

# **A LINGUISTIC ENCOUNTER BETWEEN NEIGHBORS AND RELATIVES: Reconnecting Estonian and Finnish in terms of contemporary multilingualism**

Mai Frick, Riho Grünthal and Kristiina Praakli

*Multilingual Practices in Finno-Ugric Communities.* 163-196.  
*Uralica Helsingiensia* 13. Helsinki 2018.

Keywords: multilingualism, language contacts, code-switching, morphology, Estonian, Finnish

## **Abstract**

*Contemporary mobility between Estonia and Finland is a versatile example of a sudden rise of the intermingling of two languages in a diverse language sociological context. The political situation, which prevailed after World War II and during the second half of the 20th century, prevented direct contacts between the Estonian and Finnish speech communities to a very large extent. Everyday contacts were very limited for several decades and took place only very irregularly regardless of the geographical adjacency of the two countries. In the 1990s, the situation changed abruptly after Estonia regained its independence, and some years later free travel was permitted. Currently, both Estonia and Finland are members of the European Union, which has brought the labour markets as well as the cultural and social networks of the two countries very close to one another and strongly contrasts with the earlier situation.*

*Intensive cultural and societal interaction influences the language use of individual people and micro communities in multiple ways. It is seen most illustratively in the private sphere. A regular boat connection between Estonia and Finland brings millions of people across the Gulf of Finland annually and tens of thousands of people have permanently or temporarily settled in their neighbouring country. The shared historical background and inherent grammatical and lexical features of the Estonian and Finnish languages are a substantial part of everyday contacts. These characteristics constitute the basis for mutual interaction and support the learning and adoption of practical skills in the neighbouring language.*

*This article discusses variance in code-switching between Estonian and Finnish both from a structural and interactional viewpoint. By code-switching we refer to the multiple morphological and morphosyntactic ways in which Estonians living in Finland and Finns living in Estonia combine their two sets of linguistic resources. To illustrate this, we use data both from social media and face-to-face conversations.*

## **1. Introduction**

In the long term, the current contact situation may reverse historical diversification processes of Finnish and Estonian. As a matter of fact, there are integrating trends which actually decrease the divergence between the two languages at issue. This is seen most clearly at a local level in micro communities. The current article aims at outlining different aspects involved in code-switching and the parallel use of Estonian and Finnish in interaction. In what follows, the term *code-switching* will be used as a default concept to refer to cases in which lexical and/or morphosyntactic material from at least two different languages appears in the same conversation (see, e.g., Kovács 2009: 24, Frick 2013: 10).

Our main purpose is to demonstrate the varied sources and effects of code-switching, as well as the fusion of lexis, codes, structures, and functions between two closely related languages. The topic will be focused from three different perspectives which are the sociohistorical background, the role of morphological and word-level phenomena, as well as the integration of multilingual patterns into the morphosyntax of the recipient language.

This paper is organised so that the introduction is followed by a concise overview of language contacts between Estonian and Finnish in section 2. The data used in this study are introduced in section 3.

More generally speaking, the contacts between the Estonian and Finnish speech communities are an illustrative example of contemporary mobility and a rapid change of the cultural context as they reflect our contemporary social environment. This aspect is discussed in section 4, which provides an overview on the historical contacts and modern mobility, the settling of an Estonian-speaking population in Finland and of Finns in Estonia. More detailed analysis of the nature and preconditions of code-switching phenomena is presented in the two following sections. In section 5, we discuss the shared grammatical and lexical basis between Estonian and Finnish in terms of inflectional morphology, labelled as the most language-specific domain by typologists (Haspelmath 2007). Furthermore, given that the intertwining of different language resources occurs at a morphosyntactic level, the diversity of actual code-switching instances is illustrated in section 6. These are followed by a brief discussion of analysed phenomena in section 7.

## **2. Earlier research on Finnish-Estonian contacts**

The contacts between Estonian and Finnish can be examined both from an areal and an interactional viewpoint. Areal contacts between Estonian and Finnish have mainly been researched on the basis of lexical influence and the diffusion of cultural words in a historical context (Björklöf 2012, Grünthal 1998, Punttila 1992, 1996, Söderman 1996). Less information is available on the simultaneous usage of the two languages in actual communication situations and the crossing of language borders in social networks. However, it is well-known, for instance, that the inhabitants of northeastern Estonia and the Finnish-speaking population of certain islands of the eastern part of the Gulf of Finland and the adjacent mainland regularly exchanged their food products in 19th century and early 20th century (Björklöf 2012: 8–15, Elstrok 1999, Luts 1968, 1969,

Vilkuna 1964: 144–155). Communication took place on the basis of what is currently labelled as receptive multilingualism: employing a language different from their partner's while still understanding each other mostly without the help of any additional lingua franca (see Rehbein, ten Thije & Verschik 2012). It is even reported that the Finnish partners attempted to make their language sound more Estonian in order to make their products more attractive (Björklöf 2012: 15, Elstrok 1999: 37–38).

Research into Estonian-Finnish multilingualism increased considerably during the beginning of the 21st century, although there still remain relevant gaps in the research of historical contacts, as well. Previous works have shed light on the structural aspects of the intertwining of the given languages and code-switching in Estonian-Finnish data, including morphological convergence in the speech of Ingrian Finns in Estonia (Riionheimo 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013a, 2013b), morphological integration by Finnish students in Estonia (Frick 2008), and bilingual compounds (Frick 2009). Riionheimo and Frick (2014) compare structural characteristics of code-switching of young and old Finns in Estonia. Sulkala (1994, 1996), Hintsala (1996), Kaivapalu (2005), Jokela and Paulsen (2010), and Spoelman (2013) focus on language acquisition while Härmävaara (2013, 2014, 2017), Kaivapalu and Muikku-Werner (2010), and Verschik (2012), have studied Finnish-Estonian receptive multilingualism. Three doctoral dissertations offer larger and more detailed accounts of code-switching: Hassinen (2002) focuses on bilingual first language acquisition, Praakli (2009) employs a code-copying framework based on the model of Lars Johanson (1993, 2002), and Frick (2013) views code-switching from an interactional linguistic perspective. More recently, Praakli (2014, 2016) as well as Härmävaara and Frick (2016) have focused on the pragmatics of Finnish-Estonian code-switching.

The parallel use of Estonian or Finnish with a major Indo-European language has been studied, as well. The contact between Estonian and Russian, for instance, and the intertwining of these two speech communities have been reported in several studies (Bahtina-Jantsikene 2013, Jürgenstein 2012, Verschik 2004a, 2004b, 2007, 2016, Viikberg 1989, Zabrodskaia 2005, 2009), whereas contacts between Finnish and English have been examined in different areas (cf. Kovács in this volume), as have contacts between Finnish and Swedish (see, e.g., Fremer 2000, Saari 2006, Henricson 2013).

Sociolinguistically, the contact situation between Estonian and Finnish – as well as that of Estonian or Finnish with Russian – diverges considerably from that of Russian and other Finnic languages such as Karelian that have a lower social status and a limited space of usage (cf. Karjalainen & al. 2013, Puura & al. 2013, Sarhimaa 1999), while Estonian and Finnish are typical European languages and are applied in a wide array of modern urban domains. Structurally, the language contact situation described in the current article is a contact between languages that share the lexical and grammatical basis and are thus less distinct than the Finnic languages are in comparison with Russian.

### 3. Data

The empirical part of the paper is based on multilingual practices among Estonians living in Finland and Finns living in Estonia. Examples will be presented from the speech and informal writing of both Estonian and Finnish informants based on two earlier data sets (see, Praakli 2009, Frick 2013), which are substantially compatible (see, however, Frick 2013: 48–49).

The material representing Estonians in Finland consists of both spoken data (Praakli 2009), and written data from social media (Praakli 2016). Semi-formal interviews were carried out in 2000–2002 and 2005 with 25 Estonian speakers in the city of Tampere, and these yielded a total amount of 30 hours of conversations (Praakli 2009). When presenting examples in the following, we will use the abbreviation EST\_INT to mark these data. The social media data (EST\_SM) were collected in 2015 and consist of ca. 465 Facebook wall posts together with their comments (Praakli 2016). All informants are recent migrants who have moved, alone or with their families, to Finland after 1991, hence, after Estonia regained its independence. The vast majority of this group are young or middle-aged Estonian-speakers with a heterogeneous sociolinguistic background. At the time of the interviews, the informants spoke colloquial standard Estonian as their mother tongue (L1) and Finnish as a foreign language (L2). Most of the informants have learned Finnish through everyday interaction after migrating to Finland as adults.

