

Research Paper

Reversing Language Shift and Revitalization: Ainu and the Celtic Languages

John C. MAHER (International Christian University)

Revitalization of endangered languages is a global issue. Joshua Fishman's influential theory, 'Reversing Language Shift' (1991), was an attempt to 'diagnose' difficulties, identify parallels and share solutions among languages. From the viewpoint of (a) obtaining an understanding of the situation of the language and (b) looking at mutual concerns, comparison is useful because it may enable endangered languages to help each other. Cornish and Manx lost their native speaker populations in the 20th century. Ainu has few native speakers, but excellent records of native speech exist. Endangered languages have traditionally existed as ethnolinguistic symbols, 'heritage' languages, and as tourist and business 'products.' However, recently new waves of Internet networking are enabling the emergence of new platforms for endangered languages in music (folk, rock, jazz, and techno), art, dance, film and radio, language classes, and the emergence of competent teachers and new text books. 'Indigenous' is the new cool and there is sustained political action by Ainu organizations. Strong centralization of school education and the weakness of regional autonomy in France and Japan have damaged Breton in France and Ainu in Japan. Japan and France are both countries that are reluctant to welcome the concept of ethnolinguistic diversity and lack policies to support minority and endangered languages. In Britain, political and 'local' devolution to the regions (Scotland, Wales, Cornwall) is galvanizing local governments to establish language revitalization strategies.

Key words: Joshua Fishman, reversing language shift, Ainu, Cornish, Manx, the Celtic languages

言語シフトを逆行させるプロセスと言語復興

—アイヌとケルト語派からの考察—

ジョン C. マーハ (国際基督教大学)

存続の危機にある言語を復興させることは、世界的な課題である。この分野で影響力の強いジョシュア・フィッシュマンの理論「Reversing language shift (言語シフトを逆行させるプロセス)」(1991)は、さまざまな問題について「診断」し、同様の状況に置かれている言語の共通点について検討し、解決法を共有しようとする試みである。単独では消滅の危機に瀕した言語であっても、互いを支援しあえることから、(a) 現状の把握、(b) 共通の問題に取り組むという観点に立った比較研究は有用であると考えられる。コーンウォール語とマン島語は、20世紀に最後の母語話者を亡くした。アイヌ語は、母語話者は少ないが話者に関する優れた記録が残っている。危機言語を存続させる方法には、民族の象徴・継承言語として、あるいは観光・ビジネス商品としてといった従来からの在り方に加え、近年ではインターネット上の社会的ネットワークを通じた、音楽(フォーク、ロック、ジャズ、電子)、アート、ダンス、映画、ラジオ、言語教室、有能な教師や教材などの広まりといった新しい傾向がみられる。先住民の言語とは、今やクールな存在であり、アイヌに関する諸団体の政治的なアクションを支えるものでもある。フランスや日本では、中央集権的な学校教育制度や地方の自立性の弱さによって、ブルトン語やアイヌ語が消滅の危機に追いやられてきた。これらの国では、ethnolinguistic(民族言語学的)な多様性が未だに歓迎されず、少数言語・危機言語を支える政策も不足したままである。一方、スコットランド、ウェールズ、コーンウォールなど、自治の動きが活発な英国では、スコットランドゲール語、ウェールズ語、コーンウォール語の復興に向けた動きが活気づけられている。

キーワード：ジョシュア・フィッシュマン，危機言語の再活性化，アイヌ語，コーンウォール語，マン島語，ケルト語派

1. Preface: Cool Is It

We arrived in Dublin from Tel Aviv. Me and Robert Cooper went to our hotel and sat talking in the bar. It was late. An old man was sweeping the floor. After a while he came over and said to us “God bless you, sirs, and thank you for speaking the language of our fathers! People have forgotten poor Irish these days.” Bob looked at me. I looked at him. We were speaking Yiddish. (Joshua Fishman to J. Maher. Amsterdam, 1989).

The 21st century may be symbolized by an urban, ‘metroethnic’ post-industrial and post-colonial identity that transforms traditional ethnic orthodoxies into something cool and new (Maher, 2005). In the play and dress of a (given/adopted) ethnicity and localism, language is engaged as an expression of *jouissance*. In the liberated, cool metroethnic both language and speaker are an aesthetic subject; language a lovely accessory not a perfectly formed object from an ethnic tradition. During my fieldwork on the Isle of Man (Maher, 2010), the Manx Language Officer for the Manx government stated that, to the surprise of older Manx folk, it was new migrants to the Isle of Man in the 1980s that wanted Manx as a unique and ‘cool’ way towards forging a new migrant loyalty. Do with language what you will. Knowing an endangered language does not guarantee ethnicity but opens the possibility of ludic ethnicity, performativity. Indigenous is the *nouvelle vague* prescient of more complex or hybrid identity. Cool is a cultural mechanism that actively re-directs or re-routes the traditional ethnicity-language link: “using Cornish is always a self-conscious political act approaching performance” (Kennedy, 2002, p. 87). The redirection is not merely away from a centre of power but in a situated ethics such as Pennycook’s linguistic ‘performativity’ where “however global a practice may be, it still happens locally” (Pennycook, 2010, p. 128).

Endangered languages are flourishing through Cornish and Manx-language film, ethno-fusion and punk rock, Ainu electronica, jazz and dub. Ainu rock music is inspired by Aboriginal Australian. Ireland’s cultural Celtic boom is long-lasting, even as Irish language usage numerically declines in the Gaeltacht. There is Ainu art collaboration with native Hawaiian, a resurgence of the Ainu *mukkuri*, (mouth harp) whilst a quintessential symbol of revival is the rejigging of the practically extinct *tonkori*, Ainu’s only stringed instrument. This instrument of Ainu shamans, to communicate with *kamuy* nature spirits, is now played, amplified, with Ainu-language vocals in Berlin night clubs in WOMAD in Palermo and in the back mash for video games like Final Fantasy XIII. You cannot not hear it. In matters of language revival, cool is the thing and subservience to cultural cliché and orthodoxy, whether Irish or Ainu, is out. (Maher, 2005). Revitalization activity, real success, enjoins us to rewrite the persistent threnodies.

Desire, persistence and belief in success are existential starting points for language revitalization. Long regarded as a ‘vanishing people,’ the Ainu are reasserting their culture and claim to be an ‘indigenous’ people of Japan; even though over-estimation of success, the hope of complete recall, are the treacherous waters in which revivalists swim.

Sociolinguists sometimes often miss the point, becoming distracted by the question “Will they survive?” instead of focusing on the immediate question, “What’s going on?” There are success stories. Ned Maddrell died on the Isle of Man in 1974: the last native speaker of Manx, a Celtic language closely related to Irish and Scottish Gaelic. Like other Celtic languages, Manx had gone into precipitous decline. In the following ensuing decades, a Manx Gaelic Advisory Council was established together withand community networks, such as the parents’ group *Sheshaght ny Paarantyn*, with an interest in language resto-

ration, emerged. Manx language pre-schools were begun. The Isle of Man's Department of Education, Manx-immersion established Bunscoil Ghaelgagh primary school started in 2001. Every year there is provision for a new generation of bilingual Manx-English speakers. We can learn from studying global examples of new bilingualism and language revival. As this becomes clear later Fishman's sociological theories of language shift and revitalization are influential in this respect.

