"Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction" by Bakhytzhan Khassanov, and "Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan" by Eleonora Suleimenova, Nursulu Shaimerdenova, Dana Akanova

Aidyn Aldaberdikyzy

"Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction" by Bakhytzhan Khassanov, and "Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan" by Eleonora Suleimenova, Nursulu Shaimerdenova, Dana Akanova

Review Article

Aidyn Aldaberdikyzy

Introduction

A rich vein of articles and books has recently addressed some critical issues in the field of sociolinguistics in Kazakhstan, both in terms of theoretical perspectives and of their implications in the context of education and policy. A wide range of theoretical and practical questions of Kazakhstani sociolinguistics are addressed, including:

- Defining *de jure* and *de facto* status of languages;
- Content and stages of status and corpus language planning;
- Ethnic and linguistic identification of individuals, ethnic groups and the population altogether;
- Ethnic and linguistic consciousness and self-consciousness;
- Possibility and prevention of language conflicts;
- Defining the essence and typology of Kazakhstani language policy and planning;
- Ways of implementing language policy and efficiency of activities of language planning; and
- Dynamics of functional development of a state language.

A language renaissance and the problem of language vitality depending on its status and many other aspects of linguistics, language policy, and language planning in Kazakhstan have been studied in the works of Kazakhstani and foreign sociolinguists.

This article is dedicated to describing Bakhytzhan Khassanov's *Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction,* published in 1976 by the publisher Nauka in Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan; and the *Sociolinguistic Directory Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan*, written in

cooperation with Eleonora Suleimenova (chief editor), Nursulu Shaimerdenova, Dina Akanova published in 2007 by the publishing house Arman-PV, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, as well as analyzing the ways the books achieved their purposes.

Summary

Bakhytzhan Khassanov's *Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction* explores the characteristics of the language of multinational Kazakhstan from the first half of the 20th century until the 1980s. The role that social factors play in the functioning, developing, and interacting of languages of the Kazakhstani peoples during the Soviet period in particular had a conscious influence on society. Khassanov discusses the processes of mutual interaction of languages of the Kazakhstani peoples, analyzing the Kazakh vocabulary origin used in oral and written speech among the Russian, Uyghur, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Tajik, Korean, and German people, as well as others living in Kazakhstan.

The book discusses various problems of contemporary sociolinguistics, considering them incomplete in their terminology, the spontaneous character of their development, and the intentional change of the Kazakh language's status by accepting it as a dialect of Turkish, etc. Khassanov accepts that the term "language building" and "language policy" are analogous with the terms "socialistic building," "party building," and "national policy" and "economic policy" [Khassanov, 8]. Thus, the term "language building," a multi-aspect social-linguistic phenomenon based on language policy of the USSR, is accepted as proper to only Soviet sociolinguistics. In general, this book is the first attempt to shed light on the history of development of language policy and planning in the Soviet Kazakh Republic. However, the complexity of the theme does not allow for the discussion of all possible problems of languages functioning and interaction in Kazakhstan during the Soviet epoch. It is important to note that the languages of several peoples of the Kazakh Republic like German, Korean, and Dungan, which do not refer to languages of the peoples of USSR as most of their representatives live abroad, are named "languages of Kazakhstani peoples" conditionally [Khassanov, 211].

The book consists of three chapters, each dealing with different aspects of language policy in the Kazakh Republic. The first chapter discusses V.V. Lenin's contribution to the development of national languages of the peoples of USSR. Devoting the whole chapter to

citations and discussions of Lenin's speeches and messages is quite usual for that period, taking into account the fact that "Lenin was not a linguist" according to Khassanov [Khassanov, 17]. The chapter also deals with the facts of language building practice, including creating an alphabet for 50 languages, which did not have graphics; and opening schools for instruction in the national languages and in Russian. The author states that not only Lenin influenced language building in the Kazakh Republic, but "translating Lenin's multivolume work enriched the Kazakh language; the scientific style was established, scientific and social terminology was worked out, expressive means of the languages were activated" [Khassanov, 19].

