System-internal and system-external phonic expressivity

Iconicity and Balkan affricates

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

The expressive function of language as realized phonically is explored here through an examination of the major role that affricates play in various Balkan languages, but especially Greek and Albanian, in marking words as showing emotion, affect, color, and similar sorts of expressive dimensions. Moreover, it is argued that language contact is an important causal factor here, in part through the enhancement of already existing tendencies in the languages in question and in part through the recognition that system-external elements can have an "exotic" character and thus can be especially suitable for participating in phonic expressivity.

1. Introduction

As humans, we convey information about ourselves to other humans in many ways, including how we dress,[1] the types of cars we drive (or choose not to drive), how we 'style' ourselves in general, the way we walk, via the various mannerisms that we adopt, and so on. And, along with these various indicators, there is of course language, as one of the key 'tells' by which we reveal a myriad of aspects about ourselves and about how we position ourselves relative to others. Language is the primary medium through which we state various true-or-false propositions we wish

1. A recent vivid example of such conveying of information through clothing is seen in the commentary about the United States Democratic Party leader Nancy Pelosi wearing a particular red coat as she visited the White House for an important face-to-face meeting with the President. According to one account, that of Vanessa Friedman writing in the *New York Times* (12 December 2018), her coat "also helped to transform her from a seemingly tired symbol of the establishment to one of well-dressed revolt" (see https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/12/fashion/nancy-pelosi-coat.html, last accessed 16 December 2018).

https://doi.org/10.1075/ill.17.06jos

to make known and through which we give various opinions that we hold. However, language can also go beyond that, and can allow us to indicate attitudes we have about events or people, and to reveal emotional states we are experiencing. That is, besides its purely denotational information-giving function, language can serve an expressive function, adding color to otherwise dry statements of fact, giving connotation and nuance to utterances, allowing users to reveal sides of themselves that are fun, witty, personal, emotive, creative, artistic, and the like, in a word, human, in the broadest sense.[2]

Despite the great interest that linguists tend to have – quite understandably, as it is fascinating in its own right – in the purely structural and denotative side of language, it is not hard to find reflections of the more expressive side all around us. The repetition of words in successive clauses is one expressive device that can give very powerful results, perhaps most effectively with switched function (chiasmus). An example from great oratory comes from United States President John F. Kennedy's January 20, 1961 inaugural address, where the repetition did not just make for greater oratorical power but made the whole utterance that much more memorable; the matching formatting signals the repeated (and chiastic) elements:

(1) **Ask** not what *your country* can do for ***you***; **ask** what ***you*** can do for *your country*

A less oratorically charged example, but one that is perhaps no less effective in achieving a degree of memorability – a goal of the not-so-subtle art of marketing – is this example of expressive repetition in an advertisement (from Grimard's Auto Sales and Service in Hooksett, New Hampshire; cf. https://www.grimards.com):

(2) You get a **good *deal*** and a **good *deal*** more
with a play on words as well via different senses of what *a good deal* means, both 'a lot' and 'good value for your money'.

Expressiveness can be seen also in such morphological phenomena such as *-ma-* infixation (cf. *thinga-ma-jig*, *saxo-ma-phone*, etc.) or expletive insertion (cf. *fan-frickin-tastic* (McCarthy 1982)) by which affect is added to words; in the cases just cited, the forms in question reflect a playfulness but also an extra degree of intensity or strong emotion compared to the ordinary form of the words *thing*, *saxophone*, and *fantastic*.

---

2. Both this denotational side of language and the connotational side are consistent with the purpose of language being for communication; the difference resides in the type and nature of information that is conveyed. See also Fónagy 1999, in which he refers to his dual-encoding model of language, with its conventional encoding (the grammar) and the 'expressive distorter' that distorts grammatical conventions to give expressive meaning to the denotation. I thank Olga Fischer for bringing this scholar's important and interesting work to my attention.

The examples given so far are more a matter of syntax or lexis, but expressivity is also evident at the phonic level.[3] For the most part, linguists tend to view sounds as just the incidental material that morphemes and words are made of. The sounds of a language in and of themselves are important, to be sure, and form a coherent subsystem within a language overall, complete with its own properties of internal relations and such. However, their existence is manifest only in their occurrence in particular morphemes and words. Yet there are situations in which inherently meaningless sounds alone can be carriers of meaning, thus giving an interface within grammar that can be referred to as 'phonosemantics'. Just as 'morphosyntax' represents those aspects of morphology that lie at the interface with syntax, 'phonosemantics' represents the interface between meaning and sound.

The investigation of phonosemantics against the backdrop of expressivity, with particular attention to various languages of the Balkans, is the focus of this contribution. Moreover, there is an explicit link to be made between phonosemantics and expressivity that informs the ensuing discussion of these languages.

