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1. Introduction

During the last millennium the Balto-Finnic languages, Estonian among them, have evolved under extremely unstable social conditions, characterized by frequent changes in the society and population. The languages reflect this social instability. Still quite recently numerous regional dialects were spoken while the development of common national languages was hindered by social borders. Furthermore, in all Balto-Finnic countries more than one language has been spoken at a time and the societies there have been linguistically structured in several ways. The positions of 'high' and 'low' have been occupied by different languages and varieties in a flow of change.

In this paper we outline the linguistic diversity of the Estonian speech community and its correlation between different social hierarchies in the historical perspective. We characterize the diversification and standardization of Estonian by examining the diachronic variation of the active past participle. This multifunctional variable will be traced in the history of written Estonian and in one of the South Estonian dialects.

An important peculiarity of the historical development of Balto-Finnic peoples is that socially differentiated language use has explicitly come into being as a result of foreign invasion and the formation of higher classes by the intruders. Assuming that rulers and subjects were often obliged to communi-
cate, some kind of diglossia, bilingualism, or even multilingualism must have existed. The longest observable distinctions between 'high' (H) and 'low' (L) varieties in the Balto-Finnic speech communities have been connected with separate languages, the local Balto-Finnic variety evaluated as L, and one or several foreign languages as H. Traditional examples of diglossia may involve genetically related languages (e.g. the two varieties of Arabic, Haitian creole and French) or non-related languages (Guaraní [L] and Spanish [H] in Paraguay, Hebrew [H] and Yiddish [L]) (Romani 1995: 34), but the socially structured language use in these communities has always remained relatively stable over a longer period. This is not the case in Estonia or any other Balto-
Finnic country where changes in rulership have been frequent and periods of stability relatively rare (Finland being somewhat exceptional). Constant
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2. Historical background

At the beginning of the second millennium A.D., the territory of present-day Estonia was inhabited by speakers of more than one Baltic-Finnic tribal language. The tribes inhabited a slightly wider area, stretching to present-day North Latvia and westernmost Russia close to the Estonian border. There was a sharp distinction between the North and South Estonian languages, giving rise to the later two main dialects of Estonian. The third main one is nowadays considered to be the Northeastern Coastal dialect, though it is questionable whether it has emerged from the respective tribal language (Laanest 1982: 300). As many as five separate Old Baltic-Finnic main dialects have been reported as constituting the basis for Estonian: South Estonian, North Estonian, East Estonian, North-East Estonian and Coastal Estonian (Viltsio 1985: 401). These may have been the languages of the tribes on the Estonian territory. There were no common state structures as yet in the 11th and 12th centuries. According to written sources, the country was divided into eight larger and some smaller counties (Jaanits et al. 1982: 401). Language usage in these counties has formed the basis for later dialects with considerable discrepancies between them, particularly between the main dialects. South Estonian may be characterized by numerous archaic features that do not occur in any other Baltic-Finnic language. North-East Estonian differs in various ways from South and North Estonian. It is likely that many of these differences date from the old tribal languages (see Figure 1).

No evidence has been found of any stable Baltic, Germanic or Slavic settlements on the Estonian territory at the beginning of this millennium. Written documents and archaeological finds, however, point to close military and trade contacts between Estonians and speakers of the ancient Indo-European languages (Jaanits et al. 1982: 307), attested by respective loans in Estonian.

The language situation changed drastically at the beginning of the 13th century when North Estonia was seized by the Dano and Central and South Estonia by crusaders speaking Middle Low German. Danes did not have any substantial impact on Estonian as, in the middle of the 14th century, Denmark sold its part to the State of the Teutonic Order of Knights. During the Middle Ages feudal state units developed with German speaking rulers and Estonian subjects. Even the Estonian higher class, as far as it is known, chose to speak German. German was spoken in towns and offices. This was a diglossic situation: German and Estonian were functionally separate. German was spoken among officials, landlords and when addressing them, Estonian, on the other hand, was used among peasants, servants and lower class craftsmen. The language of the rulers enjoyed its glorious literary past.
and belonged to a flourishing nation; the language of the subjects lacked a written tradition. At the same time, bilingualism on a limited scale developed during the centuries of German rule, mostly among town people and manor servants. (We hereby follow the viewpoint that diglossia is a matter of society and bilingualism is an individual ability.) However, both parties knew little about the other code and were able to adapt themselves to the situation, without actually keeping the languages rigidly apart. This kind of code-switching is known to reduce the distance between the two languages rather than to reinforce it as is typical of stable diglossia (Wardhaugh 1992: 107). As to the two local languages, both absorbed features from the other. Estonian was subject to strong German influences all over the territory, while leaving its imprint on the developing local variety of Middle Low German (Hinderling 1981: 16-19, 94f.). Tallinn town council members are reported to have even been blamed for speaking bad Low German (Aariste 1981: 27). At about the same time Finns from several districts united to struggle against the German invaders, and the old tribal languages grew more similar (Raun and Saareste 1965: 61f.).

The governmental units in the North Baltics created by foreigners in the Middle Ages did not coincide with the ethnic borders in this region. North Estonia was a separate district, whereas South Estonia and North Latvia formed the core of Old Livonia. Livonians, South Estonians and Livonians (the southernmost Baltic-Finnic tribe) lived side by side on the present-day territory of North Latvia. Livonians have assimilated into Livonians by now, and South Estonians have left behind only a couple of small language islands as their settlement retreated more to the north. Contacts between Estonians and Latvians have been lively throughout the ages. Both languages share many morpho-syntactic features. Livonian loanwords in Estonian date from various centuries of the last millennium (Vaba 1977: 268).