2. Multilingualism in Japan and the British Isles

Language shift and revitalization in Japan and Britain, linguistically diverse archipelago on either side of the Eurasian continent, invite thoughtful contrast. Their multilingual situations (Fujita-Round & Maher, 2008; Maher & Yashiro, 1995; Maher & Macdonald, 1995; Maher, 2010) involve the interplay of territory and community, languages and dialects, repression and migration. Minority and community languages in those places have contrastive configurations. Some languages are connected to ethnicity—like Ainu; independent of ethnicity like Manx Gaelic. Some languages are coterminous with territory—like Ryukyuan (Ryukyu) and Scottish Gaelic (Scotland). Other languages are active in social networking and education—like Japanese Sign Language (JSL) and British Sign Language (BSL). Unsurprisingly, common sociolinguistic processes occur across the linguistic landscape: the commodification of Chinese in Chinatowns, new urban multilingual signage (Urdu-Punjabi in Glasgow, Japanese, Korean, Chinese and English in Fukuoka). More weighty issues emerge such as progressive language leveling (what Kloss, 1967, termed 'near-dialectalization') as in Angloromani in Britain, the gravitation of traditional Japanese Sign Language (*Nihon Shuwa*) to coded Japanese (*Nihongo Taiyo Shuwa*) and in the endangered group of Ryukyuan languages where near dialectalization was "first put forth by mainland bureaucrats and later rationalized by Japanese national linguistics" (Heinrich, 2012, p. 39).

Whilst the force of devolutionary ethnopolitics is growing in Scotland (Scottish Gaelic, Scots, etc) and other Celtic areas (Wales, Cornwall, the

Isle of Man) political autonomy is weak in Japan's north and south. Ideally, multilingualism need not symbolize the guardianship of ethnic and cultural ghettos but rather the gateway to cultural openness and creative transformation of 'language-in-difficulty.' How do indigenous minority languages fare in the sociolinguistic debate on revitalization and are there mutual concerns?

3. The Beginnings of Revival: Ainu and the Celtic languages

Language shift is the "gradual replacement of one language by another" (Weinreich, 1952, p. 68). How this comes about is both complex and predictable. Speakers make choices on the basis of various options. Such choices are routinely in the direction of the language of greater utility, "Utility is an economic notion...and...language has a utility value which is variable, and that the actual and the perceived utility value of languages in contact situations is a valid predictor of language shift and maintenance" (Coulmas, 2005, p. 165). All the more significant then is the revival of interest in the study and use of so-called 'extinct' or 'dying' languages such as Ainu and Celtic languages such as *Gaelg Vanninnagh* (Manx) and *Kernewek* (Cornish). There is skepticism among sociolinguists about revitalization. Undoubtedly, it is as unwise to exaggerate claims of language revival as it is to underestimate linguistic resurgence as we see, currently, in Ainu and the Celtic languages. The revitalization work of Scottish Gaelic is worth noting. Despite substantial progress such as the Western Isles bilingual project in primary schools or the evident maintenance of speech community boundaries it has not been termed a Gaelic 'revival.' Chapman (1978, p. 215) observed: "There is no cultural renaissance lurking in an ability, however, widely spread, to phrase the Gaelic greeting *Ciamar a tha sibh?* (How are you?). The Gaelic language can only answer, 'Thank you for your kind and well intentioned enquiry. I am still dying.'"

Protest and sustained effort by speech communities are the stuff of revitalization though they may not themselves lead to 'revival.' Attacks on the stereotype of the 'dying race' and the call for equality and justice are a priority. Kaizawa Hiranosuke, on the establishment of the Ainu

organization ‘Tokachi Kyokumeisha’ (Tokachi Clear Dawn Society) deposited a letter with the Japanese government in 1927 demanding that the Ainu, as a distinct people with a culture and language, attend the ‘Congress of Asian Peoples’ in Nagasaki. The congress was a celebration of ‘pan-Asianism’ and a propaganda exercise for Imperial Japan’s dominance and expansion. The Ainu were not invited. In the same year, on a tiny, colonial island, between England and Ireland, John Kneen deposited the landmark ‘Grammar of the Manx Language’ in Manx Museum. Manx lessons started. Cornish language revival also stirred in the 1920s; the codification of Cornish orthography ‘Unified Cornish’ constituted Robert Nance’s ‘Cornish For All’ in 1929. Nance’s work became the basis for Cornish language revival efforts in the 20th century.

4. A sociological theory of ‘Reversing Language Shift’ (RLS)

Einar Haugen, in the 1940s, observed that we only start to worry about endangered languages when they are already dead. However, language revitalization received new impetus with the advent of Joshua Fishman’s theory ‘Reversing Language Shift’ (RLS), a sociological theory of revitalization. The unique aspect of Fishman’s theory is that it permits cross-language comparison: of one language situation with others. Employing the Fishman model, a comparison of Ainu and the Gaelic languages is a vantage point from which to assess mutual concerns in the process of revitalization.

4.1 Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)

Fishman’s concept of GIDS (Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale) is an interpretive device, a kind of linguistic Richter scale, to ascertain the extent of dislocation in the transmission of a language. The higher up the scale (1-8) the more intense the disruption of both the transmission as well as the code itself (‘X’ and ‘Y’ stands for ‘language’). GIDS describes, therefore, eight stages where an endangered language might be. The framework can be summarized as follows (Fishman, 1991, 2001).

•Stage 8: most vestigial users of Xish are so-

cially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories and taught to demographically unconcentrated adults.

- Stage 7: most users of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age.
- Stage 6: the attainment of intergenerational informal oralcy and its demographic concentration and institutional reinforcement.
- Stage 5: Xish literacy in home, school and community, but without taking on extra-communal reinforcement of such literacy.
- Stage 4: Xish in lower education that meets the requirements of compulsory education laws.
- Stage 3: use of Xish in the lower work sphere (outside of the Xish neighborhood/community) involving interaction between Xmen and Ymen.
- Stage 2: Xish in lower governmental services and mass media but not in the higher spheres.
- Stage 1: some use of Xish in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts (without the additional safety provided by political independence).

Few sociologists of language have proposed valid models of causality in community vitality that are applicable to linguistic minorities. Giles (1977) classic model of ‘ethnolinguistic vitality’ offered a subjective dimension on how ethnolinguistic group members perceived ‘subjectively’ their sociostructural position in contrast to the ‘objective’ accounts provided by sociolinguists, including language planners. Fishman, intended the stages of his model to be “nothing but a logical set of priorities or targets to guide RLS-efforts toward a derived goal” (2001, p. 465). There is a linkage of stages, i.e. language functions. Fishman held that only compartmentalization of threatened languages could assure their maintenance. Stage 6, on the bottom-up scale, is the crucial stage of “the intergenerational and demographically concentrated home, family, neighborhood, community: the basis of mother tongue transmission” (Fishman, 2001, p. 466). If this stage is not satisfied, “all else can amount to little more than biding time” (Fishman, 1991, p. 399). If the content of other stages of the GIDS are not linked to stage 6, revitalization efforts are doomed. In the case of Irish,

given an elaborate school system, the geographic bias encountered in the early 20th century (West of Ireland and Galway) has been levelled nationally. Stages 8 to 5 constitute an RLS ‘program minimum’ for which speakers of the minority language do not need the cooperation and approval of those in power while stages 4 to 1 are stipulated to constitute the high power stages less willingly relinquished by the dominant group.

