AGENCY LOST IN THE DISCOURSE OF LANGUAGE ENDANGERMENT: NOMINALISATION IN DISCOURSE ABOUT SOUTH ESTONIAN

Kadri Koreinik

Abstract. This paper focuses on the representation of agency in the discourse of language endangerment. I consider strategies to (de)legitimate through the competing claims regarding lesser-spoken South Estonian varieties by language activists and their opponents, language professionals and others, from 2004–2005 and arguments used in the broader media debate on pro-Estonian language policy since the mid-1990s. My focus is on what processes are nominalised in the discourse of endangerment and what other schemes of hidden or backgrounded agency are employed. I will demonstrate within the broad framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA) that material processes, which represent language change, shift or loss, are deactivated and deagentialised leaving no space for agency. Discursive practices, which hide agency and thus under-represent the process-like nature of language, support the Estonian linguistic culture of monoglossia. Finally, the public discourse of endangerment is a public arena for claims of jurisdiction for Estonian language professionals.*

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, ideational metafunction, grammar, representation, language ideology, language policy, Estonian

1. Introduction

Along with the linguistic turn – understood as the focal shift to the role of language in the human experience (Piirimäe 2008) and its newfound methodological attention in the human and social sciences (Rorty 1967, 1989, Fairclough 2001) – a link between language and ideology has emerged as a significant aspect of language studies. For example, language use, shift and loss are grasped as "a manifestation

of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups – and their languages – hierarchically within a society" (Ricento 2006c: 15). Abstract ideas have real effects for speech communities in the linguistic market: language behaviour depends on the speakers' sense of language prestige – national and standard languages are usually favoured over minority and nonstandard languages. The code image of language is another influential abstraction, which under-represents speakers' agency and the process-like character of language. The representation of language without speakers' explicit agency is also reproduced when people make and interpret language policy. Therefore, as language is experienced agentless, speakers, who in fact are also active producers of language, may underestimate or be unaware of their involvement, for example, in language change.

Concerns over unwelcome language change are produced and reproduced in the discourse of language endangerment (Duchêne, Heller 2007). The (de)legitimation discourse of South Estonian (SE) is also an example of discourse of endangerment; the arguments of danger or unwanted (language) change or loss are frequently employed in its (de)legitimation strategies (Koreinik 2011a). Moreover, challenges to existing political arrangements, ideological and policy claims are key topics in the public discourse of (de)legitimation of SE. I analyse deactivation and deagentialisation, particularly the use of nominalisation, as one linguistic ideological choice and manifestation of language policy. I also address general questions about the essence of language and (language) policy.

2. Language and agency: key concepts and research questions

A nominal view of language, shared both by linguists and non-linguists, treats languages as discrete entities (Makoni, Pennycook 2005). It exemplifies language-making processes external to the linguistic practices (cf. Gal, Irvine 1995, Crowley 2006). Language professionals are preoccupied with the code image of language (Becker 1991). Language is seen as an abstract fact, an agentless accomplishment or an outside observer's description, instead of an act or a process where speakers are involved. This view resonates with researchers of language policy as illustrated in Ricento's definition of language:

> (A) language is a code with various forms (written, spoken, standard, non-standard, etc.), functions (usually expressed in terms of domains and relative status within a polity), and value (as a medium of exchange, with particular material and non-material qualities). (Ricento 2006b: 3)

Roughly two decades ago, Becker (1991: 230), building on Ortega y Gasset and the biologists Maturana and Varela, made a case for "a shift from the code image of language to an autopoietic image of languaging". "Languaging" points to a Humboldtian idea of language as a process, the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience via language (cf. Swain 2006, Pietikäinen et al. 2008). Both images of language are the examples of language ideologies, the ways language is experienced and represented.

78

Language ideology became known as an area of linguistic-anthropological study at the end of the 20th century. While the field is in the making, its influence on language studies, including discourse analysis, is considerable (Blommaert 2006). Its focus lays in the consequences the ideologies of linguistic differentiation have for language change (Irvine, Gal 2000). Language change is what language policy is targeted to as well. While modifying linguistic behaviour, it "involves *deliberate*, although not always overt, *future-oriented* change in systems of language code and/or speaking in a societal context", all ideas and practices "intended to achieve a planned change (or stop change from happening)" (Kaplan, Baldauf 1997: 3). While the outcomes of these efforts are typically programs or laws, policy can be also depicted as the social practice of power. The socio-cultural understanding of policy foregrounds the role of agent who "produces, embeds, extends, contextualises, and in some cases transforms the text" (Levinson et al. 2009: 770). The Foucaultian 'language governmentality' suggests that for understanding how policy is effected, one needs to look at discursive and other practices (Pennycook 2006). Thus, language ideologies embedded in (discursive) practices demonstrate how language policy is appropriated and interpreted.

> Whenever communication occurs and individuals make decisions about the language variety they will speak, the form of address they will use, the posture or facial expression they will adopt, the content of their speech, their body language, and so on, the individuals express, work out, contest, interpret, and at some level analyse language policies. (Ricento, Hornberger 1996: 420)

Paradoxically, individuals' unawareness of being engaged in the reproduction of linguistic representations or language policy makes no difference in their central role as agency is about doing: "I am the author of many things I do not intend to do, and may not want to bring about, but none the less *do*" (Giddens 1984: 9). There is no perfect fit between the sociological concept of agency and its linguistic realisation (van Leeuwen 2008). Although sociological agency can be represented in discourses in a number of ways, always involving the power of human action (Giddens 1984), the discursive representation of missing agency is more limited linguistically. The most implicit way to express ideology in discourses is lexicalisation (van Dijk 1998). Propositions can be deagentialised in many ways: impersonalisation, nominalisation, and representation of the process as self-engendering (Halliday 1985). While nominalisation can be functional and is expected in writing science, "in other discourses it is largely a ritual feature, engendering only prestige and bureaucratic power" (Halliday 2004 [1993]: 217). In Estonia, nominalisation has been examined in relation to practical language planning and stylistics. Its use has been disapproved as impersonal; nominalised texts deemed to be static and abstract (Kasik 2006). Kerge (2002) has found that nominalisation has been used in all genres of media at its maximum in the 1950s and at its minimum in the 1990s; since the 2000s its usage has increased again. Nominalisation has been analysed, however, in its textual rather than its ideational function (Kasik 2006).

