5. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского язика : учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / И.В. Арнольд. – 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. / И.В. Арнольд. – На англ. яз. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986. – 295 с.

Резюме

Стаття присвячена проблемам формування термінології. Зокрема автор статті розглядає загальні методи творення термінів та зосереджує свою увагу на дослідженні методів формування лінгвістичних термінів та їх походження в англійській та українській мовах, користуючись статистичним методом визначає кількісні характеристики лінгвістичної термінології обох мов.

ENGLISH AS LINGUA FRANCA IN CONTRAST TO HEBREW AND ARABIC LANGUAGE INFLUENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE NEGOTIATION PROCESS

Ivana Pastiriková
University of P. J. Šafárik, Košice, Slovakia

Abstract. English language as an officially chosen and accepted language for communication and negotiation at international assemblies with a status of Lingua Franca implies to bring also an English (western) process of decision-making in peace talks in American-Israeli-Arabic relations reflected in the Middle East conflict resolution. Therefore, it calls for a comparison of a mechanism necessarily involved into the process. Limits of English with its representations and consequent interpretations are investigated throughout an article. A review is considerably based on a study of the Middle East Negotiation Lexicon and a comparative study of English, Hebrew and Arabic language by Raymond Cohen, a professor of negotiation studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

English as Lingua Franca. English language has been appointed as an international language for diplomacy and decision-making at political, diplomatical negotiating sessions in the Middle East (ME). „One of the reasons why English is so readily adopted as a second language is because it continues to enjoy high status. It is associated with many positive values, such as objectivity, professionalism, trendiness, authority, and globalisation (Crystal, 2003). Another explanation for English language supremacy is that „English is regarded as a neutral, flexible, direct, and emotionless language, and has gradually become the language of international [communication]" (Radbout Repository,

Face and Identity Management in Negotiation, 2002). With material objects like is a table, interpretations in other languages are not as crucial as abstract notions of „peace," „conflict," „reconciliation," „justice," „safety," „aspiration" etc. In addition, „words and their translations are not just interchangeable labels denoting some given, immutable feature of the world but keys opening the door onto different configurations of the world" (Cohen, 2001b). To find a common ground for a relevant diplomatical comprehension in the ME, references to a historical origin of significant words, codes and phrases are necessary. Studies done in a field of peace negotiation process in the past mostly leant on a culture matter. Nowadays, an orientation in the ME peace negotiation process is led to an analysis and understanding the mechanism of lingua franca users who are influenced by their own lingual, mental competencies and historical approach to the interpretations. Based on a premise that „language and culture are inseparable; language reflects culture and culture is reproduced by language" (Cohen, 2001a), a generally held idea of English language supremacy is; thus, questioned, especially with reference to Hebrew and Arabic additions. The reason for importance of lingua franca language versus culture lies in the implication that language espresses evidently different nuances of the same objects in dependence on a particular way of thinking.

To reflect a division according to which an analysis is done in regard to a historical impact on three languages, Cohen´s model of terminology of conflict resolution has been adopted (Cohen, 2001a). As far as English concerns it is: a) industrial relations, b) engineering c) Christian terminology and d) sports and games. The Arabic aspiration reflects: a) honor b) Islamic ethics. For Hebrew orientation it is: a) legal terminology, b) military terminology (Cohen, 2001a). Concerning Arabic language I would also include the Quaran tradition and Islamic religious terminology and referring to Hebrew language, the Biblical heritage of the Torah and prophets with Judaistic religious terminology will be contained.

„When negotiation takes place across languages and cultures the scope for misunderstanding increases. So much of negotiation involves arguments about words and concepts that it can not be assumed that language is secondary and all that "really" counts is the "objective" issues at stake. Can one ever speak of purely objective issues? When those issues include emotive, intangible concepts such as "honor", "standing", "national identity", "security", and "justice" can we really take it for granted that the parties understand each other perfectly? And if not, what can be done to overcome language barriers?" (Cohen, 2001b). The language users of lingua franca have a tendency to cover things by word codes and make them appear lighter. It serves to avoid real or terror striking words as codes but also its potential meanings, which in an English interpretation can be counted as definite or stative. In a conflict issue, the articulation that „language is also a window how people organize both their understanding and expression of conflict, often in keeping with cultural patterns and ways of operating" (Lederach, 1996 In: Cohen, 2001a) simply denotes to an importance of tracing a root. It is a language as a general system of codes used for encoding and decoding expressions dealing with diplomatic schemes and resulting in adequate final comprehension. English as

the political and diplomatical directive with its own code system in the ME region is used to meet that expectations. For example, the phrase „fighter for freedom" is not an exact ME equivalent to English „suicide bombers."

