Multilingualism in Finno-Ugric minority literatures: authenticity vs. emancipation?

Keynote talk at the symposium *Multilingualism in Literary Texts* (http://blogs.helsinki.fi/cocolac-rc/2016/01/28/monikielisyys-kaunokirjallisissa-teksteissa-29-4/) organized by the research group CoCoLaC at the University of Helsinki, April 29, 2016

Abstract. Modern minorities are multilingual, and the presence of the dominant language (or other languages as well, such as Lingua Franca English) characterizes their everyday lives. However, many minorities live in prescriptive linguistic cultures and their language planning is influenced by traditionally monolingual and puristic ideals of the national language as an "ideal code". At the same time, minority literatures may have an emancipatory agenda which implies realistic description of language-related issues, including code-switching and code-mixing. Studies on literary multilingualism involving minority languages often focus on the presence of minority languages in majority-language literature: how these language elements challenge the reader or "make silenced voices heard". In this talk, the focus will be on literatures written in Finno-Ugric minority languages and on questions of authenticity and emancipation: beyond the realistic representation of real-life multilingualism, what other functions can the presence of other languages in the text have, and what are the linguistic and poetic dimensions along which these can or should be investigated?

Mothers or midwives of language and literature: documenting authenticity or creating a language of one's own?

In this talk, I will try to approach the questions of multilingual writing from the point of view of Finno-Ugric minority languages and the literature written *in* these languages. So far, the presence of minority languages in multilingual writing has often been regarded from the point of view of major or dominant languages. The question is *how* occasional words and phrases in a minority language are inserted into texts which are targeting dominant-language readership, including readers who do not even understand the minority language in question – for example, what is the role of the occasional Meänkieli or Finnish elements in the Swedish-language novels by today's Swedish authors such as Mikael Niemi or Susanna Alakoski. Sometimes (as in linguistic landscape studies) such texts are even investigated by researchers who don't know the minority language at issue (see e.g. Jonsson 2012) and may exaggerate the importance of its presence.

In fact, the indexical and symbolic use of occasional minority-language items "spicing" the text as in Mikael Niemi's *Popular Music* analysed by Jonsson (2012) is probably very far from real-language multilingualism as minority speakers themselves experience it. For a reader who understands Finnish or Meänkieli, Niemi's occasional Finnish or Meänkieli words are very few and far between, especially in relation to the fact that language issues are discussed and commented on very conspicuously – but mostly in Swedish – throughout the novel. These minority-language items represent the usual fields of symbolic and socially indexical uses (address words, greetings and other ritualized phrases, ethnographic and culinary terms; cf. Jonsson 2012: 221); they provide the "local colour" with its illusory distinctiveness (cf. Kapor 2009: 76), without really challenging the reader, and one could claim that, from the point of view of the majority

readership, they, instead of "making silenced voices heard", might just as well serve to reproduce the "self-consolidating otherness" in Gayatri Spivak's sense, strengthening the subject position of a privileged inhabitant of neo-colonial space (Huddart 2008: 142). I will try to take another angle and sketch some approaches to multilingualism as it appears in minority-language literature, especially from the point of view of authenticity and the role of language use in ethnolinguistic emancipation.

Most of the Finno-Ugric minority languages have only been used in writing since the late 19th or early 20th century or even later, some of them are still in the process of being standardized for literary use. At the same time, this process of standardization and literarization is their best or perhaps even only means of emancipation in a world and a linguistic culture in which a "real" language, a language deserving recognition, is a language of written literature.

On many scales of endangerment or emancipation, the use of the language at issue in literature as an indicator of language maintenance is positioned somewhere in-between the most critical state of endangerment (in which the language often only lives as a spoken vernacular in the private sphere) and secured maintenance (in which the language is used across all informal and formal domains). For instance, already in the 1950s, Heinz Kloss described the profile of the *Ausbau* of a new language: at the first stage, the language is used for humorous or folkloristic purposes, "in a fool's gown", then in poetry, then in so-called *Zweckschrifttum* or serious prose, finally in technical and scholarly texts and in public administration (Kloss 1952: 28, quoted in Haugen 1966: 930). On the EGIDS scale created by Lewis and Simons on the basis of Fishman's famous GIDS and used in the *Ethnologue* database, between the two extremes – level 0, wide national and international use, and level 10, completely extinct – the use of the language at issue in literature characterizes the intermediate levels 5 (Developing) and 4 (Educational).

Table 1 . Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale[1]

Level	Label	Description
0	International	The language is widely used between nations in trade, knowledge exchange, and international policy.
1	National	The language is used in education, work, mass media, and government at the national level.
2	Provincial	The language is used in education, work, mass media, and government within major administrative subdivisions of a nation.
3	Wider Communication	The language is used in work and mass media without official status to transcend language differences across a region.
4	Educational	The language is in vigorous use, **with standardization and literature** being sustained through a widespread system of institutionally supported education.
5	Developing	The language is in vigorous use, **with literature in a standardized form** being used by some though this is not yet widespread or sustainable.
6a	Vigorous	The language is used for face-to-face communication by all generations and the situation is sustainable.
6b	Threatened	The language is used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users.
7	Shifting	The child-bearing generation can use the language among themselves, but it is not being transmitted to children.

[1] From Lewis et al. 2016; emphasis mine.

Level	Label	Description
8a	Moribund	The only remaining active users of the language are members of the grandparent generation and older.
8b	Nearly Extinct	The only remaining users of the language are members of the grandparent generation or older who have little opportunity to use the language.
9	Dormant	The language serves as a reminder of heritage identity for an ethnic community, but no one has more than symbolic proficiency.
10	Extinct	The language is no longer used and no one retains a sense of ethnic identity associated with the language.

However, for many Finno-Ugric minority languages, literary use represents the highest level of maintenance they can expect to achieve. With few exceptions such as some parts of the Saami area, most Finno-Ugric minority peoples are a minority even in their titular administrative areas, and in most public domains (mass media, public administration, most workplaces, etc.) the state language dominates, despite the mostly modest attempts at revitalization policies (for Russia, see especially Zamyatin 2014). This means that literature alongside other specific ethnocultural frameworks (for instance, certain restricted parts of mass media and education) is one of the very few public domains in which these languages can be used in writing.

An author writing in an endangered language of this kind is playing a dual role: both reproducing an authentic, existing language and creating it, bringing it into existence – because in our modern world, only in written literature can a language really exist. Languages without literary forms and literacy practices will be reduced to the role of "dialects", something "less than a real language". And in folk-linguistic prescriptivist thought, words and expressions which do not comply to norms and standards are not "real", they "don't exist".