In this article, I aim to explore the under-researched ideational function of nominalisation in the Estonian context and to show the way agency is represented in the discourse of endangerment. My focus is here on deactivation and

deagentialisation: what processes are nominalised in the discourse of endangerment, what other schemes of hidden or backgrounded agency are employed. The code image of language is reproduced when the propositions of language change or loss are represented as agentless in public discourse. To put it otherwise, talking or writing about a particular language also reinforces the representation of language in general. Moreover, those representations also demonstrate how language policy is interpreted.

3. Language policy and discourses of endangerment in Estonia

In Eastern Europe "not justice, but security" is the primary concern underlying national language polices (Kymlicka, Grin 2003: 13). Given the symbolic and declarative language laws of the late 1980s, which acted as *de facto* statements of Baltic independence, recent Baltic politics of language, however, have been growingly informed by issues of language ideology (Hogan-Brun et al. 2007). Language professionals and perhaps speakers too have become aware of the power embedded in politics of language and language policy. In this way, developments in Estonia and its Baltic neighbours illustrate developments in the theory and practice of language policy (cf. Ricento 2000, 2006a). Druviete (1997) found the Baltic States unique: the linguistic human rights of state language speakers can be violated and the official state language of a sovereign country can be considered as an endangered language. Moreover, Skutnabb-Kangas (1994: 178) defines the Baltic national languages as minorised majority languages "in need of protection usually necessary for the threatened minority languages". When languaging, especially the sets of different linguistic resources (Pietikäinen et al. 2008), is considered, demographics complicate Estonia's language profile: six-sevenths of residents are multilingual (mostly native speakers of Estonian) and the rest are monolinguals, mostly Russian-speakers (see for an overview Tender 2010). Thus the Baltic, incl. Estonian language markets are characterised by the paradoxical situation where both major speech communities – the autochthonous and the Russian-speaking – consider their languages as threatened or minority languages (Hogan-Brun et al. 2007).

Kalmus (2003) in her analysis of ethno-political discourse of both major ethnic groups in Estonia has described Estonians' discursive position as either that of established or endangered majority and the Russians' discursive position as minority. Similar positions manifested in the (de)legitimation discourse of SE, where language ideologies of Estonian society surfaced (Koreinik 2011a). (De)legitimation strategies include authorisation by reference to history and academic discourse, instrumental rationalisation, the linguistic ideologies of iconisation and erasure, and intergroup polarisation by negative other-presentation (Koreinik 2011a, 2011b). My analysis has also revealed some essentialised linguistic representations, which are rather characteristic to a nationalising state such as Estonia (cf. Hogan-Brun et al. 2007). There are a number of reasons to consider the discourse of (de)legitimation as a discourse of endangerment. First, language change, shift or loss is a macro topic in this discourse. Second, delegitimation is proceeding from the discursive position of endangered majority and the *topos* of threat is often employed to rationalise the

exclusion of SE varieties from the category of language. Finally, the legitimation of SE is also embedded in the discourse of language endangerment. The argumentation of the maintenance of SE varieties involves references to unwanted language loss (Koreinik 2011a). To conclude, as speakers' discursive positions and voiced arguments correspond to those of "minoritised" languages, the analysis of endangerment discourses on the level of linguistic representations, too, seems appropriate.

4. Data and method

In the context of a new, polylogical language situation (Hennoste 1997), where all languages are equally situated, a wide range of (media) texts have been published about SE varieties over last decades. There are texts published in dailies and weeklies of all-Estonian coverage, in all-Estonian and international professional and academic periodicals, and in local papers, online and on paper. The text corpus of local and all-Estonian papers (1995–2009) numbers around one thousand. As the main objective of the analysis is to study the language ideologies of both the outgroup, including scholars, columnists, and other observers, and the ingroup, i.e. the members of SE speech community and activists (cf. Koreinik 2011b), the sample of 17 articles includes the media texts of all-Estonian coverage (*Postimees*, *Eesti Päevaleht*, *Maaleht*, *Sirp*) and local texts from a SE county paper (*Võrumaa Teataja*). I have chosen those texts with an explicit discourse of endangerment, a range, which includes concerns over language loss or dialect extinction, arguments of zero-sum-game, and discussions over language change, preservation, and maintenance. Both concerns, those over the majority language Estonian and those addressing lesser-used SE varieties, are presented in the corpus.

There is a hope that the critical turn in studies of language represents a convergence in theories and practices of language studies (Blommaert, Bulcaen 2000). CDA has gained enough theoretical and methodological momentum to develop a new paradigm especially when more attention will be paid to contextualisation (ibid). Still, CDA is said to have been "selectively interdisciplinary" by ignoring developments in cognitive sciences (Chilton 2005: 28). Nevertheless, its central interest to power and ideology contributes to critical consciousness, which besides assisting individuals to become sophisticated producers and consumers of texts, also invites a wider audience to understand the hegemonic processes of language standardisation and to challenge its dominance (Fairclough 1992). CDA has been employed in the analysis of agency and the representation of social action and actors (van Leeuwen 1995, 1996, 2008). Thus, along with other approaches applied for studying concepts about language and language use, i.e. stereotypes and myths (Schiffman 1996, Bauer, Trudgill 1998, Kroskrity 2000, Blommaert 2005), CDA is also appropriate for the study of language ideologies (Blackledge 2005). My analysis follows an approach to CDA that relates discursive change to sociocultural change (Fairclough 1992, Fairclough, Wodak 1997)[1].

