Referential Studies of the Fusion Between Linguistics and Ecology

Liu Lifen*

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Abstract: The fusion of linguistics and ecology leads to either ecolinguistics or linguistic ecology. The Haugenian approach and the Hallidayan approach are generally regarded by European, American and Chinese scholars as two paradigms of ecolinguistics research. In Russia, some scholars share the same view while most do not. To sum up, there are five different viewpoints regarding the disciplines formed by the fusion of linguistics and ecology. They are the identical view, the parallel view, the inclusive & identical view, the inclusive & parallel view, and the parallel & overlapping view. This paper studies these different viewpoints from the perspectives of the discipline's foundation, research paradigm, research objective, task, content and terminological system and concludes that the combination of ecology and linguistics can produce "linguistic ecology" and "ecolinguistics", or "ecology + linguistics".

Keywords: ecolinguistics, linguistic ecology, the Haugenian approach, the Hallidayan approach

Introduction

Ecolinguistics is an emerging interdisciplinary field of study with a short history. Since the concept of "language ecology" was put forward by Einar Haugen, the study has developed merely 48 years, and

a well-established discipline system has not formed. The study has been given multiple names that have been in use in parallel since its emergence and so far there is no coherent definition. In Europe, the US and China, scholars generally considered the Haugenian approach and the Hallidayan approach as two paradigms of ecolinguistics research, calling the Haugenian approach "language ecology or the ecology of language" and the Hallidayan approach "ecolinguistics". They considered the two terms to be equivalent or considered language ecology to be a subdiscipline of ecolinguistics. In Russia there are some scholars supporting this viewpoint, but most hold different opinions. Currently there are five concepts that describe the fusion of linguistics and ecology; language ecology, the ecology of language, linguistic ecology, ecolinguistics and ecological linguistics.

In any knowledge domain, every research field that gains the status of an independent discipline must be scientific and unitary. It is stipulated in the principles of terminology and relevant international standards that a term or a name corresponds to one and only one concept (Rondeau, 1985, p. 22). Non-uniform and non-standardized social sciences terminologies are not conducive to communication and contact between people, disciplines, natural sciences or social sciences. Thus, normalizing social sciences terminologies not only has communicative and academic significance, but sometimes political as well. Due to the inconsistency of terms and unclear concepts, misunderstandings often occur (Sha, 2008, pp. 5-6). If misuse of terms happens in a specific discipline, chaos in specific concepts will be inevitable and the in-depth study of the discipline and the successful exchange of academic knowledge will be hindered. Therefore, the integration of linguistics and ecology forms, whether ecolinguistics or linguistic ecology, or others, is worth discussing.

Scholars' Views

Synonymous terms have always been one of the most controversial issues in terminology. Scholars hold different views on the coexistence of terms. V. Danilenko held that at the beginning of the formation of the terminology system, many terms coexisted without natural or artificial selection. Therefore, during the formation of scientific language, a terminology system emerged by excluding synonymous phenomena. However Loktionova N.M and Ivan Fomin (2012) held the opinion that the five terms of ecolinguistics and others were functionally parallel. Obviously, the coexistence of these terms was unhelpful, but they could coexist peacefully as synonyms of linguistic ecology. The source of semantic equivalence (synonyms) studied by Dimitar Popov was cited by Loktionova and Fomin as evidence. First, the meta-dialects of different scientific schools and the personal language characteristics of some researchers; second, the change of terminology forms; third, names of the same task from different perspectives; fourth, choices of formal and oral terms, modern and obsolete terms, complete and short terms. Guy Rondeau (1985) argued that synonyms were forbidden

in terminology, and the purpose of standardization was precisely to eliminate them. We think that during the formation of each interdisciplinary study, there is inevitably a confusion of names. In addition to acting as a stage feature of the formation of new fields, it also has modern characteristics. With the deepening and improvement of discipline research, the differences among terms will gradually become prominent. Similarly, different scholars have different interpretations on the subject names formed by the combination of linguistics and ecology.

Views of European and American Scholars

The study of linguistics and ecology can focus on either subject or both of them. The research focusing on one subject is called the single view, and the research focusing on both the balanced view.

The single view.

Scholars holding the single view take one subject as the starting point and study the other. Einar Haugen and Michael A. K. Halliday are key representatives.