Likewise, the data casting light on Finnish in Estonia consist of both spoken and written informal language. Seven recordings of everyday conversations, a total of 15 hours, were made between 2000–2010. The conversations are mainly conducted among Finnish students and work-related migrants in the city of Tartu, and the main language of the conversations was Finnish. Approximately 200 examples of code-switching to Estonian were attested in the data. These examples are marked FIN\_CONV in the following. Written informal data were drawn, firstly, from about 2000 e-mail messages from Finns to Finns, in which a total of 550 code-switching instances to Estonian were found (marked FIN\_EMAIL). Basic information and metadata of the participants were collected by means of a web-based questionnaire, which focused on the language choices in different domains.

There is considerable variation between the code-switching patterns of individual speakers. Generally speaking, the main languages of communication of Estonians in Finland were Finnish and Estonian. As a rule, English (but sometimes also Russian) was used as the *lingua franca* only with people speaking some other language. The responses by Finns living in Estonia revealed that both Estonian (public sphere) and Finnish (private sphere) are used as dominant languages in certain domains. English is present especially in media and occasionally used as a *lingua franca*. Nevertheless, despite the aim to compare parallel cases in Estonia and Finland, the survey conducted amongst Finns in Estonia is not entirely compatible with that of Estonians in Finland. Yet, the surveys clearly indicate that Finns in Estonia have somewhat fewer opportunities to use their L1 in the public sphere than Estonians do in Finland. (Frick 2013: 12–17; Praakli 2017.) This is not a surprising result, as the

Finnish-speaking population in Estonia is considerably smaller than Estonian in Finland. Nevertheless, it contradicts the widely spread belief among Finns that Finnish can be widely used in Estonia.

The extracts are chosen in order to illustrate code-switching at the sentence-level. Nevertheless, code-switching is also common in **non-sentence-like** units such as greetings or expletives. In our data, in which the base language of the texts is always the speakers first language, sentence-level code-switching is typical for speakers, who have had time to acquire the grammar of the second language, while greetings are often adopted at a very early stage after arrival to the new country (see, e.g., Frick 2013: 16–17). As emphasized in language contact studies (Clyne 2003, Matras 2006, Muysken 2000, Thomason 2001, Winford 2003), it is not always possible, or necessary, to make an explicit distinction between word-level borrowings and code-switching.

The next section will provide a short typological outline of some of the most fundamental differences between Estonian and Finnish.

#### **4. The diversification of Estonian and Finnish**

Linguistically, contacts between closely related languages are a rather frequent phenomenon as language boundaries often emerge through a gradual diversification of dialects and geographically adjacent communities. There are several examples of rather vague isoglosses in different parts of Europe, for instance, if one considers the relationship between various Germanic, Slavic, and Romance languages. Compared to other modern European countries and language areas, Estonian and Finnish yield a rather different language contact situation as they are typologically and historically different from Indo-European languages, both belonging to the Finnic branch of the Uralic languages.

Despite transparent shared vocabulary and similar inflectional paradigms there are considerable morphological and other typological differences between Estonian and Finnish. Paradigmatically, most inflectional categories are attested in both languages, including both a rich case system and verb inflection. However, although Estonian and Finnish share the vast majority of paradigmatic categories, there are striking differences in the inflection of individual words, the way grammatical relations and semantic structures are manifested.

More fine-grained distinctions are seen in the inflection of cases that display core grammatical roles. In Estonian they are strongly eroded and often display flexive forms whereas Finnish typically has segmental suffixes. Furthermore, at the syntactic level, Estonian often exhibits analytic verb phrases instead of the higher degree of synthesis manifested in Finnish. Consequently, in some typological studies Estonian has even been labelled as a completely flective (alternatively fusional) language (Korhonen 1996 [1980]: 187, [1982] 208, Skalička 1975, Viitso 1998: 110). From a more holistic viewpoint, this claim does not hold and is limited only to some key categories (Grünthal 2000, Rätsep 1981, Tauli 1984, Viitso 1990). Yet, in comparison with other Uralic languages, Estonian clearly exhibits a more frequently analytic structures and is

syntactically closer to Standard Average European in many ways (Erelt & Metslang 2006, Metslang 2009).

From a historical perspective, the contrast between two modern standard languages, such as Estonian and Finnish, reflects only a recent stage in a long-term development and the political context of the end of 19th and beginning of 20th century. Although the first efforts to create a literary language in both countries were made in the 16th century and the development of the following centuries gradually led to the establishment of a normative standard (Raag 1999, 2008), a more widespread adoption of a standard language did not begin before 20th century. The foundation of a school system based on a national language effectively promoted the use of a common standard in Estonia (Karjahärm & Sirk 1997, Talve 2004) and Finland, where the effect of school education in the national language began already at the second half of 19th century (see, e.g., Hakulinen & al. 2009: 25–27). While dialects and areal variants were still the dominant variants of both Estonian and Finnish during the first half of the 20th century, urbanisation, the intensifying of education, and mass media gave the upper hand to the spread of a literary standard and new colloquial variants based on the language of cities and the public sphere.

The beginning of the 20th century was an especially intensive period in the contacts between Estonian and Finnish, with hundreds of Finnish words purportedly borrowed into Estonian from Finnish. This occurred parallel with systematic language planning and was aimed at enriching lexical nuances by importing new units from a closely related language. (Chalvin 1992, Raag 1999, 2008, Rätsep 1976, 1981.)

Due to the Soviet occupation of Estonia, migration between the two countries stopped for almost 50 years (see Grünthal 2009; Koreinik & Praakli 2017; Rausmaa 2007, 2013; Zetterberg 2007). Contacts were re-established and new migrant communities arose around the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Compared to those contacts that occurred in a limited local framework, the contemporary contacts between Estonian and Finnish are very profuse and most likely more intensive than ever. Table 1 sums up the history of language contacts between Estonian and Finnish from the mid-19th century until today, and the sociological and political context that affected these contacts (based on Grünthal 2009: 237–238).

Table 1. The sociohistorical context of contacts between Estonian and Finnish.

Period	Sociohistorical and political context	Linguistic processes
1850–1900	The rise of modern national culture in Finland and Estonia, both parts of the Russian empire. The position of the Finnish language becomes stronger, while the public use of Estonian remains very limited. Mutual trading in the eastern area of the Gulf of Finland.	Areal contacts and borrowings between northeastern Estonia, Ingria, and southeastern Finland, including insular regions. First literary loans are borrowed from Finnish into Estonian.

1900–1940	Intensive cultural interaction. Political contacts emerge between the two independent states in the 1920s. Nationalism in both countries. Areal contacts and occasional migration.	Intentional intensive borrowing of literary loans from Finnish into Estonian. Areal diffusion continues to some extent. Increasing importance of the standard language in both communities.
1940–1965	World War II causes a total interruption of contacts between the two sides of the Iron Curtain. During the post-war period many Ingrian Finns settle in Estonia.	No areal contacts. Occasional language contacts in micro communities, which, however, remain undocumented.
1965–1990	A gradual increase of travel and contacts under strict control. Finnish radio and television broadcasts can be followed on the northern coast of Estonia.	No areal contacts. Bilingualism in micro communities among Ingrian Finns in Estonia. Increasing lexical borrowing from Finnish to Estonian, models of modern concepts.
1990–2004	Intensive cultural, social, economic, and political contacts. A sudden increase of mutual networking and mobility. Estonia and Finland are integrated by Western political collaboration, trade, and legislation. Increase of mixed marriages. Extensive tourism and travel.	Intensive language contacts. The Finnish model is consulted in Estonian language planning, the renewing of lexicon and public usage of language. Simultaneous usage of the two languages in speech communities and micro societies such as families, student and working groups.
2004–	Both countries are member states of the EU. Free labour mobility. Transnationalism, commuting. Regular intensive mutual collaboration, social, cultural, and economic interaction. Even more extensive tourism and travel.	Simultaneous usage of the two languages in numerous speech communities and micro societies such as families, student and working groups.

One of the specific characteristics of contemporary migration between Estonia and Finland is transnationalism (Jakobson & al. 2013, Koreinik & Praakli 2017: 87–88; see also Hyvönen 2007, Kingumets 2008, Kauber 2015), which refers to the multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation states (cf. Vertovec 1999: 1). The geographical adjacency of these countries and that of their capitals, Helsinki and Tallinn, which are located only a distance of roughly 80 kilometers away from each other, facilitates various cross-border practices, such as commuting for work, study, tourism, economic, political, cultural activities, etc. At present, thousands of Estonians commute weekly to Finland (VisitFinland 2016), while thousands of Finnish tourists visit Tallinn<sup>1</sup>.

Sociolinguistically, Estonians residing in Finland, Finns residing in Estonia, as well as Estonians and Finns commuting between Estonia and Finland represent relatively “new” language communities. In 2015, there were officially 48 087 people in Finland who had registered Estonian as their mother tongue (Tilastokeskus 2016)

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Foreign Ministry of Estonia, 900 000 Finns stayed overnight in Estonia in 2014 (Välisministeerium 2016). An even bigger number of visitors and tourists pay a daily visit without staying overnight.

and 2621 people in Estonia, whose mother tongue was reported to be Finnish (Eesti Statistika 2016, RL0421, RL0431).