4.2 From Rocking Chair Languages to Intergenerational Oracy

4.2.1 The Ainu Language Situation: Stages 8-6

Ainu is probably the oldest of Japan’s heritage languages. In the sociolinguistic terminology of British scholars of multilingualism it would be classified as ‘an older mother tongue’ (Alladina & Edwards, 1991). An indigenous language isolate of possibly Altaic affiliation (Vovin, 1993), Ainu is spoken as a native tongue by a handful of the estimated 50,000 Ainu people who live mostly on the northern island of Hokkaido (Ainu Association of Hokkaido, 2013). There is a small but culturally active Ainu community in the Kanto region. Within 12 months of the end of the Tokugawa rule, a full-blown assimilation policy was underway under the direction of the Hokkaido Colonization Commission. As the Meiji government deliberated about the Ainu, U.S. government consultants were invited to advise on social policy in light of their expertise with Native American Indians. From 1887, the US government had started to ‘Americanize’ Native Americans: the so-called ‘Kill the Indian, save the man policy’ contained in the patina of the ‘Manifest Destiny’ philosophy. In Japan, language prohibition began in earnest with a comprehensive educational package. A series of Acts were passed, the most significant being the ‘Law for the Protection of Native Hokkaido Aborigines’ (1899). In Hokkaido, acts such as the ‘Education Code for Hokkaido Ainu’ in 1901 prohibited use of the language. Ainu names were changed and communities driven onto reservations. Gottlieb (2006, p. 87) notes that language/ethnic stereotyping of Ainu continue though denunciation protests at media misrepresentations can, paradoxically, lead to a blackout of discussion of Ainu altogether.

The Ainu language is no longer functionally

active in neighbourhood, family, school and other public and institutional domains as result of assimilation policies (Maher, 2005). Its endangerment status is as follows: UNESCO status: Critically Endangered, Ethnologue status: Nearly extinct, Linguist List: Nearly Extinct. However, despite the critical loss of functions, Ainu plays a significant role in contemporary tradition and in the ‘language community.’ DeChicchis (1995, p. 54) sets out a typology of Ainu speakers. There are (a) esteemed archival speakers or members of a multigenerational community. Audio and video recordings serves as linguistic models for future generations of speaker-learners and (b) latent bilinguals who heard or spoke Ainu in a natural community setting as children. Though described as monolingual Japanese, some speakers have ‘come out’ as Ainu speakers in the company of Ainu speaking elders. (c) ‘Token speakers’ may recall parents and other older relatives speaking Ainu. They are Japanese dominant with a spoken command of contextually-appropriate expressions and formulaic phrases: “Many have begun formal study of Ainu grammar and spoken genres, and their skills may surpass those of some older bilinguals.” (d) Second language learners include younger Ainu with no personal memories of an Ainu speech community, and other interested people now studying and speaking Ainu in language schools and ethnic festivals. DeChicchis (1995, p. 54) notes: “these younger second language learners seem more willing to speak Ainu than do the generally older token Ainu speakers. Though this may be an effect of youthful exuberance, it may also stem from the difference in self-perception as Ainu speakers.”

The programme minimum in GIDS is the plane in which minority language speakers do not require the cooperation of political and other structures of power. In Hokkaido, fieldwork among (Stage 8) ‘vestigial users of Ainu continues with vigour. The reconstruction of an effective Ainu (grammatical and phonological) standard has progressed (Maher, 2001) and the reconstruction of an effective Ainu standard has hitherto focused on grammar (e.g. Shiraishi on the phonology of Ainu, 2001). There are innovative project-based digital archives of endangered languages

described by Bugaeva (2010) involving audio and visual language documentation of the Saru dialect.

By the 1920s the Hokkaido Prefectural Government (1919, 1927) claimed with satisfaction that with 90% of Ainu children now attending school the language was practically dead. The number of speakers that constitute ‘an ethnolinguistically active population’ is inconclusive but the proposition that the Ainu language is ‘virtually extinct’ is misleading. Nakagawa notes that, until the mid-20th century, Ainu was mostly spoken at home, speakers routinely hid their language competence the number of speakers was routinely underestimated (Nakagawa & Okuda, 2007). The number is certainly small. The presence of a population of ‘elders’ and older speakers who have knowledge of customs and folklore has permitted some transmission. We don’t know. In fieldwork in Hokkaido and Tokyo, Martin (2010, p. 71) asked informants whether they knew Ainu, “a number of people answered in the negative. However, in interviews and informal discussions they demonstrated the ability to identify and understand a number of lexical items and grammatical structures with the appropriate pragmatic competency in contexts relating to traditional Ainu customs.” Clearly, the criterion for language death is unstable.

The worldwide ethnic-music/world music boom, which employed vernacular languages of Africa, South-East Asia and Europe, arrived in Japan in the 1980s, impacting on Ainu music and dance (Chiba, 2008). France’s *Musique du Monde* series still publicizes its traditional ‘Chants des Ainu’ whilst Ainu *yukar* have emerged in modern formats (e.g. the Moshiri’s 1991 jazz adaptation of Ainu songs *Kamuy Chikap*–God’s Bird). Ainu prayers and ceremonies are experiencing a renaissance. Ritual language is chanted in *iyaihumke* (lullabies), *kamui-yukar* (totemic gods) and *oina* (ancestral heroes). The *Chiron-up-Kamui-Iyomante* (Fox God Ceremony) was revived in 1986 and now there are other ritual performances: *Kamui-nomi* (prayer of offering to the spirits), *Bekambe* (Water Caltropo Festival), *Upopo* and *Tapkar* (dance of the *Menoko*, Ainu women), *Rimse* (Dance Songs), *Shakushain* (Warrior Memorial Ceremony), *Icharupa* (Memorial Ceremony for Ancestors), *Icharupa* (Memorial for Ainu skeletons seized from

Ainu burial places by Universities), *Kunashiri-Menashi* (commemorating the Japanese invasion of Hokkaido), *Kimun Kamui Iyomante* (God of the Mountain Bear Ceremony), *Ashiri-Cheppu-Nomi* (First Fish Ceremony), *Chipsanke* (Boat Launching Ceremony).

4.2.2 The Celtic Languages Situation: Stages 8–6

“Why should Cornishmen learn Cornish? There is no money in it, it serves no practical purpose. The answer is simple. Because they are Cornishmen.” (*A Handbook of the Cornish Language*, by Henry Jenner, 1904).

Among the Ainu speech community in Hokkaido there are aged native or near-native speakers. This contrasts with some Celtic languages where the language—with the last native speaker famously ‘died out.’ The two main groups of Celtic languages spoken in the British Isles and Bretagne (north-west France) are:–Goidelic (‘Q-Celtic’), descended from Old Irish: Irish, Scottish (Gaelic), Manx–Brythonic (‘P-Celtic’): Breton, Welsh, Cornish (Ball & Müller, 2009). How does revitalization appear in this configuration of the Celtic languages?

