

## THE INTERPLAY OF SPONTANEOUS (“NATURAL”) AND DELIBERATE (“ARTIFICIAL”) IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH

Rolandas Vitalius F. Idzelis

The modes (ways) of conscious and deliberate impact of society on language in general and, in particular, with regard to the functioning of English as a means of international communication (and, finally and most important, in relation to English in Europe) have been the subject of vigorous debates and numerous publications.<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of note that at the Second International Congress of Linguist Otto Jespersen appealed to linguists “to examine how in various countries a deliberate and conscious influence has been exerted on the development of language and thus see what can actually be done in that direction... But it is my firm conviction that scholars should not confine themselves to being mere passive lookers-on, but should take an active share, each in his own country, in what is going on to modify and, if possible, improve linguistic conditions” (Actes, 1933, 96).

The roots of the problem reach back to Antiquity and embrace a wide range of questions which none the less are related to one of the central problems of linguistics – the interaction between **language** and **society**.<sup>2</sup> The characteristic feature in the development of the doctrine of conscious and deliberate

influence of man on his language were incessant debates concerning the relationship between “natural” (spontaneous) and “artificial” (deliberate) in language, “physei” and “thesei”, the qualities of language and standards of “correctness”, attempts to clarify the role played by the “international language of science” (Latin) in the making of national (standard) languages, the search for effective means of international communication, endeavours to ascertain the possibility of making use of artificial or planned languages as auxiliary languages for international communication, the impact of society on the development of the language(s) of science, the struggle of conflictive views on language policy, language planning, language maintenance and shift, etc. (Eastman, 1983; Новдхауген, 1984; Троцкий, 1936; Перельмутер, 1980; Иванов, 1964; Абрамян, 1981; Амирова и др., 1975; Гак, 1989, 104–133).

It goes without saying that to do justice to the problems raised here would need a book-length treatment. Some of them have been addressed by the present author in a number of articles. In these publications we concentrated on some of the aspects of this many-

sided problem and tried to demonstrate a wide diversity of modes of conscious and deliberate influence of man on his language. It was also very important to show the process of the formation of the belief concerning the possibility of deliberate (conscious) language regulation.<sup>3</sup> The role of Latin which, owing to its well-developed, unified, normalized (codified) character and use over vast territories, served as an excellent medium of international cultural and scientific communication had also to be given a meaning.<sup>4</sup> It was hoped that against this background the approach to the problem of international English postulated by us would be better brought to the fore (Идзелис, 1973, 1987).

With regard to the search for the optimum means of international communication the history of linguistics gives abundant evidence that the influence of man on his language manifested itself in different forms: numerous projects of artificial or planned languages constructed and designed basically modelling and using the material of natural languages (“aposteriori languages”)<sup>5</sup> (Кузнецов, 1982; 1987; Дрезен, 1928; Ахманова, Бокарев, 1956, 65–78; Бокарев, 1976, 21–25; Исаев, 1977, 69–75; 1987, 83–94; Dodge, 1941, 309–317; Sapir, 1970, 45–64; Talma, 1938, 172–186) have been worked out, attempts to revive the classical languages, in particular, Latin, and on its basis construct a universal simplified variant of Latin (“latino-sine-flectione”) have been made (Маадля, 1984, 58–73; Нахов, 1982, 92–94), an idea to use one of the most wide-spread natural languages as a means of international communication has been brought forward (Akhmanova, Idzelis, 1978; Newmark, 1979, 107–112; Костомаров, 1991).

Since the problem of deliberate and conscious influence of man on the development of language is of interest to us first of all with regard to the functioning of the English languages as a means of international communication we shall concentrate our attention on the modes (ways) of conscious impact or influence on natural languages.

At this juncture we consider it expedient to refer again to the history of linguistics. The facts conclusively show that:

1) at every period of the development of language debates concerning the interrelationship of “physei” and “thesei”, the problems of the qualities of language and standards of “correctness”, the correlation between “good English” (linguistic usage) and the “best English” (literature) have been and are still carried on between scientists, writers and educationalists;<sup>6</sup>

2) the concept of “correctness” is a historical category which undergoes changes together with the public life;

3) to set up the content of the given linguistic ideal, i.e. the notion of correct usage the knowledge of educational policies and teaching methods of a given nation at this or that period of the development of the particular nation is of paramount importance (Винокур, 1959, 235; Hall, 1950; Janicki, 1985; Crystal, 1996, 38–40; Sweet, 1964, 71–72; Palmer, 1943; Ferguson, 1971; Akhmanova, Idzelis, 1978);

4) the alienation and opposition of the “teleological aspect” and the “scientific” studies of language established the basis for the creation of artificial or planned languages (Волков, 1982, 49; Степанов, 1985, 93; Кузнецов, 1982);

5) the influence of man on his language manifested itself in different ways – the attempts made at constructing rationally numerous artificial or planned languages (basically of “a posteriori” type), on the one hand, and efforts bent on the improvement, ameliorating (cultivation) of national literary (standard) language, on the other (Heath, 1976; Дуличенко, 1984, 3–38).

It is, therefore, very important to emphasize that the modes of the impact of man on language are essentially different. They must be clearly and precisely kept apart, because the linguistic activities of man aimed at ameliorating and improving the national literary (standard) language are exercised within the philological approach to the study of language, whereas the construction of artificial or planned languages and auxiliary languages constitutes the subject of interlinguistics as part of semiotics. The failure to separate these basically different kinds of influence of man on language leads to the confusion of the methodology in the study of natural languages as a specific social phenomenon and artificial, formalized systems performing various auxiliary functions<sup>7</sup> (Исаев, 1977; Бударов, 1985).

There are one or two preliminary points to make before I clarify the terminological issues which present considerable difficulties in the discussion of philological and semiotic (interlinguistics) approaches towards the problem of international communication. The questions raised here become puzzling when we following the tradition try to divide languages into spontaneous (natural) and artificial or planned. The basic difficulty, as we have attempted to demonstrate, consists in

the fact that the problem of the interrelation between “natural” and “artificial”, which can be traced back to the ancient Greek dispute about “physei” and “thesei”, encompasses a number of fundamental problems concerning the origin of language, its development and improvement (amelioration), “correctness”, “norm”, “semiotics” (sign)<sup>8</sup> (Идзелис, 1987). The very name “natural language”, as some researchers point out, is none other than the “relapse of the theory of “physei” (Абаев, 1976, 79).

The “naturalistic” conception of language affected, to a certain extent, the concept of “artificial language”, because everything that is brought in by a man into language, what is regarded as a result of his conscious and deliberate activity, and what contravenes the natural evolution of a language, is usually associated with the notion of “artificial”. Nevertheless, there does not exist the generally accepted definition of the notion “artificial”. It embraces machine, programming, information languages, symbolic science languages as well as ancient dead languages (Sanskrit, Latin) and auxiliary international languages (Blanke, 1985, 26–28; Бокарев, 1967, 10–15). And what is more, it is argued that the national literary (standard) language is, by definition, to a certain extent “artificially” and conventionally treated and regulated: “the grammatical normalization of common (general) languages of civilized nations”, noted A. Tomson, “also contains artificial elements” (Томсон, 1910, 379).

