

INTRODUCTION

Anna Verschik

Tallinn University

The topic of the current yearbook is „Linguistic, social and cognitive aspects of language contacts and multilingualism“. No language exists in isolation nor in a contact-free environment; another matter is whether this knowledge is peripheral for a researcher or, on the contrary, is the focus of his/her research.

The authors of the current article collection come from different countries, and include both acknowledged scholars in the field of contact linguistics as well as beginners (MA and PhD students). Almost all the papers deal with linguistic situations where Estonian is involved.

The range of topics is rather broad. For instance, Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi and Hanna Lantto provide an overview of theories that explore loan translations to a greater or lesser extent. The topic of loan translations is considered from a contact linguistic perspective by Jim Hlavac. The papers by Virve-Anneli Vihman and Jim Hlavac test some well-known contact linguistic theoretical models and arrive at the conclusion that universal constraints on language contacts do not exist and that in the process innovations emerge that are not „well-formed“ from the point of view of two separate monolingual grammars. Anette Ross describes the Lotfitka variety spoken by the majority of Roma in Estonia against the background of other Romani varieties and considering the scale of borrowability proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988).

Two articles explore multilingual communication on the internet: Kristiina Praakli describes practices of communication in a Facebook community of Estonians living in Finland from a pragmatic perspective, while Helin Kask considers English impact in Estonian fashion blogs.

Two articles employ a code-copying framework (Johanson 1993): the above mentioned article by Kask and a study on Estonian-Latvian bilingual speech by Elina Joenurma. The latter focuses on bidirectionality of impact.

Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene and Ad Backus investigate Estonian-Russian receptive bilingualism. Differently from the rest of the authors, their research is based on experimental methodology. One may say that the topic of receptive bilingualism arises also in Praakli's article because she focuses on the contact of two closely related languages, Estonian and Finnish.

Brief summary of the papers

Ad Backus and Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene describe receptive multilingualism (*lingua receptiva* or LaRa) in Estonian-Russian communication. Receptive multilingualism is a mode of communication in which each participant uses his/her language and adjusts language use if needed. Thus, all participants are able to understand to an extent what is being said (for more details see Rehbein, ten Thije and Verschik 2012). This mode of communication is not limited to closely related varieties but is also possible if both participants have at least a passive command of each other's variety. As communication in this experimental setting demonstrated, proficiency in the co-participant's language is not the only decisive factor that contributes to successful communication, and that achievement of communicative goals is possible also if proficiency is limited. This may mean that the informants are too critical in their assessment of their proficiency and/or that success depends on so-called metacommunicative strategies as well.

Jim Hlavac describes Macedonian-English code-switching in Australia with a special focus on light verbs. Light verbs exist in Macedonian, albeit marginally (language planners considered it their business to purge them from the standard language). Yet, the tendency comes in handy when there is a need to integrate an English

verb into a Macedonian grammatical matrix. Thus, constructions emerge such as *walking praješ* 'you walk' (the gerund form of the verb *walk* + Macedonian verb 'to do' in the appropriate person, number and tense). It is not entirely clear whether the marginally existing possibility in Macedonian has served as a model or whether English fixed expressions such as *to do shopping*, *to have lunch* and the like have resulted in Australian Macedonian *ima lunch*.

Elina Joenurma focuses on the speech of an Estonian-Latvian bilingual informant. In the situation of balanced bilingualism it is not possible to determine which of the two languages is dominant, although the chronology of acquisition is clear enough (Estonian is L1). Although bidirectionality of impact is not unknown in contact linguistics, in research on adult bilingualism the stress is either on L1 > L2 impact (SLA research) or L2 > L1 (most contact linguistic research). The author considers impact in both directions and employs a code-copying framework (Johanson 1993). What gets copied and to what degree is not very different in Estonian to Latvian and in Latvian to Estonian copying. The difference is in copying of discourse pragmatic particles, where the direction of copying is from Estonian to Latvian. This may mean that, in the terms of Matras (1998), Estonian is pragmatically dominant language for the informant.

