

京都大学大学院文学研究科 21 世紀 COE プログラム  
「グローバル化時代の多元的人文学の拠点形成」 31 研究会

# ユーラシア古語文献の文献学的研究

NEWSLETTER

No. 10 2005/6/27

## 目次

活動報告	2
研究会報告の要旨	2
第 17 回研究会報告	3
第 19 回研究会報告	4
次回研究会の開催予定	8
編集後記	8

## 活動報告

第 21 回研究会 (第 54 回羽田記念館定例講演会、「古代世界における学派・宗派の成立と<異>意識の形成」研究会と共同開催)

日時: 2005 年 6 月 4 日 (土) 14:00 ~ 17:00

場所: 京都大学大学院文学研究科附属 ユーラシア文化研究センター (羽田記念館)

「カローシュティ―木簡に見る法と習慣」 赤松明彦 (京都大学大学院文学研究科)

司会: 白石竜彦 (COE 研究員)

「*The Gandhâra Grave culture (1600-900 BCE) and the pravargya rite of the Veda*

(ヴェーダのプラヴァルギヤ祭式とガンダーラ墓葬文化)」

Asko Parpola (Helsinki University)

司会: 藤井正人 (京都大学人文科学研究所)

## 研究会報告の要旨

2004 年 12 月 11 日 (土) に京大会館で開催された第 17 回研究会、2005 年 1 月 8 日 (土) に京都大学文学部新館で開催された第 19 回研究会の報告要旨を掲載します。

## 第 17 回研究会報告

「新出のソグド語碑文をめぐるソグド語言語学・文献学の諸問題」

吉田 豊 (神戸市外国語大学教授)

西安の 2003 年 6-8 月の発掘で、またソグド人の墓が見つかった。これまでにすでに類似の墓は何点か発見されていて、特に珍しくはないのだが、今回はソグド語と漢文のバイリンガルの墓誌も発見されたという点でユニークであった。筆者は北京大学の榮新江教授のはからいで碑文の写真と拓本を見ることができただけでなく、この碑文のソグド語版を解読して発表する機会も与えられた。2004 年 12 月 11 日に開催された京都大学言語学懇話会では、この碑文のソグド語版をめぐるソグド語研究上の問題点と、内容に関する文献学的な研究の成果について解説した。またその導入として、言語学とりわけ歴史言語学の研究者が新出の文献(写本や金石文)を解読することの重要性や、その際の新出資料の取り扱いの手続きについても説明した。

新発見の碑文は漢文版と対照すると、必ずしも一方が他方の翻訳というのではなく、独立して類似の内容を記していることがわかる。例えばソグド語版には埋葬された夫婦の結婚の日付や、あの世での冥福を願う文言が見えるが、漢文版には見あたらない。従ってソグド語版の解読には必ずしも漢文版は役に立たない。かえって破損した漢文版の理解をソグド語版が助ける場合もある。中国の研究者たちが正しく読んでいない、漢文版末尾の埋葬の日付や墓を作った被葬者の息子たちの名前は、ソグド語版を参考にして補うことが出来る。碑文を刻んだ石工の知識についても、注意を要する。漢文版もソグド語版でも随所に正しく彫られていない文字が見え、銘文を刻んだ石工は与えられた原稿を、あまり精確にコピーすることができなかったようだ。つまり彼は漢字もソグド文字も良く読めなかったらしい。

わずかに漢文版が 19 行、その右隣に縦書きされたソグド語版は 32 行の碑文だが、西暦 580 年に書かれたことが判明するこの資料は、ソグド文字の書体や言語の変化の絶対年代について重要なヒントを与えてくれる。例えばソグド文字の草書体と呼ばれている書体で書かれているが、この碑文ではまだ古風な特徴を示している。ただこの種の書体が 6 世紀の終わりには成立していたことは興味深い。社会言語学的に見ると、この碑文のソグド語版は在中国 3 世のソグド人の両親のために、4 世の息子たちが起草したものだが、その言語にきわだった中国語の影響が見られない。当時中国に寄留したソグド人たちの言語生活の一端を伺わせるものである。

## 第 19 回研究会報告

### *Pragmaphilology: the case of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Russian peasant letters*

「19 世紀末ロシア農民の手紙文とその背後にある諸事実 —語用論的文献学の確立に備えて—」

Olga T. Yokoyama (オルガ 横山)

(京都大学大学院文学研究科客員教授、米国 UCLA 教授)

This is an exploration of the role the young field of pragmatics can, and should, play within the old field of philology. It also argues the case for establishing “pragmaphilology”, a way of doing philology while explicitly and consistently incorporating pragmatics into philological analysis.

