Affective sound-changes

E. Kruisinga

To cite this article: E. Kruisinga (1921) Affective sound#changes, English Studies, 3:1-6, 7-9, DOI: [10.1080/00138382108596412](https://doi.org/10.1080/00138382108596412)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00138382108596412>

Published online: 13 Aug 2008.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 3

View related articles [↗](#)

Some Books to be Consulted.

Francis Gummere,	<i>The Beginnings of Poetry.</i>
Karl Bücher,	<i>Arbeit und Rhythmus.</i>
Frank Sidgwick,	<i>The Ballad.</i>
T. F. Henderson,	<i>The Ballad in Literature.</i>

Affective Sound-Changes.

It has sometimes been suggested that exceptions to laws of sound-change may be due to the emotional value of a word, which affects its pronunciation. Phoneticians do not seem to have taken to the idea. In the third edition of my *English Sounds* (§ 262) I have proposed affective lengthening as the explanation of the statements made by English phoneticians, that *glad*, *mad*, *sad*, *bad* have a longer vowel than *cad*, *lad*, etc.

In Wells, *Joan and Peter*, ch. 2, § 1, p. 20, I found the following example.

Mrs. Bagshot-Fawcett gets positively lush about him. It was George she always *lurved*, Mrs. Bagshot-Fawcett says, but she (i.e. the Princess) accepted his brother for Reasons of State.

In this case *lurve* seems to be an example of affective (and at the same time affected) lengthening.

A case of affective rounding is supplied by Dutch [nø] for [ne] *nee*. The rounding and pointing of the lips, characteristic of indifference, causes the change.

It seems to me, however, that the theory of affective sound-changes may explain more than such occasional deviations from regular development. In order to explain this I must first discuss the question of breath and voice.

In old-fashioned grammars, if they treated of sounds at all, such consonants as *p*, *t*, *k*, *f*, etc. were often called *hard*, in contrast to *b*, *d*, *g*, *v*, which were called *soft*. A definition of the difference was not given, for the distinction was based on a rather vague acoustic impression, as was usual before the advent of modern phonetics. The distinction of hard and soft came to be pushed into the background; indeed, the success of the English school of phoneticians seemed to have finally disposed of it as unscientific. There is not a word on it in Sweet's books on phonetics. Continental phoneticians, however, were bound to consider the difference, for they found that hard and soft in the languages they studied was by no means invariably equivalent to breathed and voiced. Rousselot, to begin by quoting a Frenchman, in his *Précis de la Prononciation française* (1903) p. 50 explains: "Une consonne est *douce* ou *forte* en raison de l'intensité relative de l'effort articulaire nécessaire pour la produire..... Comparez encore, en plaçant le doigt entre les lèvres, *v* et *f*, *b* et *p*: *v* et *b* sont des douces; *f* et *p*, des fortes. Comme, dans la sonore ¹⁾ l'effort se partage entre le larynx et l'organe articulateur (lèvres ou langue) la sonore est toujours une douce. Mais la douce n'est pas toujours une sonore. De même, la forte est naturellement sourde, l'effort articulaire s'opposant à l'action du larynx."

The distinction is of practical use, as is shown on p. 85: "La forte qui devient sonore se transforme par le fait même en douce. Mais la douce

¹⁾ i.e. voiced consonant.

qui s'assourdit devient-elle de même une forte, en sorte que *d*, par exemple dans *médecin*, se transforme en *t* au contact de l's [metsə], et *v* en *f* dans *pauvre femme* (poʁ fam)? Cette seconde étape est voisine de la première, et elle peut être franchie aisément. Cependant elle ne l'a pas encore été, au moins dans le Centre de la France."

The same explanation of the difference is given by Meillet (*Langues indo-européennes*), but he seems to limit the distinction to stops: "Si la pression exercée par la langue ou par les lèvres pour réaliser l'occlusion est intense, les occlusives sont dites *fortes*, ainsi *p, t, k*, en français; si la pression est faible, elles sont dites *douces*, ainsi *b, d, g*, en français..... Les sonores sont toujours douces et les fortes sont toujours sourdes mais l'inverse n'est pas vrai; les Alsaciens par exemple ont des douces qui ne sont pas sonores."

The distinction is easy to observe. Indeed, it is possible to see from the position of the lips whether a person is going to say *p* or *b*. Perhaps, too, the distinction is clearest in the stops. This would explain why it is far more usual for phoneticians to make the distinction with regard to these only; in this case the usual terms are *fortis* and *lenis*. The best treatment of these sounds is by Jespersen in his *Lehrbuch*.