In particular, much of what can be judged as involving phonosemantics is linguistic material that shows, or is perceived to show, a nonarbitrary connection between form and meaning, as opposed to the more usual "arbitraire du signe" (following de Saussure 1916) shown by elements in a linguistic sign.[4] Among the types of material that show such a nonarbitrary connection are (i) onomatopoeia, words mimicking sounds found in nature or the mechanical world, as with English *grrr* or *woof* for the noise a dog makes, (ii) sound symbolism, whereby apparently nonmorphemic elements of sound are associated with meaning,[5] as with the *gl-* associated with 'light, shininess' in English words like *glow*, *glisten*, *glitter*, and others,[6] or the association of high front vowels with smallness, as in English *teeny* (describing something smaller than *tiny*), and (iii) ideophones, expressions with a phonic basis to them that evoke concrete images, such as Greek *taka-taka* '(to do something) hurriedly, quickly'. Words such as these have a denotative value, to be sure, in that *glow* or *teeny* have a meaning pertaining to light and small size

3. Compare Fónagy (2001: 5), and his reference to "expressive phonemes".

4. Though see Klamer (2002) for an empirically based reconsideration of Saussure's dictum, working with data from Dutch and Kambera. For her, the range of standard sorts of nonarbitrary material goes well beyond the three listed here, to include "names (nicknames, epithets, terms of endearment, animal and plant names), as well as words with negative connotations" (p. 258). I thank Olga Fischer for drawing my attention to Klamer's excellent study.

5. I leave open the question of whether such sound symbolic sequences are indeed morphemes; I am inclined to think so but this is not the appropriate venue to argue this position.

6. This particular sound symbol is much discussed in the literature; see Sadowski (2001) for a relatively recent treatment,

respectively. However, they offer something more than that – by summoning up the physical image of light or size through their sound qualities, they offer a sensory reinforcement of the meaning. There is thus "value added" to the denotation along a dimension that is not purely fact or intellect oriented, but rather involves an appeal to one of the senses. So also with onomatopoeia, where the denotation is, for instance, a dog's bark but there is a direct appeal to an aural dimension too. The same can be said about colorful language; that is, it adds an emotive dimension, giving affect to a word that goes beyond the word's denotation.

This "value added" is tantamount to added expressiveness, so that in this way, expressivity and nonarbitrariness overlap. Note, though, that these notions are not identical in ways that would allow one term/notion to replace the other; for instance, Kennedy's chiasmus in (1) is expressive without being nonarbitrary.

To some extent, then, in phonosemantic expressivity, the impact of the message necessarily goes beyond the specifics of the content itself. In a certain sense, the characterization of Marshall McLuhan (1964), namely that "the medium is the message", is appropriate here. That is, the phonic medium itself plays a role in the message, so that more is conveyed than just the denotative content; rather, one can find affect and emotion, connotation and nuance, intensity and wit, color and posturing, all of which are subsumed under the rubric adopted here of 'expressivity'. As already noted, expressivity is the 'value added' beyond the denotative sense of a word, in a real sense "language with an attitude".[7]

These characterizations together give a sense of *what* expressivity is. Yet it is fair also to ask *where* expressivity is. To be sure, some observers have relegated it to the margins of language – and linguistic analysis – giving greater weight and importance, as noted above, to the purely denotational and structural aspects of language. And while it is true that some of the contexts for expressivity are situations that tend to stand outside of what Wescott (1975) has dubbed "conventionally structured speech",[8] and in some sense might be viewed as somewhat marked (e.g. interacting with animals in a linguistic way), at the same time, the pervasiveness of linguistic expressivity cannot be denied. Briefly put, expressiveness is everywhere.

---

7. This phrase is used in a different context, for a different purpose, by Preston (2003), but seems particularly apt here.

8. Wescott referred to this domain as 'micro-language'; everything else, where expressivity rules, so to speak, was, for him, 'allolanguage'. Together, micro-language and allo-language constitute 'macro-language'. I have found this terminology useful (see Joseph 1984, 1987, 1994, for instance). However, it must be admitted that if expressivity is as pervasive as I believe it is, referring to expressive domains as 'allo-language' suggests that it is somehow outside of and perhaps marginal to language proper, a stance which seems not to have been Wescott's intent. Wescott's 'allolanguage' seems to have some similarity with Fónagy's 'expressive distorter' (see footnote 2).

All of the examples discussed so far involve speakers' manipulation of material internally available within a single linguistic system. But expressiveness also crops up in cross-language contexts, that is, in language contact situations. Uriel Weinreich, in his classic 1953 work *Languages in Contact*, drew an explicit connection between expressivity and contact. In particular, he claimed that multilingualism increases an individual's range of expressivity. Why should this be the case? Having access to more than one language means that there is more material for a speaker to draw on for expressive purposes. That is, multi-linguals – even those with a minimal command of the other language – have choices regarding language use that monolinguals do not; greater choice equates to a greater range of nuance available, so that one thereby has greater expressivity. The other language is thus an additional resource that multi-lingual speakers have at their disposal and which they can exploit.

Furthermore, additional material from the other language necessarily – and literally – is 'exotic', standing 'outside' ('exo-') of the other language's system. Therefore, sounds from the other system are in a position to contribute to expressivity, and are prone to being considered 'exotic' in a nonliteral sense, and thus as being special in some way.

