Multilingual Education

Heiko F. Marten
Michael Rießler
Janne Saarikivi
Reetta Toivanen *Editors*

Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union

Comparative Studies on Equality and Diversity

Springer

Multilingual Education

Volume 13

The book series Multilingual Education publishes top quality monographs and edited volumes containing empirical research on multilingual language acquisition, language contact and the respective roles of languages in contexts where the languages are not cognate and where the scripts are often different, in order to be able to better understand the processes and issues involved and to inform governments and language policy makers. The volumes in this series are aimed primarily at researchers in education, especially multilingual education and other related fields, and those who are involved in the education of (language) teachers. Others who will be interested include key stakeholders and policy makers in the field of language policy and education. The editors welcome proposals and ideas for books that fit the series. For more information on how you can submit a proposal, please contact the publishing editor, Jolanda Voogd. E-mail: jolanda.voogd@springer.com

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/8836

Heiko F. Marten · Michael Rießler
Janne Saarikivi · Reetta Toivanen
Editors

Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union

Comparative Studies on Equality and Diversity

Springer

Editors
Heiko F. Marten
Department of German
Tallinn University
Tallinn
Estonia

Janne Saarikivi
Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies
University of Helsinki
Helsinki
Finland

Michael Rießler
Department of Scandinavian Studies
University of Freiburg
Freiburg
Germany

Reetta Toivanen
The Erik Castrén Institute
University of Helsinki
Helsinki
Finland

ISSN 2213-3208
ISBN 978-3-319-10454-6
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-10455-3

ISSN 2213-3216 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-319-10455-3 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014951911

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

This book is dedicated to all the activists in different parts of Europe and Russia who have contributed to our research with both critical and constructive insights, people fighting for a brighter future for small language groups, unafraid of the hard work and the dangers inherent in this paramount task.

Preface

Russia, its languages and its ethnic groups are for many readers of English surprisingly unknown territory. Even among academics and researchers familiar with many ethnolinguistic situations around the globe, there prevails rather unsystematic and fragmented knowledge about Russia. This relates to both the micro level such as the individual situations of specific ethnic or linguistic groups, and to the macro level with regard to the entire interplay of linguistic practices, ideologies, laws, and other policies in Russia. In total, this lack of information about Russia stands in sharp contrast to the abundance of literature on ethnolinguistic situations, minority languages, language revitalization, and ideologies toward languages and multilingualism which has been published throughout the past decades.

Aims of the Book

This book aims at bridging the gap between the lack of studies on minority languages and language policies in Russia published in English and the highly complex situation of languages and minorities in Russia, which in its diversity deserves as much attention as all other regions of the world. The chapter authors analyze the fates of minority languages in Russia and the whole Russian Federation and at the same time mirror the situation in Russia on a neighboring region whose linguistic diversity has received by far more attention in academic writing in English and other Western languages—the European Union. The book thereby aims at familiarizing the readers with assumingly little-known contents by comparing different minorities and indigenous groups within the Russian Federation, but also relates these analyses to a framework that will be much better known for most readers. The central question addressed by the authors contributing to this volume is how minority languages and minority language communities can survive in circumstances with traditional communities dispersing and new types of superdiverse ecolinguistic systems simultaneously emerging. At the same time, the book relates to the increasing awareness of the cultural value of endangered languages and the

benefits of multilingualism among many academics, in civil society, and in some political circles, although the political debates regarding the need for language protection continue and, in many countries, often take a fearful and hesitant tone.

The lack of knowledge about Russia among many Western researchers dealing with minority issues or questions of multilingualism is certainly, among other reasons, heavily based on the limited access to information on Russia—even though more than 20 years have passed since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Major obstacles in this are the lack of Russian language skills, and at the same time the only slowly increasing academic exchanges between Russian and Western academics. The small number of scholars who, in Western academic circles, read Russian—a language which is the mother tongue of approximately 144 million speakers and a second language or language of higher education by another 120–130 million individuals—is a clear indicator of the "otherness" of the discourse on minorities and languages in Russia and other post-Soviet countries. At the same time, even though knowledge of English in Russia and other countries with a high proportion of Russophones is increasing, there are few international publications providing research-based (as opposed to official or census-based) information on the situation of minority languages in Russia written by scholars with an access to the Western (European) academic semiosphere. This state of affairs has not only been caused by the language barrier. The ideological divide that for more than seven decades prevailed between many Western and Soviet academic communities has had consequences also on possible objects of academic study, as well as on available research materials and common methods of research implementation.

Since the main aim of the book is to contribute to spreading information about Russia, the focus of the chapters is on studies of situations in the Russian Federation, both from individual and contrastive perspectives. The parts on the European Union are to be understood as additional information which provides a reference frame for the situations in Russia. The single chapters are meant to complement each other—even though written by different authors, it has been the explicit aim to perceive the entire book as one unit, which sheds light on its major topic from different angles. The contributions are thereby concerned with socio-political, legal, and ideological processes which contribute to language loss or maintenance and revitalization of particular minority identities and languages. The case studies elaborate the multifarious factors that contribute to situations in which minority languages cease to be used in certain social contexts, move to other domains of social life, disappear and perish or, sometimes, are reinforced and revitalized in new domains of use. Consequently, many articles are of multidisciplinary nature, including aspects of linguistics as well as political and social sciences. The contributions thus tackle the question as to what are the essential components of cultural and linguistic survival in the twenty-first century from many different angles. The authors of this volume therefore wish to demonstrate how different politics, language policies, and sociocultural circumstances cause various outcomes for the prospects of minority language communities but also that there are limits to how these outcomes can be related to similar developments in other contexts.

