EUPHONY IN WORLD LANGUAGES

YURI TAMBOVTSEV

ABSTRACT. Yuri Tambovtsev. *Euphony in World Languages*. Lingua Posnaniensis, vol. LII (1)/2010. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-030-6, pp. 99–111

There are many languages in the world but every language has its own sound picture. By the sound picture of a language we mean the distribution of its speech sounds in the speech sound chain. It is very interesting to find the languages which are melodical or euphonic and which are not. Melodicity or euphony is the total of the vowels and sonorant consonants in the speech sound chain of a language. It is also possible to call this total the vocalo-sonorant quotient. Thus, the degree of melodicity is the value of this quotient.

Vowels and sonorant consonants constitute the vocalo-sonorant structure of the sound picture of any language. We take into consideration the basic features of sound classes and groups. The basic features consist of the frequency of occurrence of vowels and sonorant consonants in the speech chain. These basic features may be found in any world language. This is why, melodicity is one more language universal. Analysing the value of melodicity, one can construct the typology of distribution of language taxa according to this universal characteristic.

Austronesian languages have a great concentration of vowels in the speech sound chain (e.g. maximum – 65.24% in Hawaiian and 69.75% in Samoan).

Vocalo-sonorant quotient turned out to be bigger in the following language taxa: Sino-Tibetan family (Burmese – 75.67%), Bantu (Swahili – 76.29%), Afro-Asian family (Neo-Aramaic – 81.47%), Austronesian family (Hawaiian – 83.29%), languages of Australian aboriginals – Nunggubuyu – 85.14%). It means that 85.14% of the Nunggubuyu speech sound chain consists of vowels and sonorant consonants.

On the other hand, some of the world languages have the minimum of the concentration of vowels. So, in the Itelmen language (Paleo-Asiatic family) vowels comprise only 32.61%.

Let us consider the minimum of the vocalo-sonorant quotient. Thus, in the Adygian language (Caucasian family) this quotient reaches only 54.07%.

It should be mentioned that on the average the Caucasian language family has a rather low vocalo-sonorant quotient – 61.66%. The ordered series of the average of the vocalo-sonorant quotient in different language taxa is the following: Baltic group of Indo-European family – 62.76%; Iranian group of the Indo-European family – 63.95%); Slavonic group – 64.64%; Germanic – 64.78%; Samoyedic family – 65.16%; Finno-Ugric family – 65.57%; Mongolic family – 66.06%; Balkan language unity – 66.18%; Indic group of the Indo-European family – 66.77%; Turkic family – 66.99%; Paleo-Asiatic family – 67.58%; Sino-Tebetan family – 67.63%; Roman group of I-E family – 68.57%; Afro-Asiatic family – 68.96%; Manchu-Tungusic family – 69.54%; Austronesian family – 73.16%; Bantu – 73.40%; Languages of Australian aboriginals – 80.51%.

Melodicity, i.e. the total of vowels and sonorant consonants, may be considered a language universal.

Yuri Tambovtsev, Department of English and Linguistics, Novosibirsk Pedagogical University, P. O. Box 104, Novosibirsk-123, 630123 Russia

There are many languages in the world but every language has its own sound picture. By the sound picture of a language we mean the distribution of its speech sounds in the speech sound chain. It is very interesting to find the languages which are melodical or euphonic and which are not. By the degree of euphony we mean the total of the frequency of occurrence of the vowels and sonorant consonants in the language speech sound chain.

The goal of this paper is to compare the value of melodicity or euphony in different languages. It is important to find the maximum and minimum of euphony in the 226 world languages taken for this study. World languages are united in various language taxa. Therefore, one can estimate the degree of the euphony of this or that language taxa by its mean.

It is also possible to call euphony as the vocalo-sonorant quotient. Thus, the degree of melodicity or euphony is the value of this quotient.