The cornerstone of pragmatics is reference, the relationship between language and the referential world it represents. The referential world includes the two parties involved in the act of communication, the speaker (or writer) and the addressee (or reader). Pragmaphilology views texts as a linguistic product of the speaker’s cognitive activity targeting another individual (or individuals). Hence texts reveal not only the so-called denotative content but also the organization of the speaker’s mind, and the way the speaker views the assumed recipient of his product. The recipient the speaker assumed when producing a text was not the philologist, who is merely an eager eavesdropper on the communication between the speaker and the mind the speaker targeted. From the way the text is shaped, the eavesdropping pragmaphilologist must be able to see not only the content proper, but also how the speaker’s mind was organized, the assumptions the speaker made about the addressee, and ways the speaker viewed his or her relationship to the addressee and to the referential world. The speaker chooses what to say and how to say it depending on numerous pragmatic factors, and – importantly – does not always behave cooperatively. The pragmaphilologist strives to account for the formal choices the speaker made in producing the text, and to calculate not only the denotative but also the connotative meaning the intended addressee must have grasped from a given text.

Let us consider some of the pragmatic meaning deducible from a text fragment from l. 23-24 (1882, examined in the lecture), showing how the speaker approached both the addressee and some external realia (line breaks are ignored):

Урожай хлебов здесь ныне плохой и цена на таковой в Сарапуле  
*harvest of-grain here now poor and price for such in S.*

85 коп., а в Воткинске 95 коп. и 1 руб. за пуд ржаной  
*85 kop. and in V. 95 kop. and 1 rub. for pood of-rye*

муки. Пшеница у нас родилась, нажали до пяти овинов. Озимь  
*flour wheat at us grew reaped to 5 barns winter-crops*

посеяли четыре десятины, остальная земля под паром. Лошадь  
*sowed 4 des. remaining land lies-fallow horse*

купили, мерина пяти лет за 65 руб., коровы доят две. Вино  
*we-bought gelding of-5 years for 65 rub. cows they-milk two wine*

доставляем Бодалеву и Тюнину. Вода ныне в Каме и Волге  
*we-deliver for-B. and T. water now in K. and V.*

мала, дровами торгуем. Отец Феодор дочь отдал в Воткинск  
*low firewood we-sell father F. daughter gave to V.*

за Богослова. Бабушка живет у нас. У матери твоей болела рука  
*to theologian grandma lives at us at mother your hurt arm*

целый месяц и лечилась в Воткинском заводе, на лечение  
*whole month and she-got-treated in V. plant for treatment*

издержали 25 руб. Сена сняли 70 возов.  
*we-spent 25 rub. hay we-cut 70 carts*

‘The grain harvest here is bad this year and the price for it (i.e. grain) in Sarapul is 85 kop., while in Votkinsk (it is) 95 kop. and 1 rub., for a pood of rye flour. Wheat we had (a good harvest of): we reaped up to 5 barns. We sowed 4 acres of winter crops, (and) the rest of the land lies fallow. We bought a horse, a five-year-old gelding, for 65 rub. We have two cows that get milked. We deliver liquor for Bodalyov and Tyunin. The water in the Kama and Volga is shallow lately. We sell firewood. Father Feodor gave his daughter away to Votkinsk to a theologian. Grandmother lives with us. Your mother was hurting in her arm for a whole month and got treated in Votkinsk Plant, for the treatment we spent 25 rub. We cut 70 carts of hay.’

