

Summaria

Martin Ehala: Reversing Language Shift in Võro

The paper analyses language maintenance situation in the Võro speech area in South Estonia. The analysis is based on an ethnolinguistic vitality survey that was conducted amongst the 9th graders in the Võro county schools in 2005. The results of this study are compared to the results of a previous study carried out by Pajusalu et al. in 1998 (Pajusalu, Karl, Kadri Koreinik ja Jan Rahman 2000 13–37.). The analysis of the data collected in 2005 revealed that the Võro language use at home was declining. In 1998 14% of parents claimed to use Võro actively with their children. In 2005 only 9% of the children reported that they use Võro actively among their family. The data revealed that outside families the number of active Võro users was declining steadily as the formality of the situation increases; 49% of the respondents do not use Võro at home, 55% do not use it with friends, 65% do not speak it to fellow students, 70% do not use Võro with teachers and 71% prefer not to use Võro with other adults in formal settings. These results contrast sharply with the results of the 1998 study according to which 40% of the respondents were “definitely” prepared to teach their children to speak Võro, and 52% reported to speak Võro to their children always or often. This means that while the parents’ generation favours the use of Võro with children, the actual use of Võro among families is very low, indicating that the normal intergenerational transmission of Võro has been broken. Thus, in Fishman’s (1991) scale of language endangerment, the Võro language is currently shifting from stage 6 to stage 7. This necessitates changing the Võro language maintenance programs – at present the main priority is to re-establish the normal intergenerational language transmission.

Enn Ernits: From Contacts up to Language Shift among Small Balto-Finnic Nations

The main attention of this paper is focused on the factors which have diminished the number of the native speakers of the Balto-Finnic languages (Livonian, South Estonian, Torne Valley Finnish, Kvenish, Votic, Ingrian, Vepsian, and Karelian). The paper deals with the complex of political, military, economic, natural, demographic, emigrational, linguistic, cultural, religious, and psychological factors. Likewise, it deals with the history of linguistic boundaries of the Balto-Finnic languages. The future perspectives

of the small Balto-Finnic languages are quite miserable despite of the ethnofuturistic movements since the late 1980s which have triggered a positive influence on self-consciousness and prestige. These movements have also evoked the formation and development of written languages and literatures among nearly all small Balto-Finnic nations (except Ingrians).

Pille Eslon: Comparing Languages in the Moulding of Estonian-Russian Bilingualism

Nowadays, multilingualism is a common phenomenon. In Estonia, it is often related with the need to teach the state language to local L1-Russian speakers. Russian schools need new teaching sets of Estonian based on a uniform conception. It is not effective to teach Estonian in Russian schools in the same manner as L1-Estonian speakers are taught. Which grammars and methods should be used, still continues to be a relevant question.

In the practice of foreign language teaching there have arisen different tendencies, but the language system and the peculiarities of its functioning have remained the key issue.

Usually, the elaboration of a model necessary for foreign language learning is guided by contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 with the help of error analysis. As a result, the elaborators state that the difficulties of forming language competence and bilingualism are grounded by the interfering influence of L1. On the contrary, the practitioners engaged in error analysis and pedagogy find that cross-linguistic differences and errors rising from interference in the learner's interlanguage are not one-to-one related as cause and effect.

Therefore, the author of the article is convinced that there is a need for a fundamentally different kind of contrastive grammar – a correlation grammar based on cross-linguistic symmetrical, asymmetrical and analogical relations. The level of one's linguistic competence is not as much determined by cross-linguistic contrasts (asymmetry) as by differences and functional samenesses (analogy). Those are hard to acquire relying on contrastive grammar, but it becomes noticeably easier when the analogy with L1 is taken as the basis. Therefore, the correlation grammar provides more optimal linguistic basis for designing bilingualism than the contrastive grammar does.