---

[1] See Billig (2008) for a discussion of nominalisation and CDA.

5. Operationalisation

In exploring the experimental aspects of grammar, the following points merit examination: the types and nature of processes, the explicitness of agency, the use of nominalisations, the selection of passive or active and positive or negative sentences (Fairclough 2001). For example, the use of passive voice and the absence of agency may indicate an attempt to mask causality and responsibility. While looking at social action, I concentrate on both deactivated and deagentialised material processes, which are represented via objectivation and different types of deagentialisation. I will also pay attention to exclusion i.e. whether social agents are suppressed or backgrounded when it occurs alongside nominalisations (van Leeuwen 2008).

I concentrate on material action because these processes construct a real or imagined change or action also in terms of language change. Thus material processes are social actions, which may have a material effect of "doing" something (van Leeuwen 2008). In material processes of "doing to" or "bringing about" one may expect an obligatory Actor and an optional Goal (Halliday 1985). Material processes can be abstract doings, where distinction between Actor and Goal becomes difficult to make (ibid.). Syntactic choices of missing Actor (agent) and nominalised process verbs may cause semantic losses, which in turn may indicate the ideological preferences of authors. Furthermore, the representation of social action may determine the way it is interpreted (van Leeuwen 2008).

When deactivated, actions are represented statically. Objectivated actions are represented via nominalisations or process nouns that function either as a subject or object in the clause (ibid.). Deagentialised actions and reactions are "represented as brought about in other ways, impermeable to human agency – through natural forces, unconscious processes, and so on" (van Leeuwen 1995: 96). Van Leeuwen (1995) distinguishes three types of deagentialisation: eventuation, existentialisation and naturalisation. Eventuation stands for an action or reaction, which is represented as an event and occurs without the involvement of human agency; existentialisation is performed in objectivated manner via nominalisations like "existence" (van Leeuwen 2008).

> In case of *naturalisation*, an action or reaction is represented as a natural process by means of abstract material processes such as "vary", "expand", "develop", etc., which link actions and reactions to specific interpretations of material processes – to discourses of rise and fall, and ebb and flood; of birth and death, and growth and decay; of change and development and evolution; of fusion and disintegration, expansion and contraction. (van Leeuwen 1995: 97)

Both deactivation and deagentialisation may involve nominalisation, i.e. "a process converted into noun" (Fairclough 2001: 103). Customarily, only such a derivation, which does not change the semantics of (base) word – predicate nominalisations or even predicate nominalisations involving -*mine* affix, is understood as nominalisation in Estonian (Kasik 2006). Along with nominalisations, process nouns, which also exclude social agents, are studied. I concentrate on all nominalised material processes, including abstract ones in the discourse of endangerment. I hope to demonstrate that material processes, which represent language change, shift or

loss, are deactivated and deagentialised leaving no space for (human) agency. These representations support the image of language as a code, where speakers' role in language change is hidden or backgrounded. In nominalised material processes speakers are absent and left without a role in the processes of reversing language shift and language preservation.

6. Representing social action in the discourse of endangerment: deactivation and deagentialisation

6.1. Processes of doing represented by nominalisations

In the following extracts, actions are deactivated by objectivation, which downgrades doings in order to prioritise something else (van Leeuwen 2008). According to Duchêne and Heller (2007), the real agendas of those, who are engaged in the discourse of endangerment, might be hidden. The misuse and manipulation of endangerment may represent the (de)legitimation of some (language) policy (van Leeuwen 2008, van Dijk 2006). In (1)–(2) the need of language maintenance and planning are highlighted, but agents who maintain and plan are left invisible. This way any action or policy that aims at language maintenance could be legitimated. What is unclear who is able to maintain the language: speakers or language professionals. Objectivation is voiced by a columnist and a language activist.

(1) Eestlaste ühiskeel *vajab* **jätkuvat arendamist ning korrastamist**. (ES1)
'Estonians' common language *needs* **continued development and organisation**'

(2) **Toetamist ja kaitsmist** *vajab* nii eesti kui võru keel; nende prestiiž sõltub eelkõige meist endist. (KKam)
'Both Estonian and the Võru language *need* **support and preservation**; their prestige depends primarily on us'

Extract (3) is also an example of legitimation of standardisation, which is one of the most widespread practices of language planners or activists. For successful standardisation, planners must persuade people to accept, learn and use the standard. The argumentative strategies (of persuasion) aim to naturalise and legitimise behaviour and an attitude desired by language policy agencies (del Valle, Gabriel-Stheeman 2002). Standardisation is voiced by an academic and a language planner. However, the representation of action obscures who leads the appraisement and standardisation of small languages, and who is responsible for the preservation of linguistic diversity in the world. (4) is about language shift, but language is represented as something that can be dispossessed by an outside agency, not given up by speakers themselves. A columnist avoids blaming speakers and language planners in language shift and loss.

(3) Võrokeste moraalseks toeks ja eeskujuks *on* **praegu kõikjal maailmas, eriti aga Euroopas toimuv väikekeelte väärtustamine ning nende arendamine moodsateks regionaalseteks kirjakeelteks**, mis *on*

83

ainus reaalne võimalus **maailma tohutu, kuid kiiresti kahaneva keelterikkuse säilitamiseks**. (AK)

'The moral support and model for the Võro-folks *is*, **proceeding at the moment everywhere in the world, especially in Europe, the appreciation of small languages and the development of them into modern regional standards**, which *is* the only real possibility for **the preservation of the world's huge, but the fast decreasing richness of varieties**'

(4) **Lõunaeestlaste võõrutamine oma keelest** *algas* juba eesti aja alguses, varasemaltki veel, ja päris alguse võiks panna umbes Faehlmanni ja Kreutzwaldi aega, õieti küll sellesse "päeva", kui eesti keeleks kuulutati üks teatav Eestimaa murre. (MK)