Bengt Pohjanen has expressed this beautifully in his autobiographic novel *Jopparikuninkhaan poika* ('The son of the smuggler king'). His language is Meänkieli (aka Tornedal Finnish), a Northern Finnish variety spoken by an autochthonous minority in the Swedish Far North and officially acknowledged as a minority language in Sweden since 2000. Meänkieli, although traditionally considered a dialect of Finnish, clearly deviates from those modern Finland Finnish varieties which since the 1960's-70's have been spoken by hundreds of thousands of Finnish immigrants and their descendants in the industrial centres of Central and Southern Sweden (such as Södertälje or Torslanda in Gothenburg, mentioned in the following quotation).

> Ennää mie en halvaa olla viehraana toisten toelisuuessa. Mie hääyn oppia suomen, niin, sitä suomea, jota met puhuma ja jota ei vielä ole olemassa, mutta jota mie kannan syämessä sikiönnä, joka jo kauon oon oottanu minun hajoaamista ja sen syntymistä. Enhään mie sitä vielä käsitä, ette mie halvaan synnyttää minun äitinkielen. Samaan se sille, ette mie olen keskonen, mutta minun kielen synnyttäjä mie halvaan olla itte. En mie äpärää halvaa synnyttää rääkhyyn Södertälhjeen Scaniafapriikin krinnuitten ulkopuolele, enkä mie halvaa minun sikiötä huuthaan Torslandavärkissä kilpaa konheitten kans, ette hän halvaa syntyä häänki. Minun kieli halvaa ulos niinku kaikki kielet halvaava, syyreä saahmaan, henkhiin ja haisthaan, anthaan kukile nimiä, kaloile kans, selithään juttuja ja tinkaahmaan, lauhlaan ja itkheen, olheen muitten kielten roikassa. Mie halvaan synnyttää kielen ja sitte auttaa muitaki synnythään. Mie halvan kielen paanmuskaksi.
> 'I don't want to be a guest in the reality of other languages any more. I must learn Finnish, yes, the kind of Finnish that we speak, the language which doesn't exist yet but which I'm carrying in my heart like a child that has long waited for me to go into labour and give birth to it. I don't understand yet that I want to give birth to my mother tongue. Never mind that I was prematurely born, I myself want to be the one who gives birth to my language. I don't want to have a bastard who cries outside the gates of the Scania factory

> in Södertälje, and I don't want my child to yell through the noise of the machines in the factory in Torslanda, telling me that he, too, wants to be born. My language wants to come out like all languages do, to get oxygen, to breathe and to smell, to give names to flowers, and to fish, too, to explain things and to barter, to sing and to cry, to be a language among other languages. I want to give birth to the language and then help others give birth, too. I want to be the midwife of language.' (Pohjanen 2009: 190–191, my translation)

Pohjanen's midwife metaphor provides a skilful way of combining the two dimensions of language, "nature" or spontaneous pre-existence and "nurture" or conscious human agency, or bridging the gap between the ethnolinguistic assumption (the idea that there is a simple one-to-one correspondence between a monolingual and monocultural individual's ethnic identity and language, an organic connection as between a mother and her child; see e.g. Blommaert et al. 2012: 4) and the standard-language ideology which claims that not even native speakers can truly possess or master their language without formal education (Milroy 2001: 537), that is, metaphorically, without the help of a trained and licensed midwife. At the same time, it hides or naturalizes the social dimension of language in the sense of interpersonal conventions: for Pohjanen, language is first of all his and then each individual's own child. What, in this case, is authentic, what is constructed? This question, the legitimacy of language planning based on its authenticity, has arisen in the history of the Finno-Ugric state languages as well (for Finnish and Estonian, see especially Laakso [forthcoming]): is this the (authentic) language of the people or a (planned) language for the people? But for the non-state languages, due to the special position of literature in their maintenance, this question is especially connected to literature.

Multilingualism of minorities, conventions of literature

Today's speakers of Finno-Ugric minority languages are all bilingual or multilingual: they master the dominant majority language, especially in written and formal registers often even more fluently and more confidently than their own heritage language. The majority language is almost inevitably present in their everyday life, at their workplaces, in public services and mass media, in the education system and in communication with majority-language speakers who often do not understand the minority language and sometimes don't even tolerate its use in their presence. And even in in-group use, even the most conservative minority language speakers' language use is often characterized by frequent code-switching, code-mixing, and nonce loans.

Multilingualism thus belongs to the everyday life of minority-language speakers. However, multilingualism also clearly deviates from the ideals of national language planning. In the tradition of language planning and language-related symbol politics established in most European nation states, a unified national language was seen as a symbol of national unity, and, correspondingly, an ideal language would display minimal variation in form and a high degree of stability (see e.g. Haugen 1966: 931). Moreover, this tradition often includes purism, avoidance of conspicuously foreign elements which may represent the history of foreign oppression and underline the subordinated character of the minority language ("they don't even have a word of their own for X"). For this reason, "minority language communities often face contentious debate over whether the language can survive without foreign borrowings and whether it loses its cultural value with too many foreign words" (Garland 2008: 115).

Conspiring with monolingual ("homogenizing") conventions and practices of literature, monolingual standard-language ideologies will inevitably clash with the multilingual reality of today's minorities and the requirement of authenticity or "linguistic realism" (Cagnoli 2010). And paradoxically, of minority and migrant literature, also multilingualism and explicit representations of it (from the perspective of the majority) are often expected (cf. Tidigs 2014: 84, with further references). In the spirit of the ethnolinguistic assumption, minority literature is supposed to

represent the essentialized minority's mentality, world view and culture in the same way as the traditional role of female authors was to describe women's world, woman's psyche or the feminine world view (for a generic male reader). Both in linguistics and in literature studies, minority authors' multilingualism has often been received as a truthful representation of the multilingual world in which the authors or their ethnic communities live, or simply as an illustration of the author's individual multilingualism (cf. Tidigs 2014: 89).

Moreover, endangerment and the pressure of the dominant language make speakers of minority languages often extremely language-conscious, to the point that conversations *in* an endangered language tend to turn into conversations *about* the language (Tsitsipis 1989). Similarly, authors who write *in* an endangered language may end up writing *about* the endangered language: they have an explicit emancipatory agenda which includes consciousness-raising about language-related problems. These problems, in turn, include multilingualism issues such as the question of "foreign words", language issues in the education system, or communication problems with the majority people. In the above-mentioned novel *Jopparikuninkhaan poika,* these language issues surface, one could say, on every second or third page at least. The following example illustrates a very typical traumatic situation at school, in the author's childhood in the 1940s–50s when many children still entered the monolingual Swedish school system as monolingual Meänkieli speakers:

