言　語　学

（１）ブルームフィールドは *Language* のなかで,

> We must assume that in every speech-community some utterances are alike in form and meaning.

と述べているが，なぜ彼はこのように仮定する必要があると考えたのか説明しなさい。

（２）「昨日太郎が来た。次郎も来た」といえるし，「雨」以外の何かが降っていたわけではないのに，「雨も降り出した」ともいえる。このことをも考慮して，「も」の意味を記述しなさい。

（３）（ａ）接近音とは何か，簡潔に説明しなさい。また，ＩＰＡの中から接近音の記号を３つ取り上げて，その調音を述べなさい。

（ｂ）「東京特許許可局」はなぜいいにくいか，音声学的に説明しなさい。

（４）以下の文を読んで，「比較方法における再建の限界」について，著者の見解に賛成か反対かを，できるだけ詳しく論じなさい。

The first point to note is that the idea of being able to establish the phonemes of a language through application of a discovery procedure is an illusion. First of all, no one ever has fully worked out the phonemes of a language in this way. Secondly, it is a flawed procedure, depending on assumptions that few (or no) languages comply with. For instance, it depends on the assumption that two phonemes may never have overlapping realisations. But they often do.

Consider :

/i/ realised as [i] after a palatal consonant
and as [e] elsewhere
/ɛ/ realised as [e] after a palatal consonant
and as [ɛ] elsewhere

Considering just the phones, and their distribution, we find:

[i] after a palatal consonant
[e] in all environments
[ɛ] except after a palatal consonant

Here [i] and [e] are in contrastive distribution since they both occur after palatal

consonants, and must relate to separate phonemes. The same applies for [e] and [ɛ]. We do have [i] and [ɛ] in complementary distribution but these sounds are not phonetically adjacent and could not be considered as allophones of one phoneme. Thus, the phonemic solution of this phonetic data, applying the discovery procedure, requires three phonemes, which is wrong.

Similar difficulties arise when this discovery procedure is applied in reconstruction. We can illustrate with two examples. The first involves conditioned changes in each of two related languages, A and B:

in A: **d* > *t* finally in B: **t* > *d* medially

We then have:

(1)

			distribution		
proto-phoneme	reflex in A	reflex in B	initial	medial	final
**t*	*t*	*t*	x		x
**t*	*t*	*d*		x	
**d*	*t*	*d*			x
**d*	*d*	*d*	x	x	

There are three correspondence sets, *t* : *t*, *t* : *d* and *d*: *d*. Each is in contrastive distribution with the others — *t* : *t* with *t* : *d* finally, *t* : *t* with *d*: *d* initially, and *t*: *d* with *d*: *d* medially. We must thus reconstruct three proto-phonemes, one for each correspondence set. This is the wrong solution. What was needed, of course, was to split the correspondence set *t*: *d* into two parts-those in medial position need to be grouped with *t*: *t* and those in final position with *d*: *d*.

Now consider an example where there is a conditioned change in A but an unconditioned change in B (here *j* represents a lamino-palatal stop)

in A: **d* > *j* before *i* in B: **j* > *d* everywhere

We then get:

(2)

proto-phoneme	reflex in A	reflex in B	environment	reconstruction
**d*	*d*	*d*	except before *i*:*i*	**d*
**d*	*j*	*d*	before *i*:*i*	
**j*	*j*	*d*	everywhere	**j*

We have two correspondence sets, *d*: *d* and *j*: *d*; *j*: *d* occurs everywhere and *d*: *d* everywhere except before *i*: *i*, so they are in contrastive distribution. Each must relate to

a proto-phoneme, presumably **d* for *d*: *d* and **j* for *j*: *d*. This gives the correct number of phonemes but assigns them in the wrong way. The middle line of (2) comes from **d* but is wrongly assigned to **j*. And note that this wrong solution cannot be improved in the way that (1) could be (by distinguishing between the medial and final occurrences of *t*: *d*). Some of the correspondence sets *j*: *d* that occur before *i*: *i* come from **d*, but some of them also come from **j*, in the third line of (2). There is no way to disentangle these sets.

Hoenigswald did perceive some of these potential difficulties to the efficient operation of the discovery procedures he was suggesting, but his caveats have largely gone unremarked by later expositors. Of course, comparing more than just two languages would lessen — but by no means eliminate — the potentiality for getting wrong results by applying this procedure.

It will be seen that the comparative method discovery procedure will only yield a correct reconstruction if certain conditions have applied to the changes that have taken place between the proto-language and modern languages — and we have no way of knowing whether or not these conditions have been complied with.

(R. M. W. Dixon による)