Heian period accentuation as viewed from comparison of modern dialects: Especially bimoraic nouns
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There are two types of dialects spoken in Japan. On the one hand there are dialects like those of Tokyo and Kyoto which have so-called accent-class distinctions, so that otherwise homophonous words such as hashi HL ‘chopsticks’ and hashi LH ‘bridge’, ame HL ‘rain’ and ame LH ‘boiled sweet’ are distinguished by their accentuation. On the other hand, there are dialects such as, as discovered by professor Shirō Hattori, the Sendai
dialect which have no accent-class distinctions, so they do not distinguish homophones using accentuation. In other words, in the Sendai dialect, in natural pronunciation ‘chopsticks’ and ‘bridge’ are both hashi HL, ‘rain’ and ‘boiled sweet’ are both ame HL, and in fact all bimoraic words are pronounced with this falling pitch contour. Now, because the dialects of Yamagata city and Yonezawa city in Yamagata prefecture, Wakamatsu city, Kōriyama city and Shirakawa town in Fukushima pref., Mito city, Tsuchiura city and Koga town in Ibaraki pref., Utsunomiya city and Tochigi town in Tochigi pref., Noda town in Chiba pref., Kasukabe town in Saitama pref. and other localities all have accentuations of the same type as Sendai, it seems that dialects with no accent-class distinctions are distributed from the southern Ōu region down to the northeastern part of the Kantō region. ([1] on the map attached. Also, recent fieldwork by Teruo Hirayama has shown that the same accentual type of dialect is also distributed in a belt across Nagasaki, Saga, Fukuoka, Kumamoto and Miyazaki prefs. ([2] on the map).)

[Note] The Sendai pitch contours are taken from Shirō Hattori’s “A survey of the accentuation of various dialects of Japanese (4)” Hōgen 2.2 (1932). The accentuation of towns in Ibaraki, Tochigi, Chiba and Saitama prefs. is mainly drawn from this author’s fieldwork, and that of towns in Fukushima and Yamagata prefs. is from the pronunciation supplied by acquaintances resident in Tokyo. The Kyushu dialects are due to Teruo Hirayama’s “Accent boundaries in Kyushu” Study of Sounds 6 (1937) and “Aspects of Kyushu dialect accentuation” The Bulletin of the Phonetic Society of Japan 45 (1937).

For the moment I shall not touch on these dialects which lack accent-class distinctions. The regions outside of [1] and [2] on the map seem to be mainly occupied by dialects which have accent-class distinctions.

[Note] When I investigated the pronunciation of a person from Ajimano village in Imadate county, Fukui pref., I suspected that the speaker lacked accent-class distinctions. According to Teruo Hirayama, the same situation can be recognised in a village in Ishikawa pref. Perhaps dialects lacking accent-class distinctions are also distributed in the Hokuriku region.

[Note] When I investigated the pronunciation of a person from Ajimano village in Imadate county, Fukui pref., I suspected that the speaker lacked accent-class distinctions. According to Teruo Hirayama, the same situation can be recognised in a village in Ishikawa pref. Perhaps dialects lacking accent-class distinctions are also distributed in the Hokuriku region.
In producing this accent-distribution map, I have drawn heavily on the research of prof. Shirō Hattori, Messrs Takamichi Ōhara, Yoichi Fujiwara, Takeo Ōta, Teruo Hirayama, Jinbei Yamawaki, and others.
In dialects which have accent-class distinctions, the following two points have become clear from Prof. Shirō Hattori’s famous research.

(a) The dialects which extend along the Tōkaidō region from the Tokyo-Yokohama area ([3] on the map) and the dialects which extend throughout the Chūgoku region (including Izumo) from Okayama-Hiroshima ([5] on the map) have the same accent-type.

(b) The dialects which extend throughout the Kinki region (excluding peripheral areas) from the Osaka-Kyoto area ([4] on the map) and the dialects which extend throughout the Shikoku region (excluding the southwestern part) from Kōchi and Matsuyama ([6] on the map) have the same accent-type.

Taking the Tokyo dialect (based on Kaku Jimbō and Senri Tsunemi’s Kokugo Hatsuon Akusento Jiten [Japanese pronunciation and accent dictionary], 1937) as a representative of the Tōkaidō dialects, the Kyoto dialect (based on Kanae Ikeda’s research) as a representative of the Kinki dialects, the dialect of Setoda-chō in Toyota county, Hiroshima pref. (based on the pronunciation of Isao Shimada. This dialect is virtually identical to that of Hiroshima city) as a representative of the Chūgoku dialects, and the Kōchi dialect (based on the pronunciation of Toyo Kitamura) as a representative of the Shikoku dialects and comparing the accentuation of bimoraic nouns:

(a) The four dialects of Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Kōchi all have level, falling and rising tonal contours. However, whereas Kyoto and Kōchi dialect forms are followed by a particle, words with the rising contour split into two groups (A and B), with the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects there is no such split.


In the Kyoto, Hiroshima and Kōchi dialects these words are all pronounced with a level contour.


In the Kyoto dialect these are all pronounced with the falling (HL) contour. The Hiroshima dialect behaves as the Tokyo dialect, and the Kōchi dialect behaves as the Kyoto dialect.

(d) In the Tokyo dialect the following words belong to the falling contour (HL):
In the Kyoto dialect these are all pronounced with the rising contour LH. However the A words and the B words are pronounced differently when followed by a particle. The Hiroshima dialect behaves as the Tokyo dialect, and the Kōchi dialect behaves as the Kyoto dialect.

Of (a-d) above, in (c) and (d) the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects contrast with the Kyoto and Kōchi dialects. The same trend is also observed with the accentuation of adjectives, verbs, and one- and three-mora nouns. More detail about these points can be found in Shirō Hattori’s “A survey of the accentuation of various dialects of Japanese (1) ~ (3)” in Hōgen 1:1, 1:3, 1:4 (1931).

The Kyoto and Kōchi dialects are examples of what Hattori calls A-type dialects, and the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects are his B-type dialects.

[Note] Strictly speaking, the level contours of the Tokyo and Kyoto dialects are rather different from each other. The rising B-group of the Kyoto dialect and the rising B-group of the Kōchi dialect are also not identical. However, I will not discuss the actual phonetic contours in detail here.

According to Prof. Hattori, Takamichi Ōhara and other researchers, B-type dialects are found in northern Kyushu ([7] on the map), southeastern Shikoku ([8] on the map), and the Yamato-Totsukawa area of the Kinki region ([9] on the map), and the A-type dialects are found in the vicinity of southwest of Mino, Echizen-Tsuruga ([10] on the map). The dialects in the vicinity of Etchū-Toyama ([11] on the map) are aberrant, but it seems that at least for bimoraic nouns the accentuation is of the A-type lineage.

[Note] According to Shinkichi Hashimoto, the accentuation of Tsuruga-chō is as follows:

(a) Bimoraic nouns have level, rising and falling contours.

(b) The words kaki ‘persimmon’, ume ‘plum’, ushi ‘cow’… which are level in Kyoto are also level in Tsuruga.

(c) Of the rising-contour words in the Kyoto dialect, the B-group words (aki ‘autumn’, ume ‘rain’…) are also rising-contour forms in Tsuruga, but the A-group forms (ato ‘remains’, iki ‘breath’…) are level contour with no phonetic distinction from the words in (b) above.

(d) Falling-contour words in the Kyoto dialect (ashi ‘foot’, ikes ‘pond’, ishi ‘stone’…) are also falling contour in Tsuruga.

The fact that the distinction between A- and B-group words found in the Kyoto dialect is also found in Tsuruga, and the fact that falling-contour words in Kyoto are also falling contour in the Tsuruga dialect suggest that the Tsuruga dialect is of the A-type lineage.
According to Toshio Sugimura and other acquaintances, the accentuation of the Toyama dialect is as follows:

(a) Bimoraic nouns have level, rising and falling contours.

(b) The words *kaki* ‘persimmon’, *ume* ‘plum’, *ushi* ‘cow’… which are level in Kyoto are also level in Toyama.

(c) Of the rising-contour words in the Kyoto dialect, the B-group words split into two groups – (i) *ame* ‘rain’, *mado* ‘window’, *mae* ‘front’… are rising; (ii) *aki* ‘autumn’, *saru* ‘monkey’, *tsuru* ‘crane (bird)’… are falling contour (as in Tokyo). A-group words (*ato* ‘remains’, *iki* ‘breath’…) are, as in the Tsuruga dialect, level contour and indistinguishable from the words in (b) above.

(d) Words which are falling contour words in the Kyoto dialect also split into two groups – (i) *hana* ‘flower’, *hara* ‘stomach’, *hata* ‘flag’, *hone* ‘bone’, *ike* ‘pond’, *kawa* ‘river’, *kusa* ‘grass’, *mune* ‘chest’, *nawa* ‘rope’, *oto* ‘sound’, *shima* ‘island’, *uma* ‘horse’, *yama* ‘mountain’… are rising contour (as in Tokyo); (ii) *ashi* ‘leg’, *hashi* ‘bridge’, *inu* ‘dog’, *ishi* ‘stone’, *kami* ‘paper’, *kami* ‘(head) hair’, *mach* ‘town’, *mimi* ‘ear’, *sumi* ‘charcoal’, *tsuru* ‘string (of instrument or bow)’, *yubi* ‘finger’… are falling contour.

