# LINGUISTIC "PURITY", MORPHOLOGICAL BORROWINGS AND ISSUES OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

## *"PUREZA" LINGUÍSTICA, EMPRÉSTIMOS MORFOLÓGICOS E QUESTÕES DE COMUNICAÇÃO TRANS-CULTURAL*

## *"PUREZA" LINGÜÍSTICA, PRESTAMOS MORFOLÓGICOS Y PROBLEMAS DE COMUNICACIÓN INTERCULTURAL*

Alexander Mikhailovich AMATOV[1]
Arkadiy Petrovich SEDYKH[2]
Stella Yanovna YANUTIK[3]
Naralia Gennadievna FILIMONOVA[4]
Lyudmila Mikhailovna BUZINOVA[5]
Natalia Dmitrievna PASHKOVSKAIA[6]

**ABSTRACT**: The article deals with several aspects of language regulation considering social, economic, and political factors as well as their reflection in amateur and academic dictionaries of the English and French languages. It is shown that although the issues of language "purity" have been raised over several centuries, the approaches to the solution of these issues in different countries vary significantly. These differences are primarily associated with the status of the language in the globalizing world of today. Consequently, there is a broad spectrum of political, economic, and social factors that set in motion the various mechanisms of language regulation – from purely scientific interest or laments over the "beauty of the original language" to issues of adequate functioning and, ultimately, the survival of national languages.

**KEYWORDS**: Language policy. Linguistic protectionism. Purism. Borrowings. Lexis.

*RESUMO: O artigo trata de diversos aspectos da regulação da língua, considerando fatores sociais, econômicos e políticos, bem como sua reflexão em dicionários amadores e acadêmicos das línguas inglesa e francesa. É mostrado que, embora as questões de "pureza" da linguagem tenham sido levantadas ao longo de vários séculos, as abordagens para a solução dessas questões em diferentes países varia significativamente. Essas diferenças estão principalmente associadas ao status da língua no mundo globalizado de hoje. Consequentemente, há um amplo*

[1] Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod - Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5530-3274. E-mail: amatov@bsu.edu.ru

[2] Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod – Russia. Moscow International University, Moscow – Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6604-3722. E-mail: sedykh@bsu.edu.ru

[3] Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod - Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2609-6683. E-mail: yanutik@bsu.edu.ru

[4] Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod - Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6078-2037. E-mail: karpova_n@bsu.edu.ru

[5] Moscow International University, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2721-3482. E-mail: rluda@mail.ru

[6] Moscow International University, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2116-3189. E-mail: natulp@mail.ru

Alexander Mikhailovich AMATOV; Arkadiy Petrovich SEDYKH; Stella Yanovna YANUTIK; Naralia Gennadievna FILIMONOVA; Lyudmila Mikhailovna BUZINOVA and Natalia Dmitrievna PASHKOVSKAIA

*espectro de fatores políticos, econômicos e sociais que acionam os vários mecanismos de regulação da linguagem - desde interesses puramente científicos ou lamentos sobre a "beleza da língua original" até questões de funcionamento adequado e, em última instância, a sobrevivência das línguas nacionais.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE**: *Política de idioma. Protecionismo linguístico. Purismo. Empréstimos. Léxico.*


**RESUMEN**: *El artículo trata varios aspectos de la regulación lingüística considerando factores sociales, económicos y políticos, así como su reflejo en diccionarios de aficionados y académicos de los idiomas inglés y francés. Se muestra que, aunque los problemas de la "pureza" del lenguaje se han planteado durante varios siglos, los enfoques para la solución de estos problemas en los diferentes países varían significativamente. Estas diferencias se asocian principalmente con el estado del idioma en el mundo globalizado de hoy. En consecuencia, existe un amplio espectro de factores políticos, económicos y sociales que ponen en marcha los diversos mecanismos de regulación del lenguaje, desde el interés puramente científico o lamentos por la "belleza del idioma original" hasta cuestiones de funcionamiento adecuado y, en última instancia, la supervivencia de los idiomas nacionales.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE**: *Política lingüística. Proteccionismo lingüístico. Purismo. Préstamos. Lexis.*

## Introduction

The problem of "purity" of the native language, removing loan words is not new and is relevant in the modern context of globalization when English loan words permeate many languages.

