

Uzbek re-modeled

Russian loanwords in post-soviet Uzbek media

Lydia Catedral

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This study investigates the relationship between Russian language use and language planning in the context of newly independent, post-soviet Uzbekistan (1991–1992). It is guided by the question: *In what ways does the use of Russian loanwords in Uzbek language newspapers accomplish language planning in newly independent Uzbekistan?* The main finding from this analysis is that post-independence use of Russian loanwords from particular semantic classes in particular contexts reinforce overtly stated ideologies about Russian and construct difference between soviet Uzbekistan and independent Uzbekistan. These findings demonstrate the need to reexamine the role of Russian language in post-soviet contexts, and they contribute a unique approach to analyzing links between lexical items and ideology in language planning.

Keywords: language planning, post-soviet, language ideology, national identity, loanwords, Russian, Uzbek

1. Introduction

This study investigates the relationship between language use and language planning in the context of newly independent, post-soviet Uzbekistan (1991–1992). The long history of multilingualism and the centrality of language policies to both colonization and decolonization (Kreindler 1997) make Uzbekistan a particularly interesting site in which to investigate these issues. In order to capture the multiple levels at which language ideology operates and manifests, this study compares the explicit ideologies about language use in government-controlled media with the *actual* language use in these same media. The focus is specifically on the use of Russian, guided by the question: *In what ways does the use of Russian loanwords in Uzbek language newspapers accomplish language planning in newly independent Uzbekistan?*

By focusing on discourse and language use in government-controlled newspapers, this study examines language planning at the nexus of traditional divisions within the field: between corpus and status planning (Kloss 1969), covert and overt policies (Schiffman 1998) and top-down and bottom up processes (Hornberger 1997). The literature on language planning in Uzbekistan has focused primarily on top-down policies including official changes in language status (Fierman 1991; Kreindler 1997), the creation of committees for the implementation of language policies (Fierman 1995), and changes in orthography (Fierman 1991; Schlyter 2012). This study contributes to an understanding of local processes in this under researched region by using quantitative analysis to confirm earlier claims and by focusing on meso-level institutions (i.e. media) involved in language planning processes in Uzbekistan. Analysis of the empirical data reveals processes of de-russification, continued strategic use of Russian loanwords, and increased use of Arabic/Farsi loanwords in the construction of Uzbek national identity. These findings complicate scholarly understandings of language planning in post-soviet contexts, and demonstrate the need to look beyond Russian vs. titular language binaries. That is, the findings of this study demonstrate the importance of the continued use of Russian even in states such as Uzbekistan, which took aggressive action towards de-russification (Landau & Kellner-Heinkele 2001; Pavlenko 2008).

Lastly, this study contributes a unique approach to analyzing the links between lexical items and ideology in the context of language planning. Fishman (2000) has linked language ideology and lexical change by claiming that the lexicon (as well as all other aspects of corpus planning) is intrinsically tied to status planning, and as such can undergo processes of internationalization, purification, vernacularization etc. However, claiming that a lexicon is “internationalized” does not provide any insight into the nuanced way in which different “international” lexical items are used with different frequencies and across different discursive contexts. Following Fishman’s claim that “corpus planning always has conscious or unconscious social engineering in mind” (50), I examine in more detail the shifting frequency, distribution and discursive contexts of loanwords in order to understand the more covert ways in which corpus planning and social ideology are intimately connected. The findings reported here demonstrate that ideologies observed through patterns of language use point to a more complex relationship between language use and language planning than is observable through overt, legislated, prescriptivist statements about language. Additionally, I argue that the language use in government-controlled spaces reflects processes of iconization and erasure (Irvine & Gal 2000) to model linguistic ideologies and national identities for its readers.

The paper begins with the literature on language planning, outlining the particular approaches adopted in this study. Following this is background information on the socio-political context and history of Uzbekistan. After an explanation

of the methodologies employed in analyzing newspaper data, the results and discussion are presented in conjunction with one another.

2. Language planning

The particular type of language planning examined in this study falls within Kaplan and Baldauf's notion of language planning as "the promulgation of a language policy by government (or other authoritative body or person)" (1997, xi). However, as Schiffman (1998) notes, these language policies do not only derive their power from authoritative institutions, but also from "belief systems, attitudes, myths – the whole complex that we are referring to as *linguistic culture* [emphasis in original]" (1998, 276). The relationship between linguistic culture (or language ideology), language use, and authoritative institutions is not unidirectional, but dialogic. Language use and language ideologies are simultaneously the means of promulgating language policy and the end goals of language planning as illustrated by Kloss' (1969) categories of status and corpus planning. Corpus planning refers to the planning of linguistic forms, which become apparent in their use, while planning the status of a language is achieved through shifts in linguistic ideology. This study follows Fishman's (2000) claim that status and corpus planning are closely tied, and explores the connection between them by taking up Blommaert (1996) and Pennycook's (2000) call to analyze language use in order to understand language planning. Focusing on language *use* encourages a move away from reproducing ideologies of monolingualism as "normal" and multilingualism as "nationally problematic" (Blommaert 1996, 212), and towards theories, which take into account the meaningful ways in which *multiple* languages are used in sites of decolonization (see also Canagarajah 2000).

