínuro* 'eyelash', *brátso* 'arm', and *kótsi* 'ankle'), while not one of 55 kinship terms has a *ts*, and only one has the voiced counterpart *dz* (*badzanákis* 'brother-in-law', which actually is a loan word, from Turkish *bacanak*); moreover, not one of 19 basic and not-so-basic color terms has *ts* or *dz*, and a "Swadesh" list[11] of 207 basic vocabulary words yields only one with *ts* (*gratsunízo* 'scratch') and none with *dz*. This low type-frequency in basic lexical items accords with the phoneme token-frequency counts over

random text-samples reported by Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsoudas (1964: 6–7), who place *ts* and *dz* at the bottom of the entire list of Greek sounds in terms of their rate of occurrence in a corpus of over twenty thousand words, with rates of .06% for *ts* and .001% for *dz*. Low frequency can be taken as a sign of systemic marginality for these sounds, and thus is in keeping with the hypothesis of a special status for them.

Third, as hinted at above, these sounds have a lexically restricted distribution, a fact which provides evidence for a restricted functional status. In particular, they occur primarily[12] in "marginal" words such as interjections, calls to animals, onomatopes, quasi-onomatopoetic and highly evocative adverbials known as ideophones, conventionalized child language (the sort that adults use to children, not necessarily anything that children themselves use), generally colorful expressions (ones that often defy easy translation), words with highly negative association, sound-symbolic words where there is a strong association between the form of the word and the meaning it conveys, and the like. A sampling of the relevant evidence is given below in (1) through (8):[13]

(1) Interjections:
pri*ts* 'no way!; oh yeah?!' (also onomatope for breaking wind)
ts 'NEGATION' (actually phonetically a click, but conventionally represented like this; also conventionalized as *tsuk*)
tsa 'noise used in peek-a-boo game' (with variant *dza*)

(2) Calls to animals:
gu*ts* 'call to pigs'
*ts*us 'call to donkeys'
*ts*unx 'call to donkeys'
*ts*ikó 'call to a goat to stop'
i*ts* 'whoa!'
io*ts* 'whoa!'

(3) Onomatopes (and derivatives):
*ts*ak 'crack!' (cf. *tsakízo* 'I break')
kri*ts*-kri*ts* 'crunch!' (cf. *kritsanízo* 'I crunch')
ma*ts*-mu*ts* 'kissing noise'
*ts*iu-*ts*iu 'bird's chirp'
pli*ts*-pla*ts* 'splish-splash!'
hra*ts* 'scratching sound' (also *grats/krats*, and cf. *gratsunízo / gratsunó* 'I scratch')
*dz*i-*dz*i 'noise of a cicada' (cf. *dzídzikas* 'cicada')

(4) Ideophones:
*ts*áka-*ts*áka 'immediate quick action; straightaway; directly'
*ts*úku-*ts*úku 'steadily and surely, with a hint of secretiveness'
*ts*af-*ts*uf 'in an instant'
*tsə*kə-*tsə*kə[14] '(in reference to) repetitive (mostly verbal) bothering'

(5) Conventionalized "Child Language" Forms:
*ts*at*s*á 'aunty' (so Andriotis 1983: s.v. with *ts*á*ts*a given as variant; also with meaning 'madam [in a brothel]' in adult slang)
*ts*it*s*í 'meat' (also adult slang for 'breast')
*ts*ís(i)a 'peepee' (with variants *dz*ís(i)a)
pí*ts*i-pí*ts*i '(act of) washing'

(6) Generally colorful/connotative/iconic vocabulary:
*ts*ambunó 'I whimper; I prate; I bullshit'
*ts*alavutó 'I do a slovenly job; I splash about in shallow, muddy water'
*ts*urápi 'vulgar woman' (primary meaning: 'woolen sock')
*ts*ókaro 'vulgar (wo)man' (primary meaning: 'wooden shoe')
*ts*irízo 'I screech'
*ts*ili(m)burdó 'I gallivant; I fart about; I whore around'
*ts*it*s*ídi 'stark naked'
*dz*iri*dz*ánd*z*ules 'coquettish airs; evasiveness'
*dz*á(m)ba 'for free; thrown in; cheap'

