

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. 18 2006/07/24

目 次

研究会報告の要旨	… 1
書評	… 7
編集後記	… 9

研究会報告の要旨

今号では、2006 年 3 月 16 日（木）にユーラシア文化研究センター（羽田記念館）で開催された第 28 回研究会の報告要旨を掲載します。

第 28 回研究会報告

On the Pronunciation and the Development
of the Proto-Indo-European Sibilant */s/

Aurelijus Vijūnas
Indo-European Studies
University of California
Los Angeles

§1. If one looks for a description of the articulation of the sibilant /s/ in the handbooks of Indo-European linguistics, one will find a very simple one: the sibilant /s/ is often described as “dental” or simply as a “sibilant”, and is sometimes compared with the sibilant /s/ of the well-known modern languages, such as English, French and German.¹

How precise is such a description?

It has to be noted that in none of the languages listed above the sibilant /s/ is strictly “dental”. In linguistic handbooks, the articulation of the sound [s] is usually described as dentalveolar, alveolo-dental, dental-alveolar, or simply alveolar.² Therefore, the term “dental” used in historical handbooks is obviously a simplification.

§2. Since Proto-Indo-European only possessed one sibilant phoneme, it did not contrast with any other sibilants, which, as a rule, are articulated in the alveolar ridge region. Therefore, the precise specification of the place of articulation may appear irrelevant and, since *s* is alveolar in most of the modern major Indo-European languages, also the Proto-Indo-European /s/ is normally reconstructed as such. However, when one studies the phonological system of the modern Indo-European languages in more detail, one finds a noteworthy situation: First of all, dental /s/ appears to be extremely rare (Polish has an apico-dental /s/, cf.

¹ Cf. B. W. Fortson IV (2004: 55), M. Meier-Brügger (2000: 94), E. Tichy (2000: 26), O. J. L. Szemerényi (1996: 51), R. S. P. Beekes (1995: 124), Th. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov (1995: 100), M. Mayrhofer (1986: 118), H. Krahe (1985: 75-6), Y. Savčenko (1974: 71), A. Meillet (1964: 95), W. P. Lehmann (1955: 2ff.) and others. In addition to the PIE */s/, Gamkrelidze/Ivanov also posit the phonemes */š/ and */šʰ/ (1995:108).

² For a more detailed discussion of the articulation of *s*, see P. Ladefoged and I. Maddieson (1996: 145ff.).

Ladefoged/Maddieson 1996: 164). In other languages, the sibilant /s/ is alveolar, but in most cases, whenever a language possesses an alveolar /s/, it also has a prepalatal fricative /ʃ/. Such are many modern Indo-European languages: English, French, Lithuanian, Russian, German, standard Portuguese, Italian, standard Norwegian, etc.

The situation is rather different in languages which possess only a single sibilant. In such languages, their only sibilant generally is a postalveolar [ʃ] (also denoted as [ʃ̠] and in other ways).³ Within the Indo-European language family, such languages are Icelandic, Castilian Spanish, Greek, and Danish.

§3. The articulation of the postalveolar [ʃ̠] significantly differs from that of the alveolar [s], the former occupying an intermediate position between the “hissing” [s] and the “hushing” [ʃ]. It is therefore often described as “hissing-hushing”. During the articulation of [ʃ̠], a much larger air channel is formed than the one formed during the articulation of the alveolar [s]. However, it is smaller than that of the prepalatal [ʃ].

A comparable postalveolar [ʃ̠] can be observed among various non-Indo-European languages that possess poor sibilant systems, cf. the articulation of /s/ in Finnish, Central and Eastern Inuit (Canadian Inuktitut and Greenlandic),⁴ and in at least some Polynesian languages (e.g., Samoan),⁵ to mention a few. In all these languages, their only fricative *s* is realized as [ʃ̠]. Postalveolar /s/ [ʃ̠] has also been postulated for the ancient stages of Korean.⁶

Therefore, based on what has been said in the preceding paragraphs, it is tempting to reconstruct the single Proto-Indo-European sibilant /s/ not as a dental or alveolar *[s], but rather as a postalveolar *[ʃ̠].

§4. In fact, such a reconstruction was already suggested by A. Martinet half a century ago (1955: 236ff.), but it is nowhere mentioned in the modern handbooks. Also suggestions by other scholars that the

³ To denote the retracted variety of /s/, M. Joos used the symbol [s̠] (1952), and D. Q. Adams used the symbol [S] (1975).

⁴ For a description of the Greenlandic /s/, see W. Thalbitzer (1904). Thalbitzer used a symbol [ç] to transcribe the Greenlandic sibilant.

⁵ Cf. V. D. Arakin (1973).

