

Научная статья

5.9.8. Теоретическая, прикладная и сравнительно-сопоставительная лингвистика

УДК 81'272

EDN MVW0EU

<https://doi.org/10.34216/1998-0817-2024-30-3-164-174>

ЯЗЫК ТОТАЛИТАРИЗМА: НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА В ФАШИСТСКОЙ ИТАЛИИ И МИЛИТАРИСТСКОЙ ЯПОНИИ

Погорецкая Ольга Андреевна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры романских языков им. Т.З. Черданцевой, Московский государственный институт международных отношений (МГИМО), Москва, Россия, o.pogoretskaya@inno.mgimo.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1216-5083>

Панченко Юрий Юрьевич, старший преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков Высшей школы международных отношений и мировой политики, Нижегородский государственный лингвистический университет, Нижний Новгород, Россия, panyurij@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7441-0323>

Аннотация. Когда речь идет о создании мощной идеологии, язык в руках властей становится инструментом для консолидации нации. Фашистская Италия и милитаристская Япония являются яркими примерами использования языка как средства объединения людей во имя провозглашенных новых ценностей и идеалов. В данной статье предпринимается попытка анализа языковой политики обеих стран в период тоталитарного режима: от первоначального желания объединить жителей страны новым порядком под эгидой единой нации посредством языка до открытой враждебности к любым проявлениям неоднородности, в частности к территориальным диалектам, до открытой борьбы против любых иностранных слов, даже тех, которые уже прочно укоренились или закрепились в языке. Авторы ставят перед собой задачу проследить, какие изменения произошли в итальянском и японском языках, когда новые партии пришли к власти со своей идеологией, а также проанализировать, в какой степени языковые политики Италии и Японии первой половины двадцатого века схожи и в какой степени они различаются. Кроме того, рассматриваются итоги проведенной в обеих странах рестриктивной языковой политики после окончания Второй мировой войны.

Ключевые слова: языковая автаркия, итальянский язык, язык фашизма, итальянизация, языковая политика, фашистская Италия, милитаристская Япония, диалекты.

Для цитирования: Погорецкая О.А., Панченко Ю.Ю. Язык тоталитаризма: национальная языковая политика в фашистской Италии и милитаристской Японии // Вестник Костромского государственного университета. 2024. Т. 30, № 3. С. 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.34216/1998-0817-2024-30-3-164-174>

Research Article

LANGUAGE OF TOTALITARIANISM: NATIONAL LINGUISTIC POLICY IN FASCIST ITALY AND MILITARIST JAPAN

Olga A. Pogoretskaya, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of Cherdantseva Department of Romance Languages, Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO University), Moscow, Russia, o.pogoretskaya@inno.mgimo.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1216-5083>

Yury Yu. Panchenko, Senior Lecturer, Chair of Foreign Languages, Higher School of International Relations and World Politics, Linguistics University of Nizhny Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia, panyurij@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7441-0323>

Abstract. When it comes to creating a notorious ideology, in the hands of those in power, language becomes a tool for consolidating a nation. Fascist Italy and militarist Japan are prime examples of the use of language as a means of uniting people in the name of proclaimed “new” values and ideals. In the present article the authors provide a detailed analysis of language policy in both countries: from the initial desire to unite the inhabitants of the country with the proclaimed order under the aegis of a single nation by means of language, to open hostility to any manifestations of heterogeneity, in particular to regional dialects or dialectal variants of the literary national language, to an open struggle against loan words, even those that had already been firmly established or consolidated in the domestic language. The study attempts to trace what changes happened to Italian and Japanese languages when intransigent parties had come to power with their ideologies; to analyze to what extent the language policies of Italy and Japan in the 1st half of the 20th century are similar and to what extent they differ; and we also summarise the results of such restrictive language policies after the World War II resulted in the said politicians’ defeat.

Keywords: linguistic autarky, Italian language, language of fascist Italy, italianisation, language policy, fascist Italy, militarist Japan, dialects.

For citation: Pogoretskaya O.A., Panchenko Yu.Yu. Language of totalitarianism: national linguistic policy in fascist Italy and militarist Japan. *Vestnik of Kostroma State University*, 2024, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 164–174 (In English.). <https://doi.org/10.34216/1998-0817-2024-30-3-164-174>

Introduction

The first half of the XX century knew the boom of totalitarian regimes in the world. One of the most notorious examples are Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Militarist Japan, who formed the Axis countries during the Second World War. Despite of certain peculiarities and differences of the regime in each of these countries, they shared among others such things as the total participation of the government in the lives of the population, the cult of the leader, high importance of the militarist values and the extreme nationalism. It is obvious that such attention given to the national pride and superiority, often resulted in the severe propaganda, could not leave the national language aside from the political goals of the regime.

Just having emerged from a difficult but victorious war, a new Italian regime presented itself on the political horizon of the country safeguarding and exalting the moral values of the Nation. Many Italians accepted Mussolini's totalitarian regime in the name of national pride and anticommunism.

The principal ideology towards the language was to establish linguistic autarky. The regime wanted to use linguistic uniformity to strengthen centrist sentiment and popular approval. The language policy pursued by the Fascists was to create a one-size-fits-all norm, to give homogeneity to all local colloquialisms. A common language was to cement the process of national cohesion [Foresti: 11-26], thus becoming one of the core means not only to achieve the mutual intelligibility throughout the country but also fostering the nationalistic ideology.

Slightly different processes were going in Japan, where the progressive reforms of the new government in the Meiji period (1868-1912), which had the goal to make Japanese society closer to the Western values and ideologies, resulted in heavy debates between progressive and conservative parts of intellectual elite. The questions concerning the language policy, e.g. the reduction of characters used in writing or the need for the unified standard language, gave birth to vigorous discussions and important measures (taken or not taken) by the new government.

The imposition of the newly created standard language to unify the country where people in different regions spoke their own dialects, sometimes practically mutually incomprehensible, contributed to the shaping of the new Japanese identity. The rise of the ultraconservative wave in 1930s and its culmination

in 1940s also resulted in nation's further cohesion, contributing to the development of ultraconservative linguistic ideologies and strengthening the Japanese linguistic nationalism.

It can be seen that Italy and Japan in the beginning of the XX century, and more precisely, before the Second World War, had some common points which influenced the ideologies towards the national language. That is why the aim of the present article is to compare the language ideologies in Fascist Italy (1922-1945) and Militarist Japan (1920-1945), with special attention to the decades of the 1930s and 1940s which turned to be the culmination of totalitarianism in both countries. It is not frequent to compare these two regimes in linguistic research, so we hope that such an attempt will be useful to understand the methods of shaping of the ideology towards language issues in totalitarian regimes.