In the Toyama dialect words in (c ii) and (d), the distribution of high and low tones is the opposite of that of the same Kyoto dialect words, and quite a number of the words have the same accentuation as the Tokyo dialect, but looking in more detail we observe that of the words in (c ii) and (d), those pronounced with a rising contour all end in [a], [o] or [e] (i.e. non-high vowels), and the words pronounced with a falling contour all end with [i] or [u] (i.e. a high vowel). Probably, at some point in the past, the words in (c ii) and (d) were either all pronounced with a rising contour or with a falling contour, or perhaps they were divided into two groups (rising- and falling-contour words) but not split along the same lines as in the modern language. It can be considered that at some point a sound change took place and words such as *ame* ‘rain’ and *ike* ‘pond’ which end in a non-high vowel took on a rising contour, and words like *aki* ‘autumn’ and *ashi* ‘foot’ with a high word-final vowel took on a falling contour, so from only this it cannot be concluded whether this dialect is closer to the A-type dialects or the B-type dialects. However, from the fact that in (c) it can be observed that a distinction corresponding to the Kyoto dialect rising-contour A- and B-group words exists, it seems valid to say that the Toyama dialect is of the A-type dialect lineage.

The Tsuruga dialect data were provided by a very busy Prof. Hashimoto, and I did not elicit all of the nouns listed above, so there is the possibility that there are mistakes, but I hope this will not reflect badly on him.

I have used the following sources for the northeastern Kyushu dialects: “The boundary between Chūgoku and Kinki accentuation – the Izumo accentuation domain” by the Dialect Research Society of Tokyo University of Arts and Sciences in Högen 2:3 (1932), and “Aspects of Kyushu dialect accentuation” by Teruo Hirayama in The Bulletin of
In summary, dialects from central Kantō to northern Kyushu can be divided into A-type lineage dialects and B-type lineage dialects.
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In addition to dialects which are clearly A- or B-type dialects, there are also the following three dialect groups which have accent-class distinctions.

- [12 on the map] The Hokuō dialects: Distributed in Morioka city (Iwate pref.), Hirosaki city (Aomori pref.), Akita city (Akita pref.), Tsuruoka city (Yamagata pref.), Tsugawa town (Niigata pref.) etc.
- [13 on the map] The Izumo dialects: Almost all dialects of the former Izumo province in Shimane pref.
- [14 on the map] The southwestern Kyushu dialects: Centering on Nagasaki and Kagoshima cities, dialects distributed throughout Nagasaki, Saga, Kumamoto and Kagoshima prefectures.

[Note] Within the Hokuō dialects, as I explain below, there is a slight difference between the Morioka and Tōno dialects on the one hand and the Hirosaki, Akita and Tsuruoka dialects on the other. There also seem to be slight differences between the Aomori and Hirosaki dialects. Of the Niigata pref. dialects, those spoken in the southwest, such as in Naetsu and Aizawa towns [15 on the map] are, on the whole, similar to the Tōkaidō dialects. The Niigata city dialect too cannot really be classified as Hokuō-type, but from the points noted below, all of these dialects are of the Morioka type and not of the Tokyo type. (Niigata city dialect data is due to personal communication from Hisao Satō, and the data for the other localities are from personal communications with acquaintances living in Tokyo.)

In southwestern Kyushu, the dialects of Nagasaki, Saga, Kumamoto and Kagoshima pref.s are not identical, but it seems they can be viewed as having split off from the same dialect.

The source used for the Izumo dialects is Takamichi Ōhara’s “The boundary between Chūgoku and Kinki accentuation – the Izumo accentuation domain” in Hōgen 2:3 (1932), and the sources used for the southwestern Kyushu dialects are Teruo Hirayama’s “Accent boundaries in Kyushu” in Study of Sounds 6 (1937) and “Aspects of Kyushu dialect accentuation” in The Bulletin of the Phonetic Association of Japan 45 (1937).

Of these three dialect groups, the accentuation of the Hokuō dialects appears to be quite similar to that of the B-type dialects. Taking the Morioka dialect as a representative
example of the Hokuō dialects, the accentuation of bimoraic nouns can be outlined as follows (the data is the pronunciation of my father, who was born in Morioka).

(a) Morioka dialect has level, rising and falling tonal contours. The rising contour lacks the A/B distinction of dialects like the Kyoto dialects, and this is the same as the Tokyo dialect.


Of the words above, those which are not underlined are of the level-contour class in both the Tokyo and the Kyoto dialects, and the underlined words are of the rising class in Tokyo and of the falling class in Kyoto.


The above words are all of the rising class in Tokyo and of the falling class in Kyoto.


The above words are all of the falling class in Tokyo and of the rising A- or B-groups in Kyoto.

Looking at (a-d) above, we can see that (a), (c) and (d) are the same as the Tokyo dialect, and the only difference is (b) where the words ishi ‘stone’, kami ‘paper’, kawa ‘river’, machi ‘town’, mune ‘chest’, oto ‘sound’ and tsuru ‘string’, which have a rising contour in Tokyo, are level in Morioka. This group of words is not pronounced on a level contour in the Kyoto dialects, so it is not similar to Kyoto; we can thus consider that the Morioka dialect is very close to the B-type dialects. Comparing the accentuation of verbs, adjectives, and monomoraic nouns and nouns of three or more moras’ length seems to show the same tendency.

[Note] In the Tsuruoka city dialect (based on my observation of the pronunciation of Magojirō Koyama), of (a-d) above, (a, b, c) are exactly the same as the Morioka dialect. As for (d), the (i) words (aki ‘autumn’, hari ‘needle’, koe ‘voice’, saru ‘monkey’, tsuru ‘crane (bird)’, usu ‘mortar’) are falling as in Morioka, but the (ii) words (ame ‘rain’, ato ‘remains’, kasa ‘straw hat’, kata...
‘shoulder’, mado ‘window’, sora ‘sky’) take a rising contour. From this it may appear that the Tsuruoka dialect is close to the Kyoto dialect, but if we compare the (i) and (ii) nouns we notice that the (i) words all end with a high vowel (i, u) and the (ii) words all end in non-high vowels (a, e, o). Also, the (c) words, which have a rising contour in the Morioka dialect, are also rising in the Tsuruoka dialect regardless of the height of the final vowel. In other words, we can say that the Tsuruoka dialect was accentually identical to the Morioka dialect at some point in the past, but its falling-contour words have since undergone a change, with those ending in a non-high vowel taking on a rising contour, so the Tsuruoka dialect and the Morioka dialect can be considered to be of the same lineage. The dialect of Tsugawa town (Niigata pref.) and the Akita city dialect appear to be very similar to the Tsuruoka dialect.

If the difference between Tokyo and Morioka accentuation were simply as described above, it might be expected that a similar degree of difference might exist between the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects, which have been classified as B-type dialects. Actually, it is not the case that all words in the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects have the same accentuation – we can find quite a number of words like hato ‘pigeon’, kame ‘tortoise, turtle’, kiba ‘fang’, kumo ‘cloud’, kuwa ‘mulberry tree’ and tako ‘octopus’ which have a falling contour (HL) in Tokyo but have a rising contour (LH) in Hiroshima. The correlations between the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialect and the Tokyo and Morioka dialect accentuations are represented in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokyo dialect</th>
<th>Hiroshima dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>level contour</td>
<td>level contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rising contour</td>
<td>rising contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falling contour</td>
<td>falling contour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokyo dialect</th>
<th>Morioka dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>level contour</td>
<td>level contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rising contour</td>
<td>rising contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falling contour</td>
<td>falling contour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects, with the correspondences in the upper table above, are to be viewed as belonging to the same lineage, then perhaps it can be said that there is no impediment to considering the Tokyo and Morioka dialects, with the correspondences in the lower table, as also belong to the same lineage.

[Note] The nouns hato ‘pigeon’, kame ‘tortoise, turtle’, kumo ‘cloud’ and tako ‘octopus’ are also all pronounced on the rising contour (LH) in the Morioka dialect.

Looking at how the words hato ‘pigeon’, kame ‘tortoise, turtle’, kumo ‘cloud’ and tako ‘octopus’ are accentuated in B-type dialects which are geographically contiguous with the
Tokyo dialect (i.e. the Tōkaidō dialects), the facts listed below become apparent. The regions which are currently identifiable as using Tōkaidō dialects are Tokyo (but the accentuation of its islands is unknown), Saitama pref. (excluding the eastern part), Chiba pref. (excluding the northwest), the vicinity of Ashikaga city in Tochigi pref., Gumma pref. (excluding the southeast corner), probably the whole of Kanagawa, Yamanashi, Shizuoka and Aichi pref.s., and Gifu pref. (Gifu and Ōgaki cities, and the areas east and south of these).

(a) The word *hato* ‘pigeon’ is pronounced on a falling contour (HL) in Tokyo, and it seems to be virtually the same in Kanagawa, Gumma and Chiba pref.s. It also seems that this is the normal pronunciation in Shizuoka pref. However in Aichi and Gifu pref.s. there are a large number of areas (e.g. Nagoya city, Kōwa-chō in South Chita county, Gifu city, and the southeast part of Gifu pref.) where it is pronounced with the same rising contour (LH) as in the Hiroshima dialect.

(b) *tako* ‘octopus’ is also pronounced on a falling contour in Kanagawa, Saitama, Gumma and Chiba pref.s., as it is in Tokyo. Shizuoka pref. is likewise. However there are areas in Aichi and Gifu pref.s. (e.g. Kōwa-chō in Aichi pref., and the southeast part of Gifu pref.) where this word has the same rising contour as Hiroshima pref.

(c) *kame* ‘tortoise’ is pronounced with the same falling contour as in Tokyo in Kanagawa and Saitama pref.s. In Maebashi city, Kiryū city, Ōta town and other localities in Gumma pref., both falling-contour and rising-contour pronunciations are used. In Chiba pref., Matsudo city, Narita city and other localities have falling-contour *kame* as the normal pronunciation, but there are areas near Chiba city where rising-contour *kame* is used. The rising contour is also used in Shimoda-chō, Haibara county, and Shida county in Shizuoka pref. and Yatsushiro county in Yamanashi pref. In other words, the area nearest Tokyo uses the Tokyo-type accentuation, but outside of that in all directions the Hiroshima-type accentuation is found.

