

University of Tartu
Department of Semiotics

Peeter Tinitis

**Sociolinguistic reflection in the context of language
standardization: Language debates on Estonian 1912-1920**

Master Thesis

Supervisor: Silvi Salupere

Tartu 2015

Olen magistritöö kirjutanud iseseisvalt. Kõigile töös kasutatud teiste autorite töödele, põhimõttelisele seisukohtadele ning muudest allikaist pärinevatele andmetele on viidatud.

Peeter Tinitš

25.05.2015

Contents

Introduction.....	5
1 Basic concepts and background.....	9
1.1 Developments in standardization	10
1.2 Social meaning in linguistic analyses	13
1.3 Domain of historical sociolinguistics	14
1.4 Language ideology and metapragmatics	16
1.4.1 Field of language ideology.....	17
1.4.2 Indexical order	18
1.4.3 Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function	19
1.4.4 Ethnometapragmatics as a research area.....	21
1.4.5 Talk about talk.....	26
1.5 Three sociolinguistic topics	27
1.5.1 Enregisterment	28
1.5.2 Standard language culture	29
1.5.3 Linguistic marketplaces	31
1.6 Language debates of 1912-1920.....	33
1.7 Previous analyses of these topics	34
1.7.1 Enregisterment	35
1.7.2 Standard language culture	38
1.7.3 Linguistic marketplace	42
1.8 Aims of the study.....	45
2 Method and materials	47
2.1 Principles of analysis	47
2.2 Materials	49
3 Analysis	51
3.1 Enregisterment.....	51
3.2 Standard language culture	56
3.2.1 Discourse on variation	56
3.2.2 Attention to use and formal contexts	58
3.2.3 Discourse on mistakes.....	60
3.2.4 Legitimacy	62
3.3 Linguistic marketplace	69
3.3.1 Legitimacy through other languages.....	69
3.3.2 Striving for greater prestige among languages	71
3.3.3 Prestige of particular linguistic properties	75

Conclusion	79
References	84
Sotsiolingvistiline refleksioon standardkeele loomise kontekstis: debatid eesti keelest 1912-1920. Kokkuvõte	98
Appendix 1	102

Introduction

The object of this dissertation is metapragmatic discourse in the context of language standardization. Particularly we will investigate how the members of the Estonian language community reflexively participated in the process of language standardization during the language debates in the early 20th century. We will focus on three topics that have found mention in the sociolinguistic literature on standardization: *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace*, and analyse their discursive representation within the language debates. The main objective of this dissertation is to contribute to an understanding of language standardization as a reflexive and ideologically mediated process and present its salient aspects in the Estonian case.

Language standardization, broadly understood as a transformation of a vernacular linguistic variety into a 'standard' in a particular community, has been conceptualized as a long-term multilayered process where a number of different factors may be combined in ways that are socially and historically contingent (i.e. determined by the past history and local context of the community) (Deumert & Vandebussche 2003b: 465). Consequently, the studies of language standardization can be understood in terms of complementary perspectives each contributing to an understanding of the complex phenomenon in question (e.g. argument made in Deumert 2003b: 48). Theoretical emphasis has accordingly been placed for example on the structural linguistic changes and norm diffusion (e.g. Haugen's (1966, 1987) selection and acceptance of norms, Milroy's (2001) reduction in variation), functional elaboration in expansion of domains of use (e.g. Ferguson's (1968) development of intertranslatability, Haugen's (1966, 1987) norm elaboration), ideological or discursive phenomena (e.g. Milroy's (2001) standard language culture, Agha's (2003, 2007) discursive formation of enregisterment, or other specific topics (e.g. Deumert's (2003b) focus on ritualization).

In most (if not all) cases, language standardization is tied to a public initiative, where conscious effort is placed on transforming patterns of language use, wherein the drivers of language change can be found both in these conscious initiatives or in regular accommodation in linguistic interactions (Deumert & Vandebussche 2003b: 455-457). To the extent that these public initiatives intervene in regular language use they imply a transformation of the ethnometapragmatic frame of the individual user (Silverstein 2003: 194). Accordingly, these conscious initiatives travel as discursive formations that comment on or represent particular ethnometapragmatics, functioning as metapragmatic discourse towards them with varying degrees of effectiveness (Silverstein 1994: 39-41). In principle, these discursive formations can be analysed as a proxy in synchronic reconstruction of habits of interpretation within past communities, while the gradual sedimentation of these habits can be taken as basis for diachronic analyses (Agha 2003: 269).

In Silverstein's framework of indexical orders, these discursive formations can take the form of macro-sociological structures or ideologies which can perdure over a large number of interactions thus acting as a stable force within language change (Silverstein 2003: 194). Particularly, these ideologies mediate the reflexive interpretation and reinterpretation of signs-in-use by language users, thus bringing a number of researchers to advocate an inclusion of such language ideologies as a necessary element of linguistic research (e.g. Woolard 1998: 436 and references). Considering the historical variation of these ideological structures for both more accurate reconstruction in historical sociolinguistics (Sairio & Palander-Collin 2012: 626) and for a historiography of language ideologies (Blommaert 1999: 1) requires investigations of the past communities on these aspects, which this dissertation will also aim to do.

A notable difficulty in addressing historical contexts lies in extra constraints on the types of data that can be used as compared to similar investigations on modern times (see e.g. Preston 2010). Some relevant issues in this context are dangers of anachronism (e.g. see Bergs 2012), little access to direct interactions with visible metapragmatic discourse (e.g. see Culpeper & Kytö 2010: 7-14 for discussion), unevenly preserved data (e.g. usually materials of the higher ranking members is better preserved) (Hernandez-Campoy & Schilling 2012: 65-70), and impossibility of experimental elicitation, which are all general problems to the domain of historical sociolinguistics (see more in Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brumberg 2012: 28-29). Researchers

with disparate backgrounds have however convincingly shown that monitoring the formation and dissemination of metapragmatic discourse provides a useful window on past communities, and even on processes lasting over centuries (e.g. Agha 2003; Davies & Langer 2004).

This dissertation is an application of this principle in the context of language debates (as advocated as a research topic in Blommaert 1999: 1) during a narrow period 1912-1920 which brought with it extraordinary attention to linguistic issues and a large corpus of articulated views in the matters of standardization of Estonian language. The materials are considered as a synchronic corpus and contextualized as a reflexive representation of the sociolinguistic context at the time. The topics under focus are *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace* which could be analysed by a number of means. Previous studies have described these sociolinguistic issues usually in the context of another topic of focus and based on eclectic sets of data. Contemporary discourse has been included in these contexts sometimes, and can be built on in the current study, but so far no systematic descriptions of the reflexive discourse on the sociolinguistic situation of the time have been attempted, as is the aim of this dissertation.

Accordingly, the dissertation is divided into three major parts in addition to the introduction and the conclusion. The first chapter introduces the basic concepts used in this study, and situates it in the context of other studies. First it will introduce language standardization as a topic of research, the developments within sociolinguistics towards conceptualizing social meaning as an increasingly reflexive one, and the domain of historical sociolinguistics with its specific challenges and opportunities. After this it will introduce the ideological dimension of linguistic study as a frame of analysis, and Silverstein's notion of ethnometapragmatics and indexical order within which the sociolinguistic topics will be conceptualized. And as a last part of the chapter on concepts it will introduce three topics of focus which have emerged from the sociolinguistic literature as relevant to the situations of language standardization: *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace*. Finally the first chapter gives an overview of the current state of research bearing directly or indirectly on these topics in Estonian language history by each subtopic. This is first brought to bear to give a general sociolinguistic description of the time as context for the discourse on language, and then the earlier investigations on discourse on language will be presented for each topic.

The second chapter describes the corpus of texts used for the study and the basic principles of analysis that were implemented. The main corpus comprises of 106 texts published around the era of language debates discussing Estonian in 1912-1920 which has been conceptualized as a synchronic corpus as the reflections on the sociolinguistic situation of a community usually change in a longer time-frame. Following the principles of methodological relativism outlined by Potter (1996: 25-42) the descriptions presented within these debates will constitute an autonomous object of investigations and evaluations on topics like the adequacy of these descriptions will be out of scope of this investigation.

The third chapter constitutes the main study of discursive formations relevant to these three sociolinguistic topics. They are distributed accordingly by topic, in the following order: *enregisterment*, *standard language culture* and *linguistic marketplace* where in each topic the comments from the discourse in language debates will be considered as a reflexive representation of the authors making sense of their sociolinguistic situation at the time. The presentation of the subtopics follow the dimensions brought out in the theoretical background on each of the key concepts. The chapter on enregisterment focusses on discourse on *written language* as a differentiable register in language use in the community. The chapter on standard language culture presents four subtopics as presented in the theoretical overview: 1) discussions that pertain to making sense of linguistic variation; 2) discussions that pertain to an expected degree of attention paid to language use and the development of formal contexts; 3) discussions that pertain to the conceptualization of mistakes in linguistic practice; 4) discussions that pertain to legitimacy of the linguistic practices in focus. The chapter on linguistic marketplace focusses on the role of comparison with other languages in the framing of the linguistic discussions. Three subtopics will be brought out here: 1) the reoccurring pattern to use comparison with other languages as a source of legitimacy for the author's own ideas on language practices; 2) the articulated strive to increase the prestige and position of Estonian as compared to other languages; 3) the particular characteristics of languages that were discussed in these comparisons. As the topics are partially overlapping, overlapping data is sometimes introduced by varying degrees of granularity when necessary. Each of the subchapters contains a brief overview of the main results at the end and Appendix 1 includes the original context of the citations in Estonian whenever they were cited within the analysis.

1 Basic concepts and background

The basic concepts which this dissertation will apply are ethnometapragmatics and metapragmatic discourse which offer a window through which the reflexive meaning making of past sociolinguistic situations can be investigated. Particularly we will analyse a corpus of written texts that focuses on language issues, hence termed language debates, as an articulated reflection on the contemporary sociolinguistic concerns within the community. The community in focus has been argued to have been in the process of becoming a standard language community and therefore the sociolinguistic dimensions of interest are situated in the context of standardization studies. The dissertation will construe the involvement of the authors of the texts in the debates as an attempt at meaning making of the sociolinguistic circumstances of themselves and their linguistic practices.

This is done in the following order. First, the studies on language standardization are presented to contextualize the era and the community in question, where particularly a recent trend towards an increasing focus on social meaning will be emphasized. Second, the role social meaning in sociolinguistic analyses will be presented with the recent trend towards investigating the reflexive and micro-contextual aspects of it. Third, the domain of historical sociolinguistics will be introduced as the application of sociolinguistic theory and findings to investigate language use to investigate past communities with its specific limitations and focus.

Fourth, the concepts of language ideology and metapragmatics as the theoretical background from which the study will proceed. Particularly, the notion of indexical order will be introduced and the concepts of metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function as specific aspects of that theory. Then ethnometapragmatics will be introduced as a domain of research, and standardization as a potential field of application for it, along with a subchapter on ‘talk about talk’ on the specifics of the object in focus. The fifth subchapter will present the three specific

sociolinguistic topics by which the sociolinguistic situation around standardization will be approached, and the reflexive representations of which will be the main object of analysis in this dissertation.

The sixth subchapter presents the language debates of 1912-1920 as the main object of study. The seventh presents previous analyses that can be found as relevant to the analysis presented in this study. This will be done by topic, first introducing a general sociolinguistic description of the era based on earlier research, and then by considering the research into discourse on language that can be brought to bear on the focus of this dissertation. At the end of this chapter the main aims of the study are articulated based on the theory presented before.

1.1 Developments in standardization

Research into language standardization has been on a precarious position among the language sciences. For one, it has been often highlighted as one of the significant domains of application therein, as already Jespersen (1925: 45) put it: „the greatest and most important phenomenon of the evolution of language in historic times has been the springing up of [...] ‘standard’ languages“ (1925: 45) according to which comparative study of these events should be a major topic of focus in linguistics (e.g. Jespersen 1925: 46; Joseph 1987: 13; Deumert & Vandebussche 2003a: 1). At the same time many linguists have argued that issues of language prescription should not be included in linguistic inquiries (e.g. an overview in Milroy & Milroy 1999: 3-9) while other linguists have neglected the comparative approach and have become instrumental in maintaining the standard language, arguably a legitimate role for an expert too (e.g. an overview in Milroy 1999: 28-34).

Despite the centrality of the topic among language interests of the modern world, the study of standardization has been argued to have remained very marginal in historical linguistics (Milroy 2001: 534), as most linguistic changes have been argued to be of a non-functional or non-teleological character, that is, with little involvement of human conscious intervention (e.g. Lass, 1997: 352-369). At the same time from within the fields of sociolinguistics and sociology of language, a substantial body of literature has accumulated on the theory of language

standardization with in-depth empirical case studies (e.g. Kloss 1978; Scaglione 1984; Deumert 2004) as well as generalizations (e.g. Ferguson 1968; Haugen 1987; Joseph 1987).

As mentioned in the introduction a number of different approaches have been followed to describe language standardization. Functional studies have brought out standardization as a sum of substeps, not necessarily taking place in the same sequence. For example Ferguson (1968: 41) offers three parameters by which language standardization can be used as a developmental measure: „graphization – reduction to writing; standardization – the development of a norm which overrides regional and social dialects; and, for want of a better term, modernization—the development of intertranslatability with other languages in a range of topics and forms of discourse characteristic of industrialized, secularized, structurally differentiated, "modern" societies“. Haugen on the other hand proposes four dimensions: 1) selection of norm, 2) codification, 3) elaboration of function, 4) acceptance of norm (Haugen, 1966: 933) which have later been reformulated as 1) norm selection, 2) norm codification, 3) norm implementation, and 4) norm elaboration (Haugen, 1987: 59-64), following very similar lines. While Haugen focusses on the details within linguistic standardization and the role and targets of norms within a community, the framework is compatible with Ferguson’s notions as well belonging to the steps of standardization and in the case of norm elaboration, partially also to modernization.

Ferguson’s model formulates a general model of transition from a pre-literate community to a literate one with developmental features that often correlate with it. Haugen focusses on the role and targets of norms within a community and assumes the early steps of literacy to be present. Particularly, Haugen emphasizes the structural and the functional dimensions in stating that a standard language has minimal „variation in form“ and „maximal variation in function“ (Haugen, 1972: 107). On the basis of this Milroy (2001: 531) has proposed a clean structural definition of a standard language as „imposition of uniformity on a class of objects“ where he argues prior sociolinguistic research to have established that natural variation is usually much greater than the kind present within standard varieties.

Possibly as a result of a general turn towards performative elements in analyses (e.g. see Ortner, 1984; Bauman & Briggs 1990 for partial review), the studies of language standardization also started to include dimensions of authority and ideology as elements in their analyses of

standardiation bringing linguistic attitudes and their cultural background into the center (e.g. Joseph 1987; Milroy & Milroy 1999; Woolard 1991; Silverstein 1985). In this line, a recent sociological characterization of language standardization for cross-linguistic comparisons (Auer 2005: 7-8) also emphasizes attitudinal issues: namely, a linguistic variety is a standard language if it is (a) learned by speakers of more than one vernacular; (b) being maintained as a standard in the community at that particular moment by an explicit prestige, and (c) expected to have institutional codification by its speakers (Ibid.). With the increased inclusion of attitudes and ideological aspects into analyses the research in standardization has increasingly turned to social meaning in their explanations of the sociolinguistic changes during standardization.

Recent synthesizing enterprises have thus seen the biggest opportunities in future research in investigating the interrelations between aspects of language use and various discursive formations within the communities, and with the interrelations of language ideologies with their sociohistorical contexts, though connectivity between various pieces of evidence could be improved on a number of issues (Deumert & Vandebussche 2003b). Thus recent research has put increasing effort on describing the reflexive aspects in language use by describing ideological schemata and other discursive formations that are involved in the process of standardization (e.g. Agha, 2003: 231-232; Silverstein 2003: 216-222). These studies have been accompanied by theoretical discussions on the role of individual or group agency in sociolinguistic interactions where changes can often be driven by cultural conceptions and discursive formations as well (see e.g. Deumert 2003a for one solution).

The focus on discursive formations has led to emphasize the contingent nature of standard language cultures (Milroy 2001: 530) in the history of the world, which have dramatically altered the course of the evolution of languages (e.g. Joseph, 1987:19; Romaine 1989: 577). In that domain calls have been made to investigate the details in the international connections and motivations of the individuals and groups contributing to language standardization (Deumert & Vandebussche 2003b: 461-464) and towards a historiography of language ideologies to contextualize these historical developments (Blommaert 1999: 2). So far some progress has been made on this front (e.g. monograph Davies & Langer 2004; edited collection of articles Langer & Davies 2005), however detailed case studies on the reflexive discursive activity of particular communities which historically went through processes of standardization have so far

been few. This dissertation seeks to contribute to this enterprise by analysing the language debates taking place in Estonian language community on their representation of the contemporary sociolinguistic situation as it relates to standardization.

1.2 Social meaning in linguistic analyses

The inclusion of social meaning of linguistic phenomena, which have also been called language-external phenomena (see Romaine 1995 for review) was for modern research context initiated by the start of sociolinguistics, particularly in the pioneering studies of Labov (1966; 1972). Labov discovered in a series of studies that individuals within particular groups will show rather robust responses to linguistic variables or be inclined to use them in particular contexts. Thus for example he found that a publically stigmatized feature of rhoticity was used to a differentially by social class of the speaker and the context of use (Labov 1966). Thus it seemed that the upper middle class pronounced their /r/'s most rhotically while the lower working class did it the least, equally /r/'s were pronounced most rhotically in formal contexts such as reading a word list and least rhotically in regular conversations (Labov 1966). With these experiments Labov was able to connect intra-phonemic variation to social groups and particularly the socioeconomic class of these groups, thus it becomes possible to explain variation in language use by sociological features. Accordingly social evaluations were advocated as one of the main questions of research in sociolinguistics and historical linguistics (Weinreich et al. 1968).

Eckert (2012) has formulated an overview of the gradually increasing inclusion of social meaning in sociolinguistic studies that she characterizes as emerged in three waves. These three waves do not exactly correspond to a temporal sequence but indicate differences in focus of the studies. The approach has been termed the survey approach given its use of macrosociological categories in grounding the social meaning that could be found in language use (Ibid. 88). Eckert argues that a second wave of studies, that she terms ethnographic, built on top of this and started to use local categories of relevance in grounding the social meanings, such as Jocks and Burnouts in her own study (Eckert 2000). Particularly there were visible discrepancies in how

variation of language use distributed across social class (e.g. working class seemingly forming their own hierarchies of language use), which encouraged the researchers to investigate more closely which social dimensions were salient for the community or how they formulate within networks of individuals for example.

A third wave, that is still new in sociolinguistics, is argued by Eckert (2012: 93) to be the practice and stylistic perspective, which focusses on the role of human agency and reflexivity within these interactions. Usually these studies concentrate on interactions in the micro-social context and close observation of how meanings are negotiated within contexts. In the case of Eckert this agency is conceptualized in terms of Silverstein's indexical order (2003), articulating in this way a theory of how semiotic agents (people) can access relevant macro-sociological categories through in the realm of the micro-contextual (more on Silverstein later). The focus on reflexivity in the context of linguistic interactions also brings to focus discursive formations that articulate the sense-making of particular semiotic agents of the situations they find themselves in both in terms of lasting macro-sociological categories and short duration micro-contextual interactions.

Eckert (2012: 97-98) proposes a third wave of sociolinguistics as a general term for studies focussing on agency in social meaning as another layer of research questions in sociolinguistics. She argues (Ibid.) that there are essentially no limitations to what type of social meaning can be represented or which phenomena of language use it could situate in, that use of linguistic variants reflects and constructs social meaning within communities, and that they are only fully specified in contexts of use. According to Eckert (Ibid. 98) the third wave of sociolinguistics would take the variationist research one step closer to where the most significant linguistic impact is made, and thus the processes of language change.

1.3 Domain of historical sociolinguistics

Historical sociolinguistics is a field of study that has organically grown out of sociolinguistics as its methods and findings have been increasingly applied to historical data of earlier times. Thus as a result for historical linguistics the methods developed in sociolinguistics (e.g. Weinreich et

al. 1968) provided a more detailed view on linguistic communities by investigating orderly heterogeneity within them, for example in the form of age-gradients and changes in progress. Later studies have incorporated these methods to investigate the trajectories by which language changes diffused through communities exhibiting some robust trends (e.g. S-curves of linguistic change, see Labov 1994: 65-72; Croft & Blythe, 2012).

Historical sociolinguistics, as regular sociolinguistics, is mainly a study of variation. It has however additional problems to solve in comparison with sociolinguistics given that to the extent that the past is different from modern times, it is difficult to estimate exactly how different it could have been. Thus the research in historical sociolinguistics has resorted to a variant of the principle of uniformitarianism (Romaine 1988: 1454), stating that the forces acting on languages in the past were most likely of the same kind and magnitude as the ones in operation in the present or informational maximalism (Janda & Joseph 2003: 37) where it is sought to gain a maximum of information from a maximum of potential sources from different times, places or contexts. The task of historical sociolinguistics thus becomes twofold: 1) to describe and analyse past communities in order to better understand the parameters that influence languages in time; 2) to evaluate the degree and dimensions of interesting variation that could be expected from historical data to find the suitable parameters for comparison. At the same time historical data provides a great source of data to test modern theories of linguistic and sociolinguistic change.

The role of historical sociolinguistics in linguistics generally then is rather significant, as it seeks to combine the broadest possible sources in order to address the broadest possible dimensions known to vary in time and space as far as the current knowledge in linguistics is concerned. Being primarily about historical data, historical sociolinguistics however rarely has the same privileged access to the linguistic communities as researchers of modern languages enjoy. While this often means that the researchers of historical data will be able to depend on informed extrapolation on modern data, this also means that sometimes the topics that display much interesting variation in the modern times, are mostly opaque in older times.

In an effort to increase the informativity of past sources, recent developments in sociolinguistics have also turned to the third wave of sociolinguistics, described above, as a methodological

guideline (e.g. Sairio & Palander-Collin, 2012; Laitinen & Nordlund, 2013; Nevalainen, 2014). Particularly, a few studies have incorporated the understanding of people as reflexive semiotic agents making sense of their sociolinguistic surroundings (e.g. Agha, 2003; Davies & Langer, 2004; Cooper, 2012). These studies effectively suppose the uniformity of meaning-making processes between past and present communities which seems a reasonable assumption given that the theoretical models are able to accommodate all of modern day variation. This assumption opens up the possibility to situate past linguistic changes in the minds of the reflexive participants in their linguistic interactions, and particularly allows for the role of local macro-social categories in their interactions to be analysed.

1.4 Language ideology and metapragmatics

The reflexive aspects of language use highlighted in the chapter on social meaning have been addressed by a number of research perspectives with overlapping interests and diverse methods, under such terms as language attitude (e.g. Garrett 2010), folk linguistics (e.g. Preston 1993; Niedzielski & Preston 2003), language regard (e.g. Preston 2011a), language ideology (e.g. Woolard 1998; Irvine & Gal 2000; Silverstein 1998). While there are differences in methodologies and the underlying model in focus, these approaches are broadly compatible and can be used to complement each others findings.

Due to the focus on historical contexts Silverstein's semiotic model of indexical orders (as opposed to e.g. Preston's (2013) cognitive approach), that has been gradually built over the years, has been chosen as the underlying frame of interpretation (e.g. Silverstein 1979, 1985, 1987, 1994, 2003, 2010). Silverstein's approach also has the benefit that it has been quite influential in the third wave of sociolinguistics (e.g. see Eckert, 2012: 88) and it has already been used in conjunction with each of the three sociolinguistic topics: enregisterment (e.g. in Agha 2003: 233), standard language culture (e.g. as indexical order informed by standardization Silverstein 2003: 216-219) and linguistic marketplace (understood as commodification of linguistic varieties in Silverstein 2003: 222-227).

1.4.1 Field of language ideology

Investigations into the ideological dimension of language use often trace their roots to Silverstein's 1979 article (e.g. Woolard, 1998: 11; Kroskrity, 2010: 192) where he argued for a stronger recognition of the mediating role that language ideologies have in all linguistic interactions. His definition of language ideologies as „any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use“ (1979: 193) has since developed into variations on the theme, such as „shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world“ (Rumsey 1990: 346) or „the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests“ (Irvine 1989:255).

In a recent review, Kroskrity (2004: 496) has argued that despite recently heightened interest, the field of language ideology has yet to find a particular unity in this immense body of research, with no single core literature, or a range of definitions. Woolard (1998: 5-7) has brought out four aspects that have been most emphasized in various language ideological studies:

- 1) Language ideologies are often thought to belong to an ideational realm or the realm of meanings. While some studies require them to be conscious, other studies tie this to behavioural, practical and pre-reflexive tendencies.
- 2) Ideologies are usually considered to be connected to experiences or interests which connects the ideologies often with the practical purposes of an individual.
- 3) Often connected to the second, ideologies are understood in terms of power relations and particularly have a role in maintaining or breaking some power relations.
- 4) An element of misrepresentation is emphasized whereby the nature of an ideology to distort its object of representation is emphasized.

Silverstein's approach attempts to build a semiotic model which construes these issues via the concepts of indexical order and (ethno-)metapragmatics.

1.4.2 Indexical order

Silverstein builds his interpretation of ideological facets of language use on the Peircean typology of signs, with its most common distinction between iconic, indexical and symbolic sign functions. Broadly, iconic signs stand in relation of similarity to their objects, indexical signs to one of cooccurrence, and symbolic signs to one of habit (CP 4.531).

Silverstein argues that indexicality should be seen as a pervasive phenomenon in language use with its occurrences pointing to their context and co-text in their presuppositions and contextually created interpretations (Silverstein 1994: 36). The argument follows accordingly that highlighting this relationship as based on cooccurrence does not liberate these signs from participating in semiosis, and in the context of human interaction acquiring a habitual element to them. Due to their interrelationships with other social sign systems, „such indexicality is caught up in a dialectic process mediated by ideological formations, and that therefore there is no possible absolutely pre-ideological, i.e., zero-order, social semiotic – neither a purely 'sense'-driven denotational system for the referential-and-predicational expressions of any language, nor a totalizing system of purely "symbolic" values for any culture.“ (Silverstein 1998: 315-316).

Even more important for language ideological research, Silverstein argues, is how these ideologies as „invokable schemata of explanation/interpretation of the meaningful flow of indexicals gelled into text-like chunks“ (Ibid. 316) are thought of as relatively perduring and stable with respect to the indexicals-in-context that they construe. These schemata are then recognized as rationalizing, systematizing and naturalizing the indexical value in terms of some phenomena autonomous of the context, effectively „explaining“ it (Ibid.).

A particular schematization that guides sign uses in context is understood as an indexical order, which Silverstein (2003: 193) argues to be a necessary concept to understand the mediation between micro-social interactions (such as sign use in contexts) and macro-social categories (such as language ideologies). According to Silverstein (Ibid., 194), each element in such an indexical order is in constant competition with its potential reinterpretations that emerge naturally out of contextual use via ideological mediation.

1.4.3 Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function

The linkage from presuppositional context to entailed creative effect is mediated by what Silverstein calls metapragmatic function (Silverstein 2003: 196), which can be understood in two senses: for one it works to bring textual coherence to these creative effects by allowing the singular signs in use to be determined by each other (Silverstein 1994: 36), for another it allows a specific kind of textual coherence in allowing a denotational interpretation of reference-and-predication formed of it (Ibid. 37).

Metapragmatic function can, according to Silverstein, thus be analysed in three relevant dimensions of contrast (Ibid. 38), which help us situate various manifestations of metapragmatic functions. Ultimately these can be used to ground the notion of metapragmatic discourse and its operation.

First, they can distinguished according to their object of metase miosis as metapragmatics, which bears a relation to pragmatic or indexical dimension of language, and metasemantics, which is based on a denotational interpretation of its object and thus constitutes a very specific kind of metapragmatics (Ibid. 40-45). Urban (2006: 90) argues that this distinction also opens up another possibility when in addition to the distinction of metapragmatics and metasemantics on the sign-object relation of the sign in focus (i.e. metasemiotic markers can be in either a pragmatic relation to a semantic relation to their objects), the same distinction can also be applied on the level of analysis. Thus the analysts can interpret the analysable semantic relations pragmatically, in looking at the contexts and conditions of its use, or semantically in considering the denotational sense-relations used in the observed contexts (Ibid.). The same can be done also with what are observable as pragmatics by formulating the observations on the pragmatic aspects of them or by formulating an interpretation referring to them through denotational sign-forms (Ibid.).