For instance, although admittedly a somewhat controversial interpretation, Herbert (1990a, 1990b) has discussed the entry of clicks into the Nguni group of Bantu languages in southern Africa, and especially their occurrence in an avoidance language, a special register, known as *lhonipe*. He adopts the view, following Faye (1923–5), that through contact with Khoi-San speakers with clicks in their languages, Bantu speakers were provided with a suitably expressive set of sounds, namely various clicks, that they could exploit in *lhonipe* register, and from that register, clicks spread into more ordinary registers. Thus 'exotic' can be equated in some ways with 'system-external', suggesting a link between language contact and the expressiveness that 'exoticity' allows for, as Weinreich posited.

There is also, however, a system-internal sense of 'exotic', one bolstered by typology, namely the role that can be played by sounds that are marked or marginal within a system and which are cross-linguistically marked or marginal. Affricates are such marked sounds, for they hold a special place structurally in many phonological systems, inasmuch as they are complex elements, embodying, e.g., characteristics of both unitary segments and clusters.[9]

9. Klamer (2002) also notes structurally marked characteristics of some of the expressive forms she deals with, and treats this markedness as noncoincidental. See also Mithun (1982) on marked properties of noise words in Iroquoian languages.

Moreover, and highly relevant to the discussion here, affricates, in a functional manner that iconically mirrors their structural markedness, can hold a special place as well in terms of the expressive function of language. In particular, in some languages they are prime carriers of affect and expressivity at the phonic level. Cross-linguistically, it is no accident, as discussed by Nichols (1971), that coronal affricates such as [t^{s}] or [t^{ʃ}] occur frequently in diminutives. Diminutives typically fill highly expressive functions such as endearment, pejoration, attenuation, and so forth,[10] in addition to denoting a mere size difference (Jurafsky 1996, *inter alios*); what makes the occurrence of affricates in diminutives iconic is that from an acoustic standpoint affricates have high tonality, a phonic characteristic of small objects and the noises they make.[11] Similarly, the occurrence of such sounds in sound symbolism reflecting smallness (Hinton et al. 1994) is another reflection of this iconicity.

All of this somewhat long preliminary discussion is designed to focus attention on expressivity, iconicity, affricates, and language contact. As suggested above, I aim here to contribute to our understanding of the expressive side of language by discussing the convergence of these four notions. In particular, I examine the exotic and expressive nature of affricates in various languages in the Balkan *Sprachbund*, where such effects are especially evident and where language contact seems to have played a contributing causal role. Briefly, the [t^{s}] and [d^{z}] of Modern Greek (Joseph 1994), the [dʒ] and [d^{z}] of Albanian (Curtis 2010), and the [t^{ʃ}] and [dʒ] of Turkish (Marchand 1953) all give evidence that aligns them with phonic expressivity.[12] Further, even in Balkan Slavic, where affricates abound in ordinary, nonexpressive contexts, a similar claim can be sustained. My specific assertion is that while there are language-internal sources for the expressivity of these affricates, this value has been greatly enhanced by language contact in several ways.

---

10. Similar sorts of functions are associated with the semantic side of reduplication; see Fischer (2011) for discussion along these lines, and note that some of the material presented from Greek and Albanian in Section 3 involves reduplication. This to me suggests that reduplication is but one more formal means of expressivity to be added to the phonic expressivity argued for here.

11. Consider, for instance, the high-pitched 'pinging' noise made by dropping a pin on a flat surface as opposed to the low-pitched 'thud' made by dropping a book.

12. For typographical ease from here on in, I generally write these sounds as combinations of distinct segments without superscripts, phonemic slashes or phonetic square brackets; no analytic claim is intended by this decision.

2. Identifying expressiveness

An issue with any discussion of expressiveness is the question of how to tell that a given form or usage or expression is conveying some expressive aspect. All too often, as in the previous section, it is necessary to rely on an intuitive sense that speakers or analysts have of the notions that contribute to 'color' and thus to 'colorful, expressive language'. Such intuitions are real, to be sure, but not always independently verifiable or easily corroborated. There are, however, some ways in which controlled experimental studies can help, especially for sound symbolism (as early as Sapir, and cf. more recently Shinohara and Kawahara 2010), but even also for morphological expressiveness, as shown by Mitchell (2019) on affective verbal *-s* in African American Vernacular English (AAVE), where speakers judged the appropriateness of *–s*-marked verb forms in neutral and emotion-laden scenarios.

Moreover, collecting the intuitions of a large and broad sample of speakers can help, but precisely in the expressive realm we can expect to find a great deal of speaker-to-speaker variation, as individual speakers may have their own sense of what makes for affect, color, and such. For instance, what is sound symbolic to one speaker may not be so for another; one can wonder whether *glass* and *glaze* belong to the *gl-* 'light' sound symbol in English found in *glow*, *glisten*, *glitter*, etc. – speakers may legitimately differ on how they answer such a question.