> Meilä oon psalmvärsyjä ollu läksynä. "Det är en ros utsprungen, av Jesse rot och stam, av Fadren är upprunnen till evig salighet." Kalle pinnistää pölöstä naama punasenna ja opettaja tietenki havattee sen ja käskee Kallen lukea psalmvärsyn. Kalle freistaa. Mie viskuttelen sille. Jessen ruusu mennee hyvin, Jesse James oon tuttu värkki, niin juuri ja runko, net oon olemassa Kallen mailmassa, mutta "Fadren" joka oon "upprunnen"? Kalle vahtaa minua avuton ilme kasuvilla. "Auta, Pänktti-rukka." Mie viskuttelen kämmenen kalhveessa ja Kallen ilme kirkastuu ko se lukkee juhlalisesti: "Och Fadren är i brunnen i evig salighet!" Ei se saattanu muuale Fadrea panna ko kaihvoon. Piru oon taas irti. Kaikin ulvova ja klaakottavva. Kalle ei ossaa ruottia!
> 'We have got a home assignment to learn some hymn verses. *Det är en ros utsprungen, av Jesse rot och stam, av Fadren är upprunnen till evig salighet* ['A rose has sprung up from Jesse's root and stem, from the Father has arisen to eternal bliss']. Kalle is struggling, his face red with anguish, and the teacher of course notices it and tells Kalle to read the verse aloud. Kalle is trying hard. I'm whispering to him. Jesse's rose is OK, we know Jesse James, and roots and stems, they exist in Kalle's world, but what's that "Fadren" who is "upprunnen"? Kalle stares at me with a helpless expression on his face. "Help me, Pänktti, please!" I whisper behind my palm, and Kalle's face lights up as he reads solemnly: "Och Fadren är i brunnen i evig salighet!" ['And the Father is in the well in eternal bliss!'] He just couldn't place "Fadren" anywhere else but into the well. Hell is loose again. Everybody is howling with laughter. Kalle doesn't know Swedish!' (Pohjanen 2009: 153, my translation)

The requirement for "documentary" realism (also at the service of ethnolinguistic emancipation, for example, pointing out the traumatic consequences of linguistic oppression, as in the previous example) can be fulfilled in two ways. The monolingual strategy means restricting the themes, topoi and genres to exclude all contexts in which the dominant language must be present, such as modern urban life or interactions with authorities. This may lead to ethnographic or historical descriptions of traditional communities (cf. Cagnoli 2010 for Komi) or to focusing on specific genres such as historical fiction or lyric poetry – as in the Finland Swedish literature, which often has chosen this strategy to avoid what Clas Zilliacus calls the "reality police" (Zilliacus 2002, quoted in Tidigs 2014: 22).

In many cases, however, the expectations set to minority literature make the representation of the majority language in narration or dialogue inevitable. In what follows, I will

attempt a brief survey of the forms in which this multilingualism appears. Before that, however, some basic concepts and approaches to the research of literary multilingualism must be presented.

Code-switching vs. literary multilingualism

In the research of literary multilingualism, the forms and strategies of literary code-switching, insertion of foreign elements or other means of making other languages present in the text have been investigated with very diverse tools, using different typologies and terminologies.

Some linguists have attempted to apply the theories and research methods from spoken code-switching to literary multilingualism as well; for example, Callahan (2004) has investigated Spanish-English written codeswitching using Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model, while Laanekask (2002, 2003) has applied the same model to German-Estonian bilingualism in the letters of 19th-century Estonian activists of the national awakening. In its purest form, this means focusing on grammar and the structural properties of the texts as a written representation of spoken discourse, and is, of course, burdened with all the problems of these somewhat Procrustean models. Namely: the role of universal structural constraints for code-switching has been questioned. Indeed, counter-examples can be found to practically any purportedly universal constraint, which has led, for example, Verschik (2004) to conclude that an exclusively structural-linguistic approach to code-switching cannot be productive and that research should also pay attention to sociolinguistic and attitudinal factors.

At the same time, the concept of code-switching itself is controversial and debated. This criticism is connected with the ideas that languages themselves are merely social constructs and their borders are nationalist or colonialist artefacts (cf. Makoni & Pennycook 2007, Ansaldo 2010), produced by language policies by way of "atomization of speech forms" (Antia 2015: 479), and that multilingual language users are not switching between completely distinct, different systems but rather "polylanguaging" (see e.g. Jørgensen 2008, Jørgensen & al. 2011, Antia 2015), drawing on their coexisting and intertwined linguistic repertoires (Sarhimaa 1999: 306-307), employing "whatever linguistic features are at their disposal with the intention of achieving their communicative aims" (Jørgensen 2008: 169-170), or "simply communicating in patterns that [are] familiar to them" (Garner 2004: 212). (In fact, both in cases of closely related languages – such as former dialects or patois varieties which are now emancipating themselves as independent literary languages closely related to the dominant language – and with minority languages which are already marked by centuries-old contacts with the dominant language so that lexical items and even phonological or morphosyntactic features have been taken over, the border between code-switching and adapted old loanwords or normal language use and specifically mixed lects is difficult to determine.)

In this view, what is really interesting about multilingualism in literature is not the rules by which the "languages" alternate in the text but how both or all of them are used for "the reflection, construction and reconstruction of a hybrid/third space identity, which is fluid and always in transition" (Jonsson 2005: 254). That is, the interest is in a "linguistically hybrid culture" (cf. Sebba 2012: 6), the multilingual identity of the authors and their target audience and the means by which these multilingual or hybrid identities are constructed in the text. There is, however, an in-built controversy in this approach: the concept of hybridity in itself presupposes some kind of distinction between its originally discrete components, and in practice, even researchers who want to distance themselves from the idea of languages as distinct codes cannot investigate multilingualism without the operational concept of languages as systems or even essentialized metaphorical "beings" engaged in interaction or "playing with each other".

> *Kod* och *kodväxling* är andra termer som fortfarande är i flitigt bruk i beskrivningen av litterär flerspråkighet, men som jag har valt att inte använda mig av eftersom en syn på språk som kod har blivit alltmer problematisk att omfatta, särskilt i förhållande till

Diktonius.
'*Code* and *code-switching* are further terms which are still frequently used in the description of literary multilingualism but which I have chosen not to use, because the idea of language as a code has become increasingly problematic to adopt, especially in relation with Diktonius.' (Tidigs 2014: 31, my translation)

Det som Diktonius kommentarer kring (åtminstone för vissa läsare, om inte för honom själv) främmande ord visar är just hur glossering inte bara är en översättning från ett språk till ett annat, utan hur det är ett spel *mellan* språk, där språken kommenterar varandra på olika sätt.
'What Diktonius's comments on certain foreign words (foreign at least for certain readers, if not for himself) show is precisely how glossing is not just translating from a language to another but how it constitutes a game *between* languages, in which languages comment on each other in different ways.' (Tidigs 2014: 286, my translation)

In any case, even if literary multilingualism may include realistic description of spoken code-switching or code-mixing (as in dialogues), that is, purportedly realistic representations of the multilingual reality in which multilingual authors live, it is inevitably more than just a one-to-one transposition of spoken multilingual discourse to the written medium. Of course, using another language in a literary text is a political act (cf. Jonsson 2012: 215), always related to the prevailing linguistic culture, language policies and literacy practices, the social meanings which the author and the targeted readership assign to the written representations of each language. More importantly, however, using different languages in literature is a poetic act, an issue of choices between different poetic and mimetic strategies in the setting of prevailing literary practices and conventions.

