

Re: 'Tefu-tefu' read as 'Choo-choo'

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang.japan/2005-12/msg00280.html>

- *From:* Zhen Lin <lowzl@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 05 Dec 2005 17:35:17 +0800
-

Bart Mathias wrote:

My guess is they weren't diphthongs originally--they might have even been "felt" by Japanese speakers as "owu" and "eyi"--then went through a brief stage as diphthongs, which Japanese, and Korean, abhor. Sam Martin (and everyone else?) apparently disagrees with me on this; he holds that words like SD in NJ *are* diphthongs.

N.J.? Nara Japanese? SD as in eD? I thought eD was a more modern development... I'm confused...

Anyway. Interestingly, in modern Mandarin - there is no [o:] or [e:] but there are [ʊ] ([ʊ] = close-mid back unrounded vowel, similar to [ə]) and [eɪ] (analysed as [ə] nucleus + [u] coda for [ʊ] and [ə] + [i] for [eɪ]). Modern Cantonese also has no [o:] or [e:] (but it has [o:], [O] = open-mid back rounded vowel) - it has instead [ou] and [ei].

Aah. I wish I had a computerised comparative phonology database of "W... (I also wish information on Chinese and Korean diachronics were easier to find on the Internet.)

Well, they didn't *all* become | or ɔ. Some of the early ones have "g." ø as ɯ and ɯ°, as ɰ°, as ɰ-/ɰ°, for example. (These occur mostly in place names, such as ø}q [UL&K,,~], ø!, etc., in my limited experience.)

Hmm hmm hmm, very interesting. (Especially ɯ and ɰ° - I would have imagined ɯ° and ɰ°.)

My guess (don't I always have a wild guess?) is that after the "echo vowel" method of making Chinese finals pronounceable was given up

Are there more examples of this? And how does ɰé (assuming the from Korean hypothesis) fit into this scheme? [Come to think of it, I'm

Re: 'Tefu-tefu' read as 'Choo-choo'

wondering why éêëíí is used in katakana orthography of Ainu for the -r final instead of only ê. And why yukar was imported as æü«é instead of as æü«ë or æ«ë.]

in
favor of attaching "i" or "u," the least sonorant vowels, that ø became */sagu/, ' became */segi/, and then the sort of thing that would happen so often to "ku" and "ki" (yoki --> yoi, hayaku --> hayau, etc.) got an early start with all of these "gi"s and "gu"s.

My personal hypothesis is that they came over as nasalised /i/ and /u/, and that the nasalisation was later lost. (Do the dialects with -F` and ŪF` have a nasalised /u/? What of &F`?)

Never could think of enough to say on those lines to turn it into a research paper.

You must have accumulated enough sketches of theories and conjectures to compile them into a book. Perhaps use it as a problem set for postgrad students to solve...

.