HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Language revitalization through lexical modernization and neologism-coining : The current state and future tasks of modernizing Ainu lexicon
Author(s)	Ijas, Silja
Citation	アイヌ・先住民研究, 3, 117-160
Issue Date	2023-03-01
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/Jais.3.117
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/88326
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	09_3_Ijas.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

アイヌ・先住民研究　第３号　2023　p.117–160　ISSN 2436-1763
Aynu teetawanoankur kanpinuye (3) 2023　p.117–160　DOI 10.14943/Jais.3.117

【論文】

Language revitalization through lexical modernization and neologism-coining: The current state and future tasks of modernizing Ainu lexicon

Silja Ijas*

ABSTRACT

Being able to use an endangered language in modern everyday life is an important part of language revitalization. However, most endangered languages lack a modern lexicon, and it needs to be deliberately created. Many language revitalization projects have established new words committees to take care of lexical modernization. Lexical modernization has also been conducted in Ainu language revitalization, but the process and different initiatives have not yet been comprehensively analyzed. The objective of this article is to analyze what kind of lexical modernization work for Ainu has already been done and what kind of tasks remain to be done. The analysis is conducted by reviewing the prior research about Ainu and other indigenous languages' lexical modernization. The lexical modernization work conducted in other language revitalization projects has been used as examples and to draw ideas on how to proceed in the case of Ainu. The main findings are that while several projects have developed new lexicon for Ainu, there are no established guidelines for neologism-creation and the results of the projects are not published in a centralized way. Thus, this paper argues that Ainu language revitalization would benefit from establishing a language planning agency that would take care of coordinating lexical modernization.

Keywords: Ainu language; language revitalization; language policy and planning; lexical modernization; neologisms

1 Introduction

The last century has marked a decline in the number of actively spoken languages in the world. There is, however, a strengthening movement of countermeasures to this language loss: Language revitalization encompasses such areas as trying to create new speakers, raising the social position of the language and its speakers, and spreading the language (back) to the domains in which it is not spoken (see for example Sallabank 2012; Hinton, Huss & Roche 2018). All these areas of language revitalization can benefit from new words describing modern phenomena, that is, lexical

* Doctoral course, Graduate School of Humanities and Human Sciences, Hokkaido University

modernization and expansion. This article reviews what kind of lexical modernization attempts have already been made in the Ainu language revitalization and, on the other hand, suggests what kind of issues regarding lexical modernization of Ainu need to be addressed in the future.

In the case of many majority languages, there is an academy or council that is responsible for lexical standardization and terminology planning of the language. Many minority language speakers, and especially speakers of endangered indigenous languages, have also teamed up and started to plan the lexicon of their languages to make them more usable in the modern society. Some of the endangered language advocates have also established language councils or committees that take care of the language development work.

The language planning situation of the endangered languages is, however, different from the mainstream languages. Unlike the widely spoken languages, the endangered languages often lack vocabulary concerning entire domains, such as education, different fields of science, and politics. This is because the languages have not been used in communication in these domains and the related vocabulary has never been developed. Thus, the volume of the needed new vocabulary can be massive. Furthermore, there might be resistance to modernization within the speaker community. Therefore, starting the lexical modernization of an endangered language requires especially careful planning, paying attention to the authenticity of the new vocabulary, and the involvement of several interest groups (Kimura & Counceller 2009; Hieber 2014).

The revitalization of the Ainu—the language of indigenous Ainu people who once lived in the area covering northern Japan, southern Sakhalin, the Kurils, and the tip of Kamchatka peninsula—started in earnest in the early 1980s (Kitahara 2018a). Recently there have been several mutually independent initiatives to create different texts in Ainu and consequently they have also developed new vocabulary to answer the needs of the 21st century. In addition, some individual language advocates have been making suggestions for new words. However, the language revitalization movement lacks a permanent organization to coordinate language planning and lexical modernization. The results of this article suggest that such an organization would be highly beneficial.

This article's objective is to find out what has already been done to modernize the Ainu language and what kind of future challenges and tasks there are to be tackled in Ainu lexical modernization. To achieve the objective, the recent endeavors of the Ainu language revitalization movement to modernize the Ainu lexicon are summarized and considered in contrast with the tactics and outcomes of other endangered languages' lexical modernization projects. The research is based on a review of articles concerning lexical modernization and expansion of the Ainu language, and the

development of new words in the Ainu language revitalization movement and other endangered languages revitalization movements.

Lexical modernization is an area of Ainu language revitalization that has not yet been widely written about and the number of existing reports is small. There is not yet any single research that summarizes the recent lexical modernization efforts of Ainu language revitalization and explores the basic issues concerning Ainu lexical modernization. Consequently, this article is also a venture to fill that gap. The data discussed here is retrieved from research or reports concerning Ainu revitalization attempts and from the material private persons have produced and published online, save for some personal communication with Ainu language teacher Kenji Sekine.

In the research of endangered languages and language revitalization, lexical modernization is widely acknowledged to be crucial for language revitalization to succeed. However, there is surprisingly little research about lexical modernization not just in the case of Ainu but any endangered language. In typical research describing language revitalization efforts for a certain endangered language, lexical modernization is often discussed only very briefly in the context of corpus planning, if not discussed at all. One of the reasons might be that the topic easily evokes heated debates about how the language should be used in the modern days and what can be counted as authentic language. Yet it is important to discuss the possible disagreements and search for solutions. The discussion is necessary to be able to consider future tasks concerning language revitalization and lexical modernization.

2 Language policy and planning

Language policy and planning (LPP) is a field of sociolinguistics that investigates the behavior and beliefs that shape language usage in society as well as the attempts to change the language and its usage (García 2015: 353). Sallabank (2011: 278) divides the roles of the policy and the planning roughly in two: 'policy' refers to the top-down positions, principles, decisions, and strategies related to languages while 'planning' is the bottom-up and grassroots practices and concrete measures to support languages. LPP is thus not just a governmental activity, but individuals and small groups can also have their personal policies and they can plan their language usage, for instance, making a conscious decision to speak a minority language with children at home (Spolsky 2021).

The main purpose of LPP is not to change the language itself but to bring about a change in the society in which the language is used (García 2015; Sallabank 2011). In many cases, the language policy is not explicit but rather implicit: There is not necessarily legislation about the languages

nor clearly stated written policies but rather other political decisions about the society also have an impact on language-related matters (Spolsky 2021). The policy goals of societal change can be planned within a framework of different types of status planning, prestige planning/image planning, acquisition planning or language-in-education planning, and corpus planning. Of these language planning types, corpus planning is the only one to concern the language itself. The other types concern the societal environment in which the language is used.

Status planning aims to get the language politically and societally recognized (Sallabank 2011: 280). Prestige planning, which is sometimes seen as a part of status planning, aims to promote a positive view towards a language and change the people's attitudes towards a language so that they become more willing to accept the other planning actions (García 2015: 354; Sallabank 2011: 283). Image planning can further be separated into a subtype of its own from prestige planning. Image planning concerns "increasing confidence in and goodwill towards a language" (Sallabank 2011: 283). Acquisition planning concerns deliberate efforts to increase the number of the language's speakers, especially through school education (Sallabank 2011: 280). Corpus planning considers the language itself and its concrete products are grammars, dictionaries, and teaching materials of the language (Sallabank 2011: 279). Before those materials can be produced, there is a need for graphization, standardization, and modernization of the language (García 2015: 353).

2.1 Planning of terminology and lexicon

Nahir (1984) identifies 11 language planning goals, two of which are central for this article: lexical modernization and terminological unification. With lexical modernization, Nahir means "aiding a language in keeping up with modern life as represented in the language of an outside speech community" by "the collection of concepts imported into the community or even formed within it, and the creation or designation of new terms for them" (Nahir 1984: 307). On the other hand, terminology unification or terminology planning is about "establishing unified terminologies, mostly technical, by clarifying and defining them, in order to reduce communicative ambiguity, especially in the technological and scientific domains" (Nahir 1984: 308). In short, the first one of these goals aims to create new terms and the other to clarify and unify the existing terms. However, the divide is not necessarily this clear. For instance, terminology planning can be based on the ideology of nativization or indigenization: loanwords are replaced with words created with native linguistic material (Akbari 2020: 15). In this case, terminology planning includes also creating new words.

Since lexical modernization and terminology planning are considered separate fields, there must be a difference between their end products. Lexicon refers to words in general and terminology

to terms in specific. The totality of 'words' is called 'vocabulary' and the totality of 'terms,' 'terminology' (Sager 1990: 19). For Sager (1990: 19), words are lexical units, "which function in general reference over a variety of sublanguages" and terms "are characterized by special reference within a discipline". ISO's (2009: 34) definition for 'term' is "designation consisting of one or more words representing a general concept in a special language in a specific subject field". That is, in many cases terms consist of existing words or combinations of them and thus the line between words and terms is not necessarily explicit.

The term 'terminology planning' entails that the language to receive the planned terms already has an abundance of vocabulary covering virtually all the language domains. As Nahir (1984) states, term planning is done usually for special languages (also called specialized languages or languages for special purposes), especially special languages of science and technology. Special languages are in many cases developed by an academic society of the special field or in a local language academy (Spolsky 2021).

3 Coining new words

Languages change and develop while the society they are used in is changing. Speakers constantly create new words—neologisms—without even noticing. Sometimes it happens that the language community adopts the neologism, and it becomes part of the lexicon of the language (Keyes 2021; Akmajian et al. 2010: 27). Majority of the new words are nonce-words and only a few entrench as part of the language's lexicon (Keyes 2021; Schmid 2008). Coining new words might be easy, but as Keyes (2021) points out, establishing a new word is a haphazard business: the coiner cannot force others to use the word, no matter how apt and witty the coiner finds their creation.

There are language-dependent differences in how the new words are coined and adopted. Dominant languages, like English, have many potential word-coiners and the spread of new words is relatively fast. On the other hand, languages with very few speakers, who are not necessarily even in close contact with each other, have much slower development of new words, and the words also might spread slower. Also, the societal position of the language has an impact on how the neologisms are viewed. English, which is a highly valued international language, can assume numerous neologisms, and its position is not questioned. Usually, the lower the number of speakers, the lower the status of the language. Harlow (1993) discusses the dilemma of a lesser-spoken language: If the Māori language adopts many foreign concepts, especially in the form of loanwords from English, the language is claimed to be inauthentic and artificial and thus not a

proper language. But then again, if new words are not coined, the language cannot be used in school or science, and it is claimed to be an underdeveloped language that has no role in society (Harlow 1993: 103–104). However, if neologisms are considered artificial, then all languages are somewhat artificial because neologisms are present in all the languages (Amery 2016: 29).

3.1 The processes and mechanisms of neologisms entering the language

According to Hinton & Ahlers (1999: 63), the two main processes of new words entering a language are borrowing and word-formation. Sager (1990: 71) divides the formation of new words further down into three main processes: "(1) the use of existing resources, (2) the modification of existing resources, (3) the creation of new linguistic entities." Hinton and Ahlers (1999: 63) point out furthermore, that in word-formation, two levels must be considered: formal level and cognitive level (Hinton & Ahlers 1999: 63). If the newly coined neologism follows the word-formation processes of the language, it fulfills the formal requirements, and if the neologism "feels right", it fulfills the cognitive requirements (Hinton & Ahlers 1999: 63). To explain and define why something does or does not feel right is of course extremely difficult and it leaves a lot of room for personal interpretation.

If categorized in the three main processes Sager (1990) defines, the following word-formation processes can be found in many languages. The first process is using existing resources in word-formation, which refers to semantic extension/meaning extension in general (Sager 1990: 71–72, Akmajian et al. 2010: 28–29, 31). Second, modification of existing resources, includes such processes as derivation or affixation (suffixing and prefixing), compounding, conversion (i.e., zero-derivation or change of grammatical category), compression (acronyms, alphabetic abbreviation, abbreviation, clipping, blends, etc.) and backformation (Sager 1990: 71–79, Akmajian et al. 2010: 27–28, 31, 35, 38–43). The last process is the creation of new lexical entities, of which there are, according to Sager (1990: 79), two types: "either they are totally new creations, or they are borrowings from other languages". Totally new creations are coinages—a special type of neologisms that combine a previously non-existing sound sequence with meaning and thus create a new sound–meaning pair (Akmajian et al. 2010:27). Haspelmath (2009: 36) defines lexical borrowing or loanword as "a word that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing (or transfer or copying)." Akmajian et al. (2010: 29–30) make a further difference between direct borrowings, that is, borrowing both the sound and meaning, and indirect borrowings (loan translations or calques), which means translating a word literally from another language.

Hieber (2014) points out that many lesser-used and indigenous languages frequently use

'descriptions' as a word-formation method. Typical descriptions either (1) describe the physical characteristics, (2) describe the action, or (3) describe the purpose or function (Hieber 2014). These circumlocutory descriptions might be considered as compounds or phrases depending on the language but some of them might be recognized as words. In the latter case, the term 'phrase word' or 'syntactic word' can be used (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 78; Satō 2021: 137).