Occasionally, there can be telling statistical information, and Greek offers some corroboration along those lines, as discussed below in Section 3. Moreover, there can be details in individual languages that can offer some corroborative insights. For instance, in Greek there is an expression *to lei ke i leksi*, literally 'it says even the word', i.e. 'the very word itself says it'. This phrase means essentially that the very sound of a word speaks for itself as to its denotation so that it actually exhibits a somewhat low degree of arbitrariness in terms of the relation between form and meaning. As suggested in the discussion in Section 1, in general, lower arbitrariness means greater iconicity and a greater likelihood of expressiveness so that this phrase can be used as a test for expressivity for a given word. Another type of corroborating indication can come from speaker comments in interviews. That is, speakers sometimes verbalize their feelings about a particular word or particular sound in very revealing ways as to expressiveness; two such examples are given in the following section in which Greek affricates and expressiveness are discussed.

3. The Greek evidence: [ts] / [dz][13]

My central claim about Greek *ts*/*dz* is that their lexical distribution shows them to occupy a special functional place in the linguistic system, that of being the important carriers of phonic expressivity in the language. That is, *ts* and *dz* predominate in words that are expressive and affective, words that speakers report on as passing the *to lei ke i leksi* test and evoke telling reactions from speakers. In particular, they cluster in such lexical domains as exclamations, ideophonic adverbials, interjections, calls to animals, onomatopoeia, conventionalized forms used by adults to and around children, and the like, as well as in various colorful, playful, and/or in general somewhat slangy lexical items. These are all classes of words and utterances that are inherently expressive and contribute color to the discourse, and they often contain forms that are noncanonical in their shape (as with Klamer's Kambera data; see footnotes 4 and 9) – for instance, purely denotative words in Greek never end in *-ts* but some of these forms do – and are more on the nonarbitrary, somewhat iconic end of an 'arbitraire du signe' scale.

Examples of such words include the following:

(3) a. interjections, e.g. *príts* 'so what?!; who cares?!', *ts* 'NEGATION' (actually an apico-dental click, but conventionally represented in this way; cf. also *tsúk* as a conventionalization of this noise), *tsá* (also *dzá*) 'revelatory noise used in peek-a-boo game', *tsúp* (for a sudden and often annoying appearance of someone)

b. calls to animals, e.g. *gúts* 'call to pigs', *tsú(nk)s* 'call to donkeys', *óts* 'whoa!', *íts* 'whoa'

c. onomatopes and derivatives, e.g. *tsák* 'crack!' (cf. *tsakízo* 'I break'), *kríts-kríts* 'crunch!' (cf. *kritsanízo* 'I crunch'), *máts-múts* 'kissing noise', *tsiú-tsiú* 'bird's chirp', *plíts-pláts* 'splish-splash!', *gráts* 'scratching sound' (with variants *xráts*, *kráts*, and *kráts krúts*, and derivative *gratsunízo* 'I scratch')

d. ideophonic adverbials (where the sound is evocative of a manner of action), e.g. *tsáka-tsáka* 'immediate quick action; straightaway; directly', *tsúku-tsúku* 'steadily and surely, with a hint of secretive activity', *tsáf-tsúf* 'in an instant'

13. The data presented here on Greek [ts] and [dz] is found in more or less the same form in a number of publications of mine (e.g., Joseph 1982, 1983, 1984, 1994, 1997) that address the expressive value of these sounds from various perspectives; rather than ask the reader to find those articles, I repeat the relevant information here, so as to make the present work a self-contained study. See also Friedman and Joseph (2020: Chapter 5.7) for discussion of some of the broader Balkan dimensions.

e. adult conventionalized child-language forms, e.g. *tsátsa* 'aunty', *tsitsí* 'meat' (also adult slang for 'breast'), *tsís(i)a* 'peepee', *pítsi-pítsi* '(act of) washing'
f. expressive, playful, and/or slangy words, e.g.: *tsambunízo* 'whimper', *tsala-vutó* 'do a slovenly job', *tsapatsúlis* 'sloppy worker', *tsókaro* 'vulgar woman' (primary meaning: 'wooden shoe'), *tsirízo* 'screech', *tsili(m)burðó*' gallivant; fart about', *tsitsíði* '(stark) naked', *tsiplákis* 'naked', *tsirtsiplákis* 'stark naked', *tsevðós* 'lisping', *dza(m)ba* 'for free; cheap', *dziridzándzules* 'evasiveness, coquettish airs', *dzándzala-mándzala* 'rags and such' (with Turkish expressive *m*-reduplication)

These lexical categories and the forms cited here are highly expressive, and to a large extent make language fun, give it life and color, and allow for individuality in expression.

As a further phonic indication of expressivity, it can be shown that *ts*, and to a lesser extent *dz*, occur as the consonantal nucleus in a number of sound symbols, elements that are iconic in nature:

