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1. THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC TYPE OF JAPANESE

Survey articles about the Japanese language usually restrict their interest to a limited number of topics from descriptive or historical linguistics, occasionally accompanied by a chapter on Japanese dialects or on the problem of language and thought. This pattern is by no means characteristic for the study of the Japanese language alone: to my knowledge neither has any language so far been accounted for in its entirety as the universe of communicative competence of members of a community (cf. Hymes, forthcoming), nor have attempts been made to discuss this communicative competence as a coherent communicative style (Hymes 1961, Neustupný 1971).

In the present paper¹ I shall attempt to depart from this tradition and base my consideration on the following premises:

(1) that language means the totality of rules necessary for human communication; in other words, that language means not simply grammatical but COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE i.e., a system which contains not only rules for derivation of abstract syntactic strings but also rules specifying to whom, what and when, where and how we communicate; and

(2) that many rules of language conceived in this way can be adduced to one or several of a small number of basic common denominators or types, which in their turn constitute the COMMUNICATIVE STYLE of the system.

¹ I am indebted to Taro Takahashi for useful discussions on the topic. H. Bolitho kindly read the manuscript and made valuable suggestions.
2.

The notion of a type implies on the one hand that there is a set of features which are mutually related and supporting, and, on the other hand, that the number of types is smaller than the number of known systems: obviously unless these two conditions are fulfilled it has little sense to speak about types and communicative styles. Any language can be said to possess a genetic, interferential, areal, grammatical, and sociolinguistic type (Neustupný 1971). However it is only the sociolinguistic type which will concern us here.

The concept of the sociolinguistic type relies obviously on two additional assumptions, namely

(3) that some linguistic features are to a high degree DETERMINED (motivated) by extra-communicative factors, features of the respective social systems, and

(4) that among these determined linguistic features there are some which constitute a TYPE as defined above.

I wish to claim that sociolinguistic types in this sense exist and that they can be labelled as ... tribal ... early modern (developing), modern (developed), contemporary etc. (cf. Gumperz 1962, Neustupný 1965, 1968a, 1971).

It should be noted that this claim, not lacking parallels in the approach of social science to Japan, has long since been denied its validity in linguistics. Modern structural linguistics developed on the assumption of independence of language from what it called "extra-linguistic" phenomena, and if any connection between language and
extra-linguistic factors was admitted, it was relegated to the sphere of lexicon, occasionally to limited parts of grammar such as the honorific systems. Moreover, the idea that a language could in any sense be labelled as "primitive", "underdeveloped", "developing", or "modern" was also categorically denied. To be fair, it should be conceded that this critical attitude was well-founded when applied to studies which claimed to have related various, mostly dubious, properties of cognition and certain ill-analyzed properties of grammatical structures: lack of subject, lack of plural, categories of tense, or the grammatical type (analyticity, etc.) as a whole.

The notion of the sociolinguistic type provides for the first time a firm background for the understanding of linguistic modernization. First, by emphasizing the importance of non-grammatical components of the communicative competence and their close connection with grammar, the concept enables us to combine within the same framework our knowledge of grammatical (lexical, syntactic, etc.) modernization with modernization in the use of language. Secondly, the concept suggests that a large number of idiosyncratic features are not simply "Japanese" but possibly "traditional" or "modern", i.e. determined by traditional or modern features of the social structure. The concept of the sociolinguistic type also implies that what we are dealing with may be not a small number of scattered features but a whole set of related phenomena which affect a large area of the relevant system.

In the following I shall investigate some aspects of modernization of the Japanese system of communicative competence conceived within the described framework as a change in the sociolinguistic type. An attempt will be
made to demonstrate that a number of features within the Japanese system can be classed as [+ modern], while others are [- modern]. My conclusion will be that Japanese communicative competence as a whole can be placed on the axis early modern - modern but I wish to emphasize that the current state of research makes it impossible to characterize the distance from each of the extremes. We must be satisfied by finding that both elements marked as [- modern] and [+ modern] are present, and hope that future research will enable us to quantify with greater accuracy.

2. MACRO AND MICRO-MODERNIZATION

2.1. The macro-sociolinguistic perspective

Observed from the point of view of macro-sociolinguistics (Fishman 1965, 1970), i.e. of the communicative competence of the society as a whole, the Meiji-Taishō-Shōwa processes of modernization of Japanese cannot but appear as extremely successful (cf. Yamagiwa 1965:220).

