Japanese-English Language Contact

Barjaktarević, Uroš

Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku
Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost

Uroš Barjaktarević

Japanese-English Language Contact / Japansko-engleski jezični kontakt

Diplomski rad

Kolegij: Engleski jezik u kontaktu

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Dubravka Vidaković Erdeljić

Osijek, 2015.

Summary

JAPANESE-ENGLISH LANGUAGE CONTACT

The paper examines the language contact between Japanese and English. The first section of the paper defines language contact and the most common contact-induced language phenomena with an emphasis on linguistic borrowing as the dominant contact-induced phenomenon. The classification of linguistic borrowing thereby follows Haugen's distinction between morphemic importation and substitution. The second section of the paper presents the features of the Japanese language in terms of origin, phonology, syntax, morphology, and writing. The third section looks at the history of language contact of the Japanese with the Europeans, starting with the Portuguese and Spaniards, followed by the Dutch, and finally the English. The same section examines three different borrowing routes from English, and contact-induced language phenomena other than linguistic borrowing – bilingualism , code alternation, code-switching, negotiation, and language shift – present in Japanese-English language contact to varying degrees. This section also includes a survey of the motivation and reasons for borrowing from English, as well as the attitudes of native Japanese speakers to these borrowings. The fourth and the central section of the paper looks at the phenomenon of linguistic borrowing, its scope and the various adaptations that occur upon morphemic importation on the phonological, morphological, orthographic, semantic and syntactic levels. The final section of the paper analyzes these data, and reaches the conclusion with regard to the hypothesis of the paper.
Keywords: language contact, Japanese, English, linguistic borrowing, bilingualism

Sažetak

JAPANSKO-ENGLESKI JEZIČNI KONTAKT

U radu se istražuje jezični kontakt japanskog i engleskog jezika. U prvom se dijelu rada definira jezični kontakt i najčešće jezične pojave do kojih pritom dolazi s naglaskom na jezičnom posuđivanju kao najistaknutijom jezičnom pojavom izazvanom kontaktom. Klasifikacija jezičnog posuđivanja pritom prati Haugenovo razlikovanje morfemske importacije i substitucije. U drugom se dijelu rada predstavljaju značajke japanskog jezika u odnosu na porijeklo, fonologiju, sintaksu, morfologiju i pismo. U trećem se dijelu promatra povijest jezičnog kontakta Japanaca s Europljanima, počevši s Portugalcima i Španjolcima, zatim Nizozemcima i konačno Englezima. U istom se dijelu istražujuju i tri različita puta posuđivanja iz engleskog te druge jezične pojave izazvane kontaktom pored jezičnog posuđivanja - bilingvizam, izmjenjivanje kodova (tzv. *code alternation*), prebacivanje kodova (tzv. *code-switching*), promjena jezika (tzv. *language shift*) - koji su u različtim mjerama prisutni u japansko-engleskom jezičnom kontaktu. Isti dio sadrži i pregled motivacije i razloga za jezično posuđivanje iz engleskog, kao i stavova izvornih govornika japanskog prema posuđenicama. U četvrtom i središnjem dijelu rada istražuje se pojava jezičnog posuđivanja, njezin raspon i razne prilagodbe do kojih dolazi prilikom morfemske importacije na fonološkoj, morfološkoj, ortografskoj, semantičkoj i sintaktičkoj razini. U posljednjem se poglavlju rada analiziraju ti podaci i donosi zaključak u odnosu na hipotezu rada.
Ključne riječi: jezični kontakt, japanski jezik, engleski jezik, jezično posuđivanje, bilingvizam

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

1.1. Aims, methodology and organization of the paper

The aim of this paper in its broadest sense is to determine whether the general tendencies of contact-induced language phenomena laid out in the following section can be verified in the contact between English and Japanese. My starting hypothesis is that the Japanese-English borrowing situation lends itself to Haugen's (1950) stratification into loanwords, loanblends, and loanshifts like other cases of borrowing situations, that imported elements can be analyzed on at least three levels (morphological, phonological, and semantic) – as well as two additional levels that I posit in the theoretical part (syntactic and orthographic), and that the changes that occur thereon, in the broadest sense, are not unlike those observed in more researched cases of language contact. In addition to testing the hypothesis, one of the aims of the paper is also to attempt to determine the following (and in doing so, to identify whether they also conform to general expectation of contact linguistics):

(1) The type, intensity, period, scope of, and reason for language contact between English and Japanese. These are primarily examined in the chapter titled 'History of language contact in Japan', in 'General remarks on linguistic borrowing from English', and in the section titled 'Motivation for borrowing and attitudes to loanwords'.

(2) The types of contact-induced language phenomena that have occurred in the course of such contact. These are examined throughout the paper, but primarily in the sections 'Analysis of linguistic borrowings from English in Japanese' and 'History of language contact in Japan'.

(3) Whether linguistic borrowing is the most common of those phenomena. If yes, whether a distinction can be made between morphemic importation, morphemic substitution with importation, and morphemic substitution. Whether morphological, phonological, semantic, orthographic, and syntactic adaptation strategies upon morphemic importation observed in the cases of well-recorded linguistic borrowing between Indo-European languages can be applied to that contact. Whether a distinction can be made between foreign words and loanwords proper. Whether the types of borrowings fall under the general predictions of borrowability scales. Whether there are any structural innovations in Japanese brought about by language contact. All these are examined under the heading 'Analysis of linguistic borrowings from English in Japanese' which constitutes the bulk of the paper.

(4) Whether other contact-induced language phenomena (bilingualism, code-switching, etc.) have occurred during the English-Japanese language contact. These are examined in the section of the paper titled 'History of language contact in Japan'.
(5) The attitudes of Japanese speakers to the influence of the English language on their language. This is examined in the section titled 'Motivation for borrowing and attitudes to loanwords'.
(6) Due to the perhaps esoteric nature of the Japanese language, a section on the features of the Japanese language will also be included. These features are examined in the section titled: 'The Japanese language'.

The sources used in the creation of this paper include two online dictionaries: goo 国語辞書 ('gooJapanese Dictionary'), and EDICT (Electronic Dictionary Research and Development Group) files hosted on 楽しい JAPANESE ('Pleasant Japanese') site, Halpern's 'Kodansha Kanji Learner's Dictionary' (1999), and the dictionary found in Akiyama (2002). Arakawa's *Kadokawa Gairaigo Jiten* ('Kadokawa Loanword Dictionary') – the most comprehensive and authoritative Japanese loanword dictionary – and a number of other monolingual dictionaries have been utilised indirectly. More on these, as well as on Japanese-English contact linguistics sources (e.g. Miller (1971), Irwin (2011), Stanlaw (2004) etc.) whose accounts have been analyzed and synthesized can be found under the appropriate heading in the section titled 'Analysis of linguistic borrowings from English in Japanese'.

2. Theoretical preliminaries

2.1. Language contact

In the simplest definition, language contact is the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time (Thomason 2001: 1). When such contact occurs, languages tend to influence one another, though generally the socially prestigious language belonging to the dominant culture (also called a superstrate) remains relatively unchanged, and the less prestigious language (a substrate) undergoes certain changes. Major outcomes of such language contact, according to Winford (2003: 22-24) are threefold: language maintenance (subdivided into borrowing situations – with more lexical, and less structural borrowing – and convergence situations – with considerable structural (and lexical) borrowing), language shift (cf. definition below), and language creation (of pidgins and creoles; cf. definition below). Interestingly, Winford (2003: 30-31) considers Japanese-English language contact to be an instance of a casual borrowing situation though I will present evidence which favor the claim that the borrowing situation is moderate or perhaps even intense. On a more specific level, language contact induces a number of phenomena the most basic of which is bilingualism. According to Hermann and Schuchardt (as cited in Filipović (1971: 112-113)), bilingualism is a prerequisite for any contact-induced language phenomenon, though what type of bilingualism is a matter of debate. There are many examples where speakers of the recipient language did not speak or read the source language fluently, and yet language-induced contact phenomena did occur (a contemporary example would be the use of English in what are typically considered non-bilingual countries, owning to the influence of the internet, television or radio) – for that reason, perhaps the best course of action is to use Haugen's minimalist definition of bilingualism: 'Bilingualism ... begin[s] at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language' (Haugen (1969) as cited in Noguchi (2001: 2)). Other contact-induced phenomena include: linguistic borrowing (the most common result by a wide margin), language shift – a case where people give up their native language, and start speaking another group's language instead – code-switching – the use of material from two (or more) languages by a bilingual speaker with the same people in the same conversation (Thomason 2001: 262), code alternation – the use of one language in one set of environments and another language in a largely different set of environments by a bilingual speaker

(Thomason 2001: 261), the creation of pidgins and creoles,[1] and the most extreme of all – language death – when a language loses all of its native speakers (could also be considered the end result of a language shift). Of these, as the analysis will show, all but language shift and language death can be identified in the contact between Japanese and English. The pervasiveness of linguistic borrowing as the dominant contact-induced language phenomenon warrants further attention. Borrowing can be defined as 'the attempted reproduction by a bilingual speaker in one language of patterns previously found in another' (Haugen (1950: 212)). In such cases the original pattern in language A (the donor language) is called the model, and the loan in language B (the recipient language) may be more or less similar. Haugen (1950: 212) notes that if the loan is similar enough to the model so that a native speaker would accept it as his own, the borrowing speaker may be said to have imported the model into his language. If the loan is not acceptable to the native speaker of language A as belonging to his language, the model has been reproduced inadequately, and it can be said that the speaker of language B has substituted the model for a similar pattern from his own language. According to Haugen (1950: 213-214) the patterns that can be imported or substituted include: morphemes, phonemes, and meanings (in all cases of the former Haugen takes for granted that semantic importation has taken place). Morphemic importation naturally precludes phonemic substitution (morphemic importation is necessary for phonemic substitution: if all the model morphemes are substituted by native morphemes, then there will be no need for phonemic substitution). There is also the possibility of phonemic importation, though, according to Haugen (1950: 226), it generally does not extend beyond bilingual speakers.

The differences in the *borrowability* of certain items have urged linguists to set up borrowability scales on which they ranged the patterns according to the freedom with which they were borrowed: nouns are generally believed to be borrowed most easily, followed by verbs, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions, then suffixes, then inflections, and finally phonemes. However, my investigation of literature on language contact has led me to include grammatical (syntactic) patterns in any such scale, even though they might be the least borrowable elements. In fact, Meillet (as cited in Thomason (2001: 63)) held the view that the only borrowable grammatical elements are those that fit well with the typological structure of the recipient language, and, similarly, Jakobson and Sapir (as cited in Thomason (2001: 64)

[1] A pidgin is a mixed language that arises in a contact situation involving two or more linguistic groups that have no share language, but that need to communicate regularly, for limited purposes such as trade. They then do not learn each other's languages, but create a "new" language whose vocabulary comes from one of the languages in contact, with very little grammar. A creole is simply a pidgin language that has become the native language of a speech community (Thomason 2001: 262, 273).

argued that 'a language accepts foreign structural elements only when they correspond to its own tendencies of development'. Since any discussion of grammatical borrowing then invokes typological features of a language, the Japanese-English typological relation warrants further examination (given in the section on the Japanese language). However, some linguists (e.g. Thomason herself (2001)) reject any such scale claiming that there are almost no constraints on the borrowability of any elements, and that counter-examples (i.e. cases where there was more structural than lexical borrowing) can easily be found. In this paper, I endorse traditional borrowability scale, as the one mentioned above, when discussing different types of borrowings. Nevertheless, the primacy of morphemic importation / substitution has enabled Haugen (1950: 213-215) to set up the following three groupings of borrowings:

- LOANWORDS which exhibit morphemic importation and varying degrees of phonemic substitution, e.g. Eng. *computer* → Cro. *kompjuter* [2] exhibits the importation of two model morphemes into Croatian: *kompjut* + *-er* whose morphemes have been phonemically substituted with Croatian approximations;
- LOANBLENDS which exhibit partial morphemic importation and partial morphemic substitution (naturally then only the imported part exhibits phonemic substitution), e.g. Eng. *boxer* → Cro. *boksač* where one morpheme was imported (*boks*) and phonologically adapted (e.g. Eng. /ɑ/ in /bɑks/ was substituted by /o/) while the other morpheme was substituted with a native morpheme (*-er* → *-ač*);
- LOANSHIFTS which exhibit only morphemic substitution (and therefore no phonemic substitution). These include cases of loan translation (also known as calques), e.g. Eng. *skyscraper* → Cro. *neboder* (model morphemes substituted and meaning imported to the substitute), and cases where substituting morphemes are already existing in the language (therefore the meaning is imported to an already existing morpheme in the recipient languauge), e.g. Eng. *mouse* → Cro. *miš*.[3]

In cases of morphemic borrowing free morphemes are more easily imported, while bound morphemes are more easily substituted. Nevertheless, both types of morphemic borrowings undergo certain morphological adaptations upon substitution. The phenomenon of morphological adaptations of morphemes has been researched thoroughly with regard to the following areas: how nominal bound morphemes (expressing number, gender, and case), verbal bound morphemes (expressing person, number, tense, aspect, voice), and adjectival and

[2] All examples from Croatian are mine, unless stated otherwise.
[3] Pure importation is also called *transfer*, substition with importation *interference*, and pure substitution *integration* (Filipović, 1971: 106).

adverbial bound morphemes are adapted to the inflectional system of the recipient language, and what happens to bound morphemes when the model language and the recipient language are typologically different (e.g. English – a predominantly analytic language – and German – a synthetic language). The phenomenon of borrowing free (lexical) morphemes – called *lexical borrowing* or sometimes solely implied by the word *borrowing* – has received the most attention of all contact-induced language phenomena, especially with regard to the following: the time of (when?), way of (how?) scope of (how many and from which areas?), reason for (why?), and attitude towards borrowing lexemes, as well as the case of creative usage of borrowed lexemes in ways that do not appear in the model language – the so-called lexical pseudo-loans, e.g. Ger. *der Goalmann* is a German word made of two independent English lexemes: 'goal' and 'man' that do not appear in such a combination in English. Several of these questions warrant explanation before proceeding. Determining the approximate time of any type of contact-induced language phenomenon is necessary to detect possible innovations because any such phenomenon is always a historical fact and can be identified only by historical methods (Haugen, 1950: 227). Determining the way how such phenomena occur comes down to two possibilities: direct cultural and linguistic influence (through auditory contact with the speakers of the model language), and indirect influence (through orthographic contact with the donor language). According to Hock and Joseph (1996: 258) the reason for borrowing is also twofold: either need or prestige. The former applies when the speakers of a language take over new cultural items, new technical or religious concepts, references to foreign locations, fauna, flora, etc. and need the vocabulary to express them. The latter applies in a situation where, for sociolinguistic reasons, a superstrate language impinges on a substrate language. The attitudes toward language changes by speakers of the recipient language can, broadly speaking, either be positive or negative. Finally, determining the scope of changes has mostly to do with ascertaining the number of borrowings and their lexical groupings. Furthermore, within lexical borrowing a distinction can be made between a *Fremdwort* (foreign word), and a *Lehnwort* (loanword proper) – though it is unclear where the line between the two lies; generally, foreign words predominantly exhibit importation (on the phonemic and orthographic level), whereas loanwords exhibit substitution on those two levels (Winter-Froemel, 2008: 160-161).

In terms of phonology, as previously mentioned, substitution is the rule, and importation the exception. Every analysis of phonemic adaptation has to determine which model phonemes are substituted with which existing phonemes in the recipient language (this process is also known as *transphonemization* (Filipović (1990) as cited in Bojčić and Plavša (2012: web)), and, if there are cases of phonemic importation, which phonemes have been imported and how, and

why this importation came about. Filipović (1971: 121-122) distinguishes between several conditions for phonemic importation: (1) allophones of that phoneme already exist in the language, (2) the phonemic system of a language has latent phonemes which can be activated under the influence of foreign phonology, (3) the phoneme exists in one of the dialects of the recipient language.

When it comes to semantics, Haugen (1950: 219) does not explicitly distinguish between importation and substitution, but uses the terms loan synonym to roughly refer to semantic importation, and loan homonym[4] to refer to semantic substitution. Even though Haugen (1950: 220) states that "there is a lack of any satisfactory method of classifying degrees of semantic similarity [when it comes to semantic importation]", a successful way of doing just that was first proposed by Hope ((1960) as cited in Filipović (1971: 137-142)). He distinguishes between:

- CHANGES IN SEMANTIC EXTENSION which include ZERO SEMANTIC EXTENSION (where there is no change in the model's meaning upon importation; often occurs in words restricted to fairly specialised fields such as music, food or drinks (Filipović: 1971: 137)), SEMANTIC BROADENING or EXPANSION (where the model is first imported into the language and fills the gap in the lexicon, and then its meaning is expanded (Bojčić, Plavša, 2012: web)), and SEMANTIC NARROWING (where the model is imported with only one specific meaning, disregarding all others it might have; the most common type of semantic change throughout the world, as words are usually borrowed to fill specific gaps (Hatch and Brown (1995) as cited in Daulton (2008: 22)).
- ELLIPSIS where the meaning of the model is transferred to only one part of the model, e.g. Eng. *combine harvester* → Cro. *kombajn*.
- PEJORATION and AMELIORATION where upon importation the model receives additional negative or positive connotation, respectively, both of which often overlap with expansion, and, even more so, narrowing of meaning.
- METAPHORS and TRANSFORMATION OF PROPER NOUNS INTO COMMON NOUNS

In addition to importation and substitution on the morphological, phonological, and semantic levels, I will posit two additional levels: orthographic and syntactic – the former because the dissimilarity of the Japanese writing system warrants a complete substitution of

[4] In the case of loan homonyms, the new meaning of the model has nothing in common with the old, e.g. Eng. *dress* ['a one-piece garment (for a woman)'] → Cro. *dres* ['prepoznatljiva sportska odjeća u kojoj se nastupa'].

foreign graphs, and the latter because a syntactic framework is necessary for a discussion of grammatical importation from English in Japanese since there is little to none morphological importation from English (as will be detailed later). Orthographic importation refers to the importation of graphemes from the model language into the recipient language, and substitution refers to the substitution of model graphemes by native approximations, e.g. Ger. *die Düsse* → Cro. *dizna* [*ü* substituted with *i*], though I would argue that orthographic substitution is sometimes caused by phonemic substitution (rather than the necessity to substitute foreign graphemes) if one is dealing with an auditory loan. With orthographic loans, the reverse argument could be made. When it comes to syntax, it can be taken for granted that syntactic substitution takes place whenever loanwords are integrated into the syntactic structure of the recipient language. However, sometimes languages import whole syntactic patterns from other languages – this, and the importation of bound morphemes, is deemed structural borrowing – in which case, inherently, no substitution occurs, and the recipient language develops new syntactic patterns – this, according to the overview of contact intensity cited below, can be brought about only in very intense borrowing situations. According to Thomason (2001: 70-71), the intensity of language contact determines the extent of lexical and structural borrowing. She distinguishes between four types of contact with regard to intensity:

1. Casual contact – only lexical borrowing (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) with no structural borrowing at all. Very few to no bilinguals.
2. Slightly more intense contact – lexical borrowing (now including conjunctions and prepositions) with some structural borrowing resulting in new phonemic distributions and new functions of syntactic structures. Some fluent bilinguals, but they constitute a minority.
3. More intense contact – lexical borrowing (now also including basic vocabulary, derivational affixes, and pronouns) with structural borrowing resulting in imported phonemes, changes in syllable structure, morphophonemic rules, and word order, borrowing grammatical categories and bound morphemes. More bilinguals with better attitudes toward borrowing.
4. Intense contact – lexical borrowing (now of all elements of the lexicon) with heavy structural borrowing resulting in extreme changes in syntax (negation, coordination, subordination etc.), loss or addition of agreement patterns, shifts from flexional to agglutinating morphology, etc. Very extensive bilingualism.

