



Modern Language Policy: Specifics Of Formation And Development Of The French Vertical

Dmitry Yu. Gulinov 1

Marina R. Zheltukhina

Larisa A. Shestak

Gennady G. Slyshkin

Veronica V. Katermina

Ludmila D. Chervyakova

Romance Philology Department, Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia.

Department of Theory of English, Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia.

Department of Russian and Methods of Its Teaching, Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia.

Department of Social Sciences and Professional Communication, Russian University of Transport (MIIT), Moscow, Russia

English Philology Department, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia.

Foreign Languages Department, Faculty of Philology, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Received Dec. 2017

Accepted Feb. 2018

Keywords:

Sociolinguistics

language policy

legislative regulation of language

language policy vertical

speech portrait

norm of the French language

ABSTRACT

The relevance of the study is conditioned by the objective necessity to describe the vertical of the French language policy. The aim of the study is to identify specifics of formation and development of the modern language policy vertical in France. As material of the research, the data obtained during the analysis of legal documents concerning language policy of France, texts from modern French periodicals, fiction, media texts in the Internet, as well as the answers of the French respondents have been used. The overall corpus obtained by the continuous sampling method on the base of the French fiction comprises 3000 culturally marked names. The methods of the study include general scientific hypothetico-deductive method, introspection, contextual analysis, conceptual analysis, interpretive analysis, semantic analysis, questionnaire, elements of the quantitative analysis. In the research, general scientific methods of the analysis and synthesis, generalization and extrapolation of the findings to more wide range of phenomena were also used. The ways of analysis are useful for development of communication theory, psycho- and sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, comparative linguistics. In the article, the concept "language policy" is defined, the main stages of language policy in France are revealed, kinds of the language policy in France are determined (retrospective, promising, constructive, destructive, centralized and non-centralized language policy). It is claimed that there are many institutions in France, whose activities are aimed at developing prescriptions on the use of the French language. In the article the main criteria of classification of prescriptions are revealed, the main prescriptions of the language policy in France are identify, and the three-level vertical of the French language policy is described and analyzed.

1. Introduction

The concept of 'language policy' is very broad and includes numerous representations. To date, definitions of this phenomenon are numerous. Let us review some of them and comment on them. In the linguistic encyclopedic dictionary (Yartseva (ed.), 1990), language policy is understood to mean the totality of ideological principles and practical measures for solving language problems in society, the state. Language policy in a multinational state is particularly difficult. In this case, it should take into account such factors as multilingualism, the uniqueness of the national composition and interethnic relations, the role of individual languages and their speakers in public life (Vakhtin & Golovko, 2004; Chervyakova, 2007; 2012; Gulinov, 2012; Shestak, 2013; 2016; Katermina, 2015; Zheltukhina et al., 2016; 2017a; 2017b; 2017c; 2017d; 2017e; Zyubina, et al., 2017, etc.). Ideological principles and practical measures in the field of language policy are interdependent and inseparable, and since linguistic policy is an integral part of national policy, it basically depends on the general principles of the latter.

The hypothesis of the study is that the modern language policy in France represents a vertical with different levels (Gulinov, 2012). It is necessary to analyze and compare the contents and means of the French language policy. The overarching research question of this study was as follows: How can one identify specifics of formation and development of the modern language policy vertical in France?

2. Methodological Framework

The aim of the research defined the choice of methods of the French language policy analysis. In the work, the following methods were applied: general scientific hypothetico-deductive method, introspection, contextual analysis, conceptual analysis, interpretive analysis, semantic analysis, questionnaire, elements of the quantitative analysis. In addition, general scientific methods of the analysis and synthesis, generalization and extrapolation of the received conclusions to more wide range of phenomena were used in the research as well. To verify the hypothesis of the French society's awareness of the issues of language policy, 100 French respondents aged 20–30 were interviewed.

As material of the research, the data obtained during the analysis of legal documents concerning language policy of France, modern texts from French periodicals, fiction, media texts in the Internet, as well as the answers of the French respondents have been used. The overall corpus obtained by the continuous sampling method on the base of the French fiction comprises 3000 culturally marked names.

Let us consider the answers to the questions of the questionnaire and comment on them.

Question No. 1 *Connaissez-vous des mesures gouvernementales pour protéger et promouvoir la langue française? Are you aware of the measures that the state is taking to protect and promote the French language?*

When answering the first question of the questionnaire, the majority of respondents (62%) mentioned one measure taken by the state to protect the national language, namely, the creation of a new vocabulary, both highly specialized and of common meaning, which is intended to replace already existing loanwords. Thus, one of the institutions of French language policy – the General Commission of Terminology and Neology – develops and introduces original vocabulary (for example, computer-related). New lexemes are created not only based on the internal word-building resources of the French language (*ordinateur* – *computer*, *logiciel* – *software*, *courriel* – *e-mail*), but also by calquing a foreign language word (*toile* – *internet*, *base de données* – *database*, *cheval De Troie* – *Trojan horse*, *mise à jour* – *update*, *carte mère* – *motherboard*, *système d'exploitation* – *operating system*, *identifiant* – *login*, *lettre d'information* – *information letter*, *vernum* – *numlock key*, etc.).

The answers to the first question of the survey revealed a slight awareness of the French about the laws regulating the use of the French language. Only a small part of the respondents (11%) mentioned the Toubon law

(*certaines lois comme celle de 1994*), which is one of the milestones of the French history of language regulation (Lois linguistiques, s.d.). In nearly every answer, representatives of French linguistic culture mentioned as a measure to promote the French language activities of the international organization “Francophonie”, whose main mission statements are preservation of the peoples’ national heritage, development of cultural and linguistic diversity, dialogue of cultures, humane globalization (Leclerc, s.d.).

