

ON THE STANDARDISATION OF LANGUAGES

Takuji Sasaki

1. Dialects and Common Language
2. The Common Language and the Standard Languages
3. Standardisation and Education for the Standard Language

I would like to make emphasis on the standardisation of the Japanese language in particular. In Japan the movement towards standardisation of the language started very early; mainly in cities or in feudal lands, along with the advance of the system of education called 'terakoya kyoiku' or 'education in a temple school'. His old fashioned system prevailed during the Edo period (1603-1867) and it employed the old literary style of the written language of the time. This 'bungo' was destined to be transformed through the modernisation of Japanese society, into the standard language of modern Japan. This 'standard Japanese' has now spread throughout the country.

1. DIALECTS AND COMMON LANGUAGE

All individual idiolects slightly vary from each other. When these differences extend, from the single speaker, to a large group, we call this a dialect. At first, therefore, there is only one language which, after a long period of time, becomes divided by the generated dialects into areas separated by boundaries as clearly defined as rooms separated by walls.

Nowadays all countries have at least some native dialects. These regional differences have gradually arisen over countries of slow development or, perhaps, more rapidly, by reason of certain social phenomenon (but this latter aspect belongs to the field of social science).

Topographical factors or contacts with alien languages may also

contribute to the development of dialects or, according to Burling, differences of written script may also play a part. Vastness of the community, class or vocational discrimination are also contributing factors.

According to J.L. Dillard, and other sociolinguists a designation for something between a language and an idiolect like these is called variety, sociolect, or genus.

With the progress of civilisation, groups of languages today have become so important that the range of society is defined in accordance with the community areas where a common language or dialect is used. A unit of society is usually considered to be a country or a state, but it is often the case that one language spreads over several countries.

The formation of dialects within each country or state has many twists and turns. Dialects are defined as including all linguistic phenomena: phonological, lexical and grammatical. We in Japan define dialects precisely. Those which have particularly local characteristics of words and phraseology including local accents are called 'rigen', thus distinguishing them from other larger dialects called 'hogen'. It is considered that Japanese dialects stem from the parent Japanese proto-language (which is not, however, necessarily a substratum). The Okinawan dialect is considered to have a close relationship with the original. Generally speaking the most common language spoken in Japan nowadays derives its components from the dialect of the Tokyo area. Yet again the Tokyo dialect itself differs from 'downtown', 'Yedo (Edo)' dialect (named after the old term for this area of the city).

This common modern dialect naturally differs greatly from the hypothetical Japanese 'parent' language. Study, in the area of proto-Japanese, has been so far behind, that it is still unclearly defined.

In Japan both the regional 'parole' and a common dialect are spoken at the same time. It is perhaps not an exaggeration to suppose that the common dialect has filtered through to nearly one hundred percent of the population. In their use of language, most people are bi-dialectal or diglossic.

1.1. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE GENERAL IDEAS OF THE RULES OF DIALECT AND COMMON LANGUAGE

It is considered that these are some important points of difference between the common concept of rules governing dialects and common languages.

The first point concerns the difference of area in which a dialect is spoken. A dialect is used in a comparatively narrow community while

a common dialect (or language) is used nationally or internationally. (There are, of course, two meanings of the term 'common dialect': one used in connection with a comparatively narrow area; the other in a vast district. I will not attempt to deal with this distinction at the moment.)

Secondly, a common language is used in official life while a dialect is used in unofficial life. Thus each differs in use and standpoint: a common language is a universal while a dialect has limitations.

Thirdly, since each differs in use, it is a matter of course that a common language is always expressed in literature while a dialect seldom is. Therefore the former is stable and refined by its connection with literature and the latter changeable. This is especially true of the Japanese language as it is today. The common language usually develops from the 'langue parlée' into 'langue écrite' and then into scientific and cultural languages.

1.2. THE DIFFERENCE IN THE LINGUISTIC ASPECT

Of course, these differences depend on the languages spoken in each given country, society or district. Three aspects will be considered: phonological, grammatical and lexical together with an examination of diachronic and synchronic differences.