Vowels and sonorant consonants constitute the vocalo-sonorant structure of the sound picture of any language. We take into consideration the basic features of sound classes and groups. The basic features consist of the frequency of occurrence of vowels and sonorant consonants in the speech chain. These basic features may be found in any world language. This is why, melodicity is one more language universal. It is possible to call it a language universal since a language universal is a property claimed to be characteristic of all languages (CRYSTAL 1992: 405). Analysing the value of melodicity or euphony, one can construct the typology of distribution of language taxa according to this universal characteristic. We analysed the melodicity in nearly all language groups and families of world languages. Language subgroups, groups, unities or phyla can be in general called language taxa. Let us mention the examined language taxa in the alphabetic order: Afro-Asiatic family; Austronesian family; Balkan language union; Baltic group of the Indo-European family; Caucasian family; Finno-Ugric family; Germanic group of the Indo-European family; Indic group of the Indo-European family; Iranian group of the Indo-European family; Manchu-Tungusic family; Paleo-Asiatic family; Romance group of the Indo-European family; Samoyedic family; Sino-Tibetan family; Turkic; set of American Indian languages; set of Australian aboriginal languages; set of Bantu and some other African languages; Slavonic group of the Indo-European family; some isolated languages.

Melodicity is close to the notion of euphony in poetry (TAMBOVTSEV 1979). Usually, melodicity or euphony of a speech sound chain means the degree of beauty it bears. However, until now nobody tried to measure the degree of melodicity (i.e. euphony) of a language in the exact numbers by one and the same method. We proposed to measure the degree of melodicity of a language on the basis of the most melodical elements of the sound speech chain that is vowels and sonorant consonants long ago (TAMBOVTSEV 1977). Usually, when a euphonic language comes to mind, Italian is named. Our measurements showed that Italian is not a world champion in the degree of euphony since its value is 69.53%. However, it is not even the champion in its own group of Romance languages. In fact, its degree of euphony is less than that of Romanian – 69.91% in the group of the Romance group of Indo-European family, not to speak of many others in other language taxa (see Tab. 1–21).

We can calculate the theoretical expected frequency of melodicity in a language. If we follow the way a great American mathematician G. Polya proposed to find the theoretical expected frequency of a linguistic element, then we must know the number of the groups. When G. Polya wanted to know the theoretical expected frequency of a letter, he divided

T a b l e   1. Melodicity of the languages of the Turkic language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Altaic (Chalkan)	42.26	20.57	62.83
2.	Shor	41.07	22.62	63.69
3.	Kumandin	41.65	22.18	63.83
4.	Sary-Ujgur	40.93	23.44	64.37
5.	Altaic (Kizhi)	41.52	23.63	65.15
6.	Hakas	41.75	23.47	65.22
7.	Tatar (Chulym)	41.07	24.17	65.24
8.	Tuvin	41.62	23.89	65.51
9.	Dolgan	42.87	23.03	65.90
10.	Kazah	42.84	23.20	66.04
11.	Tofalar	42.04	24.23	66.27
12.	Kirgiz	42.37	24.31	66.68
13.	Chuvash	41.96	24.90	66.86
14.	Jakut	42.64	24.29	66.93
15.	Uzbek	41.92	25.24	67.16
16.	Ujgur	42.77	24.40	67.17
17.	Turkish	42.63	24.89	67.52
18.	Bashkir	42.37	25.90	68.27
19.	Tatar (Baraba)	42.88	25.73	68.61
20.	Tatar (Krym)	42.34	26.29	68.63
21.	Tatar (Kazan)	42.34	26.54	68.88
22.	Turkmen	42.23	27.26	69.49
23.	Azerbajdzhan	42.92	26.66	69.58
24.	Karachaevo-Balkar	42.23	27.48	69.71
25.	Karakalpak	39.89	30.68	70.57
26.	Salar	47.27	24.48	71.75
Mean		42.25	24.65	66.99
Standard (S)		1.25	2.02	2.25
Coefficient of variation (V%)		2.96	8.18	3.36
(Old Turkish)		42.55	24.04	66.59

T a b l e   2. Melodicity of the languages of the Mongolian language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Kalmyk	40.22	24.44	64.66
2.	Halha-Mongolian	43.11	23.56	66.67
3.	Buriat	45.45	21.39	66.84
Mean		42.93	23.13	66.06
Standard (S)		2.62	1.57	1.21
Coefficient of variation (V%)		6.10	6.79	1.83