Various aspects of language policy in Japan were treated in the works of V. Alpatov (2003) and L. Vasiljeva (2018), who analyzed the most important language reforms conducted in the Japan of XIX-XX centuries. A. Meshherjakov (2014) made a thorough investigation on the social life and ideology during the militarist era. For a detailed information of the linguistic peculiarities of the Japanese of that period we have recurred to the works of such Japanese scholars, as S. Araki (2004), C. Kato (2016), S. Okamoto (2004), A. Tanaka (2007), T. Yamana (2014), K. Yamaguchi (1989), who considered different aspects concerning language reforms in Japan of various periods.

Basing on the results of these studies, we have attempted to conduct a comparative analysis of language reforms in Italy and Japan under the seemingly similar totalitarian regimes, focusing on underlying ideologies towards the national language.

1. The case of Italy

1.1. Emerging of fascist language ideology

From a linguistic point of view, Fascism is of great interest because the regime intended to "discipline" the Italian language, which in fact meant its complete reform. The intentions were very wide-ranging: in addition to controlling the national language - its distribution, teaching and use - the new language policy had to have a radical impact on dialects, especially in foreign-speaking regions, and to eradicate borrowings from other languages.

Language within the regime was extremely important; it was a tool for achieving nationalist cohesion. The global goal of the entire language policy of the Fascist

era was to spread the Italian language as a symbol of unification and nationalism. By the beginning of the twentieth century, such a need was indeed urgent, since most Italians spoke mainly in dialect. The literacy rate was low, and the lower social classes had no access to books, newspapers, or any other source of literate Italian (so it is not surprising that the inhabitants of different regions of Italy spoke virtually different languages).

Thus, along with abolishing the handshake and replacing it with the Roman salute, the regime tried to control the language and its use. The justification for lexico-grammatical changes in the language was socio-ideological. For example, the replacement of the polite address to “you” – “Lei”- by the “voi”¹ form was explained as follows: the “Lei” address was a remnant of the servile of Italians towards foreign invaders.

The unification of the Italian language, or rather its spoken version, became possible thanks to the spread of mass communication media - radio, cinema, television. The unified literate Italian language became a kind of a cornerstone of the regime. We can distinguish three main vectors in which the language policy was conducted:

1) working to unify and codify the Italian language, which would become a single language for all Italian citizens,

2) the fight against borrowing (replacement of foreign terms),

3) Italianization of everything from surnames² (non-Italian) to toponyms (especially in the regions of Alto Adige, Piemonte e Valle d’Aosta).

Let us consider these directions in more detail in the main part.

1.2. Language - a tool for nation unity. Mussolini’s oratory as a starting point for a systematic language policy

The fascist conception of language relied heavily on the oratorical skills of Benito Mussolini. His manner contained diverse elements: socialist vocabulary, dannunzianism, sententiousness, active gesticulation [Desideri, 1984].

The main idea that Mussolini proclaimed was the struggle for “purezza dell’idioma patrio”³ [Mussolini 1931]. His speeches were oriented towards public appearances “in piazza”, communicating with the crowd. As a consequence, the syntax was simplified - a minimum of subordinate clauses, frequent two- and threefold repetitions, slogan-like expressions and forms. We suggest a few such expressions.

1) Twofold structure:

– The model “who ... , is ...”:

Chi si ferma, è perduto.

Chi osa, vince.

Chi non è con noi, è contro di noi.

– the “either ... or ...” model:

O l’amicizia preziosa o l’ostilità durissima.

O Fascismo o antifascismo.

– two free homogeneous elements:

si tiene duro e si dura. (impersonal construction)

molti nemici, molto onore! (nouns)

Ricordare e prepararsi (infinitives)

rinunciare alla lotta significa rinunciare alla vita.

2) Threefold structure:

La Patria è la più grande, la più umana, la più pura delle realtà.

Crede obbedire combattere.

vivere è la lotta, il rischio, la tenacia.

La libertà non è un diritto. è un dovere! Non è una elargizione. è una conquista! Non è una uguaglianza. è un privilegio!

Such forms of communication with the electorate, as in modern political discourse, are aimed at maximum direct communication. The power in the person of the leader of the fascist party B. Mussolini again turned to the genre of “slogan” due to the dynamism of this form. Subsequently, many fragments of the Fascist leader’s speeches spread in the form of graffiti [Desideri 1998], which once again confirmed the communicative success of slogan forms as one of the ways of speech impact on the voter.

1.3. The first reforms and the beginning of the fight against dialects

Before the Fascist Party came to power, language teaching was carried out in the most classical way possible, often in isolation from the linguistic reality of the peninsula. The fear of “compromising” some of the rules of the Italian language led to the fact that teaching was reduced to the teaching of the “book” norm; there was no question of teaching the literary language in the form of “as spoken”, because the linguistic norm varied greatly.

This state of affairs did not suit the regime, which led to a desire to influence the linguistic picture of the world of the “new people” already since childhood. This aspiration was reflected in a number of language reforms of the 20s-30s of the twentieth century.

The first major reform was the language reform known as the “Giovanni Gentile reform” [Gentile 1922] in 1923. This Italian philosopher and intellectual saw the reform of the Italian language as an extremely positive transformation: a large-scale language reform would be an opportunity to “organize” the Italian language, to make it more literary and, most importantly, to get rid of the clogging of foreign words (the course of “Italianization of Italian”). The teaching of Italian at school level was to be conducted according to the concept of “dal dialetto alla lingua”. It should be noted that dialect was used in schools at that time for didactic purposes - it was often used to teach literary Italian, because often even primary school teachers themselves did not speak literate Italian (supra-regional language).

Gentile's reform presupposed a relaxed attitude towards dialects; it was based on the desire to codify and spread the literary norm rather than to fight against dialects as such. However, already from 1925 the attitude to dialects became sharply negative. The dialectal variant of Italian was seen as an obstacle on the way to a unified national language. They tried to eradicate dialect from teaching in every possible way, which was quite a challenge. Since 1929, uniform textbooks have appeared for all schools in the country. An example of such an aid is *Almanacchi*, a series of books through which, in addition to the didactic task of transferring the population from dialect to a united Italian language, the regime sought to ideologically "model" the younger generation.