According to Hinton and Ahlers (1999: 64), circumlocutory descriptions as word-formation methods are good strategies to fill the cognitive requirements. Hinton & Ahlers (1999: 65) call the association of an object with an action, in which it is typically involved, "associated action frame metonymy" and point out that metaphor is an excellent way "to gain a greater understanding of traditional worldview and to find ways of expressing new ideas". The aim is to look at the imported phenomena from the point of view of traditional culture and thus make the neologisms "feel more right."

3.2 How to coin good terms and words?

Anyone can coin a new word using the productive word-formation processes of the language in question but what makes the new word usable? Even though term planning for specialized languages is not the same kind of work as the modernization of endangered languages' lexicon in terms of scope and volume of the needed vocabulary, the principles of term development might offer a good point of reference for language revitalization projects in their efforts to create a modern vocabulary.

For Akbari (2020: 15), a good term is "any new term which is the product of primary/secondary term formation (direct borrowing, loan translation, newly coined terms and so on), that is likely to enter the lexicon of a linguistic community and potentially reduces the communicative gap between different sections of society." In other words, for Akbari, a good term makes communication easier and reduces misunderstandings but is also accepted by the language community. For an even more detailed definition of a good term, it is useful to consider the standardization done in terminology planning. The ISO 704 standard considers terminology work. The general principles for term formation in ISO 704 are 1) transparency, 2) consistency, 3) appropriateness, 4) linguistic economy, 5) derivability and compoundability, 6) linguistic correctness, and 7) preference for native language (ISO 2009: 38–41).

The first principle of ISO (2009: 38–41), transparency, means that the meaning of the term can be inferred from its parts, in other words, the term can be understood without reading its definition. The second principle, consistency, means that the term formation must be systematic, and it must

correspond to the concept system, that is, new terms of a specific area must follow the formation mechanisms used in the formation of the existing terms. Third, the term is appropriate when it does not cause confusion but rather adheres to familiar, established patterns of meaning and it also is neutral and avoids distracting connotations. Fourth, the requirements of the linguistic economy are fulfilled when the term is as short and concise as possible. Fifth, terms that have a productive potential should be preferred over unproductive ones, that is, the terms can be used in derivations and compounds. Sixth, the term must follow morphological, morphosyntactic, and phonological norms of the language, in other words, it must be linguistically correct. Seventh, in term-creation, expressions in the language in question are preferred over direct loans (ISO 2009: 38–41). Sager (1990) further lists 12 idealized criteria and rules for naming and creating terms, which are mostly the same as the ISO 704 states. In addition to ISO 704, he suggests that the meaning of the terms should cover one concept only and it must be strictly defined to avoid overlapping. In addition, he emphasizes that the term should be context independent and unique with no homonyms.

Terms are created foremost with professional use in mind, and the same criteria do not necessarily apply to words. Keyes (2021) discusses contemporary English neologisms created not by a terminology committee or academy but by any wordsmith coining new words intentionally or unintentionally. He suggests the following points to predict the success of newly coined English words among the great masses. The words which are most likely to be adopted by the language speakers are 1) short, 2) playful, 3) ear-pleasing, 4) easy to picture in mind, 5) feeling evoking, and 6) using the "good letters" b, g, k, and z (Keyes 2021). These traits are language-specific and cannot be applied to other languages directly, especially the last point of using certain sounds in word-formation. However, a comparison of this list and the lists about principles of term creation describes quite clearly the differences between term development and word-coining. Rey (2005: 327–329) makes another attempt to predict the potential of neologisms. He gives four similar criteria to the principles of terminology formation given above (system conformity, semantic potential, productivity, distinctiveness/lack of competition) but also points out that the "acceptability and the word's sociolinguistic value" is crucial. This includes the factors that Hinton and Ahlers (1999) call the cognitive requirements of neologism.

These kinds of listings, whether about term development or word-creation, do of course not come without problems. Some of the principles seem to be in contradiction with each other. For example, in ISO 704 standard, the requirement of being transparent might conflict with the requirement of brevity (ISO 2009). Rey (2005) insists that all his criteria must be fulfilled simultaneously, yet Keyes (2021) states that all his requirements do not need to be fulfilled for the word to be adopted. For

instance, he mentions that if the word is fun, the speakers might adopt it even if the word is a long one (Keyes 2021: 245). What is considered a long word in one language might not be a long word in another and some languages do have relatively long words, so the length of the new terms or words is not necessarily a problem either. To summarize, giving a list of criteria for term or word-creation is easy but there are numerous practical problems to be solved when adapting such a list for use in a lexical development project of a certain language.

4 Language revitalization

Language revitalization is a specific language policy that aims to change society in such a way that the language that was once lost or almost lost is accepted and reintroduced as a part of the society's language repertoire (Sallabank 2012). That is why both bottom-up and top-down measures are needed for effective language revitalization. The speakers of endangered languages are often in a marginalized position in society and if the language policy of the state is aiming to exclude minority language speakers, it is difficult to change the society alone from an oppressed position.

Nevertheless, the most important part of language revitalization happens at communal and individual level, not at the governmental or municipal level (Fishman 2001; Hinton, Huss & Roche 2018). There might be researchers and other contributors to the language revitalization outside the community, but these people alone cannot carry out the practical work of language revitalization, that is, (re)learning the language and starting to use it again within the community, but only raise awareness and try to change attitudes (Maryniak, Majerska-Sznajder & Król 2021: 51). Therefore, the ultimate responsibility of the language revitalization is that of the language community (Fishman 2001: 465; Hinton, Huss & Roche 2018: xxiv). Fishman (2001: 465) especially warns the language revitalizers not to rely solely on outside support, because the support could end suddenly. On the other hand, language revitalization is part of decolonization process and is often an empowering experience for the community and thus rewarding (Hinton, Huss & Roche 2018: xxiv-xxv). Maryniak, Majerska-Sznajder and Król discussing the ethics and cultural awareness in language revitalization, emphasize that even if the initiator of the language revitalization was for example a researcher, who is not part of the language community, the researcher should include the community's members and "make them part of the decision-making process at all stages of the project, including planning, realization, and evaluation" (2021: 52). For the reasons above, it is widely thought that the community itself must be in control of their language's revitalization process.

The different goals of language revitalization can be categorized within the language planning types introduced earlier and in an ideal situation, all the types of planning should be promoted simultaneously because leaving one area unattained can hinder advancing the others. The language in process of revitalization needs to get a higher status and that can be attained through status planning, for example, creating legislation about the language or making the language an official language of the country or the area where it is spoken. Prestige planning aims to change the attitudes (of both the potential speakers and people in the dominant society) towards the language into a more positive and accepting direction. Acquisition planning is often thought to be the most important area of language revitalization and creating new speakers is indeed a central aim of language revitalization.

Corpus planning in the context of language revitalization can include documentation of the language if there are any fluent speakers left; deciding on an orthography for the language; making grammars and dictionaries based on the documentation using the decided orthography; making teaching and learning material based on the grammars and the vocabulary collected in the dictionaries; and, if there are no suitable words to talk about the surrounding modern world, creating new words through lexical modernization.

4.1 Lexical modernization as part of language revitalization

As a language under revitalization starts to reclaim domains it was once used in or spread into new domains—such as education, government, and health care—the current lexicon of the language likely does not have words for all the concepts in these domains. If the language in process of revitalization has not been used widely for a long time, the vocabulary of the language has probably not also developed together with the change in the society in which the language is spoken. Living language changes and a changing vocabulary is a part of that: some old vocabulary denoting customs and objects that are no longer followed or used disappears but, on the other hand, new vocabulary needed for new objects and situations appears (Hinton & Ahlers 1999: 61). The longer the language has not been used, the larger the number of missing words and the larger the gap in the lexicon of concepts used in today's society. Creating that missing vocabulary and terminology is one of the aims of language modernization.

Lexical modernization is a goal of corpus planning, but it also supports the other planning types. It is, for example, easier to appeal for changes in the legislative position of the language when the language is proven to be dynamic and vital, and the language can be used in modern contexts. Being able to use the language in contemporary life increases the attractiveness and perceived

usefulness of the language, and therefore lexical modernization is also part of prestige planning. When preparing appropriate textbooks and learning materials and arranging education through the medium of the endangered language, a modern lexicon is also required. For some people, being able to use the language in traditional situations, such as religious ceremonies, is a sufficient motivator to learn the language, but it seems that for many it is not. Thus, it also is easier to attract more learners of the language if there are more opportunities to use the language.

4.2 Lexical modernization, puristic attitudes, and borrowings

While languages change naturally over time, there are, however, people who think the language is perfect as it is and changing it, especially deliberately, is not desirable. The idea that there is only one correct and authentic form of the language and the desire to protect that form of the language from new influences is called linguistic purism (Sallabank & King 2021). Hieber (2014: 2) argues that the language attitudes and ideologies of the language revitalization advocates and the community at large have a tremendous impact on the failure and success of language revitalization and the ways the lexicon is modernized. At one extreme there are the people, who allow no changes to the language and want to preserve it as it is, and at the other end people who value for example the communicative value of the language over correct grammar and pronunciation (Sallabank & King 2021; Maryniak, Majerska-Sznajder & Król 2021; Hieber 2014; Hinton & Ahlers 1999). The more accepting the attitude towards changing language, the more likely the language revitalization is successful. Hieber (2014) attributes the concept of authenticity as the key to the puristic attitudes: what does each member of the community accept as authentic language?

Puristic attitudes in language revitalization can especially be seen in the attitudes towards loanwords. Many language advocates see borrowing from a dominant language—associated with language loss—as particularly undesirable (Blair & Fredeen 1995: 34). However, the situation is not so simple. Blair and Fredeen (1995: 34) point out other elements influencing attitudes towards borrowings in addition to purism: socio-psychological factors for willingness to assimilate, language loyalty, and conservatism.

Borrowing from a dominant language is also a question of identity. For example, Māori, after years of suffering from assimilatory policies and loss of political and economic self-determination, consciously wanted to build their identity distinct from *Pakeha* (i.e., New Zealanders of primarily European ancestry) identity and culture (Harlow 1993: 103). Māori wanted to show that the Māori language does not need to resort to borrowing words from English to survive but there were also concerns that the language is too weak after all and "will lose something of itself if it borrows"

(Harlow 1993: 103). Denzer-King (2008: 33) points out an example of a socio-psychological factor of loanwords that affects especially younger speakers: borrowings from a dominant language may put pressure on the speakers to switch to the dominant language altogether, not just using the loanwords.

Furthermore, avoidance of borrowings is not necessarily a recently emerged ideology connected to the fear of language loss. For example, Spence (2016: 74) reports that Hupa people tended to avoid lexical borrowing already before Hupa were in contact with the incoming settlers; there are very few loanwords in the Hupa language in general, even though they have been in prolonged close contact with the neighboring indigenous people. Kaurna seems to have a similar tendency: even in the earliest Kaurna documentation, there are very few borrowings (Amery 2016: 30). Krägeloh and Neha (2014: 72) add that Māori words are highly morphologically transparent and adding new opaque words to the lexicon is undesirable, thus the reason for avoiding loanwords might also be linguistic.

Now then, how to mitigate the language community's internal conflicts caused by different ambitions of the language preservation advocates and the language revitalization advocates? Languages do belong simultaneously to their speech communities as well as their individual speakers. Every speaker has the right to decide how to use the language, and whether to create new words or to use loanwords or not. To avoid unnecessary conflict, some preventive measures can be taken while modernizing the lexicon.

- If the documentation of the language shows signs of resisting borrowings, it is better not to start borrowing extensively when modernizing the lexicon either (Amery 2016: 30). Instead of borrowing, use documented word-formation methods (Amery 2016: 159).
- If it is absolutely necessary to borrow, borrow from a language of the same language family or another indigenous language and adapt the borrowings to the phonemic and morphemic system of the receiving language (Sammons 2009: 64).
- Even though the concepts to describe with the neologisms are of foreign origin, describe them in a culturally appropriate way creating language-internal neologisms (Hinton & Ahlers 1999: 65; Hieber 2014: 2; Denzer-King 2008: 33).
- Be open to dialogue about lexical modernization and clearly communicate the ideologies driving the modernization process (Leonard 2008 cited in Denzer-King 2008: 33).
- Some people might need more time to come to accept the modernized lexicon (eg. Amery 2016: 163). Proceed slowly in a way that people have time to get used to the new words (Hinton & Ahlers 1999).

The measures listed above might ease the pain of change for the people who want to keep their language as unchanged as possible. However, in language revitalization, the attention is often focused on such things as the authenticity of pronunciation or word-formation, but grammar and pragmatics are not paid attention to. For example, Amery (2016: 160) points out that Kaurna are attentive not to adopt words that do not abide by the rules attested in the documentation of the language, but still the language has incorporated many literal translations of English expressions through translation of English texts. This suggests that the threat to the authenticity is not lexical borrowings or neologisms but syntactic and pragmatic borrowings that creep into the reviving language from a dominant language without noticing and intentional planning.

4.3 To establish a language planning committee or not?

Another question to solve is to what extent lexical modernization attempts should be organized and standardized. Many language revitalization projects have established language planning committees or councils of which several especially focus on lexical modernization. The tasks of the new words committees vary but the most common tasks are discussing and creating new words, establishing a guideline for word-coining, and disseminating the newly coined words to the language community (Amery 2016; Denzer-King 2008; Sammons 2009; Hinton & Ahlers 1999; Kimura & Counceller 2009; Olthuis 2003; Hieber 2014; Harlow 1993). Some of the new words councils are seen as the only authority of lexical modernization and some take just the role of disseminator of the new words coined by the members of the language community (Hieber 2014: 5).