Second, they can be distinguished according to the denotational explicitness of the signals functioning metapragmatically (Silverstein 1994: 45-48). A fully explicit metapragmatic functioning would have to be able to possess the capabilities to ground the metapragmatic

comment or effect intended in the form of transparent semiotic expression. While natural language rarely offers such tools, a good example of such functioning can, following Silverstein, be seen in classical performative expressions of Austin, such as the verbs 'promise' and 'congratulate' (Austin, 1975: 83-93). A fully implicit metapragmatic function would signal its aims without the use of any denotationally explicit sign-forms (Silverstein 1994: 37). An additional topic therein, as offered by Silverstein (Ibid.) is whether the signalling sign-forms can be construed as doing it inherently and independent of context or through some function of contextual entailment.

Third, these metapragmatic functions can be distinguished as to their mutual pragmatic calibration between the metapragmatic signs (i.e. signaling events) and their regimented object in an entextualized form (i.e. in entextualized event structure). First of the two main types therein is reportive calibration, which entails both the metapragmatic sign and its object in the same presupposable level of interactions – that is, its object is portrayed to have an existence independence of its metapragmatic representation (Ibid. 37). A typical example of this is reported speech in discourse (e.g. „She did [x]“), where the event described within the reported speech is evoked as having an independent existence from the utterance. This is contrasted to reflexive calibration wherein the entextualized object of the metapragmatic sign seems to have emerged on the moment of entextualization due to a creative effect reached by the current configuration of cooccurrent indexicals (Ibid. 50-51). An important corollary to this calibration is that while reported calibration is limited to explicit metapragmatic functions, reflexive calibration does not have the same limitations, and can emerge as a creative result from any indexical configuration (Ibid. 51).

Metapragmatic discourse can thus be understood as sign formations making explicit these metapragmatic functions. Silverstein's descriptions of metapragmatic functions is one example of them, this subchapter is another. The objects that metapragmatic discourse portrays fall into various positions on each of these dimensions offered by Silverstein above. Metapragmatic discourse can portray pragmatic dimensions of language use or semantic ones as a specific subset of them, metapragmatic discourse can deal with elements that are denotationally explicit or implicit, and it can deal with sign functions that refer to elements presupposed within contexts or emerge creatively from within them.

This metapragmatic discourse can itself function to regiment the metapragmatic interpretations of sign use in context (e.g. it is possible to make conversational moves to signal a change in the metapragmatic frame of linguistic interactions) to various degrees of efficiency (Silverstein 2003: 196). Turning back to the mediating role of ethnometapragmatics in common linguistic interactions, Silverstein argues that while the presence of explicit metapragmatic discourse, if discoverable, is a sufficient marker of metapragmatic function and metapragmatic intentionality, it must be noted that these functions are involved in a constant dialectic between micro-contextual situated sign use and perduring macro-social categories such as language ideologies (Ibid.). This ideologically-informed ethno-metapragmatics endows mere behaviour with indexical significance that can be understood in relation to conventional norms (Ibid.). In some cases canonical metapragmatic discourse can be assumed to operate in purely denotational terms (e.g. Agha 2004: 26), however in this dissertation the term will be used on the basis of Silverstein as potentially incorporating a wide range of metapragmatic functions.

There is thus a general criticism of linguistic methodologies embedded in Silverstein's concept of indexical order. Silverstein argues that „The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is 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). As it has been succinctly phrased by Woolard (2008: 436) any investigation of language should incorporate the aspects „linguistic form, social use, and human reflection on these forms in use“ in the case that a theoretical distortion of the linguistic object is sought to be avoided.

1.4.4 Ethnometapragmatics as a research area

Following his characterization of metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic functions, Silverstein coins the term ethnometapragmatics, following the lead of ethno-methodology of Garfinkel (1967) which focusses on the 'methods' that common people use to solve their problems in everyday interactions. Ethnometapragmatics thus focuses on the way metapragmatic functions are used by semiotic agents in their common interactions. In other

words it denotes a particular cultural construal or schematization of the usage of an indexical sign (as understood in the context of the theory of indexical orders), with an emphasis that these construals are subject to variation between communities and contexts (Silverstein 2003: 194). This then constitutes an investigation into the metapragmatic frames that particular semiotic agents utilize in their common interactions. Before introducing the perspective of ethnometapragmatics as it can be used to describe language standardization, the observability of these metapragmatic frames, as they occur in the context of signs in use, for the analyst must be considered.

1.4.4.1 Sources of evidence

The reflexive aspects of language use again bring up a number of interrelated research enterprises gathered under such terms as language ideology, language regard, folk linguistics, and language attitudes. The availability of particular methods depends on the object of interest chosen by the researchers.

For example when investigating ethnometapragmatics or metapragmatic functions in their various contexts in modern language communities, one can use a number of specialized techniques. For example one can rely on a number of techniques of collecting qualitative data (e.g. you can have your research subjects draw up their own conceptualizations of linguistic phenomena, as has been long done in perceptual dialectology) or participate in the community themselves and pay attention to ethnometapragmatic patterns (e.g. techniques of conversation analysis are very relevant here) or set up controlled experimental trials to elicit reactions on particular interactions (e.g. you can manipulate variables such as the looks of a speaker and test for differences in reactions to language) (a good overview has been compiled from within folk linguistics in Preston 2011b). Indeed, these investigations have shown how local ethnometapragmatics mediating language use can significantly interfere with language production, language comprehension, and even mere perception of linguistic sounds (e.g. see Preston 2013).

In the context of past communities, however this data is not available and other paths of argumentation must be considered. Agha (e.g. 2003, 2004) formulates such an approach around for investigating social registers the conceptualization of a metapragmatic function presented above. Agha (2004: 26) argues that given the role that metapragmatic function takes in discourse is an intersubjective one, the signs acting in this capacity have to be necessarily overt in the sense of being palpable and perceivable. While they do not have to be linguistically expressed or denotationally explicit, given the pervasiveness of metapragmatic phenomena in language, in the case of a social regularity such as a social register enough data should be able to converge on the same target. As he argues succinctly (Ibid.), the same mechanisms that allow metapragmatic phenomena to be perceived in interactional contexts are the ones that allow an analyst to discover them in publically observable semiotic behaviour.

Additionally, he argues, that for social phenomena that are assumed to be shared and stable over interactions (such as various macro-social categories and language ideologies in Silverstein's model), some type of public metapragmatic signalling is a requirement for their basic operations (Ibid. 27). These social formations depend on mechanisms of replication for their continued existence through interactions and in novel contexts. This entails mechanisms of socialization for newcomers who are not familiar with these social meanings. Thus a minimal condition of existence of these social formations, in Agha's case social registers, is the communication of messages typifying these social formations, e.g. metapragmatic stereotypes, which can be found documented in the data (Ibid.). This works also the other way in Agha's conceptualization of language use as a reflexive social action – given enough regularity in discursive formations over time (particularly if these are not common in cross-cultural contexts), it can be assumed that the mechanisms forming these formations are in place, and thus in the case of metapragmatic discourse its object is probably a part of regular social reality.

Agha (2003) has utilized this insight on patterns of metapragmatic discourse grounding long-term trends in habits within a community in his investigation of the formation of the standard social register of speech 'Received Pronunciation' within the United Kingdom, incorporating evidence spanning over a few centuries. On the basis of his case study he argued further that this principle could be used in wider contexts to investigate the role of a gradual sedimentation of habits of interpretation can lead to significant transformations of the

community values (Ibid. 269). At the same time the analyst using this semiotic method can investigate the precise trajectories by which these habits were formed and diffused by, gaining significant insights into the organization of the community they took place in and the ethnometapragmatic functioning operational in it.

1.4.4.2 Ethnometapragmatics and standardization

A conceptualization of a standard language community with the help of the concepts of indexical order and ethnometapragmatics is provided by Silverstein (2003: 216-222). Silverstein introduces the notions via a classic study by Labov (1972) which investigated the rhoticity (the pronunciation of /R/) in the production of various tasks of speaking among the native English speakers in New York in the 1960s. To focus on just one aspect that is relevant to us, the study observed that the pronunciation varied so that in the tasks which implied a formal context or perhaps similarity to experiences in school, such as word lists or reading from paper, the /R/ pronunciation was not too far from the standard – however with normal interaction, the pronunciation was very far from the standard – in this case non-rhotic. And the study noticed another tendency – that it was most of all the lower middle socioeconomic class (SEC) people that used the forms closest to the standard in reading tasks, and the upper middle SEC people who used it closest to the standard (though much lower) on regular conversations. Non-rhoticity could be regarded as a stereotype of New York speech at the time which many if not most New Yorkers disliked and made fun of, but also used in their regular interactions.

Silverstein (2003: 216-222) provides a following interpretation for this. Silverstein finds that there are two indexical orders at work here in dialectic competition with each other. One of them could be found as equivalent to a vernacular – that is, the non-rhotic speech that the New Yorkers use – and the other as equivalent to a standard – that is, the rhotic speech that they use. These indexical orders are activated depending on the context of use, in case of contexts where the participants had experience with the standard or having to maintain the standard variety (such as public schools) they use the standard indexical order, and otherwise they use the vernacular. This variation between two varieties can fit into an ethnometapragmatic frame of an individual speaker where he or she makes sense of their linguistic use somehow. Silverstein

argues (Ibid. 216-217) that with these registers this is usually done with the frame of equivalence – that is, these two varieties of speaking become enregistered as „different ways of saying the same thing“ (Ibid. 216). At the same time the stereotype that they have implies that on a conscious level they value one of the varieties – namely the standard – much more than the other (in fact, stigmatizing the other, which is not uncommon in standard language cultures). Thus this language situation can be analysed via ethnometapragmatic frames that schematize the variability between the competing patterns of indexicality which have become known as, or *enregistered* as, different registers in the community (or a differentiation between ‘the standard register’ and other ways of speaking).

Another layer that can be added on top of this is via the finding about the interaction with the socioeconomic class. The way that the findings can be interpreted is if the upper middle class has their natural vernacular variety as the closest to the standard, and the lower middle class is attempting to imitate that (but going too far). This phenomenon is common in sociolinguistics and is known as hypercorrection. Namely what can be happening is that the lower middle class, who can be characterized sociologically as the most socially mobile and the ones with the greatest opportunity to gain from using the standard as the prestige variant to leave a good impression, are also working the hardest to do it (just sometimes too hard). In this case in their ethnometapragmatic frame the indexical order implied by the standard is commodified as a highly desirable variety (and also register), that can possibly give them what they need. Thus making them eager to react to the context.

To connect it to the concepts about to be introduced in the next subchapter, it could be said that this standard register increases the perceived value in using it, but does it differently for different groups, as if in a *linguistic marketplace* with different needs and capabilities between the participants. The standard and the vernacular each can become enregistered as equal ways of saying different things, or what is probably rather the case with New York, only one of them became enregistered as a legitimate linguistic practice, and the other one has bad practice or a distorted version of language (not really English). However whenever most of them are in a situation where they have to put explicit attention to speech (this is how Labov first characterized this variable) they produce variants that are much closer to the standard. The standard has more legitimacy than the other variety and is mostly used in formal contexts.

Additionally, due to socioeconomic positions the use of the standard register provides different opportunities for what are seen as social classes leading to a differential evaluation between them. This could be understood as them standing in variable positions in the linguistic marketplace having established some interpretative habits on how these registers could be valued. The other notable features, such as stigmatization on other varieties of language use leading to a reduction in variability, a central register implied for formal use which is brought about with proper attention to speech, and its greater legitimacy over other varieties of language use can be encompassed under the term *standard language culture* (Milroy 2001). Silverstein (2003: 219) notes on Labov's study in question, that this is particularly a remarkably canonical standard language community, and in most communities the orders of indexicality work in much more dimensions and provide more internal variation. Within the context of this community attention to speech (purely a one-dimensional variable) however can capture much of the variation. This can be one of the side effects of linguistic standardization.

1.4.5 Talk about talk

The object of this dissertation is the ethnometapragmatics of the semiotic agents as they make sense of their language use in their sociolinguistic situation. This ethnometapragmatics can be approached through the reflection on linguistic issues that emerges during common social interactions and which can be manifested in various types of metapragmatic discourse with various possibilities of influencing the linguistic behaviour – plainly speaking 'talk about talk'.

As argued by Lucy (1994: 9), and as would follow from the previous chapters this sort of reflexivity is pervasive in language use, and as is added by Johnstone (2006: 463) almost all of linguistics can also be considered as 'talk about talk', thus the object of investigation in this dissertation and the investigation itself constitute the same kind of objects.

The more precise object in this case is an era of language debates which led to a proliferation of publications on linguistic issues in various outlets. These were written by semiotic agents in attempts to reflexively make sense of their linguistic surroundings and used various means for it with varying degree of influence back into the practices. What an analyst can potentially

uncover from these publications are for example the particular interests of selected individuals as related to their background, or the ideological background on which these reflexive representations were formed. Both of them normally include an implicit comparative perspective as these motivations can be compared to other potential motivations in similar situations and language ideologies on other potential language ideologies that an analyst knows of that might lead the same agents to a different sort of interpretation.

As visible from the short section on sources of evidence, the reflexivity of these semiotic agents can become visible via the metapragmatic discourse that they formulate or the metapragmatic stereotypes that circulate between them in discourse. These observable metapragmatic signs provide an entry for the description of ethnometapragmatics of particular semiotic agents or groups of agents. The same way mechanisms that these agents need to use to make these signs visible to each other are the same that an analyst can follow. Thus talk about talk constitutes an object which could be analysed for various purposes. In this dissertation we are interested in how these agents reflexively interpret their sociolinguistic circumstances and on possible implications that could be brought to bear on their ethnometapragmatic frames in this way, which may not be available if just sociological descriptions are used for example.

1.5 Three sociolinguistic topics

The following three topics each bear a relevance to the standardization processes and can be construed as part of the reflexive practices within a community. These reflexive practices can leave traces among their manifestations as articulated metapragmatic discourse that can be used to interpret the ethnometapragmatics and the metapragmatic processes happening within these communities. As described above the communities with a dominant standard language can well be described with the terms of *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace*. Considering the Estonian language community we observe as going through a process of standardization, we can consider how the transformations came about in each of these dimensions, and what kind of reflection these semiotic agents produced as they made sense of their sociolinguistic surroundings. Each of these dimensions will be introduced as a general

parameter in sociolinguistics and then described in their operationalization in the context of ethnometapragmatics and the language debates in question.

1.5.1 Enregisterment

A community with a central standard language can be described according to Silverstein (2003: 216-222) as having one variety of language use enregistered as a standard within the community. Accordingly standard language communities can be characterized by a presence of an enregistered central variety which requires a number of social practices in order for the register to be maintained as a social variety among new participants. Thus an emergence of a standard language can be described in terms of its enregisterment, which can in turn be monitored in the diffusion of metapragmatic stereotypes (Agha 2004: 36).

1.5.1.1 Concept & significance

Enregisterment has been defined as a collection of „processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms.“ (Agha, 2003: 231). The concept has been introduced to incorporate the view of language use as reflexive social action into the context of studies of social registers. Agha situates this notion in contrast to an early definition (though cf. also Bussmann 2006: 994 similar definition in a recent linguistics dictionary) of a register which proposed that „differences of utterance-form involve differences of ‘register’ whenever distinct forms are viewed as appropriate to ‘different social situations’ by users (Reid 1956)“ (Agha, 2004: 36). Agha argued that this definition had significant limitations as it did not offer a theory on how speech could be linked to social situations in the first place, nor how these links could be discovered by the analyst, nor how they could be useful in generalizing across these specific utterances (Ibid). Agha’s framework of enregisterment offers solutions in linking speech with social situations via metapragmatic models of action, indicating that this link could be observed in the study of socially situated evaluative data, and that the particular utterances may participate in broader habits of

entextualization (Ibid.). This approach conceptualizes social registers as a result of semiotic processes of enregisterment which guide the ethnometapragmatic understanding of register distinctions in social life. Tongue-in-cheek, Agha adds that considering registers as countable objects within a community was erroneous from the start since, „unlike collections of pebbles“ (Ibid.), registers exist only in so far and as long as they are treated as such by language users.

1.5.1.2 Practical operationalization

In the context of this dissertation we will consider reflection on the processes of enregisterment in these debates via metapragmatic discourse that distinguishes varieties of linguistic expression from others. This can be done by a few different means. For one explicit labels denoting particular varieties of linguistic expression may be used (e.g. language of literature, language of newspapers), second prescriptive metapragmatic discourse may focus on particular domains of language use designating it as worthy of distinction, third distinctions between varieties of language use can be advocated in general terms.

1.5.2 Standard language culture

The term standard language culture has been introduced by Milroy (2001) in order to conceptualize the typological variability that languages can have on this dimension. Each community can use a number of practices observable in canonical standard language cultures, such as the New York example described by Silverstein (2003: 216-222) and thus the relative presence of a standard language culture can be observed as variation on the dimensions this concept provides. The process of standardization itself can be conceptualized as the emergence of a standard language culture which takes place gradually within a community and not without reflection from members of the community.

1.5.2.1 Concept & significance

Standard language culture has been conceptualized as a set of practices that uphold a belief that a particular language exists in a standardized form (Milroy, 2001). These practices can be institutionalized to various degrees, and maintained via various mechanisms, however they have come to follow rather similar structures in their effects. In these communities, the standard language is often considered to have the highest prestige, with the non-standard forms operating under an assumption of inferiority. For the standard variety itself, there are clear ideas on the correctness of various expressions which is often correlated with an expected degree of schooling before a required level of competence is reached. Thus, it is not enough to be a native speaker of the language, but one has to be properly schooled in it. The use of a standard variety is particularly expected in certain societal contexts often conceived as formal settings, and the correct usage of language is thus often accomplished via sufficient attention to speech, where 'lazy speech' is much more prone to non-standard forms (Ibid.).

An argument has been made that these types of practices do not always cooccur with each other and are sometimes not present at all in linguistic communities, that is, they can constitute a typological parameter on which language communities could be characterized (e.g. Milroy, 2001; Mühlhäusler, 1996). Work in linguistic anthropology has revealed communities where the speakers have no clear sense of linguistic belonging, and find it difficult to conceptualize their habits of speaking as 'a language' (e.g. Grace, 1991). Accordingly, the 'languages' of these communities have been argued to maintain a much more fluid and unstable presence, where the lack of conceptual reification also brings about differences in the practices of language use (which may require adaptation of descriptive methods, Milroy, 2001: 540). Thus the belief in standardness is not something that may not be present all linguistic communities, but may be an interesting variable to consider cross-culturally. The prestige of the standard language relies on a number of different mechanisms including building up of legitimacy via historiographical interpretation, enregistered contexts of use that require extra attention to be placed on linguistic activities, deviations from the register are usually severely punished via a discourse of mistakes, and uniformity is imposed on linguistic variation that would normally exist in the system (Milroy 2004: 133-139).

1.5.2.2 Practical operationalization

In the context of this dissertation we will consider the reflection on the parameters of standard language cultures that are emerging in this period by analysing metapragmatic discourse that comments on any of the dimensions of the canonical standard language cultures mentioned above. These are accordingly messages bearing on 1) the amount of variation within a language; 2) a distinction between formal/public and informal/private contexts of language use; 3) attention paid to linguistic expression; 4) linguistic correctness and incorrectness in language use; 5) legitimacy of linguistic varieties. We will consider formal contexts and attention to speech under one point since they are almost always overlapping.

1.5.3 Linguistic marketplaces

Linguistic marketplace has become relevant in the descriptions of standard languages via the concept of commodification (e.g. Silverstein 2003: 222-227) by which particular linguistic varieties can become enregistered as more valuable within a community. This is also included in the concept of legitimacy in Milroy's (2001) standard language culture, wherein standard languages usually have more prestige among the varieties within the community as well as often between communities. The prestige patterns tied to linguistic varieties and languages can be subject to reflection among the members of the community who attempt to make sense of their current situation and goals in their sociolinguistic situations.

1.5.3.1 Concept & significance

Linguistic marketplace or, equivalently, linguistic market (based on Bourdieu, 1977), was originally included in sociolinguistics to describe how the distribution of language use within a community can be to a large extent predicted from economic factors. Initially this was used in a rather constrained sense to focus on purely economic variable in the context of variation within

a community (e.g. Sankoff & Laberge 1978) or language shift (e.g. Gal 1979). While economic motivations are reasonable in some contexts later works in line with the general developments in sociolinguistics started to place more emphasis on local categories within the linguistic market considering the different motivations that people may have in choosing their language varieties (some of which, e.g. ascendance in career, may translate well into economic value, others may translate less well, e.g. joining a particular social circle, as in e.g. Eckert 2008: 32).

Subsequently, studies have polemized with the original notions offered by Bourdieu which were received as offering an inconveniently static approach to how social meaning was involved in local interactions (e.g. Agha, 2003: 270). Instead, following the framework of indexical order there is now talk of commodification of linguistic variation whereby certain typifications of speech become enregistered and operate as lifestyle markers which people want to participate in and accordingly value higher (e.g. 'wine talk' in Silverstein 2003: 222-227, 'Pittsburghese' in Johnstone 2009: 157-175). In the context of the current study we can also redefine the linguistic marketplace in a fashion in line with the view on language as reflexive social action, as the ethnometapragmatic frame within which choices of language use take place. This can take place between varieties of the same language or different languages. Importantly for this dissertation, the linguistic market too should become visible within metadiscursive images of the time.

1.5.3.2 Practical operationalization

In the context of this dissertation we will consider the reflection on the contemporary linguistic marketplace by analysing metapragmatic discourse that explicitly (e.g. by direct comparison) or implicitly (e.g. by a hierarchy of languages) juxtaposes enregistered varieties or languages to each other. This can encompass a broad variety of concerns that are deemed relevant in these discursive comparisons between languages and can be argued to bear eventually on the language choices presented to members of the community. Following the presentation of the topics of reflexivity and metapragmatic discourse above, these messages are argued to participate in the reflexive sense-making of the sociolinguistic situation of the community then.

1.6 Language debates of 1912-1920

Language debates refer in this dissertation to the discussions on linguistic affairs that started with J. Aavik's writings on the possibilities of language innovation. These language debates are of the same kind as recommended for an object of study by Blommaert (1999: 1-2) in his call for a historiography of language ideologies. They focus on a variety of linguistic questions, they have an impact on the language situation in which they take place, they are tied to general sociopolitical processes and they are a place in which language ideologies are articulated, formed, amended, and enforced (Ibid.).

The year 1912 has been marked as a significant turn in the discourse on language by several authors (e.g. V. Raag 1998: 25; R. Raag 2008: 145) when J. Aavik, having gathered graduated Helsinki University with a degree in Romance studies and accumulated some capital by teaching abroad in the year before, started writing on the issues of Estonian language. As Raag (2008: 145) recounts in the first year, Aavik's bibliography (Vihma & Aavik 2000: 33-37) reports altogether 29 articles, 10 reviews and 9 translations from 1912 which is a very large amount for that era. These discussions on language were accompanied by an initiative with Noor-Eesti literary society to translate great works of literature in an accessible format for the people (Tavel 1991).

The main audience for these debates was the educated elite and the literati, but at the same time much of the discussions took place in the newspapers. Particularly a series „Little notes on language“ (*Väikesed keelelised märkused*) took the form of about 50 newspaper columns amounting to a few hundred pages around 1912-1914 with which most newspaper readers had to be familiar with (Rätsep 2012). The public outreach also amounted to some written responses by readers and other language enthusiasts. These debates were mostly channeled into literary journals (primarily *Eesti Kirjandus* and *Keeleline Kuukiri*, the latter of which was published by Aavik especially for these discussions). Additionally these essays were published in separate booklets, some of which became rather popular sales articles (e.g. Towards a more beautiful sound of language, *Keele kaunima kõlavuse poole* according to Rätsep 2012).

Due to the initiative from Aavik and possibly the historiography focussing on mostly the few individuals and their intellectual contributions (e.g. Aavik's newspaper articles have thus far been mostly overlooked in scholarship, according to Rätsep 2012) the corpus of texts that forms these debates is rather skewed with Aavik doing most of the writing. It must also be kept in mind that publishing on linguistic affairs takes time and resources that were not available in large quantities at the time, with no substantial traditional elite to support these enthusiasts. There were almost no professional linguists (perhaps the professor in Tartu University J. Jõgever could be one) or language organizers at the time and they had to rely on various means to sustain themselves by successful popular publications for example. A nice contemporary commentary on this is Aavik's own article (1914e) where Aavik makes the case for why it is important to buy books also in the time of poverty and war and another article by him (1914f) debating whether it is possible to earn living as a writer in the contemporary Estonia.

These language debates however offered a channel for contemporary reflections on linguistic affairs and conscious projects of language improvement. Thus they provide a great source of information on the metapragmatics of members of the sociolinguistic community at the time. While these commentaries were articulated by only a few actors their wide popularity and spread makes it probable that they reflected or influenced more general trends. In any case they are great examples of metapragmatic reflections on linguistic matters by which the sociolinguistic circumstances of the contemporary community could be looked at in more detail.

1.7 Previous analyses of these topics

For all three topics a substantial body of research has been amassed in earlier studies that partially concern the issues in question here and on which this dissertation will build on. None of the three topics have been explicitly focussed on in earlier research, however disparate sources of evidence have been combined for analysis that can be relied on as background materials. A large eclectic body of evidence has been used to construct a general sociolinguistic history of Estonian at the time which includes evidence as diverse as economic and political changes (e.g. Hennoste 1997; Taagepera 2011), autobiographic information (e.g. R. Raag, 1999b, 2008) and

literary practices (e.g. Monticelli 2006). This includes also a number of studies on the thought and writings on particular individuals involved in the language questions, considering for example their theoretical consistency (e.g. Hint 2011: 811) or explicit principles chosen (e.g. Ereht 2003: 77-80, 87-90, 93-98). These materials contain a number of bits of evidence on the reflection on sociolinguistic issues in focus here, which will be presented in this overview as relevant to the study.

We will consider them in turn, first focussing on the eclectic base of evidence that will be used to provide a general overview of the sociolinguistic circumstances of the time, and then present studies of contemporary discourse which pertain direct relevance to the period for each of the topics in focus.

1.7.1 Enregisterment

Studies on social registers have mostly been performed by other means than observing contemporary discourse and thus suitable for other purposes (e.g. Hennoste 1997). These studies argue that during the debates in question the Estonian written register was differentiating into subregisters for domains such as fiction and newspapers. The reflexivity on the differentiation of social registers has so far not really been explored except in the mapping of theoretical arguments on related topics, such as ‘What is or should be language?’. There is a gap in research that can be filled on a closer observation of the patterns of enregisterment within the discussions in question.

1.7.1.1 Sociolinguistic background

Specialized studies on the topic of the history of social registers in Estonia (e.g. Hennoste 1997, 1999) have also briefly described the sociolinguistic background of the era. Hennoste describes registers as „situationally determined sublanguage with distinguishable functions“ (Hennoste 1997: 46) which somewhat intuitively analyses the distribution of registers within a community

based isolable communicating subcommunities and a noticeable functional distinction between them. While Hennoste brings in also a binary distinction on reflexivity within social register formation by differentiating unintentional processes resulting from functional demands of the society from intentional ones with acknowledged purpose and ideals, this distinction is not central to his analysis and is only used in case of extremes (Ibid. 47). Additionally he also emphasizes the importance of perception of these registers (e.g. as independent and autonomous or defined as a corrupt version of another, such as seeing Estonian as distorted German, Undeutsch), but these ways of reflection are not really analyzed in the context of early 20th century (Ibid. 57-60).

Based on his materials, for the period of 1880s to 1914/1920 in his classification Hennoste argues that a significant change occurs in the position of Estonian language as the written protoregister, which had emerged in the 1860s-1870s within the native Estonian community, starts to evolve into distinguishable written registers (Ibid. 59). This is found in three changes: 1) written Estonian starts to lose its similarities to the clerical Estonian register written mostly by native German speakers in earlier times; 2) the proto-register divides into registers based on domain or situation (e.g. literature, journalism etc.); 3) the written register increases autonomy from the spoken language with specialized constructions and corpus maintenance (Ibid.). Importantly, during this period the emergence of registers is limited to the state sanctions: literary, journalistic, popular science and lower education registers can develop, but registers of science, higher education, and official business remain marginal (the last of which going through devolution due to Russianization in progress at the time) (Ibid.).

A difference between old and the traditional writing system based on German and the new writing system based on Finnish (introduced by Ahrens in 1842) leads to a social differentiation between the two. When Hurt proposes the use of the new system in 1864 it first encounters resistance on the older schoolmasters (Kask 1984: 123-125). As argued by Laanekask (2004: 39) the old writing system becomes a social marker of conservativeness and of a high affiliation with the Germans which through public stigmatization may have led to the quick transition from old to the new writing system that took place during the 1870s.