Mimetic representations of multilingualism in literature: "echoes of another language"?

Already in 1981, Meir Sternberg introduced a system for describing the presence of multilingualism in the text by way of four main types of translational mimesis. As Londen (1989: 145; see also Sternberg 1981: 232) has pointed out, these can actually be ordered on a continuum from homogeneous medium (pure monolingualism) to heterogeneous medium.

Starting at the homogeneous (monolingual) end of the continuum, it is possible to completely eliminate all other languages and place the narration and the dialogues into a monolingual world. This can be done by way of *referential restriction*, that is, selecting the topics, settings, and characters so that no other language need be visibly represented, as in countless works of majority literatures in which only the majority language is spoken and used. For minority literatures, as already mentioned, considering both the multilingual reality in which most modern minorities live and the typically emancipatory agenda of minority literatures which implies a focus on language issues, this may be problematic.

Alternatively, the text may be transposed to a monolingual world by way of *homogenizing convention*: only one language is used, and the reader will understand that in the fictive world behind the text, parts of the dialogue or other elements are in another language but that in the text itself, they have all been translated into the medium language. This strategy may come with *explicit attribution,* that is, the presence of another language is explicitly stated – but often this is not necessary: in the reality of many minorities, language choices in certain domains are self-evident. In the following Kven example, for instance, it goes without saying that the news headline has been translated from Norwegian into Kven (which at the time of World War II had no public written use at all):

> Aviisista taas ihminen oli saannu lukkeet tyskän voittorikhaasta armejasta, joka vain voitti vielä tappaissaki. »Stalingrad valloitettu», oli joku norjan aviisi kirjoittannu, vaikka kaupunki oliki jo ryssän hallussa.
> 'In the newspapers, one could have read about the victorious German army which kept conquering even while losing. "Stalingrad conquered" had stood in some Norwegian newspaper, although the city was already under Russian control.' (Nilsen-Børsskog 2004: 21, my translation)

From an empirical linguist's point of view, the most problematic point on this scale is the strategy which Sternberg calls *conceptual reflection,* that is, producing "the impression of heterolingualism through culturally typical (or typified) topics, interests, attitudes, realia, forms of address, fields of allusion, or paralinguistic features like gesticulation" (Sternberg 1981: 230–231; Sternberg's own examples include the Philistines' use of the plural form *Elohim* 'gods' in II Samuel 4: 8 and the numerous expressions for consecrated oil which a half-Russian character in Rebecca West's *The Birds Fall Down* lists, demonstrating her Orthodox background). The question is whether *culture* and *language* can be conflated and whether expressions associated to a certain cultural or ethnic community can be considered representative of a certain *language*. In literature and cultural studies, there seems to be a temptation to use the concept of *language* as a label for identities, ethnocultural affiliations or aspirations, or language-related emotions and attitudes, something in which lay people typically see an essential connection to language (cf. Laakso 2015). But can we speak of the presence or an "echo" of another language (cf. Wirth-Nesher 2006: 6 about the "echoes" of Yiddish or Hebrew "haunting the text" in Jewish authors' works, quoted in Tidigs 2014: 52) if there are no overtly foreign, linguistically analysable elements or structures, if these "echoes" cannot be subjected to proper linguistic analysis? Doesn't this simply mean that rather than analysing and explaining readers' folk-linguistic intuitions and expectations concerning such texts, scholars are merely sharing them? And even if the presence of the other language is only realized in very fine nuances (for instance, giving the impression of "translated language"), slight statistical deviances in frequencies or collocations, the lack or statistically less prominent use of certain elements or grammatical constructions, etc., wouldn't this rather belong to the "interference" phenomena mentioned under the following point?

Explicit multilingual representations of multilingualism: heterogeneous medium

The presence of the other language can be indicated by what Sternberg calls *verbal transposition,* i.e. with "interference": orthographic or phonetic idiosyncrasies, grammatical or stylistic deviances. A very typical means of verbal transposition is the orthographic rendering of foreign accents, but grammatical or even lexical deviances can occur as well.

In practice, "verbal transposition" often co-occurs with the following stage, *selective reproduction.* This means the explicit presence of the other language in the form of a few selected elements. For instance, a character of the story is understood to speak another language, but only a few characteristic words (often: ritualized phrases, address words, expressions for ethnographically interesting or characteristic phenomena) are given in this original language, the rest is translated into the medium language. In practice, they may also co-occur with interference features. The selected foreign elements can be left untranslated, but an additional translation can also be given, as in this example from Alf Nilsen-Børsskog's novel. The Kven protagonists are hiding from the German occupation army; when they are running out of food supplies, they meet a friendly Saami reindeer herder who can sell them some reindeer meat. Actually, the novel describes many encounters with the Saami, and the narrator often explicitly mentions that many Kven also knew Saami and both languages were used in interethnic communication.

Taas tuli täysi hiljaisuus. Pitkä hiljaisuus. Sitte väärtti selhäätti kurkkuu monta kerttaa. *«Naa, go nu lea,»* ko se pojat niin on, sanoi poromies, ko hän oli tutkiskellu asiaa pitkän aijan, «naa, myyn mie teile rahattaki. Aika on semmoinen, ette tarvittee auttaat toista häđässä.»
'A complete silence ensued again. A long silence. Then the Saami friend cleared his throat many times. *"Naa, go nu lea,"* ['well, if it is so'], if it's so, boys, said the reindeer herder after thinking about it for a long time, "well, I'll sell it to you even without money. These are such times that one must help another in need.' (Nilsen-Børsskog 2004: 388)

Both interference features and selective reproduction set certain requirements to the readership: readers should be able to recognize the "foreign" features and usually also assign them to a certain language variety. In other words, the readership is expected to share the author's linguistic or folk-linguistic knowledge about those certain strange or funny ways of speaking which are supposed to characterize a certain group or kind of speakers or even act as shibboleths "giving away" the speakers' foreign origin.

Interference features may also represent a fictive, generic "foreign accent" or folk-linguistic but linguistically incorrect general beliefs about another language, that is, a mock ethnolect (as in North American "Mock Spanish" in which an *o* is added to English words – *no problemo!* – or in Finnish "Mock Estonian" in which Finnish voiceless stops are substituted with *b d g* also in linguistically incorrect ways). Misinterpreted or non-existent linguistic features are used to create "foreignness" in the following example from Ortjo Stepanov's novel *Kotikunnan tarina* ('Story of my kinsfolk'). The novel, published in Soviet Karelia in 1979, describes life in a White Sea Karelian village from the 1920s to World War II. The medium of narration is Standard Finnish, which for White Sea Karelian authors of Stepanov's generation was the standard language: they had been taught to regard their Karelian as a dialect of Finnish. In the dialogue, however, the Karelian characters speak mostly Karelian and only switch to Finnish in more formal contexts or with ethnic Finnish interlocutors, as in this example. At a logging site in the forest Sakun Jaakko, a local Karelian, is chatting with the foreman Kalle Lahti, one of those "Red" Finns who escaped to the Soviet Union after the civil war of 1918.