(4) a. *tsi-* 'small, narrow, thin', as in:
***tsi**tóno* 'stretch', ***tsí**xla* 'thin woman', ***tsí**ros* 'thin person', ***tsí**ta-**tsí**ta* 'just, barely (said of a narrow squeeze or a tight fit)', ***tsí**ma-**tsí**ma* 'right up to the edge, a close fit'; maybe also ***dzu**dzés* 'dwarf' (with a high vowel, even if not front (though front in the Turkish source, *cüce*)
and:
diminutives with nucleus *–ts-*: neuter diminutive noun suffix ***–itsi***, as in *kor**ítsi*** (cf. *kóri* 'girl, daughter'); feminine diminutive noun suffix ***–itsa***, as in *lemonítsa* 'little lemon tree'(cf. *lemonjá* 'lemon tree'); nonsuffixed hypocoristics derived directly from names, as in *M**íts**os* (from *Ðimítrios*) and *Kó**ts**os* (from *Konstandinos*); 'diminished' adjectives, as in *ylik**úts**ikos* 'sweet-ish, cute' (cf. *ylikós* 'sweet') or *kal**úts**ikos* 'good-ish' (cf. *kalós* 'good')
b. *tsV-* 'sting, tease, bite, burn', as in:
***tsú**zo* 'sting', ***tsu**kniða* 'nettle', ***tsi**m(b)úri* 'tick' ('small stinging insect'), ***tsi**víki* 'tick', ***tsi**(m)bó* 'pinch', ***tsa**tízo* 'I tease', ***tsits**irízo* 'sizzle, torment slowly', ***tsu**ruflízo* 'singe', ***tsí**kna* '(unpleasant) smell of meat or hair burning'

Greek *ts* can also occur in various perfectly ordinary words with no expressiveness to them at all, such as *étsi* 'so, thus', *tsiménto* 'cement', or *paputsi* 'shoe', and the same applies to *dz*, as it occurs in such nonaffective words as *dzámi* 'glass window' or *dzamí* 'mosque'. Still, the preponderance of their lexical occurrences is overwhelmingly in expressive words with affect such as those given in (3) above.

Overall, this lexical evidence shows that the affricates *ts*/*dz* figure heavily in expressiveness in Greek. There is, moreover, some corroborating evidence along a few different fronts.

First, several of the words in (3) and (4) pass the *to lei ke i leksi* test discussed in Section 2, and thus seem to be expressive. For instance, *kritsanízo* 'I crunch' is derived from the onomatope *kríts-kríts* for a crunchy noise and contains *ts*; a nearly synonymous verb, *trayanízo*, lacks the *ts*. *Kritsanizo*, however, passes the *to lei ke i leksi* test whereas *trayanízo* fails the test.[14] The same holds for *tsitsíði* '(stark) naked' as compared to its virtual synonym *jimnós*, or *dzudzés* 'dwarf' as compared to its virtual synonym *nános*. Thus, this Greek-particular test for iconicity offers a window into expressiveness that takes in words with *ts* and excludes synonyms that lack *ts*.

Second, evidence for a special expressive status for *ts* and *dz* can be gleaned from frequency statistics. According to two different phoneme frequency counts, those of Mirambel (1959) and Householder et al. (1964), *ts* and *dz* are the two least frequent sounds in Greek with a rate of occurrence of 0.07%. However, in corpora of inherently expressive material, the rate of occurrence is massively higher: in the collection of onomatopes and interjections in Householder et al. (1964), the frequency of *ts* and *dz* is 4.1%, and in a collection of hypocoristic nicknames (Lorendzatos 1923) the frequency is 6.4%.

Finally, Greek speakers interviewed in connection with the *to lei ke i leksi* test (see footnote 14) occasionally had very telling comments to make. One interviewee, for instance, said that she had always 'disliked' the sound [ts], and attributed her dislike to 'aesthetic reasons'. The invocation of an affect such as 'liking' with regard to a sound is interesting in itself, but for it to be backed up by essentially emotive factors such as aesthetics suggests that there is something going on here that goes beyond mere denotation; the sound itself is highly connotative to this speaker. Similarly, another speaker, when queried about *dzudzés* 'dwarf', a word which passed the *to lei ke i leksi* test for him, expanded on that result by saying that *dzudzés* for him summoned up an image of a morally corrupt and thoroughly awful person, someone small in character as well as size, whereas *nános* was simply a dwarf. Once again, affect and emotion figure in the assessment of the word with the affricate.

All in all, then, it seems safe to conclude that Greek *ts* and *dz* are prime phonic indicators of expressiveness in Greek. All of the available evidence points in that direction. I turn now to evidence from other languages.

14. By 'pass' or 'fail' the test here, I mean that native Greek speakers whom I consulted in interview settings in 1984 and 1985 while doing fieldwork in Greece and in the United States reported to me, when asked, their judgment that one could say *to lei ke i leksi* about this word but not about that word. Thus the test was operationalized in terms of reactions speakers had to the specific application of this phrase to a particular word.