The Estonian immigrant community in Finland is the second-largest group in terms of mother tongue after the Russians, with Russian officially having 72 436 speakers (Tilastokeskus 2016). The number of Estonians living or working in Finland grew rapidly after Estonia's entry into the European Union in 2004. Since 2006, Finland has been the main destination country for Estonian citizens, particularly among the young working-age population (PHC 2013). Similarly to other immigrant groups in Finland (Rapo 2011), Estonians tend to concentrate in metropolitan areas, i.e., Helsinki, Vantaa and Espoo in the Uusimaa region in southern Finland, and in other major cities, such as Tampere, Turku, and Lahti, situated at a distance of roughly two hundred kilometres or less from Helsinki (see Koreinik and Praakli 2017).

The number of ethnic Finns in Estonia, officially totaling 7321 in 2015 (Eesti Statistika 2016, RV022<sup>2</sup>), includes recent migrants, as well as Ingrian Finns who migrated to Estonia from other parts of the Soviet Union mainly in the 1940s and 1950s (see, e.g., Anepaio 1999). The last Estonian population census carried out in 2011, reported 1519 Finnish citizens living in Estonia and 2621 people whose mother tongue was Finnish (Eesti Statistika 2016, RL0421, RL0431). During the past decade (2004–2014), an annual average of 192 people born in Finland moved to Estonia according to the Estonian Statistical System (Eesti Statistika 2016, RVR09).

Compared to the high number of Estonian migrants in Finland, the situation of migrant Finns in Estonia is different. According to official statistics, the Finns do not belong to the largest ethnic minorities in Estonia, which lists three Slavic-speaking groups as the largest ones, namely, Russians (330 258 people in 2015), Ukrainians (22 562), and Belarusians (12 215) (Eesti Statistika 2016, RV022). According to the Embassy of Finland (2016), the majority of Finns in Estonia live in and around the capital Tallinn and are currently working either for Finnish companies or private entrepreneurs. Moreover, ca. 1300 Finnish students study in Estonia (op.cit.).

## **5. A morphological and lexical preamble: diversification and reunification**

This section will give an overview of the phonological and morphological characteristics of code-switching between Estonian and Finnish. The main focus is on morphology and inflection of words. In the research of language contacts and code-switching, switching individual words and borrowing are often considered as the first stage of foreign influence and many scholars even consider it a subtype of code-switching (Clyne 2003: 70–102, Kovács 2001: 63–64, Matras 2009: 101–145, Myers-Scotton 1992, 1993, Thomason 2001: 131–156). In the contact situation between Estonian and Finnish, a word is more than a single lexical unit because a word often includes grammatical information on morphological rules. The same is valid for other similar instances in which languages displaying inflectional morphology are involved.

---

<sup>2</sup> The code (e.g., RV0222) specifies the statistics used.



This encompasses both affixal forms and stem alternation. The inflection of words is the basic means for marking grammatical relations and, as mentioned above, in addition to basic vocabulary, Estonian and Finnish share basic inflectional categories. As a rule, verb inflection is based on suffixal forms. Furthermore, most inflectional cases are in common and transparent for both speakers with the exception of cases marking core grammatical functions, which are influenced by the strong erosion of suffixes in Estonian.

Although morphology and, more precisely, inflectional morphology, is considered the most language-specific feature any language can have (Haspelmath 2007, 2010: 664–674; for recent discussion of language-specific and comparative categories, see *Linguistic Typology* 20 (2016)), there are many conjugation and declension types in Estonian and Finnish that share the inflectional stem. This is true for two-syllable vowel-final words, such as Estonian and Finnish *kala* ‘fish’, *muna* ‘egg’, which do not display intervocalic consonant alternation. However, as noted, typologically there are some fundamental differences between the inflection of grammatical cases. Morphologically, one of the most influential sources for divergence are different stem alternation rules, which affect both single and geminate plosives in both languages, and have a much wider impact on word stem structure in Estonian.

The distinction between the nominative, genitive, partitive, and illative singular in Estonian is mainly based on flexion and has special importance for distinguishing between the subject and object, the nominal core arguments. In certain word type this has led to extensive syncretism, which blurs the grammatical effectiveness of inflectional morphology (Baerman 2005, Baerman & al. 2005, Blevins 2005, Grünthal 2001, 2007, 2010). The similarities and dissimilarities between Estonian and Finnish word inflection have been analysed in more detailed from a contrastive perspective by Remes (2009).

Table 2 illustrates the basic similarities and typological differences between Estonian and Finnish core grammatical cases. The chosen words belong to the shared lexicon, *käsi* with two historical alterations which are the weakening of intervocalic \**t* and the common Finnic sound change *ti > si*, *pesä* ~ *pesa* historically a two-syllable non-alternating stem with an open vowel in the second syllable, *tytär* ~ *tütär* a consonant-ending two-syllable word historically alternating with a three-syllable stem.

Table 2. The main differences between Estonian and Finnish case inflection.

	‘hand’		‘nest’		‘daughter’	
	Estonian	Finnish	Estonian	Finnish	Estonian	Finnish
NOM	<i>käsi</i>	<i>käsi</i>	<i>pesa</i>	<i>pesä</i>	<i>tütär</i>	<i>tytär</i>
GEN	<i>käe</i>	<i>käde-n</i>	<i>pesa</i>	<i>pesä-n</i>	<i>tütre</i>	<i>tyttäre-n</i>
PTV	<i>kätt</i>	<i>kät-tä</i>	<i>pesa</i>	<i>pesä-ä</i>	<i>tütär-t</i>	<i>tytär-tä</i>
ILL	<i>kätte</i>	<i>käte-en</i>	<i>pessa</i> ~ <i>pesasse</i>	<i>pesä-än</i>	<i>tütre-sse</i>	<i>tyttäre-en</i>

Considering the purpose of the current article, the point is that despite a major typological difference in the inflection of the genitive, partitive, and the illative, which is an adverbial case, the word stem still remains identifiable on the basis of the other language involved. Estonian and Finnish *käsi* ‘hand’ is identifiable for the speakers of either language on the basis of the nominative form and the historical consonant stem *kät-*, although the actual case forms diverge from one another and are based on differing inflectional strategies.

The morphophonological splitting between Estonian *pesa*, Finnish *pesä* ‘nest’ is manifested in the divergence of the stem and the loss of vowel harmony and the lack of front vowels in non-initial syllables in Estonian. The stem *pesa* does not directly correspond to any identical Finnish stem. In principle, *pesa* would be entirely possible in Finnish and displays a similar vowel sequence as *mela* ‘paddle’ (Estonian *mõla*), i.e., a back vowel instead of a front vowel in the second syllable. In this case, the word would not follow the vowel harmony rules of *pesä*. Yet, there is no such word as *pesa* in Finnish and the word *pesä* can only be perceived as *pesa* in Estonian, thus corresponding to its etymological cognate.

Finally, the third example in Table 2, Estonian *tütar*, Finnish *tytär* ‘daughter’ shows more commonalities between the two languages. Estonian *tütar* has replaced the front vowel *ä* in the second syllable with the corresponding back vowel *a*, as in *pesa* above. However, the nominative and partitive forms display a consonant stem *tütar*, which increases the morphological distinctiveness of the word and makes it a more transparent parallel of Finnish *tytär* in an actual speech situation. In all three examples it must be emphasized that, ultimately, the syntactic position of a given word plays an equally important role in the understanding of its semantic role for both first- and second-language speakers (see, Kaivapalu & al. 2014; Kaivapalu 2015).

Considering the phonological differences between Estonian and Finnish, certain basic differences are reflected in the adoption of code-switched words. More generally speaking, these characteristics can also be considered a specific type of word formation (see also Praakli 2010, 2014). In the data, when adapting Finnish words to the phonotactic rules of Estonian, Estonians living in Finland frequently eliminate vowel harmony as in Est. (colloquial) *üritusjuhtaja* < Fi. *yrittysjuhtaja* ‘business executive’ and Est. (col.) *henkilotunnus* < Fi. *henkilötunnus* ‘personal identity code’. In these words, the second-syllable front vowel, more precisely Finnish *-y-* and *-ö-*, is replaced with a corresponding back vowel in Estonian, namely *-u-* and *-o-*.

Another characteristic way of adjusting Finnish nouns to Estonian phonology is the spreading of apocope, the loss of word-final vowels, in multisyllable Finnish nouns, such as Est. (col.) *poliis* < Fi. *poliisi* ‘police’, Est. *maistraat* < Fi. *maistraatti* ‘city administrative court’. And finally, one other typical example of the difference between Estonian and Finnish phonology, long vowels are shortened in unstressed syllables as in Est. (col.) *sairala* < Fi. *sairaala* ‘hospital’.

