[Book Review] Ogawa Shinji (2012) Nakijin-hōgen-akusento-no shosō [Aspects of Nakijin Dialect Accentuation]

[Book Review]

Ogawa Shinji (2012)
Nakijin-hōgen-akusento-no shosō [Aspects of Nakijin Dialect Accentuation]

Tokyo: Coco Publishers (270 pages)

Wayne P. Lawrence*

Nakijin is an administrative unit (*son*) situated in the northern half of the Motobu Peninsula in northern Okinawa Island. It is home to 19 communities, each with its own dialect. In 1983 professor Nakasone Seizen of the University of the Ryukyus published a magnificent dictionary of his native dialect, the dialect of the Yonamine community of Nakijin. *Okinawa Nakijin-hōgen-jiten* (hereafter *NHJ*) has formed the basis of all later research on the Nakijin dialects, including three PhD dissertations (Lawrence, 1990; Curry, 2004; Ogawa, 2009). The book reviewed here is based on the author's 2009 dissertation submitted to Kobe University, and is the first commercially published book on the accentuation of any Ryukyuan dialect/language.

The book has a main body of 159 pages (7 chapters), followed by 19 appendices and a table of references.[1)] The main topics covered in this book are a reanalysis of the accentual system of the citation forms in *NHJ*, the accentuation of standard Japanese vocabulary items as pronounced by two generations of Nakijin inhabitants, and a reconstruction of the accent system for Proto Northern Okinawan nouns and how the Nakijin dialect system developed from this system. Due to the page limit, I am unable to cover all of the topics covered in this book, so here I will review the synchronic analysis of the traditional dialect, focussing on compound words. For a review which focusses on the historical aspect of the book, please refer to Lawrence (2013).

The synchronic analysis argued for in this volume must first be evaluated on how well it captures the content of *NHJ* (i.e., on its descriptive adequacy). Only if it is descriptively adequate can it then be weighed up against alternative analyses and frameworks.

The longest section (10 pages) of Ogawa's chapter on the reanalysis of *NHJ* is devoted to the accentuation of compound nouns. According to Ogawa, "when constructing compounds, the surface phonetic forms, and not the normally predicted underlying forms, of simple words (the free forms of the first and last elements of the compound) are the input" (p. 95). At no stage, however, is any evidence given for this analysis, which is surprising due to the fact that exceptions abound. A small sample of the types of exceptions is given below. (The Romanisation of the surface forms in this review follows Ogawa's transcription, but the underlying forms given between slashes (/… /) are those which reflect the analysis of Lawrence (1990)).

* Senior Lecturer, University of Auckland　オークランド大学上級講師

Both initial and final elements have short element-final vowels where long vowels are expected:

naci↑zi¬nu 'summer clothes' ← *na↑cii* (/naci̊/ 'summer') + *cinu↑u* (/cinu/ 'clothing')
mazi↑ri'jaʁuu¬ba 'county office' ← *mazi↑rii* (/maziri̊/ 'county') + *'jaʁu↑baa* (/jakubå/ 'public office')

Compound-final elements have unexpected short final vowels and long penultimate vowels:

ʁunii↑bunusii¬du 'mandarin thief' ← *ʁunii↑bu* (/kˀunibu/ 'mandarin') + nusi↑duu (/nusidů/ 'thief')
na↑gaa¬damuuci 'long-keeping' ← *na↑gaa-* (/nagå-/ 'long (time)' + *tamu↑cii* (/tamuci̊/ 'preservation')

Compound-final elements have short final vowels where long vowels are expected:

↑kii¬muumu 'species of peach' ← *↑kii* (kii̊ ← /ke̊/ 'hair') + *muu↑muu* (/muumů/ 'peach')
ˀajaata↑bee¬ru 'beautiful butterfly' ← *ˀaja↑a* (/aja/ 'pattern') + *tabee↑ruu* (/tabeerů/ 'butterfly')

Compound-final elements have short antepenultimate vowels where long vowels are expected:

