

Terminology and language policy (towards establishing rudiments of linguopolitology)

SERGIUSZ GRINIEWICZ

University of Białystok

Moscow Humanities Pedagogical Institute

One of the most interesting and topical directions of modern linguistic research is concerned with problems of language policy and language planning that together form the basis of an emerging new science. There is already quite a substantial amount of publications on the subject, but hardly any publication touches upon terminological aspects of language policy, aside from mentioning that in the area of respective terminology there are many ambiguities, complicated by the fact that the field, to some extent, has a different terminological structure in different languages (Cillia and Busch 2005). In this article we are going to address the following tasks: 1) to establish the basic conceptual system and scheme of this field of knowledge and suggest the respective terminological system; 2) to briefly introduce and discuss its elements; and 3) to consider terminological aspects of language policy. We intend to indicate at least several terminological aspects indispensable for the complete awareness when undertaking political decisions concerning language and to demonstrate that though conscious systemic terminological activities are crucial in successful promoting of language development, at present there is no evidence of systemic approach in language planning.

Exploration of political aspects of language and language policy has a considerable history. As maintain de Cillia and Busch (Cillia and Busch 2005), the beginning of scientific reflection on language policies and politics (LPP) as an independent field was undertaken particularly in the 1960s (Ricento 2000: 10, Labrie 1996: 828), in publications such as Haugen (1966), Kloss (1966) or Fishman (1968), and in these the focus was initially on the aspect of language planning. Ricento (2000) distinguishes a total of three stages in the evolution of language policy and planning as an area of research: what is characteristic of early work is the interest

in decolonization and state formation, the predominance of structuralism in social sciences and of pragmatism as a strategic orientation. The second phase focused – under the influence of critical sociolinguistics – on social, economic, and political effects of language contact. In the 1990s, linguistic human rights became a strategic aim; postmodern and critical theories foreground language ideologies. On the contemporary situation he comments: “whether the ecology of languages paradigm emerges as the most important conceptual framework for LPP research remains to be seen” (Ricento 2000: 22). However, in the East Europe, particularly in the former USSR, already beginning with the 1920s in connection with the large-scale elaboration of national languages there was a number of publications on the subject of language policy. Language planning activities were based on belief that in the planned economy socialist society language may be successfully controlled. Later on those theoretical studies became part of sociolinguistics though nowadays this field of study has outgrown the framework of sociolinguistics.

It should be mentioned that at the present time there is no consensus even on the name of the new science. According to Spolsky and Lambert just as with many new fields, there continues to be disagreement over the name of this one, variously called *language policy* (Nesiah 1954; Sibayan 1974), *language treatment* (Neustupny’ 1970), *language cultivation* (Prague School 1973), *language engineering* (Sibayan 1974), *language planning* (Haugen 1959), and *language management* (Jernudd 2001, Spolsky and Lambert 2005). From the point of view of terminology science this is a normal situation – at the initial stage there usually are various names of a new science, reflecting different approaches and possible aspects to be taken into consideration. Nevertheless it is already possible to establish the general structure of a new science, its main divisions and direction of research on the basis of proposed definitions and the material under investigation. As for naming theoretical foundations of the language policy we would like to suggest the term ***linguopolitology*** taking into consideration the existence of *polytology* as the established science and on the analogy with the already existing science *linguoculturology*.

There is much in common in approaches to understanding language policy in the West and in the East Europe. Whether **language policy** is defined as the commonly agreed set of choices of language items or language varieties and the beliefs or ideologies associated with those choices

in a speech community (an undefined term, ranging in size from a family through a nation-state to a multinational grouping) realised in language practices or in formal policy decisions such as laws, constitutions, or regulations (Spolsky and Lambert 2005) or the conception and planning of political activity with respect to language (Cillia and Busch 2005), or sum total of ideological principles and practical activities in solving language problems in community or state as part of national policy (Дешериев 1990), we see as its main parts **language ideology** and **language politics**. Language policy may be external when concerned with language relations outside of the country or internal, when dealing with language relations within the country.

Language ideology is claimed to have emerged as a separate field of linguistic-anthropological study in the last decades of the 20th century, combining linguistic ethnography with insights from the social-scientific study of ideology (Blommaert 2006). Though this field according to Woolard is still very much under construction, its influence on linguistic anthropology, linguistics, discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics is considerable (Woolard, 1998). In our opinion, when we speak of **language ideology** we usually mean language strategy based on the existing language situation and on the assessment of the particular language(s) state – language estimation.