'**The alienation of South Estonians from their language** *started* in the beginning of Estonian rule, even earlier, and the very beginning could be dated to Faehlmann and Kreutzwald's time, in fact to a "day", when one certain dialect of Estonia was proclaimed as Estonian'

The next extracts and the representation of action are to be interpreted in the context of popular linguistics: "language mixing, codeswitching, and creolisation thus make speech varieties particularly vulnerable to folk and prescriptivist evaluation as grammarless and/or decadent and therefore as less than fully formed" (Woolard 1998: 17). Purist voices fiercely reject language mixing. The identity of the speakers responsible for the mixing can be inferred only from the context. An activist language planner (5) is concerned about languages in contact. On the other hand, a local columnist (6) is not satisfied that speakers have to cope with language mixing, which is done by a state founded research and language planning institution dedicated to language standardisation.

(5) Hoopis suuremaks mureks *on* **võru keele segunemine eesti keelega**. (KE)

'An entirely bigger concern *is* **mingling Võru with Estonian**'

(6) **Lõunaeesti keele loomine olemasolevate murrete baasil või nende segamisel**, **mida sõna paabel tegelikult tähendabki**, *on* enam kui imelik. Samuti **sellele keelele regionaalkeele staatuse taotlemine**. (IK1)

'**The cultivation of South Estonian on the basis of existing dialects or by mixing them, that the word Babel actually means**, *is* more than weird. Also [strange is] **the application of the status of regional language for it**'

Moreover, (6) can be also interpreted in the light of the monoglossic principle of convergence, which has "influenced the perception of multilingual communities as somewhat unnatural and therefore transitional, going through a process of removal of varieties and subsequent convergence in the dominant focused grammar" (del Valle 2000: 120). Furthermore, actions related to the cultivation of a new standard variety, which may lead to convergence, are also delegitimated.

(7) Iga kodaniku esmaseks ülesandeks *on* **kirjakeele eeskujulik omanda-mine**, sellest tuleb lahus hoida murre, **mille valdamine** *pole* kellelegi häbiks. (HV)

'A primary task for each citizen *is* **the perfect acquisition of the literary standard**, a dialect, **a command of which** *is not* a shame for anyone, must be kept apart of it'

In (7) different varieties are attached different values by a teacher. Indeed, "majority languages are lauded for their 'instrumental' value, while minority languages are accorded 'sentimental' value, but are broadly construed as obstacles to social mobility and progress" (May 2006: 333). The financial costs of standardisation are highlighted in (8)–(9). The agency responsible for extra costs is, however, backgrounded by a columnist. Reference to people is made in extract (8); (9) features a zero-sum-game argument (cf. Kymlicka 2002).

(8) **Uue keele tegemise** *maksame kinni* meie, kes me Eestimaal makse maksame. (ES3)

'**The construction of a new language** *will be paid off* by us, those who pay taxes in Estonia'

(9) See vähene, mida saame eesti keele hooldeks tarvitada, *pole* **pillamiseks**. (ES2)

'The scarce bit that [we] can use for the planning of the Estonian language *is not* for **wasting**'

(10) is an illustration that "objectivation occurs mostly in relation to actions and reactions that could be interpreted negatively: 'fear', 'disharmony', 'dislocation', and so on" (van Leeuwen 2008: 66).

(10) Teiseks tahan hoiatada võimalike ohtude eest, mida **meelevaldne ümberkäimine väikerahva keelega, selle taaspihustamine** *võib kaasa tuua*. (ES1)

'Secondly, [I] want to warn against the possible dangers that **the arbitrary treatment of the language of a small nation, its re-dispersal** *might bring about*'

Indeed, in most cases nominalisations represent abstract material processes in the discourse of endangerment; however, there are a couple of (11)–(12), which, instead of being interpreted as doings, should be interpreted metaphorically. Both are voiced by columnists. The national language is represented as a monolith, which different parts (i.e. varieties) have significance only in relation to the creation and stabilisation of the monolith (cf. Pietikäinen et al. 2008).

(11) **Uue kombineeritud keele toitmine** *on* kulukas, põhjendamatu ja ohtlik eesti kirjakeelele. (IK2)

'**Feeding a new, combined language** *is* costly, ungrounded and dangerous to the Estonian written standard'

(12) **Vaevaga kujundatud rahvuskeele küljest kildude lahti toksimine** *ei ole* üldhuvides. (ES1)

'**Knocking off pieces from the national language, which was developed in hardship**, *is not* in the general interest'

In addition to other objectivations represented via nominalisations embedded in (13) and (14), the process nouns *keelevahetus* 'language shift' and *õpe* 'learning/teaching' merit examination. The process of language shift may have been realised by a language planner (13) either as an action or, when rephrased differently, as an event (what has happened): a language shifts or is shifting. An action calls for both agents and patients, whereas an event requires agents only. The use of process nouns leaves the questions of causality and agency unanswered – who causes or is involved in language shift. The whole process is represented as self-engendering. In (14) a columnist leaves unanswered who teaches or learns the dialect. Furthermore, it is not clear how dialects extinct or who dooms a dialect to extinct.