↑cii¬hasigui 'bloody phlegm' ← *↑cii* (cii̊ ← /ci̊/ 'blood') + *ha↑sii¬gui* (/kasigui̊/ 'phlegm')
'iʁii↑ga'jagusa¬mi 'widower' ← *'iʁi↑gaa* (/ekegå/ 'man') + *'ja↑guu¬sami* (/jagůsami/ 'widow')

Compound-initial elements have short final vowels where long vowels are predicted:

nusi↑dumja¬a 'thieving cat' ← *nusi↑duu* (/nusidů/ 'thief') + *↑mja¬a* (/mjåa/ 'cat')
cii↑ta¬cizuuguniici[2] '1st and 15th of the month' ← *ciita↑cii* (/ciitaci̊/ 'first day of month') + *zuugu↑nii¬ci* ('15th of month')

Lawrence (1990) is able to account for the length of vowels in the non-compounded forms and in most of the compounds above. For example, according to the analysis of Lawrence (1990), word-final accented vowels are lengthened, producing the long vowel in *nusi↑duu* 'thief.' However, when it is the initial constituent of a compound, the accented vowel is no longer word-final, so it is not lengthened. Under Ogawa's analysis, all surface long vowels which if short would not be in the head of a foot are underlyingly long, meaning that the word-final vowel in *nusi↑duu* and similar words is underlyingly long. Neither Lawrence (1990) nor Ogawa posit any vowel shortening processes for the Nakijin dialect, so it is unclear how the attested surface forms can be derived under Ogawa's assumption that compounding occurs after Rhythmic Lengthening (the equivalent of Hayes' (1996, p. 83) Iambic Lengthening) has applied, and that surface long vowels which if short would not be in the head of a foot are underlyingly long.[3]

The central innovation in Ogawa's analysis of Nakijin accentuation is that it is the rise in pitch which is most important in distinguishing meaning, and that any fall in pitch is non-distinctive. As part of his argument that this is the case, Ogawa gives the following examples of 2 mora + 3 mora compounds (p. 21) in order to show that although the locus of rise in pitch is stable, there is variation in where the pitch falls.

(19) a. ziibu↑ne¬e ○○#○●○ ‘sea-sickness even on land’
← zi↑i ‘land’ + pune↑e ‘sea-sickness’
b. peemu↑ĸe¬e ○○#○●○ ‘facing south’
← pe↑e ‘south’ + mu↑ĸee ‘direction’
c. kiisi↑ruu ○○#○●● ‘sap’
← ki↑i ‘tree’ + siru↑u ‘juice, soup’
d. haasa↑baa ○○#○●● ‘leather sandals’
← ha↑a ‘leather, skin’ + sa↑baa ‘sandal’

What escapes Ogawa under his analysis of compounding is that the fall in pitch in these words correlates with the length of the final syllable in the underlying form. Of the 86 compounds given in Appendix 2 which give the (19a, b) pitch contour, all of them have a heavy final syllable underlyingly (either a long mid-vowel or a short vowel suffixed with the morpheme *-a*/-V ‘person, thing’, giving a long vowel). Of the 132 compounds given in Appendix 3 which produce the pitch contour in (19c, d), all but one have an underlying light syllable. *siru↑u* /siru/ ‘juice’ (from 19c) has a surface long vowel due to the regular application of Rhythmic Lengthening, and that the vowel is underlyingly short is supported by compound forms such as *siruma↑ha¬i* ‘soup bowl’. However, the surface long vowel in *pune↑e* (/punee/ ‘sea-sickness’) (from 19a) is a mid-vowel, and all mid-vowels in light syllables are subject to a raising rule.[4)] That long mid-vowels are not underlyingly short is supported by the fact that they never appear as short vowels in compounds. This can be illustrated by comparison of the following two compound nouns.

pazi↑cizee¬ku ‘tattooist’ ← *pazi↑cii* (/pazici*/ ‘tattoo’) + *see↑ĸuu* (/seeku*/ ‘building work’)
haci↑neezoo¬zi ‘good at business’ ← *haci↑nee* (/ʔacinee*/ ‘commerce’) + *zoo↑zii* (/zoozi*/ ‘excellence’)