The fascist regime began actively curbing the use of dialects in the public sphere. By 1933, dialects had been forced out of school classrooms throughout Italy and were banned from any periodical press. Politicians and intellectuals supported the call for linguistic uniformity throughout Italy and showed zero tolerance for regional diversity. By 1933, the use of dialect, even for didactic purposes, had become unacceptable.

Reforms are also carried out at the level of institutions. In 1929, the *Accademia d'Italia*, the main regime body for culture in the country, began to operate. It was to this *Accademia* that Mussolini, in 1934, assigned the task of editing a "complete and updated" *Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Of course, this version of the dictionary was based on the regime's precepts: the language must reflect new ideas (while still being relatively flexible with regard to borrowings). In 1931 the infamous "Giuramento di fedeltà al Fascismo" (Oath of Fascist Allegiance) took place - all Italian university professors were obliged by royal decree and upon pain of dismissal to swear allegiance to the Fascist Party.

Thus, a gradual "fascistizzazione" of the Italian language took place. Although the attitude of the Fascist leadership towards the public use of the dialect was at times multifaceted and sometimes even openly contradictory, it can still be said that the regime discouraged - and later officially condemned - the public use, promotion and publication of the dialect. The aim of the Fascist regime was to expunge the dialect from the public sphere in the name of the Aryan nature of Italians and their national language, what researchers would later call the "dialettobia of the government" [Cortelazzo 1984: 107-116]. There was a shift towards a Fascist intellectual and cultural orthodoxy.

1.4. Mass communication media as a way to influence the speech behavior of citizens

The dictatorship counted on the potential of mass communication media, which it wanted to use in time for political purposes. Control over the mass media was a pillar of the dictatorship.

Real "campaigns" were carried out in the press: the Ministry of Popular Culture - *Minculpop* - carried out orders to broadcast news and to keep silent about what news, how and in what epithets to present this or that information. Official information instructions were sent to daily and periodicals, which had to be strictly observed.

With the help of the *Istituto Luce*, the fascist regime also planned a strict control of cinemas, not just the press. Thus, the problem of cadence, tone, diction arose. The Fascist linguistic policy was centered on the elimination of any matrix that obscured the purity of the regime; in this regard, diction also had to be uniform. The first school of diction was established in the 1930s in Rome, and a pronunciation based on Roman speech rules was imposed, ousting the previous Tuscan rules.

Among the various measures to preserve the purity of the language, mention should be made of the institution of film dubbing from 1932, which was aimed at spreading the production nationwide [Gualdo 2019]. Most American films were dubbed by Italian-Americans who had a generic knowledge of the Italian language, which consequently included mistakes, from pronunciation that differed from the real one to semantic errors. Therefore, in order to hinder the import and consumption of foreign films in Italy, the government, with Decree-Law 261 of 5 October 1933, decided that any foreign film, in order to be shown in Italy, had to be dubbed into Italian within Italian territory.

The main efforts of the Fascist regime's language policy were still directed at the campaign against "foreignness" (*forestierismi*, *barbarismi*, *esotismi*).

Language "protectionism" and active oppression of foreign words began actively in 1923. The starting point was the introduction of a signboard tax on 11 February 1923: if an exotism was indicated on the signboard, the tax was increased fourfold. Such propaganda was primarily aimed at drawing attention to the language as a national pride. In 1937, the Ministry of Press and Propaganda was transformed into the Ministry of Popular Culture, later known as *Minculpop*, which had more freedom in setting taxes. Already in 1938, the tax on exports (decree of 1923) increased 25 times, thus forcing everyone to submit to the total Italianization: "il Touring Club Italiano" became "la Consociazione Turistica Italiana", "Standard" supermarkets became "la Standa", the Milan football team "Internazionale" was already called "Ambrosiana" from 1928.

Propaganda in the name of "Italianness" and patriotic spirit became an instrument more powerful than laws. From 1926, articles in defense of the national language appeared in the *Nuova Antologia*, which promoted the idea of "bonifica linguistica", a kind of linguistic sanitation.

In the thirties, full-scale work on the "Italianization of the Italian language" is carried out throughout the

Kingdom. In 1931 in the Florentine magazine “Scena illustrate” appeared the column “Difendiamo la lingua italiana”, and in 1932 in the Roman newspaper “La Tribuna” a competition was announced for those who would propose the best way to replace 50 loanwords with words of Italian origin. In 1933 Paolo Monelli started to write a column “Una parola al giorno” in the Turin daily newspaper “la Gazzetta del Popolo”. The articles for this column were later collected in a book, *Barbaro dominio*, also known as “Processo a 500 parole esotiche” (1933). The book deals with the rejection of loanwords that have “endangered” the “purity” of the Italian language. The book quotes Niccolò Machiavelli: “le lingue non possono esser semplici, ma conviene che sieno miste con l'altre lingue. Ma quella lingua si chiama d'una patria, la quale convertisce i vocaboli ch'ella ha accattati da altri nell'uso suo, et è sì potente che i vocaboli accattati non la disordinano, ma ella disordina loro: perché quello ch'ella reca da altri lo tira a sé in modo che par suo” [Castellani Pollidori: 243].

Paolo Monelli condemned Frenchisms, for the most part, but only because they were more widespread. Instead, he admitted only a few English-language terms. The Anglo-Saxon terms allowed were: bar, bartender, sport, jazz, picnic, snob; sex-appeal and girl (they were deemed suitable to refer to militant women within variety shows).

The words condemned by Monelli, complete with examples of terms to be used in Italian, were:

Film = Pellicola; Clown = Pagliaccio; Match = Partita; Star = Stella; Toast = Crostino; Club = Circolo; Detective = Investigatore; Game = Gioco; Budget = Bilancio.

Other prominent personalities supporting this linguistic trend include Gabriele D'Annunzio (tramezzino - sandwich, slogans for Mussolini); Bruno Migliorini, founder of the magazine *Lingua nostra* (1939), who advocated replacing the French “regisseur” and “chaffeur” with the Italianized “regista” and “autista”.

All this was encouraged by the regime. There was also an increase in negative sentiment towards foreign languages with the Proclamation of Autarchy and preparations for the invasion of Ethiopia. Speaking a language other than Italian, the “language of the enemy”, was perceived as a kind of treason.

