

# Chapter Five

---

## Conclusions

The analysis of the Tatar spoken and written in post-Soviet Tatarstan presented in this dissertation demonstrates that it is necessary to look outside of language in order to understand both linguistic structure and structural innovations. The linguistic performance of young Tatars can only be understood when contextualized at both the micro-social and macro-social levels, and shows that one must analyze language as a practice in order to accurately describe language as a system.

In Chapter One, I presented the broad socio-political context of post-Soviet Tatarstan and then located individual linguistic performance within this larger context. A brief historical overview of the Tatar nation and Tatar-Russian contact showed that although for many Tatars the fall of the Kazan Khanate in 1552 is considered to be the most significant moment in Tatar history, the Tatar nation was relatively powerful and influential – with cultural, religious, educational, and socio-economic ties to the wider Islamic and Turkic worlds – up until the beginning of the Soviet era. The period from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century until the 1917 revolution in particular is considered to be the golden era of Tatar culture, characterized by a liberal and modernizing reform movement, highly regarded writers and philosophers, and the adoption of Kazan Tatar as a literary language by neighboring Turkic peoples. It is the Soviet period, with its purges of the Tatar political, cultural, and literary elite, the systematic destruction of Tatar educational and religious institutions and publishing houses, and the isolation of Russian Tatars from their Turkic brethren in Central Asia and Turkey that most significantly undermined the prestige, influence, and stability of the Tatar nation. The covert Soviet policy of “Russification” – which included a forced move to a modified Cyrillic alphabet, language engineering where

Russian was the only viable source of linguistic “enrichment,” and the limitation of Tatar’s functional domains – appears to have played a significant role in changing the situation of Tatar in Tatarstan from one of stable bilingualism to one where Tatar is a “contracting” language, losing both speakers and functional domains. Much of this Soviet legacy remains in post-Soviet Tatarstan: Tatar is to this day particularized in function and stigmatized by many, although it does retain “covert prestige” among much of the Tatar intellectual urban elite, and the language shift of the Tatar populace appears to be continuing apace and is thus classifiable as “gradual language death.” In an effort to combat this stigmatization and language shift, the ethnically Tatar government of post-Soviet Tatarstan has been engaged in the promotion of the Tatar nation as part of their sovereignty project, and although the official national ideology is one of civic multiculturalism, government resources are used to promote Tatars over other ethnic groups in the republic. Language legislation and policy have been an important part of this systematic promotion of Tatars: the declaration of sovereignty in 1990 raised Tatar to the status of an official language, and the government has promoted the mandatory teaching of Tatar in schools, an increase in the availability of Tatar-language education, and the study of Tatar by members of other ethnicities. However, particularly among the Tatar intelligentsia, there is a sense that language equality is *de jure* rather than *de facto*, and a survey of Tatar’s functional domains shows that this is indeed the case. There is an asymmetry of use and usefulness for Russian and Tatar; for example, Russian is the dominant language of the media (newspapers, magazines, television, and radio), education at all levels, and the public sphere in general.

The individual linguistic performance of Tatar urban bilinguals is set within this context of Russian dominance: the sociolinguistic conventions of present-day Tatarstan require accommodation to Russian in public domains, and this accommodation is part of the style shifting of these urban bilinguals. Violation of the rules of linguistic etiquette, most notably

using Tatar in situations that call for Russian, is used by some Tatars as a symbolic gesture: the refusal to accommodate to either Russian public space or monolingual Russian speakers demonstrates a stance that prioritizes ideology over communication, and metonymically represents the refusal to accommodate to Russian and Russians in domains outside of language. Bilingual Tatar speakers have a range of styles that can be organized according to level of language mixing, with pure Tatar on one end, pure Russian on the other end, and a variety of “mixed” styles in between; these styles are used for the audiences and situations for which they are appropriate. The theory of audience design can be used both to analyze this style shifting and to systematically account for the effect of the fieldworker on both observed and recorded speech: both the participant role of the fieldworker and the social role that is assigned to her by conversation participants can be used to explain their style shifting and style choice. Tatar styles vary in their level of “verbal hygiene,” highest in the most “performed” style, which I have labeled “Tatar on-stage” style, most saliently characterized by its “de-Russification.” “Performed” styles, which are understudied, are in fact remarkably useful for sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological inquiry, and the dichotomy between “natural/unnatural” speech is a false one, as all speech is in some way “performative.” In addition, an analysis of Tatar style shifting demonstrates the necessity of multi-stylistic data: the different styles of Tatar bilinguals demonstrate different levels of Russian influence and content, and if a description of Tatar linguistic structure were based on just one of these styles, it would be erroneous.

