

DEFINING SOCIO CHARACTERIZATION OF LANGUAGE: WHAT LANGUAGE REALLY IS!			Linguistics
		Keywords: Communicative aspect, dead language, dying language, existent language, social aspect.	
Abdur Rashed	Lecturer, Department of English, Khulna Public College, Khulna, Bangladesh		
Sheikh Saifullah Ahmed	Lecturer, Department of English and Modern Languages IUBAT-International University of Business Agriculture and Technology Dhaka, Bangladesh		
Deb Proshad Halder	Lecturer, Department of English Jashore Govt. Women's College, Jashore, Bangladesh		
Abstract			
<p>Language has been defined from phonology, morphology and syntactic aspect. But this short communicate explores to defend the sociological aspect (communicative aspect) of a language. 'Language as a means of communication' superimposes over any other definition if it can be believed two people can draw a language to exist along with other prominent languages and a language is dead when no speaker exists. However, this precise article tends to show minutely what the position of a language is if one knows this language but does not have a second one to interact with that person. Here, the bottom line is that the man cannot utilize this language to serve his communicative purpose. Hence, his language does not serve the purpose of communication. Therefore, the placement of that language is to the category of dying language in which only one person is left for that language to be characterized as a dead language.</p>			

Introduction

The thought on language, the concept of language is not really as non-opaque as crystal. A language produces power like nuclear energy that has created a civilization and the vanishing of that power has dwindled a civilization that the history of human civilization proves this fact (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011). A community may have a distinct language; this very community of a fewer number of population supposes to have been invaded and won by a greater powerful community who speak a different language. That minority group will begin to shift to the language community of invaders and they will gradually lose their ethnic identity with deliberate and assimilation process. At a certain period of time, the last person speaking of that language will be lost due to political and economic factors which will lead to natural barriers of producing this language and thus 'linguicide' (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011) will occur. And that community will linguistically be dead and merge with different linguistic community leaving behind their heritage embedded with language. The Muslims address their creator as 'Allaha' who is incorporeal. But the Hindu mythology designates 'Brahma' /brahm̩ɑ/ as their creator who is Morpheus though the 'Vedic' 'Iswar' /iʃv̩ɑr/ of Hindu religion takes on the amorphous nature. Thus, Hindu 'Brahma' cannot be replaced by the Muslim 'Allaha' thus a Hindu person cannot replace *Allaha* with *Brahma*, thus; this Hindu mythic creator will be diminished from the linguistic context if shifting happens. Then *Iswar* will take on the position replacing *Brahma* and the sense of *Brahma* will

disappear which is evidential superimposition of a cultural diction on the merged community (Curzan, 2014).

Dying Language and Cultural Transmission

The extinction of a community expedites with the suppression of their language but this cannot be biologically proved because it is intellectual aridness that silently eliminates that community. On top of that, language is one of the components of culture and cultural heritage. As consequence, there prevail examples where a community survives even after the non-operation of their language. *Aryan* race imported *Sanskrit* in Indian Sub-continent along with Hinduism (Cardona, 2012). *Sanskrit* is a dying language (the term ‘dying’ is appropriate as there are people existing in India who can maintain communication with *Sanskrit* which marks this as a language still existing as dead language is a language that observes its last user of that language dead having no person behind learning, knowing, using and communicating that very language) (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011). If and when *Sanskrit* is extinct, it is not probable that the religious ideology, philosophy, tradition imposed by the *Aryan* through the documents by *Sanskrit* will be vanished. Because the bearers of that cultural heritage have transmuted that heritage to different languages which have established proper expressions and acceptances of those practices. If it happens *Sanskrit* documents become illegible signs someday, other languages retain that heritage which keeps that cultural heritage living though the illegible signs will lose its strength to be operational.

Social Contextualization of a Language

Hence, language retains usability and transferability. And it is more likely spoken than written. Casey (2017), had investigated a man in the Amazon in Peru by the name of Amadeo Gracia Gracia who had been reported using a distinct language, *Taushiro*. He was the only surviving man who was using *Taushiro*. He stopped using this language upon his brother died as the dead brother was his companion for interchanging their views through this language. Now, the complexity peeps up here whether the last man speaking a distinct language is enough to claim it a language as he finds no one to communicate through. Here, *Taushiro* cannot serve the purpose of communication on the point of its unintelligibility from the rest of the people. Language is a medium of communication and communication caters for two poles; a sender or transmitter at a pole and a receiver at the opposite pole. *Amadeo* is both sender and receiver; thus, his communication through *Taushiro* fails. *Taushiro* loses usability and transferability. Hence, *Taushiro* cannot be language on the social ground. Hence, the last man of a distinct language cannot suffice to define a language; rather, it takes two to prove the existence of that language. The defence of this assertion is the concept of the register that highlights the fact of social interaction for a language. Because a language interacts between linguistic constructs and social situations (Mandel, 2015). It is the philosophy that reveals the practical essence of a language though there are few determining factors of being language as phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax, prosody, semantics and orthography (Mandel, 2015, para. 2). Mandel (2015) has a firm conviction

on the thought that phonology takes off all other linguistic components and it is the register, a term indicating social contextualization of language, which engulfs all other components.