Even more severe restrictions began to be imposed with the outbreak of the Second World War. The law of 23 December 1940 (n. 2042) prohibited the use of foreign words in official documents, posters, shop signs, with fines of up to five thousand lire, and arrest for up to six months. At the same time, the Accademia dei Lincei became part of the Royal Italian Academy, which was to monitor exotisms and edit a dictionary of the Italian language. The first volume (A-C) was published in 1941; it was also the last one due to the fall of the Fascist

regime. From 1940 to 1942 there was a commission for the “Italianness of the language” (“per l'italianità della lingua”).

It was in charge of drawing up lists of forbidden words with various bulletins indicating the translations. Most of the terms were French: “hôtel” was replaced by “albergo”, “grand hôtel” by “albergo imperiale”, “garage” became “autorimessa”, “papillon” - “farfallino” or “cravattino”. At the end there were about 1 500 words replaced by Italian ones and, coming to the Anglicisms: “bar” was replaced with “mescita” or “qui si beve”, “dancing” with “sala danze”, “danzatoio” or “balleria” and among the other banned words were “alcohol” (“alcole”), “boy scout” (“giovane esploratore”), “cyclostyle” (“ciclostilo”), “extra-strong” (“extra-forte”), “film” (“pellicola”), gangster (malfattore), pullman (torpedone, corriera, autocorriera), “pullover” (“maglione”), “sandwich” (“tramezzino”), “smoking” (“giacca da sera”), “toast” (“pane tostato” and “pantosto”). Among the permitted forestierisms, however, were words also used in the regime's writings such as “film” (until the 1930s in the feminine, 'la film'), “sport” or “camion”, and even in the dictionary of the Reale Accademia some forestierisms can be found, e.g. “clown”, albeit distinguished by italics and flanked by the Italian “pagliaccio”.

2. The case of Japan

2.1. Language reforms in the Westernizing Japan

The second half of the 19th century in Japan marked the beginning of a new era in Japanese history - the Meiji era (1868-1912), associated with the end of more than two centuries of the country's isolation under the military government - the shogunate - and the restoration of imperial power. The new government, recognizing Japan's backwardness compared to the contemporary Western states, embarked on a course of full-scale transformation of all aspects of Japanese society following the Western model.

Within the processes of Westernization and Europeanization in Japanese society, there were also active processes of language reform. As it is pointed out in [Alpatov 2003; Tanaka 2007], one of the most pressing problems at the beginning of the Meiji era was the discrepancy between the written literary norm, based on the classical Japanese language (*bungo*), and the spoken vernacular used in everyday life. The classical literary language did not match the massive modernization undertaken by the new government and therefore had to be reformed. There were even suggestions, such as completely switching to English as the language of the new era (proposed by Mori Arinori), or to accelerate the education of the Japanese population by completely abandoning the ideographic writing system in favor of a syllabic alphabet or Roman letters (*romaji*). Such radical projects were not implemented; however, they

laid the groundwork for further discussions on issues such as limiting the number of ideograms and their systematization, or developing methods to improve the transcription of the Japanese language.

As part of discussions on the need to create a common literary language based on the spoken vernacular, the movement for unifying written and spoken languages - *genbun itchi* - emerged. In 1902, under the Ministry of Education, a special commission for the study of the national language (*Kokugo chōsa iinkai*) was established, which among its tasks, designated the study of existing Japanese dialects with the goal of selecting a dialectal basis for creating an official standard language intended for dissemination among the Japanese population. Due to the capital nature of Tokyo, as well as the comprehensibility of the Tokyo dialect to residents of other regions, the speech of the educated population of Tokyo was chosen as the basis for the new literary - standard - language (*hyo:jungo*).

The introduction of the standard language was carried out mainly through the educational system with school textbooks being published in it [Vasiljeva 2018]. Also, teachers were to use the standard language in the classroom and discourage the children from using their local dialect. It was also the language for the radio broadcasting that has been going on since 1925. There was formed the societal norm that announcers' speech should be the standard language, and standard language workshops, organized or supported by broadcasting stations and involving announcers and educators, were held in various places [Tanaka: 97].

However, the movement to spread standard language, pursued under the centralized or totalitarian social system of the time, also had the aspect of aiming to eliminate and erase dialects, treating them as bad or shameful language. Especially in schools, this led to tragic incidents related to human rights, such as encouraging the reporting of peers who spoke in dialect, and based on such reports, forcing them to wear "dialect tags" around their necks. Shibata Takeshi even introduces the special term "dialect complex" - aversion to the dialect of one's own area, which evoked traumatic childhood memories [Shibata 1999]. Such a complex led not only to psychological discomfort among the post-war generation of Japanese, but even provoked suicides.

Such imposition of a standard language with the simultaneous eradication of local dialects, which intensified during militarist and wartime, in addition to solving exclusively communication problems, served the purpose of creating the unity of the nation and fits quite organically into the concept of *kokutai* "the body of the state", which determines the political life of militarist Japan. According to its militarist interpretation, the population of Japan is a single nation, united by a single Japanese spirit, headed by the sacred figure of

the emperor [Meshherjakov 2014]. The expression of the Japanese spirit was to be a single Japanese language. That is why one of the goals of creating the standard Japanese language was to solve the educational problem in the occupied territories. The population of occupied Korea, Taiwan and other territories, in order to become familiar with the Japanese spirit, had to study the Japanese language, which was introduced into the school education system of the respective countries [Yamaguchi 1989]. In this situation, when the standard language is at the same time the embodiment of the spirit of the nation, it is difficult to imagine a tolerant attitude towards dialects that deviate from the norm promoted by the militarist state.

The work of the Commission for the Study of the National Language and its successor in 1921, the Temporary Commission for the Study of the National Language (*Rinji kokugo chōsa kai*), was not limited exclusively to the issue of creating and disseminating the standard language, *hyo:jungo*. For example, they considered the possibilities of transitioning from syllabic writing to phonetic writing, as well as reforms of orthography and the ideographic system of the Japanese language.

2.2. Far-right criticism of the new reforms

It should be noted that the ongoing or only proposed language reforms also caused rejection from conservative groups of the population. With the strengthening of far-right, nationalist tendencies in Japanese society, which has emerged since the 1920s and reached its apogee in the 1930s, reform movements associated with Westernization began to be perceived extremely negatively, and their leaders could be persecuted.

For example, proposals to limit the use of characters, put forward since the end of the 19th century, were perceived with hostility by Japanese conservatives. For instance, plans by the Ministry of Education to limit the number of characters used, and the introduction of corresponding character minimums, undertaken by the Ministry of Education in the 1920s and 1930s, met a constant resistance from the opposition movement, led by nationalists and right-wing parties [Tanaka 2007]. Therefore, the developed drafts of the character minimums presented by the Temporary Commission in 1923 and 1931 were not put into use. The Great Kanto Earthquake on September 1, 1923 and the events in Manchuria in 1931 can also be considered as other reasons that influenced the postponement of their introduction.