It seems to me, however, that the distinction should be made with regard to the open consonants as well. As *fortis* and *lenis* suggest stops, it would be better to use other terms. Hard and soft are not quite satisfactory because they are also used in other meanings. The terms *strong* and *weak* seem to be suitable, as they suggest that the difference is in the energy of articulation. To prevent misunderstanding it may not be superfluous to point out that strong and weak are not meant to supersede breathed and voiced. The systematic examination of the glottis is one of the advantages of the English phoneticians, and it is an advantage that should not be given up. But the acoustic distinction of *strong* and *weak*, even if of secondary importance, should be made use of. This can be done in Dutch. It is usual, in Dutch, to distinguish breathed *f, s* from voiced *v, z*. This is perfectly clear when the sounds are medial. But initial *v* and *z* are half-voiced; yet they are clearly different from *f* and *s*. Is this really due to the voiced part of these consonants? ¹⁾ Besides, there is another pair of open sounds: [x, ɣ] in *lach, wagen*. But initial [ɣ], as in *goed* is certainly not voiced, nor does it seem to me half-voiced. I believe it is completely breathed. Yet, the sound is not the same as [x]. I think [ɣ] in *goed* must be called a weak but breathed back open consonant. We also have weak but breathed stops in Dutch in the first part of a compound ending in a breathed stop if the second part begins with a voiced (weak) stop: *zetbaas, dikbuik*.

If we accept the existence in Dutch of strong (breathed) and weak (breathed or voiced) consonants, it seems possible to account for some facts that have not yet been satisfactorily explained.

Although *vies*, like other words beginning with *v*, is generally pronounced with a weak (half-voiced) *v*, it is pronounced with *f* in the exclamatory *Hoe vies!* It seems natural to explain the strong *f* as the result of the strong stress. Similarly strong [x], instead of the weak [ɣ], is often heard in the exclamation *goeie hemel!* and in the oath *godverdonime!*

It has occurred to me that there is another case that can now be explained. The emphatic imperative is expressed in Dutch by the particle *toe*: *Toe, zeg het me nou*. The word is not to be found in Van Wijk's *Etym. Woordenboek*.

¹⁾ In this respect (i. e. voice) English initial *d* is practically, perhaps even completely, identical with Dutch *t* (see *English Sounds*, § 107). Yet the sounds are different.

But it seems quite probable that *toe* is nothing but the imperative *doe*¹⁾. If this can be shown to be correct, it would be possible to explain the *t* as a case of affective unvoicing. Of course, it would also be possible to account for *t* differently. For it is usual in cases of initial unvoicing to call in the help of sandhi. And a combination like *och toe* is soon found. In the same way *toch* (instead of the regular *doch*) is explained, also *toen* (instead of *doen*, which occurs in older Dutch). But I must say that this explanation seems hardly satisfactory, for it is not easy to see why these forms with a preceding word ending in a consonant should have driven out the forms with initial *d*. It is hardly likely that *och toe* is more frequent than *toe*, in the imperative.

Since writing the above I had occasion to look at Scharpé's *Nederlandsche Uitspraakleer* (Lier, 1912). In § 119 he states a change of "normally lax" consonants to "tense" owing to "intensive" pronunciation. Among the examples are *dagelijks*, pronounced [da:xələks], and even [ta:xələks]; also *doe dat* [tu' dat].

If the explanations offered are accepted, we shall have to speak of affective lengthening, affective rounding, and affective strengthening.

E. KRUISINGA.

Notes and News.

English Association in Holland. The first series of lectures, delivered by Mr. John Drinkwater in the latter part of November, at The Hague, Haarlem, Groningen and Rotterdam, was very successful. All accounts received are highly appreciative, alike as regards contents, form and delivery. Mr. Drinkwater has been good enough to place a précis at the disposal of the Association, which is here reproduced.

"His subject was the nature of art — the arts in general, not one art in particular — and the value of the artist's work to the world at large. This, he said, was a subject that had no national frontiers — it was of universal significance. Every artist had to ask himself what was the virtue in art that would justify a man in devoting his whole life and energy to its service, and in claiming that his work was of sufficient importance to enable him to demand that society should support him in return for it. Mr. Drinkwater's own answer to the question was that every mind in the world is engaged all the time in absorbing great volumes of experience from contact with men and women and the affairs of life. This experience as it comes into each mind is chaotic, unshaped, and while it is so it remains unintelligible. The deepest hunger in every mind, suggested Mr. Drinkwater, was to understand its own experience, and it was at this point that the artist's work came in. The artist was in no way different from his fellows, save that in him this hunger for understanding experience was more acute than was common, and he realised that the only way of making the confusion of his mind intelligible was to find for it clear and definite shapes or forms. That was what art was, a poem or a picture or a symphony was just a piece of shapeless experience put into definite shape. The artist in the first place

¹⁾ I seem to remember reading this form, but cannot verify it. I hope my readers will excuse me if I leave this part of the question to historical students of Dutch.