

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Сумський державний університет
Факультет іноземної філології
та соціальних комунікацій

XI

**ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКА
НАУКОВА КОНФЕРЕНЦІЯ**



СОЦІАЛЬНО-ГУМАНІТАРНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ СУЧАСНОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА

25-26 квітня 2024 року

Матеріали

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ
ТА СОЦІАЛЬНИХ КОМУНІКАЦІЙ**



**СОЦІАЛЬНО-ГУМАНІТАРНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ СУЧАСНОГО
СУСПІЛЬСТВА**

**МАТЕРІАЛИ ХІ ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКОЇ НАУКОВОЇ
КОНФЕРЕНЦІЇ СТУДЕНТІВ, АСПІРАНТІВ,
ВИКЛАДАЧІВ ТА СПІВРОБІТНИКІВ**

(Суми, 25-26 квітня 2024 року)

Суми, 2024

С-70 Соціально-гуманітарні аспекти розвитку сучасного суспільства:

Матеріали одинадцятої Всеукраїнської наукової конференції студентів, аспірантів, викладачів та співробітників (Суми, 25–26 квітня 2024 р.)

/ уклад. М. М. Набок. Суми : Сумський державний університет, 2024.

300 с.

До збірника увійшли наукові матеріали, присвячені актуальним проблемам сучасного перекладу, етнолінгвістики, стилістики, методики та методології сучасних мовознавчих та літературознавчих дисциплін. Складовою збірника є наукові розвідки з питань релігії та культури, соціальних і міжкультурних комунікацій, психологічної теорії та практики, соціологічних досліджень.

Для викладачів закладів вищої освіти, аспірантів, студентів, учителів загальноосвітніх шкіл, гімназій, ліцеїв та коледжів, усіх, хто цікавиться питаннями соціогуманітарного напрямку.

Матеріали друкуються в авторській редакції.

Halyna Chulanova,

Candidate of Philology

Associate Professor of the Department of Germanic Philology of

Sumy State University

Anzhelika Kalchenko,

student of Sumy State University

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ANGLICISMS AND INTERNATIONALISMS

As globalization continues to impact various aspects of contemporary life, language and communication remain indispensable tools in facilitating its progress. The rapid advancements in technology play a significant role in introducing foreign words into languages, known as anglicisms and internationalisms. English, being at the forefront of technological innovation and scientific discoveries, holds a dominant position as a global language, exerting influence on numerous national languages worldwide. This influence presents a dual effect: while it enriches national vocabularies, it also poses challenges to their organic development. Given the increasing attention to the impact of English on other languages, this essay holds relevance and significance in contemporary discourse.

This paper aims to delve into the distinctions between anglicisms and internationalisms within the realm of language, elucidating their origins, characteristics, usage, and impact on linguistic diversity in the context of globalization.

First of all, we have to establish clear definitions of anglicisms and internationalisms, highlighting their core attributes and how they are perceived within linguistic scholarship and across diverse language communities. A historical exploration is necessary to understand the roots and evolution of anglicisms and internationalisms. By tracing their emergence in various cultural, social, and historical contexts, we can uncover the driving forces behind their adoption and dissemination, such as technological progress, cultural exchange, and global commerce. Finally, we must evaluate the broader implications of anglicisms and internationalisms for

linguistic diversity and language vitality. This entails considering their effects on language endangerment, language shift, and language contact phenomena, as well as their coexistence with indigenous and minority languages in multilingual societies.

Considering that the terms “internationalism” and “anglicism” share similar definitions, one aspect of discussion regarding the influence of the English language on other global languages involves examining the nature of these terms.

Petralli suggests that, rather than being a distinct lexical category, the term “internationalism” refers to a group of diverse lexemes found across different languages. These lexemes share similar form and meaning, often referred to as common “(inter)lexemes” or lexical sources. In simpler terms, an internationalism is typically a word present in unrelated languages or language families, characterized by similar orthographic or phonetic structure and overlapping semantic domains. Commonly, these “internationalisms” originate from Greek or Latin roots [4].

For example, the term “*architecture*” serves as an illustration of an international word shared by a diverse array of languages. This includes Italian “*architettura*,” Latvian “*architektūra*,” Polish “*architektura*,” Romanian “*arhitectură*,” French “*architecture*,” and Ukrainian “*arkhitektura*.” According to Wexler, words like “architecture” belong to a subgroup of internationalisms characterized as “unmarked” or “denationalized” regarding a specific national origin. They are borrowed from various languages without conveying historical or contemporary ethnocultural or ideological allegiance to a particular linguistic community [5, p. 80].

Wexler also delineates another subgroup termed as “vocabulary which is marked negatively with regard to national origin.” Here, he refers to the adoption of new vocabulary, primarily from Latin and Greek origins, to replace existing terms considered undesirable [5, p. 80]. An example of this phenomenon occurred during the modernization of the Japanese language in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Japan undertook a linguistic overhaul, replacing indigenous vocabulary with new words of Chinese or Western origin as a means to distance itself from traditional cultural roots and align with the modern Western world.

