

Title	Why Japan-ese and not Japan-ian? : historical relations between demonymic suffixes and country names
Sub Title	
Author	青木, 輝(Aoki, Hikaru)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学大学院文学研究科英米文学専攻『コロキア』同人
Publication year	2022
Jtitle	Colloquia (コロキア). Vol.43, (2022. ) ,p.85- 102
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	英語学・言語学
Genre	Journal Article
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00341698-20221215-0085">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00341698-20221215-0085</a>

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

## Why *Japan-ese* and Not *Japan-ian*?:

### Historical Relations between Demyonymic Suffixes and Country Names\*

Hikaru AOKI

#### 1. Introduction

According to Dickson (xiv–xv), the term ‘demyonym’<sup>1</sup>, a coinage from the Greek morphemes *demos-* ‘people’ and *-onym* ‘name’, was introduced by George H. Scheetz to refer to generic names of people living in or born in a particular area. In countries, a national demyonym is used to represent people who have the nationality; therefore, the demyonym for people with Japanese nationality is *Japanese* and the demyonym for people with nationality of the United States is *American*. A demyonym usually originates from the name of an area where people live, and, in most cases, a suffix is involved in its derivation. *Chinese* is derived by adding the suffix *-ese* to the country name, and *Spanish* is derived by adding *-ish* to Spain. However, one question arises on this point: Why is a particular suffix selected for a given country? This question is a little confusing. A good example of this is the suffix *-ese*. While it is used for deriving *Japanese* and *Chinese*, Korea, a country adjacent to Japan and China, does not take the suffix. That is, English speakers do not call the people of Korea \**Koreanese*. Moreover, while phonologically it seems possible to call Japanese people \**Japanish* or \**Japanian*, such demyonyms are generally not used in Present-Day English. The study aims to address such questions from a historical perspective: What are the actual factors that cause this complex and confusing derivation of demyonyms?

Now, I will show the outline of the study. This paper comprises six sections. This first section provides an introductory discussion, and the following section introduces relevant previous studies that treat derivations of demyonyms. Section 3 discusses the study methods. Section 4 discusses why each suffix is added to particular countries based on concrete data, and Section 5 attempts to explain why many suffixes came to be used for demyonymic derivation throughout the history of English. Section 6 provides concluding remarks.

---

\* I would like to express my profound gratitude to Professor Ryuichi Hotta of Keio University, who has given me many invaluable and insightful comments on this study. Furthermore, I would like to thank Professor Taro Ishiguro of Meiji University, who also gave me valuable comments on this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Since the word demyonym was coined recently, it has not been used widely, and some previous studies used the technical term “ethnonym” in place of “demyonym”; however, in this paper, I will use the word “demyonym” to refer to national names.

## 2. Previous Studies

This section treats two previous studies that are relevant to this paper: those of Otaka and Sunaga. Other studies that treated demonymic derivations examined them from a phonological or other viewpoint relatively irrelevant to this paper, and thus do not suit the historical concerns of this study. They have been excluded from discussion but will be referred to as needed.

Otaka examines some properties of demonymic suffixes, mainly focusing on their phonological aspects as well as adducing several historical factors affecting the selection of suffixes while deriving demonyms. He classifies English demonyms into five types from a morphological viewpoint. The following is the classification presented in the study (4–5).

- ① Place names with a suffix (e.g., Japan / *Japanese*, Mexico / *Mexican*)
- ② Ethnic names (e.g., Finland / *Finn*)
- ③ Irregulars (e.g., Madagascar / *Malagasy*)
- ④ Borrowings (e.g., Kosovo / *Kosovar*)
- ⑤ Nicknames (e.g., Australia / *Aussie*)

Referring to the demonyms of type ①, he states that 94 percent of all demonyms fall into this type. Furthermore, the suffixes *-an*, *-er*, *-ese*, *-ian*, *-ean*, *-nian*, *-i*, and *-ish* are involved in the derivation of demonyms of the class (6). He analyses such suffixes as follows. First, he argues that the suffixes *-(a)n*, *-ian*, *-ean*, and *-nian* are added to a country name with phonological conditioning, underlining some of their phonological properties (6–10). Second, he claims that *-ese* has a tendency to be added to countries in South and East Asia, which he calls the regionality of the suffix. Additionally, some African countries have *ese*-demonyms; so, he points to the influence of French because it is spoken in the region (10). Regarding the suffixes *-ish* and *-er*, several *ish*-demonyms are used in Britain because the suffix has existed since the Old English period, and *-er* is frequently associated with a country name that has morpheme *-land* at the end, except for some countries that already have another demonym (5–6). Finally, Otaka points out that the demonyms derived from *-i* are located around the Middle East. He claims that because it originates from a Latin inflectional suffix and Middle East countries have been known since ancient times, they take *i*-demonyms (10–11).