2.2. The Japanese Language

2.2.1. Origin, Phonology and Grammar

Japanese is a language spoken by virtually the entire population of Japan - around 125 million people - and thus surpassing, in terms of the number of native speakers, some major European languages such as German and French, and ranking sixth among the languages of the world after Chinese, English, Russian, Spanish and Hindi. Despite its status as a major world language and its long literary history (dating back to the eighth century) Japanese is surrounded by numerous myths. There is still little to no consensus on the origin of the language – throughout the last century Japanese has been related to language families as divergent as Hittite, Indo-European, Korean, Altaic, Dravidian, Ainu and Austronesian (Clarke, 2009: 58) – but the most likely candidate, it can be tentatively argued, is Altaic. Altaic language family is one branch of the wider Uro-Altaic language family (in itself a highly debatable proposal) which is made up of the Uralic languages, which comprise the Finno-Ugric group (which includes languages such as Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian), and the Altaic languages which comprise the Turkish, Mongolian, Tungusic, and (arguably) Korean and Japanese languages (the latter two almost certainly being related, but it is still unclear whether this connection is due to common origin – a proto-Korean-Japanese (Miller, 1971:32) – or early borrowing (Clarke, 2009: 58)). The most convincing argument for the Altaic origin of the Japanese language has been given by Miller (1971: 12) by applying the comparative method together with the assumption of regular sound change on the forms of Old Japanese, for which there is a corpus of written records of cosiderable length, dating back to the late seventh and early eighth centuries, against the supposed (phonological) features of an earlier proto-Altaic language which have been summed up by Poppe (1960). Due to the constraints of the comparative method, namely "the lack of techniques for dealing with comparative syntax" (Miller, 1971: 21) and the phonetic brevity and semantic opacity of grammatical inflections, the bulk of his work focuses on examining phonological and lexical (namely, pronouns, interrogatives, numerals, and negation) evidence. Though the question of the origin of the language still remains uncertain, Miller's study has tipped the scales in the favor of its Altaic roots by showing that many similarities between proto-Altaic and Old Japanese are not simply a result of chance or borrowing. On the other hand, the biggest problem in relating Old Japanese to the Altaic family, according to Shibatani (1990: 101), is the discrepancy between the CV (consonant-vowel) syllable structure of Old Japanese, as well as the simplicity of its vowel system, compared to the abundance of closed syllables with syllable-final consonants and the

complexity of the vowel system in Altaic languages (although simple Japanese phonology might be due to early mixing with the people of the South Pacific (Shinmura (1908) as cited in Shibatani (1990: 103)). It is also easily plausible that Japanese is simply a language isolate in a manner similar to other isolates observed elsewhere in the world, e.g. Basque in Europe, Etruscan in northwestern Italy (now extinct) or Burushaski in northern Pakistan (Shibatani, 1990: 90).

Still, the Japanese language does exhibit a number of characteristics common to Altaic languages such as*:* simple phonemic system, simple syllable structure**;** morphological agglutination**,** primarily suffixal; rich case system, subject-verb agreement, word order SOV, strictly prespecifying; numerous participial forms (converbs) for conjunction and subordination of clauses (Bussmann, 1996: 47). Japanese is a syllabic language consisting of five pure – monophthongal – vowels: /a/, /i/, /u/, /e/, /o/, and sixteen consonants: /m/, /n/, /p/, /b/, /t/, /d/, /k/, /g/, /s/, /z/, /h/, /w/, /j/, /r/, a mora obstruent sound that will henceforth be represented as /Q/, and the moraic sound /N/. In addition to those phonemes, several allophones are posited, surveyed in Irwin (Irwin, 2011: 71-72) – the most important of which are the following:[5]

• /h/ is /ɸ̲/ before the vowel /u/ in which case it is romanised as *f(u),* e.g. 服 *fuku* ('clothes') [ɸ̲uku]

• /t/ and /d/ are /c͡ç/ and /d͡ʑ/ before the vowel /i/ in which case they are romanised as *ch(i)* and *j(i),* respectively, e.g. 町 *machi* ('town') [mac͡çi], and 事実 *jijitsu* ('truth') [d͡ʑid͡ʑitsu]

• /t/ and /d/ are also /ts/ and /z/ before the vowel /u/ in which case they are romanised as *ts(u)* and *z(u),* respectively, e.g. 説明 *setsumei* ('explanation') [setsumei], and 狡い *zurui* ('cunning / sly') [zurui]

• /s/ and /z/ are /ɕ̲/ and /d͡ʑ/ before the vowel /i/ in which case they are romanised as *sh(i)* and *j(i),* e.g. 寿司 *sushi* ('sushi') [suɕ̲i], and 時間 *jikan* ('time') [d͡ʑikaN]

• /c͡ç/, /ɕ̲/, and /d͡ʑ/ which then only appear before /i/ – *chi, shi, ji* – can also appear before /a/, /o/, and /u/ if these vowels are preceded with a glide – *ya, yo, yu* – in which case they give *cha, cho, chu, sha, sho, shu, ja, jo, ju* (only combinations with /e/ are unacceptable)

[5] Examples are mine unless stated otherwise.

Every syllable consists of an onset and a nucleus (a vowel), e.g. *ka, wo, ri*, though a distinction should be made between a syllable and a mora.[6] Mora is a "minimal unit of metrical time or weight" (Crystal, 2008: 312), shorter than a syllable. In Japanese specifically each mora corresponds to one graph of the kana syllabary. For example, a word like 新聞 *shiNbuN* ('newspaper') consists of two syllables – *shiN* and *buN* – but a Japanese speaker further subdivides the word into four units – *shi, N, bu, N* – or four moras, which correspond to four letters of the Japanese syllabary – し(shi), ん (n), ぶ (bu), ん (n) (Shibatani, 1990: 158). In addition to moraic *N*, there is one more sound that is not in and of itself a syllable – namely, moraic *Q* that is simply a prolongation of a succeeding obstruent (Irwin, 2011: 112), which in turn creates an additional mora (e.g. 事件 *jikeN* consists of three moras: *ji, ke, N* and has the meaning 'incident', as opposed to 実験 *jiQkeN* which consists of four moras: *ji, Q, ke, N*, and has the meaning 'experiment').

From the point of view of morphology, Japanese is classified as an agglutinative language, a term introduced by Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1836, because it involves a considerable amount of affixation in its verbal and adjectival morphology (Shibatani, 1990: 91), not uncommonly involving a fair number of suffixes in a row. The order of these verbal / adjectival affixes is generally fixed, though alternate orders can also be observed:

• Verbal stem - causative - passive - aspect - desiderative - negative - tense

All the possibilities are rarely, if ever, used in a single expression, but some fairly lengthy forms such as 歩かせ続けたい *arukasetsuzuketai* ('want to continue to make X walk') can be observed somewhat commonly (Shibatani, 1990: 307). The typological distance between English and Japanese – English being mostly an analytic language[7] and Japanese being mostly a synthetic

[6] Mora counting is a feature of languages where there is an opposition between light (or monomoraic) syllables, and heavy (or bimoraic syllables). (Crystal, 2008: 312). Similarily, in Japanese a distinction can be made between light – monomoraic – syllables (of the form: (C)(G)V where C is an optional consonant, G is an optional glide (approximant) and V is a vowel, e.g. *a, ka, kya*), heavy – bimoraic – syllables (of the form: (C)(G)VV, (C)(G)VQ, or (C)(G)VN, e.g. *kou, koQ* – as in the word 国庫 *koQko* 'national treasury' – or *koN*), and superheavy – trimoraic – syllables (of the form: (C)(G)VVN, (C)(G)VVQ, or (C)(G)VNQ, e.g. *donQ* as in the word ロンドンっ子 *rondonkko* 'Londoner'). Superheavy syllables occur only in loanwords. (Irwin, 2011: 74).

[7] Analytic languages are "languages that have the tendency to mark the syntactic relations in the sentence word-externally with the help of function words (synsemantic words), such as prepositions or auxiliary verbs" (Bussman,

agglutinative language – is especially important because, according to Thomason (2001: 279), the degree of structural diversity between two languages is indicative of linguistic phenomena that can occur during their contact. Structural dissimilarity between languages makes it possible for Thomason (2001: 71) to make two predictions about the outcome of their contact: first, that borrowed elements between typologically different languages closely follow the borrowability scale (nouns, verbs . . . phonemes . . . grammar), and second, that grammatical features that are borrowed tend to be those that are typologically congruent between the two languages. I would argue that the second of these is particularly interesting because it justifies the aforementioned necessity of setting up a syntactic framework (and the inclusion of syntactic patterns in any borrowability scale) for a discussion of grammatical importation from English since that is precisely the level on which the two languages are congruent. That is, since Japanese is agglutinative in inflections, but analytic in other respects, e.g. specifying cases or comparison of adjectives, just like English, I can expect that any grammatical importations will hardly be morphological, but rather syntactic (and perhaps specifically related to parts of speech that have the grammatical category of case). Following Weinreich's ([1953] 1964: 30-31) division of grammatical replication (or interference in his terminology) into three categories – (1) changes in inflectional morphology; (2) changes in word order; (3) changes in grammatical functions or replication of grammatical forms – based on what we have said, we can assume that any grammatical changes will also not be examples of (1), but rather (2) or (3). This interim hypothesis will be analyzed in the chapter 'Analysis of linguistic borrowings from English in Japanese', under the headings 'Morphological importation' and 'Syntactic importation' and commented further in the conclusion.

In terms of syntax Japanese is, unlike English, a typical SOV (Subject-Object-Verb) language, but does allow reordering of preverbal major constituents (a phenomenon referred to as *scrambling*). The verb, however, must always remain in the sentence-final position, and the strictness of this rule sets off Japanese from other agglutinative languages. Sometimes, though rarely and mostly in colloquial speech, this rule can be violated, though in such cases the falling intonation pattern suggests that the part following the verb is only to be considered as something appended to the end of a sentence as an afterthought (Shibatani, 1990: 258-259). Furthermore, the category of grammatical person does not exist in Japanese, nor does it mark gender or number of nouns (in number constructions, classifiers are employed) (Bussmann, 1996: 606), while cases of nouns are indicated syntactically, not morphologically, by separate particles,

1996: 57). In English, for example, the comparative structure *more beautiful* would be considered analytic, as opposed to *easier* which would be considered synthetic.

non-conjugating parts of speech that bear an absolute minimum of independent meaning and attach themselves to other parts of speech to indicate case or place them in context (Chino, 2001: 7). Finally, unlike English, which is mostly left-headed (or right-branching), Japanese is consistently right-headed (or left-branching) (Cipris and Hamano, 2002: 84). Thus a left-headed phrase in English such as *the name of the university's English professor* would look like 大学の英語の教授の名前 (*daigaku no eigo no kyōju no namae* 'university's English professor's name') in Japanese.

2.2.2. Writing

The history of Japanese writing can be traced back roughly to the first or second century AD, though the first written records appear in the eight century – namely, the *Nihon Shoki* ('Chronicles of Japan', a.d. 720), the *Kojiki* ('Record of Ancient Matters', a.d. 712), and the *Manyōshū* ('A Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves' a.d. 759). By the time these records were written, Japan had already borrowed the writing system of the Chinese (a combination of pictograms, logograms and ideograms known as 漢字 *kanji*, 'Chinese characters'). Before that the Japanese language existed only in spoken form, and Chinese characters were borrowed to enable it to be expressed in writing. These foreign characters were then related to the morphemes of Japanese through two types of *readings* – the *on* reading (the Japanese approximation of Chinese reading) and the *kun* reading (native Japanese reading). For example, when a character such as 海 (with the meaning 'sea' in both Chinese and Japanese) was adopted by the Japanese, they assigned their own native morpheme – in this case, *umi* – as one of its readings, and that is the *kun* reading. However, they also borrowed the Chinese pronunciation, or rather an approximation of it – in this case, Chinese *hai* was adopted as *kai* (Seeley, 1991: 1). The vast majority of Chinese characters nowadays, therefore, have at least one 音読み *onyomi* or *'on*-reading' (conventionally romanized in upper case) and one 訓読み *kunyomi* or '*kun*-reading' (conventionally romanized in lower case) (Henshall, 1988: xiii). By the time of *Kojiki, Nihon Shoki,* and *Manyōshū,* however, the Chinese characters were used almost exclusively as phonograms, i.e. as symbols representing speech sounds, rather than words or ideas (Crystal, 2008: 364). Depending on which reading – *kun* or *on* – their sound value was determined, it is possible to distinguish between *kun*-phonograms and *on*-phonograms. *Kun*-

phonograms employed the sound value of the native Japanese reading, e.g. 庭 (*niwa* 'garden') was used for a combination of Japanese particles (function words) *ni* + *wa* even though such a combination has no relation whatsoever to the meaning of the character, namely 'garden' (Seeley, 1991: 189). *On*-phonograms, on the other hand, employed the sound value of their *on* (Sino-Japanese) reading, e.g. 也 (*ya* 'to be', approximation of the Chinese reading *ye*) + 魔 (*ma* 'witch/demon', approximation of the Chinese reading *ma*) for the Japanese word *yama* 'mountain' (Seeley, 1991: 191) – which clearly has no relation whatsoever to the two characters in terms of their meaning. Since such a way of writing Japanese – namely, by reducing Chinese characters to phonograms – was very cumbersome (every syllable having to be written by a rather complex character, and some sounds being able to be expressed by different characters), a way of abbreviating Chinese characters emerged in the eight century in the form of two syllabaries – *hiragana* and *katakana*. Katakana letters retained a squarish shape, while hiragana letters developed by simplifying the cursive style of writing characters, and they retain a roundish shape (Shibatani, 1990: 126). For example, ウ(katakana *u*) developed from 宇, こ (hiragana *ko*) developed from 己, キ (katakana *ki*) developed from 幾, チ (katakana *chi*) developed from 千, ヒ(katakana *hi*) developed from 比, etc. (Henshall, 1988: 627-628). When the two syllabaries developed (by about a.d. 800) Japanese could be written down much more easily, and the Chinese characters could again be employed in their more common function as logograms (Seeley, 1991: 90). Originally, then, *kana* (a joint name for both hiragana and katakana) were used as mnemonic symbols for reading Chinese characters and were written alongside them. Despite this secondary status of *kana*, they were frequently used by women with literary aspirations, who were discouraged from learning Chinese characters that belonged to men's domain of learning and official writings. Even 源氏物語 *Genji Monogatari* ('The Tale of Genji'), one of Japan's greatest literary achievements (written between a.d. 1000 and 1012), was written by Lady Murasaki Shikibu, almost entirely in *hiragana* (Shibatani, 1990: 127-128). Despite this early separation between Chinese characters and *kana*, the contemporary practice is to use Chinese characters to denote lexical morphemes, hiragana to denote grammatical morphemes and particles, and katakana to denote loanwords and certain onomatopoeic expressions or for emphasis. It is very common for Japanese sentences to incorporate all three

scripts – Chinese characters, hiragana and katakana – and even the Roman alphabet (key: katakana, hiragana, kanji, Roman alphabet / Arabic numerals):[8]

• マリアは ABC 順に一番目です。(*Maria wa ēbīshī juN ni ichibaN me desu.* 'Maria is first in alphabetical order.')

• 彼は T シャツを着ている。(*Kare wa Tīshatsu o kite iru.* 'He is wearing a T- shirt.')

• クロアチアは 2009 年に NATO の加盟国になった。(*Kuroachia wa niseNkyūneN ni NATO no kameikoku ni naQta*. 'Croatia became a member of NATO in 2009.')

The basic kana syllables – though one of them is not a syllable, but a mora, namely *N* – are arranged in a table called the 五十音図 (*gojūoNzu* - table of 50 sounds, although it only has 46 syllables if we disregard voiced and palatalized sounds).[9] Worth mentioning is that syllables シ (*shi*), チ (*chi*), ツ (*tsu*) フ(*fu*) and ヲ(*wo*) are not phonetically uniform with the other syllables in the same column (Halpern, 2001: 900). Furthermore, voiceless consonants *k, s, t,* and *h* can be voiced into *g, z, d,* and *b* respectively by adding a diacritical mark called 濁点 (*dakuten*) to the right of the kana character. Another diacritical mark called 半濁点(*handakuten* 'semi-voiced consonant mark') can be used to create the *p* sound, even though phonetically *p* is a voiceless consonant. Moreover, combining ヤ (*ya*), ユ (*yu*), and ヨ(*yo*) with syllables ending in *i* yields palatalized sounds that are pronounced as single syllables such as キャ(*kya*) or ピョ(*pyo*) (Halpern, 2001: 901). However, as we will see later, the necessity to better represent foreign words has produced a number of new katakana letters (as well as new sound combinations). Finally, it is worth mentioning that the traditional way of writing Japanese is vertical, with lines progressing from right to left, and books therefore open from the reverse direction than in English. Today both vertical and horizontal writing are practiced, although the former is more formal, and used in newspaper articles and formal letters (Shibatani, 1990: 130).

[8] Examples are mine unless stated otherwise.
[9] All the katakana syllables taught in schools can be found in the appendix at the end of the paper (hiragana graphs are not included due to the purpose of the paper).

3. History of Language Contact in Japan

3.1. Iberian language contact (from ~1550 to ~1650)

The Iberian period began in 1543 when Portuguese merchant sailors led by Fernando Mendes Pinto, aboard a Chinese *junk* (a type of sailing vessel), stepped ashore on the southern island of Kyūshū (Stanlaw, 2004: 46; Elisonas, 2008: 302). Five years later, in 1549, they were followed by three Jesuits led by the future saint, Francis the Xavier, a Navarrese co-founder of the Society of Jesus, who landed in what is now Kagoshima (a city in southern Kyūshū) on another Chinese junk, and were soon followed by Spanish Franciscans and Dominicans (Elisonas, 2008: 303-304). In the ensuing decades, the Japanese started opening their ports to Portuguese (1571), Spanish (1592), Dutch (1609), and English (1613) merchants (Irwin, 2011: 33). By 1640, however, a change in the political climate towards the foreigners (as a result of numerous intrigues between the Christian missionaries and the local Kyūshū government, as well as clashes with the Buddhist clergy) led the son of the first shogun of the Tokugawa shogunate, Tokugawa Hidetada, to ban Christianity, kill all Japanese converts who refused to give up the religion, and expel many of the Europeans (Stanlaw, 2004: 47), which marked the beginning of 鎖国 *sakoku* ('national isolation'). The only foreigners who were allowed to stay were the Dutch who were seen as "unsullied by Christianity" (Irwin, 2011: 33), but were restricted to Dejima, a small, artificial island in Nagasaki Bay, in southwest Kyūshū (more on the Dutch in the following section). In this period of roughly 100 years, the Japanese were acquainted not only with Western ideas and innovations, but also with the Portuguese and Spanish, and Latin languages (English and Dutch influence during this period was minimal).