The Requirement of Speakers for a Language to Exist

It is evidential that all languages did not have any written forms (Schmandt et. al, 2008). If a language, for instances; develops its written forms, this language tends to exist as long as cannot be possible for that language that has no written forms. The speakers may not exist for that language; however, the written documents lend out pieces of evidence to characterize this whether it is a language or mere figures conventional in that race through which they transferred the message and preserved messages for future use. The anthropology puts forward that a man like Amadeo GraciaGracia puts up a prolonged connectedness with any of the established races who could develop their language. Hence, the last man speaking Taushiro language in the Amazon under the part of Peru can never be attired of the off-shoot representative of a very alien mode of communication which cannot be verified and analyzed with established tools, techniques and theories of language. On top of that, the UG (Universal Grammar) theory brought out by Noam Chomsky postulates the possibility of similarity of certain structural components among human languages though a race experiences zero cultural amalgamation from all other cultures of the world (Evans et. al, 2009). Thus, the language of the last man can definitely be proved. Here, comparative study unlocks the complexity to determine the language if the anthropological study suits the linguists whereas Chomskian UG theory fits in if comparative and historical linguistics fail to broaden the scope of the language. Hence, the language exists as long as the speaker exists if that language cannot lend out any written form of linguistic symbolic expressions.

The Speaker's Flexibility Tending to Ellipsis in Phonological Level

Phonology calls for the basic minimal unit of a language; the concept, development, study, assimilation or deduction that a language needs to give in the efforts of the language researchers strengthened up this basic unit of language. A meaningful sound builds up morphemes that construct a syntax and a logical order, the logical order determined only by this distinct language community, results in a meaningful establishment of phonemes generating a language. The human language claims supremacy in the thought of its generative nature. This creativity possesses the core principle of a human language. Hence, the question of the numbers of sounds or phonemes a human can produce tends to be indecisive. But, so many sounds can create a language difficult to learn and understand. This complexity is ameliorated in the late 19th century when the International Phonetic Association dreamed to work on laying down a scientific pattern for the study of the world speech languages. Otto Jespersen suggested the development of alphabets for the speech- languages and the language thinkers like Alexander John Ellis, Henry Sweet, Daniel Jones, and Passy developed 44 symbols for the speech sounds. Thus, the speech-language can be expressed and analyzed through these 44 symbols which are termed as IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) or IPA symbols (International Phonetic Association) symbols (McMahon & Michael, 1996). The concluding line is that the human speech-language may have varied sounds; they only

produce a limited number of sounds as they have physiological restrictions on the grounds of organs of speech justifications; their speech-language can be justified on the basis of 20 vowel IPA and 24 consonant IPA; hence, human produces or needs to produce only 44 sounds for the purpose of speech; thus, a limiting process is initiated to unite the languages, to make these easily learnable, memorable, usable, transferrable and analyzable. This limiting process continues; for instances, Bengali had three 'RA' letters: (i) Cerebral /r/, (ii) Frontal Palate /r/, and (iii) Central Palate/ Fricative /r/. In the case of English, the /r/ sound positioning after a vowel and at the ending of the word remains unvoiced and the first letter kicking off with /r/ sound is voiced while the tip of the tongue touches upon the palate. The IPA provides two symbols for 'RA' sounds as (i) /r:/ symbol voiced and fricative in manner, (ii) /r/ palatal and sometimes unvoiced as per placement in a word. The IPA does not cover the Cerebral 'RA' sound which the Bengali language derives from the Sanskrit language. Though there are few unchanged Sanskrit words where Cerebral "RA" was conventional as /Reeshi/ and /Reen/, these words are written frontal palatal "RA" and uttered like frontal palatal 'RA' sound because the symbol used for the Cerebral 'RA' has been diminished from the Bengali alphabet list. Thus, language strives to reach finiteness leaving behind its infinite production of phonemes.

But language possesses productivity and creativity; it also works on the case of phonology. If the tendency of language to reach finiteness claims to be evidential, it can never be disproved that phonological distinctiveness among the same morpheme retains identical utterances. It occurs that changes in utterances in an identical linguistic community are traceable. Why this change occurs has its varied reasons as a nation belonging a language is divided with communities, geographical boundaries, and biological and physiological factors etc. As these variances exist, the existence of phonological variances emerge and these variations divide a language including various existing dialects. Hence, dialect is the deviation of language at the phonological level. Now, the complex question may be the deciding factor of that language which works as a touchstone to determine the deviations of that community languages remarked as 'dialects'.