In language situation the following aspects may be distinguished:

- number of existing idioms (understanding idiom as the speech proper to, or typical of, a people or place; a dialect or local language – *The Oxford companion to the English language* 1992);
- character of components of language situation (languages, dialects or sub-dialects);
- genetic relations of idioms (related, unrelated);
- functions of particular idioms;
- character of dominating idiom – native or imported (cf. Виноградов 1990).

There are various types of language situation. It may be monolingual, bilingual or multilingual; exoglossal, being the sum total of different languages or endoglossal – the sum total of territorial and social dialects of the same language; balanced, if its components (languages, dialects) are functionally equipollent, or unbalanced, when its components are

distributed by various spheres of communication and social groups (Швейцер 1990).

In language (dialect, sublanguage) estimation (language assessing, language analysis) the following quantitative characteristics are taken into consideration:

- idiom demographic power (the number of native speakers in proportion to the whole number of inhabitants of the territory);
- idiom communicative possibilities (the number of functions of particular idioms as related to total number of such functions);
- idiom political status;
- idiom prestigiousness;
- level of idiom development;
- rate of idiom change (development);
- lingual tendencies (cf. Виноградов 1990).

The above mentioned factors should be taken into consideration in **language strategy** – conscious or implicit intensions concerning a language (or languages) – taking shape in respective approaches and realised in politics. Such strategy may be retrospective – directed at preservation of the existing state of a language (maintaining language culture, limiting overflows of borrowings, etc.) or perspective – aiming at language development, and also take form of lingual nationalism when minority languages are threatened and marginalized by the dominance of established national languages or lingual pluralism (language situation in Switzerland or Belgium where national languages have equal rights).

Language politics (LPt) may be defined as actual political activity with respect to language and can be distinguished from language policy (LPc), i.e. the conception and planning of such activity (Ammon 2006) or as practical activities in connection with language in community or state as part of national policy (Дешериев 1990). Objectives of LPt can vary greatly depending on interests and motives – e.g. ‘purifying’ one’s own national language of foreign loans to shape it into a more adequate symbol of national identity, or spreading the language within the state or beyond in order to more efficiently exert power. LPt has to reckon with existing language rights and may result in new language rights (Paulston 1997).

According to Ammon internal LPt regulates language within the polity, while external LPt aims beyond it. For the state, the former is part

of interior politics, the latter of exterior politics. Internal LPt can be directed at language structure (language corpus politics, LCPt) or language status and function (language status politics, LSPt). Typical aims of LCPt are graphization (introducing or regulating script and orthography); standardization, including codification (selection and codification of norms of spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and style or texts); ‘purification’ (eliminating foreign loans); and modernization (developing modern terminology). Typical aims of LSPt are spreading the norm of a standard variety and, in the case of multilingual communities, allocating languages to certain regions (McRae 1975) or domains and functions – for example, official (Laitin 1992), educational (medium or subject of teaching on various educational levels; Lo Bianco 1987), religious (Landau and Kellner-Heinkele 2001), the media, or the military (Ager 1996, Schiffman 1996). Politics of language promotion, language maintenance, or language revival can comprise LCPt, such as constructing or reconstructing vocabulary, as well as LSPt, such as encouraging use in the family or institutionalization in school (Ó Riagáin 1997).

Judging by the accumulation of names for this concept in the last 40 years – such as *language treatment* (Neustupny 1970), *language cultivation* (Prague School 1973), *language engineering* (Sibayan 1974), *language planning* (Haugen 1959), and *language management* (Jernudd 2001) – it is a very important concept implying a wide spectre of activities. As in many similar cases those synonyms could be rather used, in accordance with their usual meanings, as names for particular aspects of language politics. In our opinion two general aspects of language politics should be distinguished first of all – language treatment (or language approach) and language management.