Tiina Halling: Livonian in the Sphere of Influence of Latvian

Livonians who belong to the Finnic group of the Uralic language family and Latvians from the Baltic group of Indo-European languages have always shared a common territory. Thus, the mutual impact on each other's languages is only natural. Into Livonian there have been borrowed ca 3,000 words directly from Latvian or through the medium of the Latvian language. Livonians use all 11 Latvian verbal prefixes (*aiz-*, *ap-*, *at-*, *ie-*, *iz-*, *no-*, *pa-*, *pār-*, *pie-*, *sa-*, *uz-*), although phonetically in a more varied manner (*aiš-*, *aiZ-*, *aiž-*, *aiš-*, *ais-*; *ap-*; *at-*; *ie-*, *i'e-*; *is-*; *nu'o-*, *nuo-*, *no-*, *nu-*; *pa-*, *pā-*, *pā-*, *pō-*, *pōr*, *pār-*, *pār-*; *pi'e-*; *sa-*; *us-*, *uz-*, *ūs-*, *ūz-*). In all, different variants amount to 28 prefixes.

Latvian has had an influence on Livonian negation; thereby the verb conjugates in all plural tenses as in Latvian (*mēg āb lu'ggōm* 'we do not read(+P11)', cf. Lat. *mēs nesalam*). Likewise, Livonian debitive mood has been influenced by Latvian (*tā'mmōn vuoļ brou'tšōmōst sūomō* 'he had to go to Finland'; word for word 'he had travelling...').

An obligatory component of the Livonian imperative clause is the calqued loan particle *laz* (cf. Lat. *lai*) 'let' and sometimes also the third person verb indicative, e.g. Liv. *laz ta rōkāndōb* (pro *rōkāndōg*), Lat. *lai viņš runā* 'he (has to) speak', word for word 'let him speak'.

Livonian impersonal present participle expresses a similar meaning with the respective form in Latvian: *jūdōb* 'drinkable, of drink; drink', cf. Lat. *dzeram(ai)s* (a similar Latvian feature has been also stated in Estonian dialects), etc.

Unlike the other Finnic languages, Livonian case paradigm has an (*ō*)*n*-ending dative, *ks-/kōks*-ending instrumental as well as "disturbances" in locative cases and in distinguishing locative relationships. The incidence of the dative and instrumental in the paradigm and their functions are also an apparent Latvian influence, although the markers of the above named cases have not been influenced.

In expressing abessivity, in most instances the expected Livonian abessive suffix *-ttō* (< **-tta(k)*) is not used, at the same time the abessive is made up by a construction that consists of a partitive noun and calqued preposition *bāz* (< Lat. *bez*): *um lāmōst bāz leibō* (*bāz*+Npart) 'one has to go without bread', cf. Lat. *bez maizes* (*bez*+Nnom). Besides a typical Latvian *bāz* the preserved Finnic form *ilmō* 'without' can be found.

On the other hand, among 80 Livonian prepositions/postpositions there are only few that come from Latvian (e.g. *līdz* 'until', *bāz* 'without').

Tapani Harviainen: Multilingual Karaims in Lithuania

The Karaim community is the smallest of the so-called national minorities in Lithuania; in 2003 it counted 280 members who have approx. 120 relatives living in Poland. Originally Karaims profess the Karaite form of Judaism which rose as a reformation movement in the present-day Iraq in the 8th century A. D. In Southeast Europe a (non-Khazar) Turkic-speaking ethnic group whose descendants constitute the Karaim community in the Crimea accepted the Karaite creed. The Karaim migration from the Crimea to Galicia-Volhynia and Lithuania probably started in the 14th century. After the Russian occupation of the Crimea and the partitions of Poland the Karaims in the Russian Empire endeavoured to underline their distinctive national habits and customs. Finally this policy granted them civil rights in the Empire in 1863; simultaneously it led them to constitute an independent religious and ethnic minority.

On the basis of the Jewish religious background, Hebrew was employed by Karaims in Lithuania as their literary language until the middle of the 20th century. Their native Turkic vernacular, called Karaim, was written in Hebrew characters at least since the 17th century; in the 19th and 20th centuries various Latin (Polish and Lithuanian) and Cyrillic orthographies were introduced in the Karaim literature. Word-for-word translations from Hebrew, the influence of Slavonic languages (and Lithuanian) and the lack of instruction in Karaim have left deep traces in Turkic Karaim which, nevertheless, since the last decades of the 20th century, has been employed as the language of religious ceremonies and numerous recent publications. However, Karaim is a very endangered language spoken by 40–50 elderly members of the community.