4. The Albanian evidence

Curtis (2010) has argued for an expressive status in Albanian for the strident palatal voiced affricate ([dʒ]) spelled < xh > in Albanian orthography, along lines similar to what is seen in Greek for *ts* and *dz*. That is, Curtis shows that the primary lexical occurrences of *xh* come in onomatopoeia and expressive, sometimes reduplicative, formations, as in the following, from Newmark (1998):

(5) *xhagajdur* 'cocky braggard who goes around looking for a fight; bully'
xhahil '(person) who is ignorant, backward, uncultured and thickheaded'
xhambaz 'swindler, con-artist'
xhaxhi 'child's term of affectionate respect for a man'
xhingërrima 'baubles, trifles, trivia'
xhingla-mingla 'trifles, trivia; small ornaments, baubles'
xhingël 'spangle'
xhixhë 'glittering bauble'
xhixhëlloj 'glitter, glisten'
xhixhëllojë 'firefly, glowworm'
xhuxh 'dwarf'
xhuxhmaxhuxh 'very short old man [in folklore] with a long beard who lives underground; dwarf'

Moreover, a similar argument can be made for the Albanian voiced dental affricate ([dᶻ]), a sound spelled < x > in Albanian orthography; the following words, all with some sort of affect associated with their meanings, are representative of words with initial *x*:

(6) *xanxar* '(entity) with bad habits; naughty person'
xarbaxul 'shabbily dressed and dirty person'
xexerica 'claptrap, nonsense'
xixëlloj 'sparkle, twinkle'
xixë 'spark; sparkle'
xixëllim 'sparkling'
xixëlloj 'give off sparks; sparkle, twinkle'
xixëllonjë 'firefly; glowworm'
xixërij '(of flames) spurt and give off sparks'
xixoj 'give off sparks; spark'
xixërimë 'crackling sound (of wood giving off sparks)'
xuq 'shrivelled-up old person who can barely speak'
xurxull 'soaked from head to toe; stone drunk, soused'
xa 'here you are!'

< xh > and < x > in non-initial position do occur outside of such expressive lexemes, but word-initially, they are rare outside of such words (or loanwords). Thus, their distribution is somewhat freer than the comparable sounds in Greek. Still, as in Greek, the expressivity of the sounds in question comes largely through their concentration of occurrence in expressive lexical items.

Thus, there is a striking parallelism in Greek and Albanian regarding the phonosemantic functional value, i.e. the expressivity, of their coronal affricates.

5. The role of language contact: Loans and Turkish evidence

Some of the words with these affricates in both Greek and Albanian derive from native sources or can be explained on language-internal grounds. For instance, among the *ts*/*dz* words in Greek, the following have reasonable etymologies from earlier Greek (Ancient, Post-Classical, or Medieval Greek) sources:

(7) *tsúzo* 'sting' < Ancient Greek *sizō* 'steam, hiss'
tsirízo 'screech' < Ancient Greek *syrizō* 'whistle'
tsíkna 'smell of meat or hair burning' < Ancient Greek *knîsa* 'savour of burnt offerings'
tsim(b)úri 'tick' < earlier Greek *kimmúros* '(one who) counts trifles'
tsíxla 'thin woman' < Ancient Greek *kíkhlē* 'thrush'
tsirós 'thin person' < Ancient Greek *kirrís* 'sea-fish'
tsevðós 'lisping' < Ancient *pseudḗs* 'false'

And, as for the words with *xh* and *x* in Albanian, an internal origin can be presumed for *xhingël* 'spangle', *xhixhë* 'glittering bauble' *xhixhëlloj* 'glitter, glisten', *xixëlloj* 'sparkle, twinkle', and *xixërimë* 'crackling sound (of wood giving off sparks)' in terms of a derivation via Albanian-internal onomatopoeia.

Admittedly, some of the changes involved in Greek *ts* and *dz* are not regular sound changes, but may reflect developments in certain dialects, specifically those where the sound change known as *tsitakismos* – the emergence of [ts] – is regular; that is, they may well involve dialect borrowing. Invoking dialect borrowing means that some of these words may reflect, internally within Greek, a kind of diffusion through contact.

But there is also contact completely external to the language that seems to have played a role, in two ways in both languages. First, of the lexical items with *ts*/*dz* in Greek and *xh*/*x* in Albanian, several are loan words, mostly from Turkish but also from other languages; a sampling is given in (8):

(8) Grk *tsapatsúlis* / Alb *xarbacul* < Turkish *çapaçul* 'untidy, slovenly'
Grk *dzudzés* / Alb *xhuxh* < Turkish *cüce* 'dwarf'
Grk *tsatízo* < Turkish *çatışmak* 'to quarrel'
Grk *tsíma tsíma* < Italian *cima* 'top'

Especially with Turkish items, it is highly relevant that there is a general lower stylistic status for Turkish words in Greek and in the Balkans in general, as Kazazis (1972) has argued. Lower stylistic status can mean a greater degree of colloquialness and informal status. Expressiveness comes into play here since colloquial language tends to be more expressive and more colorful, less purely denotational and more nuanced with connotation. This means that these borrowings would naturally have fit into the system marked for expressiveness, and the sounds in such words would thus be prime candidates for taking on an expressive function in and of themselves.

Thus, the Greek and Albanian lexicons, which already contained some expressive affricate elements from internal sources, were enriched by these importations into the native system, by borrowings that were literally 'exotic' elements, coming in from outside the system. The presence of these loans can be surmised to have interacted with the presence of already existing words with these sounds, reinforcing them and strengthening the functional, phonosemantic value of the affricates as expressive.