Words borrowed from this period number some 3500 (Irwin, 2011: 31), though only 200 to 400 are still in everyday use (Stanlaw, 2004: 46). Most of the words are related to trade or Christian doctrine; some examples include:[10] アニマ *anima* ('soul') from Latin *anima,* パン *paN* ('holy wafer') from Portuguese *pão,* ミサ *misa* ('mass') from Portuguese *missa,* デウス *deusu* ('Deus/God') from Latin *deus,* アベマリア *abemaria* ('Ave Maria') from Latin *ave maria,* タバコ *tabako* ('tobacco') from Portuguese *tabaco,* イギリス *igirisu* ('Great Britain') from Portuguese *ingles,* ボタン *botaN* ('button') from Portuguese *botão,* オランダ *oraNda* ('Holland') from Portuguese *Holanda,* 南瓜 *kabocha* ('pumpkin') from Portuguese *Cambodia abobora,* ゲリラ *gerira* from Spanish *guerrilla* etc.[11] Some of these words are quite ubiquitous in everyday Japanese: *pan* (now any bread, not just the holy wafer), *tabako, botaN,* or *igirisu* can be encountered at the very basic level of the language. Others have in time been supplanted by Sino-Japanese words or words from the English language (e.g. ナタル *nataru*, now an obsolete word for Christmas from the Portuguese word *natal*, has been replaced by クリスマス *kurisumasu*) (Irwin, 2011: 33). This was also the period when first bilingual dictionaries, grammars of Japanese, and transcriptions of Japanese literature started to appear, as well as the time when 'some of the processes of nativization that would later be applied to other foreign borrowings began to be seen' (Stanlaw, 2004: 46).

3.2. Dutch language contact (from ~1650 to ~1850)

From the middle of the 17th century to 1853, the Dutch were the only Europeans allowed in Japan. The Dutch living on Dejima were not allowed to learn Japanese, whereas knowledge of Dutch was restricted to interpreters of Dutch, the so-called オランダ通詞 *oraNda tsūji*, which came from hereditary interpreter families living in Nagasaki (Stanlaw. 2004: 47) (since Dejima was an island in Nagasaki Bay). However, since Western books were banned with the imposition of *sakoku* in the 1630s, the contact between the Dutch and the Japanese was mostly

[10] Contemporary spelling is used, though many different spellings were attested in the 16th century.
[11] The examples were taken from several sources: Stanlaw (2004), Irwin (2011), Fresslevig (2010).

mercantile in nature. It was only after 1720, when the reigning shogun, Tokugawa Yoshimune, lifted the ban on Western books, that the Japanese started to learn the Dutch language and read Dutch books, and thus acquaint themselves with the Western sciences (especially medicine). This marked the beginning of 蘭学 *raNgaku* ('Dutch studies' or 'Western studies'). Hundreds of books (mostly medical) were translated from Dutch into Japanese between the period from 1720 to 1850, and multiple *rangaku* schools were founded that taught Dutch, as well as several government institutes which studied Dutch,[12] French and English. The latter two languages started being studied when the English ship *Phaeton* entered Nagasaki harbor flying a Dutch flag and raided the Dutch settlement on Dejima in 1808, which urged the shogun to re-evaluate the foreign language policy of the nation in anticipation of the growing military strength of the English and the French (Stanlaw, 2004: 49-50) since this was the time of the Napoleonic wars. As a result of Dutch studies and numerous translations, many words from Dutch entered the Japanese language during this period – though, as Irwin (2011: 40) notes, many Dutch were in fact, German, so the donor language may have been German, or Portuguese/Spanish in the cases where Dutch and Portuguese/Spanish forms were extremely similar, or English (near the end of this period). Because of this, some scholars have adopted the so-called *multiple etymology theory* which states that similar forms were borrowed from various languages, and that later borrowings were reinforced by earlier ones (Umegaki (1963) and Ishiwata (2001) as cited in Irwin (2011: 40)). Nevertheless, the amount of words that entered the language in the period is anywhere between 300 and 3000 (Sonoda as cited in Stanlaw (2004: 48)). Some of the borrowings include: レンズ *reNzu* ('lens') from *lens*, アルコール *arukōru* ('alcohol') from *alcohol*, ガス *gasu* ('gas') from *gas*, メス *mesu* ('scalpel') from *mes*, カンフル *kaNfuru* ('camphor') from *kamfer*, コレラ *korera* ('cholera') from *cholera*, セメント, *semeNto* ('cement') from *cement*, カテーテル *katēteru* ('catheter') from *katheter*, アルカリ *arukari* ('alcali') from *alkali*, コバルト *kobaruto* ('cobalt') from *kobalt*, リチウム *richiumu* ('lithium') from *lithium*, モルヒネ *moruhine* ('morphine') from *morfine*, コーヒー *kōhī* ('coffee') from *koffie*, ビール *bīru* ('beer') from *bier*, ミルク *miruku* ('milk') from *melk*,ドイツ *doitsu* ('Germany') from *Duits*, ガラス *garasu* ('glass') from *glas*, ハム *hamu* ('ham') from *ham*, ゴム *gomu* ('gum/rubber') from *gom*, カカオ *kakao* ('cacao') from *cacao*,

[12] These institutes would later evolve to become present-day universities.

デッキ *deQki* ('deck') from *dek*, ドック *doQku* ('dock') from *dok* etc.[13] Based on my knowledge of Japanese, numerous of these words (especially the latter ones) are today indispensible for everyday conversations, such as: *kōhī, bīru, hamu, gasu, gomu, miruku* etc. Finally, it should be noted that Dutch was used as the language for international negotiations in Japan until 1870 (Irwin, 2011: 37-38), and its huge impact on the Japanese language set the stage for an even more intense contact with the English language.

3.3. English language contact (from ~1850 to today)

The Japanese national policy of 鎖国 *sakoku* ('national isolation'), which permitted trade only to the Dutch, started to crumble in 1853, when Commodore Matthew C. Perry of the United States Navy entered Edo (Tokyo) Bay and demanded (though under amicable pretense) that Japan opens its ports to American whaling ships where they could replenish with water and coal. The result of this intrusion was a treaty, signed on March 31, 1854, under which Japan opened two of its ports – Shimoda (south of Tokyo) and Hakodate (on the island of Hokkaido) – to American ships for supplies (Beasley, 2008: 270). However, it was not until the Ansei Commercial Treaties of 1858 (with the Dutch, the British, and the Americans) that *sakoku* officially ended (Stanlaw, 2004: 53). In the ensuing years of the Harris Treaty – signed by the American consul in Japan, Townsend Harris,[14] in 1858 – the following ports were opened to the Americans: Yokohama, Nagasaki, Nīgata, Kobe, and trade was allowed in Edo (Tokyo) and Osaka (Beasley: 2008: 280). Many Japanese 大名 *daimyo* ('feudal lords') saw these agreements as humiliating and unequal, which, coupled with a number of political intricacies of the incumbent government, led to the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate in 1867 (Stanlaw, 2004: 53). In 1868 a new government was established in the name of the Meiji emperor which marked the beginning of the period known as 明治維新 *meiji ishiN* ('Meiji Restoration') that saw Japan abolish its 幕府 *bakufu* ('shogunate') system, and begin a large-scale modernization process. Many Americans and Englishmen started pouring into the country and the use of English soon started to be considered fashionable, and daily conversations in Japanese became interspersed with English borrowings, e.g. ちょっとそのブックを 見せてくれんか。*ChoQto sono* ***buQku*** *wo misete*

[13] The examples were taken from several sources: Kay (1995), Stanlaw (2004), Irwin (2011), Fresslevig (2010).
[14] The right for Americans to have a consul in Japan was given to them four years prior.

kureN ka? ('Can I take a look at that ***book*** for a moment?) (a novel from 1875 as cited in Stanlaw (2004: 61)). The English language was held in such high esteem in the 1870s and 1880s that the leading intellectual and Minister for Education, Mori Arinori, suggested that Japanese be abolished in favor of English (Irwin, 2011: 54):

> *Under the circumstances, our meager language, which can never be of use outside of our small islands, is doomed to yield to the domination of the English tongue, especially when the power of steam and electricity shall have pervaded our land . . . All reason suggests its disuse.* (Mori (1873) as cited in Stanlaw (2004))

In the 1880s and 1890s the necessity for some kind of language reform in Japan (as a result of infatuation with the Western script and languages and dissatisfaction with the Japanese script and lexical poverty) was narrowed down to four possibilities (Stanlaw, 2004: 65): (1) replacing Japanese with English – a proposal which was often brought up in theory (again after the Second World War), but never actually put into practice; (2) replacing Chinese characters with the *kana* syllabary – to this end Maejima Hisoka, Shimizu Usaburō, and the *Kana Club* published all-*kana* newspapers, but the proposal eventually reached an impasse due to the very nature of combining the three scripts in written Japanese,[15] and the lack of normative *kana* orthography (the Japanese used historic *kana* until 1946 when it was replaced by pronunciation-based *kana*)[16]; (3) adopting the Roman alphabet to write Japanese – a proposal which gained momentum in 1885 with the formation of the *Romanisation Club*, but failed to reach consensus on some major issues – such as which romanisation to adopt,[17] as well as facing the same issue

[15] Since there are no word boundaries between words in written Japanese, and since Chinese characters denote lexical morphemes, locating word boundaries in Japanese is much easier if Chinese characters are employed. However, that is not the only advantage of using Chinese characters. The fact that *on*-readings of kanji are not quantitatively equally distributed among all kanji (i.e. despite there being about 100 syllables in the Japanese language, some of them are used to a greater extent than the others in reading kanji – e.g. the syllables (*on*-readings) SHŌ and KŌ cover around 10% of *on*-readings of all characters used in Japan based on my analysis of the Kanji readings of the characters in the Jōyō kanji list) results in a huge number of homophones (and, if they are written solely in *kana*, in homographs) so that, for example, the phonetic sequence KŌSHŌ is virtually unintelligible if written in kana (こうしょう) because it can mean over 30 different things depending on which characters are used, e.g. 交渉 - negotiation; 公証 - authentication; 考証 - investigation; 公称 - nominal / public name; 鉱床 - mineral deposit; 校章 - school badge; 高尚 - noble / refined; 工商 - industry and commerce; 口承 - oral tradition, and many others). Consequently, understanding spoken Japanese is even harder because one cannot simply look at which characters (i.e. lexical morphemes) the speaker had in mind.

[16] Historic kana usage is not based on pronunciation, but on historic documents (which, in turn, are based on the speech of the Kyōto court of the 14th century). Since it does not reflect contemporary pronunciation, such usage is naturally difficult to master, and before 1946 there were multiple variants to spell each word. (Seeley, 1991: 124-125)

[17] To this day there are several different ways of romanising Japanese – the Hepburn system (ヘボン式 *heboNshiki*), the Kunrei system (訓令式 *kunreishiki*), which has replaced the 19th century Nippon system (日本式 *nippoNshiki*),

with homophones as the previous one – and disbanded; and (4) limiting the number of Chinese characters in use – the only proposal that gained significant support, but did not fully manifest itself until after the Second World War and the introduction of the *Tōyō Kanji* list in 1946 (which has been replaced by the *Jōyō Kanji* list in 1981 that is still in use); it was accompanied by a movement to simplify the form of the characters (in order to reduce their stroke-count), and a movement to standardize *kana* syllables (Seeley, 1991: 138-142).

Some of the borrowings from this early period include words such as: ホテル *hoteru* ('hotel'), ベースボール *bēsubōru* ('baseball'), (ワイ)シャツ *(wai)shatsu* ('shirt'), ブラシ *burashi* ('brush'), ハンカチ *haNkachi* ('handkerchief'), キャベツ *kyabetsu* ('cabbage').[18] Many more loanwords entered the Japanese language at the start of the 20th century, especially during the Taishō period (1912–1926), and although their number was not overwhelming (such was after the Second World War), the 'Taishō period established patterns of taking, modifying, and creating English vocabulary items and English-language concepts and cognitive schemas which continue to this day' (Stanlaw, 2004: 68). Borrowings from the Taishō period remain to this day some of the most used English loans: ラジオ *rajio* ('radio'), タクシー *takushī* ('taxi'), サラリーマン *sararīmaN* ('office worker'), while others were borrowed from the spheres of sports, music, politics, and fashion: リーグ *rīgu* ('league'), ファン *faN* ('fan'), ジャズ *jazu* ('jazz'), ブラウス *burausu* ('blouse'), スーツ *sūtsu* ('suit'), アナーキスト *anākisuto* ('anarchist').[19] Many of the early borrowings from English, especially those referring to abstract concepts, entered the language as loan translations (or calques) by finding a kanji combination, or coining a new Sino-Japanese compound (vocalized using the Sino-Japanese, i.e. *on*, reading), that corresponds (loosely) in meaning to the foreign word. Examples include: 社会 *shakai* ('society' = shrine + meeting), 民主主義 *miNshushugi* ('democracy' = people + master + rule), 哲学 *tetsugaku* ('philosophy' = clear + learning), 電話 *denwa* ('telephone' = electricity + speak), , 国民 *kokumiN* ('people' = country + people), 心理学 *shiNrigaku* ('psychology' = mind + reason + study), 摩天楼 *mateNrō* ('skyscraper' = grind / scrape + heavens + high building) etc.[20] Sometimes, the borrowed words

and the Wāpuro system (ワープロ *wāpuro*). (Halpern, 2001: 903) This paper follows the Hepburn system of romanisation.

[18] The examples were taken from Irwin (2011).

[19] The examples were taken from Stanlaw (2004).

[20] The examples were taken from Fresslevig (2010), and several of them are mine.

were written in Chinese characters (which had a similar meaning), but retained their foreign pronunciation, e.g. 食堂 now prounounced *shokudō*, was pronounced as if it were written as ダイニングルーム *dainiNgu rūmu* ('dining room') (Fresslevig, 2010: 409). The intense borrowing during the Taishō period was followed by government propaganda campaigns against the English language which culminated during the Second World War, when many borrowings were de-anglicized and replaced by older or newly-coined Sino–Japanese compounds: サッカー *saQkā* ('soccer') was replaced by 蹴球 *shūkyū* (kick + ball), アナウンサー *anauNsā* ('announcer') was replaced by 放送員 *hōsōiN* (broadcast + person), ニュス *nyusu* ('news') was replaced by 報道 *hōdō* (intelligence, report) etc. (Irwin, 2011: 56-57). However, the end of the War saw a quick return of English to its former level of prestige. The intake of loanwords in this period was greater than in any period before it, and it was precisely after the War that English attained the monopoly on loanwords that it still has today. This was caused not only by the growing prestige of English on the international level, but also as a result of the US military occupation of Japan. Some of the words borrowed after the War include: プライバシー *puraibashī* ('privacy'), ストレス *sutoresu* ('stress'), セクシー *sekushī* ('sexy'), レジャー *rejā* ('leisure'), ジャンクフード *jaNkufūdo* ('junk food'), インセンティブ *iNsentibu* ('incentive'), カルト *karuto* ('cult'), スポンサー *supoNsā* ('sponsor') etc (Irwin, 2011: 57).

Intense borrowing from English has continued ever since and has been accompanied by improvements in English education and wider, though limited, bilingualism in Japan, and far greater contact with and access to English, in particular American English (Fresslevig, 2010: 411). Today, English words are pouring into the Japanese language almost unabated which makes it difficult to distinguish between loanwords proper and foreign words which remain unintelligible to the majority of native speakers of Japanese. In fact, the influx of English words into Japanese is currently so overwhelming that in 2003 the National Institute for Japanese Language established a foreign loanwords committee to survey the use of foreign loanwords, issue guidelines and suggest substitutes for difficult or unnecessary borrowings from English (Clarke, 2009: 59).

This brief survey of language contact in Japan illuminates at least two things this paper was set to determine. Firstly, that the contact between English and Japanese has been going on for almost 200 years. And secondly, that of the three borrowing routes (an auditory route which

occurs in direct contact with speakers of other languages, and two dictionary routes – one based on the prescribed dictionary pronunciation, and one based on the spelling of the model) the auditory route is the least common. Japan is an isolated country and has never had a huge amount of speakers of foreign languages. According to Irwin (2011: 76-80) throughout most of the contact history, barring the contemporary digital era, contact with the foreigners was made only by trained translators. Loans based on an orthographic source "comprise the bulk of the *gairaigo* [loanword] stratum" (Irwin, 2011: 78), and depending on whether the loan has been assigned a dictionary pronunciation or not, we can distinguish between a dictionary loan with an assigned pronunciation (the majority of English loanwords are dictionary loans), and a spelling loan where the correct pronunciation has not been assigned, and the words are pronounced 'incorrectly', e.g. 'Wikipedia' has been borrowed as *wikipedia* instead of the expected *wikipidia*; further examples include: 'monkey' *monkī* rather than *mankī,* 'zero' *zero* rather than *jīro,* 'news' *nyūsu* rather than *nyūzu,* 'sponge' *suponji* rather than *supanji*.[21] It is also worthy of mention that English dictionary loans tend to favor Received Pronunciation (RP) rather than General American (GA) pronunciation because when dictionary traditions were formed in the 19th century, Japanese advisors on foreign languages were heavily influenced by British scholars and that has remained since, although secondary and tertiary English education in Japan nowadays greatly favors GA pronunciation (Irwin, 2011: 80). Finally, this summary also sheds some light on contact-induced language phenomena such as limited bilingualism or language shift from a diachronic perspective – in what follows I will treat these phenomena in more detail (synchronically).

BILINGUALISM

Japan is generally believed to be an "English as a Foreign Language" country, where English is used only for international communication, and barely at all outside the school classroom (Matsuda, 2000: 49). Loveday describes the Japanese public as 'distant non-bilingual', and having a low, pidgin-like command of English covering only the most basic of needs – almost no graduate can communicate with foreigners beyond a few formulaic expressions, and English is one of the most unpopular subjects among Japanese students (Loveday, 1996: 95, 99, 153). Most Japanese seldom or never hear spoken English, or talk with a native English speaker, and English doesn't play a meaningful role in their lives. Modern

[21] The examples were taken from Irwin (2011).

Japanese often experience their country as the very homogeneous nation, ethnically and linguistically, it is commonly portrayed to be (Benjamin (1997) as cited in Noguchi (2001: 2)), and it is still possible to hear statements such as the one made by the Japanese Prime Minister in 1986, who claimed that Japanese homogeneity was the determining factor in educational superiority of Japanese over Americans, since, unlike America, Japan does not have to deal with "minority groups of low intelligence, such as Mexicans and blacks" (Masayo as cited in Noguchi (2001: 24)) or that "in Japan, Japanese is the only language spoken by some 110,000,000 people throughout the country and no bilingual district is found" (Hoshiyama as cited in Matsuda (2000: 49)). A cursory glance at the census report of 1998 shows that perhaps such an opinion is not unjustified as it may initially seem – the number of foreigners in Japan accounted for only 1.2% of the nation's population – of these the overwhelming majority were Asians (~75%), followed by South Americans as the largest group (a report in 'Japan Times' (June 6, 1999) as cited in Noguchi (2001: 267)). According to these same statistics, the number of immigrants from English-speaking countries is between 50,000 and 100,000. However, despite all this, it seems that the Japanese have a positive image of bilinguals, and one study shows that they overwhelmingly associate bilingualism with Japanese who have acquired a high level of proficiency in English (Masayo (2001) as cited in Noguchi (2001: 17)). I would claim that such a finding is particularly interesting since English is one of the least spoken minority languages (Chinese and Korean being the dominant ones), and the Japanese themselves are not very apt to identify themselves as bilingual. The same study showed that less than 7% respondents considered themselves bilingual, while using the strictest definition of bilingualism [a native-like command over two languages] (Masayo, 2001: 37). Masayo (2001: 28) categorizes Japanese-English bilinguals in Japan into four main groups:

> (1) Mainstream Japanese studying English – In Japan, English is studied at school for six years, then one or two years more at university. However, the results of those eight years of study are often fairly disappointing, and year after year, Japanese students have some of the lowest scores on the international TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) test. Hence a very small amount of Japanese from this stratum can be truly called bilingual (Hyde, 2002: 16). However, at least one group of Japanese students can be considered fully bilingual. That group consists of school children between kindergarten and high school age who are attending English-medium international schools in Japan and various English-immersion programs. In 1994 it was estimated that there were about 8500 students in 27 such schools throughout the

country (a report by the Japan Council of International School (1994) as cited in Kite (2001: 312)).