The contribution by Helin Kask deals with English-Estonian code-copying in online fashion blogs. So far the position of English in Estonia has been mostly described and analysed from a macro-sociolinguistic perspective (based on surveys, etc.). The article concentrates on contact linguistic aspects of the English influence. Most of the copies are global copies (one or multi-word lexical items, idioms). This is rather expected and understandable because lexical and semantic impact appears in early stages of language contact. Yet much depends on the genre of text in question: multilingualism is a norm in Estonian fashion blogs. A blog is a monological format (different from chats or forums) and, therefore, even longer stretches in another language are possible. English lexical items are not always

entirely integrated into Estonian grammar. In addition to semantic-specific lexical items (fashion terms), English lexical impact is visible in discourse pragmatic particles (e.g. *well*, *anyway*). The latter are present in oral speech of young Estonians as well and are not specific to any topic or text type. In the data, selective copies are rather rare (2 % of all copies) and mixed copies (for instance, *epic-kiire* ‘epic fast’) are slightly more frequent (7 % of occurrences).

Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi and Hanna Lantto provide a picture on how different linguistic disciplines view loan translations. The disciplines in question (SLA, contact linguistics, translation studies) use rather different metalanguage, although all three agree on the cognitive basis of loan translations. SLA primarily sees loan translations as L1 impact. This impact is responsible for production of non-target forms. Contact linguistics sees loan translations in a neutral light as innovations appearing as a result of impact from either language. Surprisingly, the topic is somewhat marginal in translation studies, where loan translations are viewed as neologisms. All three disciplines agree that loan translations are not a merely lexical phenomenon but that they can also introduce morphosyntactic and semantic innovations.

Kristiina Praakli analyses data from a Facebook group of Estonians residing in Finland. Compared to the other articles, this one is less concentrated on linguistic structures. The author instead chooses a pragmatic approach to bilingual communication. Language choice by topic starter is also a hint to commentators. Like in oral communication, one of the main functions of code-switching in this virtual environment is the reference function (quotation, rendition of other people’s speech, digest). Code-switching is an unwritten norm in the community, yet very long stretches in Finnish do not seem to be acceptable. The fact that some Estonians choose to communicate to each other in Finnish is surprising to others and leads to meta-linguistic comments on language choice. Code-switching is smooth and does not affect morphosyntax (but see Kask, Vihman in this volume).

Anette Ross describes Estonian Lotfitka, a variety used by Roma people in Estonia with reference to the other Romani and non-Romani varieties (such as Russian, Latvian, Estonian) that have impacted it. The language is placed into the context of the borrowability scale proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988). In the situation of language maintenance, changes start from the lexicon and later borrowing of meaning and non-core structural elements (word order, intonation, argument structure, etc.) becomes possible. The Roma in Estonia have mostly arrived from Latvia and their variety belongs to the North-Eastern family of Romani varieties (together with Russian Romani (Xaladytka), the Polish variety of Polska Roma, etc.). There exist some Xaladytka speakers in Estonia as well. Historically, Lotfitka has been impacted by Russian and Latvian. As of today, Latvian impact on Estonian Lotfitka has weakened and Estonian has a growing influence. There is evidence of Estonian lexical and semantic impact. New lexical items preserve Estonian phonemes. In the framework of Thomason and Kaufman, contacts between Estonian and Lotfitka are between stage one (casual contact) and stage two (more intensive contact).

Virve-Anneli Vihman tests highly influential models such as MLF and the M4 model and questions whether language contacts occur within a clause or also outside it. She concludes that the models are accurate in situations where the matrix language is clear, but this is not always the case. For instance, an inserted English verb may affect the grammar of the entire clause: in *doesn't täida soovid* 'does not fulfil wishes' the Estonian verb phrase is not well-formed from the point of view of Estonian monolingual grammar and instead the partitive plural (*soove* 'wishes') should appear; yet, the form *soovid* is in nominative plural. Thus, both languages can contribute to the grammar of bilingual speech. Similar observations have been made about other language pairs as well (Auer and Muhamedova 2005).

It is my hope that the collection will familiarise readers with contact linguistic research and will successfully demonstrate that

all authors participate in an international discussion and share theoretical metalanguage, no matter what language pair(s) they investigate.

REFERENCES

- Auer, Peter and Muhamedova, Raihan 2005. 'Embedded language' and 'matrix language' insertional language mixing: Some problematic cases. *Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di linguistica* 17 (1), 35–54 (special issue, ed. G. Berruto).
- Johanson, Lars 1993. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. – *Immigrant languages in Europe*. (Eds.) G. Extra, L. Verhoeven. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide, 197–221.
- Matras, Yaron 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing – *Linguistics* 36 (2), 281–331.
- Rehbein, Jochen, ten Thije, Jan D. and Verschik, Anna 2012. Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. In ten Thije, J. D.; Rehbein, J. and Verschik, A. (Eds.) *Lingua Receptiva. International Journal for Bilingualism* 16 (3), 248–264
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Kaufman, Terence 1998. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.