The second chapter is dedicated to the functioning of languages in Kazakhstan during the Soviet epoch. It offers statistical data that 130 nations and peoples live in the Soviet Union, while 122 nations and peoples, including Kazakhs, live in the Kazakh Republic, which made Kazakhstan the most multinational among the 15 Soviet countries. The author also differentiates domains of a language depending on the functions it perform in different spheres of a society: (1) language of instruction at different stages in school; (2) languages of social and political life, such as in meetings in factories, kolzhozes, sovkhozes; (3) language of literary, social-political and scientific literature; (4) language periodicals; (5) language of communication between speakers in all of the spheres of their activity within a village, district; (6) language of communication between its speakers within the Soviet Union or autonomic republics; and (7) language of international communication (e.g., Russian). The chapter also gives a detailed description of the history of implementing language policy before the "Great October" Revolution of October 1917 during the Russian Tsarist Government, and further development of language functioning after the Soviets gained the power.

The third chapter discusses language contacts and relations in the Soviet Kazakh Republic, paying much attention to the types of bilingualism, differentiating it into individual and massive, Russian-national and national-Russian, as well as identifying Kazakh-Uyghur-Russian, Dungan-Uyghur-Kazakh-Russian, and other types of multilingualism. The author gives detailed information on settlements of various ethnoses in the territory of the Kazakh Republic based on statistical data, and analyzes loan words of Kazakh origin borrowed by other languages and linguistic interferences in oral and written speech of

speakers of the language other than Kazakh, which take place as a result of subordinative bilingualism. Languages of the peoples of Kazakhstan underwent noticeable changes: a large amount of neologisms emerged, archaic words gained new meanings, and new word combinations and complex syntactical constructions were formed, most of affixes activated.

In studying language functioning in the Kazakh Republic, the author tried to take into account linguistic, cultural-historical, demographic, geographic, economic, and political factors and used whole Soviet census data, scientific resources, data of the Central Statistics Department of USSR, statistic reports of the State book chamber of the Kazakh Soviet Republic, materials from the Ministry of Education of the Kazakh Republic, results of some sociologic researches, and observations of reality.

The second source I address is "Languages of Peoples' of Kazakhstan," Sociolinguistic Directory by Eleonora Suleimenova (chief editor), Nursulu Shaimerdenova, and Dina Akanova, published in 2007 as a way of both updating sociolinguistic studies in Kazakhstan and of addressing its implications for practice. To some extent, the book tries to give a complete answer to questions such as how many peoples live in Kazakhstan, how many and which languages are used in Kazakhstan, which genetic and typological groups they refer to, which languages they speak, whether each group has its own referent language or not, whether these languages are used in education, mass media, central and local administrative bodies. The book also continues the work with the sociolinguistic description of the languages of Kazakhstan, systematizing and defining the terminological apparatus of sociolinguistics, as well as creating systematized educational texts. The publication is also dedicated to describing linguistic situations in contemporary independent Kazakhstan from the viewpoint of demographic inequality, exoglossity, the vitalities of the Kazakh and Russian languages, and the effectiveness of language policy supporting the language renaissance in Kazakhstan.

The first chapter gives information about the linguistics of modern Kazakhstan from a viewpoint of demographic nonequilibium, exoglossity, polysubjectivity; the description of the Kazakh and Russian languages' vitality is given; and the problem of the language renaissance is studied.

The second chapter "Classification of Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan" discusses approaches and possibilities of language

classification, which reflects the modern condition and perspectives of development of linguistics and is composed of special ways of organizing the knowledge about languages. It also serves as the basis for creating a unique terminology in describing languages and helps to make a correct choice in methods and approaches of analysis of any language. The authors of the directory enumerate a number of main classification categories traditionally accepted in linguistics, and provide information on genealogical, typological (morphological, partially syntactical) classifications of languages in Kazakhstan, as well as classification of languages by the number of referent ethnoses. Thus, languages having over one million speakers in Kazakhstan are Kazakh and Russian, while Aleut, Itelmen, Ket, Liv, Mansi, Negidal, Nivkh, Oroch, Saam, Selkup, Serbian, Ulch, Enets, and the Yukagir languages have the least number of speakers; to be more precise, fewer than ten.

The sociolinguistic inventory of languages of Kazakstan and their characteristics in accordance with the status regulation of their relations—as well as the distribution in Kazakhstan and in the main country of referent peoples—furthered the division of languages into the following groups, which make up the chapter content of the given Directory: "the Kazakh language" (chapter 3), "the Russian Language" (chapter 4), "Exogenetic and Endogenetic languages of Kazakhstani diasporas" (chapter 5), and "Immigrant languages of peoples of Kazakhstan" (chapter 6). Consequently, 126 languages are described: the Kazakh state language, the Russian language, exogenous and endogenous languages of diasporas, and immigrant languages.