In 1970, Haugen first proposed "the ecology of language" and defined it as "the study of the interactions between any given language and its environment", in which "environment" referred to the society in which the language is used (Haugen, 1972, p. 325). Haugen's "the ecology of language" focuses on studying language-related issues through ecology. In the *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (1981), co-authored by R.R.K. Hartmann and F.C. Stork, linguistic ecology is defined as "the research of interactions between language and environment in the fields of ethnolinguistics, anthropological linguistics and sociolinguistics" (Zhang & Feng, 2010, p. 125). Trampe (Ivanov, 2007, p. 34) first attempted to formalize the concept of the ecology of language, emphasizing the direct relationships between language ecology and biological ecology. He stressed that the ecology of language was a science based on the interactions of ecosystems in the form of language communication, which was the same as Haugen's. The term "ecolinguistics" first appeared in the work published in 1979 of psychologist Kurt Salzinger, who incorporated the surrounding environment of language use. The term appeared for the second time in French linguist Claude Hagège's book *L'Homme de paroles* published in 1985. In his view, the future of this science was to study how domesticated "nature" integrated with language: the characteristics of the four directions, the landscape and the dwelling place and the cosmic phenomena (Azhezh, 2003, p. 233).

In 1990, British linguist Michael A. K. Halliday put forward some problems concerning interactions between languages and environments and some theoretical challenges linguists needed to address; how language structure and text units participated in the elaboration of environment-related issues and whether language made these issues clearer, more intelligible and more approachable (Kurashkina, 2015, p. 147). The term "environment" referred to the natural environment. Later, linguists interpreted Halliday's theory as "linguistics of environment", a study directly linked the movement of language with the natural ecology

and focused on the impact of language and even linguistics on the ecological environment. By R. Gabbard's (2000) definition of ecolinguistics, the goal of ecolinguistics was to explore the possible impact of language on the adjustment of ecosystems and its role in the process of ecological destruction or ecological coordination. This view was in line with Halliday's.

The balanced view.

Peter Mühlhäusler and Alwin Fill (2001, p. 48) considered "ecolinguistics" as a general term linking all fields of ecology and linguistics and divided it into three subdisciplines; "ecology of language" (studying the interactions between languages in order to protect linguistic diversity), "ecological linguistics" (using ecological methods and rules to study languages, such as ecosystem concepts) and "language ecology" (studying the relationships between language and ecological problems). The former two shared the same view with Haugen's, while the latter was similar to Halliday's point.

There are two views on the combination of linguistics and ecology among European and American scholars. Haugen's research could be regarded as "linguistic ecology" and Halliday's as "ecological linguistics". Fill and others took ecological linguistics as a collective term with three subdisciplines, which correspond to Haugen and Halliday's views respectively.

Views of Chinese Scholars

Chinese scholars, based on the research of their European and American counterparts, either carry on or further expound their counterparts' points of view. They have developed three views: identical, single and parallel.

The identical view.

Most scholars in China refer to the combination of linguistics and ecology as "ecolinguistics" or "linguistic ecology", and consider them to be the same. It is an emerging and promising interdisciplinary research field (Zhang & Feng, 2010, p. 125). Ecolinguistics, also known as linguistic ecology, is a new subdiscipline of linguistics formed by the combination of ecology and linguistics, aiming at revealing the interactions between languages and environments by studying the ecological factors of language (Han, 2013, p. 107) and taking the "Haugenian" and "Hallidayan" approaches as its research models.

The single view.

Scholars holding the single view refer to the combination of linguistics and ecology as ecolinguistics and consider the "Haugenian approach" (the ecology of language) and the "Hallidayan approach" (the linguistics of ecology) as two parallel paradigms. For example, Fan Junjun (2005, p. 112) held that the study of ecolinguistics contained two research fields: one used the principles of ecology to investigate and study various environmental factors that might enhance or weaken language functions, examined the ecological environment for languages to survive and develop, and assessed the vitality and existence of various languages; the other made a micro-study of discourses and texts to analyze the non-ecological features of

language systems and uses and to study the influence and role of languages in the ecological environment. In his research, the former was called "the ecology of language" and the latter "environmental linguistics". Cai Yongliang (2012, p. 216) explained that the differences between the "Haugenian approach" and the "Hallidayan approach" were that Haugen focused on the impact of social environment on language, and the term "ecology" was a metaphor while Halliday paid more attention to the direct impact of language on ecology, and the term "ecology" took on its real meaning. According to Huang Guowen (2016, p. 11), there were metaphors and non-metaphors in ecolinguistics. The metaphorical paradigm was the "Haugenian approach" and the other belonged to the "Hallidayan approach".

The parallel view.

Disapproving the above divisions, some scholars divide the combination of linguistics and ecology into ecolinguistics and linguistic ecology which are interrelated yet different. For example, Chen Xi (2014, pp. 138-139) believed that the theories of Haugen and Halliday were two relatively independent disciplines, which were linguistic ecology and ecolinguistics, with different research objects and tasks. Linguistic ecology studied the impact of ecology (mainly social ecology) on language, while ecolinguistics studied the impact of language on ecology (mainly natural ecology).