Let us comment briefly on the results obtained in the analysis of the first question of the questionnaire. The actual data indicate interest in preserving the purity of the French language and the increase of its prestige within the country and abroad. This is confirmed by the repeated reference to the name of the international organization “Francophonie” standing guard over the interests of the French language speakers. One important detail should be noted: the state supports any initiative of the citizens to protect national and cultural identity. An example of this is the website of the General Delegation for the French language and the languages of France (*La délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France*), where the vocabulary of English origin is discussed and new terminology for potential replacement of loanwords is suggested (Politique linguistique de la France, s.d.).

Question No. 2 A travers quels moyens de communication pensez-vous que le français est employé le plus correctement au niveau de la grammaire, de la syntaxe et de l'orthographe parmi internet, radio, télévision? In what means of mass communication, in your opinion – on the Internet, on radio, on television – the French language is used most competently from the point of view of grammar, syntax and spelling?

Most respondents (52%) believe that the radio is the source of the ideal language, though emphasizing that the specific radio broadcast and the quality of the French language on which it is broadcast are directly related: *tout dépend des émissions car on a les deux extrêmes dans tous les médias; Dans chaque média il y a du bon et du mauvais – cela dépend de l'émission, de l'heure de passage, du public visé, des stations particulières (it all depends on the program itself, since in any program there is both good and bad; Depends on the time of the broadcast, the target audience, etc.)*.

A smaller number of respondents (38%) consider the language of television as ideal-forming. This category of respondents notes the obvious connection between the television broadcast, its genre specificity and the level of literacy provided by the authors and moderators: *ça dépend du programme que l'on regarde; Pour certains programmes comme le journal ou le documentaire mais pas pour les séries; Les chaînes principales – bonne réputation (it all depends on the program you are watching; this applies to news releases, documentaries, but not to serials; the main channels have a good reputation, etc.)*. Finally, 10% of representatives of the French language culture believe that the exemplary French language can be found on the Internet, however, in their opinion, it all comes down to choosing a site: *tout dépend du site (it all depends on the website)*.

When commenting on the answers to the second question of the survey, the respondents’ preference of radio and television, where, in their opinion, the French language is exemplar, should be justified. The correct literary usage in radio and television was made possible by the law on freedom of information transfer, which obliges the members of the above-mentioned mass media to ensure the quality and diversity of programs and popularize the French language and French culture on television and on the radio.

It should be added that currently there is a quota on French radio – 40% of the songs should sound in French, and French television channels, which have chosen to show domestic-produced films as priority, enjoy substantial tax benefits from the state (Lois linguistiques, s.d.).

Question No.3 A travers quels acteurs pensez-vous que le français est le plus correctement employé au niveau de la grammaire, de la syntaxe et de l'orthographe: professeurs, journalistes, écrivains, politiques, animateurs de télé, acteurs de cinéma? – In your opinion, representatives of which profession speak French most

competently: teachers, journalists, writers, politicians, TV presenters, actors?

The answers of the representatives of the French linguistic culture were as follows: 32% of respondents believe that the most literate in the French language are writers, 28% of the respondents prefer teachers, and 23% spoke in favor of politicians. The remaining votes were given to TV presenters (9%), journalists (5%) and actors (3%).

Let us dwell selectively on the results obtained in answering the third question of the survey and comment on them. The choice of respondents in favor of writers may be due to the existence of a special body in France that plays an important role in preserving the cultural significance of the French language and development of French literature – the French Academy. This social institution has been functioning since 1635 and its members are prominent literary figures (including writers and poets), who make a significant contribution to the modern standards of the French language (Politique linguistique de la France, s.d.).

The preference of the survey participants for politicians can be explained by the fact that many French politicians express themselves in good French, besides, the history of France abounds with examples of well-known politicians becoming initiators and developers of state orders in the field of language.

Question No. 4 Qu'est-ce qui selon vous altère le plus la langue française? – What do you think is most harmful to the French language?

The majority of the French who took part in the survey (43%) believe that the French language is most harmed by the language of SMS and social networks (*le langage SMS; l'absence d'efforts pour écrire correctement sur Facebook et Skype – text language; indisposition to write in Facebook and Skype competently*), 31% of representatives of the French linguistic culture believe that their native language is most threatened by loan-words from English (*l'utilisation abusive des mots d'origine anglaise dans les médias – excessive use of English words in media*), in 26% of answers, the respondents mentioned the Internet (*les nouvelles technologies en général: internet – mainly new technologies: Internet*) and reality shows (*la télé réalité*) – 17 and 9%, respectively, as the main harm to the French language.

Let us comment on some of the answers to the final question of the survey. It is no coincidence that French respondents referred to text messages as the main threat to the French language. Today, SMS-language, the emergence of which was promoted by the wide spread of high technologies, is an integral part of the French language.

The main characteristics of SMS messages – brevity, immediacy and the particular nature of content – determine their language. Simplified way of communicating via SMS leads to violations of the language rules.

The following can serve an illustration of the above said: elimination of letters (*Cfo – C'est faux*), use of one letter instead of the doubled (*Jenémar – J'en ai marre*), abbreviation using the consonant mode of writing (*bcp – beaucoup, Dsl – désolé*), use of the initial abbreviation (*M – merci, ALP – à la prochaine*), various abbreviations (*DQP – dès que possible, BAL – boîte aux lettres*), truncations (*auj – aujourd'hui, d'ac – d'accord*) and others.

Despite all the efforts made by the French language policy institutions, there is a large number of English-language loans in French. That's why the survey participants mentioned English-language vocabulary as a phenomenon that could harm the French language.