Consider the underlined sentence-/clause-initial items in the transcription (note that in

the English translation, subjects missing in the Russian texts have been supplied, and that the word order differs from that of the original). These items are syntactically heterogeneous, including nominative subjects (урожай ‘harvest’, цена ‘price’, пшеница ‘wheat’, вода ‘water’, отец Феодор ‘Father Feodor’, бабушка ‘grandmother’), direct objects (лошадь ‘horse’, вино ‘wine’), governed nouns in direct object numeral phrases (озими ‘of winter crops’, коровы ‘of cows’, сена ‘of hay’), prepositional phrases (у матери твоей ‘at your mother’s’, на лечение ‘for treatment’), and oblique complements (дровами ‘firewood.instr.sg.’). What is common to all of them is their Topic status in their respective clauses, as revealed by their initial position in conjunction with the kind of formulaic utterance intonation that lacks accentual prominence. This requires some explanation, for while linear position is of course directly “visible” sentence intonation is not. Yet the impossibility of placing the sentential stress on the clause-initial items can be deduced from general principles of Russian word order and intonation: when stressed items appear utterance-initially, the segmental material that follows them is deaccented and delivered in a monotone (carrying the so-called spreading phrase accent), with no contour tones. As such, this stretch cannot be too long, as it would have to be if the initial items, say, in Урожай хлебов здесь ныне плохой ‘The grain harvest here is bad this year’ or in Вода ныне в Каме и Волге мала ‘The water in the Kama and Volga is shallow lately’ were to be stressed. The interconnection between the amount of segmental material and the presence/absence of sentential stress thus rules out sentential stress placement on the initial items in these sentences, resulting in the formulaic measured intonation typical of interlocutor distance and formality. In fact, once the “distant” intonational mode sets in, the “distant key” is maintained even in shorter clauses, e.g., дровами торгуем ‘We sell firewood’.

The formulaic intonation that can be gathered from this “visible” linear arrangement suggests that the author of this text (the father of the family) established a formal distance between himself and the addressee (his seventeen-year-old son). (In fact, this is the case with the overwhelming majority of the father’s letters, in contrast to those authored by the mother.) Given this formality, however, the fact that the author did not place those items at the end of their clauses (where rhematic material is located in utterances with formal intonation) shows that he treated them as Topics — and here another cognitive feature of this text is revealed. To treat a given referential item as Topic, the speaker normally needs some evidence that the addressee is currently concerned with the item in question. If this item was just men-

tioned in the preceding context, such evidence is unequivocal and the speaker is on objective ground. A cooperative peer speaker prototypically shapes his utterances according to such objective evidence. But there is no objective evidence that the initial items in the example just considered appeared in the preceding context. Clause after clause, the speaker brings in new referential items (with differing grammatical status) and places them in Topic positions, thus treating them as if the addressee was currently concerned with them. This kind of impositional speaker behavior is typical of a close interlocutor relationship, arising from the speaker's own concern with the topics in question, which in turn leads him to impose his own concern onto the addressee's presumed cognitive state. Thus the father in this case, through his word order, displays a sort of "If I'm concerned about it you must be concerned about it, too" attitude.

The excerpt just examined tells the pragmaphilologist much more than what the economic life of that family was like in the summer of 1882. In addition to the denotational content, we can deduce from the structure of the text that the father, on the one hand, treated his teenage son formally, in keeping with the epistolary tradition of the time, while on the other, he was self-centered enough to assume that whatever was on his own mind had to be on his son's mind as well. This analysis was possible because a tacit assumption was made that the structure of Russian intonation has not changed since the time of the letter. Such an assumption is not unreasonable, given all we know about Russian poetics and about the traditional stage pronunciation of the recent past. This brings us to another important aspect of pragmaphilology: it calls for the examination of relatively recent texts, where the analyst is on a relatively firm footing. Once everything is known about that layer of the recent past (including subtle pragmatic evidence from areas like intonation), the researcher can safely proceed to still deeper layers of the past, gradually working backwards toward an understanding of philological data more and more removed from the present.

## 次回研究会の開催予定

### 第 22 回研究会

日時: 2005 年 7 月 23 日 (土) 14:00 ~ 17:00

場所: 京都大学大学院文学研究科附属ユーラシア文化研究センター (羽田記念館)

「古代イタリア半島・サベル諸語の最上級形式について」

西村 周浩 (米国 UCLA)

「史料としてのシュメール語王碑文」

前田 徹 (早稲田大学大学院文学研究科教授)

---

## 編集後記

COE 31 研究会ニューズレター第 10 号をお届けいたします。研究会等、今後も活発に活動して参ります。皆様のあたたかいご支援、ご協力をお願い申し上げます。

## 連絡先

「ユーラシア古語文献の文献学的研究」研究会

〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田本町 京都大学大学院文学研究科言語学研究室 (稲垣)

Tel & Fax: 075-753-2862 E-mail: [eurasia-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp](mailto:eurasia-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

Web page: <http://www.hmn.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/eurasia>