First, the phonological aspect. In the Japanese, language the series of vowels (diphthongs and triphthongs but mainly diphthongs), tend to change into monothongs or long vowels. For example: *nai* becomes *ne* or *nē*, *atatakai* becomes *atatakē*. (The former belongs to the common dialect the latter local dialect.)

Even in modern Japanese some sounds of the common dialect have already undergone a historical change. For example: *sei* has become *sē* and *hei*, *hē*, this can be seen in the words *seito pupil sēto* and *heitai soldier hētai*.

This phenomenon also occurs even when semi vowels or /h/ sounds are inserted into words. For example *nan to iu koto* (/nan to ihu koto/) *common* becomes *nan chū koto dialect* or *colloquial* also *tefutefu* (/tehu tehu/) changes to *chōchō butterfly*. This illustrates a diachronic change in the common dialect.

These changes are noticeable also in other languages, for example, similar sound changes occur in the English 'cockney' accent when compared to standard English R.P.

In the French 'langue Commune' not all of the written letters are pronounced. There is a regularity in this muting of letters which seems to follow different rules from those of other French dialects. It is conceivable that the 'langue Commune' speaker thinks of the

silent letters when he is speaking, but his colloquial practice involves liaison between the last silent letter of one word with the first letter of the next (if that word starts with a vowel letter).

Now, secondly, let us examine the grammatical aspects of the common language and dialect. Every official language or language family has its characteristic distinctions between common language and dialect. Let us take the Japanese language for example: aside from the fact that dialects preserve, as in other languages, the old forms; it is the usual case that the sound systems of dialects 'fuse' individual sounds into one. (This is sound-fusion rather than true syncretism). This, of course, comes from the principle of economy in sound, and this fusion occurs in substantival construction (mentioned earlier) but in addition to this phenomenon also appears in the cases of substantives plus case making particles) declinable words plus case making particles, and in the case of particles plus particles. (We call these particles 'ji' or dependant words).

Examples (written in the Japanese style of Romanisation) of substantives ≠ 'ji'.

watasi wa → *watasya or watsya or atya
I (subjective particle)

ore wa → oraa
I

are wa → aryaa (*araa or *ara)
that

kore o → karyoo
~~this~~ (objective particle)

ore no tokoro → orantoko (*orentoko or *orentokoro)
my place

boku no uti → *bokunti
my home

yama niwa → *yamanyaa
mountain in

(* These can be included in the colloquial style of the common Japanese)

Declinable words ≠ 'ji'

ari wa sinai → *aryaa sinai
cannot be

deki wa sinai → *dekyaa sinai
impossible

'ji' ≠ 'ji'

itte wa (≠ negation) → *ittya
go

ii dewa nai ka ii *zya nai ka
(you) don't mind, do you?

toranakereba → *toranakya
if you don't take

(* These can also be included in the colloquial style of the common Japanese)

In conclusion, it may be noticed that these words are phonetically very closely related to each other since they are spoken.

In the case of the common dialect, however, which is usually written, all the syllabaries are conspicuous and therefore the sounds can be kept from changing (___ syllabarisation).

This syllabarisation renders the common dialect readily open to morphological analysis and restrained sound changes, while the lack of written syllabaries in local dialects allows free and unrestrained sound changes.

Thirdly, the lexical aspects. There is a great difference in meaning between the vocabularies of the common language and those of dialects. In Japanese, especially, dialect words and phrases display enormous gradations of shades of meaning.

So far, I have examined differences between common language and dialects mainly with reference to the language of Japan. Social environments in other countries, however, differ and this is reflected in their dialects.