(13) **Sellele käimasolevale võru-eesti suunalisele keelevahetusele, mille tulemuseks on võru keele kõnelejate ja kasutusalade pidev vähenemine**, *lisandub* veel **kogu Eestit ja tervet maailma tabanud inglise keele arutu levitamine ja ületähtsustamine**. (AK)
'**To the ongoing language shift from the Võru to Estonian direction that results in the constant decrease of Võru language-speakers and domains**, *accrue*, as yet, **the senseless dissemination of English and its overstatement, which have hit Estonia and the whole world**'

(14) **Igasugune õpe** *peaks aitama* inimest ühiskonnas paremini toime tulla, **väljasuremisele määratud murde sundõpe** *töötab* aga vastupidises suunas ja *täidab* mälu pahnaga. (TM)
'**Every learning/teaching** *should help* an individual to cope better in society, **the compulsory training of a dialect doomed to extinction** *works* but in the opposite direction and fills one's memory with trash'

6.2. Processes of being represented by nominalisations

In (15)–(19), there was another choice besides nominalisation – the processes could have been represented as events, too: Estonian endures, dialects disappear, culture vanishes, a dialect dies out, etc. Nevertheless, the agency in those processes is left unidentified: it cannot be inferred who is in fact causes language loss or how it happens. (15) and (17) are also examples of existentialisation, where the action is objectivated and "fills the slot of the 'existent' (the entity predicated to exist) in 'existential' clauses" (van Leeuwen 2008: 67). When existentialisation is employed in the discourse of endangerment it illustrates the zero-sum nature of language choice: in the linguistic market some languages and speakers gain, while others lose. "The objectivation and existentialisation of conflictive events is one of the main linguistic resources to avoid assigning responsibility in the discourse, as is the construal of agentless events" (Oteíza, Pinto 2008: 355). Objectivation is voiced by a columnist and mediated by a journalist (15), (19), a columnist (16), (18) and a teacher (17).

(15) Elame ka praegu ohtlikul ajal, kui **eesti keele püsimine** *on* ohus. (KKab)
'We live now, too, in a dangerous time when **the survival of Estonian** *is* in danger'

(16) Hoides mõttetult seda, mida ei saa hoida, ja jättes tegemata tarvilikud asjad, *sillutame teed* **eestlaste kultuuri ühisosa vaiksele hääbumisele**. (EHo)
'By maintaining unreasonably that what cannot be maintained and leaving undone things that are needed, [we] *are paving* the road for **the silent vanishing of intersection of Estonians' culture**'

(17) Niisiis on murded olnud väärtuslikuks allikaks, kuid tänapäeval *on* **nende järkjärguline kadumine** paratamatu. (HV)
'So dialects have been a valuable [re]source, but today **their gradual disappearance** *is* inevitable'

(18) Seepärast võib öelda, et isegi üsna õiges Võru murdes lugu *aitab kaasa* **Võru murde väljasuremisele** (EHa)
'Therefore it can be said that even the story in a quite genuine Võru dialect *facilitate* **the extinction of Võru dialect**'

(19) See peaks vähendama kartust, et murdeid *ähvardab* Euroopa Liidus **hääbumine**. (RR)
'It should diminish fear that **regression** *threatens* dialects in the European Union'

6.3. Excluded and passivated social agents

Finally, although nominalisations are underlined, the focus in this section is on the exclusion of social actors. Exclusion can be radical or less radical. In the former case, the text does not provide any indication about who else might have been included. When actions are included and actors are omitted, exclusion is generally traceable (van Leeuwen 2008). Suppression is typically realised via passive agent deletion. In the following extracts suppressed actors are people who are active in the interpretation of language policy and in school landscapes (cf. Brown 2005): language and education professionals, school directors, teachers, students, parents, and people in general. Suppression is used by an academic in (20) and by activists in (21), (22).

(20) Ränga hoobi lõunaeesti iseteadvusele *andsid* nii okupatsioonide repressioonid kui ka **Nõukogude ajal otse ideoloogiaks tõstetud keeleline ja kultuuriline nivelleerimine normkeele juurutamise näol. Seda keelesuretamist** *harrastati* paljudes Lõuna-Eesti koolides eriti 1950-60ndatel aastatel. (MH)
'The repressions that occurred during the occupations, and **the linguistic and cultural levelling through the cultivation of a normative language**, **elevated flat-out as an ideology in the Soviet period**,

both delivered a heavy blow to South Estonian self-consciousness. **This mortification of language** *was practiced* in many Southern Estonian schools, especially in the 1950s-60s'

(21) Vastukaaluks **keelte, rahvaste, kultuuride kokkusegamisele ja ühtesulamisele** *püütakse* kõikjal maailmas järjest rohkem *rõhutada* erinevusi ja omapära. (KKam)
'To counterbalance **the mixing and melting of languages, peoples, and cultures**, differences and uniqueness *are* gradually *being stressed* everywhere in the world'

(22) Seni *on* seda probleemi *proovitud lahendada* **võru keele keelamise ja väljajuurimisega**. (AK)
'So far, this problem *has been tried to solve* by **prohibiting and the evulsion of the Võru language**'

(23) and (24) illustrate backgrounding, where "the excluded social actors may not be mentioned in relation to a given action, but they are mentioned elsewhere in the text, and we can infer with reasonable (though never total) certainty who they are" (van Leeuwen 2008: 29). It can be inferred that backgrounded actors are "we" the speakers.

(23) Mingil juhul ei tohi aga **murrete kadumist** vägivaldselt *kiirendada*, niisama *pole põhjust* murret kunstlikult *säilitada*. (HV)
'**The disappearance of dialects** *should* by no means *be* violently *speeded up*; equally there *is* merely *no reason* to artificially *preserve* a dialect'

(24) Kõik, mis kipub meie igapäevases kasutuses hääbuma, kuid on **hoidmist** väärt, *tuleb säilitada* arhiivides ja muuseumides, mitte aga *kulutada* energiat, raha ja aega **selle kunstlikuks elushoidmiseks**. (EHo)
'Everything that tends to vanish in our everyday usage, however, that is **worthy of preservation**, *must be preserved* in archives and museums, but *not to waste* energy, money and time for **its artificial preservation**'

7. Discussion

Discursive aspects of language ideology and policy, the latter, broadly understood as social practice of power, are discussed in this concluding section. First, findings are outlined. Then the representation of language and its manifestation in the appropriation of language policy are discussed. Finally, some aspects of politics are featured.