Background and Content of the Book

The scholars who have contributed to this book have been engaged in joint research activities aiming at enhancing understanding between Russian and Western academic discourses. Most of these activities have taken place within an informal interdisciplinary research network called *Poga—The Language Survival Network.* This network was founded in 2007 as a body uniting scholars specializing in questions relating to minority languages and ethnicity in the European Union, the Russian Federation and other Eurasian countries. The members of the network represent different academic disciplines such as linguistics, sociology of language, history, ethnic and revitalization research, indigenous studies, legal anthropology, human rights, political science, and minority protection law. The network lays emphasis on a comparative research approach and fosters cooperation and exchange of ideas between scholars with Russian and non-Russian backgrounds. One of its main objectives is also to empower researchers of Russian origin working among their own minorities to become more successful in their work through a better knowledge of minority situations and policies elsewhere. The network members have been interested in understanding the diversity of elements that positively influence the commitment of minorities to promote and maintain their languages and cultures. At the same time, the researchers are interested to identify factors that inevitably have had a negative impact on the "cultural survival" of minority communities. Central to the network's activities are also its emphasis on Russia and the simultaneous, comparative and interdisciplinary approach to minority communities.

Some of the contributions to this volume are based on papers which were first presented on the network's first symposium which took place in Lovozero (Murmansk oblast, Russia) in 2007, other papers were initially presented at symposia in Inari (Finland) in 2009, Petrozavodsk (Karelian Republic, Russia) in 2009, in Mariehamn (Åland Islands) in 2010 and Tallinn (Estonia) in 2010. Drafts of the contributions were continuously circulating among network members, who collaboratively discussed their content and suggested additions, improvements and updates in order to best fit into the general topic of this book.

The book contains 12 chapters which are grouped into three parts. The first part with the title *Languages, Identities and Human Rights* includes three contributions that deal with general issues related to minority language maintenance. It is opened by the introductory chapter "Change and Maintenance of Plurilingualism in the Russian Federation and the European Union" by Janne Saarikivi and Reetta Toivanen. The chapter provides an overview of important contexts in which minority language decline and maintenance takes place in Russia, contrasted to the countries of the European Union. The authors discuss questions related to language extinction and maintenance in Russia, and highlight in which way they are similar to or different from languages in other geographical and cultural contexts. The chapter also introduces central theoretical viewpoints on language endangerment

and maintenance and scrutinizes the ways in which members of the rapidly changing communities of the twenty-first century use minority languages.

The introduction is followed by Suzanne Romaine's contribution on "The Global Extinction of Languages and Its Consequences for Cultural Diversity." This chapter provides an overview of the phenomenon of language death and its consequences for humanity at a global scale. The author points out that 50–90 % of the world's 6,900 languages are predicted to be extinct by the end of this century. Because a large part of any language is culture-specific, people feel that an important part of their traditional culture and identity is also lost when their language disappears.

The third chapter by Theodore S. Orlin on "The Death of Languages; the Death of Minority Cultures; the Death of a People's Dignity" discusses the extinction of minority languages and cultures from a human rights law perspective. It explores the question of when the loss of language may constitute a violation of human rights and by its negative impact on minority cultures may threaten democratic principles. The author points out that where state policy and/or action reflect the preference of its majority at the expense of the minority, then concerns are raised as to the protection of human dignity and identification of a minority.

Part II of the book is called *Case Studies on Cultural Change and Minority Language Maintenance.* It consists of studies describing challenges and problems related to individual situations of minority language and culture maintenance. All of these studies indicate in which way there are similar issues on minority languages at stake both in the European Union and in the Russian Federation.

Five chapters are included in this part. The fourth chapter by Reetta Toivanen discusses "Obstacles and Successes" for minority language activism among the Sorbs in Germany and the Sámi in Finland. It addresses problems faced by minority representatives when they act on behalf of the minority group. Looking at the cases of the Sorbian minority in Lower and Upper Lusatia in Germany and the Sámi home territory in Finnish Lapland, the author argues that the representatives of minorities face severe problems in trying to keep a balance between an authenticity acknowledged by the majority (state) and an authenticity recognized by the members of the minority.

The fifth chapter "Fallen Ill in Political Draughts" by Indrek Jääts deals with changes in social status among the users of Komi-Permyak. The main problem in preserving and developing this language has always been the weakness of the Komi-Permyaks' ethnic identity which has even been described as ethnic nihilism, and the related belittling attitude toward their own language, caused by an interplay of different historical factors, and, to a large extent, policies on nationalities by the Russian state. Despite these processes, however, tens of thousands of Komi-Permyaks are still living compactly in their villages. The chapter discusses the role of the language and culture today in relation to urban and rural settings.

The sixth chapter on "Finnic Minorities of Ingria" by Natalia Kuznetsova, Elena Markus, and Mehmed Muslimov is dedicated to the complex analysis of the language situation in contemporary Ingria by paying major attention to Ingrians and Votes. The authors present a summary of the results of their extensive

sociolinguistic and language sociological research during the last years and propose an analysis of the underlying reasons for the present language situation of these Finnic minorities in Russia.

The seventh chapter on "The Challenge of Language" is based on a research project by Lennard Sillanpää in collaboration with a group of researchers from the Russian Academy of Sciences. They conducted interviews with members of smaller ethnic groups in Russian Siberia to discuss, among other topics, the importance of their mother tongues and their future prospectives for ethnic survival. While many older persons interviewed claimed a working fluency in their mother tongues, most of those in their twenties, thirties, and forties confessed, often with tears, how they had completely lost any proficiency they once may have had or only possessed rudimentary skills sufficient to convey greetings or to produce snatches of phrases.