– Juu, juu. Kuulemma rajan takaa on tuotu hevosia.
– Jottako?! Jaakko ihan ponnahti pystyyn.
– Niin rahatimiehet kertoivat.
»Rahatimies» samoin kuin monissa muissa sanoissa Kalle äännähti kerakkeiden väliin liian ääntiön mikä synnytti lisätavuja ja teki lausunnan jotenkin katkonaiseksi.
'– Yeah, yeah. They say that horses have been imported from across the border.
– Really?! Jaakko literally jumped up.
– That's what the freight wagon drivers told me.
In the word »rahatimies» [i.e. *rahtimies* 'freight wagon driver'] as in many other words Kalle pronounced a superfluous vowel between the consonants, which created additional syllables and made his speech somewhat choppy.' (Stepanov 1979: 25, my translation)

Although old-school Soviet White Sea Karelian authors like Stepanov had acquired an excellent command of Standard Finnish in their education, also thanks to the very close relatedness between Finnish and their White Sea Karelian native dialect, this attempt to imitate dialectal spoken Finnish is linguistically incorrect. Epenthetic vowels do appear in some stem-internal consonant clusters in many Finnish dialects (e.g. *vahava* instead of *vahva* 'strong'), but never between *h* and *t*. However, for the author's purposes this incorrect imitation or "Mock Dialectal Finnish" does the job: it marks the presence of a substandard variety and, in a way, positions this speaker – despite his superior position at the logging site and his wartime merits – on the same level of authenticity and solidarity with uneducated Karelians whose speech also deviates from Standard Finnish.

In principle, it is also possible to make the text truly multilingual, with ample switches between languages. This may represent real-life multilingual discourses, either realistically – for instance, bilingual characters in their dialogue switch freely between their languages – or by way of *vehicular matching* (Sternberg 1981: 223–224), assigning to each language a certain vehicular role or function in the text. A kind of vehicular matching is traditionally used in realistic prose where the narration is in the standard language but the dialogue of dialect speakers represents their dialect(s). This appears in the works of Ortjo Stepanov and other White Sea Karelian authors of his generation as well: Karelians in their traditional community speak Karelian, while the narration is in Standard Finnish.

In many minority literatures, the switches will operate in the other direction. The majority language can be freely used in dialogues, or in realistic representations of the presence of the majority language as the prospective readership is bilingual and will understand all majority-language items without any difficulties. The use of the majority language in the dialogue can add a realistic touch to the text for readers in whose everyday life the use of their minority language in certain domains is out of question. In this example from a Mari-language short story by V. Berdinskij (published in 2010, quoted from Gavrilova 2013: 34, with my translation), Soviet officers simply cannot speak Mari, the language of the narration, as Mari never was officially used in the Russian or the Soviet army. The requirement of sociolinguistic authenticity overrides any homogenizing convention or any language-political goal.

> – Откатить пушки налево!
> – Товарищ капитан, надо стрелять, – öршдымö лейтенант тудын ваштареш лие, – раздавят!
> – Слушай приказ: немедленно поверните пушки налево и вон туда, в то логово, понял, сопляк!
> '– Move the cannons to the left!
> – Comrade captain, we must fire, – the clean-shaven lieutenant objected [only this five-word phrase is in Mari], – they'll crush us!
> – This is an order: quickly turn the cannons to the left and over there, towards that hole, d'you understand, you snot-nose!'

Realistic switches to the majority language in the dialogue can also be used to construct the characters by showing their language preferences. A recurring character in minority-language literatures seems to be the "renegade", a person who is a member of the minority speech community in a sense but nevertheless ostentatiously chooses to speak the dominant language, and the overt representation of this language choice serves to express this person's attitudes towards the language and the ethnic identity it represents.

The following example comes from the year 1988, the time of South Estonian (Võro-Seto) ethnolinguistic awakening and the political awakening in Estonia which anticipated the collapse of the Soviet system. These two processes intertwine in the short story *Maas'kamaa* ('Strawberry land') by Kauksi Ülle. The protagonist Liivi, a young teacher, is spending the summer in the South Estonian countryside at her grandmother's, together with her little daughter, while her husband, among other Estonian conscripts in the Soviet army, has been sent to clean up the nuclear catastrophe site in Chernobyl. A silent tension develops between Liivi's family and the neighbour's Russian (!) summer tenants who just don't understand that the local people don't want them to pick "their" wild strawberries near their houses. In this conflict between basically well-meaning but ignorant and nonchalant outsiders on the one side and the South Estonian protagonists on the other, Liivi's mother, a former teacher who is now an invalid after having a nervous breakdown, assumes the role of the renegade both politically and linguistically. Her sympathy with Russians, the Russian language and the Soviet system is in line with her antipathy against the Võro language – which is spoken by all other family members and is also the language of the narration – and consequently, she speaks Standard Estonian.

«Vanaimä, aga nä tulõva jo nigu sakslasõ, püssägä!» ütel Liivi. «Vai nä kiäki targõmba ommava,» hiitse vanaimä käega. «Tulliva sakslasõ neläkümne edimädse aasta, nõudsiva spekk ja aier. Neläkümne nelädä tulliva säntesama, küsseva mjässo ja jaitsa. Ütesugudse mõtsalise olliva mõlõmba, ku kõikõ är es anna, käändseva sahvri paheldõ. Anna sis latsilõ midä tahat.»
«Mida sa lastele õpetad?» kärät imä vanaimäle pääle. Imä ol' noorõlt inne ku segi lät's pioneerijuht olnu ja parteilane päälekauba, ku tä vihalõ lät's, nakas alati rääkmä. «Mis siis sellest, et meil Leningradist suvitajad on, õpitegi vene keele selgeks.»
«Sa vast tahat, et Mari nakkaski sullõ baabuška ütlemä,» naarsõ Liivi.
«Kuidas sa räägid emaga! Mida sa koolis lastele õpetama hakkad!» – «Kuis midä, eesti kiilt oppa.»
"Grandma, they are coming just like the Germans did, with guns!", Liivi said. "As if one were wiser than another," Grandma shrugged. "The Germans came in '41, required *Speck* and *Eier* ['bacon and eggs']. In '44, these came in the same way, asking for *myaso* and *yaytsa* ['meat and eggs']. Wild beasts all the same, if you didn't give them all you had, they would turn your larder upside down. Then you can give your children whatever you please."
"*What are you teaching to the children?"* Mommy snapped to Grandma. In her youth, before she went nuts, Mommy had been a leader in the Pioneers [Communist children's organisation] and even a member of the Party. When she got roused, she always started speaking [i.e. Standard Estonian; the verb *rääkmä,* Standard Estonian *rääkima* 'speak', instead of typically and indexically South Estonian *kõnõlõma,* indicates the language].
"What's wrong with the summer tenants coming to us from Leningrad? You will learn proper Russian."
"Do you want Mari to start calling you *babushka*?" Liivi laughed.
"How are you talking to your mother? What are you going to teach to the children at school?" –
"Depends. I'll teach them Estonian."
(Kauksi Ülle 1988: 24, my translation; Liivi's mother's lines in Standard Estonian italicized by me)

Outside the dialogue and the issues of people's language choices, the use of the majority language may simply be due to the requirement of linguistic realism. For instance, the minority language is often never represented in public signage.