Cornish (Kernewek), Cornwall (Kernow), in the south-west of England, is a peninsula bordered by the Celtic Sea (An Mor Keltek), never occupied by the Romans, and is widely quoted as a place of ‘language extinction.’ This is correct. Cornwall has no ‘vestigial speakers’ of Cornish. The last monoglot speaker was Dolly Pentreath, (died in 1777) whilst John Mann was the last traditional Cornish speaker (died in 1914). Bilingual children emerged during the Cornish revival of 1904 when Jenner’s *A Handbook of the Cornish Language* was published in the same year. The land mass of Cornwall, a peninsular periphery, is bigger in both land mass and population than independent and linguistically autonomous European nations such as Iceland, Malta and Luxembourg. The Cornish language, Kernowek, is closer to Breton than Welsh. The claim of revivalists is that the language never died out, that it was always spoken by a few people in some areas and families. Two thousand people are now said to be fluent. How

many people speak Cornish? Intelligent estimates of speakers of Ainu and revived Cornish are hampered by unknowns. The ‘Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek’ survey of November 2005 allows us to draw a more accurate estimate. This organisation includes the bulk of fluent users of ‘common’ Cornish plus some users of ‘unified.’ In response to a questionnaire completed by 176 of its members (Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek, 2006, p. 9) 61 claimed to be able to speak Cornish competently or fluently. A reasonable estimate of the number of competent and fluent speakers of Cornish might be 140 to 150 at most.

Manx (*Gaelg*). Formerly extinct as a first language, the last native speaker, Ned Maddrell, died in 1974. Territorially bounded on the Isle of Man, it is estimated that Man now has about 600 persons who can continue a sustained conversation (Ynsee Gaelg, 2013). The language has moved from critical Stage 8 language to the creation of a population supported the Manx Government and the Manx Language Office whose role is to raise the profile of Manx Gaelic on the Island and internationally and to support language organizations. At critical Stage 8 its older speakers were nevertheless, just as Ainu, well recorded for the next generation.

Irish (*Gaeilge*) is a standardized language an (an Caighdeán Oifigiúil), relatively strong as a community language in some Gaeltachtaí (Irish-speaking areas) employed widely in media such as the TG4 (Raidió na Gaeltachta) compulsory in schools, and is the official language of the Republic of Ireland. In the 2006 Census, 72,000 people reported as daily Irish speakers, 495,000 residing outside Gaeltachtaí. Irish is strongly dependent upon social networks and relationships (Stage 6) which by themselves cannot guarantee the future stability of the language.

Welsh (*Cymraeg*) has official status in Wales, and is a community language in the north and west, weakening in the south but with increasing numbers of speakers and learners for overall. In terms of Fishman’s cline of vitality Welsh is robust with a substantial number of speakers. The UK 2011 Census recorded that 19% (562,000) of Welsh residents over the age of three years reported the ability to speak Welsh; of those, 77%

(431,000) had mastery of three skills: speaking, reading and writing Welsh. 73% of Welsh residents (2.2 million) reported having no skills. These figures contrast with the 2001 Census, in which 20.8% of the population (582,000) reported being able to speak Welsh. Government surveys of 2004-2006 reported that 57% (315,000) of Welsh speakers regarded themselves as fluent in writing. The social identity of Welsh learners has changed over the decades (Jones & Williams, 2009).

Paradoxically, the Celtic language with the highest number of speakers (an estimated 250,000 speakers 66% of whom are over the age of 65) is now ‘endangered’ (UNESCO, 2013). Breton is the only Celtic language that is not ‘official.’ There were 1.3 million speakers in 1930. The rapid decline of Breton and its status as an endangered language has coincided with sustained political centralization in France. As the official statement below indicates whilst there is intergenerational hollowing out among the 20–50 generation the number of adult learners enrolled weekly has risen, “Aujourd’hui, le creux générationnel se situe parmi les 20–50 ans ... Mais ... là aussi, le nombre d’apprenants est en hausse pour les cours hebdomadaires.” (Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg, 2013).

Scottish Gaelic (*Gàidhlig*). Scottish Gaelic (more accurately Highland Gaelic) is a traditional community language that suffers problems of intergenerational transmission (Stage 8–6) which militates against language revitalization. The 2002 census of Scotland indicated that 58,652 (1.2%) of the Scottish population aged over three years old in Scotland could speak Gaelic. The number of younger speakers has increased whilst there is sustained decline in the core Gàidhealtachd (Gaelic-speaking) areas due to de-population/urban migration. Dialects of Scottish Gaelic exist in Canadian Gaelic Cape Breton Island, Eastern Ontario and areas of the Nova Scotia mainland.

4.2.3 The Ainu Languages Situation: Stages 5–1

There is no integrated policy and language planning for the Ainu language. The government has no policy strategy and there is little political will for language diversity, as yet no comparative investigation of ‘good practice’ vis-à-vis multilingualism in other countries. Conversely, there is

the will, however, among many Ainu residents for access to language education/language learning. According to the ‘Survey on the Hokkaido Ainu Living Conditions’ conducted in 2006 by the Hokkaido Government, the Ainu population in Hokkaido was 23,782 in 72 municipalities. In a questionnaire to the Ainu population (‘Request for Ainu Measures’) the request that language and culture be taught in (Hokkaido) schools polled third of all 14: 1,863 persons out of 3,000 (The Ainu Association of Hokkaido, 2013).

With the Japanese government’s adoption of the “United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” the Ainu were recognized as an indigenous people in 2008. This coincided with the G8 Summit and simultaneously the Indigenous Peoples Summit (IPS) in Ainu *Mosir*. A government-appointed Council of Experts on the Implementation of Ainu Policy (*Ainu seisaku no arikata ni kansuru yūshikisha kondankai*) issued a report in 2009. The thrust of the document was ‘Promotion of the Ainu Culture Prioritizing the Ainu Language’ involving “enhancement and expansion of opportunities to learn and experience Ainu language and culture; initiatives for advancing the status of the Ainu language (designation/signation of place names by their Ainu name, and so forth).” The report is careful to note “Ainu choose to live in a variety of different ways” (Winchester, 2009). This includes the choice to use, selectively, the Ainu language. The lure of ‘strategic essentialism’ is always there, i.e. pushing an agenda of “traditionalists vs. moderns.”

Language education in Ainu turned a corner with the ‘Ainu Promotion Act’ of 1997. As the 1901 Education Code aimed at the linguistic conformity and the elimination of the Ainu language, a century later, after decades of deliberation and controversy, the Japanese government enacted an important piece of Ainu legislation, the Act for the Promotion of Ainu Culture, the Dissemination of Knowledge of Ainu Tradition, and an Educational Campaign. The new Act contained the following flagship statement: “This Act aims to bring to reality a society in which the ethnic pride of the Ainu people is respected, enhancing the development of diverse cultures in our nation by the implementation of measures for the