Views of Russian Scholars

Following their European and American counterparts, most researchers in Russia initially used the terms "the ecology of language" and "language ecology" to describe the combination of language and ecology. At present, there are five expressions left in Russia, some of which were identical in Chinese. In order to distinguish them, the following translation methods were adopted in this paper: эколингвистика (ecolinguistics), экологическая лингвистика (ecological linguistics), лингвоэкология (linguistic ecology), лингвистическая (языковая) экология (language ecology), экология языка (языков) (the ecology of language). The definitions of subject nouns could be classified as identical, parallel, inclusive & identical, inclusive & parallel and parallel & overlapping.

The identical view.

Researchers who hold this view consider the five terms as synonyms (Moiseenko, 2007; Kravchenko, 2014; Kurashkina, 2015).

The parallel view.

When making distinctions between these terms, Russian scholars select several of them to make classification.

Distinction between "the ecology of language" and "language ecology". The two terms reflect the two different approaches to solving interdisciplinary problems. "The ecology of language" (in Haugen's terminology) applied ecological concepts, principles and methodological metaphors to linguistic research. "Language ecology" (in Halliday's terminology) studied

language and text from the perspective of the "ecology" of humans and societies, analyzing the role of language in describing problems, clarifying solutions, and solving problems beyond the scope of linguistics through linguistic methods (Ionova, 2011, p. 190).

Distinction between "the ecology of language" and "linguistic ecology". Most ecolinguists believed that "the ecology of language" was not equal to "linguistic ecology". The former mainly studied the language and speech environments in the process of language changes, especially "the problem of language degradation" (negative impact on language development and speech realization) and the process of "language and speech recovery" (Milovanova, Terenteva, 2013, p. 81). Unfortunately, the definition of the latter could not be found.

Distinction between "ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology". Korovushkin (2011, p. 62) held that "ecolinguistics" was a branch of "linguistics, whose starting point is linguistic facts— linguistic symbols," while "linguistic ecology" was a branch of ecology, whose starting point was the ecological facts that affected the function of linguistic symbols. But he merged the two terms in his definition. "Ecolinguistics" (linguistic ecology) could be summarized as an independent interdisciplinary research field, dealing with the existence of language in social environments and the existence of people and societies in language environments. Some scholars equated "linguistic ecology" with "language ecology" based on these criteria, while most scholars took issues with the concept itself. Kurashkina (2015, p. 143) pointed out that terms and concepts of the ecology of language and ecolinguistic classified by Korovushkin were not logical. Actually, they all belonged to "linguistic ecology".

Distinction between "linguistic ecology" and "the ecology of language". "Linguistic ecology" described language phenomena on the basis of ecological principles, that is, ecology and its basic terminology were the starting points, and of course, the use of linguistic terms was not excluded (Polikarpov, 2012, p. 292). "The ecology of language" studied the relationships between language and ecological problems, and the interactions between languages. This concept included "the ecology of language" and "language ecology" classified by Fill.

The inclusive & identical view.

Scholars holding this view define the combination of linguistics and ecology as "ecolinguistics", and the disciplines under its field as subdisciplines, considering them to be the same. A.P. Skovorodnikov (2014, p. 155) believed that "ecolinguistics" was the general term for all research directions combining ecology and linguistics. "Linguistic ecology" or "the ecology of language" was a field of ecolinguistics, constituting the comprehensive ecological direction of linguistics. He considered that linguistic ecology was identical to the ecology of language and that ecolinguistics was identical to linguistic ecology, holding that the latter two were an interdisciplinary research field under linguistics and interacted with a series of linguistic disciplines (sociolinguistics, national linguistics, national psychology, cultural linguistics, legal linguistics, language conflict) as well as with the history of specific nations, their cultures and languages. Ecolinguistics or linguistic ecology studied the linguistic conditions as a complex

symbolic system. The linguistic condition was subject to the quality of the environment under which the condition existed and functioned (Skovorodnikov, 2013, p. 207).

The inclusive & parallel view.

Semantically, a concept was regarded as a subordinate concept, on which several parallel subordinate concepts were separated. There were mainly the following categories.

First, Semchuk (2014, p. 1234) held that the term "the ecology of language" was an integrated discipline to study linguistic issues within the framework of ecology. And the term had two implications in the scientific literature: "linguistic ecology" and "ecolinguistics". Linguistic ecology was at the edge of linguistics, sociology and ecology. He mainly elaborated the definition and research task of linguistic ecology.