Кӧзяин пуктіс пызан вылӧ кык книга, кодъясӧс видзис шкапас. Ӧтиас пасйысьӧны локтысь-мунысьяс, почта да эстафета. Мӧдыслы мышкас гижӧма рочӧн: »Для жалоб».
'The landlord brought two books which he kept in his cupboard and put them on the table. Into one of them, travellers, postmen and message-bearers wrote their names. On the spine of the other, there stood in Russian: »Dlya zhalob ['For complaints']».' (Fedorov 1982: 9, my translation)

This example, in Komi, comes from a historical novel about the life of Ivan A. Kuratov, the pioneer of Komi literature. In this scene, the young Kuratov, on his way home from the priest seminar in Vologda, is stopping at a postal station, where he has to show his passport and sign the guestbook. This takes place in 1861, at a time when the Komi language was practically never used in writing and had no official status whatsoever, and for official and semi-official public signage and the like, Russian was the only thinkable option in these parts of the Russian empire. The text "For complaints" just couldn't be in any other language, certainly not in Komi, and considering that practically all Komi speakers in our days are bilingual in Russian, any prospective reader will recognize and understand the Russian words without any explanations. However, for some reason the author wants to explicitly comment on the language – perhaps in order to apologize for the breach against the homogenizing convention, as the narration otherwise is consistently in Komi.

And the story goes on. On the following page, Kuratov after signing in starts looking around in the room and notices some pictures on the wall. (His reaction serves to construct the Soviet-time "official" image – somewhat counterfactual, in fact, cf. Bartens 1990 – of Kuratov, the national poet, as a critic of religion and the Orthodox church, despite his clerical education.)

> Куратов сюсьджыка видзӧдліс ен нога картинаяс вылӧ. Ӧти вылын Георгий победоносец вӧв вылын пукалӧ, кузь шыӧн зургӧ веглясьысь змейлы. Уліас гижӧд: »Как Егорий во бою на серу сидит коню, держит в руце копие, тычет змию в жопие...» Куратов эз вермы кутчысьны да вак-вакӧн серӧктіс, быттьӧ пес чипас гольдіс-киссис.
> 'Kuratov took a closer look at the pictures which resembled icons. On one of them, St. George was sitting on a horse, piercing the crawling dragon with a long spear. Below him, the text: *Kak Egoriy* (...) ['How George in the battle sitteth on a grey horse, holdeth a spear in his hand, poketh the dragon's arse...']
> Kuratov couldn't restrain himself but burst into a rumbling laughter, as if a stack of firewood were falling down.'

The text in what turns out to be a parody or a caricature of an Orthodox icon is in archaizing language, a parody of Church Slavonic in fact, and represents a genre and a register for which there is no equivalent in Komi – after the mediaeval Old Permic literacy had been given up, in Kuratov's times the Russian Orthodox church only used Church Slavonic or Russian, and any parodic puns at the cost of religious language could only function in these languages. Consequently, the homogenizing convention simply cannot be applied. What we see here is vehicular matching conditioned by style or register in a multilingual setting, for readers whose bilingualism enables code-switching for stylistic purposes.

Beyond vehicular matching, multilingualism can form an essential part of the dialogue or even the narration. These multilingual texts invite the reader to share the aesthetic, emotional and intellectual joys of crossing the language border, using "multilayered" (Verschik 2013: 23) multilingual puns or playing on culture-specific meanings, semantic nuances or connotations which only readers who know both or all the languages involved can understand. Macaronic texts challenge their readers to creatively and consciously use their full linguistic repertoire and (folk-)linguistic knowledge of the languages involved: they stimulate (and require) language awareness and direct the reader's attention from the message to the medium. They are often "inside jokes", targeting an academic, educated readership (as in classical European macaronic poetry which operates with Latin and local vernaculars) or fellow members of a multilingual community in which multilingualism is perceived as socially indexical, characteristic of "us". Macaronic folklore often arises in multilingual contexts, as in the Estonian-Russian-German trilingual urban speech communities in Estonia before World War I (Ariste 1981):

> *Eines Tages tahtsin minna*
> *üle silla встретиться,*
> *aber kui ma jõudsin sinna,*
> *kam die Mutter luuaga.*
> '[German:] One day [Estonian:] I wanted to go
> across the bridge [Russian:] for a rendez-vous,
> [German:] but [Estonian:] as I got there,
> [German:] the mother came [Estonian:] with a broomstick.'

Interestingly, however, true macaronic texts in which "polylingual means are (...) flagrantly summoned to represent a unilingual reality of discourse" (Sternberg 1981: 224) are hard to find in the young written literatures of the Finno-Ugric minorities. Instead of "vehicular promiscuity", a term which Tidigs (2014: 52) criticizes with good reason, it seems that either the homogenizing convention or vehicular matching in the spirit of linguistic realism is the preferred strategy.

Although the Sternbergian continuum from monolingual to multilingual medium offers a nice approach to the classification of the different forms of literary multilingualism, it has some problematic points, most notably the idea of "conceptual reflection", that is, "multilingualism within one language". As Tidigs (l.cit.) points out, Sternberg doesn't seem to really understand the legitimacy of literary multilingualism outside mere depiction of reality (which, for most modern minorities, is multilingual anyway), that is, the poetic function of multilingualism. Furthermore, the dimension of monolingual vs. multilingual medium doesn't essentially help in understanding the poetic or political functions of literary multilingualism. The question is rather *how* real-life multilingualism – because the real-life language use of modern minorities is multilingual in any case – is translated into the mostly monolingual conventions and ideals of literature and language planning and what this means for the literature and the language for which minority-language authors inevitably carry a burden of responsibility and moral obligations. This, finally, brings us to the issues of authenticity and emancipation.

Authenticity and emancipation: returning to where we started

Minority literatures draw their political legitimation from the authenticity of the language whose "birth" they assist, as in Bengt Pohjanen's midwife metaphor cited above: the language has the right to be born because it actually exists already and wants to be born. Authenticity, a much-discussed concept in sociolinguistics, as Coupland (2010: 104) summarizes, is a question of values which are related to ontology (authentic things are "real"), historicity (authentic things are durable or even timeless), systemic coherence (authenticity is seen as a matter of making sense and imposing order) and consensus (social process of authentication). This list can be connected to a corresponding list of folk-linguistic ideas about language (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 1999).