The time of the German invasion was also the beginning of a Swedish influx to North-West Estonia and the West Estonian islands. The first Swedes were mostly peasants who settled down separately from Estonians. Therefore, the Swedish impact remained relatively insignificant. Nevertheless, Estonian Swedish has contributed a number of loanwords to Estonian (Lagema 1971: 16f., 239-55).

Russian warriors and merchants have visited the Estonian territory for the last thousand years. It is likely that the first Russians settled down in Northeastern and Southeastern Estonia as early as in the 13th and 14th centuries. By this time the Votic language had separated from the North-East Estonian tribal language under the influence of Russian. Mixed Estonian-Russian settlements developed during the next centuries along the whole eastern border. The inhabitants of the parishes of Estonia in the North-East became Estonian-Russian bilinguals (Moora 1964: 274-78). Some South Estonian territories were occupied by Russians already at the end of the 13th century. The Russian Orthodox Monastery, founded in Pehra in 1473, became the center of Russian influence in this region. Local South Estonians (Setu people) accepted the Russian Orthodox faith, their language and customs were affected by the contacts. However, their essential cultural and linguistic characteristics survived. From the end of the 17th century onwards, Russian overlords (old believers) settled down on the western coast of Lake Peipus and formed a separate closed ethnic unit. Russian loans have probably penetrated into Estonian dialects and the common language during the whole millennium. The proportion is bigger in South Estonia due to the immediate contact area (Aariste 1981: 89). However, the role of Russian in the development of Estonian was modest until the 18th century.

During the Middle Ages two bigger economic and cultural centers evolved in Estonia: Tallinn and Tartu. Each had its own spoken language, the Tallinn people using North Estonian and the Tartu people South Estonian. One had to take this fact into account when the German clergy had to start writing
religious texts in the native language after the Reformation. Even the very first written documents of Estonian (from the 16th century) underline the serious discrepancies between dialects that later caused so many disagreements about the common written language (Kask 1970: 30). Eventually, at that time, two written languages came into being: North Estonian and South Estonian or the languages of Tallinn and Tartu, respectively. However, South Estonian lost some of its character by being submissive to the Northern influence and serving as a mere Southern alternative to the Northern.

After the Livonian War in the 16th century North Estonia fell into the hands of Sweden and South Estonia under the rule of Poland. The Polish language was not influential here; Polish loanwords in Estonian are rare and have rather arrived via Baltic German (Hinderling 1981: 27). Sweden became the master of the whole country by the end of the 1620s, and Estonia was part of the Swedish Kingdom until the beginning of the 18th century. A number of Swedish civil servants stayed there permanently and used Swedish in their job. Several Finns settled down in many places as Swedish subjects, but were quickly Estonized. Besides Swedish, German retained its governing position. Tuition at Tartu University (founded in 1632) was carried out in Latin, the language of correspondence was mainly Swedish, and at times documents appeared in German (Fiirnisse 1982: 90). There was an apparent conflict between Swedish and German which were the dominating languages of 17th-century Estonia.

Under the Swedish rule serfdom bound Estonian peasants to the land, i.e., they were not allowed to leave the local community without the permission of the landlord. This brought about further diversification of parish dialects. On the other hand, North Estonian and South Estonian regional standards advanced as an outcome of the expanding literature and schooling. Starting from the 17th century Estonians had to learn the written language at school in addition to their native dialect that they acquired at home (Andreassen 1991: 31-34).

From the beginning of the 17th century High German instead of Low German started to gain the position of the official language. In Tallinn the two varieties of German were used by particular social classes: High German was spoken by the wealthiest and most educated people. Low German by the middle class bourgeoisie and common people (Ariste 1981: 29). For Estonian Germans the situation became close to diglossia. Low German 'went out of fashion' by the end of the 18th century but was long after spoken 'among close friends' (Ariste 1981: 97). If we look at the entire society, the picture of typical double-nested diglossia appears; there are additional H and L oppositions within H and L varieties. Faasul (1984: 46-48) describes an analogous case in Khadapur, India, between Hindi and the dialect, where both are divided into H and L varieties. In 17th-century Estonia the continuum would be dialect (LL) - written Estonian (LH) - Low German (HL) - High German (HH) with the position of State Swedish parallel to HH. In general it is likely that three different varieties of Baltic German have been spoken: the German of the upper class and educated people (Gebildemanshanddeutsch), the German of the common people (Kniipandteutsch) and the German of non-Germans (Halbedeutsch). The latter is a pidgin, used by non-native German speakers in Estonia and Livonia. The Estonian language had contacts mostly with the latter two (Hask 1990: 353). On the other hand, for centuries German pastors practised a form of simplified Estonian (pidgin Estonian), learned from incompetent grammars.

For several centuries there have been some small minorities in Estonia that have left the general language usage untouched. Jews, craftsmen have worked here since the 14th century, whereas a more stable community developed at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The latter community spoke Yiddish among themselves, used German for wider communication and usually mastered Estonian as well. Estonian was enriched by some Yiddish loans. Gipsies are known to have arrived in Estonia not later than in the 16th century. They studied Estonian, their language abounded with local traits, but eventually Estonian absorbed a couple of loans again (Ariste 1981: 157-59).