 Second, "ecolinguistics" could be divided into "the ecology of language" (metaphorically applying ecological concepts such as ecology, the environment and the ecosystem to language) and "language ecology" (studying language and text from the perspective of "ecology", studying the role of language and its ability to reflect environmental realities in order to highlight or solve these problems) (Pylaeva, 2014; Brusenskaya, Kulikova, 2016, p. 12). The two fields of study correspond to the Haugenian approach and the Hallidayan approach respectively.

Third, "ecolinguistics" could be divided into "ecological linguistics" (applying the terminology, principles and methods of ecology to language and linguistics), "the ecology of language" (using linguistic terms and methods to study the ecological problems reflected by language in describing environmental problems) and "biolinguistics" (a science of the interconnection of the material and spiritual foundations of the human body) (Poteryakhina, 2015). The former two correspond to the Haugenian approach and the Hallidayan approach respectively.

Fourth, "linguistic ecology" studied the change in language systems while focusing on observing (maintaining) the rules to enable the system to develop towards enriching or destroying the balance of interests of the speaker and the receiver. It was divided into "speech ecology" (the study of changes in usage) and "the ecology of language" (the study of changes in the balance of the system's composition) (Sirotinina, 2013, p. 201). G.A Kopnina (2014, p. 78) viewed them as branches of "ecolinguistics", with different objects, tasks and conceptual terminologies.

The parallel & overlapping view.

Belogolova Galina and Belozerova Olga (2012, pp. 43-45) considered "the ecology of language" and "ecolinguistics" to be different disciplines, and made a distinction between them from research paradigms, objects, tasks, materials, biospheres, symbolic circles, national circles, social circles, technological circles, humans, cultures, countries, values and aesthetics.

Russian scholars failed to distinguish the five terms no matter what classification they adopted. Instead, they only made distinctions between some of them and confusion or even contradictions can be found in their studies. From their definitions, we can roughly draw a conclusion that the scholars who used the terms "the ecology of language", "ecological

linguistics" and "linguistic ecology" brought their own research into the framework of linguistics, where language issues came first and ecology served as a means to solve these linguistic problems. In their views, the three terms could be regarded as equivalent. There were also studies about distinctions between "the ecology of language" and "linguistic ecology" (actually both from an ecological perspective) and between "ecological linguistics" (from an ecological point of view) and "the ecology of language" (from a linguistic point of view). Scholars who made studies in the terms "the ecology of language" and "ecological linguistics" brought their research into the framework of ecology, where ecological problems came first, and linguistics served as the means to solve ecological problems.

Above all, domestic and foreign scholars held the following four views towards the discipline that combines linguistics and ecology. First, the inclusive & parallel view. "Ecolinguistics" was a general term, including the "Haugenian approach (linguistic ecology)" and the "Hallidayan approach (ecolinguistics)." Second, the parallel view. "Ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology" were considered as two parallel independent disciplines. Third, the identical view. "Ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology" were considered as equivalent. Fourth, the parallel & overlapping view. "Ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology" were thought of as two different but overlapping disciplines. In addition to "the ecology of language (the Haugenian approach)" and "ecological linguistics (the Hallidayan approach)", some scholars also added a third branch into "ecolinguistics", the "biolinguistics".

Accuracy of Reference in the Integration of Linguistics and Ecology

Classification Motivation

The single meaning characteristic of terminology requires, in principle, that the signifier should exactly correspond to the signified. A term refers to one concept, vice versa. The relationship between signifier and signified, name and concept is single and reversible. According to the parallel and inclusive view accepted by most scholars at home and abroad, "ecolinguistics" is a collective term and includes "linguistic ecology". Such a nomenclature is not advisable as the superordinate concept and the subordinate concept are given the same name while they have different implications. In interdisciplinary concepts, a term should not have two or more meanings, and its meaning should be singular. A term with multiple meanings can not accurately reflect the corresponding concepts of the discipline or knowledge domain (Zhao, 1983, p. 63). The choice of terminology should follow the principles of accuracy, single meaning, systematicness, conciseness, rationality and stability (Feng, 1997, pp. 1-5). We can refer to the naming of "pear-apple" to decide what the discipline that combines linguistics and ecology should be called. "Pear-apple" is a new variety of apple produced by Michurin Ivan Vladimirovich by grafting apple wood to a pear tree. It takes an apple branch as scion

and a pear tree as rootstock, which bears apples that have some of the characteristics of pears. However, if you use a pear branch as scion and an apple tree as rootstock, the product is an "apple-pear", which is essentially a pear in apple's shape. Similarly, the combination of ecology and linguistics constitutes ecolinguistics if ecology is the scion and linguistics is the rootstock. If the roles are reversed, linguistic ecology is formed.