The eighth chapter "Uneven Steps to Literacy" is co-authored by Florian Siegl and Michael Rießler. They analyze the creation of literacy standards for indigenous languages in the Soviet Union and sketch this development from the perspective of four indigenous languages of the Russian North and Siberia, i.e. Skolt and Kildin Sámi, Dolgan and Forest Enets. In the context of this contrastive volume, it is of particular relevance that one of the languages discussed, Skolt Sámi, is also spoken in the European Union.

Part III of the volume, entitled *Why Some languages Survive. On Language Laws, Policies and Changing Attitudes* deals with revitalization processes and current changes in minority identities and political frameworks. It provides answers to the central question as to why some minorities are able to successfully connect their cultural and linguistic heritage to the modern world while others face extinction.

The ninth chapter by Ekaterina Gruzdeva on "Explaining Language Loss" in the case of Sakhalin Nivkh provides a sociological survey of language use among Sakhalin Nivkhs from diachronic and synchronic perspectives. It traces the development of language shift, analyses political, economic and cultural reasons for language marginalization, and describes attempts for standardizing, teaching and preserving Nivkh at different stages of its history.

The tenth chapter by Heiko F. Marten on "Parliamentary Structures and Their Impact on Empowering Minority Language Communities" discusses the impact of political decentralization processes on minority language policy and language maintenance efforts. It demonstrates how new channels of decision-making have been used by minority language speakers and activists, and compares these ways of influence in the light of different models of decentralized parliamentary representation. The Scottish Parliament and the Sámi Parliaments in Norway are contrasted with the situations of Frisian and Sorbian in Germany, the political framework in multilingual South Tyrol, and the situation of Latgalian in Latvia.

The eleventh chapter by Konstantin Zamyatin deals with "The Evolution of Language Ideology in Post-Soviet Russia." The author provides a comparative analysis and evaluates the effectiveness of language policies implemented in the Republics of Udmurtia and Mari El in the light of the goals of language policies.

Udmurtia and Mari El are compared to the Republics of Tatarstan and Chuvashia where more successful language revival projects have been implemented.

The final chapter on "The Impact of Language Policy on Language Revitalization" in the Case of the Basque Language, by Xabier Arzoz describes language policies implemented in the Basque Country after the proclamation of the Spanish constitution in 1978 and the transformation of Spain's authoritarian unitary regime into a decentralized democratic state and their impact on the revitalization of the Basque language. The author points out that the Basque experience shows the effectiveness of selective intensive policies that focus on those segments of population most engaged and supportive of social change. Thereby, the chapter rounds up the collection by providing another contrastive picture from Western Europe which may serve as a point of reference for the Russian cases discussed previously.

The map on the following page illustrates the geographic area of investigation and shows all languages discussed in this book. More detailed maps, zooming in on the relevant areas are included in all chapters presenting case studies on specific languages.

The appendix includes an index, which refers back to all languages and peoples mentioned in the single chapters.

Tallinn — Heiko F. Marten
Freiburg — Michael Rießler
Helsinki — Janne Saarikivi
July 2014 — Reetta Toivanen

Acknowledgments

The editors of this volume would like to thank the contributors to this book as well as all members of *Poga—The Language Survival Network*—among them many language activists in different parts of Europe and Russia—for your participation in fruitful discussions and your contribution with critical and constructive insights. Our academic cooperation has, not least of all, been highly enjoyable and given all of us new awareness about numerous topics and perspectives. We would also like to thank our publisher for the supportive cooperation and patience in the production of this book, and most notably the reviewers for their valuable advice. Finally, we would like to thank all individuals who have directly helped in producing this volume through their comments, proofreading, and administrative work.

We are grateful for the generous support we have received from different research funding agencies. First of all we thank Volkswagen Foundation for believing in the importance of our research network and funding our inaugural workshop in Lovozero/Lujāvv'r. Since that time, we have received notable support from Kone Foundation, NOS-HS and HERA Nordic Council funding, and the Academy of Finland. We also wish to thank Siida, the National Museum of the Finnish Sámi, for the fruitful cooperation in organizing our conference in Inari/Aanaar/Aanar/Anár in 2009, the Karelian Research Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences for supporting our conference in Petrozavodsk/Petroskoi in 2009, Åland Peace Institute for supporting our meeting in Mariehamn in 2010, and Tallinn University for enabling us to carry out our meetings in Tallinn 2010 and in Noarootsi in 2012. These meetings were organized by the editors of this book together with our project coordinators and conference secretaries Evgeniya Zhivotova (Leipzig), Outi Tanzcos and Lotta Jalava (both Helsinki). For the practical preparation of this volume we have been assisted by Iris Perkmann (Freiburg).

Contents

Contributors

Xabier Arzoz University of The Basque Country, Bilbao, Spain

Ekaterina Gruzdeva University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Indrek Jääts Estonian National Museum, Tartu, Estonia

Natalia Kuznetsova Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia

Elena Markus University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Heiko F. Marten Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

Mehmet Muslimov Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia

Theodore S. Orlin Utica College, Utica, USA

Michael Rießler University of Freiburg, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany

Suzanne Romaine University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Janne Saarikivi University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Florian Siegl University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Lennard Sillanpää Laurentian University of Sudbury, Ontario, Canada

Reetta Toivanen University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Konstantin Zamyatin University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Fig. 1 Map of the European Union and the Russian Federation showing all languages investigated in the present case studies and the approximate area where they are spoken

Part I
Languages, Identities and Human Rights

Change and Maintenance of Plurilingualism in the Russian Federation and the European Union

Introduction to the Volume

Janne Saarikivi and Reetta Toivanen

Abstract Linguistics, anthropology, social sciences and law have treated languages as more or less closed systems. Scholars have been interested in the variation in language and the linguistic behavior of the people that speak particular languages. Some scholars have postulated that all languages are "invented" and questioned the very existence of languages, speech communities and ethnolinguistic groups. This chapter argues that denying the existence of a particular language may also represent denying the identity of members of minority communities, many of which fight for recognition as an independent ethnic and linguistic identity and stresses that in order to understand the processes leading to language attrition and loss of minority linguistic heritage, one has to create theoretical models that join the perspectives of contact linguistics and variation studies with a framework of careful ethnographic study of social identity and status position and critical research into power relations in a context of changing language use.