promotion of Ainu culture, the dissemination of knowledge about Ainu Traditions, and education of the nation” (my translation). The provisions of the law, however, did not substantially meet the demands of the Ainu people, treating language as a defining characteristic of Ainu culture where ‘Ainu Culture’ meant the Ainu language in cultural activities such as music, dance. Siddle’s (2001) strong critique of the new legislation noted that the Ainu played virtually no part in drafting the Act and there was no apology for the colonial history of oppression, land seizure, social and linguistic discrimination. Since the 1980s, efforts have been made to increase the cultural vitality of Ainu in the form of the revival of traditional rituals, the development of teaching materials, language classes in community centres and some universities, and a body of Ainu-sponsored political proposals which touches upon language maintenance. A handful of universities in the northern prefectures of Hokkaido offer Ainu language instruction. Language learning classes have been held in the Nibutani Valley area (the main concentration of the Ainu community in Hokkaido) for many years (Anderson & Iwasaki-Goodman, 2001) but this has now been joined by a number of other ‘Ainugo Kyoshitsu’ (Ainu language classes) now in operation by local community groups in community centres in Hokkaido such as Sapporo, Asahikawa, Obihiro, Chitose, Wakkanai and elsewhere. Organizations such as the ‘Foundation for Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture’ (FRPAC) is an implementation body which follows on from the 1997 Law for the Promotion of the Ainu Culture and for the Dissemination and Advocacy for the Traditions of the Ainu and the Ainu Culture. FRPAC (a) trains instructors—providing learning opportunities to train Ainu language instructors, and annual intensive courses on effective instruction methods. There are language classes, for the improvement of Ainu language education, from intermediate-level speakers to advanced levels, Parent–Child Study of the Ainu language to promote the Ainu language and preserve Ainu traditions and culture for Ainu parents; Project for Development of Ainu Language Teaching materials: to develop textbooks that cover different levels and dialects to improve learning and providing them

as teaching materials for those who inherit the language. Adopting a method used widely in modern language teaching/learning in Japan, an annual *Ainugo Benron Taikai* (Ainu Language Speech Contest) is held—the first such competition to be held in Japan. It receives media coverage on television and newspaper and is attended by several hundred people including Ainu, Japanese and non-Japanese. In 1987, a commercial radio station in Hokkaido began broadcasting a language course from Sapporo Broadcasting Corporation (STV). The programme aims to create public interest in both the language and the traditional Ainu outlook on nature and life.

In addition to university courses (Waseda from 1975) and a robust history of Ainu language instruction at Chiba University, a handful of universities in Hokkaido offer Ainu instruction (e.g. Hokkaido University’s ‘Center for Ainu & Indigenous Studies’). Language learning classes have been held in the Nibutani area (the main concentration of the Ainu community in Hokkaido) for many years now joined by other classes in community centres in Hokkaido: Nibutani, Asahikawa, Urakawa and Kushiro.

In the penumbra of indigenous education rights, Ainu-language awareness and teaching in public schools in some communities in Hokkaido (as an extra-curricular activity or during the ‘Foreign Language Activities’ period) could be, but is not a wedge issue for those seeking school-driven revitalization. In Japan’s schools there is always what Kameda (2010, p. 30) describes in her study of hybrid identities in Japan the ‘the enactment of Japaneseness.’ The possibility that the state educational administration in Japan would implement a locality-specific Ainu education system in Hokkaido is as likely as Paris introducing Brezhnev education for 200,000 speakers in Brittany (Gayman, 2011).

That Ainu cannot function as a language for real-world communication was a prevalent view among students of Ainu—until recently. The emphasis shifted from a focus on decline to practical measures (see the DIY audio-visuals of the Kamuyturano Association in 1988).

Written materials are remarkably similar in format: a phrase-book type approach requiring

memorization rather than pragmatic manipulation. Word lists or labelled drawings of traditional Ainu implements for hunting, fishing, and cooking, as well as place-names are standard presentation. The lack of activity-based language learning could be attributed as much to the need for modernization of the language itself as the formalism of the grammar-translation methods still in vogue in modern language teaching in Japan. An early audio-visual approach to Ainu language teaching was the *manga* (cartoon) books by Yokoyama and Thiri, in particular *Ainu Itak* (1987) (Ainu Language Manual) and *Ainu Ukoyso-Itak* (1988) (Ainu Conversation Manual). In the annual Ainu Speech Contest, in 1997, they were a minority, now almost half of the participants are in their teens or twenties.

A resurgence in Ainu art, dance, jazz and pop and *Upopo* (rhythmical patterns sung in canon—see Marewrew), has created a new generation of Ainu artists and musicians some bi- or tri-lingual performing new Ainu-language work (Imurat, Ainu Rebels). An example is the community-based ‘Ainu Arts Project,’ a native rock band based on traditional Ainu music “inspired by the aboriginal Australian band Yothu Yindi and Native American bands...25 members, from kids to seniors, performing 50 to 60 times a year” (Birmingham, 2010, p. 9). The revivalist Oki (Oki Kano) son of Ainu sculptor and activist Bikki Sunazawa, employs the (electric) *tonkori* for the performance of Ainu dub (Oki Dub Ainu Band), folk and rock. The band ‘Ainu Rebels’ perform music and dance combining traditional Ainu features with hip hop and R&B. There is also an emergent cottage film industry on Ainu issues (Ainu Pride Productions, 2011).

4.2.4 The Cornish and Manx Gaelic Renaissance Stages 5–1

The Cornish Revival started at GIDS 8 but with increasingly robust institutional support it has ‘stage jumped’ to higher levels. The UK government recognizes Cornish under The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML). It is supported by Cornwall County Council with the Cornish Language Partnership as the main actor in revitalization and promotion. Revival started on a small scale in the 1970s. Relying both on cultural, linguistic and language

planning agencies Cornish is in the process of a modest revival. Their geographical location on the periphery, and their symbolic past as the Kingdom of Cornwall gives status to claims of cultural ‘difference’ (comparison can be made with Japan’s ‘Kingdom of the Ryukyu’ located similarly on the territorial periphery).

Cornwall agencies and institutions for revival are just beginning. Cornwall Council has a Cornish Language Policy and has adopted an explicit ‘Development Strategy for Cornish’ in 2006 together with other bodies. The ‘Development Strategy’ includes the following:

3. In furtherance of this recognition the Council will:

3.1 Implement a system of bilingual signage with regard to street and place names for new and replacement signs;

3.2 Consider the use of bilingual signage within Council premises on the same basis;

3.3 Consider the use of Cornish within all future Council publications and promotional literature, including the Council website;

3.4 Ensure the availability of Cornish language material to the public through its outlets;

3.5 Ensure that each department gives positive consideration to the ways in which Cornish may be incorporated within its work over and above inclusion in publications.

Local Government in Cornwall (The Department for Communities and Local Government and Cornwall Council) funds MAGA (Keskowethyans an Taves Kernewek), the Cornish Language Partnership. This language promotion body was established in 2005 to oversee the implementation of the Cornish Language Development Strategy. The Partnership involves local authorities and organizations and organizations (e.g. Agan Tavas–Our Language, Cussel an Tavaz Kernuak–Cornish Language Council, Gorsedh Kernow–Gorsedh of the bards of Cornwall, Kesva an Taves Kernewek–Cornish Language Board, Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek Warlinenn–Cornish Language Fellowship) who combine to promote Cornish and develop it further in Cornish life. Among other

things, MAGA offers a free translation service, advice and support on learning and using Cornish and works closely with local authorities, schools, public bodies, businesses and communities. It also points to services offered by members groups of the Partnership. Revitalisation activities comprise language classes, the introduction of Cornish as a language option in primary schools, bilingual nursery schools (Movyans Skolyow Meythrin—a bilingual nursery school network), bible translation in Cornish, Cornish language radio online, as well as Cornish punk/alternative/screamo, rock/indie/nuz-jazz. The talismanic Cornish rock song ‘Fordh dhe Dalvann’ by won by Krena at the 2005 Pan Celtic Song Competition in Ireland. A study in 2000 suggested that there were around 300 people who spoke Cornish fluently (MacKinnon, 2007). The language is taught in about twelve primary schools. A Standard Written Form was agreed in 2008 and is occasionally used in religious and civic ceremonies. In 2002, Cornish was officially recognised as a UK minority language (i.e. attained ‘legal status’) and in 2005 received limited Government funding.