1.7.1.2 Discursive reflection

Discursive representations that could work as metapragmatic stereotypes distinguishing one variety of speech from another have been found in calls to form a new language, such as ones articulated by Aavik described by Monticelli (2009: 107) or Hint (2011: 817). These can only somewhat tentatively be tied to enregisterment since although metapragmatic signs denoting register differentiation undoubtedly exist in these cases there is no observable repertoire that it refers to. It is however plausible that abstract calls for a new language or register can be tied to a certain set of articulable practices, such as the language of language innovation become known as.

The distinction articulated between between the self-denomination of 'language reformers', and 'language organizers' (Hennoste 1997: 59), within their own representations also allows for potential enregisterment, however in Hennoste's view (Ibid.) these groupings did not establish a stability in repertoire in either case.

At the same time, Hennoste argues (Ibid.), a distinction between high and low registers or educated and uneducated registers is introduced and becomes common within the community. The metapragmatic stereotype of 'written language' (*kirjakeel*) portrays an interesting case for enregisterment studies. A number of studies have focussed on discourse on the 'written language' (often understood as just 'language') and what its definition is argued to entail (e.g. Erelt 2003; Monticelli 2009: 207), the discussions on which arguably continue to this day (e.g. see Kerge 2003). At the same time studies into the development of various uses the label 'written language' has been put to, and the metapragmatic stereotypes implied have not been done. What is kept in mind is usually the metapragmatic stereotype of written Estonian as a distinguishable register of language use that may differ from merely Estonian that is put into written language, however this may vary noticeably by time and context. Given that there are also theoretical disagreements (see the presentation by Erelt 2003) to what it should entail or by which principles it should operate by, it is not clear whether this label refers to the same object. Whichever the case, this type of naming usually implies processes of enregisterment in the perception of its object.

Studies on enregisterment on the period have not really problematized the metapragmatic stereotypes such as 'literary language' (*ilukirjanduskeel*) or 'scientific language' (*teaduskeel*) as they relate to the language practices at the time. They are mostly handled only in a certain teleological sense whereby 'literary language' can be seen as not yet formed or already formed (Hennoste 1997: 59) as opposed to investigating the use of these metapragmatic stereotypes and the trajectories that they would predict for the community in detail. Equally studies on enregisterment have not really focussed on ethnometapragmatic markers on dialectal variation (while e.g. for 1820s they were a significant topic on discussion on Tartu and Tallinn varieties during the language debates of the time, see Laanekask 1984: 681-682). This is probably due to an expectation of stabilization of these distinctions by the time. A recent analysis (Pajusalu 2013) does address these issues very briefly by providing the dialectal map according to Aavik in 1920 (Ibid. 172) and describing how Ridala values some dialects over others for their assumed historical properties (i.e. Viru and Võru dialects for Ridala 1915:406 in Pajusalu 2013: 171). Broader analyses on this have not yet been performed.

1.7.2 Standard language culture

Research in language history has come to argue an increasing concern with linguistic matters during the time in focus and a process of language standardization taking place through various mechanisms. This has been done without direct reference to a term of standard language culture and has been rarely problematized within the literature, with some exceptions (such as R. Raag (1999a: 35) arguing a difference between 1850s and 1920s linguistic practices to be an attitudinal issue. The discursive reflection on the emerging standard language culture has mostly been given sporadic treatment in the literature mentioning on occasions the emerging perceived need for language organization and codification and the few subgroupings that emerged during and became characteristic of the language debates of the time. Systematic description on the reflexive discourse of the individuals on the situation of standardization has so far not been composed.

1.7.2.1 Sociolinguistic background

Estonian as a „highly planned ethnic language“ (R. Raag 2008: 22) has been characterized thoroughly in its research history as a standard language. While comprehensive studies on it have been few (see R. Raag 2008: 24-25), standardization as a term has been included in many more linguistic studies. Estonian has been characterized as a typical Ausbau language (Kloss 1978: 304) where one among a few related dialects has been chosen as a supraregional standard (R. Raag 2008: 290), this entails a process of linguistic construction which is to a large extent planned and consciously done. Accordingly standardization processes characterize much of the history of Estonian.

In the context of recent history before the period in focus, there some convergence in opinion that conscious language standardization within the native Estonian community was heavily activated in the 1870s (Laanekask 2004: 39; V. Raag 1998: 25; R. Raag 2008: 67). Accordingly it has been argued that up until this mid or late 19th century native Estonians felt little stigma in using their local vernacular for any purpose in the society (e.g. R. Raag 1999a: 35). Wiedemann's (1875: III) dictionary is cited in this case as a mostly reliable source in saying that Estonians understand only their local vernacular and no common supra-local variety exists yet (e.g. Laanekask 2004: 38). The period of 1857-1905 is according to Laanekask characterizable by a general strive for a unified Estonian language and an increase in its status (Ibid. 36). She argues even that it is difficult to find influential Estonians at the time who did was involved with issues of written language (Ibid.). She adds though that neither of these strives did come to a completion with this period by 1905, but only focus these enterprises for the next period (Ibid.).

There have been frequent calls for conscious reduction of variation within the language. R. Raag (2008: 73) mentions a language teacher J. Kurrik writing in 1876 that, particularly with the new writing system in use, the legion of writing styles in the language impedes teaching the language and thus some organization is needed for it. In 1886 he expressed this concern again leading up to public debates and some decisions that were reached being published in the newspapers again. This type of a format of debates through newspapers and civic societies (such as Society of Estonian Literati, *Eesti Kirjameeste Selts*) took place a few times and became a habitual platform for discussing linguistic issues.

The period of Russianization (1887-1914) slowed down these discussions for a while with language lessons in Estonian schools coming to a halt and the schoolbooks being less produced. This decreased the familiarity with literate practices among Estonians and has given rise to arguments that the writing of people schooled during Russianization was essentially full of mistakes as it didn't conform to either older traditions or newer traditions in writing (R. Raag 2008: 86). At the same time the work at codification of Estonian language continued, and an eventual decrease in variation within the written language took place (R. Raag 2008: 112). A particular influence can be seen in a contest that offered a large monetary prize for a grammar of Estonian language, which led to three grammars being published in 1884, by K. A. Hermann, by J. Nebokat, and by H. Einer. Notably none of them were published in the deadline given for the contest and were eligible for the award (R. Raag 2008: 111).

The problem of variance within the language became an increasingly attended concern, where language societies founded in 1906 (*Eestimaa Rahvahariduse Selts*, Society of Estonian Public Education) and 1907 (*Eesti Kirjanduse Selts*, Estonian Literature Society) took the organization of variation up as its main topics of focus (R. Raag 2008: 136). Particularly notable is that most people there were convinced that this variation needs to be rooted out, very few disagreed (Ibid. 135). These discussions culminated in four Language Conferences (1908, 1909, 1910, 1911) where the questions of language variation were discussed with some success towards solutions (R. Raag 2008: 138-139). Most of the decisions were published in a small booklet in 1912 by J. V. Veski. The influence of these conferences can be seen in the fact that most of the proposals made there are currently in effect in modern Estonian (Ibid.).

The enterprise towards conscious language improvement received another momentum in 1912 when J. Aavik started actively writing on language innovation, which caused others interested in the language affairs to act as well (R. Raag 2008: 145-155). These started the era of language debates that is in the focus of this dissertation. Initiated in the language conferences, and also in the same period, during 1911-1916 Estonian Literature Society was working on a normative dictionary of Estonian dictionary with about 20,000 words which was published in 1918 (R. Raag 2008: 178). At the beginning of the century, also specialist vocabulary received more attention, as before it was only developed sporadically, and during the period of 1907-1917 nine specialist dictionaries were published (R. Raag 2008: 133-134).

Thus Laanekask (2004: 38) can argue that at the end of the 19th century, written Estonian contained too much variation to handle due to an increase in the ratio of native Estonian writers who were confident in their native vernaculars, due to the bible previously regarded as a normative target, and due to the lack of an authoritative dictionary. But transformations in linguistic practices and attention to language led to a quick decrease in this variation (R. Raag 2008: 112). This brought with it notable changes in the vocabulary and grammar of the language which have been tracked in a number of case studies (Tauli, 1982, 1984; V. Raag, 1998; Ehala, 1995; Kerge, 2003; Chalvin, 2010). These changes can be characterized as well by a general rise of a standard language culture in Estonian language communities, phrased by Hennoste as „the beginning of a totalitarian linguistic consciousness: that there is only one and true Estonian which is the written Estonian based on Northern Estonian dialects“ (1997: 61) which can be seen to have formed by mid 1930s.

1.7.2.2 Discursive reflection

The need for conscious attention in language organization and language use have often been regarded as unproblematically natural in the face of a disorganized system (Kask 1984: 170-173; Laanekask 2004: 39-40; R. Raag 2008: 135). It should be expected though that this organization or disorganization is historically a relative concept and the emergence of these appeals for conscious organization may depend on their sociocultural context as well as linguistic affairs. As such it has been argued that the ideas for language reform in Europe were most influenced by the German reform movements at the time and spread to other places in Eastern Europe and around the globe (V. Raag 1998: 22).

Much of the research on discourse has focussed on individuals in the form of personal overviews on thought and on the known figures who were active in language debates of the time (e.g. Veski, Aavik, Kettunen, Grünthal-Ridala, Saareste, Leetberg in Erelt 2003). Appeals for conscious improvement have been documented in a number of studies (e.g. V. Raag 1997: 14-48; Tauli 1968: 11-16; Monticelli 2009: 107). Undusk (2012) for example argues that the appeals for language improvement, such as in the case of Aavik, are a direct continuation and processing of much earlier Enlightenment ideas, such as the argument by Arvelius from 1792

who states that the uncultivated state of the language does not allow him to bring enlightenment to the Estonian people and thus advocates language improvement.

In the context of the years in question V. Raag (1998: 33-34) describes how the two approaches to standardization ('language organization' and 'language renewal') contrasted themselves in their definitions of the language and thus through which ways they could be improved. This contrast also led to differing allegiances with noticeable groupings emerging among the enthusiasts. V. Raag (1998: 35 – 48) argues that there are eventually three of them 'language organizers', 'language reformers' and 'advocates of self-regulating development'. The development of their thought is also construable as positioning relative to the other groups (R. Raag 2008: 153-155). Particularly these distinctions have been noted in the contemporary metadiscourse as showed in Monticelli (2009: 105) on how Aavik (1924[1918]: 7) assesses that differences in opinion on the means of language improvement often derive from the ideas about what 'language' is or should be themselves.

The problem of 'who is the target of language innovation' has been problematized in Monticelli (2009: 106) who offers that in the case of Aavik it was somewhat contradictorily set between the literary elite and the common people ending up with something like 'elite for the people'. Another aspect of standard language culture is the perceived need for codification. Reflections on this have been arguably captured somewhat in an obituary for K. A. Hermann which compared the grammar he had written to bringing earth to someone who is sinking, as argued by R. Raag (2008: 111).

1.7.3 Linguistic marketplace

Earlier research into the sociolinguistic position of Estonian during the debates argues that it had for a long time positioned at lower positions in a trilingual community. The policies of Russianization that had immediately preceded these debates had however broken down the linguistic hierarchies in the society, allowing the position of Estonian to improve in various contexts. Autobiographic assessments on the start of the century however still give a mixed picture on the relative position of Estonian as compared to Russian and German in professional

and educated contexts. On the reflections of Estonian's relative position among other known languages the attempts at becoming part of the European cultural space has been characterized on a number of practices such as translation of literary content and vocabulary extension. The articulations of individual reflection on these practices have so far been presented only sporadically in the literature as illustrative comments on the practices.

1.7.3.1 Sociolinguistic background

There is a general understanding of Estonian language being situated in a trilingual community (although trilingual individuals were rare, R. Raag 2008: 163) with German and Russian as the other significant languages (e.g. Hennoste 1997: 59; Jansen & Saari 1999: 240). There are no focussed assessments of Estonian language situation for the period of 1912-1920, however the presentations of longer time periods offer notable insight into it. Within the recent past, especially in correlation with increasing social mobility since the 1860s, German language had increased its presence within the Estonian community. This can be explained with the earlier past when up until the mid 19th century the community in which native Estonians were placed was based on class not ethnic divisions (Paul 1999: 69). As argued by Paul, upwardly mobile individuals picked up German and downwardly mobile individuals picked up Estonian as the non-native Estonian peasants seemed to assimilate equally well (Ibid.). By 1860s Estonian had become used as a language in newspaper publications and a few public organizations, however it remained less represented in other areas of use, particularly education was limited to the most basic levels, while higher education was predominantly German, sometimes Russian (R. Raag 2008: 65). Thus, during the 1870s and 1880s the educated language of communication was usually German and even societies focussing on activities in Estonian, such as the theatre society Vanemuine, had troubles with its members speaking excessive amounts of German to each other (R. Raag 2008: 65-66). It was not an atypical situation whereby educated native Estonians used German in their homes and started to use Estonian again as a ceremonial or 'Sunday' language in the public (Ibid.).

In a period of Russianization (1887-1914) the Russian Empire implemented policies to replace German with Russian in most public affairs and also Estonian with Russian on lower levels of

schooling (R. Raag 2008: 81-84). This increased central control in cultural activities but as it has been argued repeatedly (e.g. R. Raag 2008: 84; Laanekask 2004: 44; Taagepera 2011: 136-137; Hennoste 1997: 57-60), this pressure on existing sociolinguistic hierarchies substantially improved the position of Estonian language within the community. The natural path of using German for upwardly mobility did not work anymore, but the infrastructures for use of Russian in these cases were not in place and the forced policies that harmed Estonian cultural endeavors increased national self-consciousness (R. Raag 2008: 84-86). During the start of this period Estonians can be seen as partially oppressed in language issues, as is argued by estimating a decrease in literacy at the end of the 19th century (from 98% in 1886 (Talve 2005: 330) to 80% in 1901 (Talve 2005: 553)) and qualitative assessments on restricted registers in journalistic language (Kerge 2003: 12). However at the same time publication market in Estonian language seemed to show only a steady increase and by the end of 1890s, a handful of professional journalists, writers and politicians had emerged (Ibid. 559-562).

Increasing tensions in the society led to a social upheaval in 1905, after which the Russianization policies were relaxed somewhat. Estonians and Germans were allowed to make various civic unions and even form private schools (R. Raag 2008: 119). The society offered more and more professional opportunities to use Estonian in the both private and the public sphere (Ibid.). Autobiographic reports describe that German was still widely used in interactions in around the turn of the century by native Estonians with a few individuals also resorting to Russian „to discuss higher topics“ (Ibid. 120). The first two decades of the 20th century therefore offer a mixed picture, generally Estonian became used in an increasing number of social domains, but its position in the community was not yet dominant either.

1.7.3.2 Discursive reflection

Studies on discursive reflection on Estonian language written with various aims have a reoccurring theme in expressions of unhappiness (e.g. on Veski Erelt 2003; 76-77; on Aavik Monticelli 2009: 115) with the state or position of the language. Most initiatives for conscious improvement can be seen in these terms, although they are very often described in ambiguous terms such as „felt the need“ which does not specify the mechanisms by which this need came

about or whether it is justified. Undusk (2012) for example sets a broader cultural frame on this and argues that the desire for language improvement, particularly where insufficiency of vocabulary or expressive capabilities of the language were concerned was a general continuation of enlightenment discourse starting from the 18th century on Estonian.

Prior work has particularly emphasized the role of translation in the desires for language improvement, particularly on the dimension of vocabulary. Thus, Monticelli (2006: 382) has highlighted that the language work that was done was explicitly motivated by the need to become part of the modern European culture and be able to communicate in the same or equally functional concepts. Subsequently, it has been argued by Chalvin (2010: 215; Undusk 2010) that the need for vocabulary elaboration did not derive from the actual problems with the vocabulary but rather a sense of inferiority among the educated elite. Partially this was motivated, he argues (2008: 113) in case of Aavik purely from adjusting to the French cultural sphere which did not fit the Estonian one exactly and the ideals derived from there (also in Ross 2005: 525).

An aspect that repeatedly emerges in the debates on language is the concept of cultural language and a cultural nation (Estonian: *kultuurkeel*, *kultuurrahvus*; German: *Kultursprache*, *Kulturnation*, as Watts (2011: 117-118) argues this doesn't have a good translation in English) which remains an explicit target for improvement while it has not been emphasized much in the literature on discourse. As argued still nowadays within the same standard language culture, existence as a cultural language is one of the strategies of language survival (e.g. Erelt 2000: 78). Particularly the role that particular texts took in heightening the status of a language, though this has been documented better for earlier times of the language community (e.g. Laanekask 2004: 30, Undusk 2011: 563). The enterprise of Noor-Eesti in publishing world classics in readable format definitely falls in the same category though (Monticelli 2009: 382).

1.8 Aims of the study

This dissertation aims to describe the reflexive discourse of the participants within the language debates 1912-1920 on the sociolinguistic situation of Estonian language varieties. These debates

are investigated for articulated metapragmatic discourse which give an overview of the concerns and the reflection of the participants in the context of the contemporary process of language standardization. The study aims to contribute to a general understanding of language standardization as a reflexive process mediated by the concerns of particular individuals and to an understanding of the specifics of the sociolinguistic context in particular.

The sociolinguistic context will be approached in the theoretical terms of enregisterment, standard language culture and linguistic marketplace each of which allow for a consideration of the reflexive discourse, as shown above. For each of the topics we will present the analysis of the evidence found in the text corpus in focus where we will address the following questions.

1. What kind of evidence of reflexive concerns on sociolinguistic issues can we find from the metapragmatic discourse in the corpus of language debates?
2. What kind of evidence of the perceptions of the contemporary sociolinguistic situations emerges from an analysis of this reflexive discourse?

2 Method and materials

The materials that have been gathered for the study will be approached as articulations of reflection on the sociolinguistic situation of the time and thus as part of the ethnometapragmatics by which the participants in the debates operated. The analysis will be informed by a principle of methodological relativism by which these articulations will be considered as an autonomous domain of study leaving various assessments of them, such as their adequacy or appropriateness out of scope of this dissertation.

The corpus under study has been compiled with the help of personal bibliographies selecting texts that comment to a large extent on general language matters. It will be analysed as a synchronic corpus as the sociolinguistic processes that are the subject to reflection usually take place in a longer timeframe. The materials are somewhat unevenly distributed by authorship based on the available bibliographies with a few authors doing most of the writing, however this may reflect a natural bias in the time when a few authors just were able to be more active than many others.

2.1 Principles of analysis

The analysis of the corpus of texts will consider discussions on linguistic affairs as a reflexive discourse on the sociolinguistic position of language at the time, particularly related to the processes of language standardization that were arguably in process at the time and were partially the object of discourse. The study will follow the principle of methodological relativism as outlined by Potter (1996: 25-42) as a general methodological principle for discourse studies according to which this discourse will be considered merely as descriptions,

and the validity of these descriptions (e.g. whether contemporary language was poor or beautiful) will not be assessed.

This approach was constructed to address the problem that analysts seem to have to know more than the scientists that they are studying in order to study the social construction of science and technology which is almost always not the case, and at best forces the analyst to trust the newest scientific knowledge as less socially constructed than all other descriptions. Thus as it has been argued by Potter, a general solution is to focus on the descriptions themselves and consider how they are used and constructed to manipulate and reflect on the social world around them.

This is also the solution from the background within ethnometapragmatics described above. Ethnometapragmatics sets forth to analyse the evaluations within particular communities in order to describe their diversity and make generalizations based on them. In line with methodological relativism, the appropriateness or even the driving force of these evaluations (which could be broader cultural or ideological habits within the community, or universal reactions to the situations the semiotic agents were in) is not considered in these studies of ethnometapragmatics. Eventually different viewpoints can and must be considered, but these different aspects must be first constructed with proper care.

The study has derived its concepts from modern sociolinguistic concerns and thus exhibits a broadly comparative approach (as followed e.g. in Davies & Langer, 2004; Thomas, 1991) which contrasts the phenomena familiar from sociolinguistic literature with the discourse at another time and place. The sociolinguistic theory, represented by three concerns of enregisterment, standard language culture and enregisterment, thus functions as a guideline for analysis of the text corpus. The study aims to gather the discourse formations relevant to these sociolinguistic issues, however notably discourse remains an autonomous source of evidence on these affairs.

It is notable also that the current analysis of discourse on language during the time has exactly the same ontological status as that discourse, namely just being talk about talk, as described above. These processes of reflection on language at the time also included reflections on these reflections leading to classifications and clearer presentations of these issues. Thus partially the same work has already been done in the materials used in this study. However the concerns of

the participants in these discussions were aligned differently than the modern sociolinguistic theories and thus implementing the latter as a filter on the former can bring out interesting results.

As already expressed the main aim of the study is to make this data on discourse available for interpretation in the broader domain of sociolinguistics, possibly contrasting these reflections on language use and status with actual language use. This would generally lead to a better understanding of how these processes of standardization developed within Estonian language communities, and also a broader understanding of how the processes of standardization were generally received on comparison with language standardization initiatives of the late 19th – early 20th century Europe.

2.2 Materials

The period under study is 1912-1920, starting with a particularly strong activation in the debates on the language issues (as demarcated in e.g. Ehala 1998: 77; V. R. Raag 1998: 25) and concludes with the formation of a peace-time Estonian nation which significantly changed both the sociolinguistic circumstances and the nature of the debates. A few additional materials were included as primary sources (Aavik 1905, 1907; Veski 1907, 1911) as they bore direct relevance on the debates and were referred to within them.

To compile the corpus of texts for study two major bibliographies available on this topic were used (Kask 1958; Vihma 1994) from which texts were selected which included discussions on general linguistic affairs in addition to discussing particular linguistic variables (which is not under observation here). This resulted in 106 texts (see list of primary sources) varying from newspaper articles to book length essays in length. Due to the bibliographies used which focussed on two authors and interrelated discussions, there is a strong skew within the corpus on the authorship of the texts – 69 of the 106 texts were written by Aavik, 10 texts were written by Veski, 5 texts by Jõgever, 4 texts by Leetberg with all other authors represented by up to two articles). In order to provide a more naturalistic representation of the texts cited, all direct

citations will be provided in their broader context in the Estonian language originals in Appendix 1.

This will be taken into account within analysis in considering the different authorship of these texts, however as a synchronic corpus need really to have some representation for analysis. It is admitted that extending the corpus particularly to include more diverse points of view could improve the analysis in future studies. It must be noted that during the time Aavik wrote much more than other participants in the debate (e.g. see R. Raag 2008: 145), and additionally had a much bigger interest in general linguistic issues than other authors so an extended corpus may also reflect a natural skew that may even adequately portray the public discourse at the time. Additionally, bibliographical collection so far has been author-based, and while an extended bibliography exists on the movement of language innovation (Vihma & Aavik 2000), purely topic-based bibliographies may be able to present a better representation of the society. It is the hope of the author that future studies on these questions will be able to involve a larger corpus of texts for analysis.

3 Analysis

The analysis is performed in turn by the three sociolinguistic topics in question, bringing out the statements within the debates that can be construed as reflections of the sociolinguistic circumstances of varieties of Estonian as perceived by the authors involved. Each topic will first provide the context on which the analysis was built on and introduce the setup if more than one subchapters are included. The sociolinguistic topics are partially overlapping in the practices involved and therefore on some cases the same articulations are mentioned in more than one subtopics in order to bring coherence into particular subtopics (sometimes referring to the other for additional detail). At the end of each discussion on each topic, a short summary is provided on the main dimensions revealed by the analysis.

3.1 Enregisterment

The main register that we have issue with is the centralized written register which was partially enregistered and autonomous from the vernacular diversity at the time (as argued by Hennoste 1997: 56). This was referred to mainly by the term 'written language' (*kirjakeel*), but also by 'correct language' (*korrekt keel*), 'educated language' (*harit keel*, *haritud keel*), 'book language' (*raamatukeel*), along with other options which were sometimes autonomous from it, sometimes fulfilled the same function 'newspaper language' (*ajakirjanduskeel*, *ajalehekeel*), 'literary language' (*ilukirjanduskeel*), language of poetry (*luulekeel*), and it was contrasted to 'common language' (*tavakeel*, *rahvakeel*), spoken language (*kõnekeel*) or common dialects (*rahvamurded*). Due to the functions that this 'written language' is placed in, the description of enregisterment of it is partially overlapping with the developments on standard language culture

generally and the attention to language use and distinction of formal and informal contexts more particularly, more of which will be spoken in designated subchapters below.

The definition of it was often provided very explicitly. For example Aavik (1913p: 156) states that „written language is already by definition different from the common language: it has completely different tasks and demands to fulfil than a peasant dialect. It is naturally and necessarily richer and more complicated in its syntax and vocabulary: it has its own phraseology that has emerged mostly through books. It has also a peculiar style, long-sentenced, dotted, scientific, which in regular spoken language would seem too stiff and formal“. Aavik (1912i: 367) writes that „written language, if it really wants to be written language – i.e. educated language – can't always be concerned with whether some phenomenon exists in common language and whether it can use it for this reason“.

There was a significant effort for distinguishing the written language from other language uses within the community. Aavik (1914b:37) writes that in order to allow language improvement to happen, by which he means improvement of the written language register, „we must renounce the biased notion that any bloke without study and education would understand it. That the written or book language of educated people is difficult to understand for a 'common person' is unavoidable and even large culture nations have not been able to prevent this from happening“. The same kind of functional differentiation was additionally advocated on spoken language where for example Veski argued for increased attention to be placed on a functionally differentiated public spoken language used for example in theatre or public office (Veski 1914b: 176).

In a contemporary historiography, which can also be read as advocating the same distinction with even further arguments, Aavik (1915: 219-220, 224-225) develops the story of Estonian written language gaining autonomy from the common language during the 1860s-1870s first remaining 'semi-educated' for some time, but developing into a more cosmopolitan language with the Noor-Eesti movement. Written language there is explained also as naturally developing an autonomy from the common language which can though be improved upon with proper handling.

This elevation of written language as something that is different from common writing or common language is nicely characterized by Aavik's longer statement:

It seems to us that this kind of attempted similarity with common language limits the free development of the written language style. Accordingly we think that now it is most appropriate and recommend to fall into the vice of complicated and artificial sentence structure and subtler style than sin with the rudely simple way of writing. Since Jannsen we have had enough of this type of common language fluency. The opposing extremity would not hurt us too much. There will always be time for reaction or backtracking in case that is needed. (Aavik 1913p: 150)

Aavik thus set out to develop the written language into a more autonomous way of using writing while in his arguments there was not enough awareness of the specificity of the educated written registers (see also the chapter on attention to language use and formal contexts).

At the same time written language is already conceived as an autonomous register with an established tradition that could be construed as a singular object. Words have been rejected from it (1912f: 466), it has a known origin in the dialects (Ibid. 475), and it has a diachronic pathway on which it has changed (Ibid. 473). It is a collective object that noone speaks natively (Ibid. 476) and the initiative for learning it is due to the strong prestige that it has (Ibid.). According to these parameters, it sounds like a fully enregistered standard language register within a standard language culture with a linear and a legitimate history and some autonomous existence. In this light it becomes particularly peculiar how Aavik (1914a) starts to analyse, next to the language of the contemporary books, also books older than 50 years for mistakes. Aavik seems to be trying to move the roots of the language tree for the written language or at least rattle it slightly by laying doubt on the legitimacy of canonical texts within this culture. This is of course not without response as Aavik's discourse on mistakes (more in the next subchapters) is openly polemized by Jõgever (1914a: 177) who particularly argues for the absurdity of considering common spoken language, folksongs, older Estonian writers, and the written language generally to be full of mistakes. Other critique of the current written language is much better received, for example the critique on the Germanized syntax of current written language (e.g. 1912i: 354).

The process of language enrichment is however defined through explicit metapragmatic terms – that is, through observable discursive features which guide the ethnometapragmatics of semiotic

actors within this community. Written language is something that is manipulated with via these public messages which can be discussed and aligned with later with the semiotic agents. For example let's consider the four means of language enrichment given by Aavik (1912j: 6): word derivation, using dialectal words unknown to written language, using foreign or cultural words, borrowing Finnish words. These techniques which situate the written language register not only between languages (foreign and Finnish), but among varieties of speaking within the community (dialects) and their productive patterns (derivation). These kinds of techniques emphasize very well the distinctness of the written language register as sought to do by Aavik. This functional autonomy from the common language is also emphasized in public discourse, for example Aavik makes an argument that a proper educated written language requires distancing from „the biased notion that any bloke without study and education would understand it.“ (Aavik 1914b: 37). Not only would this imply limited access to the register, but also that anyone wanting to use it would have to learn the rules (more on this under standard language culture).