For example, let us examine the Romance dialects. Latin, as the official language and an expression of the power of the Roman Empire spread throughout its territories and particularly throughout the countries we now call 'Romance'. The language of the administrative ruling clans filtered through to their subjects, then according to R.A. Hall a process called 'nativisation' or creolisation, began. But the changes were by no means consistent, Latin was in each case affected by the indigenous language of the territory; different characteristics developed. We now call these Latin variations 'Romance Languages'. Latin was affected most positively in the northern districts of France (Jaul) and Roumania.¹

Nevertheless, it may be taken for granted that all the negotiations among the countries of the Roman Empire were conducted in Latin. Even if the negotiations were carried out among people of a lower class

¹A language is nativized when it is taken over by a group of speakers who have previously used some other language, so that the new language becomes the native language of the group. This process of language-replacement has taken place many times in history, as when the tribes of Italy, Gaul, and Iberia gradually gave up their earlier languages and went over to Latin, which then developed into the various Romance tongues, being handed down from one generation to another by a tradition of first-language learning.
 (R.A. Hall, Jr., *Pidgin and Creole Languages*)

Latin was the official language used. Broadly speaking Latin played the role of the lingua franca at that time, and so, to a lesser extent, did the 'reduced' Latin, the common Romance.¹

Next, may I draw your attention to the Indonesian language group: the Malayo-Polynesian language family. Within this family languages display similar characteristics, for example:

English	Malagasy	Indonesia	Tagalog
<i>die</i>	<i>fati</i>	<i>mati</i>	<i>patay</i>
<i>stone</i>	<i>vato</i>	<i>batu</i>	<i>bato</i>

(Sakiyama 1974)

In the Philippines, it is said that there are eight major dialect groups or eight groups of languages. That is to say, that in one country there are several ethnic groups. This resembles the situation in southern Europe, but where, however, there are several independent countries in place of one country of the Philippines. Among the eight major cultural-linguistic groups of the islands the chief language is Tagalog. This, together with English, has, broadly speaking, the role of the lingua franca. In Japan the Tokyo dialect plays the same role as Tagalog in the Philippines. J.L. Dillard and other sociolinguists term this 'koinē'.²

In short a common language (not a common dialect) falls into the categories of either pidgin, creole or lingua franca depending on the country or district where it is spoken.

The official language is the one approved by the government on the basis of its being widely used. In the case of an international auxiliary language, such as Esperanto, an artificially constructed language, developed and used largely in eastern Europe, although not exactly a pidgin language, it may be considered as such in the future.

2. THE COMMON LANGUAGE AND THE STANDARD LANGUAGE

The common language is commonly termed 'Sein' and the standard language 'Sollen'. The standard language must be an ideal covering all aspects phonological, structural and lexical. M. Iwamoto says we should lay down criterions or standards on the three aspects. The resultant language should then, in consequence, be called the 'Standard

¹J.L. Dillard, *Black English*, p.80.

²J.L. Dillard, *Black English*, p.302.

Koine is the term for a 'common' dialect which lacks the prominent features of the more conventional dialects of a language. It is the end result of dialect leveling. Impressively often, the koine is characterised by the speakers of a language as 'good' speech in that language. It tends to be required of actors or television announcers. A koine is often a standard dialect, but there is no necessary identity between the two.

Language'. As a matter of course, legislation is ultimately required to establish this.

R. Ishiguro says that we ought to endeavour to enhance constructively the efficiency and cultural value of this consequential standard language. He adds that this is rather easier to realise in a unilingual rather than a bi- or multilingual state.

On the other hand a common language does not necessarily demand idealism and legislation. Even if the common language is undesirable in expression, if it is spoken on a nationwide scale, it is still defined as a common language. This is also true of a creolised language. T. Shibata mentions that a common language is less normative and artificial than a standard one. Therefore it can be said that most countries possess only a common and not a standard language. Yet, in a unilingual country such as Japan, a common language as actually admitted as the standard. However T. Iwai contends that although there is a reasonably high standard common language in Japan, it is not realised as such by the general public. He adds that the language of text books has led to the modern standard language of the country.

Indeed, in Japan, language textbooks have been closely studied since the Meiji Restoration, about one hundred and ten years ago. Before the advent of the mass communications media they were the only reliable way transferring knowledge. Terms and phraseology were modelled after the language textbooks. (The standard was therefore written rather than spoken.)

People were able to distinguish an official situation from a private one by the use of certain words, phrases and phraseology. People of a low cultural level were not, however, able to recognise these distinctions. Socio-linguists call this state of affairs 'diglossic' rather than bidialectal. In the field of education the peculiar standard language became known by the technical term of 'classroom' or 'school' Japanese.