Language and peace negotiation process in the Middle East. Negotiation as stated by the professor Raymond Cohen, classifies „negotiation [as] an exercise in language and communication, an attempt to create shared understanding where previously there have been contested understandings" (Cohen, 2001a). Moreover, Kamel S. Abu Jaber, a president of Jordan Institute for Middle Eastern Studies, an Arabic counterpart to Israeli Cohen lyricizes that „diplomatic language is the child of the language of communication. Its formalisation into special patterns, with a chosen cadence and sometimes repetitive pattern is, and has been designed to oil the joints of relationship between people and nations." (Jaber, 2001). Both sides refer to setting an environment pragmatically comprehensible for all parties involved. Language becomes a tool and a directive.

The semantic interpretations of very basic concepts of negotiation terminology (*conflict, peace, compromise*) in English, Hebrew and Arabic language will serve as the theoretical ground for a further analysis. An English version operates and differentiates two words – *dispute* and *conflict*. A *dispute* can be a basis for a „conflict" but it does not have to necessarily mean the conflict itself. *Conflict* is viewed differently in Hebrew. Since in a Hebrew notion it names major and minor situations from disruption to hostility „the word has less fateful connotations than „conflict" (Cohen, 2001a). A Hebrew equivalent *sichsuch* is a part of the natural order of things, but there is the implication that the same methods of reasoned persuasion used for tackling a minor quarrel are equally appropriate for settling a major case of strife *(ibid).* An Arabic counterpart of *niza* as well as the Hebrew word *sichsuch* covers both meanings of a minor dispute or a major conflict. Additionaly, the Arabic use of niza „as the term of choice for "conflict" indicates it to be treated as a soluble "dispute" through negotiations" (Alon, 2010). *Peace* in English understanding influenced mostly by the Christian terminology reflects a state of no war, fighting nor conflict (Longman dictionary of contemporary English, 2001). In other words, „a relationship established by treaty between states concluding war, an ideal prophetic vision of harmony and tranquility" (Cohen, 2001b). A Hebrew expression *shalom* has multiple meanings. Generally it refers to „wholeness and completeness, well being, wellfare, health, greetings, safety*" (ibid).* An Arabic *salam* also covers a semantic field of „peace, safety, security, health, wellbeing." On the contrary, Arabs distinguish between two subwords of *salam,* which are *salm* and *sulh. Salm* in political and international contexts denotes a formal state of contractual peace and formal peace between, usually, non-Arabic nations and governments, while *sulh* marks a situation of a true reconciliation between people following the conclusion of *salm (ibid). Compromise* is a situation for finding a mutual ground, a certain settlement when both sides are willing to lose something to gain a more comlex and an expected peace mode. *Pshara* in Hebrew is more identical to English compromise than Arabic phrases. The concept of making compromise is not welcomed in the Arabic world, since it implies a kind of submission, losing face and „if there is to

be a workable solution, neither party must be shamed" *(ibid)*. Socially this status indicates „win, win" conclusion to any niza. Instead, the Arabic situational applying to the negotiation process does not hint that direction.