Both language planning in the form of *language use* and language planning in the form of *language ideology* must take place within particular institutional spaces. While language planning research initially focused on top down processes of language legislation mandated by government and other authoritative institutions, Hornberger (1997) among others has demonstrated the utility of more bottom up approaches to language planning. Johnson (2013) argues; however, that even this distinction between top-down and bottom up processes is insufficient for understanding the multiple levels at which language policies operate. He notes that these distinctions "fail to capture the multiple levels of context which influence language policy decisions and ignore how policy-making power can be differentially allocated within the 'community'" (108). Johnson thus captures the importance of investigating the manifestation of language planning in intermediary institutions such as educational institutions and public media.

2.1 Theoretical framework

In this study language use and language ideologies in post-soviet Uzbek language newspapers are examined in order to understand the ways in which language policies are enacted in non-government, government-censored media for the planning of language use and of language ideology. Within this study, language ideology and language use are not understood as ends in and of themselves, but rather as being in service of the planning of national identity. This understanding of national identity as constructed through language use aligns with De Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak's definition of "national identities" which they claim are created "*discursively*, [emphasis in original] by means of language and other semiotic systems" (1999, 153). This discursive construction of national identity is achieved through emphasis of "*intra-national sameness or similarity*" (161) and "*difference between nations*" (162).

In order to analyze the ways in which the semiotic system of language emphasizes difference and/or similarity this study uses Irvine and Gal's (2000) notions of iconization and erasure. Iconization is a process through which the sign (i.e. the linguistic form) becomes linked with the social image (i.e. a particular nation or political entity) "in a linkage that appears to be inherent" (38), while, erasure "is the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible" (38). While I do not claim that the writers of the newspapers were consciously attempting to erase or iconize particular linguistic forms, I do find these notions useful tools in examining the cumulative patterns that emerge from my data. These notions are used to explain the ways in which language use becomes salient not only for corpus planning, but also for the planning of linguistic ideology, and by extension, for the transformation of national identity.

3. The Uzbek context

Examining language planning in the context of Uzbekistan is particularly interesting because of the visible role it played in discussions of national identity, both during soviet times and after independence (Kreindler 1997). Loanwords form an especially salient category in relation to language planning in Uzbekistan because of the way in which they were continuously "manipulated as a symbol of identity" (Fierman 1991, 149).¹ In order to understand the indexical (Silverstein

1. I claim that the words in this study are loanwords based on Myers-Scotton's (1992) definition that borrowings are lexical items, which become part of the mental lexicon of a language.

1993) values of these loanwords and the reason they became so salient in establishing national identity it is necessary to have some understanding of the history of multilingualism in the region. Prior to the establishment of Uzbekistan as a nation state under the Soviet Union the region was intensely multilingual and multi-ethnic. Arabic and Islam were introduced to the region as far back as 709 A.D. as a result of conquest by Arab invaders (Levi 2007). The end of the 10th century brought about recognition of Farsi as a literary language and a language of Islam (Khalid 2007) due to the rise of the Samanid family. In the early 1300s, the Turkic language-speaking Tamerlane came to power in the region, but his empire was displaced in the 1500s with the invasion of a Turkic people known as the “Uzbeks” (Levi 2007). Because of the long history of Arabic and Farsi in the region, and the long history of contact with Uzbek, the contemporary Uzbek language has many Arabic and Farsi loanwords (Marashi 1988; Boeschoten 1998).

In 1924 Uzbekistan was established as a nation state through its integration into the Soviet Union. Alongside the establishment of the nation state, the status of the Uzbek language was raised as part of the soviet project of “korenizatsiya” (Fierman 1982), which was an attempt to raise the status of indigenous ethnic groups. However this raising of the titular language only lasted until the 1930s when Russian became the primary official language. At this time, the Uzbek language was purged of its Arabic and Farsi loanwords, which were replaced with Russian loanwords. Kari-Nyazov’s (1955) corpus analysis of Uzbek language newspapers between 1933 and 1940 show that the use of Arabic and Farsi loanwords decreased from 37% to 25% of all words while the use of Russian words increased from 2% to 15% of all words. The attested purpose of this loanword replacement was the “internationalization” of the Uzbek language (Fierman 1991) through the removal of outdated Arabic and Farsi loanwords. The data analyzed in this study are related to a second purging of loanwords – the decrease in Russian loanwords and the reinstatement of Arabic and Farsi borrowings (Roy 2000). This second purge began with the October 1989 declaration of Uzbek as the official language of Uzbekistan following protests in the capital city of Tashkent. The new language law was accompanied by de-russification and a wider acceptance of Arabic and Farsi (Landau & Kellner-Heinkele 2001).

Newspapers in soviet and post-soviet spaces are especially interesting meso-level sites because of the censorship of public media within these spaces. Across the Soviet Union mass media were self-declared instruments for social control rather than the dissemination of information (McNair 1991), and *glasnost*, which was a historical period characterized by various freedoms and reforms leading up to the fall of the Soviet Union, still saw relatively little change with regards to the “freedom of the press” (Androunas 1993), especially for the Central Asian

republics (Brown 1995).² In the years immediately following independence, Uzbek media saw the arrest and detainment of journalists, the censorship of opposition party newspapers, and the removal of all independent and private media publications in 1993 (Brown 1995). A U.S. Department of State Report published in 1994 states that “newspapers may not be printed without the censor’s approval” and that “journalists and writers who want to ensure that their work is published report that they practice self-censorship.”³ This practice of self-censorship results in texts generated within a space that is simultaneously governmental and non-governmental – ideal for examining the ways in which top down processes are mediated through various levels of authoritative community institutions.