T a b l e 3. Melodicity of the languages of the Manchu-Tungusic language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Oroch	48.90	17.19	66.09
2.	Nanaj	47.62	20.05	67.67
3.	Negidal	43.47	25.29	68.76
4.	Orok	48.43	20.64	69.07
5.	Even (Lamut)	42.34	27.71	70.05
6.	Ul'ch	47.80	22.43	70.23
7.	Manchu	49.88	20.79	70.67
8.	Udeghe	50.48	20.83	71.31
9.	Even (Tungus)	43.66	28.32	71.98
Mean		46.95	22.58	69.54
Standard (S)		3.01	3.74	1.85
Coefficient of variation (V%)		6.41	16.56	2.66

T a b l e 4. Melodicity of the languages of the Finno-Ugric language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Veps	42.04	19.30	61.34
2.	Hanty (East)	40.02	21.83	61.85
3.	Mordovian (Moksha)	41.43	20.78	62.21
4.	Karelian (Ludik)	43.24	19.01	62.25
5.	Komi-Permian	41.76	20.79	62.55
6.	Komi-Zyrian	41.32	21.83	63.15
7.	Mordovian (Erzia)	40.30	23.37	63.67
8.	Saami (Lopari)	37.90	25.87	63.77
9.	Hungarian	41.98	22.53	64.51
10.	Vodian	44.10	20.71	64.81
11.	Mari (Lawn)	41.40	23.81	65.21
12.	Karelian (Livvik)	43.87	21.85	65.72
13.	Udmurt	41.22	25.10	66.32
14.	Mari (Mountain)	42.13	24.62	66.75
15.	Karelian (Tihvin)	45.30	21.73	67.03
16.	Mansi (Konda)	37.22	30.07	67.29
17.	Estonian	45.43	22.45	67.88
18.	Mansi (Northern)	38.93	32.03	70.96
19.	Hanty (Kazym)	40.36	30.96	71.32
20.	Finnish	49.53	23.32	72.85
Mean		41.97	23.56	65.57
Standard (S)		2.80	3.66	3.29
Coefficient of variation (V%)		6.67	15.52	5.02

100% by 26, because there were 26 letters in the inventory (POLYA 1954: 316–317). Since melodicity consists of the frequency of vowels, we must reserve 50% for vowels. The rest 50% out of 100%, we reserve for consonants. We have 3 groups of consonants defined from the point of view of the manner of articulation: sonorant, occlusive and fricative. Therefore, we must divide 50% by 3. In this way we obtain 16.67%. Thus, we reserve 16.67% for the sonorant consonants as the probable theoretical frequency in a language speech sound chain.

T a b l e 5. Melodicity of the languages of the Samoyedic language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Sel'kup	41.97	21.37	63.34
2.	Kamassin	41.21	24.21	65.42
3.	Nganasan	45.00	20.51	65.51
4.	Nenets	40.74	25.64	66.38
Mean		42.23	22.93	65.16
Standard (S)		1.91	2.40	1.29
Coefficient of variation (V%)		4.52	10.47	1.98

T a b l e 6. Melodicity of the languages of the Austronesian language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Indonesian	40.61	25.40	66.01
2.	Marquiz	57.42	9.41	66.83
3.	Dajak	46.51	22.50	69.01
4.	Uma	51.55	19.38	70.93
5.	Cebuano	45.86	25.83	71.69
6.	Tagalog	46.00	28.70	74.70
7.	Maori	57.70	18.20	75.90
8.	Samoa	69.75	10.32	80.07
9.	Hawaiian	65.24	18.05	83.29
Mean		53.40	19.75	73.16
Standard (S)		9.80	6.69	5.85
Coefficient of variation (V%)		18.35	33.87	8.02