There are two types of ***language approaches*** – either language cultivation or hindering of language development. In the case of language cultivation (*cultivation* – improving or development by careful attention, training or study – *Longman dictionary of English language and culture*) creating beneficial conditions for development of language may take various forms – simply promoting language by improving its state, raising its prestige (in M. Inoue’s terminology – valorization of a particular language – Inoue 2006), advancing its vocabulary, simplifying its orthography and grammar, introducing benefits for its usage (preferences in communication, availability of literature, widening the scope of its usage, etc.),

launching campaigns of promotion, state measures, such as standardization of a chosen idiom. Language standardization gives privilege, authority, and legitimacy to a particular language variety, and thus creates a hierarchy in which ‘nonstandard’ varieties, whether they are characterized as accents, dialects, or other languages, are marginalized. Such a linguistic hierarchy is often hegemonic in the sense that it is simply taken for granted by speakers. Even in a society where a multicultural, multiethnic, and multilingual ideal is officially celebrated and advocated, the standardness of language is tacitly assumed and naturalized in such a way that it is associated with moral superiority, class mobility, and ‘culture’ (Inoue 2006).

In some cases language cultivation may take form of language reviving (revitalization, reclaiming). It may also take the crude form of language imposing, which contradicts the universally accepted notion of language rights, but nevertheless is still practiced in some European countries.

Hindering (impeding, hampering, evicting, expelling, forcing out, oppressing) language also may take various forms from language retarding by official and unofficial means, direct language blocking (obstructing its development, language nihilism) and language extermination (ousting, dislodging, dismissing, displacing, language genocide).

In the case of **language management** (*management* – the art or practice of controlling the affairs – *Longman dictionary of English language and culture*), that may be viewed as actions taken by formal authorities such as governments or other agencies or people who believe that they have authority, such as parents, teachers, or academies, to modify the language choices made by those they claim to have under their control (Spolsky 2004).

Language management has three components: the development of explicit language plans and policies which we suggest to call language planning proper (*planning* – the forming of plans designing something; arranging (carefully) in advance – *Longman dictionary of English language and culture*), their implementation (by rules or laws or resource allocation), which we suggest to call language regulation, and the evaluation of results and effects (cf. Rubin and Jernudd 1979: 2–3).

When we speak about various actions constituting language management we should first of all consider terminological activities for a number of reasons. Firstly, language development primarily consists of vocabulary growth, the lexical level of the language system being more prone to changes than other levels. As we already pointed out in a number of

publications (Griniewicz 2006, Гринев-Гриневич 2008), the growth of scientific and technical vocabularies is much faster than that of the everyday speech vocabulary, so at present the number of terms in some sciences (for example chemistry or biology) exceeds the number of common words. Latest information compels us to update some of our earlier data presented in (Griniewicz 2006) – according to *Wikipedia* modern biological terminology may now reach even up to 100 million names for varieties of living beings, and probably nowadays special lexical units comprise not 90%, but rather more than 99% of new words in modern languages. This tendency would remain, because special vocabulary not only already comprises the major part of any advanced national language but also is the most dynamic strata of language.

Secondly, lately there appeared definite political reasons to pay more attention to regulation of special vocabulary. Presently terminology science concerns itself with globalisation of the industry, economics, culture, even everyday life that results in forming of new conditions of the existence and interaction of the national languages. One of them is the lessening of the number of the actively used languages. According to the UNO calculations during the current century approximately 2,500 of the presently functioning 3,000 languages will disappear from active usage. Director of Research for Living Tongues Institute for Endangered Languages at Swarthmore College (Pennsylvania) Dr. K. David Harrison predicts that 90% of the World's languages will be extinct by 2050. Other calculations mention 6,800 languages, or between 6,000 and 7,000 languages 90% of which are due to disappear, the outcome being roughly the same (Grenoble 2006, Gorter 2006). These statements sound tragically, but the source of such statements may be rather terminological ignorance or slovenliness when not only dialects, but sometimes sub-dialects (one-village dialects, *говоры* – the smallest territorial varieties of language, means of everyday communication of inhabitants of one, seldom a few villages – Касаткин 1990, Пшеничнова 1997) as well are wrongfully included in the lists of languages (all sources maintain that it is difficult to give an exact figure of the number of languages that exist in the world, because the difference between a language and a dialect is not always clear-cut).