(d) Lastly, *kumo* ‘cloud’ is pronounced with the same falling contour in Yokohama (Kanagawa pref.) as in Tokyo, but in Koshigoe village in Kamakura county, and in Miyagino village in South Ashigara county (both in Kanagawa pref.), the same rising-contour form as is used in Hiroshima is used. Further to the west, Gotemba-chō, Mishima town and Shimoda-chō in Shizuoka pref. and Kōfu city in Yamanashi pref. all also use rising-contour *kumo*. To the north, in Urawa city (Saitama pref.) both falling and rising contours are used, but Kumagaya city and Honjō town (Saitama pref.), Maebashi and Kiryū cities (Gumma pref.) and Ashikaga city (Tochigi pref.) all have the rising contour as its normal...
pronunciation. In Chiba pref. too, the vicinity of Chiba city and Katsu’ura town have rising-contour *kumo*, and even in Tokyo, Hachioji city and the vicinity of the Murayama reservoir also use the rising contour. I am currently living in Higashida town in Suginami ward, Tokyo, where there are many residents who have moved here from the central city, and those people of course use the falling contour, but recently I asked a local landscape gardener and he used the rising contour. From the above examples, especially *kumo* ‘cloud’, and keeping in mind that the language of the political and cultural center often changes ahead of the surrounding regions, it can be suggested that *kumo* ‘cloud’ had the Hiroshima-type rising contour until very recently.

Bimyō Yamada’s dictionary, *Nihon Daijisho* (1892), gives ‘tortoise’ as *kame* LH, the rising contour, so we can know that the Hiroshima-type accentuation of this word was still being used in Tokyo in the late 19th century.

In the case of the words *hato* ‘pigeon’ and *tako* ‘octopus’, the Tokyo-type accentuation is used over a very wide area. We should not rush to a conclusion, but it is possible that this is because in Tokyo the change from *hato* LH and *tako* LH to the modern *hato* HL and *tako* HL took place at an older stage than the same change in the words *kame* ‘tortoise’ and *kumo* ‘cloud’.

[Note] The data for the dialects referred to above come from the following sources. Those of Saitama, Gumma and Chiba prefs. are mainly from my own fieldwork, and those of other prefectures are mainly the pronunciations of acquaintances living in Tokyo. However, much of Shizuoka, Aichi and Gifu prefs. is due to fieldwork by Jimbei Yamawaki and Kanjirō Oda and dialect dictionaries. The western boundary of the Tōkaidō dialect region is due to Prof. Hattori’s “The boundary between the Kinki accent and the Eastern accent” in *Study of Sounds* 3 (1930).

The following facts are observed in the modern Tokyo dialect.

(a) *furo* ‘bath’, *mago* ‘grandchild’, *saka* ‘slope’, *tsuba* ‘saliva’… are listed as having a rising contour (LH) in both Yamada’s 1892 dictionary and in Jimbō and Tsunemi’s *Kokugo Hatsuon Akusento Jiten* (1932). However, among young people born in Tokyo there are many who pronounce these words using the falling contour (HL).

(b) *kiba* ‘fang’, *saku* ‘fence’, *wani* ‘crocodile’, *yuge* ‘steam’… are listed with falling-contour pronunciations in both dictionaries, but one hears a rising-contour pronunciation from some elderly speakers born in Tokyo.

(c) There are quite a large number of words which have a rising contour in Yamada (1892) but which have a falling contour in Jimbō and Tsunemi (1932) (e.g. *aza* ‘sub-unit of village/town’, *tachi* ‘sword’, *tomo* ‘attendant’, *tomo* ‘stern (of boat)’…),
and there are a small number of words given as rising in Yamada (1892) but both rising and falling by Jimbō and Tsunemi (1932) (e.g. *haha* ‘mother’, *kami* ‘god’).

In other words, in modern Tokyo dialect we sometimes encounter bimoraic nouns which are thought to be undergoing a change from rising contour to falling contour. That being the case, it is not unreasonable to think that in the past too some Tokyo dialect bimoraic nouns underwent the same change, and that *hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’ and *tako* ‘octopus’ are examples of this.

[Note] I suggest that people who were raised in Tokyo and who have had an interest in accentuation since they were young would find the falling-contour pronunciations of *kami* ‘god’, *saka* ‘slope’, *tsuba* ‘saliva’, *tsue* ‘staff’… to be childish, and the rising-contour pronunciations to be adult-like. I was informed of the fact that the noun *saka* ‘slope’ is taking on the falling contour (HL) among the younger generation by Takeo Miyake. This section owes much to page 51 onwards of Miyake’s *Onsei Kōgohō* (1934).

Looking at how the words *hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’ and *tako* ‘octopus’ are pronounced in dialects of other lineages shows that it is probably wrong to assume that the Tokyo pronunciations of these words were the falling contour from the distant past. For example, nouns such as *aki* ‘autumn’, *ame* ‘rain’, *ato* ‘remains’ and *iki* ‘breath’ which are pronounced with the falling contour (HL) in Tokyo are pronounced in the Kōchi dialect with the rising contour (LH), and nouns such as *ashi* ‘foot, leg’, *ike* ‘pond, *intu* ‘dog’ and *ishii* ‘stone’ which are rising-contour words in Tokyo are pronounced with a falling contour in Kōchi. However, although *hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’ and *tako* ‘octopus’ have the falling contour in Tokyo, in the Kōchi dialect they are also pronounced with the falling contour, breaking the rule. In other words, it is very convenient to assume that the nouns *hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’ and *tako* ‘octopus’ in the Tokyo dialect used to be pronounced with a rising contour, as in the Hiroshima dialect.

[Note] In the Takamatsu dialect, to be discussed later, these four nouns are all pronounced with the level contour, which also supports this assumption.

Following the above logic, it seems reasonable to conclude that the reason why a subset of words pronounced with the falling contour in the Tokyo dialect (*hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’, *tako* ‘octopus’) are pronounced with the rising-contour class in Hiroshima is because the Hiroshima dialect, with regard to these nouns, retains the Tokyo accent system of a few generations ago.
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In the Morioka dialect, a subset of the words pronounced with a rising contour in the Tokyo dialect (*hashi* ‘bridge’, *hata* ‘flag’, *ishi* ‘stone’, *kami* ‘paper’, *kawa* ‘river’, *machi* ‘town’, *mune* ‘chest’, *oto* ‘sound’, *tsuru* ‘string (of instrument)’…) are pronounced on a
level contour. However in this case one should not jump to the conclusion that this is due to the Morioka dialect preserving the old accentuation of the Tokyo dialect.

(a) Although there are some words such as *hato* ‘pigeon’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’ and *tako* ‘octopus’ which are falling in Tokyo and rising in Hiroshima, there are many more words which are rising in Tokyo and level in Morioka (e.g. *hashi* ‘bridge’, *hata* ‘flag’, *kame* ‘tortoise, turtle’, *kumo* ‘cloud’, *tako* ‘octopus’). In addition to the nouns *hashi* ‘bridge’, *tsuru* ‘string (of instrument or bow)’ listed above, one can also give *aza* ‘birthmark, bruise’, *fuyu* ‘winter’, *hiji* ‘elbow’, *iwa* ‘boulder’, *kara* ‘husk, (egg) shell’, *kata* ‘pattern’, *kishi* ‘(river) bank’, *kita* ‘north’, *kobu* ‘lump’, *kura* ‘saddle’, *nashi* ‘pear’, *natsu* ‘summer’, *uta* ‘song’, *yuki* ‘snow’….

(b) There are not many words in the Tokyo dialect which appear to be changing from level contour to rising contour. Level in Yamada (1892) and rising in Jimbō and Tsunemi (1932) there is *hire* ‘fin’, and level in Yamada (1892) but level and rising in Jimbō and Tsunemi (1932) is *uchi* ‘within, home’, but such examples are rare.

(c) *hashi* ‘bridge’ … *tsuru* ‘string’ are pronounced with a rising contour in the San’in dialects and the Totsukawa dialect, as they are in Tokyo. It is difficult to say that these words all changed from a level contour to a rising contour independently in these three geographically separated dialects.

Looking at how these words (*hashi* ‘bridge’, *hata* ‘flag’…) are pronounced in the region between Morioka and Tokyo, we find the following. (The accentuation of Tochigi and Fukushima pref.s is excluded as it is of a completely different accent type.)

(a) In the dialect of Tsugawa town of East Kambara county in Niigata pref. we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Contour</th>
<th>Rising Contour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

and in this respect it is just like the Morioka-type. Also in Niigata pref., the dialects of the vicinity of Aizawa town in South Uonuma county and Hokura village (near Naoetsu town) in Naka-Kubiki county are very similar to the Tsugawa-town dialect in this regard. Further north, the dialects of Niigata city and Sakata city (the latter in Yamagata pref.) are of course of the Morioka-Type.
(b) In contrast, the Numata-town dialect of Tone county in Gumma pref. is completely Tokyo-type, with the following contours used.

  - ——— level contour

- **hashi** ‘bridge’, **hata** ‘flag’, **ishi** ‘stone’, **kami** ‘paper’, **kawa** ‘river’, **machi** ‘town’, **mune** ‘chest’, **oto** ‘sound’, **tsuru** ‘string (of instrument or bow)’, **fuyu** ‘winter’, **natsu** ‘summer’, **yuki** ‘snow’
  - ——— rising contour

  - ——— rising contour

Further south, the dialects of Shibukawa town, Maebashi city and Kiryū city (Gumma pref.) and Ashikaga city (Tochigi pref.) of course follow the Numata-town dialect.