T a b l e 7. Melodicity of the Bantu and some other languages of Africa

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Moore	41.53	29.37	70.90
2.	Wolof	41.38	29.69	71.07
3.	Tonga	46.16	25.92	72.08
4.	Fulde	44.38	27.86	72.24
5.	Luganda	46.99	25.37	72.36
6.	Kiniarwanda	48.10	24.62	72.72
7.	X'osa	48.83	24.22	73.05
8.	Tsewana	49.18	24.09	73.27
9.	Chichewa	47.80	25.93	73.73
10.	Zarma	45.93	28.15	74.08
11.	Lwo	48.83	25.89	74.72
12.	Bemba	49.06	26.26	75.32
13.	Hanga	48.18	27.57	75.75
14.	Swahili	49.85	26.44	76.29
Mean		46.87	26.53	73.40
Standard (S)		2.73	1.78	1.67
Coefficient of variation (V%)		5.82	6.71	2.28

T a b l e   8. Melodicity of the languages of the Sino-Tibetan language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Tibetan	34.17	22.33	56.50
2.	Chinese	44.41	23.54	67.95
3.	Dungan	43.63	24.57	68.20
4.	Thai	39.71	30.14	69.85
5.	Burmese	44.66	31.01	75.67
Mean		41.32	26.32	67.63
Standard (S)		4.46	3.98	6.96
Coefficient of variation (V%)		10.79	15.12	10.29

T a b l e   9. Melodicity of the languages of the Paleo-Asiatic language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Itel'men	32.61	26.91	59.52
2.	Eskimo (Naukan)	43.51	24.25	67.76
3.	Eskimo (Imaklin)	44.41	23.92	68.33
4.	Koriak	39.01	30.46	69.47
5.	Chukot	40.22	32.62	72.84
Mean		39.95	27.43	67.58
Standard (S)		4.67	3.90	4.92
Coefficient of variation (V%)		11.69	14.22	7.28

T a b l e   10. Melodicity of the languages of Australian aboriginals

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Ngandi	43.60	33.24	76.84
2.	Ngaanyatjarra	41.52	35.58	77.10
3.	Nyangumada	47.30	33.50	80.80
4.	Dyingili	47.13	34.14	81.27
5.	Mangarayi	42.44	39.49	81.93
6.	Nunggubuyu	50.66	34.48	85.14
Mean		45.44	35.07	80.51
Standard (S)		3.50	2.32	3.14
Coefficient of variation (V%)		7.70	6.60	3.90

Consequently, the euphony (melodicity) is equal to 50% + 16.67% = 66.75%. We can reason in the following way: if the value of the melodicity of some language is greater than 66.75%, then the language in question over-uses the vowels and sonorant consonants in its speech sound chain. It means that this language puts too great a load on vowels and sonorants. So, vowels and sonorants overrun the limits of the theoretical frequency, i.e. probability of occurrence. We can claim that they are over-exploited. In the ordered series of the Turkic languages (Tab. 1) Kirgiz is in the middle with the frequency of occurrence of 66.68%. It means that Chuvash, Jakut and the other Turkic language (Tab. 1) overload their speech sound chains. It is possible to call these languages melodical or euphonic from the point of view of Turkic languages. However, to understand what the euphony is in general, one

should take into account the mean degree of euphony in world languages. We found this euphonic mean in 226 world languages to be 67.03%. It is very close to the theoretical value 66.67%. To a human ear in general the languages with the euphony greater than 67.03% should sound beautifully (see Tab. 1–21). Consequently, Kirgiz with its vocalo-sonorant quotient (66.68%) cannot be recognised as a euphonic language from the point of view of world languages.

T a b l e   11. Melodicity of the languages of the Afro-Asian language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Sokotrian	40.01	20.31	60.32
2.	Arabic	39.47	25.17	64.64
3.	Assyrian	42.29	25.15	67.44
4.	Hebrew	43.90	23.58	67.48
5.	Somali	45.28	24.03	69.31
6.	Hausa	47.96	24.09	72.05
7.	Neo-Aramaic	59.10	22.37	81.47
Mean		45.43	23.53	68.96
Standard (S)		6.71	1.51	6.63
Coefficient of variation (V%)		14.77	7.27	9.61