An outstanding Russian and Polish philologist Baudouin de Courtenay is often referred to in this connection, who held that actually there are no differences between natural lan-

guages, i. e. languages originated spontaneously and artificial or planned languages, i. e. the so-called “a posteriori” languages constructed and designed modelling and using the material of natural languages, because the latter do not contain anything that the natural languages, inherited “spontaneously”, historically would not possess (Бодуэн де Куртенэ, 1963, 154). Moreover, he emphasized that both the natural and artificial or planned languages (“a posteriori”) are characterized by the same elements and directions but only in different sequence and different quantitative interrelations (op. cit., 1963, 154). It is the specific character of combination of linguistic elements in “different quantitative interrelations” that sets the task of considering the planned languages **typologically** with the view of establishing the measure or degree of “aposterioriness” and adding precision to the nature or character of “a priori-a posteriori” continuance (Кузнецов, 1976, 60–79).

It is of great importance therefore not to lose one’s bearings lest we find ourselves in captivity of metalinguistic specifications and categories. It must be borne in mind that as long as the given natural language functions as an international language its ontology is the unity of “physei” and “thesei”, “natural disposition” and “socio-cultural fixedness”.

Natural language, as is generally known, is a social phenomenon, and as every social event it originated historically, “naturally” (“physei”) in precisely this, but not another way, because such was the history of the given nation. At the same time, as has been mentioned above, every nation in some way or other continuously exerts influence on the development of its language (“thesei”).

To put it in other words, by “physei” we mean the **historical motivation** of the given language, its **philology**, and “thesei” is understood as the exertion or efforts made by the rational man upon his inherited language with the view of adapting it to the specific needs of communication, referring to the **semiotic categories** (disembodiment, arbitrariness, singularity) and methods of description of a language.<sup>9</sup>

The approach to the study of international English put forward here attempts to reveal the natural connection between “physei” and “thesei”, philology and semiotics (inter-linguistics) and strives to disclose clearly and convincingly the inseparable unity and struggle of these two indispensable opposites. The analysis of the state of the art and the results achieved in the study of international English has conclusively demonstrated that we can better understand the essence or nature of the relationship between “natural” (spontaneous) and “artificial” (deliberate), philology (“physei”) and semiotics (“thesei”), “institutional” and “liberation” linguistics, “description” and “prescription”, etc., if we adopt the above-mentioned approach, because the unity or interplay of these basic concepts serves as a sound methodological basis, or frame of reference in the study of attempts made at rationalising international communication. Suffice it to mention Air Traffic Control Language, Seaspeak, Police-speak, Basic English, Nuclear English, etc. (McArthur, 1991, 17–18; Alexander, 1990, 36; Humpreys, 1991, 32–36; Kachru, 1991, 3–13; Quirk, 1990, 3–10; Идзелис, 1989, 80–103).

To illustrate the point, let us again recall some facts from the history of the English

language. In this respect the fate of Basic English is very instructive, because the unity of “physei” and “thesei” manifests itself in a very peculiar way. The authors of Basic English tried to accomplish absolutely unrealizable task, i. e. to break apart the inseparable unity of these two indispensable opposites. Preserving the essential features or properties of the English language as a natural, spontaneous, historically formed and **developing** system, they endeavoured to turn it into a rational **semiotic** system.

As we have showed, (Идзелис, 1987; 1989) this attempt, unfortunately, has failed. It was the approach, the general principle that proved faulty: the “textual” aspect of the problem cannot be properly handled unless the unity and globality of texts in general is thoroughly understood. Texts cannot, in principle, be generated, synthesized by mechanically adding on the ultimate parts of a previously devised semiotic system (for example, the 850 rationally selected “words” of Basic English).

The chief reason why Basic English has failed was the faulty **methodological** approach which led to the forced detachment of “physei” from “thesei”. The creators of Basic English were at great pains constructing Basic English to preserve the essential features of full-fledged, natural English and at the same time to impose strict constraints, eliminating the possibility of **development** and **change** which is a vital condition for the normal functioning of any language (Журавлев, 1982; Пауль, 1960). The realization that the approach turned out to be faulty came later. In his book published in 1968 one of the coauthors of Basic English Ivor A. Richards noted that “... no

doubt we can now see, as the proposer of Basic English hardly could, that an auxiliary world language will have to be (as with the automobile and the airplane) a developing design, re-designed as performance date indicate” (op. cit., 1968, 241).

Although the attempt to work out a simplified form of English as a means of international communication was unsuccessful, the tradition of structural simplification, which has a long and honorable pedigree in English language teaching, has not died out at all. This trend of structural simplification is clearly reflected in recent approaches to international English, one of the motive forces being the desire of making the teaching of English easier<sup>10</sup> (Quirk, 1982, 15–28; Bolinger, 1990, 25–28).

Bearing in mind the unity of “physei” and “thesei” (and the space limit of the present article), let us consider the attempt to work out a simplified form of English for international communication undertaken by R. Quirk, (Quirk, 1982, 15–28; Stein, 1978, 64–76). It must be emphasized (and actually this is what distinguishes Quirk’s approach from Basic English) that the initial stage in adapting or “extracting” the language for intercultural communication or the language for “common utilitarian purposes” (Widdowson, 1982, 9) is the philological basis (“physei”), a “linguistic force with existing momentum” (Quirk, 1982, 19).

His Nuclear English is a carpented section of full-fledged, idiomatic English with the more difficult features of the English language set aside (“thesei”). This simplified form of English must be decidedly easier and faster to learn than any variety of natural,

“full”, or “adopted” English and “constitute a nuclear medium for international use”.<sup>11</sup>

R. Quirk adduces numerous examples illustrating the way in which the carpentering would be done to find “appropriate nuclei in lexis and grammar”. The more difficult points of grammar include the English tag questions, non-restrictive relative clauses, noun clauses or restrictive relative clauses with “zero” particle: “He was afraid she was hurt”, “The man she loves”, some non-finite constructions, “complex transitive” and “di-transitive” structures, and, of course, the modals (Quirk, 1982, 20–27).

It is a pity that Nuclear English is still a project. To quote R. Quirk again: “Much research and experiment will be necessary to find out the extent to which these principles can be translated into blueprint for prescribing the grammar of Nuclear English” (op. cit., 1982, 21–22). But it is necessary to emphasize again that this was the most cogent attempt to find out a way of rationalizing international communication clearly realizing the natural connection between “physei” and “thesei” and the inseparable unity and struggle of these two opposites. The starting point in adapting the “variety” of international English was the philological basis, but not rationally built semiotic systems or a priori constructs or structures (lexical or grammatical). Of course, “thesei”, the semiotic component of the dialectical interplay was also applied in seeking nuclei in lexis and grammar.

In other words, as far as grammar is concerned, R. Quirk believes that the solution to the problem of international English “lies in a principled meditation between (a) the

grammatical structure of ordinary English and (b) a language-neutral assessment of communicative needs. The order here is vital: the starting point must be (a), not (b)” (op. cit., 1982, 21). He stresses that all suggestions concerning the “common core”, or nuclear in grammar of Nuclear English do not go beyond the rules of ordinary acceptable English, since the use of major systems is defined in terms of relevant communicative needs. But equally noteworthy: the proposed solutions have no bearing upon the frequency of occurrence in ordinary English”<sup>12</sup> (op. cit., 1982, 21).