Homogeneity

First, the overstratification of the pre-modern period has been overcome and it can be said that Japan has achieved a high degree of linguistic homogeneity. The phenomenon of diglossia, the concurrent use of the Classical and Modern standard (Ferguson 1959), was removed gradually and with final validity by the end of World War II. A limited number of legal codes written in Classical Japanese constitute the only remnant of the situation beyond its limited use in religion, art, and historical studies. The spread of the Modern Japanese standard as a means of both written and spoken national language has been remarkably
successful. It is true that the dialects survive as native varieties of a large number of speakers, but they are superposed for all speakers by the school-acquired standard. The survival of dialects can hardly be seen as substantially different from the situation in most other developed nations of the world.

Development

The second feature of linguistic modernization of Japan can be seen in the fact that the limited range of information transferred within networks of a pre-modern society has been considerably widened. The linguistic development of Japanese is a fact which cannot be denied. In Japanese, all types of information can and are easily transferred: scientific, literary, administrative, and any other. Lexicon, syntax, and writing systems are fully available for this purpose. If Japanese doctors write the diagnosis on patient's cards in German, this is not because the same content could not be adequately expressed in Japanese - a claim confirmed by the fact that Latin words serve the same purpose for German doctors (Takahashi 1965:254).

Equality

Thirdly, the hierarchical restrictions in pre-modern communication, with division into classes and strata, is alien to the contemporary system. Linguistic equality is a remarkable trace of contemporary Japanese communicative competence. It is a well known fact that both the spoken and the written standard are accessible to the vast majority of the community. Literacy, although perhaps not as high as the official numbers might indicate, can nevertheless be supposed to have reached the same, if not higher, standards
as any developed Western community (cf. the summary of several literacy surveys in Ishiguro 1963:315).

**Alliance**

Finally, as far as its linguistic alliance is concerned, during the process of modernization the Japanese system of communicative competence has acquired two undisputably modern characteristics. First, a high degree of linguistic independence, uniqueness, or in Fishman's words "authentification" (Fishman 1971:4) has resulted. The Japanese system of communication is not dependent on any other system. Secondly, the old connections with the less developed world have been cut off while the distance between Japan and the West has been radically reduced. English is Japan's first foreign language. Semantic mapping in contemporary Japanese, although partly using Chinese elements for surface manifestations, is almost entirely European-Continental or Anglo-American, and even the phonological shapes of morphemes are in a large number of cases borrowed from the West. It is interesting to note that at the same time the grammatical type of Japanese has moved significantly toward analyticity (cf. Tanaka 1965). Although it is not likely that a direct social influence could be proved, this development, as Tanaka argues, can be connected with modernization indirectly, through the process of standardization. It may be added here that the fact that both Japanization and Westernization in general are only two different but indispensable contributions toward modernization of the "alliance" relationship seems to have escaped the attention of some students of Japanese modernization. However, Shively has recently argued that Japanization is not a simple "reaction" to Westernization and claimed its independent role in Japan's modernization (1971:117).
From the macro-sociolinguistic perspective, modernization of the sociolinguistic type of the contemporary Japanese system of communicative competence appears then as a completed task which may need to be perfected in minor details but which cannot be questioned as a whole. The possible contribution of the linguist seems to consist in tracing the history of the success and accounting for its course. Notice also that this macro-modernization of Japanese took place quite early in Japan's post-Meiji history. As Passin says, Japan had the good fortune to be able to carry on her modern development in her own language (Passin 1963).

The reflection of macro-modernization in systems of language treatment

We should not overlook the fact that the indices of the macro-sociolinguistic modernization quoted in the preceding paragraphs mostly represent language problems that are likely to cross the boundary of consciousness and within the given social situation give rise to theories and acts of "language treatment" (Neustupný 1970). Indeed this is what happened in Japan during the post-Meiji period. The problem of linguistic HOMOGENEITY became the object of such language treatment processes as genbun itchi (unification of the spoken and written language) and hyōjungoka (standardization). EQUALITY has been achieved through a conscious emphasis on education, and completed through a series of successful postwar language (writing) reforms. ALLIANCE with the developed West proceeded via Westernization and although the corresponding policies were sometimes directed against, not toward, Westernization (cf. Hirai 1948:376, Shibata 1965) this is not difficult to understand if we realize that
independence was another objective. Strangely enough, it seems to be only the problem of DEVELOPMENT of lexicon and of the modern scientific and other functional styles which did not attract much conscious attention. While the most important changes in the Japanese vocabulary occurred in the Meiji period (cf. an excellent analysis in Miyajima 1967), it was not until the thirties that planning processes were initiated (Amano-Ukita 1961:146) and to my knowledge the planner's intervention has never been very intensive.