At the beginning of the 19th century, attempts were made to preserve the original literary traditions of the Russian language of the 18th century from innovations and fashion trends. Thus, A.S. Shishkov (1754–1841), prominent Russian statesman, vice admiral and writer, Minister of Public Education and Head of the Bureau of Censorship, published in 1803 his most famous work, Discourse on the Old and New Style of the Russian Language. Some ideas in defense of the Russian language from unnecessary borrowing were perceived by contemporaries as a return to outdated forms and nothing more. In contemporary texts, including textbooks, A.S. Shishkov appears as the author of not very successful attempts to find Russian replacements for loan words such as "galoshes" – "wet shoes", "anatomy" – "taking apart corpses", "geometry" – "land surveying". It is noteworthy that in Shishkov's texts, such amusing substitutions were not present (AKSENOVA, 2004).

Nowadays, for example, sports terms that penetrate texts intended for the general reader are often full of vocabulary that does not exist in Russian, which often prevents an adequate

perception of information. In articles about boxing, there are *kruzery* [cruisers] (heavyweights, literally – cruising boxers), *prospekty* [prospects] (promising boxers), *chellendzhery* and *kontendery* [challengers and contenders] (contenders for the champion title), *panchery* [punchers] (boxers who knock out the opponent with one strong blow), etc. As for football terminology, one should mention the recently used loan words *bek, khavbek, golkiper, korner* [back, halfback, goalkeeper, corner], etc., of which the *forvard* [forward] has remained in use today.

Naturally, these jargonisms are quite appropriate on the Internet forums of boxing or football fans, but the use of as many unfamiliar words as possible without any comments should probably indicate the author's professionalism (or special dedication), and there is a special professional chic in this (KRONGAUZ, 2008).

Such an abundant and not always well-considered use of foreign vocabulary in Russian speech often arouses protest both among ordinary people and politicians. Thus, in February 2013, deputies from the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia (LDPR) came up with a legislative initiative to ban foreign words and impose fines for using them (LDPR predlagaet shtrafovat SMI, 2013).

However, there is a positive side to loan words. Namely, borrowed and international words facilitate the perception of foreign language speech and, in general, make the process of intercultural communication easier. This, in particular, is indicated by several studies in the field of loan words in Russian (MZHELSKAYA, 2007), German (GRETSKAYA, 2017), and English (RYTSAREVA, 2002).

**Methods**

Since the main object under consideration in this article is the lexis and morphology, the main methods include lexicographic, lexical-semantic, and morphological analysis of lexical units. Moreover, the comparative historical research method allows one to identify key moments in the history of the language that influenced the adaptation of loan vocabulary.

Namely, although the English language is usually accused of various "intrusions" into other languages (primarily into their vocabulary), until about the 19th century the situation was rather the opposite. The fact is that during economic and political development, languages can change their roles, "donors" periodically become "recipients", and vice versa.

*Alexander Mikhailovich AMATOV; Arkadiy Petrovich SEDYKH; Stella Yanovna YANUTIK; Naralia Gennadievna FILIMONOVA; Lyudmila Mikhailovna BUZINOVA and Natalia Dmitrievna PASHKOVSKAIA*

**Results**

Only in the 20ᵗʰ century, English began its unprecedented spread in the world. For several centuries before that, English had been an "importer" rather than an "exporter" of vocabulary and morphemes. This is clearly shown by the fact that only 25% of the vocabulary of modern English is of Germanic origin, and not necessarily Anglo-Saxon (this also includes words of German, Dutch, Norwegian, Danish origin). In comparison, Latin and French as sources each account for over 28% of modern English vocabulary (FINKENSTAEDT; WOLFF, 1973). It is also important that a significant number of affixes in modern English are of Latin or Greek origin (ÖZ, 2014).

As the overwhelming majority of borrowings came to Middle English, the idea that the original words of Anglo-Saxon origin should have priority in use over foreign ones (mainly Romance, Latin, and Greek) was expressed already in the early New English period. Thus, Sir John Cheke, famous English scholar, statesman, and writer, wrote in his letter to Thomas Hoby in 1561, "*I am of this opinion that our own tung shold be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangeled with borowing of other tunges, wherein if we take not heed by tiim, ever borowing and never paying, she shall be fain to keep her house as bankrupt"* (quote from LANGER; DAVIES, 2005).