In this connection, as in case of Basic English, the problem of interrelation between “natural” and “artificial” arises: is it justifiable to assert that the type or form of language which is “not (but is merely related to) a natural language” (Quirk, 1982, 20), but the “subset of the properties of natural English” (op. cit., 1982, 19) and which is “extracted” in terms of relevant communicative needs by realizing the possibilities put in the structure of the English language is “artificial”?

Continuing the reasoning along these lines, it would be expedient to ask the following question: how can one determine the bound going beyond which will enable him or her to assess the simplifications of the structure of a natural language as affecting its essential characteristics? There is no doubt that, for example, idiomaticalness is one of the essential features of the English language. Therefore, in “tag questions”: “I’m late, aren’t I?”, “She used to work here, didn’t she?”, “They oughtn’t to go there, ought they?” the requirement of reversed polarity, supply of

tensed operator and congruent subject, maintains Quirk, could be abandoned in favour of “isn’t that right?”, or “is that so?”, the latter being, as R. Burchfield pointed out, “artificial”, since their use infringe upon the “natural” property of English, i. e. its idiomaticality (Burchfield, 1985, 172).

It is interesting to note that H. G. Widdowson has indicated the complexity of attempts to extract the type of language for “common utilitarian purposes” and expressed doubts concerning the feasibility of the approach adopted by R. Quirk, and argued that its very nature precludes a satisfactory solution. Therefore, he admits the possibility of “some deliberate reduction of linguistic complexity” for teaching purposes, but only as a “transitional measure, justified by pedagogic principle, but not as a means of refashioning the language itself”<sup>13</sup> (Widdowson, 1982, 13). Michael Swan also does not exclude the possibility of the “development of a standard simplified language which will have shed many of the phonological and grammatical complexities that make present-day English difficult to learn” (Swan, 1985, 8).

The idea that World Standard English presents an extraction problem or setting up a neutral variety is corroborated by the works of a number of other linguists (Crystal, 1996, 40; Greenbaum, 1991, 4; Fairman, 1988, 4). It is regrettable, therefore, that the reaction to Nuclear English was, for the most part, negative. One quotation to illustrate the point: “Nuclear English... can be no more than a plaything for linguists to amuse themselves with”<sup>14</sup> (Wong, 1982, 269). Robert Burchfield envisages that it is most unlikely that this simplified or prescriptively reduced

variety of English will be regarded as an acceptable model for international communication by the foreigners. He thinks that “foreigners cannot be reduced to one amorphous mass labelled “not a native speaker of English” (Burchfield, 1985, 172).

R. Quirk’s endeavour to create the nuclear medium for international use that could be “culture-free as calculus, with no literary, aesthetic, or emotional aspirations” and “correspondingly more free than the “national Englishes” of any suspicion that it smacks of linguistic imperialism” (Quirk, 1982, 19–20) – the arguments that are also adduced by the advocates of artificially constructed, planned languages – seems to be in accord with the doctrine of English as a lingua franca, carrying no references to any specific target culture<sup>15</sup> (Thürmann, 1994, 47–48; Quell, 1997, 71; Верецагин, Костомаров, 1989, 21–31).

In this context it would be worthy to consider very briefly some tendencies that take shape in the approaches to the functioning of English in Europe. The concept of global society (i. e. the world-wide economy, the revolution in communications and information technology, the crisis in traditional ideological paradigms, geographical mobility, recent political developments in Europe, etc.), has exerted a considerable influence upon educational policies and brought to the fore two apparently contradictory trends prevailing in modern society: the standardisation (internationalisation) of cultural patterns, on the one hand, and the search for basic points of reference (roots, sense of belonging) for cultural identity and, consequently, in terms of educational objectives, the necessity of developing and maintaining a secure sense

of national identity in the learners, on the other.<sup>16</sup>

The subtle interplay of universal (general) and separate (individual, specific)<sup>17</sup> becomes apparent with the introduction of the European dimension, i. e. the concept of diversity of cultures and the intercultural dimension into curriculum, which calls for reconsidering the concept of international English as a lingua franca, carrying no reference to any specific target culture<sup>18</sup> (Thürmann, 1994, 47–48). For the European Union countries the subsidiary tenet of “bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore” (Article 128 of the Treaty), the arguments adduced for the dissemination of the dominant languages<sup>19</sup> (English, French, German) beyond the country’s frontiers – the universalism of their cultural/civilisation values which are at the core of each country’s **national identity** (Zarate, 1997, 7–14) – and the view that the accession of new member states to the Council of Europe will give rise to broader diversity, but not change the general approach (the concept of national identity tends to be marginal in the overall approach (op. cit., 1997, 116–117) brings to memory the issues raised by B. L. Whorf and especially his concept of “Standard Average European”. Here is a short quotation to clarify the point: “The work began to assume the character of a comparison between Hopi and western European languages. It also became evident that even the grammar of Hopi bore a relation to Hopi culture, and the grammar of European tongues to our own “Western” or “European” culture. And it appeared that the interrelation brought in those large subsummations of experience by language, such as our own

terms “time”, “space”, “substance”, and “matter”. Since, with respect to the traits compared, there is little difference between English, French, German, or other European languages with the POSSIBLE (but doubtful) exception of Balto-Slavic and non-Indo-European, I have lumped these languages into one group called SAE, or “Standard Average European”<sup>20</sup> (Whorf, 1956, 138).

The reference to B. L. Whorf’s contentious point is germane: it would not seem imprudent to suppose that beyond “the possible exception – the Balto-Slavic languages” – (bearing in mind the (possible) integration of the countries of central and eastern Europe and the broadening of the concept of cultural diversity) stand the fundamental differences of the two types of societies which are reflected in the differences of the very nature or type of the languages<sup>21</sup>.

The issues of English in Europe are stupendously complex because they, in some way or other, are concerned with the sensitive problems of cultural identities<sup>22</sup>. One cannot help but agree with Robert Phillipson that the shift from a monolingual state identity (incidentally, we still operate with the concept of state, nation and language having a perfect fit as **real**, not mythical)<sup>23</sup> to multilingual supranational identities is a journey into uncharted territory. The supranational language policy involved, maintains R. Phillipson, “is novel, ambivalent, with uncertainties about how national interests and languages intermesh with supranational interests and languages”<sup>24</sup> (Phillipson, 1996, 58–59).

Much cooperation and rigorous scholarship is needed to push forward the development of a Common European Framework of



Reference for language learning and teaching. It is our hope that the common educational and communicational policy, conscious and deliberate attempts to steer language teaching/learning towards convergent approaches, despite the great diversity of edu-

cational systems, will mitigate the divergence of English and facilitate the selection of academic models and the kind or type, or "variety" of English to be taught as the international standard English in the democratic and unified Europe<sup>25</sup>.