2.2. The micro-sociolinguistic perspective

To what extent does this picture of completed modernization change if we switch from macro- to what J. A. Fishman on the analogy of sociology and economics describes as micro-sociolinguistics (Fishman 1965, 1970). Of course, the distinction between macro- and micro- phenomena is a matter of degree and this fact should be always fully realized unless we wish to arrive at a valueless arbitrary typology.

Once the observer's criteria became finer, networks of lesser extension than the whole society are considered and the individual is in focus, the picture of the sociolinguistic type of Japanese moves backwards on the developmental scale. Homogeneity, development, equality and Western alliance become less convincing; problems of modernization that had not been expected emerge and new solutions are required.

The reflection of micro-modernization is systems of language treatment

It is interesting to notice again that it is not only the type of actual language problems that changes, but also their perception and treatment by the community. I have tried
to argue elsewhere (Neustupný 1970) that in their approach to language problems -of which modernization certainly is a typical example- communities develop differing idioms of treatment. The early modern approach, characterising communities in which it is the societal level at which linguistic heterogeneity, underdevelopment, inequality, and type of alliance present most distinctive problems, can be called the POLICY APPROACH. On the other hand, within a more or less modern community where the society-wide problems have been actually or seemingly solved, and where it is the individual's rights that matter, the vision of the community and its behaviour toward language (Fishman 1971) necessarily change and the idiom of language treatment develops into a more microscopic CULTIVATION APPROACH.

In Japan this change in perception seems to have occurred around the second world war. While the late 40's with their major language reforms still fall into the former category, it is in the fifties and early sixties that attention is being paid to problems such as the necessity of development of dialogue (Nishio 1957), further unification of the spoken and written language (Nishio 1955: second genbun itchi), regulation of the honorific usage (Korekara no keigo), and even to non-verbal polite expressions (Kindaichi 1964). However the level of consciousness about the micro-modernization is relatively weak. While little has been thought, said, or done, the type of the Japanese communicative competence itself is changing: we have been witnesses to profound micro-modernization processes, the birth of a true spoken-language-based literature, the rise of a truly individualistic scholar, the beginning of a new type of humour etc. How much of
the pre-modern type has been preserved? An answer will be suggested in the following paragraphs.

3. SOME PROBLEMS OF THE MICRO-MODERNIZATION OF JAPANESE

3.1. Heterogeneity

The amount and structure of linguistic variation seems to be highly indicative of the sociolinguistic type: a premodern or early modern community which is socially highly stratified may be expected to prove analogous features also in its communication system, and this expectation is indeed fully confirmed by our knowledge about the traditional systems of communication. The extreme, in which each social group and each situation is assigned a separate variety may never be realized, but traditional systems are much closer to this extreme than the modern ones. It is true of course, as Fishman finds, that urbanization and industrialization neither in the United States nor in Europe have necessarily resulted in complete interregional homogeneity, and the unification pressures in language seem to be strong in conjunction with only certain varieties and networks (Fishman 1970:285). This finding can further be specified if we divide variation into "arbitrary" and "functional" (Neustupný 1965:89): it then seems obvious that, other factors being equal, it is the arbitrary variation which is easily removed by linguistic modernization. For example, most of the variation between the Classical and Modern standards in the case of the premodern diglossia are arbitrary in the sense that the way in which varieties differ is not necessarily connected with differences in their function.
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It is then not a matter of chance that the diglossia, a typical case of arbitrary variation, is most often removed at an early stage of modernization (cf. Konrad 1952). On the other hand, the appearance of various scientific and technical languages can be classified as functional variation if the means which differentiate such varieties from the conversational and other varieties are inevitable for their functioning. The number of functional varieties sharply increases with modern development of a language, while the amount of arbitrary variation, which may occasionally accompany the functional varieties, gradually decreases (disappearance of technical jargon, reduction of the differences between spoken and written language, etc. - cf. also paragraph 3.2.).

