

JAPAN

FUJIWARA YOICHI. *Chūgoku, Shikoku, Kinki, Kyūshū hōgen jōtai no hōgenchirigakuteki kenkyū* 中国四国近畿九州方言状態の方言地理学的研究 [A dialect-geographical study of the state of dialects in Western Honshu, Shikoku, the Kinki District, and Kyushu]. Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 1991. 312 pages. 252 figures. ¥22,660. ISBN 4-87088-431-3. (In Japanese)

Dealing mainly with grammar and lexicon, and covering an area of approximately 60,000 square kilometers, or roughly one-sixth of Japan, this work contains distribution maps and explanatory text related to 833 places surveyed, and, in an appendix, 59 distribution maps of pitch accents of selected lexical items. It is actually a Japanese version of what was published in 1956 as *Folklore Studies XV*, under the title *A Dialect-Geographical Study of the Japanese Dialects* (which is why all the map names are in English), though it contains many more maps than the English version did, and the explanatory text has been revised to reflect developments in the author's research since the time of the original publication.

The basic materials for this work were gathered from 1933 to 1934, and they thus represent data that is impossible to obtain now. They also belong among the very earliest attempts at dialect studies in Japan (the first survey took place in 1902; records of the second one, which was more ambitious in scope, were destroyed by fire in the Great Earthquake of 1923), and were gathered in the wake of a surge of interest in dialect distribution following Yanagida Kunio's return from Europe in 1927 and his introduction of the new European methods of dialect geography.

Fujiwara's surveys were originally conducted in the nine prefectures of Western Honshū (the Chūgoku District) and Shikoku, with the inclusion of Osaka and Hyōgo (of the Kinki District) bringing the number to eleven. With the cooperation of girls' normal schools set up by the various local governments, he collected answers written down by the girl students in questionnaire booklets, in which the students found forms supposed to be spoken in their regional dialects, and which they were to verify during school holidays through questioning of people in their hometowns. The data on pitch accents were gathered from 1934 to 1936, using roughly the same method, but the remaining prefectures in the Kinki District were added, as well as Fukuoka, Oita, and Miyazaki prefectures from Kyushu, thus lowering the density of places surveyed. During the long years of war these materials lay dormant, to be resurrected ten years after war's end. Particulars of how this came about are given on p. 2 of the author's Introduction.

The author's interest in producing distribution maps lay in first making a distribution map for each item surveyed, then next, integrating a number of distribution maps, showing the overall trends in dialect distribution. I believe this results from the author's intention to combine both Yanagida Kunio's ideas and the idea of Tōjō Misao, under whom Fujiwara studied, of regional division of the whole of Japan on the basis of dialects.

I have no particular opinion regarding the author's arrangement of distribution trends. Rather, I would take the issue a step earlier and draw attention to the grounds on which these trends were produced, namely, the distribution maps. The reason is that now there exist several other surveys conducted in the same regions and taking up the same survey items as this work. I felt that some comparisons between them and the present work would be desirable. It would be interesting to see if similarities

remained or if differences appeared between the two sets of findings, and to find out why. Do similarities indicate items that have withstood the passage of time over several decades? Do differences reflect historical changes in language, or are they due to differences in the survey methods used? Until these sorts of questions are clarified, I feel, it is difficult to discuss comprehensive distribution trends.

This is not the place to go into great detail on the more recent research, but I would like to take one sample item from each of four recent publications and compare the findings with those of the work under review, and thus point up the kind of results such comparison/contrast would produce. (One of the works, the third, is also by Fujiwara Yoichi.)

When we compare the distribution maps for *nai* ['there is not'] in HIROTO 1965 and the present work, we find agreement as to *na*: (distribution quite similar), but *disagreement* as to *ne*: *ne*, *næ*: (in HIROTO 1965 the territories are more clearly defined) and *næi*, *nja*:, and *nja* (found only in HIROTO 1965). Comments: in phonetic expression there tends to be individuality. When Fujiwara did the survey for the present work, he had students write in questionnaire booklets, whereas the Hiroto data were collected through field surveys. The disagreement in results might stem, therefore, from these differences in survey methods.