## NOTES

1. There is a considerable literature on these topics. See, for example, Akhmanova, 1967, 13–16; Akhmanova, Idzelis, 1978, Akhmanova, 1977; Sapir, 1970, 45–64; Strevens, 1984, 2–9; 1985, 5–8; Christophersen, 1988, 15–18; Brumfit, 1982, 1–7; Quirk, 1990, 3–10; Kachru, 1991, 3–13; Pulcini, 1994, 49–52; Fairman, 1988, 3–5; Sinclair, 1988, 3–6; Urdang, 1985, 9–10; Akinaso, 1994, 139–168; Ridder, 1995, 44–50; Bailey, 1985, 3–6; Maley, 1985, 30–33; Loonen, 1996, 58–59; Berns, 1995, 3–11.

2. The problems associated with the social conditionality of language fall into the province of sociolinguistics, which seeks, in particular, to cope with some practical questions of language policy, language planning, language maintenance and language shift that require conscious, deliberate and regulatory interference of human society. See, for example, Makkai, 1993, 6; Fasold, 1993; Language Maintenance, 1980; Language Planning, 1976; Eastman, 1983; Белл, 1980; Вандриес, 1937; Дешериев, 1977; Жирмунский, 1968, 22–38; Звегинцев, 1982, 250–258; Панфилов, 1983, 6–36; Рождественский, 1990, 36–62; Швейцер, 1971; Ярцева, 1968, 39–54; Якубинский, 1986.

3. This idea matured in Italian linguistics. Later, the idea of the possibility of conscious and deliberate impact on the development of language spread to France and through the French linguistic tradition to the European and world linguistics. See: Амирова, 1975, 185.

4. Indeed, not a single foreign language played in Europe during the entire period of the history of the development of its culture this unique role that Latin did during almost fifteen centuries. Discussing the problems of international communication, it was necessary to point out the tendency which indispensably characterizes any natural language used for international communication, i. e. the shaping of local "varieties" of the given language. Latin did not escape

to common lot: "In the VII–XIII centuries in numerous educational institutions of university character with the students coming from different European countries, it was soon clearly understood how markedly the medieval Latin used as a medium of communication in the civilised Europe differed from the norms (standards) of classical Latin, especially in pronunciation, usage and less in grammar" (Амирова, 1975, 168). "The Latin", remarks L. Mal'avina, "that was used by church and school, set up by church, sharply contrasted with the Latin used by the humanists (i. e. scholars of the Renaissance who pursued and disseminated the study and understanding of the cultures of ancient Rome and Greece), because both church and school were preoccupied with the problem of making easier the perception of church dogmas and school knowledge by the vast masses. A "variety" of a language sprung up that was rather some "koiné" than the classical Latin. The lexis and syntax were preserved in that "language", whereas the systems of Latin declension and conjugation have been reduced. This was the international language of communication in schools and universities" (Малявина, 1985, 15).

The humanists, who strived to emulate the antique authors (classics) in their own writings, violently attacked that kind or "variety" of the Latin language. The struggle between the humanists and the authors, who wrote using the variety of Latin that was drawing nearer to the colloquial form of Latin, at one moment subsided, at another intensified.

It was in the XVth century that the struggle between the scholastic Latin, on the one hand, and the Latin of the humanists, which retained the stylistic and lexical purity of the classical authors, on the other, reached its climax. But, paradoxically, the humanists themselves paved the way for the defeat of Latin: "Having interrupted the natural course of

development of Latin by restoring the former unique significance of the classical writings, the humanists, not even realizing it, struck a death-blow to the world Latin literature and made it incapable of serving the needs of international communication in the sphere of science and business” (Плауль, 1960, 479). See also: Жирмунский, 1936; Идзелис, 1983, 94–127; 1989, 80–103).

5. For the basic terms of interlinguistics, see: Кузнецов, 1982. See also: Кузнецов, 1987; Ахманова, Бокарев, 1956, 65–78; Бокарев, 1976, 21–25; Исаев, 1977, 69–75; 1987, 83–94; Дрезен, 1928. For a recent example of “apriori” type, see: Hanks, 1992.

6. The diversity of problems that arise in this connection is discussed in: Newman, 1974; 1976; Vallins, 1963; 1965; Smith, 1972, 274–277; Steiner, 1972, 278–283; Ярцева, 1969; 1985; Гухман, Семенов, 1983; Жирмунский, 1936; Будагов, 1967, 306–311; Филин, 1979, 3–19.

7. These two types of the impact of man on language are also different functionally in terms of the correlation between functional and virtual or essential characteristics of a language. See: Стюсаева, 1979, 136–144. Indeed, the modes of the influence of man on language are diverse, because “the treatment of language by grammar and other philological and rhetorical disciplines is, in general, closely associated with the peculiarities of the development and amelioration of the language” (Ольховиков, 1985, 21). Cf.: Heath, 1976. See also: Будагов, 1977.

It is also important to note that in the process of the shaping of national literary (standard) language the interrelation of “physei” and “thesei” is pushed into the foreground. The role of writers and public figures in the establishment of the “norm” is especially great (Будагов, 1980, 290). See also: Вепешагин, 1972, 8. It is pertinent here to refer to the Plain English Movement (McArthur, 1991, 13–19; Quiller-Couch, 1938; Valins, 1965).

8. The interrelation of “natural” and “artificial” in the epoch of the revolution in communications and information technology has additional aspect: in the literature on cybernetics it is considered as the problem of the correlation between human brain and electronic (or abstract, logical) machine (Иванов, 1983, 5–23).

The impact of “computers” and, more recently, that of “information technology” is discussed in: Rafferty, 1997, 959–969. A short quotation will suffice to illustrate the point: “Currently the term “information and communication technologies” (ICT)

is increasingly used to describe the range of activities that are possible through networked computers using synchronous (at the same time) and asynchronous (at different times) means of communicating and working on information individually or together over distance. The nature and extent of these phenomena are not yet clear but they are contributing to the major transitions which are occurring in the way we: work, learn, communicate, shop, entertain ourselves, “do” business and provide social welfare. Key shifts are: the impact of technology on globalization and marketization of service industries, and the way in which technology change has opened up debate on the nature and role of information itself” (op. cit., 1997, 959–960). See also: Star (ed.), 1995; Forster, Morrison, 1990; Korsvold, Rüschoff (eds.), 1997; Rüschoff, 1997, 37–54; Неклесса, 1998, 165–179.

9. Philology is concerned with all aspects and sides of life and activities of the given nation to the extent to which these human activities and institutions are reflected in the language, written records and literature of the given nation. That is why philology – one of the oldest scholarship – has not lost its significance, in spite of the fact that it is, perhaps, no longer proclaimed or enunciated as a basis of any humanitarian knowledge besides the philological or general hermeneutics (Лихачев, 1979, 36–37; 1989; Аверинев, 1979, 373; Будагов, 1976, 21; Шпрой, 1987, 8–24).

Linguistics as part of philology is a science dealing with natural human languages in their real, historically conditioned existence and development and in indissoluble connection with reasoning (Ахманова, 1969, 530). Therefore, the relation between philology and linguistics is determined by the very function of language in society, i. e. to serve as a means of communication, cognition and reverberation of reality. The conception of language as the “immediate reality of thought” determines the relation of language to reasoning, reasoning to culture, culture to the state of society of a definite epoch (Будагов, 1980, 16).