The transition from syllabic writing to phonetic writing, which was advocated already at the end of the 19th century by representatives of the so-called "Romanization movement" and the possibilities of which were even considered by the Commission for the Study of the National Language, became one of the symbols of the previously carried out Westernization in the era of

increasing militarism [Tanaka 2007]. Saito Hideo, who led the magazine “Moji to Gengo” (Characters and Language) and worked on the spread of Roman letters and Esperanto, was arrested for the first time in 1939 by the Special Higher Police (thought police), and after being arrested three times, he died in 1940 due to exhaustion from prison life. In 1938, the “Left-wing Romanization Incident” occurred, where many advocates of Romanization, including Teru Takakura, Masao Hirai, and Reizo Kito, as well as students from the Waseda University Romanization Club, were arrested as anti-nationalists.

2.3. Far-right attitude towards loan words

Of particular interest is the question of the attitude towards loanwords in the Japanese language during the period of militarization. Along with Westernization carried out during the Meiji era, a stream of new concepts poured into the country. In order to express these concepts in Japanese at first new words were composed from Chinese roots. The defeat of China in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895 and the collapse of the Qing dynasty in 1911 ended Chinese influence on Japanese reality.

At the same time, the process of constructing new words from Chinese roots to reflect new concepts was replaced by direct borrowings of words from Western languages (primarily English). Another reason for this was the difficulties in differentiating and understanding of the words constructed from Chinese roots. The flow of loanwords intensified even more during the years of “Taisho democracy” (1912-1925) [Loveday 1996]. These processes led to a significant increase of the number words of foreign (non-Chinese) origin – *gairaigo* - in the lexical system of the Japanese language.

However, the situation changed radically with the strengthening of nationalist tendencies in Japanese society in the 1930s. Words borrowed from European languages started to be perceived as alien to Japanese society and proposals were made to replace them with Japanese equivalents.

For example, there was a well-known controversy regarding the words “papa” (“father”) and “mama” (“mother”), which were widespread among the Tokyo middle class and Tokyo nobility in 1930s and for which there were equivalents in the standard language: “*oto:san*” and “*oka:san*” respectively. The use of the words “papa” and “mama” began to be ridiculed as a sign of “white collar” (*haikara shumi*) culture and a manifestation of a Western touch (*seiyo: kabure*). By the mid-30s, and then in wartime, these words fell out of use due to growing nationalist sentiments, but returned to Japanese speech again in the 1950s [Tanaka 2007].

Negative rejection of foreign loanwords (*gairaigo*) was also accompanied by a deterioration in the attitude towards the English language as a whole. On one hand, Japanese English language teachers saw teaching English

as a way to introduce Japanese citizens to world culture. For example, Ichikawa Mikio, in the article “On the Issue of the English Department,” strongly opposes the “banning of the English language.”: “We English teachers are striving under all adversities to advance our country's culture through English and to provide our fellow citizens with the dignity of being global citizens.” [Araki: 65].

On the other hand, in 1931, the Manchurian Incident occurred, followed by the Shanghai Incident in 1932, propelling Japan into war, and English transitioned from being an “enemy language” to a “language of the enemy nations.” By 1931, English class hours in middle schools were reduced, and around 1935, English departments in girls' schools became elective or were abolished. America and Britain were labeled as “demonic beasts,” and textbook descriptions praising the US and Britain were banned, with city names and borrowings from English written in *katakana* (a Japanese syllabary, which was used also for writing foreign words) being translated into Japanese.

The beginning of an active campaign against loanwords from “enemy languages” (*tekisei-go*) can be considered 1937, which became the unleashing of the Second Sino-Japanese War, in which China received support from the USA, the USSR and their allies. It should be noted that the term “enemy language” was not an official term but an expression of the increased fighting spirit that arose as a form of self-regulation by ordinary civilians and private organizations, backed by rising nationalism as the country headed toward war against Britain and the United States [Kato 2016].

According to [Tanaka 2007], the peak of the anti-foreign word campaigns was during the “*Eibei gekimetsu*” (“Annihilation of Britain and America”) period of the Pacific War (part of the World War II). The discussion on excluding foreign words during this period was advocated by right-wing groups and veterans' associations, spreading through the worlds of journalism and education, involving broadcasting and journalism, and eventually becoming a societal trend. “Enemy words” were not recommended for use in the media, where it was proposed to replace them with Japanese equivalents [Stanlaw 2004; Loveday 1996]. Such Japanese equivalents could be synonymous words of Japanese origin or composed of Chinese roots that had already functioned earlier (during the Meiji era) but were later supplanted by European borrowings. If such a “forgotten” word was not found, a new word could be created from Chinese roots.

Company names and signs saw the disappearance of words like “enjin” (engine), “gasorin” (gasoline), “kamera” (camera), which became “mechanism that starts a movement” (*hatsudo:ki*), “vaporizing oil” (*kihatsuyu*) and “mechanism for photos (*shashinki*) respectively.

Even baseball calls like “se:fu” (safe), “auto” (out), “sutoraiku” (strike), “bo:ru” (ball), “fau ru” (foul) were replaced with “good” (yoshi), “no good” (dame) to progress the games. Some sports also were renamed, e.g. “volleyball” became “pressing ball” (haikyū:), “golf” became “beating ball” (dakyū:), etc.

In broadcast music programs, “baiorin” (violin), “ako:deon” (accordion) were changed to “teikin (Japanese koto), tefu:kin (hand harmonica)”, and terms like “sonata” (sonata), “serena:de” (serenade), “nokuta:n” (nocturne), “fu:ga” (fugue) were altered to “tune to be performed” (so:meikyoku), “small evening tune” (sayokyoku), “tune for night reflections” (yaso:kyoku) and “running and escaping tune” (tonso:kyoku). Even for the names of the music notes the wide-spread do, re, mi, fa etc. were substituted to the syllables of the Japanese traditional poem *Iroha-uta*, which is still used sometimes as a scale for enumerations [Tanaka 2007].