Most extracts illustrate the way nominalised abstract material processes are used in the discourse of endangerment. The processes of language change, shift or loss are deactivated via objectivation. Deagentialisation is realised through existentialisation and naturalisations. Argumentative strategies, known from the (de)legitimation discourse, for example authorisation by reference to legitimate others, i.e. other language planners and activists in the whole world, and rationalisa-

tion, i.e. reference to costs of language maintenance, were employed in the discourse of endangerment too (cf. van Leeuwen, Wodak 1999, Koreinik 2011a). Moreover, some propositions employed illustrate the biologised representation of language endangerment, where homogenisation is represented unified and abstract, while its opposite "diversity" "becomes a code-word or condensation symbol for everything globalisation is felt to threaten" (Cameron 2007: 283). In some extracts, opposition to the monoglossic principles of focalisation and convergence is represented (del Valle 2000)[2]. Therefore, the discourse of language endangerment is simultaneously the discourse of (de)legitimation. The explicit manipulation of danger is a common characteristic of both endangerment and (de)legitimation discourses. While colonisation is unlikely, national languages are represented to be at risk due to a zero-sum-game with other languages.

Nominalisations employed in the discourse of endangerment reproduce the code image of language, the agentless representation of language, its representation without speakers. Deactivation and deagentialisation may also indicate that language is primarily experienced as a symbol of the (ethnic) group and less as a cultural institution (cf. del Valle 2000). Iconisation of Estonian was also explicit in the discourse of (de)legitimation (Koreinik 2011a). The code image of language supports the idea of language as a symbol, one firmly embedded in the Western culture of monoglossia, where formal resemblance between the standard variety and language use has been presumed (del Valle 2000). In monoglossic linguistic cultures languaging has obviously received less attention. In heteroglossic ones, vice versa, "coexistence and interaction between different linguistic norms are considered organic and may form a source of identity" (del Valle, Gabriel-Stheeman 2002: 10). Discursive practices, which hide agency and thus under-represent the process-like nature of language, reproduce the Estonian linguistic culture of monoglossia.

In the analysis of discourses of endangerment the focus should be on the winners and losers of language maintenance and their stakes (Duchêne, Heller 2007). Therefore the interplay of language and politics is of great importance (Crowley 2006). Language professionals (researchers, educators, planners, activists), some of whom are also media professionals (columnists, journalists), are, though not always, key contributors to this discourse. The use of nominalisations reflects a parallel between the academic discourse, where nominalisations have traditionally been expected, but used for different purposes, and the public discourse of endangerment. This confluence, in turn, may demonstrate a number of points. First, language professionals, are active producers of the discourse of language endangerment; it seems to be a public arena for their claims of jurisdiction, "claims to classify a problem, to reason about it, and to take action on it" in the system of professions (Abbott 1988: 40). Second, their discursive involvement may also reference a degree of alienation speakers have from their language or speakers' "limited access to specialised domains of cultural experience" (Halliday 2004 [1993]: 217). Third, it may demonstrate language professionals' adherence to "a language of hierarchy", a particular, likely, dominating academic discourse on language. Finally, when deactivation and deagentialisation are seen as a part of social practice of power all

---
[2]   The principle of focalisation (or focused grammar) – speaking always entails using a grammar, understood as a well-defined and minimally variable system; unfocused or highly variable linguistic behaviours are thus stigmatised in linguistic communities where monoglossic culture is dominant. The principle of convergence – the diachronic counterpart of focalisation, assumes that the verbal behaviour of the members of a community tends to become more and more homogeneous with time. Multilingualism is assumed to slowly disappear as people acquire the dominant language, and the dialectical variation is believed to decrease as the educational system spreads the dominant variety (del Valle 2000: 10).

manipulative voices in the discourse of endangerment also (re)produce language policy or shape the appropriation of language policy. The agentless representation of language hides speakers' responsibility in language change, wanted or not. Language is represented as an abstract fact, speakers are backgrounded "as lacking all agency and choice" (Cameron 2007: 281). Thus, language change, shift and loss are experienced as caused by an outside agency not speakers themselves. The role of political voices in this representation is explicit; manipulation with dangers should not be accepted by speakers whose interests are concerned without doubt. Further research should address interdiscursivity in the (semi)public discourse of language change.

Corpus bibliography

AK = Künstler, Aili 2002. Kui tugev on eestluse tagala? Regionaalse omakultuuri ajaliku elu ja olu jälil? – Sirp, 27.09.

EHa = Haabsaar, Enn 2004. Kas Eesti vajab teist kirjakeelt? – Võrumaa Teataja, 15.04.

EHo = Hoop, Elmar 2008. Kes peaks appi karjuma? – Võrumaa Teataja, 20.12.

ES1 = Soosaar, Enn 2000. Arukust vajame ka keele puhul ehk murded on (väike)keele minevik, mitte tulevik. – Võrumaa Teataja, 15.04.

ES2 = Soosaar, Enn 2002. Separaatkeel jäägu eralõbuks. – Eesti Päevaleht, 21.02.

ES3 = Soosaar, Enn 2002. Uus keel – kellele ja milleks? – Võrumaa Teataja, 05.03.

HV = Viires, Helju 2000. Mitu keelt on Eestis? – Eesti Päevaleht, 05.02.

IK1 = Kaarna, Ivi 2004. Keelte paabel on juba olnud. – Võrumaa Teataja, 15.05.

IK2 = Kaarna, Ivi 2008. Mu kallis koduvillane provints. – Võrumaa Teataja, 16.07.

KE = Eichenbaum, Külli 2005. Keel elab, kui seda kasutatakse. – Võrumaa Teataja, 11.06.

KKab = Kabun, Kaile 2008. Esimese Võrumaa vapimärgi saab Valdur Raudvassar. – Võrumaa Teataja, 23.02.

KKam = Kama, Kaido. 2002. Kaigas om katõ otsaga. – Sirp, 09.08.