An interesting factor within the representations of the written register is that it is also tied to references to cultural development (e.g. Aavik 1914a: 5, 1914i: 2, 1924[1918]: 7). As it seems from the discussion on the linguistic marketplace having a strong functional differentiation between the written register in questions and other types of language use is seen as desirable in most of these reflections at the time. Indeed the 'definitions' of language brought above indicate that 'written language' is offered as something definitive and universal, as a goal to which all cultural nations and cultural languages must develop. At least from the aspirations to become a culture or nation among the great nations as equal in mind and culture set very clear standards to what must be accomplished for it and also indicate towards known pathways by which these can be accomplished. These reflections also carry over to the register differentiation at the time where the polemic is mostly concerned with the central written variety and its comparative development.

The specific labelling of the neighboring concepts is not that common at the time. Newspaper language is used a few times, but there is little indication that it would be considered as an autonomous way of writing except for Aavik's claim that it has to be conservative due to its social positioning to write in the most publically understandable way (Aavik 1913p: 149),

which for the development of language improvement this is argued to be downright hostile (1916d: 111). Jøgever mentions it as a special domain which allowed new vocabulary to enter into the written language (1914a: 178). Aavik includes it briefly as a contrast against the 'renewed written language' (Aavik 1924[1918]: 147) and as a language quite resistant to change (Ibid. 75). It is used as a concept for written language of the most accessible type (Aavik 1913m: 99) and as a domain of writing (Aavik 1916e: 60). It may be that the newspaper languages general social position matches it to what is known as common language and does not really allow it to develop into a register acknowledged as distinct from it. There is more representation of the language of poetry which is regarded as a register with more innovative vocabulary than the common language (Aavik 1924[1918]: 95-97; Aavik 1915c: 255) where more should be allowed (e.g. Aavik 1914p: 9; 1916e: 122; 1920b: 8). Literary language is generally just regarded as a domain of use that is also very close to common language (Aavik 1924[1918]: 36)

Common language is sometimes used as a singular formation implying uniformity, but there were also public debates arguing explicitly that they should be regarded as a plural with explaining the situations that there were often agreements as to what was 'correct' in the common language due to a dialectal background, stating that „there is no common language only singular dialects“ (Aavik 1913p: 149). This was mostly done in polemic that common language should not be contrasted to the written language nor appealed to such common language's majesty (Ibid.) Aavik also describes a transition by which spoken language has become more and more similar to the 'official' written language especially in the cities (Aavik 1924[1918]: 148). Aavik also chose to use 'common language' to refer to the common written and spoken language together, as it was becoming a new and somewhat unified phenomenon different from the dialects (Aavik 1916c: 168).

The analysis of language debates as a reflection and metapragmatic discourse on enregisterment indicates a tendency to consider 'written language' as an increasingly autonomous social register visible in the articulations of its definition as a linguistic practice autonomous of common language, and through the construal the dynamics of 'written language' as partially independent of its users. The presence of an elevated written standard is considered as a

characteristic of mature cultures and as a necessary counterpart of development towards maturity. The neighboring registers argued to be becoming independent at the time by Hennoste (1997: 56) is not visible in explicit labelling however the languages within the domains of poetry and newspapers are considered to have some autonomy in their use also within contemporary reflections.

3.2 Standard language culture

The reflections on standard language culture are considered on four dimensions. First metapragmatic discourse on the presence of variation among the linguistic practices within the community and the activities that are felt needed to be done towards them are characterized. Second the metapragmatic discourse that is concerned with attention to use and the differentiation between formal and informal contexts is introduced. Third the metapragmatic discourse on linguistic mistakes and how they were conceptualized within the community is considered. And fourth the discussions on legitimacy of the language practices are considered under two subtopics. First one therein conceptualizes authenticity as a variable considered important for the legitimacy of the standard variety. Second one discusses the contemporary historiography on language and linguistic varieties that can be seen as direct comments on or manipulations of the legitimacy of various linguistic practices within the community or Estonian language generally.

3.2.1 Discourse on variation

As argued by R. Raag (2008: 135) the problem of variance (that is, if you had two or more expressions competing for the same perceived meaning) as an issue that needs solution emerged among the language enthusiasts during the start of the 20th century. This was the issue at stake in the grammar conferences and this was the main issue in Aavik's grammar corner 'Little notes on language' in newspapers. The early years of the century are ushered in with the language

conferences whose specific focus was to solve questions on linguistic variation, and a general call to organize and collect the vocabulary for an overview (Veski 1907).

This was seen as a general parameter of the uneducatedness of the language, that its grammar is unorganized, and filled with „hundreds of uncertainties and weak parallel forms“ which are used widely (Aavik 1914l: 1). Aavik sees a great opportunity here, arguing that „if our language was not complete“ we would not have the amount of internal variation to choose from (Aavik 1912f: 461). He finds for example forms that were used frequently a few decades before that he considers more beautiful and argues that they could be returned to use (Ibid. 466). Similar cases were argued elsewhere too (e.g. Kettunen 1916: 115; Ridala 1916a: 119). Aavik argues firmly that the work in language organization should not limit itself to just organizing the variation present, but to improve it generally even if that means temporarily including new variation (Aavik 1914l: 2).

When dealing with variation in meaning of the same form, for example when one meaning was a foreign borrowing and another was from a local dialect, Aavik advocated the use of just the meaning that is more commonly used (Aavik 1914b: 26). Given that it was an open discussion how much and what kind of the dialectal variation should be included in the 'written language', Aavik advocated as well the use of foreign languages, such as Finnish (which was equated functionally to Estonian dialects, e.g. Aavik 1924[1918]: 34), for this purpose (e.g. Aavik 1912f: 465). These statements already led to a polemic on the origin of evaluation in these cases, where Jõgever argued that Aavik would just choose anything in Finnish (Jõgever 1913a: 242). Aavik in contradiction makes a case that beauty is relative and therefore the use of any language for ideas is perfectly acceptable (Aavik 1913a: 424).

At the same time when introducing new words, Aavik did not see a great problem in them becoming variants of an already existing word, perhaps even becoming enregistered as part of a „more familiar and vulgar“ (Aavik 1924: 41) style when he was unhappy with the current form in use (see more e.g. Aavik 1924: 70, 95, 108). He also saw an opportunity to use existing variation in the language to introduce distinctions in meaning (e.g. to use *kultur* in the sense of 'civilization' and *kultura* in the sense of 'being educated') (Aavik 1912r: 132). He also encouraged introduction of variation in some cases, arguing that parallel forms are a great way

to improve a language by offering a more flexible stylistic register, and he encouraged people not to fear the parallel forms, but „acquire them“ (Aavik 1924: 95).

This can generally be seen as a metapragmatic understanding of ways of speaking within a language by which variation is understood in terms of 'same meaning – different form', i.e. it implies a certain level on which the linguistic forms and meanings are contrasted and equated. According to Silverstein, this entails a practice whereby indexical meanings (which are almost never the same) are reduced to perceived sense meanings or denotational meanings which makes this comparison possible.

Partially the reflections on perceived variation within the community match exactly canonical language cultures as among the participants in the discussion and also other language enthusiasts at the time the need to reduce variation among linguistic practices is seen as the most dire need. At the same time, these reflections bring out an interesting ambivalence in their articulations. While the notion of standard language culture has been usually tied to a unidirectional decrease of variation among the linguistic practices within the community, Aavik's statements are concerned with developments towards increasing the same variation, indeed explicitly advocating this increase at the same time. This relates the concept of standard language culture more closely to the Estonian community in question which is arguably in the process of transformation towards a standard language culture. The specificities of the contexts of transition and the emergence of standard language culture as a temporal process have not been previously focussed on, and it may be asked whether this ambivalence towards variation can be perhaps generally found in transitionary contexts. The answer to this would require further typological studies.

3.2.2 Attention to use and formal contexts

Much of these discussions on language were formulated as a need to pay more attention to language use in the choice in expressions in various contexts. This can be approached under two

main themes, with general discourse on attention to language use and the more specific requirements to use language more attentively in certain contexts. The latter of the two can also be seen as a metapragmatic differentiation between formal and informal contexts.

Partially this was done in very general terms, such as Aavik who describes what he sees as a sad state of language by expressing that people write „however they please and how it happens, falling into all sorts of false analogies, rude and simple linguistic errors and grammatical foolishness“ (Aavik 1914l: 2). This is tied to concerns about consistency which Aavik (1914m: 31) estimates to be completely lacking in the contemporary literature and journalism which even amplifies the lack of consistency in the written language as a whole (Ibid.). Thus, laziness and convenience are repeatedly referred to explicitly in the discourse on language as the major obstacle between language development (Aavik 1913m: 99, 1916b: 151). The syntax of the language is argued to become better only if „our writers start to put bigger emphasis on the ordering of their words consciously and with determination“ (Aavik 1912i: 369).

Partially these discussions on attention to language use can be formulated also in terms of enregisterment, that is, on representations which imply a functional differentiation of registers, between an educated one requiring attention and a popular one which can do without it. Thus Aavik argues that the enrichment of the language requires „the biased notion that any bloke without study and education would understand it“ (Aavik 1914b: 37).

Particularly the role of newspapers in formulating a public register has been emphasized, as Aavik (1912n: 5) argued that their help in paying more attention to their own expression and also codifying it would greatly help the state of the Estonian language, although it is added that newspapers are not in the best position to innovate language as it may be unfamiliar at first (Aavik 1913p: 149). The same call had been made for translators to better organize their vocabulary and build indexes that contain novel words to help the organization of the language (Aavik 1912q: 178). A few years later though Aavik (1916d: 111-112, 1917b: 1) still referred to an utter lack of concern on linguistic matters among the newspapers with even no need felt for language correctors, partially due to personal vendettas even.

Among other things, also the need for attention in the use of spoken language was argued at the time by Veski who complained that „other nations go to the theatre to hear the best language, to learn, we however have to settle with a subvaluedly tolerated mish-mash of dictions“ (Veski 1914b: 176).

The reflection on attention to language use as articulated in these debates indicate an advocacy to tie language use more closely with conscious attention for example in Aavik's calls for increased attention to language use. This can be seen as part of the process of enregisterment by which 'written language' is considered as placing autonomous demands on the writer that are different from common language use, and also as part of creation of a register of formality which would fulfill its role by being used when heightened attention is required. One of the main objects of these discussions is the newspaper language. Interestingly, the same formal register requirements are also advocated for spoken language where a variety of speaking that requires proper attention and learning to be used is considered as desirable too.

3.2.3 Discourse on mistakes

Language mistakes was a significant topic during the language debates both in the practice of linguistic correction that was encouraged quite often, and in discussions on what these mistakes should be. General normative discourse was also often phrased as suggestions (e.g. most of Little notes on language) considering the sense of standard language culture phrased above we will be concerned with discourse that explicitly emphasized some linguistic practices as mistakes. Particularly interesting twist on the matter is Aavik's phrasing that „there are no 'correct' speakers as there is no 'correct language' to speak of“ (Aavik 1914a: 2) as he implied a novel register that would be worthy of these terms. However this was also related to the observable practices of the time by Aavik speculating on how many people could write language „without mistakes the common newspaper language“ guessing that it may be a hundred or less people and perhaps five or less women among them (Aavik 1913m: 99).

At the same time the recent period of Russianization which created obstacles for schooling allowed estimations of the entire generation as being semi-speakers whose language is full of mistakes (e.g. Aavik 1912l: 2, 1913l: 315-316). While similar claims have been made in retrospective linguistic works as mentioned in the research overview, other authors, such as Jøgever ironize Aavik's high threshold and ideals for correct speech arguing that is somewhat absurd to say that common language is full of mistakes or the folk songs are full of mistakes (Jøgever 1914a: 177). At the same time Aavik has made contributions to explain how the impact of dialectal influence may play out in discussions - „what is correct for one, is wrong for another“ which ought to be kept in mind (Aavik 1913p: 149).

A particular manifestation of this discourse on mistakes is an initiative for linguistic book reviews, proposed by Aavik arguing that „our books, even from the best authors, are still full of all sorts of mistakes, faults, lazyness [...] which can't be considered correct according to the current written language standards“ (Aavik 1913l: 315-316) for which a solution could be to publish more book reviews which would help point out these issues and gradually allow the situation to get better. A number of these were compiled during the years of the language debates (e.g. Aavik 1912l,r, 1913e,f, 1914a; Leetberg 1912; Jøgever 1913a; Treiberg 1915a). A particularly influential one was Aavik's review on the national epic Kreutzwald (more in the subchapter on legitimacy) which reviewed a writing more than 50 years old and from a completely different era for language mistakes. This review was in response also criticized by Jøgever (1914a: 177) who argued that it is difficult to see how the concept of 'mistake' adapts to works so old which added to countercritique of Aavik (1914m: 33-34) arguing that these kinds of works are excellent to understand the written language better. Aavik also continued to criticize the newspapers on linguistic issues, arguing that „all our newspapers without exception [...] are full of all sorts of language mistakes, inconsistencies, disallowed dialectal features, foreign sentence constructions“ (Aavik 1916d: 110).

The topic of language mistakes is a visible part of the reflective discourse on language within these debates. Particularly it is manifested by a genre of linguistic reviews, a few of which were

written at the time, as well as evaluations of the language use of various groups in the society as erroneous. The discourse of mistakes emerges in the context of newspaper writing, but also as a general characteristic of the generation brought up during Russianization and for whom schooling in Estonian was usually not possible. A particular case in point is Aavik's review of the national epic written more than 50 years ago as erroneous due to mistakes inherent in the language of folklore and also Kreutzwald's own lack of concern for language. Related to this are the discussions on legitimate opinions on language in the next subtopic, where bilinguals and literati are considered as already naturally ill-suited to make linguistic judgements.

3.2.4 Legitimacy

The discussions bearing on legitimacy can be approached from two directions. On the one hand, there were explicit discussions on the historiography of the language, situating the current events and situations on a historical trajectory that would be acceptable and understandable. On the other there were discussions on which of the phenomena would be which properties the legitimacy or the authenticity could be founded in, and which properties could be found relevant for it. The presentation will proceed with the latter.

3.2.4.1 Authenticity

In the language debates, a significant attention was placed on the properties that make a language legitimate and authentic – that is, acceptable to the people who would use this. Much of these discussions is particularly addressed at a general question of 'what is or should be language?'. Thus it is accordingly argued for example by Aavik (e.g. 1915d: 46, 1924[1918]: 8-12) that Estonian language should be regarded as a machine and approached by the methods of engineering and science, using whatever means at their disposal to improve its functioning as is suitable for modern times. Any past errors could and should thus be repaired for a better future. A somewhat opposing view is argued by Veski (1915: 96) that the Estonian language is much more like an organism or a living being, the development of which is very gradual and

determined by its contemporary needs. Radical changes should thus be avoided. Taking an even more conservative approach, Leetberg (1913: 441) argues that speakers of Estonian should particularly limit themselves to their own vernaculars and dialects and when this is done any novelty will not seem novel at all, but will feel just right. These different notions of language that were circulating also gave different grounds for considering the language legitimate. Much of it had to do with the sense of continuity with the past, but as Aavik's arguments show there were other ways of looking at it. The way that he redefined the position of Estonian in history is addressed more thoroughly in the next subchapter.

On a few different dimensions Aavik presented arguments on reevaluation of regular practices in Estonian, for example offering arguments based on euphony or sound esthetics to reevaluate contemporary variation within Estonian (Aavik 1912f) or based on historical reasons to reevaluate some dominating grammatical constructions (Aavik 1912i). Aavik has stated that his purpose wasn't even really to clearly change the language, but he would be quite happy if his writing would just help „our writers place more emphasis on the sequencing of words and consciousness in it“ and that already in this case language would win in uniqueness, cleanliness, clarity, flexibility, legibility, rhythm and elegance“ (Ibid. 369). In this case his suggestion actually was completely taken up within the language (Ehala 1998). Both the source domains and esthetic principles were subject to discussion, for example Ridala (1916b:95) supported the reduction of German influences for anyone, while he (Ibid. 94) argued that the esthetic principles ought to be followed by the people who judge them the same and feel the real need to use these words.

One interesting case is the question of scientificity of the opinions on language, where there was a polemic between Jürgenstein and Aavik (reported in Aavik 1915e). Jürgenstein criticizes the mass creation of linguistic items within the language renewal movement and argues that words should be made by writers and poets and not professional linguists (Aavik 1915e:97-99), Aavik however argues the opposite case that these writers and poets already are in desperate need of novel linguistic items and therefore it can be the linguists who come to an aid (Ibid. 99). Thus when Jürgenstein makes the claim that he trusts his own (unspoiled) language instinct further than one of a grammarian, Aavik ridicules the statement fully, arguing that educated Estonians, possibly due to the multilingual environment they live in, definitely do not have an unspoiled

language instinct anymore (Ibid.). As for the profession of a linguist, Aavik adds that it is difficult to position between the demands of more scientificity and less scientificity in their statements and adds explicitly that in the case of a language innovator there hasn't been found a proper profession within the cultured nations as improving a living language is somewhat different from being a linguist (Ibid.).

The movement of language renewal within language debates thus is observed to be curiously positioned, with some authors considering it more of an aim in itself than a means for the people. Põld (1915: 91) criticizes them as demonstrating a lack of a principle as they on the one hand reach back in time to earlier forms in dialects and related languages but at the same time deny history to other decisions basing them on taste and coincidence. They also try and clean Estonian of foreign influence, but also add newer influences to it (Ibid.). Põld (Ibid.) however does observe that this movement has been helpful in bringing these topics to the public focus and speeding up the language improvement generally. There are general worries in whether the language renewal movement in particular is not taking the language improvement to the excess (e.g. Jürgenstein 1915: 89; Leetberg 1915: 90; Veski 1915: 95) thus possibly delegitimizing the whole affair of language improvement. Thus Treiberg (1915b: 170) is concerned that if the linguists and language reformers initiate movements too quickly and radically then people will come to regard it as a curiosity and a source of humour instead of something to follow.

One of the problems that becomes salient during these language discussions is the problem of learning, that is, for any additions from language improvement to be accepted they will have to be learnable for the public. This problem is introduced for example by Aavik (1914a: 5) where he perceives that for the improvement of language to become „a living and common good, it is important that it does not stay a hobby of a few language enthusiasts“. Important for this is to publish as many books as possible including the novel words and forms because „language is nothing but a set of habits“ (Ibid.). However given the indifferent attitude perceived at most publishers on this issue, Aavik decided to start his own publishing house to publish the more innovative books (Ibid.). The issue was also felt expressed with newspapers as their language would have great power in formulating the habits of the people (Aavik 1912n: 5), but as Aavik (1913p: 149) was concerned they had to be conservative due to their focus on informativity which novel words may disrupt. It was also added by Aavik that the issue of whether the public

will want to improve their language which meant explaining the usefulness of the educated language to them (Aavik 1914b: 37).

One of the questions of legitimacy at the time was whether real poets can use that language. In this way Jürgenstein for example had argued that poets „learn their language from living people“ (1915: 230) and creativity does not work well with artificial forms, thus implying also that it would take a few generations before language could be used for poetry (Ibid.). Aavik on the other hand took a polar opposite view arguing that poets usually use a common written variety which is learnt primarily from reading instead of a vernacular, and as the preceding decade had shown much of the novel vocabulary was already used in poetry (Aavik 1915c: 254-255). Thus Aavik argues instead that the reason that Estonians have „no great writers yet“ is because „language is not yet ripe [...] for better literature“ (Aavik 1912b: 59), and exactly for them some greater improvement of literary language is required. In public polemic on the other hand Oorgu (1912:60) argues that what is needed instead is a greater attention to problems of the soul, that is, language wouldn't stand in the way, but great writers are needed in the first place. Aavik agrees that content is an issue too, but that still there lies a strong connection between language as an instrument and literature as a product (Aavik 1912m: 62). Elsewhere Aavik (1915c: 253) also argues that the relationship between a writer and a language is meant similar to a musician and an instrument in that when the musician is good, even a bad instrument will do the job, but in any case a better instrument would be more pleasing both for the musician and the audience.

Accompanied by the need for social transformation that framed also the language improvement (e.g. Aavik 1924[1918]: 5-7, but see the next subchapter further), also the already existing need for vocabulary to deal with the new (foreign) concepts that people already think with was used as a source of legitimation (Ibid. 7). This was argued from personal perspectives, thus for example Tuglas (1915: 52) explained that „this, what has been regarded as game or fashion, is really a dire need [-] who of us hasn't suffered from the poverty and the lack of education with Estonian language“. Aavik (1912j: 5-6) has even argued that just from observing how quickly new words have come into use in the recent past it is plain that there is a great need for them in that particular time. This legitimacy was also argued on the basis of having opportunity, that is,

just because these extensive improvements are possible due the poor state of Estonian, this provides an opportunity to become „first at something in the world“ (Aavik 1924[1918]: 137)

Bilingualism constituted a special case within these discussions as there was a theoretical background which argued that they usually exhibit „a darkened native language instinct“ and have started to think of their second language as nicer than the first (e.g. Veski 1914a: 172). Similarly Aavik argues that bilingualism „in any land is bad for both languages, but especially for the less educated, poorer, lower standing, despised one, which Estonian has been“ (Aavik 1914b: 19). Thus Aavik was able to ironize Jürgenstein’s statement that he trusts his (unspoiled) language instinct more than that of the linguists or grammarians by claiming that educated Estonians are unable to have unspoiled language instincts (Aavik 1915e:99). Aavik develops his statements into a longer case within his historiographical writing (see more in the next subchapter) eventually working to reduce the legitimacy of the current standard as an erroneous path in Estonian language history, focussing most of all on its recent Germanic influences. This constitutes a rather interesting historical reinterpretation, partially designed to justify the rising standard language culture at the time.

3.2.4.2 Historiography

The historiographical positioning of contemporary Estonian was a central topic in the writings of Aavik who repeatedly expressed that a good Estonian language must be made for the future, and some confusion in the present could be tolerated for this purpose as „from this purgatory [language] will rise cleaner and better“ (e.g. Aavik 1913m: 99). There was polemic involved in this as Leetberg in opposition argued that words should be created „not for future and others [...] but for present and ourselves (Leetberg, 1913a: 247).

Two of Aavik’s writings could be seen having an explicitly historiographical focus (Aavik 1912k, Aavik 1915b). Aavik’s historiographical approach situated Estonian as a young language (argument set in Aavik 1905: 116) which in some cases includes estimations of earlier writings as fitting for the time (for the early to mid 19th century, Aavik 1915b: 218-219), in some cases however explicit disassociations with the past communities (for the late 19th century,

e.g. „you could say that from then on [1870s] Estonian style is nothing but German style with Estonian words, but more vulgar, peasant-like“, Aavik 1915b: 220-221). The latter issue was elaborated to extreme phrasings, such that the influential writers of the national awakening in the 1860s and 1870s were argued to be „more or less language spoilers; their native instinct about their native language seems to have been very vague and confused“ by Aavik and Ridala (Aavik 1912j: 12) and indeed making „terrible mistakes“ (Aavik 1914a: 11). The previous generations of speakers was thus assessed by Aavik to have had a strong detrimental effect on contemporary language and thus distancing from their way of saying would be highly beneficial (Aavik 1914b: 19).

Aavik refers particularly the the writings of older generations as targets, a particular influential case is his language review of the earlier Estonian epic „Kalevipoeg“ written by Faehlmann and Kreutzwald in the 1840s-50 written „not in order to tear down old temples and idols“ (Aavik 1914a: 7), but with the assumption that during the rapidly changing era it would be good to „breathe some new wind into it“ (Ibid.). This criticism states that the epic has a „legion“ of linguistic mistakes and is almost „exploding from them“ (Ibid. 10). Aavik particularly describes this as a sign of the times when language „was in a confused and uncertain state, and there was little worry about correctness“ (Ibid. 17). In a historiographic move Aavik also finds a citation from Kreutzwald where he expresses that he has little concern of whether his writings have any sign of grammar as he has „learnt his Estonian from the people, like a bird learns her song“ (Ibid. 26). This is criticised by Jõgever in that it is absurd to say that Kreutzwald’s writings were mistaken if he was understood at the time and argued that with this writing Aavik had „denounced all linguistic knowledge“ (Jõgever 1914a: 177). He generally considers the idea that the recent history of Estonian was on a mistaken path absurd (Ibid.). Aavik (1914m: 33-34) on the other hand considers this canonization of the classics and finds this argument strange as it goes against Jõgever’s previous statements against Aavik. In this way past language practices become reactivated as equal partners in contemporary discussions on the written language.

Additionally, and particularly by Aavik next to the youth of the language also its poverty was emphasized, thus in early on he articulated that they „have nothing to lose, and everything to gain“ (Aavik 1912k : 178; see also Aavik 1924[1918]: 138). Accordingly he took the raising of the currently impoverished language to a „educated status“ (Aavik 1914a: 5) as the most

important mission at the moment. He argued that at this point in time „noone could write“ Estonian correctly because this correct Estonian didn't exist (Aavik 1912l: 2). While he stated also that this was partially to the impact of the recent period of Russianization on schooling, even if the schooling would suddenly and quickly return the teachers would be forced to teach this same „bad, uncertain, incorrect language“ (Aavik 1912l: 2). Indeed, the difficulties in Estonian schooling in the past generation become an repeatable excuse to talk about the mistakes in contemporary writing (Aavik 1913l: 315-316).

For future states these historiographies were rather optimistic, e.g. Aavik states in the article that started the 'Little notes on language' newspaper articles that „in 20 years of less“ we will have an educated language by whichever means (Aavik 1912c: 177). The cultural development can also be established by language as „developing and educating the language in any way is absolutely necessary for national development (Aavik 1915d: 41). Particularly referring to past events he states that Estonian has had „enough of fluency in the style of Jannsen for a while“ (Aavik 1913: 150) and would benefit greatly from experimenting at this point in time.

The discussions on legitimacy of various linguistic varieties, and particularly the central 'written language' on which the debates were focussed presented a complex set of topics and concerns. The legitimacy of linguistic practices depended partially on the perception of language as a phenomenon by the authors in the debates. Thus the relationship between the written language and its suitability for various means of expression was addressed with a notable concern on its usability for poetry or great literature. On this matter opposing opinions were articulated arguing for a need for improvement for great literature to thrive or against these matters as they would confuse the language. The perceived youth of a language was juxtaposed with the perceived youth of the culture. Special attention was also given to the bilingual influences among the educated Estonians which were argued to have significantly darkened their native language instincts by several authors.

Among the discussions on legitimacy of the central standard variety as well as Estonian in general a particular move sometimes made was a construction of a history of Estonian which could legitimize or delegitimize varieties of speaking. A particular case here was made by Aavik whose writings denoted the writings of earlier generations as peasant speech or an unhealthy bilingual mixture, both of which were portrayed as necessary earlier stages of language which however would not be useful for the future. Particularly Aavik criticized the writings of past generations as erroneous and not following the rules of Estonian language. At the same time Aavik among others that within 20 years Estonian would have much improved both in its contents and in its standings. These kinds of writings contributed also to a more general trend of purism by which especially the Germanic influences were attempted to be rid of in language while the influences of more distant language were sometimes encouraged.

3.3 Linguistic marketplace

The representation of other nations and other languages within this discourse as subjects of comparison had two broader purposes: they were used either as prestigious role models to legitimate movements that may have been controversial for Estonian and they partially guided the semiotic evaluation of linguistic practices within the Estonian language community. The issues will be presented under three separable underlying themes: other languages were used as comparisons to legitimate the Estonian language by describing that they also had similar properties or notable differences, the general strive towards becoming a prestige language, and the structural properties of the language that were tied to it.

3.3.1 Legitimacy through other languages

During the language debates many references were made to other nations as examples by which the processes in the Estonian language community could be understood and rationalized. In this sense there were frequent references to language reform movements in other lands (e.g. Aavik, 1912b: 59, 1912m: 62, 1913j: 212, Ridala 1916b: 93, Veski 1914b: 176) to the point that Aavik

is even able to polemize it himself: "In our case, it is so, that nothing can be done before England or Germany has not done it." (Aavik 1924[1918]: 135). In order to popularize the idea of language improvement, Aavik (1913i: 214) writes a full article on the Hungarian language reforms leading also to some follow-up discussions on how exactly they are equivalent or not (Leetberg 1913a). Aavik once (1912k: 171) mentions that even Latvians, a common rival for Estonians, had surpassed them in language development. These are contrasted often in general terms, for example Ridala states that as opposed to for example French, Hungarian or Swedish language, Estonian has never gone through a linguistic revolution and argues that thus it may be well the time for it then (Ridala 1916b: 93). Veski on the other hand argues for a spoken register differentiation also by arguing on cultured nations which do it (Veski 1914b: 176).

