Introduction
In the world today there are thousands of different languages, each with its own phonetic system, grammatical structure and word-stock, and each with its own status in the society where it is spoken. Regardless of these different aspects these languages have some inter- and extra-linguistic similarities. This chapter describes the sociolinguistic stratification of languages in the era of globalisation. This typology differs from others in that it recognises that cultural, social, political, religious, historical and other factors frequently interact in determining the role which a language plays in society.

Typologies for the classification of languages
Contemporary linguistics classifies languages mostly from the point of view of their common source or root, grammatical structure and social characteristics, though they may also be grouped according to certain other features.

When languages are classified according to their source the analyst does this by identifying related languages. This approach has a long history, dating back to the 16th and 17th centuries. It was William Jones, a British lawyer in India, who first noticed the identity of roots of Sanskrit and European languages. In 1786 he wrote:

The Sanskrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin and more exquisitely refined than either; yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and in the forms of grammar, than could possibly be produced by accident; so strong, indeed, that no philologer could examine them all three without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists. There is similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanskrit.

This observation gave rise to the development of philology as a field of study in the 19th century, using comparative methodology as a core technique in researching related languages. Thus genetic typology has its own object of research and its own method, which is called the comparative–historical. Its main goal is to identify related languages or languages that have sprung from a common source.

The second – and the most widely spread – method of classifying languages is based on the grammatical structure of languages irrespective of their roots, of their families. This approach studies the structural similarity of languages. There are many conceptions which are generally accepted in linguistics today which were generated by this approach. For instance, Schiegel (1809) identified three types of language: isolating, agglutinative and flexional. To these categories, Humboldt (1836, 1988) added a fourth: incorporating (or
polysynthetic) languages. Sapir (1963) then proposed a new principle of classification which is based on the expression of relations within the sentence and on the presence or absence of derivation. Thus, he distinguishes concrete radical, derived, concrete rational and pure relational languages. He also groups sentences according to the ‘technique’ by which secondary elements are attached (thus classifying them as isolating, agglutinative, fusional and symbolic). There is a third aspect of classification in Sapir’s system which is connected with the degree of synthesis of language units (analytic, synthetic and polysynthetic). Anyway the morphological or structural classification of languages came into being in the process of classifying languages on the basis of relatedness. The approach has developed its own method known as ‘analytical comparison’, although in American linguistics it is also referred to as the ‘confrontational’ method.

We can see, therefore, that both the genetic and the morphological typologies actually deal with the language structure and its system. Both of these typologies are said to be concerned with ‘internal’ linguistics or ‘microlinguistics’.

**Sociolinguistics**

But neither the genetic nor the morphological classifications differentiate languages in terms of whether they are strong or weak, big or small, rich or poor, their degree of popularity, or how influential and prestigious they are in the era of globalisation and so on. These characteristics are ignored by the genetic and morphological classification systems. But it is precisely these issues which are the subject matter of sociolinguistics because, when defining a language socially, one makes use of other criteria which have nothing to do with its relatedness to other languages or with its structural identity.

Compared to the genetic classification system, sociolinguistics is a comparatively new branch in linguistics. This approach, unlike internal linguistics or microlinguistics, takes as its subject matter external linguistics or metalinguistics. It studies the social contexts of languages since languages are spoken in society, not in a vacuum. Thus, the different aspects of variable speech are the corner-stone of sociolinguistics. As Kottak (1996) maintains:

> Sociolinguists don’t deny that people who share the same language share deep structures and rules, which permit mutually intelligible communication. However, sociolinguists focus on features that vary systematically with social position and situation.

Meanwhile Duranti (1997:13) writes that ‘Sociolinguistics came out of urban dialectology in the late 1950s and early 1960s.’ All languages serve as means of communication but the forms and conditions of their use depend on social and historical conditions in the area. The term ‘ecology’, which originated in the field of biology, has been borrowed by linguistics to mean ‘interdependence of language and its surroundings’ (Haugen 1972).

Sociolinguistics as a relatively new discipline does not yet have its own highly perfected methodology, although it tends to favour quantitative techniques. Among the most widely used procedures for studying the social differentiation of languages are ‘social network analysis’ (SNA) and ‘principal components analysis’ (PCA) (Duranti 1997:13). SNA operates with two concepts: closeknit and looseknit. Closeknit networks characterise speakers of the highest and lowest socioeconomic status (SES) groups in a community. Usually closeknit networks among the high SES groups reinforce standard speech whilst low SES groups speak varieties which are considered to be non-standard. PCA uses statistical techniques that allow the investigator to examine a large number of linguistic variants to compare speakers with similar linguistic characteristics and, as a last step, to determine what social similarities are shared by these linguistically categorised groups of speakers and what the differences are.