T a b l e   12. Melodicity of the languages of the Caucasian language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Adygian	41.33	12.74	54.07
2.	Kabardian	45.07	15.55	60.62
3.	Abhaz	40.29	20.82	61.11
4.	Chechen	42.58	20.23	62.81
5.	Avarian	44.83	20.29	65.12
6.	Georgian	43.07	23.18	66.25
Mean		42.86	18.80	61.66
Standard (S)		1.89	3.87	4.32
Coefficient of variation (V%)		4.41	20.59	7.01

T a b l e   13. Melodicity of the languages of the Indic group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Gudjarati	40.70	24.44	65.14
2.	Hindi	43.64	22.27	65.91
3.	Bengali	42.42	23.58	66.00
4.	Gypsy	43.61	24.60	68.21
5.	Marathi	42.63	25.96	68.59
Mean		42.60	24.17	66.77
Standard (S)		1.20	1.36	1.53
Coefficient of variation (V%)		2.82	5.64	2.29

T a b l e 14. Melodicity of the languages of Iranian group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Tadjic	40.54	21.06	61.60
2.	Dari (Afganistan)	41.37	20.91	62.28
3.	Iranian	40.56	22.93	63.49
4.	Pushtu (Pashto)	41.11	22.90	64.01
5.	Osetian	41.35	22.91	64.26
6.	Gilian	43.10	21.94	65.04
7.	Talysh	45.14	19.99	65.13
8.	Kurdish	38.41	27.38	65.79
Mean		41.45	22.50	63.95
Standard (S)		1.98	2.25	1.44
Coefficient of variation (V%)		4.78	10.01	2.25

T a b l e 15. Melodicity of the languages of Slavonic group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Belorussian	39.96	20.70	60.66
2.	Polish	40.86	21.10	61.96
3.	Czech	41.20	21.39	62.59
4.	Macedonian	44.29	18.68	62.97
5.	Ukrainian	42.20	21.42	63.62
6.	Slovak	43.58	20.25	63.83
7.	Old Russian	44.57	19.44	64.01
8.	Russian	42.18	23.07	65.25
9.	Slovene	41.25	24.04	65.29
10.	Serbian	39.90	27.12	67.02
11.	Bulgarian	48.72	19.54	68.26
12.	Serbo-Croatian	45.13	25.06	70.19
Mean		42.82	21.82	64.64
Standard (S)		2.56	2.53	2.74
Coefficient of variation (V%)		5.98	11.59	4.24

T a b l e 16. Melodicity of the languages of the Baltic group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Lithuanian	42.02	19.38	61.40
2.	Latvian	44.63	19.48	64.11
Mean		43.33	19.43	62.76
Standard (S)		1.85	0.07	1.92
Coefficient of variation (V%)		4.27	0.36	3.06

T a b l e 17. Melodicity of the languages of the Romance group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	French	43.31	24.06	67.37
2.	Portuguese	44.74	22.67	67.41
3.	Moldavian	44.82	23.63	68.45
4.	Spanish	49.40	19.35	68.75
5.	Italian	44.53	24.99	69.52
6.	Rumanian	45.20	24.71	69.91
Mean		45.33	23.24	23.24
Standard (S)		2.09	2.07	1.05
Coefficient of variation (V%)		4.61	8.91	1.53

T a b l e 18. Melodicity of the languages of the Germanic group of the Indo-European language family

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	English	38.49	22.59	61.08
2.	Dutch	38.66	24.95	63.61
3.	German	38.72	25.18	63.90
4.	Swedish	38.60	26.60	65.20
5.	Danish	40.00	27.08	67.08
6.	Norwegian	44.70	23.10	67.80
Mean		39.86	24.92	64.78
Standard (S)		2.43	1.81	2.47
Coefficient of variation (V%)		6.10	7.26	3.81

T a b l e 19. Melodicity of the languages of the Balkan Language Union

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Albanian	38.45	18.11	56.56
2.	Greek	46.24	20.71	66.95
3.	Bulgarian	48.72	19.54	68.46
4.	Rumanian	47.95	20.77	68.72
5.	Serbo-Croatian	45.13	25.06	70.19
Mean		45.30	20.84	66.18
Standard (S)		4.08	2.60	5.50
Coefficient of variation (V%)		9.01	12.46	8.31

Why should we bother to spend so much time and energy to obtain the mean value of euphony in world languages? It is as simple as that: theoretical probability may be much greater or much lower than the real euphonic probability. It this case, the theoretical probability is rather close to the actual probability of euphony. It is just a lucky chance. Nevertheless, one can suppose that any human language tend to use enough of vowels and sonorant since it is easier to hear them in the conditions of bad communication.