(2) Japanese children repatriated after living abroad for an extended period (often called 帰国子女 *kikoku shijo* ('returnees')) – There is around 100,000 such children currently living in Japan. These children often require JSL (Japanese as Second Language) classes, especially focusing on writing skills, due to the complexity of Japanese orthography (Matsuda, 2000: 50).

(3) Offspring of parents who have different native languages (one native English speaker, one native Japanese speaker) – The number of such children living in Japan is well under 10,000, but is on the rise (Noguchi, 2001: 237). Since English enjoys plenty of prestige in Japan, the parents often attempt to raise such children as bilinguals, but they rarely become active bilinguals, rather passive bilinguals with limited productive skills. According to Noguchi (2001: 234, 239) that is caused not simply by a lack of opportunity to use English in a meaningful way outside the home, but also by peer pressure to be 'like everyone else' – the children reject the parent's native language (English) as an attempt to reduce feelings of social isolation.

(4) English-speaking immigrants residing in Japan and learning Japanese (around three to five thousand of whom are English teachers).

CODE-SWITCHING and CODE-ALTERNATION

According to Matsuda (2000), code-switching is particularly prominent with two groups of Japanese bilinguals. The first includes Japanese students studying at English-medium-international schools where 30-50% of their courses are given in English and the integration of the two languages creates a relatively stable bilingual community. The other group includes Japanese returnees who have spent up to ten years living abroad before returning to Japan. A study by Matsuda (2000: 50-53) has shown that their code-switching performs the following functions: (1) filling linguistic gaps – especially with certain 'untranslatable' words such as the Japanese *yoroshiku*; (2) pragmatic effect and discourse management – code-switching individuals often use English for sarcastic remarks, 'taboo' topics such as sex or money, and Japanese for requests, apologies, and pleasantries; (3) defining social relationships – the use of English with someone often implies congeniality, since the majority of Japanese are not

bilinguals; (4) as a form of self-expression – respondents claim that they are more conservative, reserved and quiet when using Japanese, and more relaxed and 'wild' when using English.

The cases of code alternation seem to be limited to the third and fourth group of bilinguals mentioned above where the speakers are native English speakers or have one native English-speaking parent. In such cases those speakers tend to use one of the two language management strategies: one parent / one language (where they use English with their English-speaking parent and Japanese with their Japanese-speaking parent) and home / community language (where English is used at home, and Japanese at work and in the community) (Noguchi, 2001: 234-271).

NEGOTIATION

Negotiation is the process by which a pidgin is created in a contact situation where nobody knows anybody else's language. As people try to communicate – generally for limited purposes (e.g. trade) – they make guesses about the other person's language that become the foundation of the emerging pidgin (Thomason, 2001: 142, 159). By surveying literature on the history of language contact in Japan (e.g. Stanlaw (2004 and 1992), Atkinson (1874), Kay (1995) etc.), I have managed to identify at least two situations of 'negotiation' and emerging pidgins in the course of Japanese-English language contact. The first of these occurred when the Meiji government first opened the ports of Yokohama and Nagasaki to foreigners in 1859. In order to communicate with the British and the Americans who arrived for purposes of trade, the Japanese developed a pidginized version of Japanese English, known as the 'Yokohama dialect' (Stanlaw, 2004: 56). The only source for the vocabulary of this pidgin is a 15-page pamphlet written by Hoffman Atkinson (who calls himself the 'Bishop of Homoco') in 1874 (revised and edited edition was published 5 years later, but remained in circulation for about 60 years). According to my investigation of the pamphlet, it consists of five lessons and a practice section where the reader is encouraged to translate expressions from English into Yokohaman and the other way round. The entries in the first five lessons are humorous because Atkinson's 'transcriptions' of the words (most of which were Japanese) were made to resemble real English (presumably in order to help the reader remember them). Vocabulary examples of this pidgin, according to Atkinson, include: *die job* (= unmistakably, from Jap. 大丈夫 *daijōbu*), *your a shee* (= good, alright, from Jap. よろしい *yoroshī*), *moose me* (= woman, from Jap. 娘 *musume*), *she buyer* (= theater, from Jap. 芝居 *shibai*), *dam your eye sto* (= sailor, from Eng. *Damn your*

eyes! + Jap. 人 *hito* ('person')), *house* (= house, from Eng. *house*), *kamiya* (= dog, from Eng. *Come here!*); sometimes single sentences have much longer English equivalents, e.g. *kinsatz yah dai oh Dora your a shee* (= The great depreciation of the value of the paper currency of the Imperial Japanese Government renders it impossible during the prolonged absence of my partners to accept your tempting offer.). Stanlaw (2004, 59, 62-63) recounts several reasons for the dying out of the 'Yokohama dialect' such as direct and indirect government support for learning 'real' English, or the fact that the number of English speakers in Japanese ports increased exponentially, and English became the code of choice whenever Japanese and foreigners met. The second pidgin is often referred to as 'Bamboo English', which came to existence after World War II between some Japanese and the US military forces that occupied Japan. Under the influence of the US military, this pidgin later spread to Korea, Thailand, Vietnam, and the Philippines, while incorporating elements from those languages. An example of this pidgin includes a story surviving from the Korean War, written by a US soldier, that starts in the following way: *Taksan* (from Jap. 沢山 *takusan* 'many') *years ago, skoshi* (from Jap. 少し *sukoshi* 'little' but only as a quantifier in Standard Japanese) *Cinderella-san* (from Jap. さん *san*, a nominal suffix translatable as 'Mr / Mrs') *lived in hootchie* (? unknown origin) *with sisters* (Stanlaw, 1992: 543).

LANGUAGE SHIFT

Even though Japan is a country where major language shift has occurred at least twice – when Okinawans from the Ryūkyū Islands, and Ainu, the indigenous people of Hokkaidō, were forced to relinquish their language in favor of Japanese during the Meiji Restoration –the Japanese language itself is actively spoken by the entire population of Japan and I would argue that it will not be endangered in the foreseeable future. Throughout history there were at least two periods when there was some pressure from the intelligentsia to replace Japanese with English – during the initial contact with English (~1880), and after the Second World War – but there was never an attempt to carry out such a shift. In recent times, Hyde notes (2002: 15), the desire to give English the status of the second official language of Japan has again emerged with numerous arguments for and against such a motion. Nevertheless, to that end nothing has been carried out in practice, but what I would point out in particular is the belief the Japanese have (and have had since the initial contact with the Americans) that Japanese can simply be

supplanted or rivaled by English on the basis of government action alone. Such an attitude is very peculiar considering the low levels of bilingualism of Japanese speakers.

3. 4. Motivation for borrowing and attitudes to borrowings

When Japan first came in contact with the Americans in the 19th century, Hyde (2002: 14) notes, the perceived superiority (both military and cultural) coupled with the need to catch up with Western development led to a huge influx of English borrowing, a movement for the romanisation of Japanese script, and even to a proposal for English to become the national language (as previously mentioned). After 50 years of extensive borrowing, both the need and prestige of the English language in Japan waned, and English was suppressed before and during the Second World War. The victory of the Allies in the War, followed by the occupation of Japan, reintroduced the idea of the prestigious West which, coupled with growing international power of English, fostered language borrowing in Japan once more, so much so that Japanese was seen as 'an impediment to cultural development' (Loveday (1996) as cited in Hyde (2002: 14)). Since the 1980s this trend has been seeing a third resurgence, the prestige of English tied to the economic superiority of its speakers as opposed to the bursting of Japan's economic bubble; the need for it necessitated by its international character and monopoly over the IT industry. Comparing the figures of a 1970s katakana dictionary to the latest loanword dictionary published by Sanseido in 2000 (*Sanseido Pocket Katakana Jiten*) reveals an increase of almost 35,000 words (20,000 in 1972), so that today English loanwords comprise nearly 10% of the Japanese language (MacGregor, 2003:18). However, to say that the contemporary Japanese attitude to English loanwords is necessarily positive would be a misleading overgeneralization – there are considerable differences in attitudes among members of different social and age strata. A number of surveys conducted since the 1990s, cited in Irwin (Irwin, 2001: 195-199), paint a slightly more accurate picture that I will attempt to summarize here. The overwhelming majority of respondents from all social strata feel that there are too many loanwords in the words they hear and speak on a daily basis. Forty percent of the respondents (mainly older ones) have an undesirable opinion of loanwords – the most common reasons for this being the difficulty of understanding, a sense of corruption of the Japanese language and culture, as well a sense of ostentation – whereas the 60% who have a positive opinion attribute this mainly to necessity, ease of understanding, linguistic and cultural enrichment, while prestige plays an

insignificant role. Around 65% of the respondents believe that an increase in loanwords would be undesirable, but an equal proportion of them believe that nothing in particular should be done to reduce their number (men and students having the most positive attitude to loanwords, whereas the older population leaning toward some sort of government intervention). Up to 80% of the respondents have reported having trouble understanding loanwords, whereas the respondents are divided on how they feel about writing foreign words in the Roman script. Finally, the most common semantic domains where loanwords pose problems for comprehension, according to the surveys include: welfare, technology, and government and economics. Several things are noteworthy here, in particular, the idea that loanwords are difficult to comprehend to the Japanese. This difficulty is not only caused by an unselective borrowing process where loanwords are the result of the whims of journalists, writers, and bureaucrats[22] – though, as Koscielecki (2006: 27) points out, loanwords have to be approved by the Ministry of Education before being eligible for "official" use – and their meaning then tends to be obscure to people unfamiliar with English, but is also caused by some phonological and morphological adaptation strategies (discussed in detail in the analysis of linguistic borrowing) such as phonic substitution and vowel epenthesis, mora-clipping or compound reduction. For example, a word like バス *basu* can either mean 'bus' (vowel epenthesis of *u*) or 'bath' (phonic substitution /θ/→/s/, followed by vowel epenthesis of *u*). Similarly, インスト *iNsuto* can mean three different things: 'installing (software)' (where the final mora was clipped), 'instruction' (where four final moras were clipped), or 'instrumental' (where five final moras were clipped). The same goes for mora-clipping in compounds where it is sometimes impossible to determine the meaning of one of the constituents; e.g. the clipped element コン *koN* can mean very different things depending on the first constituent: ボディコン *bodikoN* ('body' + 'con(scious)'), ファミコン *famikoN* ('fami(ly)' + 'com(puter)'), ミスコン *misukoN* ('Miss' + 'con(test)')[23] and so on. The attempts to substitute problematic loanwords with coined new words by the Loanword Committee (外来語委員会 *gairaigo iiNkai*) often turn out to be dismal failures, presumably because such new words are almost exclusively coined using the Sino-Japanese *on*-readings of kanji which are prone to even less intelligible homophony than English

[22] Daulton notes: What can generally be said is that *elite* groups in society, those in government (e.g. bureaucrats and lawmakers), academia (e.g. translators and researchers), and particularly the media (e.g. copy-writers and journalists), are the main actors in the flood of new *gairaigo* (2008: 26).
[23] These examples were taken from Irwin (2011: 145).

loanwords (cf. footnote on page 23). The second thing that the surveys capture is the notion that English may not be held in such high prestige as previously thought. However, I would argue that it may just be the case that its lack of prestige is the opinion of older age cohorts, who comprise a growing chunk of the Japanese population, and are irritated by pompous, unintelligible loanwords, and that people who have a better command of English do hold it in higher prestige.[24] Furthermore, a study of the language of shop signs in Tokyo by MacGregor (2003: 21) reveals that English is, in fact, used for prestige in industries that view their Western counterparts as superior, e.g. clothing stores, hair salons, clinics etc.[25] Aside from need and prestige, I would posit that English in Japanese serves at least two other functions that cannot be easily subsumed under these two headings. The first is euphemistic – Kay (1995: 74) argues that 'English loans do not have as deep undertones of meaning as native words, and can be used more easily to express sentiments or describe situations which may be difficult to talk about in Japanese,' for example, the word シルバーシート *shirubā shīto* ('silver seat') is used to refer to a priority seat for seniors and handicapped people by the door on public transport. This function is especially evident in loanword vocabulary (in this case, lexical pseudo-loans made in Japan) pertaining to sex, bodily functions, and the sex industry: ベビーストップ *bebīsutoQpu* (baby + stop = 'abortion'), ブルーデー *burūdē* (blue + day = 'day when one is menstruating'), or ニューハーフ *nyūhāfu* (new + half = 'a post-operative transsexual man').[26] It is often applied by government bureaucrats as well, as a form of *doublespeak*, in order to perhaps circumvent a possible public backlash to an undesirable government policy in words such as: ペンディング *peNdiNgu* ('pending') or ノーコメント *nō komeNto* ('no comment').[27] The second function is purely emblematic – namely, for special effect in marketing and advertising. At first glance, this function falls under prestige, but since such use of English does not have communicative purpose, I believe the two should arguably be separated on that basis. Even a cursory glance at Japanese advertisements – either in Roman script or katakana – ('Sale: to you who know true values'), bar notices ('Special cocktails for persons with nuts'), hotel signs ('You are invited to take advantage of the

[24] John Dougill (2008: 19) gives an example: "To watch *terebi* (television), you use a *rimōto* (remote control), to control the room temperature, you use an *eakoN* (air conditioner), and to take a picture, you use a *dejikame* (digital camera). Such is the flood of words that old people claim they can no longer understand their own native language.
[25] MacGregor. (2003: 21) also notes: "The use of Anglo American is likely an attempt to communicate prestige."
[26] These examples were taken from Irwin (2011: 156).
[27] Koscielecki (2006: 28) gives an interesting example: On June 29, 1992, a political dispute surfaced between the Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa and the party vice-president Shin Kanemaru when the latter reprimanded the former for using the acronym *PKO* (peace-keeping operation) in front of Japanese people. Reportedly, Kanemaru said 'Government bureaucrats use English for everything. But not all of us are as smart as you are'.

chambermaids'), apartment blocks ('Royal Mansion'), items of clothing ('Just Flesh – we are the flesh foods eater Bears Honey rabbits carrot'), plastic bags ('Nature's wind: I feel like relax') or pencil cases (The basic concept of Boxy exists in the cross between ergonomics and engineering and suggests a new life-style')[28] reveals that they are only 'superficially English' – Hyde (2002: 12-15) claims they are not aimed at speakers of English at all, but at native speakers of Japanese as a way to convey an image, rather than an exact meaning. According to John Dougil (2008: 22), emblematic English is simply the product of Japan's isolative monoculturalism – an attempt to look international while remaining insular. What is more concerning in my opinion is that emblematic use of English is perhaps indicative of a much more pernicious perception of English – namely, that conveying meaning ultimately doesn't matter, because English is simply too difficult to learn, and that *Japanized English* is meaningful enough for native speakers of Japanese. This is especially evident in ELT (English Language Teaching) in Japan where an underlying fear of English, coupled with the national 'spirit of dependence' and veiled threats of possible ostracism if one refuses to conform, stunt the development of speaking and listening skills. The typical Japanese student prefers passive language learning – mostly grammar or composition activities – and Japanese as the language of instruction (textbooks of English often including fair amounts of Japanese explanations and translations). There are barely any class discussions or two-way conversations (presumably because Japanese teachers of English also lack confidence in their English). Ultimately, the overwhelming focus on grammar completely overshadows the communicative purpose of the language, which is then treated as a transformational logic puzzle with little to no practical use, only to be forgotten after leaving high school or university.[29] Despite all this, several authors (e.g. Guiraudon and Joppke (2001) as cited in (Goettlib, 2012: 22)) note that the beginning of the 21st century has seen a shift in Japan's perception of itself as a unique and homogenous nation, and that immigration has turned Japan into a de-facto multilingual and multicultural society. "In a globalising world monolingualism is becoming increasingly irrelevant", Goettlib (2012: 21) remarks, and the Japanese will soon have to reassess their attitudes to English and ELT if they wish to remain internationally competitive.

[28] These examples were taken from Dougill, (2008: 18-22).

[29] I have written this brief description of ELT in Japan by surveying accounts given in Martin (2004), Loveday (1996), Hyde (2002), Daulton (2008), and Miller (1998).

4. Analysis of linguistic borrowings from English in Japanese

4.1. Hypothesis and methodology

In the sections that follow I will attempt to test my hypothesis – that the Japanese-English borrowing situation lends itself to Haugen's (1950) stratification into loanwords, loanblends, and loanshifts like other cases of borrowing situations, that imported elements can be analyzed on at least three levels (morphological, phonological, and semantic) – as well as

two additional levels I have posited in the theoretical part (namely, syntactic and orthographic), and that the changes that occur thereon, in the broadest sense, are not unlike those observed in more researched cases of language contact. In order to do this I have attempted to divide all borrowings from English in Japanese from the sources listed below into three distinct groups: loanwords (morphemic importation), loanblends (morphemic importation with substitution), and loanshifts (morphemic substitution). Within each of these sections (and where necessary), I have discussed the adaptations (importation and substitution on the five levels mentioned above) which occurred, and attempted to compare them with similar cases in other languages in the 'Results and conclusion' section. Since the theoretical framework I have set up in the preceding chapters does not suffice for some terms related to Japanese linguistics specifically (e.g. mora obstruent epenthesis, peculiarities related to orthography, historical development of the Japanese language etc.) each section will be preceded by a very brief list of sources I have used in tackling these phenomena. The examples of borrowings in succeeding chapters I have taken from two online sources: goo 国語辞書 ('gooJapanese Dictionary'), and EDICT (Electronic Dictionary Research and Development Group) files hosted on 楽しい JAPANESE ('Pleasant Japanese') site, Halpern's 'Kodansha Kanji Learner's Dictionary' (1999), and the dictionary found in Akiyama (2002), as well as from contact literature – namely, Stanlaw (2004), Irwin (2011), Kay (1995), and Fresslevig (2010) for whom the most important dictionary sources include:

- Sobe Arakawa's *Kadokawa Gairaigo Jiten* ('Kadokawa Loanword Dictionary'), 2nd edn. – the most comprehensive and authoritative Japanese loanword dictionary published in 1977.
- Shōgakukan's *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* ('The Great Dictionary of the Japanese language'), 2nd edn. published in 2000-2002.
- *Konsaisu Gairaigo Jiten* ('Concise Loanword Dictionary') dictionaries published by Sanseido since 1979.
- Toshio Ishiwata's *Kihon Gairaigo Jiten* ('Basic Loanword Dictionary') from 1990.
- Takao Maruyama's *Katakanago o Eigo ni Suru Jiten* ('Dictionary of *Katakana* words and their English Translations') published in 1992.
- Norio Yoshizawa and Toshio Ishiwata's *Gairaigo no Gogen* ('Loanword Etymological Dictionary') published in 1979.