This can also be based on the directionality of contrasts in comparative linguistics. Generally, only two languages are involved in contrastive studies, with unidirectional and bidirectional functions. The unidirectional function is from language A to language B, or from language B to language A, and bidirectional is from the third party, which is the basis of common contrast, to language A and B respectively. For example, when we compare English with Chinese, if we are based on English, it is a comparison of English-Chinese, conversely, it is a comparison of Chinese-English; if we are based on both English and Chinese, English-Chinese / Chinese-English is contrasted. Accordingly, the combination of linguistics and ecology can lead to the following two forms: "linguistic ecology" and "ecolinguistics" or "linguistics + ecology". That is the dichotomy and the monism, which cannot coexist at the same time.

Monism

The study of the relationship between language and ecology can be understood from three aspects: the study of language in the context of ecology, the study of ecology by means of language, and the study of the relationship between language and ecology. The first two belong to ecolinguistics and linguistic ecology, and the third one should be "ecology + linguistics".

All problems concerning the relationship between language and ecology should be studied within the scope of a science. Based on the understanding of relational disciplines, the discipline composed of linguistics and ecology should be "linguistics + ecology", in which the positions of "linguistics" and "ecology" are interchangeable. If we construct the discipline system from the perspective of relational discipline based on the relationship between language and ecology, we may attempt to establish another discipline system formed by the combination of linguistics and ecology from three aspects (Huang & Jiao, 2011).

First, the corresponding relationship between language and ecology. There is an organic relationship between language and ecology. Language itself is a part of the ecology. Although it is not a living organism, it has the attributes of emergence, existence and development, which are associated with the environment (Liu, 2013, p. 127). The life of language depends on social environments, namely, the use of language in human societies. Language is not only one of the important factors for the formation of a human society, but also a necessary condition for its continuation and development. In this regard, language and the environment are interdependent.

Second, the impact of ecology on language. Language depends on the ecological environment, which influences its generation, use and development. Language exists only in

the minds of its users, and it only functions in relating these users to one another and to nature, i.e, their social and natural environment (Haugen, 1972, p. 325).

Third, the impact of language on ecology. Language is formed by the interactions of people living in a certain environment. More than a tool to understand the world, it is also a tool used to act on the social and natural environments, affecting others' thinking and emotions, and also the surrounding world, because language accompanies and controls the activities of the people in the communities and in the natural environment. Language structure determines people's mindsets and the ways they understand the outside world. It can change the ecological environment and even solve environmental problems. The diversity of ecology also can be embodied by various languages.

The Dichotomy

The combination of linguistics and ecology has brought into being two parallel disciplines: linguistic ecology and ecolinguistics. They share something in common as both deal with language and ecology yet differ greatly because they have a different focus. Next, we will distinguish them in terms of starting points, research paradigms, objects, targets, and tasks and terminology systems.

The starting point.

The establishment of any discipline is progressive and experiences a number of stages, from incubation to forming, storming and norming (Feng, 2010, p. 1). Linguistic ecology is now in the forming stage, and there are controversies over its name, as in the case of "sociology of language" / "sociolinguistics," "psychology of language" / "psycholinguistics" (although they have been separated to some extent, there are still different voices). Take "sociology of language" / "sociolinguistics" as an example. Their research scope relies on which comes first, language or society. Thus, the relationship between language and society can be studied in a reciprocal way, just as the pragmatic relationship between linguistic signs and humans in the context of semiotics is considered to be reversible. If linguistic facts—linguistic signs are adopted as the starting point, it is an approach of sociolinguistics. If social categories (social groups, social roles of communicators, purposes of communicators) are taken as the starting point of the study, the study turns to the linguistic phenomena peculiar to these social categories, then the sociology of language approach appears. In this way, sociolinguistics and sociology of language come into being. Sociolinguistics belongs to the research category of linguistics, because the linguistic system is the basis of the study, while sociology of language takes the social system as its starting point, regarding it as a social subject is reasonable. According to this method, the term "ecolinguistics" could be considered as a branch of linguistics that used linguistic facts—linguistic signs as its starting point; on the contrary, the term "linguistic ecology" should be treated as a branch of ecology, which took the ecological facts that affected the function of linguistic symbols as its starting point (Korovushkin, 2011,

p. 61). Therefore, the combination of linguistics and ecology constitutes two independent interdisciplinary fields, "linguistic ecology" and "ecolinguistics". The former is an ecological study related to language to explore the ecological aspects of language, while the latter is a linguistic study related to ecology to explore the linguistic aspects of ecology. No matter what the study focuses on, only the synergy of scholars with academic backgrounds in linguistics or ecology or in both fields can thoroughly understand the problem.