Sunaga's study also examines demonymic suffixes, not only from a phonological viewpoint but also from a historical one. She reveals the regional distribution of each sort of demonym and discusses how and why such distributions happened. She suggests that *ese*-demonyms are

possibly located along the Portuguese sea routes in the Age of Discovery, and *i*-demonyms are widely used in Jewish and Semitic areas, or in areas where Arabic or Swahili is spoken or Islam is followed (183, 185).

As discussed above, distribution of each type of demonyms has been previously discussed, but there are discrepancies among them. First, while Otaka ascribes the *ese*-distribution to regionality and French influence, Sunaga attributes it to Portuguese sea routes. Second, where Otaka claims that *-i* in *i*-demonyms is of Latin origin, Sunaga differs. In summary, it can be said that the sources of the regional distributions of both *ese*-demonyms and *i*-demonyms are debatable. Furthermore, no sufficient study on the distribution of *ish*-demonyms has been conducted so far. Therefore, this study examines these three demonymic suffixes that show idiosyncratic regional distributions and were not coined from the country names for phonological reasons, such as hold for *ian*-demonyms.

### 3. Method

This section presents the method of this study. In this study I consulted the *Oxford English Dictionary* to look up the dates of the first attestation on each demonym. By referring to the dates, a historical perspective is introduced that enables us to consider the historical backgrounds of the suffixes and demonymic derivations. However, we need to first consider the limitation of the use of the *OED* as a tool for lexical studies. As pointed out by some researchers, such as Bauer and Durkin, the *OED* has some problems concerning its sources of vocabulary.

The first problem is indicated in Bauer's comment in his study that "because a source such as the *OED* is so inclusive, it may not be clear how long a word was used for or how frequent it was: first citations can be earlier than the general use and last citations can postdate the vitality of the pattern by a long way; rare persisting words may have as many citations as common but short-lived words" (182). This means that one cannot gain any concrete information on the general use of a word, such as frequency, because the data in the *OED* are solely based on the remaining literature. However, as this study seeks to examine the relationship between history and suffixes comparatively, only the dates of first attestations are needed. In other words, this study does not require any information except the dates, and this concern will not be a striking problem on this study.

Furthermore, both Bauer and Durkin pointed out that the first attestation based on historical records may arise after the actual appearance in colloquial use at that time. While this may be a significant problem in most lexical studies, it is not so for this paper. Demonyms are, needless

to say, the names of people all over the world, and ordinary English people at that time could not have known such words before they spread from the written language. It thus seems impossible that the demonyms had already disseminated before their literary use started. In other words, colloquial use preceded literary use in this category of words. Therefore, a lag between the use in spoken language and that in written language is not a concern for the present analysis.

The third concern is pointed out by Durkin as well as Bauer.

(...) what is reported in historical dictionaries is based on analysis of the evidence available at time of publication of the dictionary entry, and may well be subject to review if and when further evidence comes to light. First dates of attestation are particularly subject to change, as new evidence becomes available, and as the dating of existing evidence is reconsidered. (406)

While this paper obviates the methodological issues, this point is beyond any methodological remedy. It is highly unlikely that all demonyms will be subject to the drastic updates on their dates of attestation; however, considering this point, the validity of this study can be guaranteed to the extent that historical science ensures the credibility of the attestations in the *OED*.

#### 4. Data and Discussions on Each Suffix

##### 4.1 -ese

This suffix originates from the Latin suffix *-ensis*, and there are a few suffixes that have the same origin in Romance languages, such as Italian, French, and Portuguese. Previous studies have pointed out this suffix is basically added to the names of countries in Asia and Africa, and the reason for this tendency has been debated in research on demonyms. According to Lee (appendix), there are 25 demonyms of *ese*-countries worldwide. However, some of them need to be eliminated for this study because Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan and overseas departments of France are not officially recognized as countries. The following table accordingly shows the numbers of demonyms for each region after excluding such areas.