In the following section I will provide some general facts about linguistic borrowing from English in Japanese. In the sections that follow, I will deal with morphemic importation (LOANWORDS), morphemic importation occurring together with substitution (LOANBLENDS), and pure substitution (LOANSHIFTS) in that order. Most substitutions that occur upon importation I will discuss only in the section on pure importation (LOANWORDS) seeing as they are the same for loanwords and loanblends, and naturally cannot appear in loanshifts which are composed of native morphemes only.

4.2. General remarks on linguistic borrowing from English

Linguistic borrowing from English which has been occurring for the past 150 years in Japan has been primarily lexical. The vast majority of borrowings in Japanese are nouns (around 90%), followed by verbs, adjectives and adverbs, interjections (オーライ *ōrai* 'alright', サンキュー *saNkyū* 'thank you') and prepositions (ダウン *daun* 'down', アウト *auto* 'out'), numbers (ツー *tsū* 'two'), pronouns (マイ *mai* 'my'), and even articles (ザ *za* 'the') and conjunctions (アンド *ando* 'and') (Irwin, 2011: 1). It is important to note here that parts of speech other than nouns, when borrowed, tend to overwhelmingly be used as nouns (which can then be readily verbalized, adjectivized or adverbialized) with very few exceptions, such as interjections that often function as one-word-reply sentences (Loveday (1996) as cited in Daulton (2008: 20)). Articles, prepositions (when not verbalized) and conjunctions are mostly used in advertising, generally in set phrases, sometimes written in the Latin script e.g. 居酒屋 IN 長崎 *izakaya IN Nagasaki* ('pubs in Nagasaki').[30] However, there has also been some structural borrowing[31] which will be examined further in a later section.

The distribution of borrowed words in relation to native words has been the subject of numerous surveys in Japan. Shibatani (1990: 143) cites the study conducted by the National Language Institute in 1971 on the vocabulary of newspapers published five years before, which yielded the following results: 4 – 6% of all the words by token, and 12 – 13% of the words by type were borrowings. A more recent and comprehensive survey was conducted by the National

[30] The example was taken from Irwin (2011: 58).
[31] Also known as grammatical calquing, morphosyntactic diffusion, or grammatical replication. (Heine, and Kuteva, 2005: 6).

Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) in 2005/2006 on a huge sample of magazines and newspapers published in 1994. According to the survey borrowings comprise around 12% of the total Japanese vocabulary by token, and around 35% by type (NINJAL survey (2006) as cited in Irwin, (2011: 15-18)). Such data is therefore indicative of two things: first, that the number has almost doubled since 1971, and second, that most borrowings appear with very low frequency (since the type : token ratio is 3:1).[32] These numbers include all borrowings, not just English, but if the fact that English borrowings comprise 90% of all borrowings in Japanese (Yazaki (1975) as cited in Daulton (2008: 12)) is taken into account, I will make the generalization that English borrowings comprise around 30% of Japanese vocabulary by type (though the majority of them live ephemeral lives, and appear with very low frequency). English borrowings fall into a number of different semantic groupings – the highest number of borrowings relate to Western sports, and personal appearance, followed by computer science, broadcasting, trade, marketing, medicine, food, music, and lastly law and politics (Irwin, 2011: 153; Loveday (1996) as cited in Daulton (2008: 27)). When it comes to differentiating foreign words (*Fremdwort*) from loanwords proper (*Lehnwort*), there is still a lot of unresolved issues on the topic. Loveday (1996: 49-50) argues that "the main determining factors for recognizing *gairaigo* [loanwords proper] would seem to be: the degree of the item's historic assimilation, and its general level of intelligibility in the community, both of which reveal themselves in the extent of its orthographic and phonetic conformity to Japanese norms and in its increased occurrence." Irwin (2011: 11) makes a distinction between 外来語 *gairaigo* (loanword proper) and 外国語 *gaikokugo* (foreign word), but he makes it explicitly clear that his distinction differs from the traditional *Fremdwort – Lehnwort* distinction. Even though he speaks of 'adaptation to native phonology', the basis of his distinction seems to be the degree of intelligibility of the word by native speakers of Japanese. I would argue that the degree of intelligibility seems to be the only coherent basis for making the distinction (needless to say, different speakers have different repertoires of integrated loanwords and there are immense discrepancies in understanding among different age groups (Fresslevig, 2010: 412)) because all borrowings – both loanwords and borrowed words – necessarily undergo orthographic adaptation, as well as at least the phonetic adaptation of conforming to the syllabic structure of the language.

[32] Irwin (2011: 15) notes: "The proportion of gairaigo . . . only becomes the dominant stratum (37%) among the least frequent lexemes."

4.3. Importation

The cases of pure importation (i.e. LOANWORDS) comprise the largest bulk of borrowings in Japanese. Examples of loanwords include: テレビ *terebi* ('television'), ラジオ *rajio* ('radio'), スポーツ *supōtsu* ('sports'), ベースボール *bēsubōru* ('baseball'), カー *kā* ('car'), デジカメ *dejikame* ('digital camera') etc. In all these cases foreign morphemes were imported and adapted – phonologically, morphologically, orthographically, semantically, and syntactically. All the substitutions and importations (innovations) on those levels are described below.

PHONOLOGY:

For phonological phenomena which are distinct to Japanese linguistics I have surveyed the following sources: Fresslevig (2010), Irwin (2011), Kay (1995), Stanlaw (2004), Shibatani (1990). Examples are taken from sources listed on pages 35-36.

IMPORTATION: Fresslevig (2010: 388-389) and Irwin (2011: 72) note that under the influence of loanwords, the allophones /ɸ̲/, /e̲/, /ts/, /d͡z̲/, and /c͡ç/ have become phonemic so that today they appear in a wider range of phonological contexts:

- /ɸ̲/ now appears before all vowels, not just before /u/: *fi̲rumu* ('film'), *fō̲kasu* ('focus'), *fa̲iru* ('file'), or *fe̲idoauto* ('fadeout').
- /ts/ also now appears before all vowels, not just /u/ (though examples are marginal, mainly in German words): *ts̲a̲itogaisuto* ('zeitgeist'), *ts̲i̲tadeQra* ('Citadella'), *sukerut̲s̲o* ('scherzo'), *ts̲e̲QperiN* ('Zeppelin airship')
- /e̲/, /c͡ç/, and /d͡z̲/ which could only appear before /i/, and /a/ /o/, /u/ if the latter were preceded by a glide, can now appear before /e/ as well: *sh̲e̲rī* ('sherry'), *ch̲ē̲N* ('chain'), *j̲e̲rī* ('jelly').

Other changes have occurred as well:

- /t/ and /d/ have become phonemic before /i/ whereas before they only appeared as allophones /c͡ç/ and /d͡z̲/ in that context: *pātī̲* (as opposed to *pāch̲i̲*; 'party'), *d̲i̲suko* (as opposed to *j̲i̲suko*; 'disco').
- mora obstruent /Q/ which never occurred before voiced stops, now also appears in those contexts: *beQd̲o* ('bed'), *baQg̲u* ('bag'), *kareQj̲i* ('college'); while the most innovative speakers use it before any obstruent, and even before sonorants (thus

bringing the very name mora obstruent into question): *aQrā* ('Allah'), *muQrā* ('mullah'), or the previously mentioned *tsitadeQra* ('Citadella').[33]

In addition to those phonological changes, my survey of online dictionary sources has indentified two additional changes (albeit more marginal than the above ones):

- /t/ and /d/ have become phonemic before /u/ as well whereas before they only appeared as allophones /ts/ and /z/ in that context: *tuasu-sekando-rinku* (as opposed to *tsuasu-sekando-rinku*; 'Tuas Second Link' (a bridge connecting Singapore and Johor in Malaysia)), *dūwapQu* (as opposed to *zūwapQu*; 'doo-wop' (a type of rhythm and blues – R&B)).
- /s/ has arguably become phonemic before /i/ whereas before it appeared exclusively as /ɕ/ in this context, though examples of this are very esoteric, mostly restricted to place names, *gaikokugo* rather than *gairaigo*: *sīzuN* ('season'), *sitorai-mahi-hosa* ('Sitora-Mohi-Hosa' (a palace and museum in Uzbekistan)), *siguruda* ('Sigulda' (a town in Latvia in the vicinity of Riga)), *sione,* alt. *tyuone* ('Thyone' (one of Jupiter's moons)).

In addition to all these innovations, the Japanese phonemic system has also acquired the sound /v/ whose phonemic status is debatable since, according to Irwin (2011: 73), it appears only in the most innovative pronunciations, and many Japanese speakers cannot pronounce it – /v/ is therefore generally substituted by /b/, e.g. *vaioriN* and *baioriN*, both used for the English word 'violin'. Other examples include: *vaNdaru zoku* ('the Vandals'), *venetsia* ('Venice'), *vaimāru* ('Weimar'). Nevertheless, this /v/ only occurs in borrowings, and I have found no cases of its usage with native words where it would be used in the place of /b/. The traditional Japanese phonemic system has, then, been transformed under the influence of *gairaigo* and now consists of 21 (22 with /v/) consonants and five vowels.

SUBSTITUTION: Since Japanese is phonemically more impoverished than its donor languages, borrowings in Japanese have to undergo certain (sometimes extreme) phonological and phonemic adaptation. The main adaptation strategies include: phonic substitution and

[33] I would argue that all the mentioned examples with a mora obstruent before a sonorant have most likely been influenced by donor orthography since the written word was the dominant borrowing route from English in Japanese. These words then have been borrowed via English where they are spelled with a geminated consonant group 'll', even though English doesn't have long consonants.

epenthesis (vowel and mora obstruent) (Irwin, 2011: 81). In addition to these two, two more could be distinguished: deletion and mora-clipping, though I consider the latter one a morphological, rather than a phonological phenomenon, and will discuss it under morphology. Phonic substitution refers to the substitution of foreign consonant and vowel sounds with native approximations, whereas epenthesis refers to an insertion of an extra vowel (or vowels) into a word (in order to make every syllable open, because the only closed syllables allowed in Japanese are those ending in moraic consonants *N* and *Q*) or the insertion of a mora obstruent *Q*.[34] On the following pages I have attempted to create an overview of phonic substitution and vowel/mora obstruent epenthesis which happen when English phonemes are adapted to the Japanese phonemic system by synthesizing accounts of the sources provided in the introduction, as well as dictionary sources also mentioned in the introduction. To the left are English phonemes, and to the right their adaptation / substitutes, and further explanation on vowel and mora obstruent epenthesis which happens when they occur in closed syllables.

Consonants:

/p/ → /p/: 'pants' → *pantsu*, 'purple' → *pāpuru*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'group' → *gurūpu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'tip' → *chiQpu* (word-final), 'happy' → *haQpī* (stressed medial), 'apple' → *aQpuru* (syllabic l)

/b/ → /b/: 'bike' → *baiku*, 'bubble' → *baburu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'pub' → *pabu*, 'eve' → *ibu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'mob' → *moQbu* (word-final), 'snob' → *snoQbu* (word-final)

/k/ → /k/: 'cookie' → *kuQkī,* 'cake' → *kēki*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'screen' → *sukurīN*; in earlier borrowings and sometimes before /s/ takes epenthetic /i/: 'cake' → *kēki*, 'strike' → *sutoraiki*, 'text' → *tekisuto,* 'sex' → *seQkusu* and *seQkisu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'click' → *kuriQku* (word-final), 'saccharin' → *saQkariN* (stressed medial), 'tackle' → *taQkuru* (syllabic l)

/g/ → /g/: 'goggles' → *gōguru*, 'gum' → *gamu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'green' → *gurīN*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'smog'

[34] Several things should be noted here about mora obstruent epenthesis. Firstly, it occurs in four types of environments: with word-final consonants, stressed medial consonants, syllabic l, and consonant clusters; secondly, it does not occur regularly so the examples provided should not be taken as representative of regular changes happening in such environments, and, thirdly, it only occurs after checked vowels (Irwin, 2011: 113) – i.e. vowels occurring in checked (an alternative name for "closed") syllables (Crystal, 2008: 74). These checked vowels can sometimes also be the result of previous epenthesis.

→ *sumoQgu* (word-final), 'slugger' → *suraQgā* (stressed medial), 'juggle' → *jaQguru* (syllabic l)

/d/ → /d/: 'dodo' → *dōdō,* 'dam' → *damu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /o/: 'android' → *aNdoroido*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'thoroughbred' → *sarabureQdo* (word-final), 'bed' → *beQdo* (also: *beQto* – an example of devoicing during mora obstruent epenthesis), 'heading' → *heQdiNgu* (stressed medial)

/z/ before /u/ in older loans and in conservative pronunciation: 'Hindu' → *hiNzu*

/d͡z/ before /i/ in older loans (and in conservative pronunciation): 'dilemma' → *jireNma*

/t/ → /t/: 'tartan' → *tātaN,* 'tatoo' → *tatū*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /o/: 'straight' → *sutorēto,* 'twelve' → *toerubu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'diet' → *daieQto* (word-final), 'batter' → *baQtā* (stressed medial), 'throttle' → *suroQtoru* (syllabic l)

/ts/ before /u/ in older loans (and in conservative pronunciation): 'Toulouse' → *tsūrūzu*

/c͡ç/ before /i/ in older loans and in conservative pronunciation: 'typhus' → *chifusu,* 'team' → *chīmu*

/s/ → /s/: 'save' → *sēbu,* 'sales' → *sērusu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'status' → *sutētasu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'message' → *meQsēji* (stressed medial), 'whistle' → *hoiQsuru* (syllabic l)

/ɕ/ before /i/: 'scene' → *shīn* (though there are exceptions: 'season' → *sīzuN* and *shīzuN*)

/z/ → /z/: 'season' → *sīzuN*, 'zombie' → *zoNbi*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'cruise' → *kurūzu*

/d͡z/ before /i/: 'magazine' → *magajiN*

/v/ → /b/: 'veteran' → *beteraN,* 'da Vinci' → *dabiNchi*

/v/ – an innovative pronunciation, obscure to most native speakers (doublets with /b/ and /v/ sometimes occur: 'deja vu' → *dejavyu* and *dejabyu*, 'violin' → *vaioriN* and *baioriN*); in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/ like /b/: 'eve' → *ivu* (also: *ibu*)

/f/ → /f/: 'fence' → *fensu,* 'film' → *firumu,* 'fan' → *faN*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'phrase' → *furēzu*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'buffer' → *buQfā* (stressed medial), 'waffle' → *waQfuru* (syllabic l)

/h/ before all vowels except /u/ in older loans before /f/ became phonemic (and in conservative pronunciation): 'coffee' → *kōhī*

/θ̲/ → /s/: 'marathon' → *marasoN*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/ like /s/: 'thriller' → *su̲rirā*

/ɕ̲/ before /i/: 'theater' → *shiatā* (also: *teatoru*); examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'nothing' → *naQshiNgu* (stressed medial)

/ð̲/ → /z/: 'leather' → *rezā*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/ like /z/: 'rhythm' → *ri̲zu̲mu*

/d͡ʑ̲/ before /i/: 'smoothie' → *smūjī*

/ʃ̲/, /s̲/ → /ɕ̲/: 'shampoo' → *shaNpū,* 'shepherd' → *shepādo*, 'shade' → *shēdo*; /ʃ̲/ in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/, but some older loans take /i/: 'brush' → *bura̲shi* and *buraQ̲shu* 'flash' → *furaQ̲shu*; /s̲/ in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /i/; 'Pushkin' → *pū̲shi̲kiN*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'cash' → *kyaQshu* (word-final), 'stylish' → *sutairiQshu* (word-final), 'admission' → *adomiQshoN* (stressed medial), 'bushel' → *buQsheru* (syllabic l)

/s/ before /e/ in conservative pronunciation: 'shepherd' → *sepādo,* 'shade' → *sēdo*

/ʒ̲/, /z̲/ → /d͡ʑ̲/: 'garage' → *garēji,* 'genre' → *jaNru*; /ʒ̲/ in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'beige' → *bēju̲*; /z̲/ in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /i/: ' Brezhnev' (Leonid) → *bure̲ji̲nefu*

/h/ → /h/: 'horror' → *horā*, 'ham' → *hamu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/ in which case /h/ becomes /f/: 'Ahmadinejad' → *afu̲madīnejādo*

/f/ before /u/: 'hood' → *fūdo*

/ts/ → /ts/: 'pants' → *pantsu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/ (*pantsu̲*); examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'guts' → *gaQtsu* (word-final), 'spritzer' → *supuriQtsa* (stressed medial)

/dz/ → /z/: 'Leeds' → *rīzu,* 'AIDS' → *ēzu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'kids' → *kiQzu̲*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'odds' → *ōQzu* (*kiQzu̲* as well) (word-final), 'dredger' → *doreQjā* (stressed medial)

/t̲ʃ̲/ → /c͡ɕ/: 'chat room' → *chattorūmu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /i/: 'inch' → *in̲chi*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'sketch' → *sukeQchi* (word-final), 'pitcher' → *piQchā* (stressed medial),

/s/ before /e/ in conservative pronunciation: 'cello' → *sero*

/dʒ/ → /d͡ʑ/: 'agent' → *ējeNto,* 'jogging' → *jogiNgu*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /i/: 'page' → *pēji*; judge → *jaQji*; examples of mora obstruent epenthesis: 'judge' → *jaQji* (word-final)

/z/ before /e/ in conservative pronunciation: 'jelly' → *zerī,* 'gentleman' → *zeNtorumaN*

/n/ → /n/ when word-initial or occurring before a vowel: 'needs' → *nīzu,* 'unique' → *yunīku*

/N/ when word-final: or occurring before a consonant: 'lemon' → *remoN*, 'panther' → *pansā*

/m/ → /m/: 'jam' → *jamu*, 'mama' → *mama*, 'mic(rophone)' → *maiku*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'film' → *firumu*

/N/ before bilabial and labiodental sounds: 'symbol' → *shiNboru,* 'jamming' → *jamiNgu,* 'swimming' → *suimiNgu*

/ŋ/ → /N/ before velars and plosives: 'pink' → *piNku*, 'Washington' → *washiNtoN*

/Ng/: 'hunger strike' → *haNgāsutoraiki,* 'gangster' → *gyaNgstā*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'aqualung' → *akuaruNgu*

/ɲ/ → /ny/ or /niy/ before the vowels /a/, /o/, /u/: 'lasagna' → *razānya* or *razāniya,* 'El Niño' → *erunīnyo*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /i/: 'Gdansk' → *gudanisuku*

/n/ before the vowels /e/, /i/: 'bolognese' → *boronēze*

/r/, /l/, /ɹ/ → /r/: 'lock' → *roQku*, 'rule' → *rūru*, 'pride' → *puraido*, 'love' → *rabu*, 'light / right' → *raito,* 'link' → *riNku*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'encore' → *aNkōru*, 'rule' → *rūru,* 'pool' → *pūru*

/w/ → /w/ before the vowel /a/: 'wine' → *waiN*

/ø/ before the vowel /u/ or if /w/ is post-consonantal: 'Worcester sauce' → *usutāsōsu,* 'sweater' → *sētā,* 'equal' → *ikōru,* 'bilingual' → *bairiNgaru*

/u/ or /w/ in all other contexts: 'weekend' → *wīkueNdo*, 'waiter' → *uētā*, 'water polo' → *uōtāporo*

/ʍ/ → /how/ before the vowel /a/: 'white' → *howaito*

/ho/ before the vowels /e/, /i/: 'whistle' → *hoiQsuru*, 'whale watching' → *hoērūoQchiNgu*

/j/ → /y/ before the vowels /a/, /o/, /u/: 'yard' → *yādo*, 'Yankee' → *yaNkī*; in closed syllables and consonant clusters takes epenthetic /u/: 'Marseille' → *marusēyu*

/ø/ before the vowel /i/: 'yeast' → *īsuto*

/i/ or /y/ before the vowel /e/: 'yellow card' → *ierōkādo,* 'Jena' → *yēna*

Vowels:

/æ/, /ʌ/, /ɑ/, /a̲/, /ɐ̲/, /ɜ̲/	→	/a/: 'map' → *maQpu*, 'soccer' → *saQkā,* 'cut' → *kaQto*
/e/, /ɛ̲/	→	/e/: 'elevator' → *erebētā,* 'elegant' → *eregaNto*, 'Eric' → *eriQku*
/i/, /ɪ̲/ /ʏ̲/	→	/i/: 'image' → *imēji,* 'inch' → *iNchi,* 'index' → *iNdeQkusu,* 'Indiana' → *iNdiana*
/o/, /ɔ̲/ /ɒ̲/[35]	→	/o/: 'offside' → *ofusaido*, 'oasis' → *oashisu,* 'office' → *ofisu,* 'offshore' → *ofushoa,* 'oil' → *oiru*
/ʊ̲/, /ɯ̲/, /u/	→	/u/: 'Uruguay' → *uruguai,* 'Uzbekistan' → *uzubekistaN,* 'looks' → *ruQkusu*

• All long vowels (/i:/, /e:/, /ɑ:/, /ɔ̲:/, /u:/ etc.) → double vowels (/ii/, /ee/, /aa/, /oo/, /uu/[36]): 'scene' → *šīN*, 'spa' → *supā*, 'straw' → *sutorō,* 'blues' → *burūzu*.