The whole names of companies also underwent changes. So, Japan Times became Nippon Times, Ko:rakuen Stadium became Ko:rakuen undōjo:, etc. Such journals as “Sande: mainichi” (Sunday everyday), “Economisuto” (Economist) and “Keizai magajin” (Economic magazine) became “Shu:kan mainichi”, “Keizai mainichi” and “Keizai Nippon”. An interesting example is that of the children magazine “Kinda: bukku” (Kinder book). Here the German “Kinder” was changed for the Japanese “Kodomo”, so the title of the magazine became “Mikuni no kodomo” (“Children of the country”).

The same thing happened with the names of educational institutions that contained foreign words [Kato 2016]: Wilmina Women Institute (Uwirumina jogakuin) became Osaka Women High School (Osaka jogakuin ko:to: jogakko:), Pool Women High School became Seisen Women High School. Furthermore, if the name of a school contained the word “English”, it also could be changed. In this manner the Institute for Research in English Teaching (Eigo kyo:ju kenkyo:jo) became the Institute for Research in Teaching Linguistics (Gogaku kyo:iku kenkyu:jo), Shizuoka English-Japanese Women School (Shizuoka Eiwa Jogakko:) became Seiryō Senior High School (Seiryō: Ko:to: Jogakko:). Sometimes the character 英 “ei” representing “England” and “English” was substituted by others that had the same pronunciation: 永 (To:yo: eiwa jogakko:) or 榮 (Yamanashi eiwa jogakko:).

The hostility towards English also took place in the field of proper nouns. People from the show business of the 1930s who had English-style names, due to the pressure of the times, hurriedly changed them to Japanese-style names [Kato 2016]. Many of them changed back to their real Japanese names. Such is the case of the singers Dick Mine and Miss Columbia

who went back to Koichi Mine and Masao Matsubara respectively. Some geographical names also were changed. An interesting example is that of “The Japanese Alps” - a series of mountain ranges that separate the Western and the Eastern Japan. Its Japanese name “Nihon arupusu” was replaced with “a mountain range of the Chubu Region” (Chu:bu sangaku).

To sum up, the substitutions of loanwords were carried on literally in every aspect of everyday life of the Japanese people. Even the widespread and familiar to everyone loanwords could be a target for criticism and a subsequent replacement. In the absence of any official decree abolishing the use of borrowed words in Japan and officially advocating for such a policy, an extremely high level of psychological and societal pressure that existed in Japan can be imagined.

However, since there was not any law banishing the use of loanwords, the rejection to replace them could not be legally penalized. Probably this is why even in the war-time there appeared some brands under English names: “nashonaru” (Matsumoto Electric) or “sha:pu” (Hasegawa Electric Plant). Also, as it is pointed out in [Yamana 2014], the abolishment of all loan words as practically impossible, because many of them had been already deeply rooted in the lexical system of Japanese.

Discussion

After having outlined the peculiarities of ultraconservative language ideologies which reigned in Fascist Italy and Military Japan, it is clear that in both countries there were going similar processes.

First of all, both in Italy and in Japan in the beginning of the XX century the principal language policy was marked with the expansion of the national (standard) language. The factitious extermination of dialects (or regional languages), their complete disregard was the condition for the national language to be absorbed by the population in both countries.

Secondly, in both countries language purism was actively implemented. It took form of the fight against borrowings. The loan words from the language spoken in “enemy countries” received strictly negative connotations. Therefore, the use of such words in both countries could be seen as the lack of patriotism. However, in Japan there had not been adopted any law banning loan words, the society regulated itself creating such a psychological climate where it would take certain bravery to keep using word borrowed from “the enemy languages”. In Italy

Italy has gone even further - legislative measures have been taken to reduce foreign words (with subsequent eradication). For example, an increased tax on signs containing foreign words contributed to the forced Italianization of signs and slogans.

However, it seems that such policies in Japan were less institutionalized that they were in Italy. We think this was due to a higher level of cohesion in Japanese society.

The importance of belonging to the group and, even more, to the country, emphasized in the theory of *kokutai* made it unnecessary to officially cement ultraconservative language ideologies.

It is also interesting to observe the fate of these ideologies after the fall of fascism in Italy and militarism in Japan. With the fall of both regimes, not all the changes that had been imposed on native speakers of Italian or Japanese have taken hold.

As for foreignisms, with the Liberation a new door opened, that of Anglo-Americanisms, which had already appeared during the twenty years of fascism. With the collapse of the fascism, along with the arrival of American soldiers, their language and culture also arrived in Italy, which, precisely as a reaction to fascism, in the following decades became identified with freedom and the American dream.

The same thing happened in Japan. After the loss in the Second World War Japan was occupied by the American Army and suddenly the country saw the close presence of phenomena related to American culture, which was associated to liberalism and democracy. With the new orientation towards the democracy and in the conditions of the post-war rebuilding a large number of borrowings from American English started to enter Japan. This trend continues up to nowadays [Alpatov 2003; Okamoto 2004].

Speaking of the results of the fight against loan words in Italy, it does not seem possible to say that it has worked, but neither can it be said that anything has taken root. Certainly, some proposals were successful, and during Fascism some words such as “registra” or “autista” were stabilized, or much of the sports terminology that in those days was predominantly English (“gol” for “rete”, “basketball” for “pallacanestro”). Many translations did not undermine the English equivalents, but still co-exist today as synonyms perhaps with a lower frequency, e.g. “scarto” (dribbling) or “scatto” (sprinting). In many other cases the substitutes did not work at all, sometimes not even during the regime, such as “mescita” for “bar”, “pallacorda” or “giuoco della racchetta” for “tennis”, “fiorellare” for “flirtare” (Panzini’s neologism) or “balleria” or “danzatoio” for “dancing”. At other times they worked in the fascist era only to regress later (“palla ovale”/ “rugby”). The answers are complex also because in the meantime language has evolved and meanings have changed: D’Annunzio’s “tramezzino” as an alternative to “sandwich” has become a very specific snack made with toast bread.

In the case of Japan, the equivalents proposed during the militarist years are still present in dictionaries. However, it does not mean that they are in active use nowadays. The major tendency seems to have been to go back to the loan words and renounce the equivalents. We suppose it was due to the strong association of these words

to the militarist and war time, which were incompatible with the new democratic orientation of Japan.

Sometimes it is not possible to establish whether the appearance of certain equivalents used in Fascist Italy was the direct consequence of fascist policy or not, and even drawing up lists of replacements and then counting what remained and what vanished would lead nowhere. Many alternatives circulated even before fascism, and according to Riccardo Tesi especially these were followed up [Tesi 2005].