(7) Words with highly negative connotations:
a. General
*ts*apa*ts*úlis 'slovenly (in one's work)'
*ts*ulís 'untidy person'
*ts*ingúnis 'miser'
*ts*ifútis 'skinflint'
*ts*úla 'loose-living or low-class woman; slut'
b. Referring to deformities and deficiencies
*ts*evdós 'lisping' (and derivatives *ts*evdízo 'I lisp', etc.)
*ts*átra-pátra 'after a fashion; stumblingly (especially of speech)' (so Pring 1975: s.v.)
*ts*imbliáris 'bleary-eyed' (cf. *ts*ímbla 'eye-mucus')
*dz*ud*z*és 'dwarf; clown; jester'
c. Deformity subgroup defined by the shape [k-VOWEL-*ts*-]:
ku*ts*ós 'lame'
ka*ts*o- 'wrinkledy'
ka*ts*ída 'balding, scurvy head'
ko*dz*am- (prefix for largeness often with a contrasting defect)

(8) Sound-symbolic groups
a. Initial *tsi-* in words for 'small', 'thin', 'tight':[15]
*ts*itóno 'I stretch'
*ts*íta-*ts*íta 'just, barely (said of a tight fit)'
*ts*íma-*ts*íma 'right up to the edge; close'
*ts*íhla 'thin woman' (primary meaning: 'thrush')
*ts*ilivíthra 'thin woman' (primary meaning: 'wagtail')
*ts*íros 'thin person' (primary meaning: 'dried mackerel')
*ts*írla 'diarrhea (i.e. a thin stool)'

b. Initial *tsV-* in words for 'sting', 'bite', 'tease', 'burn':
*ts*im(b)úri 'tick'
*ts*iwíki 'tick'
tsi(m)bó 'I pinch, I nip'
*ts*uknída 'nettle'
*ts*úzo 'I sting'
*ts*ingló 'I goad'
*ts*atízo 'I tease'
*tsitsi*rízo 'I sizzle; I torment slowly'
*ts*íkna 'smell of meat or hair burning'
*ts*iknízo 'I burn (in cooking)'.

There is actually much more that can be said on this issue,[16] but it is not strictly relevant to the matter at hand. What is relevant, though, is the well-known fact that in many of the regional dialects of Modern Greek, these sounds—or their palatal counterparts such as [č]—are far more frequent than in the standard language. Thus, the special affective and marginal status that I have posited for these sounds is for the most part only a standard language phenomenon; the marginality is less pronounced in the dialects where the sounds themselves occur with greater frequency. It is also well known, as demonstrated by Mirambel 1946, that many standard language words with *ts/dz* are essentially borrowings from the regional dialects into the standard language. Since these borrowings have generally ended up with a low stylistic value, if one combines the hypothesis concerning the status of these sounds with Mirambel's account of the origin of standard language words containing them, one is led to the conclusion that speakers of Standard Greek assigned a low value to these dialect forms as they entered the standard language. That is to say, there was an ongoing stigmatization of dialectal forms indicative of standard speakers' attitudes toward those dialects and those forms. Indeed, anecdotally I can relate that Modern Greek speakers have on occasion overtly expressed opinions concerning such words that reveal these attitudes; one speaker, for instance, reported that these are words which she would say but would never write, indicative of the low stylistic value accorded these words.[17]

There is, moreover, some corroborating evidence, beyond the hypercorrections cited at the outset, supporting the idea of stigmatization of dialectal *ts* and *dz*. Admittedly of Medieval Greek provenance but telling nonetheless, there is found in Greek of the 16th century a special label for users of these sounds;[18] this is the word τζόπελος, cited by Crusius (1584) and again by Du Cange (1688). The relevant portions of Du Cange's citation of τζόπελος is given, with a translation, in (9):

(9) τζοπέλους . . . uocamus eos qui semper utuntur τζ siue τζίντα, id est talibus verbis quae sic incipiunt aut desinent; ut pro πρόβατο, προβατάτζι, αρνί, αρνάτζο . . .