In Section 2 of this paper I suggested that some of the excessive and largely arbitrary stratification in Japanese speech on the societal or macro-sociolinguistic level has already been substantially reduced or removed. There are also numerous instances of more recent movement toward the homogeneization of the Japanese system of communicative competence: the phonological shapes of Western loan-words have been simplified and standardized (some phonemes and clusters such as v, si have been removed), the weather forecast "dialect" (niwakaame ga furimashō) has been restricted, the modern written language is moving closer to the spoken standard, etc.

**Micro-sociolinguistic variation**

On the other hand a considerable amount of the early modern arbitrary variation in the sphere of micro-sociolinguistics has undoubtedly survived. The variation is sometimes visible on the grammatical (i.e. grammar, lexicon, phonology)
level as for instance in the case of ii yo/ii ka/boku : ii wa/ii no/atashi (masculine vs. feminine language), taberu/takai/takusan da: tabemasu/takai desu/takusan desu (ingroup vs. outgroup language), washi/oru/ikoo : watashi/iru/iku daroo (generational variation). A well known example of arbitrary variation which depends on situation is the word "constant": as early as 1950 the White Paper of the National Language (Kokugo shingikai 1950) turned attention to the fact that it was rendered as jōsū in mathematics and physics, kansū in chemistry, teisū in engineering, and fuhensū in economics. Similarly the terminology of ikebana varies considerably according to the school etc.

The situation acquires however greater clarity if our attention is not restricted to grammar and if the whole of the communicative competence is considered. Undoubtedly the differences between the masculine and feminine language extend far beyond the grammatical features. There are differences in communicational settings (when and where speech occurs, cf. Hayashi Sh. 1966) differences in networks (who, how much, and to whom communicates), in topics, in channels (e.g. handwriting), etc. It can be mentioned in this connection that much of the so-called underprivileged position of the Japanese women may actually be rather a matter of communication rules than of social structure.

The example of the masculine and feminine variation however is not isolated. The principle that speakers use and receive different language in accordance with the difference in roles they occupy seems to be valid also in a number of other circumstances. An infant for instance uses and receives a grammatically different variety from
the adult, the baby talk (cf. Fisher 1970), and this privilege is connected with his "superior" position in networks: his mother is always ready to attend to his protest (Caudill and Weinstein 1970), he is allowed verbal - as well as other aggression, the use of kinship terms is adjusted to his level (Fisher 1964), in entertainment situations he functions as the pivot etc. Similarly, in Japanese a speaker talks in a different way to his parents, siblings, wife, to his superior, to his inferior, to a taxi driver, to a shop attendant, to the doctor, at school, in a governmental office, etc. On the other hand, in modern Western communities far less cultural difference correlates with different roles and situations and as far as communication is concerned, there is a clear tendency to use the same language to all interlocutors and in all situations.

The extent of variation is highlighted in situations of contact with a different system of communication: foreign speakers of Japanese underdifferentiate (e.g. by using honorifics to a taxi driver), while native speakers of Japanese when speaking in English very often, for instance, when speaking to women, shop attendants etc., overdifferentiate the usage.

It should also be said that sometimes the variation seems to affect only the non-grammatical components of communicative competence. For instance, during the individual's life cycle several relatively distant phases of his "life communication cycle" can be distinguished: infancy, childhood, adolescence, establishment phase, stability phase etc. As Sh. Hayashi's research suggests (1966) there is enormous variation in setting, channel,
and other rules and one of the basic determinants of this pattern seems to be the different position an individual occupies in communicative networks.

*Removal of micro-sociolinguistic variation*

Notice that the micro-sociolinguistic heterogeneity exemplified in the preceding paragraphs is often perceived as a feature with [- modern] determinants. This is confirmed by the fact that a clear trend to remove the unnecessary stratification is asserting itself and the amount of variation is actually decreasing. However, these correction processes are not necessarily conscious, and they are not accompanied by any major theory or acts of language treatment (language policy, cultivation). This is what makes the micro-modernization less conspicuous and more difficult to understand than the macro-modernization process. Within a scientifically elaborated system of language planning (cf. Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971) this type of problems should however not escape our attention.

3.2. Development

The index of linguistic development can be found in the type of information which can and habitually is transferred within the system.