English loans in French are, first and foremost, sports vocabulary: *football, coach, handball, volleyball, beach volley, cross, goal (goalkeeper), dribble, drop, corner, rollers, footing, walk, walking, jogging, crawl, fair-play (game respecting the rules), fitness*.

The lexicon of business communication follows example of sports vocabulary: *management, business, marketing, meeting, speech, brainstorming, briefing, merchandising* (the art of selling a product or services).

In French, a lot of vocabulary related to new technologies is widely used: *mail, wi-fi, scanner, smart-phone, iphone, podcast* (digital radio or television recording that can be downloaded), *web, google* (to google), *software, chater* (to chat), *surfer, walkman*.

The list of English words, which the French use regularly in their speech practice, includes also gastronomic vocabulary: *hot dog, beefsteak, sandwich, chewing gum, fast-food, hamburger, coca cola, self-service, toast*.

The English vocabulary includes words that designate clothes: *tee-shirt, sweat, jeans, short, pull-over*.

The borrowed lexemes are also words representing various phenomena of the surrounding reality: *week-end, parking, lifting, listing, design, flyer, star, fashion, game over, shopping, challenge, baby-boom, baby-sitter, one man show, trailer, leader*, etc.

Thus, the questionnaire shows the interest of the French in preserving the purity of the French language and increasing its prestige both inside and outside the country. Most participants to the survey consider the standard language in terms of spelling, grammar and vocabulary to be the language of French radio and television. According to the respondents, writers, teachers and politicians are the most competent in French. As the phenomena that threaten the purity of the French language, the survey participants mentioned the language of SMS and social networks, as well as the excessive use of words of the English origin.

In general, despite the low awareness of representatives of the French linguistic culture of the legislative regulation of the French language (ignorance of specific laws in the field of language), the survey results make it possible to conclude that the French are involved in the implementation of state programs to preserve the purity of their native language.

3. Results

In our research, we prove a hypothesis that the modern language policy in France represents a vertical with different levels (Gulinov, 2012). In what follows, specifics of formation and development of the modern French language policy vertical will be identified.

I.V. Popescu (2003) singles out several stages of language policy.

The first is the stage of the formation of goals and objectives of language policy. At the legislative level, it is expressed in the development of the state concept of ethnopolitics and language policy as its component. At this stage, a decision is made regarding the choice of the language that for some reason is considered optimal. In most cases, the language policy is perspective by nature, so its measures suggest changing the language situation and existing norms. At the first stage, the data of language forecasting are very important.

The second stage of the language policy is the preparation for the task implementation, that is, preparation for the introduction of the chosen optimal linguistic variant, its legalization. This stage is associated with so-called language planning.

Language policy can be conducted by official government agencies or independent non-governmental organizations, and therefore the “credibility” of the proposed measures will be different.

At the state level, it is the adoption of laws in the field of language functioning and accession to international treaties in this field; at the non-governmental level, it is elaboration of appeals to the government and recommendations for it, their own researches and cultural and educational activities.

This stage is closely connected with the so-called language setting, which refers to the decisions of the authorities on preserving, expanding or restricting the use of a particular language. Then comes the stage of implementation of international obligations, as well as the norms of domestic legislation in practice.

The last stage is the stage of language construction, which is characterized by the language policy resulting

in efforts (including material and financial ones) aimed at forcing or persuading the speakers to accept the innovations recommended by the bodies pursuing the language policy. In this case, the speakers can accept the recommendations completely, partially or not to accept them at all. The degree of acceptance of recommendations makes it possible to evaluate the effectiveness and prospects of language policy, its results, and to forecast the linguistic development in this or that country, in this or that region (Popescu, 2003).

In the French language, in a certain period, a policy aimed at the creation of new vocabulary, both highly specialized and common, which was not reduced to the production of verbal expressions for general concepts, but also suggested the replacement of already existing lexical units of foreign origin, was proclaimed. This phenomenon is called reverse tracing, and its essence consists in replacing already borrowed and assimilated words in the language with the original words. Among such words, first of all, the technical terms *pick-up*, *tracking*, *padding* should be considered.

Once there are too many borrowings of the kind in the language, society tries to get rid of them by all available means, taking appropriate decisions at the highest level. For example, the French Committee for the Study of Technical Terminology decided to establish a national technical nomenclature and proposed options for replacing technical terms borrowed from English with the words of the French origin: *pick-up* > *capteur*, *tracking* > *cheminement*, *padding* > *tapissage*.

These are examples of a successful replacement of the borrowed English terminology. However, most English words function freely in French, and attempts to supersede them did not lead to the desired result. So, the English *businessman* and *football* are used by French speakers much more often than their French equivalents *affairiste* and *la balle au pied*. This can be explained by the fact that English borrowings took root in the minds of the French and occupied a certain niche in French public life. In addition, the meanings of words of foreign origin and their national variants often do not coincide on the connotative level (cf.: *a businessman is a businessman, an affairiste is a speculator*).

Let us turn to the characteristics and types of language policy described in the sociolinguistic literature.

Schweitzer identifies a retrospective, promising, constructive, destructive, centralized and non-centralized language policy (Schweitzer & Nikolskiy, 1978, p. 125–131).

The retrospective nature of language policy is connected with the establishment of the preservation of the existing language situation or language norms that are weakened by native speakers. As an example of this type of language policy, one can cite state measures aimed at popularizing French regional languages and cultures.

The promising nature of language policy lies in changes of the functional relationship of linguistic formations, stimulation of abolition of old norms, codification of new norms, spelling reform, and creation of terminology systems. The manifestation of a promising language policy in France is a trend towards feminization of the names of professions, positions, and titles. This linguistic fact was noted by the French General Commission of Terminology and Neology in a special report published in October 1998.