At the beginning of the 18th century Estonia was occupied by Russia and remained annexed to it till 1918. Russian became the second official language beside German. Starting with Russification in the 1880s Russian was granted the absolute superiority as the only official language in Estonia, and children had to study in Russian already in primary schools. Only religion continued to be taught in Estonian. In order to balance it, Estonians consolidated culturally and linguistically. Close contacts with Finns were established quickly, and many Finnish loans were deliberately introduced into written Estonian. In the middle of the 19th century the whole Estonian territory witnessed an overwhelming rational awakening. The language of this movement was the written variety of North Estonian. The South Estonian written language gradually lost its importance; the last clerical books and textbooks for schools were printed during the first decade of this century.

Most of the basic norms of Modern Estonian were fixed around the turn of the century and during the first 30 years of this century. When the independent Estonian state was founded in 1918, Estonian secured its position as a civilized language, the language of the state, science and culture. For the first time in 700 years Estonian became the leading language, but its status was threatened again about twenty years later.
In 1939 and 1940 most Germans left Estonia and the Estonian Swedes followed suit during World War II. From 1940, when Estonia was incorporated into the Soviet Union, Russian became the official language again. Its domination was enhanced by the Russian mass immigration after the war. In 1939 Russians formed 8.2% of the population, by 1989 the percentage had risen to 30.3. Bilingualism was overtly propagated, but was ultimately expected to end in Russian monolingualism and pave the way for assimilation and cultural homogenization (Hiet 1988: 34-57). Bilingualism was strongly recommended to all non-Russian Soviet citizens; administrative means were intensively used to achieve this aim. Estonian as a developed language did not give up easily. Rather than melting together, two separate communities lived side by side, speaking different languages (Lauristin et al. 1989: 242f). The functions of the two languages did not coincide. For example, academic degrees could not be obtained in Estonian, some areas of the service sector such as the post and railway functioned in Russian, Estonians prevailed in the countryside. Many Estonians mastered certain registers in Russian while the actual percentage of bilingual speakers was small. According to Fishman’s classification it would be a case of diglossia without bilingualism (1972: 75), comparable to the situations in Canada or Belgium with widespread monolingualism in individual territories. The Russian minority forms the majority in Northeastern Estonia and constitutes more than half of the population in the capital.

From 1989 Estonian has been the only official language in Estonia. Russian is still relevant for social communication. Other languages that once played an important role, like German and Swedish, have receded. Besides Estonian and Russian, English and Finnish are widespread.

The linguistic development of the Estonian community is depicted in Figure 2.

3. Diversity of Estonian

Estonian dialects developed very late, between the 16th and the 19th centuries, when Estonia was administratively divided into small units. The diversification of oral varieties went on regardless of the development of the written language and in spite of the spreading primary education. Idiosyncratic dialect features started to retreat only in the second half of the 19th century when the written variety became more persistent. The transition was not immediate, rather an intermediate stage was formed. Local dialects melted into regional koine that preserved many local features but were different from both the old dialects and the written language. Thus, a new three-step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Standard Estonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balto-Finnic</td>
<td>written North Estonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td>written South Estonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tribal languages</td>
<td>Estonian dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votic</td>
<td>regional South Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Estonian subdialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td>local koine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Danish Baltic German
Swedish Estonian Swedish
Russian Standard Russian
Larvi Polish Romany
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Figure 2: Linguistic formation of the Estonian society during the last millennium. The predominating languages (N) are given in bold print.

Linguistic Diversity and Standardisation in Estonian language diversity arose, where each variety had a different social function and meaning. Köhnes have been characterized as often taking the middle position between dialects and the standard language (Daniel 1968: 1509). They can be considered to be dialect-based lingua frasae, where dialect peculiarities are somewhat levelled and many borrowings have been introduced (Sammarco 1988: 373). Nobody has investigated these spoken koine of Estonian, but the peculiarities are obvious. Northeastern Coastal Estonian reveals no phonological distinction between long and overløg quantities, the finals variety lacks the unreleased mid-central ə etc. (Pajusalu 1992: 28f). The situation is most clear in South Estonian. Local features have become assimilated to the regional, low variety, rather than to the written variety. The modern South Estonian koine has preserved most South Estonian or North Estonian features characteristic of the exterminated South Estonian written language. The new variety is a continuation of this language form, and for this
reason it may have maintained its regional prestige. Locals want to use it at social events and in local offices, they are pleased to hear it over the radio and do not like those who speak North Estonian to their children (Org et al. 1994: 208ff.).

The common spoken variety of Estonian developed partly from further dialect and lexis contacts but mostly apparently on the basis of the written language. It is likely that it started to be spoken all over the country at about the turn of the century. The written language itself was shaped in fierce discussions, some aspects of which will be described in the next chapter.

The development of Estonian sociolinguistics is late and very much connected to foreign influence. Estonian cooks used German and Swedish cookbooks and the terminology there; Estonian craftsmen generally spoke Halbunivits, borrowing words. Until World War II a common 'Baltic Sea' language was spoken by sailors, based on Swedish and other Germanic languages. Later military jargon is full of Russianisms as is the language used by Soviet public administrators. Tallinn student slang, however, contains only 15% loans, of them 40% are from English (Loog 1992: 12). A great amount of terminology has been borrowed from Finnish, Russian and English. The attempts to create original computer terms, for example, have not been too successful.