The research paradigm, object and target.

The establishment of a new discipline must have three basic elements: an independent and irreplaceable research target or field; a rigorous and logical theoretical system or knowledge system; and a production mode or methodology of scientific knowledge. The most important is the first element, which is the premise of the discipline. The paradigm of "linguistic ecology" is different from that of "ecolinguistics". The former is a prescriptive paradigm, which suggests the use of norms and promotes the maintenance of the current situation of a language (maintaining linguistic components at all levels); the latter is an explanatory paradigm, which adopts the functional approach of language and discourse phenomena. Within the framework of the functional approach, one language and multi-languages are taken as the life systems, closely related to other life systems, including social language groups, natural environments and rational thinking (Belozerova, Labunets, 2012, pp. 46-47). They study different objects. The former studies a single language, endangered language, dialect and stratum language; while the latter studies the natural environment of a natural language. The composition of this natural environment may be the whole and of a social language group or individual discourse activities. Therefore, language individuals, namely, social language groups and discourse performers in natural environments, are also the research objects of ecolinguistics (Belozerova, Labunets, 2012, p. 47, 51). They have different study targets. First, the former focuses on the relationship between language and the ecological environment, mainly the social ecological environment; the latter mainly attends to the natural ecological environment. Second, the former studies various ways of preserving languages, including the principles of constructing normative or prescriptive dictionaries and grammar; the latter studies the different functions of language and discourse in social and natural environments, and describes the principles of compiling dictionaries, corpuses and individual dictionaries (Belozerova, Labunets, 2012, p. 47-48).

The research task.

The fusion of linguistics and ecology brings into being a new interdisciplinary subject. As an emerging discipline, its research task is in the process of formation and determination. Its interdisciplinarity leads to the complexity of its research content and the breadth of its research field, and its interdisciplinarity also affects the starting points of scholars in different fields, thus making their research tasks different.

E. D. Bernatskaya (2014) believed that the supreme goal and super task of linguistic ecology was to preserve the identity of national languages on the basis of social and spiritual health and

national security. According to Haugen (1972, p. 337), the top priority of linguistic ecology is to identify the status of language, its status in a typology of ecological classification (where the language stands and where it is going in comparison with the other languages of the world). From the viewpoints of different scholars, we point out that linguistic ecology also focus on the following aspects. First, linguistic diversity (causes, forms, functions and consequences); second, endangered and weak languages; third, degradation of language and speech (factors affecting language development and its realization) and repair (systems for enriching language and improving morality and pragmatic rules of verbal communication); fourth, the change of language, rare languages replaced by widely used languages with obvious economic value; fifth, language vitality, language evolution and balance among languages; sixth, language planning, language policy, bilingual phenomena, language choice, language maintenance, etc.; seventh, the relationships between culture and biodiversity; eighth, searching for non-contradictory language theories (Fill, 2001, p. 51; Semchuk, 2014, p. 1234; Brusenskaya, Kulikova, 2016, p. 16).

The study of ecolinguistics deals with the following subjects. First, the influence of language on the change of natural ecological environments; second, the role of language in protecting natural environments and solving ecological environment problems; third, language systems and texts: analysis and criticism of non-ecological factors of language systems and texts related to environmental issues; fourth, the ideological system in discourse (anthropocentrism, growth doctrines, hierarchies, etc.); fifth, language manipulation strategies (especially in the field of ecological problems) and the role of language in various conflicts and language contacts; sixth, searching for the ecological and non-ecological components of language structure (grammar) and constructing ecological grammar and green grammar; seventh, making comparative studies with the linguistic commonalities related to ecological problems; eighth, the role of language in imparting ecological knowledge (all interrelated knowledge in the world), etc. (Fill, 2001, p. 43, 51; Sushchenko, 2011, p. 60; Pylaeva, 2011, p. 107; Kurashkina, 2015, p. 147; Chen, 2014; Xin & Huang, 2013; Han, 2013).

The Terminology system.

The leader of Russian linguistic ecology, Aleksandr Petrovich Skovorodnikov (2000, pp. 73-75), formulated linguistic ecology terminology, introducing terms from the field of ecology into linguistic ecology. Based on previous studies, Korovushkin (2011, pp. 63-64) constructed the concepts and terminology systems for linguistic ecology and ecolinguistics, respectively.