Standardization of a Language

It is to claim that the endowment of a standard language is socio-political more than linguistic. The selection, codification, elaboration and lastly acceptance (Holmes, 2001)- these all four factors work for the standardization of a language and these factorial procedures are deliberate choosing worked out by the elites of the society who employed this process of standardization through grammars, spelling books, dictionaries and possibly literatures (Ramlan, 2018, p. 30). Romaine (1994) has excerpted a study on the varieties of languages in Papua New Guinea where almost 700 varieties of languages are spoken and 40 percent of the languages are spoken not more than 500 people in a village. The author lent out 10 examples of varieties in order to designate the trick behind a standard language, a dialect or another different language. Few examples are derived to illustrate the characterizing features between language and dialect.

The expression ‘*Give me some betelnut to chew*’ is expressed (Romaine, 1994, p.3):

01. Vuai-namanga-songo,
 02. Vuai-mainga-songo,
 03. Bua i-namnga-songo.
-

Here, let the language be partitioned into three portions; the first portion of the three examples reveals slight deviation at the third example changing from ‘vua’ to ‘bua’, and the second portion reveals deviations at almost every variety of examples though the third portion claims no variations among the three examples. As the sentence patterns for these three examples are the same, these emerge from the same language family because languages emerging from the same language family retain identical sentence pattern; for example languages from Indo-European family reveals through S+O+V (Subject+ Object+ Verb) patterns which are changed in S+V+O in the case of the Germanic language family. Suppose, these three sentences are the representations of three languages. It is not impossible because the determination of a variation as a language is a political decision that is related to the independence of that society by nation and boundary. Let the sentence ‘*Don’t say farewell ever*’ be considered;

01. Kavubidaibolo na (Bengali),
 02. Kavialbida nakhena (Hindi).
-

The translations of the phrases are as follows (a) kavu/kavi as ‘ever’, (b) bidai/albida as ‘farewell’ (c) bolo na/ nakehena as ‘don’t say’. The syntactic construction of these two variations is as Adverb+ Object+ Negative verb. The changes between the two variations are very slight at the phonological level. In this respect, the first variation could have been the dialect of the second variation or vice versa. But, these two variations are languages of two countries because of the sovereignty of the two states. Hence, the language determinism is not linguistic. If these two variations had been practised in a national boundary by two social communities, one could have been a standard language while the other could have been a dialect. The community that has written tools, socio-political supremacy tends to choose their community speech as standard which is called selection and this selected variation is codified through the written documents which they sell out as prescriptive grammar (Szczegielniak, 2020) of the standard language and establish the probable elaboration of this language in phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic level and the ultimate result of this initiative is to achieve acceptance. And, the acquisition of general acceptance for this language variation as the standard language has inevitability due to its synchronic and diachronic level of investigation which establishes permanence of this language from further frequent ellipsis.

Conclusion

Thus, the standardization of a language is a movement initiated by the sophisticated personalities of a nation that tends to elate a dialect as a standard language and to characterize all other ethnic, social and regional community languages as deviations from that standard language. Therefore, Malay becomes the standard language of Indonesia. Again, standard language is not any specific forms; rather, it is the language itself and thus, Mandarin claims to be the Chinese language in Singapore.

References

- Zuckermann, Ghil'ad and Michael Walsh. (2011). 'Stop, Revive, Survive: Lessons from the Hebrew Revival Applicable to the Reclamation, Maintenance and Empowerment of Aboriginal Languages and Cultures', *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 111–127.
- Curzan, Anne (2014). Dead Words. Michigan Today. University of Michigan. [BlogPost]. Retrieved on 18th March, 2020 from <https://michigantoday.umich.edu/2014/03/04/dead-words/>
- Cardona, George (2012). Sanskrit Language. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved on 18th March, 2020 from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Sanskrit-language#accordion-article-history>
- Casey, N. (2017, Dec 26). Thousands Once Spoke His Language in the Amazon. Now, He's the Only One. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/26/world/americas/peru-amazon-the-end.html?smid=tw-nytimesworld&smtyp=cur>
- Mandel, M.A. (2015, May 19). Do all languages consist of words? *Quora*. [BlogPost]. Retrieved on 20th March, 2020 from <https://www.quora.com/Do-all-languages-consist-of-words>
- Schmandt-Besserat, Denise and Michael Erard. (2008) "Origins and Forms of Writing." *Handbook of Research on Writing: History, Society, School, Individual, Text*. Charles Bazerman, ed. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 7-21
- Evans, Nicholas; Levinson, Stephen C. (26 October 2009). "The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science". *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 32 (5): 429–48. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0999094X
- Szczepielniak, A. (2020). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Retrieved from https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/adam/files/what_is_language.ppt.pdf
- MacMahon, Michael K. C. (1996). "Phonetic Notation". In P. T. Daniels; W. Bright (eds.). *The World's Writing Systems*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 821–846. ISBN 0-19-507993-0.
- Holmes, Janet (2001). *Learning About language: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. England: Edinburgh Gate.
- Ramlan (2018). LANGUAGE STANDARDIZATION IN GENERAL POINT OF VIEW. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. Volume I, February 2018, Page: 27-33
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP.