FUJIWARA (Yoichi)

A Dialect-geographical Study of the Japanese Dialects,

Tokyo, 1956, 254 pages, 180 maps.
(Folklore Studies, vol. XV, SVD Resèarch Institute)
Sales agents : Charles E. Tuttle C° 東京都文京区江戸川町15
5 dollars, 1800 yen.

One of the great problems of mankind is the communication of knowledge and therefore the sweeping away of obstacles between human minds.I felt this very strongly when I arrived in Japan at the end of 1950. I had just come from Louvain, where the Rumanian dialectologist S. Pop was putting out a large 1300 pages volume about dialectology in the main countries of the world. But Japan was not even mentionned in the book. The great reason for that is the language barrier. Nobody reads Japanese among the leading dialectologists, and therefore the important contribution to dialectology which we owe to such a great number of Japanese scholars, goes unnoticed.

We must therefore be thankful to the Research Institute of Oriental Culture 日華文化研究所 to have filled completely one volume of its Journal Folklore Studies 民俗学誌 to present to the English reading public the first long dialectal study published in a foreign language since the war. In 1952' the same center had already published a shorter paper by professor Umegaki Minoru 楳垣実 on Wakayama honorifics (1952' vol. XI' p 183-200). The 日華文化研究所 which is the successor of the Peking Catholic University 輔仁大学 moved to Tokyo after the confiscation by the Peking Government. Its section of dialectology and folklore has been enlarged to cover beside China also Japan, the Philippines and Southeast Asia. Its direcor is Father M. Eder an Austrian, and its present address is: 名古屋市昭和区五軒家町南山大学内。

Professor Fujiwara is well-known to the readers of this Journal because of his interest in the study of dialectal grammar. The present study has a much larger scope: it presents the dialectal material gathered during a survey in 1933

and 1934' covering the nine 県 of 中国 and 四国 (691 localities) to which the 兵庫県 and 大阪府 were added (142 localities); the latter were added to trace the influence of Kinki 近畿 on the 中国, 四国 dialects and vice versa.

The author is pointing out very frankly the limitations of his survey in the introduction. These limitations are the consequences of the chosen method. He couldn't possibly cover such a large territory with a personal survey (臨地調査), nor could he completely trust a correspondence survey (通信調査). He chose a middle-course. He prepared a questionnaire (調査票) which was adapted to the dialects of that district; I mean by this that he made use not only of his own knowledge of these regions, but also of a survey made by professor Tōjō 東条 in the Chugoku (中国) area. The possible forms which could be expected were presented beforehand on the work sheets (調査票). The author went then himself to each women teacher's college of the area, explained minutely the purpose of the survey, gave instructions to fill in the sheets. Here he had the good sense not to interrogate the girls themselves about their dialect, but to have them fill in the questionnaire at home in their dialectal surroundings during the holidays.

I think that the greatest drawback of interrogating girls between 15 and 18 (namely their susceptibility to the language surroundings of the school) was cleverly avoided by this method. Even so, the author remained somewhat sceptic regarding the reliability of his material; out of his three-parts questionnaire (87 items for the vocabulary, 56 items for the grammar, and 55 items for the phonetic part), he made almost no use of the third and last part, clearly the least trustworthy in the case of unskilled informants. We must also note that the maps themselves provide a method to check on the reliability of the materials.

The maps appended to this study are of two kinds: There are first 62 sketch maps inserted in the text; these constitute easily read summaries, they are interpretations and have the same value as the writtem explanation by the author. But besides, there are 118 maps of full page size at end of the book; these maps reproduce the dialectal material objectively, by representing the linguistic form used in each locality by a distinctive sign; in this sense the author is right where he says: "the maps themselves constitute the main and first result of the survey."They are objective and allow the reader to make his own personal interpretation. Even people who cannot read easily the English text of this book, can make good use of the maps, which are clear by themselves. On such maps, one extraordinary and isolated linguistic form may be looked upon with suspicion, because it may reveal a mistake made by the informant. The maps therefore contain their own way of checking.

Here I wish to make a general remark for tke Japanese reader. Professor Fujiwara never forgot that for many readers of his work, this would be the first contact with Japanese dialectology. The Japanese specialist therefore may find some explanations not quite necessary for himself, and specially he may express doubts about the advisability of the second part of this work. This second part covers only 15 pages of the text, but has 58 large maps. Their material was not gathered in the same way as described above; here we have the result of personal interviews during a survey by the author himself with a list of 86 expressions, all aimed for a study of the accentuation system. He covered also the eastern half of 九州 besides the territories covered by the first part.

The author of this book was clearly over-happy of being able to publish so many maps at once, and he took the opportunity to give the foreign reader as many maps as possible. The Japanese specialist may wish fewer maps, arranged according to the few main types of accent. And the foreign reader on the other hand, while being very glad to see such a wealth of material will wish probably that a longer text had be given to explain all the significance of the various accent distributions. The text relating to these accent maps is too terse for easy comprehension.