From this it seems that the accentuation of **hashi** ‘bridge’, **hata** ‘flag’, **ishi** ‘stone’, **kami** ‘paper’… from the Mikami mountain range north is Morioka-type level contour, and south of the mountain range it is Tokyo-type rising contour. There is some uncertainty over the Hokushin region, but in the vicinity of the border region of Niigata and Gumma pref.s there is a rather clear boundary between the Morioka-type accentuation and the Tokyo-type accentuation. This is in marked contrast to the lack of a boundary between the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects described in the previous section.

[Note] According to the pronunciation of a friend from Nagano city, the words **ishi** ‘stone’, **kami** ‘paper’, **kawa** ‘river’ and **hashi** ‘bridge’ from the above word list are clearly level contour and so Morioka-type, but I have some doubt about **fuyu** ‘winter’, **machi** ‘town’, **natsu** ‘summer’…. The accentuation of the Nanshin region is unknown.

From this it can be suspected that there is more to the difference between the Tokyo and Morioka accentuations than the difference between the Tokyo and Hiroshima accentuations. And this suspicion only strengthens when we compare the tone contours used in dialects of other lineages when pronouncing these words.

First we will look at the Matsue dialect as a representative of the Izumo dialects ([13] on the map).
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On the subject of Matsue dialect accentuation we have the detailed research of Takamichi Ōhara. Prof. Hattori was kind enough to show me his copy (hand-copied into a notebook) of this, so I will use that to provide an overview of the accentuation of bimoraic nouns in the Matsue dialect.
(a) The Matsue dialect has level, rising and falling contours. As with the Tokyo dialect, it lacks the A/B split of rising-contour words.


Of the words above, those which are not underlined are of the level tonal class in both Tokyo and Kyoto dialects, and the underlined words are of the rising class in Tokyo and of the falling class in Kyoto.


Of the words above, those which are underlined are of the rising tonal class in Tokyo and falling tonal class in Kyoto, and the words which are not underlined are of the falling class in Tokyo and of the falling class (A or B) in Kyoto.

(d) The following words belong to the falling class: aki ‘autumn’, hari ‘needle’, saru ‘monkey’, tsuru ‘crane (bird)’.

These words are all falling in Tokyo and rising (A or B) in Kyoto.

Looking at (a-d) above, it is difficult to say which type (b, c) are closer to, but because (a, d) agree with the Tokyo dialect and differ from the Kyoto dialect, we can conclude that the Izumo dialects, like the Morioka dialect, are close to the B-type dialects. Comparing the accentuation of verbs, adjectives, and monomoraic nouns and nouns of three or more moras, they seem to display the same tendency.

[Note] In the Matsue dialect, when a rising-class noun is followed by a particle, the nouns split into A and B groups, but this split is conditioned by the degree of aperture of the noun-final vowel, so it is fundamentally different from the situation observed in the Kinki and Shikoku dialects. Detail is found in Yoshinari Katō’s “On the phonology of the central Izumo dialects” in Hōgen 6:6 (1936).

However, here we need to be mindful of the similarity with the Hokuō dialects, situated far away across the sea. That is to say, nouns which are rising class in both Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects split, in the Morioka dialect, into those which are rising contour and those which are level contour. The split is as follows:
(a) **ashi** ‘leg’, **hana** ‘flower’, **hara** ‘stomach’, **hone** ‘bone’, **ike** ‘pond’, **INU** ‘dog’, **kami** (head) hair, **kusa** ‘grass’, **mimi** ‘ear’, **nawa** ‘rope’, **shima** ‘island’, **sumi** ‘charcoal’, **ude** ‘arm’, **uma** ‘horse’, **yama** ‘mountain’, **yubi** ‘finger’  (Rising contour in Tokyo, Hiroshima and Morioka)

(b) **hashi** ‘bridge’, **HATA** ‘flag’, **ishi** ‘stone’, **kami** ‘paper’, **kawa** ‘river’, **nachi** ‘town’, **mune** ‘chest’, **oto** ‘sound’, **tsuru** ‘string (of instrument or bow)’, (**fuyu** ‘winter’, **nashi** ‘pear’, **natsu** ‘summer’, **yuki** ‘snow’…)  (Rising contour in Tokyo and Hiroshima; level contour in Morioka)

However, both here and in the Matsue dialect, some of the rising-contour nouns of the Tokyo dialect are rising and others are level. The split is as follows:

(a’) **ashi** ‘leg’, **hana** ‘flower’, **hara** ‘stomach’, **hone** ‘bone’, **ike** ‘pond’, **INU** ‘dog’, **kami** (head) hair, **kusa** ‘grass’, **mimi** ‘ear’, **nawa** ‘rope’, **shima** ‘island’, **sumi** ‘charcoal’, **ude** ‘arm’, **uma** ‘horse’, **yama** ‘mountain’, **yubi** ‘finger’  (Rising contour in Tokyo, Hiroshima and Matsue)

(b’) **hashi** ‘bridge’, **HATA** ‘flag’, **ishi** ‘stone’, **kami** ‘paper’, **kawa** ‘river’, **nachi** ‘town’, **mune** ‘chest’, **oto** ‘sound’, **tsuru** ‘string (of instrument or bow)’, (**fuyu** ‘winter’, **nashi** ‘pear’, **natsu** ‘summer’, **yuki** ‘snow’…)  (Rising contour in Tokyo and Hiroshima; level contour in Matsue)

Looking at (a,b,a’,b’) above, the vocabulary in (a) is identical to that in (a’) and the vocabulary in (b) is identical to that in (b’). This relationship can be collated as the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokyo/Hiroshima</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>rising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morioka/Matsue</th>
<th>rising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the modern Kyoto, Tsuruga and Toyama dialects, the **hashi** ‘bridge’, **HATA** ‘flag’, **ishi** ‘stone’… group of words have the same contour as the **ashi** ‘leg’, **hana** ‘flower’, **hara** ‘stomach’… group, and a different contour from the **hako** ‘box’, **hana** ‘nose’, **kaki** ‘persimmon’… group, which is exactly the same as the situation in the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects. In other words, with the Hakuō and Izumo dialects being geographically distant from each other, the correspondence observed here is nothing short of miraculous.
[Note] Strictly speaking, in the Toyama dialect the hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’… group and the ashi ‘leg’, hana ‘flower’… group do not belong to the same class, but for the sake of convenience they will be treated as the same here. (Regarding the Toyama dialect, please refer to the note in section 2.) In other words, we can say that an accentual distinction between the hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’… and the ashi ‘leg’, hana ‘flower’… groups does not exist in the dialects spoken in the region between the Hokuō dialects of Niigata and further north and the Izumo dialect region. Also, as stated previously, in the Hokuō dialects of Tsuruoka city and the Japan Sea coastal region, a subset of the words which are pronounced with the falling contour in Tokyo and Hiroshima are pronounced on a falling contour, and the remainder are pronounced with a rising contour, so in this regard, rather than the Izumo dialects being similar to Morioka dialects, they are more similar to the Hokuō dialects of the Japan Sea coastal region.

That the Izumo dialects are accentually unlike the San’in and the Tōkaidō dialects, and are instead similar to the Hokuō dialects, is surprising, and this similarity is especially marked in the conjugation of verbs and adjectives and the accentuation of compounds.

Of course, as there are quite a number of features of the phonemic inventory and other aspects of the Izumo and Hokuō dialects which are similar, this correspondence in the accentuation may not seem so surprising. Next we compare dialects with the last remaining accent class distinction, the south-western Kyushu dialects.
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Because Teruo Hirayama has published detailed research on the Kagoshima dialect, the Kagoshima dialect will be used as a representative of the south-western Kyushu dialects. In this dialect words such as matsu ‘pine’ and machi ‘town’ are normally pronounced as maʔ with a checked syllable pronunciation, but here, in order to facilitate comparison with other dialects, I will consider the accentuation of words pronounced carefully so that the word-final vowel is pronounced. Following Hirayama’s description, the accentuation of Kagoshima bimoraic nouns is as follows.

(a) The Kagoshima dialect has falling and rising contours. The level contour of the Tokyo and Kyoto dialects is lacking.


Of the words above, (i) those which are not underlined are of the level tonal class in both Tokyo and Kyoto dialects, and (ii) the underlined words are of the rising class in Tokyo and of the falling class in Kyoto.

Of the words above, those which are underlined are of the rising tonal class in Tokyo and falling tonal class in Kyoto, and the words which are not underlined are of the falling class in Tokyo and of the rising class in Kyoto.

Looking at (a-c) above, (a) and (b) differ from both Tokyo and Kyoto, and it is difficult to say which of Tokyo and Kyoto (c) is closer to, so it appears that the southwestern Kyushu dialects are a special dialect group, quite different from both the A- and B-type dialects. If one had to decide which type they were closer to, as pointed out by Shirō Hattori and Teruo Hirayama, there are details which suggest an affinity with the A-type dialects, rather than with the Hokuō dialects and the Matsue dialect discussed above. Comparison of the accentuation of verbs and adjectives and monosyllabic nouns also leads to the same conclusion.

[Note] On the subject of Kagoshima accentuation, Teruo Hirayama’s “Research into Southern Kyushu accentuation (1)” in Hōgen 6:4 and “Research into Southern Kyushu accentuation (2)” in Hōgen 6:5 (both 1936) are detailed. Prof. Hattori’s views on Kagoshima accentuation have been published in “A survey of the accentuation of various dialects of Japanese (5)” in Hōgen 2:4 (1932). However, please also refer to p.70 of his book Accent and Dialect (1933).

However, there are aspects of the Kagoshima dialect which have points in common with the Izumo and Hokuō dialects. With the following three noun groups


the following relationships exist.