Synchronically the diversity of the Estonian language could be outlined in the following way:

**Written language versus Common Estonian.** There is a well-known distinction between oral and written language use. The former is much more democratic. Common Estonian, spoken by most educated people, is very close to the written language. It is generally assumed that the rules that are compulsory in writing are also valid for speaking. Estonians believe that language is an instrument that can be endlessly improved, remade and diversified through written media. This belief dates from the first decades of this century and is connected with the movement called Language Renewal, led by Johannes Aavik (his views are explicitly stated in Aavik 1924). Estonians are exceptionally aware of the standard; newspapers constantly deal with the question of rights and wrongs in the (written) language. From time to time the rules of the written variety are adapted to oral usage. Outright appeals to reduce the distance between the two varieties by "writing the way we speak" are less frequent. Jaan Kaplinski's views (1994) are the latest and most notable example.

Within the standard usage of Estonian, two distinct styles could be observed until quite recently. In a totalitarian society, where individual survival may depend on a single word, the ability to express oneself in an indirect way is essential. Therefore a separate variety with a great number of clichés, compulsory euphemisms and vague agents came into being, sometimes called

"normal standard" as opposed to 'normal standard' (Pajusala 1992: 26). Wierzbicka (1990) has described a country-wide grammar of this totalitarian language variety in Poland, where political resistance was explicit in popular names for 'sacred' Soviet institutions, a direct mockery of the frozen style. The tendency is not alien to Estonian.

**Common Estonian involves several social usages and jargons which diverge from each other first and foremost in the lexicon.** As mentioned above, they can be loans from foreign languages. Computers and music are typical areas that attract numerous English words. North Estonians' speech is rich in quotes from Finnish TV advertisements and serials.

**Common Estonian versus regional koine.** These are not exclusively separate codes, of course, and the value ascribed to them is not the same everywhere. In North Estonia educated people tried to speak the more prestigious written language and only the less educated spoke the koine, whereas in South Estonia South Estonian has been used even on the wealthiest farms by their educated owners. Local prestige and traditions support this widely spoken regional language. Nowadays people from other areas who come to live there make efforts to use South Estonian (Org et al. 1994: 207). For North Estonians South Estonian has acquired the connotations outdated, and cold, but familiar and traditional. For example, the 1994 Estonian Top Ten included a song in South Estonian that was performed by a group with a South Estonian name.

A subtype of the regional varieties are the town varieties. The two educational centers of Estonia, Tartu and Tallinn, can be told apart by a couple of features. No clearly separate town varieties have developed.

The opposition koine versus local dialects. Although still existent, this is mainly a diachronical opposition. Older speakers use the dialect and younger generations the koine. An example may be drawn from one village, Sute. The genuine dialect is disappearing gradually, the youngest ones speak the levelling regional South Estonian koine (Org et al. 1994: 204-06). And yet it can be prestigious to master one's native dialect properly after the Southern revival at the end of the 1980s.

Not surprisingly, the actual picture is often more blurred than the stratification above. As an illustration of this we present an overview of one especially sensitive variable in the oppositions 'written versus Common Estonian' and 'dialect versus koine versus written Estonian'.
4. The case of the active past participle: a Common Estonian variable in the written language

Common Estonian has an optional shorter suffix for the active past participle (-nd versus the standard -nud). It has been around for hundreds of years, surviving even a decisive elimination from the standard language, and goes unnoticed in everyday speech. Standard written Estonian denies the existence of -nd, and therefore it is perceived as restricted to the informal registers of the language, while -nud would be the appropriate variant in formal contexts (Keevallik 1994: 131f). The crucial fact about -nud--nd variation is that it is visible even among highly educated speakers who obviously are most knowledgeable about the standard. In fact, much more happens in connected speech: mõeld "thought" is reduced to mõel, obsd. "been" to old or onr or even on in unstressed positions, forms that coincide with the word stem not "wanted", vott "taken" and and "given" (standard tahnud, vittnad, andun) pop up in casual style. The spoken variety allows more variation, which is one of the contrastive features between Common and written Estonian. The latter has acknowledged -nd only at times. It should be pointed out here that -nd has some advantages as far as universality is concerned; -nd cannot, for example, appear after consonant clusters or labial stops (thus "merina 'broken', "rapu 'killed').

The syntactic functions fulfilled by the past participle are somewhat different in the written language and in the spoken variety. In the former it can appear in the present and past perfect (on käinud "has gone", ol fiinud "had gone"), in the negative imperfect (ei käinud 'did not go'), as an adjective (palunud sul or sul on palunud "a door that has closed"), as an auxiliary in the past perfect (eit olud külas 'had not gone') or as a noun (on olud huige 'has been told') as well as in conditional and reported speech (oleks tulnud 'would have come'). The latter occurs without eit in Common Estonian as a predicate all alone and is widely used in narrative style. This usage is alien to the written variety.

The historical suffix -nd developed into North Estonian -ndu and South Estonian -nu. Further contraction -nu > -n in North Estonian has been estimated to have taken place in the 17th century (Kaan and Saareste 1965: 66). The syncopeed forms spread extensively all over North Estonia, so that by the beginning of the 20th century -nd was the predominant variant in most parishes (see Figure 1). For the early North Estonian written language (16th century), -ndu (or -nud) was the only option as the shortening took place later. Once established, it was not easy to count on the changed oral usage, especially in canonical texts. When variation was finally allowed in writing, the propagators of language norms could not tolerate its free usage, and forced it to retreat. Thus, at the present moment both have an established domain of usage and respective meaning.