Individual style shifting is set against the backdrop of post-Soviet Tatar language ideologies. Chapter Two shows how language ideologies are the mediating link between Tatar’s socio-cultural context and its linguistic structure. Language ideologies are never simply about language, and the language ideology that I call the “Tatar discourse of purity” can be seen as a counter-hegemonic discourse that expresses resistance to Russian domination. This discourse of

purity, as is common in post-colonial and post-imperial transitions, is part of the attempt to “revalorize” a subordinate group, and language is used as a symbolic resource. The Tatar discourse of purity is a significant part of the construction of the post-Soviet Tatar identity, and is based on both a logic of “oppositional identity” and “selective targeting” – Tatar identity is defined in opposition to Russian, and Russian is the selective target of purification. “Pure” Tatar is implicitly defined as Tatar without Russian influence or interference, and is implicitly opposed to the “impure” Tatar that is ubiquitous in Kazan – Tatar with phonetic interference, spelling mistakes, or errors that occur in translation from Russian. Code-switching with Russian is also perceived as “impure” Tatar. While Russian influence is rejected, influences from languages that are not perceived as threats can be interpreted as congruent with the post-Soviet Tatar identity. Language is a marker of group identity and often part of a feature cluster that includes descent, religion, and culture: however, at least in post-Soviet Tatarstan, language in particular is seen as a metonymic representative of the nation, where the impurity and decline of the Tatar language are seen as representative of the impurity and decline of the Tatar nation as a whole. The expression of the Tatar discourse of purity on an individual level is found in the de-Russified Tatar on-stage style; on the communal level, it is found in purification movements that are common in post-colonial contexts, most notably orthographic and lexical reform. The recently legislated shift from a modified Cyrillic alphabet to a Latin-based alphabet can be read via metaphor and metonymy as a symbolic gesture of cultural and political reorientation, away from Russian and Russia and towards both Turkey and the West. Other historical Tatar orthographies can also be linked via metaphor and metonymy to an interest in the cultures, politics and social realities associated with them: pan-Turkic runic writing is associated with both the antiquity of the Tatar nation and with pan-Turkic separatist leanings, while Arabic orthography is used both to express religious orientation and to allude to the “golden era” of pre-Revolutionary Tatar

culture. The purification of the lexicon can also be read symbolically: many Russian words brought into the Tatar language during the Soviet period are being discarded, and their replacements are usually not native Tatar words, but rather the Arabic loanwords that were removed from Tatar by Soviet-era language engineering. Once again, Russian is the selective target, while Arabic influence, part of the pre-Soviet Tatar identity, is seen as congruent with the post-Soviet Tatar identity as well. Post-Soviet Tatar lexical reform also shows which elements of Russian influence are most salient to speakers and thus subject to purification on the individual level: the words in question are all content words and the vast majority are nouns. An examination of 20<sup>th</sup> century post-imperial Turkish lexical and orthographic purification movements shows that they too were based on revalorization, oppositional identity and selective targeting: here, Arabic orthography and lexical items were the targets of purification. This comparison with the Turkish case makes particularly clear the ways in which socio-cultural and political structure can affect linguistic structure: language engineering in both Turkey and Tatarstan has rendered texts written just one hundred years ago nearly unintelligible to modern speakers, and has reduced the mutual intelligibility of the two languages.

In Chapter Three, I returned to the Tatar discourse of purity, integral to the understanding of the linguistic performance of individual Tatars, who have “pure” (= “de-Russified”) Tatar at one extreme of a cline of language mixing. I have labeled this style “Tatar on-stage” style, as it is a “performed” style integral to the construction of a cultural and ethnic Tatar identity. This style, where speakers exhibit the highest level of verbal hygiene, is found when audience and setting require a prominent presentation of Tatar identity; for example, public speaking at Tatar cultural events, all speech on Tatar radio and television, regardless of register, and conversations with investigators of Tatar language and culture. When the audience and setting require Tatar to be the language of conversation, but do not require such a high level