• /i:/ → /e:/ in some cases (esp. with word-final *-ey*): 'money' → *manē,* 'curry' → *karē*, 'volleyball' → *barēbōru.*

• /aɪ̲/, /au/, /ɔ̲i/ and most other diphthongs tend to be adapted according to the individual values of the vowels constituting the diphthong→ /ai/, /au/, /oi/: 'line' → *raiN*, 'pouch' → *pauchi,* 'toilet paper' → *toireQtopēpā.*

• Some diphthongs exhibit somewhat unpredictable approximations, though they generally resemble the constituent vowels of the donor language (/eɪ̲/ → /ee/: 'lace' → *rēsu*, /əʊ̲/ → /oo/: 'show' → *shō*, /i:/ → /i/: 'kerosene' → *keroshiN*, etc.)

• Rhotic vowels (/ɛ̲ɹ/, /ɪ̲ɹ/, /ʊ̲ɹ/, /ɑɹ/, /oɹ/ etc.) are all approximated according to Received Pronunciation (due to the aforementioned influence of British scholars in the 19th century) → /ea/: 'shareware' → *sheawea*, /ia/: 'clear' → *kuria*, 'career' → *kyariā*, /ua/: 'tour' → *tsuā*, /aa/ 'par' → *pā,* /oa/: 'door' → *doa* etc.

• /ə/ is approximated according to its spelling in English (which, I would argue, is another clear evidence of the influence of donor orthography): as /a/: 'final' → *fainaru*; as /e/: 'garden' → *gādeN*; as /i/: 'kitchen' → *kichiN*; as /o/: 'police' → *porisu*; or as /u/: 'symposium' → *shiNpojiumu*.

---

[35] /ɑ/ and /ɒ̲/ are the GA and RP phonic realizations of the same phoneme in English, e.g. lot → [lɒ̲t] in RP, and [lɑt] in GA. In Japanese, these two phones have different approximations: the RP sound /ɒ̲/ is approximated to /o/, whereas the GA sound /ɑ/ is approximated to /a/, e.g. 'volleyball', introduced to Japan from the US is approximated to: *barebōru*, whereas 'volley', introduced from the UK, is approximated to *borē* (Irwin, 2011: 96).

[36] These are nowadays spelled not by using two vowels, but a vowel and the 長音符 *chōoNpu* "−", or the Katakana-Hiragana Prolonged Sound Mark (e.g. *kaa* → カ−); in this paper I transcribe such long vowels with a macron over the long vowel, e.g. *kaa* → *kā.*

Besides phonic substitution and epenthesis of vowels and the mora obstruent, the third adaptation strategy is deletion. According to Irwin (2011: 123-125), deletion is mostly restricted to auditory loans and can be classified into four categories. However, since the auditory route has never been especially prominent in the contact between Japanese and English, the number of these words is arguably very low.

(1) deletion of the initial unstressed vowel: 'American' → *merikeN* (rather than: *amerikeN*);

(2) consonant cluster simplification: 'Hepburn' → *heboN* (rather than: *heQpubāN*), 'beefsteak' → *bisuteki* (rather than: *bīfusutēki*), 'glycerine' → *risuriN* (rather than: *guriseriN*), 'white shirt' → *waishatsu* (rather than: *howaitoshatsu*);

(3) deletion of the word-final consonant: 'alright' → *ōrai* (rather than: *ōruraito*), 'lemonade' → *ramune* (rather than: *remonēdo*), 'handkerchief' → *haNkachi* (rather than: *haNkaruchīfu*), 'yard' → *yāru* (rather than: *yārudo*), 'check it out' → *chekira* (rather than: *cheQkuiruauto*);

(4) simplification of the velar nasal /ŋ/ (/n/ instead of the expected /Ngu/): 'pingpong' → *piNpoN*, 'surfing' → *sāfiN*, 'pudding' → *puriN*, 'darling' → *dāriN*.

MORPHOLOGY:

For morphological phenomena which are distinct to Japanese linguistics I have investigated the following sources: Akiyama (2002), Kay (1995), Stanlaw (2004) and Irwin (2011). Examples are taken from sources listed on pages 35-36.

SUBSTITUTION: Any word that is borrowed into the Japanese language is treated as an uninflected noun or bound base that does not belong to any word class, potentially convertible by means of suffixation, and morphological changes are very rarely made to such bound bases (Loveday as cited in Daulton (2008: 20)). If the loanword functions as a noun – and the vast majority of English loanwords do (more than 90%) (Irwin, 2011: 137) – since nouns are not inflected for gender, number (in number constructions, classifiers are employed) or case (cases are indicated syntactically, not morphologically), the loanwords exhibit no such morphology and can be freely used just like native nouns. The only morphology they exhibit include rare examples of loss of donor morphology, mora-clipping and compound reduction, which are actually morphonological phenomena, and are treated in the following paragraphs. Loanwords which function as verbs, adjectives and adverbs, on the other hand, are converted to verbs, adjectives and adverbs by means of verbal, adjectival, and adverbial suffixes which are applied

indiscriminately to both loanwords and native words. Since I consider these in essence to be loanblends – because the lexical morpheme is imported, and the bound morpheme is treated as part of the lexical base, and substituted with a native bound morpheme I will treat them under loanblends.

Loss of donor morphology refers to the process of removing native bound morphemes altogether during the process of borrowing, as well as removing articles and conjunctions. Examples (taken from Irwin, 2011: 141-142) include: 'pyjamas' → パジャマ *pajama* (removal of the plural marker), 'smoked salmon' → スモークサーモン *sūmōkusāmoN* (removal of the past participle marker), 'Valentine's Day' → バレンタイン·デー *bareNtaiNdē* (removal of the possessive marker), 'copy and paste' →コピーペースト *kopīpēsuto* (removal of the conjunction), 'off the record'→ オフレコード *ofurekō* (removal of the article); though exceptions to this exist: 'poached egg' → ポーチドエッグ *pōchidoeQgu* (retention of the past participle marker).

Mora-clipping refers to the deletion of one, two, three, or more moras from a previously phonologically adapted form (which sets it off from deletion where a loanword is immediately received in its truncated form). According to Kay (1995: 70), the motivation for mora-clipping is the necessity to abbreviate loanwords due to their becoming very long in the borrowing process (as a result of being accommodated to the syllabic structure of Japanese). My investigation has yielded three main types of mora-clipping:

- Back-clipping where the latter moras of the word are clipped, and initial moras retained: 'acceler(ator)' → アクセル *akuseru*, 'buil(ding)' → ビル *biru*, 'conne(ctions)' → コネ *kone*, 'televi(sion)' → テレビ *terebi*, 'automa(tic)' → オートマ *ōtoma*, 'impo(tence)' → インポ *iNpo*, 'anima(tion)' → アニメ *anime*, 'mis(take)' →ミス *misu.*
- Fore-clipping where the initial moras are clipped, and latter moras retained (much less common than back-clipping): '(var)nish' → ニス *nisu*, '(plat)form → ホーム *hōmu,* '(tri)angle' → アングル *aNguru.*
- Mid-clipping where one or more medial moras, and usually the last one as well, are clipped (also extremely rare): 'en(ter)ta(in)me(nt)' → エンタメ *eNtame*, 'in(s)tr(uctor)' → イントラ *iNtora*, 'corre(s)pon(dence)' → コレポン *korepoN*.

Compound reduction refers to the clipping of moras in compounds, removing one of the constituent elements altogether or blending. The first of these, compound clipping, is essentially mora back-clipping – always back-clipping and never fore- or mid-clipping – of both (or all) constituents of a compound word to, generally, two moras in each constituent. For example: 'wo(rd) pro(cessor)' → ワープロ *wāpuro*, 'seco(nd) han(d)' → セコハン *sekohaN*, 'hun(ger) st(rike)' → ハンスト *haNsuto*, 'pocke(t) mon(ster)' → ポケモン *pokemoN*, 'ta(pe) reco(rder)' → テレコ *tereko*, 'pota(to) ch(ips)' → ポテチ *potechi* etc. Such clipped constituents generally do not exist as independent mora-clipped words (Kay, 1995: 71) (e.g. *pote* is never used individually to mean 'potato'), and, similarly, many words used as compound constituents are used only in compounds, and never on their own, e.g. the loanword フード *fūdo* ('food') is never used on its own to refer to food in general (Kay, 1995: 71) – only in phrases such as 'fast food' → ファストフード *fasuto fūdo,* or 'slow food (as opposed to fast food)' → スローフード *surō fūdo*. A more radical example of compound reduction involves the ellipsis of a whole constituent – either the first or the final (Irwin, 2011: 148). Examples include: 'super(market)' → スーパー *sūpā*, 'over(coat)' → オーバー *ōbā*, 'make-(up)' → メーク *mēku*, '(sewing) machine' → ミシン *mishiN*, '(sand)paper' → ペーパー *pēpā*, 'ball(point) pen' → ボールペン *bōrupeN*. In addition to these two strategies, Irwin (2011: 149-150), also talks about blending or portmanteau formation, while keeping it distinct from compound-clipping in that the constituent elements of compounds in blending are always clipped in unpredictable ways, whereas in compound clipping constituent elements are always back-clipped. Examples include: 'yacht' + 'hotel' → ヨッテル *yoQteru* ('yachtel'), 'motor' + 'apartment' → モパート *mopāto* ('apartment with garage'), 'Japanese' + 'Asian' → ジャパニアン *japaniaN* ('Japanese working in Asia').

IMPORTATION: In the history of Japanese-English language contact I have identified no cases of borrowing of grammatical inflections or declension / verb paradigms (especially since neither English nor Japanese possess the former). The only case of overt morphological importation I have managed to find includes the importation of English derivational suffixes (*-er*, *-ful*, *-ism*, *-ship*, *-tic*), though, based on my observations, these suffixes never change the word class of the base they are attached to since the base itself belongs to an undetermined word class before

suffixation (verbs, adjectives, adverbs) or before inclusion in a sentence (nouns). Therefore it is arguable whether these should be considered cases of morphological importation at all. However, even in English derivational suffixes do not necessarily change the word class of the word they are attached to, which makes these examples noteworthy: 'oshare' (Jap. 'stylish / chic') + '-ism' = stylishness → おしゃれイズム *oshareizumu*; 'manga' (Jap. 'comic book / manga') + '-tic' = mangaesque → 漫画チック *maNgachiQku*. These can also be added to previously borrowed bases: 'heart' + '-ful' = heart-warming → ハートフル *hātofuru*.

ORTHOGRAPHY:

For orthographic phenomena which are distinct to Japanese linguistics I have investigated the following sources: Seeley (1991), Daulton (2008), Kay (1995), Stanlaw (2004), Irwin (2011) and Twine (1984). Examples are taken from sources listed on pages 35-36.

SUBSTITUTION: When loanwords are adapted to the Japanese language in writing, the Latin script is substituted with one of the two native syllabaries: katakana. According to Loveday ((1996) as cited in Daulton (2008: 15)), the use of katakana for loanwords, however, is a relatively new phenomenon. During the Iberian borrowing period loanwords were primarily written in hiragana and kanji, while the Dutch preferred katakana to hiragana, but employed kanji even more frequently than the two. This practice continued well into the 20th century, and katakana only became dominant for writing loanwords in the period between the two World Wars. This linguistic segregation of *gairaigo* caused by katakana is not stigmatizing – katakana was originally chosen to represent loanwords because of its higher historical prestige compared to hiragana, having been used to notate Buddhist scripture. Aside from the substitution of scripts, I have identified only three purely orthographic substitution issues with regard to loanwords: (1) how to indicate word breaks in loanwords that consist of several words (this is still largely a matter of personal choice with several options: by spacing the words (or not), by using a hyphen or a double hyphen, or by using a 中黒 *nakaguro* – a full stop mark at mid-character height:・; e.g. Charles Babbage → *chāruzu babeiji* can be spaced in three ways: チャールズ バベイジ or チャールズ・バベイジ or チャールズ＝バベイジ), (2) how to indicate long vowels (this is today done with the so-called 長音符 *chōoNpu* – the katakana-hiragana prolonged sound mark), and whether to favour monomoraic or bimoraic spelling in innovative syllables, though I would

argue that there are differences in pronunciation when it comes to such variants based on my investigation of dictionary sources, e.g.フイルム *fuirumu* – *fi* is bimoraic: *fu* + *i* – or フィルム *firumu* – *fi* is monomoraic: *fi*).

Straddling the line between importation and substitution, and phonology and orthography, is the development of new syllables in the kana syllabary – importation because the graphs represent new sounds or combinations of sounds, and substitutions because they are still substituted with kana characters. Since the match between kana graphs and the sounds they actually represent in modern standard Japanese is almost 100% transparent (Irwin, 2011: 184) the phonemicization of allophones (and the breakdown of the traditional phonemic system), mentioned in the section on phonology, have directly reflected onto the Japanese writing system, and due to the influence of loanwords the traditional katakana syllabary has developed at least 40 new symbols (Stanlaw, 2004: 83). However, since the majority of English loanwords in Japanese are based on an orthographic source (as mentioned previously), I would note that it is perhaps more accurate to say that orthographic innovations have brought about changes in the phonetic system than the other way round, though the best approach would be to deal with innovative syllables / kana on a case by case basis. New phonemes that have developed from pre-existing allophones, and the sound /v/ now have appropriate cognates in katakana. In addition to that, some new combinations such as スァ(*swa*) or クェ (*kwe*) have appeared, but such combinations are pronounced bimoraicly – *suwa* or *kuwe* – and do not bring about changes in the phonology. Aside from that, I have encountered them very rarely, almost exclusively in place names or scientific terminology. Still, this development is not exclusive to katakana because the corresponding syllables have also developed in hiragana, but only as derivations from katakana, not as innovations in and of themselves; their usage is fairly obscure as well. Some of the new syllables[37]– which I have taken from the Monbushō (1955) and Bunkachō (1991) recommendations cited in Irwin (2011: 164-165) – include the following:

• /a/ group → クァ (*kwa*), グァ (*gwa*), スァ(*swa*), ファ (*fa*), ヴァ(*va*), ツァ(*tsa*);

[37] The new syllables are formed in one of the two ways: either by writing a syllable from the /u/, /i/, /e/ or /o/ group, such as *fu, shi, te* or *do,* and adding a vowel in subscript next to this syllable which indicates the vowel of the syllable (the /u/ or /i/ or /e/ or /o/ vowel included in the initial syllable then serves only as a slot-filler), e.g. ティ *ti* is written using テ *te* and ィ *i* in subscript, or by adding the previously mentioned *dakuten* (diacritical mark) to a syllable and again adding a vowel in subscript next to this syllable, e.g. ヴィ *vi* is written by adding the diacritical mark to ウ *u* and ィ *i* in subscript.

• /i/ group → スィ (*si*), ズィ (*zi*), ティ (*ti*), ディ (*di*), ウィ (*wi*), クィ(*kwi*), グィ (*gwi*), スィ (*swi* – identical to *si* in writing, but pronounced with a glide), フィ(fi), ヴィ(*vi*), ツィ(*tsi*);

• /u/ group → トゥ (*tu*), ドゥ (*du*), フゥ (*hu*), チュ (*tyu*), ヂュ (*dyu*), ヴ (*vu*), ヴュ (*vyu*), フュ (*fyu*);

• /e/ group → シェ (*she*), ジェ (*je*), チェ (*che*), ウェ(*we*), クェ (*kwe*), グェ(*gwe*), スェ(*swe*), フェ (*fe*), ヴェ (*ve*), ツェ (*tse*), イェ (*ye*);

• /o/ group → クォ (*kwo*), グォ(*gwo*), フォ (*fo*), ヴォ (*vo*), ツォ (*tso*).

Many more new syllables also exist, but they are very obscure, primarily used in *gaikokugo* rather than *gairaigo*, and are not recommended for usage in any official document; examples include: *mwa, nwa, rwa, ywa, fwa, dwa, tswa, pye, dye, dyo, pwo, swo* etc. Contemporary orthographic practice with regard to loanwords is mainly the result of two reports – one by 文部省 *moNbushō* ('Ministry of Education') in 1955, the other by 文化庁 *buNkachō* ('Agency for Cultural Affairs') in 1991 (Irwin, 2011: 173). The two reports, very similar in their advice, roughly prescribe the following: that loanwords should be written in katakana (and they prescribe which kana are advised, and which are not – they generally favor syllables based on traditional pronunciation, e.g. *b-* and *h-* rather than *v-* and *f-*), that the moraic consonants *N* and *Q* should be written ン and ッ, respectively, how subscript vowels should and should not be used, that long vowels should be indicated with a *chōoNpu* rather than by reduplication of the vowel, and how word breaks should be indicated in loanwords. If we accept that spelling differences are in fact pronunciation differences (because kana graphs accurately represent the sounds of the language), then we can argue that all the prescriptions concerning orthographic variants, are, in fact, acknowledging pronunciation variants as well, and giving pronunciation advice. For example, if the *Monbushō* report favours インタビュー *iNtabyū* over インタヴュー *iNtavyū*, what they are actually condemning is the latter pronunciation, as well as its orthographic form.