Semiotics or semiology is also an old science: the study of signs and sign systems, the statement of the question what a “sign” is and how it should be interpreted and/or understood is traceable to the ancient Greeks (Античные теории, 1936, 14; Перельмутер, 1980, 113–114; Иванов, 1964, 85–94). Semiology is the science of signs in general; it embraces linguistics to the extent to which language possesses these

semiological properties (Ахманова, 1969, 402). In other words, linguistics becomes part of semiotics only in some of its aspects (Ахманова, Idzelis, 1979; Идзелис, 1987; Будагов, 1983, 221–222; 1984, 11–17; Рождественский, 1990, 112–117; Никитин, 1997, 3–14; Солнцев, 1971, 92–139).

10. "Consequently, any discussion of the use of English for international purposes must eventually come to consider how to make teaching easier, quicker and cheaper" (Brumfit, 1982, 4).

11. For a critical analysis of Nuclear English, see: Burchfield, 1985, 171–173.

12. In this respect, Nuclear English parallels Basic English, because the principle of the frequency of occurrence cannot be realized in any simplified system. See: Идзелис, 1989, 99.

13. Cf. also: "The simple language must in the long run be seen as a pedagogic device in relation to learning normal English, not as a substitute for normal English" (Brumfit, 1982, 6).

14. See also: The Culture, 1978.

15. "Or perhaps a better question – can English be divorced from its cultural origins and still be English? How far is the medium also the message?" (Maley, 1985, 32).

16. However, all these topics exceed the scope of this article. For a deeper discussion of these problems see, for example: Learning, 1996; Calleja (ed.), 1995; Language Policies, 1993; Information, 1995.

17. Cf. "communicative function" and "identifying function" (Widdowson, 1982, 11).

18. Carsten Quell conceives that there is something about English which makes it more feasible as a lingua franca than other languages: "Whether by design or by accident, English has taken on a truly pluricentric character which gives the language a de-ethnized and culture unbounded quality and allows its speakers to use it freely without identifying with one particular country" (Quell, 1997, 71). But there are, however, other views: "We have enough interpretation of textual evidence now to show that those who deny ideological bases for educational institutions and practices are not confronting the real world. And they have their own reasons for doing so" (Kachru, 1996, 41).

19. The parity between the national cultures and the commitment of European governments to "maintaining the rich linguistic ecology of Europe, in consonance with human rights principle", does not, however, exclude the "hierarchisation of languages

and incipient diglossia that is already manifest in Europe. Hopefully this is what advocates for English support! (Phillipson, 1996, 58–59). One more quotation: "The present linguistic arrangement is an arrangement of regulation by default... At the current rate, the only language which stands to gain is English. Considering the fact that most people do not wish to see English gain more ground, it is curious that it is, nonetheless, establishing itself as the dominant language of the European bureaucracy". For a detailed and well-reasoned analysis of institutional language choice and language policy preferences among those working in the European Commission, see: Quell, 1997, 57–76. See also: Ammon (ed.), 1994.

20. As is generally known, ethnolinguistics strives to establish the relationship between the structures or elements of the language, their change and the customs, traditions, folklore, the life, in short, culture/civilisation of the given nation, and ascertain the interrelation between culture and the corresponding structural type or kind of the language: "Working especially with Hopi, Whorf found in that language a "hidden metaphysics. The very categories of the language predisposed Hopi to think about the nature of the universe in ways different from the ways consistent with speaking English or Russian. Was this true?

The discussion of the problem at the International Symposium of Anthropology held in New York in 1952 tended to the conclusion that the view of Whorf was unproved but in much need of further investigation" (Hoijer (ed.), 1963, V–VI). The results of further investigation of the question are presented in: Hoijer (ed.), 1963. It is pertinent to remind ourselves that "approaches somewhat similar to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis may be found among European writers, and are "particularly strong in the German-speaking world", where they can be "traced back at least as far as Herder in the latter part of the eighteenth century". Alexander von Humboldt is mentioned as having a profound influence in this development, together with more modern scholars like Ernst Cassirer, Johann Leo Weisgerber, and Jost Trier. To these we should probably add Charles Bally, Marcel Granet, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jean Piaget, Alf Sommerfelt, and L. Wittgenstein" (Hoijer, 1963, 92–105). For a criticism of B. L. Whorf's conception, see: Яруева, 1968, 9–54; Звергушев, 1960, 172–174.

21. "The ethnic state and its ideology (ethnic nationalism) advocate the ideal of a homogenous community, a compact, monolithic culture steeped in an innate principle which would once have been

called the “spirit of the people” or “national character” and which there is now a preference for calling a “national outlook” or “national identity” (Gelpi (ed.), 1996, 32). When on the ruins of the Middle Ages sprung up a modern society of the West, one of the most important condition of its consolidation was the development of a basically different language instead of vulgar, vernacular language. As Gukovskaja remarks, “the dialectics of the struggle between a vulgar language which gradually shaped itself as a national language and Latin consisted in Latin being forced out from the traditional spheres of its use; but the young national language, annihilating Latin was, nevertheless, treated and interpreted with the help of the Latin language, its grammar and rhetoric” (Гуковская, 1940, 11).

Thus, “this new language drew much from science, became rational and freed itself from vague senses rooted in the depth of tradition and legends. The word became free, devoid of sanctity and interdictions or taboos that were usually associated with it. As a matter of fact, only then could the idea of freedom of speech emerge. The whole technology of elaborating, teaching and using a language has been developed” (Капа-Мурза, 1977, 120–130).

The inclusion of new cultural areas and the arrival of new member states “whose very titles previously contained the term “democratic”, albeit with different social and cultural practices” reflects an “ideological transformation and makes the concept of diversity more complex” (Zarate, 1997, 8). The acquisition of intercultural competence presupposes the development of new and appropriate attitudes and a readiness to engage with “otherness”: “For teachers in Western European countries, the question is often about how ethnocentricity and negative attitudes towards difference can be changed, but the presence of teachers from Central and Eastern Europe in workshops often reminded us that the problem can be reversed. Learners who have had little or no personal contact with the West, are frequently over-enthusiastic and uncritical in their understanding of other cultures and societies. In such cases, objectives and teaching and learning processes need to focus on the development of realistic and appropriate attitudes” (Byram, 1997, 109). See also: Grigas, 1993; 1995; Kachru, 1996, 41–44; Ornev, 1997, 10; Кантор, 1998, 3; Неклесса, 1998, 165–179.

22. For a recent account of the work in this field, see: Byram, Zarate (eds.), 1997; Ammon (ed.), 1994; Zalewski, 1997, 143–148.

23. By the way, R. Phillipson is not solitary: “Graffiti are short and to the point. “We are here because you were there”, one could read on London walls only recently. Migration – at least partly due to the colonial past of some European states – has clearly ended the myth of nationally homogeneous cultures” (Thürmann, 1994, 46). Therefore, cultural diversity is regarded by some authors as a constituting element of modern industrial societies (op. cit., 1994, 43–48). Cf.: Grigas, 1993, 73.