Table 1. Number of *ese*-demonyms in each region

Asia	Africa	Europe	S. America	Others	Total
8	6	4	1	1 <sup>2</sup>	20

<sup>2</sup> The Marshall Islands are located near Australia in Oceania.

Fig. 1. Distribution of *ese*-demonyms<sup>3</sup>



<This map was created at <https://mapchart.net/world.html>>

It is noticeable that *ese*-countries are concentrated in Asia and Africa, and this distributional tendency is the most disputed issue of these demonyms.

The discussion now turns to the dates of first attestation of the *ese*-demonyms in Africa and Asia.

Table 2. African *ese*-demonyms and the dates of their first attestation<sup>4</sup>

Country Name	Demonym	First Attestation
Benin	Beninese	1705
Congo <sup>5</sup>	Congolese <sup>6</sup>	1839
Sudan	Sudanese	1826
Gabon	Gabonese	1866
Senegal	Senegalese	1917
Togo	Togolese	1957(1962)

<sup>3</sup> The Marshall Islands, the Faroe Islands, and San Marino cannot be depicted in Figure 1 because of the tool used to create this figure. The Faroe Islands are located between Norway and Iceland, and San Marino is located in central-eastern Italy.

<sup>4</sup> In the case where the first attestation was as an adjective, the year of the attestation as a demonym is given in parentheses.

<sup>5</sup> Having the same origin, the Republic of the Congo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo also have the same demonym *Congolese*; thus, in this paper I will treat them as the same.

<sup>6</sup> According to the *OED*, there was a demonym *\*Congoese* that appeared in 1765.

Table 3. Asian *ese*-demonyms and the dates of their first attestation

Country Name	Demonym	First Attestation
China	Chinese	1577(1606)
Japan	Japanese	1588(1604)
Nepal	Nepalese	1800
Bhutan	Bhutanese	1813
Burma	Burmese	1823(1824)
East Timor	Timorese	1869
Lebanon	Lebanese	1920
Vietnam	Vietnamese	1947

According to the dates of first attestation, two out of six demonyms appeared in the 1700s, which gives an important clue regarding the issue of demonymic distribution. As Otaka mentioned, some demonyms seem to be affected by French through their coining. For example, Gabon originally had a demonym *\*Gaboon*<sup>7</sup>; however, after France moved in on the country and expanded its influence in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, *Gabonese* appeared in 1866. Senegal appertained to France in 1783, and its *ese*-demonym appeared in 1917. The most remarkable is the demonym *Togolese*. Regarding this demonym, the *OED* states:

Etymology: < *Togo* (see below) + *-ese suffix*, after French *togolais*.

Consequently, it can be said that French partly influenced the derivation of *ese*-demonyms in Africa, as pointed out by Otaka. However, a few demonyms seem not to have such a relationship between their derivations and the French language. For example, while Benin became a protectorate in 1892 following the French army intervention in 1884 and Congo became a French colony in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, both demonyms for the countries had already appeared by the time (Table 2). There may have been some degree of French influence on Africa before it became a French protectorate or colony; however it is not as convincing as the previous examples. Therefore, we need to consider the influence of Portugal. Sunaga states that *ese*-demonyms are located along the Portuguese sea routes in the Age of Discovery (185). This suggestion makes the incompatibilities between the dates of first attestation and the year in which French influence uncontroversial, for Benin and Congo were

---

<sup>7</sup> See the *OED* “Gaboon”.

influenced by the Portuguese. Therefore, both French and Portuguese influenced the derivation of African *ese*-demonyms at the same time.

This can be observed in Asia as well. Lebanon was placed under the French Mandate in 1919, and its demonym appeared in the next year. Lee notes that one of the limitations of using *-ese* to derive demonyms is that the area to which the suffix is added has to be in the French bloc (53). This claim is compatible with the use of *-ese* in the derivation of *Lebanese*. French influence is also recognized in Asia on this point. Moreover, Portuguese influence is found in Asian *ese*-demonyms. Regarding Japan and China, *ese*-adjectives appeared in the late 1500s, and their use as demonyms appeared soon after. Considering the history of the two countries during this period, the Portuguese came to Tanegashima and brought guns to Japan in 1543; moreover, according to the *OED*, *Chin*, the name of China, was mentioned in Marco Polo, and the name China was also found in both Barbosa’s work in 1516 and Garcia de Orta’s work in 1563. While the writer Marco Polo was from Venetia, Barbosa and Orta were both from Portugal. Further, other Portuguese people came to the country later. From this point, it is natural to assume that the visit of the Portuguese to Japan and China after the Age of Discovery had an impact on the use of *-ese*. Additionally, East Timor was historically under the control of Portugal as early as 1701; so East Timor has *Timorese* as its demonym.