After the war, home-town dialects were mixed and corrupted due to the demobilisation of soldiers and, together with the extraordinary development of mass communication this resulted in the nationwide overflow of the Tokyo accent; which was until that being the influence of the accent of the announcers of the mass communications networks.

That is to say, they played the role of a *koiné*. Now we call this Tokyo accent the 'Network Standard Dialect'. Another major cause that should not be overlooked is the fact that people were no longer contented with localism and chose to centralise culture.

3. STANDARDISATION AND EDUCATION FOR THE STANDARD LANGUAGE

After the war the remarkable development of mass communications media resulted in the possessing of radio or television sets by almost every household in Japan. The network standard dialect has become familiar to all the people in the countries including those inhabitants of the outlying islands except for the remotest islands of Ryukyu. The network standard dialect is almost the same as the common Tokyo dialect which we call 'standard accent'. However, exposure to the standard accent through radio or T.V. does not necessarily result in the listener learning to use it in conversation. He may, however, be compelled to use it by vocational demands, he may use it unconsciously or, most importantly, environmental, social and cultural factors determine his speech. It is unlikely, if we belong to a low-culture group, that we will adopt the network standard dialect.

According to J.L. Dillard, when there is no environmental pressure on the American negroes living in ghettos to use Standard English they do not use it but continue to speak their nature language (Non-Standard-Negro English). Dillard says that television shouldn't be considered as some kind of miracle worker. The most striking example of the medium failure concerns children reared in cultural ghettos: vast amounts of time are spent before the television set but they nevertheless do not learn standard language. Educational activities, it would seem, should not involve television unless material particularly relevant to the pupil is used.¹

The case of the American negro is regrettable. They are neither bidialectal nor bicultural. They do however form a small but strong cultural group.

In Japan the so-called 'Standard Japanese' was thought of as the modern written language: it was used only for writing purpose. It is therefore more proper to say we engaged in diglossia or diglottism rather than bidialectalism.

This state of affairs resembles almost exactly that of the German language. There is written form of German which differs from the spoken forms of Regional language.

J.A. Fishman and E. Lueders-Salmon say that Regional German is used in neither reading nor writing as far as the indiginous diglottic system is concerned. Over a period of years a variety of non-conversational German is learned, slowly and enjoyably, to be used for the purposes of reading and writing (and also some types of signing and reciting). Those people of a high cultural level tend to gather a

¹J.L. Dillard, *Black English*, p.285.

better understanding of this language than do others.¹

In Japanese schools we still have the so-called 'classroom-dialect' that has been used by school children for many years. It is the 'written standard dialect' which is however spoken in the classroom.

When a local dialect is outstandingly characteristic and cultural areas are decentralised, the standard language does not spread throughout the country in question. People are satisfied with the local dialect.

In the case of Japan, since the Meiji era (1868-1913), owing to centralism of education and to *mombusho*'s (the Department of Education) unification of language textbooks used in elementary schools, written Japanese has played the part of the 'Standard Language', local dialects, as has been mentioned, were not appropriate to the written language. Before the Meiji Restoration there was no necessity for the peasants to learn to read or write. This was restricted to some administrators, rulers, writers and scholars. These latter used the traditional written language called 'Bungo'. They established understanding between themselves by using 'bungo' even for spoken communication.

Thus, it may be noticed that the educational and cultural groups tended towards centralism while the majority of the population were still divided into several cultural areas, however, the more brilliant a cultural centre became, the more strongly were the people around it influenced. In those cases which had no cultural centre, development proceeded without influence or by contacts on the borderline of the area with other areas. For example, in the Kansai District the characteristic local culture, the centre of which existed in Kyoto and Osaka, persisted. In the northernmost Tohoko District and in the southernmost Kyushu District there were no centres and their cultures therefore show marked individual development. Most of the people belonging to these districts, especially Kansai people, had a definite pride in their own local culture. Nowadays some of the Kyoto and Osaka people are still ethnocentric.