Some language communities chose not to have a language planning committee. Hupa, like the other indigenous languages spoken in California, does not have an authoritative body regulating the creation of new words (Hinton & Ahlers 1999: 61). Instead, according to Hinton and Ahlers (1999: 61), the words are created one by one through the language revitalization activities, such as one-on-one master and apprentice language learning sessions, and the newly created words spread slowly to the speaker community. Hinton and Ahlers (1999: 61) further note that this is a typical situation for a language that is not taught through formal school education or that is not used as a medium of education: there is no need to make sure everyone is using the same words like it is in a school education setting.

Many of the lexical modernization initiatives have indeed been prompted by the decision to start schooling using the endangered language as a medium. For example, the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee has been creating Hawaiian new words lists since 1983 to support the creation of *Pūnana Leo* Hawaii language medium preschools (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 121). The most active

new word-coiners and proposers throughout the committee's history have been the creators or translators of educational materials (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 136). Also, the lexical development of the Māori language was accelerated by the educational initiatives using Māori as a medium. *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*, the Māori Language Commission, has especially developed vocabulary for mathematics and science teaching (Harlow 1993; Krägeloh & Neha 2014). Furthermore, much of the Inari Sámi vocabulary development has been prompted by the need to develop textbooks and other educational material. The new vocabulary has been mainly created and spread by the educational material unit of the Sámi parliament in Finland (Olthuis 2003: 574–575).

The committees have varying working methods related for example to the publication of the newly coined words, decision making, and the composition of the language planning committees. Who participates in the committee work and with what kind of role, how the decisions are made, and how the neologisms are published depends of course on the cultural practices of the community as well as the level of endangerment of the language in question, for example, if there are any first language speakers left to consult. Hieber (2014: 6) notes that the role of the language planning committee can also be simply collecting neologisms developed in the community and disseminating the new words. A common factor in all the language revitalization projects reviewed here is that the final decision is always within the language community, not an outsider researcher or a linguist (Kimura & Counceller 2009; Hieber 2014; Couzens, Gaby & Stebbins 2020).

For instance, in the case of Hawaiian, new word lists have been compiled into a new words dictionary *Māmaka Kaiao*, which is updated regularly (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 121). In the early 1980s, the people engaged in the development of the lexicon were potential teachers for the preschools, elder native speakers, and '*Aha Pūnana Leo* (organization for Hawaiian medium preschools) founders (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 122). The native speakers had, however, difficulties developing a vocabulary for abstract modern concepts, such as 'evolution' or 'theory', so the focus of the committee shifted to clarifying the existing words for everyday household items, cultural values, etc. and to approving of the words coined by the second language speakers (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 123–124). When the pressure to concentrate more on the vocabulary needed in education increased, the composition of the committee changed to second language speakers and the elders were consulted when possible (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 124).

Organizing the lexical modernization work in a committee can sometimes be too slow. The need for the new words can be urgent and the language users do not have months to wait for the committee decision. This encourages the users to take the lead and develop the vocabulary themselves. The attitudes of the language users as well as the committee members can also prevent

the adoption of the new words. Harlow (1993) gives an example of Māori: The local language teachers had developed vocabulary on their own and when they sent their vocabulary list to *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*, the committee did not acknowledge the words but tried to modify them to suit better their ideas. However, the teachers insisted to continue using their own vocabulary, and therefore, for example, at least three different ways to express the linguistic term 'subject' (*pane, tāhu, māhunga*) were developed in Māori (Harlow 1993: 105).

4.4 Guidelines for word-creation in language revitalization

Many language planning committees have created word-creation guidelines to ease their work. The Hawaiian Lexicon Committee has a guideline, which is followed in most cases. The guideline includes such points as how to deal with error correction, how to add definitions for the words or make the existing definitions more specific, and what are the preferred word-creation mechanisms. In general, the words in the Hawaiian language have broad meanings and the specified meaning is understood in the context or by modifying the word for example with an adjective (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 125). *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori* also has guidelines to follow (loosely) in their lexical expansion work. The new vocabulary must (1) not be borrowed from English, (2) be short, and (3) be transparent (Harlow 1993: 100). The existing and well-established (English) loanwords are not to be deliberately replaced with words with Māori origin only but nonetheless some replacements have been proposed and they also have been adapted by the language community (Harlow 1993: 102). The word-formation methods used in Hawaiian and Māori are, for example, circumlocution (phrase words), calques/loan translations, reduplication, (analogous) compounds, meaning extensions, clippings, derivation, and borrowing with adapted phonology (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 137–138; Harlow 1993: 100–101).

Language revitalization projects for smaller languages have also created some loose guidelines. Mohawk Language Standardization Project has a guideline that forming new words by describing the function, activity, or characteristics is preferable, but loanwords are also acceptable (Hieber 2014: 2–3). In the case of Kaurna, loanwords are strongly resisted by the language community, so the documented word-formation processes—mainly semantic extension, compounding, and derivation—are used (Amery 2016: 159).

The guidelines above concentrate especially on the morpho-phono-syntactic correctness of the neologisms but there are no guidelines about creating successful neologisms. The fact that a neologism follows the word-formation conventions of the language does not guarantee that the speakers will adopt the word is not widely discussed. There are few exceptions, however, such as

Hinton and Ahlers (1999) introduced in the section about processes and mechanisms of neologisms entering the language, as well as Olthuis (2003) discussing the lexical modernization of Inari Sámi. Olthuis (2003: 577) argues that it is not enough to have the basic knowledge of word-formation but also to understand when each word-formation process can be used and where to find a good model for each neologism and thus predict the conditions in which the speakers will accept the new word.

This kind of forethought is probably only possible in a case like Inari Sámi that has never lost all its speakers. On the other hand, new speakers might accept new words easily. This is because the new speakers might not yet have a strong sense of which word-formation processes to use and when and whether the word feels authentic. Olthuis (2003: 577) also emphasizes the importance of not adopting several neologism candidates for a single concept, because it might lead to confusion among the speakers and to a situation, in which none of the suggested candidates is entrenched.

What comes to the ISO 704 standard about terminology work, the recommendations of the standard, and the actual word-coining as a part of language revitalization can differ greatly. For example, the first principle—'transparency'—can be an ambiguous aim for an endangered language. Whose sense of transparency should be considered: the current speakers or the speakers before the language contact started to change the world view of the language community? From the point of view of authenticity, the latter should probably be the starting point, but then the neologisms can be incomprehensible for current speakers, who are not necessarily aware of all the aspects of traditional culture. On the other hand, Hieber (2014: 4) reminds that most neologisms are nevertheless opaque and the logic behind the meaning of the word needs to be explained in any case for the word to be understandable. It is important to remember that lexical modernization is not the same as terminology development. The latter aims for extreme clarity and clear-cut differences between the terms but it is not the purpose of expanding the vocabulary of an endangered language. The principles of terminology development can thus be a good help when establishing guidelines for lexical modernization work, but they should not restrict vocabulary development.

In the case of endangered languages, sometimes even the sixth principle of ISO (linguistic correctness) can be problematic. For the new speakers, coining new words can be empowering and a source of motivation to learn the language, but when still in the process of learning the language, they might be prone to make mistakes. The dilemma is whether the coined words that do not follow the conventions of the word-forming should be corrected or not. On one hand, many of the language revitalization activists revitalizing their heritage language want to follow the traditions of the language as closely as possible and want the language to be authentic and thus be

morphologically, phonologically, and syntactically correct. On the other hand, correcting someone's language usage can easily hurt their feelings and in the worst case, make them quit the efforts to learn the language. The ownership of the language is after all within the people, not for example researchers or linguists (See more about the issue of community-driven language revitalization efforts and linguists' interference in general in Couzens, Gaby & Stebbins 2020).

4.5 Lexical modernization as language standardization

It is important to notice that lexical modernization is a form of language standardization. If a language planning committee tries to standardize the language using its own ideals and preferences, not all the language community members will approve of the standard. If a standard that is not approved by the different speech communities is created, the language revitalization does not probably advance either. Olthuis (2003: 576) warns not to over-standardize the language because it creates a fear of making mistakes and discourages people from using the language they have just learned with great effort. The language needs to be "let go" to the community or the language growth can be retarded (Hieber 2014: 5). If the speakers take actively part in the language revitalization, they have more opportunities to explore the differences between the standard and local dialects and find the balance in their personal language use (Olthuis 2003: 577).

Consequently, standardization should be done with the language users' views in mind. For example, even though from a linguistic point of view the differences between the Alutiiq varieties are not great, Alutiiq speakers value their local varieties highly. Therefore, the variation of the language has been taken into consideration in Alutiiq lexical modernization project, for example allowing more than one word for one item or more than one meaning for a word (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 134). Kimura and Counceller (2009) also point out that the members of the Alutiiq New Words Council have been keenly aware of the standardizing role of the council since its beginning and suggested that the work should also cover such tasks as spelling standardization, community education, and increasing the status of the language.

Many of the existing new words committees are also aware of the ever-changing nature of language planning. For example, the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee acknowledges that sometimes a word already approved turns out to be an unsuitable choice, and then it is better to recommend another word instead (Kimura & Counceller 2009: 139). The example of Alutiiq also shows that standardization does not need to be based on a strict classification of acceptable and unacceptable language forms but there can be room for variation and diversity. Lane, Costa, and De Korne (2018: 11–13) show that standardizing minority languages differs from standardizing majority languages

in three ways. First, the marginalized status of minority languages and their speakers gives the standardization attempts of the minority languages a different position than the majority languages and thus the standardization has in principle different aims than those of dominant majority languages: to change the already established hierarchy, to improve the status of a minority group and change the longstanding prejudices. Second, unlike majority languages, whose standardization is represented to be a natural process and thus unquestionable, the standardization process of minority languages is an open, negotiable, debatable, and contestable and it allows participation of various societal actors, not just one authority. Third, the standardization of minority languages supports multilingualism, it questions the norm of monolingualism and views diversity as an asset.

5 Lexical modernization of the Ainu language

Ainu is a language isolate once spoken in Hokkaido, northern parts of Japan's main island Honshu, southern Sakhalin, the Kuriles, and possibly at the southern tip of the Kamchatka peninsula by the Ainu people. The number of Ainu speakers started to rapidly decrease in the late 19th century and early 20th century when *Wajin*—ethnic Japanese from the point of view of Ainu—colonized the lands of Ainu and imposed an assimilatory policy on them (Kitahara 2018a; Tamura 2000). The Ainu language ceased to be used as a community language in the 1950s. The number of Ainu speakers is unknown, but it is estimated to be very low, and Ainu is classified as a critically endangered language (Kitahara 2018a).

Ainu is a non-standardized language. There are three main varieties of the language: Hokkaido Ainu, Sakhalin Ainu, and Kuril Ainu, of which Hokkaido Ainu can be further categorized into 4–5 subvarieties and Sakhalin Ainu into 2–4 subvarieties (Tamura 2000: 2–3, Bugaeva 2012: 33). Hokkaido Ainu can also be simply divided in two: northeastern and southwestern varieties (Bugaeva 2012: 33). Each local community has their varieties called dialects that differ to some extent in terms of phonology, vocabulary, and word-formation (Tamura 2000: 2–3). However, speakers of different Ainu language varieties primarily understand each their neighbors, but the tree main varieties are not fully mutually intelligible. Moreover, Ainu do value their local varieties very dearly. Kitahara (2018a: 195) notes that now the main motivator to learn the language for many Ainu is to find a connection with one's ancestors, not the common usage of the language. For this reason, many Ainu want to learn in particular their ancestral variety not some other variety even though the linguistic differences are relatively small.

The Ainu writing system has not been standardized either. During its relatively short literal

history, Ainu has been written with the Japanese katakana and hiragana syllabaries, the Cyrillic alphabet, and the Latin alphabet depending on the preference of the notetaker (Tamura 2000: 5), and it does not have one single orthography even today. In this article, the writing system and spelling of the source is used as it is with an occasional note about other possible spellings of the words.

John Batchelor, a British missionary, was one of the first people to attempt to do linguistic research on the Ainu language. He also coined and recorded a substantial number of neologisms in Ainu for his Bible translation project in the early 20th century (Refsing 2000). Refsing, however, points out that Batchelor's work on the Ainu language has several flaws and outright mistakes from phonology to morphology and grammar to vocabulary, so the words he created are likely to have similar problems. An example of a neologism created by Batchelor is *kamui-shongoakore-guru*[1] (God-message-somebody gives-person) meaning 'angel' (Refsing 2000: 28). Furthermore, how widely the Ainu accepted and used the words Batchelor made is unknown.