of verbal hygiene, young Tatars will use what I call “Tatar-preferred style”: while they are still filtering out Russian elements, these Russian elements are limited to content words, while Russian discourse-pragmatic words on the metalinguistic level of language are allowed to “sneak through.” Neither speakers nor listeners appear to be aware of these Russian words that are organizing and commenting on otherwise purely Tatar discourse, and they can even appear (to a much lesser extent) in the highly performed Tatar on-stage style. This code-mixing is particularly interesting because it is found in the speech of even the most culturally and politically active young Tatars in Tatarstan, speakers who are either Tatar-dominant or balanced bilinguals and who use Tatar in a variety of functional domains, including in professional and educational spheres. Evidence of this code-mixing was found in the speech and writing of Tatar Social Club members who have demonstrated that language ideologies can be more important to them than communication, and who have explicitly stated that they dislike speaking Russian and use it as infrequently as possible. Many of these Russian discourse-pragmatic words retain their Russian grammatical requirements when they are code-mixed into otherwise Tatar discourse; for example, in lieu of embedded pre-head clauses subordinated with non-finite verb forms we find post-head clauses introduced by subordinating conjunctions, and prepositions retain their prepositional nature (Tatar is postpositional). Tatar-preferred style can thus be analyzed as a “composite” that is mostly Tatar yet includes not only Russian lexical items, but also Russian semantic and syntactic patterns. This form of language mixing and the lexical and structural alterations that go along with it indicate a pathway of language attrition and language influence that has not been described in other studies of language contact.

Chapter Four shows that this Tatar pattern of language mixing is not an isolated case, and that using discourse-pragmatics as an organizing principle can both explain and give motivation for lexical and structural borrowing in other sociolinguistically similar contact

situations. Previous work on language contact has aptly typologized hierarchies of lexical and structural borrowing without giving real motivation for these hierarchies. A new three-stage model of lexical and structural borrowing, which is based not on the usual dichotomy of system/content but rather on the trichotomy of system/content/discourse-pragmatic, shows that while the borrowing of content words (Stage One) minimally alters a language, it is the borrowing of discourse-pragmatic words that retain their grammatical requirements which triggers contact-induced structural innovations (Stage Two). Additionally, cross-linguistic evidence demonstrates that discourse-pragmatic words with the same meanings and functions are borrowed again and again, and when separate contact situations have a dominant language in common, it is the very same words that are borrowed. For example, Persian *kei* ‘that’ can be found as a loanword in Tatar, Karaim, and Turkish, and was borrowed from Turkish into Asia Minor Greek, while Russian *chto* ‘that’ is code-mixed into Tatar. Coordinating conjunctions meaning ‘and’ are either code-mixed words or conventional borrowings in all of the languages examined here: Persian *häm* was borrowed into Tatar and Turkish, and borrowed again from Turkish into Asia Minor Greek; Tatar *wä* is a loanword from Arabic; and young Tatars currently code-mix Russian *i*, which is a conventional borrowing in Karaim. In addition, Hebrew *ve* is found code-mixed in Israeli English, and English *and* is found code-mixed in Irish discourse. Structural innovations induced by the code-mixing and borrowing of discourse-pragmatic words cause the structure of minority language to become more like that of the dominant language with which it is in contact, and include alterations in subordination, coordination, interrogatives, word order, verbal constructions, case governance, semantics, and polysemy patterns. Only after a language has gone through Stage Two borrowing of discourse-pragmatic words will it begin to borrow system words and morphemes (Stage Three). Discourse-pragmatic words that are polysemous will be borrowed only in their grammaticalized form in Stage Two, and in Stage Three may be

borrowed in their root meanings and functions. Grammaticalized borrowings in Stage Two include epistemics, adverbs of stance, spatial relators used as hedges, question words with evaluative function, and coordinators used for narrative structure. In Stage Three, borrowings include deontics, adverbs of manner, spatial relators used in their root meanings, question words without evaluative function, and coordinators used as general grammatical coordinators. Both discourse theory and theories of grammaticalization, usually applied to the analysis of monolingual data, are here used as organizing principles to distinguish between borrowings found in different stages of language contact and influence.

While introducing the category of discourse-pragmatics to the established categories of system and content words allows for a better understanding of the stages, hierarchies, and types of lexical and structural borrowing, an important question remains: just why are dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words borrowed into minority languages that have previously borrowed only content words? The mechanism of their borrowing appears to be code-mixing: the frequency and placement of the Russian discourse-pragmatic words code-mixed in Tatar parallel the frequency and placement of discourse-pragmatic words that are conventional borrowings, including Arabic and Persian borrowings in Tatar, Russian and Polish borrowings in Karaim, and Turkish borrowings in Asia Minor Greek. The question then should perhaps shift to code-mixing – why are dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words code-mixed into minority-language speech and writing where the only other dominant-language words are content words that have become conventional borrowings? Why does Tatar-preferred style seem to demonstrate that young Tatar bilinguals use Russian to organize and evaluate their Tatar discourse, even when they are Tatar-dominant, explicitly state that they prefer to not speak in Russian, and indicate through their linguistic performance that “pure” Tatar is an explicit and implicit ideal? There are several potential explanations for this behavior: one is cognitive, and

based on the peripherality of discourse-pragmatics words to awareness; a second highlights the iconicity of discourse-pragmatic words; and a third incorporates social factors into the use of dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words.