However, with the flourishing interchange of inhabitants between center and province - the development of industries was brought about, railways were built, nice facilities were arranged and mass communications media increased the exchange of personnel. Local culture was absorbed and assimilated into the central 'civilised' culture. When this phenomenon is regarded linguistically these aspects emerge: elites in the provinces have enjoyed the central civilised culture and

¹Joshua A. Fishman and Erika Luedes-Salmon, 'Social Repertoires', in Courtney B. Cazden and Vera P. John and Dell Hymes (eds.), *The Functions of Language in the Classroom*, p.80.

they have constructed a unitary linguistic community, even if they lived a great distance from the cultures centre (Burling recognises the same state of affairs in the communication of Hind's culture).

Thus they have enjoyed the prestige of speaking the central dialect. Except for the people of Kyoto and Osaka, the people in the provinces have not taken any obvious pride in their dialects that so ever, but have tended to regard them as inferior. Therefore, the rising generation is especially proud of speaking the 'Standard Language' which they assume to be more advanced and complete than their own local dialect. This dialect together with local cultures are the source of an inferiority complex amongst the young. The older inhabitants, however, still maintain a resistance against this modern tendency. Now that young people possess the so-called 'high' business mind they find the necessity of thinking about their own material future. Nowadays there are a great many job opportunities in a great city, like Tokyo, owing to the modern tendency towards centralisation in large urban areas.

Today, bidialectalism still exists in Kagoshima, Kyushu, Tohoku District, and Okinawa, so forth. Here provincial accents are very strong. There are five Japanese vowels /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/. There are only three Okinawan vowels /a/, /i/, /u/. Before long these provincial accents may change to 'Standard accent'. The change will occur more rapidly in those areas than the areas with only slight differences in accent. It is a great pity that we rarely hear the strong accent of Kagoshima, however it is often possible to hear the Kansai accent.

In the Tohoku District the vowels the young people pronounce have recently assimilated traces of the standard accent. The Tohoku dialect differs greatly from that of Tokyo particularly in the articulation points of the vowels (for example the distinctions between /i/ and /e/ or /u/ and /o/ are not clear). But owing to mass communication and language education young people have come to be able to pronounce the Tokyo accent rather more easily than before. Thus they can now articulate both kinds of sounds and their range of articulation has therefore extended.

The increase of the intellectual middle class (due to the extension of secondary education) and the more beneficial economic climate have resulted in the young being able to enjoy the prestige of pronouncing words differently from their parents. This provides an interesting parallel with the state indicated by Burling in Indian society where there is a difference of speaking sound dependant on caste.

The difference between Tagalog and Pampango or Ilokano, in the Philippines, seems to resemble that of Tokyo and Okinawan dialect, which are considerably unlike one another. (Okinawa is more individual

than for example the Kagohisma dialect). Okinawa and Tokyo dialects are not precisely homogeneous. There is also the case of the Ainu language which is thought to be unrelated to Japanese (although the Ainu people have assimilated Japanese). Ainu and Japanese have, however, some lexical relationships. It holds a similar position to Celtic, Gaelic and Cymric to English in the British Isles or Breton and Basque to French and Spanish. Catalan also may be a dialect. People in the Philippines engage in bidialectalism but in the future some dialects may be assimilated in Tagalog. Or rather, Tagalog, which was chosen as the basis of the Philippine national language in 1937 may skillfully assimilated lexical elements from the other dialects. Tagalog and English, however, do not fuse or blend together simply. This, of course, is a bilingual case but sometimes words or phrases mingle. For example, according to Llamzon (1969):

'I did not know, may salo-salo pala sa inyo', or 'May I borrow your book, hindi ko maintindihan any lesson natin for today, eh!'
They call it 'halo-halo (mix-mix)'.

Here is another example in Mexican-American.

- M - : But the person ----- de ----- de grande (*as an adult*) is gotta have something in his mouth.
M - : Sera que quiero l tetera? para pacify myself? (*It must be that I want the baby bottle to ---*)
M - : The type of work he did cuando trabajada (*when he worked*) he ----- what ----- that I remember, era regador (*he was an an irrigator*) at one time.
M - : An' my uncle Sam es el mas agabachado (*is the most Americanized*).