We have already said that with regard to the overall potential of transmitting modern messages in administration, industry, education, science etc., Japanese undoubtedly belongs to the family of highly developed languages of the world. To what extent however does this characteristic hold true also in other spheres of the social life?
Conversational variety and oralization

It was after World War II that Minoru Nishio and E. Iwabuchi, the first and second director of Japan's National Language Research Institute, launched the slogan of the necessity of the "second genbun itchi (unification of the spoken and written language) movement". What is the implication of this requirement? If we watch the analogical developments in contemporary European languages it becomes obvious that after the establishment of the modern standard there came a moment - mostly the first two decades of the twentieth century - when through a new wave of changes the arbitrary differences between the modern written standard and the spoken language of the period were removed. It was suddenly felt that the poet and writer could express themselves in a variety which abandoned all the finesses of the old literary language and used basically the language which they spoke. The same situation emerged in drama where the cothurnus style inevitably left the stage. Notice that these developments are different from a simple romantic inclination toward the popular language: we have to do with an utterly modern idiom which carries modern ideas. It is also important to realize that along with tying up with modern topics, this new style required as its prerequisite modern syntagmatic frames, such as the development of the dialogue (Neustupný 1968a:290). In other words, the oralization of the modern standard presupposes the development of the so-called conversational functional variety of the standard language (Havránek 1963:71) within all spheres of communicative rules.

Nishio's and Iwabuchi's problem seems to be identical with the Western problem of oralization of the modern
standard. In 1955 in a paper entitled "Language Life Hereafter" Nishio clearly indicated what he had in mind: the problems of writing poems in the spoken language, the problem of modern drama, and the problem of the dialogue. In all three spheres considerable advances could be observed during the subsequent period, but as a whole the establishment of the conversational variety and subsequently of the orally-based literary language is still awaiting its completion.

The establishment of the conversational variety of the standard and oralization of the whole of the standard language, including the language of literature, constitute an important modernization task, a problem of development. Unlike in the case of the administrative, scientific, technical etc. varieties this is not a problem which would figure prominently on the societal level. The lack of the conversational language is most strongly felt in the individual's communication. It appears sometimes with monstrous magnitude in contact situations where a language - such as English - with a well developed conversational variety has to be used and the lack of appropriate topical, network, message form, and other rules is strongly felt. Likewise, in poetry and drama the poet and the author on the one hand and the addressee of the literary act on the other may feel that their modern individual feelings cannot be adequately expressed in the old language.

Modernization or rationalization?

In connection with the problem of oralization of standard Japanese an objection, potentially valid also for other cases of micro-modernization, could be raised. Namely, if language does not cease to change, where should the boundary between
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modernization and post-modernization processes be placed? Is the process of oralization not simply another example of rationalization of a basically modern system? One important premise for answering this query consists in the acceptance of the fact that no hard and fast boundaries should be imposed and that the characterization of certain processes as modernization should not turn into an exercise of arbitrary categorization. Nevertheless two arguments seem to support placing the oralization rather before than after the modernization landmark. First, there is the fact that in Western languages the date of these changes is rather old. Second, the development seems to be quite intimately connected with other developments which seem to fall clearly within the range of modernization: the development of modern dialogue, modern conversational networks etc. (cf. below, paragraph 3.3.). It is this interconnectedness that constitutes the sociolinguistic type as opposed to a simple coincidence of features.

Communication of distance

Another problem of development of the contemporary Japanese language understood in the sense described above consists in the habitual communication of certain premodern meanings. The best example is provided by the sector of "distance" meanings (Goffman 1956, Neustupný, forthcoming), i.e. those meanings which derive from distance between sections of the communities and from distance (hierarchy) between members of the same sub-community. Honorifics are an obvious example, the same problem being involved of course also in the etiquette and other components of the "politeness system" (cf. Kindaichi 1964, Neustupný 1968b). I should add here that within the
sphere of honorifics the addressee honorifics (teineigo) seem to be on the increase since the Meiji period. It seems to me that they are well compatible with a modern situation if structured in a way similar to the ingroup/outgroup distribution of the TU/VOUS of the modern European languages (Brown and Gilman 1960). On the other hand usage differentiated in dependence on addressee or situation, and the irreciprocity which originates in such usage, seem to reflect both the social heterogeneity and the hierarchical arrangement of the sub-communities and appear to me as a traditional feature par excellence.