Estonian language was situated against the cultural history of other languages. For example, in order to justify language improvement Aavik argues that the Estonian language literature is at the moment „at the very same state as French went through during the 16th century activity of the Plejads and Ronfard“, while „in Germany this happened a hundred years later in the 18th century (Aavik 1912b: 59). But Goethe and Schiller had with the previous century and Gottsched received a more or less suitable tool, a ready written language“ continuing on with comparisons with Russian and Finnish literary histories (Ibid.). Aavik in this case argues that the situation in Estonian language community is quite natural in the context of world history, and thus some information is available also on how Estonians should proceed. Aavik also uses examples of other countries to argue a need for mass vocabulary expansion in Estonian at the time (Aavik 1912c: 176). On some occasions he also used the examples of other languages to explain particular linguistic forms (e.g. Aavik 1912f: 472).

Comparisons with other nations are also used to emphasize the differences. As such Aavik (1924[1918]: 136) argues that German language at the moment is following a different path: „German language is a highly educated language, it is in its cultural peak, with which it has developed“, hence it does not feel the need for quick changes or due to its mass is even capable of performing them. Smaller cultures have gone through very rapid changes if they have passed through a period of 'cultural fever' (Ibid.). Thus, he adds, that while it is not known well in Estonian community New Greek, Hungarian, Romanian and Finnish languages went through very rapid changes in short times when language questions were in the air. He proposes that

Estonians use this opportunity that it has for quick development and go even further arguing on the basis of other nations' experiences that it should be possible (Ibid. 137). He summarizes: „Other languages if they would want to, couldn't do it as easily, because their fixity and high development is an obstacle for any more abrupt change“ (Ibid. 137; see also Hubel 1915: 88).

The debates on language repeatedly refer to other nations and language as historical examples whether bad or good, for the purposes of indicating similarities to developments with Estonian or differences. In this way the perception of Estonian language community is explicitly conceptualized among the knowledge of other language communities and thus equated in its basic functions to them. The authors within these debates thus bring in additional knowledge to construe also the sociolinguistic situation of Estonian in its contemporary context.

3.3.2 Striving for greater prestige among languages

There is an oft repeated assumption during the time that Estonian is a poor language in the corpus (e.g. Tuglas 1915: 5, Aavik 1912k : 178, 1914a: 5) although contrary positions were expressed too (Jõgever 1914a: 177) . As is explained in depth by Aavik (1914l: 1):

She is characterized by shortcomings contrary to educated languages: she is poor and uneducated. Often the most needed words are lacking for things and virtues which an educated person has a need to name (the need which, truth be told, has arisen by familiarization with other cultural languages by which these things and virtues themselves have become known). And the ineducation of our language lies particularly in her disorganizedness of grammar and uncertainty: there are hundreds of uncertainties, suspicious forms, weak parallel forms, outright mistaken sayings which are still common. Anyone writes in multiple forms and constructions however they want and however happens, falling into all sorts of false analogies, simply rude language errors, grammatical foolishness, as if out of spite choosing forms which they should not have chosen, and discarding those which by their beauty and greater peculiarity that they perform, would be worthwhile to accept into the written language. Noone, absolutely noone can write the written language here correctly

and without mistakes, as much as they would seek to, for a simple reason that we do not have this correct written language yet. (Aavik 1914l : 2)

Thus the dimensions on which Estonian was considered poor were quite manifold, and accordingly there were multiple ways for improvement, some of which we elaborate on here (and some have been mentioned in other chapters). The result of this poverty has also been expressed in a dramatic fashion by Ernits:

We need ultrafast language development because we have been placed into the rocky waters of European culture which obliges us to develop quicker lest we would have to fall below the general plane of education and mentally vegetate like some asians. A linguistic development is however the most important corollary to mental development. (Ernits 1915: 88)

This poverty was in some cases articulated as a strong need that required quick solutions instead of the path of normal development.

The situation was seen to be improved with a number of initiatives. A particular historiographical case was argued by Aavik (1914b: 18) that the education of Estonians has always been initiated by foreign education and it could also be done in this case (more on this on prestige of linguistic properties). Thus the incorporation of international concepts into the Estonian vocabulary would be a clear way towards improvement (Ibid.). For improvement and against his positions on other issues Aavik argues for example that Estonian is an ugly language on a number of features (Aavik 1912e: 257-260), while for some of them this was not the case just a few decades before (Ibid. 263). The way towards an enregistered standard or a decrease of variation within the language were also strategies for the elevation of Estonian position in the transnational linguistic marketplace (covered in previous subchapters in more detail).

A very significant dimension in these discussions was a strive towards cultural languages or towards becoming a cultural language (or an educated language, a common synonym), a strive which was not even really questioned by any of the participants in the debates. A case in point was to become an equal amongst other cultural languages (e.g. Aavik 1914a: 5, 1914l: 2, 1924[1918]: 7). The translation of Finnish epic Kalevala was introduced with the phrase „It has been translated to every educated language – why shouldn’t it be available for the people who are the closest to them by blood and language“ (Aavik 1913e: 199). Becoming a cultural language is considered as a natural target for language development in the writings of Aavik

before he had studied philology in the university (Aavik 1905: 114). It is also considered a natural counterpart of Estonians participating in the communication with other nations (Jürgenstein 1915: 89). Other terms were used for this too but the notion of cultural language (*Kultursprache*) seemed to entail a complex understanding and a hierarchy of languages. The need to be „not ashamed next to large cultural nations, but even proud“ is put by Aavik (1924[1918]: 7) into nationalist terms in the context of assimilation:

This is extremely important from the perspective of the nationalist struggle: an educated and beautiful native language will be considered as more dear and people will be less willing to let go of it in exchange of another. In giving the idea more value also the national vitality and resilience in the struggle for survival will be raised. It should be obvious to everybody. (Ibid.)

As an interesting investigation into the contemporary language discourse, Aavik presented a questionnaire in his journal for language enthusiasts at the time, the results of which were published in the same journal. The first question in there was „Do you believe that Estonian language in the future will become rich and developed in every way and worthy of older cultural languages, with which you can, at least in literature, express the most subtle phenomena of thought and feeling?“ (Aavik 1914n :26). Interestingly, all 15 people who returned answers, answered yes to the question, expressing optimism in Estonian being able to obtain the same capabilities of expression at least in the future if not already (Aavik 1916f: 134). Most survey participants kept in mind a time in the near future, such as Linde (1916: 90) who argued that on the basis of current tempo of literary progress Estonian should be able to express all that's needed for a cultural language in a few decades.

Estonian was positioned also historiographically, thus Aavik argued that „languages of young nations (like ours) who have just started to emerge among the educated people especially need the work of language engineers and technicians, to complete the developmental process for which languages of older cultural nations have had centuries for“ (Aavik 1915d: 42). Thus Estonians were asked to make a quick progress due to the somewhat backwards state, but also because of the flexibility that it allowed – „beat the iron while it's hot“, as Aavik (1914a: 2) argued elsewhere. At the same time language development was introduced as a necessary step for cultural development (e.g. Aavik 1924[1918]: 7).

A dimension that emerged in the debates was that what was missing in the Estonian language were writers of importance for world culture (e.g. Aavik 1912b: 59), which was connected in addition to language also to the general cultural development. Arguments were made that while the problem could be language (Aavik 1912m: 62), what is needed is also conceptual and spiritual development and finding something to write about (Oorgu 1912:60). Language was seen as a main determining feature by Aavik though. Aavik expresses a genuine concern on his position though:

Leetberg does not believe that the arrival of great writers could be quickened by lesser mortals [i.e. linguists]. Had German been less educated during Goethe's time then of course it wouldn't have prevented Goethe from being born. It would though be questionable whether Goethe would have been interested to write in an uneducated language. Maybe he would have chosen some other language, such as French, with which he couldn't have expresses his spiritual and racial uniqueness because when writing in a foreign language you inevitably lose something of your peculiarities. (Aavik 1913j: 212)

Aavik makes a notable point here that perhaps the capabilities of expression don't really pit cultures against each other but they offer languages for great writers to choose from (which may possibly inhibit their path to becoming a great writer (see also the similar point on cultural languages). Thus in his ethnometapragmatic understanding Aavik may have very well been thinking in terms of guiding people in a situation of language shift instead of just linguistic and cultural determinism.

Among the comparisons with other languages it was repeatedly brought out that Estonian in its current state was a poor language and one in need of improvement, for which a number of strategies were seen. A central topic among these debates was a strive to become a cultural language among other cultural languages for which Estonian had to be able to contribute to world culture to the equal extent as known major languages. This was seen as a plausible historical outcome over the next generation for a number of the authors involved. An interesting case emerged where the comparison between languages had the authors also articulate their reasoning behind the need for this improvement of language structure and accordingly also its relative prestige among other languages. On two occasions Aavik particularly articulated this

reason to lie in the context of language shift as in the original studies of linguistic marketplace. He made the claim that if the language remains poor, the educated and perhaps the genius writers will be tempted to do their work in other languages. However if improvements were made this temptation would decrease as their native language would give them all the tools needed for good expression.

3.3.3 Prestige of particular linguistic properties

The main issue with the properties of the language seems to be with vocabulary. As argued by Aavik „the most important element of a language is words, grammar and syntax are just there to tie words together“ (Aavik 1912c: 176). He presents the example of English language which by all grammatic and syntactic characteristics that he mentions would be very simple, but due to the vocabulary size is „possibly the most developed cultural languages in the world“ (Ibid.). He continues to say that most young cultural languages have gone through a period of intense vocabulary expansion by which they are now much richer, and argues that Estonian should do the same (Ibid.). An extensive vocabulary is argued to have benefits both for thought and communication, and an explicit scale is offered between nations with the wild tribes having perhaps a few hundred words in their vocabulary, while the English probably have more than the French, as argued by Aavik (Ibid.). Naturally, Estonian is also placed on this ladder and by Aavik and argued that with some work its position could significantly improved (Ibid.) He also sets the frame that „within twenty years and maybe sooner we will have all this, no matter how, but we must not sit idly waiting. [Words] do not come on their own, but they need to be created and sought. The question is only how, where from, and by which principles, and means“ (Aavik 1912c: 177). Thus what is the responsibility of intellectuals there is to make sure that this vocabulary is extended the right way, perhaps to preserve the uniqueness and the spirit of the people for example.

Thus one of the features that is desirable for Estonian at this point is the introduction of words to express international meanings, Aavik particularly emphasises abstract vocabulary „because on these words all educated languages tend towards likeness, while with common and popular

sayings and shades of meaning difference and uniqueness naturally remain“ (Aavik 1924[1918]: 154). Aavik proposes that the improvement of the international vocabulary could be done also consciously by collecting the major vocabulary from major languages and cross-checking them against Estonian (Ibid.). Aavik also points out that a large part of the „international cultural vocabulary has been borrowed from Greek or Latin“ which is why Estonian should also have no problem doing the same (Ibid. 22). Considering the expansion of the cultural vocabulary Aavik argues also that it is not an issue of forced creation as „our writers already possess a large portion of these cultural concepts; they have been acquired by foreign languages, only in their own language are words lacking for their expression (Aavik 1915e: 98).

This attitude for the comparison of languages is partially motivated by the perceived role of vocabulary in expressing thought. For example Aavik repeatedly argues that with Bushman or Hotentot language „it would be probably be difficult if not impossible to write a novel like Bourget’s „Student““ (Aavik 1913j: 212; also Aavik 1912b: 59). The need for improvement is argued to be dire, as „our constantly developing culture demands an educated language which would be certain in all its subtleties“ (Aavik, J. 1913l: 315). Aavik argues also that the history of the conceptual system of Estonian language is essentially a story of external education as „the time when Germans arrived to the Baltics, Estonians must have been speaking a very simple language where conceptions and phrases were considered“, whereby language-external terms were appropriated from foreign use (1914b: 18). The case is argued succinctly by Aavik that „national culture is not possible without a cultural language which could be used in any domain and naturally by the people, or more specifically the educated elite“ (1924[1918]: 7) adding a technically that „if once it will be acknowledged a merit and a desire for national, unique and own language culture“ (Ibid.) the action on the linguistic front has to be very quick as it will be a precondition for all further progress (Ibid.).

The survey performed by Aavik on Estonian becoming a language of culture mentioned in the previous subchapter (Aavik 1914n :26), which received all positive answers (Aavik 1916f: 134), also focussed on the expressivity of vocabulary, thus it could be regarded also as a contemporary estimation on the current and near future vocabulary in its capabilities. The answers also included ones that disemphasized the importance of vocabulary such as Kitzberg saying that Estonian already has expressive capabilities that some other cultural languages don’t

have, and that if a regular development following only present needs with no extremities is led, Estonian will still become a cultural language (Kitzberg 1916: 132). Hubel (1915: 88) also added that Estonian will be able to compete also for expression within the domain of science.

A property that was valued as well to be included in educated and organized languages is its organization, as Aavik argues „[in educated languages] even poetry [is] limited and organized in its own linguistic peculiarities“ while a disorganized language may allow texts that do not even seem to fit the same language in poetic expression (1914a: 18).

The principles by which a better linguistic structure was sought were manifold, and usually not precise. As argued by Aavik (1914o: 95) this is „because developing a new written language is not like solving a mathematical equation, but a bit like art, the making of which requires some taste and sense of beauty“. Nevertheless, principles for language improvement are frequently and quite clearly phrased during the debates: for example Aavik (Ibid.) states quite succinctly three main principles: uniqueness (which entails in one case older forms, dialectal forms, uniqueness, older language, and personal taste), utility (including in one case novelty of written language, natural possibilities of language, and the enriching Finnish words), and beauty (including for one case grandiousness, subtlety and elegance, and partially Finnish). Thus Aavik presents a longer argument for beauty:

If our native language perhaps will never become as rich and powerful as one of a cultural nation with dozens of millions of people, let her be at least prettier and better sounding than many of them, so that our ear could rejoice from her harmonic phrases and she could remind us of the gracious beauty of nature in our homeland, and our beautiful dreams of youth with her gentle fondue of syllables. (Aavik 1912f: 451)

Uniqueness is particularly emphasized in this market for languages (e.g. Veski 1914a: 171). Aavik describes how despite knowledge of the power of vocabulary he personally loves particularly grammatically complex and heavy languages like those of the old Romans and the Greek, and also Estonian and Finnish (Aavik 1912c: 176). He confesses: „I find a peculiar beauty in this maze of forms, I watch and admire it as an artistic architecture with its uncountable pillars, towers, windows [etc.]. For no price would I want to let go of any Finnish or Estonian forms for the purpose of simplifying form“ (Ibid.), at the same time an opposite attitude is expressed on the complex Germanic syntax in Estonian at the time which also does

not exist „in any language but the German“ (Aavik 1912i: 358). A firm belief in Estonian uniqueness is also expressed by (Veski 1914a: 171) who argues that much of the supposed clumsiness of Estonian as expressed in the language debates is due to incongruencies that generally exist between various languages, and that the unique features of Estonian provide enough materials for independent thought and expression. The role of the natural peculiarities of language is also invoked in practical affairs on organizing the phonemic representation of foreign terms (Semper 1912: 334).

The comparisons between languages were presented on a number of structural dimensions, perhaps as the most notable of which was vocabulary. Vocabulary was seen as the most important characteristic which allowed linguistic expression of thought and provided richness for it. Thus a major path of improvement was seen in the inclusion of the international vocabulary, mostly based on Greek and Latin into the Estonian language which would allow Estonians to better receive the ideas discussed in the context of more mature nations and also contribute to them. Other characteristics that were seen as valuable in comparison with other nations were utility (this includes much of the discussions on vocabulary), beauty, and uniqueness which were both argued to be generally important among languages, thus formulating language improvement in explicitly these terms. While articulated in terms they were not always used in a clear and consistent sense, leading also to some polemics on inconsistency. As one example language complexity, if it was seen as a legitimate property of the language (was considered as an inherent part of the language), was perceived as positive and a beautiful feature, while if it was seen as illegitimate (was considered as a foreign loan), it was seen as quite hideous and clumsy on occasion. The debates included a number of active discussions on particular properties of the vocabulary, morphological or syntactical elements and other features where many arguments were made for or against particular features. This was quite often set in the context of explicit comparisons with other languages and nations.

Conclusion

This dissertation has analysed the reflexivity of language enthusiasts participating in the language debates on Estonian language on the sociolinguistic situation of their language community, particularly referring to the context of language standardization. For this purpose metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic stereotypes in the discursive representation within the text corpus in focus were observed. Three sociolinguistic concepts were argued to be relevant to characterize sociolinguistic reflection in the context of standardization: *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and participation in the *linguistic marketplace* between languages. The text corpus of the debates was thus analysed on these three dimensions bringing out the reflexive discourse on the sociolinguistic situation on each of them.

Structurally the dissertation was distributed between three functional chapters. The first of them introduced the theoretical background of the analysis and the earlier work on this topic. The second one introduced the materials in question and the principles of analysis and the third one presented the analysis that followed as the theoretical background was applied to the materials.

The first chapter introduced the basic concepts and the research background, ultimately bringing out the three sociolinguistic concepts *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace* and research into language ideologies and ethnometapragmatics as the frame through which they could be approached. In order to do that, first an overview of standardization studies was provided, particularly emphasizing the way social meaning has come to play an increasingly relevant part in the analyses. Then the role of social meaning in sociolinguistics was characterized where the most recent trend seeks to investigate meaning as it is negotiated and reflected upon in local contexts. Third the domain of historical sociolinguistics was introduced as a specialized application of sociolinguistic theory with its own constraints and opportunities.

The key term set focussed around ethnometapragmatics derived from language ideology studies, and thus this domain of study was first introduced. Ethnometapragmatics can be seen as one aspect of Silverstein's theory of indexical orders which refer to the capacities of most signs in use to refer to their context and co-text of occurrence which may thus sediment in an evaluative function. Metapragmatics speaks particularly of the reflexive capacity to refer to the presuppositions and creative effects of sign use which can be understood as particular ethnometapragmatics on particular individuals or groups. Metapragmatics is negotiated in interaction in various ways which can particularly be formulated as metapragmatic discourse which can represent the metapragmatic functions involved to various degrees of effectiveness.

Ethnometapragmatics can thus be seen as a field of study wherein particular schematizations of metapragmatics among participants in the interaction can be investigated. As Agha argued, this can be done by monitoring the ethnometapragmatic stereotypes that become observable to the analyst by the same mechanisms that they become observable to the participants in the interactions by. Particularly, it was shown possible to construe a standard language community as offering a particular ethnometapragmatic regimentation and to be amenable to research in these terms. The main object of the study was thereafter construed as 'talk about talk' as a pervasive characteristic in human societies and also the status of this dissertation.

Finally the three sociolinguistic concepts relevant to investigating standard language communities were introduced *enregisterment*, *standard language culture*, and *linguistic marketplace*. Enregisterment was described as the collection of processes that lead to a recognition of a variety of language use as a distinct social register, which is usually the status that standard varieties within a community stand in. Standard language culture was introduced as a typological characteristic offering a few dimensions on which language communities can vary as to the presence of standard language culture within them. The parameters focussed on in this dissertation were the amount of variation, attention to language use, contexts implying formality, a high awareness of linguistic mistakes and the legitimacy of the main variety or the entire language. Linguistic marketplace was introduced to characterize the way language communities can commodify particular varieties of language use depending on the sociolinguistic situations that these varieties stand in or due to other influences. According to the theoretical framework offered in this dissertation, all of the three parameters were shown to be

analysable by the means of metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic stereotypes that articulate the reflexive processes of interpretation as the individuals and groups involved make sense of their sociolinguistic situation.

After the theoretical background, the subject matter of language debates of 1912-1920 was introduced describing briefly also its societal context. This was followed by a review of the work that has been done previously bearing direct relevance to the study of discourse in language debates in 1912-1920 organized by the three sociolinguistic concepts. On each of the dimensions first a sociolinguistic description of the dimension was introduced based on various sources of information, and second the earlier discourse studies on the same era which could be seen as relevant to the current study were described. Finally the aims of the current study were articulated once again.

The study was performed on a collection of texts arranged into a synchronic corpus that was gathered with the help of two personal bibliographies. The texts were selected to include the ones focussing on general language issues and were analysed considering descriptions of the time as an autonomous object of study. The assessments of adequacy or appropriateness of these descriptions was left for future studies. The results of the analysis proceeded to be presented by the sociolinguistic topics offered before. Each of the subchapters offered a brief overview of the main findings on that particular topic at the end.

The chapter on enregisterment discussed the status and enregisterment practices of 'written language' as a social register within the community. During these debates there emerged a perceived need to explicitly discuss the role of writing in language and to bring out 'written language' as a social register that becomes naturally autonomous in mature cultures. This was seen both to elevate the status of the Estonian in general and the written Estonian in particular conceptualizing it as something that needed to be learnt and thus different from common use of language, even if in written form.

The chapter on standard language considered four subtopics: 1) the reflection on perceived variation within the language; 2) the discourse on attention to language use and the perceived demands of formal contexts; 3) the discourse on linguistic mistakes; 4) the questions of legitimacy. These topics partially overlapped with the topic of enregisterment as the 'written

language' was the object of discussions on most of the issues above. Analysing the discourse on variation brought out an interesting find that in addition to metapragmatic discourse explicitly discussing the need to decrease variation, which would be expected from a canonical standard language culture, but at the same time reflections on variation also indicated a desire to increase this variation too, which differs from what is normally used of standard language cultures. On the discourse of attention to language use emerged from the analysis that there were explicit calls for more attention paid to language use, as expected in standard language cultures, in both written and spoken language. These reflections also designated a need to differentiate formal and informal contexts.

The discourse on language mistakes gave ground to a specialized genre of linguistic reviews on contemporary publications but also ones from earlier generations. As a particular example, Aavik wrote a review on the national epic written more than 50 years earlier and argued it to be full of mistakes due to them being inherent in the language of folklore and also due to the lack of concern on them from the writer. This gave ground to an increased polemic on the language mistakes which was a popular topic already, due to the last generation being perceived as poor on linguistic development due to the period of Russianization. This ties directly into the topic of legitimacy where writings such as linguistic reviews and historiographies addressed the questions of legitimacy in subgroups within the community, where Aavik for example had argued that the preceding generations were either using a peasant language ill-suited for contemporary times or an unfortunate mixture of German and Estonian among the educated literati. Bilingualism, which was common among the educated Estonians, itself was seen as having a detrimental impact on language judgements by several authors.

The chapter on linguistic marketplaces analysed how other known languages were used as points of comparison within these debates. The analysis brought out that other languages and nations were repeatedly used as a means to contextualize the situation the contemporary of Estonian and argue for particular solutions. A significant topic that was reiterated was the perceived need to become an equal among the cultural languages of Europe which implied contributing to the world culture. There were various types of reasoning behind it, but a particularly interesting one emerged from the analysis, as Aavik stated his concerns explicitly in the frame of language shift, arguing that unless Estonian language is improved, the educated and

the great writers of Estonian heritage would be tempted to use other languages for their purpose. The targets and means for language improvement were seen on a number of different dimensions.

The possibility of such detailed insight into the reflexive discourse on the language situation at the time is the main result of the study, as it allows a noticeable increase in detail also in sociolinguistic models of the time. The methods implemented prove themselves productive for the current materials and also future extensions as even this limited study demonstrates new and interesting results. A detailed view on language reflection opens up other questions for sociolinguists to study and as it is visible from the current study this analysis can benefit sociolinguist theory in general (e.g. the role and mechanisms of decreasing variation may not be as unidirectional as the theory implies or perhaps the canonical standard language culture is limited in its application to transitory contexts as in this case) or reconstruction of Estonian cultural history in particular (e.g. the explicit worries Aavik had on a possible language shift among the literati that would happen unless the language is educated has to the author's knowledge not been mentioned before in the secondary literature on that era).

The result of the dissertation is thus a detailed description of the reflexive discourse on the chosen three sociolinguistic issues during the language debates 1912-1920. This analysis reveals broad patterns of discourse organization through which the participants in these debates actively reflected on their sociolinguistic situation which may have significantly impacted the way they acted during these times. This the first time such reflective discourse on sociolinguistic patterns has been investigated within the Estonian context and the collected data can be used for generalizations in extended studies. This dissertation also leads to open the discussion on the reflection on the sociolinguistic context during the late 19th century, early 20th century standardization regards which prior research has either mostly neglected discourse or sought to generalize on the background of the individual past and not the sociolinguistic surroundings. The novel problem proposed thus opens new horizons in the research in Estonian historical sociolinguistics and works to contribute to the active investigation on the reflective patterns on language use within the wider realm of historical sociolinguistics.

References

Primary sources

- Aavik, J. 1905. Kirjakeele täiendamise abinõudest. *Noor-Eesti I*. Tartu: Noor-Eesti kirjastus, 114-131.
- Aavik, J. 1907. Abstraktlikud substantivid eesti keeles. *Noor-Eesti II*. Tartu: "Noor-Eesti" - "Kirjanduse Sõprade" väljaanne, 220-232.
- Aavik, J. 1912a. Avalik kiri hr. W. R-le. *Päevaleht*. 02.04.1912, 74.
- Aavik, J. 1912b. Enam keele kulturi. *Tallinna Teataja* 12.03.1912, 59: 2.
- Aavik, J. 1912c. Enam uusi sõnu. *Postimees* 2.08.1912, 176; 03.08.1912, 177.
- Aavik, J. 1912d. Germani ja Romani kultur. *Eesti Kirjandus* 2: 62-72.
- Aavik, J. 1912e. Ilusa keele kõlaline inetus. *Eesti Kirjandus* 7: 257-273.
- Aavik, J. 1912f. Keele kaunima kõlavuse poole. *Eesti Kirjandus* 11/12: 451-484.
- Aavik, J. 1912g. Kolm suurt hoiatust kõigile neile, kes Eesti keelt tarvitavad sõnas ja kirjas. *Tallinna Teataja* 09.05.1912, 105.
- Aavik, J. 1912h. Kultura ja kultur. *Postimees* 12.06.1912, 132.
- Aavik, J. 1912i. Kõige suurem germanismus Eesti keeles. *Eesti Kirjandus* 9: 353-369.
- Aavik, J. 1912j. Soome sõnad Eesti kirjakeeles. *Eesti Kirjandus* 1: 5-30.
- Aavik, J. 1912k. Tuleviku Eesti-keel. *Noor-Eesti IV*. Helsinki: E. K. S. Noor-Eesti, 170-179.
- Aavik, J. 1912l. Uue testamendi tõlke viimane parandatud trükk. *Eesti Kirjandus* 8: 305-320.
- Aavik, J. 1912m. Vastuseks hr. Oorgu kirjutusele. *Tallinna Teataja* 15.03.1912, 62.
- Aavik, J. 1912n. Viis soovi meie ajalehtedele. *Postimees* 18.01.1912, 14: 5.
- Aavik, J. 1912p. Üks ajakohane ettepanek. *Tallinna Teataja* 17.03.1912, 64; 19.03.1912, 65.
- Aavik, J. 1912q. Üks ettepanek tõlkijatele. *Postimees* 4.08.1912, 178: 5.
- Aavik, J. 1912r. Eesti Kultura I Korraldanud W. Reiman. Tartus 1911. Oma maa I. Korraldanud E. Virgo Tartus 1911. [Arvustus.] *Eesti Kirjandus* 3: 131-136.