The importance of these differences can also be observed in the opposite direction of borrowing when Finns in Estonia adapt Estonian words to Finnish phonological rules, if the stem diverges from the expected Finnish one. The preference for vowel-

final nominative forms is shown by the addition of a final vowel in singular nominatives, such as Fi. (colloquial) *viikki* < Est. *viik* ‘tie; draw’, Fi. (col.) *korppi* < Est. (col.) *corp* ‘(students’) association’, Fi. (col.) *masina* < Est. *masin* ‘machine’. Certain nouns and adjectives have a word-final *-n* in Finnish, a substitution for the loss of this element that has taken place in Estonian as in Fi. (col.) *praktinen* < Est. *praktiline* ‘practical’, Fi. (col.) *võimalinen* < Est. *võimeline* ‘able, capable’. In the latter case, Finnish *voima* ‘strength; force’ is an etymological cognate of Estonian *võim* ‘authority; power’. Instead of applying the corresponding Finnish stem, the Estonian stem and its semantic properties are preserved in the transmitted derivation.

Finally, a very illustrative difference between the vowel paradigms is that Estonian has the central vowel *õ*, which is completely absent in Finnish. Conceivably, in colloquial speech, it is normally substituted either with Finnish *ö* or *o* as in Fi. (col.) *röömus* < Est. *rõõmus* ‘happy; joyful’, Fi. (col.) *joulisii* powerful.PTV < Est. *jõulisi* powerful.PTV ‘powerful, forceful’<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, in informal written data, the possibilities of dexterous orthographic solutions are occasionally used by both Estonians and Finns. These include the substitution of Estonian *ü* and *õ* with Finnish *y* and Estonian *õ* with Finnish *ö* or *o* following the phonological substitution described above.

Like phonological adaptation, morphological integration is a basic tool for the adoption of new units in both data sets (see Frick 2008, 2013: 16–17; Praakli 2009: 115–140, 2015: 391). It happens most typically by adding L1 suffixes to L2 nouns and verbs, which are thus integrated into the recipient language of the conversation. In general, the adoption of Finnish vocabulary into Estonian or vice versa is not complicated as the basic syllable structure of inflectional stems in both languages most commonly ends in a vowel and vowel stems are preferred, as a rule (VISK §55; 63–77, Viitso 2003: 10–81). However, as both languages display quite extensive morphophonological alternation following language-specific rules, the integration of a given word affects the stem, affix, and inflectional rules of the word at issue. Extracts (1) and (2) are taken from a mailing list of Finnish students studying in Estonia. The authors of the informal excerpts are native Finnish speakers.

(1) FIN\_EMAIL

*Koite-taan pääs-tä latino+pidu-un.*  
 attempt-PASS get-INF Latino.party-ILL  
 ‘Let’s try to get to the Latino party!’

In (1), the stem of the compound word *latinopiduun* is inflected like any two-syllable Finnish word with a CVCV stem. The illative case is indicated by the lengthening of the word-final vowel and the nasal, accordingly *-V<sup>2</sup>V<sup>2</sup>n*. However, in Finnish the stem is always in the strong grade if the given word displays consonant gradation, whereas

---

<sup>3</sup> In the word *joulisii* the partitive form of the word is based on the lengthening of the stem vowel, characteristic of colloquial Finnish but different from the standard language displaying a word-final *-a* in plural.

an intervocalic *-d-* never occurs in a strong grade in inherent vocabulary. In Estonian, none of the possible illative forms of the word *pidu* ‘party’, which are *peo-sse ~ pidu-sse ~ pittu*, correspond to the Finnish illative. Moreover, morphosyntactically the allative form *peo-le* party-ALL is more common and would be expected in this context. The plural nominative displays the normal consonant gradation rules in Finnish and the stem occurs in a weak grade in a closed syllable. Thus, the plural form (2) *latinopidut* is comparable with the Finnish cognate stem *pito* : *pido-t* party-PL ‘parties’.

## (2) FIN\_EMAIL

*Hei, joo mu-lle paita ja latino+pidu-t on tä-llä hetke-llä "on hold".*

hi yes I-ALL shirt and Latino+party-PL is this-ADE moment-ADE on hold  
 ‘Hi, yes, a shirt for me, and the Latino party is “on hold” at the moment.’

In the analysed data, verbs are integrated in a similar manner, which is seen, for example, in the native Finnish speakers’ use of colloquial Finnish infinitive forms and modification of the consonant gradation when necessary, as in Fi. (col.) *nakattua* < Est. *nakatuda* ‘to catch (a disease)’ and Fi. (col.) *piiluu* < Est. *piiluda* ‘to snoop’.

Another type of morphological integration is seen in (3), a spoken utterance by an Estonian residing in Finland. It is not possible to decide on the basis of the recording, whether the stop in the last syllable is a Finnish voiceless dental *t* or an Estonian voiceless alveolar or post-dental *d*. The interpretation of *maahanmuuttajaida ~ maahanmuuttajaita* depends on which language is considered to be the grammatical base language. In Finnish, the expected plural partitive form would be *maahanmuuttajia* lacking an overtly manifested plosive in the suffix, whereas in Estonian the given stem type ending in *-ja* would suggest a plural partitive ending *-id* as in *õpetaja-id* teacher-PTV ‘teachers’. The informant actually combines the plural partitive formation rules of both languages involved.

## (3) EST\_INT

*Mina ela-n sellise-s maja-s, ku-s on palju maahan+muuttaja-i-t/d-a.*

I live-1SG such-INE house-INE, where-INE is many immigrant-PL-PTV-PTV  
 ‘I live in such a house, in which there are many immigrants.’

The morphological dimension of code-switching discussed here is pervasive because it involves basic typological differences. In his analysis of Estonian morphological paradigms Blevins (2005: 7–8) notes that, actually, the kennform category varies between declension types. The concept of a kennform (the English *leading form* is less frequently used) originates from Wolfgang Wurzel’s (1984) natural morphology and suggests that certain inflectional forms include the core information of the declension or conjugation type, whereas the rest of the paradigm is predictable on the basis of the kennform. Hence, it may be either the nominative, genitive, or partitive singular depending on the stem, declension type, and its permutations. However, it is likely that it is not solely a word-level prosodic structure or morphological form that determines

the kennform of bilingual Estonian and Finnish phrases. As Müller (2013) has recently emphasised, morphological phenomena are paired with morphosyntactic values. Shared syntactic characteristics such as case government and word order increase or decrease the similarity embedded units and the context.

The next section will focus on the morphosyntactic properties of code-switched elements and syntactic impact of code-switching in more detail.

## 6. Morphosyntax of Estonian-Finnish and Finnish-Estonian code-switching

The discussion in this section will follow Muysken's (2000) classification of code-switching patterns, alternatively *code-mixing* in his terminology. We will start by discussing examples of congruent lexicalisation, then insertions (in Muysken's terms), and finally the alternation of morphosyntactically complete chunks of speech. Muysken's model is based on the presumption that some language pairs share linguistic structures despite apparent lexical differences. Congruent lexicalisation can happen when two languages share a linguistic structure, and speakers fill this structure with lexemes from the two languages (Muysken 2000: 122–153). In Finnish and Estonian, the basic constituent order and argument structure are shared. For instance, the order of the head and modifier of a genitive phrase is the same in Estonian and Finnish as the genitive attribute always precedes the head and several modifiers may follow one another. This is seen in (4), which is taken from an e-mail message written by a Finn living in Estonia. The recipient language of the message is Finnish.

### (4) FIN\_EMAIL

*Kato-i-n muuten mi-tä ema+joe-n äri+keskukse-n sauna-n vuokraaminen maksa-a.*  
 watch-PST-1SG by.the.way what-PTV Ema+jõgi-GEN business+centre-GEN sauna-GEN  
 hiring cost-3SG

‘By the way, I checked how much renting the sauna of Emajõe shopping centre costs.’

Extract (4) involves two genitive phrases. The first one is a calque of the name of an Estonian business centre *Emajõe ärikeskus* consisting of two compound nouns. In both cases the stem belongs to shared vocabulary, namely Estonian *jõgi* : *jõe* ‘river’, Finnish *joki* : *joen* ‘id.’, and Estonian *keskus* : *keskuse* ‘centre’, Finnish *keskus* : *keskuksen* ‘id.’. Moreover, the word Estonian *saun* : *sauna*, Finnish *sauna* : *saunan* belongs to the shared lexicon as well. These parallels allow for the smooth transfer of an Estonian phrase into colloquial Finnish without violating its inherent morphosyntactic structure. However, in the given case the point is that the genitive phrase and the constituent order constitute the morphosyntactic pattern in which lexical modifications are done.

Another type of switching benefitting from lexical similarities between the languages is translations that are created by means of an item-by-item translation of the source unit (Frick 2009; cf. Verschik 2002, 2004a, 2016 on Estonian-Russian data). These are typically complex lexical units, either compound words or phrasal expressions which are phonetically close but have a different meaning as in (5).