Words as frames and mechanism of negotiation. People in the ME peace talks might speak, negotiate and communicate in English but they think in Hebrew and Arabic, their mother tongues. From a cognitive linguistic point of view these references are entitled as „mind frames" (e.g.: Lakoff, van Dijk). Some authors, like Cohen, uses a computerized term „programming" for creating mind maps, frames in an interpreting system: „It is the programming of the human system – the software – that translates potential to actuality. Here the diversity is enormous. Human cultural software is made up of ideas, meanings, conventions, and assumptions. It moulds our perceptions, it shapes our actions, defining the rules for interaction, meeting, parting, and bestowing hospitality, trading, begging, giving, and negotiating" (Cohen, 1993). Using English as lingua franca in the ME region with Hebrew and Arabic influences, communication in a social situation is more burdened for senders and recipients and their ability to appropriately code and decode a content. Bearing in the mind own frames of meanings, Szalay, whose model was used, points out that „the idea itself does not really travel, only the code; the words, the patterns of sound or print. The meaning that a person attaches to the words received will come from his own mind. His interpretation is determined by his own frame of reference, his ideas, interests, past experiences, etc. – just as much as the meaning of the original message is fundamentally determined by the sender´s mind, his frame of reference" (Szalay In: Cohen, 1997). In the crucial ME peace talks, it is not only semantic meanings of terms, but also its social understanding with historical and religious impacts. „For a message to be correctly understood there must be sufficient similarity, if not identity, between the intention of the sender and the meaning attributed by the receiver. Put another way, the content encoded by the sender must be consistent with the content decoded by the receiver. If the parties involved are able to draw upon similar semantic assumptions, if they both use the same sort of code to convey a certain meaning, then they will be able to communicate successfully with each other" (Cohen, 1997).

Conclusion. Using English as a lingua franca in the ME peace process with unsolvable results over more than four decades is a proof that the study needs to be taken into a deeper, linguistic analysis than to reducing it only to cultural interpretations of cultures (Israeli, Arabic) of the region. The honor cause, islamic ethics of dignity and standing with a face are thoroughly infiltrated into linguistic representations of the Arabic peace process reality. Israeli willingness for dispute, debate, polemic, discussion shows a positive attitude displayed by a rich and varied vocabulary of argumentation. The USA as a mediator with English linguistic realm of thinking and its dimension creates a mental and lingual frame for a systematic constructive communication in the ME peace process. However, its mental and social limits are required to be taken into serious consideration for productive results.

Bibliography

1. Alon, I. 2010. *A Linguistic Analysis of the 2002/2007 Arab Peace Initiative Documents.* The Joseph and Alma Gildenhorn Institute of Israel Studies, available at http://israelstudies.umd.edu/articles/linguistic-analysis-Alon.pdf, last visited April 2013
2. Cohen, R., In: Garcha A., (n.d.). *Diplomatic Culture or Cultural Diplomacy: The role For culture in international negotiation?,* available at http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/content/pdf/icd_diplomaticculture_of_cultural_ diplomacy.pdf, last visited April 2013
3. Cohen, R. 1997. *Negotiating Across Cultures: International Communication in An Interdependent World*, available at http://books. google.sk/books?id=nhTXHKk3EsC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_ summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false, last visited February 2013
4. Cohen, R. 2001a. *Language and Conflict Resolution: The Limits of English,* available at http://translating-cultures-networking-development.com/ img/upload/390/documents/language%20and%20conflict%20resolution_133 2353345550.pdf, last visited January 2013
5. Cohen, R. 2001b. *Language and Diplomacy. Language and Negotiation: A Middle East Lexicon.* Jerusalem, available at http://www-test.bc.edu/ content/dam/files/centers/boisi/pdf/f09/Language-and-Negotiation.pdf, last visited January 2013
6. Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a Global Language.* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Jaber, A. 2001. *Language and Diplomacy.* Malta: DiploProjects, available at http://www.ati.usacademy.org/Books/Language_and_Diplomacy.pdf, last visited April 2013
8. Lederach, J. P. In: Cohen, R. 2001a. *Language and Conflict Resolution: The Limits of English,* available at http://translating-cultures-networking-development.com/mg/upload/390/documents/language%20and% 20conflict%20 resolution_1332353345550.pdf, last visited January 2013
9. *Longman dictionary of contemporary English.* (2001). London: Pearson Education Limited.
10. *Radbout Repository. Face and Identity Management in Negotiation.* 2002, available at http://repository.ubn.kun.nl/bitstream/2066/19187/1/19187_ faceanidm.pdf, last visited March 2013
11. Szalay, R., In: Cohen, R., 1997, *Negotiating Across Cultures: International Communication in An Interdependent World*, available At http://books.google.sk/books?id=nhTXHKk3EsC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false, last visited February 2013