IMPORTATION: Although the Latin script was introduced to the Japanese with the arrival of the Portuguese in the 16th century, it wasn't until the middle of the 19th century that it became widespread, so that there was even a movement for the romanisation of Japanese writing (discussed more in the section on the history of language contact). According to Daulton (2008:

14), after the Second World War, the Roman alphabet (called ローマ字 *rōmaji* 'Roman characters') became mandatory in schools, and nowadays it is taught in the fourth grade of elementary school (two years before English education starts). Furthermore, Daulton (2008) notes, the importation of the Roman alphabet was also accompanied by the importation of Roman numerals. However, whereas the former are mostly used in marketing (e.g. shop names or magazine titles) and graphic design (e.g. product names and on T-shirts) typically having a decorative function, the latter have replaced Chinese kanji numerals as the dominant way of writing numbers. Some of the most common words written in *rōmaji* are abbreviations and acronyms, though full words can be found as well. According to the previously mentioned survey by the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) of magazines published in 1994 (NINJAL as cited in Irwin (2011: 187)), the most frequent *rōmaji* words include: *m, cm, km, mm, g, eng, EU, CD, ATM, AIDS, super, sports, type, set, design, hotel, model* etc. Abbreviations and full words are pronounced as if they were phonologically adapted full words, e.g. *type → taipu, m → mētoru*, while acronyms are pronounced either as words or each letter separately, e.g. *CD → shīdī, AIDS → ēzu.* That being said, an analysis of a dictionary of foreign words published in 2000 found that of the 52,500 listed words, 7,500 were written in *rōmaji* (Barrs, 2011: 15). The beginning of the Western borrowing period (~1860) also saw the introduction of punctuation into the Japanese language – up to that point an extremely limited range of punctuation marks had been used in Japanese texts only sporadically, if at all (Seeley, 1991: 141). Under the influence of Western texts, scholars and novelists in Japan soon started using spacing, paragraphing, commas (、), full stops (。), quotation marks (「　」), colons, questions marks, and exclamation marks (Twine, 1984: 1). The use of the previously mentioned 長音符 *chōoNpu* appeared some time during the Dutch borrowing period, whereas the use of subscript vowels for new syllables is an invention from the early or mid 19th century.

SEMANTICS:

For semantic phenomena which are distinct to Japanese linguistics I have investigated the following sources: Stanlaw (2004), Irwin (2011), Kay (1995), Daulton (2008), and Akiyama (2002). Examples are taken from sources listed on pages 35-36.

IMPORTATION: Imported morphemes in Japanese undergo certain semantic adaptations – in Haugen's terminology these are cases of loan synonyms (though the fact that their meaning is always displaced from that of the model brings the very name synonyms into questions). My

analysis of dictionary sources and examples found in contact literature has enabled me to sort them into the following groups (following Hope's (1960) classification laid out in the introductory section):

a. Changes in semantic extension:

(1) Zero semantic extension often occurs in words restricted to fairly specialised fields such as music, food or drinks. Examples include: サルサ *sarusa* ('salsa'), ピザ *piza* ('pizza'), ウィスキー *uisukī* (*'whiskey'*), コーヒー*kōhī* ('coffee'), ジャズ *jazu* ('jazz'), ロック *rokQu* ('rock') etc.

(2) Many more words exhibit narrowing, where they generally retain only one specific meaning; examples include: エキストラ *ekisutora* (a film extra), ツナ *tsuna* (tinned, but not fresh tuna),ミシン *mishiN* (only a sewing machine, and not any other type of machine), レストラン *resutoraN* (only a Western-style restaurant), テーブル *tēburu* (only a Western-style table), マウス *mausu* (only a computer mouse) プリン *puriN* (only caramel custard pudding), フイルム *fuirumu* (only a roll of film, but not 'movie', though it does occur in the phrase *pinku fuirumu* meaning 'erotic films'), アップル *aQpuru* ('apple') and ティー *tī* ('tea') are similarly used only when prepared Western-style or in Western-dishes, イクラ *ikura* (only salmon roe), ジュース *jūsu* (only fruit juice), ボーナス *bōnasu* (only extra wage payment), エール *ēru* (only yelling when supporting your team, i.e. cheering), リニューアル *rinyūaru* (only store renovation or overhaul).[38]

(3) Expansion of meaning, which is relatively rare in Japanese according to Daulton (2008: 22) – some examples include: ハンドル *haNdoru* ('handle, steering wheel, handlebar on a bicycle')[39], トランプ *toraNpu* ('playing cards', whereas in English 'trump' refers to a specific card or a suit of cards), ホームページ *hōmupēji* (in Japanese refers to a homepage, but also any website, and even the internet), ジンクス *jiNkusu* (either good or bad omen, whereas in English it is necessarily bad), シール *shīru* (in addition to 'seal', also means 'sticky label'). Irwin (2011: 140), notes that some imported derivational affixes have also undergone semantic change, for example, the

[38] The examples for semantic narrowing were taken mostly from Stanlaw (2004: 16, 96) and Kay (1995: 71).

[39] Interestingly enough, Winford (2003: 33) considers *haNdoru* to be a case of semantic narrowing rather than expansion.

suffix *-er* (adapted as アー *ā*) has had its meaning broadened to 'someone who is into something', e.g. シャネラー *shanerā* ('someone who is into Chanel goods').

b. Pejoration and amelioration. Two examples of the former includes クレーム *kurēmu* (that is either 'an objection' or 'a customer complaint seeking compensation', whereas the English 'claim' does not have such negative connotations) or ボス *bosu* (which means the powerful head of a group of gangsters or politicians). Examples of amelioration include: ムーディー *mūdī* ('romantic', 'good' (atmosphere)), ナイーブ *naību* ('sensitive, unpretentious'), サービス *sābisu* ('goods or service without charge').

c. Ellipsis. Examples include (these were mentioned under compound reduction, so they will just be repeated here): 'super(market)' → スーパー *sūpā*, 'over(coat)' → オーバー *ōbā*, 'make-(up)' → メーク *mēku*, '(sewing) machine' → ミシン *mishiN*, '(sand)paper' → ペーパー *pēpā*, 'ball(point) pen' → ボールペン *bōrupeN.*

d. The two remaining strategies: metaphors and transformation of proper nouns into common nouns, can also be found, albeit to a much lesser extent. The example of metaphorical usage of loanwords include: ピンク *piNku* ('pink', used to mean 'erotic'), ブルー *burū* ('blue', used to mean 'erotic' as well, but also 'sad'), シルバー *shirubā* ('silver', used to refer to the elderly), while the example of the latter would be バイキング *baikiNgu* ('smorgasbord style of eating', from proper name 'Viking'; also a case of semantic substitution).

SUBSTITUTION: A much rarer occurrence than semantic displacement upon morphemic importation is semantic substitution – in Haugen's terms these are examples of loan homonyms where the new meaning has little in common with the old. Another term for these is 'semantic pseudo-loans'. Examples of this include the following: フェミニスト *feminisuto* (not 'feminist', but rather 'lady's man'), スマート *sumāto* ('slender, slim'), コンパニー *koNpanī* ('(drinking) party' rather than 'company'), バイキング *baikiNgu* ('smorgasbord style of eating' (from 'Viking')), ラフ *rafu*

('casual (fashion)' rather than 'rough'), ビッグバン *biggubaN* ('financial reform'; from 'Big Bang'), カンニングする *kaNniNgu suru* ('cheating in an examination').

SYNTAX:

For syntactic phenomena which are distinct to Japanese linguistics I have investigated the following sources: Fresslevig (2010), Miura (1979), Stanlaw (2004), and Koscielecki (2006). Examples are taken from sources listed on pages 35-36, with phrases and sentences taken from Miura (1979), and some of them are my own.

SUBSTITUTION: According to Kay (1995: 72), loanwords fit into the Japanese syntactic structure as if they were native words, being ascribed particles such as the subject particle は *wa* or object particle を *wo* where necessary. An exception to this rule is when a whole phrase is borrowed, as in the expressions レディーファースト *redī fāsuto* ('ladie(s) first') or マンツーマン *maN tsū maN* (man-to-man), though, as mentioned previously, since these tend to be used as standalone sentences, I would argue that it makes little sense to speak of their syntactic integration.

IMPORTATION: The importation of syntactic patterns, which is the least borrowable element according to the borrowability scale laid out in the introductory part, is present to an extent in the contact between English and Japanese. I have identified several such importations:
(1) Changes in the use of the passive: The traditional Japanese passive voice is quite unlike the one found in contemporary English – it is more often used with intransitive verbs and the semantic patient (the syntactic subject) is only somehow adversely affected by the predicate of the clause. An example of such a passive would be:

彼は	お母さんに	死なれました。
Kare wa	*okāsaN ni*	*shiNaremashita.*
He (patient)	by mother (agent)	was died.

Literally: He was died by his mother. A more sensible translation of the sentence would be: His mother died (on him). However, according to Fresslevig (2010: 410), under the influence of English and Dutch passives the Japanese have started using 'direct passives' with transitive verbs and overtly expressed semantic agents. Influenced by English 'by X' and Dutch 'door X'

the Japanese have started using the phrases によって *ni yoQte*, and により て *ni yorite* (sometimes simply: agent + に *ni* as above) to indicate agents of such direct passive sentences during the Meiji period (1868 onwards). These phrases had already existed in the Japanese language, but had a slightly different meaning – namely, 'because' or 'due to', rather than 'by'. Furthermore, prior to the Meiji period the Japanese had never marked agents if they were inanimate, which has also changed under the influence of English and Dutch. Today, based on my understanding of the Japanese language, both the traditional passive, and the direct passive are used equally, as well as the phrases *ni yoQte* and *ni yorite* to indicate their agents. A sentence such as: 彼女は両親によって立派に育てられた。*Kanojo wa ryōshiN ni yoQte riQpa ni sodaterareta.* ('She was well brought up by her parents.') is perfectly acceptable and common.

(2) According to Fresslevig (2010: 411), the obligatory marking of the core arguments of a sentence (topic with は *wa*, subject with が *ga*, object with を *wo*) that is not a feature of (informal) spoken Japanese today, and had not been the feature of written Japanese up to the Meiji era, was introduced in that period under the influence of English and Dutch as a way to mimic the normative, regular grammar for written language found in European books. Just like the previous importation, my observations have confirmed this feature is now ubiquitous in written Japanese.

(3) The usage of pronouns: Prior to the late 19th century, Japanese did not have 3rd person pronouns *he* and *she* – 彼 *kare* which existed had the meaning of 'that', 'that thing' or 'that person' and 彼女 *kanojo*, which did not exist in traditional Japanese, was invented by translators of European texts as a female gender counterpart to *kare*. Under the influence of English and Dutch, these two pronouns started being used in the same way they were used in English (this imitation went so far that the Japanese used *kanojo* to refer to ships as well) – such usage became widespread in literary writing, and eventually entered general language (Fresslevig, 2010: 410). The use of the 2nd person pronoun *anata* has undergone changes similar to that of *kare*, according to Miura (1979: 12-13), despite its more limited usage since normal Japanese conversations avoid mentioning the addressee or simply refer to him by his name. In general, the usage of explicit subjects and personal pronouns became more common during the Meiji era, especially if they functioned as subjects. Since Japanese is a null-subject language, and

rarely explicitly states the subject of a sentence[40] – especially if the subject is 'I' – according to my familiarity with the language such usage is seen as odd by contemporary standards.

(4) Further influence on written-style Japanese: Koscielecki (2006: 29) notes that Natsume Sōseki, considered by many to be the greatest Japanese writer of all times, was heavily influenced by Western-style writing (especially George Meredith and Robert Louis Stevenson) which reflected in his novels. For example, his novel *Kokoro* (lit. 'Heart') contains almost a hundred relative clauses which were very unusual for Japanese novels of that time. The difference between written and spoken Japanese, mentioned several times already, requires further attention. Up until the twentieth century, written Japanese was very different from spoken Japanese – in writing, erudite classical Sino-Japanese expressions were used, interspersed with ancient grammatical and syntactic forms. When the Japanese noticed that there was very little difference between writing and speech in European languages, they brought written syntax and grammar in line with 'real' Japanese; the example with Natsume Sōseki illustrates one instances of that transition. Moreover, written Japanese, which very rarely utilized relative clauses, had no relative pronouns (*which, that, who* etc.) with which it could indicate them. However, Stanlaw (2004: 48-49) points out, the contact with European languages and translation of European books led them to 'create' ところの *tokoro no* which served as an all-purpose relative pronoun. In contemporary Japanese that pronoun no longer exists; instead, *soko* and *sono* tend to be employed when a sentence needs clarification (Miura, 1979: 23). Furthermore, in written Japanese specifically, three other notable changes have occurred as well:

> (1) In terms of tenses: Under the influence of English *will* / *shall* some modern Japanese writers have started using *de arō* or *darō* to indicate future even though these expressions are traditionally not used as future markers, but only as probability markers. Moreover, the phrase *tsūtsū aru* has seen an increase in usage since the Meiji era as a way of replicating English 'be +ing'. Another phrase which has been 'revived' to mimic English to-infinitive structures is the use of *beki* after verbs, e.g. 憐れむべき男 *awaremu-beki otoko* ('a man to be pitied') (Miura, 1979: 17, 18, 24).

[40] The lack of explicit subject can cause numerous problems to learners of Japanese since there is no agreement between the verb and the subject (since the grammatical categories of person, number, and gender do not exist in the language). Instead, the subject is retrievable from context, knowledge of the world, or verb choice (e.g. honorific verb forms are never used for subjects in the first person, informal verb forms are never used for subjects in the third person etc.).

(2) Under the influence of English texts, Japanese writers have started using more conjunctions, specifically sentence connectors such as *soshite* ('and'), *dakara* ('therefore'), *suru to* ('thereupon'), *shikashi* ('however'), and at least one such connector was invented in response to English 'because' – namely, *nazenara* (Miura, 1979: 19-20). By contemporary standards, these are quite ubiquitous and considered natural.
(3) Replicating English comparative structures: To that end, several devices have been invented by Japanese writers, for example: *dake sore dake ōku* ('as many [NOUN] as') or *hodo sore hodo* ('so [ADJECTIVE] as to') (Miura, 1979: 21-22).

In addition to all the adaptations mentioned above, it must be noted that imported lexical morphemes are sometimes used in creative ways in what is deemed 和製英語 wasei eigo (lit. 'English which has become Japanese' (Kay, 1995: 70)) by assembling them into compounds which do not appear in such combinations in English. Examples of this abound: 'paper + test' = written test → ペーパーテスト *pēpātesuto*; 'high + sense' = 'good taste in fashion' → ハイセンス *haiseNsu*; 'free + size' = one-size-fits-all → フリーサイズ *furīsaizu*; 'cherry + boy' = male virgin → チェリーボーイ *cherībōi*; 'out + sex' = extramerital sex → アウトセックス *autoseQkusu*; 'front + glass' = windscreen フロントガラス *furoNtogarasu*; 'skin + ship' = physical contact → スキン + シップ *sukiNshiQpu*; 'price' + 'off' = discount → プライスオフ *puraisuofu*; 'level' + 'up' = improvement → レベルアップ *reberuaQpu* and many others. Such creative usage can also be observed in certain made-in-Japan acronyms (written in the Roman script) such as: PK *pīkē* ('penalty kick'), JR *jēāru* ('Japan Railway'), CM *shīemu* ('commercial message'), OL *ōeru* ('office lady').[41] All the above-mentioned examples can be subsumed under the term 'lexical pseudo-loans', and are identical in most regards to the likes of *Goalmann* mentioned in the theoretical part.

4.4 Importation with substitution

[41] The acronym *OL* was created in 1983 in response to the fact that NHK television stations banned the word *BG* ('business girl') because it had acquired sexual connotations. As a result of this, the woman's weekly magazine *Josei-Jishin* asked the readers to choose a new acronym for *BG*, and the majority of women voted for *OL* as the preferred alternative. (Koscielecki, 2006: 28).

The cases of morphemic importation with substitution (i.e. LOANBLENDS), based on my research of dictionary sources and contact literature, are less common than the former group (though still considerably common). Examples of loanblends where lexical morphemes were substituted include: 歯ブラシ *haburashi* ('toothbrush'), where *ha* is the Japanese substitution for 'tooth', and *burashi* an importation of English 'brush'; 電話ボックス *denwaboQkusu* (telephone + box = 'telephone booth / box'); 懐メロ *natsumero* (nostalgia + melo(di) = 'nostalgic melody'); 朝シャン *asashaN* (morning + sham(poo) = 'morning shampoo'); 蝶ネクタイ *chōnekutai* (butterfly + necktie = 'bowtie'); カーボン紙 *kāboNshi* (carbon + paper = 'carbon paper'). Examples where bound morphemes were substituted include the aforementioned loan bases which function as verbs, adjectives, and adverbs where the lexical morpheme is imported, but its bound morpheme is treated as part of the bound lexical base and substituted with a native bound morpheme. Because of that, I have decided to treat verbs, adjectives, and adverbs as loanblends. In such cases the imported part of the word is always written in katakana, and the substituted part in hiragana (which is generally used for bound morphemes in Japanese).

Verbs are formed from bound nominal bases by two types of suffixation. The first type involves adding the native verbalizer する *suru* ('to do') to the base. The vast majority of bases are verbalized in this manner; examples include: サインする *saiN suru* ('to sign'), スタートする *sutāto suru* ('to start'), アップする *aQpu suru* ('to increase'), アナウンスする *anauNsu suru* ('to announce'), カールする *kāru suru* ('to curl'), カバーする *kabā suru* ('cover / cover up'), カスタマイズする *kasutamaizu suru* ('customize') etc. The second type involves adding the verbal ending *-ru* typical of Japanese verbs, the majority of which end in *-ru*, directly to the bound base or its shortened, mora-clipped form.[42] Examples include: サボる *saboru* ('to skip classes'; *sabo* is a mora-clipped form of the verb 'sabotage'), パニックる *paniQkuru* ('to panic'), スタバる *sutabaru* ('go to Starbucks'; *suta* is a mora-clipped form of the word 'Starbucks'), メモる *memoru* ('to take notes'), ハモる *hamoru* ('to harmonize') etc. Irwin (2011: 138) points out that loanwords already ending in *-ru*, such as サイクル *saikuru* ('to cycle') or リサイクル *risaikuru* ('to recycle'), do not

[42] Daulton notes that "this unorthodox suffixation is a favourite of non-standard registers such as youth slang" (2008: 20) and later refers to such usage as "arcane", and adds that it rarely becomes mainstream (2008: 38).

take the suffix *-ru*, but can be used as both verbs and nouns ('cycling' / 'recycling'), though when they function as verbs they tend to be verbalized by adding *suru* (*saikuru suru / risaikuru suru*). In terms of their conjugations, all such loanblends are conjugated according to the consonant conjugation,[43] e.g. *saboru* → *saborimashita* ('skipped classes'), and not *sabomashita* which would be the vowel conjugation.

Japanese distinguishes two major types of adjectives: verbal adjectives with verb-like characteristics (verbal conjugation), and adjectival nouns with noun-like characteristics. The former always end in two vowels, the second of which is always *-i*, and are therefore also called *-i* adjectives, e.g. 小さい *chīsai* ('small'), 美味しい *oishī* ('delicious'), 黒い *kuroi* ('black'), etc. The latter are essentially nouns which are transformed into adjectives with the addition of the suffix *-na*, e.g. 元気 *geNki* ('health, vigor') → 元気な *geNki na* ('healthy, vigorous') (Akiyama, 2002: 162-170). When nominal bases from English are transformed into adjectives they almost exclusively function as adjectival nouns – デラックスな *derakkusu na* ('deluxe'), カジュアルな *kajuaru na* ('casual'), シビアな *shibia na* ('severe'), ベストな *besuto na* ('the best') – with only a very small amount of adjectives behaving like verbal adjectives: ナウい *naui* ('trendy'), エロい *eroi* ('pornographic, erotic'), グロい *guroi* ('grotesque, disgusting'). Adjectives formed by such suffixation can further be transformed into adverbs, just like native adjectives – adjectival nouns by using the particle *-ni* in the place of *-na* (e.g. 元気な *genki na* → 元気に *genki ni* 'vigorously, cheerfully'), verbal adjectives by replacing the final *-i* with *-ku* (e.g. 美味しい *oishii* → 美味しく *oishiku* 'deliciously'). Loanblend examples include: カジュアルに *kajuaru ni* ('casually'), シビアに *shibia ni* ('severely'), グロく *guroku* ('disgustingly'), ナウく *nauku* ('trendily').