As per the discussion above, let us look at English *ese*-demonyms and their counterparts in Portuguese and French (see the tables below).

Table 4. Comparison of African demonyms in English, French, and Portuguese<sup>8</sup>

<b>English</b>	<b>French</b>	<b>Portuguese</b>
Beninese	?	Beninense
Congolese	Congolais	Congolês
Sudanese	Soudanais	Sudanês
Gabonese	Gabonais	Gabonês
Senegalese	Sènégalais	Senegalês
Togolese	Togolais	?

<sup>8</sup> Question marks in the Tables indicate that the corresponding item was not found in the referenced dictionary.



Table 5. Comparison of Asian demonyms in English, French, and Portuguese

<b>English</b>	<b>French</b>	<b>Portuguese</b>
Chinese	Chinois	Chinês
Japanese	Japonais	Japonês
Nepalese	Nepalais	Nepalês
Bhutanese	Bhoutanais	Butanês
Burmese	Burman	?
Timorese	?	Timorense
Lebanese	Libanais	Libanês
Vietnamese	Vietnamien	Vietnamita

Most *ese*-demonyms and their counterparts correspond. Assuming that these reflect Portuguese and French influences, the suffixes are expected to be shared between English demonyms and Portuguese or French counterparts. In this respect, some *ese*-demonyms may have been added to the country names in Asia or Africa under the influence of Portuguese or French<sup>9</sup>.

However, it has been found that *Vietnamese* and *Burmese* do not correspond to their French and Portuguese counterparts. One possible reason of this is the regionality of the suffix discussed by Otaka. Because of Portuguese influence, there had already been some *ese*-demonyms across the region before the words *Vietnamese* and *Burmese* were derived. In particular, *Japanese* and *Chinese* were taken as English demonyms and came in use by 1600. For such reasons, *-ese* was associated with South and East Asia in English, and this regionality developed analogically. Therefore, some country names, such as Vietnam, Burma, and Nepal, a country that has little influence of Portugal, are associated with *-ese*.

In summary, in the case of the deriving *ese*-demonyms in Asia and Africa, there was some French influence on the demonymic derivation, as Otaka implied. However, there was also Portuguese influence on the derivational selection of *-ese*, as Sunaga pointed out. Furthermore, such historical factors caused the regionality of the suffix, whereby this suffix was associated

---

<sup>9</sup>While this study does not treat demonyms *Macanese*, *Taiwanese*, and *Hongkongese*, previous studies have treated them as *ese*-demonyms. We can see the same Portuguese influence in the derivation of *Macanese*. To be concrete, the Portuguese arrived in Macau as early as 1513 and established a permanent settlement in the mid-16th century. From this, Macau has an *ese*-demonym as its own demonym.

with the area around China and Japan. Consequently, *-ese* came to be added to the country names in Asia, and demonyms, such as *Vietnamese*, were coined<sup>10</sup>.

We now extend this discussion to the *ese*-demonyms in other regions. As shown in Table 1, Europe has four *ese*-demonyms; South America has two; and Oceania has one. The four *ese*-demonyms in Europe are: *Portuguese*, *Maltese*, *Faroese*, and *Sammarinese*. Regarding *Portuguese* and *Sammarinese*, Romance languages are spoken in both Portugal and San Marino. The language of the former is Portuguese, and that of the latter is Italian. These two languages originate from Latin and share the *ensis*-originated suffix as much as the other Romance languages do. In this respect, it is natural that English adopted *ese*-demonyms following these languages. As to *Maltese*, the *OED* describes its origin as follows:

Etymology: < *Malta* (see *Malta n.*) + *-ese* suffix.

In quot. 1585 at sense A. 1 after Middle French *Malteses* (feminine plural adjective) (...).