The directory also includes "Alphabetic classification of languages of peoples of Kazakhstan," in which the languages are set in an alphabetic order by the linguonyms, regardless of their demographic or social-functional characteristics. The directory contains the following information on languages: reference ethnos, language status (state, exoglossic/endoglossic languages of diasporas, immigrant languages), genetic and typological property of languages, and a glossary of main terms. The volume of the articles is quite different: the state Kazakh and Russian languages are described in detail compared with exogenous and endogenous languages of diasporas, as well as immigrant languages. The article about language is presented in the form of an essay, and includes sociolinguistic and linguistic data:

- Names are given in Russian, Kazakh and English: the Russian name of a language is the name of the article;

variants of language names are also given; Kazakh and English names are in parenthesis;

- Language qualification and its place in a genetic (language elation to coherent subdivision of genetic class of languages, like group, branch, family) and typological (relations to a morphological and syntactical type) classification of languages;
- Name and self-name of the ethnic group/ethnos;
- The main country(ies) where the referent ethnos/group inhabits (country and regions of distribution are given, statistic data on the volume of the ethnos are presented, short historical or ethnographic material is supplied, sociolinguistic status of the language is identified, number of speakers is shown, if possible, and the percentage of native language speakers to the general number of ethnic group is given);
- Short sociolinguistic, geographical, cultural-historical data about languages of the Kazakhstani diaspora (volume of diaspora according to census data; number of native language speakers, if possible percentage of native language speakers to the general number of the ethnic group; number of people speaking Kazakh/Russian as second language; and the number of people speaking only Kazakh/Russian. If possible, the volume of functions of language is provided;
- Data about national-cultural centers registered in the Republic of Kazakhstan, including associations, national-cultural centers and public organizations dealing with language teaching and supporting language development;
- Linguistic data about a language, including the time that the language was established; character of alphabet used; and presence of dialects.

Sociolinguistic identification and description of language of Kazakhstan materialized in conditions when the essential variables, characterization of linguistic situation, and the language planning changed dynamically. This required re-reasoning a wide range of problems, which inevitably were reflected in the content of the directory being analyzed in the given article, as well as in other works of the directory's authors.

The directory's authors take into account the fact that various languages existed in Kazakhstan, whose speakers immigrated into the country due to several reasons, and live in its territory. Thus, a desciption of almost all languages, irrelevant to their status, populations of speakers, peculiarities, volume of their social functions, and genetic and typological relations to groups was included into the book. The authors accept the complexety and difficulty of the questions posed, and the fact that most of these questions do not have a final answer. According to the authors, the objective difficulties of sociolinguistic identification and estimation of languages are related with a range of circumstances.

First, there is no complete list of ethnonyms and linguonyms. It is a well-known fact that the quantity of ethnonyms and linguonyms exceeds the quantity of ethnoses (ethnic groups, nations, nationalities, peoples, etc.), whose identification is made with the help of languages.

The second is a mismatch of linguonyms and ethnonyms, for example, the Orok language is spoken by a people which names itself Ulta; Pushtu (Pashto) is a language of Afghans; Kabardin-Cherkes is a language of Kabardins and Cherkeses; Karachai-Balkar (or Balkar) is a language of Karachais and Balkars; Tatar is a language of Tatars and Crimean Jews; Tat is a language of Tats and Highland Jews; Tadzhik is a language of Tadzhiks and Middle-Asian Jews; Hebrew and Yiddish are languages of Jews, etc. The absence of adequate coincidence of linguonyms and ethnonyms is clearly seen in the formula: "one linguonym – two and more referent ethnonyms," "two and more linguonyms – one referent ethnonym."

The third—the ethnic identification during census—has some specific features: thus, in 1926 the USSR census registered 194 nationalities; by the time of the 1976 census, a list of 800 ethnonyms grouped under 141 main nationalities was compiled; the results of the census were classified into 104 nationalities. The authors cite V.A. Tishkov in explaining the reasons of such essential disaccordance or even contradiction: not all the names are the linguistic and local versions that denote one and the same group; a part of the name could exist in one census and be lost in another as a result of assimilative processes or assimilative settings of the census organizers. There are some names which move from one to another list because of preferred names at the certain historic moment (Highland Jews – Tats, Lopars – Saams, Inuits – Escimos, etc.) or as a result of changed scientific requalification.