(Gumperz and Hernandez (1969))

In Japan such conversations occur among Korean people, one of the country's minority races.

But to return to the main topic: all of the eight major Philippine languages are related. They are all cognate languages. Nowadays, in most Philippine provinces and cities the majority of the population can speak Tagalog plus their native cognate language, therefore we can say they are engaging bidialectalism. As mentioned earlier the other Philippine languages will be assimilated into Tagalog, since they all belong to the same language family and that Tagalog is now the dominant language in the Philippines. In Soviet Russia and other multi-lingual countries, where non-cognate languages are grouped together, things are different. Where different races or cultural-linguistic groups have their own dominant ranges in one country, or where races are completely linguistically mixed, they can not easily unify into languages, nor neither can they be persuaded to use a unitary 'standard' language.

These two cases are illustrated by the situation in the Soviet Union, China and India in the former instance and Jamaica and Surinam (both having Creole languages) in the latter. One has to consider a minor 'standard' language in each district or land. The juxtaposition of plural 'standards' presents a solution to this problem. However, in Jamaica there has recently been a movement against British English.

The island-born (Jamaican) whites became so creolized in their habits and speech that those not sent to England for education never did learn to speak proper British English. Yet however firmly the Creole was established, it has always been thought of as intrinsically less good (not to say bad), and every kind of preferment has been correlated with some command of educated English.

(Cassidy 1971)

Roumanian or Hindi and Urdu may have been creole languages in their early stages of development.

Now we must consider the issue of standardisation in Japan. What provisions have been for the spread of language education?

As mentioned earlier 'Standard Japanese' was, and is, based on the Tokyo dialect which was used among the upper and middle classes. It was, as a matter of fact, used only within the Tokyo city boundaries, in the environs they spoke other dialects, which even those people living in the city center found difficult to understand. A decade ago a number of minority dialects still existed positive phonological and lexical differences. Speaking from personal experience there was a time when I could distinguish the people of Northern Kyoto from those of Kyoto proper by the slight differences of accent they displayed. However, taken as a whole, Japanese was a unitary language. Mutual understanding was comparatively uncomplicated due to the 'bungo' style of communication: the typical Japanese written style which stemmed from the ancient style and played the role of the common language. It was extremely useful in the creation of centralised government.

Throughout the Meiji era, language policy developed rapidly and for the first time vocabularies were 'arranged'. (Mombusho, the Ministry of Education, published three 'word books'.) The style of the sentence at that time was 'kanbun' (using Chinese characters in Chinese order) style Japanese. That is to say 'kambun' was written in a Japanese order and was intended to be read in a Japanese manner. (See my paper that I read at the first conference here in Manila).

After the movement which insisted on the identity of written and spoken language, only those school textbooks written by Mombusho were used. In Japanese there is a problem beside that of 'kanji', that is the way using the 'kana' or Japanese syllabary. And, moreover, it is not at all convenient to use only the classical 'kana' therefore a

'classical to modern' kana dictionary was needed. Thus up to now, the greatest difficulties facing Japanese educationalists and linguists have been and still are, in the area of the written rather than the spoken language.

In 1902 a board of 'Investigation of Language' was founded, and in consequence, Chinese characters in common use were limited to 1936 in 1923. In 1934 a board of consultation (closely resembling the French Academy) was instituted. The board of consultation has lasted in common use and to arrange correct phonetic reading, and correct Japanese reading of 'kanji'. It also arranges the declensional 'kana' endings. The board first tackles a literal problem but from now on they should consider the problems of 'standard language' also together with normal study words. This was already being done by the board of investigation in 1902, one of the indications of this was the official function of the board; namely 'Investigation of dialects and election of a standard language'. It is regrettable that the problem has not been fully solved even today.