- Aavik, J. 1912s. Meie Issanda Jeesuse Kristuse Uus Testament ehk Seaduse Raamat ja Kuninga Taaveti Laulu-Raamat. 1911. *Tallinna Teataja* 24.07.1912, 167; 25.07.1912, 168.
- Aavik, J. 1912t. *Mõned keele reeglid: Nõuded ja soovid*. Tartu: Noor-Eesti Kirjastus.
- Aavik, J. 1913a. Eesti õigekeelsuse ja keele ilu küsimus: Vastuseletuseks hra Jõgeverile. *Eesti Kirjandus* 11: 422-427; 12: 480.
- Aavik, J. 1913b. Avalikud küsimused hra Leetbergile. *Postimees* 26.10.1913, 247.
- Aavik, J. 1913c. Viis soovi meie ajalehtedele. *Postimees* 30.12.1913, 299.
- Aavik, J. 1913d. Kettunen, L. Lautgeschichtliche Untersuchung über den Koda ferschen Dialekt. Helsinki, 1913. [Arvustus] *Postimees* 29.11.1913, 276.
- Aavik, J. 1913e. Kalevala. Eestistanud R. J. Eisen [Arvustus] *Postimees*. s.d., 199.
- Aavik, J. 1913f. Iselaadi teaduslik uurimine Eesti rahva mineviku kohta [Arvustus] *Postimees* 28.09.1913, 224.
- Aavik, J. 1913g. Kodukoha uurimise tähtsus ja ülesanded [Arvustus] *Postimees* 16.11.1913, 276.
- Aavik, J. 1913h. Vastuseks L'Adultera tõlke arvustuse vastu protesteerijale. *Postimees* 23.10.1913, 244.
- Aavik, J. 1913i. Keeleuuendus Ungaris. *Postimees* 17.09.1913, 214.
- Aavik, J. 1913j. K. Leetbergi kõne puhul. *Postimees* 14.09.1913, 212.
- Aavik, J. 1913l. Õigekeelsuslikud arvustused. *Eesti Kirjandus* 8: 315 – 319.
- Aavik, J. 1913m. Aforismid Eesti keele üle. *Postimees* 02.05.1913, 99.
- Aavik, J. 1913n. Rahvuse tundest. *Postimees* 12.10.1913, 236.
- Aavik, J. 1913o. Vastuseks Hoia Rongale. *Postimees* 13.04.1913, 85.
- Aavik, J. 1913p. Keelelised aforismid. *Postimees* 04.07.1913, 149; 05.07.1913, 150; 12.07.1913, 156.
- Aavik, J. 1914a. Eesti rahvusliku suurteose keel : Lisad : Rahvalaulu salmimõõt; Rahvalaulu keel; Proov parandatud "Kalevipoja" teksti. Tartu: Reform.
- Aavik, J. 1914b. Kas uuendada või mitte? : 28 väidet ja vastuväidet J.V. Veski'le. Tartu: Noor-Eesti Kirjastus.
- Aavik, J. 1914c. Järelmärkus. *Postimees* 30.04.1914, 96.
- Aavik, J. 1914d. Järelmärkus. *Postimees* 14.04.1914, 82.
- Aavik, J. 1914e. Kas peab praegusel ajal raamatuid ostma. *Postimees* 18.12.1914, 291.

- Aavik, J. 1914f. Kas võib Eesti kirjanik ainsa kirjandusliku tööga oma seisusekohase sisetuleku saada? *Postimees* 20.12.1914, 293.
- Aavik, J. 1914g. Keele alalt: "Ühisus". *Postimees* 29.11.1914, 275.
- Aavik, J. 1914h. Keelelised märkused: Sõna, mida valetähenduses tarvitatakse: See on "ühisus". *Postimees* 26.11.1914 272.
- Aavik, J. 1914i. Vastuseks sellele, kes "uulitsa" asemel "teed" soovitab. *Postimees* 24.04.1914, 91.
- Aavik, J. 1914j. Võõrakeeliste nimede väljarääkimisest. *Postimees* 28.08.1914, 265.
- Aavik, J. 1914k. Väike abinõu Eesti keele rikastamiseks: Vaja hakata rohkem kokkuliidetud adjektiive looma ja neid ka - õigesti looma. *Postimees* 19.11.1914, 265.
- Aavik, J. 1914l. Keelelise kuukirja siht ja laad. *Keeleline kuukiri* 1/2: 1-4.
- Aavik, J. 1914m. Kuidas keeleuudendusele vastu tullakse. *Keeleline kuukiri* 1/2: 30-36.
- Aavik, J. 1914n. Üleskutse ankeediks. *Keeleline kuukiri* 1/2: 26.
- Aavik, J. 1914o. Eesti keele uuenduse asjus. (Vastuseks J. V. Veskile). *Keel ja Kirjandus* 8: 194-196.
- Aavik, J. 1914p. Lühemad paljuse osastavad kahesilbilistest tüvedest. *Keeleline kuukiri* 1/2: 4-13.
- Aavik, J. 1915a. Kas avaldab sõna kirjutatud kuju kõneldud keele peale mõju või mitte? *Päevaleht* 29.07.1915, 170.
- Aavik, J. 1915b. Eesti kirjakeelse stiili arenemisejärgud: Visand. *Noor-Eesti* V. Jurjev: Noor-Eesti Kirjastus, 216-229.
- Aavik, J. 1915c. Keel ja kiri. Keele ja kirjanduse vahekorra küsimus: Vastuseks hr. A Jürgensteini viimasele "Keele- ja meeleparanduslikele vestele" (Eesti Kirjandus nr. 7-8). *Eesti Kirjandus* 9: 252- 255.
- Aavik, J. 1915d. Kaksteist teesi. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 41-42.
- Aavik, J. 1915e. Kuidas meil keeleuudendusele vastu tullakse. [Vastuseks A. Jürgensteini „ Keele- ja meele paranduslikele vestetele “]. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 97-99.
- Aavik, J. 1916a. Mis on keeleuudendus? Ta põhjendus ja ta programm. Tartu: Reform.
- Aavik, J. 1916b. Uudenduse kaitseks: Mõne aja eest ilmus K. A. H. ja allakirjutanu vahel keeleline vaidlus sõna "jaunis" puhul. *Postimees* 07.07.1916, 151.

- Aavik, J. 1916c. Mis on keeleuuendus? Uuenduse kaitseks "uuenduse" kaitsja vastu. *Postimees* 27.07.1916, 168.
- Aavik, J. 1916d. Ajakirjandus ja keeleuuendus. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 105-114.
- Aavik, J. 1916e. Kahesilbiliste verbide kolm päaliiki (järg ja lõpp). *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 117-126.
- Aavik, J. 1916f. Kokkuvõtteline ülevaade vastustest. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 134-135.
- Aavik, J. 1917a. Väiksed keelelised märkused. *Uus Postimees* 21.12.1917, 14.
- Aavik, J. 1917b. Ajalehed ja Eesti keel. *Uus Postimees* 06.12.1917, 1.
- Aavik, J. 1919. Keeleuuendus ja ta oodatavad tagajärjed iseseisvas eestis: Paradoksid. *Odamees*. 01.05.1919, 2: 41-46.
- Aavik, J. 1920a. Rahvamurded ja kirjakeel: Õigekeelsuse kysimus rahvamurdes ja kirjakeeles. Tartu: Istandik.
- Aavik, J. 1920b. Keelelised vastuväited Prof. Dr. L. Kettuse Arvustavate märkuste puhul. Tartu: Istandik.
- Aavik, J. 1924[1918]. *Keeleuuenduse äärmised võimalused*. Tartu: Istandik.
- Audova, J. 1912. Keele sündimine moderni hingeteaduse seisukohalt. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 234-245.
- Ernits, V. 1916. Keeleuuendusvõitluse hingelised põhjooned. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 127-130.
- Hubel, E. 1915. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 88.
- Jõgever, J. 1913a. Joh. Aavik Keele Kaunima kõlavuse poole. [Arvustus] *Eesti Kirjandus* 6: 239-243.
- Jõgever, J. 1913b. Õigekeelsus ja õigekiri. *Eesti Kirjandus* 8: 289-303.
- Jõgever, J. 1914a. Eesti rahvusliku suurteose keel. [Arvustus] *Eesti Kirjandus* 7: 176-180.
- Jõgever, J. 1914b. Joh. Aavik, Kas uuendada või mitte? 28 väidet ja vastuväidet J. W. Weskile [Arvustus]. *Eesti Kirjandus* 5/6: 157-159.
- Jõgever, J. 1914c. Materjalid Eesti kirjakeele ajaloo jaoks. *Eesti Kirjandus* 2: 62-70; 8: 185-192.
- Jürgenstein, A. 1915. Keele- ja meeleparanduslised vested. *Eesti Kirjandus* 2: 46-50; 7/8: 229-230.
- Jürgenstein, A. 1915. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 89-90.
- K., L. 1914. "Aine" ja "ollus". *Postimees* 30.04.1914, 96.
- Kettunen, L. 1916. Murdeütetus, mis ei tohiks kaotsi minna. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 114-116.

- Kitzberg, A. 1916. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 132-133.
- Leetberg, K. 1912. Uue testamendi parandatud ümberpanek. *Eesti Kirjandus* 7: 430-450.
- Leetberg, K. 1913a. Veel kord uued sõnad: (Vastuseks Joh. Aaviku teise kirjutuse peale).
Postimees 26.10.1913, 247.
- Leetberg, K. 1913b. Keele rikastamisest. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 12: 433-444.
- Leetberg, K. 1915. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 90.
- Oorgu, M. [Luts, M.] 1912. J. Aaviku kõne puhul: "Enam keele kultuuri". *Tallinna Teataja*
13.03.1912, 60.
- Pitka, P. A. 1914. Kas "elukutse pooldest" või "elukutselt"? *Postimees* : Lisaleht. 14.04.1914, 82.
- Pöld, P. 1915. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 91.
- Ridala, Villem 1915. Harald Põllu "Eesti keeleõpetuse" I jao arvustus. *Eesti Kirjandus* 12, 405–
423.
- Ridala, V. 1916a. Kas d või t partitiivi lõppuna? *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 114-116.
- Ridala, V. 1916b. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 5/6: 92-95.
- Semper, J. 1912. Mõnda võõrakeelistest sõnadest Eesti keeles. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 8: 328-342.
- Treiberg, P. 1915a. Katsed ja näited; [1] : Koguke keeleproovidenäide tõlgitud novelle ühes
pikema grammatilise sissejuhatusel / Tlk. ja koost: J. Aavik. Jurjev: Reform, 1915.
[Arvustus.] *Postimees* 29.06.1915, 144.
- Treiberg, P. 1915b. Vastuseks herrale Aavikule *Päevaleht* 29.07.1915, 170.
- Tuglas, F. 1915. Võhiku mõtted I. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 51-53.
- Veski, J. V. 1907. Üleskutse Eesti keele sõnade korraldamise asjus. *Päevaleht* 14.08.1908, 185.
- Veski, J. V. 1911. Väike ettepanek kirjameestele. *Päevaleht* 28.12.1911, 297:1.
- Veski, J. V. 1914a. Eesti keele praegune arenemisejärg. *Eesti Kirjandus* 7: 169-176.
- Veski, J. V. 1914b. Eesti Kirjanduse Selsi tegevus ja kavatsused. *Eesti Kirjandus* 5/6: 137-146.
- Veski, J. V. 1914c. Eesti keele uuendamise asjus: (Vastukaaluks J. Aaviku mõõtteavaldustele).
Eesti Kirjandus 7: 182-184.
- Veski, J. V. 1915. Vastused ankeedile. *Keeleline kuukiri* 3/4: 95-96.
- Veski, J. V. 1916. Tähelepanemiseks rahvakeele tundjatele. *Postimees* 29.04.1916 96: 1.
- Veski, J. V. 1919a. Ühisele õigekirjutusele! *Postimees* 06.02.1919, 20: 6.
- Veski, J. V. 1919b. Paar avalikku küsimust J. Aavikule. *Postimees* 14.06.1919, 120: 5-6.

Secondary sources

- Agha, Agha 2003. The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication* 23: 231-273.
- 2004. Registers of Language. In: Alessandro Duranti, (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 23–45.
- 2007. *Language and social relations* (No. 24). Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter 2005. Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations. Delbecque, Nicole; van der Auwera, Johan; Geeraerts, Dirk (eds.) *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*. Berlin/New York, de Gruyter, 7-42.
- Austin, John L. 1975. Lecture VII. In: Austin, John L.; Urmson, James O.; Marina Sbisà (eds.) *How to do things with words*. 2nd edition, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 83-93.
- Bauman, Richard, & Briggs, Charles L. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual review of Anthropology* 19: 59-88.
- Bergs, Alexander 2012. The uniformitarian principle and the risk of anachronisms in language and social history. In: Fernandez-Campoy, Juan M., Conde-Silvestre, Juan C. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 80–92.
- Blommaert, Jan 1999. Introduction. In: Blommaert, Jan (ed.) *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-38.
- Blythe, Richard A., & Croft, William 2012. S-curves and the mechanisms of propagation in language change. *Language* 88(2): 269-304.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16 (6): 645-668.
- Bussmann, Harold 1996. *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Chalvin, Antoine 2008. Johannes Aavik ja prantsuse keel. Johannes Aavik and the French Language. *Methis. Studia humaniora Estonica*, 1(1-2), 104-115.
- 2010. *Johannes Aavik et la rénovation de la langue estonienne*. Paris: ADÉFO/L'harmattan.

- Cooper, Paul 2012. *Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: A Framework*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Sheffield.
- CP = Peirce, Charles S. 1931–1958. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [Hartshorne, Charles; Weiss, Paul (eds.), 1931–1935; vols. 7–8. Burks, A. W. (ed.) 1958; In-text references are to CP, followed by volume and paragraph numbers]
- Culpeper, Jonathan & Kytö, Merja 2010. *Early Modern English Dialogues: Spoken Interaction as Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Winifred, & Langer, Nils 2004. *The Making of Bad Language*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Deumert, Ana 2003a. Bringing speakers back in? Epistemological reflections on speaker-oriented explanations of language change. *Language Sciences* 25(1): 15-76.
- 2003b. Standard Languages As Civic Rituals—Theory and Examples. *Sociolinguistica*. 17: 31-50.
- 2004. *Language standardization and language change: the dynamics of Cape Dutch* (Vol. 19). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Deumert, Ana, & Vandebussche, Wim 2003a. Standard languages: Taxonomies and histories. In: Deumert, Ana & Vandebussche, Wim (eds.) *Germanic Standardizations: Past to Present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-14.
- 2003b. Research directions in the study of language standardization. In: Deumert, Ana & Vandebussche, Wim (eds.) *Germanic standardizations: Past to present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 455-470.
- Eckert, Penelope 2000. *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 2008. Where do ethnolects stop?. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12(1-2): 25-42.
- 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87-100.
- Ehala, Martin 1998. How a man changed a parameter value: the loss of SOV in Estonian subclauses. In: Hogg, Richard M., van Bergen, Linda (eds.) *Historical Linguistics 1995: Volume 2: Germanic linguistics. Selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 73-88.

- Erelt, Mati 2000. Eestikeelse kõrghariduse vajalikkusest. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat 44–45 (1998–1999)*. Tartu: Teaduste Akadeemia Kirjastus, 77–82.
- Erelt, Tiiu 2003. *Eesti keelekorraldus*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Ferguson, C. A. 1968. Language development. In: Fishman, Joshua A.; Ferguson, Charles A.; Gupta, John D. (eds) *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 27-35.
- Fernandez-Campoy, Juan M.; Schilling, N. 2012. The Application of the Quantitative Paradigm to Historical Sociolinguistics: Problems with the Generalizability Principle. In: Fernandez-Campoy, Juan M., Conde-Silvestre, Juan C. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 63–79.
- Gal, Susan 1979. *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Garrett, Peter 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grace, George. 1991. *How do languages change? (More on 'aberrant languages')*. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Austronesian linguistics, Honolulu.
- Haugen, Einar 1966. Dialect, language nation. *American Anthropologist* 68 (6): 922–935.
- 1972. The Scandinavian languages as cultural artefacts. In: Dil, Anwar S. (ed.) *The Ecology of Language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 265–286.
- 1987. *Blessings of Babel*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hennoste, Tiit 1997. Eesti keele sotsioperioodid. Üldpilt. *Pühendusteos Huno Rätsepale 28.12.1997*. (= *Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 7.*) Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 44–66.
- Hint, Mati 2011. Kas ynned sa olbama sirnangot? Johannes Aaviku visionäärsus keeleteoreetilisest vaatepunktist. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 11: 809-820.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16:248-267.
- Irvine, Judith & Gal, Susan 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Kroskrity, Paul (ed.) *Regimes of language: ideologies, politics and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Press. 25-83.

- Janda, Richard D. & Joseph, Brian D. 2003. On language, change, and language change – or, of history, linguistics, and historical linguistics. In: Joseph, Brian D.; Janda, Richard D. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 3–180.
- Jansen, Ea & Saari, Henn 1999. Kolm kohalikku keelt. – Viikberg, Jüri (ed.). *Eesti rahvaste raamat. Rahvusvähemused, -rühmad ja -killud*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus, 240–249.
- Jespersen, Otto 1925. *Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Company.
- Johnstone, Barbara 2006. Reflexivity in Sociolinguistics. In: Brown, Keith (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* 10: 463–464.
- 2009. Pittsburghese shirts: Commodification and the enregisterment of an urban dialect. *American Speech* 84(2): 157–175.
- Joseph, John E. 1987. *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Kask, Arnold 1958. *Johannes Voldemar Veski keelelisi töid*. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- 1984. Eesti murded ja kirjakeel. *Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Seltsi toimetised*, 16. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Kerge, Krista. 2003. Eesti kirjakeele mõtteruum. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat* 49. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 7 - 22.
- Kloss, H. 1978. *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800. Second, expanded edition*. Düsseldorf: Swann.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2004. Language ideologies. In: Duranti, A. (Ed.) *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517
- 2010. Language ideologies – Evolving perspectives. In: Jaspers, Jürgen; Verschueren, Jef; Östman, Jan-Ola (eds.) *Society and language use. Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights* 7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 192–211.
- Laanekask, Heli 1984. Eesti kirjakeelte administratiivse ühendamise katse XIX sajandi algul. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 11: 679–685.
- 2004. *Eesti kirjakeele kujunemine ja kujundamine 16.-19. sajandil*. (Dissertationes Philologiae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis 14.). Tartu: Tartu Ülikool.

- Labov, William 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- 1972. The study of language in its social context. In: Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) *Advances in the Sociology of Language, Vol. 1*. The Hague: Mouton & Co, 152–216.
- 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 1: Internal Factors* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Laitinen, Lea & Nordlund, Taru 2013. Language from below? Indexing Identities in the Writings of Common People in 19th-century Finland. In: Kuismin, Anna; Driscoll, Matthew J. (eds.) *White Field, Black Seeds: Nordic Literacy Practices in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 169-189.
- Langer, Nils, & Davies, Winifred (Eds.). 2005. *Linguistic purism in the Germanic language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lass, Roger 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics Vol. 81)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, John A. 1993. Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In: Lucy, John A. ed. *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 9-32.
- McColl Millar, Robert 2005. *Language, Nation and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 2010. *Authority and Identity: A Sociolinguistic History of Europe Before the Modern Age*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milroy, James 1999. The consequences of standardisation in descriptive linguistics. In: Bex, Tony; Watts, Richard J. (eds.). *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, 16-39.
- 2001. *Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(4): 530–555.
- 2004. Language ideologies and linguistic change. In: Fought, Carmen (ed.) *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 161-177.
- 2012. Sociolinguistics and Ideologies in Language History. In: In: Hernández-Campoy, Juan M., Conde-Silvestre, Juan C. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 569-584.
- Milroy, James; Milroy, Lesley 1999. *Authority in Language. Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation (3rd ed.)*. London: Routledge.

- Monticelli, Danielle 2006. Keeleuuendus ja tõlkimine Noor-Eesti kultuurilise utoopia raames Villem Ridala tõlgitud "Süütu" näitel. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 5-6: 379 - 386, 477-490.
- 2009. Eesti keeleuuendus ja Itaalia questione della lingua. Paralleelid ja põimumised. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 2: 104 – 123.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter 1996. *Linguistic Ecology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nevalainen, Terttu & Raumolin-Brunberg, Helena 2012. Historical Sociolinguistics: Origins, Motivations, and Paradigms. In: Hernández-Campoy, Juan M.; Conde-Silvestre, Juan C. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 22–40.
- Nevalainen, Terttu 2014. *Historical Sociolinguistics: from the Wave Model to the “Third Wave” and Beyond*. Talk at the Sociolinguistics Symposium 2014, Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Niedzielski, Nancy A., & Preston, Dennis R. 2003. *Folk linguistics. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs. Vol. 122)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1984. Theory in anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative studies in society and history*. 26(1): 126-166.
- Pajusalu, Karl 2013. Eesti keeleuuendus ja murded. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat* 58: 168 – 185.
- Paul, Toomas. 1999. *Eesti piiblitõlke ajalugu: Esimestest katsetest kuni 1999. aastani*. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia.
- Potter, Jonathan 1996. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Preston, Dennis R. 1993. The uses of folk linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(2): 181-259.
- 2010. Variation in Language Regard In: Zeigler E., Gilles P. & Scharloth J. eds. *Variatio delectat : Empirische Evidenzen und theoretische Passungen sprachlicher Variation*. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang. 7-27.
- 2011a. The power of language regard-discrimination, classification, comprehension, and production. *Dialectologia: revista electrònica*, 9-33.
- 2011b. Methods in (applied) folk linguistics: Getting into the minds of the folk. *AILA Review* 24(1): 15-39.
- 2013. The influence of regard on language variation and change. *Journal of Pragmatics* 52: 93–104.

- Raag, Raimo 1999a. One plus one equals one: the forging of Standard Estonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 139(1): 17-38.
- 1999b. *Fran allmogemal till nationalsprak. Sprakvard och spralkpolitik i Estland fran 1857 till 1999*. (Acta Universitatis Upsalaensis. Studia Multiethnica Upsaliensia 12.) Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- 2008. *Talurahva keelest riigikeeleks*. Tartu: Atlex.
- Raag, Virve 1998. *The effects of Planned Change on Estonian Morphology*. (Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 29.) Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Rätsep, Huno 2012. *Johannes Aavik 1913. aastal eesti keelt korraldamas*. Ettekanne Emeriitprofessor akad. Huno Rätsepa 85. sünnipäevale pühendatud konverentsil (Saadaval <http://www.uttv.ee/naita?id=16404> 23.05.2015).
- Romaine, Suzanne 1988. Historical sociolinguistics: Problems and methodology. In: . Ammon, Ulrich; Dittmar, Norbert and Mattheier, Klaus J. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society, Part 2*. 1452-1469.
- 1989. Review of John E. Joseph, *Eloquence and power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. *Linguistics* 27: 574-79
- 1995. Internal vs. External Factors in Socio-Historical Explanations of Change: A Fruitless Dichotomy? In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Historical Issues in Sociolinguistics/Social Issues in Historical Linguistics*, 478-490.
- Ross, Kristiina 2005. Algkmesest lõpmatuse kulgevad keeleuenduste kurvid. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 7: 521-525.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1990. Wording, Meaning and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92: 346-361.
- Sairio, Anni & Palander-Collin, Minna 2012. The Reconstruction of Prestige Patterns in Language History. In: Hernández-Campoy, Juan M.; Conde-Silvestre, Juan C. (eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 626-638.
- Sankoff, David, & Laberge, Suzanne. 1978. The linguistic market and the statistical explanation of variability. In: Sankoff, David (ed.) *Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods*. New York: Academic Press, 239-250.

- Scaglione, Aldo 1984. The Rise of National Languages: East and West. In: Scaglione; Aldo (ed.) *The Emergence of National Languages*. Ravenna: Longo Editore, 9–49.
- Silverstein, Michael 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In: Clyne, Paul R.; Hanks, William F.; Hofbauer, Carol L. (eds.) *The Elements: a Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193–247.
- 1985. Language and the Culture of Gender: At the Intersection of Structure, Usage, and Ideology. In: Mertz, Elizabeth; Parmentier, Richard J. *Semiotic Mediation* (ed.) Orlando: Academic Press, 219–239.
- 1987. Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony. *Working papers and proceedings of the Center for Psychosocial Studies, (13)*.
- 1994. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In: Lucy, John A. (ed.) *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 32–58.
- 1998. The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary. In: Schieffelin, Bambi B.; Woolard, Kathryn A.; Kroskrity, Paul V. (eds.) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 68–86.
- 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23(3-4): 193-229.
- 2010. "Direct" and "indirect" communicative acts in semiotic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(2), 337-353.
- Taagepera, Rein 2011. Albert, Martin, and Peter too: their roles in creating the Estonian and Latvian nations. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 42(2): 125-141.
- Talve, Ilmar. 2005. *Eesti kultuurilugu : keskaja algusest Eesti iseseisvuseni. 2 tr.* Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Tavel, Lehte 1991. "Noor-Eesti" kirjastustegevuse algusest. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 9: 588-598.
- Tauli, Valter 1982. *Johannes Aaviku keeleuendus: kriitiline ülevaade*. Stockholm: Eesti Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- . 1984: *The estonian language reform*. Hamburg: Buske
- Thomas, Georg 1991. *Linguistic purism*. London and New York: Longman Publishing Group.

- Undusk, Jaan 2004. „Die Muttersprachenlandschaft“. Ein Topos der Sprachverehrung. In: Varpio, Yrjö; Zadencka, Maria (eds.) *Literatur und nationale Identität. 4, Landschaft und Territorium : zur Literatur, Kunst und Geschichte des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts im Ostseeraum: Finnland, Estland, Lettland, Litauen und Polen.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 32 - 49.
- 2010. Antoine Chalvini meistritöö. *Sirp* 19.11.2010
- 2011. Baltisaksa kirjakultuuri struktuurist. Ärgituseks erinumbri lugejale. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 8-9: 561 – 571.
- 2012. Luterlik, valgustuslik ja romantiline keeleideoloogia meie vanemas kirjakultuuris. *Vikerkaar* 10/11: 73 – 90.
- Urban, Greg 2006. Metasemiosis and metapragmatics. In: Brown, Keith (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 88-91.
- Vihma, Helgi 1994. *Johannes Aaviku publikatsioonid 1901-1993: bibliograafia.* Tallinn : Johannes Aaviku Selts.
- Vihma, Helgi, & Aavik, Johannes 2000. *Johannes Aavik ja eesti keeleuendus: bibliograafia 1901-1996 (Vol. 4).* Tartu: Akadeemia Trükk.
- Watts, Richard J. 2011. *Language Myths and the History of English.* Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weinreich, Uriel, Labov, William, & Herzog, Marvin I. 1968. *Empirical foundations for a theory of language change.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand J. 1875. *Grammatik der ehstnischen Sprache.* St.-Petersbourg: L'Academie Imperieale des sciences.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1991. Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics* 2(3): 235-249.
- 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In: Schieffelin, Bambi B.; Woolard, Kathryn A.; Kroskrity, Paul (eds.) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 3–47.

Sotsiolingvistiline refleksioon standardkeele loomise kontekstis: debatid eesti keelest 1912-1920. Kokkuvõte

Käesolev magistritöö uurib 20. sajandi alguse eestikeelse keelekogukonna sotsiolingvistilist situatsiooni keelelaste kommentaaride kaudu. Eelneva uurimistöö põhjal on võimalik märgata tol ajal küpsevat standardkeelekultuuri, mis viis mõnekümne aasta jooksul eesti keelekogukonna arusaamani ühtsest standardkeelest, mis on teisiti tuntud ka kui eesti kirjakeel. Seda teemat on varem käsitletud sotsioloogilistes uurimustes, isikuloolistes uurimustes või detailuurimustest keeleteooriast. Käesolev uurimus laiendab kirjeldust tollest ajastust käsitledes arvamusi keelest refleksiivse kirjeldusena tollaegsest sotsiolingvistilisest situatsioonist eesti keele ümber lähtudes sotsiolingvistilises teoorias esile toodud pidepunktidest.

Töö keskseks objektiks on vahemikus 1912-1920 avaldatud esseistikas toimunud debatid, mille raames osutati eriti suurt tähelepanu keeleküsimustele. Töö eesmärgiks on esile tuua debattide põhjal koostatud keelekorpusest kirjeldused, mida võib käsitleda kui toonase eesti keelekogukonna sotsiolingvistilise situatsiooni refleksiivset mõtestamist.

Töö teoreetiliseks aluseks on Silversteini indeksikaalse korra teooria ning sellega seotud etnometapragmaatika mõiste. See teooria tegeleb laiemalt keeleliste hoiakutega, mis kujundavad igapäevast keelekasutust. Läbi indeksikaalse korra võidakse teatud sõnadele omistada väärtusfunktsioone – väärtusfunktsioonide mõtestamine on aga mõjutatud makrosotsiaalsetest tendentsidest. Etnometapragmaatika uurimisalana tugineb tähelepanekule, et need vahendusprotsessid toimivad paljuski avalikul suhtlustasandil, mistõttu on võimalik ka uurijal neid jälgida. Teatud kogukonna etnometapragmaatika saab ladestuda korduvates kujundites, mis etnometapragmaatika reegleid vanade ja uute osalejate seas aktiivsemana hoiavad. Need korduvad kujundid, mida Agha nimetab metapragmaatilisteks stereotüüpideks, võivad peituda igasugustel väljenduskanalitel, muuhulgas ka kirjutatud tekstides, nagu seda on

ka 100 aastat tagasi keele kohta kirjutatud arvamused. Nõnda saab selliste tekstikujundite kaudu uurida suhtlusreegleid suurelt ajadistantsilt.

Etnometapragmaatika mõiste kaudu on viimasel ajal sotsiolingvistikas hakatud lähenema refleksiivsetele protsessidele keekekasutuses. Käesolev töö on võtnud eesmärgiks rakendada sama lähenemist ajaloolise sotsiolingvistika kontekstis, standardkeelekultuuri esilekerkimisega seotud refleksiivsete protsesside uurimiseks. Selle jaoks on uurimistöös välja valitud kolm mõistet, mille kaudu standardkeele loomise juures olev ühiskond hästi iseloomustatav oleks.