4.5 Substitution

The cases of pure substitution (LOANSHIFTS) are the rarest of all borrowings. As mentioned in the introduction, these include two types: loan translations (calques) and cases

[43] There are two main conjugation groups in the Japanese language – the vowel conjugation and the consonant conjugation. Verbs from the former group all end in *-eru* and *-iru*, and form their stem by removing the final *-ru* (e.g. *taberu* ('to eat'); stem: *tabe-*), whereas the verbs from the latter group end in any syllable with the nucleus sound /u/, e.g. *-su*, *-ru*,*- mu*, *-nu*, *-gu* etc., and form their stem by dropping the final *-u*, and therefore having a stem ending in a consonant (e.g. *tobu* ('to fly'); stem: *tob-*). (Akiyama, 2002: 79-83)

where a foreign meaning is imported to an already existing morpheme in the recipient language (the term 'loanshifts' sometimes refers only to this particular kind). The cases of calquing were described in the section on the history of language contact, and will simply be repeated here with some additions: 社会 *shakai* ('society' = shrine + meeting), 民主主義 *miNshushugi* ('democracy' = people + master + rule), 哲学 *tetsugaku* ('philosophy' = clear + learning), 電話 *deNwa* ('telephone' = electricity + speak), , 国民 *kokumiN* ('people' = country + people), 心理学 *shiNrigaku* ('psychology' = mind + reason + study), 摩天楼 *mateNrō* ('skyscraper' = grind / scrape + heavens + high building), 空港 *kūkō* ('airport' = air + port). According to Daulton (2008: 14-15, prior to the Second World War, calquing was very prolific, and most foreign ideas were imported into the language by means of loan translations. However, after the war, under the influence of American Occupation Forces the national policy regarding language changed drastically – the new language policy was to promote literacy and education by limiting the number of Chinese characters used, which indirectly led to the demise of the system of loan translations since calques were always created by inventing new combinations of existing Chinese characters. Furthermore, he notes, the end of the War marked the beginning of katakana dominance in writing loanwords, which reinforced the downfall of loan translations. Since the Loanword Committee was founded in 2003, there have been proposed replacements for some less intelligible borrowings. I consider these to be essentially calques, but their usage is somewhat esoteric. Two examples include: 利用しやすさ *riyōshiyasusa* (lit. 'ease of usage' as a replacement for アクセシビリティ *akusechibiritī* 'accessibility'), and 法執行 *hōshiQkō* (lit. 'the act of executing the law' as a replacement for エンフォースメント *eNfōsumeNto* 'enforcement'). The analysis of literature on English borrowings in Japanese does not confirm any examples of the second kind of loanshift.

6. Results and conclusion

The data presented in the previous section seem to confirm the starting hypothesis for the most part – namely, that the Japanese-English borrowing situation lends itself to Haugen's (1950) stratification into loanwords, loanblends, and loanshifts like other cases of borrowing situations, that imported elements can be analyzed on at least three levels (morphological, phonological, and semantic) – as well as two additional levels I have posited in the theoretical part (syntactic and orthographic), and that the changes that occur thereon, in the broadest sense, are not unlike those observed in more researched cases of language contact. All the borrowings examined can be considered either loanwords, loanblends, or loanshifts as presented above. The

question of the adaptations they undergo, and whether these are ubiquitous in contact situations, however, warrants further attention.

In phonology, the five new phonemes that have developed – /ɸ/, /ɕ/, /ts/, /d͡ʑ/, and /c͡ç/ – have done so in alignment with Filipović's (1971) first condition for phonemic importation in contact situation – namely, that allophones of those phonemes already exist in the recipient language. The changes in the usage of the mora obstruent – a phenomenon I have not stumbled upon in researching other contact literature – were brought about by donor orthography in cases where it occurs before a sonorant, whereas its usage before obstruents other than voiceless stops and /ɕ/ is still a highly debated issue and considerable fluctuation between voicing and devoicing of obstruents following the mora obstruent exists – *beQto* and *beQdo* both being viable pronunciations.[44] The only real deviation (or perhaps unexpected development) from the norm is the actual importation of the phoneme /v/, though its phonemic status is still undetermined – it is used rarely, mostly by educated speakers, and generally in specialized contexts.

When it comes to morphological adaptations, due to the lack of case, number, person and gender categories in the Japanese language, only a number of truncation and ellipsis strategies are identified that seem to be very rare in most other varieties of language contact. In Japanese these are particularly prominent due to the syllabic nature of the language – since every consonant cluster needs to be expanded by means of vowel and mora epenthesis in order to conform to the open-syllable rule, borrowed words tend to be exceedingly long. In order to ease communication, large parts of the borrowings then have to be truncated. Furthermore, when words are borrowed, they are not assigned a word class immediately, but only upon contextualization with the addition of suffixes (with the exception of nouns that do not need to take a suffix, and are therefore morphologically undistinguishable from such bases). This phenomenon – namely, that borrowings are generally converted to 'nouns', or rather noun-like forms, upon borrowing – seems to be present in other cases of contact. One example of this would be the English adverb *out* that is treated as a noun (*aut*) when borrowed in Croatian.[45] Finally, there are almost no cases of morphological importation, except some derivational morphology, which stands in line with general predictions of borrowability scales in language contact.

[44] Daulton (2008: 11) argues that this particular example is not a case of devoicing, but of two different borrowing routes: *beQto* which was borrowed from German *Bett*, and *beQdo* which was borrowed from English *Bed*.
[45] The example was taken from Filipović (1971: 139).

In orthography, the phenomena found in Japanese-English language contact seem to deviate from the expected norm considerably, which is the result of the Japanese singular writing system (a combination of three different scripts). Whereas in the contact of European languages, we find occasional intrusion of certain similar-looking graphemes, in Japan the whole script has been imported. I would tentatively generalize that such a situation is, at present, with regard to major languages, only observable in the contact between English and Chinese and English and Korean. What is also unprecedented is the development of new graphemes (e.g. ヷ to represent /v/) and new combinations of graphemes to represent new combinations of sounds in the language. Furthermore, the importation of punctuation into the Japanese language is also fairly exceptional and unexpected.

In the field of semantics there seems to be the greatest correspondence between my hypothesis and the actual situation. Not only can all borrowings be subsumed under Haugen's (1950) two headings of loan synonyms and loan homonyms (which in my analysis corresponds to importation and substitution, respectively), but they also readily lend themselves to Hope's (1960) five substitution strategies – namely, changes in semantic extension, pejoration and amelioration, ellipsis, metaphors. and transformation of proper nouns into common nouns. Furthermore, their distribution also corresponds to expectations in that semantic narrowing is the most common, followed by zero semantic extension; other strategies being somewhat uncommon.

The field of syntactic adaptations has perhaps yielded the most interesting results. If we go back to the interim hypothesis I posited in the chapter 'Japanese language' – namely, that we can expect that any grammatical importations will hardly be morphological, but rather syntactic (and perhaps specifically related to parts of speech that have the grammatical category of case) – we will notice that that is precisely what we find. All changes can be tentatively subsumed under Weinreich's (1953) third category of grammatical interference as expected – changes in grammatical functions under the influence of English (the use of direct passives which now overtly mark the agent, even if it is inanimate; changes in the usage of pronouns, and their increase in frequency especially in the subject position; the increase in the frequency of sentence particles which mark the core arguments: *wo, wa, ga*; the increase in the length and number of relative clauses) or replication of English grammatical forms (replicated comparative structures, sentence connectors, relative pronouns: *tokoro no,* and the re-designated *soko* and *sono*; the use of *tsūtsū aru* or V-inf + *beki* which were 'revived' to replicate English syntactic structures, namely, *be +ing* and to-infinitive). The change in the usage of *de arō* or *darō* to indicate future

even though these expressions are traditionally not used as future markers, but only as probability markers is perhaps a change not overtly caused by English influence, since the grammaticalization of probability markers into future markers seems to occur in a number of languages (including English). Rather it is more fitting to say that English only added impetus to an already on-going development, though this hypothesis requires further investigation. Finally, as expected the changes themselves are syntactic in nature, and the only morphology that has been borrowed is derivational, and even that to a very low extent. Since these changes are fairly extensive, based on my knowledge of Japanese some of them now pervasive in everyday Japanese – esp. explicit passives with inanimate objects, *de arō* and *darō* as future markers, very lengthy relative clauses, the usage of personal pronouns (particularly in writing) and the marking of core arguments with particles – I would argue that Winford's (2003: 30-31) assertion that the Japanese-English borrowing situation is 'casual' is unfounded, and a more precise designation would be 'intense' since there is moderate structural borrowing, and heavy lexical borrowing from English. On Thomason's scale (2001: 70-71), the intensity of Japanese-English language contact arguably lies in the 'more intense' region (reflected in heavy lexical borrowing), though some aspects of it fall under 'casual contact' (namely, the lack of widespread bilingualism). To summarize then, the results of the hypothesis are as follows: the first part of the hypothesis has been confirmed, and Haugen's classification of borrowings can be applied to English borrowings in Japanese; the second part, however, has been partially confirmed: semantic and syntactic adaptations seem to conform to all general expectations, whereas phonological, morphological, and orthographic adaptations (in increasing order of deviation) seem to diverge from general expectations, albeit only in some regards.

On a more general note, with regard to the secondary aims of the paper laid out in the introduction, the paper has attempted to demonstrate the following facts.

1) That the phenomena that have taken place in the course of Japanese-English language contact include: bilingualism, code-switching, code-alternation, negotiation, and linguistic borrowing, the most common of which has invariably been linguistic borrowing.

2) That the distinction between foreign words and loanwords proper does not necessarily apply to borrowings in Japanese since the degree of orthographic and phonological conformity cannot be considered distinctive. Instead, the degree of intelligibility of the borrowing is taken as the basis for a distinction between *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*, which would then only loosely correspond to loanwords proper and foreign words, respectively.

3) That the attitudes of native Japanese speakers to the influence of the English language seem to be mixed, though more favourable than not, the greatest opposition to borrowing coming from older age cohorts, while younger people tend to endorse borrowings indiscriminately.
4) That the reasons for borrowing can be subsumed under four headings: prestige, need, and euphemistic or emblematic. Of these four, the first two are the norm, arguably the third one as well since it is not uncommon that borrowed words have lighter undertones than corresponding native words, especially with bilingual speakers. In that sense, only the emblematic, decorative function of English and English borrowings can be considered generally unexpected.

In conclusion, it can be argued that the phenomena occurring in Japanese-English language contact follow tendencies observed elsewhere in the world in most regards. However, this contact still remains relatively unrepresented in Western linguistics, though recent decades have seen some proliferation of literature on this topic (Miller, Loveday, Stanlaw, Irwin primarily). Nevertheless, the prospects of researching Japanese-English language contact are abundant for philologists and sociolinguists alike.

7. Appendix

Figure 1 – Graphs for basic sounds.

ア A	イ I	ウ U	エ E	オ O
カ KA	キ KI	ク KU	ケ KE	コ KO
タ TA	チ CHI	ツ TSU	テ TE	ト TO
サ SA	シ SHI	ス SU	セ SE	ソ SO
ナ NA	ニ NI	ヌ NU	ネ NE	ノ NO

ハ HA	ヒ HI	フ FU	ヘ HE	ホ HO
マ MA	ミ MI	ム MU	メ ME	モ MO
ヤ YA		ユ YU		ヨ YO
ラ RA	リ RI	ル RU	レ RE	ロ RO
ワ WA				ヲ WO
				ン N

Figure 2 – Graphs for voiced sounds.

ガ GA	ギ GI	グ GU	ゲ GE	ゴ GO
ザ ZA	ジ JI	ズ ZU	ゼ ZE	ゾ ZO
ダ DA	ジ JI	ヅ ZU	デ DE	ド DO
バ BA	ビ BI	ブ BU	ベ BE	ボ BO
パ PA	ピ PI	プ PU	ペ PE	ポ PO

Figure 3 – Graphs for palatalized sounds.

キャ KYA	キュ KYU	キョ KYO	ギャ GYA	ギュ GYU	ギョ GYO
シャ SHA	シュ SHU	ショ SHO	ジャ JA	ジュ JU	ジョ JO
チャ CHA	チュ CHU	チョ CHO			
ニャ NYA	ニュ NYU	ニョ NYO			
ヒャ HYA	ヒュ HYU	ヒョ HYO	ビャ BYA	ビュ BYU	ビョ BYO
ミャ MYA	ミュ MYU	ミョ MYO	ピャ PYA	ピュ PYU	ピョ PYO
リャ RYA	リュ RYU	リョ RYO			

Figure 4. Places of major language contact in Japan before the 20th century.

8. Bibliography

1. Akiyama, Nobuo, and Carol Akiyama (2002). *Japanese Grammar*. 2nd ed. Hauppauge, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Series. Print.
2. Appel, Rene, and Pieter Muysken (2005). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP. Print.
3. Atkinson, Hoffman (1879). *Revised and Enlarged Edition of Exercises in the Yokohama Dialect*. Yokohama. Print.
4. Barrs, Keith (2011). *Unlocking the Encoded English Vocabulary in the Japanese Language.* English Today, Vol. 27, No. 4. pp 15-20. Print.
5. Beasley, W.G. (2008). *The Foreign Threat and the Opening of the Ports*. Jansen, Marius B., ed. *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 5: The Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 259-307. Print.
6. Bojčić, Ivana, and Braović Plavša, Mira (2012). *Language Borrowing*. Zbornik radova Međimurskog veleučilišta u Čakovcu, Vol. 3, No. 2. Print.
7. Bussmann, Hadumod (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge. Print.
8. Chino, Naoko (2001). *All About Particles - A Handbook of Japanese Function Words*. Tokyo: Kodansha International. Print.
9. Cipris, Zeljko, and Shoko Hamano (2002). *Making Sense of Japanese Grammar: A Clear Guide through Common Problems*. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i. Print.
10. Clarke, Hugh (2009). *Language*. 41. Sugimoto, Yoshio, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Japanese Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 56-75. Print.
11. Crystal, David (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell. Print.
12. Daulton, Frank E. (2008). *Japan's Built-in Lexicon of English-based Loanwords*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Print.
13. Dougill, John (2008). *Japanese and English as an alien language.* English Today, Vol. 24, No. 1. pp 18-22. Print.
14. Elisonas, Jurgis (2008). *Christianity and the Daimyo*. Hall, John Whitney, ed. *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 4: Early Modern Japan*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 301-372. Print.
15. Filipović, Rudolf (1971). *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi*. Zagreb: Školska Knjiga. Print.
16. Frellesvig, Bjarke (2010). *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Print.

17. Gottlieb, Nanette (2012). *Language Policy in Japan: The Challenge of Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Print.
18. Halpern, Jack (2001). *The Kodansha Kanji Learner's Dictionary*. New ed. Tokyo: Kodansha International. Print.
19. Haugen, Einar (1950). *The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing.* Language, Vol. 26., No. 2. pp 210-231. Print.
20. Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva (2005). *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Print.
21. Henshall, Kenneth G. (1988). *A Guide to Remembering Japanese Characters*. Tokyo: Tuttle Publishing. Print.
22. Hock, Hans Henrich, and Brian D. Joseph (1996). *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. Print.
23. Hyde, Barbara (2002). *Japan's Emblematic English.* English Today, Vol. null, No. 3. pp 12-16. Print.
24. Irwin, Mark (2011). *Loanwords in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Print.
25. Kay, Gillian (1995). *English Loanwords in Japanese*. World Englishes, Vol. 14, No.1. pp 67-76. Print.
26. Kite, Yuriko (2001). *English/Japanese Codeswitching Among Students in an International High School*. Mary Goebel, and Sandra Fotos, eds. *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 312-328. Print.
27. Koscielecki, Marek (2006.). *Japanized English, Its Context and Socio-historical Background.* English Today, Vol. null, No. 4. pp 25-31. 2006. Print.
28. Loveday, Leo (1996). *Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: New York. Print.
29. MacGregor, Laura (2003). *The Language of Shop Signs in Tokyo.* English Today, Vol. null, No. 1. pp 18-23. Print.
30. Martin, Assunta (2004). *The 'Katakana' Effect and Teaching English in Japan.* English Today, Vol. null, No. 1. pp 50-55. Print.
31. Masayo, Yamamoto (2001). *Japanese Attitudes Towards Bilingualism: A Survey and Its Implications*. Noguchi, Mary Goebel, and Sandra Fotos, eds. *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 24-44. Print.
32. Matsuda, Aya (2000). *The Use of English Among Japanese Returnees.* English Today, Vol. 16, No. 4. pp 49-55. Print.

33. Miller, Roy Andrew (1971). *Japanese and the Other Altaic Languages*. Chicago: U of Chicago. Print.
34. Miller, Roy Andrew (1998). Review: *Language Contact in Japan: A Sociolinguistic History* by Leo J. Loveday. Journal of Japanese Studies, Vol. 24, No. 1. pp 208-212. Print.
35. Miura, Akira (1979). *The Influence of English on Japanese Grammar*. The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, Vol. 14, No. 1. pp 3-30. Print.
36. Noguchi, Mary Goebel (2001). *Introduction: The Crumbling of a Myth*. Noguchi, Mary Goebel, and Sandra Fotos, eds. *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1-23. Print.
37. Noguchi, May Goebel (2001). *Bilinguality and Bicultural Children in Japan: A Pilot Survey of Factors Linked to Active English-Japanese Bilingualism*. Noguchi, Mary Goebel, and Sandra Fotos, eds. *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 234-271. Print.
38. Seeley, Christopher (1991). *A History of Writing in Japan*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991. Print.
39. Shibatani, Masayoshi (1990). *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Print.
40. Stanlaw, James (1992). *Japanese Pidgin English*. 3McArthur, Tom, ed. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 543-544. Print.
41. Stanlaw, James (1998). Review: *Language Contact in Japan: A Sociolinguistic History* by Leo J. Loveday. Language, Vol. 74, No. 2. pp 395-397. Print.
42. Stanlaw, James (2004). *Japanese English Language and Culture Contact*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong UP. Print.
43. Thomason, Sarah Grey (2001). *Language Contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP. Print.
44. Twine, Nannette (1983). *The Adoption of Punctuation in Japanese Script*. Visible Language, Issue 18.3. Print.
45. Weinreich, Uriel (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and Problems.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. Print.
46. Winford, Donald (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Print.
47. Winter-Froemel, Esme (2008). *Studying Loanwords and Loanword Integration: Two Criteria of Conformity*. Web. URL: http://www.ncl.ac.uk/linguistics/assets/documents/11.Esme_ Winter-Froemel-FT.pdf

48. *Goo Kokugo Jisho* (goo 国語辞書) 'goo Japanese dictionary'. Web. URL: http://dictionary. goo.ne.jp/jn/
49. *Tanoshī Japanese* (楽しい JAPANESE) 'Pleasant Japanese' (a dictionary site hosting EDICT and KANJIDIC dictionary files). Web. URL: http://www.tanoshii japanese.com/home/