

Perspectives on learning, knowing, and understanding languages

The 29th volume of the periodical *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* ('Close Comparisons') continues a long tradition but also brings in new dimensions concerning both the languages under study and the topics of the contributions. The articles published here have found their way to *LV* through various channels of scholarly communication; some are based on talks given in 2018 at the VIRSU workshop at the autumn symposium of AFinLA, the Finnish Association for Applied Linguistics.

Following its well-established traditions, *LV 29* focuses on the comparison of languages and linguistic phenomena. While Estonian, Finnish, and Russian have often been dealt with in *LV*, and also quite a few of contributions about the Karelian language have appeared, this volume brings in comparisons involving the Latvian language as well. Comparisons between languages is approached both from a contrastive and from an applied-linguistic perspective, focusing on various prerequisites and forms of language learning. This volume introduces a novel dimension which is also important from the point of view of language policy: the role and use of the Finnish language in academia.

As in many previous volumes already, we are dealing with the mutual intelligibility of closely related languages: receptive multilingualism is the topic of two contributions. Pirkko Muikku-Werner and Helka Riionheimo explore the cognitive strategies which Finnish-speaking students apply when translating Livvi Karelian texts into Finnish, and also reflect on the teachability of such strategies. Hanna-Ilona Härmävaara and Charlotte Gooskens focus on the mutual intelligibility of Finnish and Estonian vocabulary, both written and oral, comparing this on an earlier

extensive study on the mutual intelligibility between Germanic, Slavic and Romance languages.

Niclas Oranen describes the functions of the adessive case in Tver Karelian, comparing its use with the corresponding cases in Finnish, Estonian, and Russian. The study shows that although adessive is historically connected with external or vicinal locations, it can also express time, instrument, possessor, recipient, or experiencer. In addition to these, the adessive in Tver Karelian also marks direct and other objects. In two further contributions, Estonian is involved in comparisons. Sirje Kupp-Sazonov explores the Estonian counterparts of Russian diminutive nouns in short stories by Anton Chekhov and their Estonian translations; Ilze Tälberga and Merle Vare examine the Latvian verb prefixes on the basis of Estonian translations of Latvian literature.

Old textbooks of Finnish have been the subject of study in previous volumes of *LV*, and now Marja Järventausta takes up the topic. Her study deals with *Soome keele õperaamat iseõppijatele* ('Coursebook of Finnish language for self-study'), published in Estonia in 1919 and translated from a German textbook from 1890, *Praktische Grammatik der Finnischen Sprache für den Selbstunterricht*. The *Õperaamat* is also compared with two Estonian textbooks of Finnish: *Praktilik Soome keele õpetus* by Johannes Aavik (1908) and *Soome keele õpiraamat* by Lauri Kettunen (1920).

Kristina Koppel in her contribution presents the current situation of e-lexicography in Europe and in Estonia, investigating whether automatically selected authentic corpus sentences can be used in a dictionary for Estonian learners at the CEFR levels B2 to C1. Markku Nikulin calls attention to academic immigrants' experiences of the need of Finnish language skills in their work and everyday life, emphasizing the connections between language knowledge and the well-being and integration of his informants.

We thank all authors for their interesting and diverse articles and all reviewers for their valuable feedback, which the authors have applied accordingly. We are very grateful to everybody involved in the editing

and publishing of this volume for their efficiency and flexibility. Our particular thanks are due to the Finno-Ugric Cultural Foundation (*Suomalais-ugrilaisen kulttuurirahaston säätiö*) and to the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research for their financial support, and to the Estonian Association for Applied Linguistics for allowing us to publish *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* under their aegis.

Joensuu, Vienna, Seattle, and Tartu

Annekatriin Kaivapalu, Johanna Laakso,

Hanna-Ilona Härmävaara, Raili Pool