

Variations in the *shiki* domain formation of Kinki Japanese compound words: a pilot study
Mariko Sugahara
Doshisha University

The goal of this study is to reveal how different age groups of Kinki Japanese speakers vary in their *shiki* domain formation of compound words in which their second members are either (a) single-morpheme loan words with five or more than five morae or (b) compound words consisting of three or more than three Sino-Japanese morphemes.

The vocabulary of Kinki Japanese (KJ) are different from those of Tokyo Japanese (TJ) that it has not only an accented/unaccented contrast but also a High-beginning/Low-beginning tonal contrast. The H and the L tone that determine the word-beginning pitch levels spread to a syllable immediately before an accented syllable when a word is accented, and it spreads till its end when unaccented (Pierrehumbert & Beckman 1988). Those high and low pitch levels lexically determined for KJ words are called *shiki*.

When a compound word is formed with a light second member consisting of two feet or less, the lexically specified *shiki* of its second member does not surface: the *shiki* of the second member is lost and that of the first member spreads to the second member. For example, ^H*kurisúmasu* ‘Christmas’ + _L*tsurûi* ‘tree’ → ^H*kurisumasutsurûi* (Nakai 2002). That is, both the first and the second member form a single *shiki* domain. However, the spreading of the *shiki* of the first member to the second member of a compound does not take place and the original *shiki* of the second member is preserved when the second member is heavy with more than two feet, resulting in two separate *shiki* domains, as in _L*howáito* ‘white’ + ^H*kurisúmasu* ‘Christmas’ → _L*howaito*^H*kurisúmasu* ‘White Christmas’ (Nakai 2002).

The current study examines whether the separation of the *shiki* domains when the second member of a compound is heavy is a stable phenomenon across all generations of KJ speakers. Three older generation KJ speakers (between 45 and 65 years old) and three younger KJ speakers (21 years old) took part in our experiment. They were asked to read aloud two types of compound words: one with a second member consisting of a heavy single-morpheme loanword with five or more than five morae such as _L*enérugii* ‘energy’ and the other with a second member consisting of a heavy complex Sino-Japanese word consisting of three morphemes such as *ho-jó-kin* ‘grant money’ (an assumption here is that each Sino-Japanese morpheme constitutes a single foot: Tateishi 1985, Kubozono et al. 1995). 11 compound forms with loan second words, e.g. ^H*kágaku* ‘science’ + _L*tekunórojii* ‘technology’, and 15 compound forms with Sino-Japanese second members, e.g. _L*genshíryoku* ‘nuclear energy’ + ^H*hatsu-den-sho* ‘power plant’, were employed in the study.

The two age groups showed different results. While the older speakers put the first and the second members into separate *shiki* domains almost 100% of the time regardless of the second member vocabulary types, the younger speakers did so only 24% of the time when the second members were loanwords and 53% of the time when they were Sino-Japanese. The difference between the older and the younger generation was significantly different ($\chi^2=70.3$, $p < .001$). The difference within the younger speakers between the loanword and the Sino-Japanese second member cases was also significant ($\chi^2=6.66$, $p = .01$).

The results above imply that changes in the grammar of *shiki* domain formation are now taking place in KJ. It should be also explained why younger speakers put both members of a compound into a single *shiki* domain more often when the second member was a heavy loanword than when it was heavy Sino-Japanese. According to Kubozono (2004) and Kubozono & Ogawa (2004), both loanwords and Sino-Japanese words with more than two feet equally form complex prosodic words, by which the similarity in their accentuation patterns are explained. Under that hypothesis, we cannot attribute the difference between the two cases into their prosodic structure differences. Instead, it should be due to different constraint rankings associated with the second members of different vocabulary types.