

## **BELONGING THROUGH LINGUISTIC PLACE-MAKING IN CENTER-PERIPHERY CONSTELLATIONS**

**Urinbekov Jasurbek Jurabek ugli**

Fargʻona davlat universiteti oʻqituvchisi

**Abdullayev Abdurashid Abdusattorovich**

Fargʻona davlat universiteti oʻqituvchisi

***Annotation:** This article discovers the theme of belonging through linguistic place-making in center-periphery multilingual environment. It originated from workshops held at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS) and a colloquium at a Sociolinguistics Symposium. The focus was on how individuals in marginal or peripheral areas construct senses of belonging through language practices in the face of centralization-peripheralization dynamics. The book aims to advance sociolinguistic studies by emphasizing the total linguistic fact as an unstable interaction of sign forms mediated by cultural ideology. Concepts of place and belonging have been central in sociolinguistics, with Tuan's perspective influencing the field significantly. The volume seeks to develop these concepts further to understand processes of identification through language use. Feelings of belonging are viewed as dynamic and shaped by social interactions and semiotic resources. By bringing peripheries to the forefront, the book aims to enrich sociolinguistic research.*

***Аннотация:** В данной статье раскрывается тема принадлежности через лингвистическое местоустройство в центрально-периферийной многоязычной среде. Основное внимание уделялось тому, как люди в маргинальных или периферийных районах формируют чувство принадлежности посредством языковой практики в условиях динамики централизации-периферализации. Статья направлена на развитие социолингвистических исследований, подчеркивая тот лингвистический факт, что нестабильное взаимодействие знаковых форм, опосредованное культурной идеологией. Понятия места и принадлежности занимали центральное место в социолингвистике, при этом точка зрения Туана оказала значительное влияние на эту область. Целью статьи является дальнейшее развитие этих концепций для понимания процессов идентификации через использование языка. Чувство принадлежности рассматривается как динамичное и формируемое социальными взаимодействиями и семиотическими ресурсами. Выдвигая периферию на передний план, статья стремится обогатить социолингвистические исследования.*

***Annotatsiya:** Ushbu maqolada markaziy-periferik hududlardagi ko‘p tilli muhitda lingvistik joylashish orqali tegishlilik mavzusini ochib beradi. Diqqat markazlashtirish-periferiklashtirish dinamikasida til amaliyotlari orqali qoloq va chekka hududlardagi odamlar qanday qilib tegishlilik tuyg‘usini yaratishga qaratilgan. Maqola sotsiolingvistik tadqiqotlarni rivojlantirishga qaratilgan bo‘lib, lingvistik haqiqatni ta’kidlab, belgi shakllarining beqaror o‘zaro ta’siri madaniy mafkura vositasida amalga oshiriladi. Joy va mansublik tushunchalari sotsiolingvistikada markaziy o‘rin tutgan, Tuanning fikri bu sohaga sezilarli ta’sir ko‘rsatgan. Maqolaning maqsadi tildan foydalanish orqali identifikatsiyalash jarayonlarini tushunish uchun ushbu tushunchalarni yanada rivojlantirishdir. Mansublik tuyg‘usi dinamik va ijtimoiy o‘zaro ta’sirlar va semiotik manbalar tomonidan shakllantiriladi. Maqola periferiyani birinchi o‘ringa olib chiqish orqali sotsiolingvistik tadqiqotlarni boyitishga intiladi.*

This paper arose from two workshops that was organized at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS) in 2011 and 2013 – the latter while coordinating the NIAS theme group The construction of local identities through language practices – and from a colloquium Language, identity and community: Moving margins – Reversals and recursions in processes of placemaking convened together with Barbara Johnstone at Sociolinguistics Symposium 20 in Jyväskylä, Finland, in 2014. Bringing together scholars working on linguistic place-making and belonging in various, mostly European, settings, the aim of the NIAS research group and the workshops resulting from it, was to clarify how people, subject to an all-pervading centralization-peripheralization dynamics, construct place-based senses of belonging through language practices. Participants in these workshops focused on people identifying with places and areas that are seen as marginal or peripheral by those inhabiting centers of economic power and/or linguistic and cultural prestige. Presenting perspectives from the margins, the authors of this book show how the marginalized comment on, resist, and subvert dominant center-periphery orderings through language practices. NIAS offered our research group an ideal context: working on themes that were both interdisciplinary and innovative, it was possible to exchange and synthesize knowledge and insights from sociolinguistics, sociocultural anthropology, and linguistic anthropology. It is hoped that our combined research at NIAS and this resulting volume will advance the development of sociolinguistic studies of centralization-peripheralization that take their subject matter to be the total linguistic fact: “an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use, mediated by the fact of cultural ideology” (Silverstein 1985: 220). The notions of place and belonging that figure in the title of this volume have been at the core of sociolinguistics from