As a result of this reform, the names of professions, positions, and titles, previously used only in the masculine, acquired a feminine form: *une gouverneure* (female governor), *une professeure* (female teacher), *une ingénieure* (female engineer), *une sculpteure* (female sculptor), *une maire* (female mayor), *une chef* (female chief), etc.

A promising language policy is also the state policy aimed at the rehabilitation of regional and minority languages in France. Let us consider the case of the Breton language. At present, teaching in Breton is allowed officially in Brittany, television and radio broadcast in this language, books, newspapers and magazines are published. In addition, Brittany use a bilingual signal system on the roads and a number of public services. A special role is played every year by the grandiose holidays of Breton culture, which gather hundreds of

thousands of people. All this speaks for a certain perspective of the development of the language, in other words, about the promising language policy in relation to the Breton language.

Language policy aimed at changing the language can be constructive and destructive. Constructive policy is the policy aimed at expanding the communicative functions of languages, scope of their application, social and communicative role, and creation and development of literary languages.

In recent years, France has implemented a number of programs to rehabilitate the languages of the French regions. Such a policy with respect to regional languages, the preservation of their status, and expansion of their communicative potential can be called constructive. Despite the categorical nature of Article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, which says that *the language of the Republic is French, La langue de la République est le français* (Full text of the Constitution of 1958 as amended on July 23, 2008), today the prospects of the development and strengthening of the positions of regional languages are evident. This is a constructive policy for the revival of the Breton, Basque, Catalan, Alsatian, Occitan (Provençal) and other regional languages.

An example of destructive language policy is the rigid policy of eradicating regional variants of the French language, which was proclaimed in France in the 16th century. The history of French language policy knows a decree of 1539, which prescribed the use of French in governmental and judicial acts and the establishment of the French Academy in 1635. The revolution promoted the process of linguistic unification so that citizens express their thoughts in the same language, guaranteeing the unity and indivisibility of the Republic. Hence the decisive intention to eradicate the languages of the regions (Ponto, 2007, p. 91). The active process of ousting regional languages was observed at that time in schools. Thus, primary school teachers imposed various punishments, including bodily punishment, for using the words of the local language.

A centralized and non-centralized language policy should also be distinguished. Centralized language policy is pursued by the state and provides for a system of compulsory measures.

For example, in 2009 the Ministry of Culture and Public Affairs of France prepared a report on the measures taken by various organizations and institutions undertaken in defense of the French language. This centralized language policy was aimed at establishing control over the use of the French language in such spheres of public life as food, industrial production, leisure and sports. In the reporting year, special attention was paid to food products of foreign origin (fish, canned goods, cheeses). Some food products that arrived on store shelves from abroad were not accompanied by the necessary information in French. In a number of cases, instructions and operating instructions for industrial goods of foreign origin were not translated into French. Finally, in the sphere of leisure and sports, the facts of improper registration in the French language of guidelines on the use of personal protective equipment during active recreation and sports activities were revealed.

Non-centralized is the policy of local authorities that doesn't have statutory force outside the region, as well as the language policy pursued by public organizations and scientific societies. Today there are many public organizations competent in the implementation of language policy in France, among which the following should be noted: *Association francophone d'amitié et de liaison* (Francophone Friendship and Cooperation Association), *Avenir de la langue française* (Future of the French language), *Défense de la Langue française* (Protection of the French language), etc. The main purpose of these organizations is to preserve and develop the French language, which is common to fifty French-speaking countries, no matter in what relations these countries are with France.

The above-mentioned organizations defend the right to work in French, consume goods and services in French, choose foreign languages for study at school, communicate in French with institutions and organizations of the European Union (in compliance with the 1958 decree guaranteeing the equality of all the official languages of the countries, Members of the European Union).

Questions of language policy, an obligatory part of the overall policy of the state, are quite acute and topical at the present stage, which determines the relevance of their linguistic analysis (Schweitzer, Nikolskiy, 1978; Grishaeva, 2007; Klovov, 2009; Marusenko, 2011, etc.).

The importance of accounting for language policy is an indicator of the viability and effectiveness of the state, while non-observance of linguistic policy can lead to a violation of the integrity of the state and ethnic tragedies. The dynamics of modern society, new trends in politics, economics, cultural life of the country, peoples are reflected in the language and, of course, require their own linguistic interpretation.

A careful examination of the history of French language policy shows the constant interest of the French in preserving and developing the language and resisting the influence from the outside (Kuralesina, 2011; Gulinov, 2015). In this regard, it should be noted that the language policy in France, focused on the preservation of national identity, is consistent and systematic.

One of the priorities of the French language policy is the enrichment and renewal of the national language, which manifests, in particular, in replacing borrowed words of English origin with the original words. Attention is drawn to the fact that a set of measures to deliberately influence the language that forms the basis of linguistic policy is not only a consequence of the state relation to the functioning and development of the language, but also the reaction of the society that requires the state to be correct in this or that matter (Minyar-Beloruhev & Pokrovskaya, 2007). In other words, the state becomes an object of influence, and is forced to obey the public moods.

To implement the language policy in France, a number of institutions have been set up, whose activities are aimed at developing prescriptions on the use of the French language.

The main prescriptions of the language policy are laws and regulations on language, language reforms, as well as any decisions taken by the state or any other social body that has the right to do so, aimed at regulating the use of language units or the use of the language as a whole.

The prescriptions can be classified based on the following criteria: the nature of the impact, scope of distribution, intended addressee.

Depending on the nature of the effect, prescriptions can be divided into obligatory and optional. In the first case, these are the prescriptions that are followed strictly; in the second case, they are recommendatory in nature.