τζοπέλους . . . we call those who always use τζ or τζίντα, that is with such words as begin or end in that way; thus for πρόβατο, προβατάτζι, αρνί, αρνάτζο . . .[19]

The existence of such a label, a specific word referring to the use of ‹τζ›, is highly suggestive of stereotyping that focuses on the use of *ts* and *dz* by a subset of the speech community, thus providing some indication of a stigmatization of these sounds in the 16th-17th century Greek speech community. This word seems not to have continued into Modern Greek with this stereotyped meaning; the only citation for such a form is from Dimitrakos 1950, the largest available dictionary of Modern Greek:[20]

(10) τσόπελος: ποιμήν έχων μόνιμον κατοικίαν, ασχολούμενος μάλλον εις την γεοργίαν

tsópelos: a shepherd who has a permanent dwelling, who occupies himself mainly in agriculture

This *tsópelos* may or may not be the same as that cited by Crusius and Du Cange, but if it is, then the alteration in the meaning of τζόπελος does not negate this latter word's value for providing an insight into attitudes concerning these sounds among Greek speakers in the 16th and 17th centuries. Moreover, given the meaning Dimitrakos attributes to the word, the semantic shift may even point to the development of a perception of a rural/urban split regarding *ts* and *dz*. Such a perceived split would correlate with the fact that the standard language is basically (now at least) an urban-centered dialect while the majority of dialects with more frequent and nonmarginal *ts* (and [č]) as well as, to a lesser extent, *dz*, are in fact rural. Moreover, the period Crusius and Du Cange report on occurred not long before the period in which the lexical borrowings with *ts* and *dz* from a variety of regional dialects (so Mirambel 1946, as noted above) made their way into the dialect that formed the basis for the standard language.

This evidence squares with a view of *ts* and *dz* that emerges from the purely linguistic analysis of the lexical distribution of these sounds in the standard language and from a consideration of the occasional hypercorrections involving *ts* and *dz*. These facts, then, taken together, attest to an "uneasiness" with the use of *ts* and *dz*, presumably because they are marked as dialectal elements. This uneasiness was brought on by the greater prestige—and thus power—of the standard lan-

guage. The case of Greek *ts* and *dz,* therefore, provides an important insight into matters of language and power.

3. *Native versus non-native distinctions*

As noted in the previous section, it is significant that many of the Modern Greek words with *ts* and *dz* that help to define the skewed lexical distribution of these sounds entered the standard language from regional dialects (Mirambel 1946). Yet another major source of such words is various neighboring languages that Greek has borrowed from over the years, most notably Turkish. In the list given above in (1) through (8), *tsurápi, tsókaro, dzá(m)ba, tsifútis, dzudzés, kodzam-,* and possibly *tsátra-pátra* are all borrowings.[21] Numerous other Greek words with these sounds—not necessarily all with any affective value—have a similar origin. In many instances, it is possible to find doublets, i.e., synonymous words that not only differ in origin and in the presence versus absence of *ts* or *dz,* but also differ stylistically in that the borrowed word with *ts/dz* predictably belongs to a lower stylistic level. Some examples include *dzá(m)ba* versus *doreán,* both meaning roughly 'for free', and *dzudzés* versus *nános,* both meaning 'dwarf'.[22] These stylistic distinctions can be found even for pairs that do not involve *ts* and *dz,* for instance *tíhos* and *duvári,* both meaning 'wall' but with the latter being of Turkish origin and having a lower status stylistically[23] than the former, the native Greek word.

What is operative in such pairs is another type of interlectal awareness of the relative "power" of different linguistic systems, namely the native/non-native distinction. Just as in the case of the inter-dialectal tensions previously discussed, inter-lingual awareness can also be a reflection of the relationship between language and power.

These particular examples are cases in which the non-native items are stigmatized, and the stigmatization here may even tie in with the rural/urban split discussed in section 2, if, as seems likely, many Turkish words entered Greek through contact in rural areas. The opposite outcome is also possible, in which prestige has been accorded to non-native forms, as one additional example makes clear.