There is increasing support for Scottish Gaelic, particularly since political devolution in Scotland. This derives from the establishment of a Scottish Parliament and the Gaelic development body, Board Na Gaidhlig, on a statutory basis. The goal is to secure the status of the Gaelic language as the official language of Scotland. This conforms to Stage 1 of the Fishman model. Scottish Gaelic literature is undergoing a renaissance with poetry, works of fiction (including science fiction) and two Gaelic theatre companies. There is some action on language policy and corpus planning (Dunbar, 2010) and a media presence. The BBC operates a Gaelic-language radio station Radio nan Gaidheal as well as a television channel, BBC Alba. Bilingual toponymic signage, business and advertisement signage have been introduced throughout Gaelic-speaking regions. In the church domain, there are Gaelic-speaking congregations in the Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, and the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Secondary schools offer Gaelic examinations of two types, across the curriculum: Gaelic as a Second or Foreign Language, and Gaelic for native speakers. In October 2009, a new agreement

permitted Scottish Gaelic to be used formally between Scottish Government ministers and European Union officials.

There is ongoing language planning and national political support for Irish. Policy and ideology differ North and South. Irish in the north is still part of a nationalist agenda whilst in the south the Republic has moved into a post-nationalist era. Transnational/cross border cooperation is underway with agencies such as the *Forsa na Gaelge*. Irish incorporates all stages in Fishman's model (O'Riagain, 2001) but no gradualized progression along Stages 8-1.

Welsh is recognized by the Council of Europe (not to be confused with the EU) as a European minority and regional language entitled to protection. There is provision for Welsh-medium education: primary to higher university. There is a robust presence in the media (TV and radio) as well compulsory bilingualism for public services and support in terms of both policy and planning. Writing is standardized and there is an emerging vernacular koine.

On the Isle of Man, a new generation of native speakers has emerged from 5 all-Manx medium kindergartens (pre-schools) and a primary school (approximately 55 children). Manx is undergoing revival, now taught as a second language at all primary and secondary schools. Manx is recognized under the European Charter for Regional/Minority Languages and a regional language recognized by the British-Irish Council. The policy of the Government's *Undinys Eiraght Vannin* (Manx Heritage Foundation) is fourfold (a) Planning for language learning—includes supporting language transmission in the family, pre-school and at Manx Medium education, (b) Planning for language use—the promotion of cultural tourism and the use of Manx in the public/private and voluntary sectors. (c) Status Planning—language visibility needs to be raised and Government encouraged to work towards compliance with the European Charter. (d) Corpus planning—the need for linguistic standardization and development of specialized terminology. Manx looks good for business. Businesses, including Isle of Man Newspapers, have taken up the opportunity offered by the Manx Heritage Foundation to conduct Manx lessons

for staff. Manx Telecom answer telephones with Gaelg greetings.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Politics and Struggle

The ramping up of peninsular Cornwall's cultural uniqueness from the rest of England and its linkage with other Celtic cultures (the annual Celtic Music Festival, etc.) dovetail with the Isle of Man's aggressive Manx cultural and language campaign. In the war of words that is language revitalization, Cornish punk and the Ainu rap are ever symbols of resistance. Likewise, in the postcolonial context of another island community, Palau, Matsumoto (2010) notes how 'combined networks' of exchange and interaction involving 'significant others' are crucial for language maintenance but also how languages that are re-inventing themselves need symbols and ciphers of oppositional ideology (Matsumoto & Britain, 2003) to sustain and give historical determinism to their struggle.

In the 21st century is likely that half of the world's estimated 6,500 languages will disappear. One fourth of the world's languages (lesser known languages) are spoken by less than a thousand people. Languages are in danger. Majority languages account for approximately 1.5% of the total. In his classic framework, Joshua Fishman was moved to describe three 'success stories' of minority languages: Hebrew, Catalan, and Quebec French (Fishman, 1991). The view expressed was that rigorous and sustained language can have a positive effect. Language revitalization projects are underway in Japan and in the Celtic language regions. It is an international movement. In Japan, linkage with Okinawa from 1984 coincided with the meeting of poet and Ryukyuan independence advocate Takara Ben and Ainu activist Chikap Mieko in 1984 at the 'Kyoto Conference of Minority Peoples Suffering from Discrimination' (Siddle, 1996). In the British Isles, new endeavours for Manx have attracted the attention of the Scottish Government which is now studying the immersion system on the Isle of Man. There are robust organizations in Japan such as FRPAC in Tokyo and the Hokkaido Ainu Association. For the Ainu in particular, the United Nations' declaration on

language rights in the Year of the Indigenous Peoples (1993) was a landmark in the history of language maintenance among the peripheral language communities in Japan. Supported by many language minorities, the Ainu achieved significant progress in their efforts for language protection.

The growing political autonomy of Scotland has jolted Celtic languages in Britain. A new sense of territorial alliance appears to be emerging. (Nationalists like to recall that the Scotland and Cornwall fought side by side in the old Jacobite wars). More than this. Although it is usual to speak of Ainu as ‘home alone’ in Japan, Ainu research and artistic enterprise are active internationally. What is interesting is that Ainu has yet to establish a robust sociolinguistic alliance with Ryukyuan. Language activists and scholars north and south have some way to go before there is a coordination of vision, commitment to change and shared strategies.

Ainu language rights is not simply a matter of permission for linguistic difference but involves the balance of centre and periphery: The imposing fact is that Ainu is ‘primordially’ the indigenous language of the far north. The territory of Hokkaido was long the site of pioneer struggle, the felling of trees, the clearing of forests, of snow and ice, of settlement and struggle. Long controlled by independent Matsumae clan rather than Edo-Tokyo the north has been the site of suspicion and at whose centre has resided the Ainu language: curiosity and nuisance.

Military conquest, forced assimilation and imposition of Japanese on Hokkaido Ainu, like English on Native Americans, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico by the United States, perpetuated colonial relationships. Like Ainu in Hokkaido, these languages were forced into minority status. The outcome is not always the same. In the case of New York Puerto Ricans, physically and culturally dislocated as a colonized minority, there is little attachment to language as a marker of identity or an instrument of social benefit. Reversing language shift is of little or no interest to some populations. Also, territorial, demographic and cultural dislocation causes most cases of language shift (Fishman, 1991, pp. 55–65). A language might be threatened by simple biological extinc-

tion. (The majority of the Great Andamanese languages ceased to exist due to the reduction in the population of speakers in the Andaman islands of the Bay of Bengal). The forced relocation of Ainu in the early 20th century led to disease and demographic dislocation.

5.2 Fishman’s Model and Revitalization

5.2.1 ‘It Ain’t Easy’

Joshua Fishman’s influential theory ‘Reversing Language Shift’ was an attempt to ‘diagnose’ difficulties, identify parallels and share solutions among languages. It ain’t easy. Fishman’s stage formulations must be viewed as a cline. Austin & Sallabank (2011) highlight key themes in language endangerment such as the nature of language ecology among speakers and communities, language contact and change in endangered languages, structural aspects of language endangerment, issues of language and culture, speakers and language documentation, language policy for endangered languages, orthography development, lexicography, language curriculum design and evaluation for endangered languages, the role of information technology in supporting minority and endangered languages, endangered languages and economic development, researcher training and capacity development in language documentation.