4. The current study

The goal of this study is to examine overt statements of ideology, language use, and the ideological implications of this language use within newspapers. In order to examine overt statements of ideology, newspaper and journal articles listed in the National Bibliography *Letopis Pechati* ‘Print Chronicle’ that were published in Uzbekistan from 1989–1991 were consulted.^{4,5} In order to examine actual language use within newspapers, a corpus linguistic methodology was applied to one newspaper which was published both before and after Uzbek independence in the capital city of Tashkent. The newspaper was originally called *O’qituvchilar Gazetasi* ‘Teachers’ Newspaper’, but in 1991, its name was changed to *Ma’rifat* ‘Enlightenment’. The topic of the newspaper was education. The majority of the corpus analysis draws data from two issues of this newspaper: January 15, 1989 and January 11, 1992.⁶ The times of publication were chosen in such a way as to obtain data from before the language law (October 21, 1989) and after independence (September 1, 1991) since both of these events were expected to have an

2. Nonetheless, as Fierman (1989) notes, the relative increase in free speech was used by Uzbek literati to promote wider recognition of Uzbek language and culture.

3. Source: http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/democracy/1993_hrp_report/93hrp_report_eur/Uzbekistan.html (Last accessed November 5, 2015).

4. Although the newspapers used for this study were written in Cyrillic, all Russian and Uzbek words will be written in this paper using the Uzbek Latin script.

5. The records from the *Letopis Pechati* ‘Print Chronicle’ published after 1991 are less reliable and less accessible, which is why they were not included in this analysis.

6. The first issue has 12062 words and the second issue has 11562 words making this a relatively small-scale corpus study.

impact on language use in the newspaper. The pre-independence/pre language law corpus acts as a reference for the post-independence/post language law corpus.

4.1 Counting and classification

For analysis, newspapers in microfilm were converted to text files, which were then analyzed using the text editor, Notepad++ and the concordance program, AntConc (Anthony 2014) to determine word frequency.⁷ Significance was tested for all frequency relationships using chi-squared tests. Changes in frequency of Russian loanword usage were calculated through manual generation of word types and automated searches for word tokens. In order to investigate the change in usage of specific semantic classes of Russian words, all Russian loanwords were categorized according to the following semantic classes. Note that categories 1–12 are taken from Akiner's (1997) semantic categorization, while categories 13–15 have been added in order to account for outliers, and political changes that become relevant only after independence in 1991.

1. Political and administrative
2. Trade and industry
3. Modern science and technology
4. Other specialized academic disciplines
5. Agriculture
6. Urbanization
7. Medicine
8. Military
9. Names and months, weights and measures
10. Culture and education
11. Sport
12. European/Russian way of life
13. International politics
14. Soviet words
15. Other⁸

Category 13 was added to separate words in category 1) such as *byuro* 'bureau' from words, which were specifically related to the politics of other nations, such as *nemis-fashist* 'Nazi.' Category 14 words are loanwords, which uniquely or primarily refer to soviet institutions and ideologies. This category is particularly

7. Source: <http://notepad-plus-plus.org/> (Last accessed April 21, 2015).

8. The "other" category was used to place words that did not fit into any of the other categories.

important for the following analysis and throughout the paper I will refer to these loanwords as soviet Russian loanwords to indicate that they are a semantic category of Russian loanwords.

4.2 Context

In examining the discourse contexts in which soviet Russian loanwords appear, it was found that this particular semantic category of Russian loanwords appears in contemporary historical discourse contexts (contemporary dates) more frequently pre-independence (1989) than post-independence (1992), and that these same soviet Russian loanwords appear more frequently in distant historical discourse contexts (older dates) post-independence than pre-independence. Additional issues from the newspaper were consulted because it was not possible to run tests for significance based on just two issues. This expanded corpus was manually searched for dates and corresponding soviet Russian loanwords. Distant historical dates were defined as 1928–1979, and contemporary dates were defined as 1980–1992.

In order to determine which words were used to replace Russian loanwords (across all semantic categories), Russian loanwords that appeared in the restricted context of titles in 1989 were compared to these same titles in 1992. These title contexts included titles of positions within government and education, as well as the names of institutions, organizations and locations, as shown in (1) and (2). These examples illustrate the replacement of the Russian loanword *rayon* ‘district’ with the Arabic loanword *nohiya* ‘district’ between 1989 and 1992.

- (1) January 1989 issue:

Toshkent shahrinning Hamza rayonida faoliyat ko'rsatayotgan
‘In Tashkent city's **Hamza district** [those who have been] active’

- (2) January 1992 issue:

Nazira Hamroqulova Hamza nohiyasidagi 225-maktab fizika muallimasi
‘Nazira Hamroqulova, **Hamza district's** school #18's physics teacher’

Both excerpts refer to the same district of “Hamza”; however, they are referring to it with different loanwords, indicating that the second loanword is a replacement of the first.

5. Results and discussion

This section presents the results and discussion in conjunction with one another. The first results section focuses on the overt language ideologies circulating both

before the language law and after independence. The main finding from this analysis is that the notion of “good Uzbek” is less dependent on language purification than on the relationship between the loanword languages (i.e. Russian, Arabic and Farsi) and the national identity of the state. The second results section focuses on findings from the corpus analysis. The main finding from this analysis is that the post-independence use of Russian loanwords from particular semantic classes, in particular contexts reinforces language ideologies about Russian and constructs difference between soviet Uzbekistan and newly independent Uzbekistan through processes of iconization and erasure. These findings are then discussed for their relevance regarding the role of Russian language in post-soviet contexts and the links between lexical items and ideology in language planning.