A case in point is the use of non-native morphology, in particular grammatical suffixes, in specialized contexts. This phenomenon is similar to the English use of various learnèd plural suffixes from the classical languages, especially in technical terms, giving them a more "important" and "dignified" sound, e.g., *antennae* versus *antennas,* where the former is usual among entomologists and the latter is more common when it signifies the apparatus for receiving television signals.[24]

Greek is a language with a built-in source of learnèd morphology and lexical items in the still-accessible earlier stages of the language, and there are doublets such as *kivérnisis/kivernís̆eos* for the genitive singular of 'government' which show the effects of learnèd borrowings from earlier stages of Greek on the grammar of the modern language.[25] Of relevance to the native/non-native question is the fact that one can witness the relatively recent encroachment on Greek made by English as a new source of learnèd grammatical morphology.

In particular, Newton (1972b: 20) has noted the occurrence in Cypriot Greek of such plurals as *ta films* 'strips of photographic film' and *ta čč̆eks* 'checks', and others can be found on the Greek mainland, e.g. *ta tests* 'tests'.[26] The use of English plural morphology carries a certain power—as Newton puts it, "these unintegrated foreign words are apparently uttered in full consciousness of their foreign character and usually for specific effects"—just as the use of learned katharevousa forms had such a power earlier. This aspect of English influence is especially noteworthy in the Greek context because of the failure of Turkish grammatical morphology to enter the language in general during the period of intense Turkish influence in Greece,[27] a fact that suggests a different power status for English now in Greece than has been enjoyed by any other foreign language. The linguistic evidence of new Greek plurals from English is thus a clue to the prestige accorded English, a prestige evident also from the large numbers of recent English loan words in Greek, the many *frondistíria* that teach English as opposed to the few that teach other languages, etc.

4. *Conclusion*

The facts discussed here show that various interlectal distinctions that speakers are aware of, namely, those holding between regional dialects and the standard dialect and between native and non-native elements in a language, are indeed relevant factors that lie at the intersection of language and power. There is more that could be said with regard to each of these linguistic manifestations of language-power interplay; for example, the matter of the pronunciation of foreign words and of the values attached to different pronunciations is one such area worthy of further investigation. Still, the act of documenting these factors in the Greek context and of bringing them into the arena of discourse in Greek linguistics, sociology, and sociolinguistics is an important step to understanding fully the Greek realization of the interaction of language issues with matters of social power.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the members of the MGSA Panel at which this paper was first presented—Kostas Kazazis, Deborah Tannen, and Lukas Tsitsipis—as well as members of the audience there (and elsewhere where I have spoken on my ideas concerning *ts* and *dz* in Greek) and two anonymous reviewers for their many useful comments. In addition, Keith Walters, Richard Janda, and Julie Auger have helped me to clarify certain aspects of the sociolinguistic discussion contained herein.

[1]In coining this phrase, I draw on the widespread use of the term "lect" among sociolinguists as a somewhat more technical (and less neutral) alternative to "variety," referring to varieties within a speech community rather than different speech types in general.

[2]Among the evidence for the universality of this phenomenon is its occurrence even in Creole speech communities, i.e., involving languages that are relatively newly created; as Rickford (1985: 155) observes, "reports of language attitudes in Creole continua emphasize the positiveness of orientation toward the standard variety and the negativeness of orientations toward the non-standard 'Creole' varieties."

[3]See Kazazis 1992 for some discussion of this issue.

[4]Mackridge actually refers to the Greek of "moderately educated Greeks in the urban centres" of Greece, since the variety spoken in Thessaloniki is not radically different from that spoken in Athens. Still, since Athens is by far the largest urban center, it is Athenian Greek that dominates linguistically.

[5]I say "incorrect" here, since the resulting expression has an entirely different meaning from the intended one, namely "I will get a telephone for you", with *su* having its benefactive indirect object sense.

[6]See also the brief summary of the relevant facts given in Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 258–261).