Ainu language linguist Suzuko Tamura (neé Fukuda) conducted extensive fieldwork interviewing the remaining fluent Ainu speakers during the 1950s–60s and compiled a dictionary based on her fieldwork. There are some instances of neologisms in the dictionary, such as *aeynup* 'phone' (people–with it listen to matters–thing: *a-* 'indefinite subject person marker'; *eynu* 'to listen to matters with'; *p* 'thing (nominalizer)') and *kasi aoósorusip* 'chair' (on top of it–people–to–buttocks–attach something to something–thing: *kasi* 'on top of'; *a-* 'indefinite subject person marker'; *o-* 'applicative prefix indicating locative meaning in general'; *osor* 'buttocks'; *usi* 'attach something to something'; *p* 'thing (nominalizer)') (Tamura 1996 English translation by the author). These words cannot be widely found in Ainu language records[2], and it is unknown how commonly they have been used in the speech community since the words have been documented at a point when the Ainu language was already in decline. It is also possible that these words are nonce-words coined for the need of the moment but as they were recorded by Tamura, the words found their way into the dictionary.

Recently, there have been increasing number of individual Ainu language related projects,

1 In the modern transcription, the phrase is written as *kamuy sonko a=kore kur*. This is also an example of Batchelor's incomplete understanding of Ainu. The expression for 'angel' is grammatically correct, but its meaning is not what was intended: Angels bring messages from God to the people, but people do not give the angels messages from God, as Batchelor's neologism suggests. A semantically coherent version is *kamuy sonko i=kore kur*: the indefinite person marker is changed from subject marker *a=* to object marker *i=*. The meaning changes from the original 'a person, to whom people give (*a=kore*) God's message' to 'a person who gives God's message to people (*i=kore*).' One of the reviewers of this article pointed out that *a=* could also work as a passive marker here, making the meaning of the word into 'a person who was given the message of God.' If this is the case, the word fails to convey the core purpose of angels, that is, to convey the God's message to the people.

2 However, as pointed out by one of the reviewers, the word *kasi aoósorusip* is also recorded in the Horobetsu dialect (Hattori 1964: 105), which indicates a possible wider use.

which have developed a new vocabulary not as the main goal of the project but as a byproduct. Such projects are for instance translating a pamphlet about Hokkaido University's Center of Ainu and Indigenous Studies partly in Ainu (Kitahara 2018a), creating bus announcements (Kitahara 2018b), creating a vocabulary to be used in Ainu language weather forecast in Minapa plaza (City of Sapporo 2019), writing exhibit labels for the National Ainu Museum (Satō 2021) and translating Hokkaido University campus map in Ainu (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022). In addition, when Māori from *Aotearoa* (New Zealand) visited the Ainu community in Nibutani village, the Ainu language teachers and researchers participating in the event produced some new vocabulary to adapt the Māori's *te atārangi* method for Ainu language teaching. The vocabulary produced covers mainly names for colors that have not been traditionally named in Ainu (personal communication Kenji Sekine 17 June 2022). In addition, some individuals and small groups of language advocates have tried their hands at word-coining.

In the next section, some recent attempts to modernize the Ainu lexicon are introduced. Before starting, two notes must be made: Some words introduced here, assigned to a certain source, are not necessarily made, or first used by the group or person cited. While many of the neologisms are indeed made by the group or person cited here, a few of them might not. For example, the newly coined names for the days of the week have probably been used much earlier than the Minapa project introduced below started to use them. Since the researcher must cite some source for the words introduced here, this article refers to the Minapa project webpage (City of Sapporo 2019). Thus, the researcher does not claim that any of the projects has been the first to use the words or that the project group has created the words, just that these words can be found in the material the project has published.

Another point to note is that it is unknown how widely these words are used. There is no corpus of modern Ainu to determine whether the words have become entrenched in the language or not. Some might even claim that these words should not be called neologisms but nonce-words because their level of entrenchment is uncertain. This article, however, takes the same stance as Schmid (2008) and assumes that the newly coined words can be counted as neologisms from an early stage after their first emergence. The words are also documented in writing and are thus continuously used.

5.1 Recent language planning efforts concerning Ainu lexical modernization

Currently, there is no established committee for Ainu language planning, including vocabulary and terminology planning. The closest equivalent to such a committee seems to be one the groups Satō (2021) describes in his article about the Ainu signage and exhibition commentary development

for the needs of National Ainu Museum and Park (the so-called 'symbolic space of ethnic harmony', nicknamed Upopoy). In the Upopoy project, two groups were formed to discuss and decide on the Ainu language to be used in the facility: 'Committee to Study Ainu Language Labeling and Exhibition Commentary at the National Ainu Museum'[3] and 'Working Group to Study Ainu Language Expressions and Neologisms'[4] (Satō 2021: 136). The goals of the groups were to create explanatory labels for the museum exhibits in Ainu and to create signage in Ainu for the museum respectively (Satō 2021: 136; Kobayashi & Fukazawa 2022).

The participants in the working group and the committee included for example Ainu language specialists, people involved in Ainu language revitalization activities, Upopoy staff with Ainu language knowledge, and Ainu who are learning their ancestral language (Satō 2021: 136; Kobayashi & Fukazawa 2022). The participation of Ainu members and the recommendations the Ainu participants make are prioritized in decision-making, for example, how to handle different dialects (Satō 2021: 136; Kobayashi & Fukazawa 2022). The Working Group to Study Ainu Language Expressions and New Words did not only develop new words but also looked through the Ainu language records to find existing but forgotten ways to express certain concepts (Satō 2021: 136). The starting point of the work was texts and labels written in Japanese, so the work of both groups was also about finding ways to translate from Japanese to Ainu (Satō 2021: 136). The Committee to Study Ainu Language Labeling and Exhibition Commentary at the National Ainu Museum paired the language experts with Ainu participants to translate the exhibition labels. After creating drafts of the Ainu text, the suggestions of each pair were discussed thoroughly among the whole committee and changes to the translations were made if deemed necessary (Satō 2021: 137, 139–140). Until today, the Working Group to Study Ainu Language Expressions and Neologisms has developed about 180 new words to express the modern concepts found in the Upopoy facilities (Kobayashi & Fukazawa 2022).

The other groups producing new vocabulary for different projects have been nonrecurring but have nonetheless been somewhat productive from the point of view of neologism-coining. One of the groups was a project to develop names for the bus stops on the Donan bus line going through the town of Biratori, a town that has the highest percentage of Ainu inhabitants in Hokkaido. Some of the words the project created are *uepekerkampi* 'explanatory leaflet' (alternative spelling:

3 *Kokuritsu Ainu Minzoku Hakubutsukan ni okeru Ainugo Hyōji/Tenjikaisetsu Kentōiinkai*

4 *Ainugo Hyōgen/Shingo Kentō waakingukaigi*

uwepekerkanpi), *tumamkauspe* 'poster', *kampinukatcise* 'school'[5], and *sisamnomicise* 'Shinto shrine' (Kitahara 2018b). Another project created vocabulary to be used on the weather forecast screen in Minapa plaza in Sapporo Chi-ka-ho underground passageway. The project wrote down the names for the days of the weeks— *tokapcup* (*to*) 'Sunday', *kunnecup* (*to*) 'Monday', *ape* (*to*) 'Tuesday', *wakka* (*to*) 'Wednesday', *ni* (*to*) 'Thursday', *kani* (*to*) 'Friday', and *toy* (*to*) 'Saturday'—as well as expressions *tanto/nisatta nisoro nekon an?* 'What is the weather like today/tomorrow?' and ~ *kem an* 'It is now ~ o'clock' (City of Sapporo 2019).

Some of the new words have been developed in the initiatives to translate place names and the names of facilities in Hokkaido University. The first such project was when Hokkaido University's Center of Ainu and Indigenous Studies was established and its name and some related material, such as its webpage and a pamphlet about the center, were partly translated into Ainu (Kitahara 2018a). Another project was about translating the place and facility names for the Hokkaido University campus guide map (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022). Both translations are made by linguistics professor Tomomi Satō of Hokkaido University. In the case of the campus guide map project, the translations were further discussed with the Center for Ainu and Indigenous Studies' professors, who are Ainu themselves (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022). Even though the projects were titled translation projects, most of the translations consist of new expressions. Some of the translations/new words are fairly short, such as *kanpikar us i* 'Administration Bureau', *noski un mun us i* 'Central Lawn', *iconi upeka ikir* 'Ginkgo Avenue', and *cipapa uwerankarap itak* 'director's message', but some become quite lengthy and syntactically complicated, for instance, *kikir kanpinuye/saranpe kar kikir respa kanpinuye teeta tunpu* 'Former School of Entomology', *mosir ka us pe nukar us i* 'Botanic Garden,' and *aynu teetawanoankur kampinuye cise sekor an pe* 'role of the Center for Ainu and Indigenous Studies' (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022; Kitahara 2018a: 197).

Another type of word-coining project was initiated when a group of Māori visited Nibutani village in 2013 to teach the *te atārangi* language teaching method to Ainu language teachers and researchers. Much of the *te atārangi* method relies on using Cuisenaire rods, colorful rods of different lengths. The group developed words for 'rod', *niras* (*ni* 'tree; wood'–*ras* 'wood chip'), and the colors that did not yet have names in the Ainu language (personal communication Kenji Sekine 22 July 2022). The colors traditionally named in Ainu are *retar* 'to be white'[6], *kunne* 'to be

5 The word *pon kampinukatcise* is used for 'elementary school' (lit. 'small reading house'), *haykannu kampinukatcise* for 'middle school' (lit. 'medium-sized reading house'), and *poro kampinukatcise* for 'high school' (lit. 'large reading house'). The word for 'university' does not appear in the bus stop names but the project suggests the word *kampinuyecise* for 'university' (lit. 'writing house' or 'studying house').

6 Ainu does not have the word class called 'adjectives.' Instead, words that would be counted as adjectives by their meaning in English, are intransitive verbs in Ainu. In addition to being stative verbs, they have inchoative meanings, e.g., 'to become white; to turn white; to whiten.'

black', *hure* 'to be red' (covers different hues from blood red to orange), and *siwnin* 'to be blue; to be green' (covers different hues from yellow to green and blue). Since the method requires that the learners can verbally differentiate the distinct colors of the rods, new color words were developed, or existing lesser-used or dialect-specific words were searched from documentation.

The group adopted *sikerpepeus* 'to be yellow' from Obihiro dialect (Hattori 1964: 282), *toyne* 'to be brown' that has been used to mean 'ghastly pale' (of face color) (Kubodera 2020: 283), and *hukinane* 'to be dark green'[7] (Batchelor 1905: 133) from Shizunai dialect.[8] In addition, two new words were developed: *makayone* 'to be light green' and *homane* 'to be orange' (personal communication Kenji Sekine 22 July 2022). The existing words *hure* and *siwnin* were assigned only for 'to be red' and 'to be blue' respectively. There was also a suggestion to assign *surkune* to 'to be pink' but since there is an established means to express light color—prefix *ru-* 'slightly'—it was decided that the word *ruhure* will be used (personal communication Kenji Sekine 22 July 2022). *Surkune* can be used to refer to 'violet' instead (personal communication Kenji Sekine 22 July 2022).

A dictionary project to create a dictionary for the Asahikawa variety of the Ainu language also produced some new words. Ainu language teacher Mitsuru Kamusokkay Ōta who was the initiator of the project especially emphasized that the creation of new words must be a common effort (Ōta 2004). His philosophy was not to make the new words arbitrarily but rather to involve the language course students in the creation of the words (Ōta 2004: 50). As a result of the dictionary-making, some useful words for daily life, such as *imeruinaw* 'phone', *imerupasuy* 'mobile phone', and *imerukampi* 'email,' were coined and published (Kawamura & Ōta 2005).

Furthermore, there are some individuals, who are suggesting and disseminating new words on social media. Nickname 'asiriitakku' has published a list of about 170 suggestions of Ainu neologisms on Twitter between 2014 and 2017. The user has since become inactive but their suggestions—some of them very humorous—are still available to read. The neologisms and coinages include such words as, *ruukakusi* 'intersection', *etukisanrekucitusarei* 'otorhinolaryngologist clinic', *ramrit* 'nerve', *citsep* 'clock', and *onpekotope* 'cheese' (Asiriitakku 2017). Another Ainu culture and language advocate Maya Sekine publishes short Ainu language and culture lessons on her Youtube channel *Sitochanneru*. Some of the lessons also include neologisms since the purpose of the lessons is to use the language in modern everyday conversations. Some examples of the new

7 However, when using *te atārangi* method to teach the Saru dialect of Ainu, the word *hukinatomne* 'to be very green' (*hu* 'fresh'–*kina* 'grass'–*tom* 'to shine; to be bright'–*ne* 'to be') is preferred for '(dark) green' because it can be found in Tamura's 1996 Saru dialect dictionary.

8 It was one of the reviewers of the article who pointed out that *sikerpepeus*, *toyne*, and *hukinane* are existing words, not neologisms developed by the *te atārangi* group.

vocabulary used in *Sitochanneru*'s language lessons are *usapauwante* 'a test; an exam,' *aesinamaratto* 'a surprise party,' *nonnoape* 'fireworks,' and *epuykoesna* 'hay fever' (Sekine 2021).