Table 20. Melodicity of the languages of American Indians

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
			[%]	
1.	Kadiweu	35.73	19.50	55.23
2.	Oowekeeno	39.52	17.52	57.04
3.	Oneida	41.24	16.83	58.07
4.	Mam	35.90	22.33	58.23
5.	Haida	39.37	20.91	60.28
6.	Cocopa	34.76	26.21	60.97
7.	Totonac	38.29	22.90	61.19
8.	Kawasquar	39.25	22.20	61.45
9.	Huastec	38.47	23.36	61.83
10.	Capanahua	45.66	16.65	62.31
11.	Quiche	41.46	20.90	62.36
12.	Cofan	53.04	10.02	63.06
13.	Piratapuyo	50.70	13.01	63.71
14.	Jacoltek	39.61	24.20	63.81
15.	Sayula populuca	43.33	20.73	64.06
16.	Acateco	40.00	24.13	64.13
17.	Sweet Grass Cree	43.42	20.74	64.16
18.	Navaho	47.95	16.23	64.18
19.	Odjibwe	37.64	26.68	64.32
20.	Quequechi	40.06	24.84	64.90
21.	Pocomchi	41.71	24.35	66.06
22.	Tzutujil	43.53	23.17	66.70
23.	Nahuatl (Aztek)	42.41	24.86	67.27
24.	Secoya	51.43	16.63	68.06
25.	Kaiwa	55.75	13.19	68.94
26.	Guambiano	44.25	25.87	70.12
27.	Apinaye	41.42	29.19	70.61
28.	Kechua	44.49	26.79	71.28
29.	Inga	46.06	25.66	71.72
30.	Guarani	58.29	16.60	74.89
31.	Siriano	56.26	18.76	75.02
32.	Iquito	58.84	18.01	76.85
Mean		44.06	21.03	65.09
Standard (S)		6.68	4.60	5.29
Coefficient of variation (V%)		15.16	21.87	8.13

However, we agree to those linguists who object that theoretical probability of linguistic elements are too abstract to say anything about real world languages. This is why, a linguist must spend much time and effort to count the actual phonemic frequencies of occurrence in different languages to draw some solid conclusions about languages. Therefore, we had to calculate the empirical mean of the melodicity of 226 world languages which turned to be equal to 67.03% of the speech sound chain. We repeat this value because it is very important. It shows how a human language works. It is advisable to use the value of this characteristic to find out the melodic or euphonic languages in the mass of world languages. The mean melodicity of the 26 Turkic languages (Tab. 1) is a bit less than 67.03%. It is 66.99%. It means that on the average Turkic languages are not very melodical. However, the

Table 21. Melodicity of the Isolated languages

№	Language	Vowels	Sonorant	Melodicity
		[%]		
1.	Ainu			50.82
2.	Japanese			51.86
3.	Korean			53.73
4.	Greek			53.77
5.	Esperanto			54.12
6.	Ket (Yug)			56.36
7.	Armenian			59.41
8.	Albanian			61.55
9.	Yukaghir			61.62
10.	Nivhi			62.97

mean melodicity of Mongolian language family (66.06%) is even less than 67.03%. Thus, Mongolian languages under-use vowels and sonorant consonants in their speech sound chain (Tab. 2). Now let us consider what language taxa do not use enough euphonic elements in their speech sound chain. In fact, Caucasian (Tab. 12 – 61,66%), Finno-Ugric (Tab. 4 – 65.57%), Samoyedic (Tab. 5 – 65.16%) American Indian languages (Tab. 20 – 65.09%), Indic (Tab. 13 – 66.77%) also under-exploit vowels and sonorant consonants. This is just an example. One can see in detail which language taxa under-exploit in the ordered series of the means of euphony. We discuss it in detail later.