Communication of appeal

On the other hand, the sector of appeal meanings seems to strengthen in connection with individuation. No direct appeal is necessary in a community in which roles are fixed and speech is not addressed to an individual. Direct appeal is naturally unacceptable when maximum distance is implied, it is to superiors. Lack of polite imperatives is a fact which should be classified here. Words such as oi! "Hello!" which have no polite counterpart point to the same. Interesting is the case of expressions like Ōkāsan wa dō? "How about you, mother" in which the usual Japanese form for the addressee is "non-vocative" while in the Western languages the usual corresponding expression is "vocative". Notice also that greetings in Japanese are not accompanied by reference to the addressee; against "Good morning, Mr. Smith" we have the simple Ohayō gozaimasu.

Contact meanings

Various contact topics reflect the stratification of the society and the necessity to establish and maintain
contact between social groups. The outgroup aisatsu (greeting) is a case in point. On the other hand Ogasawara (1970) has correctly pointed out that in in-group situations greetings are rare, and that very few parents or teachers would say "thank you" to their child. Another example of bridging the social distance is in declaring one's social group and position within the group. It has already been suggested that visiting cards fulfil this function. Further, looking for mutual friends is a good topic, in the same way as speaking about them and supplying new information about their contemporary alliance.

All these micro-problems of modern development, and many others — such as the problem of the promise — may occasionally attract attention, but in general, their solution does not take recourse to the methods of language treatment. The appropriate correction processes pass without the awareness of the community and it may be before we realize their existence that these problems finally disappear.

3.3. Equality

While equality in access to the standard language does not reveal much difference compared with the West, the Japanese system of communicative competence presents other interesting problems of equality of participants in communication networks.

It will be necessary to mention here that two types of networks must be distinguished: GROUP networks which include individuals who usually intercommunicate (a participant and his family, friends, colleagues, etc.) and
ENCOUNTER networks, i.e. networks within a situation, irrespective of whether the participants belong to the same group network or not (cf. Goffman 1961). En passant, although this will necessarily show as a difference of degree we can expect that within a traditional setting the two types of networks will be closer one to the other than in a modern society.

Hierarchy in networks

Access to speech within a traditional network is limited due to the fact that the network is hierarchically organized with a rather clear pivot (centre) and peripheral positions. In a modern society the hierarchical networks survive for some time in social situations which are characterized by a large amount of asymmetrical power, such as the army and school. This is where the pivot initiates communication and where response from the peripheral positions is directed toward the pivot. Even these situations, at least at school, are however denied their rationality in the West with the new developments in education. In entertainment networks, where few limitations are imposed by their function, the equalization of access to communication has been achieved long since. A modern Western entertainment network such as a party easily splits into dyads in which dialogues, a framework in which all participants have the same rights, is the basic mode of speech.

Although a detailed study of the Japanese networks is still missing, work on the topic has already been commenced (cf. Hinata, ms.), and certain hypotheses can be formulated. Along with modern open structures the traditional separated
and closed networks continue to exist; and at least some of them have a hierarchical structure. Entertainment networks such as konshinkai, kondankai, sōbetsukai, bōnenkai etc., unless very informal, do not easily split into dyads and show dominance of monologue (aisatsu, supiichī, etc.) over dialogues (cf. Nishio's criticism 1957:32, and also Ogasawara 1970:61). The social determinants of this communicative behaviour are not difficult to identify. Basically they can be related to the position of an individual in his social group and to the relationship between the social groups.

Networks and honorifics

It may be of interest to realize that the character of networks in contemporary Japanese is connected with a large number of other characteristics, including the grammatical rules of the language. For instance, the rule that there is only one pivot within a network seems to be related with the impossibility to pay respect to two superiors within a situation in which one is the subject and one is the object of the same predicate. For instance "Professor A, did you tell Professor B?" can only be rendered as either A-sensei, B-sensei ni o-hanashi ni narimashita ka?, in which case A is treated as the superior, or A-sensei, B-sensei ni o-hanashi shimashita ka?, where it is B who receives the respect form. There are some exceptions (Neustupný 1972:106) but the general trend is clear.

Speech particularism

Another example of the same kind is differential access to acceptance of the speaker's message. I have called this phenomenon, signalized for a completely different cultural
millieu by Adams (1957), speech particularism (Neustupný 1968a:291). The matter is that information supplied by the speaker is sometimes judged differently according to whether he is a member of the same social group or not. A criticism is not a criticism if it emanates from one's group but it is interpreted as an attack if it comes from an outgroup position. Similar trends can of course be observed also in modern developed systems but it seems to me that the social determinants are different.