As concerns ontology: in lay people's thought, real languages "exist" as entities in a kind of reality (while incorrect or inferior forms of language "do not exist" – "there's no such word", "it's not a real word"). That is, written and standardized languages, even if their standardized written representations are created with the painstaking work of language activists (the "midwives"), exist for real, while a language without writing is not a real language.

Historicity corresponds to the idea of the authentic language being old, ancient, or original. Folk ideas of certain languages (especially those that are felt to be of particular emotional or nationalist value) being "older" than others are widely spread and difficult to part with. Besides, with many endangered languages the process of language loss is imminent, with the oldest generations being the most fluent speakers, which creates or strengthens the impression that the language as such belongs to the past. Systemic coherence, in turn, can be seen as related to the idea of languages being clear-cut systems with clear borders. And finally, social authentication – the fact that authenticity is negotiated in intersubjective and collective processes – corresponds to the folk idea of an inextricable link between a language and the groupness of its users who will either accept or reject each utterance, expression or text (cf. e.g. Edwards 2009: 55).

Relating these aspects to the dimension of multilingualism vs. homogeneity shows how complicated the idea of authenticity can be for a multilingual speech community. The first three aspects seem to be connected to idealized homogeneity, purity (or purism) and monolingualism. Language planning ("correctness"), idealizing an imagined original monolingualism (for the repercussions of this idea in Finno-Ugric linguistics, see Laakso 2014), and the idea of "languageness" (Garner 2004) or the language existing as a system might all speak in favour of monolingual strategies. However, the social aspects of authentication can *also* be connected to group multilingualism, celebrating a multilingual group identity (as in the case of macaronic folklore): actually, we are a people of many languages!

This, in fact, is explicitly expressed in Alf Nilsen-Børsskog's historical novel, one of the first works of Kven literature, with obvious emancipatory goals. Here, the author again stages a meeting between his Kven protagonists and their Saami neighbours:

> Ko poropaimen saattoi norjaa ja omma kieltä ja lisäksi puhui vielä pyssyjokilaistenki kieltä, niin tunturilla pyssyjokilaistelthiin, ja puhuskelthiin vähän paimenen kieltäki. Het olthiin kieltten tunttijoita. [...] Kello oli jo sivvu keskipäivän ennen ko miehet lähđethiin siitä. Het sanothiin «hyvästi» väärttile, jota het tulleissa olthiin puuristelheet. Sehän kuului hyvhiin taphoin. Väärtti huusi vielä heiđän pörhään: «Ampukkaa, pojat, niitä porroi. Siinä on pieni tšorrakka pohjaisemppaa. Net on minun. En mie jätä niitä tyskälaisele. Ja menkkää tervheenä,» lisäis hän vielä omala kielelä. «Jää sieki tervheenä!»
> 'As the reindeer herder knew Norwegian and his own language and also spoke the language of the Pyssyjoki people, they talked in Pyssyjoki way and also chatted a little in the reindeer herder's language. They were language-savvy people. [...] It was already past noon when the men left. They said "goodbye" to their Saami friend whom they had greeted with *bures* [Saami greeting word] as they came. That belonged to good manners. The Saami friend shouted after them: "Shoot those reindeer, boys. There's a small herd to the North. They belong to me. I'm not going to leave them to the German. And go healthy" [literal translation of the Saami 'goodbye', *mannet dearvan*], he added in his own language. "You stay healthy, too!"

Now if we look closer at the text, we actually find that it highlights and celebrates and explicitly thematizes multilingualism with very sparse and almost purely monolingual means. Although it is explicitly emphasized that the Saami language was an essential and welcome part of the protagonists' world, the text only has one half-adapted Saami loanword *(tšorrakka),* one adapted derivative of a Saami word *(puuristele-* 'greet with *bures*') and a literal translation of a Saami idiom ('go/stay healthy!'). In other words, the "multilingualism" in this text very much resembles the "multilingualism" of Mikael Niemi's *Populärmusik från Vittula:* there's a lot of talk about the other language while real representations of the language are few and far between, are realized on different levels (more or less adapted loanwords, literal translations etc.) and might even go unnoticed.

This, finally, is why it would be so important and interesting to distinguish the different types of representations of literary multilingualism from each other. Thematization of multilingualism does not require the explicit presence of the other language. The implicit presence of the other language can assume many forms which can often only be understood in connection with the linguistic culture and history of the speech community depicted – in other words, mimetic representations of language-related issues may be at least as challenging to the reader or to the researcher as overt multilingualism. And, furthermore, no single dimension of multilingualism – focusing on the monolingualism or multilingualism of the medium, or the form in which the elements of the other language appear, or on the ideological or stylistic functions of switching and mixing in constructing hybrid identities, or on the roles of different languages – can alone do justice to the diverse forms and uses of multilingualism in literature. Moreover, in order to understand how and why multilingualism and different languages can be represented in literature, we must understand the role of folk-linguistic ideas about language and languages. They condition not only language policy (cf. Albury 2016) but also the use of different languages in literature – recall that literature for many Finno-Ugric minorities is the highest level of official language use they can reach, regulated by language policies of the authorities!

And, finally, why have I chosen to talk about this from the point of view of Finno-Ugric minority languages? These languages and their mostly fairly or very young literatures have many common features such as the tradition of nationalist, prescriptive linguistic culture or the emancipatory agenda which can lead to a focus on either monolingual purity or multilingual realism. However, they exist in very different political and historical frameworks and have hardly ever been investigated from the point of view of multilingualism and in a comparative perspective, especially as concerns the implicit contradiction between what exists – the "authentic" language – and what needs to be created or reproduced, between authenticity and emancipation.

In order to really tackle these complicated problems, profound expertise in both linguistics and literature studies would be needed, and an immense amount of work remains to be done.

References

Albury, Nathan John (2016). The power of folk linguistic knowledge in language policy. *Language Policy* 15: 2. DOI 10.1007/s10993-016-9404-4

Ansaldo, Umberto (2010). Identity alignment and language creation in multilingual communities. *Language Sciences* 32: 615–623.

Antia, Bassey E. (2015). Language policy and terminology in South Africa. In: Hendrik J. Kockaert & Frieda Steurs (eds.), *Handbook of Terminology,* Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 467–488.

Ariste, Paul (1981). *Keelekontaktid. Eesti keele kontakte teiste keeltega.* (Emakeele Seltsi toimetised 14.) Tallinn: Valgus.