For example in Dagestan some of the languages, such as *chamalinskij*, *bagvalinskij*, *botlihskij*, *godoberihskij*, *bezhtinskij*, *hvarshinskij*, *gunzibskij*, *ginuhskij*, *archinskij*, *buduhsij*, *hinalugskij*, – are used by less than

5 thousand people each and do not have written form. They are close to losing the status of independent languages. It does not mean that they would disappear – rather they would be rightly apprehended as dialects of the closest wider used languages. According to the latest publications some of them already are viewed as dialects. Thus in fact we rather have to deal with correcting the mistake of wrongly calling languages what in reality are dialects.

In modern conditions of globalisation of the world space and forming new states in some areas of Asia and Africa we may view centripetal tendencies characteristic of the period of forming new states in Europe in Modern Times when local dialects step aside and the central dialect serves as the basis for a national state language. The principle “one language – one nation” is not valid any more when many nations share the same language.

There may be various causes for disappearance of minority languages – the most natural one being establishing more precisely the status of some minor language which in reality are dialects; there also may be political reasons, for example proclaiming Moldavian language a dialect of Romanian language.

It follows that the surviving languages will widen their functional domain and territory outside the countries of their origin (it might be mentioned as a curious fact that at the present time both the British and the Russians constitute national minorities among the native speakers of the respective languages). With the commencement of international application of some of the existing languages we come across the problem of their effective usage. And here the question of the national language policy arises.

To elaborate recommendations for such policy first of all the analysis of the present language situation should be undertaken. At present we can see that some of the political decisions concerning language have only momentary political reasons with complete ignorance of the natural tendencies of language development. Therefore working out sound impartial recommendations based on the analysis of natural processes of evolution and, in particular, international interaction of languages becomes a necessity. Such recommendations should be concerned primarily with terminology for a number of reasons.

Firstly, in contrast to the common everyday vocabulary that is relatively stable and is not susceptible to changes the special vocabulary may be regulated. Terminology always is a result of agreement on usage of

certain names of concepts of specialist of the respective field of knowledge. Therefore special vocabulary is quite probably the only part of language that might be consciously manipulated and controlled. In many languages it is possible to work out sets of rules for coining new special lexical units and regulating the existing ones. There are reasons to believe that the most numerous layer of special word stock consisting of the so-called *nomens* might be successfully regulated and developed according to pre-established sets of rules.

Secondly, it should be mentioned that some linguistic problems, especially of the semantic nature could be much more clearly viewed in the domain of terminology which is connected with the precise nature of terms.

Thirdly, controlling special vocabulary may enhance greatly the progress of science and technology. The success of contemporary research of the laws of thinking (especially creative) and simulating thinking processes, investigating development of human civilisation and stimulating scientific and technological progress largely depend on solving a number of terminological problems.

Finally, the latest anthropolinguistic data give reason to believe that may be certain correspondences between the size of national vocabulary and the level of the national mentality. Therefore terminological aspects ought to be necessarily taken into consideration (if not be decisive) in language strategy decisions. Conscious language policy and in the first place language management should concern itself primarily with advancing special vocabulary.

Language planning, especially long-term planning should be based on systemic over-all analysis of the existing state of terminology and close examination of the existing trends and tendencies (an example of bringing to light tendencies of terminologies development is presented in Grinev 1993), prognostication of language development and establishing directions and modes of regulating special vocabulary.

Practical terminological work as a crucial part of language policy should presuppose systemic approach based on sound knowledge of main characteristics of terminologies. Experience of terminological work in the former USSR showed this to be quite a difficult goal. As was mentioned in (Grinev 1994) the peculiar character of the Soviet terminological activities and the respective theory was strongly influenced by the initial belief that general language development could well be ordered and

planned. This romantic post-revolution belief that language development could be managed and taken under the human control was supported by Marx' belief that language would be one of the things that in time would be taken under control by the victorious proletariat. Later (up to the present time) the idea of the human control was substituted by the idea of the state control which was reflected in the obligatory character of terminological standardization in the USSR. That is why it is difficult to find in the Soviet standards permitted synonyms or polysemic terms which we can view in abundance in the British, Indian, Australian or New Zealand terminological standards; and that is also why discussions of terminological standards in Russia sometimes take very fierce character.

The first attempts to bring the language to the proper ordered state and to substitute the current terms by the ideal ones were unsuccessful. According to the evidence of the founder of the Russian terminology school D. S. Lotte, the cause of this failure was the complete ignorance of the character of the object of ordering and the absence of the principles of terminology ordering. Therefore terminology science appeared as means of theoretical foundation of the practical work – which is completely ignored by many contemporary investigators of terminology.