⁶ Cf. H. M. Sohn (2001).

postalveolar [ʃ] must have been more widespread in the medieval times than today have mostly been neglected. In 1962, A. Galmés de Fuentes' argued (in my view, persuasively) that the Latin sibilant /s/ must have been realized as [ʃ]. Galmés de Fuentes based this view on an extensive study of the phonological development of sibilants in all Italic dialects, described in his book "Las sibilantes en la Romania".

It has also been known for a long time that the medieval German pronunciation of the inherited phoneme /s/ was different from what it is today. The medieval German /s/ is often described as a sound "between [s] and [ʃ]", or a retracted *s*. That the pronunciation of the inherited *s* must have been different from the new old High German sibilant [s] <z/zz> that arose via assibilation from an older affricate [ts] is implied by a very low number of scribal errors and suggested by the use of the symbols <ɣ> and <ʒ> to represent the sounds [š, ž, č] resp. [s, z] in several medieval Slovenian manuscripts (X-XI c.).⁷

In the course of the development of the German language, the inherited retracted sibilant partially merged with the new alveolar *s*, and partially with the prepalatal shibilant [ʃ] that started developing in the latest stages of Old High German (around XII c.), cf. Modern German *Schnee* 'snow' [š-] < **snaiwa*- [š-] resp. *ist* 'is' (3. sg.) [-s-] < **ist* [-š-], etc.

§5. The reconstruction of the Proto-Germanic */s/ as a shibilant can also find support in the Scandinavian branch. Although already Martinet pointed out in his "Économie" that Danish possessed a retracted [ʃ] as its only sibilant,⁸ his observation never acquired much attention, and the evidence of the Scandinavian languages has largely been neglected in the study of Indo-European sibilants.

It has to be pointed out that beside Danish, also Icelandic possesses a retracted [ʃ] as its only sibilant. There are good reasons to assume that Old Faroese, a close relative of Icelandic, once had the same sibilant

⁷ For a discussion of the Old High German /s/, see J. Schatz (1907), L. R. Zinder and T. V. Strojeva (1965), R. Kolarič (1967), S. Pirchegger (1968), H. Penzl (1971), H. Eggers (1977), etc.

⁸ Martinet, loc. cit. Notation mine.

system as Icelandic.⁹ The Icelandic *s* normally reflects the Proto-Germanic *s; therefore, since there is no evidence that the pronunciation of the Icelandic /s/ has ever changed, there is a good reason to think that it has retained its original Proto-Germanic pronunciation.

The Icelandic evidence is very important, since Icelandic is in many respects extremely archaic. Combined with the Old High German evidence, Icelandic makes a good case for the reconstruction of the Proto-Germanic /s/ as a shibilant.

§6. A few words need to be said about the articulation of sibilants in Greek and in Anatolian. The ancient Greek /σ/ is normally assumed to have been dental, but, as was said above, this is only a term of convenience. However, when one looks at the modern Greek /σ/ which directly continues the ancient Greek /σ/, it appears to be a postalveolar sound. Since the modern Greek /σ/ reflects ancient Greek /σ/, this implies that the ancient Greek /σ/ may have been postalveolar as well. Such a view becomes especially plausible when Greek is compared with Italic and Germanic languages discussed in the preceding sections.¹⁰

The Anatolian situation at first sight appears much less clear. In handbooks, the pronunciation is either not discussed, or speaks in favour of the dental /s/.¹¹ However, as we see from the cuneiform writing system, it is constantly represented by <š>.

Against the pronunciation [š] speak several factors. First of all, Hittite proper names containing sibilants are sometimes transcribed with <s> in languages that possess a preplatal /š/, cf. ancient Egyptian spellings like <Mrsr> ‘Muršiliš’, <Ḫtsr> ‘Ḫattušiliš’. The reconstruction of the single Anatolian sibilant as [š] is not favoured by language typology either, as languages with such phonological systems do not occur.

Conversely, some scholars claim that Hittite /s/ was dental namely because of the Egyptian spellings shown above and such Hittite spellings as <azzikizzi> /ad-ski-tsi/ ‘eats continuously’ (< virtual *h₁d-ske-ti).

⁹ Modern Faroese possesses two sibilant phonemes, viz. /s/ and /š/. The phoneme /š/ is relatively recent, and has developed out of the consonant clusters *sk*, *sj* and in several other positions (e.g., *geisli* ‘ray’ [gʰaʰʂli]). It is noteworthy, that the phoneme /s/ is normally realized as [š].

¹⁰ Greek σ in many instances reflects stops, affricates and consonant clusters, cf. τέσσαρες ‘4’ (< *k^het₄-), but /σ/ of whatever origin merged together into [š].