For centuries (the local variant of) Polish has been the language of communication with non-Karaims; still at present 60% of Lithuanian Karaims declare to know this language. Lithuanian and Russian have a shorter history among Karaims; nevertheless, practically all Karaims in Lithuania declare to have a good knowledge of Russian and almost 80% of them are fluent in Lithuanian, too. In particular, Lithuanian is the principal language of the younger generation.

The interplay between four or five very different languages among a small ethnic group offers a great number of various topics for the research of multilingual processes. However, the traditional knowledge of languages among Karaims is rapidly disappearing; thus the linguists should make use of the opportunities as long as these exist.

Heinike Heinsoo: About the Votic Language Change

The Votic have survived several stages of language change.

Already in the beginning of the 20th century the Votic exchanged their language for Izhorian. Even in the middle of the 20th century the result of language change has been that the children of one family have become the speakers of different languages; the one who married an Izhorian adopted the Izhorian language, and the one who married a Votic preserved the Votic language.

If the Votic had not become Russified, they would have become Izhorian. Territorial neighbourhood and mixed marriages played the last trump to Izhorian; the Izhorian language has always been superior to Votic as the Izhorian speakers have always been superior to the Votic speakers.

According to Tsvetkov, in the beginning of the 19th century only 10% of the Votic understood Church Slavonic and 50% understood Russian. In 1925 when Tsvetkov's article was published in all the Votic could speak Russian, except the oldest people. Today the children of more than 70 years old Votic language speakers can not speak Votic because their parents have not been speaking Votic to them at home. Russian has become home language likewise in Votic-Izhorian mixed families.

Speaking of Votic ended suddenly during one generation.

Common traits of language change for the last Votic speaking people are as follows:

- 1) if a speaker of Izhorian enters the company, Votic-speaking people shift to Izhorian;
- 2) the Votic use Russian while speaking about medicine, politics or referring to someone's words.

Marje Joalaid: Language Shift in Obonezhye Piatina (Fifth) of Novgorod Principality

Although Vepsians have inhabited their territory for millenniums, their settlements are first mentioned in Russian cadastral registers of Obonezhye piatina (fifth) compiled in 1495/1496, 1563/1564, and 1582/1583. The second cadastre repeats the descriptions and settlement names of the first cadastre, whereas the settlements described in the third cadastre have not been recorded in the same order as in the previous cadastres. The settlement

names mentioned in the first two cadastres coincide with the local Russian name variants of the settlements.

The territory inhabited by Vepsians in the 15th century covered a larger area than at present. The Livonian war (1558–1583) and the plagues accompanying it devastated almost the whole south-western part of Obonezhye piatina. Consequently the cadastre of 1582/1583 shows that the pogost (parish) Kaiv was totally uninhabited then. Today, only one settlement in the pogost – *Arškaht*, Russ. Радогоща – has Vepsian-speaking population.

The settlements mentioned in the cadastral register of 1495/1496 may be divided into four groups: 1) Vepsian settlements which have remained Vepsian until today (e.g. the whole Peloi pogost); 2) Vepsian settlements where language shift from Vepsian to Russian has taken place (e.g. the northern part of the Vingl pogost); 3) Vepsian settlements inhabited by Vepsians in 1495/1496, uninhabited in 1583, and later repopulated, probably by Russians (e.g. most settlements in the pogost Kaiv); and 4) Russian settlements (the settlements around Ošta, an important centre in the 15th–16th centuries).

The settlement names in cadastres covering Vepsian territory are descriptive. It is quite sure that the describing type of settlement names points to Balto-Finnic population there. So at that time, the whole eastern area of Obonezhye piatina had a Balto-Finnic, i.e. Vepsian-speaking population.