Unfortunately even now we evidence lack of conscious systematic terminological work based on elementary principles of planning and knowledge of language tendencies. Enormous amount of terminological standards prepared in the 1960s and 1970s were carried out unsystematically and without sound principles and were of poor quality. Terminological standards of the Comecon countries were of a better quality, but were based not on the overall systemic approach, but rather on choosing separate subject fields. Much closer to the optimal conditions was undertaken at the end of the 1970s the All-Union endeavour to elaborate linguistic means of the branch information-retrieval systems that were planned to be united in an overall system, but this work was not correctly finished. Nowadays when terminological efforts are determined by financial means and are not supported by the state the situation is much worse. We may condole ourselves only with the knowledge that in international terminological activities the situation is not better, because in the free market conditions the role of planning is insignificant.

It should be mentioned that at present there is no evidence of any attempts to organise planned wide-scale regulation of special lexis, though

there is some experience in this direction in the Nordic countries. One of the reasons that governments pay no attention to opportunities for developing national special languages is that the cases of immediate losses from unsuccessful trade names and also the hampering of scientific progress is not deemed significant and could not be exactly measured. Therefore the development of special vocabulary, creating conditions for scientific, industrial and cultural development, which should be one of the priorities in planning and financing, is sadly neglected and only carried out by the efforts of a small number of enthusiasts. Some terminological activities are necessarily accompanying scientific research, but in the absence of special training and co-ordination, these activities are carried out in an unsystematic way, based only on common sense, which is characteristic of primitive cultures and states of cognition.

At the same time some principles and successful attempts at designing optimal forms for terms and nomens were worked out on the basis of practical experience and theoretical analysis (terminology design projects carried out by П. В. Веселов, Н. И. Кулиш, Э. А. Сорокина – Веселов 1971; Кулиш 1984, 1985; Сорокина 2007). We already mentioned some principles of convergent policy of related languages concerning borrowing (Griniewicz 2006: 14–15); similar approach may be used in coordinating elaboration of means of derivation. Already in the 1980s it was found that enormous quantities of nomens could be easily constructed according to the optimal forms and some principles of designing nomens were elaborated (Гринев 1986, 1987). There were formulated other recommendations concerning the choice of terminological forms and organizing terminological work.

Terminology advancing proper as part of national policy should consist of a number of directions and stages. One of the most important and traditional directions is ordering special vocabulary, that includes special vocabulary inventory, systematisation of special vocabulary, unification of special vocabulary and optimising special vocabulary. Another, less known, but very important direction is vocabulary construction, presupposing elaboration of banks of morphemes to be used as building material and design and construction systems of terms and nomens. Development of terminology science created possibilities of rational regulation and advancement of national languages vocabularies. However the present political situation in many newly found states rather gives ground to pessimistic prognoses concerning successful using of these possibilities.

CONCLUSIONS

Presently we evidence emergence of a new, very broad-scoped and important science dealing with making vital decisions concerning languages which we suggest to name *linguopolitology*. At the present time there are no reasons to view many political decisions concerning languages as a planned activity. However, progress in a number of adjacent fields of knowledge, such as sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, anthropolinguistics and terminology science creates possibilities of working out rational systemic foundations of language policy, first of all in language planning and management. It is still problematic, whether these possibilities would be realised; there are reasons to believe that rather not. Still, appearance of a new linguistic discipline having both highly interesting theoretical and important practical aspects should be considered as an important step in cultural progress.

APPENDIX: General suggested structure of linguopolitology

Language Policy

Language ideology

Language situation

Language estimation,

Language strategy

Language approaches

Language cultivation (language promoting, advancing, fostering)

Language hindering (impeding, hampering, evicting, expelling, forcing out, oppressing)

Language management (language politics)