---

21 Globalisation is the emergence of a complex web of interconnectedness that means that our lives are increasingly shaped by events that occur and decisions that are made at a great distance from us. The central feature of globalisation is therefore that geographical distance is of declining relevance, and that territorial boundaries such as those between nation-states are becoming less significant.
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Criteria
Any classification system presupposes the availability of certain criteria. The British sociolinguist Roger Bell makes use of four criteria in his research: standardisation, autonomousness, historic character and vitality (1976:198). Meanwhile the Russian scholar Vinogradov (1976:41-42) argues that there can be only one criterion for grouping languages in terms of social characteristics, i.e. the communicative environment which includes within it social, ethnic, demographic, historic and other features of language.

In her recent work Mechkovskaya (2001:132, 217) proposes five criteria for the social typology of languages: 1) communicative rank of language; 2) existence of written language (script); 3) degree of standardisation; 4) legal status of languages (‘state’, ‘official’, ‘constitutional’ and so on); and 5) its confessional and educational statuses.

Southerland (2001:509) characterises sociolinguistic research in this way:

... [it] ranges from the very limited and localised context of a single conversation to studies of language use by whole populations.

The same writer discusses speech varieties thus (Southerland 2001:510):

The term speech variety is the label given to that language (or form of language) used by any group of speakers. ... Speech varieties are of four types: 1) the standard language; 2) social speech varieties (also called social dialects or sociolects); 3) regional speech varieties (or regional dialects) [and 4) functional speech varieties (or registers)].

All of these measures are subdivided into several smaller categories. So, for instance, sociolects are associated with the socioeconomic status of the speaker, i.e. their ethnicity, gender, occupation, age group, and so on. These characteristics are arranged along a vertical dimension. Meanwhile, regional dialects are distributed across a horizontal dimension whilst functional speech varieties (also known as registers) are interested in language use in specific speech situations.

As we can see there is no overall agreement concerning the criteria which should be employed for classifying languages socially. Nevertheless, although scholars do not share the same fundamental concepts, there are certain terms that are common to many classification systems.

For the purposes of this chapter we make use of six criteria to describe the status of contemporary Uzbek in the post-Soviet period. These criteria are:
1. Communicative rank
2. Standardisation
3. Legal status
4. Confessional or prophetic status
5. Educational status
6. Communication spheres.

1 Communicative rank
In order to define the communicative rank of a language one should know the number of people, the ethnic groups and the number of countries that speak this language as well as the social functions which the language has and the social spheres in which it is used in the countries where it occurs.
It has been calculated that there are currently 6,912 living languages in the world\(^2\). However, approximately 3,050 million people - almost half of the population of the world - speak just 12 principal languages. These are Mandarin Chinese (873 million), English (508 million), Spanish (322 million), Bengali (211 million), Arabic (206 million + 246 second language speakers), Hindi (181 million), Portuguese (177 million), Russian (145 million + 110 million second language speakers), Indonesian (140 million), Japanese (122 million), German (95 million + 28 million second language speakers) and Korean (67 million). In this list Uzbek comes in 54th place with 19 million speakers.

When defining the communicative rank of languages it is very important to take into account the amount of communication in the world. Although Mandarin Chinese is spoken by more people than any other language it is spoken in a relatively small number of countries which are concentrated in East and Southeast Asia whilst English is spoken in a much larger number of countries spread across every continent. Moreover, English is very frequently used as the medium of communication between native speakers of other languages; Mandarin Chinese is much less frequently employed in this way. Thus, although English is spoken by only about 58% of the total number of people who speak Mandarin Chinese, its communicative rank is actually higher than that of Chinese.

From the communicative rank of languages we can identify world languages. By this term we refer to the inter-ethnic and inter-governmental languages which have the status of official and working languages of the United Nations Organisation. Under the Charter of this organisation the official languages are Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. Arabic has also been added as an official language of the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Economic and Social Council.

Sociolinguistic typology also identifies state or national languages. The national language is usually the language of the majority of the population in a country. Whereas international languages are spoken in more than one country, state or national languages tend to be spoken in one country, like Uzbek in Uzbekistan. Uzbek is both the mother tongue and the official state language for Uzbeks living in Uzbekistan and the official state language for linguistic minorities who live in this country even though their mother tongue may be different. In some neighbouring countries Russian and local languages are of absolute legal equality.