¹¹ Cf. J. Friedrich (1960: 32), C. H. Melchert (2004: 579).

Neither of these arguments in favour of the alveolar [s] pronunciation is really trustworthy. As far as the Egyptian spellings with <s> are concerned, it is quite common that native speakers of languages that possess both [s] and [ʃ] perceive the postalveolar [ʃ] as [s]. Therefore, the value of the ancient Egyptian spellings becomes nearly negligible. As for the Hittite spellings like <azzikizzi>, they are practically unusable as well, since the cuneiform writing system would have been unable to spell out any difference between an alveolar affricate [ts] and a postalveolar [tʃ]. Moreover, the precise pronunciation of the Hittite affricate /z/ itself is not known. The only thing that we can be fairly sure about is that the symbols of the <z> series represented an affricate of some sort ([ts]?, [tʃ]?).

§7. In conclusion, I would like to say that there are good reasons to revise the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European sibilant /s/, reconstructing it as a retracted postalveolar shibilant [ʃ]. Originally proposed by Martinet, this theory finds further support from subsequent studies of the articulation of sibilants in various medieval European languages, as well as typological comparison.

REFERENCES:

- ADAMS, D. Q. 1975. The Distribution of Retracted Sibilants in Medieval Europe. *Language* 51:282-92.
- BEEKES, R. S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- EGGERS, H. 1977. *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*. I-II. Bänder. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH.
- FORTSON, B. W. IV. 2004. *Indo-European Language and Culture*. Blackwell Publishing.
- FRIEDRICH, J. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*. I Teil. 2. Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- GALMÉS DE FUENTES, A. 1962. *Las sibilantes en la Romania*. Madrid: Gredos.
- GAMKRELIDZE, TH. V.; IVANOV, V. V. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Vol. 1. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JOOS, M. 1952. The Medieval Sibilants. *Language* 28:222-31.
- KOLARIČ, R. 1968. Sprachliche Analyse. In *Freisinger Denkmäler - Brižinski spomeniki - Monumenta frisingensia* (Entwurf und Redaktion: Jože Pogačnik), 18 – 106. München: Drukerei Dr. Rudolf Trofenik.
- KRAHE, H. 1985. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Sechste, unveränderte Auflage des I. und II. Teils in einem Band. Bearbeitet von Wolfgang Meid. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York.
- LADEFOGED, P.; MADDIESON, I. 1996. *The Sounds of the World's Languages*. Blackwell Publishing.
- LEHMANN, W. P. 1955. *Proto-Indo-European Phonology*. Austin: University of Texas Press and Linguistic Society of America.

- MARTINET, A. 1955. *Économie des changements phonétiques*. Berne: Éditions A. Francke.
- MAYRHOFER, M (ed.). 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Band I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. 2000. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 7., völlig neubearbeitete Auflage unter Mitarbeit von Matthias Fritz und Manfred Mayrhofer. Berlin – New York : Walter de Gruyter.
- MEILLET, A. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. University of Alabama Press.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 2004. Luvian. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (edited by R. D. Woodard), 578-584. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PENZL, H. 1971. *Lautsystem und Lautwandel in den althochdeutschen Dialekten*. München: Max Hueber Verlag.
- PIRCHEGGER, S. 1968. *Untersuchungen über die altslovenischen Freisinger Denkmäler*. Veröffentlichungen des Slavischen Instituts an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Berlin, herausgegeben von Max Vasmer. Band 5. First published in Leipzig, 1931. Nendeln/ Liechtenstein: Kraus reprint.
- SCHATZ, J. 1907. *Altbairische Grammatik. Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Grammatiken der althochdeutschen Dialekte. I. Band. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- SOHN, H. M. 2001. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- SZEMERÉNYI, O. J. L. 1996. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- THALBITZER, W. 1904. *A Phonetical Study of the Eskimo Language*. Copenhagen.
- TICHY, E. 2000. *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für studierenden sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- АРАКИН, В. Д. 1973. *Самоанский язык*. Москва: „Наука“.
- ЗИНДЕР, Л. Р.; СТРОЕВА, Т. В. 1965. *Историческая фонетика немецкого языка*. Москва – Ленинград: Издательство „Просвещение“.
- САВЧЕНКО, А. Н. 1974. *Сравнительная грамматика индоевропейских языков*. Москва: „Высшая школа“.