Language planning

Language long-term planning

Analysis of language tendencies

Language development prognostication

LP professional training

Language short-time planning

Language regulation, engineering, control

Language normalisation

Terminology advancing

Ordering special vocabulary

Special Vocabulary inventory

Systematisation of special vocabulary

Unification of special vocabulary

Optimising special vocabulary

Vocabulary construction

Elaborating banks of morphemes

Design and construction of systems of nomens

REFERENCES

- Ager D. E. 1996: *Language policy in Britain and France*, London and New York: Cassell.
- Ammon U. 2005: Language Politics. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Baines S. 2006: Minority languages: oppression. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Blommaert J. 2006: Language ideology. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Bowerman S. 2006: Language loyalty. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Brenzinger M. 2006: Language maintenance and shift. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Brumfit C. J. 1992: Language planning. – *The Oxford companion to the English language*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- de Cillia R., Busch B. 2006: Language Policies: Policies on Language in Europe. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Eisenlohr P. 2006: Linguistic Ethnonationalism. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Extra G., Yagmur K. 2006: Migration and Language planning. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Fishman J. A. 1968: Sociolinguistics and the language problems of the developing countries. – *Language problems of developing nations*; Fishman J. A., Ferguson C. A. & das Gupta J. (eds.), New York: John Wiley & Sons, 3–16.
- Gorter D. 2006: Minorities and Language. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Grenoble L. 2006: Endangered Languages. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Grinev S. V. 1993: The Perspectives of Terminology Theory: the Quest For Regularities. – *Selected Readings in Russian Terminology Research*, Wien, 13–27.
- Grinev S. V. 1994: Theoretical Foundations of Russian Terminology Work: Peculiarities and Perspectives. – *Applications and Implications. Current LSP Research*. Vol. 1, Bergen, 49–56.
- Griniewicz S. 2006: Terminology in the era of globalisation. – *Terminologija* 13, 10–16.
- Harrison K. D. 2007: *When Languages Die*. Oxford University Press.
- Haugen E. 1959: Planning for a standard language in Norway. – *Anthropological Linguistics* 1(3), 8–21.
- Haugen E. 1966: *Language conflict and language planning: the case of modern Norwegian*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hutton C. M. 2006: *Nationalism and linguistics*. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Inoue M. 2006: Standardization. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Jernudd B. (ed.) 2001: *Language management and language problems*: special issue of Journal of Asian Pacific Communications 11:1 (Vol. 2), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kloss H. 1966: Types of multilingual communities: A discussion of ten variables. – *Sociological Inquiry* 36, p. 7–17.
- Labrie N. 1996: Politique linguistique. – *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung, 1. Halbband*; Goebel H., Nelde P., Stary Z. and Wölk W. (eds.), Berlin: de Gruyter, 826–833.
- Laitin D. D. 1992: *Language repertoires and state construction in Africa*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Landau J., Kellner-Heinkele B. 2001: *Politics of language in the ex-Soviet Muslim states*, London: Hurst.
- Lo Bianco J. 1987: *National policy on languages*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Longman dictionary of English language and culture*. Longman, 1999.
- McArthur T. 1992: Idiom. – *The Oxford companion to the English language*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- McRae K. D. 1975: The principle of territoriality and the principle of personality in multilingual states. – *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 4, 33–54.
- Nesiah K. 1954: *The mother tongue in education and a language policy for Ceylon*, Colombo: Ola Book.
- Neustupny J. V. 1970: Basic types of treatment of language problems. – *Linguistic Communications* 1, 77–98.
- Ó Riagáin 1997: *Language policy and social reproduction: Ireland, 1893–1993*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ozolins U. 1996: Language policy and political reality. – *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 18, 181–200.