An example of obligatory prescriptions is the Bas-Lauriol law (loi Bas-Lauriol), which prohibits the use of foreign terms if there are equivalent original words. The illustration of prescriptive prescriptions is the replacement of the English borrowing *e-mail* (e-mail) by the French word *mel*, obtained by combining the first letters of the phrase *messagerie électronique*. Another lexeme designating e-mail (*courriel* – from *courrier électronique*), appeared in the French-speaking province of Canada Quebec. In French, this term began to be introduced actively only in 2003 after its publication in the Official Gazette of the Republic. The use of the words *mel* and *courriel* is advisory in nature, it is for this reason that in everyday communication in France any words referring to e-mail can be found: *e-mail*, *mel*, *courriel*.

Depending on the scope of distribution, centralized and local prescriptions are distinguished. The centralized character is seen in the prescriptions that provide for a system of compulsory measures. For example, in 2009, the Ministry of Culture and Public Affairs of France prepared a report containing the measures taken by various organizations and institutions to protect the French language. Such prescriptions were necessary to control the use of the language in such spheres of public life as food, industrial production, leisure and sports.

As for local prescriptions, they include, first, any initiatives of local authorities (in the form of laws, decrees, and other documents) that do not have statutory force outside the region. An example of this type of prescriptions is the activity of local authorities in preserving the identity of the languages of the French regions.

This not only speaks in favor of preserving regional languages, but also witnesses the prospects for their development, the transfer of their original character from generation to generation by introducing them as a subject into primary schools. This is largely due to prescriptions of a local character in the revival of regional languages.

Depending on the intended recipient, there are prescriptions targeting an institutionally prepared audience, and prescriptions addressed to the public. The users of language policy that receive instructions on the use of the language within ministries and departments can be referred to as institutionally prepared audience.

The algorithm for developing this type of prescriptions is as follows: terminological neoplasms are born in the inmost recesses of the specialized commissions on terminology and neology under ministries and departments, and then the General Commission of Terminology and Neology discusses them. Finally, neologisms are transferred to the approval of the French Academy, after which new units of the language are published in the Official Gazette of the French Republic and become mandatory for use by public services.

Here is an example of prescriptions addressed to a given type of addressee. The General Commission of Terminology and Neology posted on one of its websites about 6,000 new lexicon units, which still have to undergo the approval procedure of the French Academy. Neologisms are classified according to the thematic principle and correspond with the following fields of science and technology: *Arts* (the Arts), *Astronomie* (Astronomy), *Automobile* (Automobiles), *Biologie* (Biology), *Défense* (Defense), *Environnement* (Environment), *Santé et médecine* (Health and medicine), *Transports* (Transport), etc.

For example, the thematic area *Santé et médecine* contains 74 lexical units, among which the following new ones appear: *absorbeur*, *aidant*, *axénique*, *bacterial bandage*, *bandage de contention*, *biothèque* (Biobank), *claquade* (slapping as a kind of massage), *éveinage* (removal of varicose veins), *lissage* (flattening), *plateau technique* (technical platform), *urgentiste* (ambulance doctor), etc.

The above inventory of lexemes is intended for use by medical workers, and, therefore, is addressed to institutionally employed persons.

The opposite type of prescriptions is aimed at the public. Thus, the main administration of the French language through the website wikilf.culture.fr appeals to the citizens of France to take part in activities aimed at protecting the French language from foreign influence. For example, the above website offers for discussion the following terms of English origin: *edit* (editorial), *blogueur* (blogger), *wiki* (technology of user interaction with the website, designed for collective development, structuring and storage of information), *photowalk* (photowalk), *freak* (freak), *dress code* (recommended clothing style), *flirt* (flirt), *Living lab* (“live” laboratory), *facebook* (facebook), etc.

The discussion of words is held in the section *de quoi s'agit-il* (what is it about?), in which the etymological meaning of the word is revealed. It is followed by the section *des pistes pour se renseigner* (for reference), containing links to texts in which the word occurs. Finally, in the key rubric *proposition* (suggestion) the term considered as a potential substitute for a borrowing is given. So, as a replacement for the English borrowing *self-discount*, the word of the French origin *libre-frac* appears, which fully reflects the principle of the functioning of special self-service departments in hypermarkets (*libre* = self-service + *frac* = goods without packaging, per weight).

Thus, having analyzed the activity of the institutions of language policy aimed at developing prescriptions on the proper use of language, the existence of a vertical of the French language policy should be recognized.

4. DISCUSSIONS

Some scholars identify the language policy with “practical measures of the state relating to the status of the

state language, its functions, protection of the monopoly use of the state language in the most important social spheres, regulation of the use of local languages” (Belikov, Krysin, 2001, p. 263). In this case, “the main tool of language policy should be laws on the language that can be created only on the basis of comprehensive knowledge of its functional properties, the degree of development of certain systems in it, a more or less detailed idea of the possibilities of language in the various social and situational conditions of its application” (Ibid., p. 264).

The above definition of language policy refers to any form of decision taken by the state for orientation and regulation in the field of the use of one or several languages. The dominant position here is given to the state language and its status.

However, another point of view exists. French linguist L.-J. Rousseau considers language policy as “any decisions taken by the state or any other social body entitled to this, aimed at using one or more languages in a given territory, real or virtual, and regulating its use or their use” (Rousseau, 2007, p. 97).

In this definition, language policy is considered from two positions – general and private. From the position of the general understanding, it correlates with any decisions of the state (social institution, organization) on the use of a language in a given territory. From the position of the private understanding, language policy is related to the competence of the state or other social body to make any decisions on the regulation of the language use in a given territory.

In the definition by the well-known linguist A.D. Schweitzer language policy appears as “a set of measures taken by the state, party, class, social grouping to change or preserve the existing functional distribution of languages or linguistic subsystems, introduce new or maintain existing linguistic norms” (Schweitzer, Nikolskiy, 1978, p. 117).