Keywords Language variation · Linguistic behavior · Revitalization of minorities · Power · Language identity

1 Plurilingualism at the Threshold of the 21st Century

The languages of the world represent a complex diversity that reflects human culture, thought, mentality and history in a variety of ways. Generally, linguistics, anthropology, social sciences and law have treated languages as more or less closed systems. At the same time, scholars have been interested in the variation in language and the linguistic behavior of the people that speak particular languages. This linguistic variation is areal, social and situational, and represents both the use of a single language in multiple settings and in different ways, as well as the use of different languages in different domains in multilingual contexts.

J. Saarikivi (✉) · R. Toivanen
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
e-mail: janne.saarikivi@helsinki.fi

R. Toivanen
e-mail: reetta.toivanen@helsinki.fi

H.F. Marten et al. (eds.), *Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union*, Multilingual Education 13,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-10455-3_1

1.1 Plurilinguistic Variation as an Object of Scientific Investigation

Notable interest regarding linguistic variation in multilingual contexts derives also from the field of language planning and governance studies (Gal 2010, 29). This line of research, situated in terms of its disciplinary characteristics in-between linguistics and social sciences, is interested in social meanings associated with particular languages as ethnic emblems, symbols of plurality, or in the governance of multilingual regions. It has often been connected with efforts of governing bodies to create a functioning state where minority groups can be either successfully governed, or integrated or assimilated into a linguistic majority, depending on the political agenda of the authorities.

The Russian Federation, the main focus of this volume, represents a country that has had an early and explicitly expressed interest in language planning as a means of modernizing, governing and culturally assimilating ethnic and linguistic minorities while simultaneously supporting certain aspects of a linguistic multitude (Lewis 1972; Grenoble 2003). The countries of the European Union that offer a comparative perspective for Russia in this volume have in turn, during the process of increasing European integration, become more pronouncedly interested in matters related to creating and maintaining multilingual realms but also in envisioning Europe as a commonwealth of nations representing multiple traditions of language use and governance (Kraus 2008).

In the scholarly literature of the last decade, the homogeneous entities of studies of historical and social variation, such as languages and speech communities, have often been replaced by more dynamic concepts such as multilingualism or "plurilingualism" or "linguistic resources". Some contemporary scholars working on linguistic variation stress that people do not speak "languages" but instead "are languaging", i.e. using pieces of languages, or linguistic resources to construct social identities (Jørgensen et al. 2011). In this vein, it has even been postulated that all languages are "invented" (Makoni and Pennycook 2007). For instance, Blommaert and Rampton (2011) question the very existence of languages, speech communities and ethnolinguistic groups. They describe a linguistic "superdiversity" (a notion first proposed by Vertovec 2007) and note that "mixing, political dynamics and historical embedding are now central concerns in the study of languages, language groups and communication" rather than "homogeneity, stability and boundedness" that used to be the starting assumptions of the traditional grammatical descriptions. Plurilingualism, i.e. multiple uses of several different linguistic codes, has even officially been set as the future goal of the European Union's language policies (CEC 2005).

However, a radical deconstructive point of view regarding languages and speech communities can and should be challenged by the numerous anthropological investigations which point to the fact that even in primordial communities, there often are prevailing and robust ideas of languages, language communities and their physical and mental borders as well as linguistic differences and their social meaning as signifiers of group belonging (cf. Barth 1969; Smith 1986; Kraus 2008). Thus, denying the existence of a particular language may also represent denying the identity of

members of minority communities, many of which fight for recognition as an independent ethnic and linguistic group that, in the context of the majority culture, can be characterized as no more than a vernacular, or a regional or ethnic sub-identity dependent on the majority.

Self-evidently, mixing of languages, borrowing and creolization are natural phenomena, commonplace and probably a natural condition of linguistic systems. But it should be equally obvious that the superdiversity that is visible in multilingual urban centers such as London, Paris or Moscow is also an expression of rapid and devastating cultural transformation among many traditional groups due to changing livelihoods, urbanization, new types of intergroup contact, rising standards of education, literalization of culture, new forms of labour related to literary language use and new types of media use. The identities and social networks related to the traditional groups have fostered most of the world's languages—or most of the world's linguistic heritage, if one is willing to deny the existence of languages as closed systems. The new social situation characterized by the replacement of large swathes of these groups in the urban environments, or a fundamental change in their lifestyles in the traditional settlements of the groups under consideration, is a threat to this heritage even if it simultaneously represents new diversities. The new superdiversity reflects the search for new individual and group identities in circumstances where the old ways of living in traditional communities have become difficult or impossible to exercise and people's future prospects lie in the cities and professions related to education and employment in the majority languages. Often, it represents more diverse patterns of language use than did life in the traditional communities (multi- and plurilingualism and the emergence of mixed codes), but one can nonetheless predict that it will likely lead ultimately to more uniform patterns of linguistic cultures and the disappearance of vast amounts of linguistic traditions.