its early beginnings. Labov's (1963) classic Martha's Vineyard study is in fact all about place (a peripheral place at that!) and belonging. Within sociolinguistics, however, the concepts of place and belonging have long remained relatively underdeveloped theoretically. Over the past few decades, Tuan's (1991) place-making perspective, conceptualizing places as socially constructed, invested with socio-cultural meaning through language practices, has had a profound influence on many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists, an influence that is clearly visible in the contributions to this book. Belonging also has started to make its way into sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology but it has been used quite loosely and has not been thoroughly discussed and defined as a theoretical concept. One of the main aims of this volume is to develop 'belonging' and 'place' into concepts that help us understand the dynamics of processes of (dis) identification through language (in) use. How can we conceptualize and operationalize these concepts and find out to what extent they can have explanatory power in contemporary sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological studies? In our view, feelings of belonging are best seen not as simply enduring through time and space, but as changing and variable across situations and stages of life. People develop feelings of belonging in social interaction by engaging with semiotic resources such as physical space, material culture (including the built-up environment), and linguistic features involved in processes of enregisterment (Agha 2006), and by referring to these in metapragmatic practices (Cornips & de Rooij 2015a, b; Youkhana 2015). In concurrence with developing and applying concepts of place and belonging, the volume wants to bring the study of peripheries to the center of sociolinguistic research. The main reason for this is that much recent sociolinguistic research, informed by theories of globalization, shows a clear bias toward the study of metropolitan areas. Rural, as well as urbanized peripheries that are supposed to be less ethnically mixed have, until now, received relatively little attention (notable recent exceptions are Cornips et al. 2017; Cornips & de Rooij 2015b; Pietikainen & Kelly-Holmes 2013; Wang et al. 2014). Of course, people living in less 'spectacular' margins or peripheries that are not overtly recognized as mixed and hybridized are not immune to the effects of globalization and rapid technological change. They too constantly form new ensembles from linguistic and cultural resources which they invest with novel, instable, often ambiguous meanings. The erasure of purportedly unspectacular margins or peripheries from sociolinguistic research stands in the way of a full understanding of the relation between language, place and belonging. This volume wants to explore how we can pursue the study of processes of linguistic (dis) identification by starting from the assumption that people are always and everywhere caught up in a 'politics of belonging' driven by a centralization-peripheralization dynamics. The central question then becomes: how do people position themselves

toward others and how do they include or exclude those others using linguistic and cultural resources? Center-periphery theorizing has quite a pedigree in the social sciences as Woolard's (this volume) critical and insightful appraisal demonstrates; her excellent review of major sources made us decide not to include such a review in this introduction, although we do take up some of the themes and issues discussed by Woolard. In our own research (Cornips & de Rooij 2015b; Cornips et al. 2017), it was investigated the inextricably intertwined threads of language and culture (cf. Agar 1994) and how these affect the production and reproduction of social differences and power relations between different groups within centralization and peripheralization dynamics. To understand the power dimension in processes of centralization-peripheralization, one needs to address the question of how social-economic, and political and spatial understandings of the periphery (Wall 2015) give rise to (feelings of) linguistic marginalization. Linguistic marginalization Center and periphery are not necessarily to be conceptualized as place-based categories since they result from a complex processes of social, cultural and linguistic differentiation (Massey 1993: 67), which constantly trigger intricate linguistic and cultural reorderings. This center-periphery dynamics is all about how people position themselves toward received categories and hegemonic ideologies. As pointed out by Wang et al. (2014: 36), "[i]n many countries, one finds a deeply entrenched language ideology that is built on the unquestioned principle that a nation-state should be linguistically uniform." In most cases, the imposed national 'standard variety' has been matched with the variety spoken and written in the center of political and economic power in the nation-state. This standardized national variety is perceived as neutral, not rooted in, or associated with, a particular place but rather with the national public sphere, and can thus act as the medium of the 'view from nowhere' (Nagel 1986; Smakman 2006: 108–112). This variety is imposed on speakers in the periphery through the school system which (re) produces the devaluation of localized, place-bound non-standard varieties. The neutral, standard variety is often equated with 'the highest prestige' variety. Because of the prestige of the national standard variety, speakers in the periphery are perceived not to speak 'the right way' and are often negatively stereotyped as backward when they speak 'dialect' or a 'minority language'. In response to this, as pointed out by Preston (2013:177), "speakers of devalued varieties (like prejudiced against groups in general) derive solidarity from their distinctive behaviors, in this case, linguistic ones". Seen in this light, linguistic and cultural differences between the perceived center and periphery are never socially neutral but constitute rich resources for social meaning making in identity work. In most Western countries, there is one standard language which dominates politics, the media and education, and this means that other language varieties are relegated to a subordinate social and cultural status, even if they are

spoken by sizeable proportions of the population. These language varieties, and the people who speak them, are often the object of heavy negative social stereotyping, and as a result, speakers of these varieties may end up feeling marginalized linguistically, politically and even economically. The perceived peripheries are routinely associated with these people speaking dialects, regional minority languages or simply non-standard. These language varieties are seen as anchoring people to specific places. However, increasing globalization has meant that dialect has become a resource for indexing intersections of gender, class, and race/ethnicity, which are often unstable and ambiguous. New media and language policies, along with the growing commodification of local languages make it increasingly common for public events such as the Dutch Limburg carnival (Cornips & de Rooij 2015b; Cornips et al. 2017; Thissen 2018) to feature both individuals and institutions (re)producing their own versions of local uniqueness and authenticity. There may be disagreements on who/ what is authentic, on who has the right to speak dialect or what kind of dialect one should speak, but all the parties under scrutiny in the research reported on in this volume, wittingly or not, help to reproduce power inequalities.