The key words in this definition of language policy are “change” and “preservation”. In the opinion of A.D. Schweitzer, language policy is aimed not only at preserving the existing state of a particular language, but also at changing it, in demand by time and society: the revival of national traits, creation of new vocabulary. This definition of language policy is on tune with the terms “language construction” and “language planning” widely used in sociolinguistic literature.

S.N. Kuznetsov defines language policy as a system of measures implemented by the state, the union of states, influential social institutions and cultural figures for preserving or changing the language, language group, linguistic or communicative situation (Kuznetsov, 2001, p. 40).

According to N.B. Vakhtin and E.V. Golovko, the language policy of the state is part of the overall policy of the state. The state adopts basic principles of the policy regarding the languages that are circulated on its territory and implements this policy in the form of language planning (Vakhtin, Golovko, 2004, p. 163).

Let us consider a point of view on the content of the concept of language policy that belongs to V.A. Avrorin. In his opinion, “the language policy of a certain social class, party, state is a system of measures of deliberate regulatory influence on the functional side of language, and through its medium, to a certain extent, also on its structure” (Avrorin, 1975, p. 10). V.A. Avrorin emphasizes the organized and focused nature of language policy, the object of which is not the language and its structure, but the functional side of the language.

The opinion of A.D. Schweitzer is in tune with the above view: “in most cases the language system or the language subsystem is undergoing changes not under the direct influence of the society, but indirectly, due to the expansion or narrowing of private communicative functions” (Schweitzer, Nikolskiy, 1978, p. 117).

The definition of the “language policy” concept, proposed by V.T. Klokov, can be summarized in the following statement: “Language policy is a deliberate and purposeful influence on the functional and structural fields of the language by official and unofficial persons, public organizations, parties, governments, classes, etc.”

(Klokov, 1992, p. 9). In the definition, V.T. Klokov draws attention to the fact that the language can be influenced by both people in an appropriate position, and ordinary citizens participating in the processes of language regulation.

Another understanding of language policy is found in (Mechkovskaya, 1996): “Language policy is all kinds of deliberate activity of the society aimed at regulating the use of the language” (Mechkovskaya, 1996, p. 199).

Summarizing the various interpretations of one of the key concepts of sociolinguistics, we will show the basic coordinates by which the multifaceted phenomenon is specified:

1. Language policy is a set of measures taken by the state, any other body in an appropriate position, public and private figures to influence the language deliberately.

2. Language policy is a deliberate and purposeful influence with the aim of preserving or changing the existing state of the language.

3. Measures developed in the framework of language policy are aimed at the functional side of the language, but through its medium and its own structure.

It can be claimed that the vertical of the French language policy has several levels. The first level is represented by the first persons of the state (the president, ministers), public figures, and officials capable of influencing the current language situation in the country, initiating language laws and regulations that determine the state policy in the field of language as a whole. At the second level, there are institutions of language policy – state and public structures, whose activities are aimed at preserving the identity of the language, as well as regulating the processes of language development. At the third level, there are consumers of language reforms developed by state institutions.

Let us consider each of the levels separately.

The history of France contains numerous evidences of well known politicians becoming initiators and developers of state orders in the field of language. To this day, famous politicians take a direct part in the implementation of the policy in the field of language, it is for this reason that the language issue often becomes part of the electoral program of presidential candidates. As an example, pre-election programs of French presidential candidates in 2012 and 2017 (Francois Hollande, Marin Le Pen, Nicolas Sarkozy, Emmanuel Macron, etc.) can be mentioned, which referred to the issues of the language life of the French society.

As noted above, at the second level of the vertical of language policy in France are the institutions of language policy. State bodies whose activities are aimed at preserving and developing the language are referred to the institutions of language policy. It is due to the activities of the above commission in the French language that a lot of neologisms of aboriginal origin appeared. For example, the computer sphere has been updated with such original terms as *administrateur système* (system administrator), *adresse électronique* (e-mail address), *aide* (aid), *bande passante* (passing band), *carte mère* (motherboard), *corbeille* (basket), *courriel* (E-mail), *espioniciel* (spyware), *gratuciel* (free program), *fichier* (file), *logiciel* (software), *mémoire vive* (RAM), *mise à jour* (update), *ordinateur* (computer), *pare-feu* (Fire partition), etc.

Finally, the third level of the vertical of the French language policy is represented by ordinary people. At the same time, they act not only as passive consumers of language reforms, but also as active participants in solving the problems of the language life of the society.

5. Conclusions

Therefore, as a result of the conducted research it has been established that language policy is a set of measures taken by the state, any other body in an appropriate position, public and private people to deliberately influence the language. The language policy supposes deliberate and purposeful influence with the aim of

preserving or changing the existing linguistic situation. It has been proved that measures developed in the framework of language policy are aimed at the functional side of the language, but through its medium and the structure of the language itself.

The main stages of language policy in France have been revealed: 1) setting of goals and objectives of language policy; 2) preparation for the implementation of the task, that is, preparation for the introduction of the chosen optimal linguistic variant, its legalization; 3) language planning at the state and non-governmental levels; 4) language setting, which refers to the decisions of the authorities on preserving, expanding or restricting the use of a particular language; 5) implementation of international obligations, as well as the norms of domestic legislation in practice; 6) language construction as adoption of the innovations recommended by the bodies pursuing the language policy.

Kinds of the language policy in France have been defined: retrospective, promising, constructive, destructive, centralized and non-centralized language policies.

It has been established that to implement the language policy in France, a number of institutions had been set up, whose activities are aimed at developing prescriptions on the use of the French language. The main criteria of classification of prescriptions have been revealed: depending on the nature of the impact, scope of distribution, intended addressee. It has been proved that the main prescriptions of the language policy in France are laws and regulations on language, language reforms, as well as any decisions taken by the state or any other social body that has the right to do so, aimed at regulating the use of language units or the use of the language as a whole.