[7]I write these sounds as *ts* and *dz* (thus roughly following Greek orthography) even though they represent not two-segment sequences but rather a single complex segment, the affricates [t^s] and [d^z] respectively. See Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 231–232, 238) for some discussion.

[8]The status of *ts* and *dz* in Ancient Greek is a bit harder to determine. Although *ts* was not part of the phonemic inventory of at least the Attic dialect of the Classical period (unless, as seems unlikely—see Allen 1983: 61—the orthographic ‹ττ› in words like πράττω 'I do' represented the affricate [t^s]), it was presumably part of the sound system of prehistoric stages of Greek. Lejeune (1972: 63) has suggested that in the development of *si* in most dialects of Ancient Greek from earlier *ti (e.g. as in δίδωσι '(s)he gives' from earlier *di-do:-ti), there was a transitional stage with affricate *t^{s}i. As for *dz*, even though the most likely pronunciation of ‹ζ› in Ancient Greek was [zd] (cf. forms like 'Αθηνάζε 'to Athens' from *'Αθηνάνσ-δε), it is possible that an affricate [d^z] occurred as a transitional stage in the development from *dy to ‹ζ›, as in Ζεύς from earlier *dyeus (see Allen 1983: 56ff. for discussion).

[9]I am excluding from consideration here the occurrence of apparent *ts* via vowel reduction in fast speech and dialectally in words such as [perpátsa] 'I walked' (for careful speech [perpátisa]). Based on the observation of Newton (1972a : 213–214) that in the dialect of Lesvos a two-segment cluster [ts] arising from the deletion of unstressed [i] (a regular process in that dialect) differs phonetically from the true affricate [t^s], it seems likely that instances of [ts] via vowel reduction in the Standard language are also phonetically different from the *ts* of more independent origin. The one apparent exception in the Standard language to this claim, the imperative singular *kátse* 'sit!', turns out on closer inspection to be unproblematic. Even though *kátse* 'sit!' derives

historically from *káthise* via vowel reduction and thus might be expected to have a tw
segment cluster, like fast-speech [perpátsa], it is phonetically [kátˢe] and the stem *k*
occurs even in the plural (phonetically [kátˢete]) where historically the *-i-* was stres
(i.e., *kathísete*) and not readily deletable. Presumably, then, *kátse* is no longer synchr
ically derived from *káthise*, and shows the effects of an early affricate creation pro
(giving [tˢ] out of the cluster [ts]) and a relexicalization of the stem with the affri
[tˢ].

[10]The basis for these counts is the lists given in Chapter 5 of Joseph and Philipp
Warburton 1987. There are of course potential problems with frequency counts,
surveying such lexical lists can only give the type-frequency, and not the to
frequency, of *ts* and *dz*; the occurrence of *ts* in a commonly used word such as *é*
in the quite common diminutive suffixes—especially *-itsa*—would increase the t
frequency of *ts*, but would not be reflected in a lexical count yielding only type-frequ
Similarly, it is quite possible that within some groups of Greek speakers, words
or *dz* might have a higher frequency than they do within others. Moreover, exam
such lists begs the difficult question of how to define "basic vocabulary," althou
use of such lists is a common practice in certain types of lexical studies. Thu
frequency-count results reported here are suggestive only and not conclusive.

[11]This term derives from the linguist Morris Swadesh, who pioneered diac
research into basic vocabulary items and their properties as a class.

[12]The operative word here is "primarily," for it is undeniable that there
dinary, nonaffective, nonmarginal words with these sounds, such as *étsi* 'so; th
'tea', *tsépi* 'pocket', *dzámi* 'window-pane', among others. What is so striking and,
claim, significant, about *ts* and *dz* is the fact that the vast majority of words i
they are found consists of marginal, affective words of the sort listed below.

[13]In giving these lists, I make no pretense of exhaustiveness, but I main
these categories are representative of the lexical distribution of *ts* and *dz*.

[14]Note the occurrence of the vowel [ə], otherwise nonexistent in Gre
indebted to Lukas Tsitsipis for bringing this form to my attention.