The fourth, the violation of ethno-attitude classification by including one uniting name for seperate ethnonyms. For example, in the census of the Republic of Kazakhstan of 1999, there is one line for the peoples of India and Pakistan (analogue is "peoples of Dagestan," "peoples of Siberia," "Latish and Latgals," and "Adigeis and Cherkeses" in the USSR census of 1939).

The fifth, the difficulties in identifying languages and dialects (territorial, as well as social variants of languages).

The sixth, the indistinctness of notions used in census, like the term "native language," which led to a failure in ethnic and linguistic identification.

The seventh, the absence of data of representatives of some ethnoses, like Highland and Lowland Maris, as well as Moksha and Erzia and others, which consider themselves seperate peoples. Thus, differentiation of languages accepted in linguistics was chosen as a basis in compiling the list of languages in Kazakhstan, but not the ethnonyms used in the census of Kazakshtan in 1999.

The eighth, a special status of some peoples like Tatars and Crimean Tatars; Jews, Highland Jews, Georgian Jews, Middle-Asian Jews; Krymchaks; Germans; and Moldavans. In the existing lists of ethnonyms, there is still the influence of Soviet ideology, which considers some peoples official, and some unofficial (undesired, hidden, ignored, etc). This can be explained by a "sudden" emergence or sharp increase in the number of some peoples among the Kazakhstani population, like Turkish Meskhets, Talyshes, Chuvans, Shugnans, Entses, Livs, Rushans, etc.

The ninth, the absence of certain creteria in defining dying or extinct languages. Linguists note that the speed of dissappearing languages (consequently, referent peoples) increased because of intense civilization and globalization prosesses.

However, despite the above-mentioned and other difficulties encountered during a sociolinguistic inventory of languages in Kazakhstan, the authors could compile a list of the country's languages and provide it with the coherent sociolinguistic, historical, and statistical comments; at present, it is in the form of a directory.

The authors of the directory note a constant and increasing process of renaissance of the Kazakh language, supported by state language planning, which includes the coexistence and some polarization of various ideologies, such as vernacularization, monolingualism,

multilingualism, and internationalization. The choice of the autochthon language of Kazakhs as a state language is realized in accordance with the ideology of vernacularization and monolingualism, while the support and protection of the Russian language and languages of diasporas are the characteristics of multilingualism, preservation of Russian communicative-linguistic space, and the formation of the English communicative-linguistic space (especially in education) are the primary features of internationalization.

Writers of the book support their arguments with the data from historical documents, the whole union census of USSR conducted at different times; census and statistics data of Independent Kazakhstan; materials of various sociolinguistic questionnaires; and research compiled by sociolinguists and Kazakhstan's public organizations. Also included are legal documents including the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Law on Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan, State Programs of Languages Functioning and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Conception of Language Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, collection of documents of different kinds of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Constitutions of various states (primarily, of the former Soviet republics), and different normative and judiciary documents of the European Union.

Discussion and Conclusion

The books selected for discussion of this article are about the language of the peoples of Kazakhstan, but compiled in two different times: the former was published at the peak of Soviet power and in Kazakhstan particularly, while the latter was written 30 years later during the second decade of Kazakhstan's independence. Certainly, the political and social factors influenced the authors' opinions, as well as the content and thematic variety of the books. Thus, Khassanov devoted the whole chapter to V.V. Lenin's role in language policy and the importance of the Socialist movement on language function in the Kazakh Soviet Republic, stating that "in building socialism, undeveloped peoples escaped capitalistic formation and managed to develop into socialistic nations; consequently, they could form a national language" [Khassanov, 22].

The emergence of the newly independent states instead of the Soviet Union—where language policy was formulated, and language planning was realized within a similar framework—required new language considerations and the defining of priorities and directions of

language policy and language planning. The declarative statements of Soviet sociolinguistics on language policy were revised in a new context, and new-born state languages began regulating language situations. They realized that language planning is a vital part of national state policy, which helps to define the preservation of the state.