5.1 Results and discussion part I: Language ideologies

While linguists have long understood that the notion of “good” language is a social construct, which shifts as socio-political circumstances shift, in the case of Uzbekistan there is shift in understandings of what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate language *mixing*. Example (3) is drawn from proceedings of a conference focused on Uzbek corpus planning after the passing of the October 1989 Uzbek language law. This excerpt outlines some suggestions for deciding whether or not a loanword should be replaced and accordingly highlights relatively negative attitudes towards the use of Russian loanwords in Uzbek.

- (3) *O'zbek tilida avvaldan iste'molda bo'lib, keyinchalik asossiz ravishda ruscha yoki baynalmilal muqobili bilan almashtirilgan so'z va atamalarning qayta tiklanishni ma'qullash kerak (inqilob – revolyutsiya, jumhuriyat – respbulika...)*

‘We need to support the reinstatement of words that were formerly in use, but were later replaced by Russian or international words in an unsubstantiated manner (e.g. revolution – revolution, republic – republic...)⁹

A distinction is drawn between loanwords that were used in Uzbek *avvaldan* ‘from the beginning’ vs. the Russian words that replaced this first category of loanwords in an “unsubstantiated manner”. In parenthesis two pairs of words are given as examples. The first word in each pair is an example of a word, which was used in Uzbek “from the beginning”, while the second word in each pair is an example of an unsubstantiated replacement. Notably, the second word in each pair is

9. “Davlat tili haqidagi qonun – amalda [In practice – the law regarding the state language].” O'zbek tili vaadabiyoti. [Uzbek language and literature]. Issue: May-June 1991.

Russian, while the first word in each pair is an Arabic loanword, likely borrowed through Farsi.¹⁰

What is important to note here is the way in which Russian and Arabic/Farsi are discursively constructed relative to Uzbek and to one another. The assertion that Arabic/Farsi words have been a part of the Uzbek language “from the beginning” erases the complexity and uncertainty about when these languages first came into contact with one another. This assertion also creates the notion that Arabic/Farsi is indigenous to the Uzbek language. The discursive construction of Arabic/Farsi words as enduring and historical accomplishes a certain type of authentication described by Bauman as *traditionalization* (1992, 137). This type of authentication is an “active construction of connections that link the present with a meaningful past” (136). The “meaningful past” of Arabic/Farsi is apparent, not only in the use of loanwords, but also in the larger nationalist discourses in independent Uzbekistan. For example, Arabic and Persian historical figures are recognized as Uzbek national heroes. Roy (2000) notes that the Persian writer Alisher Nava’i is promoted in Uzbekistan as the father of the Uzbek language. Arabic/Farsi were the languages of the ruling class in pre-soviet times (Levi 2007; Khalid 2007), which were periods of economic and scientific flourishing. This in turn creates an association between Arabic, religious discourse and literacy. This association carries over into the post-soviet space where loanwords from Arabic/Farsi are seen as markers of authority and prestige (Roy, 2000), and perhaps even more importantly as markers of indigenouness.

The reference to Russian replacements as unsubstantiated in (3), on the other hand, constructs an understanding of Russian loanwords as unnecessary. Furthermore, since Russian was used to replace Arabic/Farsi loanwords, which were indigenous and authenticated, Russian loanwords are also discursively constructed as invasive. This view of Russian loanwords as invasive and unnecessary; however, was not articulated in media publications only a few years earlier, previous to the language law. Taken from an April 1989 publication, the text in (4) puts forth the claim that Uzbek has actually benefited from mixing with Russian.

- (4) *O‘zbek tilining rivojlanishiga rus tili katta hayotbaxsh ta’sir ko‘rsatdi.*
 ‘The Russian language has had a very life giving effect on the development of the Uzbek language.’¹¹

10. This assessment is based on phonology and the more significant impact that Farsi has had on Uzbek (see also Marashi 1988).

11. E. Yusupov, “Qayta qurish: Milliy tillar rivoji [Rebuilding: The development of ethnic languages].” *Sovet O‘zbekiston* [Soviet Uzbekistan]. April 8, 1989.

The discourse of Russian as invasive and unsubstantiated seen in (3) is a departure from the earlier discourse of Russian as “life giving” in terms of its relationship to Uzbek. In (4) Uzbek is seen as becoming a better version of itself through the influence of Russian, whereas in (3) Uzbek is seen as being unnecessarily invaded by Russian loanwords. The main point to take from the texts presented here is that what constitutes good Uzbek changes over time, and that the purification of Uzbek is not a process of returning to linguistic purity per se, but rather a process of categorizing and recategorizing what is socially considered indigenous vs. non-indigenous, developmentally beneficial vs. invasive. This perspective is instructive as it illuminates the ways in which language planning in post-soviet contexts was not an unambiguous project of de-russification, but rather a renegotiation of the associations of Russian, the titular language (i.e. Uzbek), and the other historical contact languages (i.e. Farsi and Arabic). In the analysis that follows, I examine how renegotiation of the associations of these languages is achieved in part through the use of loanwords in particular discursive contexts, across particular semantic categories and with particular frequencies.

