

言語学

(1) 以下の文に共通してみられる表現の特徴について，考えを述べなさい。

- (a) もっと情報を流してください。
- (b) どこからこの情報がもれたのだろう。
- (c) かなりの情報がたまった。
- (d) 情報があふれている。

(2) 次の文章は，“Introduction” in Franz Boas, *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (1911)からの抜粋である(一部表記を改めた)。ここで述べられている論点を，簡潔にかつ余すところなく，要約しなさい。

It seems important at this point of our considerations to emphasize the fact that the groups of ideas expressed by specific phonetic groups show very material differences in different languages, and do not conform by any means to the same principles of classification. To take again the example of English, we find that the idea of WATER is expressed in a great variety of forms: one term serves to express water as a LIQUID; another one, water in the form of a large expanse (LAKE); others, water as running in a large body or in a small body (RIVER and BROOK); still other terms express water in the form RAIN, DEW, WAVE, and FOAM. It is perfectly conceivable that this variety of ideas, each of which is expressed by a single independent term in English, might be expressed in other languages by derivations from the same term.

Another example of the same kind, the words for SNOW in Eskimo, may be given. Here we find one word, *aput*, expressing SNOW ON THE GROUND; another one, *qana*, FALLING SNOW; a third one, *piqsirpoq*, DRIFTING SNOW; and a fourth one, *qimuqsuq*, A SNOWDRIFT.

In the same language the SEAL in different conditions is expressed by a variety of terms. One word is the general term for SEAL; another one signifies the SEAL BASKING IN THE SUN; a third one, a SEAL FLOATING ON A PIECE OF ICE; not to mention the many names for the seals of different ages and for male and female.

As an example of the manner in which terms that we express by independent words are grouped together under one concept, the Dakota language may be selected. The terms *naxtáka* TO KICK, *paxtaka* TO BIND IN BUNDLES, *yaxtaka* TO BITE, *išáxtaka* TO BE NEAR TO, *boxtaka* TO POUND, are all derived from the common

element *xtaka* TO GRIP, which holds them together, while we use distinct words for expressing the various ideas.

It seems fairly evident that the selection of such simple terms must to a certain extent depend upon the chief interests of a people; and where it is necessary to distinguish a certain phenomenon in many aspects, which in the life of the people play each an entirely independent role, many independent words may develop, while in other cases modifications of a single term may suffice.

Thus it happens that each language, from the point of view of another language, may be arbitrary in its classifications; that what appears as a single simple idea in one language may be characterized by a series of distinct phonetic groups in another.

The tendency of a language to express a complex idea by a single term has been termed "holophrasis," and it appears therefore that every language may be holophrastic from the point of view of another language. Holophrasis can hardly be taken as a fundamental characteristic of primitive languages.

We have seen before that some kind of classification of expression must be found in every language. This classification of ideas into groups, each of which is expressed by an independent phonetic group, makes it necessary that concepts which are not readily rendered by a single one among the available sound-complexes should be expressed by combinations or by modifications of what might be called the elementary phonetic groups, in accordance with the elementary ideas to which the particular idea is reduced.

This classification and the necessity of expressing certain experiences by means of other related ones, which by limiting one another define the special idea to be expressed, entail the presence of certain formal elements which determine the relations of the single phonetic groups. If each idea could be expressed by a single phonetic group, languages without form would be possible. Since, however, ideas must be expressed by being reduced to a number of related ideas, the kinds of relation become important elements in articulate speech; and it follows that all languages must contain formal elements, and that their number must be the greater, the fewer the elementary phonetic groups that define special ideas. In a language which commands a very large, fixed vocabulary, the number of formal elements may become quite small.

The few examples that I have given here illustrate that many of the categories which we are inclined to consider as essential may be absent in foreign languages, and that other categories may occur as substitutes.

When we consider for a moment what this implies, it will be recognized that in each language only a part of the complete concept that we have in mind is expressed,

and that each language has a peculiar tendency to select this or that aspect of the mental image which is conveyed by the expression of the thought. To use again the example which I mentioned before, *The man is sick*. We express by this sentence, in English, the idea, *a definite single man at present sick*. In Kwakiutl this sentence would have to be rendered by an expression which would mean, in the vaguest possible form that could be given to it, *definite man near him invisible sick near him invisible*. Visibility and nearness to the first or second person might, of course, have been selected in our example in place of invisibility and nearness to the third person. An idiomatic expression of the sentence in this language would, however, be much more definite, and would require an expression somewhat like the following, *That invisible man lies sick on his back on the floor of the absent house*. In Eskimo, on the other hand, the same idea would be expressed by a form like *(single) man sick*, leaving place and time entirely indefinite. In Ponca, one of the Siouan dialects, the same idea would require a decision of the question whether the man is at rest or moving, and we might have a form like *the moving single man sick*. If we take into consideration further traits of idiomatic expression, this example might be further expanded by adding modalities of the verb; thus the Kwakiutl, whose language I have used several times as an example, would require a form indicating whether this is a new subject introduced in conversation or not; and, in case the speaker had not seen the sick person himself, he would have to express whether he knows by hearsay or by evidence that the person is sick, or whether he has dreamed it. It seems, however, better not to complicate our present discussion by taking into consideration the possibilities of exact expression that may be required in idiomatic forms of speech, but rather to consider only those parts of the sentence which, according to the morphology of the language, *must* be expressed.

We conclude from the examples here given that in a discussion of the characteristics of various languages different fundamental categories will be found, and that in a comparison of different languages it will be necessary to compare as well the phonetic characteristics as the characteristics of the vocabulary and those of the grammatical concepts in order to give each language its proper place.