The concepts and terms for linguistic ecology based on the nature of social ecology and the terminology Skovorodnikov formulated. The most typical terms are: language / speech contaminants, language cynicism, language radiation, speech (text) polluted rate, language / speech deterioration (language deterioration), language syndrome, linguistic ecology dangerous area, red book or red brochure, linguistic toxicology, linguistic system buffer capacity, linguistic homeostasis, linguistic ecological or environmental areas, linguistic ecology law, linguistic eco-

crime, linguistic ecological code of conduct, linguistic ecology monitoring, linguistic ecology identification, etc.

Ecolinguistic concepts and terms based on the nature of social language. For example; a. individual combinations: social combinations (society, social language groups, groups, communities, marginalizations—abnormal, anti-social subculture), social language combinations (language groups, language teams, language communities), social speech combinations (speech teams, speech communities); b. units and measures of social variants of language and speech: social language changes, language hierarchy and situational variants, social communication systems, social language situations, bilingualism, diglossia, social language and language ecological criteria; c. forms of language existence: language existence forms, ethnic variants of ethnic and multi-ethnic languages, standard languages, vernacular dialects (regional dialects, geographical dialects, half dialect / local accent, local dialects), mixed existence forms of language (common language, creole, pidgin language and similar language forms), sublanguage / sub-language, social dialects, national social dialect, national social regional dialects, marginal subculture vocabularies, language sub-standards (non-standard, local, national, vocabulary sub-standards, that is, national vocabulary sub-standards, including vulgar spoken words, slang, common sayings; special vocabulary sub-standards, including social industries and small groups' language and social argot and jargon.

The above explanation of differences between "ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology" from the aspects of disciplines, research paradigms, objects, targets, tasks and terminology systems has fully revealed that the combination of linguistics and ecology has brought into being two independent subdisciplines, "ecolinguistics" and "linguistic ecology", which are defined as follows:

"Ecolinguistics" is a branch of modern linguistics, which is formed at the junction of sociology (the relationship between society and linguistic structure in the process of thinking development), psychology (the problem of speech functions) and philosophy (revealing the universal characteristics and development rules of societies and cognitions in language). As a new school to study social linguistic environments, its formation is to explain the general law, principles and rules that govern the development of ecology and linguistics, and to study the role of languages in solving environmental problems.

"Language ecology" is a branch of ecology, which uses metaphorical analogy between language environments and ecological environments to study the interactions between languages and environments. It is a theory that reveals the influence of language ecological environments on the existence, development and evolution and the laws of language, aiming to deal with the crisis of language ecology and maintain and coordinate the balance of language ecology.

In the two terms, the advantage of linguistic ecology lies in its rich linguistic tradition, and that of ecolinguistics lies in its relationship with linguistics. Linguists prefer the term

"ecolinguistics" because it studies language from the perspective of ecology.

Conclusion

Despite their intersections, ecolinguistics differs greatly from linguistic ecology. The former is actually an ecological turn in the field of linguistics, while the latter is a linguistic turn in the field of ecology. Ecolinguistics is a field for linguists. It is understandable and reasonable for scholars to use different terms in different contexts considering their discipline backgrounds, professional knowledge, and research focus. That there are so many terms for one concept does reflect the complexity and difficulty of terminology definition. Now, the social economy, political culture and disciplinary research are going deeper and becoming more refined, continuously increasing the internal differentiation of disciplines, which will inevitably lead to changes in the disciplines. Facing the increasing crossings of boundaries between disciplines and the emergence of new interdisciplinary fields, how to name new interdisciplinary fields is the most critical issue, which will, to some extent, affect the understanding of the nature of the disciplines (Liu, 2017).

REFERENCES

A.V. Nekotorye. Linguoecological Features of Substandard Synonymy in English and Russian languages. *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*, 2007.13: 63-69. Polikarapov, A. M. Oral and Comparative Linguoecology, in the Development of and in Tegrat and in Translation Studies. *Ecology of Language: Proceedings of the 5th International Scientific Conference* [C]. Penza, 2012 (5): 291-297.

Agierz K. *Talking Man: Contributing Linguistics to the Humanities* [M] Per. spr. M .: URSS editorial, 2003.

B Russensky I L. K., Kulikova E. G. *Ecological Linguistics.* M.: Flint: Science, 2016.

Belozerova N. N., Labunets N.V. Ecolinguistics: in search of research methods. Tyumen: Publishing House of the Tyumen State. University, 2012.

Bernatskaya A. A. Linguoecology and "criticism of the language." Ecology of language and communicative practice, 2014 (2): 15-31.

Cai, Yongliang. (2012). Language ecology: thesis and theories. *Journal of University of Shanghai for Science and Technology (Social Science edition)*, (3): 211-217.