Thus, the present process of global extinction of languages should be characterized not only as rapidly reducing linguistic diversity but also as new but short-lived diversities that reflect changing human networks and identities in dispersed traditional communities seeking for new ways of life. Certainly, traditional communities have not been stable or unilingual either; many types of resilient plurilingual systems that lasted for centuries have been described in the scholarly literature such as those that prevailed, to point to just some examples from the European context, in Transylvania (cf. Feischmidt 2003, 28–29), the Balkans (Lindstedt 2000) and the Middle Volga area (cf. Haarmann 1998, 235). Whereas the use of some minority languages has traditionally been restricted to intra-group communication, maintaining one's identity and the home, meaning that the language had no relevance in any other contexts (Crawford 1995, 21), the spheres of use of some other minority languages such as Komi or Tatar in Russia have, through a diversity of societal processes, expanded to the extent that the language has been adopted by several speakers of other minority languages (for Swahili, see also Mufwene and Klasen 2005).

In Russia, many different patterns of both contemporary as well as historical plurilingualism have been attested. The plurilinguistic nature of many of the small hunter-gatherer communities around the globe has been stressed in the ethnographic literature (cf. Saarikivi and Lavento 2012; Janhunen 1997) and in Siberia and the Far

East of Russia such patterns of multiple language use have survived up to the present day to some degree. Highly plurilingual rural communities have survived also in the Caucasus region, most notably in Dagestan, known as the linguistic diversity hotspot of Russia, and there is evidence of early widespread multilingualism even in other contexts. It is intriguing to note that the western Eurasian areas where the modern state of Russia subsequently emerged have, in the course of millennia, been dominated by mobile and multilingual herding communities (cf. Nichols 1997). Even the historical origins of present-day Russia are, according to many historians, to be traced back to a medieval multi-ethnic tribal union consisting of Slavic, Baltic and Finno-Ugric people (likely, under Northern Germanic leadership) that was based more on economic interests than a linguistic unity (cf. Lind 2007).

However, the kind of plurilingualism that presently emerges in (post)modern communities is different from old multilingual communities in that the language use in it fulfills partly different purposes and is executed in different societal frameworks. The dominating languages in these communities are widely used in writing, and practically the entire population of these communities can read and write in some language (on the effects of literacy on language, society and individual, see Scribner and Cole 1981; Blommaert 2008). The education system is based on a requirement of elaborate language skills, typically in one or several dominant languages. Employment is also increasingly executed through writing and reading. Professions are adopted through lengthy educational processes that involve constant contact with the standardized literary language(s). In addition, new types of media, most notably television and the internet, are changing the use of languages and affect the social processes in which the language-based discourses function (Cormack and Hourigan 2007).

All of these processes substantially alter and, in most cases, reduce the role of traditional minority languages in modern societies—even if the language communities within them may become increasingly multilingual. Undoubtedly, new information technologies also provide more opportunities to use minority languages in writing, but one can discern great variation in how these opportunities are used by the minority communities, whose linguistic identities and the prevailing traditions of literary language use have been shaped in the networks dominated by majority languages (Warschauer 2000).

1.2 Linguistic Variation in Language Attrition and Shift Situations

In studies of language maintenance and revitalization, one must distinguish between the necessary cultural change reflected in the patterns of language use and language form on one hand, and the processes that lead to abrupt language shift and loss of linguistic cultural heritage on the other. As has been pointed out above, it is obvious that the same social processes that lead to language loss in some communities also create new kinds of diversities, communities and networks. One should thus distinguish between language change and language shift, or the continuity and interruption of linguistic heritage. Bilingualism or the emergence of bi-, multi- and plurilingual

realms does not necessarily mean a threat to the existence of a minority language and may even create new and stable diversities. From the perspective of studies of language contraction and language death, it is thus a challenge to define when language interference and changes in linguistic behavior threaten the very existence of linguistic heritage (cf. Hoenigswald 1989).

Sometimes new varieties of dominating languages that emerge in communities undergoing language shift may have an important role as mediators of the minority language-related identity under new circumstances dominated by a majority language. For instance, Hebridean Scots emerged in a process where the Gaelic-speaking population shifted to English, but it has subsequently served as yet another emblem of Hebridean islanders' identity. Thus, the target language of the Gaelic language shifters is not Standard English, but a particular variant of Highland Scots representing a new type of diversity borne out by the language contact and shift situation itself (Filppula et al. 2009, on other varieties of English under Celtic influence).

In other cases new languages develop in the process of language shift in a plurilingual community. There has been a discussion of whether creolization is a result of abrupt and incomplete language-learning that creates a new language on the basis of linguistic universals and the characteristics of the languages in contact (Thomason and Kaufman 1988; O'Shannessy 2011, 91) or whether creoles emerge as languages created more or less consciously in a scenario of inter-ethnic contact (Baker 1994; Bickerton 2008). Most likely, both of these processes often take place simultaneously. Closely related to creoles are also the intertwined languages in which the lexicon and grammar derive from different sources and which are therefore typically unintelligible to the representatives of both source-language communities. For instance, the *stadin slangi* 'city slang', a mixed Finnish-Swedish vernacular spoken in Helsinki predominantly by the male working-class population, emerged in the first half of the 20th century as an emblem of a new social class, the urban working-class people, mostly men, on the basis of Finnish (the original main language of the population moving into city to work in industry), and Swedish (the main language of Helsinki at that time) that functioned as a lexifier language (cf. Paunonen and Paunonen 2000). In addition, a substantial portion of the lexicon of this vernacular derived from Russian. *Stadin slangi* thus represents an example of an intertwined language determined by social and gender factors and arising in a new plurilinguistic urban situation, but it turned out not to be particularly enduring. By the second half of the 20th century, this mixed vernacular moved increasingly closer to Standard Finnish due to lexical borrowing (Paunonen and Paunonen 2000). Similar processes have been described in creole studies in many different contexts. However, there is also evidence that new types of mixed vernaculars continue to emerge on the basis of Standard Finnish in plurilingual immigrant communities of Helsinki with new lexifier languages (Lehtonen 2004).