An example of a small group's lexical modernization effort was the Ainu language localization project of OpenOffice software. Three language advocates started to translate the user interface of the OpenOffice text processing program into Ainu in 2004. In an interview by Suárez-Potts (2004), the translation team comments on the difficulty to express the technical terms in Ainu. The team was very aware since the start of the translation project that they lacked the knowledge and experience in creating Ainu words and translating technical terms into Ainu, and they did not have enough participants for the project either (Suárez-Potts 2004). The project released some prototypes of the OpenOffice's user interface with Ainu translations, but it seems that the localization project was not finished after all. Some of the translations used on the prototype user interface are *iyop* 'file,' *data a=kara* 'edit,' *inkar hi ta an puri* 'view,' *data a=okewe wa oro mosma p a=omare* 'insert,' *kampinuye hi ta an puri* 'format,' *a=eywanke p* 'tools,' and *puyar* 'window' (Hirano 2004a; 2004b).

5.2 Word-formation mechanisms and processes used in the Ainu neologisms

Most of the outputs of the projects concerning lexical modernization thus far have been nouns. According to Satō (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 77–78; Satō 2021: 137), the main two noun creation mechanisms in Ainu are compounding and descriptive noun phrases. Noun compounds are simply formed with the pattern 'noun 1 + noun 2 (... + noun n).' Satō (2021: 137; 2008: 180–181) points out that Ainu has very limited means to derive nouns from verbs; this is done mainly by using formal nouns (eg. *p/pe* 'thing', *hi* 'place; time', *usi* 'place', *kur* 'person', *utar* 'people', *hike* 'direction; side') that are more like ancillary words than affixes. Tamura (2000: 193) notes that the majority of the compounds in Ainu have the same structure as phrases, which leads to the fact that it is difficult to distinguish words from phrases. Satō (2021: 137) takes the stand that these kinds of lexical units with a formal noun or a free-standing noun as a head should be considered phrases rather than words. Some of these phrases are, however, recognized as words, hence the name of the phenomenon, phrase word (or syntactic word) (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 78; Satō 2021: 137). Furthermore, in Ainu, intransitive verbs can be converted into nouns, and because of this, noun phrases/phrase words following the pattern 'intransitive verb + noun', can be reduced through noun conversion to the compound pattern 'noun + noun' (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 77–78).

It is somewhat unclear how the neologisms that are circumlocutory noun phrases should be treated: are they words or are they phrases? From the point of linguistic theory, especially when considering the words that have not been entrenched yet, it would be safest to consider these

descriptive noun phrases as phrases, not words (lexical phrases/units). On the other hand, many of the word-coiners using this word-formation method have *written* the noun phrases as one word, that is, there are no spaces between the different words and morphemes constructing the phrase. Even though the neologism might not yet be well entrenched and lexicalized, at least the coiners themselves seem to conceptualize their creations as words, not as phrases. However, the purpose of this article is not to argue how to classify the neologisms created with this word-formation method, so here they are referred to as phrase words/noun phrases.

The two mechanisms introduced above have been used widely in different projects thus far. Examples of compounds are *uwesopki noka*[9] 'organization chart' (*uwesopki* 'the seating arrangement adopted during large-scale religious ceremonies'–*noka* 'picture; form') (Kitahara 2018a: 197), *uepekerkampi*[10] 'explanatory leaflet' (*uepeker* 'storytelling'–*kampi* 'paper; document') (Kitahara 2018b), *menas ricup arso* 'northeast' (*menas* 'east'–*ricup* 'culmination of the sun'–*arso* 'opposite side') (Satō 2021: 139) and *kanpi pu* 'library' (*kanpi* 'paper; document'–*pu* 'storehouse') (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 83). Examples of compounds can also be seen in the individual word-coiners projects, such as Asiritakku's *ramrit* 'nerve' (*ram* 'heart; mind; spirit' – *rit* 'sinew; muscle') and Sitochanneru's *ihokcisemaciya* 'shopping district' (*ihok*[11] 'trade; commerce'–*cise* 'house'–*maciya* 'city; town') (Sekine 2021). Some examples of phrase words/noun phrases are *aynu teetawanoankur kampinuye cise sekor an pe* 'role of the Center for Ainu and Indigenous Studies' (*aynu* 'Ainu people'–*teeta* 'to be ancient; of long ago'–*wano* 'from (on)'–*an* 'to exist; to be'–*kur* 'person'–*kampinuye* 'to study'–*cise* 'house'–*sekor* 'called; that says; that is'–*an* 'to exist; to be'–*pe* 'thing') (Kitahara 2018a: 197), *kampinukatcise* 'school' (*kampi* 'paper; document'–*nukat* < *nukar* 'to look at something'–*cise* 'house') (Kitahara 2018b), *mosir ka us pe nukar us i* 'Botanic Garden' (*mosir* 'earth; soil; island'–*ka* 'on top of'–*us* to be attached to something; to grow somewhere'–*pe* 'thing'–*nukar* 'to look at something'–*us* 'to (do) habitually'–*i* 'place') (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 86), and *aesinamaratto* 'surprise party,' (*a-* 'indefinite subject person marker'–*esina* 'to make something secretly; to hide something'–*maratto* 'a banquet; a feast; a drinking party') (Sekine 2021). Both compounding and coining phrase words/noun phrases are sometimes used together. For example, *mosir ka us pe nukar us i* consists of two phrase words/noun phrases *mosir ka us pe* 'plant' ('the thing that grows on the ground') and *nukar us i* 'viewing spot' ('a place to habitually look at something'), which are then made into a compound 'a place to habitually look at the things that grow on the ground' to mean 'Botanic Garden'.

9 *uwesopki* is an intransitive verb but since in Ainu intransitive verbs can be converted into nouns, the word can be interpreted as a compound of two nouns.

10 *uepeker* (*or uwepeker*) is an intransitive verb 'to tell a story' and it can be interpreted here as a converted noun.

11 *ihok* is an intransitive verb 'to trade; to buy and sell' and it can be interpreted here as a converted noun.

Furthermore, some word-coiners have utilized semantic expansion, for example expanding the meaning of *uwesopki* 'the sitting order in a religious ceremony' to 'organization' (Kitahara 2018a: 197), *sinta* 'cradle' to 'airplane' (Izutsu 2016: 277; Sekine 2021)—further used in compounds like *sintatomari* 'airport' (*sinta* 'airplane < cradle'–*tomari* 'harbor') (Izutsu 2016: 277)— *mintar* 'yard; garden; square' to cover the meaning of 'park' (The Foundation for Ainu Culture 2022), and *a=eywanke p* 'tools' and *puyar* 'window' to also cover the computer software related terms (Hirano 2004b). The words created in the Ainu language Asahikawa variety dictionary project are also semantic expansions. The word *imeru* 'lightning' that appears in all the examples from the dictionary given earlier has been extended to mean 'electricity'. The second word—*inaw*—in the neologism *imeruinaw* 'phone,' means a shaved wood stick that is offered to the gods in religious ceremonies. It is a device of communication between humans and the gods, hence the extension to be part of the compound for 'phone.' The word *pasuy* in *imerupasuy* 'mobile phone' is based on similar logic. A wooden carved stick called *ikupasuy* is used in religious ceremonies to offer the gods sake and *pasuy* in *imerupasuy* refers to that stick.

The new color names developed in the Ainu *te atārangi* project make an exception to the pattern that the new words are mostly only nouns. The word-formation mechanism used here is derivation by attaching the copula *ne* to a noun that has typically the color the neologism expresses. Thus, *makayone* 'to be light green' as *makayo* 'flower bud of giant butterbur' and *ne* 'to be; to become', *homane* 'to be orange' as *homa* 'roe' and *ne* 'to be; to become', and *surkune* 'to be violet' as *surku* 'aconite' and *ne* 'to be; to become'. These neologisms are analogous to the pattern seen in some of the existing descriptive verbs, such as *kotne* 'to be dented' (*kot* 'a dent; a hollow; a depression'–*ne* 'to be; to become'), and *tontone* 'to be bald' (*tonto* 'a hairless skin'–*ne* 'to be; to become') (examples and analysis from Tamura 1996, English translations by the author).

5.3 Loanwords, borrowings, and Ainu neologisms

None of the projects introduced above have expressed an explicit policy towards loanwords and borrowings and very few of them relied on new direct loans from Japanese or any other language. Satō has used one direct loan in his translation: Ainu does not have a native word for ginkgo tree and Satō suggests that the name of the tree can be formed with *ico* < Japanese *ichō* 'ginkgo' and Ainu word *ni* 'tree' (Satō, Kitahara & Ijas 2022: 85). Another example of a new direct loan is the OpenOffice translation project and their suggestion to use the word 'data' as it is in the Ainu language (Hirano 2004a; 2004b). The existing loanwords from Japanese, however, have been used quite frequently, for example, *kanpi/kampi* 'paper; document; letter; reading and writing; study;

learning' (from Japanese *kami* 'paper'). The existing Ainu borrowings from Japanese are adapted to Ainu phonology, as seen in *kanpi* above, or *punki* 'guard' (from Japanese *bugyō* 'magistrate'), *pintoro* 'glass' (from obsolete Japanese *bīdoro*[12] 'glass'), and tuki 'saké cup' (from obsolete Japanese tsuki 'a shallow bowl') (examples from Tamura 1996).[13]

Calques or loan translations also do not seem to be a favored word-formation method. There are some examples of calques, however. The days of the week in the Minapa weather forecast are a good example of loan translation from Japanese. For example, *tokapcup* (*to*) 'Sunday' means verbatim 'the sun (day), which is *nichiyōbi* (*nichi* 'sun'–*yōbi* 'day of the week') in Japanese. The other names of the days of the week follow the same pattern, for instance, Wednesday is *wakka* (*to*) or *wakka* 'water' (*to* 'day') and Friday *kani* (*to*) or *kani*[14] 'metal' (*to* 'day'). Another neologism based on loan translation is *imerunoype* 'computer' or a compound of *imeru* 'electricity < lightning' and *noype* 'brain.' The Ainu word is modeled after Māori *rorohiko* 'computer' (from *roro* 'brain' and *hiko* 'electricity < lightning') (personal communication Kenji Sekine 21 January 2022). Some calques can also be found in Sitochanneru's videos, for instance, *nonnoape* 'fireworks' (*nonno* 'flower'–*ape* 'fire') is based on Japanese *hanabi* (*hana* 'flower'–*bi* < *hi* 'fire') (Sekine 2021). The OpenOffice software translation project's *a=eywanke p* 'tools' and *puyar* 'window' are also calques from English (Hirano 2004b).

However, some people prefer using Japanese loanwords instead of neologisms. These borrowings are direct borrowings with no attempt at phonological adaptation to the Ainu sound system. This can be seen as a natural thing because all the current Ainu speakers in Japan can also speak Japanese and thus there should not be anyone who does not understand the meaning of the Japanese words (see also Haspelmath 2009). When writing Ainu with katakana, these words are not written in katakana but they rather mirror the Japanese orthography, that is, they are written either with katakana or hiragana syllables or kanji characters.

For example, the magazine Ainu Times has adopted a policy of not directly forbidding newly coined words, but it prefers Japanese loanwords in many cases. In a nutshell, the magazine motivates its decision by clarity and understandability (Ainu Times 2022). Already early in the magazine's history, its editorial board has created a five-point list of guidelines for its contributors about the approval of neologisms and loanwords.

12 *bīdoro* again is a borrowing into Japanese from Portuguese *vidro*.

13 One of the reviewers wanted to point out that the origins of *kanpi* and *punki* are unclear because it is difficult to find phonological regularities in the loanwords adopted from Japanese long ago. Here, however, Tamura's (1996) interpretation is used.

14 However, the Japanese word *kinyōbi* 'Friday' refers to 'gold' rather than 'metal' in general. 'Gold' in Ainu is *konkani* or *konkane*.

1) Grammatical correctness of is the absolute minimum requirement.
2) The words used must be understandable for proficient Ainu speakers without additional explanation. Rephrasing and explaining a concept is better than creating a coinage.
3) Foreign concepts must be described from the point of view of the Ainu culture. Rephrase or use a loanword if the literal translation deviates from the traditional Ainu worldview. For example, the way John Batchelor created terminology for Christianity should be avoided.
4) Do not try to standardize the new words or the Ainu language but let everyone participate in the word-coining and leave some leeway for interpretation.
5) Foreign words are allowed if there is no way to avoid using them. In many cases, loanwords also used in Japanese are better understood than new Ainu coinages. For example, extending the meaning of 'spider web' to 'internet' was refused by the editorial board because it was impossible to distinguish it from an ordinary spider's web and it caused unnecessary confusion. (Ainu Times 2022)

Thus, it looks like the guidelines—especially the second, third, and fifth points—discourage the contributors from coining new words and favor longer explanative phrases and loanwords, especially from Japanese. It seems that the initial confusion the newly coined words can cause is seen as an insurmountable problem that does not disappear when people get used to the new words. Ueno (2004: 26) notes that when the number of loanwords increases, the text is easy to understand for Japanese speakers, but the uniqueness of the Ainu language is lost. He gives example (1) from the Ainu Times with the loanwords marked with cursive:

(1) ne *katakana mozi* anak *yunikôdo* 3.3 sekor a=ye *kokusai-kikaku* or a=omare wa, asir *yunikôdo* a=kar.
These *katakana characters* were added to the *international standard of Unicode* 3.3 and a new *Unicode* was created.
(Hiroyuki Yokoyama quoted in Ueno 2004: 26, English translation by the author)

Like many other recently written Ainu texts, the Ainu Times uses double orthography in its articles: both the katakana version and the Latin alphabet version are provided. In the katakana version, the Japanese borrowings are written just as they are written in Japanese, including kanji characters. In the Latin alphabet version, the loanwords are latinized versions of Japanese words and there is no phonological adaptation to Ainu.