Later, attempts to "purify" the language from borrowings were made repeatedly in different countries and with varying success. In the next section, we will look at two different trends in linguistic purism using the example of two languages: English and French.

**Discussion**

In the 19ᵗʰ century, several English linguists and writers attempted to "purify" the language from foreign buildup. The most famous in this regard was William Barnes who developed and applied several methods, in particular, the return of obsolete words instead of loan words, calques of borrowed words using English morphemes, and the creation of new words using English roots and affixes.

Since then, the supporters of the "purity" of the English language (however, quite scarce) have developed Barnes' methods, reconstructing a significant part of the vocabulary and even slightly changing the grammar (mainly morphology). In particular, one can note in this regard the book "Uncleftish beholding" by the famous American science fiction writer Poul Anderson (1989), devoted to nuclear research and written in "original English". One of the last

major works in this direction is the book by D. Cowley (2009) "How we'd talk if the English had won in 1066".

The term Anglish, originally coined as a joke by the English comic Paul Jennings in the distant 1968, is now often used (as opposed to official English) to denote some form of "pure" English (primarily vocabulary), recreated from the roots and morpheme of Germanic (mainly Anglo-Saxon) origin. Some websites present fairly complex lexical derivation systems and corresponding dictionaries of the "correct" English language (for example RAINBOW. n.d.; The Anglish Moot, n.d.).

In particular, the radical revision affects the names of sciences, the overwhelming majority of which are internationalisms based on Latin and Greek roots. The most productive element here is the *lore* element (obsolete – knowledge, teaching, art") which replaces the Greek and Latin elements (-*logy, -istics*, etc.). Thus, linguistics in Anglish dictionaries is usually referred to as *speechlore* – a complex word from original English components. It should be noted here that the correctness of the term itself raises criticism: since the object of linguistics is still not speech, but language, a more adequate term *tunglore* can be proposed. The constituent parts of linguistics, respectively, are *wordsetting* (syntax), *wordlinglore* (morphology), *meaninglore* (semantics) and *dinlore* (phonetics). There are also adjacent and interdisciplinary areas of knowledge such as *mindspeechlore* (psycholinguistics), *guildspeechlore* (sociolinguistics), *speechgaining* (teaching languages), etc.

Other noteworthy names of sciences and individual areas include *lifelore* (biology), *littlelifelore* (microbiology), *landshape* (geography), *telcraft* (mathematics), *shapelore* (geometry), and others.

Onomastics also did not escape the attention of purists: for example, the names of many countries, especially those containing common nouns, have undergone significant transformations. Thus, the United States of America in Anglish was named Banded Folkdoms of Americksland, Russia – Russland (almost identical to German), Belarus – White Russland, France – Frankland, Japan – Dawnland ("Land of Dawn", i.e., "the rising sun"), Korea – *Mornfrithland* ("Country of Morning Freshness"), etc.

Nevertheless, although such attempts to recreate "pure" English often present intriguing solutions to non-trivial linguistic problems, in general, these attempts do not arouse any noticeable interest from the perspective of the language policy in English-speaking countries. People who devote themselves to such work usually act out of purely scientific (and sometimes parascientific) interest, or simply yearn for the "beauty of the true English language". Moreover, sometimes this practice encounters criticism, an example of which is in the following passage:

> *Language peevers write for one another. They are not really writing for the larger public; they do not expect to be heeded by the larger public, and it would not be desirable if they were. Their identities are predicated on the belief that they are an elect, **purists** holding up the flickering candle of civilization amid the rabble. They write for one another to reinforce this status. If everyone wrote as they prescribe, their distinction would vanish. Actually, there is a small additional audience of aspirants to the club: English majors, journalists, teacher's pets in whose minds a handful of shibboleths lodge, to be applied mechanically and unintelligently thereafter. But the great unwashed public pays no attention and does not care, except to the extent that they have been schooled to feel vaguely uneasy about the way they speak and write* (MCINTYRE, 2014).