In Japan also some equivalents already existed in the Japanese language before, however, without being in a broad use. Such is the case, e.g., of the objects that came to Japan from the West after the Meiji period and for whom there were created Japanese words out of Chinese routes (“camera” - *shashinki*). However, then with the appearance of the equivalent from the Western languages (primarily, English), a loan word of Western origin came into use (“camera” - *kamera*). So, in the militarist years there was no need to create out of nowhere a new word to name the “camera”, as the already existing (previously constructed) word of Chinese origin could be used.

Conclusion

As analyses of national language policy in Fascist Italy and militarist Japan have shown, there is a similar logic in both Western and Eastern culture on the part of the regime representatives. When it comes to creating a powerful ideology, in the hands of those in power, language becomes a tool for consolidating the nation. Language is used as a way to influence the worldview of its speakers. Under the pretext of linguistic unification and codification, the authorities use language as a means of safeguarding and exalting the moral values of the nation.

Language cannot be left out of a regime’s political objectives. The desire to unite the country under the aegis of “greatness”, “national identity”, to equalize all speakers and to suppress linguistic diversity within the country has resulted, both in Italy and Japan, in a desire to establish linguistic homogeneity.

In this regard, the processes of language regulation were very similar in both countries whose language policies were examined in this study. The similarity of these processes was also influenced by the similar initial linguistic situation in both countries: both Italy and Japan observed a great dialectal diversity, a dramatically smaller proportion of the population spoke a literary language, the literary language had a higher status, but given the total number of speakers, it did not diminish the dignity of dialect speakers, much less hinder them in their careers. But in order to unify the country where people in different regions spoke their own dialects, sometimes practically mutually incomprehensible, drastic measures were necessary. The expansion of the national (standard) language became a priority in the field of language policy.

The second global vector of language policy was language purism. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the world was changing and developing rapidly, and foreign words, primarily from English, were penetrating into Italian and Japanese - as well as other European and Oriental languages. However, in the wake of the politics of “exclusivity”, the promotion of “national pride” and “national consciousness”, the use of foreign words came to be seen as a manifestation of unpatriotism and led to substitutions of loanwords being carried on literally in every aspect of everyday life.

Such reforms were undoubtedly fueled by the developing mass media and public education. Newspapers and the radio contributed to the normalization of the new political trends towards the language, and educational reforms were aimed at unifying, consolidating society by erasing regional differences at the level of language.

When the war was lost, both Italy and Japan were greatly influenced by American culture and the English language as part of it (it was as if English had become the language of the victors). Prohibitionism certainly failed, as a method. And the policy against “il barbaro dominio” through repression and censorship is today the heaviest legacy of totalitarianism, linguistically speaking. In reaction, it has subsequently thrown the doors wide open to accept linguistic diversity, embracing the regional linguistic differences or welcoming borrowings from other languages, which sometimes can be seen as too extensive.

Примечания

¹ For this reason, despite the different meaning of the word, the magazine “Lei” became “Annabella”, since the lei had been abolished, but fortunately one could still speak of Galileo Galilei and not Galileo Galivoi, to quote a joke by Totò that earned him a later dismissed complaint.

² Fascist law provided for the Italianisation of a surname considered to be of Italian origin, without the consent of the person concerned. If, for example, the surname was clearly foreign, the process of rendering it into Italian was “optional” but “recommended”; however, if the person had decided to keep the surname of origin, he could also incur certain repercussions; this was the case if he held public office, suffering career blocks.

³ “Discorso su Tommaso Tittoni” written by Mussolini and pronounced in Parliament by Luigi Federzoni on March, 16, 1931.

Список литературы

Алтаов В.М. Япония: язык и общество. Москва: Муравей, 2003. 208 с.

Васильева Л.В. Языковая политика Японии с периода Мэйдзи до наших дней // Япония: 150 лет революции Мэйдзи. 2018. С. 630–637. (Вопросы японоведения, № 7).

Мещераков А.Н. Статья японцем. Топография тела и его приключений. Москва: Наталис, 2013. 432 с.

Araki S. Linguistic imperialism and teaching of foreign languages in Japan. («日本における英語帝国主義—英語帝国主義と外国語教育»). Bulletin of the Faculty of Communication of Gunma University, 2004, no. 21, pp. 53-72.

Ben-Ghiat R. Language and the Construction of National Identity in Fascist Italy. The European Legacy 2.3, 1997, pp. 438-443.

Castellani Pollidori O. Niccolò Machiavelli e il “Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua”, con una edizione critica del testo. Firenze, Olschki Publ., 1978, 243 p.

Cannistraro P.V. La fabbrica del consenso: fascismo e mass media. Roma, Bari, Laterza Publ., 1975, 123 p.

Cortelazzo M. Il dialetto sotto il fascismo. Movimento operaio e socialista, 1984, no. 1.7, pp. 107-116.

Desideri P. Teoria e prassi del discorso politico. Strategie persuasive e percorsi comunicativi. Bulzoni, Roma Publ., 1984, 232 p.

Desideri P. L'imperio del segno, ovvero la scritta murale fascista, in Ead. (a cura di), Il segno in scena. Scritte murali e graffiti come pratiche semio-linguistiche. Ancona, Mediateca delle Marche Publ., 1998, pp. 175-223.

Enciclopedia Treccani. URL: [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-del-fascismo_\(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-del-fascismo_(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano)) (дата обращения: 29.07.2024).

Foresti F. Credere, obbedire, combattere. Il regime linguistico nel Ventennio, Bologna, Pendragon (1^a ed. La lingua italiana e il fascismo, Bologna, Consorzio provinciale pubblica lettura, 1977), 2003, 325 p.

Gentile G. The Reform of Education. New York, Harcourt Publ., Brace and Company Publ., 1922, 250 p.

Gualdo R. Gli accoppiamenti maliziosi. Scambi e contatti di lingua e altro, tra italiane e inglesi. Franco Cesati Editore Publ., 2019, 123 p.

Kato C. Teacher Chikara's language ecology. (“ちから教授のコトバ生態学.”). Nagoya, Chunichi-bunka Publ., 2016, 230 p.

Klein G. “L'italianità della lingua” e l'Accademia d'Italia. Sulla politica linguistica fascista. Quaderni storici, 1981, vol. 16.47, no. 2, pp. 639-675.

Loveday L. Language contact in Japan a socio-linguistic history. Oxford, New York, 1996, 235 p.

Mussolini B. 1931. URL: <https://www.adamoli.org/benito-mussolini/pag0473-.htm> (дата обращения: 29.07.2024).