Under Ogawa’s analysis, which has the final vowels of both initial constituents as underlyingly long, there is no principled explanation for the fact that when compounded, one surfaces as short. Additionally, Lawrence (1990) would predict that, if the final constituent of a compound, there should be the contrast *-pazii¬ci* vs. *-hacine¬e* (final accent is deleted, and accent is assigned to the penultimate mora), and parallel examples which support this prediction are easy to find (e.g. *saĸaa↑na’jaa’inaa¬gu* ‘barmaid-prostitute’ ending with *’inaa↑guu* (/inagu*/ ‘woman’) and *saa↑τaaguruu¬ma* ‘sugar press’ ending with *ĸuru↑maa* (/kʔuruma*/ ‘wheel’) vs. *’inaa↑gusoode¬e* ‘sister’ ending with *soo↑dee* (/coodee*/ ‘sibling’) and *saa↑τaabaĸu’jo¬o* ‘sugar broker’ ending with *baĸu↑’joo* (/bakujoo*/ ‘broker, trade’)). So far as this reviewer can ascertain, Ogawa’s analysis will not permit derivation of the correct surface forms.

Ogawa treats all surface long mid-vowels under iambic-foot heads, including long mid-vowels, as the result of Rhythmic Lengthening (pp. 43–4). Because of Ogawa’s failure to recognise the correlation between the underlying form and the presence of a fall in pitch in the examples in (19), he concludes that there is “variation” in words with the same structure. This is one factor which leads Ogawa to the conclusion that the fall in pitch in words is of no significance (except in words

where only the first mora is high—Ogawa's C-class words (p. 45)), and that what is significant in the Nakijin dialect is the locus of the rise in pitch.

Under Ogawa's analysis, long vowels in syllables which if short would not be heads of iambic feet must be long underlyingly (p. 44). However, the table on p. 71 tells us that an underlying B-class form with an unaccented HL structure (where H is a heavy syllable, and L is a light syllable) gives rise to surface forms of both the structure H↑L and H↑H.[5] This is an unsatisfactory situation, in that there seems to be no way to tell whether the final underlying light syllable should lengthen or not.

Ogawa (pp. 90–1) takes up the example of the compound verb *numi*↑ᴋ*u*¬*m*i*N* 'swallow' (← *numi*↑*N* 'drink, swallow' + -ᴋ*umiN* 'move inward'). In (122) he gives the foot structure as [numi][kú]#[miN], where # is the boundary between the stem and the conjugation ending (p. 90), and the diacritic ´ marks the location of the accent. Locating the morpheme boundary before the *m*, rather than after it, is questionable, but here I would like to focus on the major difference between Ogawa's analysis and that of Lawrence (1990)—the issue of the accent. Both Ogawa (pp. 41–3, 70) and Lawrence claim that an accent blocks Rhythmic Lengthening of a high vowel in an adjacent syllable, but whereas Lawrence identifies the accent as a (potential) locus of fall in pitch, Ogawa identifies the locus of the rise in pitch with the accent.

Parallel to Ogawa's footing of *numi*↑ᴋ*u*¬*m*i*N* 'swallow', for argument's sake I shall assume that the verbs *pa*↑*ταaracu*¬*N* 'work' and *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*N* 'renew' (*NHJ* pp. 684–5) will be footed as [paταa][ra]#[cuN] and [ʔaraa][tami]#[ruN] respectively. The question which arises is why the *i* in *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*N* is not lengthened by Rhythmic Lengthening under Ogawa's analysis.[6] The interrogative forms of these two verbs are *pa*↑*ταaracuu*¬*mi* and *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*mi*, and the question this time is why the *u* in *pa*↑*ταaracuu*¬*mi* lengthens (with a supposed foot structure of [paταa][ra]#[cuu]#mi), whereas neither the word-medial *i* nor *u* in *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*mi* lengthen (supposed foot structure [ʔaraa][tami]#[ru]#mi). The progressive hortative forms of the same two verbs are *pa*↑*ταaracuraa* and *ʔaraata*↑*miruraa*, and the same vowels are not lengthened in either verb. Lawrence (1990, pp. 109–25) argues that the verb endings we have here are /-i*ur-N/ (conclusive), /-i*ur-mi/ (interrogative), and /-i*ur-a*/ (progressive hortative) and shows that the distribution of accents on all verb endings is predictable. These accents suffice to account for the non-lengthening of the high vowels in the even-numbered syllables in these and other verb forms. Under Ogawa's analysis, however, the accent is on the first high mora of each form, and there can be only one accent per word (p. 95). There is thus no accent (rise in pitch) available on an adjacent syllable to block Rhythmic Lengthening in the fourth syllables in *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*N*, *ʔaraata*↑*miru*¬*mi*, and *ʔaraata*↑*miruraa*, and the "accent" in *pa*↑*ταaracuraa* is too far removed from the fourth syllable to block lengthening.