The situation with the French language is different, where very influential political forces are involved in solving the problems of linguistic protectionism. The situation is also interesting as the modern French language to a large extent "gets change" with the very words that the language once generously distributed to other languages, primarily to English.

All in all, the question of the purity of the French language was raised around the end of the 17th century (an example is the famous writer Ch. Perrault). It is well-known that a common language binds a nation together. A long time ago, France was divided into regions, each of which spoke its own language – Breton, Languedoc, Flemish. This posed a serious threat to the unity of France, therefore, in French schools, students were punished if the latter spoke their local dialect (patois) instead of French. As a result, the French Academy became the guardian of the purity of the French language, deciding whether a particular word was acceptable. In the 20th century, arduous work was carried out in this direction. Several decrees and resolutions were issued regarding the use of the French language, and on 31 Dec. 1975, a law on language (*Loi # 75-1349 relative à l'emploi de la langue Française*) was adopted, which was reissued on 4 Aug. 1994 in a new expanded version. Some of the priorities of the French language policy are the enrichment and renewal of the French language, which explains the existence of some texts in the French mass media space dedicated to the key policy issue in the field of language regulation (GULINOV, 2013).

The technological advancements of the 20th century resulted in Anglicisms permeating many spheres of public life in France. Consequently, the French Academy publishes official guidelines for replacing a particular English term. For example, in the field of Internet technologies, there are equivalents for *e-mail – courriel* (from *courrier électronique*), for hacker – *fouineur* (from the verb *fouiner* 'poke one's nose everywhere; meddle in other people's business'). It should be noted that some of the recommended neologisms do not yet appear in dictionaries. Thus, the noun *fouineur* means 'fan of going to flea markets, charity shops'. The use of as many unfamiliar words as possible without any comments should probably indicate

the author's professionalism (or special dedication), and there is a special professional chic in this (KRONGAUZ, 2008).

Since the 1970s, the French government has enshrined in law the terms that should be used instead of foreign ones (ANDY, 2014). For example, the term *logicel* 'software', proposed by the Computer Science Commission, has completely replaced English *software* in less than ten years. The term *informatique* itself, a neologism created in 1962 by Philip Dreyfus from the words *information* 'information' and *automatique* 'automatics', does not have an exact equivalent in English. The closest concepts are *information technology, computer science* or *data processing*.

The general public is also involved in eradicating English loan words. Thus, on 15 Jan. 2010, the State Secretariat for Francophonie announced a competition for the best innovative translation of the English words *buzz, chat, newsletter, talk, tuning*, that were firmly anchored in the French language. The same situation is developing in Quebec where French equivalents have already been found for English terms: *chat – clavardage* (from *clavier* 'keyboard' and *bavardage* 'chatter'), *newsletter – lettre d'information*, *talk (show) – interview-variétés*. Some technical terms have been translated as follows: *podcast – baladodiffusion, scanner – numériseur*.

As a result, the jury of the competition chose options that most fully reflected the concepts represented by English terms. The nouns *tchatche* and *éblabla* were suggested for *chat*. *Tchatche* resembles the English term *chat* but in the French spelling. The second variant *éblabla* contains the initial sound [e], which speaks of electronic communication *électronique* and the French noun *blabla* 'chatter'. These options seemed more adequate to the jury members, in contrast to the noun *dialogue* 'dialogue' proposed by the Terminology Commission.

For the noun *newsletter,* the option *infolettre* was chosen as opposed to the Canadian version *lettre d'information*. The term *talk* which is set aside from new technologies is represented by the French noun *débat* 'debate; discussion; dispute'. The Terminology Commission proposes to replace the English term with the compound noun *émission-débat* (from the French nouns *émission* 'radio or television broadcast' and *débat* 'discussion').

As for such a thing as *tuning* – 'modification (to improve consumer qualities) of cars', the variant of *personnalisation* was proposed 'personalization, individualization; focus on each individual', which does not fully reflect the essence of the concept. As a result, the jury settled on the *bolidage* option, which seems quite logical, although this noun is not in the dictionary. The word is derived from the sports term *bolide* 'high-speed, racing car' and the suffix *-age* which conveys a certain process or action performed on the car.