In Fishman’s formulation, we must divide RLS-related activities into language policy and language planning (Sallabank, 2011). The former points to top-down measures driven by official agencies; the latter, language planning (also ‘language management’ Spolsky, 2009) is bottom-up, grassroots-level activity. Even with a felicitous combination of both approaches is hard to strengthen threatened ‘ethnocultural’ languages and scholars have found Fishman’s formulation problematic. There are complicating issues. For example, (a) Time. The loss of a language is the result of a long journey, for the Ainu of Japan whose traditionalists still maintain essential sustaining rituals, like *Rimse*, and Manx in the Isle of Man for whom its parliament, the Tynwald is a language vehicle par excellence. A community may be hundreds of years away from a traditional culture like the Quechua in the Andean highlands of Peru. (b) Social Meaning. The cultural ensemble of traditional practice, belief systems and social

meanings of the community has disappeared. (c) Utilitarianism. Critics of RLS emphasize that the major reward system in society does not favour the threatened language. Why learn Okinawan in Japan or Navajo in North America? Where does it get you in society? (d) Rivalry. A rival identity in another language has been already established and it is a comfortable one (Japanese in Japan, English in Ireland). (e) Damage. Revitalisation in kindergartens and language-nests (e.g. the Maori-derived *kehanga-reo* model in New Zealand) is regarded by critics as a selfish adult hobby that damages the chances of children of the young next generation. (f) Ethnocentrism. Efforts to organize on behalf of the weaker language is regarded as anti-modern, parochial, tribalistic, ethnocentric. (g) Separatism. Efforts toward a threatened language may be linked to a movement for political separatism/independence (e.g. in Catalonia and Scotland). (h) Reinforcement. To revitalize means simultaneously working with power structures below (community) and above (government), at the same time. (i) Disruption. Revitalisation may be socio-politically disruptive of big international goals.

Ainu and the Celtic languages such as Cornish, Manx and Scottish Gaelic are classified by UNESCO as EMLs, ‘endangered minority languages’ (UNESCO, 2013). The landmark study of language endangerment was of a Celtic language: Nancy Dorian’s (1989) treatise on Scottish Gaelic. The study was important because it took the whole community as its focus. Language is not a separate and independent phenomenon). Rather, it involves economics, political structure, community expectations, religion, education, contacts with the mainstream, diglossic patterns and literacy practices. Is Fishman’s model insufficiently flexible in overlaying ‘domains’ of social function out of their interlocking context? This presages Dorian’s social setting but the theory undoubtedly assists comparison of Ainu and the Celtic languages from the viewpoint of mutual concerns and combined purpose. Endangered languages will work together another or they will disappear in isolation. Not least because communities like languages are always in transition, their viability always in question (see Kayano et al., 2009 for a case study of an

Ainu hamlet).

Cornish and Manx lost their native speaker populations in the 20th century. Ainu has few native speakers but excellent native speaker records. Irish language decline in Gaelic-speaking areas contrasts with the increase in middle-class speakers in urban areas. Endangered languages traditionally exist as ethnolinguistic symbols, ‘heritage’ languages, tourist and business ‘products’ but there is also a ‘new wave’ of internet networking, folk and rock music, film and radio, language classes, the emergence of competent teachers, textbooks. Sustained political action by Ainu organizations (e.g. The Ainu Association of Hokkaido) led to governmental action and language support bodies (e.g. FRPAC).

5.2.2 Mixing and Jumping Fishman’s Stages: Cornish

In Fishman’s RLS model home, neighbourhood and education are the royal road to revitalization. The reverse is the case with Cornish. The current members in the Parliament of the United Kingdom for St Ives, North Cornwall, St Austell and Newquay, and Sarah Newton, MP for Truro and Falmouth repeated their Parliamentary oaths in Cornish. *Radyo an Gernewegva* is part of *Kernewegva*, an online Cornish speaking community which features a chat room, TV clips, software downloads, podcasts and more. There was a Cornish rebellion of 1497, when of thousands of Cornishmen marched on London, have calls for autonomy been so strident. Now a campaign has been launched to have Cornish offered as a nationality option in the 2011 census. Europe’s recognition of Cornish as a minority language in 2002, which brought in new funding for cultural projects. Fifty county primary schools now teach Cornish. The Cornish Language Partnership and *Hevva*, a Cornish music and group, claim renewed enthusiasm for asserting the county’s separate identity. A survey of 70,000 schoolchildren indicated that 41% see themselves as ‘Cornish’ not English (Cornwall Council). Irish, concentrated in the *Gaeltacht*, receives government protection and is territorially diglossic approach. There is an increase of Welsh speakers among the younger generation. Education is a key to revival.

5.2.3 Expectations and Over-Estimations

Since the 1980s, efforts have been made to increase the ethnolinguistic cultural vitality of Ainu. The United Nations' declaration on language rights in the 'Year of the Indigenous Peoples' (1993) was a landmark in the history of language maintenance among the peripheral language communities in Japan. Supported by many language minorities, the Ainu are achieving significant progress in their struggle for language recognition as an 'indigenous people'. What is ethnicity in Japan is nationalism in Europe, the will to exist in stateless nations (e.g. Scotland, Catalonia). Strong centralization of school education and a weakness of regional autonomy in France and Japan have damaged Breton in France and Ainu in Japan. Both countries do not yet welcome the concept of ethnolinguistic diversity and lack policies to support minority and endangered languages. At the national level in Britain, political devolution to the regions (Scotland, Wales, Cornwall) is galvanizing local governments towards revitalization strategies.

Over-estimation of success, the expectation of total recall, is a danger for language revitalization. In his survey of Irish, O'Riagain (2001) refers to Bourdieu's demand that one cannot save the value of a competence unless one saves... the whole set of political and social conditions of production. This is a critical problem for Fishman's model. The stages seem 'autonomous.' How are the economic and social incorporated for analytical and prescriptive purposes? Fishman is correct to stress negative facts like the constant diminution of speakers. He also argues against 'head in the sand' and passive acceptance of a language situation.

Some endangered languages like Welsh and Scottish Gaelic operate within, and mimic, administrative structures. Whilst languages such as Cornish are clearly minority and endangered—'ground zero' in the Fishman model—(Fishman, 2001) paradoxically they participate in the highest levels (Stage 1 and Stage 2). This is a classificatory paradox in the Fishman model. By contrast, Ainu have had little input in the policy process. During the deliberations for the 1997 reform law, no Ainu person sat in the committee meeting.

5.2.4 The Ainu Language Situation: Celtic and Other European Connections

Language revitalization requires many different approaches and the support of various people and organizations. What societal factors contribute to language shift and what are the possible conditions for resistance and reversal? The questions usually refer to a language that has suffered drastic decline of the speaker population in the past but now shows high levels of political status, family support, government and school peer support. The reviving language might be perceived as a 'heritage' language thus linking up with aspects of social identity and the provision of speech and literacy development. Without doubt, Celtic languages revival is a useful vantage point to examine this linkage.