Chen, Qian. (2014). Discrimination and analysis of linguistic ecology and ecolinguistics. *Journal of Hubei University (Philosophy and Social Science)*, (4): 136-140.

Fan, Junjun. (2005). Research summary of ecolinguistics. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *37*(2): 110-115.

Feng, Guangyi. (2010). Research on linguistic ecology. *Journal of Hubei Normal University (Philosophy and Social Science)*, *30*(4): 1-6, 15.

Feng, Zhiwei. (1997). *Introduction to modern terminology.* Beijing: Yuwen Press.

Alwin Fill. & P. Mühlhäusler. (2001). *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology, and Environment.* London: Continuum.

Gabbard, R. (2000). Ecolinguistics: The future of linguistics. Ecolinguistics. Retrieved from http://www.ecoling.net.

Han, Jun. (2013). The review of the domestic research on ecolinguistics. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, (4): 107-112.

Haugen, E. *The ecology of language.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1972: 325.

Huang, Guowen. (2016). Rise and development of ecolinguistics. *Foreign Languages in China, 13*(1): 1, 9-12.

Huang, Zhilian & Jiao, Pengshuai. (March 24, 2011). Construction of a new disciplinary system for geography of translation *Chinese Social Science Today*.

Ionova S. B. On the issue of environmental friendliness of text communication. Bulletin of the Volgograd State University. Series 2. *Linguistics*, 2011 (1): 190-197.

Ivanova E. V. *Metaphorical conceptualization of natural disasters in environmental discourse: media material texts*. disc. kand. filol. sciences. Chelyabinsk, 2007.

Kopnina G. A. Ecology of language and ecology of speech as sections of ecolinguistics. *Ecology of language and communicative practice*, 2014 (2): 78-89.

Korovushkin V. P. The main attributes of linguoecology as an autonomous between science and science and linguistics. *Bulletin of the Cherepovets State University*, 2011 (1): 60-64.

Kravchenko A. V. Two views on the ecology of language and environmental linguistics. *Ecology of language and communicative practice*, 2014 (2): 90-99.

Kurashkina N. A. Ecolinguistics or linguoecology? *Terminological Diploma: Ecology of Language and Communicative practice*, 2015 (2): 143-156.

Liu, Lifen. (November 8, 2017). The Name of ecolinguistics concerns its subject nature. *Chinese Social Science Today*.

Liu, Si. (2013). Ecological ideology and language. *Journal of Lanzhou University (Social Science), 41*(5): 122-128.

Milovanova M. V., Terentyeva E.V. Linguistic Space of a Multiethnic Region: An Ecolinguistic Approach. *Power*, 2013 (6): 80-82.

Poteryakhina I.N. *Linguoecological characteristics of the English language in the Republic of Korea*. Abstract. diss. filol. sciences. Pyatigorsk, 2015.

Pylaeva E. M., Kushnina L. V. Ecology of translation: Current Trends and Approaches. Vestnik of Perm University. *Russian and Foreign Philology*, 2014, 26: 70-77.

Rondeau, G. (1985). *Introduction a la terminolgie*. Beijing: Science Press.

Semchuk E. V. Linguoecology as an Interdisciplinary Science. *Young Scientist*, 2014 (4): 1233-1235.

Sha, Zongyuan. (2008). *Research on the standardization of literary academic terms*. Hefei: Anhui University Press,

Sirotinina O. B. Reflections on How the Struggle for the Ecology of the Language Should be Understood. *Ecology of the language and communicative Practice*, 2013 (1): 177-193.

Skovorodnikov A. P. On the Subject of Ecolinguistics in Relation to the State of the Russian language. *Ecology of Language and Communicative Practice*, 2013 (1): 205-233.

Skovorodnikov A. P. To the Establishment of a Linguoecological Terminology System. *Speech Communication*, 2000 (11): 70-78.

Skovorodnikov A. P. To the Philosophical Foundations of the Subject Area of Ecolinguistics. *Ecology of Language and communicative Practice*, 2014 (2): 140-161.

Suschenko E. A. Dictionary-dictionary of Linguoecological Terms and Concepts. St. *Petersburg: Publishing House Petropolis*, 2011.

Xin, Zhiying & Huang, Guowen. (2013). *System-functional linguistics and analysis of ecological discourse Foreign Language Education, 34*(3): 7-10

Zhang, Yanlin & Feng, Guangzhi. (2010). Several concepts of linguistic ecology. *Hubei Social Sciences*, (9): 125-127.

Zhao, Hua. (1983). Translation and conceptual system of scientific and research terms. *Foreign Language Research*, (4): 62-67.

(Translator: Yu Jianing; Editor: Gerald)