Leelo Keevallik: The Types of Borrowed Pragmatic Particles in Swedish Estonian

It has been noticed that the so-called discourse-pragmatic words are especially prone to transfer in intensive language contact situations. This article studies Swedish Estonian pragmatic particles, i.e. linguistic items that can implement a social action on their own or whose function can only be understood in sequences of social action in oral usage. To characterise the patterns of borrowing, the article outlines its three types: 1) replacing an existing item (e.g. Sw. *asså* ‘thus’ for Est. *tähendab* ‘it means’), including borrowings of a phonologically similar item or merely prosody; 2) widening or narrowing the pragmatic scope of a particle (such as the Swedish Estonian usage of *jaa* ‘yes’ for initiation of digressions); and 3) the introduction of new semantic-pragmatic contrasts with a particle (e.g. the intro-

duction of the Swedish negative polarity response *juu* into Swedish Estonian).

It is argued that pragmatic particles have been treated as peripheral to language system by contact linguists and that the same connotation may be the reason why these items may go unnoticed for the bilingual speakers themselves. They might be subtle markers of identity for speakers of Swedish Estonian who have actually been eager to preserve their Estonian language. In addition, pragmatic particles are automatised ways of carrying out extremely frequent actions in everyday conversation and may therefore be sensitive to transfer from the other commonly used language.

Simo Muir: Parody of Jewish Swedish and Jewish Finnish in Yiddish Cabaret of the 1920s and 40s

The article at hand analyses the parodies of Jewish (Finland) Swedish discovered in a Yiddish cabaret play (1929) by Helsinkian Jac Weinstein (1883–1976). Some remarks are also made about the Jewish Finnish language that was found in another play (1940). The parodies of Jewish Swedish found in satiric Swedish-speaking magazine *Fyren* (1899–1922) serve as a contrastive corpus. The aim of the paper is to analyse these parodies in the light of code-switching theories. The parodies deserve to be examined because they are the only known source of old (spoken) Jewish Swedish.

There have been two language shifts in the Jewish community of Helsinki: Yiddish > (Finland) Swedish > Finnish. The shift from Yiddish to Swedish occurred already at an early stage. Nevertheless, Yiddish preserved its status as a community language relatively long, certainly until the 20th century. The shift to Finnish began in 1933 when the Jewish school started gradually to use Finnish for Swedish.

The Jewish community in Helsinki was already highly emancipated during the interwar-period and therefore stereotypical “Ost-Juden” characters became a target of satire. In Central European (Jewish as well as non-Jewish) cabaret the use of language itself had become the means of focusing to societal issues of nation, class, ethnicity and gender. In Weinstein’s cabaret sketch (1929) Jewish shop keepers speak Yiddish among themselves and Swedish to clients. Their Swedish is clearly a variety typical to immigrants. However, it cannot be ruled out that some of these features did not occur in the Jewish Swedish ethnolect spoken as the first language.

I analyse Weinstein's language parodies in the light of Clyne's code-switching theories (as presented in *Dynamics of Language Contacts*, 2003). Clyne divides the term *code-switching* into three sub-categories, i.e. *transference*, *convergence* and *transversion*. In Weinstein's parody of Jewish Swedish there are many illustrative examples of transference and convergence, but none of transversion. In this parody of Jewish Finnish there occur differences in the Finnish spoken by the older and the younger generation, hence in the speech of the former group there is still Yiddish interference, whereas the younger generation makes mistakes typical for Swedish-speakers. Some of the mechanisms used in the parodies by Weinstein and *Fyren* are similar, but there are also major differences, e.g. the substrate in *Fyren* is German not Yiddish. Another feature which differs between the two corpuses is that lexico- and semantico-syntactic transfers seem to be absent in the parodies of *Fyren*, whereas Weinstein's parody has many of them.

Anastassia Zabrodskaia: Russian-Estonian Code-switching as “Negotiation” Strategy in Kohtla-Järve Bilingual Language Practices

Sarah Thomason (1997; 2001: 129–156) discusses seven mechanisms of contact-induced change: code-switching, code alternation, passive familiarity, “negotiation”, second-language acquisition strategies, bilingual first-language acquisition, and change by deliberate decision.