Next, if we compare the distribution maps for *tsurara* ['icicle'] in KOKURITSU KOKUGO KENKYŪJO 1967-75 (KKK) and the present work, we find *agreement* as to distribution of *jimidzai*, *jindzai*, *sai*, *sae*, *se*:, *nanrjo*:, *mandzo*:, and *sumaru*, but *disagreement* as to *tjirara* (not found in KKK), *tsudzura* (higher rate of appearance in the present work), *kaneko:ri*, *kanako:ri*, *gira(gi)ra*, etc. (only in KKK), and whereas *kurara* is distributed only in the vicinity of Kōchi City according to the present work, it can be found in places quite distant from Kōchi City in KKK. Comments: could *tjirara* and *tsudzura* have disappeared or waned in the course of the time between the two surveys? Or might it be that *tjirara* is included in the more dominant *tsurara* as a result of the mapping policies adopted by KKK? And the absence of *kaneko:ri*, *kanako:ri*, *gira(gi)ra*, etc. in the present work might have stemmed from the fact that the author had provided supposed forms in the questionnaires as leads. Finally, as regards the distribution of *kurara* in Kōchi, perhaps the geographical dissemination of the dialect and the difference in survey times are relevant.

Next, when we compare distribution maps for *tako* ['kite'] in FUJIWARA 1974 and in the present work, there is *agreement* in the distribution of *jo:dzu* and *ikanobori*, and *disagreement* as regards *ika* (dominant form in all regions covered by the present work, but receding in almost all regions covered by FUJIWARA 1974), while *jo(:)kambe*, *ikatako*, *takoika*, etc. are found in the latter but not in the present work. Comments: the receding of *ika* in FUJIWARA 1974 seems to be due to inroads being made by *tako*, which is not found in the present work. Now, the respondents for the present work were girls 15 to 18 in 1933, and those for FUJIWARA 1974 elderly people born around 1900, so that, although there is a gap in the times when the two surveys were conducted, still, it may be said that approximately the same age group was surveyed in both surveys. What accounts, then, for the big difference in findings? Perhaps, in regard to word forms that do not appear in the present work but appear in FUJIWARA 1974, the same observations hold as were made in the preceding paragraph, about the survey method. Another point that may be relevant is the difference in the density of survey locations (Fujiwara's 1974 work being much more dense).

Finally, a comparison of maps for *futteiru* ['is raining'] in TAKAHASHI 1991 and the present work shows *agreement* on the distribution of *ϕurijoru*, but *disagreement* on *ϕurrjoru* (not found in TAKAHASHI 1991) and *ϕunrjoru* (not found in the present work).

Comments: Takahashi also adopted the method of giving anticipated word forms to act as guides, and perhaps the points of difference with the present work are based on differences in these anticipated forms. Furthermore, Takahashi also gave the forms ϕ urijou, ϕ urijo:, and ϕ urju: (and distributions for each of these were found), and these probably were included within ϕ urijoru in the present work.

Few as these examples are, and brief my discussion of them, I believe they suggest interesting possibilities for future contrastive-comparative studies, which will in turn no doubt raise further questions. Besides such comparisons with the present work and, indeed, between the other works I have mentioned above, comparison should also be made with works in the Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo's *Hōgen bunpō zenkoku chizu* (1990~) series.

The present work is undoubtedly to be recognized as the pioneer in this genre of studies, and it deserves to be singled out for special mention as an achievement that provides hints for ever deeper research—for example, for more detailed field surveys or more detailed analyses of individual distribution maps. As mentioned before, the present work relied on anticipated word forms in its survey; with the receding of dialects in the present day, I feel this method has taken on new importance. Possible research topics would include the obvious development and deepening of this method, using the already available publications, with the present work the focal point.

Finally, I would like to add the opinion that the usefulness of this work would have been enhanced if an alphabetical index of the maps and an index of the word forms appearing in the maps had been provided.

REFERENCES CITED:

FUJIWARA Yoichi 藤原与一

1956 A dialect-geographical study of the Japanese dialects. *Folklore Studies* XV [available from Asian Folklore Studies].

1974 *Setonaikai gengo zukan* 瀬戸内海言語図巻 [Linguistic maps of (regions surrounding) the Seto Inland Sea]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

HIROTO Atsushi 広戸惇

1965 *Chūgoku chihō goken gengo chizu* 中国地方五県言語地図 [Linguistic atlas of the five provinces of west Japan]. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.

KOKURITSU KOKUGO KENKYŪJO, ed. 国立国語研究所編

1967-75 *Nihon gengo chizu* 日本言語地図 [Linguistic atlas of Japan]. Tokyo: The National Language Research Institute.

1990~ *Hōgen bunpō zenkoku chizu* 方言文法全国地図 [Grammar atlas of Japanese dialects]. Tokyo: The National Language Research Institute.

TAKAHASHI Kenji 高橋顕志

1991 *Shikoku gengo chizu* 四国言語地図 [Linguistic atlas of Shikoku]. Kōchi: Kōchi Joshidai Kokugogaku Kenkyūshitsu.

TOKUGAWA Munemasa
Osaka University
Toyonaka