- Paulston C. B. 1997: Language policies and language rights. – *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26, 73–85.
- Prague School 1973: General principles for the cultivation of good language. – *Language planning: current issues and research*; Rubin J. & Shuy R. (eds.), Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 102–111.
- Ricento T. 2000: Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. – *Ideology, politics and language policies. Focus on English*; Ricento T. (ed.), Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 9–24.
- Rubin J., Jernudd B. 1979: *References for students of language planning*, Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Schiffman H. E. 1996: *Linguistic culture and language policy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sibayan B. 1974: Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines. – *Advances in language planning*; Fishman J. A. (ed.), The Hague: Mouton, 221–254.
- Spolsky B. 2004: *Language policy*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Spolsky B., Lambert R. D. 2006: Language Planning and Policy: Models. – *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed., Elsevier.
- Woolard K. 1998: Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiry. – *Language ideologies: practice and theory*; Schieffelin B., Woolard K., Kroskrity P. (eds.), New York: Oxford University Press, 3–47.
- Веселов П. В. 1971: *Структура терминов дефинитивного типа* (На материале терминологии пластических масс и мягких искусственных кож). Дис. ... канд. филол. наук, Москва.
- Виноградов В. А. 1990: Языковая ситуация. – *Энциклопедический словарь «Языкознание»*, Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.
- Гринев С. В. 1986: Перспективы и предпосылки упорядочения номенклатурных единиц. – *Научно-техническая терминология*, Вып. 10, 1–5.
- Гринев С. В. 1987: Принципы упорядочения технических номенклатурных единиц. – *Научно-техническая терминология*, Вып. 1, 6–10.
- Гринев-Гриневич. С. В. 2008: *Терминоведение*: учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений, Москва: Издательский центр «Академия».
- Дешериев Ю. Д. 1990: Языковая политика. – *Энциклопедический словарь «Языкознание»*, Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.
- Исаев М. И. 2008: Этно-культурологические аспекты языкового планирования. – *Лингводидактика. Социолингвистика. Языки мира. К 90-летию со дня рождения академика И.Ф. Протченко*, Москва.
- Касаткин Д. Л. 1990: Говор. Дialeкт. – *Энциклопедический словарь «Языкознание»*, Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.
- Кузнецов С. Н. 1998: Модели языковой политики в русскоязычном сообществе. – *Русская социолингвистика*, Москва: МГУ.
- Кулиш Н. И. 1984: Методика создания интернациональной номенклатуры хирургических операций. – *Научно-техническая терминология*, Вып. 6.
- Кулиш Н. И. 1985: Методика упорядочения терминологии в клинической лимфологии. – *Клиническая лимфология*, Москва–Подольск.
- Пищальникова В. А., Сонин А. Г. 2009: Государственное регулирование языковой ситуации. – *Общее языкознание: учебник для студ. высш. учеб. заведений*, Москва: Издательский центр «Академия».
- Пшеничнова Н. Н. 1997: Говор. Дialeкт. Наречие. – *Энциклопедия «Русский язык»*, Москва.
- Сорокина Э. А. 2007: *Когнитивные аспекты лексического проектирования (к основам когнитивного терминоведения)*, Москва: Издательство МГОУ.
- Хауген Э. 1975: Лингвистика и языковое планирование. – *Новое в лингвистике. Выпуск VII: Социолингвистика*, Москва: Прогресс.
- Швейцер А. Д. 1997: Социолингвистика. – *Энциклопедия «Русский язык»*, Москва.

TERMINOLOGIJA IR KALBOS POLITIKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami besiformuojančios plačios mokslo srities, kurią siūloma vadinti lingvopolitologija, terminologiniai aspektai. Bandoma atskleisti ir trumpai panagrinėti naujojo mokslo sandarą ir pagrindinių jos sričių turinį. Pažymima, kad šiuo metu nėra pagrindo kalbėti apie įsisąmonintą ir planingą požiūrį į kalbų plėtros klausimus, nors būtinybė atsižvelgti į terminologinius kalbos politikos aspektus yra akivaizdi. Pasitaiko atvejų, kai nacionalinė kalbos politika būna nepakankamai apgalvota.

Vis dėlto sukaupia terminologinių tyrimų ir praktinio terminologijos darbo patirtis leidžia formuluoti tam tikrus principus ir konkrečius būdus, kuriais būtų galima skatinti kalbos plėtrą ir kuriuos būtų galima įgyvendinti tvarkant ir plėtojant specialiąją kalbos leksiką.

ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЯ И ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА

Рассматриваются терминологические аспекты формирующейся обширной области знания, которую предлагается назвать лингвополитологией. Делается попытка представления и краткого рассмотрения структуры новой науки и содержания ее основных разделов. Отмечается, что, несмотря на очевидную необходимость учета терминологических аспектов языковой политики, в настоящее время нет оснований говорить о сознательном разумном плановом подходе к вопросам развития языков. В ряде случаев национальная языковая политика носит непродуманный характер. Однако накопленный опыт в первую очередь терминологических исследований и практики дал возможность сформулировать некоторые принципы и конкретные способы содействия развитию языка, которые могут быть реализованы в упорядочении и расширении специального лексического состава языка.

Gauta 2010–11–16

Sergiusz Griniewicz
University of Białystok
Waska 4, m.20, Białystok, 15-481, Poland
E-mail griniewicz@w.tkb.pl