Accordingly, *ese*-demonyms in Europe were also influenced by Romance languages, such as French and Portuguese. Regarding *ese*-demonyms in Europe, one interesting case is *Faroese*. Like *Marshallese* in Oceania, this demonym was derived by using *-ese*, while the country name has the morpheme *-land*. As pointed out by Otaka and others, in general, a country name ending with the morpheme *-land* tends to be associated with the suffix *-er* (e.g., *New Zealander*, *Icelander*, *Greenlander*, and *Solomon Islander*). That is, these two demonyms are exceptional regarding both *-ese* and *-er*. As a matter of fact, these demonyms are inexplicable exceptions.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ota claims that *-ese* are selected to derive demonyms for a racist reason, citing Saito's description of Tenshin Okakura in 2000 (1–2). The anecdote in Saito is as follows:

In 1904, Tenshin visited America (...) and he was asked by a young man “What sort of ‘nese’ are you people? Are you Chinese, or Japanese, or Javanese?” in jest. In response to this blunt question, Tenshin turned to the man and said, “We are Japanese gentlemen. But what kind of ‘key’ are you? Are you a Yankee, a donkey, or a monkey?” After this fluent reply, he walked away. (Translation by the author)

Indeed, there was clearly a racist implication in the remark; however, this racist feeling was held by native speakers at that time, and it is hard to say that *-ese* was chosen for the same reason, regarding the derivation of *ese*-demonyms. Rather, this anecdote should be considered for revealing the regionality of the suffix. The young man called Tenshin ‘-ese’ because *-ese* had already become associated with Asia and acquired regionality in English by the time Tenshin visited America. In other words, it should be regarded as evidence of *-ese*'s regionality.

However, there is a suggestive description on *Marshallese*. See the citation from the *OED* below.

Etymology: < the name of the Marshall Islands, a republic in the central Pacific Ocean made up of two chains of coral atolls ( < the name of Captain John or William Marshall , English merchant seaman, who visited the islands in 1788 with Captain Thomas Gilbert: compare Gilbertese adj. and n.) + -ese suffix.

In short, it is found that the word Marshall in Marshall Island originates from a person's name, and the island was found by an English seaman. Therefore, there was no name in English to represent this island before the discovery. To use *-er* to derive demonyms, the name of the country needs to contain the morpheme *-land*. The lack of such a proper noun at the time of discovery could be why *-ese* was selected.

Overall, French influence, Portuguese influence originating from the Age of Discovery, and the regionality of the suffix acquired through the history were among major factors *-ese* was selected to derive each *ese*-demonyms.

#### 4.2 -ish

The suffix *-ish* has existed since the Old English period and originated in Proto-Germanic. Otake states that demonyms derived with this suffix are typically found in British place names (6). Like *-ese*, which tends to be added to the country names in Asia and Africa, *-ish* tends to be associated with European countries. In fact, all *ish*-demonyms are coined from the names of European countries in Present-Day English.

Fig. 2. Distribution of *ish*-demonyms



<This map was created at <https://mapchart.net/world.html>>

This part will examine the reason for this distributional inclination in the backdrop of history. The dates of first attestation of each *ish*-demonym in Europe are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. All *ish*-countries, their demonyms, and the dates of their first attestation

Country Name	Demonym	First Attestation as an Adjective	First Attestation as a Demonym
England	English	eOE	OE
Ireland	Irish	OE	1275
Spain	Spanish	c1275 (?a1200)	1660
France	French	OE	OE
Wales	Welsh	eOE	IOE
Scotland	Scottish	eOE	1350
Denmark	Danish	845	833

It is noteworthy that every *ish*-demonym had appeared by 1275 as adjectives, and most of them were also used as demonyms in the early period. This affirms a significant aspect of the suffix and the reason for its regionality. Because it has existed since the Old English period and demonymic suffixes such as *-ese* and *-ian* did not exist at that time, the suffix was added to the name of people the Anglo-Saxons were in contact with during the early period. In the age of Anglo-Saxons, no major expeditions enabled them to make contact with some people in distant areas like Asia. In other words, the tribes with whom Anglo-Saxons had contact before other demonymic suffixes were introduced in English were necessarily limited to the area around Britain. Therefore, *-ish* has a tendency to be associated with the names of countries around the island of Great Britain.

#### 4.3 -i

It is said that the suffix *-i* is associated with the countries in the Middle East, constituting a characteristic regional distribution of *i*-demonyms. As discussed in Section 2, while Otaka describes its origin as Latin, Sunaga considers the origin as the languages of the area, in which respect this suffix is debatable. Furthermore, there are few descriptions on this suffix in the *OED*.

A termination used in the names of certain Near-Eastern and Eastern peoples, as Iraqi, Israeli, Pakistani.