Thus, having analyzed the activity of the institutions of language policy aimed at developing prescriptions on the proper use of language, the existence of a three-level vertical of the French language policy should be posited: 1) the first persons of the state (the president, ministers), public figures, officials capable of influencing the current language situation in the country, initiating language laws and regulations that determine the state policy in the field of language as a whole; 2) the institutions of language policy – state and public structures, whose activities are aimed at preserving the identity of the language, as well as regulating the processes of the language development; 3) consumers of language reforms developed by state institutions.

Implications and recommendations for future studies are as follows. For achievement of efficiency of the language policy in France, it is necessary to investigate methods and means of forcing or persuading the speakers to accept all language innovations.

Based on the findings of this study, it is possible to analyze and compare the contents and means of language policy in different linguocultures. It should be noted that the future study could form integrated communicative algorithm for realizing language policy of the state. It is recommended that linguistic and cultural development of the research should include complex methods, which would be integrated into research process and should be discussed by experts in the fields of linguistics, sociology, psychology, politics, business, etc. The next step in the development of this research will be development of an algorithm of implementation of a linguoculturally specific language policy of the state.

References

1. Avrorin, V.A. (1975). *Problemy izucheniya funktsionalnoy storony yazyka: K voprosu o predmete sotsiolingvistiki* [Problems of Studying the Functional Aspect of the Language: Revisiting the Subject of Sociolinguistics]. Leningrad: Nauka. (In Russian).
2. Belikov, V.I., & Krysin, L.P. (2001). *Sotsiolingvistika* [Sociolinguistics]. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University. (In Russian).

3. Chervyakova, L.D. (2007). 'Sootnoshenie printsipov regulirovaniya rechevogo obshcheniya i rechevogo etiketa v delovoy kommunikatsii' [Correlation of the Principles of Regulation of Speech Communication and Speech Etiquette in Business Communication]. *Vestnik RUDN. Questions of Education Series: Languages and Profession*, 3: 11–18. (In Russian).

4. Chervyakova, L.D. (2012). 'Vliyanie dostizheniy etnopsikhologii na etnokulturnuyu spetsifiku formirovaniya mezhekulturnogo delovogo obshcheniya' [Influence of Achievements of Ethnopsychology on Ethnocultural Specifics of Cross-Cultural Business Communication Formation]. S.I. Kudinov, Ye.N. Reznikov, Z.V. Boyko, I.A. Novikova, Yu.A. Chudina (eds.), *Aktualnye problemy etnicheskoy, sotsialnoy i differentsialnoy psikhologii: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii molodykh uchenykh, studentov i aspirantov. Moskva, RUDN, 6–7 dekabrya 2012 g.* [Current Issues in Ethnic, Social and Differential Psychology: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference of Young Scientists, Students and PhD Students. Moscow, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, 6–7 December 2012]. Moscow: Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, 209–216. (In Russian).

5. Grishaeva, E.B. (2007). *Tipologiya yazykovykh politik i yazykovogo planirovaniya v polietnicheskom i multikulturnom prostranstve: funktsionalnyy aspekt* [Typology of Language Policies and Language Planning in a Multi-Ethnic and Multicultural Space (Functional Aspect)]. Author's Abstract of a PhD Thesis. Krasnoyarsk: Krasnoyarsk State University. (In Russian).

6. Gulinov, D.Yu. (2012). 'Vertikal yazykovoy politiki Frantsii' [Vertical of Language Policy of France]. *Vestnik Kostromskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 18(3): 53–56. (In Russian).

7. Gulinov, D.Yu. (2015). *Diskursivnye kharakteristiki yazykovoy politiki sovremennoy Frantsii* [Discursive characteristics of the language policy of modern France]. PhD Thesis. Volgograd: Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University. (In Russian).

8. Katermina, V.V. (2015). 'Emotsii v khudozhestvennom tekste' [Emotions in the Art Text]. *Inostrannye yazyki: ligvisticheskie i metodicheskie aspekty*, 32, 134–139. (In Russian).

9. Klovov, V.T. (2009). 'Sovremennyy vzglyad na razvitie frantsuzskoy yazykovoy politiki' [Modern View on the Development of French Language Policy]. *Izvestiya Saratovskogo universiteta. New Series. Series: Philology. Journalism*, 9(3): 3–10. (In Russian).

10. Kuralesina, E.N. (2011). *Evolutsiya yazykovykh politik Frantsii i Kanady v sravnitelno-istoricheskom aspekte* [Evolution of the Language Policies of France and Canada Viewed in Comparative and Historical Perspective]. PhD Thesis. St Petersburg: St Petersburg State University. (In Russian).

11. Kuznetsov, S.N. (2001). 'Modeli yazykovoy politiki v russkoyazychnom obshchestve' [Models of Language Policy in the Russian-Speaking Society]. In: M.L. Remneva, A.A. Polikarpov (eds.), *Russkiy yazyk: istoricheskie sudby i sovremennost. Mezhdunar. kongress: Trudy i materialy* [Russian Language: Historical Destinies and the Present: Intern. Congress: Proceedings and Materials]. Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 308–309. (In Russian).

12. Leclerc, J. *L'aménagement linguistique dans le monde* (Electronic resource). URL: <http://www.tlfq.ulaval.ca/AXL>

13. *Lois linguistiques*. (Electronic resource). URL: <http://www.axl.cefan.ulaval.ca/Langues/LOIS-LINGUISTIQUES-index.htm>

14. Marusenko, M.A. (2011). *Yazykovaya politika Frantsii* [Language Policy of France]. St Petersburg: St Petersburg State University Press. (In Russian).