3.4. Alliance

In paragraph 2.1. we suggested that with regard to other systems a modern system of communication is usually characterized by two features: independence, and alliance with the modern world. It is not altogether clear to me to what extent these two features are concomitants and to what degree they are necessary components of modernization. While in the above discussion it was emphasized that the initial dependence and the amount of distance at the point of Japan's entrance into the modern world has been enormously reduced, at this place I wish to introduce counter-examples from several spheres.

Problems of borrowings

It is true that as far as the selection of whole varieties is concerned Japanese is not dependent on any other linguistic system in the world. However, in terms of components of the Japanese language it must be said that the amount of foreign elements that enter into the Japanese system almost daily seems to be considerable. Most of these elements -names of new technical and intellectual products- remain strongly marked as [+ foreign] and are not fully incorporated into the language. Some of them are
replaced by native words, still others remain on the periphery of the language as long as they are needed and then disappear. It is certainly not the case that such denominations could not be produced from Japanese roots. Whether this phenomenon of over-borrowing is in connection with the premodern features of the society or whether it simply reflects the power of English in the contemporary international society—a power which affects most Western languages as well—is not easy to assess.

_Micro-linguistic distance_

The Western alliance of the Japanese communication system manifests itself principally in large scale (international) networks, in mass communication, and in the lexicon. On the level of the individual, in individual communication of native speakers of Japanese the distance however remains enormous. The fact that so much energy is spent in Japan on learning English does not mean that Japan is practically bilingual. I have suggested elsewhere, that in the case of Japanese speakers abroad it is not the lack of knowledge of English that causes their isolation but the inability to communicate which blocks the way to the acquisition of English: if we want to practise, the first prerequisite is the establishment of networks: however, in order to establish networks it is necessary to know the appropriate system of network formation, topics, routines etc.—and these are so different. It is also important to assume a universalistic attitude to the content of communication—otherwise the feeling prevails that the content is alien and irrelevant and no speech acts are likely to be initiated. As mentioned earlier, a conversational variety, which is neither formal nor informal is necessary. This seems
to be another stumbling block (cf. Hoffer 1970:18). It might also be mentioned in this connection that the mastery of Western languages other than English appears to be on a somewhat higher level than the knowledge of English. Most probably, the sociolinguistic type of Japanese is closer to the continental languages than to English, the foreign language No. 1, and the differential competence of native Japanese speakers in various Western languages (if proved to be a fact) might be accounted for by this circumstance.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The obvious conclusions from the discussion presented above are that a distinction between a macro- and micro-modernization of Japanese may be necessary. In other words, we can posit the existence of two different processes in the modern development of the Japanese system of communicative competence: the first or macro-modernization affected the Japanese society as a whole and resulted in the creation of a single and homogeneous national language, development of vocabulary, syntax, and style, facilitated access to the national language for all members of the community, and achieved both the relative independence and the alliance with the Western languages. The second or micro-modernization affects primarily the individual. The premodern features which form the object of this second modernization consist in excessive and arbitrary compartmentalization of the system, in limited development of communication in some situations and the necessity to communicate unwanted content,
in restricted equality of the individual and vigour of the hierarchical principle, and possibly also in somewhat limited independence and enormous distance from the communication systems of other developed nations of the world. This second, micro-sociolinguistic modernization is of course not -as the folk theory of Japanese history has it- a post-war development. Most probably it commenced with the macro-sociolinguistic modernization - its pace is however slower and still at present it can hardly be described as concluded. Only further research can reveal to what extent this development is universal and to what extent it is typically Japanese.

The four indices of homogeneity, development, equality, and developed alliance used already in a previous study (Neustupný 1968) have proved useful in our discussion. However, these criteria should not be conceived as completely independent features. Linguistic modernization probably can be summarized into these four, but in their own turn the four features support and supplement each other: for instance homogeneity easily combines with open networks which are likely to be equilitarian, do not readily place themselves in hierarchical dependence on others, etc.

The systems of language treatment follow in principle the development of the system of communicative competence. The Japanese language policy (kokugo mondai) approach corresponds to the needs of the first modernization while the cultivation (gengo seikatsu) approach corresponds to the second wave. The correlation is however not strong. Considerations of the (objective) facts of language development and the (subjective) systems of language
treatment should be kept apart. Language treatment idioms, as they historically develop, reflect only a limited number of language problems and the way the problems are reflected is often biased.

The sociolinguistic type of the contemporary Japanese system of communicative competence as a whole can be placed on the line between the early modern and modern: the exact point cannot be ascertained without further data-oriented research.
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