MH = Hint, Mati 2007. Lõuna-Eesti väärtus. – Postimees, 10.11.

MK = Kõiv, Madis 2002. Causerie du vendredi lõunapoolsetest asjadest. Millal ja kuidas muutus Võru kuraaž häbi- ja alaväärsustundeks? – Sirp, 27.09.

RR = Raudvere, Rein 1999. Võru keel otsib väärilist kohta. – Maaleht, 14.01.

TM = Mattson, Toomas 2000. Murret? Tänan, ei! – Postimees, 24.03.

References

Abbott, Andrew 1988. The System of Professions: Essay on the Division of Expert Labour. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bauer, Laurie; Trudgill, Peter (Eds.) 1998. Language Myths. London: Penguin Books.

Becker, A. L. 1991. A short essay on languaging. – Frederick Steier (Ed.). Research and Reflexivity. London: Sage, 35–41.

Billig, Michael 2008. The language of critical discourse analysis: the case of nominalisation. – Discourse and Society, 19, 6, 783–800. doi:10.1177/0957926508095894

Blackledge, Adrian 2005. Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World. Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, 15. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Blommaert, Jan 2005. Discourse. A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511610295

Blommaert, Jan 2006. Language ideologies. – Keith Brown (Ed.). The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. 2nd ed. Oxford: Elsevier, 510–522.

Blommaert, Jan; Bulcaen, Chris 2000. Critical discourse analysis. – Annual Review of Anthropology, 29, 447–466. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447

Brown, Kara D. 2005. Estonian schoolscapes and the marginalisation of regional identity in education. – European Education, 37, 3, 78–89.

Cameron, Deborah 2007. Language endangerment and verbal hygiene: history, morality and politics. – Alexandre Duchêne, Monica Heller (Eds.). Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages. London, New York: Continuum, 268–285.

Chilton, Paul 2005. Missing links in mainstream CDA. Modules, blends and the critical instinct. – Ruth Wodak, Paul Chilton (Eds.). A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity. Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, 13. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 19–51.

Crowley, Tony 2006. The political production of a language: the case of Ulster-Scots. – Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 16, 1, 23–35. doi:10.1525/jlin.2006.16.1.023

del Valle, José 2000. Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. – Language and Communication, 20, 2, 105–132. doi:10.1016/S0271-5309(99)00021-X

del Valle, José; Gabriel-Stheeman, Luis 2002. The Battle over Spanish Between 1800 and 2000: Language Ideologies and Hispanic Intellectuals. London: Routledge.

Druviete, Ina 1997. Linguistic human rights in the Baltic States. – International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 127, 161–186. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1997.127.161

Duchêne, Alexandre; Heller, Monica 2007. Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages. London, New York: Continuum.

Fairclough, Norman 1992. Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman 2001. Language and Power. 2nd ed. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman; Wodak, Ruth 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. – Teun A. van Dijk (Ed.). Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. London: Sage Publications, 258–284.

Gal, Susan; Irvine, Judith T. 1995. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: how ideologies construct difference. – Social Research, 62, 4, 966–1001.

Giddens, Anthony 1984. The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Cambridge: Polity.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. 2004. Writing science: literacy and discursive power (1993). – Jonathan J. Webster (Ed.). The Language of Science. Volume 5 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday. London, New York: Continuum, 199–225.

Hennoste, Tiit 1997. Eesti keele sotsioperioodid. – Mati Erelt, Meeli Sedrik, Ellen Uuspõld (Toim.). Pühendusteos Huno Rätsepale. Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised, 7. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, 45–66.

Hogan-Brun, Gabrielle; Ozolins, Uldis; Ramoniené, Meiluté; Rannut, Mart 2007. Language politics and practices in the Baltic States. – Current Issues in Language Planning, 8, 4, 469–631. doi:10.2167/cilp124.0

Irvine, Judith T.; Gal, Susan 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. – Paul V. Kroskrity (Ed.). Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities, and Identities. School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, Oxford: James Currey, 35–83.

Kalmus, Veronika 2003. "Is interethnic integration possible in Estonia?": ethno-political discourse of two ethnic groups. – Discourse and Society, 14, 6, 667–697. doi:10.1177/09579265030146001

Kaplan, Robert B.; Baldauf Richard B. Jr. 1997. Language Planning from Practice to Theory. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kasik, Reet 2006. Nominalisatsioon meediauudiste tekstimoodustusvõttena. – Keel ja Kirjandus, 2, 122–134.

Koreinik, Kadri 2011a (forthcoming). Public discourse of (de)legitimation: the case of South Estonian language. – Journal of Baltic Studies, 42, 2, x–x.

Koreinik, Kadri 2011b. Language ideologies and identity-building in the public discourse of South Estonian. – Riho Grünthal, Magdolna Kovács, Irja Seurujärvi-Kari (Eds.). Ethnic and Linguistic Context of Identity: Finno-Ugric Minorities. Uralica Helsingiensia, 5. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seura, 247–266.

Kerge, Krista 2002. Kirjakeele kasutusvaldkondade süntaktiline keerukus. – Reet Kasik (Ed.). Tekstid ja taustad. Artikleid tekstianalüüsist. Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised, 23. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 29–46.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (Ed.) 2000. Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities, and Identities. School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, Oxford: James Currey.

Kymlicka, Will 2002. Multiculturalism and minority rights: west and east. – Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe, 4, 1–25.

Kymlicka, Will; Grin, François 2003. Assessing the politics of diversity in transition countries. – Farimah Daftary, François Grin (Eds.). Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries. Series on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues. Budapest: LGI Books, 1–27.