書 評

2005年3月に発行されました、佐藤昭裕著『中世スラブ語研究 –『過ぎし年月の物語』の言語と古教会スラブ語–』(ユーラシア古語文献研究叢書3)の書評を掲載いたします。

佐藤 昭裕 『中世スラブ語研究 –『過ぎし年月の物語』の言語と古教会スラブ語–』
(ユーラシア古語文献研究叢書3)

岡本 崇男(神戸市外国語大学)

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」に属する研究班「ユーラシア古語文献の文献学的研究」の計画に基づく「ユーラシア古語文献叢書」の第三冊目となる本書では、副題『過ぎし年月の物語』の言語と古教会スラブ語が示すように、中世ロシアの代表的な年代記の言

語と古教会スラブ語との関係が論じられている。11世紀から17世紀に至るまで、ロシア標準文章語が適用される文献ジャンルの中で量的に最大のものが年代記であるため、年代記言語の分析の意義は大きい。

しかし、年代記言語の研究を困難にする要因として、その中に常に二つの異質な要素が混在していることがあげられる。ロシアの文献文化は、ギリシャ正教の聖典言語である古教会スラブ語をロシアが受容したことがきっかけとなって始まる。これはキエフ・ルーシの土着語である東スラブ語とは違った方言特徴を持つ南スラブ語を基礎として成立した人工的な書き言葉である。しかし、年代記においてキエフ・ルーシに固有の事物、事象、人物などについて記述する必要がある場合は、古教会スラブ語ではなく東スラブ語の特徴を持つ形式が使用されることが多い。つまり、語られる内容や文脈、あるいは伝達の目的に応じて南スラブ語的要素と東スラブ語的要素が使い分けられていたのである。これは音韻、形態、統語、語彙など言語の様々なレベルに関わっている。

こうした状況のなかで、多くのロシア語史研究者は二種類の言語要素とそれらが含まれるテキストの文脈との相関関係を検証を試みるのであるが、本書において佐藤氏は年代記のテキスト構造の分析というあまり前例のない方法にあえて挑戦している。そして、第1章『『過ぎし年月の物語』の言語とテキスト構造』において、南スラブ語(=古教会スラブ語)の要素と東スラブ語的要素との複雑な関係を浮き彫りにすることに成功した。

すなわち、『過ぎし年月の物語』において、二つのタイプのテキストの繰り返しが観察されるというのである。そのうちの一つは「事実叙述タイプ」のテキストであって、ここでは直接話法による引用が多用され、音韻・形態・語彙のレベルにおいては東スラブ語の要素が優勢である。一方、先のタイプのテキストで述べられた歴史的な出来事やそれに関与した人物などについて、聖書の語句を援用しながら年代記編纂者が自分なりの評価を下す部分は、当然のことながら南スラブ語の要素が圧倒的なもう一つのテキストタイプを形成しており、佐藤氏はこれを「コメントタイプ」と名付けている。しかし、統語レベルにおいて、「事実叙述タイプ」のテキストは述語動詞が主語に先行するVS語順を基本とし、時おりS *že* V (*že* は接続詞)語順によって主語が転換されてリズム感が生まれるという。これにたいして「コメントタイプ」テキストではSV語順が主流であり、現代ロシア語とも通じる機能的に語順が決定されることもある。つまり、主語と述語の語順にかんしては、外見上東スラブ語的要素が優勢なテキストタイプの方が様式化されており、南スラブ語的要素中心のテキストタイプは逆に「口語的」であるという二つの言語要素の複合的な係わり合いが明らかにされたのである。

次に、佐藤氏は第2章において、『過ぎし年月の物語』の成立過程とテキストタイプとの関係を検証し、第1章で確定された二つのテキストタイプが繰り返されるという語りのパターンがかなり初期の集成において既に完成していたことを指摘している。したがって、中世ロシア年代記の語りの様式は、すでに文献時代の最初期(11世紀前半)に確立していた可能性が極めて強いといえる。ただし、これが古教会スラブ語起源であるのか、あるいはキエフ・ルーシにおいて創り上げられたオリジナルな様式であるのかについてはさらなる検討を要する。そこで、本書の第3章以降は具体的な事例(発言を意味する二つの動詞の使い分け、「死ぬ」を意味する二つの動詞の違い)について、ロシア年代記の語りの様式の形成に古教会スラブ語が果たした役割を明確に提示している。

本書において、一般化を急ぐことなく、自説に対する異論を想定しながら問題を忍耐強く丁寧に検証する佐藤氏の態度は印象的である。また、本書が年代記言語の一つの研究方法を示したというだけで

なく、年代記研究にたずさわる者に新たな指標を与えたといえることができる。

編集後記

COE31 研究会ニューズレター第 18 号をお届けいたします。

今後も活発に研究会等を企画して参りますので、皆様のご支援、ご協力をお願いいたします。

2006 年 4 月 1 日より金澤雄介が 2006 年度 COE 補佐員となりました。どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

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（金澤）

Tel & Fax: 075-753-2862 E-mail: eurasia-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

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