On the other hand, one can find individual languages in whose speech sound chain the vowels and sonorant consonants do not occur as often as 67.03%. One can analyse the ordered series of the Turkic languages taken for the study. Such languages as Tofalar, Kazah and the other Turkic languages whose vocalo-sonorant quotient is less than the threshold, under-exploit (under-use) vowels and sonorants. Thus, their vowels and sonorants do not occupy the speech sound chain in great numbers. It is possible to look through our tables (Tab. 1–21) in order to see the euphonic languages and those which cannot be called the euphonic languages by our classification.

The other important question is how close the euphonic values are crowded around the mean in this or that language taxa. That is, how high is the quotient of its compactness. It can be measured by the coefficient of variance or the coefficient of variation (HERDAN 1966: 93–94). The less this coefficient, the tighter the values around its mean. If the coefficient of variation is great, then the values of euphony are distributed sparsely. Christopher Butler is correct to warn linguists that it is not possible to compare two or more means of different samples without testing for homogeneity of variance (BUTLER 1985: 127). If the coefficient of variation is too great, then we can say that there is no homogeneity of data. Therefore, the samples cannot be compared. Studying many languages we can come to a conclusion that if the coefficient of variation is greater than 33%, than there is no homogeneity (TAMBOVTSEV: 12–16).

Let us consider the value of the coefficient of variation in different language taxa. It is possible to construct the following ordered series: Romance (1.53%); Mongolic (1.83%); Samoyedic (1.98%); Bantu (2.28%); Iranian (2.25%); Indic (2.29%); Manchu-Tungusic (2.66%); Baltic (3.06%); Turkic (3.36%); Germanic (3.81%); Australian Abori-

ginal (3.90%); Slavonic (4.24%); Finno-Ugric (5.02%); Caucasian (7.01%); Paleo-Asiatic (7.28%); Austronesian (8.02%); American Indian (8.13%); Afro-Asian (9.61%); Sino-Tibetan (10.29%). One can see that all the language taxa have the values of the coefficient of variation which are much less than 33%.

CONCLUSION

Austronesian languages have a great concentration of vowels in the speech sound chain (e.g. maximum – 65.24% in Hawaiian and 69.75% in Samoan).

American Indian languages have the maximum of melodicity in Odjibwe – 64.32%.

Let us consider the maximum and minimum value of euphony in all the language taxa under investigation. The maximum of the euphony is in the Australian aboriginal language of Nunggubuyu (85.14%), the minimum — in the Caucasian language of Adygian (54.07%).

Let us consider the maximum value of euphony in different language taxa. It is possible to put the maximum values of the quotient of euphony, that is, vocalo-sonorant quotient in the ordered series: Latvian (Baltic of Indo-European) – 64.11%; Kurdish (Iranian of Indo-European) – 65.79%; Georgean (Caucasian) – 66.25%; Nenets (Samoyedic) – 66.38%; Buriat (Mongolic) – 66.84%; Norwegian (Germanic of Indo-European) – 67.80%; Marathi (Indic of Indo-European) – 68.59%; Romanian (Romance of Indo-European) – 69.91%; Serbian (Slavonic of Indo-European) – 70.19%; Salarian of the Turkic family – 71.75%; Evenk (Manchu-Tungusic) – 71.98%; Choockchee (Paleo-Asiatic) – 72.84%; Finnish (Finno-Ugric) – 72.85%; Burmese (Sino-Tibetan) – 75.67%; Swahili (Bantu) – 76.29%; Neo-Aramaic (Afro-Asiatic) – 81.47%; Hawaiian (Austronesian) – 83.29%; Nunggubuyu (Australian Aboriginal) – 85.14%.

Thus, one can see that the vocalo-sonorant quotient turned out to be bigger in five language taxa. May be, there is something special in the phonetic systems of the following languages of different language taxa: Burmese – 75.67%, Swahili – 76.29%, Neo-Aramaic – 81.47%, Hawaiian – 83.29%, Nunggubuyu – 85.14%. It means that the greater part (85.14%) of the Nunggubuyu speech sound chain consists of vowels and sonorant consonants.