To inquire about the development of variation, it would be illuminating to trace the variation through the history of written Estonian. While doing so, several points should be kept in mind. First, there was no homogeneous variation in the whole Estonian territory until about the middle of the last century when common norms for the written language were first established. Before that most writings aimed to follow the fragment written tradition but reflected the peculiarities of geographical dialects and resulted in uncomparable differences between contemporary writers. Second, the early writers were not native Estonians but German pastors who had learned Estonian with the purpose of making themselves understood to the native population and more or less merely embodied Estonian words into German or Swedish syntax. Third, the genre of the first texts is limited to the religious sphere, step by step widening to official announcements, spelling-books, calendars, and transcriptions of local songs.

With these drawbacks in mind, it is possible, however, to indicate the time when the dialectally widespread shorter suffix (-nd) was introduced to and subsequently eliminated from the written language and also to inquire about the reasons and aspirations behind it.

The first Estonian texts date from the period of Reformation (1524, 1535) and give no evidence of the shorter suffix (see Table 1). At the beginning of the 17th century the tradition continues with the sermon by Georg Müller (baustat "declared", Pittmat "must", Sauriste and Cederberg 1992: 5-15).

The first grammar of Estonian was written by Heinrich Stahl and published in 1637. Stahl took Latin as a model and tried to show the same regularities in Estonian. He worked in the region where -nud was spread in the dialect at least as an option, and used only -nud (-nut) in his texts (1632-1649; attuned "stepped", pühats "tried"); Sauriste and Cederberg 1992: 35-51). Stahl's grammar won great popularity among the German pastors who were now obliged to express themselves in Estonian. They found Stahl's guidelines easy to follow, and usually added some local flavour. Even if the change -nd > -nu was going on, the German clergymen chose to trust the written example. Also the next grammarian, Heinrich Siiksen, who can be characterized by a Western dialect background with -nd (or even -n) as the past participle suffix, prefers to continue Stahl's tradition (tühats 'beaten', nekats 'seen'; Sauriste and Cederberg 1992: 62f). His grammar was published in 1660. None of the texts give any proof of the existence of the shorter suffix at that time (see Table 1). Written Estonian was first set into a foreign mold. Besides, it combined features from the Central, Eastern, Western (all from the North
#### Table 2: The usage of the past participle in the history of written Estonian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Accent Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Leitso</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Knöpfl</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 353-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806-1806</td>
<td>Müller</td>
<td>German (Est.?)*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 5-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Gußnack</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-1856</td>
<td>Gußnack</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 120-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Saarman</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 82-66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Gillius</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 144-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Gönker</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Virginias</td>
<td>German?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 168-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1701</td>
<td>A.G. Virginias</td>
<td>German?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 187-210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Horning</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Creusing</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 232-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 264-49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Käsmann</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 305-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Schöll</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 317-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Öra</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 320-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Hornung ed.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 322-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Helle</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Graundm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Helle ed.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>S: 150-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Apelius</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>E: 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793-1707</td>
<td>Wilhelmi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cler. + sec.</td>
<td>E: 24-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Holle</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>E: 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Ungel</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816-1825</td>
<td>Masing</td>
<td>Est., Germ.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 29-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841, 1843</td>
<td>Sommer</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 40-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Fauchmann</td>
<td>Est., Germ.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Kreuzner</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>E: 45-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Albers</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851, 1863</td>
<td>Jaanus</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 135-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1875</td>
<td>Koldula</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>secular</td>
<td>S: 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source code: E = Særensen (1959); K = Kals (1994); SI = Særensen und Cederberg (1999); Tk = Tamar kalendar (Tamar Calendar) (1869); SI = Seto kapitami | [The Sea Reader I] (1922); V-S = Viro-Sotaliitrumaat | [The Viro-Sota Calendar] (1995).
Estonian area) and the Coastal dialect, thus shaping the future independent North Estonian written variety.

In addition to the amalgamation of various dialectal traits in the northern part of the country, the language written in the South was noticeably different. It was the grammar by Johann Gunzlaff (1614) where a new literary standard was first introduced for South Estonia. The past particle suffix was said to be -na, a common speech form in this region, described as a development of the original -nad (-nat). In his translations of the Bible, however, he mixed up the two (sadun 'got', teres 'done', olun 'been', saliu 'stood' (1649-1656; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 102-07). Another author from South Estonia, Virginius, is persistent in the use of -nu (1686; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 106-83). Forellin, in his spelling-book of 1694, gives -nad as the North Estonian form and -na as South Estonian, keeping them adequately apart. From then onward there are no problems for the South Estonian written usage: a song from the region sticks exclusively to the -na variant (kooliku 'died', kumapõl 'begged'; a funeral song to Charles XI (1697); Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 254-65); an oath from 1699 includes a single -nu suffix (Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 271), and a sermon from 1700 uses them exclusively (vaimus 'taught', motiones 'thought'; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 277-84). The same is true for Kau Ants in 1706 (see Table 1).