[15]It is likely that the diminutive suffixes with *-ts-*, such as *-itsa*, *-itsi*, *-itsos*, a
belong conceptually in this group of forms for smallness and related notions; t
correlate of this group would thus not be restricted to initial *tsi-, but rat
focus more on the occurrence of *-ts-* itself in the forms in question.

[16]In a book-length monograph I intend to collect all the relevant materi
with the discussion necessary to place the phenomenon in an adequate
framework.

[17]Such self-reports are of course not intended as a reliable indicato
linguistic behavior, but rather as suggestive of attitudes that speakers have

[18]In Medieval Greek, both [ts] and [dz] were written with the same
digraph ‹τζ›, even though it is clear from the development of these words in
that the spelling here was masking a phonetic distinction. I give Medieval
in the Greek alphabet, in order to avoid any possible confusion as to w
cited.

[19]Presumably, the ‹τζ› Du Cange reports on here in προβατάτζι reflec
palatalization of *k*, standing thus for Standard προβατάκι. In αρνάτζο,
have to reckon with an independent diminutive suffix, as in hypocoristics
from *Dimítris*.

[20]Moreover, native speakers of Greek that I have consulted did
word.

[21]Except for *tsókaro*, which is from Italian, these words are of Turk

[22]Stylistic distinctions are admittedly difficult to document, but it ca
Pring (1975: s.v.) gives the designation "fam.," standing for "familiar

usage," under the entry for *dzá(m)ba*. As for *dzudzés*, some native speakers of Greek have volunteered strong emotionally tinged connotations for this word, such as "vile, disgusting man," that they do not report for *nános*.

[23]For example, the word of Turkish origin, *duvári*, can be used pejoratively (though somewhat playfully) in the expression *ísai duvári* 'You are stupid!' (literally: "You are a wall"; compare the English use of *thick* in a similar meaning), whereas this same phrase with *tíhos* substituted has no particular affective value.

[24]Similar examples include *schemata* versus *schemas* and *memoranda* versus *memorandums*. Interestingly, in the light of the earlier discussion concerning hypercorrection, some hypercorrect learnèd plurals are occasionally encountered in English; the use of *(course) curriculae* for the correct Latinate *(course) curricula* has been reported to me, for instance.

[25]See Kazazis 1992 for further examples and discussion.

[26]This last example is from a pamphlet put out by the Amerikanikó Ekpedeftikó Ídrima: Τα τεστς SAT ή το ACT είναι δυνατόν να ζητηθούν . . . αυτό το τέστ μετράει . . . 'It is possible for the SAT tests or the ACT to be requested . . . this test counts . . .', where it is clear that the singular form is τεστ and the plural τεστς, with the English grammatical suffix. While there are some English loan words that have generalized the plural -s to the singular in Greek, e.g., *to tanks* 'the tank', such is not the case with *to test* (or *to film* or *to tsek*).

[27]It is true of course that several Turkish word-forming suffixes have been borrowed into Greek, most notably the occupational noun suffix *-cI/-çI*, the source of Greek *-dzis*. However, such so-called "derivational" suffixes are qualitatively different from suffixes with a grammatical function; for example the former seem to be more easily borrowed than the latter. I am also excluding from consideration the *-d-* of the Turkish past tense which has been incorporated into the Greek form of some borrowed verbs, e.g. *baïldízo* 'I faint' (cf. Turkish *bayıl-mak* 'to faint', past *bayıl-dı* 'he fainted'), for it clearly has been made part of the verbal root and has no past tense marking function. Finally, it can be noted that Greek dialects of Asia Minor (see Dawkins 1916) were heavily influenced by Turkish, and incorporated numerous Turkish grammatical as well as derivational elements; what is at issue here, though, is Greek of the Greek mainland.

Within the wider Balkan context, the failure of Turkish grammatical markings, especially the noun plural suffix *-lAr*, to penetrate the grammar of Greek is especially noteworthy, for Turkish plurals can be found in other Balkan languages, most notably Albanian and Bulgarian; see Grannes 1977 for some discussion and examples.