Bartens, Raija (1990). Kuratovin Jumala-kuva. In: Johanna Laakso (ed), *Komin kansan ensimmäinen runoilija. 150 vuotta I. A. Kuratovin syntymästä.* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 36.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Blommaert, Jan, Leppänen, Sirpa and Spotti, Massimiliano (2012). Endangering multilingualism. In Jan Blommaert, Sirpa Leppänen, Päivi Pahta and Tiina Räisänen (eds) *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity, and Normality*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–24.

Cagnoli, Sébastien (2010). Bilingualism in Komi society as reflected in national drama. (Paper presented at the 11th International Congress for Finno-Ugric Studies at Piliscsaba, Hungary, August 12, 2010.)

Callahan, Laura (2004). *Spanish/English Codeswitching in a Written Corpus.* (Studies in Bilingualism 27.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Coupland, Nikolas (2010). The authentic speaker and the speech community. In: Carmen Llamas & Dominic Watts (eds), *Language and Identities.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 99–112.

Edwards, John (2009). *Language and Identity: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Fedorov (1982) = Геннадий Федоров, *Востым.* Сыктывкар: Коми книжнöй издательство.

Garland, Jennifer (2008). *The minority language and the cosmopolitan speaker: Ideologies of Irish language learners.* PhD thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Garner, Mark (2004). *Language: an ecological view*. Contemporary Studies in Descriptive Linguistics, vol. 1. Bern: Peter Lang.

Gavrilova (2013) = В. Г. Гаврилова, Переключение кодов в художественной литературе на марийском языке. *Филология и культура* 31:1, 30–35. http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pereklyuchenie-kodov-v-hudozhestvennoy-literature-na-mariyskom-yazyke, accessed April 8, 2015.

Haugen, Einar (1966). Language, Dialect, Nation. – *American Anthropologist,* New Series, 68: 922–935.

Huddart, David (2008). *Postcolonial theory and autobiography.* Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Jonsson, Carla (2005). *Code-switching in Chicano Theater: Power, Identity and Style in Three Plays by Cherríe Moraga.* PhD thesis. Umeå: Umeå University.

Jonsson, Carla (2012). Making silenced voices heard: code-switching in multilingual literary texts in Sweden. In: Sebba, Mark – Mahootian, Shahrzad – Jonsson, Carla (eds), *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing. Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 212–232.

Jørgensen, J. Norman (2008). Introduction: Polylingual Languaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5, 3: 161–176.
Jørgensen, J. Norman & Martha Sif Karrebæk, Lian Malai Madsen, Janus Spindler Møller (2011). Polylanguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13, no. 2 www.unesco.org/shs/diversities/vol13/issue2/art2
Kapor, Vladimir (2009). *Local colour: a travelling concept* (Romanticism and after in France 13). Bern: Peter Lang.
Kauksi Ülle (1988). Maas'kamaa. *Vikerkaar* 8/1988: 20–26.
Kloss, Heinz (1952). *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen von 1800 bis 1950*. München: Pohl.
Laakso, Johanna (2014). The prehistoric multilingual speaker: what can we know about the multilingualism of Proto-Uralic speakers? *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 38: 93–114.
Laakso, Johanna (2015). Linguistische und literarische Einblicke. Was uns die Mehrsprachigkeit von der Beziehung von zwei Schwesterwissenschaften lehren kann. In: Márta Csire, Erika Erlinghagen, Zsuzsa Gáti, Brigitta Pesti, Wolfgang Müller-Funk (eds.), *Ein Land mit Eigenschaften: Sprache, Literatur und Kultur in Ungarn in transnationalen Kontexten*. Wien: Praesens, 55–66.
Laakso, Johanna (forthcoming). The language of the people, or a language for the people? On the literarisation of the vernaculars in Finland and Estonia. In: Norbert Kössinger, Elke Krotz, Stephan Müller, Pavlina Rychterová (eds.), *Anfangsgeschichten / Origin Stories: Der Beginn volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit in komparatistischer Perspektive / The rise of vernacular literacy in a comparative perspective*. (MittelalterStudien). München: Wilhelm Fink.
Laanekask, Heli (2002). Koodivahetuse grammatikast Koidula kirjades Kreutzwaldile. In: Reet Kasik (ed), *Lähivertailuja* 12. (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised; 19). Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, 41–56.
Laanekask, Heli (2003). Yksi kirjoittaja, monta kieltä: kielenvaihto Lydia Koidulan kirjeissä Friedrich Kreutzwaldille. In: Ellen Niit & Ulla Palomäki (eds), *Lähivertailuja* 11. (Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics of the University of Turku, 71). Turku: University of Turku, 47–67.
Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.) (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Nineteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com.
Londen, Anne-Marie (1989). *Litterärt talspråk. Studier i Runar Schildts berättarteknik med särskild hänsyn till dialogen*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland 557. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.
Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. – In: Sinfree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 62. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1–41.
Milroy, James (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5/4: 530–555.
Niedzielski, Nancy A. and Dennis Preston (1999). *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Nilsen-Børsskog, Alf (2004). *Kuosuvaaran takana*. S.l.: Iđut.
Pohjanen, Bengt (2009). *Jopparikuninkhaan poika*. Överkalix: Barents.
Sarhimaa, Anneli (1999). *Syntactic transfer, contact-induced change and the evolution of bilingual mixed codes. Focus on Karelian-Russian language alternation*. Studia Fennica Linguistica 9. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
Sebba, Mark (2012). Researching and theorising multilingual texts. In: Sebba, Mark – Mahootian, Shahrzad – Jonsson, Carla (eds), *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing. Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 1–26.
Stepanov, Ortjo (1979). *Kotikunnan tarina*. Petroskoi: Karjala-kustantamo.
Tidigs, Julia (2014). *Att skriva sig över språkgränserna. Flerspråkighet i Jac. Ahrenbergs och Elmer Diktonius prosa*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Tsitsipis, Lukas D. (1989). Skewed performance and full performance. In: Dorian, Nancy C. (ed.), *Investigating obsolescence. Studies in language contraction and death.* Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language 7. Cambridge University Press. 117–138.

Verschik, Anna (2004). Aspects of Russian-Estonian codeswitching: Research perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 8:4, 427–448.

Verschik, Anna (2013). Mitmekeelsus kui ideaal ja loovuse allikas. In: Jüvä Sullõv (ed), *Kiili rikkus ja elojoud = Keelte paljusus ja elujõud = Diversity and vitality of languages* (Publications of Võro Institute 27). Võro: Võro Instituut, 11–29.

Wirth-Nesher, Hana (2006). *Call It English. The Languages of Jewish American Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zamyatin, Konstantin (2014). *An Official Status for Minority Languages? A Study of State Languages in Russia's Finno-Ugric Republics* (Uralica Helsingiensia 6). Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Zilliacus, Clas (2002). Den finlandssvenska litteraturens korta, lyckliga liv. In: Garton, Janet and Robinson, Michael (eds), *On the Threshold. New studies in Nordic literature.* Norwich: Norvik Press, 62–74.