Okamoto S. Receptivity and Language Management of Foreign Words from the Language Policy Viewpoint. («外来語の受容と管理 : 言語政策の視点から»). Journal of Hokkaido Bunkyo University, 2004, no. 5, pp. 51-63.

Shibata T., Tetsuya K., Inoue F., Long D. 10. The Rise and Fall of Dialects. Sociolinguistics in Japanese Contexts. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter Publ., 1999, pp. 183-206.

Stanlaw J. Japanese English: Language and culture contact. Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press Publ., 2004, 388 p.

Tanaka A. Japanese in movement. (“揺れ動く二ホン語”). Tokyo, Tokyodo Publ., 2007, 276 p.

Tesi R. Storia dell'italiano. La lingua moderna e contemporanea (Bologna, Zanichelli, 2005), M. Fanfani. LINGUA NOSTRA. STAMPA, LXIX, 2008, pp. 123-125.

Yamaguchi K. Problems Concerning Modernization and the Japanese Language: from “Japanese” as the National Language to “Japanese” as a Language of the Human Race. («近・現代化とことばの問題 : 日本語(邦語), 国語から人間のことばの一つとしての日本語へ»). Ritsumeikan Bunka Kenkyu, 1989, no. 1, pp. 25-45.

Yamana T. Reconsidering loan words. («外来語再考»). Bulletin of Tsukuba International University, 2014, no. 20, pp. 19-24.

References

Alpatov V.M. *Yaponija: jazyk i obshchestvo* [Japan: language and society]. Moscow, Muravej Publ., 2003, 208 p.

Meshherjakov A.N. *Stat' japoncem. Topografija tela i ego prikljuchenija* [Become Japanese. Topography of the body and its adventures]. Moscow, Natalis Publ., 2014, 432 p.

Vasiljeva L.V. *Jazykovaja politika Japonii s perioda Mejdzi do nashih dnei* [Language policy in Japan from the Meiji period to nowadays]. *Voprosy japonovedenija* [Issues of Japanology], 2018, pp. 630-637. (Japonija: 150 let revoljucii Mejdzi [Japan: 150 years since the Meiji revolution, no. 7]).

Araki S. Linguistic imperialism and teaching of foreign languages in Japan. («日本における英語帝国主義—英語帝国主義と外国語教育»). Bulletin of the Faculty of Communication of Gunma University, 2004, no. 21, pp. 53-72.

Ben-Ghiat R. Language and the Construction of National Identity in Fascist Italy. *The European Legacy* 2.3, 1997, pp. 438-443.

Castellani Pollidori O. Niccolò Machiavelli e il “Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua”, con una edizione critica del testo. Firenze, Olschki Publ., 1978, 243 p.

Cannistraro P.V. *La fabbrica del consenso: fascismo e mass media*. Roma, Bari, Laterza Publ., 1975, 123 p.

Cortelazzo M. *Il dialetto sotto il fascismo. Movimento operaio e socialista*, 1984, no. 1.7, pp. 107-116.

Desideri P. *Teoria e prassi del discorso politico. Strategie persuasive e percorsi comunicativi*. Bulzoni, Roma Publ., 1984, 232 p.

Desideri P. *L'imperio del segno, ovvero la scritta murale fascista*, in Ead. (a cura di), *Il segno in scena. Scritte murali e graffiti come pratiche semio-linguistiche*. Ancona, Mediateca delle Marche Publ., 1998, pp. 175-223.

Enciclopedia Treccani. URL: [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-del-fascismo_\(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-del-fascismo_(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano)) (дата обращения: 29.07.2024).

Foresti F. *Credere, obbedire, combattere. Il regime linguistico nel Ventennio*, Bologna, Pendragon (1^a ed. *La lingua italiana e il fascismo*, Bologna, Consorzio provinciale pubblica lettura, 1977), 2003, 325 p.

Gentile G. *The Reform of Education*. New York, Harcourt Publ., Brace and Company Publ., 1922, 250 p.

Gualdo R. *Gli accoppiamenti maliziosi. Scambi e contatti di lingua e altro, tra italiane e inglesi*. Franco Cesati Editore Publ., 2019, 123 p.

Kato C. *Teacher Chikara's language ecology*. (“ちから教授のコトバ生態学.”). Nagoya, Chunichi-bunka Publ., 2016, 230 p.

Klein G. “L'italianità della lingua” e l'Accademia d'Italia. *Sulla politica linguistica fascista. Quaderni storici*, 1981, vol. 16.47, no. 2, pp. 639-675.

Loveday L. *Language contact in Japan a socio-linguistic history*. Oxford, New York, 1996, 235 p.

Mussolini B. 1931. URL: <https://www.adamoli.org/benito-mussolini/pag0473-.htm> (access date: 29.07.2024).

Okamoto S. *Receptivity and Language Management of Foreign Words from the Language Policy Viewpoint*. («外来語の受容と管理 : 言語政策の視点から»). *Journal of Hokkaido Bunkyo University*, 2004, no. 5, pp. 51-63.

Shibata T., Tetsuya K., Inoue F., Long D. 10. *The Rise and Fall of Dialects. Sociolinguistics in Japanese Contexts*. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter Publ., 1999, pp. 183-206.

Stanlaw J. Japanese English: Language and culture contact. Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press Publ., 2004, 388 p.

Tanaka A. Japanese in movement. (“揺れ動く二ホン語”). Tokyo, Tokyodo Publ., 2007, 276 p.

Tesi R. Storia dell'italiano. La lingua moderna e contemporanea (Bologna, Zanichelli, 2005), M. Fanfani. LINGUA NOSTRA. STAMPA, LXIX, 2008, pp. 123-125.

Yamaguchi K. Problems Concerning Modernization and the Japanese Language: from “Japanese” as the National Language to “Japanese” as a Language of the Human Race. («近・現代化とことばの問題 : 日本語(邦語), 国語から人間のことばの一つとしての日本語へ»). Ritsumeikan Bunka Kenkyu, 1989, no. 1, pp. 25-45.

Yamana T. Reconsidering loan words. («外来語再考»). Bulletin of Tsukuba International University, 2014, no. 20, pp. 19-24.

Статья поступила в редакцию 01.06.2024; одобрена после рецензирования 24.06.2024; принята к публикации 08.09.2024.

The article was submitted 01.06.2024; approved after reviewing 24.06.2024; accepted for publication 08.09.2024.