On the other hand, some of the world languages have the minimum of the concentration of vowels. So, in the Itelmen language (Paleo-Asiatic family) vowels comprise only 32.61%.

Let us consider the minimum of the vocalo-sonorant quotient in different language taxa. Thus, in the Adygian language (Caucasian family) this quotient reaches only 54.07%. Therefore, the ordered series of the vocalo-sonorant quotient of the languages in different language taxa is the following: Kadeweu (American Indian) – 55.23%; Tibetan (Sino-Tibetan) – 56.50%; Itel'men (Paleo-Asiatic) – 59.52%; Sokotrian (Afro-Asiatic) – 60.32%; Belorussian (Slavonic of Indo-European) – 60.66%; English (Germanic of Indo-European) – 61.08%; Vepsian (Finno-Ugric) – 61.34%; Lithuanian (Baltic of Indo-European) – 61.40%; Tadjic (Iranian of Indo-European) – 61.60%; Chalkan (Turkic) – 62.83%; Sel'kup (Samoyedic) – 63.34%; Kalmyk (Mongolic) – 64.66%; Gujarati (Indic of Indo-European) – 65.14; Indonesian (Austronesian) – 66.01%; Oroch (Manch-Tungusic) – 66.09%; Romanian (Romance of Indo-European) – 67.37; Moore (Bantu) – 70.90%; Ngandi (Australian Aboriginal) – 76.84%.

In the American Indian languages it is rather low – 55.23% in Kadeweu, which is second to the world euphonic minimum.

Let us consider the average value of euphony in different language taxa. It should be mentioned that on the average the Caucasian language family has a rather low vocalo-sonorant quotient — 61.66%. The ordered series of the average of the vocalo-sonorant quotient in different language taxa is the following: Baltic group of Indo-European family – 62.76%; Iranian group of the Indo-European family – 63.95%; Slavonic group – 64.64%; Germanic – 64.78%; American Indian languages – 65.09%; Samoyedic family – 65.16%; Finno-Ugric family – 65.57%; Mongolic family – 66.06%; Balkan language unity – 66.18%; Indic group of the Indo-European family – 66.77%; Turkic family – 66.99%; Paleo-Asiatic family – 67.58%; Sino-Tebetan family – 67.63%; Roman group of I-E family – 68.57%; Afro-Asiatic family – 68.96%; Manchu-Tungusic family – 69.54%; Austronesian family – 73.16%; Bantu – 73.40%; Languages of Australian aboriginals – 80.51%.

Melodicity or euphony, i.e. the total of vowels and sonorant consonants in the speech sound chain, may be considered a new language universal.

REFERENCES

Butler Christopher. 1985. *Statistics in Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Crystal David. 1992. *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Herdan Gustav. 1966. *The Advanced Theory of Language as Choice and Chance*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Polya George. 1954. *Mathematics and Plausible Reasoning*. Princeton (New Jersey, USA): Princeton University Press.

Tambovtsev Yuri Alex. 1977. "Nekotorye harakteristiki raspredelenija fonem mansijskogo jazyka" [Some Characteristics of the Distribution of Phonemse in the Mansi Language]. *Sovetskoe Finno-Ugrovedenije* [Soviet Finno-Ugric Studies] 13(3), 195–198.

Tambovtsev Yuri Alex. 1979. "Raspredelenie glasnyh fonem v mansijskoj poezii" [Distribution of Vowels in the Mansi Poetry]. *Sovetskoe Finno-Ugrovedenie* [Soviet Finno-Ugric Studies] 15(3), 164–167.

Tambovtsev Yuri Alex. 2003. *Tipologija funktsionorovanija fonem v zvukovoj tsepochke indoevropejskih, paleoasiatskih, uralo-altajskih i drugih jazykov mira: kompaktnost' podgrupp, grupp, semej i drugih jazykovah taksonov* [Typology of Functioning of Phonemes in the Sound Chain of Indo-European, Paleo-Asiatic, Uralo-Altaic and Other World Languages: Compactness of Subgroups, Groups, Families and Other Language Taxa]. Novosibirsk: Sibirskij Nezavisimyj Institut.

Allatum die 8 mensis Augusti Anno 2010