5.2 Results and discussion part II

5.2.1 *Decrease in use of Russian loanwords*

Comparing the 1989 and 1992 corpora reveals a decrease from 1,135 to 386 Russian loanwords, from 9.34% to 2.98% of the total corpus. This decrease is significant, $\chi^2(1) = 407.822$, $p < .001$. In those cases where Russian loanwords were no longer used, they were replaced primarily with Arabic/Farsi loanwords. This 749-word decrease in the use of Russian loanwords is in line with the ideology that mixing Russian and Uzbek is unsubstantiated. Quantitative evidence of this decrease also bolsters earlier claims about the de-russification undertaken in Uzbekistan (Pavlenko 2008; Landau & Kellner-Heinkele 2001) and demonstrates that this de-russification was not only manifest in top-down policies, but also in Russian loanword frequency within newspapers. Given the strong association between Russian language and soviet rule (Fierman 1991, 1995; Landau & Kellner-Heinkele 2001), the decrease in the use of Russian loanwords also marks a distinction between the new Uzbek national identity and the previous soviet identity. This is bolstered by the fact that Arabic/Farsi loanwords were strategically purged by the Soviet Union to make space for the addition of Russian loanwords (Kari-Nyazov 1968), suggesting that the reversal of this process – the strategic replacement of Russian loanwords with Arabic/Farsi loanwords – is in and of itself an action which disowns soviet identities through reversing soviet historical processes.

5.2.2 Maintenance of Russian loanwords

While the number of Russian loanwords used in this Uzbek language newspaper decreased overall, loanwords from different semantic categories decreased to different degrees, meaning that some semantic categories of Russian loanwords were maintained in Russian more than others. I argue that this differential maintenance is evidence of the fact that de-russification is a complex phenomenon in which both decreasing and *maintaining* Russian loanwords can have consequences for the status planning of all involved languages and for the discursive construction of national identity. In so arguing, I complicate visions of de-russification, which focus exclusively on the removal of Russian from the public sphere and provide additional evidence for Canagarajah’s (2000) claims that colonial languages themselves can be used in sites of decolonization.

The maintenance of Russian loanwords is most apparent in the fact that soviet Russian loanwords (as a semantic category) decreased less drastically than Russian loanwords in all other semantic categories (e.g. political and administrative, agricultural). Note Table 1, which indicates the percentage of Russian loanwords per semantic category. Semantically soviet Russian loanwords (e.g. *sovet* ‘soviet’) make up a larger percentage of all Russian loanwords in 1992, than in 1989. This greater maintenance of soviet Russian loanwords in comparison to the maintenance for other semantic categories of Russian loanwords is significant, $\chi^2(1) = 9.416$, $p < 0.002$.

Table 1. Percentage of total Russian loanwords per semantic category

	1989		1992	
	Percentage of Russian loanwords	Raw number of words	Percentage of Russian loanwords	Raw number of words
Soviet loan- words	11.49%	125	15.8%	61
All other seman- tic categories	88.51%	1010	84.2%	325

Those categories in which the use of Russian loanwords is decreasing more see a surge in the use of Arabic/Farsi replacement loanwords, while those categories in which the use of Russian is decreasing less are being maintained in Russian. The maintenance of soviet loanwords in Russian is significant because of what this semantic class represents. While words in other semantic categories (e.g. political and administrative, agricultural) are being indigenized through the use of Arabic/Farsi words, words in the soviet semantic category are being maintained

in Russian. The fact that soviet loanwords are maintained in Russian marks this particular class of loanwords as distinctively non-indigenous.¹²

Iconization is the process through which a sign (i.e. the Russian loanword) becomes linked with the social image (i.e. soviet structures and ideologies) “in a linkage that appears to be inherent” (Irvine and Gal 2000, 38). The maintenance of this class of words in Russian is a process of iconization, which highlights the russianness of these words, making them diacritics of difference in an otherwise de-russifying Uzbek. This focus on the russianness of soviet loanwords in turn makes inherent the link between Russian language and soviet structures and ideologies. The iconization of the link between the Russian language and the soviet, in turn allows for an emphasis of the difference between soviet Uzbekistan and the independent Uzbek nation state. That is, by demonstrating that semantically political and agricultural loanwords can be indigenized, but that semantically soviet loanwords cannot, soviet structures and ideologies become discursively incompatible with and sufficiently differentiated from the new nation state and soviet identity is recast as a primarily foreign and non-Uzbek identity.

Another way in which the use of semantically soviet Russian loanwords emphasizes difference between soviet and post-soviet Uzbekistan is revealed through an examination of the context in which these words appear, specifically through an examination of their historical discourse contexts. A distant historical context refers to the appearance of a year between 1928 and 1979 in the text, while a contemporary historical context refers to the appearance of a year between 1980 and 1992 in the text. An example of a soviet Russian loanword co-occurring with a contemporary historical discourse context is found in (5), while an example of a soviet Russian loanword co-occurring with a distant historical discourse context is found in (6). The loanword and discourse context have been bolded in each example.

(5) January 1989

1989 yil 10 yanvar kuni KPSS Markaziy Komitetining navbatdagi Plenumi bo'ldi.

‘On January 10th **1989** the Central Committee of the **Communist Party of the Soviet Union** held its next meeting.’

(6) January 1992

1936 yilda O'zbekiston SSR Markaziy Ijroiya Qo'mitasi xalq o'qituvchisi A. Ibodeviga “Mehnat qahramoni” unvonini bergan edi.

‘In **1936** the Executive Central Committee of the Uzbek **Soviet Socialist Republic** gave the title of “Labor hero” to local teacher, A. Ibodeviga.’