Other examples of using direct loans from Japanese without phonological adjustment include

some of the Ainu language radio classes' material. For example, in Kumagai's (2006) lessons, the Japanese words ハンバーガー (*hanbāgā*) 'hamburger', 映画 (*eiga*) 'movie', and カンガルー (*kangarū*) 'kangaroo' are written within the Ainu katakana orthography exactly as they are written in Japanese. However, the words ハンバーガー (*hanbāgā*) and カンガルー (*kangarū*)—English borrowings to Japanese—are written in the Latin alphabet with capital letters and with English orthography ('HAMBURGER' and 'KANGAROO'). Examples of this kind of orthography are in (2) and (3).

(2) トオンペ　カンガルー　ネ。
toonpe　KANGAROO　ne.　(Kumagai 2006: 24)
'That is a kangaroo.'

(3) アチャ　映画　ヌカㇽ　カネ　アン。
aca　EIGA　nukar　kane　an.　(Kumagai 2006: 20)
'Father is watching a movie.'

On the other hand, some of the radio classes include newly coined words, such as Ōta's class of 2004. The neologisms include *nanunpe* 'glasses' (*nan* 'face'–*un* 'to be somewhere; to be attached to something'–*pe* 'thing'), *siporoimeruipiskip* 'computer' (*si* 'real; true; great; main; major'–*poro* 'to be big'–*imeru* 'electricity < lightning'–*ipiski* 'to count things'–p 'thing'), *anenuyep* 'pencil' (*an-* 'indefinite subject person marker'–*enuye* 'to carve with something; to write with something'–*p* 'thing'), and *imeruinaw* 'telephone' already discussed earlier in this article (Ōta & Izutsu 2004).

The different stances on borrowings and varying orthographical means show that there is still much variation in the preference of loanwords to neologisms and that it is possible to follow one's personal preferences in the choice of words and style of orthography when expressing oneself in Ainu. However, not everyone is pleased with any additions to the Ainu vocabulary. Izutsu (2016) points out that the Ainu language advocates can be roughly divided into the ones that want to revitalize the language and the ones that aspire to preserve the language. The latter seem to take a negative attitude towards neologisms in general (Izutsu 2016: 276–277). He finds another difference in the attitudes of the revitalizers towards the preferred method of modernizing the language: should one rather use neologisms or borrowings (Izutsu 2016: 277)? The number of Ainu who wish to revitalize or even preserve the Ainu language seems to be relatively low in the total Ainu population. Therefore, building understanding between these groups of people with different

goals and ways of thinking about Ainu lexical modernization is crucial for successful language revitalization and preservation.

6 Future tasks and open questions related to Ainu lexical modernization

Modern lexicon for the Ainu language has slowly increased during the last decade. As can be seen from the examples given above, some good progress has been made in the modernization of the Ainu lexicon, but many open questions are still left unanswered. Comparing the Ainu language's situation with the other language revitalization endeavors and how they have tackled lexical modernization, especially the following questions require additional consideration: How to disseminate the new vocabulary, to what extent Ainu should be standardized in the process of creating neologisms if it should be standardized at all, should the existing Ainu word-formation methods be utilized more widely, and is there a need for general guidelines about the preferred word-formation methods? These questions lead to the big question: should there be an Ainu language planning agency and if yes, what should be its tasks?

The author is aware that these questions are not necessarily new to all Ainu, since some Ainu have been engaging in international co-operation with other indigenous peoples, for example, with Māori, as pointed out earlier in this article. For those people the following can act as a checklist. Another group of people, who should be aware of the issues pointed out here, are the policymakers and those, who decide on budget. They are not language policy experts and do not necessarily understand how many tasks there are to accomplish regarding lexical modernization alone, not to mention corpus planning in general.

6.1 Disseminating the new vocabulary among the speakers

There is no data on how widely the examples of neologisms above are accepted and used among the Ainu language speakers and learners. This article is based on reports concerning projects creating a variety of texts in Ainu and new words as a byproduct as well as individual language users' innovations. These are not helpful to determine the actual spread of the words. There is no established Ainu language committee, as well as there is not any other single point of contact either to gather and publish the new lexicon or to help the speakers with their modern vocabulary-related questions.

Each of the projects has published partly or in full the vocabulary they have created in a manner that suits the project main aims the best: on a webpage related to the project, on a map

or a brochure, or in a public place the new words are designed for or in a combination of these. Especially the projects that have created a relatively large number of new words, that is, the Upopoy project and Asiriitakku's neologisms on Twitter, are not compiled into comprehensive word lists or dictionaries and published. For instance, to find all the words coined in the Upopoy project, one must search them on the museum's web page, the Upopoy smartphone application, and possibly even visit the Upopoy premises. However, there is a plan to publish the word list sometime in the future (Kobayashi & Fukazawa 2022). To find all the tweets from Asiriitakku, one must go through a several-year-long tweet log. Kawamura and Ōta's (2005) dictionary has some new words in it, and as a personal note from the researcher, these words (eg. *imeru* 'electricity') seem to have spread at least to some extent among the language revitalization advocates and learners. However, there is no electronic version of the dictionary, only a sold-out paper version, which imposes some restrictions on the possibilities to use the dictionary.

Compared with how other language revitalization projects have handled the issue of spreading the neologisms among the speakers, there is a difference between the languages that are used as a medium in education and the ones that are not. Education and textbooks are an easy way to spread new words but that is not the only method of word dissemination. For example, Māori and Inari Sámi neologisms are published both in paper and online dictionaries. An online dictionary is a cost-efficient way to reach a wide public, but it is not necessarily accessible for everyone, for example, due to a lack of technical devices, technical skills, or the preference to use paper dictionaries. Alutiiq new words council added their newly coined words to a list on the Alutiiq Museum's webpage and the words were published in print after the new words project ended. Publishing books even in paperback format is expensive, but this kind of light version of print publishing could also be suitable for Ainu.

Another question to solve related to the dissemination of neologisms is how to handle competing neologisms. Olthuis (2003) warns against having several words assigned to the same concept but with no coordination and a place to gather and publish the new Ainu vocabulary, some overlap is expected to happen. In the material gathered for this article, two competing neologisms from different sources have emerged. One of them is 'computer' with neologisms *imerunoype* and *siporoimeruipiskip*, and the other 'phone' with neologisms *imeruinaw* and *aeinup*. On the other hand, for example, the Twitterist asiriitakku often gives several suggestions for one concept, for instance, *hawkonnoka* (*haw* 'voice'–*kon* < *kor* 'to have; to possess'–*noka* 'picture'), *ramatunnoka* (*ramat* 'soul'–*un* 'to be somewhere; to be attached to something'–*noka* 'picture') and *moymoykep* (*moymoyke* 'to move'–*p* 'thing') for 'video' (Asiriitakku 2017). Olthuis (2003) considers the issue from the point of view

of a language that is used in education. However, in the case of Ainu, it is probably best to assume the same stance as Alutiiq speakers, that is, giving room for variation, recording all the different suggestions, and letting the speakers choose the words they want to use.

6.2 The standardizing effect of neologisms on Ainu

In many other language revitalization projects, it is well acknowledged that lexical modernization is never just about coining new words, but it is understood more widely as a form of standardizing the language. Lexical modernization usually entails for example selecting a certain way of spelling and choices between the different varieties (morphemes, lexicon, grammar, etc.) to be used in word-coining. One of the first tasks that must be tackled is to decide to which level Ainu should be standardized in relation to lexical modernization.

For example, in northeastern varieties of Hokkaido Ainu and Sakhalin Ainu 'mouth' is *car*[15] but in the southern Hokkaido Ainu varieties, the form *par* is used. When using this word in the creation of new vocabulary, which one of the varieties should be used in compounds? Will the speakers, who rather use the other variety, accept the word with the "wrong" component? Of course, one option is not to standardize and to create several new words using all the possible different varieties for all the different variety speakers.

On the other hand, there are examples of existing words that are based on components used in other varieties: For example, southern Hokkaido varieties have the word *caranke* 'to argue; to debate' that comes from the northeastern variety *car* 'mouth' and *ranke* 'to drop; to take down' (Tamura 1996). Other similar examples are southern Hokkaido Ainu words *omanan* 'to travel; to walk about' (*oman* 'to go' and *an* 'to exist') and *iyomante* 'to sacrifice (a bear) ceremonially[16]' (*i-* 'thing(s)', (epenthetic *-y-*), *oman* 'to go', and *-te* '[causative suffix]') (Tamura 1996). The word for 'to go' used in these compounds, *oman*, is used as an independent word mainly in the northeastern varieties. The southern Hokkaido Ainu variety uses *arpa* 'to go' instead (Tamura 1996). This demonstrates that mixing of different varieties has happened when Ainu was still widely used and notably also in culturally significant words such as *iyomante* and *caranke*. The forms used only as components in complex words in certain dialects can be deemed to be older forms of language, for example, the form *ca*(*r*) is older than *pa*(*r*) (Nakagawa & Fukazawa 2022: 286). Thus, creating neologisms by using a component currently used in just one of the varieties should not be a problem of authenticity, since it has naturally happened before.

15 However, the possessive forms are different: *cara* in northeastern Hokkaido Ainu and *caro* in Sakhalin Ainu.

16 Again, an intransitive verb can be converted into a noun: 'a (bear) sacrifice ceremony.'

It is important to remember that none of the decisions made about standardization is final and unchangeable. As Lane, Costa, and de Korne (2018) suggest, the way minority languages are standardized is negotiable and the decisions made can always be contested. The other indigenous language committees and councils are aware that they sometimes need to rethink their decisions when new information is found, the language community does not accept the suggested neologism, or the opinion of the language community changes. Reassessment should not be seen as a failure but as a normal part of lexical development.

6.3 Word-formation mechanisms not yet widely used in Ainu neologisms

As mentioned earlier, most of the new Ainu vocabulary created in the different projects is classified as nouns, so the discussion here is also especially concentrated on the creation of nouns. According to Tamura (2000), the two main word-formation processes in Ainu are compounding and derivation. In the Ainu lexical modernization attempts conducted until today, compounding has been used extensively but derivation of completely new words that cannot be found in current dictionaries can be only rarely seen, for example, in Ota's *siporoimeruipiskip* 'computer' in which *si-* 'true; great' is a derivative prefix (Ōta & Izutsu 2004). Ainu compounds sometimes become quite long but word length is not a problem per se in Ainu and many existing words are indeed several syllables long. However, if neologisms that can be expected to be used as part of further compounds are already lengthy, the word length might cause inconvenience. For example, the words can be difficult to remember, and it will take a lot of space when writing them down, which can be a problem, especially in a case of a webpage menu or a smartphone application user interface. An example of neologism with possibly problematic length is *data a=okewe wa oro mosma p a=omare*, the expression the OpenOffice localization team suggested to mean 'insert' (Hirano 2004a). Therefore, derivation can offer many opportunities to expand the Ainu lexicon.

The problem of productivity—the degree of usage of each word-formation method—is not discussed here widely. Some of the word-formation processes introduced below might indeed be non-productive or rather, were deemed as non-productive when Ainu was still spoken more widely. However, since there are no longer people left, who speak Ainu fluently as their first language, it is difficult to determine the current potential usage of each word-formation process. In revitalization attempts of languages with no speakers left, productivity or non-productivity has not been seen as an issue and the available documented word-formation processes are used as needed (for example Kaurna language, see Amery 2016). In the case of Ainu, there are some mentions in the documented sources about certain processes being non-productive. For example, the negative prefix *sem-* is said

to be appearing only in a definite set of words (Tamura 1996). Yet, having a negating prefix in one's toolbox of word-formation mechanisms seems useful. If the new speakers of Ainu decide that they want to start to use the prefix again, they will. In that case, there will also be people—even linguists who should in definition be descriptivists, not prescriptivists—against the reintroduction of this once non-productive form. The core problem here seems to be again the question of authenticity and/or artificiality of the revitalized language: To what degree can the language be changed intentionally in the manner that the language community still considers the language authentic?

According to Tamura (2000), in the Saru variety of Ainu, the main derivation processes are as follows. Verbs can be derived by attaching several types of verb prefixes, for example, nominal prefixes *u-* 'each other', *yay-* 'self', *si-* 'self', applicative prefixes that express case relationship (*e-* 'using; concerning', *ko-* 'against; towards; facing' and *o-* 'at; towards; from'), adverbial prefixes *ar-* 'completely', *ru-* 'slightly; low', *si-* 'truly', *ray-* 'exaggeratedly', *wen-* 'excessively', *toy-* 'totally' (of which three last are also nouns, and therefore the formed words can also be interpreted as compounds), and adverbial prefixes created by combining certain aforementioned prefixes with the applicative prefix *ko-* 'towards' (*uko-* 'together; all (parts) treated as a whole', *yayko-* 'alone; a little', *sirko-* 'suddenly, unexpectedly', *toyko-* 'thoroughly') (Tamura 2000: 204–210). A quite widely used prefix is the antipassive *i-*, which deletes the object of the verb (Bugaeva 2012: 486–487). Another type of derivation is noun incorporation, in which one of the core arguments becomes part of the verb through prefixing, and the verb valency is decreased by one argument (Satō 2008: 222; Bugaeva 2012: 489). The most common type of noun incorporation is object incorporation, which turns a transitive verb into an intransitive verb (Satō 2008: 225; Bugaeva 2012: 490).