Therefore, we can say that there is room for a discussion on this suffix.

Fig. 3. Distribution of *i*-demonyms



<This map was created at <https://mapchart.net/world.html>>

Table 7. All *i*-countries, demonyms, and the date of their first attestation

Country Name	Demonym	First Attestation
Azerbaijan	Azerbaijani	1888
Bahrain	Bahraini	N/A
Bangladesh	Bangladeshi	1971
Iraq	Iraqi	1777
Israel	Israeli	1948
Kazakhstan	Kazakhstani	N/A
Kuwait	Kuwaiti	1928
Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstani	N/A
Oman	Omani	c1819
Pakistan	Pakistani	1935(1941)
Qatar	Qatari	1954
Somalia	Somali	1809
Tajikistan	Tajikistani	N/A
UAE	Emirati	1979
Uzbekistan	Uzbekistani	N/A
Yemen	Yemeni	1888

The data shown in the table tells us that each *i*-demonym first appeared in the modern period. However, considering that the Middle East region has been known since ancient times, it must have been used earlier than its actual appearance. In addition to this assumption, some of the country names in the Middle East were created in the modern period. For example, the *OED* describes the origin of Pakistan as follows:

The name *Pakistan* was coined by C. Rahmat Ali Now or Never (1933) < Urdu *pak* and its etymon Persian *pak* pure, perfect, complete, with the suffix *-stan* common in the names of countries and regions in south and central Asia (compare *stan n. 1*). He explained it as additionally an acronym of letters representing the names of the areas of western British India inhabited predominantly by Muslims: *Punjab*, *Afghani border*, *Kashmir*, *Sindh*, and *Baluchistan*.

Accordingly, it is impossible that the name of the country was known in antiquity, which was why *-i* was selected, as Otake claims. Indeed, the Modern English period is known as the time in which several Latinate words were created. In view of this, *i*-demonyms may have been coined because of the Latin influence. However, two doubts remain. First, the assumption that a mere inflectional suffix was used is dubious, given that there were some productive demonymic suffixes, such as *-ian*. Second, the reason why the inflectional suffix was used only for the Middle Eastern demonyms is unclear. That is, there is no motivation to associate only with the Middle East a Latin suffix of the nominal inflection that seems applicable to a wide range of country names. These facts lead us to consider that there is little possibility of Latin influence on the derivation using the suffix, or alternatively, that the suffix *-i* found in the Middle East does not originate from Latin.

Furthermore, some origins of *i*-demonyms are described in the *OED* as being drawn from Arabic (cf. the *OED* “Iraqi,” “Kuwaiti,” “Omani,” “Emirati,” “Qatari”). Supposing *-i* is of Arabic origin, the suffix and the regionality are easily associated.

Although there is room for etymological scrutiny, in consequence, we may say that *-i* originates from the languages in the Middle East, and the factors affecting selection of the suffix are similar to what Sunaga claimed.

## 5. Further Discussion

While the previous section discussed some factors of demonymic distribution, this section argues about its factors that lie in the entire English history.

The first point is the change of the English lexical characteristics after the Norman Conquest. English was once a language that created compounds by combining Germanic elements to make new words. However, after the Norman Conquest in 1066, English gradually came to rely on foreign languages as a source of new words. Baugh and Cable describe this change as follows:

One of the most obvious characteristics of present-day English is the size and mixed character of its vocabulary. English is classified as a Germanic language; that is to say, it belongs to the group of languages to which German, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian also belong. It shares with these languages similar grammatical structure and many common words. On the other hand, more than half of its vocabulary is derived from Latin. Some of these borrowings have been direct, a great many through French, some through the other Romance languages. As a result, English also shares a great number of words with those languages of Europe that are derived from Latin, notably French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. (...). Instead of making new words chiefly by the combination of existing elements, as German does, English has shown a marked tendency to go outside its own linguistic resources and borrow from other languages. In the course of centuries of this practice, English has built up an unusual capacity for assimilating outside elements.

(9)

Further, in the Modern English period, when many demonyms were coined, the use of borrowed affixes increased significantly. Referring to the studies of Wersmer (64) and Nevalainen (352), Cowie states that “the relative frequency of nonnative affixes to native affixes in coined words rises from 20% at the beginning of the Early Modern English period to 70% at the end of it” (610). The reasons for the increase vary from period to period; however, the facts that English came not to use its native element, *-ish*, continually and that demonyms came to be derived from non-native elements reflect the change in the nature of the English lexicon that originated in the Norman Conquest.