Using the compound verb *sikoi*-↑ᴋ*e*¬*eruN* 'convert' (where I have added a hyphen to indicate the boundary between the two verbal components) as an example, Ogawa gives the following explanation (where 'prefix' refers to the first verb in the compound):

> When the prefix is made extrametrical, the accentual information held by the first component in the compound, which is important for compound accentuation rules, is lost. If it is assumed

> that next a High-Low tone sequence is specified at the morpheme boundary, because the prefix is extrametrical the High-Low is specified on the first two moras of the second component in the compound. (p. 94)

However, from compound verbs such as *sizi-*↑*pu*˥ᴋ*aasuɴ*~*siɴ*↑*zi-pu*˥ᴋ*aasuɴ* (not **siɴzi-*↑*pu*˥ᴋ*aasuɴ*) 'over-brew' and *hacira*↑*si-*ᴋ*e*˥*esuɴ* (not **hacirasi-*↑ᴋ*e*˥*esuɴ*) 're-heat', which have the same High-Low specification at the morpheme boundary, we can see that it is not the prefix which is extrametrical but instead the initial foot of the first element (in all of Ogawa's examples the first element is one foot long). This is in fact Lawrence's (1990) analysis of what Ogawa calls the B class of vocabulary. However, to account for B-class vocabulary, Ogawa does not employ extrametricality of the initial foot but instead uses the constraint Non-Initiality(Ft), which has the same effect (p. 72). Why both Non-Initiality / Non-Finality and extrametricality are required in the analysis of the Nakijin dialect, and what the difference is between the two, is not explained. This is an example of insufficient attention being paid to explaining the theoretical assumptions being relied upon. Another example of this is the fact that the term "accent" is not defined. From p. 81 (101) it appears that when an accent is assigned to the second mora of a heavy syllable, the accent is copied (not moved) both to the syllable level and onto the first mora of the syllable. Without a definition of what the accent is in Ogawa's analysis, it is hard to reconcile this structure, where there are three accentual markings in one syllable, with the explicit claim made on p. 95 that there may be only one accent per word. It is also clear that in Ogawa's analysis, accent is something which is assigned (section 2 of Ch. 4 is titled "accent assignment"), Rhythmic Lengthening must apply after accent assignment, and compounding takes place after this vowel lengthening, but no attempt is made to explain how this derivational ordering is supposed to fit in with the non-derivational Optimality Theoretical Model being used in parts of the book.

In conclusion, we have seen that the following aspects of Ogawa's proposed analysis fail to account for the data: identification of the accent, which blocks Rhythmic Lengthening, with the rise in pitch; compounding takes place after the application of Rhythmic Lengthening; underlyingly short mid-vowels become long mid-vowels by Rhythmic Lengthening. Reconciling the influence of the accent on Rhythmic Lengthening (adopted from Lawrence (1990)) with his other assumptions of a maximum of one accent per word (contra Lawrence (1990) which has a maximum of one per morpheme) and identification of the accent with the rise in pitch (contra Lawrence (1990)) is likely to be an impossible project, as suggested by the verb forms above.

This book is well produced (although misprints and misinterpretations present in Ogawa (2009) remain) and contains a number of interesting if unproven ideas. I recommend that the book be critically read in conjunction with *NHJ* and Lawrence (1990) for the synchronic analysis, and Lawrence (2009) for the historical analysis. The Nakijin dialect is accentually fascinating, and the historical question of how such a system developed, when other Ryukyuan dialects appear to have word-tone systems, is an intriguing question. It is hoped that the publication of this book will invigorate research into the prosody and other aspects of the dialects of the region.