REFERENCES CITED

Allen, W. Sidney
1987 *Vox Graeca. The Pronunciation of Classical Greek.* 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andriotis, N. P.
1983 Ν. Π. Ανδριώτης, *Ετυμολογικό λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής*. 3rd edition. Thessaloniki: Ídrima Manóli Triandafillídi.

Crusius, Martinus
1584 *Turcograeciae Libri Octo.* Basileae: Leonardus Ostenius Sebastianus Henricpetrus.

Dawkins, R. M.
1916 *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: a Study of the Dialects of Sílli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dimitrákos, D.
1950 Δ. Δημητράκος, *Μέγα λεξικόν της ελληνικής γλώσσης.* Athens: Ellinikí Paideía.

Du Cange, Dominus (Carolus Du Fresne)
1688 *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae & Infimae Graecitatis.* Lugduni: Annissoniorum Joannis Posuel, et Claudii Rigaud.

Grannes, Alf
1977 "The Use of the Turkish Pluralizer *-lx²r* in South Slavic and Albanian." *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 11(2):83–93.

Householder, Fred, Kostas Kazazis, and Andreas Koutsoudas.
1964 *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki.* Bloomington/The Hague: Indiana University/Mouton & Co. (= Publication 31 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics / Part II of *International Journal of American Linguistics* Volume 30 [2]).

Joseph, Brian D.
1982 [1985]. «Για την ιδιαίτερη θέση του [ts]/[dz] στην ελληνική φωνολογία.» In *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 26–28 April 1982,* 227–235. Thessaloniki: Publication Service of the Aristotelian University.
1983 "Language Use in the Balkans: The Contributions of Historical Linguistics." *Anthropological Linguistics* 25:275–287.
1984a "Balkan Expressive and Affective Phonology—The Case of Greek *ts/dz.*" In *Papers for the V. Congress of Southeast European Studies, Belgrade, September 1984,*" edited by K. Shangriladze & E. Townsend, 227–237. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
1984b "The Appropriateness of [ts] in Certain Greek Suffixes." *Onomata: Revue Onomastique* 9:21–25.
1986 "Modern Greek *ts*: On Beyond Sound Symbolism." Paper read at Conference on Sound Symbolism, January, at University of California, Berkeley. To appear in conference proceedings, edited by L. Hinton, J. Nichols, and J. Ohala (Cambridge University Press).
1987 "On the Use of Iconic Elements in Etymological Investigation. Some Case Studies from Greek." *Diachronica: International Journal for Historical Linguistics* 4(1/2):1–26.
1991 "A Greek Perspective on the Question of the Arbitrariness of Linguistic Signs." *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 7: 335–352.

Joseph, Brian D. and Irene Philippaki-Warburton
1987 *Modern Greek.* London: Croom Helm.

Kazazis, Kostas
1992 "Sunday Greek Revisited." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10: 57–69.

Kukulés, F.
1923 Φ. Κουκουλές, «Γλωσσικά εκ Κύθνου». *Λεξικογραφικόν αρχείον της μέσης και νέας ελληνικής* 6: 271–325.

Lejeune, Michel
1972 *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien.* Paris: Éditions Klincksieck (Tradition de l'Humanisme IX).

Mackridge, Peter
1985 *The Modern Greek Language: A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Mirambel, André
1946 "Le groupe *ts* en grec moderne." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 42:89–101.

Newton, Brian
1972a *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1972b *Cypriot Greek.* The Hague: Mouton.

Pring, J. T.
1975 *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek (Greek-English).* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rickford, John R.
1985 "Standard and Non-Standard Language Attitudes in a Creole Continuum." In *Language of Inequality,* edited by Nessa Wolfson and Joan Manes, 145–160. Berlin and New York: Mouton. (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 36.)

Trudgill, Peter
1979 *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Wald, Benji
1985 "Vernacular and Standard Swahili as Seen by Members of the Mombasa Swahili Speech Community." In *Language of Inequality,* edited by Nessa Wolfson and Joan Manes, 123–143. Berlin and New York: Mouton. (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 36.)