(5) EST\_INT

*Minu töö-ks on ürituste+vaheline arvuti+võrku-de loomine.*

I.GEN job-TRA is company/happening.PL.GEN.inter computer.network-PL.GEN creating  
'My job is to create computer networks between companies/activities.'

In (5), the Finnish noun phrase *yritystenvälinen* 'between companies' serves as the model for the phonetically similar Estonian adjective phrase *üritustevaheline* consisting of lexical cognates. The code-switching includes a semantic loan because in monolingual Estonian, the phrase would have a different meaning 'between events'. More precisely, the difference is based on the different meaning of the modifier, Finnish *yritys* 'company; enterprise' and Estonian *üritus* 'happening, activity'. However, the word itself was originally borrowed from Finnish, first as a verb *üritama* 'to try' (Rätsep 1976: 215–216).

There are also examples of code-switching, in which lexical similarities between the two languages play no role. In (6)<sup>4</sup>, a genitive phrase resembling a compound noun consisting of *söökla* 'canteen' and *haju* 'smell', exploits a similar morphosyntactic relationship between the modifier and the head. Neither *söökla* nor *haju* bare any phonetic resemblance to their etymological cognate in the other language.

(6) FIN\_CONV

*Siellä on söökla haju ku joku teke-e ruoka-a.*

there be.3SG restaurant(.GEN)+smell when somebody make-3SG food-PTV  
'There is the smell of a canteen when somebody is cooking'

The modifier in (6) *söökla* 'canteen' is clearly exhibited in Estonian, but because of the lack of morphological marking as an *a*-stem bisyllabic word it is impossible to determine the case on the basis of the inflection. It can be encoded both as the nominative and genitive. In both languages both nominative and genitive cases are possible in the modifier of a compound noun. The genitive, in the given example is, however, the most probable choice of case in both languages and especially in Estonian because the modifier occurs in the genitive considerably more often than the nominative.

Muysken's model includes other types of code-switching, as well. One of these is insertion, which is used when a given structure is not shared by the two languages. In this case, the speaker has to adapt the morphosyntactic characteristics of the utterance in order to combine the two elements (Muysken 2000: 60–95). However, insertions are very rare in our data. We suspect that this has to do with the structural similarity and genetic affinity of the languages. It is also noteworthy that the contact situation is new, the speakers represent the first generation and use both their L1 and L2 in monolingual contexts. A different kind of contact situation of the same language pair has led to

---

<sup>4</sup> This example is analysed from another perspective in Frick (2013:49–50).

more intensive intermingling of the languages also on the structural level (Riionheimo & Frick 2014).

Some bilingual compounds can, with some notes of caution, be regarded as insertions. The selection of the case of the modifier depends on the semantic relation of the modifier and head. As a rule, the genitive case is much more common in Estonian than Finnish. There are examples, in which the genitive case is obligatory in Estonian, while Finnish uses the nominative. Such is the compound word denoting ‘kidney book’ in (7), taken from an e-mail message of a Finn living in Estonia.

(7) FIN\_EMAIL

*Mä oon täydellisesti menettä-nyt hermo-ni se-n **neeru**+kirja-n kanssa....*

I am totally loose-PST.PTCP nerve-1SG it-GEN kidney.GEN+book-GEN with  
‘I’ve totally lost my nerve with that kidney book.’

In (7), the Estonian modifier *neeru* ‘kidney’ is in the genitive case whereas the nominative form would be *neer*. A monolingual Finnish compound with a similar meaning would, however, require the modifier to be in the nominative case as in *sieni+kirja* mushroom.NOM+book.NOM ‘mushroom book’. Thus, the compound is based on modifying both the lexical and morphosyntactic characteristics of *neeru* according to Estonian grammar. Nevertheless, this corresponds to the phonological adaptation of Estonian words in Finnish discourse (cf. section 3). In the given example the Estonian genitive ends in a final vowel, which as an inflectional stem resembling most Finnish nominative case nouns.

The discussion above also illustrates the relative ease with which speakers can switch between Estonian and Finnish. Since the languages share a great deal of their morphosyntactic structures, they remain intact in most code-switching types. There are, nevertheless, some examples, in which two different morphosyntactic structures are combined. Although speakers of Estonian and Finnish need not make many morphosyntactic modifications subsumed to code-switching, this is not the whole picture. As we saw in the analysis of compound nouns, structure does not exist in isolation of the lexicon. It is sometimes impossible to distinguish whether a switch happens at the “structural” or “lexical” level. An example of this is semantic loans of multi-word constructions.

Semantic loans are a special subtype of code-switching, in which the meaning is taken from the other language, although a given word is seemingly monolingual. When the semantic loan occurs in a syntactic unit consisting of several words and is governed by internal morphosyntactic relations, a semantic loan can occur as an insertion-like modification of the morphosyntactic structure. In (8) and (9), the quantifier *kaikki* ‘all’ is located in a sentence-final position, follows the predicate *on* ‘is’ and is a part of the Finnish lexicon. Extracts (8) and (9) are taken from a mailing list of Finnish students in Estonia. The authors of the excerpts are native Finnish speakers, and the recipient language is Finnish.

(8) FIN\_EMAIL

*Se on siis lyhyesti kaikki.*

it is then briefly all

‘Thus, this is briefly all.’

(9) FIN\_EMAIL

*Joo, nää on kaikki ÕIS:ssa ja K. Kuuse sano-i että tää on kaikki*

yes, these is all ÕIS-INE and K. Kuuse say-PST that this is all

‘Yes, these are all in ÕIS and K. Kuuse said that this is all.’

From the perspective of Finnish syntax, the expected default value of the two examples, *kaikki* must be followed by a locative modifier as in (9) *kaikki ÕIS:ssa*. The two other occurrences lack this morphosyntactic value and actually obey Estonian lexically derived syntactic rules corresponding to the use of the Estonian cognate word *kõik* ‘all’. The phrase *tää on kaikki* ‘this is all’ in (9) indicates that everything has been said about the topic (cf. Estonian *see on kõik*). Structurally, the phrase consists of a pronominal subject, the predicate, and the quantifier.

We will next move to the alternation of units, for which morphosyntactic modification is not an issue. Alternation involves switching chunks of speech so that the speaker moves from using structures and lexicon of one language to that of the other. Since the applied lexicon matches the language of the structure of each chunk, then no morphosyntactic modifications are needed. (Muysken 2000: 96–121.) Extract (10) is drawn from an e-mail message of a Finnish student living in Estonia.

(10) FIN\_EMAIL

*Kuten kaikki kuul-i-mme, kuningatar on tulo-ssa vierailu-lle perjantai-na,*

like all hear-PST-1PL queen is coming-INE visit-ALL Friday-ESS

*minkä vuoksi õpetus ei toimu klo 12 jälkeen ja keskkonna-n praksi-a ei oo.*

what.GEN because.of teaching NEG occur clock 12 after and environment-GEN practice-PTV NEG be.CNG

‘As we all heard, the queen is coming for a visit on Friday, due to which there will be no classes after 12, and no class in environmental medicine.’

The above extract (10) is one of the few examples in the data, in which not only a longer chunk of speech or informal text is switched, but also the morphosyntactic organisation of the text changes together with the switch. The Estonian phrase *õpetus ei toimu*, literally ‘teaching doesn’t take place’ has no direct morphosyntactic equivalent in Finnish. It is placed in a Finnish subordinate clause and framed by a Finnish subordinating phrase *minkä vuoksi* ‘due to which’ and an adverbial clause *klo 12 jälkeen* ‘after 12 o’clock’.



## 7. Discussion

Similarly to code-switching between Finnish and English (see, e.g., Halmari 1997, Kovács 2001) and respectively between Finnish and Swedish (see, e.g., Fremer 2000; Saari 2006; Henricson 2013), the intertwining of Estonian and Finnish in speech and informal writing takes place by combining two different lexical and grammatical resources, which are combined for functional and communicational purposes. It is commonly believed that structural similarities facilitate code-switching while differences between the two languages provide a fertile ground for textual and pragmatic uses of code-switching. Preliminary analysis of Finnish-Estonian code-switching suggests that this may also apply in the contact between these two languages (see Frick 2008). In general, code-switching occurs between both genetically and typologically distant and close varieties. In either case, speakers may benefit from the lexical and structural similarities and differences and utilise their language resources for practical purposes.

Basically, the parallel use of two or more languages increases the resources of individual speakers and different forms of variation in speech. Unlike in more uniform language communities, the alternation between the lexicon, phrases, constructions, and collocations is based on more random criteria when several languages are involved. While idiosyncratic variation within a given speech community has the advantage of personal combinations following the rules and limits of that community (cf. Kurki 2005: 28, Labov 2001: 33–34, Milroy & Milroy 1997: 50–53, Mustanoja 2011: 75, Paunonen 2003: 236), the adoption of two different systems makes this much less predictable.