Need on *registriloomeprotsess* kui protsess, mis viib sotsiaalse registri eristumisele ühiskonnas, *standardkeelekultuur*, mis toob esile standardkeelsuse keeletüpoloogilise kategooriana ja on seotud mitmesuguste praktikatega kogukonnas, ning *keelte turg*, mis viitab keelendite erinevale väärtustamisele kogukonnas ja erinevatele motivatsioonidele, mis võib selle taga olla. Varasemad uurimused, mida saab uurimisobjektiga siduda on esitatud teemade kaupa, kirjeldades kõigepealt mitmesugustel allikel põhinevat teavet toonase sotsiolingvistilise tausta kohta nendest parameetritest lähtuvalt ning seejärel täpsemalt toonasele keelealasele diskursusele põhinevatest töödest leitavat teavet, millele saab ka käesolevas analüüsis tugineda ning mis iseloomustavad ka teema varasemat uuritust.

Uurimuse läbiviimiseks on kahe isikuloolise bibliograafia põhjal koostatud korpus 106-st artiklist vaadeldavast ajastust, mis tegelesid keekeküsimustega. Valikut tehes on välja otsitud just need artiklid, mis puudutavad üldisemaid keekeküsimusi. Seda materjalikogu on käsitletud sünkroonse korpusena, kuna ajavahemik on üpris väike ning vaatlusalused protsessid on enamasti pikaajalisemad.

Korpuse analüüs tulemused on esitatud teemade kaupa, järjestuses *registriloom*e, *standardkeele kultuur* ja *keelte turg*. Teemad kontekstualiseeritakse omakorda lühidalt alateemade sees, mille raames kirjeldatakse sotsiolingvistilise teooriaga vahetumalt haakuvaid kirjeldusi, mis on tekstikorpusest leitud. Analüüsi tulemused tuuakse esile teemade kaupa ning olulisemad tulemused võetakse kokku alateemade järel ja magistritöö kokkuvõttes.

Registriloompeatükk toob esile korpuses leitud tekstid, kus on esile tõstetud protsesse, mis hoiavad alal või proovivad luua ühiskonnas eristatud registrit. Antud uurimuse raames sai

keskendatud kirjakeele mõistele, kus sai vaadatud tema eristumist teistest registritest. Esile tuli sage ühitamine kirjakeele ja haritkeele mõistete vahel.

Standardkeele kultuuri peatükk on jaotatud alateemadeks vastavalt teoreetilises taustas esile toodud suundadele. Kõigepealt vaadeldi käsitlusi keele variatiivsusest. Standardkeele kultuuri mõiste puhul on muidu peetud silmas puhtalt ühesuunalist variatiivsuse vähenemist, antud juhul oli märgata, et keelekirjeldustes tajuti variatiivsust nii kasvava kui kahanevana.

Teise teemana on käsitletud formaalseid kontekste ja tähelepanu osutamist keelelekasutusele kui standardkeelekultuuri osa. Korpusest selgus, et mitmel puhul osutati tõesti otsesõnu vajadusele pöörata rohkem tähelepanu keelekasutusele, seda nii kirjakeele kui suulise keele puhul. Mitmel juhul on jälgitav ka tendents formaalse ja mitteformaalse konteksti kasvavale erinevusele.

Kolmas teema oli arutelu keelevigade teemal. Eriti tähelepanuväärne oli Johannes Aaviku arvustus Kalevipojast, mis viitas suurele hulgale keelevigadele selles, mis tuginesid Aaviku sõnul nii vigasele keelele rahvaluules kui ka Kreutzwaldi enda väljendusprobleemidele. See tekitas toona poleemikat ning arutelu vigade mõiste üle üldisemalt keelekasutuses.

Neljas teema – legitiimsus – on sellega samuti vahetult seotud. Keeledebattide raames käsitleti põhjalikult teemat, kuidas mitte võõranduda rahvast, kuna ühe osana püüti debattides kujundada arvamust eesti kirjakeelest kui eraldiseisvast ja autonoomsest registrist, mille omandamiseks ja kasutamiseks tuleb näha vaeva ja see ei pruugigi olla kõigile kättesaadav. Selle raames esitati ka keelalisi hinnanguid kahele eelnevale põlvkonnale kui talupojalikule keelekogukonnale või siis ebapuhtale kakskeelsele segule.

Viimane teema analüüsil, keelte turg, sai jaotatud kolmeks funktsionaalseks osaks. Esimene alapeatükk tõi esile korduva praktika teiste rahvuste ja riikide eeskujudele viitamise abil enda ettepanekute sobilikkuse kirjeldamiseks. Toodi esile nii positiivseid kui negatiivseid näiteid, mis aitasid eesti keele positsiooni kontekstualiseerida teiste tuntud keelte seas. Teine alapeatükk näitas nende arutelude raamimist omamoodi keeltevaheliseks konkurentsiks, kus nn. kultuurkeeleks tõusmist toodi esile kui silmapaistvat eesmärki. Eesti keelt mõtestati vaesena ning keele arendamisel peeti vajalikuks tema rikkust ja väärtust kasvatada. Kolmas alapeatükk

tõi esile keele konkreetseid omadusi, mille muutmise kaudu püüti keele positsiooni keeltevahelises võrdluses parandada. Seal tulid esile oluliste teemadena väljendusvõime parandamine sõnavara, eriti rahvusvahelise abstraktsete teemade alase sõnavara, laiendamise kaudu. Sõnavara ja väljenduskerge vahel leiti olevat otsene seos ja selle arendamisel sõnastati konkreetseid põhimõtteid, mille ümber joonduda.

Magistritöö tulemustest on näha, et keelekirjelduste sidumisel konkreetsete teemadega sotsiolingvistilisest teooriast on juba ka esmakordsel analüüsil võimalik panustada nii sotsiolingvistilisse teooriasse enesesse kui ka eesti keelekogukondade mineviku rekonstrueerimisse. Näiteks vastupidistele suundadele keskenduvat refleksiooni keelelisest variatiivsusest ei ole varem peetud standardkeelekultuuri tüüpiliseks osaks. Siin võib ehk edaspidi uurida, et kas üleminekuolukordades toimivadki need parameetrid teisiti. Samuti ei ole varasemas kirjanduses esile toodud viise, kuidas keelte võrdlusi refleksiivselt ühiskonnas mõtestati, iseäranis seda, et Aavik mõnel pool sõnastaski keelearendamise ümberrahvastuse probleemina, mitte lihtsalt abstraktse konkurentsina keelte vahel.

Magistritöö avab teema edasisteks uuringuteks, mis käsitleksid keelealast diskussiooni kaasäegse sotsiolingvistilise olukorra refleksiivse mõtestamisena. Töö põhiliseks tulemuseks ongi vaatluse all oleva tekstikorpuse detailne analüüs. Keeledebattide vaatlemist etnometapragmaatika mõiste ning keelekasutuse refleksiivse mõtestamise kaudu võib pidada tulemuslikuks nii sotsiolingvistilise teooria jaoks kui ka vaatluse all oleva kogukonna ajaloo rekonstrueerimisel.

Appendix 1

The appendix contains the citations explicitly quoted in the analysis in their original contexts and language. The citations are ordered alphabetically by the name of the author then by year and then by page.

1. Võiks ütelda, et säält pääle Eesti stiil ei ole peaaegu muud midagi kui Saksa stiil eesti sõnadega, ainult labasem, talupoeglikum, lihtsam, ja omades eestilikku ainult nii palju kui puhtasti keelised elemendid ja iseäraldused seda paratamata tekitasid. (Aavik 1905: 220)
2. Et meil veel suuri kirjanikka ei ole olnud ega praegugi ei ole, kes igapidi kõrgema kunsti nõudeid täidavad, tuleb kahtlemata osalt sellest, et meie keel parema kirjanduse loomiseks veel ei ole küps, välja kujunenud. Meie kirjanikkudel läheb liig palju energiat keelise külje võitlemise peale ja selle loomulik tagajärg on, et loow puhtalt kirjanduslik tegewus selle all kannatab. Meie kirjandus on praegu osalt täitsa peaaegu samas seisukorras, mida Prantsuse oma 16. aastasajal kirjanduslise tooli Plejadi tegewuse ja Ronfardi ajal läbi elas. Ka siis otsiti uusi wormisid, jäljendati teisi, võeti wanu keeli eeskujuks, loodi uusi sõnu – paenutati keelt uute nõuete järele. Alles kui see palawuslik ja osalt korratu ettevalmistuse ajajärk möödas oli, teel kindla, lõpuliku kuju saanud, wõib suure aastasaja – grand siecle – hiilge-aeg oma geeniustega ilmuda. Saksamaal sündis see kõik sada aastat hljemini, nimelt 18. aastasajal. Kuid Goethe ja Schiller oliwad juba Gottschedi ja eelmise aastasaja resultadina vähemalt enam vähem hea tööriista, walmis kirjakeele, kaasa saanud. Ja Wene kirjanduses on Puschkinile ning Gogolile Lomonossow ning Karamafin pidanud eel käima. Samal põhjusel on osalt ka seletataw, miks Soome suured kirjanikud, nagu Aho stiili ja üleüldse unsti poolelet meie

sama ajajärgu kirjanikkudest, nagu Wldest, Petersonist, Juhan Liiwist eest on: seal oli see kirjakeele loomise ning fikseermise (kindlaks kujundamise tegewus juba oma suure töö ära teinud, kui Aho 80. aastate lõpupoolel oma kirjandusliku tegewuse algas. Ja nii saab ta wist meilgi olema. Ilma et tarwitseks prohwet olla, wõib ette ütelda, et praeguse sugupõlwe kirjanikkudest, need, kes nüüd üle 25. eluaasta on sammuunud, ühestki seda suurt kirjanikku ei saa, kelle ilmumist kõik igatsusega ootame ja loodame. (Aavik 1912b: 2)

3. Kõige tähtsam, kõige olulisem element keeles on sõnad, grammatika wormide, lauseõpetuse ülesanne ei ole muud kui neid sõnu üksteisega siduda, nende wahekordi ära määrata. Keel wõib waene olla morfologia (sõnawormide) poolest, aga kui tal suur sõnatagawara, siis Wõib teda ikkagi rikkaks keeleks pidada. Inglis keel näitab seda kõige selgemini: ta grammatika ehitus on äärmiselt lihtne: reeglikorralisel werbil on kogu konjugatsioonis kõigeks wiis isesugust wormi (lõppu) (greekakeelsel werbil on neid umbes 200!); substantiwiil kaks (Eesti ja Soome keelel 28); adjektiwiil üks. Kuid oma määratu leksikoni tõttu, mis kahe keele sõnastikust koos, on ta siiski wahest kõige enam arenenud ja kõige kulturalisem keel maailmas. (Aavik 1912c: 176)
4. Ma leian sellest wormide rägastikust isesugust ilu, ma waatlen ja imetlen seda kui toredat kunstilist arhitekturi ta lugemata sammaste, tornikeste, akende, karniiside, nikerduste, ilustuste, simside, balkonite, ballustradidega. Miski hinna eest ei tahaks ma ühestki Soome wõi Eesti keele wormist keele lihtsastamise eesmärgil loobuda. (Aavik 1912c: 176)
5. Kuid kõige nende ülemal ettetoodud aimete wõimalikult palju eritüwesid oleks, mis läbi ju weel paljude teiste jaoks peame wastawad eestikeelsed sõnad soetama. See on tarwilik. See on paramata, kui me tahame oma keelest haritud keele luua. Ja see sünnib. Kahekümne aasta parast ja wõib olla juba warem on nad meil tingimata olemas, ükskõik mis kujul, Kuid me ei pea käed rüppes neid ootama jääma. Nad ei tule mitte iseenesest, waid neid waja luua ja muretseda. Küsimus on ainult selles, kuidas ja kust, mis põhjused järele ja mis abinõudega seda teha. (Aavik 1912c: 177)

6. Senni on meil vähe, kui pea sugugi mitte, rõhku pandud keele kõlalise ilu, e u f o n i a l peäle õigekeelsuse küsimusi otsustades ja grammatikat arendades. Ainult omapärasuse ja otstarbekohasuse põhjusemõte on juhtiv ja mõõduandev olnud, kui üleüldse mingisuguast põhjusemõttest teadlikud oldi. Sellega eksiti: estetilinegi külg on tähtis. Sest ilu on see, mis iga asja kallimaks ja väärtuslikumaks teeb, ka keele. Sellega saaks viimane ka tugevamaks ja vastupidavamaks selles võitluses ja võistluses, mis tal oma naabritega on pidada. Kui meie emakeel küll iialgi nii rikkaks ega nii vägevaks ei edene kui mitmekümne miljonilise kulturaraha oma, siis olgu ta vähemalt ilusam ja kõlavam kui mõnigi neist, et meie kõrv võiks rõõmu tunda ta harmoonilistest fraasidest ja ta oma silpide sulava mahedusega meile meie kodumaa looduse õrna ilu ja meie nooruse kaunid unistusi meele tuletaks. Ja kuigi me ei või mõtelda oma keelest rikka teadusliku kirjanduse kandjat teha, olgu ta siis ometi materjaliks, mist väikseid kirjandusliku mosaika meistritöid luua ja mist võiks ilusaid sõnade lillekimpude kokku seada (Aavik 1912f: 451).

7. Aga kust neid vähem inetuid vorme saada, kui kord inetumad on keeles olemas? Kui meie keel lõpulikult oleks välja kujunenud, oleks võimatu küsimust lahenda; ei jääks muud üle kui järele ja alla anda. Õnneks ei ole asjalugu nii: otse vastupidi, meie keel on oma sõnakujude poolest mitmeti alles õigegegi vankuv; on paralleelvorme, kahekordseid kujusid, mis üksteisega võistlevad. Sellest põhjusemõte, mis siit pääle vaja juhtnööriks teha: kui ühe aime jaoks kaks ehk enam vormisid on, siis lõpulikult ja ainuõigena tarvitusele võtta see, mis paremini ilukõla, eufonia nõudeid täidab. (Aavik 1912f: 461)

8. Neile, kes võõraist keelist ainult riigikeelt oskavad ja -ismis seepärast Vene mõju näevad, ütleme, et -ismus ainult paaris Euroopa keeles on omaseks saanud, kuna -ismi pääle Vene keele veel suurem hulk Euroopa keeli, nimelt Prantsuse, Inglise, Poola, Tsehhi, Daani, Norra, Rootsi, Soome ja Läti keel tarvitavad. (Aavik 1912f: 472)

9. Üheski keeles, ei Romani, Slaavi ega Germani (peale Saksa keele) aga ei ole moodustunud niisugust sõnade korda, mis praegu Eesti kirjakeelele on omaks saanud.

Sellepärast on vähe tõenäolik, et Eesti keel sinna oleks iseenesest jõudnud, olgugi et oletatakse alg-Soome keelel mingi kalduvus olnud verbi lause lõppu paigutada. Kui Eesti keel oleks saanud, kordan veel, ilma Saksa mõjuta edeneda, siis oleks ta välja töötanud peaaegu sarnase sõnade korra, mis kõigile Europa keelile on omane, ja ülemal tsiteeritud lause oleks sõnade korra poolest umbes järgmiselt kõlanud: „kui ma omalt sõbralt, kes eileõhtuse rongiga oli tulnud tagasi lähemast linnast, olin saanud teada, et meie ühine ettevõtte, milleks me olime pannud kaalu peäle nii suure rahasumma, oli hakanud jõudsasti edenema, siis otsustasin jätta esialgu kõrvale kõik muu töö, et end kõige jõuga pühendada sellele uuele tegevusele, mis juba paar aastat on olnud mu armsam unistus'. (Aavik 1912i: 358)

10. Kirjakeel, kui ta tõesti kirjakeel, -s. o. haritud keel tahab olla, ei või omas arenemises mitte ikka selle peale vaadata, kas see või teine nähtus rahvakeeles olemas on ja kas ta sellepärast tohib seda tarvitada. Kirjakeelel on hoopis teised, keerulisemad ja kõrgemad ülesanded, teistsugusem, keerulisem lauseehitus ja fraseologია ning kaugelt rikkam sõnastik kui talupoegade lihtsal ja igapäevasel kõnekeelel, mida harilikult „rahvakeeleks" nimetataksegi. Meie põhjusemõtte olgu: kirjakeelt arendades mitte liig pedantlikult ja orjalikult rahvakeelest kinni hoida, iseäranis mis lauseehitusesse ja sõnastikusse puutub. Aavik (1912i: 367)
11. Keeleoskamatus oli rahvuslise ärkamise aja kirjanikkude juures üldine. Nagu V. Grünthal omas „Lesti kirjakeele arenemises" õigesti konstateerib, ei osanud meie tähtsad mehed selle rahva keelt mitte, millele nad tahtsid kirjandust põhjendada; kõik Jannsenid ja Jakobsonid, Kreutzwaldid ja Koidulad olivad enam vähem keele solkijad; keele instinkt näib neil emakeele kohta õige segane ja udune olnud olevat. Ja ka uueas kirjanduses ei ole asi selle poolest veel kaugeltki korras. (Aavik 1912j: 12)
12. Kindel on igatahes, et riista ja teose wahel mingisugune side ja rippuwus walitseb. Ilma klawerita ei oleks Lisati ja Ehopini tegewus mitte mõeldaw. Suur kirjanik wõib ju küll olla, kuid ta ei saa oma täit suurust ja peenust näidata. Ma arwan, et ühe Bushmani wõi

hotentoti keelewaradega oleks siiski raske, kui mitte võimatu niisugust romaani kirjutaba kui Bourget «Õpilane». (Aavik 1913j: 212)

13. Leetberg et usu, et suurte kirjanikkude tulekut vähemate surelikkude ettevalmistaw töö võib kiirendada. Oleks Saksa keel Goethe ajal vähem välja haritud, siis ei oleks see küll muidugi Goethe sündimist võinud takistada. Küsitaw aga on siiski, kas Goethele siis oleks huwitust pakkunud haritamata keeles kirjutada. Võib olla, et ta oma awaldamiswahendiks siis oleks mingi muu keele, näit. Prantsuse keele walinud, millega ta oma hingelist ja tõulist omapärasust ei oleks võinud nii awaldada, sest wõõrarahwa keeles kirjutades kaotad paratamaia midagi oma rahwuslikkust omapärasusest ja langed teatawat määral wõõra maitse, stiili, hingeelu mõju rõhuwuse alla. Leibniz ja Preisi Prits on ju Prantsuse keeles kirjutanud, sest et Saksa keel nende meelest liig harimata oli. Ja Lessingi tunnistab oma „La okooni" eeskõnes, et ta selle raamatu peaaegu Prantsuse keeli oleks kirjutanud. (Aavik 1913j: 212)

14. See ei maksaks suuremat midagi. Tõlkimise jooksul märgitaks sellekohased sõnad üles ja asetataks pärast tähestikulisesse korda. See oleks lihtne ja nagu mööda minnes tehtud töö. Rääkimata sellest, et see tõlkijale enesele huwitust pakuks ja ta töösse suurema hoolsuse ning järjekindluse ühes tooks, elustaks niisuguste nimekirjade awaldamine üleüldse tõlkijate agarust, wõistlust ja püüdu suurema täielikkuse poole. (Aavik 1912q: 178)

15. Meil ei ole midagi ohverda! Meil ei ole senni ühtegi ilukirjanduslikku teost olemas, mille ebaloetavust muudetud keele tagajärjel tuleks kahetseda. Me ei ole tänini omanud ühtegi draamat, ühtegi novelli, ühtegi romani, ühtegi luuletustekogu, ühtegi ideesisulist või arvustuslikku teost, vähematki teadusliku tööd, mille väärtus oleks seda võrd suur, et tulevasi inimesi kahjustunnue valdaks nähes nende keelelist traditsiooni arhaistlikuks, ja mis veel hirksam, põlatuks saavat. Aga mitte ainustki! Meil ei ole siis midagi kaota, vaid kõik võita. Sest meie klassilik kirjandus, meie tõsiselt väärtuslikud teosed on alles ees. Need loovad vast tulevased sugupõlved ja vahest juba praegune „tõusev sugu“, nagu seda häämeelega loodame. (Aavik 1912k : 178).

16. Keele puhastamise ja korraldamise töö on meil praegu päevakorral, sest meie ühtelugu arenev kultuura nõuab haritud keelt, mis kõigis üksikutes peensustes oleks kindlaks kujunenud. Kahjuks aga ei näi asi meie kirjanikkude juures kõigist selleks otstarbeks tehtud juhatustest ja märkustest hoolimata mitte küllalt jõudsasti tahtvat edeneda. Meie raamatud, ka kõige paremate autorite omad, kubisevad ikkagi veel kõiksugu vigadest, eksimustest, keelelohakustest, mis mitte üksi radikalse uuenduse seisukohalt ei ole hukka mõistetavad, vaid mida ka praegu maksva enam vähem kujunenud kirjakeele järele ei või õigeks tunnistada- Ei ole ka miski ime: meie kirjanikud ei ole koolis Eesti keelt õppinud, ja pärastises elus ei võeta oma algatusel mitte kergesti grammatikat kätte. (Aavik, J. 1913l: 315)

17. Meie raamatud, ka kõige paremate autorite omad, kubisevad ikkagi veel kõiksugu vigadest, eksimustest, keelelohakustest, mis mitte üksi radikalse uuenduse seisukohalt ei ole hukka mõistetavad, vaid mida ka praegu maksva enam vähem kujunenud kirjakeele järele ei või õigeks tunnistada. Ei ole ka miski ime: meie kirjanikud ei ole koolis Eesti keelt õppinud, ja pärastises elus ei võeta oma algatusel mitte kergesti grammatikat kätte. Pealegi ei olegi meil veel olemas niisugust head grammatikat, mis ajakohast keelt kõigile loetaval ja mõnusal kujul esitaks. Üks hea abinõu keele õpetamiseks ja vigadest hoitamiseks on uuemaid raamatuid keeleliselt küljelt arvustada, neist vigu ja puudusi välja noppides ja nende asemele vastavaid õigeid või õigemaid vorme ette pannes, nagu seda meil viimsel ajal ongi hakatud heade tagajärgedega tegema. (Aavik 1913l: 315-316)

18. Meie teele arenemist kiirus, jõudsus ja intensiteet ripub suuresti sest, kui palju meie inimesed tahavad ja viitsivad uut juure omandada. Laiskus ja mõnususe puudumine on sin tähtsamaks takistajaks teel ees. Mitmed on just mõnust pärast uue keele vastu, sest et see neilt teatawat jõupingutust nõuab. Neile peab Eesti keel ja stiil niisugune olema, mida päälle läuehitatud nasocgi või enne magamaminekut võib lergesti lugeda. Nii tunnistas mulle üks juba wanemasse sugupõlve kuuluv haritlane ja ise tuntud kirjanik, et ta ühe noorema kirjaniku kirjutusi põhjusemõtteliselt mitte ei loe, teele pärast muidugi, mis talle

raskusi tegevat. Kas võiks niisugust psüchologia juures ülepää mingi edu võimalik olla?
(Aavik 1913m: 99)

19. Oleks huwitaw teada, kui palju on Eestis neid isikuid, kes Praegu maksvat üleüldist, ajalehekeelt oskavad grammatiliselt ja ortografiliselt wigadeta kirjutada ? Ons neid sada? Veelgi huwitawam oleks vahest teada, kui palju on Eestis naisterahvaid, kes seda täiesti ostavad. Ons neid kümme? Ons neid wiis? (Aavik 1913m: 99)
20. Heidetakse mõnelt poolt, enamasti wanemate inimeste poolt, keeleuudajaile ette, et nad oma uuendustega keelde liig suure segabüst ja korralagedust toovad, neidgi reeglid wapustades ja ümber lükates, mis sääl juba olid jõudnud kindlaks kujuneda ja kõweneda; tulla mingi keeleline keskaeg, mingi õigekeelsuse interregnum, wahewalitsus. Kuid mis sest wiga? Me ei näe selles ühtegi hädaohtu. Otse wastupidi: mida suuremaks segadus praegu kaswab, seda parem, sest suur segadus on siin just jõu tunnismärk, ja sellest mässust ja möllust kerkib lui puhastustulest wiimati seda puhtamana ja selgimana, seda ilusamana ja täielikumana välja see uus keel, mis üksi väärt ja omane on suuri kirjanduslikku kunstiteoseid kandma. (Aavik 1913m: 99)
21. Mis ühe järgi õige. on teise järgi wäär. Ühes murdes kõneleb rahwas „ärgranud“ ja see on sääl õige, teises jälle räägitakse ärkanud", mis selles järjelikult kõige õigemaks tuleb pidada. (Aavik 1913p: 149)
22. Järjelikult on meie arwamist mööda praegusel ajal kohasem ja soowitawam keerulise ja kunstliku lauseehituse ning peenema stiili pahessc langeda kui labaselt lihtsa kirjutamisewiisiga patustada. Jannsenist saadik on seda rahwa pärast ladusust meile küllalt pakutud. Vastupidine liialdus ei teeks seepärast esialgu paha. Reaktsioniks, wastuwooluks on meil alati wõimalus olemas, kui see tarwilikuks saab. (Aavik 1913p: 150)
23. Kirjakeel on juba oma definitsiooni poolest midagi muud kui rahwakeel: tal on hoopis teised ülesanded ja nõuded täita tui talupoegade murdel. Ta on loomulikult ja paratamata

rikkam, keerulisem omas süntaksis ja sõnawaras: tal on ka täitsa isesugune fraseologia, mis suurelt osalt raamatulist teed on tekkinud. Selle tõttu on tal ka hoopis isesugune stiil, pikalauseline, täpipäälne, teaduslikum, mis igapäewases kõnekeeles liig pidulik ja kange tunduks. (Aavik 1913p: 156)

24. Kuid keelt ei pea mitte ainult korraldama, vaid ka parandama ja suursugustarna. Praegu on seks kõige kohasem aeg. Kümne-kahekümne aasta pärast, siis kui keel juba enam on jõudnud kivineda ja tarduda oma vormides rohke tarvituse tõttu, saab see olema palju raskem, peaaegu võimatu. Tagugem seepärast rauda, kunni ta kuum on! (Aavik 1914a: 2)
25. Kuid et Keele Reform — sest see kultuurastamine ei lähe ilma teatava reformita — elavaks ja üleüldis-kasulikuks tööks saaks, seks on vaja, et see mitte üksikute keelesõprade era-asjaks ei jääks, vaid laiemiski ringkonnis vastuvõtmist leiaks ja omaseks muutuks ja viimati selleks ainu-õigeks ja sallitud normaalkeeleks kujuneks, mida iga haritud eestlane on kohustatud oskama ja tarvitama. Siin aga ei saa teoreetilistest abinõudest küllalt; vaja, et asja võimalikult praktiliselt aetaks. Vaja, et uus keel oma rohke ja sageda esinemisega kirjanduses inimesi endaga ara harjutaks, neile uusi harjumusi looks ja vanu vapustaks (sest keel ei ole muud kui teatavate harjumuste kogu), ja ühe sõnaga end pääle suggereeriks. Vaja, et võimalikult palju raamatuid ilmuks, mis uusi sõnu ja vorme sisaldavad. (Aavik 1914a: 5)
26. Vastupanekust ja ükskõiksusest hoolimata, mida mõnelt poolt avaldatakse, läheb keeleuendus alati edeneval jõul edasi, uusi poolehoidjaid võites ja eelarvamisi hävitades, sest arukamad hakkavad ikka enam mõistma ja omaks tegema seda seisukohta, et meie senni nii armetuma keele puhastamine, rikastamine, kaunistamine ja üleüldse haritud keele seisusse tõstmine üks hädalisemist ja tähtsamist on rahvusliku kultuura ülesannete hulgas (muidugi neile, kes rahvusliku kultuura ideaali kõiges ulatuses ülepää tunnustavad ja selle tulevikku usuvad). (Aavik 1914a: 5)