The “negotiation” or accommodation is a process where speakers adjust their grammar and/or lexicon to make it more similar to that of their interlocutors. The term does not imply conscious discussion of language use, but rather an adjustment of one's speech to what is perceived “as the pattern of another language” (Thomason 1997: 199). This can happen in the situations where speakers are fluent bilinguals or have just an idea about each other's language.

The aim of this article has been to describe and analyse language choice and “negotiation” patterns found in multilingual communication in Pärna School in Kohtla-Järve. The data was collected between 2003 and 2005.

There are several strategies in communication between Russian- and Estonian-speaking people. Estonians use participant's language to show their solidarity or to help during the conversation the Russian-speaking teachers/pupils, whose Estonian is very poor. As Russian-speaking persons

consider often a monolingual conversation in Russian as inconvenient, sometimes interlocutors use each other's mother tongue. In one context this phenomenon can be named *language politeness*, because the partner's dominant language is used. On the other hand this phenomenon can be described as *language training* as both wish to practice and improve their knowledge of another language. Thus, the language choice patterns are to a great extent related to the level of Estonian language proficiency.

The formality of a situation is an important social factor. This means that it is not unusual for the Estonian- and Russian-speaking teachers to use "negotiation" strategies. However, the conversations between the headmaster, director of studies and Estonian-speaking teachers are only in Estonian.

The abovementioned examples demonstrate that "negotiation" definitely contributes to the emergence of numerous compromise forms that are absent from the respective monolingual varieties.

Tõnu Tender: Multilingualism in Estonia as Compared to the Rest of Europe

The first part of the article gives an overview of multilingualism; how linguists understand the term, and how the term is defined in the European Union political discourse. In the EU political discourse multilingualism is perceived as a binary notion; first, it is a case when one person can speak several languages, and second, it is a case when different language communities are living in the same geographical area.

For a European it is very important to command foreign languages; though, that kind of attitude is natural. The common idea is that besides one's mother tongue one can speak at least two foreign languages.

In the context of the EU political discourse the improving of linguistic variation means to teach and learn as many foreign languages as possible. Big and small European languages, regional, minority and immigrant languages should be learned and taught.

The central issue of the article is the question how well are foreign languages mastered in Estonia as compared to the rest of Europe.

According to the results it can be said that in Estonia foreign languages are commanded quite well. The 2005 Eurobarometer Survey (Europeans and Languages) investigated how well a foreign language is mastered. According to that study Estonia appeared to hold the 9th position. The study demonstrates that 30% of the Estonian society can speak two foreign lan-

guages (the EU mean was 28%), 22% command three or more foreign languages (the EU mean reached up to 11%). 14% of Estonians can speak one language, i.e. only one's mother tongue (the EU mean was 44%).

In Estonia, as well as in many other European countries, the aim is to learn English as a first foreign language.

Mati Hint: Contest for the Tartu or Tallinn Literary Language in Rõngu Graveyard

The article at hand analyses the epitaphs on iron crosses in Rõngu graveyard. The central issue is the relationship between the Tartu and Tallinn literary language used on the crosses, and how the Tartu literary language was exchanged for the Tallinn literary language. Presumably, the people who let to engrave those texts did not acknowledge the choice of language at all.

There are few crosses that have Estonian epitaphs on them, and such crosses are dated later than 1870. Moreover, even then it was the time when German-like families let to engrave German texts on the crosses. Furthermore, the epitaphs which are in Estonian have only names and dates on them. Many iron crosses have been ruined; in towns the Soviet dictatorship let to ruin the crosses, and in the country the iron crosses were not so popular any more and that is why people used to replace them with gravestones.

In Rõngu the South Estonian and North Estonian language were used together for a long time (at least for 100 years). Newspapers and some schoolbooks were written in the Tallinn literary language, the others were in the Tartu literary language; likewise, the latter was used for communicating. Nevertheless, the Tallinn literary language had obtained more official and higher stylistic status. Whereby, it can be stated that since the 1890s Rõngu was a typical language change area. The argument is supported by the epitaphs on the iron crosses where it can be seen that since the 1880s the Tallinn literary language is interfering into South Estonian epitaphs.