In Tokyo, Kyoto and Kōchi dialects and dialects of these lineages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 nouns</th>
<th>different contour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 nouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 nouns</td>
<td>same contour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Morioka and Matsue dialects

| Group 1 nouns | same contour |
| Group 2 nouns | same contour |
| Group 3 nouns | different contour |


| Group 1 nouns | same contour |
| Group 2 nouns | same contour |
| Group 3 nouns | different contour |

so unexpectedly the Kagoshima dialect patterns with the Morioka and Matsue dialects.

Schematizing a comparison of the above dialects gives the following table. (Dialects named in parentheses are those which have not been sufficiently surveyed. Group 4 and 5 nouns are not directly related to the discussion here, but group 4 nouns include all of the words listed in (d i) in the note near the end of section 2, and group 5 nouns include all the words listed in (d ii) in the same note.)
Comparing this table with the map given at the beginning of this paper, the dialects within the bold lines on the map ([3]-[11]) are dialects where group 1 and 2 nouns have differing contours, and in the dialects outside of the bold lines ([12]-[15]) group 2 and 3 nouns are pronounced with differing contours. (Dialects lacking accent class distinctions ([1], [2]) are excluded.)

[Note] Dr Kanae Sakuma discovered a “law of register conservation” operating in the Tokyo dialect, showing that (for example in bimoraic words) of the three contours of level, rising and falling, rising and falling (contour register) are similar, and the level contour (level register) stands in contrast to these. To give one example, looking at words ending with –ya ‘shop, vendor’, when this morpheme suffixes to rising-contour hana ‘flower’, kami ‘paper’… the result is LHL hanaya ‘florist (shop), kamiya ‘paper shop’…, when it suffixes to falling-contour kasa ‘umbrella’, yane ‘roof’…, the result is LHL kasaya ‘umbrella store’, yaneya ‘roofer’…, but when it suffixes to level-contour take ‘bamboo’, ane ‘boiled sweet’… the result is level-contour takeya ‘shop selling bamboo (goods), ameya ‘sweet shop’… This is one clear example, but Sakuma gives many examples in Ch.17 and elsewhere in his book *Japanese Phonetics* (1929). In the Tokyo dialect, group 1 words have a level contour, and groups 2-5 have either a rising or a falling contour, so, from an accentual perspective, Tokyo dialect nouns split first into group 1 nouns and group 2-5 nouns. The Chūgoku, northeastern Kyushu, southwestern Shikoku and Totsukawa dialects are thought to be the same.
According to the research of Kanae Ikeda, unlike in other dialects, in the Kyoto dialect the split of level contour vs rising/falling contour carries little meaning. In other words, it is not necessarily the case that the Kyoto dialect divides bimoraic nouns into group 1 nouns and group 2-5 nouns. However, it is certain that the major split is not groups 1 and 2 vs groups 3-5, so this is in agreement with the Tokyo dialect. The Kōchi dialect is thought to be the same as the Kyoto dialect in this regard. The major split is not groups 1,2 vs groups 3,4,5.

In contrast to this, in the Morioka and Matsue dialects, when group 3 rising-contour words (hana ‘flower’, yama ‘mountain’, shimo ‘frost’…) are the initial component of a compound, the result is compounds like hanazakari LLLLHL ‘in full bloom’, yunamawari LLLLHL ‘mountain route’, shimobashira LLLLLL ‘frost column’, and when group 4,5 falling-contour words (koi ‘carp’, kibi ‘millet’…) are the initial components of compounds the result is koinobori LLLLHL ‘carp streamer’, kibidango LLLLHL ‘millet dumpling’, with the same contour. However, when group 1,2 level-contour nouns (ushi ‘cow’, une ‘plum’, machi ‘town’, natsu ‘summer’) are the initial components of compounds the result is ushiguruma ‘ox-drawn cart’, umebayashi ‘plum-tree forest’, machihazure ‘outskirts of town’, natsumikan ‘Chinese citron’ which are all level contour, so clearly different. (The above examples have the same contours in both the Morioka and Matsue dialects.) Thus in these dialects bimoraic nouns split into groups 1,2 vs groups 3,4,5. (Dr Sakuma states in the preface to his book that the law of register conservation has many exceptions. The same appears to be the case in the Kyoto dialect. On the other hand, in the Morioka and Matsue dialects, the law of register conservation appears to be very strictly followed. Perhaps this suggests that dialects that those of Tokyo and Kyoto have recently undergone a major change of accentual contours.) It goes without saying that, in the Kagoshima dialect, nouns split between groups 1,2 and groups 3,4,5.

In summary we can say that the dialects spoken outside of the bold lines on the map have a clear split between group 1 and 2 nouns on the one hand and group 3, 4 and 5 on the other, but in dialects located within the bold lines, the contours of groups 2 and 3 have merged so this split is not observed. (In some dialects there is a split between group 1 and groups 2-5.)

Prof. Hattori informs me that also in the dialect of Yonamine in Nakijin village, Kunigami county, and in the Shuri and Naha dialects also in Okinawa pref., nouns cognate with the group 1 words hako ‘box’, hana ‘nose’… and group 2 words hashii ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’… are pronounced with the same contour, and words cognate with group 2 nouns and group 3 nouns (ashi ‘foot’, hana ‘flower’)… are pronounced on different contours.

The above fact recalls Kunio Yanagita’s theory of peripheral distribution of dialectal forms. The Morioka, Matsue and Kagoshima (and Ryukyuan) dialects and others which lie in the periphery of Japan share a characteristic which can be considered to actually be a reflection of the ancient Japanese language.
(A) In Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Köchi dialects, the group 2 and group 3 nouns are pronounced with the same contour, but it is possible that in the past, these two noun groups had different contours as in the peripheral dialects.

(B) In Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Köchi dialects, the group 1 and group 2 nouns are of quite different characters, but it is possible that, in the past, these two noun groups were, if not the same, at least very similar to each other.

[Note] Modern-day Hokuō, Izumo, southwestern Kyushu and Ryukyuan dialects pronounce group 1 and 2 nouns with the same contour. Because of this, it seems reasonable to infer that groups 1 and 2 once belonged to the same accentual class (and were not just pronounced with similar contours). However, generally speaking, if one accentual class were to split into two classes, there must be some phonological or other conditioning of the split, and currently no such conditioning factors can be detected which account for the separation of group 1 and 2 nouns. For this reason, it is more reasonable to view group 1 and 2 nouns as originally having had very similar contours, and that, due to the similarity, confusion between the two groups arose in the Hokuō, Izumo, southwestern Kyushu dialects. (The above explanation is entirely due to personal communications from Prof. Hattori. I had adopted the alternative view that groups 1 and 2 originally had identical contours and that the three peripheral regions reflected this original situation.)

There are some dialects which are highly relevant to this point. These are the dialects of Kagawa pref. ([16] on the map) which attracted the attention of Prof. Hattori as A-type dialect with distinctive characteristics (Hattori 1931 “A survey of the accentuation of various dialects of Japanese (3), Hōgen 1:4). Masayuki Inagaki, from Takamatsu city, has shown me his detailed research on the Takamatsu dialect, so I will draw on his analysis to give an overview of the accentuation of bimoraic nouns in the Takamatsu dialect.

(a) The Takamatsu dialect has level, rising and falling contours. The rising-contour nouns are divided into A- and B-groups, as in the Kyoto dialect.

(b) The following nouns are pronounced with the level contour.


(c) The following nouns are pronounced with the falling contour.

- hashi ‘bridge’, ishi ‘stone’, kami ‘paper’, kawa ‘river’, machi ‘town’, tsuru ‘string (of instrument or bow)’  (These words are all group 2 nouns.)

(d) The following words are rising contour A

(e) The following words are all rising contour B
aki ‘autumn’, ame ‘rain’, kata ‘flag’, kawa ‘river’, mado ‘window’, mae ‘front’, mune ‘chest’, oto ‘sound’, saru ‘monkey’, tsuru ‘crane (bird)’ (Of these words, the underlined forms are group 2, and the words which are not underlined are group 5 nouns.)

From (a,c,d) above there can be no doubt that this dialect is accentually close to the Kyoto dialect. (As will be shown below, other differences in the accentuation can be assumed to have arisen since the Insei period (1086 - 1192).)

In the modern Takamatsu dialect, some group 2 words are pronounced with a falling contour, whereas others are pronounced with the rising contour (B group). (According to Chikara Tahara of Ikeda-chō in Tokushima pref., falling-contour hashi ‘bridge’, ishi ‘stone’ … tsuru ‘string’ all end in a high vowel ([i, u]), and rising-contour hata ‘flag’, kawa ‘river’, mune ‘chest’, oto ‘sound’ end in non-high vowels, so it is thought that before the split these words were all falling contour, as in the Ikeda dialect. (Compare this with the Toyama dialect (section 2) and Tsuruoka dialect (section 3).) On the other hand, group 3 nouns are level, and group 2 and group 3 nouns being pronounced on different contours is a point of difference with the Kyoto dialect and a point of correspondence with the peripheral dialects. (That the Takamatsu dialect, which is so similar to the Kyoto dialect, has this characteristic supports the assumption that the Kyoto dialect also once distinguished group 2 and group 3 words accentually.)

Because this kind of dialect exists, we cannot rush to the conclusion that group 1 words and group 2 words were once pronounced with the same contour, as in the Hokuō, Izumo and southwestern Kyushu dialects.