The differences in paradigms is clearly seen in vocabulary choices and sentence constructions, thus, Khassanov says that "Russian became a language of international communication and cooperation of peoples of USSR in the result of not artificial, but natural ethnolinguistic processes" [Khassanov, 25], while Suleimenova, agreeing with Khassanov, adds that "a number of political, economic, demographic and social factors, as joining Kazakhstan to Russia, repeated revision of state borders, total change of the whole social system, modernization of the society and economy of Kazakhstan, influenced on formation of complex ethnolinguistic situation of Kazakhstan", and supports her words with 'strong, emotional words' as "… large lands for agricultural reforms of Stolypin…", "…demographic catastrophe of 1929-1933…", "…massive deportation of repressed peoples to Kazakhstan…" in supporting the historical facts [Suleimenova, 11]. This can be explained by the fact that most of the top secret information of the Soviet government became available after Kazakhstan gained its independence, which inevitably changed social attitudes toward the former epoch in general and the authors opinions in particular, as they are all representatives of autochthon Kazakh ethnos.

Except for the political and scientific paradigms the books follow, they also differ in defining and differentiating the terminological apparatus of sociolinguistics. Thus, Khassanov supports Lenin's idea of 'language of the republic' instead of 'state language,' considering that "the notion of 'language of the republic' is wider than 'state language,' as the former defines a language as a category of the majority of the republic's population, but not an administratively 'must be' category" [Khassanov, 26]. Suleimenova does not differentiate the so-called 'language of the republic' from 'state language' and defines the latter as "a language, having a special political and judiciary status in the territory of a definite state…" [Suleimenova, 279].

Statistic data and live observation allow assuming that Kazakhstan was and is a multinational, polyethnic, multicultural, and polyconfessional country, where people, speaking in languages of different genetic groups and structural types, live. Khassanov gives an

exact number of 123 ethnoses, consequently, languages living and existing in the Kazakh Republic [Khassanov, 32], while Suleimenova states that there are 126 languages in contemporary Kazakhstan. The difference in number can be explained by the evidence that some ethnoses were 'ignored, hidden, and even undesired' in USSR census registration [Suleimenova, 17]. Thus, the number of Talysh, Ents, and Meskhetian Turks rose suddenly not only in Russia, but in Kazakhstan as well: Talysh: 1970 – 0, 1979 – 0, 1989 – 37, 1999 – 691; Ents: 1970 – 0, 1979 – 0, 1989 – 2, 1999 – 7; Meskhetin Turks: 1970 – 0, 1979 – 0, 1989 – 0, 1999 – 2761 and others [Suleimenova, 17].

Khassanov was the first to give a detailed description of functioning peculiarities and development tendencies of languages existing in the Kazakh Republic, although he limited the scope by the Kazakh, Russian, Uigur, Dungan, Korean and German languages, while Suleimenova managed to describe a state Kazakh language, and exogenous and endogenous languages of diasporas and immigrant languages of Kazakhstan, totaling 126. However, the limited number of languages described in Khassanov's book demonstrates once again that it was quite difficult to obtain statistic data in Soviet times.

In conclusion, it is of great importance to note that both books were written in Russian, despite the fact that the authors are representatives of the Kazakh nation and there is almost a 30-year lifespan between their publications. It can be explained by the notion that Russian does not serve as a language of intellectual capital in contemporary Kazakhstan, as it was during the Soviet Kazakh republic.

It is quite true to say that "Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan" by Eleonora Suleimenova, Nursulu Shaimerdenova, Dina Akanova features complete the terminological apparatus of sociolinguistics, and is rich in information on almost all languages existing in Kazakhstan compared with "Languages of Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction" by Bakhytzhan Khassanov. However, the former suffers from lack of historical background on the sociolinguistic situation of Kazakhstan of the Soviet period, while the latter is more historical and analytical.

Certainly, there are coincidences and differences in facts, data, and content of these two books, but it is perhaps better to sum up that the information they present overlaps, and are better used in combination rather than separately

The peoples of Kazakhstan annually celebrate a day of languages in September, which became a common holiday for all peoples of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The uniting idea of this holiday is the awareness of unchangeable value of each and every language and culture, understanding that every language is part of a spiritual heritage of humanity as a whole, while the culture of any nationality is an immeasurable contribution to world civilization. In such a polyethnic, multilingual, and multicultural country as Kazakhstan, this idea found a number of supporters in all strata of society, and inspired the authors of the directory to create this Sociolinguistic Directory. In my mind, they succeeded.