24. The twenty-first century will have to cope with other uncertainties such as the tension between the global and the local, the universal and the individual, tradition and modernity, the need for competition and the concern for equality of opportunity, the extraordinary expansion of knowledge and human beings’ capacity to assimilate it, the spiritual and the material (Learning, 1996, 17–18). At present, conceives A. Neklessa, the forced realization of the liberal project which is, in a sense, side by side the Communism and Nazism, the third secular quasireligion of the present century. And we are at the origins of the new world construction.

It is evident, goes on A. Neklessa, that the globalisation of social landscape did not result in its unification. In the end, not only did the project of the world communism turn out to be Utopian, but also the egalitarian image of “global society”.

National frontiers, perhaps, have lost their former significance, but being washed away, they by no means do not disappear in a universal way and not on a world scale. The process has a “stratified”, hierarchical enough character. In other words, the frontiers became transparent for the travellers from the North, but not for the migrants from the South. The world citizenship, not having come into being yet, is already stratified into classes (Неклесса, 1998, 165–166). Cf. also: Трубачев, 1989, 395–400.

25. It should be borne in mind that “recognising another community’s cultural autonomy entails acceptance of risk, but otherwise intercultural relations might amount to cultural imperialism, a sophisticated brand of violence, an oppression as harmful to the oppressor as to the oppressed. Education can be an important force in either direction. It can teach us to respect or destroy the other, in both cases in the name of eternal values” (Gelpi (ed.), 1996, 27).

## References

- Actes, 1933 – *Actes du Deuxième Congrès International de Linguistes. Genève 1931, 25–29 août*. Paris, 1933.
- Akhmanova, O. Concerning the Logic of Natural Languages and the “Naturalness” of the Logical Ones // *Word*. 1967. 23(1–3). 13–16.
- Akhmanova, O. *Optimization of Natural Communication Systems*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1977.
- Akhmanova, O., Idzelis, R. F. *What is the English We Use?* Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1978.
- Akhmanova, O., Idzelis, R. F. *Linguistics and Semiotics*. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1979.
- Akinnsa, F. N. Linguistic Unification and Language Rights // *Applied Linguistics*. 1994. 15(2). 139–168.
- Alexander, L. Fads and Fashions in English Language Teaching // *English Today*. 1990. 6(1). 35–56.
- Ammon, U. (ed.) English Only? in Europa (in Europe) en Europe // *Sociolinguistica*. 1994. 8.
- Bailey, R. W. The Idea of World English // *English Today*. 1985. 1(1). 3–6.
- Berns, M. English in the European Union // *English Today*. 1995. 11(3). 3–11.
- Blanke, D. *Internationale Plansprachen*. Berlin, 1985.
- Bolinger, D. The Doolittling of English // *English Today*. 1990. 6(2). 25–28.
- Brumfit, C. English as an International Language I: What Do We Mean by English // *English for International Communication*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. 1–7.
- Burchfield, R. *The English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Byram, M. Summary // *The Sociocultural and Intercultural Dimension of Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997. 109–112.
- Byram, M., Zarate, G. (eds.) *The Sociocultural and Intercultural Dimension of Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997.
- Calleja, J. (ed.) *International Education and the University*. UNESCO Publishing, 1995.
- Chase, S. *Power of Words*. New York: Rarcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1954.
- Christophersen, P. “Native Speakers” and World English // *English Today*. 1988. 4(3). 15–18.
- Crystal, D. Reithed in Gloom // *English Today*. 1996. 12(3). 38–40.
- Dodge, E. Esperanto – Instrument of Mental Training // *Education*. 1941. 61. 309–317.
- Eastman, C. M. *Language Planning. An Introduction*. San Francisco, 1983.
- Fairman, T. Let Grammarians Return to Describing the Language // *English Today*. 1988. 5(1). 3–5.
- Fasold, R. *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers, 1993.
- Ferguson, C. *Language Structure and Language Use*. Stanford, 1971.
- Forster, T., Morrison, P. (eds.) *Computer Ethics. Cautionary Tales and Ethical Dilemmas in Computing*. Mass.: The MIT Press, 1990.
- Gelpi, E. (ed.) *Towards a Democratic Citizenship 1994–1995. Report*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1996.
- Greenbaum, S. ICE : The International Corpus of English // *English Today*. 1991. 7(4). 3–7
- Grigas, R. *Tautos savigny*. Vilnius: „Academia“, 1993.
- Grigas, R. *Tautos likimas*. Vilnius: Rosma, 1995.
- Hall, R. A. *Leave Your Language Alone*. New York, 1950.
- Hankes, E. J. *Ehmay Ghee Shah: A Universal Second Language*. Minn., 1992.
- Heath, S. B. A National Language Academy? Debate in the New Nation // *Language Planning in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976. 9–43.
- Hilgendorf, S. K. The Impact of English in Germany // *English Today*. 1996. 12(3). 3–14.
- Hojjer, H. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis // *Language in Culture*. Chicago, 1963. 92–105.
- Hojjer, H. (ed.) *Language in Culture. Conference on the Interrelations of Language and Other Aspects of Culture*. Chicago, 1963.
- Hovdhaugen, E. *Foundations of Western Linguistics. From Beginning to the End of th First Millenium A. D.* Oslo, 1984.
- Humphreys, R. L. From Blazonry to Police Speak // *English Today*. 1991. 7(3). 32–36.
- Information, 1995 – *Information Technologies in Teacher Education : Issues and Experiences for Centuries in Transition*. UNESCO Publishing, 1995.
- Janicki, K. *The Foreigner’s Language. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford, 1985.