The scenario envisioned here is rather like the situation with English words in [–æg] (Hock and Joseph [1996/2009: Chap. 9], drawing on Samuels 1972), where a combination of native and borrowed words clustered to create a limited sound symbol, with a group of words all having something to do with slowness, fatigue, or tedium:

(9) *drag* 'lag behind' < ME *draggen* < OE *dragan* or ON *draga* 'drag, pull'
fag 'exhaust, weary, grow weary', presumably < ME *fagge* 'droop'
flag 'hang limply; droop', probably of Scandinavian origin, from a word akin to Old Norse *flögra* 'flap about'
lag 'fail to keep up; straggle' < earlier English *lag* 'last person', ME *lag-* 'last', possibly from Scandinavian

As noted in (9), these four words go back to earlier forms, some native and some borrowed, which already contained *-ag* and were semantically related. One more word, though, is relevant here: *sag* 'sink; droop' from earlier *sacke* (of Scandinavian origin, cf. Swed. *sacka* '(to) sink'). It gives direct evidence for the sound symbol, showing that those four words cohered as a cluster of related forms, for it joins the other four phonically, changing its final *-k-* to *-g-*, and thus matching the others in form just as it matches them in its 'fatigue/slow'-like semantics. This sound symbol, therefore, already built on native and foreign material, drew another word with a

relevant shape and meaning into its 'orbit', further enhancing its expressive value by expanding its 'membership'. A similar sort of scenario can be posited for Greek and Albanian, given the various sources of their affective and expressive affricates.

A second way in which contact may have been involved is less direct than borrowings. Marchand (1953: 59) has claimed that Turkish voiceless and voiced palatal affricates *ç*/*c* occur in several words that are *lautsymbolisch*, 'sound symbolic', e.g. words for murmured and vibrating noises, and in words of 'affective' origin, e.g. onomatopoetic roots like *cıvıl-* 'twitter' and *çatır-* 'crunch', pet names (hypocoristics) like *cici*, and conventionalized child-language forms like *çiş* 'peepee'. Thus, *ç*/*c* have a distribution in Turkish and serve a function in that language similar to that of *ts*/*dz* in Greek or *xh*/*x* in Albanian.

It would seem, therefore, that the expressive function that these Turkish sounds are associated with could have diffused into other languages, through the medium of speakers who were bilingual to some degree, and familiar enough with the words that contain these sounds. This value could then have been taken up by Greek and Albanian speakers, infusing their own affricates with this Turkish special 'flavor'. Relevant here are the loanword evidence and the general low-style status of Turkisms in the Balkans. In this way, the Turkish value of the affricates would have been something like a model for Greek and Albanian speakers, reinforcing the value that was emerging in each language from the lexical clustering discussed above.

Another dimension to the role of foreign elements may well have been a factor, too. Expressiveness in a certain sense resides in being out of the ordinary, in being striking and attention-grabbing in some way. Foreign elements by definition are extra-ordinary, literally, as well as 'exotic', again literally, and they typically fall outside of the usual patterns of the recipient language system. Of necessity, therefore, they carry a certain marked and special character to them, a markedness which could have manifested itself in expressiveness, especially in an emerging phonosemantic system of affricate-based expressivity.

One additional Balkan language group has some relevance here in that Balkan Slavic also participates in a limited way in the special value of affricates. As it happens, the voiceless affricates [t^{s}] and [t^{ʃ}] are quite common in Balkan Slavic in all types of words, as they are the outcome of earlier *k* in different environments. However, the voiced affricate *dz* is quite rare in Bulgarian and some of the relatively few lexical occurrences of *dz* are in onomatopoeia, e.g. *dzânkam* 'tinkle, jingle'. Moreover, the affricate *dž* in Macedonian, as a variant of *ž*, is said to have an "expressive effect" when it occurs (Friedman 2002: 10).

6. Conclusion

The types of lexical items focused on here, sound symbols, onomatopes, interjections, calls to animals, slang, and so on, might seem like a disparate set of lexical types, but they are all linked by their expressive character and by the fact that they often stand outside of the usual structuring of language, therefore representing ways in which lexical items are nonarbitrary (iconic) and thus noncanonical. The occurrence of loanwords in some of these groups is consistent with this characterization, since by definition loanwords stand outside of the native system, at least in their first appearance.

Thus, to return, by way of conclusion, to Weinreich's observation about the effects of language contact on expressivity, the evidence from the Balkans confirms his claim that contact between languages can lead to an enhanced range of expressivity for the speakers and thus can add to a given language system's overall expressive power. However, contact can do this not just by giving speakers more choices. Rather, just as has been reported on for certain instances of grammatical borrowing, e.g. by Friedman (2006) regarding the emergence of evidentiality in the grammar of Balkan Slavic under Turkish influence through the enhancement of pre-existing characteristics, this outcome can be achieved also through the amplification of tendencies already present in the receiving language and through the diffusion of affective lexemes and their affective value across the languages involved.

References

Curtis, M. C. 2010. *Xhorxh, xhuxhmaxhuxh* and the *xhaxhallerë*: The xenophonemic status of Albanian /xh/. *Balkanistica* 23: 67–96.

de Saussure, F. 1916. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.