27. See raamatuke on pühendatud „Kalevipoja“ keele ja salmivormi arvustamisele. Mitte et oleks just tahetud alusta vanade templite rikkumisega ja endiste ebajumalate mahakiskumisega, mida meie isade pieteet on austanud, sest meile ei jäeta vist mitte ette heitmata pieteedi puudust Kreutzwaldi suremata ja kõrgeks peetud töö, meie rahvusliku suurteose kohta, et selle meie eepose keelelise ja vormilise külje kohta nii laitvaid ja hukkamõistvaid sõnu ütleme. Kuid me arvame, et meie ümberkujunemise ja väärtuste ümberhindamise ajajärgul mitte paha ei tee, vaid vastupidi õige tervendav on vanade templite sumbunud õhku natuke tuuluta ja puhasta, kuigi sellejuures saal mõned liig ebaseisukad ja vankuvad asjad ümber aetakse ja mõned liig usklikud väikse nohu saavad. (Aavik 1914a: 7)
28. Vigade ja vääratuste arv, mis ta saal korda saadab, ei ole mitte väike: selle nimi on leegion. Eepos kubiseb neist. Ta kihab neist. Ta on neist lõhkemas! Neid leidub igas „loos“, igal leheküljel, peaaegu igas reas. Näib nagu oleks tahetud neid meelega teha, kihilveoks. (Aavik 1914a: 10)
29. Ajajärk ei olnud kohane ega soodus. See oli aeg, mineva. aastasaja keskpaigu, kus keel, hoolimata algavast rahvuslikust liikumisest, veel õige segases ja ebakindlas olekus viibis, kus keele korrektsusest õige vähe muretseti. (Aavik 1914a: 16)
30. On palju kõhutavamaid vigu. Mis iseäranis haavab ja millega nüüdse keelepruugiga harjunu kuidagi ei saa leppida [...]See viga on küll üleüldse tolleaegsele keelele omane ; Jannseni, Koidula, Jakobsoni kirjutused kubisevad sest. Neile on see peaaegu reegliks. Hermannini ajast saadik saab küll kongruerimine sundlikuks ja reeglipäraseks, kuid siiski tuleb kõrvalekaldumisi veel nüüdselgi ajal ette. (Aavik 1914a: 11)
31. Haritud ja väljakujunenud keeles panevad kindlad grammatika reeglid ja harjumused vabadusele, mis luuletajad endale võtavad, määratud piiri, üle mille nad ei või astuda, sest saal on luulekeelgi oma keeleliste iseäralduste poolest piiratud ja korraldatud. Täbaram ja hädaohtlikum on see luulevabadus keeles, mis kirjanduslikult ja

- grammatiliselt veel ei ole jõudnud fikseeruda ja kus kindlaid traditsioone ei ole. (Aavik 1914a: 18)
32. Kreutzwald ei olnud keelemees. Veel enam, teda ei näi üldse keeleline külg ja puhtus huvitanud. Oma ükskõiksust selle kohta tunnistab ta ise ilusa naiivsusega. Ta kirjutab Fählmannile: „Eesti keele, mida tarvitan, olen nagu noor lind oma laulu, rahva suust õppinud; kas selles mingit märki grammatikast esineb, selle üle ei või ma otsusta ega ole selle pärast iialgi paad murdnud; mu püüdesiht on ainult see olnud: nõnda oma mõtteid avalda, et inimesed sest aru saaksid.” Muidugi kui tahetakse ainult arusaadav olla, siis võib seda ka halva ja vigase keelega. Me saame Kalevipojast aru, kuid ta keelevelaad haavavad ja tülitavad meid. Kreutzwald oleks pidanud tõepoolest suuremat rõhku oma suure töö keele paale panema; see oleks selle läbi ainult võitnud. Nüüd aga on see hädaohus selle puuduse tõttu ebamaitsetavaks ja peaaegu võimatumaks saada. (Aavik 1914a: 22)
33. D i g l o t t i s ehk kahekeelsus kuskil maal on mõlemale keelele kahjulik, eriti aga vähem haritule, vaesemale, madalamal seisvale, põlatumale, nagu seda Eesti keel oli. Seda ei katsunudki keegi õigesti ja puhtasti kõnelda (Aavik 1914b: 19).
34. See keel, mida eestlased sakslaste Baltimaale tuleku ajal kõnelesid, pidi oma mõistelistest sõnade ja fraseoloogia poolest õige lihtne ja vaene olema; et endale aimet teha, kui lihtne see oli, kujutelgem*) ühe 10—12 aastase karjapoisi keel, kes raamatutega võimalikult vähe on tegemist teinud, või kõige parem, sugugi lugeda ei oska ja, mis ka tähtis, kuskil kõrvalises kõlglas üles kasvanud : kõik, mis selle suus liig tark, haritud, raamatuline, abstrakt tunduks, ei ole mitte rahva enda pinnal tekkinud, vaid avaldab v ä l i s e h a r i d u s e mõju: „südametu” piltlikus mõttes) oleks üks niisugune sõna. (Aavik 1914b: 18)
35. Veel enam hakkas d i g l o t t i d e (kahekeeliste) keel rahva keele paale mõjuma vaimuliku seisuse kaudu ja iseäranis veel vaimuliku kirjanduse kaudu, mis kirjakeelele aluseks sai. Kuid, paradoksaalne nähtus, kõige suurem oli diglottismi mõju Eesti keelele

just 19-ndal aastasajal, siis kui rahvahariduse tõusu ja rahvusliku iseteadvuse ärkamisega ka kirjandus edenema hakkas ja seega kirjakeel endisega võrreldes kiiresti arenes. Üleüldse on seega Eesti kirjakeel diglottide loodud ja see on kirjanduse kaudu ka rahva suhu ulatanud, nii et nüüdsel ajal vaevalt veel mõnes kaugemas kõigas vanu inimesi leidub, kelle keel sellest mõjust puhas oleks. Praegune ühine- kõnekeel, mida enam haritud inimesed kõnelevad, on seega rahvakeele ja diglottide keele kompromiss ja segu. (Aavik 1914b: 19)

36. Meie keele rikastamise, parandamise ja peenendamise püüde suurem või vähem kordaminek ripub siis suurelt osalt sellest, kas me i e r a h v a s t a h a b õ p p i d a või m i t t e . Kui me igapidi haritud keelt tahame luua, siis tuleb ükskord ometi loobuda sellest v i l d a k a s t nõudest ja kahjulikust vaatest, et haritud Eesti keel niisugune olgu, millest iga mats kohe ilma õppimiseta ja hariduseta aru saaks. Et haritlaste kirja- ehk raamatukeelest „liht inimene" puudulikult jagu saab ega saal kõiki sõnu ei mõista, on parattamatus, mida ka suurte kultuurarahvaste juures ei ole suudetud ara hoida. (Aavik 1914b: 37)

37. Kes aga leiab, et siin mõndagi liiga on nõutud ja et raske on kõike ühekorraga läbi viia, see olgu esialgu mõõdukam, kuid ärgu sellepärast kogu meie paranduse ettepaneku kohta käega heitku. Tehku igitiks vähemalt, mis ta oma maitse kohaselt arvab võimaliku olevat Kui see kirjutus, mis küsimust veel kaugeltki mitte lõpulikult ega täielikult läbi ei haruta, omalt poolt kaasa mõjub, et meie kirjanikud hakkavad suuremat rõhku oma sõnade järjestuse peale panema ja seda nimelt sihikindlalt ja teadlikult, siis on ta oma eesmärgi saavutanud (kätte saanud), nimelt selle, et meile kõigile kallis emakeel järgmiste heade omaduste poolest võidaks: omapärasus, puhtus, selgus, paenduvus, kergem loetavus, suurem rütmilik ilu ning elegants (Aavik 1914i: 369).

38. Ja meie keele harimattus esineb iseäranis ta grammatika korratuses ja ebakindluses: sääli leidub sadu vankumisi, kahtlasi vorme, äbaraid paralleel-kujusid, lausa vigaseid ütlemissviise, mida siiski õige laialt tarvitatakse. (Aavik 1914l: 1)

39. Teda iseloomustavad haritud keelele vastakad puudused: ta on vaene ja ta on harimata. Sagedasti kõige tarvilisemad sõnad tal puuduvad asjade ja aadete jaoks, mida haritud inimesel tarve on nimetada (tarve, mis, tõsi küll, mõne teise kultuurkeelega tutvunemise tõttu on tekkinud, mille kaudu need aated ja asjadki on teadlikuks saanud). Ja meie keele harimatus esineb iseäranis ta grammatika korratuses ja ebakindluses: sääli leidub sadu vankumisi, kahtlasi vorme, äbaraid paralleel-kujusid, lausa vigaseid ütlemissuhteid, mida siiski õige laialt tarvitatakse. (Aavik 1914l : 2)
40. Igaüks kirjutab mitmes vormis ja konstruktsioonis nagu ta tahab ja nagu juhtub, kõiksugu vääranaloogetesse langedes, lihtsaid jämedaid keele vigu, grammatilisi rumalusi tehes, nagu kiuste neid vorme valides, millest oleks pidanud hoiduma, ja neid kõrvaleheites, mis oma ilu ja suurema omapärasuse tõttu, midanad teostavad, väärt oleksid kirjakeele vastu võetud saada. Keegi, aga absoluutselt mitte keegi ei oska meil kirjakeelt k o r r e k t i l t ja vigadeta kirjutada, nii väga kui ta seda katsukski, sel lihtsal põhjusel, et meil seda korrektil kirjakeelt veel ei ole. (Aavik 1914l : 2)
41. Õeldakse, kõik see keeleline viletsus tuleb emakeeliste koolide äraolekust, kus grammatika maast-madalast pikkamisi, aastate jooksul, nagu märkamata, pähe tuubitaks ja instinktiks muutuks. See on küll tõsi. Kuid kuigi emakeelsed koolid korraga tuleksid, siis ei võikski nad esialgu muud teha kui seda halba, kindlusteta, ebakorrektil keelt õpetada, sest et õpetajad ise paremat ei mõista ega ole seda paremat veel õieti olemaski. See vaja alles luua, et tulevasel emakeelsel koolil oleks, mida õpetada. (Aavik 1914l: 2)
42. Kas usute, et Eesti keel tulevikus igapidi väljatöötatud ja rikkaks, vanemate kultuurkeelte vääriliseks keeleks areneb, millega võib, vähemalt ilukirjanduses, kõige peenemaid mõtte- ja tunde-elu nähtusi väljendada? (Aavik 1914n :26)
43. Nimetatud kõnes põhjusemõtetest tähendasime ka, et mis põhjusemõttele neist kolmest igal eri juhtumisel eesõigus anda, sagedasti oleneb keelemehe maitsest ja arusaamisest. Sest uue kirjakeele loomine ei ole mitte mõne matemaatilise ülesande lahendamine, vaid teataval määral kunsti töö, mille moodustamine maitset ja ilutunnet nõuab. Muidugi on

palju juhtumisi, kus kõik põhjused ja vaatepunktid nagu ühel meelel mingi vormi paratamata ja kõrvalekaldumata paremaks ja soovitatavamaks tunnistavad (nagu näit. i-lised paljused, käändelised rektsioonid järeldajaliste asemel, lühemad vormid võorakeelsist sõnust, näit, -ism, tüüp, tehnika jne.). (Aavik 1914o: 195)

44. 1. Ilma keeleta ühtegi rahvust. Keel on kõige olulisem ja tarvilisem asi, et rahvast rahvust teha. Keel on abinõu, milles rahvus avaldub kõige iseloomulisemal, kõrgemal ja jäädavamal kujul.

2. Vaene, harimata, arenemata, teistest taha jäänud keel on hädahuks rahvuse olemasolule.

3. Järelikult igaühele, kes tunnustab ja toetab rahvuse aadet ja liikumist, peab ka keel olema äärmiselt tähtis ja kallis. Ta rahvuslik huvi nõuab, et keel igapidi võimalik kõrgele arenemise ja väljajärjeharimise tipule viidaks, et sellest kõige paremat ja täielisemat abinõu teha, millega rahvus võiks mõtteid avaldada ja oma kunsttöid luua. Seega on keele arendamine ja täiendamine üks tähtsamist ja hädalisemist rahvuslikest ülesandest. (Aavik 1915d: 41)

45. Noorte rahvuste keeled (nagu nimelt meie oma), kes alles hiljuti haritud rahvaste kilda hakanud tõusma, tarvitsevad eriti seda keeleinseneride ja tehnikute tööd, et mõne aastakümnega läbi teha seda tarvilist arenemiskäiku, milleks vanemate kultuurrahvaste keeled, millele nad peavad järele jõudma, aastasadu on tarvitanud. (Aavik 1915d: 42).

46. Ajakirjandus esiteks hoolitseb liig vähe oma keele puhtuse ja järjekindluse eest. Kõik meie ajalehed ilma ühegi erandita, nii suuremad kui vähemad, nii pää- kui provintslinnade omad, kubisevad kõiksugu keele vigadest, lohakustest, ebajärjekindlustest, lubamata murdevormidest, võõrapärasest lausehitusest, mida igal veerul võib leida. (Aavik 1915d: 110)

47. Naiivselt kõlab järgmine Jürgensteini lause: „Me usaldame siin oma r i k k u m a t a (minu harvendus) keele instinkti rohkem kui keeleteadlaste, grammatikuste oma.“ Eesti haritlane julgeb oma rikkumata ja terve keeleinstinktist kõnelda ! (Aavik 1915e:99)

48. Asi on nimelt see, et suur hulk neid kultuurilisimõisteid on meie kirjanduses juba olemas; nad on need võeraste keelte kaudu omandanud; ainult omas keeles puuduvad neile nende väljendamiseks kohased sõnad. (Aavik 1915e: 98).
49. Tulen veel kord keele kui erkuse küsimuse juure tagasi. Ühes esitatud waimus ja programmis saadud, on ta palju raskem praktikas teostada, tui lihtne, harilik keelekorraldamine ning arendamine. Mitmete keelewormide, konstruktsioonide ja muutmisesüsteemide ümber õppimine nõuab suuremat jõupingutust ja enne seda veel teatawat arusaamise ja maitse peenust seks, et uute paremate wormide järele üleüldse tarwidusi tunda. Uuendusel tuleb wõidelda kõigi meie rahwa tõuliste pahedega: tuimusega, mõtlemise laiskusega, liig alalhoidliku waimuga, esteetlise tunde wähesese arenenusega, talupoeglikkusega. Seeparast, neil, kes tahawad omandada ja teisi omandama panna uuendatud keele, tuleb end warustada suure energia ja idealismi tagawaraga. Kuid selle jõupingutuse resultaati ja tasu on ka wäärtuslikum ja suurepärasem; warjundirikkam, peenem, painduwam, ilusam, kaunim ja kõlawam Eesti keel. (Aavik 1916c: 168)
50. Ajakirjandus esiteks hoolitseb liig vähe oma keele puhtuse ja järjekindluse eest. Kõik meie ajalehed ilma ühegi erandita, nii suuremad kui vähemad, nii pää- kui provintslinnade omad, kubisevad kõiksugu keele wigadest, lohakustest, ebajärjekindlustest, lubamata murdevormidest, võõrapärasest lauseehitusest, mida igal veerul võib leida. (Aavik 1916d: 110)
51. Me peame saama ja ära õppima keele rikka ja ilusa, niisuguse, millest me suurte kultuurrahvaste kõrval ei tarvitse häbeneda, vaid millest koguni võime uhked olla. Päälegi on see ka ylitähtis rahvusliku võitluse seisukohalt: harit ja ilusat emakeelt peetakse kallimaks ja ollakse vähem valmis tasta loobuma ja teda teise vastu vahetama. Idee väärtusi tõstes tõstetakse seega ka rahvuse elujõudu ja vastupidavust võitluses olemasolu eest. See kõik peaks olema selge ja silmanähtav kõigile. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 7)

52. Sest rahvuslik kultuur on võimatu ilma kultuurilise keeleta, millega seda saaks väljendada kõigil ta aladel, ja, endast mõista, ka mitte ilma selle keele oskamiseta asjaomase rahva, või täpsemalt, ta haritlaskonna poolt. See kõik oli just meie seisuslik orid. Pikemad seletused siin on tarbetumad, seemäärana on see kõigile ilmne ja silmanähtav. Seepärast kui meil kord tunnustetakse rahvusliku, omapärase ja omakeelse kultuuri aade ja soovitavus, kui meil tahetakse rahvusena püsida, siis esineb paratamatuna ja hädalisena vajadus keelt arendada, rikastada, ta teha nõtkemaks, peenejoonelisemaks, ka ilusamaks, et last saaks kohane ja väärikas riist ja vahend, peaaegu suurte kultuurkeelte võrdne, meie harit seltskonnale, meie kirjanikele ja teadlasile. See on selleks tarviline abinõu, tähtis eeltingimus, nagu mänguriist ja selle hädus ning laad kunstnikule. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 7)
53. Seepärast ei olegi nii kahetsetav, vaid, vastupidi, ses mõttes koguni hää see asjaolu, et kõigi harit keelte teaduslik terminoloogia ja suur osa rahvusvahelist kultuursõnastikku on laenat greeka ja ladina keelest. (Aavik 1924: 22)
54. Muidugi võivad ju sennised kokkuliidet sõnad esialgu (või osalt ka jäädavalt) jääda mingisuguseiks paralleelsõnuks ja dublettideks familiaarsema ja labasema stiili jaoks. (Aavik 1924: 70)
55. Seepärast paralleelsõnad ja dubletid ei ole ilmaaegsed, tarbetumad, vaid nad rikastavad ja peenendavad keelt kui kunstilist instrumenti. Mida rohkem synonyme ja dublette, seda mitmekylgsem, painduvam, tihedam ja võimalusrikkani on keele stiililine orkester: saal samuti kui muusikalises orkestris lastakse mingi viis kord yhel, kord teisel instrumendil kõlada, nii võib seda ka keeles teha: sama mõistet väljendada vahelduseks ja värvingu vaheldamiseks eri sõnadega. Järelikult ärge kartke dublette, vaid, ymberpöördult, muresege, soetage, hankige neid! (Aavik 1924: 96)
56. Meil on nimelt nii, et midagi ei tohi teha, mida Inglis- või eriti Saksamaa (enne eriti veel Venemaa) ei ole ette teind. Olen kindel, et kui meil keegl mingi kasuliku masina välja mõtleks, meie rahva poolt see mitte ei leiaks vastu- ja tarvituselevõttu. Mitte sellepärast,

- et vahest raha ei oleks ja tarvitajate ringkond väike, vaid lihtsalt seepärast, et kardetaks seega end naeruväärseks teha, sest ei jaksata selle käsust aru saada ja vaadatakse umbusaldusega kogu ettevõtte pääle. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 135)
57. Et sakslased oma keelega meile seepoolast pole eeskujuga annud, on arusaadav. See seletub sellega, et saksa keel on kõrgesti haritud keel; ta on kultuuri tipul, millega ta on yhesammund ja yhesarenend. Ta ei tunne seepärast tarvet rutuliste, järskude uuenduste ja tungivate parandustööde järele. Päälegi on ta, -olles olnud kauemat aega haritud keel, juba enam kivistund; teiseks, et seda kõneleb suurem rahvahulk, siis on selle inertis ka suurem. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 136)
58. Ärgem oodakem siis, et keegi teine rahvas seda meile enne ette teeks! **J u l g e g e m y k s k o r d k a y h e s a s j a s o l l a e s i m e s e d m a a i l m a s**, olla sel alal arenemise kõrgeimal tipul! Jah, **Eesti keeleuuendus peab saama esimeseks maailmas!** Ta peab saama sesuhtes keelte seas esimesele kohale! Sest kui kunstlikku täiendamist ja parandamist, näit. teadlikult kombineerit sõnade loomist tarvitame ja seda veel suuremal määral, siis saab meie keel oma arenemis- ja kujunemisabinõude ning meetodi poolest a i n u l a a d s e k s k e e l e k s m a a i l m a s! Ta võib yhel päeval eeskujuga pakkuda muile keelile. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 137)
59. Nagu seletet, võime seda kergemini teha kui suured kultuurarahvad. Tarvitagem juhust! Teised keeled, kui seda tahaksidki, ei saaks seda nii kergesti, kuna nende fiksiteet ja väljakujunenus takistuseks on igale järsemalle muutuselle. Toogu meie keele väljakujunematu, vankuv ja vähe haritud olek meile vähemalt see käsu, et ta meid võimaldab ja õigustab seda meelt mööda ymber tegema ja parandama. (Aavik 1924[1918]: 137)
60. Et saada enam-vähem selgem ylevaade puuduvast sõnust (ja osalt ka mõisteist), tuleks läbi vaadata vähemalt kõigi tähtsamate kultuurkeelte — prantsuse, inglise, saksa, vene, itaalia, hispaania, rootsi, ka soome) sõnastikud ja neis ara märkida meil puuduvad sõnad ja tähendused. Sellest ylevaatest selguks siis ka, missugused neist tuleks meil kõige

- hädapärasemalt ja kõige esimeses joones luua. Muidugi tuleb eesõigus anda yldkultuurilistele abstrakt-mõistesõnadelle, sest et nende poolest kõik harit keeled yhesuguseks tehdeerivad, kuna igapäevaste ja rahvaomaste ytluste ning varjundite suhtes loomulikult jääb püsima erinevus ja omapärasus. (Aavik 1924: 154)
61. Jah. Meil on ülikiiret keelelist arenemist tarvis, sest meie oleme poole aastasajaga euroopaliku kultuuri voolu kistud, mis meid kohustab kiiremini vaimliselt arenema, kui meie üleüldise haridustasapinna a l l a ei pea jääma ja mingisugusena asiaatide hulga vaimliselt vegeteerima. Keeleline arenemine on aga vaimlise arenemise tähtsam kaastingimus. (Ernits 1915: 88)
62. Hr. Aavikut on nähtavaste see tõeasi eksiteele viinud, et metsrahvaste juures ühe Goethe või Shakespeare ilmumine võimata on, niisama nagu see ka Eestis 17, 18. ja koguni 19. aastasajal võimatu oli, mitte et sõnadest puudus oleks olnud, ehk keelel tarviline ilu oleks puudunud, vaid et mõistete kogu, teise sõnaga haridusline ala veel liig madal oli. Sellestasamast keelelisest materjalist, mille varal Koidula 19. aastasaja teisel poolel laulu „Ema süda“ lõi, suudeti aastasaja esimesel poolel ainult haledaid vemmel-värssisid luua. Keel oli mõlemal puhul üks ja seesama, kuid haridusline ala oli sedavõrt kerkinud, et Koidula ilmuda võis, et temast suudeti aru saada. (Jõgever 1913a: 240)
63. Hr. Aavik loeb siin tõeste terve rea keele nähtusi ette, mis tema arvates inetumad pidavat olema. Need olevat järgmised: 1. Rõhk esimese silbi peal: „see on midagi jõhkrat ja ebaeleganti. Sõnad, mis keskel (eel-eelviimsel, eelviimsel, koguni viimsel silbil) rõhutud, on ilusamad, elegandimad, harmonilisemad; nad avaldavad suuremat proportsioni ja tasakaalu.“ Siin soovitatakse Eesti keelt Prantsuse keelega võrrelda. Selle põhjenduse võime lühemate sõnadega järgmiselt ära ütelda: Sõnad, millel rõhk esimese silbi peal, on inetumad, selleparast et nad inetumad on; sõnad millel rõhk mitte esimese silbi peal ei ole, on ilusad, sellepärast et nad ilusad on. Mina ei ole sarnase põhjendamise läbi põrmugi targemaks ega ka usklikumaks saanud. (Jõgever 1913a: 241)

64. Meie oleme tänini katsunud hr. Aaviku püüdmistest keele alal aru saada, neid tõsiselt hindamise alla võtta nii kaua kui arvata võis, et meil keeleteadlasega tegemist on. Oma viimastes kirjutustes salgab aga Aarvik kõik keeleteadused kriteeriumid ja koguni igapäise loogika nõudmised. Rahva kõnekeel on vigane; rahvalaulud kubisevad vigadest, mis võõra mõju all rahva suhu saanud; kõik tänised Eesti kirjanikud on armetu vigaselt kirjutanud, sest et nad õiget keelt ei mõistnud; selle pärast on Eesti kirjakeel ainus vigade kogu; oma ajaloolisel edenemise teel on Eesti keel ainult vigasid sünnitanud; tema terve edenemise käik on vale olnud; keele foneetika on võimatu halb ja inetu ja peab uuele alusele seatud saama: nõnda siis viivad Eesti keele foneetika, keele ajalugu, rahvakeel, kust kõik teised rahvad tõendusid ja põhjendusid oma keelte vormidele ammutavad, eestlast ainult valeteele. Ainuke tee õigeid vormisid leida on hra Aaviku „ilutunne“. (Jõgever 1914a: 177)
65. Luuletaja ei õpi oma keelt ega otsi sõnu mitteraamatutest tühjade vormidena, vaid ühes oma sisuga elavatelt inimestelt, iseäranis mis lauseehitusesse ja sõnajärge puutub. Loomisemõiste iseenesest ei lase seda mõtet sugugi ligi, et keegi oma mõttele ja tundmusele teiste poolt sünnitatud kunstlikka vorme otsib. See oleks vanapagana hundiloomine, kus hundi kere valmis loodi, ilma et temale hinge sisse saadi. Kui keelemeister loodab, et luuletaja tema loodud keeli kõneleb, siis tahab ta kirjanikku sundida oma sisemist ilma tema liistu pealepainutama. Seda nõudmist ei täida aga keegi. Uus keel peab juba paarile inimesepõlvele omaseks saanud olema, nii et tulev luuletaja tema kui v a n a rahva hingeelu väljendaja juba lapsest saadik omandab; siis alles saab ta teda oma loomisetööl tarvitada (Jürgenstein 1915: 230).
66. Usun, et Eesti keel kultuurkeeleks edeneb. On temal ju Eesti enese mõtte- ja tunde-elu avaldamiseks rikkusid, mida, võib olla, mõnel kultuurkeelet ei ole. Tõendus: katsutagu midagi päris Eesti omalaadilist võerasse keelde tõlkida, kohe on puudus käes. Et me nii kaugele ei peaks saama, ka teiste rahvaste mõtte- ja tunde-elu avaldusi omaskeeles välja ütelda, seda ei tahaks uskuda. Kui ise edeneb, edeneb ka keel, selle eest muretseb juba rahva geenius. Aga, kui uutel sõnadel loomulik alus, tarvidus, puudub, jäävad nad õhku rippuma. (Kitzberg, 1916: 132)

67. Sellepärast piame sõnu tegema mitte tulewiku jaoks teistele— sest mis teame meie, mis sõnu teistele tarwis on? — waid igauks iseenele seks praeguseks korraks, lus meil omal tarwis on, Kui meie sõna teistele la kõlbab — seda parem; kui mitte, siis nab leiawad ise kohasema. (Leetberg 1913a: 247)
68. See, mis arvatakse mäng ja moodihaigus olevat, on tõepoolest kibe vajadus. Kes meist ei oleks kannatanud Eesti keele vaesuse ja harimatuse all! Kes ei oleks temaga heidelnud nagu Jakob Issandaga! Tarwis tõlkida mõnest haritud keelest ükskõik kas teaduslik artikkel või psühholoogiline novell, et näha, kui vaene, harimatu ja labane Eesti keel õieti on. Meie protesteerime viletsate aineliste ja vaimuste olude vastu, mis meid ümbritsevad. Kas ei ole meil siis õigus appikisendada selle otse füüsilise valu käes, mis meis äratub tänapäev ametlikult valitsev Eesti keel? (Tuglas 1915: 52)
69. Kuid veel kaugemale lähevad diglotid: Et nad oma emakeele kahjuks liialt teise keele mõju alla on sattunud, siis näib neile ka nii mõnigi võõra keele kõnekäänd palju ilusam olevat kui emakeelne. Ja selle tagajärjel kantakse meie keelesse kõiksugu sõnu kui ka ütlemissvormisid Saksa, Vene, Soome ja teistest keeltest sisse – ikka keele paremaks tegemise lipu all, seda aga hoopis arvesse võtmata jättes, et igal keelel oma iseäraldused on, mis teise keele omadega mitte ühte ei sünni. Tumenenud emakeeleinstinkt ei, näi neile tavalikult elarnisevoli uues asukohas keelavat. (Veski 1914a: 172)
70. Kõige eeltäh. keelearendamise-töoga käsikäes peab aga ka meie kord harituks saava keele väljarääkimine käima. Täni ei ole meil seda kahjuks veel alustatudki; igauks peab oma kodumurdelist diktsiooni kõige õigemaks - ja nii kõlab meie praegune avalik keel kirju seguna meie näitelavadelt, kõnetoolidelt jne. Teised rahvad lähevad teatrisse kõige eeskujulikumat keelt kuulma, ka õppima, meie peame seal valitseva kõnekeelega esiotsa kui üksnes alaväärtuslise sallitava diktsioonisegadikuga leppima. (Veski 1914b: 176).

Non-exclusive licence to reproduce thesis and make thesis public

I, Peeter Timits (5.05.1986)

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to:
 - 1.1. reproduce, for the purpose of preservation and making available to the public, including for addition to the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright, and
 - 1.2. make available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright,

Sociolinguistic reflection in the context of language standardization: Language debates on Estonian 1912-1920

supervised by Silvi Salupere

2. I am aware of the fact that the author retains these rights.
3. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe the intellectual property rights or rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act.

Tartu, 25.05.2015