Referring to the second point, the functional change of *-ish* has been pointed out. Hotta shows that *-ish* changed its function from representing national names to denoting people, animals, and objects, and came to be added to adjectives, thereby extending the use of the suffix. Considering this change, it is possible that its major function changed as the result of the varied use of the suffix, and that other suffixes came to be used for deriving demonyms in place of *-ish*.

Finally, the period in which new demonyms were created should be considered. New demonyms were required was after the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when navigation developed and the Age of Discovery started. This happened much later in English history. In other words, the change in the nature of the language and suffixes took place when these demonyms and their production were required.

In short, because of navigation development, European people encountered several regions, which required them to create many new demonyms for people they met. However, at that time, English had been changing its lexical characteristics, and its native suffix was by then used in other ways. Hence, English depended on other languages to create numerous new demonyms, leading the vast influx of new demonymic suffixes, such as *-ese* and *-ian*.

These facts are illustrated by the case of demonymic variation in China. Bauer states that competition takes place when two or more words or types of word formation patterns coexist in the same slot, adducing the competition of gender-making suffixes, such as *-ess* and *-ster*. In such a competition, in some cases the older one wins out under the Aronoff's principle of blocking, and at other times the newer one wins. The case of *-ster* and *-ess* exemplifies the latter, as the two competed as the basic suffix to express "female," and *-ess*, the newer suffix, won out, displacing *-ster*. Bauer discusses this competition as follows:

If words with competing affixes were distinguished according to predictable patterns, we might expect both affixes to survive with new, more specific meanings. But while this happens in the competition between individual words, it seems to be less usual as the resolution of competition between word formation patterns. Gender-making *-ster* yielding to *-ess* but continuing as a profession marker seems atypical in this regard. (182)

When we focus on the case of demonyms representing Chinese people, we see a similar competition between demonymic suffixes. According to the *OED*, China once had a demonym *\*Chinish*, which was first attested in 1577. That is, *-ese* and *-ish* competed for the slot of demonymic suffix. One should remember that the functions of *-ish* had already changed by the time of the competition, unlike the case that Bauer examines. Accordingly, in this competition, since *-ish* had deviated from the position of demonymic suffix, dragging force worked to compensate the loss in the slot, attracting some new suffixes to the place of demonymic suffix. Moreover, the change of English lexical characteristics, a vast number of borrowings, and urgent necessity of creation of new demonyms, also worked toward Romance suffixes to dislodge *-ish* from the slot, as a pushing force. Consequently, accompanied by both dragging



and pushing forces, multiple suffixes were used to coin new demonyms, which caused a chaotic and idiosyncratic distribution of demonyms in Present-Day English.

## **6. Conclusion**

This study discussed how and why suffixes were selected and why English demonyms are so varied in Present-Day English, from the viewpoint of both the history of each demonymic suffix and the overall history of English. In particular, the study treated three demonyms thought to have been selected for demonymic derivation for non-phonological reasons.

First, the factors for selecting *-ese* are: location along the sea routes of Portugal during the Age of Discovery, adjacent location to *ese*-countries, or French influence over the country to whose name suffix is added.

Second, concerning *ish*-demonyms, the range of the use of suffix *-ish* was limited to countries or people known during the Anglo-Saxon period. Because of lack of efficient navigation at the time of the contacts, the distribution of *ish*-demonyms is limited to the region around the Britain Isles.

Finally, regarding the suffix *-i*, while previous studies described its origin in different ways, this study supports Sunaga's claim that this suffix originates from the local languages in regions where the suffix was used, showing the description in the *OED* and comparing with the history around the region.

In addition, regarding the history of the English language, I argued that three factors caused this demonymic diversity: the change in the nature of English new words, the possibility of a functional change in the suffix *-ish*, and the period in which new demonyms were created. Motivated by such events and facts, the competition between demonymic suffixes has occurred in the history of the English language. These are the reasons for the current confusing distribution of the demonyms worldwide.