Faye, C. U. 1923–5. The influence of "Hlonipa" on the Zulu clicks. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 3: 757–782. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00000471

Fischer, O. 2011. Cognitive iconic grounding of reduplication in language. In *Semblance and Signification*, Michelucci, P., Fischer, O., & Ljungberg, C. (eds), 55–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ill.10.04fis

Fónagy, I. 1999. Why iconicity? In *Form Miming Meaning*, Nänny, M. & Fischer, O. (eds), 3–36. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ill.1.06fon

Fónagy, I. 2001. *Languages within Language. An Evolutive Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/fos.13

Friedman, V. A. 2002. *Macedonian* (LOM/117). Munich: Lincom Europa.

Friedman, V. A. 2006. The Balkans as a linguistic area. In *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1, K. Brown (ed.), 657–72. Oxford: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00178-4

Friedman, V. A. & Joseph, B. D. 2020. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herbert, R. K. 1990a. *Hlonipha* and the ambiguous woman. *Anthropos* 85: 455–473.

Herbert, R. K. 1990b. The relative markedness of click sounds: Evidence from language change, acquisition, and avoidance. *Anthropological Linguistics* 32: 120–138.

Hinton, L., Nichols, J. & Ohala, J. 1994. Introduction: Sound symbolic processes. In *Sound Symbolism*, Hinton, L., Nichols, J., & Ohala, J. (eds), 1–13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hock, H. H. & Joseph, B. D. 1996/2009. *Language Change, Language History, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (1st edn., 1996; 2nd edn., 2009).

Householder, F. W., Kazazis, K., & Koutsoudas, A. 1964. *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki*. (*International Journal of American Linguistics* 30: 2/Publication 31 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.) Bloomington: Indiana University.

Joseph, B. D. 1982. Ya tin idieteri θesi tu [ts]/[dz] stin eliniki fonologia [On the special status of [ts]/[dz] in Greek phonology]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 1982 [1985]*, 227–235. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Joseph, B. D. 1983. Language use in the Balkans – The contributions of historical linguistics. *Anthropological Linguistics* 25: 275–287.

Joseph, B. D. 1984. Balkan expressive and affective phonology – The case of Greek *ts/dz*. In *Papers for the V. Congress of Southeast European Studies (Belgrade, September 1984)*, Shangriladze, K. and Townsend, E. (eds), 227–237. Slavica Publishers (for the US National Committee of the AIESEE).

Joseph, B. D. 1987. On the use of iconic elements in etymological investigation: Some case studies from Greek. *Diachronica* 4: 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.4.1-2.02jos

Joseph, B. D. 1994. Modern Greek *ts*: Beyond sound symbolism. In *Sound Symbolism*, L. Hinton, Nichols, J., & Ohala, J. (eds), 222–236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, B. D. 1997. On the linguistics of marginality: The centrality of the periphery. In *Papers from the 33rd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Anderson, G., et al. (eds), 197–213. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Jurafsky, D. 1996. Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language* 72: 533–578. https://doi.org/10.2307/416278

Kazazis, K. 1972. The status of Turkisms in the present-day Balkan languages. In *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Balkan Conference Held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969*, Birnbaum, H. & Vryonis, Jr., S. (eds), 87–116. The Hague: Mouton.

Klamer, M. 2002. Semantically motivated lexical patterns: A study of Dutch and Kambera expressives. *Language* 78: 258–286. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2002.0101

Lorendzatos, P. 1923. Simvoli is ta neoelinika paronimia. *Leksikografikon arxion tis mesis ke neas elnikis* 6: 40–71.

Marchand, H. 1953. Die Bildung der lautsymbolischen Wörter im Türkischen. *Oriens* 6: 50–62.

McCarthy, J. 1982. Prosodic structure and expletive infixation. *Language* 63: 574–590 https://doi.org/10.2307/413849

McLuhan, M. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: Mentor.

Mirambel, A. 1959. *La langue grecque moderne: description et analyse*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Mitchell, D. 2019. *Verbal -s in AAVE: Affect, Aspect, Dialectology, and Perceptions*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Mithun, M. 1982. The synchronic and diachronic behavior of plops, squeaks, croaks, sighs and moans. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48: 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1086/465712

Newmark, L. 1998. *Oxford Albanian-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nichols, J. 1971. Diminutive consonant symbolism in western North America. *Language* 47: 826–848. https://doi.org/10.2307/412159

Preston, D. 2003. Language with an attitude. In *Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, P., & Schilling-Estes, N. (eds), Chap. 2. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sadowski, P. 2001. The sound as echo to the sense: The iconicity of English *gl-* words. In *The Motivated Sign*, Fischer, O. & Nänny, M. (eds), 69–88. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ill.2.09sad

Samuels, M. 1972. *Linguistic Evolution, with Special Reference to English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139086707

Shinohara, K. & Kawahara, S. 2010. A cross-linguistic study of sound symbolism: The images of size. *Berkeley Linguistics Society 2010*, 396–410. (http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/bls.v36i1.3926, published by the Linguistic Society of America.)

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wescott, R. 1975. Allolinguistics: Exploring the peripheries of speech. In *The Second LACUS Forum*, Reich, P. (ed), 497–513. Columbia: The Hornbeam Press.