During the 17th century, when the towns expanded, the North Estonian common language developed in Tallinn, where Central, Western, Coastal and Eastern dialects met. It is clear that much variation originates from that period, and much of the confusion in contemporary writings has its roots in the unstable oral usage, where wide options were available. Towards the very end of the 17th century (1695), Johann Hornung is the first grammarian to mention the existence of two North Estonian forms: olun and olun 'been', sadun and sadun 'got', piddamas and pidid 'must'. His knowledge of the Estonian dialects was wider than that of his predecessors due to his attending the Bible conferences (1686, 1687) where the linguistic side of the future translation of the Bible was discussed. Those conferences have been regarded as a general turning point in the history of written Estonian when German orthography was finally adapted and several specific questions discussed. Hornung's grammar takes into consideration the actual usage more than any earlier grammar, resulting in several parallel forms. In his own writings Hornung tended to use more the -nad variant, especially persistently in religious texts; -na appears occasionally. As Hornung took part in translating and editing the New Testament that came out in 1715, both variants, -nad and -na, appear there (sinuned 'sinned', patumad 'escaped'; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 322-33) (Kask 1984: 72). But already in 1697 -nad had occurred a couple of times in a public announcement: armund 'gruedted', round 'plundered'; Royal

order in case of a shipwreck (Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 65-69; see Table 1). A 1702 appeal to peasants includes two instances of pidadam 'must' and three of pidian (Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 287f), demonstrating the naturalness of variation. Schultz and Orn from the Western dialect area use both as expected (1709; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 317-20, 220f).

As a matter of fact, the particular time of introducing the shorter suffix into literature tells us very little about the habits of native speakers. It might have been there much earlier, but it went unnoticed by the literate foreign clergy who established the first traditions mostly in religious writing. These traditions were not easy to break. From the same period there are several authors who consider just the full variant appropriate, and several anonymous texts employ just -nad (A.A.A. Virginius 1690-1701; Creutzer 1694; A Handbook 1699, A Political Document from Tallinn 1700, About the Dreadful Devastation of Jerusalem 1701; Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 287-290, 293-301). It is important, however, to notice the segregation of styles. The texts mentioned last are mainly clerical. Creutzer and Virginius translated the Bible, the story of Jerusalem comes from the Bible and the Handbook is addressed to pastors. On the contrary, the above-mentioned written records with -nad and -na were either addressed to the people (the public announcement and the appeal to peasants) or were non-religious poems (Shuliten, A Song for the Praise of Hebrew and Onn, A Song of Walks). The conclusion is that translations of the Bible, sermons and other religious texts tended to keep to the correct variant deemed worthy by generations of clergymen, whereas texts with secular content were free to use either. Hornung came closer to native speakers, merging higher and lower styles, and the literary language proved most inert in canonical registers. The higher style was obviously colored by Germans and practiced in the church. But so far only Germans possessed the privilege to write Estonian, a proof that their Estonian was more effective and deserved greater authority. The awareness of this 'higher' style extended to the 19th century, when it is reported to have led to unusual hypercorrections: Estonian school teachers sometimes imitated the mistakes made by German pastors (Kask 1984: 113).

After Hornung's breakthrough, Anton Thor Helje's grammar of 1732 relies upon him and upon his own experience of some -nad dialects around Tallinn. Helje is considered the first person to have set up standards for Estonian, as he eliminated some redundant parallels (Kask 1984: 90). The suffix -nad stayed on. Both suffixes appear in the full translation of the Bible (1739), mainly Helje's work, e.g., pidadam 'must', suadin 'got' but elland 'lived', holld 'cared' (Saareste and Cederberg 1992: 150-54). From this point onwards, -nad was used freely as a parallel to -na. Helje's grammar and the Bible became important guides. They were based on the Coastal dialect and the earlier written
During the second half of the 19th century several North Estonian authors chose to use both -mad and -me suffixes (P.R. Kreutzwald, E. Bornhöfe, J.V. Jannsen, L. Koidula) and several did not (C.R. Jakobson [with rare exceptions], J. Hunt; Kask 1984: 131-62). To a certain extent this depended on their background. Jannsen and Koidula came from the Western (-me) dialect area, Jakobson from the Eastern (with -mad in majority), and Hunt from the Southern (with -me suffix). It could also be a conscious choice by -mad users to leave out the other as inappropriate for written language. This claim is undoubtedly valid for Hunt who actively fought for the establishment of language norms and according to some scholars was the main figure who helped to secure the position of -mad as the only suitable variant for writing (Kask 1984: 146). Hermann mentions just -mad in his grammar from 1884 (p. 99), but in the second edition cannot help giving examples of sentences (lines of poetry) including -me suffixes (1905: 126). More and more writers keep to -mad only (see Table 1). All of a sudden, -mad was ascribed the value of being 'correct' and -me the opposite.