Currently documents which record the accentuation of by-gone stages of Japanese are extremely rare; of the Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Kōchi dialects, not one document recording premodern accentuation of the Hiroshima and Kōchi dialects has yet been discovered. There are some records of early Tokyo accentuation up until the 18th century (mid-Edo period), but these are all fragmentary, and do not even permit us to know how many tonal contours were used for bimoraic nouns in the Tokyo dialect of the time, let alone whether group 2 nouns hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’ … and group 3 nouns ashi ‘leg’, hana ‘flower’… had the same contour or not, or what relationship group 1 nouns hako ‘box’, hana ‘nose’… have with group two nouns hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’…. The Kyoto dialect alone has a large number of accentual materials spanning the period from the mid-Heian period (10th century) until the late Edo period (19th century), and there are very good materials from the early Insei period (late 11th century) and the early Edo period (17th century).
According to Dr Takao Yamada, the Ruijumyōgishō (10 volume Chinese character dictionary) was completed sometime between the reigns of emperors Ichijō and Horikawa (i.e. 986 – 1107), but looking at the Kanchi’in edition there are a large number of Chinese characters and Sino-Japanese words which are followed by Japanese readings which have dots in red ink located at the top left corner or bottom left corner (also rarely at the top right corner) of the syllabic characters denoting the pronunciation, as in the following examples.ii (Counting only bimoraic nouns, there are approximately 600 annotated with these dots.)

'cow' ˙ u ˙ shi (B4 p.1f)  
'foot' ˙ a, shi (H1 p.37f)  
'stone' ˙ i, shi (H2 p.1f)  
'autumn' ˙ a 'ki (H3 p.7f)  

According to Nagatomo Ban’s “Ruijumyōgishō preface and postscript” (19th century), in a copy of the Ruijumyōgishō owned by Hirokata Yashiro there was a preface at the beginning of the volume giving explanatory notes on the forms of the syllabic characters used (e.g. "爪" is used as a variant form of "ス su" and "\ is an abbreviation of "キ ki"), and after this was the following diagram and line of text:

```
shang  qu
ping  so ru tone does not exist
```

This can be viewed as giving the phonetic values of the red dots at the three corners of a syllabic character. It is thought that they were pronounced as follows.

(a) A syllabic character with a dot in the bottom left corner (e.g. from the examples above, the shi of ‘stone’, the a and shi of ‘foot’, the a of ‘autumn’, etc.) had the tone value of the Chinese ping tone.

(b) A syllabic character with a dot in the top left corner (e.g. from the examples above, the u and shi of ‘cow’, the i of ‘stone’, the ki of ‘autumn’, etc.) had the tone value of the Chinese shang tone.

(c) A syllabic character with a dot in the top right corner (no examples in the above words) had the tone value of the Chinese qu tone.

[Note] In surviving editions of the Ruijumyōgishō, when the same word appears twice it usually has its tone dots in the same place, and words which in modern dialects are in the same accentual class have the same tone dots, so it is believed that the accent marks in this book are, for the most part, trustworthy.

In answer to the question how were tone dots assigned to bisyllabic nouns, it seems there were the following four patterns:

(a) As in ushi ‘cow’ above, both syllables have dots indicating the shang tone;
(b) As in *ishi ‘stone’* above, the first syllable has a dot for the *shang* tone and the second syllable has a dot indicating the *ping* tone;

(c) As in *ashi ‘foot’* above, both syllables have dots indicating the *ping* tone;

(d) As in *aki ‘autumn’* above, the first syllable has a dot indicating the *ping* tone and the second has a dot for the *shang* tone.

[Note] The word *fagi ‘shin’* has a dot in the *qu*-tone corner of the syllable *fa* and a *ping* tone on the syllable *gi*. There are four examples of this, but there are also examples of the same word with *ping* markings on both syllables, so there is some doubt. It is not that there are no other words with a *qu* tone marked on the initial syllable, but because they are all somewhat doubtful and they are extremely rare, they are not included here.

For the time being these (a-d) will be named the *shang-shang*, *shang-ping*, *ping-ping*, and *ping-shang* classes respectively, and words which are given in the *Ruijumyōgishō* with these tone patterns are listed below.

(a) Words given which are *shang-shang*:
- *fako ‘box’* (S1 p.38b and 5 other places),
- *fana ‘nose’* (B2 p.19b and 2 other places),
- *kafo ‘face’* (B4 p.11b and 2 other examples),
- *kaki ‘persimmon’* (B4 p.5f),
- *kaze ‘wind’* (S3 p.26f),
- *kuti ‘mouth’* (H1 p.2b and 3 others),
- *kubi ‘neck’* (B3 and 3 other places, but 2 examples doubtful),
- *midu ‘water’* (H1 p.1f),
- *moe ‘road’* (B1 p.22b and 2 other places),
- *sake ‘rice wine’* (H1 p.22b and 4 others),
- *take ‘bamboo’* (S1 p.31f),
- *tori ‘bird’* (S2 p.55b and 1 other place),
- *tume ‘(finger) nail’* (S2 p.3b and 4 other places),
- *ume ‘plum’* (B4 p.42b),
- *ushi ‘cow’* (B4 p.1f)

(b) Words given which are *shang-ping*:
- *fashi ‘bridge’* (H1 p.26b and 4 other places, but 2 examples with other tones indicated),
- *fata ‘flag’* (S2 14f and 1 other place),
- *ishi ‘stone’* (H2 p.1f and 2 other places),
- *kafa ‘river’* (B1 p.40b and 1 other place),
- *kami ‘paper’* (B4 p.68b),
- *matsu ‘town’* (B3 p.22b),
- *mune ‘chest’* (B2 p.63b and 5 other places),
- *oto ‘sound’* (B2 p.1f and 1 other place),
- *turu ‘string (of instrument)’* (S2 p.13f)

(c) Words given which are *ping-ping*:
- *ashi ‘foot’* (H1 p.37f and 1 other place, but 1 example with other tones indicated),
- *fana ‘flower’* (B1 p.3f and 7 other places),
- *fara ‘stomach’* (B2 p.1f and 1 other place, but 1 example with other tones indicated),
- *fene ‘bone’* (B3 p.3f),
- *ike ‘pond’* (H1 p.1b and 2 other places),
- *inu ‘dog’* (B3 p.64b),
- *kami ‘head hair’* (B3 p.17f and 1 other place),
- *kusa ‘grass’* (S1 1f and 3 other places, but 1 example with other tones indicated),
- *mimi ‘ear’* (B2 p.1f and 1 other place, but 2 examples with other tones indicated),
- *nafa ‘rope’* (H2 p.66b and 4 others),
- *shina ‘island’* (H1 p.17f and 1 other place),
- *sumi ‘charcoal’* (H2 p.34b and 1 other place),
- *ude ‘arm’* (B2 p.57f),
una ‘horse’ (S2 p.48b and 3 other places), yama ‘mountain’ (H1 p.53b), yubi ‘finger’ (B3 p.20f)

(d) Words given which are ping-shang:
aki ‘autumn’ (H3 p.7f), ame ‘rain’ (H3 p.33f but there is some doubt), ato ‘remains’ (B1 p.29f and 6 other places), fari ‘needle’ (S1 p.61b), fashi ‘chopsticks’ (S1 p.31b and 1 other place), iki ‘breath’ (H2 p.36f and 2 other places), kasa ‘straw hat’ (S1 p.33b and 3 other places), kata ‘shoulder’ (B2 p.63f and 2 other places), mado ‘window’ (H3 p.30b and 3 other places), mafe ‘front’ (S3 p.6f and 1 other place, but 1 example with other tones indicated), matu ‘pine’ (B3 p.43b), saru ‘monkey’ (B1 40b and 2 other places), sora ‘sky’ (B2 p.46b and 1 other place), tane ‘seed’ (H3 p.10f and 2 other places), turu ‘crane’ (S2 p.57f), usu ‘mortar’ (H2 p.3b)

Comparison of (a-d) above and the table in the preceding section gives the following:

(a) Words given as shang-shang (fako ‘box’, fana ‘nose’, kafo ‘face’…) are all group 1 nouns
(b) Words given as shang-ping (fashi ‘bridge’, fata ‘flag’, ishi ‘stone’…) are all group 2 nouns
(c) Words given as ping-ping (ashi ‘foot’, fana ‘flower’, fara ‘stomach’…) are all group 3 nouns
(d) Words given as ping-shang (aki ‘autumn’, ame ‘rain’, ato ‘remains’…) are all group 4 and 5 nouns

This can be represented in reverse as:
Group 1 nouns .......... shang-shang
Group 2 nouns .......... shang-ping
Group 3 nouns .......... ping-ping
Group 4 nouns .......... ping-shang
Group 5 nouns

To be noted is that here the group 2 and group 3 nouns, which belong to different accentual classes in Morioka, Matsue and Kagoshima but belong to the same class in Kyoto (and Tokyo), are represented differently in the Ruijumyōgishō.

[Note] Group 1 and group 2 nouns, which belong to different accentual classes in Morioka, Matsue and Kagoshima and also in Tokyo and Kyoto, are also represented differently in the Ruijumyōgishō.
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How were these words which were transcribed with four different tone patterns actually pronounced? In Buddhist circles, it seems that sutras and the like have long been,
and still are, read pronouncing Chinese characters with the original four tones, where the relevant tones are realised as:

(a) a ping-tone character is usually pronounced on a low level tone
(b) a shang-tone character is usually pronounced on a high level tone
(c) a qu-tone character is usually pronounced starting low and ending high

For example, the following pronunciations are used (taken from Kōjun Ōyama’s *The History and Musical Temperament of Ceremonial Buddhist Chants* (1930)).