Although Estonian and Finnish share their basic vocabulary and grammatical foundations, as mentioned above, the way lexicon and grammar are chosen is language-specific to a very large extent. Consequently, idiosyncratic variation becomes much more divergent and unsystematic.

### Abbreviations

ADE adessive	NOM nominative
ALL allative	PASS passive
CNG connegative	PL plural
ESS essive	PST past tense
GEN genitive	PTCP participle
ILL illative	PTV partitive
INE inessive	SG singular
INF infinite	TRA transitive
NEG negative	

### References

- Anepaio, Terje 1999: The land next to Ingria. Ingrian Finns in North-East Estonia after World War II. – Markku Teinonen & Timo J. Virtanen (eds), *Ingrians and Neighbours. Focus on the Eastern Baltic Sea Region*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 155–181.

- Auer, Peter 2007: Code-switching/mixing. – Ruth Wodak, Barbara Johnstone & Paul E. Kerswill (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 460–478.
- Baerman, Matthew 2005: Directionality and (un)natural classes in syncretism. – *Language* 80: 807–824.
- Baerman, Matthew & Brown, Dunstan & Corbett, Greville 2005: *The syntax-morphology interface. A study of syncretism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bahtina-Jantsikene, Daria 2013: *Lingua Receptiva in Estonian-Russian communication*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Björklöf, Sofia 2012: *Viron rantamurteen länsiryhmän sanaston alkuperä suomalaislainojen valossa*. Master's dissertation. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. [<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2012121410304> accessed 1.4.2016]
- Blevins, Jim 2005: Word-based declension in Estonian. – Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*. Amsterdam: Springer. 1–25.
- Chalvin, Antoine 1992: Johannes Aavik et la rénovation de l'estonien. – *Études finno-ougriennes* 24: 75–111.
- Clyne, Michael 2003: *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Eesti Statistika 2016: [[www.stat.ee](http://www.stat.ee) accessed 11.4.2016.]
- Elstrok, Helmut 1999: *Sõbrakaubandus – sepralaitos*. Tallinn: Infotrukk.
- Embassy of Finland 2016: Suomen ulkoasiainministeriö. Suomi Virossa. [<http://www.finland.ee/public/default.aspx?nodeid=40615&contentlan=1&culture=fi-FI> Accessed 11.4.2016.]
- Erelt, Mati & Metslang, Helle 2006: Estonian clause patterns. From Finno-Ugric to SAE. – *Linguistica Uralica* 42: 254–266.
- Fremer, Maria 2000: Finska, engelska och slang i Helsingforssvenskt ungdomssamtal. – Anna-Brita Stenström & Ulla-Britt Kotsinas & Eli-Marie Drange (eds), *Ungdommens språkmøter*. Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd. 61–87.
- Frick, Maria 2008: Morphological integration of Estonian lexical elements in a Finnish language base. – *Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education* 1: 81–95.
- Frick, Maria. 2013: *Emergent Bilingual Constructions: Finnish-Estonian Codeswitching in Interaction*. Doctoral thesis. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. [<http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-9019-6> accessed 20.6.2016].
- Grünthal, Riho 1998: Suomalais-virolaisia meriyhteyksiä ja seprakaupan kielellisiä sivutuotteita. – Riho Grünthal & Johanna Laakso (eds), *Oekeeta asijoo. Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Seppo Suhonen sexagenarii 16.V.1998*. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 228. 106–120.
- Grünthal, Riho 2000: Typological characteristics of the Finnic languages: a reappraisal. – Johanna Laakso (ed.), *Facing Finnic. Some Challenges to Historical and Contact Linguistics*. Castrenianumin toimitteita 59. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. 31–63.
- Grünthal, Riho 2001: Homonymy and systemacy in Estonian noun inflection. – Reet Kasik (ed.), *Keele kannul. Pühendusteos Mati Erelti 60. sünnipäevaks 12. märtsil 2001*. Tartu ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 17. Tartu: University of Tartu. 42–61.
- Grünthal, Riho 2007: Morphological change and the influence of language contacts in Estonian. – Hans Fix (ed.), *Beiträge zur Morphologie. Germanisch, Baltisch, Ostseefinnisch*. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark. 403–432.
- Grünthal, Riho 2009: Suomen kielen vaikutus viron kieleen. – Jyrki Kalliokoski, Lari Kotilainen & Päivi Pahta (eds), *Kielet kohtaavat*. Tietolipas 227. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 231–263.
- Grünthal, Riho 2010: Sijasynekretismi morfologian koetinkivenä. – *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugrian Linguistics* 2: 91–113. [<http://jeful.ut.ee/public/files/grynthal-esuka2.pdf> accessed 1.4.2016].
- Hakulinen, Auli & Kalliokoski, Jyrki & Kankaanpää, Salli & Kanner, Antti & Koskenniemi, Kimmo & Laitinen, Lea & Maamies, Sari & Nuolijärvi, Pirkko 2009: *Suomen kielen tulevaisuus. Kielipoliittinen toimintaohjelma*. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

- Halmari, Helena 1997: *Government and codeswitching. Explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Härmävaara, Hanna-Ilona 2013: Kielten samankaltaisuus monikielisen virolais-suomalaisen vuorovaikutuksen resurssina. – *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* 23: 60–88.
- Härmävaara, Hanna-Ilona 2014: Facilitating mutual understanding in everyday interaction between Finns and Estonians. – *Applied Linguistics Review* 5 (1): 211–245.
- Härmävaara, Hanna-Ilona 2017: Official language policy as a factor for using receptive multilingualism among members of an Estonian and a Finnish student organization. – Maarja Siiner & Kara D. Brown & Kadri Koreinik (eds), *Language policy beyond the state*. Cham: Springer. 201–221.
- Härmävaara, Hanna-Ilona & Frick, Maria 2016: Handling linguistic asymmetries by bilingual punning in conversations among speakers of cognate languages. – Sebastian Knospe & Alexander Onysko & Maik Goth (eds), *Crossing Languages to Play with Words: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: DeGruyter. 113–134.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2007: Pre-established categories don't exist. Consequences for language description and typology. – *Linguistic Typology* 11: 119–132.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2010: Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. – *Language* 86: 663–687.
- Hassinen, Sirje 2002: *Simultaaninen kaksikielisyys. Läheiset sukukielet viro ja suomi rinnakkain*. Doctoral thesis. Oulu: University of Oulu.
- Henricson, Sofie 2013: *Svenska i finsk miljö. Interaktion, grammatik och flerspråkighet i samtal på svenska språköar i Finland*. Doctoral thesis. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies.
- Hintsala, Saara 1996: Virolaisen adoptiolapsen suomen kielen verbisuffiksien omaksumisesta. – Helena Sulkala & Minna Zaman-Zadeh (eds), *Suomenoppijan kieli tutkimuskohteena*. Suomen ja saamen kielen ja logopedian laitoksen julkaisuja 5. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto. 46–74.
- Hyvönen, Heli 2007: Koti on Suomessa mutta kotimaa on Viro. Suomessa asuvien virolaisäitien transnationaaliset sosiaaliset tilat. – Tuomas Martikainen & Marja Tiilikainen (eds), *Maahanmuuttajanaiset. Kotoutuminen, perhe ja työ*. Helsinki: Population Research Institute of Finland. 190–217.
- Jakobson, Mari-Liis & Kalev, Leif & Ruutsoo, Rein 2012: *Eesti-Soome hargmaise ruumi võimalused ja ohud*. Riigikogu Toimetised. Tallinn : Riigikogu Kantselei. 124–133.
- Johanson, Lars 1993: Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. – Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds), *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon – Philadelphia – Adelaide: Multilingual Matters. 197–221.
- Johanson, Lars 2002: Contact-induced linguistic change in a code-copying framework. – Mari Jones & Edith Esch (eds), *Language change. The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 86. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 285–313.
- Jokela, Hanna & Paulsen, Geda 2010: Vötke minust eesmärki. Monikielinen lapsi rakenteita yhdistämässä. – *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* 19: 61–75.
- Jürgenstein, Lea 2012: Koodivahetusest Peterburi vanima põlvkonna eestlaste keelekasutuses. – *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri - The Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics (ESUKA – JEFUL)* 3 (2): 31–55.
- Kaivapalu, Annekatrin 2005: *Lähdekieli kielenoppimisen apuna*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 44. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Kaivapalu, Annekatrin 2015: Eesti ja soome keele vastastikune mõistmine üksiksõna- ja tekstitasandil. Lingvistilised tegurid, mõistmisprotsess ja sümmeetria. – *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühingu aastaraamat* 11: 55–74.
- Kaivapalu, Annekatrin & Martin, Maisa 2014: Symmetry of similarity: definition, perception, measurement. Finnish and Estonian noun morphology as a testing ground. – Heli Paulasto & Lea Meriläinen & Helka Riionheimo & Maria Kok (eds), *Language Contacts at the Crossroads of Disciplines*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 283–318.