Nevertheless, -me survived and gained extraordinary popularity three decades later. The influential linguist Johannes Aavik argued against -me, 'seest mad oodustava kah meie keele kõikalt pehme türgiga ehitatud sagedust, eriti õppusel, ja teisteks, lühikeste lõpuomaste sildide järgnemini, mis õnnest vennaks ja lühemaks teevad' (because it promotes the two disadvantages of the sound of our language: the frequent occurrence of dark u, particularly in the suffixes, and second, the sequences of short and poor syllables that make words watery and pliable); kuid tõmmatu 'wrong', laburad 'promised', kadurad 'disappeared', etc. (Aavik 1916: 11.). His recommendation was to use -me after vowels, which would be even more consonants clustered together as a result of shortening (thus *napud 'killed', *võlud 'taken', *kõnealud 'talked' Aavik 1916: 14). Aavik stated that it had always been common to use -me, and many had tried to change their usage to -mad just in order to sound 'correct', 'literate', 'fashionable' and 'as-if-from-the-capital' (Aavik 1916: 121). By this time it had become clear what is right and what is wrong in a written language, regardless of current oral usage. Once again popular sensitivity to 'appropriate' language had been verified. Although Aavik's ideas spread to some grammars (Loorits 1923) and were often cited, it appeared not easy to fight against the existing prestige norms. The suffix -me was used extensively by the supporters of Aavik, several writers and poets who found his proposals fascinating. On the other hand, they faced a strong opposition preferring a more traditional written language with clear norms and a fixed structure. As a compromise between the two, Loorits attempted to standardize -me after vowels and -mad after consonants in his grammar. The norm was followed by
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5. Active past participle in the Mulgi dialect

Next we will take a look at how the past participles is used in the Mulgi dialect that historically belongs to South Estonian but borders on North Estonian (see Figure 1) and shares many of its features. Mulgi has also had close historical contacts with Latvian and Livonian in the south, resulting in certain similarities. Besides, it has idiosyncratic features that have not spread to any other Estonian dialect, e.g., widespread syncope and apocopes, the replacement of a (a) with e in monosyllabic syllables, including suffixes (Common Estonian vaata, Mulgi vaader 'look', third person plural), specific grammatical categories like diminutive optative (moosker 'go'), diminutive, divergent core lexicon (Mulgi dilm, South Estonian õil, North Estonian ema 'mother'; Mulgi kuru, South Estonian soksa, North Estonian reina 'to stand'). The social history of the Mulgi dialect is unique. Although belonging to South Estonian, it has administratively been incorporated into the North Estonian dialect area for the last centuries. The South Estonian written language never spread there, and the North Estonian standard has been taught at schools and used in offices, sharply divergent from the dialect. It is interesting to mention that Mulgi was one of the most educated parts of the country, a dense network of schools had been established there by the end of the 18th century (Andresen 1991: 52). In the 19th century it became the most prosperous part of Estonia, thanks to favourable agricultural conditions and the cultivation of flax. In the second half of the century it was an important center of the national awakening. Regardless of the general ability to speak Common Estonian, the dialect was in use at home and among local people until the 1930s. This century has witnessed some writers who used the Mulgi dialect in poetry. The outcome of World War II was disastrous—a great number of the inhabitants fled to the West or were deported to Siberia in 1949. This brought about changes in the local population and the assimilation of the dialect. In recent years Mulgi clubs have been established to promote local culture and language again.

To characterize the past participle, the central Karksi parish is chosen as a sample. The data was collected in 1936 to 1939 (group I), 1958 to 1959 (II), 1972 to 1974 (III), 1984 (IV), and 1984 to 1988 (V). In groups I-IV elderly peasants with local primary education were recorded to elicit the 'proper'

...
dialect. In group V collective farm workers and employees with a local secondary education, born in the 1930s, were recorded. For statistical analysis three men and three women from each group were observed during 45 to 60 minutes of relaxed narration.

The active past participle is one of the most multifunctional verb forms in the syntax of Estonian dialects, the same is true for Karksi. Besides occurring as an ordinary participle in the present perfect and past perfect (e.g. om kiidutu 'has talked', et jõe olla 'had not been', as ifter 'would have liked') it is often a predicate on its own in declarative reported speech. The latter is exceptional in the written language but widely used in Common Estonian and in many dialects. Depending on the context, the meaning of these forms can be either constructive or passive (e.g. puidutu ulla 'the women had allegedly come out', uden toot 'she should have asked to do'). Attributive use is common (pudumu arm 'burnt love') but unlike the written variety it can be declined as well (koidutk niisaksi 'the baked potatoes', plural participle) and may occasionally be followed by the plural suffix -(e) in the third person plural (and pudunne 'they allegedly stayed'). Thus the dialect offers wider possibilities for expressing morpho-syntactic functions, but the options divergent from the standard tend to fall out of use starting from group III. The plural is not marked any more and the attributive participles are not declined.

As could be noticed above, the active past participle is formulated in several ways in the Karksi usage. The historical -n must have had seven corresponding allomorphs there in the 1930s, the choice of which was determined by the morphological type of the verb. Among all the 2712 verbs observed, the most productive suffix is clearly -n (with 1795 verbs, 66.2%6) that occurred after binyamic stems with a long initial syllable or after stems with more syllables, e.g. andun 'given', pakasnus 'round'. The suffix -n is typical of Mulgi and reflects the late apocope in this particular region. Besides, these forms are characteristic of Livonian (Ketsum 1947: 87). The rest of South Estonian has -mu. The suffix -mu is the second productive suffix in Mulgi (886 verbs, 33%) and appears after monosyllabic stems or binyamic stems with a short initial syllable, e.g. saamu 'got', kahamu 'lost'. Other allomorphs were less active: -u came up with 42 verbs where the -n of the historical suffix had assimilated to the final nasal or liquid of the stem, e.g. koolu 'dead', olla 'been'; -mu appeared with the three frequent verbs laamu 'gone', saamu 'been' and taamu 'done', where the historical stem-final stop has been assimilated by the suffix, e.g. laamun > laamun; the analogical -en cropped up with parandu 'put' (stem piane), compare andun 'given', stem andun); -m as a counterpart to North Estonian -nd, a loan from North Estonian, to be precise, was used with one verb, namely pukan 'has been obliged' (the word-final stop is pronounced as a lenis in North Estonian and as a fortis in South Estonian). The last two allomorphs have probably come into use via some additional emotive meaning, -en for passive and -m for active.