(i) shaka ‘Śakya’ (both sha and ka are ping) is pronounced low level
(ii) shishin ‘four views of the Buddha’s body’ (shi is ping and shin is shang) is pronounced with shi low and shin high
(iii) fuzhi ‘unique’ (fu is shang and zhi is ping) is pronounced with fu high and zhi low
(iv) nyorai ‘tathāgata’ (both nyo and rai are shang) is pronounced high level

[Note] Of course not all words are pronounced regularly as above; there seem to be quite a number of words read irregularly. An example from Ōyama’s book is ge-kyū-ruka-dō ‘the lower extends to the six destinies’ (all four Chinese characters have ping-tone marks) which is expected to be pronounced on a low level contour, but the whole word is actually pronounced on a high level contour. In general, within morphemes marked with ping tone, there are light ping and heavy ping tones, with different contours, so in actuality things appear to be quite complicated.

Provisionally using the above tonal values, the four tonal patterns which are found in the *Myōgishō* will be pronounced as follows:

(a) shang-shang words such as ushi ‘cow’ will be pronounced high level
(b) shang-ping words such as ishi ‘stone’ will be pronounced starting high and ending low, which is the modern-day falling contour
(c) ping-ping words such as ashi ‘foot’ will be pronounced low level
(d) ping-shang words such as aki ‘autumn’ will be pronounced starting low and ending high, which is the modern-day rising contour

[Note] The late Okumoto Inoue began historical research into accentuation early on, and he seemed to view the tone patterns in the *Myōgishō* in the following way.

(a) shang-shang = high level contour       (b) shang-ping = falling contour
(c) ping-ping = falling contour           (d) ping-shang = rising contour

Under this interpretation, both forms transcribed as shang-ping and forms transcribed as ping-ping objectively had the same falling contour. In other words, it seems he believed there were two transcriptions (shang-ping and ping-ping) which represented the same falling tone contour (Inoue (1928) “A short history of Japanese accentology” *Study of Sounds* 2, p.80). However, looking through the *Myōgishō*, words represented as shang-ping in one place are represented as shang-ping in all other occurrences, and never as ping-ping, and, conversely, words represented as ping-ping
in one place are represented as ping-ping, and never as shang-ping, in all other occurrences. (For example, the conclusive form of verbs which in the modern Tokyo and Kyoto dialects are of the level class (iku ‘go’, oku ‘put’…) were always transcribed as ping-ping in the Myōgishō.) I believe that this indicates that words transcribed as shang-ping and words transcribed as ping-ping were actually pronounced with differing accentuations. (Comparison of the accentuation of compound words (see section 10) also points to shang-ping and ping-ping being different contours.) It seems that the main reason Inoue concluded that shang-ping and ping-ping both represented the falling contour was that both shang-ping and ping-ping words are pronounced on the falling contour in the modern Kyoto dialect (and also in the dialect of Maizuru-chō where he resided).

In summary, we can assume that the basic accentuation of bimoraic nouns in the Kyoto dialect of the Insei period (1086 – 1192) was as follows.

(a) There were four main pitch contours: high level, falling, low level, and rising.
(b) The following words belonged to the high level contour class.
(c) The following words belonged to the falling contour class.
(d) The following words belonged to the low level contour class.
(e) The following words belonged to the rising contour class.
   aki ‘autumn’, ame ‘rain’, ato ‘remains’, fari ‘needle’, fashi ‘chopsticks’, iki ‘breath’, kasa ‘straw hat’, kata ‘shoulder’, mado ‘window’, mafe ‘front’, mafu ‘pine’, saru ‘monkey’, sora ‘sky’, tane ‘seed’, turu ‘crane’, usu ‘mortar’ (Because there are very few examples which have a following particle, it is completely unknown whether particles joined on high or low, or whether, as in the modern Kyoto dialect, they joined on high or low depending on the noun. However, it does appear that the possessive particle –no was pronounced low when attached to all of these nouns.)

Comparison with the modern Kyoto dialect gives the following.
(a) Nouns pronounced on the level contour (more accurately, this is a high level contour) in the modern dialect were also mainly pronounced high level in the late 11th century
(b) Nouns pronounced on the rising contour (A- and B-groups) in the modern dialect were also mainly pronounced with a rising contour.

(c) It seems that some of the nouns pronounced on the falling contour in the modern language (hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’…) were also pronounced on the falling contour, but others (ashi ‘foot’, hana ‘flower’…) were pronounced on the low level contour.

From this we can say that, although nowadays the group 2 nouns and group 3 nouns are pronounced with the same tone contour in the Kyoto dialect, in the Insei period they were pronounced on different contours, as is still the case in the Morioka, Matsue and Kagoshima dialects.

[Note] Viewed in reverse, of the four pitch contours which existed in the late Heian period (1086-1185) Kyoto dialect, the three contours of high level, falling, and rising continued without change into the modern language, and only the words pronounced on the low level contour, for some reason, all changed to the falling contour in one change. (It can thus be seen that there was very little change in the accentuation of the Kyoto dialect over this period.) When then did this change, i.e. the merger of group 2 and group 3 words, occur? In the Bumōki (publ. 1687), an accent guide discovered by Prof. Shinkichi Hashimoto, words which were pronounced with the low level contour (ashi ‘foot’, ike ‘pond’, hana ‘flower’, yama ‘mountain’…) are all recorded as being pronounced with the falling contour, so it seems that by the early Edo period Kyoto dialect already had the same accentuation system as it has today. In the Mōtanshichinshō published in the Muromachi period (1392 – 1467), the word inu ‘dog’ (low level in the Myōgishō) is recorded as falling, and in the Mojigaeshi completed in the Kamakura period (1192 – 1333) the word shima ‘island’ (low level in the Myōgishō) appears to be recorded as falling. (I was introduced to these two documents by Prof. Hashimoto.) In summary, it seems that group 2 words which had been low level in the Insei period (1086 – 1192) started to be pronounced with the group 3 falling tone in the Kamakura period (1192 – 1333).

If we can conclude that the above change occurred in the history of the Kyoto dialect, there should be no reason not to consider that, in the same way, group 2 and group 3 nouns had different tone contours in the Osaka dialect and other Kinki-region dialects, which are very similar to the Kyoto dialects, and in the Tsuruga and Toyama dialects.

[Note] I will take this opportunity to compare the accent contours of two non-typical B-type dialects, the Ikeda-chō dialect of Tokushima pref. and the Takamatsu dialect (see the last note in section 7), with the Myōgishō accentuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Myōgishō</th>
<th>Ikeda-chō</th>
<th>Takamatsu</th>
<th>(Kyoto)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>hako ‘box’, hana ‘nose’…</td>
<td>high level</td>
<td>(high) level</td>
<td>(high) level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KINDAICHI  Pioneering Linguistic Works in Japan

Group 2  hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’… falling  falling  (falling)

Group 3  ashi ‘foot’, hana ‘flower’… low level  (high) level (high) level  (falling)

Group 4  aki ‘autumn’, ame ‘rain’… rising  rising  rising  (rising)

Group 5

The Icheda-chō and Takamatsu dialects also once had the same accentuation as is seen in the Myōgishō, as in the case of the Kyoto dialect, and groups 1, 4 and 5 underwent no changes, again as in Kyoto, but group 3 nouns (which in Kyoto changed to the falling contour) became high level and merged with group 1, and in Ikeda-chō, as in Kyoto, group 2 did not change. However, in the Takamatsu dialect group 2 nouns ending in non-high vowels took on the rising contour, and those ending in high vowels retained the original contour, resulting in the modern day system.

This leaves the B-type dialects, represented by the Tokyo and Hiroshima dialects. In all other dialects either the accentual distinction between group 2 nouns and group 3 nouns exists today, or if it no longer exists we can say that it once existed, so it is unlikely that the B-type dialects alone never had the distinction. It seems better to take the view that these dialects also once had the distinction between group 2 and 3 nouns, and that this distinction was lost for some unknown reason.
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Finally, the peripheral dialects of the Hokuō, Izumo, southwestern Kyushu and other regions have in common that they distinguish between group 2 and group 3 nouns, and that their group 1 and group 2 nouns are pronounced with the same contour. For this reason, it can be presumed that even dialects such as the Tokyo, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Kōchi dialects, which now have no distinction between group 2 and group 3 nouns, and which have completely different contours on group 1 nouns and group 2 nouns, had different tonal contours for group 2 and 3 nouns in the past, and the contours on group 1 and 2 nouns were probably very similar to each other.

On this topic, first looking at the Kyoto dialect, according to the Ruijumyōgishō the accentuation of bisyllabic nouns in the Kyoto dialect of the Insei period (1086 – 1192) period as described in section 9 can be presumed to be as follows.

Group 1 nouns ……... high level (shang-shang) fako ‘box’, fana ‘nose’, kafe ‘face’…

Group 2 nouns ……… falling contour (shang-ping) fashi ‘bridge’, fata ‘flag’, ishi ‘stone’…

Group 3 nouns ……… low level (ping-ping) ashi ‘foot’, fana ‘flower’, fana ‘stomach’…

Group 4 nouns  … rising contour (ping-shang) aki ‘autumn’, ame ‘rain’, ato
Group 5 nouns

From this we can see that each of groups 1, 2 and 3 had differing contours, but with only this information it is difficult to ascertain whether the contours of groups 1 and 2 were similar to each other, or whether groups 2 and 3 had similar contours. (Given that in modern dialects throughout Japan all contours can be divided into level-register and contour-register contours, one may suspect that perhaps group 1 and group 3 were similar to each other.)

However, in a small number of modern dialects the degree of relatedness of noun accentuation contours appears clearly in compound words. (Refer to the note immediately following the dialect comparison table in section 7.) I have thus selected from the Ruijumyōgishō compounds containing words which belong to these four contours as the compound-initial component and compared their contours, giving the following results.