In one relatively small country there may be as many as 11 national or official languages. A case in point is South Africa.

2 Standardisation

The next aspect of sociolinguistic typology to be considered is the degree of language standardisation. Languages differ greatly from each other in this regard. A language can be said to be uniform if there is unity between its dialects, slang, popular speech and literary language. The closer these constituents are to each other the more perfect is the language.

Standardisation is a very important approach to the classification of languages from the point of view of their social differentiation. This criterion is closely connected with the previous one, i.e. with language function. Actually the degree of standardisation of a language depends on the level of education in the country where it is spoken, the existence of radio and TV broadcasts, and the publication of periodicals (newspapers and magazines). All these are present in the case of Uzbek.

During the Soviet period, although Uzbek was considered to be an official state language of the Republic of Uzbekistan, in fact official meetings at all levels, especially in the cities, were conducted in Russian. The same was true of official correspondence. This means that in reality the official spoken language was...
Russian. From all the sociolinguistic dimensions it is the relationship between the literary language and the dialects which is the most important. The closer this relationship is the more standardised the language can be said to be. Even if schools were teaching Uzbek, and even though periodicals were being published in Uzbek, standardisation cannot be said to have been achieved if the language was not spoken in all spheres of everyday life. This was the actual situation as it affected the languages of all the republics of the Soviet Union.

Mechkovskaya (2001) maintains that ‘the Constitution of 1977 granted equal protection of the law to all citizens regardless of their language,’ as well as the opportunity to be instructed in their native language at school, and ‘the right to speak the native language in courts of law.’ Nevertheless the Constitution failed to provide guidance which would guarantee adherence to the declared principles. This led to a lack of legal security for the national languages and ‘silent’ or unspoken advantages for the language of the bureaucracy. It also made it possible for restrictions on the social functions of local languages to appear to be ‘natural’, undermining even the rights declared by the Constitution. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR did not define the legal status of particular languages. There was nothing in it to indicate the specific status of the Russian language (for example, there was no expression such as ‘language of international communication’). Nevertheless, a de facto hierarchy of languages and the specific status of the Russian language, though unstated, became apparent in several subtle ways.23

In the situation which has just been described it was actually impossible for the languages of ethnic minorities to develop towards absolute standardisation24. Though today Uzbek can be classified as a language which has been relatively well codified (that is to say, it is a language with well worked out literary norms in standard grammar and vocabulary), we would like it to have become the truly official language of the country. This issue is raised here because in recent years a number of scholars have written with great concern that even as the country celebrates the 16th anniversary of the declaration of Uzbek as a state language it is common to find syntactical constructions in Uzbek which are copied from Russian, as in the following example from Mamatov (2001): ‘OAK ... ni professor ilmiy unvonida tasdiqladi’ (‘The degree of Doctor was conferred on him/her by the Supreme Attestation Commission’), where the correct Uzbek should be ‘OAK ... ga professor ilmiy unvonini berdi’. Illustrating his argument with many other examples, Mamatov argues that Uzbek is currently competing with two other languages, English and Russian. If the situation continues like this then Uzbek will lose the competition and be replaced by English and Russian as the country’s official languages. Though this may be thought of as a rather exaggerated scenario, it is not difficult to find people who hold such opinions in Uzbekistan at the present time.

We should also mention that in some developed countries one cannot help noticing that there is a strong counter-tendency to homogeneity. In other words, native speakers are proud of their local dialects and try to use these dialects whenever possible. Of course, this tendency may strengthen the status of dialects and lead to their further development. We wonder if this phenomenon can also be explained by globalisation?

3 Legal status
The legal status of languages is also an important feature in their social typology. Many different terms have been used to define the legal status of languages, including state language, national language, official language, language of interethnic or international communication, local language, language of ethnic

---

23 The de facto privileged status of the Russian language can be seen from the heraldry of the USSR and of the constituent republics. Firstly, the State Emblem of the USSR bore the inscription ‘Workers All over the World, Unite!’ The version written in Russian appeared with larger font than other versions in the languages of the other Union Republics; moreover, the Russian version was placed in a highly prominent position, in the middle and at the bottom of the emblem, whilst the inscriptions in other languages were situated in subservient positions, symmetrically on the right and on the left of the emblem. Next, the State Emblems of the individual Union Republics bore the same inscription ‘Workers All Over the World, Unite!’ in two languages, i.e. the language of the respective constituent Republic and Russian. (Mechkovskaya 2001:217)

24 Languages constantly change and they change according to the needs of society. These changes try to meet the needs of the society that uses these languages. However, languages never achieve perfect or absolute standardisation.
minority and so on. In some sociolinguistic literature the terms state, official and national are not
differentiated; when there is only one state, national or official language in a country, these terms usually
mean the same and so become synonymous. But there are countries that do differentiate them on legal
grounds as is the case, for instance, in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. In this country Arabic is the
national language and French is the official language. In the case of Uzbekistan, Uzbek was declared to be
the national, state and official language of the country in 1989.