12. As an anonymous reviewer pointed out, another possible reason for the maintenance of soviet loanwords in Russian is that they refer to entities, which no longer exist.

Note that the historical discourse context determines the historical space to which the remainder of the text is understood to refer. That is, a co-occurrence of a soviet Russian loanword and a contemporary historical discourse context is a reference to contemporary soviet ideologies and/or structures, while a co-occurrence of a Russian soviet loanword and a distant historical discourse context is a reference to historically distant soviet ideologies and structures.

A quantitative analysis of the distributions of these types of co-occurrences across the expanded corpus (8 issues total) demonstrates that soviet Russian loanwords co-occur with *distant* historical contexts more frequently post-independence than pre-independence, and that these same loanwords co-occur with *contemporary* historical contexts more frequently pre-independence than post-independence, as shown in Table 2. A chi-square test on the association between the co-occurrence of soviet Russian loanwords in historical discourse contexts and the time period in which the newspaper was published demonstrates that there is a significant association, $\chi^2(1) = 7.364, p < 0.01$.

Table 2. Raw numbers and percentages for instances of co-occurrence of historical discourse context and soviet loanwords

Historical Discourse Context	Pre-independence (raw numbers)	Pre-independence (percentages)	Post-independence (raw numbers)	Post-independence (percentages)
Distant	8	34.78%	15	65.21%
Contemporary	21	72.41%	8	27.59%

This relegation of soviet Russian loanwords to discussions of the distant historical past, as in (6) creates an association between soviet structures and a historically removed time. The systematic use of this semantic class of loanwords in distant historical contexts post-independence can be seen as a strategic historicization of the Soviet Union employed to emphasize the temporal difference between the Soviet Union and independent Uzbekistan. Using Irvine and Gal’s terminology, this constitutes an erasure of the very recent history in which Uzbekistan was a soviet republic. Given that the post-soviet newspapers examined in this study are from 1992, Uzbekistan was a part of the Soviet Union only one year earlier. By erasing this recent history through the strategic placement of soviet Russian loanwords, the discourse effectively deemphasizes the temporal similarities between the Uzbek nation state and other soviet republics.

Both the strategic historicization of the Soviet Union and the association of soviet structures with “foreignness” are the cumulative effects of Russian loanwords being maintained in particular semantic categories and discursive contexts. While the most visible impact of post-soviet language planning on the newspaper

corpus is the removal of Russian loanwords, this analysis has demonstrated how the less visible *maintenance* of Russian loanwords also impacts language status and national identity. Focusing on the cumulative effects of the micro, covert patterns of Russian loanword maintenance allows us to observe the ways in which state-controlled media use the colonial language for processes of decolonization. This in turn allows for a reconsideration of the relationship between corpus planning and national language ideology under Fishman's framework. Take for instance, Fishman's (2004) description of the "purity" concern as one which "rejects influences, old or new, that are associated with impinging ethnocultural entities or influences via language spread..." (84). Through the examples he gives (e.g. France's "phobia against 'anglicisms'") Fishman characterizes this concern as being about the intrusion of impure and foreign loanwords, but does not detail the ways in which this concern plays out. The results of this study have demonstrated that, while the post-soviet media in Uzbekistan is undoubtedly characterized by the removal of "foreign" Russian loanwords, it is also important to note that the construction of Russian as "foreign" is established through the *use* of Russian loanwords in the corpus examined here. In other words, while purity concerns are enacted through the removal of Russian loanwords, they are constructed in part through the maintenance of those same loanwords in new discursive contexts and for new discursive effects.

5.2.3 *Restricted use for Russian loanwords*

Turning to a different semantic class of Russian loanwords, the use of semantically political and administrative Russian loanwords decreases more drastically than Russian loanwords in all other semantic categories. This decrease in political Russian loanwords reflects a concerted effort to create distinction between the politics and administration of the Soviet Union and the politics and administration of independent Uzbekistan. However, there are political Russian loanwords, which continue to be used alongside Arabic/Farsi replacements in a few restrictive contexts. Examining the ways in which the Russian loanword *respublika* 'republic' and the Arabic/Farsi loanword *jumhuriyat* 'republic' are used in complementary distribution, gives a better understanding of other more subtle types of iconization achieved through the restricted use of non-soviet Russian loanwords.

Prior to independence, Russian *respublika* 'republic' was used exclusively without any occurrences of Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* 'republic'. After independence both terms are used; however, a complementary pattern emerges with regards to their possessive morphology. Note that the 1st person plural possessive suffix *-miz* 'our' appears on the Russian loanword *respublika* 'republic' in example (7) taken from the 1989 corpus, but it does not appear on the Russian loanword *respublika* 'republic' in example (8) taken from the 1992 corpus. However, the *-miz* 'our' suffix

appears on the Arabic/Farsi loanword *jumhuriyat* ‘republic’ in example (9) which is also taken from the 1992 corpus.

- (7)

January 1989

Respublika-miz-da bunday mutaxassislikka ega bo'lgan o'qituvchilar sanoqli
'In **our** **republic**, teachers with this level of expertise are limited'
- (8)

January 1992

Mustaqil respublika-ni qo'riqlaydigan botir...
'The heroes who defend the independent **republic**...'
- (9)

January 1992

Ma'lumki, jumhuriyat-i-miz mustaqillikka qadam qo'yishi bilanoq...
'As you know, with the steps that **our** **republic** took towards independence...'

