

2003

Phoneme

John J. McCarthy

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, jmccarthy@linguist.umass.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_faculty_pubs



Part of the [Morphology Commons](#), [Near Eastern Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [Phonetics and Phonology Commons](#)

McCarthy, John J., "Phoneme" (2003). *Linguistics Department Faculty Publication Series*. Paper 58.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_faculty_pubs/58

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Linguistics at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Linguistics Department Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF
LINGUISTICS
SECOND EDITION

WILLIAM J. FRAWLEY

Editor in Chief

Volume 3
Mande Languages–Selection

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2003

Senior Consulting Editor

WILLIAM BRIGHT

Department of Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles, Emeritus

Consulting Editors

KEITH ALLAN

Department of Linguistics, Monash University, Clayton, Australia

STEPHEN ANDERSON

Department of Linguistics and Cognitive Science, Yale University

JENNY CHESHIRE

Department of Linguistics, Queen Mary and Westfield College,
University of London

EVE V. CLARK

Department of Linguistics, Stanford University

BERNARD COMRIE

Department of Linguistics, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary
Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany

FLORIAN COULMAS

Fachschaft Modernes Japan, Gerhard Mercator University, Duis-
burg, Germany

RICHARD CURETON

Department of English, University of Michigan

REGNA DARNELL

Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES

Somerville College, Oxford

WILLIAM GRABE

Department of English, Northern Arizona University

BARBARA F. GRIMES

SIL International

JOSEPH E. GRIMES

Department of Linguistics, Cornell University, Emeritus, and SIL
International

HENRY HOENIGSWALD

Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania

ROBERT B. KAPLAN

Port Angeles, Washington

SUZANNE KEMMER

Department of Linguistics, Rice University

SARA E. KIMBALL

Division of Rhetoric and Composition, University of Texas, Aus-
tin

JUDITH L. KLAVANS

Center for Research on Information Access and Department of
Computer Science, Columbia University

ANDRAS KORNAI

Metacarta Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts

PETER LADEFOGED

Department of Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles

DAVID LIGHTFOOT

Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Georgetown Uni-
versity

JOHN MCCARTHY

Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

LISE MENN

Department of Linguistics, University of Colorado

R. H. ROBINS (DECEASED)

Department of Linguistics, School of Oriental and African Stud-
ies, University of London

DEBORAH SCHIFFRIN

Department of Linguistics, Georgetown University

SCOTT SOAMES

Department of Philosophy, Princeton University

- tions: In defense of Russell. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14.171–202.
- McCawley, James. 1979. Presupposition and discourse structure. In *Syntax and semantics 11*, edited by D. Dinneen and C. K. Oh, pp. 371–388. New York: Academic Press.
- Neale, Stephen. 1990. *Descriptions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1905. On denoting. *Mind* 14.479–493.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1919. *Introduction to mathematical philosophy*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Sharvy, Richard. 1980. A more general theory of definite descriptions. *Philosophical Review* 89.607–623.
- Soames, Scott. 1986. Incomplete definite descriptions. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 27.349–375.
- Strawson, Peter. 1950. On referring. *Mind* 59.320–344.
- Strawson, Peter. 1952. *Introduction to logical theory*. London: Methuen.
- Whitehead, Alfred N., and Bertrand Russell. 1925. *Principia mathematica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, George. 1978. On definite and indefinite description. *Philosophical Review* 87.48–76.

DELIA GRAFF

PHONEME. Some phonological theories recognize an element called the phoneme, defined as the smallest sound unit that can distinguish words. For example, /d/ and /ð/ are different phonemes of English because they distinguish between the words *breed* and *breathe*. (These words are called a *minimal pair*; identifying minimal pairs is an essential part of analyzing the phonemic system of a language.) Speech sounds that are audibly different but are not used to distinguish between words are called *allophones*. For example, Spanish [d] and [ð] are allophones of the phoneme /d/ because no pair of Spanish words is ever distinguished by them. Allophones cannot distinguish words because they always occur in different contexts; they are therefore said to be in *complementary distribution*. For example, Spanish [d] occurs initially and after [n] or [l], with [ð] occurring everywhere else.

Since about 1950, it has been known that there are various problems with the concept of the phoneme (Halle 1959, Joos 1957). In some dialects of American English, for instance, the phonemic distinction between /i/ and /ɛ/ (e.g. cf. *pit/pet*) is neutralized before a nasal, so *pin* and *pen* or *Jim* and *gem* are homophonous. The vowel occurring in these words, approximately [ɛ̃], must be an allophone of /i/ or /ɛ/, because it is in complementary distribution with both—but which one is it an allophone

of? Generative Phonology regards this and other paradoxes as definitive evidence against positing a phonemic level of representation (Chomsky 1964, 1966, Chomsky and Halle 1965). These arguments against the phoneme were widely accepted, leading to near-universal rejection of the phoneme as an element of linguistic theory. Still, the word “phoneme” continues to be used as a convenient way of talking about speech sounds, and the theory of Lexical Phonology includes a level of representation that harks back to the phoneme.

[See also Generative Phonology; Lexical Phonology, Overview; Phonology, *articles on American Structuralist Phonology and European Structuralist Phonology*; Segments; and Phonemic Systems.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1985. *Phonology in the twentieth century: Theories of rules and theories of representations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1964. *Current issues in linguistic theory*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1966. *Topics in the theory of generative grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. 1965. Some controversial questions in phonological theory. *Journal of Linguistics* 1.97–138.
- Halle, Morris. 1959. *The sound pattern of Russian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Joos, Martin. 1957. *Readings in linguistics I*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

JOHN J. MCCARTHY

PHONEMIC SYSTEMS. Most traditions of phonological analysis establish, for any given language, a set of contrasting sound types that distinguish one word from another. This set is usually designated the *phonemes*, or the underlying *segments*, of the language. Comparison of the content of such sets is one basic way to examine the similarities and differences among the phonological structures of languages. Generalizations can be based both on the number of members of the set and on the patterns of sound types found in the set. Much of the work to date on language universals at the phonological level has been based on the analysis of such patterns (Greenberg 1978).

The phonemic systems in a representative sample of 317 languages are described in Maddieson 1984, and expanded versions of the database underlying this anal-