- Kaivapalu, Annekatrin & Muikku-Werner, Pirkko 2010: Reseptiivinen monikielisyys. Miten suomenkielinen oppija ymmärtää viroa äidinkieltensä pohjalta? – *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja*, 19: 68–97.
- Karjahärm, Toomas & Sirk, Väino 1997: *Eesti haritlaskonna kujunemine ja ideed 1850–1917*. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.
- Karjalainen, Heini & Puura, Ulriikka & Grünthal, Riho & Kovaleva, Svetlana 2013: *Karelian in Russia. ELDIA Case Specific Report. Studies in European Language Diversity* 26. Mainz: ELDIA.
- Kauber, Sten 2015: *Transnational material practices of Estonians in Finland*. Master's dissertation. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, valtiotieteellinen tiedekunta, Sosiaalitieteiden laitos. [http://hdl.handle.net/10138/155251 accessed 14.5.2016].
- Kingumets, Jaanika. 2008: *Travelling across Estonian-Finnish borders and its transnational dimensions. An ethnographical perspective of Estonians living in Finland*. Master's dissertation. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta, Sosiologian ja sosiaalipsykologian laitos. [http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:uta-1-19349 accessed 14.5.2016].
- Koreinik, Kadri & Praakli, Kristiina 2017: Emerging language political agency among Estonian native speakers in Finland. – Maarja Siiner & Kara D. Brown & Kadri Koreinik (eds), *Language Policy Beyond the State*. Cham: Springer. 81–98.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1996: *Typological and historical studies in language*. MSFOu 223. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Kovács, Magdolna 2001: *Code-Switching and Language Shift in Australian Finnish in Comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Kovács, Magdolna 2009: Koodinvaihto ja kielioppi. – Jyrki Kalliokoski & Lari Kotilainen & Päivi Pahta (eds), *Kielet kohtaavat*. Tietolipas 227. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 24–49.
- Kurki, Tommi 2005: *Yksilön ja ryhmän kielen reaaliaikainen muuttuminen. Kielenmuutosten seuraamisesta ja niiden tarkastelussa käytettävistä menetelmistä*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1036. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Labov, William 2001: *Principles of Linguistic Change II. Social Factors*. Language in Society 29. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Luts, Arved 1968: Eesti põhjarandlaste kartulivedu Soome. – *Etnograafia Muuseumi Aastaraamat XXIII*. Tallinn: Valgus. 102–132.
- Luts, Arved 1969: Soomlaste silgukaubandus Viru rannikul. – *Etnograafia Muuseumi Aastaraamat XXIV*. Tallinn: Valgus. 288–318.
- Matras, Yaron 2009: *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metslang, Helle 2009: Estonian grammar between Finnic and SAE: some comparisons. – *Language Typology and Universals / Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 62. 49–71.
- Milroy, James & Milroy, Lesley 1997: Varieties and variation. – Florian Coulmas (ed.), *The handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 47–64.
- Müller, Gereon 2013: A radically non-morphemic approach to bidirectional syncretism. – *Morphology* 23: 245–268.
- Mustanoja, Liisa 2011: *Idiolekti ja sen muuttuminen. Reaalitutkimus Tampereen puhekielestä*. Doctoral Thesis. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 1065. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.
- Muysken, Pieter 2000: *Bilingual Speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol 1992: Comparing code-switching and borrowing. – *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 19–40.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol 1993: *Social Motivations for Codeswitching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Paunonen, Heikki 2003: Suomen kielen morfologisista muutosmekanismeista. – Lea Laitinen & Hanna Lappalainen & Päivi**

- Markkola & Johanna Vaattovaara (eds), *Muotojen mieli: kirjoituksia morfologiasta ja variaatiosta*. Kieli 15. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 187–248.
- Praakli, Kristiina 2009: *Esimese põlvkonna Soome eestlaste kakskeelne keelekasutus ja koodikopeerimine*. Doctoral thesis. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Praakli, Kristiina 2014: *On the bilingual language use of the Estonian – speakers in Finland*. – *Sociolinguistic Studies* 8 (3): 383–409.
- Praakli, Kristiina 2016: *Koodivahetuse mitu nägu*. – Anna Verschik (ed.), *Proceedings of TLU Institute of Estonian Language and Culture*. Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Praakli, Kristiina 2017: *Eesti keel Soomes. ELDIA uurimisaruanne*. Studies in European Language Diversity 29.2. Wien: Austria.
- Puntila, Matti 1992: *Eesti keelesaar Porvoo ja Loviisa vahel*. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 35: 281–285.
- Puntila, Matti 1996: *Pernajan Kabböle. Suomen ainoa virolaiskylä. – Kielen kannoilla. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus 20 vuotta*. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. 292–311, 325–326.
- Puura, Ulriikka & Karjalainen, Heini & Zajceva, Nina & Grünthal, Riho 2013: *Veps language in Russia. ELDIA case-specific report*. Studies in European Language Diversity 25. [<https://phaidra.univie.ac.at/view/o:315545> Accessed 16.4.2018]
- Raag, Raimo 1999: *Från allmogemål till nationalspråk. Språkvård och språkpolitik i Estland från 1857 till 1999*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Multiethnica Upsaliensia 12. Uppsala.
- Raag, Raimo 2008: *Talurahva keelest riigikeeleks*. Tartu: AS Atlex.
- Rapo, Markus 2011: *Foreign-language speakers are still rare in many municipalities*. – Statistics Finland. Products and Services. Articles. [[http://www.stat.fi/tup/v12010/art\\_2011-06-21\\_001\\_en.html](http://www.stat.fi/tup/v12010/art_2011-06-21_001_en.html) accessed 3.8.2016.]
- Rätsep, Huno 1976: *Soome laenudest eesti kirjakeeles*. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 19: 210–216.
- Rätsep, Huno 1981: *Johannes Aavik ja soome laenud*. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 24: 289–296.
- Rausmaa, Heikki 2007: *Tuglaksen tuli palaa. Tuglas-seuran ja suomalais-virolaisten suhteiden historiaa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1136. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Rausmaa, Heikki 2013: *”Kyllä kulttuurin nimissä voi harrastella aika paljon”. Suomen ja Viron poliittiset suhteet keväästä 1988 diplomaattisuhteiden solmimiseen elokuussa 1991*. Doctoral thesis. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Rehbein, Jochen & ten Thije, Jan & Verschik, Anna 2012: *Lingua receptiva (LaRa). Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism*. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16 (3): 248–264.
- Remes, Hannu 2009: *Muodot kontrastissa. Suomen ja viron vertailevaa taivutusmorfologiaa*. Oulu: Oulu University Press. [<http://jultika.oulu.fi/files/isbn9789514291500.pdf> accessed 1.4.2016].
- Riionheimo, Helka 2007: *Muutoksen monet juuret. Oman ja vieraan risteytyminen Viron inkerinsuomalaisten imperfektinmuodostuksessa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1107. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Riionheimo, Helka 2009: *Interference and attrition in inflectional morphology. A theoretical perspective*. – Esa Penttilä & Heli Paulasto (eds), *Language contacts meet English dialects: Studies in honour of Markku Filppula*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 83–104.
- Riionheimo, Helka 2011: *Complex morphologies in contact. The case of Ingrian Finns in Estonia*. – Kelechukwu Ihemere (ed.), *Language contact and language shift. Grammatical and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Munich: Lincom. 10–36.
- Riionheimo, Helka 2013a: *Inkerinsuomen verbimorfologia kielikontaktissa ja attritiossa*. – Kimmo Granqvist & Päivi Rainò (eds), *Rapautuva kieli*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1404. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 37–74.
- Riionheimo, Helka 2013b: *Multiple roots of innovations in language contact. Evidence from morphological intermingling in the contact between Ingrian Finnish and Estonian*. – *Studies in Language* 37 (3): 645–674.
- Riionheimo, Helka & Frick, Maria 2014: *Emergence of Finnish-Estonian bilingual constructions in two contact settings*. – *Sociolinguistic Studies* 8 (3): 409–447.