Aikio (1991) points out the ambivalence between attempts to preserve a language and the need for openness about 'depressing research results.' The subject is sensitive but I repeat, it is unreasonable to declare near 'extinction' of Ainu if we can document resurgence other than 'number of native speakers' (i.e. an increasing number of people interested in learning Ainu as a 2nd language or 'media representation,' or community language maintenance.

The Ainu languages have a transcendent coloring through rituals such as song, dance and religious ceremony. This seems less important in the case of Irish or Scottish Gaelic. As Lewallen (2006) has convincingly argued, cultural work, whilst articulated in an apolitical register, is symbolic leverage against canonical claims to Japanese homogeneity. Through weaving, and basketry for tourist market and museum replica, people revisit ancestral values and by such practices, craft themselves as symbolic agents who simultaneously redesign the discourse of colonialism in Hokkaido. It is surely in the work of weaving, putting back together, redesigning, and 'reworking' endangered languages that they can be not merely restored but revitalized.

References

- Aikio, Marjut (1991). The Sami Language: Pressure of change and reification. *Journal of Multilingual and*

- Multicultural Development*, 12, 93–103.
- Ainu Association of Hokkaido (2013). Survey <<http://www.ainu-assn.or.jp/english/eabout03.html>>
- Ainu Pride Productions (2011). <<http://www.ainu-pride.com>>
- Alladina, Safder, & Edwards, Viv (1991). *Multilingualism in the British isles*. London: Longman.
- Anderson, Fred E., & Iwasaki-Goodman, Masami (2001). Language and culture revitalization in a Hokkaido Ainu Community. In Noguchi, Mary Goebel, & Fotos, Sandra (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*, pp. 45–67. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Austin, Peter K., & Sallabank, Julia (Eds.) (2011). *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ball, Martin J., & Müller, Nicole (Eds.) (2009). *The Celtic languages*. London: Routledge.
- Birmingham, Lucy (2010). A cultural revival. The spirit of Japan's Ainu. *Wall Street Journal*, February 26, 18.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2010). Internet applications for endangered languages: A talking dictionary of Ainu, documentation of the Saru dialect of Ainu <http://www.waseda.jp/wias/achievement/bulletin/data/a_bugaeva_2010.pdf>
- Chapman, Michael (1978). *The Gaelic Vision in Scottish culture*. London: Croom Helm.
- Chiba, Nobuhiko (2008). The music of the Ainu. In Tokita, Alison, & Hughes, David (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to Japanese music*, pp. ● – ● Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Coulmas, Florian (2005). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeChicchis, Joseph (1995). The Present State of the Ainu language. In Maher, John, & Yashiro, Kyoko (Eds.), *Multilingual Japan*, pp. 54–78. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dorian, Nancy C. (Ed.) (1989). *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunbar, Robert (2010). Language planning. In MacLeod, Michelle, & Watson, Moray (Eds.), *The Edinburgh companion to the Gaelic language*, pp. 146–171. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theory and practice of assistance to threatened languages*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua (Ed.) (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fujita-Round, Sachiyo, & Maher, John (2008). Language education policy in Japan. In May, Stephen & Hornberger, Nancy (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 1*, pp. 393–404. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Gayman, Jeffrey (2011). Ainu right to education and ainu practice of 'education.' *Current Intercultural Education*, 22(1), 15–28.
- Giles, Howard (Ed.) (1977). *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Gottlieb, Nancy (2006). *Linguistic stereotyping and minority groups in Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Heinrich, Patrick (2012). *The making of monolingual Japan*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Jenner, Henry (1904). *A handbook of the Cornish language*. Gutenberg org files.
- Jones, Robert O., & Williams, Colin (2009). The sociolinguistic context of Welsh. In Ball, Martin, & Müller, Nicole (Eds.), *The Celtic languages*. pp. 650–711. London: Routledge.
- Kameda, Laurel (2010). *Hybrid identities and adolescent girls: Being 'half' in Japan*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kayano, Shiro, Kawakami, Masashi, & Gayman, Jeffrey (2009). Nibutani village, a language-revitalization case study of one Ainu hamlet in transition. *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues*, 12(1-4), 248–258.
- Kennedy, Neil (2002). Fatel era ny a keel? Revived Cornish: Taking stock. In Payton, Peter (Ed.), *Cornish studies ten*, pp. 283–302. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Kloss, Heinz (1967). Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9(7), 29–41.
- Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek (2006). *Membership Survey November 2005*. Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek, <www.cornish-language.org>
- Lewallen, Ann Elise (2006). *Hands that never rest: Ainu women, cultural revival, and indigenous politics in Japan*. Ph.D. Diss. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- MacKinnon, Ken (2009). Scottish history and contemporary status. In Ball, Martin, & Müller, Nicole (Eds.), *The Celtic languages*, pp. 587–649. London: Routledge.
- Maher, John (2001). Akor Itak-Our language, your language Ainu in Japan. In Fishman, Joshua (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved?* pp. 323–349. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maher, John (2005). Metroethnicity, language, and the principle of Cool. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 175/176, 83–102.
- Maher, John (2010). Metrolanguages and Metroethnic-

- ity. In Coupland, Nikolas (Ed.), *Handbook of language and globalization*, pp. 575-591. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Maher, John, & Macdonald, Gaynor (Eds.) (1995). *Diversity in Japanese culture and language*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Maher, John, & Yashiro, Kyoko (1995). *Multilingual Japan*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, Kylie (2010). Aynu itak: On the road to Ainu language revitalization. *Media and Communication Studies*, 60, 57-93.
- Matsumoto, Kazuko (2010). The role of social networks in the post-colonial multilingual island of Palau: Mechanisms of language maintenance and shift. *Multilingua*, 29, 133-165.
- Matsumoto, Kazuko, & Britain, David (2003). Language choice and cultural hegemony: Linguistic symbols of dominance and resistance in Palau. In Dedaic, Mirjana, & Nelson, Daniel (Eds.), *At war with words*, pp. 321-349. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi, & Okuda, Osamu (2007). Nivkh and Ainu. In Miyaoka, Osahito et al. (Eds.), *The vanishing languages of the pacific rim*. pp. 371-385. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ofis Publik ar Brezhoneg. (2013). Reports opab-opalb. Cles.
- O'Riagain, Pdraic (2001). Irish language reproduction 1981-1996. In Fishman, Joshua (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved?*, pp. 195-214. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, Alastair (2010). *Language as social practice*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Sallabank, Julia (2011). Language policy for endangered languages. In Austin, Peter, & Sallabank, Julia (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, pp. 278-290. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shiraishi, Hidetoshi (2001). Prosodic structure and Sandhi phenomena in the Saru Dialect of Ainu. In van de Weijer, Jeroen, & Nishihara, Tetsuo (Eds.), *Issues in Japanese phonology and morphology*. pp. 141-157. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Siddle, Richard (1996). *Race, resistance, and the Ainu of Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Spolsky, Bernard (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO (2013). *Atlas of the world's languages in danger*.
- Vovin, Alexander (1993). *A reconstruction of proto-Ainu*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1952). *Languages in contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winchester, Mark (2009). On the dawn of a new national Ainu policy: The 'Ainu' as a situation today. *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*, 41, 3-09.
- Ynsee Gaelg (2013). <<http://www.learn-manx.com>>

(2013年9月30日受付)
 (2014年4月22日修正版受付)
 (2014年6月30日掲載決定)