15. Mechkovskaya, N.B. (1996). *Sotsialnaya lingvistika* [Social Linguistics]. 2nd ed. Moscow: Aspekt-Press. (In Russian).

16. Minyar-Beloruhev, A.P., & Pokrovskaya, M.E. (2007). 'Politicheskaya korrektnost i yazykovaya norma' [Political Correctness and Language Norm]. *Vestnik Yuzhno-Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, Series: Linguistics, 1(73): 27–31. (In Russian).

17. Politique linguistique de la France. (Electronic resource). URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politique_linguistique_de_la_France

18. Ponto, M. (2007). 'Yazykovye politiki v multikulturnom prostranstve. Yazykovaya adaptatsiya immigrantov. Sluchay Kanady' [Language Policies in Multicultural Space. Language Adaptation of Immigrants. The Case of Canada]. In: *Yazykovaya politika v sovremennom mire: po materialam Tretego i Chetvertogo mezhdunar. seminarov po gos. yazykovoy politike i aktual. problemam dvuyazychiya* (Parizh, 2005; SPb., 2005–2006) [Language Policy in the Modern World: Proceedings of the 3rd and 4th International Sessions on the State Language Policy and Current Issues of Bilingualism (Paris, 2005; St Petersburg, 2005–2006)]. St Petersburg: Zlatoust, 143–145. (In Russian).

19. Popescu, I.V. (2003). *Teoreticheskie osnovy yazykovoy politiki* [Theoretical Foundations of Language Policy]. (Electronic resource). URL: <http://www.russian.kiev.ua/archives/2003/0310/031029ep01.shtml> (In Russian).

20. Rousseau, L.-J. (2007). 'Razrabotka i provedenie v zhizn yazykovoy politiki' [Development and Implementation of Language Policy]. In: *Yazykovaya politika v sovremennom mire: po materialam Tretego i Chetvertogo mezhdunar. seminarov po gos. yazykovoy politike i aktual. problemam dvuyazychiya* (Parizh, 2005; SPb., 2005–2006) [Language Policy in the Modern World: Proceedings of the 3rd and 4th International Sessions on the State Language Policy and Current Issues of Bilingualism (Paris, 2005; St Petersburg, 2005–2006)]. St Petersburg: Zlatoust, 97–121. (In Russian).

21. Schweitzer, A.D, & Nikolskiy, L.B. (1978). *Vvedenie v sotsiolingvistiku* [Introduction to Sociolinguistics]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. (In Russian).

22. Shestak, L.A. (2013). 'Prikladnye modeli yazyka: kognitivnaya i didakticheskaya modeli' [Applied Models of Language: Cognitive and Didactic Models]. In: S. Masalova V. Solovyev (eds.), *Kognitivnoe modelirovanie* : Trudy Pervogo Mezhdunarodnogo foruma po kognitivnomu modelirovaniyu (14–21 sentyabrya 2013 g., Italiya, Milano Marittima) [Cognitive Modeling: Collection of Papers of the First International Forum on Cognitive Modeling (14–21 September, 2013, Italy, Milano-Marittima)]. In 2 parts.. Part 2. Rostov-on-Don: Southern Federal University Press, 374–377. (In Russian).

23. Shestak, L.A. (2016). 'Kartina mira v narodnom slove' [Worldview in a People's Word]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* , 9–10(113): 143–146. (In Russian).

24. Vakhtin, N.B., & Golovko, E.V. (2004). *Sotsiolingvistika i sotsiologiya yazyka* [Sociolinguistics and Sociology of Language]. St Petersburg: Gumanitnaya Akademiya. (In Russian).

25. Yartseva, V.N. (ed.). (1990). *Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya. (In Russian).

26. Zheltukhina, M.R., Biryukova, E.V., Gerasimova, S.A., Repina, E.A., Klyoster, A.M., & Komleva, L.A. (2017a). 'Modern Media Advertising: Effective Directions of Influence in Business and Political Communication'. *Man in India*, 97(14): 207–215.

27. Zheltukhina, M.R., Mouzykant, V.L., Barabash, V.V., Ponomarenko, E.B., Morozova, E.V., & Mori, S. (2017b). 'Russian and Japanese Younger Generations in Search for a New Media Product'. *Man In India*, 97(3): 223–236.

28. Zheltukhina, M.R., Slyshkin, G.G., Muzykant, V.L., Ponomarenko, E.B., & Masalimova, A.R. (2017c). 'Functional Characteristics of the English and Russian Media Texts about the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympic

Games: Political and Linguistic Aspects'. *XLinguae Journal*, 10(3): 83–100.

29. Zheltukhina, M.R., Vikulova, L.G., Kovaleva, N.A., Ryanskaya, E.M., & Fomina, Zh.V. (2017d). 'Symbolic Nature of Culture: Features of the English Floristic Symbolics in Modern Economic and Political Media Texts'. *Man in India*, 97(14): 61–71.

30. Zheltukhina, M.R., Vikulova, L.G., Mikhaylova, S.V., Borbotko, L.A. & Masalimova, A.R. (2017e). 'Communicative Theatre Space in the Linguistic and Pragmatic Paradigm'. *XLinguae Journal*, 10(2): 85–100.

31. Zheltukhina, M.R., Zinkovskaya, A.V., Katermina, V.V., & Shershneva, N.B. (2016). 'Dialogue as a Constituent Resource for Dramatic Discourse: Language, Person and Culture'. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(15): 7408–7420.

32. Zyubina, I.A., Matveeva, G.G., Zheltukhina, M.R., Slyshkin, G.G., & Shevchenko, A.V. (2017). 'Forensic Prosecutor's Speech as a Speech Genre'. *XLinguae Journal*, 10(3): 312–323.