## Works Cited

- Bauer, Laurie. "Competition in English Word Formation." *The Handbook of the History of English*. edited by Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los. Blackwell, 2006, pp. 177–198.
- Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. *A History of the English Language*. 6th ed., Routledge, 2013.
- Cowie, Claire. "Early Modern English: Morphology." vol. 1 of *English Historical Linguistics: An International Handbook*. 2 vols. edited by Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton. Mouton de Gruyter, 2012, pp. 604–620.
- Dickson, Paul. *Labels for Locals: What to Call People from Abilene to Zimbabwe*. Collins, 2006.
- Durkin, Philip. "The OED and HTOED as Tools in Practical Research: A Test Case Examining the Impact of Loanwords on Areas of the Core Lexicon." *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*. edited by Merja Kytö and Päivi Pahta. Cambridge UP, 2016, pp. 390–406.
- Hotta Ryuichi. "The Suffix *-ish* and Its Derogatory Connotation: An OEDBased Historical Study." *Journal of the Faculty of Letters: Language, Literature and Culture*, vol. 108, 2011, pp. 107–132.
- Lee, Borim. "A Study on English Donymic Forms of the World Nations." *Linguistic Research*, vol. 26, 2009, pp. 43–65.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/>. Accessed 8 Sept. 2022.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. "Early Modern English Lexis and Semantics." vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. 6 vols. edited by Roger Lass. Cambridge UP, 1999, pp. 332–458.
- Ota Satoshi. "Hito ya Dougu wo Arawasu Eigo no Setsubiji ni Tsuite [Remarks on English Suffixes Related to People and Instrument]." *Eigo to Eibeibungaku [English and English Literature]*, vol. 44, 2009, pp. 1–15.
- Otaka Hiromi. "An Exploration of the Forms of English Demonyms: On their Varieties and Regularities." *Ex: Journal of Language and Culture*, vol. 8, 2013, pp. 1–16.
- Sunaga Shinobu. "A Morphological and Phonological Study on "National Names" in English." *Journal of Komazawa Women's University*, vol. 2, 1995, pp. 179–194.
- Ukaji Masatomo. *Eigoshi [A History of the English Language]*. Kaitakusha, 2000.
- Wersmer, Richard. *Statistische Studien zur Entwicklung des englischen Wortschatzes*. Francke, 1976.
- [Dictionaries]
- Atkins, Beryl T., et al., editors. Collins - Robert French~English English~French Dictionary. 2nd ed., Collins, 1987.
- Coelho, Jaime and Yoshihumi Hida, editors. *Gendai Nichiho Jiten [Contemporary Japanese - Portuguese Dictionary]*. Shougakukan, 1998.
- Hinata Noemia, editors. *Nihongo Burajiru • Porutogarugo Jiten [Japanese – Brazilian • Portuguese Dictionary]*. Sanshodo, 2010.
- Suzuki Shinataro, editors. *Sutandado Wahutu Jiten [Standard Japanese - French Dictionary]*. Taishukanshoten, 1972.
- Tanabe Hiroshi, et al., editors. *Sekai Chiri Daihyakka Jiten*. 5 vols. Asakurashoten, 1998–2002. Trans. of *Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations*. 8th ed., 5 vols. Gale Research, 1995.
- The Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Oxford University Press, 2022. <http://www.oed.com/>. Accessed 8 Sept. 2022.

## Appendix

### List of *ese*-demonyms based on Lee (appendix)

Benin / Beninese	Malta / Maltese
Bhutan / Bhutanese	Marshall Islands / Marshallese
China / Chinese	Myanmar / Myanmarese, Burmese
Congo / Congolese	Nepal / Nepalese
East Timor / Timorese	Portugal / Portuguese
Faroe Islands / Faroese	San Marino / Sammarinese
Gabon / Gabonese	Senegal / Senegalese
Guyana / Guyanese	Sudan / Sudanese
Japan / Japanese	Togo / Togolese
Lebanon / Lebanese	Vietnam / Vietnamese

### List of *ish*-demonyms based on Lee (appendix)

Denmark / Danish	Scotland / Scottish
England / English	Spain / Spanish
France / French	Wales / Welsh
Ireland / Irish	

### List of *i*-demonyms based on Lee (appendix)

Azerbaijan / Azerbaijani	Oman / Omani
Bahrain / Bahraini	Pakistan / Pakistani
Bangladesh / Bangladeshi	Qatar / Qatari
Iraq / Iraqi	Somalia / Somali
Israel / Israeli	Tajikistan / Tajikistani
Kazakhstan / Kazakhstani	UAE / Emirati
Kuwait / Kuwaiti	Uzbekistan / Uzbekistani
Kyrgyzstan / Kyrgyzstani	Yemen / Yemeni