One must admit that the processes leading to language loss may simultaneously lead to the emergence of new languages and identities, yet new types of linguistic cultures and vital plurilinguistic realms also simultaneously threaten the old plurilinguistic status quo. Thus the idea of a majority language replacing a minority language in a situation of language shift needs to be seen within a language attrition process

that often lasts for generations and represents multiple variations in language use. In order to understand the processes leading to language attrition and loss of minority linguistic heritage, one has to create theoretical models that join the perspectives of contact linguistics and variation studies with a framework of careful ethnographic study of social identity and status position and critical research into power relations in a context of changing language use.

For instance, Sarhimaa (1999) discusses necessitative constructions in Karelian, a Finnic minority language spoken in Northwest Russia, in a typical language form of a language-shifting community characterized by remarkable code-mixing with Russian. The constructions under consideration are seemingly borrowed or copied from Russian, but they behave and develop partly according to Finnic patterns that on the one hand do not employ features such as grammatical gender or animacy and on the other hand bring in new features such as the alternation between a total and a partial object and different types of subject of the construction. Thus, multiple new complex constructions evolve and are endowed with social meanings within a scenario of language contact that, in fact, may end in the loss of the language form in which these new diversities emerge and thus doom both the new and old types of variation. In a similar vein, Edygarova (2014) investigates the genres of the Central Russian minority language Udmurt (see also Konstantin Zamyatin's chapter in this volume, "The Evolution of Language Ideology in post-Soviet Russia") spoken language that represent different mixes of traditional vernaculars and dialects, literary language, code-mixing with Russian dialects and the Russian literary language all of which represent different social gestures and roles. She concludes that the linguistic variation in the minority language community is much more versatile than the traditional documentary and comparative approach largely focusing on areal (dialectal) variation presupposes. In addition to the pressure exerted by the majority language, also efforts to revitalize the minority language through a literary standard and neologisms can create confusion in the language community when puristic linguistic attitudes based on the idea of the desirability of the standard language use spread. Even here, the result is much more diverse than the starting point, but it might turn out to be short-lived.

It is important to note that while the changing social context of languages often leads to a remarkable loss or change of the linguistic heritage, also most instances of more or less successful language revitalization described in the scholarly literature involve a substantial cultural change in the life of the language community. In these cases the language has been transformed into a means of communication in new domains, most notably in education and modern professions. They also nearly always mean the establishment of a literary form for the minority language under consideration and the creation of social identities and educational structures that favor the use of the new literary standard (on Inari Sámi, cf. Olthuis et al. 2013). This leads one to consider the necessity of cultural change as a vehicle that not only threatens minority languages but that also keeps them alive.

However, defining the circumstances in which the particular social value attained to a language form turns into a vehicle of language maintenance and revitalization is not an easy task. In many traditional communities that lose their language, it is often

the perceived situation that the language shift is caused by the change in living habits. The traditional languages are often associated with particular traditional settlements and their environment, particular forms of livelihood and human networks that are then considered by speakers to be old-fashioned and outdated due, for instance, to changing livelihoods and labor, educational policies that stress the importance of one state-bearing language, role models related to majority language use disseminated in the media, or the experience of outright racism by some members of the majority population. The changing social environment that is often also reflected in mixed marriages contribute to the low prestige of the minority languages and evidently also to loss of the language (on the different reasons for language shift among certain minority peoples of Russia, cf. Vachtin 2001).

1.3 Consequences of Language Loss

Language loss and language maintenance are thus not linguistic processes per se but social processes in which the human relationships and networks that support a language and transmit it to new generations of speakers are affected. The constant negotiation and identity creation in which people take part, shape the ethnic, social and linguistic identities they live by (Barth 1969; Brubaker 2004; Cowan et al. 2001). In these processes, the linguistic features are constantly reinterpreted and turned into social emblems of particular groups and identities.

The loss of language thus almost always entails significant changes in social networks and value systems of the community. Such changes are reflected not only in the linguistic behavior but also in changing societal hierarchies, identities, and networks as well as in forms of livelihood and governance. In this multifaceted field of investigation, language use, language practices, language policies and language politics represent interrelated aspects of social and linguistic relations that cannot be meaningfully addressed from a point of view of one scientific discipline only. Negative attitudes towards minority languages held by the dominant population, or even the fear that the speakers of languages other than the dominant one might endanger the unity of the state, have for decades and across the world led to rigid monolingual ideologies that, in turn, have been reflected in laws and policies (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). On the other hand, it has been pointed out that the fate of individual languages or types of linguistic heritage are determined not only by language politics and policies but by entire linguistic cultures that prevail in society and consist not only of legal and educational politics and policies, but of attitudes, tolerance and traditions of intergroup communication (cf. Schiffman 2006). Schiffman describes the linguistic culture as the "sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious structures, and all the other cultural 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their culture" (112, 121). Thus the perspectives of the social and political sciences, anthropology, law and history are all relevant in understanding the social settings and the prevailing ideologies in which language shift or maintenance takes

place. It is easy to point to various communities from both Russia and the European Union that live in a seemingly similar societal framework from the point of view of size, majority/minority proportion or language planning yet display very different degrees of language maintenance. This social diversity related to linguistic cultures and language choices of communities makes the investigation of language loss and maintenance, as well as the creation of effective measures for language revitalization, an extremely challenging task.