- Kachru, Braj. B. Liberation Linguistics and the Quirk Concern // *English Today*. 1991. 7(1). 3–13.
- Kachru, Y. Kachru Revisits Contrasts // *English Today*. 1996. 12(1). 41–44.
- Korsvold, A.-K., Rüschoff, B. (eds.) *New Technologies in Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997.
- Language Maintenance, 1980 – *Language Maintenance and Language Shift*. The Hague: Mouton, 1980.
- Language Planning, 1976 – *Language Planning in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.
- Language Policies, 1993 – *Language Policies for the World of the Twenty-first Century: Report for UNESCO, August 1993*. UNESCO Publishing, 1993.
- Learning, 1996 – *Learning: The Treasure Within: Report to UNESCO of the International Committee on Education*. UNESCO Publishing, 1996.
- Loonen, P. English in Europe From Timid to Tyrannical // *English Today*. 1996. 12(2). 3–9.
- Makkai, A. *Ecolinguistics*. London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1993.
- Maley, A. The Most Chamelon of Languages // *English Today*. 1985. 4(1). 30–33.
- McArthur, T. The Pedigree of Plain English // *English Today*. 1991. 7(3). 13–19.
- Newman, E. *Strictly Speaking Will America Be the Death of English*. Indianapolis, New York, 1974.
- Newman, E. *A Civil Tongue*. Indianapolis, New York, 1976.
- Newmark, P. The Status of Foreign Languages in Some European Countries // *The Incorporated Linguist*. 1979. 18(4). 107–112.
- Palmer, H. *The Oral Method of Teaching Languages*. Cambridge, 1943.
- Phillipson, R. On English in Europe // *English Today*. 1996. 12(4). 58–59.
- Pulcini, V. The English Language in Italy // *English Today*. 1994. 10(4). 49–52.
- Quell, C. Language Choice in Multilingual Institutions : A Case Study at the European Commission with Particular Reference to the Role of English, French, and German as Working Languages // *Multilingua*. 1997. 16(1). 57–76.
- Quiller-Couch, 1938 – Quiller-Couch Sir Arthur. *The Art of Writing*. Cambridge, 1938.
- Quirk, R. International Communication and the Concept of Nuclear English // *English for International Communication*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. 15–28.
- Quirk, R. Language Varieties and Standard Language // *English Today*. 1990. 6(1). 3–10.
- Rafferti, J. Shifting Paradigms of Information Technology in Social Work Education and Practice // *The British Journal of Social Work*. 1997. 27(6). 959–969.
- Richards, I. A. *So Much Nearer: Essays Toward a World English*. New York, 1968.
- Ridder, S. English in Dutch // *English Today*. 1995. 11(4). 44–50.
- Rüschoff, B. Technology Enhanced Resources and Information Technology in Vocationally Oriented Language Learning // *Languages for Work and Life : The Council of Europe and Vocationally Oriented Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997. 37–54.
- Sapir, E. The Functions of an International Auxiliary Language // *Culture, Language, Personality*. Berkley, 1970. 45–64.
- Sinclair, J. Models and Monuments // *English Today*. 1988. 4(3). 3–8.
- Smith, M. S. Some Thoughts on the Place of Literature in a Practical English Syllabus // *English Language Teaching*. 1972. 26(3). 274–277.
- Smith, R. Single Market, Single Currency, Single Language // *English Today*. 1996. 12(2). 10–14.
- Star, S. L. (ed.) *The Cultures of Computing*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.
- Stein, G. Nuclear English: Reflections on the Structure of Its Vocabulary // *Poetica*. 1978. 10. 64–76.
- Steiner, F. Teaching Literature in the Secondary Schools // *The Modern Language Journal*. 1972. 56(5). 278–283.
- Stevens, P. International Maritime English (Seaspeak) // *Special Language. Fachsprache*. 1984. 6(1–2). 2–9.
- Stevens, P. Standards and the Standard Language // *English Today*. 1985. 2(2). 5–8.
- Swan, M. Where is the Language Going? // *English Today*. 1985. 3(3). 6–8.
- Sweet, H. *The Practical Study of Languages*. Oxford, 1964.
- Talmay, M. Auxiliary Language Question // *Modern Language Journal*. 1938. 23. 172–186.
- Teacher Training, 1995 – *Teacher Training and Multiculturalism*. UNESCO Publishing, 1995.

The Culture, 1978 – *The Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center in Hawaii, April, 1978.*

Thürman, E. Foreign Languages Curriculum Development and Intercultural Learning // *Language Learning for European Citizenship. Report. Soest, Germany, 20–26 November 1993.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1994. 43–48.

Urdang, L. Where is the Language Going? // *English Today.* 1985. 4(3). 9–10.

Vallins, G. H. *The Best English.* London, 1963.

Vallins, G. H. *Good English How to Use It.* London, 1965.

Whorf, B. L. The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language // *Language, Thought and Reality.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1956. 134–159.

Widdowson, H. G. English as an International Language What Do We Mean by “International Language”? // *English for International Communication.* Oxford, 1982. 9–13.

Wong, I. Native-speaker English for the Third World To-day? // *New Englishes.* Rowley, London, Tokyo, 1982. 261–286.

Zalecki, P. Cultural Problems of Europe at the End of the 20th Century. Bachtolik, 18–20 wrzesnia // *Studia Sociologiczne.* 1997. 2. 143–148.

Zarate, G. Cultural Issues in a Changing Europe // *The Sociocultural and Intercultural Dimension of Language Learning and Teaching.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997. 7–14.

Zarate, G. Priorities and Outlook: Institutionalised Mobility and Intercultural Competence // *The Sociocultural Dimension of Language Learning and Teaching.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1997. 113–117.

Абаев В. И. О термине „естественный язык“ // *Вопросы языкознания.* 1976. 4. 77–80.

Абрамян, Н. Л. Несколько замечаний о „правильности“ имен // *Семиотика и проблемы коммуникации.* Ереван, 1981. 152–155.

Аверинцев, С. С. Филология // *Русский язык. Энциклопедия.* Москва, 1979. 373.

Амирова и др. – Амирова, Т. А., Ольховиков, Б. А., Рождественский, Ю. В. *Очерки по истории лингвистики.* Москва, 1975.

Античные теории, 1936. – Античные теории языка и стиля. Москва, Ленинград, 1936.

Ахманова, О. С. *Словарь лингвистических терминов.* Москва, 1969.

Ахманова, О. С., Бокарев, Е. А. Международный вспомогательный язык как лингвистическая проблема // *Вопросы языкознания.* 1956. 6. 65–78.

Белл, Р. Т. *Социоллингвистика : цели, методы и проблемы.* Москва, 1980.

Бодуэн де Куртене. К критике международных искусственных языков // *Избранные труды по общему языкознанию.* Москва, 1963. 2.

Бокарев, Е. А. Стихийное и сознательное в языке // *Русская речь.* 1967. 2. 10–15.

Бокарев, Е. А. О международном языке науки // *Проблемы интерлингвистики.* Москва, 1976. 21–25.

Будагов, Р. А. *Литературные языки и языковые стили.* Москва, 1967. 306–311.

Будагов, Р. А. О некоторых общих проблемах филологии // *Филологические науки.* 1976. 1. 21–28.

Будагов, Р. А. Что такое развитие и совершенствование языка. Москва, 1977.

Будагов, Р. А. *Филология и культура.* Москва, 1980.

Будагов, Р. А. *Язык – реальность* язык. Москва, 1983.

Будагов, Р. А. Филология в современной борьбе идей // *Филологические науки.* 1984. 3. 11–17.

Будагов, Р. А. Сходства и несходства между родственными языками. Москва, 1985.

Вандриес, Ж. *Язык. Лингвистическое введение в историю.* Москва, 1937.

Верещагин, Е. М. Из истории возникновения первого литературного языка славян. Варьирование средств выражения в переводческой технике Кирилла и Мефодия. Москва, 1972.

Верещагин, Е. М., Костомаров, В. Г. Русский язык среди „мировых языков“ и концепция их денационализации // *Русский язык и современность.* Киев, 1989. 21–31.

Винокур, Г. О. Об изучении языка литературных произведений // *Избранные работы по русскому языку.* Москва, 1959. 229–256.

Волков, А. А. *Грамматология.* Москва, 1982.

Гак, В. Г. К типологии форм языковой политики // *Вопросы языкознания.* 1989. 5. 104–133.

Гуковская, З. В. *Из истории лингвистических воззрений эпохи Возрождения Теория языка и „Плеяды“.* Ленинград, 1940.

Гухман, М. М., Семенок, Н. Н. *История немецкого литературного языка IX–XV вв.* Москва, 1983.

