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This paper focuses on cross-dialectal differences in the intonational characteristics of [WH...C_{[+wh]}] structures in the Fukuoka, Nagasaki, Kagoshima and Tokyo dialects, and discusses how the differences are captured by the compound analysis (Kubo 2016).

It is known that the Fukuoka dialect and the Nagasaki dialect show the similarity in the intonational characteristics that can be accounted for by the compound analysis. In the Fukuoka dialect, which has a pitch accent system, lexical accents are deleted and flat high pitch spreads between WH-words and their associated complementizer (C_{[+wh]}) (Kubo 1989). Sato (2016a) reports that a similar phenomenon is observed in the Nagasaki dialect with some WH-associated complementizers, even though the dialect has a word tone system, which is essentially different from the accent system in the Fukuoka dialect.

In this paper, we will discuss this characteristic intonational pattern occurring in [WH...C_{[+wh]}] structures of the Fukuoka and Nagasaki dialects. The intonational pattern that [WH...C_{[+wh]}] structures are assigned is regarded as a “compound accent” in these two dialects. As pointed out in Sato (2016b), this compound accent occurs in [WH...C_{[+wh]}] of these two dialects via deletion of lexical accents/tones, irrespective of the difference in their accent system. We can conclude that this intonational pattern observed in these two dialects in common cannot be accounted for uniformly without assuming the compound analysis proposed in Kubo (2016), in which [WH...C_{[+wh]}] is analyzed as a phonological compound.

We also explore two more dialects—the Tokyo dialect, which has a pitch accent system, and the Kagoshima dialect, which has a word tone system—in addition to the Fukuoka and Nagasaki dialects, in order to make a classification with respect to the deletion of accents/tones within [WH...C_{[+wh]}] and the restriction on C_{[+wh]}.

(1) a. Lexical accents/tones are deleted in [WH...C_{[+wh]}].
   i) all C_{[+wh]}$^S$
   ii) a particular item of C_{[+wh]}$^S$

b. Lexical accents/tones are not deleted.

Each dialect has the following characteristics.

(2) **Accent/tone deletion in the four dialects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>deletion</th>
<th>restriction</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>accent system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>(1a-i)</td>
<td>pitch accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(1a-ii)</td>
<td>word tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>pitch accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagoshima</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>(1b)</td>
<td>word tone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Accent deletion in the Tokyo dialect leaves room for discussion.)

The classification demonstrated in the Table (2) shows that the intonational characteristics observed within [WH...C_{[+wh]}] in these four dialects are independent of their accent systems. Furthermore, we will discuss whether the differences/similarities among these four dialects can be captured by the compound analysis.