To return now to the first part, which will interest both Japanese and foreign scholars, we have, arranged in three chapters (Phonetics, grammar and vocabulary) the description of the main tendencies of the dialect movements in 中国, 四国 and 近畿. Each of these three chapters has approximately the same structure. In each, the material is presented purely according to the geographical distribution, and not to historical categories. I must explain here what I mean.

I think it is a great quality of Prof. Fujiwara's work that he gave priority to purely geographical reasons when it came to group together some maps. For instance, if words happen to have forms used both in the north of 四国 and in the south of 中国 it is linguistically important to group them together, to trace the general patterns of influence. Such group of words may contain names of insects, a couple of adjectives, some verbal forms, and other various linguistics features. The very fact that they do not have a natural, internal relation with each other, or the very fact that they do not belong to the same historical category, these two facts make the coincidence of their areas very important to discern the main dialect tendencies, the broad waves of influence which are working under the surface. I am sure that some of the maps of Prof. Fujiwara will cause some sadness to the heart of a few dialectologists, because they will look in vain for a lucid, simple and easy to understand division of western 本州 Honshu in three or four independent dialects. The reality of dialectal life is much more complicated. In fact the reality

is so complicated that I am sure that many readers will wish that more had been said about each map.

I may propose here a different title for this valuable work, a title that would still better express its nature. I would call it: "A Dialect-atlas of West-Honshú (本州)" Like a dialectatlas it gives more material than could possibly be explained in a hundred pages. The reader has now at hand a valuable storehouse of new material; each map ought to be studied in itself, and then compared with some of the other maps which show a clear relationship with the first through similar distribution patterns. I could maybe make a suggestion to the writer here: he has now at his disposition the plates of the maps, and they can now be reproduced without extra costs. May we expect him to give us sometimes a detailed, and complete analysis of two or three related maps? He could do this in Japanese, in some journal, and this time with the complete historical written sources as collateral information.

When one hears say that Gilliéron in France is the father of the dialectgeography, that does not only means that he acquired this title because of the publication of the materials of the Linguistic Atlas of France. He did much more: he founded the science of the interpretation of maps. He had the historical hnowledge for that, and still more important he had the deep feeling of the rural language. Armed with these two weapons, he attacked several linguistic riddles and opened new paths to linguistic interpretation. Prof. Fujiwara is in the right place, as a native of these regions and as a student of these dialects, to give us deeper and new interpretations of maps. Of course the present book gives more than only the material of the local dialects. There is already a good amount of interpretation which is sufficient to bring into the open the great tendencies; for instance: the nexus between 四国 and 中国, the less expected nexus between 四国 and parts of 近畿; also some relationship between dialectal tendencies found in south 四国 with these of west 中国 and then of north 中国, all together forming a kind of circular area; and this phenomenon was found in several, mutually unrelated linguistic features. There are several more such findings indicated by the author, which are worth a very searching analysis.

But this dialect atlas of 本州 will not only teach us new facts about dialect groups, or will not only give us insight in the historical process by which language grew in these regions. I wish also that these maps may be used to study the stylistics and the psychology, the inner mainsprings of the Japanese languae.

As everybody knows, the main lines of linguistic analysis found in the modern linguistic treatises, were discovered first through the study of dialectal maps by Gillieron in France, Wrede in Germany, Jud/Jaberg in Italy and many others, Such

main conclusions have not to be discovered again here: we know they must exist in Japanese too, but we must try to see in what peculiar, distinctive shape they exist in the Japanese dialects. This work has already be done in part by several leading dialectologists. But on top of these general truths, it would be natural to expect the discovery of new laws, of things that can originate only in the special linguistic surroundings proper to the Japanese language. Let us not forget that Fujiwara's work is the first to give such a great number of maps extending over such a large territory. Till we see the future linguistic atlas of Japan planned now by the 国立国語研究所, the present work constitutes a new date, a new starting post for a further progress in our linguistic comprehension of the Japanese language.

Willem A. Grootaers

補遺

二十八輯二十六ページ下段において、漢書抄の簡単な書誌学的説明を試みたが、原稿執筆後次の問題について教示を得たのでおそおそながら附記しておく。

桃源抄と記されたテキストの一四七面に、死時七十九——ヲレカ今ノ年ソコワイ事ソという一文があるが、このヲレを桃源とすると従来知られている桃源の年譜と全くあわない。大塚光信氏の教示によると、このヲレは妙智（等連）であり、その妙智講ずるところを桃源が記した（ほゞ応仁元—二年の講）と考えられる由であるが、この説は他の色々の事項と非常によく符合する。謝意を表して、漢書抄の一部の講者を妙智と訂正させて頂きたい。

寿岳章子