By marking *respublika* ‘republic’ with *-miz* ‘our’ in (7), the limited expertise of the teachers is framed as a shared national responsibility. Similarly, affixing *-miz* ‘our’ to the Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* ‘republic’ in (9) frames the steps being taken by the republic as a shared undertaking. In contrast, the use of *respublika* ‘republic’ in (8) without *-miz* ‘our’ lacks this emphasis on shared ownership. De Cillia et al. (1999) note that the use of the first person plural is of “utmost importance in the discourses about nations and national identities” (163) because when applied to the nation state, this first person possessive pronoun can be seen as an appeal to national solidarity and a discursive move to diminish the real differences between members of a nation state. In the case of examples (7) – (9), intra-national sameness is associated with Russian *respublika* ‘republic’, previous to independence, but after independence, intra-national sameness is only associated with the use of Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* ‘republic’.

Table 3 indicates that the distribution of the *-miz* ‘our’ suffix holds across comparisons of multiple examples pre- and post-independence. Although the numbers here are too small to run statistical tests, there is an observable pattern. Most notably, Russian *respublika* ‘republic’ never appears with *-miz* ‘our’ post-independence, but appears with this possessive affix five out of thirteen times pre-independence.

Table 3. Possessive morphology on the word *republic* in Arabic and Russian for 1989 and 1992

	<i>respublika</i> (1989)	<i>jumhuriyat</i> (1989)	<i>respublika</i> (1992)	<i>jumhuriyat</i> (1992)
With “-miz”	5	0	0	5
Without “-miz”	13	0	6	4
Total frequency	18	0	6	9

Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* ‘republic’ appears with this suffix five out of nine times post-independence, and is not used at all in the 1989 publication.

Given that the Russian loanword is used to refer to the same entity (the republic), before and after independence, it must be assumed that it is not a change in the referential meaning of the loanword that causes it to be restricted to certain contexts, but rather a restriction of the non-referential meaning. Post-independence, Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* takes over the solidarity uses of the word ‘republic’ that previously had been communicated with the use of Russian *respublika*. Through the process of restricting Russian *respublika* and replacing it with Arabic/Farsi *jumhuriyat* in contexts of shared ownership, the non-referential indexical value of Russian is also restricted to contexts of officiality, and kept distinct from contexts of shared ownership and solidarity. What this means in terms of iconization is that Russian becomes understood as inherently ill suited for expressing solidarity, while Arabic/Farsi become understood as inherently well suited to expressing national solidarity. Given post-independence language ideologies about Arabic/Farsi as indigenous, this iconization can be further interpreted as an understanding that Uzbek national solidarity is an inherently indigenous and local phenomenon, rather than a soviet and Russian phenomenon. Once again, an analysis of the use of Russian loanwords in context allows us to observe the multiple ways in which corpus planning and status planning are connected. In this case we observe how the distribution of a particular morpheme across *jumhuriyat* vs. *respublika* informs language ideology and national identity.

6. Conclusion

The continued use of Russian, in albeit limited and restricted contexts within censored Uzbek public media is understood to have ideological functions which extend beyond the corpus planning agenda overtly stated by authoritative and governmental institutions. The main claim here is that the use of Russian loanwords in Uzbek language newspapers post-independence functions less as a means of modeling appropriate language use and more as a means of modeling appropriate linguistic and national ideology. That is, the complex negotiation of loanword distribution across semantic fields and discourse contexts contributes to the ideologically loaded processes of iconization and erasure, which promote a particular vision of national identity and language ideology. The claim that changes to the lexicon function as a means of modeling language ideology is very much in line with Fishman’s (2000) claim that the hidden agenda of corpus planning is in fact status planning. However, this study has also added to Fishman’s model by tracing this connection between lexical change and ideology through language use in

discursive and linguistic contexts and by demonstrating how purity concerns are constructed in part through the maintenance of the very loanwords, which are marked as “impure”. By demonstrating that the use of Russian loanwords can be used to discursively create a non-soviet Uzbek identity, this study has added to our understanding of why the use of a particular language cannot be equated to the endorsement of that language. While corpus planning may result in status planning, the relationship is not a direct, one-to-one correlation. Rather, as demonstrated in 5.1, the indexical associations of particular languages are shifting and flexible, and as shown in 5.2, the positioning of a language within a specific context and the limiting of its scope to a particular topic can be used to exploit the indexicalities of that language for the more complex task of national identity transformation. The exploitation of the indexicalities of Russian discussed in this study is also informative in conceptualizing Russian in post-soviet Uzbekistan. Although Uzbekistan was more aggressive in its de-russification than any of the other Central Asian States (Pavlenko 2008), the findings here suggest that Russian did not entirely lose its role in constructing national identity.

This study focuses on the functions of Russian in government-controlled newspapers, which expands understandings of how language planning occurs across multiple levels of governmental and community authority, and how top down processes are mediated in highly censored contexts. However, to more fully understand the ways in which post-soviet newspapers mediate language ideologies, as well as the functions of Russian within post-soviet Uzbekistan, it would be necessary to examine how the ideologies outlined here are taken up or resisted by the readers of newspapers.

Acknowledgements

This paper would not have been possible without the assistance of Rakesh Bhatt, Joseph Lenkart or the valuable feedback from the Language and Society Discussion group, specifically Itxaso Rodriguez, Staci Defibaugh, Farzad Karimzad, Kate Lyons and Megan Kennedy. Thanks also to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback. All errors and omissions remain my own.