- Дешериев, Ю. Д. *Социальная лингвистика*. Москва, 1977.
- Дрезен, Э. За всеобщим языком. (Три века исканий.) Москва, Ленинград, 1928.
- Дуличенко, А. Д. Современное состояние интерлингвистики. Обзор важнейших интерлингвистических изысканий в СССР // *Interlinguistica Tartuensia*. 1984. 3. 3–38.
- Жирмунский, В. М. *Национальный язык и социальные диалекты*. Ленинград, 1936.
- Жирмунский, В. М. Проблема социальной дифференциации языков // *Язык и общество*. Москва, 1968. 22–38.
- Журавлев, В. К. *Внешние и внутренние факторы языковой эволюции*. Москва, 1982.
- Зевгинцев, В. А. Этнолингвистика // *История языкознания XIX и XX веков в очерках и извлечениях*, ч. II. Москва, 1960. 172–174.
- Зевгинцев, В. А. Социальное и лингвистическое в социолингвистике // *Известия АН СССР, ОЛЯ*. 41(3). 250–258.
- Иванов, Вяч. Вс. Древнеиндийский миф об установлении имен и его параллель в греческой традиции // *Индия в древности*. Москва, 1964. 85–94.
- Иванов, Вяч. Вс. Естественный язык – мозг, искусственный язык – машина // *Кибернетическая лингвистика*. Москва, 1983. 5–23.
- Издзелис, Р.-В. Ф. „Язык иностранца“ как стилистическая проблема. Дисс. канд. филол. наук. Москва, 1973.
- Издзелис, Р.-В. Ф. О путях и средствах оптимизации международного научного общения // *Teksto struktūros ir analizės klausimai*. Vilnius, 1983. 94–127.
- Издзелис, Р.-В. Ф. *Единство филологии и семиотики в изучении английской научной речи*. Дисс. доктора филол. наук. Москва, 1987.
- Издзелис, Р.-В. Ф. Оптимизация международного научного общения и „упрощенные“ системы английского языка „Basic English“ // *Mokslu kalba : semantika, semiotika, stilistika*. Vilnius, 1989. 80–103.
- Исаев, М. М. К проблеме вспомогательного языка в эпоху научно-технической революции // *Научно-техническая революция и функционирование языков мира*. Москва, 1977. 69–75.
- Исаев, М. М. Международный вспомогательный язык эсперанто: вопросы теории и практики (к столетию создания и развития) // *Вопросы языкознания*. 1987. 4. 83–94.
- Кантор, В. О национальном мифе непонимания // *Литературная газета*. 1998. 8. 3.
- Кара-Мурза, С. Россия : Что значит „не быть западом“ // *Наши современники*. 1997. 9. 120–130.
- Костомаров, В. Г. *Мой гений, мой язык*. Москва, 1991.
- Кузнецов, С. Н. К вопросу о типологической классификации международных искусственных языков // *Проблемы интерлингвистики*. Москва, 1976. 60–79.
- Кузнецов, С. Н. *Основные понятия и термины интерлингвистики*. Москва, 1982.
- Кузнецов, С. Н. *Теоретические основы интерлингвистики*. Москва, 1987.
- Лихачев, Д. С. Связь всех связей // *Лит. обозрение*. 1979. 1. 36–37.
- Лихачев, Д. С. *О филологии*. Москва, 1989.
- Маадля, Ю. Й. О современных попытках „оживления“ латыни как языка международного общения // *Interlinguistica Tartuensia*. 1984. 3. 58–73.
- Малаявина, Л. А. *У истоков языкознания нового времени*. Москва, 1985.
- Нахов, И. М. Здесь говорили по-латыни. Пятый международный конгресс латинской культуры в Трире // *Вестник МГУ. Филология*. 1982. 2. 92–94.
- Неклесса, А. Конец цивилизации, или Зигзаг истории // *Знамя*. 1998. 1. 165–179.
- Никитин, В. М. Предел семиотики // *Вопросы языкознания*. 1997. 1. 3–14.
- Огнев, В. Море и берег // *Литературная газета*. 1997. 47. 10.
- Ольховиков, Б. А. *Теория языка и вид грамматического описания в истории языкознания*. Москва, 1985.
- Панфилов, В. З. Язык как предмет языкознания. Общественная природа // *Онтология языка как общественного явления*. Москва, 1983. 6–36.
- Пауль, Г. *Принципы истории языка*. Москва, 1960.
- Перельмутер, И. А. Греческие мыслители V в. до н. э. Платон // *История лингвистических учений. Древний мир*. Ленинград, 1980. 116–124.
- Рождественский, Ю. В. Лекция по общему языкознанию. Москва, 1990.



Семенец, Е. О. *Социальный контекст и языковое развитие. Территориальная и социальная дифференциация английского языка в развивающихся странах.* Киев, 1985.

Слюсарева, Н. А. Методологический аспект понятия функций языка // *Изв. АН СССР, ОЛЯ.* 1979. 38(2). 136–144.

Солнцев, В. М. *Язык как системно-структурное образование.* Москва, 1971.

Степанов, Ю. С. *В трехмерном пространстве языка.* Москва, 1985.

Томсон, А. И. *Общее языкознание.* Одесса, 1910.

Троцкий, И. Проблема языка в античной науке // *Античные теории языка и стиля.* Москва, Ленинград, 1936. 7–28.

Трубачев, О. Н. Несколько слов о наших национально-языковых проблемах // *Изв. АН СССР, ОЛЯ.* 1989. 48(5). 395–400.

Филин, Ф. П. К проблеме социальной обусловленности языка // *Язык и общество.* Москва, 1968. 5–22.

Филин, Ф. П. Что такое литературный язык // *Вопросы языкознания.* 1979. 3. 3–19.

Швейцер, А. Д. *Вопросы социологии языка в американской лингвистике.* Ленинград, 1971.

Швейцер, А. Д. *Современная социолингвистика: теория, проблемы, методы.* Москва, 1977.

Шпрой, А. Об эвристической ценности антиципационных понятий и обобщенной единой концепции языкознания в 1800–1830 годы // *В. Гумбольдт и братья Грим – труды и преемственность идей.* Москва, 1987. 8–24.

Якубинский, Л. П. *Избранные работы.* Москва, 1986.

Ярцева, В. Н. Проблема связи языка и общества в современном языкознании // *Язык и общество.* Москва, 1968. 39–54.

Ярцева, В. Н. *Развитие национального литературного английского языка.* Москва, 1969.

Ярцева, В. Н. *История английского литературного языка IX–XV вв.* Москва, 1985. 148–168.

## ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ СТИХИЙНОГО („ЕСТЕСТВЕННОГО“) И СОЗНАТЕЛЬНОГО („ИСКУССТВЕННОГО“) В ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА КАК ЯЗЫКА МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО ОБЩЕНИЯ

Роландас-Виталиюс Ф. Илзелис

### Резюме

Статья показывает действенность подхода к изучению проблемы международного общения, основанного на диалектическом единстве „стихийного“ и „сознательного“, т. е. того, что дано

филологической традицией, с одной стороны, и того, что может быть в той или иной степени разъяснено исходя из закономерностей семиотического характера, с другой.

Vilnius universiteto  
GTMF Anglų kalbos katedra

Įteikta  
1998 m. kovo 30 d.