Verbs can be formed from roots by adding different verb suffixes for intransitive verbs and transitive verbs as well as by reduplicating the root and adding a suffix (Tamura 2000: 211–213). Other verb suffixes are causative suffixes (*-re*/*-e*/*-te*) and indefinite causative suffixes (*-yar*/*-ar*), aspectual suffixes (eg. *-kosanu*/*-kosanpa* 'suddenly', *-natara*/*-itara* 'continuation of a condition', *-tektek* 'sudden and momentary action', *-rototke*/*rototo* '(sounds or feelings) occur one after another', *-atki* 'to continue', *-no* 'sufficiently, well'), suffixes that verbalize nouns (e.g. *-nu* 'to have; to secrete', *-o* 'to exist (there), to be situated', *-asnu* 'to have much of something (that is good to have)', *-asap* 'to not have much of something (and that is not good or wanted)') (Tamura 2000: 213–219).

New nouns can be derived by expanding the meaning of the existing nouns with noun prefixes, for example *ar-*/*oar-* 'one side, one of a pair', *uren-* 'both', *si-* 'big; (the) real (thing)', *harki-* 'left', *simon-* 'right', and noun suffixes, for instance *-utar* 'people' and *-po* '(diminutive suffix)' (Tamura 2000: 220–222). Adverbs can be derived from verbs with suffixes *-no* and *-ko* (makes an adverb with

an opposite meaning) and from the pattern 'prefix+noun indicating a place+suffix' (eg. *e- -ne* ('head'- -copula), *o- -un* ('rear'- -'towards'), *he- -asi* ('head'- -'stand)') (Tamura 2000: 222–224). As mentioned earlier, not all the derivation processes mentioned above are necessarily thought to be productive.

In Ainu, there are especially many word-formation processes to create verbs (examples of derivation above from Tamura 2000; see also Satō 2008: 270–277). Since intransitive verbs can be converted into nouns in Ainu, utilizing different verb derivation mechanisms to create intransitive verbs that can be treated as nouns through noun conversion could be useful also in the current type of lexical modernization projects. Some of the affixes mentioned above increase the valency of the verb (eg. applicative prefixes, causative suffixes) and some of them decrease the valency (eg. reflexives *yay-* and *si-*, reciprocal *u-*, antipassive *i-*). Another method of decreasing the valency of a verb is noun incorporation or attaching one of the verb's core arguments—most commonly object—to the verb (Bugaeva 2012: 489–490). However, noun incorporation occurs especially when the action the word describes has some level of cultural significance and it refers to a customary action (Satō 2008: 222; Bugaeva 2012: 490). Thus, it seems to be a rather non-productive word-formation process. However, it needs to be clarified what is a culturally significant customary action for today's Ainu; can, for example, 'TV-watching,' 'email-writing,' or 'smartphone-using' be counted as such actions?

Furthermore, Ainu has a relatively small number of roots and even the basic vocabulary is mainly composed of derivation with affixes to these roots (Tamura 2000: 254). For example, the root *rut-* has a meaning of 'to push along'. To form a transitive verb from the root, the suffix *-u* needs to be attached (*rutu* 'to push along'), and for an intransitive verb, the suffix *-ke* is needed (*rutke* 'to be pushed along'). Word *horutk*e 'to collapse' consists of the prefix *ho-* 'rear; end; buttocks,' root *rut-* 'to push along,' and verb suffix *-ke*. The word *urerutrutu* 'to probe with one's feet' consists of *ure* 'foot', reduplicated root *rut-*, ie. *rutrut-* 'to push continuously along,' and the verb suffix *-u*. *Urerutrutu* is an example of noun incorporation: the noun *ure* 'foot' is incorporated into the transitive verb *rutrutu* 'to continuously push something along.' The projects introduced in this article have done minimal attempts to create new words using the roots (including partial or full reduplication of the roots) and affixes attached to these roots.

Another method to expand the vocabulary, which is not yet used to great extent in Ainu lexical modernization, is to repurpose archaisms and obsolete words. There are some examples of this already mentioned in this article, for instance, expanding the meaning of *sinta* 'cradle' to 'airplane.' The types of cradles *sinta* refers to are not widely used anymore, so it can be interpreted that *sinta* as a cradle is an archaism. Kitahara (2018b) mentions another example of repurposing a word:

ramatunsikso (*ramat* 'soul'– *un* 'to be confined in'–*sik* 'eye'–*so* 'surface') is used to mean 'television' by some people in the Asahikawa area. The word is originally from an epic poem, and it is a radar-like device to detect approaching people. Thus, the Twitterist asiriitakku suggests that *ramatunsikso* could be repurposed as 'radar', 'surveillance camera with movement detection sensors', or 'monitor' (Asiriitakku 2017).

Traditionally, Ainu words seem not to consist of abbreviations, acronyms, blends, clippings, etc. but there might be some use for them in the lexical modernization of Ainu. Another word-formation method of which there are no examples to be found in the currently created neologism is coinages, that is, creating completely new words *ex nihilo*. New coinages often utilize onomatopoetic connotations of certain sounds or use recognizable (parts of) existing words or roots in combination with meaningless components, as long as they are in accord with the phonology of the language. These word-formation methods can be easily seen as the most inauthentic and thus they might cause opposition. For this reason, if they are decided to be used, they must be used with caution in order not to alienate the potential word users.

6.4 Guidelines for creating neologisms

It might be useful to create guidelines to help the different future projects and individuals in their word-coining. First, the guidelines can help language learners to understand the variety of word-formation processes Ainu has. Second, it can give ideas to the coiners about the methods they are not so familiar with. Third, it can also guide the coiners in other matters than just word-formation processes: how to coin consistent, authentic words that are linguistically economical and culturally appropriate.

The guidelines used for example by the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee, Mohawk Language Standardization Project, and Māori *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori* can offer a model for lexical development guidelines for Ainu, for example, how to handle borrowings and loanwords. It is probably a good idea to also include principles about the authenticity and the cultural acceptability of the new words, as Olthuis (2003) suggests. In addition, flexibility in adopting the guidelines and the process of changing a decided word when needed should also be written down in the guidelines, as the other language revitalization projects have done. It is advisable to consider if there are points that must absolutely be followed always and some that are more negotiable. The guidelines about the best practices developed for terminology planning can also be a useful reference when considering word-coining guidelines for Ainu and they can offer some ideas to be incorporated into the Ainu guidelines. For example, the ISO 704 standard for terminology planning

lists principles on how the new words should be in relation to the existing vocabulary, such as consistency, linguistic economy, derivability, and compoundability, which are missing from the other language revitalization projects guidelines referred to in this article.

Here are some more specific questions about guidelines for neologism-creating to solve in the future. Guidelines/principles about desirable term formation suggest that short words are good. But that is a language-specific question. Ainu tends to have long words; it is not necessarily an undesirable property. Now mostly used word-formation methods are compounds and phrase words/noun phrases and the neologisms sometimes do become long. As mentioned above, word length might have not been a problem for traditional Ainu speakers, but the new speakers might find the new words quite a mouthful. Especially if common words are long, it might make people avoid using them. Should the word-coiners look more into creating new words with such word-formation methods as derivation, duplication, and even new coinages to create more compact basic words? Should there be a rule of thumb in which cases it is acceptable to create long words and in which cases not?

Another point to consider is when meaning extensions are a hindrance to understanding. Extending the meaning of spider's web to the internet should not cause problems because they have both very different referents, and they are used in very different contexts. The word 'web' in 'I bought it on the web' and 'I swept the web off the corner' are easy to distinguish to refer to different concepts. On the other hand, if the referents are too close concepts, it might evoke misunderstanding. For example, extending the meaning of *mintar* 'yard; garden; square' into 'park' might cause communicative problems. All these meanings are close concepts, and adding another possible referent makes communication even more complex, which means that further negotiation of meaning is almost unavoidably required when talking about *mintar*.

The issue of borrowings and loanwords have been discussed throughout this article but here is a summary of the questions to be answered. Is there a need for special consideration about how to handle future borrowings and loanwords in Ainu? Should there be loanwords and if there should, are there any preferences about the donor languages? Is language internal word-coining preferred over borrowings as in many other language revitalization projects? If borrowing is not preferable, what is the reason for it, for example, does borrowing create a problem of authenticity? If there are loanwords, should they be adjusted to Ainu phonology or not? How about writing loanwords? Is it a problem if the same loanword is written in many ways?

Although not exactly the topic of this article, another big question is not just creating a modern lexicon, but the pragmatics related to the question of how to use the newly coined words in modern

Ainu discourse and the pragmatics of the new language domains. Amery (2016) points out that Kaurna people are very aware of authenticity issues related to neologisms but most of the Kaurna texts are produced as translations from English. This will eventually lead to the copying of English expressions and speech patterns. In the case of Ainu, it might be good to think in advance whether copying the discourse patterns from Japanese is an issue.

6.5 Language planning committee

The final big question is if a language planning committee or agency for the Ainu language is needed. The questions posed above are complex and hard to solve, and for that reason, it might be useful to have an organization that discusses the questions and solves the problems. Furthermore, since the questions above concern not just a single local Ainu variety or dialect but the whole language, the wishes and needs of each variety's speakers should be heard in the decision-making. That requires a local representation for each variety. For these reasons, the researcher suggests that Ainu start at least a provisional organization for language planning that discusses these issues and decides if there is a need for a permanent agency.

In principle, the language planning agencies are controlled by the people whose language the agency plans and manages. Language revitalization is not just about reintroducing a language but also about decolonization and reclaiming one's identity. Therefore, also in the case of Ainu, the possible agency must be in Ainu control from the start, and it is for the Ainu to decide how the setup of the agency should be: Should the agency be part of some existing organization, such as the Foundation of Ainu Culture or Upopoy, or should it be independent of all the existing governmental organizations? Who participates in the planning work? What are the tasks of the agency and is lexical modernization one of them? How often should it meet? After deciding on those questions, the tasks introduced in this article can also be tackled.

Answering the questions listed above is difficult since Ainu do not have a self-governing body for decision-making. There are, however, examples of other indigenous people starting language-centered initiatives without official government support. For example, Inari Sámi revitalization was initiated when a group of Inari Sámi language advocates established the Inari Sámi Language Association and started to revitalize and promote the language through the activities of the association (Olthuis 2003). Establishing a similar Ainu-governed grassroots initiative might also be an option for Ainu before a possible government-supported official organization can be established.

7 Conclusion

The present article shows that Ainu lexical modernization is well underway and different actors are creating new lexicon for different needs. Furthermore, there are several tasks to solve in the future regarding how to proceed with lexical modernization. The findings of the article suggest that Ainu language revitalization benefits from a more centralized approach to lexical modernization while supporting and encouraging the Ainu speakers and learners to participate in lexicon development. Comprehensive research on the modernization of the Ainu lexicon has not been conducted earlier but it is a crucial area of research for Ainu language revitalization.

To summarize the tasks related to Ainu lexical modernization, the answers to the four main questions—how to disseminate the new words, what level of standardization of Ainu is acceptable as a consequence of lexical modernization, should Ainu word-formation processes be used more creatively than in the neologisms created thus far, and is there a need for guidelines about how to create new, authentic words in Ainu—lead the path to the fifth question: should there be a language planning committee? Indigenous language planning is not just mechanical word-creation, but it also concerns such issues as decolonization, regaining one's right to self-decision, and reinforcing one's indigenous identity. The problems to solve are complex and sometimes they divide opinions. In a situation like this, the best solution is to create an Ainu-governed language planning committee that can focus only on the issues concerning the Ainu language.

The review and the suggestions made here are mainly based on reports and papers and other literal material about the lexical modernization of Ainu. It has been emphasized several times that all the decision-making about how to proceed with the neologism-coining should be made by Ainu themselves. After all, it is Ainu themselves who know how they want to use their language. This, of course, does not mean Ainu have to do everything alone. They can always decide to utilize outsiders' help when needed.

This article does not clarify the different needs and wishes Ainu have about lexical modernization. Also, the lexical modernization of Ainu has a strong link to the goals of the Ainu language revitalization in general. The answers to the questions about lexical modernization are thus connected to the open questions about the goals of language revitalization: What kind of words are needed, that is, in what kind of situations and domains Ainu language should be used? Who should be speaking Ainu and what kind of words do they need? These are all questions only the Ainu themselves can answer. That survey is left to be conducted in future research.

References

Ainu Times (2022) *2. Taimuzu kosei to henshu ni kanshite (3) Gairaigo to zōgo* [2. About proofreading and editing the Times (3) Loanwords and coinages]. https://otarunay.at-ninja.jp/taimuzu.html#edit [accessed 17 June 2022].