Perceptions of peripheries Places that are perceived as peripheral, and the people living there, are often, but not necessarily, associated with socio-cultural marginality, i. e. as being non-standard. This non-standardness can take on negative and positive connotations at the same time, along the lines of Baumann's orientaling grammar that is based on the idea that "[o]rientalism is ... not a simple binary opposition of 'us=good' and 'them=bad', but a very shrewd mirrored reversal of 'what is good in us is [still] bad in them, but what got twisted in us [still] remains straight in them'" (Baumann 2004: 20). Limburg and its inhabitants, prominent in the chapters by Stengs and Thissen, provide an example of how this works out in practice. In the Netherlands, Limburg and its inhabitants are the object of peripheralization vis-à-vis the western part of the country. Westerners think of themselves as enlightened ('good in us') while Limburgers are seen as backward ('[still] bad in them'), but at the same time Westerners also see themselves as cold and calculating ('what got twisted in us') and Limburgers as warm and spontaneous (what '[still] remains straight in them'). This idea of Baumann also explains why the periphery-center relation is often complex and rife with ambiguities and contradictions, which provide the base for center-periphery reversals and collapses that can be seen in the parodic performances central in the chapters by Stengs, Petrović, and Thissen. As pointed out by Pietikainen & Holmes (2013: 2), "the centre-periphery relationship is never fixed, but instead constantly renegotiated and mutually constitutive." What is meant by 'periphery' and 'center' is thus inherently ambiguous, as it depends on situated temporal framings and spatial perspectives

(Wall 2015) or as Hall (2015: 162) argues: “Where the periphery is depends on where you stand.” Centralization-peripheralization also involves fractal recursivity (Gal & Irvine 1995) : within each periphery, a new center may be formed, and within each center a new periphery (we see this process at work in various forms in all chapters of this volume). Language ‘in the periphery’ may be promoted to a new standard linked with a regional ‘center’, which people in the region orient to revealing linguistic representations of peripheral areas as hierarchical multidialectal spaces (Cornips et al. 2016). The social oppositions produced in processes of centralization-peripheralization may lead to the emergence of multiple systems of norms and values activated within specific scalar configurations. These norms may be more fluid and situational in peripheral places than the ones linked to fairly well-established hegemonic centers (Pietikäinen & Holmes 2013: 9). The periphery may be felt as ‘far away’ from the perspective of the residents of the periphery itself because it is seen as such from within the center (Balibar 2004: 12). Power asymmetries in centralization and peripheralization dynamics can, but need not be ‘real’ in the sense that they can be measured in e. g. economic strength. More often than not, however, they are based on economic exploitation. Heller et al. (2016: 67–68) argue that “[s]tate centralization produced peripheries as potentially exploitable and explorable spaces” and that “[t]he role of the periphery is to supply the center with human and material resources as needed, and to act as a frontier for economic expansion, absorbing surplus population and providing new spaces for investment” (ibid.:67). Whether real exploitation takes place or not, what is crucial is that people residing in the periphery or encountering peripheralization experience a difference and feel marginalized economically, politically, culturally, and linguistically by (perceived) centralization (see Cornips et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2014). Important factors contributing to feelings of being marginalized economically are limited transport infrastructure or being located at the end of transport networks, an economy based on natural resources, out-migration, and low production of high-value products and services (Hall 2015: 166–168). People in the perceived periphery are particularly aggrieved by forms of symbolic domination by the center that devalue the historical and cultural heritage on which the residents of the periphery build their regional identities (Zarycki 2007: 125–126).

### **References**

1. Agar, M. 1994. *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
2. Agha, A. 2006. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Antonsich, M. 2010. Searching for belonging: An analytical framework. *Geography Compass* 4 (6) : 644–659. doi:10. 1111/j. 1749-8198.

4. Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

5. Brown, B. B., Altman, I. & Werner, C. M. 2012. Place attachment. In *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, S. J. Smith (ed. ), 183–188. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

6. Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F. 2000. Beyond “identity”. *Theory and Society* 29 (1) : 1–47.

7. Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. 2005. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7 (4–5) : 585–614.

8. Cornips, L. & de Rooij, V. 2015a. Belonging as local achievement. Talk presented at the workshop. The languagecultural conceptualization of belonging. Maastricht University, 10 June 2015.

9. Cornips, L. & de Rooij, V. 2015b. Belonging through languagecultural practices in the periphery: The politics of carnival in the Dutch province of Limburg. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 24 (1) : 83–101.