*Alexander Mikhailovich AMATOV; Arkadiy Petrovich SEDYKH; Stella Yanovna YANUTIK; Naralia Gennadievna FILIMONOVA; Lyudmila Mikhailovna BUZINOVA and Natalia Dmitrievna PASHKOVSKAIA*

Language regulation in France is a constant, continuous process that reacts to changes in the language. Thus, due to the beginning of the widespread proliferation of Internet technologies, on 16 Mar. 1998 the Terminology Commission published an official list of French terms that had to correspond to the English ones. For example, the World Wide Web – *toile d'araignée mondiale, toile mondiale, toile n. f. sg., T.A.M., site (de la toile, sur la toile) – website, web site, browser – logiciel de navigation, navigateur*. The influence of the English language is often caused in this area by the influence of the translator's "false friends". For example, in computer science, the English *library* is translated into French as *librairie* 'bookstore' instead of *bibliothèque*. With a full graphic match of the English and French *agenda*, the word is misused in context since in English the noun is 'a program (work), a plan (events); agenda' whereas in French it is 'a notebook', for example: *L'examen et l'approbation du budget proposé sont inscrits à l'agenda de la réunion mensuelle*.

Along with this, there are some opposite processes. In 2015, about 150 new lexical units were included in French dictionaries, English loan words (ANDY, 2014). Let us look at some examples.

Thus, if the noun *hamburger* was already recorded in dictionaries several decades ago, then with the appearance in the restaurant menu of a new dish *burger, burger de poulet, au poulet* – a burger with chicken, the noun *burger* will find its place in French dictionaries. This is an Americanism which is short for *hamburger*.

The terms related to Internet technologies were also affected. A short and funny looping animation is conveyed by the noun *gif* formed from the English Graphic Interchange Format.

Due to the development of microblogging in social networks, the term *hashtag* appeared (from the English *hashtag* from *hash* – the symbol "hash" + *tag*), which allows one to combine a group of messages by topic or type.

Another noun borrowed from the English language is *troll* which since the mid-2000s has meant a bore known for their inappropriate comments and discussions on forums or social networks on the Internet.

Several nouns included in dictionaries convey some of the realities of the social environment and culture. A young city dweller with a special taste in clothes contrary to popular culture is a *hipster*. This person is also characterized by a cap, large glasses, and a thick beard. Originally in the 1950s, a jazz lover was called a hipster in English. Another phenomenon swept the world of social media in 2013. This is a digital self-portrait, the so-called *selfie* (from the English *self*).

Another loan word included in the new dictionaries of the French language is associated with the Soviet liquid-propellant single-stage ballistic missile R-11 and its subsequent modifications. According to the NATO classification, this product was referred to as *SS-1 Scud-A* (in English – Scud). It remains to be seen how the name of the missile used in many military conflicts entered the language as a noun scud with the meaning 'harsh criticism', 'scolding'. For example, *La candidate a envoyé un bon scud à son adversaire* – The candidate harshly criticized her opponent; *Je me suis pris un scud pour 4 minutes de retard* – I got a scolding for being four minutes late.

Other examples of French replacements for English loan words include *toile d'araignée mondiale* (or *toile mondiale*) instead of the *World Wide Web*, *logiciel de navigation* (or *navigateur*) for *web browser*, *site de la toile* (*sur la toile*) instead of *website*, etc. One should also note that the term *ordinateur* was proposed by Pierre Guiraud (1959) to replace the word *computer* which sounded similar to the combination of obscene French words *con* and *pute*.

## Conclusion

The rapid development of international relations, cross-language contacts, the introduction of technological innovations, for example, SMS, ICQ, Facebook, etc., lead to the justified appearance in a particular language of vocabulary reflecting these realities. During their functioning, these terms are assimilated, but sometimes the phenomenon disappears and so does the lexical unit, such as a pager. Nevertheless, the issues of language regulation are an integral part of the state policy in the field of language considering social, economic, and political factors.

It should also be noted that loan words are more susceptible to fluctuations, such borrowings enter the language more easily and also more easily disappear both due to the changed situation and as a result of the struggle for the "purity" of the language. The morphological level of the language is generally less subject to outside influence (CARLISLE, 1995; HASPELMATH, 2002), however, borrowed morphemes, once in this system, remain there for a long time, if not forever.