Levinson, Bradley A. U.; Sutton, Margaret; Winstead, Teresa 2009. Education policy as a practice of power. Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. – Educational Policy, 23, 6, 767–795. doi:10.1177/0895904808320676

Makoni, Sinfree; Pennycook, Alastair 2005. Disinventing and (re)constituting languages. – Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 2, 3, 137–156. doi:10.1207/s15427595cils0203_1

May, Stephen 2006. Language rights: moving the debate forward. – Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9, 3, 319–347. doi:10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00295.x

Oteíza, Teresa; Pinto, Derrin 2008. Agency, responsibility and silence in the construction of contemporary history in Chile and Spain. – Discourse and Society, 19, 3, 333–358. doi:10.1177/0957926508088964

Pennycook, Alastair 2006. Postmodernism in language policy. – Thomas Ricento (Ed.). An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 60–76.

Pietikäinen, Sari; Alanen, Riika; Dufva, Hannele; Kalaja, Paula; Leppänen, Sirppa; Pitkänen-Huhta, Anne 2008. Languaging in Ultima Thule: multilingualism in the life of a Sami boy. – International Journal of Multilingualism, 5, 2, 79–99. doi:10.1080/14790710802152289

Piirimäe, Eva 2008. Keeleline pööre. – Keel ja Kirjandus, 8-9, 589–603.

Ricento, Thomas 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. – Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4, 2, 196–213. doi:10.1111/1467-9481.00111

Ricento, Thomas (Ed.) 2006a. An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.

Ricento, Thomas 2006b. Theoretical perspectives in language policy: an overview. – Thomas Ricento (Ed.). An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 3–9.

Ricento, Thomas 2006c. Language policy: theory and practice – An introduction. – Thomas Ricento (Ed.). An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method. Malden, Massachusetts Blackwell Publishing, 10–23.

Ricento, Thomas; Hornberger, Nancy 1996. Unpeeling the onion: language planning and policy and the ELT professional. – TESOL Quarterly, 30, 3, 401–428. doi:10.2307/3587691

Rorty, Richard M. (Ed.) 1967. The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rorty, Richard M. 1989. Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffman, Harold 1996. Linguistic Culture and Language Policy. Politics of Language. London: Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 1994. Linguistic Human Rights in Education. – Language Policy in the Baltic States. Conference Papers. Riga: Gara Pupa, 173–191.

Swain, Merrill 2006. Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. – Heidi Byrnes (Ed.). Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky. New York: Continuum, 95–108.

Tender, Tõnu 2010. Mitmekeelsus Eestis Euroopa Liidu mitmekeelsuse ideaali taustal. Dissertationes de Mediis et Communicationibus Universitatis Tartuensis, 9. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

van Dijk, Teun A. 1998. Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. Discourse and manipulation. – Discourse and Society, 17, 3, 359–383. doi:10.1177/0957926506060250

van Leeuwen, Theo J. 1995. Representing social action. – Discourse and Society, 6, 1, 81–106. doi:10.1177/0957926595006001005

van Leeuwen, Theo J. 1996. The representation of social actors. – Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard, Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.). Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge, 32–70.

van Leeuwen, Theo J. 2008. Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.

van Leeuwen, Theo J.; Wodak, Ruth 1999. Legitimising immigration control: a discourse-historical analysis. – Discourse Studies, 1, 1, 83–118. doi:10.1177/1461445699001001005

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction. Language ideology as a field of inquiry. – Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, Paul V. Kroskrity (Eds.). Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–47.

Kadri Koreinik (University of Tartu) is a sociologist who specializes in the sociology of language and media studies. She has studied public discourse on South-Estonian dialects, including media representations of language ideologies and the discourse practices that affect language use and attitudes.
kadri.koreinik@ut.ee

NOMINALISATSIOONI KASUTAMINE KEELE OHUSTATUSE DISKURSUSES

Kadri Koreinik
Tartu Ülikool

Artiklis on analüüsitud agentsuse representatsiooni avalikus diskursuses keele ohustatuse üle. Vaatluse all on nii lõunaeesti keeleaktivistide kui ka nende oponentide (de)legitimatsioonistrateegiad tekstides ajavahemikus 2004–2005 ning alates 1990. aastate keskpaigast toimuva laiema, eesti keele poliitikat toetava meediadebati argumentatsioon. Kitsam fookus on suunatud sellele, millised protsessid on nominaliseeritud, milliseid teisi varjatud või taandatud agentsuse võtteid on kasutatud. Kasutades kriitilise diskursuse analüüsi raamistikku, näitan, et materiaalsetes protsessides, mis esitavad keelemuutusi, -vahetust või -kadu, on agent välja jäetud. Diskursiivsed praktikad, mis varjavad keelekasutaja agentsust ja koos sellega alaesitavad keele protsessilaadset loomust, toetavad kaudselt Eesti monoglossilist keelelist kultuuri. Tähelepanu pälvivad ka keele ohustatuse diskursuse keeleideoloogilised ja -poliitilised aspektid. Keele ohustatuse avalikku diskursust toodavad ja taastoodavad keeleprofessionaalid (keeleuurijad, -õpetajad, -korraldajad, -aktivistid), kellest mõned on ka meediaprofessionaalid (kolumnistid, ajakirjanikud). Nominalisatsiooni kasutamine, ehkki erinevatel eesmärkidel, viitab seosele akadeemilise ja avaliku diskursuse vahel. Keele ohustatuse diskursus on ka professionaliseerumise avalikuks areeniks. Selle diskursuse raames esitatakse n-ö pädevusnõudeid, millega keeleprofessionaalid taotlevad avalikku heakskiitu, et erialaseid probleeme (sh keel ja keelemuutused) klassifitseerida, nende üle arutleda ja nende suhtes samme astuda. Nominalisatsiooni võimupraktika osana vaadeldes võib kõiki diskursuses osalevaid manipuleerivaid "hääli" pidada (keele) poliitika (taas)tootjateks.

Võtmesõnad: kriitiline diskursusanalüüs, ideatsiooniline metafunktsioon, grammatika, representatsioon, keeleideoloogiad, keelepoliitika, eesti keel