Notes

1) Appendix 19 is incomplete, giving only part of the data on which the tables on pp. 142–3 are based. The missing portion of the appendix is to be found in Ogawa (2009, pp. 219–220).
2) This word is a coordinate (dvandva) compound and so, according to Lawrence (1990), is accented on the mora following the first foot (cf. *tii*↑*jo*┐*opisaa'joo* '(indicate) using hands and feet', *ʔu'jaa*↑*ço*┐*odee* 'parents and siblings'). This type of compound is outside of the range of Ogawa's analysis, but it would seem to present a problem, not only for the length of the final vowel of the initial component but also for the location of the accent, which is not on a foot head. Except for C-class words, and for B-class words of four moras in length, accents are supposed to be located on foot-heads (pp. 68–9). It is this aspect of Ogawa's analysis, which is not motivated in the book, which forces him to postulate irregular monomoraic feet in compounds (pp. 90–1), as exemplified in the example *numi*↑*ku*┐*min* 'swallow' below.
3) On p. 55 Ogawa gives the compound *siru*↑*sina*┐*(a)* (according to *NHJ* the form is *siru*↑*si*┐*na(a)*) 'white sand' as deriving from *si*↑*ru*┐*u* 'white', but *si*↑*ru*┐*u* is a derived noun /siru+V/ meaning 'white (n); white thing'. The initial component in the compound is the adjective stem /siru/, which has an underlying short vowel. This is therefore not an instance of vowel shortening.

   The example *puru*↑*'wa*┐*ta* 'old cotton' (p. 55) likewise derives from the adjective stem /puru/. Ogawa analyses it as deriving from *puru*↑*u* 'old thing', but he does not explain how the vowel is to be shortened in the compound.
4) There are thus very few mid vowels (*e*, *o*) in light syllables in Nakijin, and the few examples there are only apparent exceptions (see Lawrence, 2000, pp. 55–6, 58).
5) The same situation exists for Ogawa's A-class words, where underlying HL gives rise to both surface ↑HL and ↑HH.
6) The same vowel is lengthened in the imperative form *ʔaraata*↑*mii*┐*ri* and conjunctive form *ʔaraata*↑*mii*┐*ti*, showing that there is nothing intrinsic in the vowel which resists lengthening.

References

Curry, S. A. (2004). *Small Linguistics: Phonological History and Lexical Loans in Nakijin Dialect Okinawan*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Hawai'i.

Hayes, B. P. (1996). *Metrical Stress Theory: Principles and Case Studies*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lawrence, W. P. (1990). *Nakijin Phonology: Feet and Extrametricality in a Japanese Dialect*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Tsukuba.

Lawrence, W. P. (2000). Shi'in-o koete okoru boin-no yūgō: Ryūkyū-shohōgen-ni okeru genshō-o chūshin-ni [Vowel coalescence across consonants: The phenomenon in Ryukyuan dialects], *Onsei Kenkyū* [Journal of the Phonetic Society of Japan] 4(1), 55–60.

Lawrence, W. P. (2009). Kita-ryūkyū-sogo-no meisi-onchō: Shiron [The tone system of Proto-Northern-Ryukyuan nouns—a proposal], *Okinawa Bunka* 106, 1–17.

Lawrence, W. P. (2013). Shohyō: Ogawa Shinji *Nakijin-hōgen-akusento-no shosō, Nihongo-no Kenkyū* [Studies in the Japanese Language] 9(3), 65–69.

Matsumori, A. (2000). Ryūkyū-akusento-chōsa-no tame-no ruibetsu-go'i-no kaihatsu: Okinoerabu-no chōsakara [The development of word lists for Ryukyuan accent research: Based on the dialects of Okinoerabu island], *Onsei Kenkyū* [Journal of the Phonetic Society of Japan] 4(1), 61–71.

Nakasone, S. (1983). *Okinawa Nakijin-hōgen-jiten*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

Ogawa S. (2009). *Nakijin-hōgen-no akusento-taikei* [The accentuation system of the Nakijin dialect]. (Doctoral dissertation). Kobe University.