4 Confessional or prophetic status
Another very important feature in the social classification of languages is the relationship between the local
language and the language of religious worship and rituals, because in many cases the confessional or
prophetic language differs from the local language. In the context of Central Asia, including Uzbekistan, the
confessional or prophetic language has long been and is still Classical Arabic, which became the language of
the Koran in the 7th century. Languages in this category, everywhere in the world, are considered to be
sacred. Being so, they play an important role in society and in the development of local languages. It is due to
the influence of Classical Arabic, and particularly the Koran, that the Turkic languages - including Uzbek – were
first written in Arabic script. Classical Arabic also had a considerable lexical influence on the Turkic languages,
whereas its grammatical, structural and phonetic impact has been relatively slight. Many words have been
borrowed from this prophetic language, including the names of people, cultural and religious events.

Originally, the contents of the Koran were known only to educated people and, due to its sacredness, it was
not translated into any of the local languages before 1917. After the revolution, religion was actually
prohibited and because of this translating the Koran was not allowed. Consequently, translating the Koran
into Uzbek became possible only after Uzbekistan gained independence; now, with a translation of the
sacred book freely available, everybody can become acquainted with it.

Previously, before an Uzbek translation of the Koran became available, one had to go to religious meetings
where those religious personnel who had graduated from madrasahs interpreted the content. Verbal
manifestations of religious beliefs such as prayers, chants, invocations, myths, fables and tales, statements
about ethics, behavioural standards and morality were taught from the standpoint of the Koran. But now that
people can read the Koran in their mother tongue, the social function of Uzbek has widened considerably.

5 Educational status
Three categories of educational status of languages can be identified:
a) official state language learnt by ethnic minorities that live in the country
b) the medium of instruction, when education is conducted in this language,
c) a special subject taught in schools.

From the point of view of the first type of languages Uzbek is taught in schools and higher education
institutions as an official state language to all ethnic minorities who live in Uzbekistan and whose mother
tongue is not Uzbek. It is taught not as a language of major communicative importance but as the official
state language of the country.

Since Uzbek is a state, official and national language in the country education is conducted in Uzbek though
there are schools and university departments where classes are conducted in Russian and in some other
languages too.

In Uzbekistan, Uzbek is taught in education institutions first as a mother tongue, so that students can
perfect their knowledge of the language, and secondly in philological departments that train future
teachers of Uzbek, translators, linguists and so on.
Thus, educationally Uzbek plays all three roles identified by a social typology of languages: a) as an auxiliary language, b) as a means of education, since it is the language of the ethnic majority and an official, state language, and c) as a special subject taught in schools.

6 Spheres of communication

During the Soviet period Uzbekistan – like other republics - was bilingual. In many societies usually the law defines the functions of each language. But, as we noted above, in the case of Uzbekistan during the Soviet period there was never a clear-cut definition of the functions of the languages of the ethnic majority (Russian) and the ethnic minority (Uzbek). We can identify six important spheres or arenas in which communication takes place: (1) education; (2) government bodies, legislation, clerical work, legal proceedings; 3) mass media; 4) personal documents including passports, diplomas, driving licences, etc; 5) services, including trade, healthcare, communications and so on; 6) visual information (geographic names, names of streets, traffic signs, advertisements and the like). Of these, Uzbek is now widely used in the first five spheres. The sixth is something of an exception, since the strong influence of Russian and English is observed in advertisements. This is explained by globalisation and by the entry of Uzbekistan into the world community. Borrowing words and expressions from the languages that have become means of interethnic communication is natural and one can hardly resist such changes.

Conclusions

In this chapter we have made an attempt to describe languages from the point of view of a social typology of languages. We have also attempted to place Uzbek in this context. The social typology of languages is a comparatively new branch in linguistics; this means that much still has to be done in the future. The findings of this chapter are not final; more research lies ahead.
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