The factor most frequently mentioned when discussing language extinction is the inequality of educational systems which typically function in the framework of states and only provide schooling in the languages of the linguistic majority or elite. Of the approximately 6,000 languages in the world, only ca. 100–200 are used widely in education or different working environments outside traditional economic settings. Self-evidently, the language choices of schooling institutions are also reflected in access to institutions of political and economic power (Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000).

It is important to stress that the raising of educational standards is related to many other thorough changes in a society undergoing modernization, most notably the changes in the fields of work and labor. Thus, in today's society, much of the work is somehow connected with language use, either in that the work itself takes place in a certain language (for instance, in schooling, consulting, courts, administration, etc.) or in that professions are obtained through a years-long educational process that takes place in a standardized language. Languages thus turn increasingly from means of communication to tools of work. It would seem to be the case that the underlying change in all these processes is the transition of a language to literary use that enables the creation of much larger linguistic communities and changes the use of the language in a society in a multi-faceted manner. Along with the turn to literary use, also standardization of the languages and their use in electronic media (television, radio, internet) emerges. The introduction of these facilities often entails a significant change in community practices and values (on the introduction of radio and TV in Tibet, cf. Lakhi et al. 2013).

Thus, it seems to be the case that often only those languages which have functions in the domains of work, labor, employment or in the economy at large, represent the sufficient value by which they remain relevant in the globalized world. This is also reflected in that the last stronghold of several threatened minority languages is often a domain related to a particular livelihood, such as reindeer herding in the case of Russian indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East.

Apart from education, among the factors that predict whether or not language loss will take place are the size and demography of the linguistic minority, the characteristics of language transmission, availability of media, economic situation, labour-related issues, language standardization, attitudes and religion (Edwards 2010). These are also those aspects of language vitality assessed in the UNESCO language vitality report. A recently created alternative Language Maintenance Barometer (EuLaViBar) by the international research project ELDIA[1] has adopted the

[1] http://www.eldia-project.org/.

conceptual tools created by Grin (2005) and Strubell (1999) and assesses language use, education, media, language-related legislation and media separately within the realms of capacity, opportunity, desire and "language products". The study shows that factors influencing language maintenance are manifold and cannot be studied in isolation (Laakso et al. 2013).

1.4 Language Loss: Why Should Anyone Care?

When academics are becoming increasingly aware of the threat that most of the world's languages may disappear in a generation's time, there is growing interest in the relationship of language and cultural heritage and the dangers that language extinction poses to human cultural diversity (for an overview see Lewis and Simons 2010; this is also one of the themes addressed by Suzanne Romaine in the chapter "The Global Extinction of Languages and Its Consequences for Cultural Diversity"). Some aspects of cultural loss related to language loss that have been pointed out in the scholarly literature are the loss of metaphors and semiotics related to particular languages (Idström and Piirainen 2012) and ecologically relevant information regarding plants and animals (Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas and Heugh 2012). Other aspects of this process may include the loss of patterns of thought related to grammatical categories or lexical semantics and the loss of lexicon-based associations connected to a particular language (cf. Zamyatin et al. 2012).

Further, it has been pointed out that the loss of ecological and linguistic diversity is—at least in some contexts—interconnected (Mühlhäusler 1996; Mufwene and Klasen 2005; Crystal 2000). This is understandable in that human cultural diversity typically reflects the diversity in terrain, flora and fauna through different livelihoods, settlement patterns and diet and all such aspects of cultural life support distinct speech communities. Such aspects of human life, in turn, have a linguistic expression in the system of toponyms, denominations of geographical features, plant and animal species.

Even health problems among indigenous peoples seem to be linked with the loss of languages, disappearance of traditional communities and loss of cultural heritage (Hallett et al. 2007; see also the chapter by Suzanne Romaine "The Global Extinction of Languages and Its Consequences for Cultural Diversity"). This is due to a variety of factors, most notably, the psychological stress experienced in a rapidly changing community marked with the loss of intergenerational cultural and also linguistic ties.

Each language, or a mix of languages used in a particular speech community, represents a unique discourse framework with a distinct tradition of use that has the potential to foster a culture different to those nurtured by any other linguistic bases and that functions as an expression of local values, social history and the conceptual realm. This is also the reason why for language revitalization, it is not enough to offer translations into the minority language of the same information that is already available in the majority languages. A translation merely transfers the discourse of the

dominating languages into the minority context but does not support the conceptual diversity that, in principle, is reachable in a plurilinguistic community (cf. also Fettes 1997).

1.5 Politicizing the Minority Language Issue

Clearly, the level of modernization of the language, i.e. the use of the language in schooling, work, media, popular culture and administration, as well as the social prestige of the language predicts much better the prospects of a language's survival than the number of speakers that the language has or the proportion of the minority and majority language speakers in an administrative territory. Therefore, the protection of minority languages is also an object of investigation for the political and social sciences (Gal 2010).

To understand how languages could be protected, in-depth research is being carried out by numerous scholars regarding the social processes that lead to marginalization, disempowerment and language death as well as those processes that make it possible for languages and cultures to survive in the circumstances of rapidly changing, urbanizing societies (Fishman 1991; Romaine 2000; Nettle and Romaine 2000; Crystal 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000; Hinton and Hale 2001; Extra and Gorter 2001; Kymlicka and Patten 2003; Harrisson 2007; Arzoz 2007; Edwards 2010; May 2012).

It can be assumed that, at least in most cases, guaranteeing social participation, most notably in the educational process through the transformation of minority languages into literary ones, access to resources and self-determination of groups differing in language or culture from dominating groups in a state are crucial for effective language maintenance. At the same time, minority-majority relations are frequently a polemic issue even in the most democratic of states. Although it has deep roots in the history of international law, awareness of the need to protect minorities has only in the last several decades become more widespread, with highly varying political regimes and solutions. As is presented in this book, even inside the European Union and in the Russian Federation the status of minority languages and their speech communities may range from fairly far-reaching minority protection regimes and autonomy regulations to a continuing lack of acceptance of linguistic and cultural diversity, where minority demands continue to be perceived as threats to nationhood.