Akbari, Fatemeh (2020) *Iran's Language Planning Confronting English Abbreviations—Persian Terminology Planning*. Cham: Springer.

Akmajian, Adrian, Richard A. Demers, Ann K. Farmer & Robert M. Harnish (2010) *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. 6th edition. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press.

Amery, Rob (2016) *Warraparna Kaurna! Reclaiming an Australian language*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.

Asiriitakku (2017) *Twitter posts*. https://twitter.com/asiriitakku [accessed 15 May 2022].

Batchelor, John (1905) *Ainu–English–Japanese Dictionary (Including a Grammar of the Ainu Language)*. Second edition. Tokyo: Methodist Publishing House.

Blair, Heather & Shirley Fredeen (1995) Do Not Go Gentle into That Good Night. Rage, Rage, against the Dying of the Light. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 26 (1): 27–49.

Bugaeva, Anna (2012) Southern Hokkaido Ainu. In: Nicolas Tranter (ed.) *The languages of Japan and Korea*, 461–509. London: Routledge.

City of Sapporo (2019) *Ainu bunka wo hasshinsuru kūkan 'Minapa'* [Minapa—a place to transmit the Ainu culture]. https://www.city.sapporo.jp/shimin/ainushisaku/minapa/index.html [accessed 23 June 2022].

Couzens, Vicki, Alice Gaby & Tonya Stebbins (2020) Standardise This! Prescriptivism and Resistance to Standardization in Language Revitalization. In: Keith Allan (ed.) *Dynamics of Language Changes—Looking Within and Across Languages*: 37–55. Singapore: Springer.

Denzer-King, Ryan (2008) Neologisms in Indigenous Languages of North America. Joye Kiester and Verónica Muñoz-Ledo (eds.) *Proceedings from the eleventh Workshop on American Indigenous Languages. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics*, 19. UC, Santa Barbara.

Fishman, Joshua (2001) From Theory to Practice (and Vice Versa): Review, Reconsideration and Reiteration. In: Joshua Fishman (ed.) *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited*, 451–483. Clevedon Toronto Buffalo Sydney: Multilingual matters ltd.

García, Ofelia (2015) Language Policy. In: J. D. Wright (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, Vol 13: 353–359. Oxford: Elsevier.

Harlow, Ray (1993) Shorter Communication: Lexical Expansion in Māori. *The Journal of Polynesian Society* 102 (1): 99–107.

Haspelmath, Martin (2009) Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In: Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (eds.) *Loanwords in the World's Languages– A Comparative Handbook*, 35–54. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hattori, Shirō (ed.) (1964) *An Ainu dialect dictionary—with Ainu, Japanese, and English indexes*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten Publishers.

Hieber, Daniel W. (2014) Building the lexicon for awakening languages. Chapter prepared for *the Conference on Language Revitalization: Sleeping & Awakened Languages of the Gulf South*, Tulane University. Unpublished.

Hinton, Leanne, Leena Huss & Gerald Roche (2018) Introduction Language Revitalization as a Growing Field of Study and Practice. In: Leanne Hinton, Leena Huss & Gerald Roche (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization*, xxi–xxx. New York: Routledge.

Hinton, Leanne & Jocelyn Ahlers (1999) The issue of "authenticity" in California language restoration. *American Anthropological Association* 30(1): 56–67.

Hirano, Kazunari (2004a) *OOo1.1.1 Aynu Prototype menu 1*. https://openoffice.exblog.jp/307547/ [accessed 13 July 2022].

Hirano, Kazunari (2004b) *OOo1.1.1 Aynu Prototype menu* 2. https://openoffice.exblog.jp/307586/ [accessed 13 July 2022].

ISO (2009) *ISO 704:2009(E) Terminology work — Principles and methods — Travail terminologique — Principes et méthodes*. Third edition. The International Organization for Standardization. Online version. https://ddialliance.org/sites/default/files/shared/2012/DDI%20Moving%20Forward/ISO/ISO704_2009.pdf [accessed 30 June 2022].

Izutsu, Katsunobu (2016) Ainu Languages: Correct, Good, and Less So. In: Masahide Ishihara, Eiichi Hoshino & Yoko Fujita (eds.) *Self-determinable Development of Small Islands*: 269–285. Singapore: Springer Science+Business Media.

Kawamura, Sinrit eoripak aynu & Mitsuru Ōta (2005) *Asahikawa ainugo jiten* [A dictionary of Asahikawa Ainu language]. Asahikawa: Ainugo kenkyūsho.

Keyes, Ralph (2021) *The hidden history of coined words*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimura, Larry & Isiik April G. L. Counceller (2009) Indigenous New Words Creation Perspectives from Alaska and Hawai'i. In: Jon Allan Reyhner & Louise Lockard (eds.) *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance & Lessons Learned*: 121–139. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Kitahara, Jirōta (2018a) Current status of Ainu cultural revitalization. In: Neyooxet Greymorning (ed.) *Being Indigenous: Perspectives on Activism, Culture, Language and Identity*: 187–200. London: Routledge.

Kitahara, Jirōta (2018b) <Sinrit urespa (Sosen no kurashi) 27> Ainugo de basu anaunsu —Ainugo ga hibiku kūkan wo—[Bus announcements in Ainu—Making a space for the Ainu language to be heard]. *Gekkan Siror*, 4/2018. https://ainugo.nam.go.jp/siror/monthly/201804.html#01 [accessed 16 June 2022].

Kobayashi, Miki & Mika Fukazawa (2022) Kyurētāzunōto: Dai ichi gengo wo Ainugo ni suru tame ni — Kokuritsu Ainuminzoku hakubutsukan no chōsen [Note from the curators: To make Ainu the first language— The challenge of the National Ainu Museum] *Bijutsukan/Āto jōhō no Web magajin*, 2022/4/15. https://artscape.jp/report/curator/10175513_1634.html. [accessed 22 September 2022].

Krägeloh, Chris & Tia N. Neha (2014) Lexical expansion and terminological planning in indigenous and planned languages — Comparisons between Te Reo Māori and Esperanto. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 38 (1): 59–86.

Kubodera, Itsuhiko (ed.) (2020) *Ainugo/Nihongo jitenkō. Kubodera Itsuhiko chosakushū 4* [Ainu/Japanese dictionary manuscript. Kubodera Itsuhiko collection 4]. Urayasu: Sōfūkan.

Kumagai, Kane (2006) *Ainugo rajio kōza tekisuto Heisei 18-nendo dai-1-ki* [Textbook for the Ainu language radio course, the first period of 2006]. https://www.ff-ainu.or.jp/radio/files/06-1.pdf [accessed 20 July 2022].

Lane, Pia, James Costa & Haley De Korne (2018) Standardising Minority Languages: Reinventing Peripheral Languages in the 21st Century. In: Pia Lane, James Costa & Haley De Korne (eds.) *Standardizing Minority Languages—Competing Ideologies of Authority and Authenticity in the Global Periphery*: 1–23. Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism. New York and London: Routledge.

Maryniak, Joanna, Justyna Majerska-Sznajder & Tymoteusz Król (2021) Ethical Aspects and Cultural Sensitivity in Language Revitalization. In: Justyna Olko & Julia Sallabank (eds.) *Revitalizing endangered languages: a practical guide*, 49–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nahir, Moshe (1984) Language planning goals: a classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 8: 294–327.

Nakagawa, Hiroshi & Mika Fukazawa (2022) Hokkaido Ainu dialects: Towards a classification of Ainu dialects. In: Anna Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu language*, 253–328. (Handbooks of Japanese Language and Linguistics 12). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Olthuis, Marja-Liisa (2003) Uhanalaisen kielen elvytys: Esimerkkinä inarinsaame [Revitalization of an endangered language: Inari Sámi as an example]. *Virittäjä* 4: 568–579.

Ōta, Mitsuru & Katsunobu Izutsu (2004) *Ainugo rajio kōza tekisuto Heisei 16-nendo dai-1-ki* [Textbook for the Ainu language radio course, the first period of 2004]. https://www.ff-ainu.or.jp/radio/files/04-1.pdf [accessed 20 July 2022].

Ōta, Kamusokkay Mitsuru (2004) Ainugo fukkō ni kakawaru shomondai—Ishikarikawasuji no bāi— [Various problems concerning Ainu language revitalization—The case of places along the Ishikari river—]. *The Foundation for Ainu Culture, report collection of the public awareness seminar of 2004*. Sapporo: The Foundation for Ainu Culture.

Rey, Alain (2005) The concept of neologism and the evolution of terminologies in individual languages: translated by Juan C. Sager. *Terminology*, 11(2): 311–331.

Refsing, Kirsten (2000) Lost Aryans? John Batchelor and the Colonization of the Ainu *Language. Interventions*, 2 (1): 21–34.

Sager, Juan C. (1990) *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sallabank, Julia (2011) Language policy for endangered languages. In: Peter K. Austin & Julia Sallabank (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*: 277–290. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sallabank, Julia (2012) Diversity and language policy for endangered languages. In: Bernard Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*: 100–123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sallabank, Julia & Jeanette King (2021) What Do We Revitalise? In: Justyna Olko & Julia Sallabank (eds.) *Revitalizing endangered languages: a practical guide*, 33–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sammons, Olivia N. (2009) Updating the Sauk lexicon: Strategies and implications for language revitalization. In: Daisy Rosenblum & Carrie Meeker (eds.) *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Workshop on American Indigenous Languages* 20: 46–69. UC, Santa Barbara.

Satō, Tomomi (2008) *Ainugo bunpō no kiso* [The basics of Ainu grammar]. Tokyo: Daigakushorin.

Satō, Tomomi (2021) *A Brief Report of Some Attempts of Language Revitalization at the National Ainu Museum and Related Issues*. The Japanese Journal of Language in Society, 24 (1): 135–143.

Satō, Tomomi, Mokottunas Kitahara & Silja Ijas (2022) Problems with translation: A report of the Japanese-Ainu translation of the "Hokkaido University Campus Guide Map". *Journal of Ainu and Indigenous Studies*, 2022 (2): 75–101.

Schmid, Hans-Jörg (2008) New Words in the Mind: Concept-formation and Entrenchment of Neologisms. *Anglia*, 126 (1): 1–36.

Sekine, Maya (2021) *Sitochanneru* [Sito channel]. https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCsvS5QjLwvlVhWpK48L57Cg [accessed 15 May 2022].

Spence, Justin (2016) Lexical Innovation and Variation in Hupa. IJAL, 82(1): 71–93.

Spolsky, Bernard (2021) *Rethinking Language* Policy. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Suárez-Potts, Louis (2004) *Interview: Aynu Localization Team*. Open office. https://www.openoffice.org/editorial/aynu_team.html [accessed 13 July 2022].

Tamura, Suzuko (1996) *Ainugo Saruhogen Jiten* [Dictionary of Ainu Language Saru Dialect]. Tokyo: Sofukan. Online version. https://ainugo.nam.go.jp/.

Tamura, Suzuko (2000) *The Ainu Language*. ICHEL Linguistic Studies Vol.2. Translated by the Department of Asian and Pacific Linguistics, Institute of Cross-Cultural Studies, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, the University of Tokyo. Tokyo: Sanseido.

The Foundation for Ainu Culture (2022) *National Ainu Park*. https://ainu-upopoy.jp/en/facility/park/ [accessed 24 July 2022].

Ueno, Masayuki (2004) Ainugo no fukkō to fukyū ni okeru media riyō no torikumi ni tsuite—Ainu taimuzu to FM Nibutani hosō no jirei wo chūshin ni [The Utilization of Media in the Revitalization and Dissemination of the Ainu Language: Focusing on Case Studies of the Ainu Times and FM Nibutani Broadcasting]. *The Bulletin of the Graduate School of Education of Waseda University*. Separate Volume, 10(2): 23–34.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2119.

I would like to thank professor Tomomi Satō and Saana Santalahti for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. I must also thank the anonymous referees for their insightful suggestions that improved the quality of the article.

（2022年9月30日受付、2023年1月5日審査終了）
(Received 2022/9/30. Review passed 2023/1/5)

語彙近代化と新語作りを通じての言語復興
―アイヌ語の語彙近代化の現状と今後の課題―

シリヤ　イヤス*

要　旨

危機言語を現代の日常生活で使えるようにすることは、言語復興の重要な要素である。しかし、ほとんどの危機言語には現代語彙がないから、意図的に作成する必要がある。多くの言語復興事業では、新語委員会を設立し、語彙近代化を担当している。アイヌ語復興においても語彙近代化は行われているが、そのプロセスやさまざまな取り組みについては、まだ包括的に分析されていない。本稿の目的は、アイヌ語復興においてすでにどのような語彙近代化作業が行われたか、どのような課題が残されているかを分析することである。分析は、アイヌ語をはじめとする先住民族言語の語彙近代化に関する先行研究をレビューすることによって行われる。その結果、いくつかの事業でアイヌ語の新しい語彙が開発されているものの、新語作りのためのガイドラインが確立されておらず、事業の成果のまとめも発表されていないことがわかった。本稿では、アイヌ語復興には、語彙近代化を調整する言語計画機関の設立が有効であることを主張する。

キーワード：アイヌ語、言語復興、言語政策と言語計画、語彙近代化、新語

*　北海道大学文学院博士後期課程