(a) Compound words where the initial component (2-syllables) is high level

- *fanadura* ‘nose ring (for oxen)’ shang-shang-shang-ping (H2-57f)
- *kaobase* ‘facial features’ shang-shang-shang-ping (H1-51b)
- *kazakiri* ‘flight feathers’ shang-shang-shang (S3-49b)
- *kubikashi* ‘neck shackle’ shang-shang-shang-ping (B3-52f)
- *kutifashi* ‘beak’ shang-shang-shang-shang-ping (B3-5b)
- *kutitori* ‘leading a horse’ shang-shang-shang-ping (S2-49b)
- *kutufami* ‘(horse) bit’ shang-shang-shang-shang (H1-49f and 1 other place)
- *midukaki* ‘web (of duck’s feet etc.)’ shang-shang-shang-shang (H1-40f)
- *midukane* ‘mercury (metal)’ shang-shang-ping-ping (S1-57f)
- *sakaduki* ‘sake cup’ shang-shang-shang-ping (S2-7b and 4 other places)
- *takafana* ‘bamboo grove’ shang-shang-shang-ping (S1-31f)
- *toriamii* ‘fowling net’ shang-shang-shang-shang (S2-6f)
- *torikubi* ‘plough beam’ shang-shang-shang-shang (H3-13f)

(b) Compound words where the initial component (2-syllables) is falling

- *fata’ashi* ‘fly (part of flag)’ shang-shang-shang-shang (S2-14b)
- *fidimaki* ‘bangle’ shang-shang-shang-shang (S1-62f; fidi ‘elbow’ appears at B2-64f and 2 other places)
- *ifagoke* ‘Selaginella tamariscina (plant)’ shang-shang-shang-shang (H3-29b; ifa ‘rock’ appears at H2-2b)
- *ifagumi* ‘Szechwan chinaberry fruit’ shang-shang-shang-shang (S1-6b and 2 others)
- *ishigame* ‘pond turtle’ shang-shang-ping-ping (S3-14f)
- *ishigani* ‘kind of crab’ shang-shang-ping-ping (S3-13b)
- *ishimoti* ‘white croaker (fish)’ shang-shang-shang-shang (S3-3f)
rising (d) morphemes are all transcribed as shang-shang-shang (H2-2b)
kamizeni ‘paper cut to shape of coins’ shang-shang-shang- ping (S1-65b) places
kurabone ‘saddle’ shang-shang-shang (S2-36b; kura ‘saddle’ appears at S2-36b)

(C) Compound words where the initial component (2-moras) is low level
ashiatō ‘footprint’ ping-ping-ping-shang (H1-39f)
ashikashi ‘leg irons’ ping-ping-ping-ping (B3-47b)
ashinabe ‘small tripod kettle’ ping-ping-shang-shang (S1-58b)
asuinafe ‘lameness’ ping-ping-ping-ping (H1-37f and 1 other place)
fanagame ‘vase’ ping-ping-ping-shang (S2-9f)
faraabi ‘belly band’ ping-ping-ping-shang (S2-38f and 1 other place)
kamisori ‘razor’ ping-ping-ping-ping (S1-47f)
kanzashi ‘hairpin’ ping-ping-ping-ping (S1-31b and 2 other places)
makafu ‘horse keeper’ ping-ping-ping-ping (S2-49b and 1 other place)
mmazemi ‘kind of cicada’ ping-shang- ping-ping (S3-14b and 1 other place)
yamabuki ‘kerria (bush)’ ping-ping-shang-shang (S1-65b and 1 other place)
yamadori ‘mountain bird’ ping-ping-shang-shang (S2-64b)
yamagufa ‘Korean mulberry’ ping-ping- ping-ping (B3-56f)
yamagusu ‘Stellera chamaejasme (plant)’ ping-ping-shang-ping (B3-69f)
yamakaki ‘Diospyros kaki (tree)’ ping-ping-ping-shang (B3-55f)
yamamono ‘bayberry’ ping-ping-shang-ping (B3-42b)
yamanashi ‘Chinese pear’ ping-ping-ping-shang (B3-58b)
yubimaki ‘ring (jewelry)’ ping-ping-ping-shang (S1-66f)

(D) Compound words where the initial component (2-syllables) is rising
amaginu ‘raincoat’ ping-ping-ping-shang (H2-68b)
amagofu ‘praying for rain’ ping-ping-ping-ping (B3-47f)
asamizō ‘sweat groove (on horse)’ ping-ping-ping- ping (H1-21b; ase ‘sweat’ appears at H1-1b)
katasaki ‘top of shoulder’ ping-ping-shang-ping (B3-4f)
kinugasa ‘long-handled umbrella’ ping-ping-ping- ping (S2-8f; kinu ‘silk’ appears at H2-68b)
makadare ‘apron’ ping-ping-ping-shang (H2-69b and 1 other place)
zenigata ‘paper cut to shape of coins’ ping-ping-ping-shang (S1-65b; zeni ‘coin’ appears at S1-65b)

Looking at (a-d) above, we observe that compounds that begin with high level morphemes (a) and falling morphemes (b) are all transcribed as shang-shang… (i.e. what is thought to be a high level beginning), and compounds that begin with low level (c) and rising (d) morphemes are all transcribed as ping-ping… (i.e. what is thought to be a low level beginning), and there are no exceptions. It is dangerous to draw conclusions about the original contours of the component morphemes in compounds based only on the accentuation of compounds, but as the above generalisation cannot be considered to be
coincidental, we can suspect that high level (a) (i.e. group 1 nouns) and falling (b) (i.e. group 2 nouns) are closely related to each other, and that low level (c) (i.e. group 3 nouns) and rising (d) (i.e. group 4 nouns) are closely related to each other.

Although the Kyoto dialect group 1 nouns and group 2 nouns are now pronounced on quite different contours, and group 2 nouns and group 3 nouns have identical contours, if we go back to the Insei period (1086 – 1192), it seems we can say that group 1 and group 2 nouns had similar characteristics and group 2 and 3 nouns had different characteristics, which is the same situation as in the dialects spoken in the peripheral regions of Japan. The Osaka dialect and other Kinki region dialects, which are nowadays similar to the Kyoto dialect, and the Kōchi and other central Shikoku dialects, and the Tsuruga and Toyama dialects were probably very similar to the Insei period Kyoto dialect in this respect.

Finally, the Tōkaidō and San’yō dialects remain. As all other dialects either have the above-mentioned characteristics, or, if they do not, they can be considered to have had them in the past, we will not consider that the Tōkaidō and San’yō dialects alone are different, so it can be assumed that in the past in these dialects too the accentuations of group 1 and group 2 nouns were closely related (and in the modern dialects they have merged into one contour) and those of group 2 and group 3 nouns were distantly related to each other.

Combining the facts determined in sections 9 and 10, we arrive at the following.

(A) In dialects throughout Japan, in the past, group 2 nouns (hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’, ishi ‘stone’…) and group 3 nouns (ashi ‘foot’, hana ‘flower’, hara ‘stomach’…) were pronounced with completely dissimilar contours.

(B) On the other hand, group 1 nouns (hako ‘box’, hana ‘nose’, kao ‘face’ …) and group 2 nouns (hashi ‘bridge’, hata ‘flag’, ishi ‘stone’…) were pronounced with extremely similar contours.

(C) Regarding the degree of similarity between the tonal contours of these groups, the central dialects (e.g. the dialects of the Tōkaidō, Kinki, Hokuriku, San’yō, Shikoku, and northeastern Kyushu regions) underwent quite a marked change. That is to say, the accentual distinction between the group 1 nouns and the group 2 nouns became much more marked, and additionally the tonal contour on the group 2 nouns became closer to that on the group 3 nouns until the two contours finally merged. (However, in some of the dialects of Shikoku, the contours of group 1 and group 3 nouns merged.)

(D) In contrast to this, in the peripheral dialects (e.g. the dialects of the Hokuō, Izumo, southwestern Kyushu and the Ryūkyūs) the original accentual relationship described in (A) has been relatively well preserved, with the distinction between group 2 and group 3 nouns has been retained until the
present day. (However, the distinction between the contours of group 1 and group 2 nouns became smaller and eventually the two merged.)

There are very few historical documents which contain evidence for the accentuation of past stages of Japanese, and so the outlook for document-based diachronic research is very gloomy, but in the current situation where there are a variety of dialects, meticulous comparison of these dialects will hopefully be able to throw light on this topic, and it is to this end that I have started this research. This paper is not yet fully developed, and so I hesitated to publish it, but it is my long-cherished hope that, by publishing some of my thoughts on the accentuation of bimoraic words, I will receive feedback and instruction from far and wide.

Translator’s notes
i Rising contour nouns to which particles join on with a high pitch will be referred to as rising-contour A group words, and rising contour nouns to which particles join with a low pitch will be referred to a rising contour B group words. This should not be confused with the division of dialects into A-type and B-type dialects.

ii The Ruijumyōgishō is made up of three parts, the butsu ‘Buddha’ part, with four volumes, the hō ‘law’ part with three volumes, and the sō ‘monk’ part also with three volumes. When giving references to pages in the Ruijumyōgishō, B, H and S will be used as abbreviations for butsu, hō and sō respectively, and the following number will be the volume within that part. This will be followed by the leaf number followed by the letter f (front) or b (back), indicating whether the word is recorded on the front or back of the leaf/page. For example, H2-57f refers to the recto of leaf 57 in the second volume within the hō part.

iii In his book Research on the Shiza Kōshiki (1964), Kinda’ichi retracts this explanation and explains (ch.2, section 12.9.3) that the part of the Mojigaeshi being referred to here is not actually referring the accentuation of the word shima ‘island’, but instead is being used to refer to the Japanese accentuation of the Sino-Japanese morpheme setu ‘cut’, and the shima ‘island’ refers to Japan, in contrast to China (and the Chinese tone of the morpheme).

iv The original gives H1-1f as the reference for rising contour ase ‘sweat’, but I have corrected this here.