Minority-majority relations are always inherently subjects to conflicts which may include questions of access to important resources, wealth, educational opportunities, political and societal participation and of setting linguistic and non-linguistic behavioral norms. Although minority protection thus goes hand in hand with issues of democracy and human rights, it would seem to be the case that the advancement of the latter is not necessarily accompanied by maintenance of linguistic diversity. In fact, many of the world's most democratic regimes are also the most linguistically uniform, such as the European states (only approx. 3 % of the world's languages are spoken in Europe). On the other hand, many societies with enormous linguistic diversity have dismal human rights record. The Chapter by Theodore Orlin in this book demonstrates that there is no human right to language maintenance, and such a

right can only be executed as part of one's right to practice his/her own culture. Even more notably, it has been pointed out that many of the Western democratic societies have emerged through a process of homogenization of identity and language in a vast area that, quite obviously, often had devastating consequences for linguistic and cultural plurality (Mann 2005). Therefore, there may be reason to suggest that a certain reduction of cultural and linguistic diversity has, at least in some historical periods, been one part of the democratization process where the ideological foundation of the state has been that of a homogeneous population.

Typically, countries have developed measures for protection of minority languages, but in many cases, these are orientated only towards those people who are considered to represent a particular minority. An analysis of the language legislation of different countries shows that it is usually assumed by the authorities that a person can have only one "true" mother tongue or ethnic identity. Those countries that collect information regarding the native languages of the population usually allow announcing only one native language in their statistics, thus creating what is often a heavily distorted image of the actual language use in the plurilingual minority communities. In circumstances when minority languages are increasingly spoken by bi- and multilingual communities with a variety of ethnic and linguistic identities, this state of affairs often leads to overt or hidden support of the majority identity at the expense of the minority identity.

Further, it would seem to be the case that very few (if any) countries support multi- and plurilingualism for the majority populations. It has been pointed out by ELDIA specialists that typically "acquired multilingualism" (i.e. learning major languages such as English) is seen as an asset for the individual and a necessary educational investment for the society but minority languages, on the other hand, are seen not in terms of 'doing' but in terms of 'being', as an integral part of belonging to an ethnic group (cf. Laakso et al. 2013).

In this respect, the linguistic cultures of Western countries and Russia would seem to be surprisingly similar. Although the official European Union language policies stress the need to develop a "plurilinguistic" approach to language education, minority languages are typically not taught to majorities and few measures are taken to promote their learning and use among the main population group. Exceptions to this are those cases where the linguistic minority exists in a nearly-majority position, and represents a well-integrated traditional group, such as the Catalan or Basque community in Spain, the Welsh community in the UK or the Swedish-speaking community in Finland. In Russia, a similar situation prevails: only few regional languages are widely taught to the Russian-speaking majority, and only in the autonomous regions that have the strongest local power centres (cf. Zamyatin et al. 2012). Even so, an asymmetric bilingualism prevails and the majority population's command of the regional language is low or often lacking altogether.

The existing modes of power exercised by policy-makers but also members of minorities influence the probability of cultural and linguistic survival. The degree of minorities' involvement in decision-making and particular channels of influence that concern specifically minority groups play a crucial role in defining the status of a minority community (Toivanen 2003). The latter includes the autonomy of

a minority in a given geographical area, independent decision-making in certain matters, special representation granted to minority groups in decision-making bodies or a special hearing procedure for minority groups in decision-making (Green 1995; Levy 1997; Arzoz 2008; Saarikivi and Marten 2012; Marten 2009; see also the chapter by Theodore S. Orlin "The Death of Languages; the Death of Minority Cultures; the Death of a People's Dignity" and the chapter by Heiko F. Marten "Parliamentary Structures and Their Impact on Minority Language Communities"). With regard to the possibilities of political influence, the significance lies in who are considered to be entitled to participate in political decision-making. This, in turn, depends on how the nature of the political community is understood; what kinds of conceptions about citizenship, nation and democracy hold a hegemonic position (Hammar 1990; Brubaker 1994; Rieger 1998). In order to understand the exercise of political power in the Russian Federation and the European Union, it is central to clarify the multifarious ways of marginalization by disseminating how the power structures of a hegemonic state organization are already a hidden agency of the empowerment projects and its consequences.

2 The European Union and the Russian Federation as Multilingual Regions

The identities, decline or empowerment tendencies and revitalization opportunities among the European Union and Russian minorities, developments in decentralized decision-making and self-determination and thereby also the long-term prospects of language survival provide an interesting possibility for a wide range of studies that profit from a comparative approach. As is apparent from the aforementioned, both regions share a number of interesting parallels, and it is remarkable that despite their proximity, contrastive studies which include both Russia and Europe seem to be rare.

2.1 The Present-Day Linguistic Multitude

About 8 % of Europe's population belongs to autochthonous minorities and 6.5 % to immigrant minorities and ca. 55 million people speak a minority language. In Russia, over 19 % of the population belong to national minorities and approx. 20 million or over 14 % report knowledge of their languages (Russian Census 2010, down from approx. 23 million and nearly 16 % in 2002). This number includes both the autochthonous as well as the immigrant minorities, although it should be noted that the former are more numerous in Russia (on the difficulties of determining the immigrant and autochthonous minorities, cf. below).

While the countries of the European Union represent a wide range of governance traditions, the Russian administrative structure is, for the most part, inherited from the Soviet period. Presently, there are 21 autonomous republics and four autonomous