References

- Akiner, Shirin. 1997. “Survey of the Lexical Influence of Russian on Modern Uzbek (1870 1990).” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 75(1): 1–35.
- Androunas, Elena. 1993. *Soviet Media in Transition: Structural and Economic Alternatives*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

- Anthony, Laurence. 2014. *AntConc (Version 3.4.3)* [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/>
- Bauman, Richard. 1992. "Contextualization, Tradition, and the Dialogue of Genres: Icelandic Legends of the Kraftaskald." In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin, 125–146. New York, NY / Oakleigh, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 1996. "Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition." *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 20(3): 199–222. doi: 10.1075/lplp.20.3.01blo
- Boeschoten, Hendrik. 1998. "Uzbek" In *The Turkic Languages*, ed. by Lars Johanson, and Éva Csátó, 357–378. London / New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Brown, Jeff. 1995. "Mass Media in Transition in Central Asia." *International Communication Gazette*, 54(3): 249–265. doi: 10.1177/001654929505400304
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2000. "Negotiating Ideologies through English: Strategies from the Periphery." In *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English* ed. by Thomas Ricento, 121–132. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: 10.1075/impact.6.1ocan
- De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak. 1999. "The Discursive Construction of National Identities." *Discourse & Society*, 10(2): 149–173. doi: 10.1177/0957926599010002002
- Fierman, William. 1982. "The Shifting Russian and Uzbek Language Balance in pre-World War II Uzbekistan." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (38): 125–125.
- Fierman, William. 1989. "Glasnost in Practice: The Uzbek Experience." *Central Asian Survey*, 8(2): 1–45. doi: 10.1080/02634938908400663
- Fierman, William. 1991. *Language Planning and National Development: The Uzbek Experience*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. doi: 10.1515/9783110853384
- Fierman, William. 1995. Problems of Language Law Implementation in Uzbekistan. *Nationalities Papers*, 23(3): 573–595. doi: 10.1080/00905999508408403
- Fishman, Joshua. 2000. "The Status Agenda in Corpus Planning." In *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of A. Ronald Walton*, ed. by Richard Labert, and Elena Shohamy, 43–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: 10.1075/z.96.03fs
- Fishman, Joshua. 2004. "Ethnicity and Supra-ethnicity in Corpus Planning: The Hidden Status Agenda in Corpus Planning." *Nations and Nationalism* 10(1–2): 79–94. doi: 10.1111/j.1354-5078.2004.00156.x
- Hornberger, Nancy. 1997. "Language Planning from the Bottom Up." In *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up*, ed. by Nancy Hornberger, 357–366. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. doi: 10.1515/9783110814798.357
- Irvine, Judith and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, & Identities*, ed. by Paul V. Kroskrity, 35–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Johnson, David. 2013. *Language Policy*. Berlin: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9781137316202
- Kaplan, Robert and Richard Baldauf Jr. 1997. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kari-Nyazov, Tashmuxeamed. 1955. *Studies in the History and Culture of Soviet Uzbekistan*. [Очерки истории культуры Советского Узбекистана.] Moscow: Nauk and Tashkent University Press.

- Khalid, Adeeb. 2007. *Islam after Communism*. Berkeley / Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1969. *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- Kreindler, Isabelle. 1997. "Multilingualism in the Successor States of the Soviet Union." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17: 91–112. doi: 10.1017/S0267190500003299
- Landau, Jacob and Barbara Kellner-Heinkele. 2001. *Politics of Language in the ex-Soviet Muslim States: Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, and Tajikistan*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Levi, Scott. 2007. Turks and Tajiks in Central Asian History. *Everyday Life in Central Asia: Past and Present*, ed. by Jeff Sahadeo, and Russell Zanca, 13–31. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Marashi, Mehdi. 1988. "Phonetic and Semantic Modification of Farsi Loanwords in Contemporary Uzbek." *Islamic Culture* 62(2–3), 79–96.
- McNair, Brian. 1991. *Glasnost, Perestroika and the Soviet Media*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1992. "Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13:(1–2), 19–39. doi: 10.1080/01434632.1992.9994481
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2008. "Russian in post-Soviet Countries." *Russian Linguistics* 32(1): 59–80. doi: 10.1007/s11185-007-9020-1
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2000. "Language, Ideology and Hindsight: Lessons from Colonial Language Policy." *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English*, ed. by Thomas Ricento, 49–65. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: 10.1075/impact.6.06pen
- Roy, Olivier. 2000. *The New Central Asia: The Creation of Nations*. New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.
- Schiffman, Harold. 1998. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Schlyter, Birgit. 2012. Language policy and Language Development in Multilingual Uzbekistan. In *Language Policy and Language Conflict in Afghanistan and Its Neighbors: The Changing Politics of Language Choice*, ed. by H. Schiffman, 176–207. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, ed. by John Lucy, 33–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511621031.004

Author's address

Lydia Catedral
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 4080 Foreign Languages Building
 707 S. Mathews Ave. MC-168, Urbana, IL 61801
 USA
 medill2@illinois.edu

Biographical notes

Lydia Catedral is a PhD candidate in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her general research focuses are on language and identity in post-soviet Central Asia, and among marginalized groups in the United States. Her dissertation concerns the language of criticism and its role in constructing morality and identity for immigrant women from Uzbekistan currently living in the U.S.

Publication history

Date received: 16 May 2015

Date accepted: 14 January 2016

Published online: 21 March 2017