- Saari, Mirja 2006: Stadin ruotsi. Huomioita erään nuorisoryhmän koodin vaihtelusta. – Kaisu Juusela & Katariina Nisula (eds), *Helsinki kieliyhteisönä*. Helsinki: Suomen kielen ja kotimaisen kirjallisuuden laitos, Helsingin yliopisto. 142–161.
- 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.
- Skalička, Vladimir 1975: Über die Typologie des Estnischen. – *Congressus tertius internationalis fennougristarum I*. Tallinn. 369–373.
- Spoelman, Marianne 2013: *Prior linguistic knowledge matters. The use of the partitive case in Finnish learner language*. Doctoral thesis. University of Oulu.
- Sulkala, Helena 1994: Suomi toisena kielenä kielisukulaisille. – *Lähivertailuja* 8: 106–113.
- Sulkala, Helena 1996: Finnish as second language for speakers of related languages. – Maisa Martin & Pirkko Muikku-Werner (eds), *Finnish and Estonian – new target languages: Proceedings of the Fenno-Ugric Languages as Second and Foreign Languages Symposium. Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 10.–15.8.1995*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. 143–159.
- Söderman, Tiina 1996: *Lexical Characteristics of the Estonian North Eastern Coastal Dialect*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 24. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Talve, Ilmar 2004: *Eesti kultuurilugu. Keskaja algusest Eesti iseseisvuseni*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Tauli, Valter 1984: Is the structural change of languages really predestined? – *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge* 4: 25–35.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001: *Language Contact*. Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tilastokeskus 2016 = Tilastokeskuksen PX-Web-tietokannat-Px-Web StatFin-Väestö-Väestörakenne. Kieli iän ja sukupuolen mukaan maakunnittain 1990–2015. [<http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/tup/tilastotietokannat/index.html> accessed 23.7.2016]
- Välisministerium 2016: Soome Vabariik III. Eesti-Soome Majandussuhted. [<http://www.vm.ee/et/soome-vabariik-iii-eesti-soome-majandussuhted#6> accessed 8.4.2016].
- Verschik, Anna 2002: Russian-Estonian contacts and mechanisms of interference. – *Trames* 6: 245–265.
- Verschik, Anna 2004a: Estonian compound nouns and their equivalents in the local variety of Russian. – *Scando-Slavica* 50: 93–109.
- Verschik, Anna 2004b: Koodivahetus meil ja mujal. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 47: 25–46.
- Verschik, Anna 2007: Keelekontaktid, laenatavus ja verbi kopeerimine eestivene keelevariandis. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 50: 357–377.
- Verschik, Anna 2012: Practising receptive multilingualism: Estonian-Finnish communication in Tallinn. – *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16: 265–286.
- Verschik, Anna 2016: Mixed Copying in Blogs: Evidence from Estonian-Russian Language Contacts. – *Journal of Language Contact* 9: 186–209.
- Vertovec, Steven 1999: Conceiving and researching transnationalism. – *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22: 447–462.
- Viikberg, Jüri 1989: Koodivahetus ja Siberi eestlased. Lähtekohti. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 32: 202–205.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein 1990: Eesti keele kujunemine flekteerivaks keeleks. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 33: 456–461, 542–548.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein 1998: Fennic. – Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London: Routledge. 96–114.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein 2003: Structure of the Estonian language. – Mati Ereht (ed.), *Estonian Language*. Linguistica Uralica, Supplementary series 1. Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers. 9–129.
- Vilkuna, Kustaa 1964: *Kihlakunta ja häävuode. Tutkimuksia suomalaisen yhteiskunnan järjestymisen vaiheilta*. Helsinki: Otava.
- VisitFinland 2016: Suomessa vieraili 7,4 miljoona matkailijaa vuonna 2015. [<http://www.visitfinland.fi/news/suomessa-vieraili-74-miljoonaa-matkailijaa-vuonna-2015/>. Accessed 28 June 2017.]

- VISK = Auli Hakulinen & Maria Vilkuna & Riitta Korhonen & Vesa Koivisto & Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Electronic version. [accessed 12.8.2016]. Available <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk> URN:ISBN:978-952-5446-35-7.
- Winford, Donald 2003: *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. London: Blackwell.
- Wurzel, Wolfgang 1984: *Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Zabrodskaya, Anastasiya 2005: *Vene-eesti koodivahetus Kohtla-Järve vene emakeelega algkoolilastel*. Tallinna Ülikooli eesti filoloogia osakonna toimetised 6. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus.
- Zabrodskaya, Anastasiya 2009: *Russian-Estonian language contacts: grammatical aspects of language use and change*. Tallinn University Dissertations on Humanities. [[https://www.academia.edu/523525/RUSSIAN-ESTONIAN\\_LANGUAGE\\_CONTACTS\\_GRAMMATICAL\\_ASPECTS\\_OF\\_LANGUAGE\\_US\\_E\\_AND\\_CHANGE](https://www.academia.edu/523525/RUSSIAN-ESTONIAN_LANGUAGE_CONTACTS_GRAMMATICAL_ASPECTS_OF_LANGUAGE_US_E_AND_CHANGE). Accessed 22 March 2016.]
- Zetterberg, Seppo 2007: *Viron historia*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1118. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

## **Naaber- ja sugulaskeelte kohtumine: eesti ja soome keele omavaheline lõimumine ja mitmekeelsus 21. sajandil**

### **Kokkuvõte**

Tänapäeva tihe liiklemine Eesti ja Soome vahel on loonud erakordselt soodsad tingimused eesti ja soome keele vaheliste mitmekesiste kontaktide tekkeks. Pärast teist maailmasõda kuni Eesti taasiseseisvumiseni kehtinud poliitiline olukord pidurdas suhtlemist ja lausa takistas vahetuid kontakte mõlema keele kõnelejate vahel. Igapäevaseid kokkupuuteid oli vähe ja vaatamata riikide geograafilisele lähedusele tuleb neid hinnata pigem juhuslikeks. Olukord muutus järsult 20. sajandi lõpul, kui kehtestati viisavabadus ning oli jälle võimalik vabalt üle Soome lahe sõita. Praeguseks on nii Eesti kui ka Soome Euroopa Liidu liikmed, tänu millele on ka tööturg, kultuurilised kokkupuuted ja sotsiaalsed võrgustikud järjest lähedasemad. Varasemaga võrreldes erineb praegune olukord mitmel viisil. Intensiivsed kokkupuuted kultuuris ja ühiskonnas mõjutavad inimeste ja inimrühmade keelelisi kombeid ja valikuid mitmeti. Üle Soome lahe sõidavad tänapäeval laevadega miljonid inimesed aastas. Kümned tuhanded eestlased elavad Soomes alaliselt või ajutiselt, soomlasi viibib Eestis ohtralt. Ühine ajalooline taust ja keeltevahelised grammatilised ja leksikaalsed sarnasused esinevad igas argipäeva kohtumises. See vundament võimaldab ladusat argisuhtlust ja praktilist keele omandamist naabermaas. Käesolev artikkel vaatlleb eesti ja soome keele vahelist koodivahetust, eeskätt struktuurilisi ja suhtlusstrateegilisi erijooni. Erilist tähelepanu pööratakse Soomes elavate eestlaste ja Eestis elavate soomlaste keeles esinevatele vahenditele, millega ühendatakse eesti ja soome keele morfoloogilisi ja morfosüntaktilisi iseärasusi. Näiteid tuuakse nii sotsiaalmeediast kui ka intervjuudest.

## **Naapuri- ja sukulaiskielet kohtaavat: suomen ja viron lähentymisestä 2000-luvun monikielisissä tilanteissa**

### **Tiivistelmä**

Nykyinen liikkuvuus Suomen ja Viron välillä on luonut otollisen ympäristön suomen ja viron kielen välisille kontakteille eri tilanteissa. Toisen maailmansodan jälkeen ja 1900-luvun loppupuolelle asti vallinnut poliittinen tilanne haittasi ja jopa esti suorat yhteydet viron ja suomen puhujien välillä. Arkiset kohtaamiset olivat hyvin vähäisiä ja satunnaisia usean vuosikymmenen ajan huolimatta maidemme maantieteellisestä läheisyydestä. 1990-luvulla tilanne muuttui yllättäen, kun Viro itsenäistyi uudelleen ja matkustus vapautui joitakin vuosia sen jälkeen. Tällä hetkellä Viro ja Suomi molemmat kuuluvat Euroopan Unioniin, mikä on lähentänyt työmarkkinoita, kulttuuriyhteyksiä ja sosiaalisia verkostoja. Nykytilanne siis poikkeaa aiemmasta suuresti.

Intensiiviset kontaktit puhujayhteisöjen välillä vaikuttavat yksittäisten ihmisten ja ryhmien kielenkäyttöön monella tapaa. Suomen ja Viron välillä matkustavat nykyään vuosittain miljoonat ihmiset ja kymmeniä tuhansia virolaisia asuu Suomessa pysyvästi tai väliaikaisesti. Myös suomalaisia asuu paljon Virossa. Yhteinen historiallinen tausta ja kieltemme väliset kieliopilliset ja sanastolliset yhtymäkohdat tulevat näkyviksi arkisissa kohtaamisissa. Ne luovat pohjan vuorovaikutukselle ja helpottavat käytännön kielitaidon omaksumista naapurimaassa.

Tämä artikkeli käsittelee suomen ja viron välisen koodinvaihdon rakenteellisia ja vuorovaikutuksellisia piirteitä. Koodinvaihdolla tarkoitamme tässä erityisesti Suomessa asuvien

virolaisten ja Virossa asuvien suomalaisten keinoja yhdistää suomen ja viron morfologisia ja morfosyntaktisia piirteitä. Havainnollistamme tätä sosiaalisesta mediasta ja kasvokkai keskusteluista otetuilla esimerkeillä.