For instance, the Japanese word for “*clothing*,” “*fuku*,” was substituted with “*fashion*,” derived from the English term. Similarly, the term for “*technology*” in Japanese, “*ninjutsu*,” was supplanted by “*ekunoroji*” (technology), borrowed from the English word “*technology*.”

Wexler also identified a third subgroup of neo-classical vocabulary termed as “marked positively for national origin.” Here, the recipient language consciously and willingly adopts terms from a specific donor language to foster an ethnocultural, political, and ideological connection and identification with it [5, p. 81]. As an example, Wexler discusses the influence of classical Arabic languages on Islamic languages, which serves as a demonstration of respect and the propagation of Muslim culture.

Similarly, Wexler notes the impact of the Russian language on all other languages of the former Soviet Union countries as another instance of the spread of internationalism. This influence extended to the adoption of the Cyrillic alphabet in these languages [5, p. 81].

Furthermore, there is ongoing disagreement among linguists and scholars, including Manfred Görlach, John M. Lipski, Koller, and others, regarding the definitions of “*internationalism*” and “*anglicism*.” While some contend that these terms are interchangeable as they both refer to words or expressions borrowed from other languages and used in a new context, others argue that there are notable distinctions between the two. These differences hinge on factors such as the frequency of usage, level of integration into the target language, and cultural connotations associated with the borrowed terms.

One theory posits that internationalisms and anglicisms share similarities as they both represent forms of linguistic borrowing with comparable impacts on the recipient language. Both types of borrowings, for instance, have the potential to introduce new vocabulary and concepts, expand the lexicon of a language, and facilitate communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. However, it's essential to acknowledge that this viewpoint is just one perspective on the matter, and there are

numerous other factors to take into account when comparing internationalism and anglicism.

For example, Manfred Görlach, a prominent lexicographer, approached the task of distinguishing internationalisms from borrowings of identifiable national origins with seriousness when he developed the Dictionary of European Anglicisms [1]. His decision was to exclude internationalisms from the dictionary to align primarily with his definition of anglicism, which he defines as “a word or phrase that bears recognizable English characteristics in its form (spelling, pronunciation, morphology), or at least one of these” [1, p. 3]. In contrast, many neo-Greek/Latin words are genuinely international, devoid of any national connotations unless there are extralinguistic factors involved.

In contrast, American linguist John M. Lipski presented an opposing viewpoint on the similarity between anglicisms and internationalisms in his paper “Latin American Spanish” [3, p. 11]. Lipski argues that “internationalism” and “anglicism” are often used interchangeably, referring to imported words and phrases that have become integrated into the lexicon of the target language.

Another perspective on the differences between these terms suggests that their definitions may depend on cultural background, leading to them being considered equivalent or distinct. This idea is echoed in a quote by Koller from her book chapter titled “Anglicisms and Internationalism in German,” found in the edited volume “International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca” [2, p. 357]. In this chapter, Koller explores the use of anglicisms and internationalisms in the German language and discusses the factors influencing their adoption and adaptation in various contexts. The scientist notes, “Both anglicisms and internationalisms may be seen as a reflection of the growing internationalization of languages, as well as the dominance of English as a global language” [2, p. 357].

In conclusion, the exploration of anglicisms and internationalisms within the context of globalization reveals their significant impact on language evolution and diversity. As English continues to exert influence on global communication, the distinctions between these linguistic phenomena provide insights into the complex

dynamics of language borrowing and cultural exchange. The ongoing debate among linguists and scholars regarding their definitions underscores the need for a nuanced understanding of linguistic phenomena in diverse cultural contexts. By recognizing the multifaceted nature of anglicisms and internationalisms, we can navigate language globalization more effectively and contribute to the preservation and promotion of linguistic diversity worldwide.

References:

1. Görlach M. A dictionary of European Anglicisms. Oxford, 2001.
2. Koller, Lynne H. It Could Never Happen Here: Promoting Violence Prevention Education for Emergency Department Nurses. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*. 2016. № 47(8). 356–360.
3. Lipski J. M. Latin American Spanish. New York : Longman Pub Group, 1994. 440 p.
4. Petrali A. Tendenze europee nel lessico italiano. Internazionalismi: problemi di metodo e nuove parole d'Europa. Rome, 1992.
5. Wexler P. Towards a structural definition of 'internationalisms'. Bologna, 1969. Pp. 77–92.

Maxym Shyshkin,

Postgraduate student of Sumy State University

EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN POLITICAL MEDIA DISCOURSE

The relevance of the work deals with the causal relationship study of modern American political media discourse evolution based on American journalism history formation.

The purpose of the work is the analytical aspect of researching the historical background of the American journalism formation and the federal authorities influence, which have an impact on the modern media discourse formation in general.