Let us consider vocabularies of phraseology for example. The Japanese chose the more difficult wording. It is now our duty to simplify this. 'Kango' (Chinese words, expression or phraseology) should be read in a Japanese way, or one should use the plainer 'kango', concrete not abstract, if possible.

ikaku (威嚇) (menace or threat)

odokasi (odokashi) (おどかし)

kengi (嫌疑) (suspicion)

utagai (疑い、うたがい)

Also it is desirable to clarify inflection, specific usage, accent and articulation etc.: restrict the use of 'kanji', make honorific expressions normal (these present special difficulties) and consider loan words.

Since the Edo era (1603-1867) Japanese education has flourished remarkably, and especially since the Meiji era, general education has spread widely. Language education has been particularly accentuated in it. It has been indispensable for Japan's modernisation and to the execution of national policy. Education was focused on so-called 'standard' language, which was a particular written style of language. It certainly had some merits, one of which was that it fostered the rapid development of administration suitable to a modern power centralised nation. On the other hand, it fostered the development of 'kansonyahi' (which means 'respect bureaucracy, despise the citizens') and also it caused a tendency to overesteem the Tokyo dialect. Strictly

speaking the movement against local dialects arose in the provinces as well as the capital but the movement was not in any way successful.

After World War II education for 'Standard language' was again given in the provinces such as the Tohoku district and so forth. The reason that it has succeeded this time is the people's demand for a 'standard language'.

So, not only language education, will enable us to solve this issue and gain good results. We have to give more attention to education itself, language education must come second not first as in Germany.¹ The standardisation of a language depends on modernisation, stabilisation and civilisation of a nation.

¹J.A. Fishman and E. Luedes-Salmon, 'Social Repertoires', in Courtney B. Cazden and Vera P. John and Dell Hymes (eds.), *The Functions of Language in the Classroom*, p.80. During elementary school in particular, more attention is given to educating children and to encouraging them to express themselves clearly, forcefully, and effectively than to standard German reading and writing or formal language skills as a whole. seemingly, 'getting educated' and 'learning standard German' are not considered to be one and the same.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BUNKACHO (THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE), ed.

1973 *Kokugo Mondai [The Language Problem]*. Tokyo.

1973 *Hyojunga to Hogen [Standard Language and Dialects]*. Tokyo.

BURLING, Robbins

1970 *Man's Many Voices*. New York.

1973 *English Black and White*. New York.

CASSIDY, Frederic G.

1971 'The Pidgin Element in Jamaican Creole'. In: Hymes, Dell (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*.

CAZDEN, C.B., V.P. JOHN and D. HYMES, (eds)

1972 *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York and London.

CONSTANTINO, E.

1967 *Tagalog and Other Major Language of the Philippines*.
Unpublished.

DILLARD, J.L.

1972 *Black English*. New York.

FUKUDA

1973 *Gengo Seisaku no Kenkyu [The Study of Language Policy]*.
Tokyo.

GUMPERZ, J.J. and E. HERNANDEZ

- 1969 'Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication'. Working paper No. 28, Language Behavior Research Laboratory. Berkeley.

HALL, Robert A., Jr.

- 1966 *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Ithaca.

HYMES, Dell, ed.

- 1971 *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge.

ISHIGURO, R.

- 1950 *Hyojuno [The Standard Language]*. Tokyo.

LLAMZON, Teodoro A.

- 1969 *Standard Filipino English*. Manila.

MARTINET, Andre, ed.

- 1971 *La linguistique Guide Alphabetique [Japanese Translation]*. Tokyo.

OISHI, H.

- 1971 *Hanashikotoba-ron [Some Comments on Colloquial Language]*. Tokyo.

PRIDE, J.B. and Janet HOLMES, (eds)

- 1972 *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin Books.

REINECKE, John E.

- 1969 *Language and Dialect in Hawaii*. Honolulu.

SAKIYAMA, O.

- 1974 *Nantogo Kenkyu no Shomondai [Problems in Malayo-Polynesian Language Study]*. Tokyo.

TOKIEDA, M., ed.

- 1955 *Kokugogaku Jiten [The Dictionary of Japanese Language Study]*. Tokyo.

YASUI, M., ed.

- 1971 *Shingengogaku Jiten [The Dictionary of the New Linguistics]*. Tokyo.