As to the status of these suffixes, -ne is characteristic of the Karksi vernacular only, -n and -mu of the whole Mulgi dialect and -mu of all South Estonian. The data under observation is further complicated by the North Estonian suffixes -nr that can be heard in places close to the North Estonian border and -maad (adapted from North Estonian -maad). The suffix -nr is the adaptation of North Estonian -maad that is unsuitable for the dialect. The active past participle in Karksi is an extraordinarily heterogeneous form. We proceed to look at the dynamic usage of the variable in different inflectional subclasses.

The Karksi -ne is used marginally by the first three groups in one verb subtype only (see Figure 3). In the subtype where -ne, -m and -mu appeared in group I, -m grew noticeably more common in group II, indicating that the natural change towards the generalization of -m was still going on.

![Figure 3: Use of different suffixes in the old mulgi-ne-m-variation type of Karksi](image-url)
of one border dialect between the different standards can serve as an illustration of what is happening in many regions of Estonia at the moment, regardless of or even thanks to the narrowly defined written standard. How disparate the oral usage and the written standard are is clear from the single example.

6. Conclusion

The Estonian language community is very small (1.6 million inhabitants at the present time [about 1 million of them Estonians]) but, for example, only 750,000 in the middle of the 19th century). From the outside it is often hard to imagine that it abounds with regional dialects, not to speak of social stratification. It is largely a historical coincidence that Estonian emerged as a separate, viable national language which nearly carried out all the functions of a full-fledged language. The contacts with Western culture thanks to several occupations have not been of minor importance here. Moreover, the invaders have unified the country either directly by administration or indirectly by invoking common resistance. The idea of a single written standard originates from foreigners. Ultimately, the continuous presence of other languages has served as a source of inspiration and richness, rather than as a repressive force for Estonian.

What has been peculiar about the situation of Estonian is its constantly changing ingredients of the population and the social classes. Indigenous peoples have had to adapt themselves to the different foreign languages spoken in the society and so have the foreigners. Language habits and attitudes have changed accordingly. On the other hand, while the society can go through revolutions, invasions and quick structural changes, the turnabouts in the language do not happen as quickly. It takes time for a language change to take place. The human abilities to conform linguistically to a new social situation are limited not only in terms of acquiring a new language or a dialect, but also because of difficulties in removing old usage stereotypes. Therefore, the language is often somewhat behind the events and the controversy may be disturbing for the effective functioning of the society. Both sides are forced to conform to each other; the society has to conform to the linguistic habits of its members and the languages have to conform to the society, as could be seen in the case of Estonian.

Very unstable societies nurture specific linguistic stereotypes. Local people may preserve and develop their own language as a stabilizing alternative to the interchanging foreign varieties. If we look at the development of the Estonian speech community, the standard Estonian language appears to be H
from one side and I from the other, so that the simplified scheme might look as follows: 

$$H < L < H < L$$

(i.e. foreign language < Standard Estonian < koine).

The peculiarity of this situation, compared to the above-mentioned double-nested diglossia (Faucauld 1984: 47), is that there is one central, well-defined, and relatively stable variety, with all the other varieties being in some kind of opposition and less stable. This double-opposed diglossia has developed in Estonia over several centuries. It has been characteristic of the situation that Standard Estonian is narrowly defined, but mastered by most members of the language community. Its centrality is acknowledged even by those whose everyday usage is markedly different, as was indicated in the case of -rad standardisation. Standard Estonian has had a wider scope of use than the traditional H of a diglossic situation. The H of the double-opposed diglossia in Estonia can be characterized by limited use, mostly in governmental affairs, and limited prestige. It has been the language of rulers in the history of Estonian, either German, Swedish, Polish or Russian. Only some registers of such a H need to be acquired in order to be socially successful. The L of Estonian is the everyday spoken language and therefore considerably variable. Nevertheless, the L tends to shape its own norms (e.g. -th suffix in North Estonian, and -nu in South Estonian) and become homogenized, although through an intermediate extremely variable restructuring stage (e.g. the Karksi situation).

Besides, during the last century the traditional multilingual society of Estonia has developed towards a community dominated by a single language. The opposition that had earlier been characteristic of the multilingual society came into being inside the Estonian language via increased differences between varieties and/or via ascribing new social values to them. When the pressure of the invaders decreased, Estonian took over some of the functions that were previously carried out by foreign languages. The multilingual code-switching may have been replaced by monolingual style-shifting, as was shown above in the case of -rad variation.

Estonian, along with Finnish, are the only two success stories among the Baltic-Finnic languages, and together with Hungarian, the only ones among the whole Finno-Ugric family. The rest of the Baltic-Finnic languages have been able to temporally compartmentalize their language for use in the spheres of L, but are by now losing ground even there. The main reason why Estonian managed to win the position of H was its consolidation to the extent that the single written language was established and thereafter actively used after
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