## REFERENCES

AKSENOVA, G.V. **A.S. Shishkov i problemy kultury russkoi rechi** [A.S. Shishkov and the problems of Russian speech culture]. Obrazovatel'nyy portal Slovo, 2004. Available: www.portal-slovo.ru/history/35320.php

*Alexander Mikhailovich AMATOV; Arkadiy Petrovich SEDYKH; Stella Yanovna YANUTIK; Naralia Gennadievna FILIMONOVA; Lyudmila Mikhailovna BUZINOVA and Natalia Dmitrievna PASHKOVSKAIA*

ANDERSON, P. Uncleftish Beholding. **Analog Science Fiction/Science Fact**, v. 109, no. 13, p. 132–135, 1989.

ANDY, D. **Les nouveaux mots du dictionnaire 2015**. Linternaute, May 23, 2014. Available: https://www.linternaute.com/actualite/societe/1193417-les-nouveaux-mots-du-dictionnaire-2015/

**The Anglish Moot**. Fandom, n.d. Available: http://anglish.wikia.com/wiki/Main_leaf

CARLISLE, J. F. Morphological awareness and early reading achievement. In: Feldman, L.B. (Ed.). **Morphological aspects of language processing**. Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 1995. p. 189–209.

COWLEY, D. **How we'd talk if the English had won in 1066**. London: Bright Pen Books, 2009.

FINKENSTAEDT, T.; WOLFF, D. **Ordered profusion; studies in dictionaries and the English lexicon**. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1973.

GRETSKAYA, T. V. Rol internatsionalnoi leksiki v obuchenii nemetskomu yazyku v meditsinskom vuze [The role of international vocabulary in learning German at medical universities]. In: Kaynova, G.A.; Osyanina, E.I. (Eds.). **Innovatsionnye pedagogicheskie tekhnologii** [Innovative pedagogical technologies]. Kazan: Buk, 2017. p. 102-104.

GUIRAUD, P. **Problèmes et méthodes de la statistique linguistique**. Dordrecht: Springer. 1959.

GULINOV, D.Yu. Yazykovaya politika v aspekte mass-mediinogo diskursa (na materiale frantsuzskogo yazyka) [Language policy in the aspect of mass media discourse (on the example of the French language]. **Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki** [Philological sciences. Theory and practice], no. 9-1(27), p. 48-51, 2013.

HASPELMATH, M. **Understanding morphology**. London: Arnold, 2002.

KRONGAUZ, M.A. **Russkii yazyk na grani nervnogo sryva** [The Russian language on the verge of a nervous breakdown]. Moscow: Znak; Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, 2008.

LANGER, N.; DAVIES, V. W. **Linguistic purism in the Germanic languages**. Dordrecht: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

LDPR predlagaet shtrafovat SMI za upotreblenie inostrannykh slov [LDPR proposes to fine mass media for using foreign words]. **Argumenty i fakty**, Feb. 21, 2013. Available: https://aif.ru/politics/russia/296194

MCINTYRE, J. E. **Secrets of the Peevers**. The Baltimore Sun, May 14, 2014.

MZHELSKAYA, O. K. Zaimstvovaniya kak rezultat vzaimodeistviya yazykov i nekotorye napravleniya ikh izucheniya [Borrowings as a result of interaction between languages and some directions of study]. **Omskii nauchnyi vestnik. Series "Filologiya"**, no. 5, p. 115-117, 2007.

ÖZ, H. Morphology and implications for English language teaching. In: Saricoban, A. (Ed.). **Linguistics for English language teaching studies**. Ankara: Ani Publishing, 2014. p. 83-120.

RAINBOW, K. **Ednew English**, n.d. Available: http://ednewenglish.tripod.com/index.htm

RYTSAREVA, A. E. **Pragmalingvisticheskii aspekt internatsionalnoi leksiki: na materiale angliiskogo yazyka** [Pragmalinguistic aspect of international lexis: on the example of the English language]: Dissertation … by the Candidate of Philological Sciences: 10.02.04. Volgograd State University, Volgograd, 2002. 197 p.

**How to reference this article**