Discourse-pragmatic words, particularly those words that structure discourse, often come in peripheral word slots, and when they are not utterance- or sentence-initial they are often clause initial. It appears that discourse-pragmatic words are peripheral to awareness as well, and less salient than content-word, or denotative-language, nonce borrowings. Errington, writing on the syncretic composite language composed of Indonesian and Javanese known locally as “language salad,” contends that content-word borrowings are “conspicuous” to speakers and listeners, while discourse particles are not (1998: 10, 100ff):

“Extensive repertoires of discourse particles serve Javanese Indonesians as a means for marking feelings about and stances towards conversational topics, contexts, and participants. Their non-referential, crucially situated significances appear to make them peripheral for speakers’ awarenesses relative not just to their encoded linguistic functions...but also with respect to their various provenances as well” (ibid. 10).

Errington believes that these discourse particles function as what Gumperz calls “contextualization cues,” which are “[h]abitually used and perceived but rarely consciously noted and almost never talked about directly” (Gumperz 1982: 131, cited in Errington 1998: 100). This was seen in Chapter Three; young Tatars are apparently unaware that their “pure” Tatar linguistic performance was actually replete with Russian discourse pragmatic words, and this lack of salience seems to be repeated among the Karaim.<sup>1</sup> Articles in the post-Soviet Tatar press that are concerned with linguistic purity and the use of either Russian or Arabic borrowings refer *only* to denotative-level content words, and usually only to nouns – discourse-pragmatic words do

---

<sup>1</sup> When discussing linguistic purism among the Karaim, Csató’s sole example of a borrowing salient to speakers is a Russian noun, *stol* ‘table’ (1999a: 85).

not appear to be salient to Tatar speakers concerned with lexical reform. Nor do they appear to have been salient to Turkish language reformers in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: despite the fact that hundreds of Arabic and Persian borrowings were removed during the transition from Ottoman Turkish to Modern Turkish, the vast majority of Arabic and Persian discourse-pragmatic borrowings remained, and those Arabic and Persian discourse-pragmatic words that were borrowed into Asia Minor Greek via Turkish over a century ago are all in standard usage in Turkish today. Minority-language speakers who are communicatively competent in two codes, even those with an explicit discourse of purity, simply appear to not notice when they import the metalinguistic code of the dominant language into the denotative code of the minority language. The mixing of denotative codes is salient to speakers, but the mixing of a metalinguistic code and a denotative code apparently is not.<sup>2</sup>

Iconicity has also been suggested as an explanation for the code-mixing of discourse-pragmatic words into minority-language speech. Maschler's analysis of the Hebrew-English code-mixing briefly described in Chapter Four relies upon the separation of the denotative and metalinguistic levels of language; she contends that code-mixing is iconic and allows one language to serve as 'commentary' on the other (1994: 325). Maschler found that Hebrew code-mixing was "frequently employed in utterances that negotiate a boundary between the immediately preceding part of the interaction and the immediately following part" (ibid. 332). The metalinguistic code-mixed words thus segment the discourse by acting as boundaries between what Maschler calls "verbal activities"; for example, Hebrew discourse-pragmatic words are used to separate interruptions and asides from the main discourse in English. The discourse-

---

<sup>2</sup> It is currently unclear why this apparent difference in salience should exist, and this is a question that invites cognitive linguistic research into the processing of discourse organization.

segmentation function of these words is therefore enhanced by their being in a different language: the words themselves create discourse boundaries, and the switch to another language emphasizes the fact that a boundary has been created. Discourse-pragmatic words used to express contrast can also be interpreted as iconic. For example, Cotter notes that the English word *but* code-mixed in Irish discourse is contrastive in two ways: it is semantically contrastive, and it is contrasted with the Irish discourse that surrounds it by means of being in English (1996: 187).

However, code-mixed discourse-pragmatic words do more than just segment discourse and express contrast: they structure discourse in other ways such as subordination and coordination; they organize event structure and are used for deixis and as directives; they perform social functions such as greeting and leave taking; and they express both speaker stance toward and evaluation of the denotative discourse at hand. Therefore iconicity, while a plausible motivation, cannot be the only explanation for their use. Additionally, while the cognitive explanation appears to be extremely plausible – when speakers are engaged in verbal hygiene and filtering their speech, discourse-pragmatic words are salient and thus removed only at the very highest level of verbal hygiene and purity requirements – this explanation too seems insufficient in some ways. Perhaps cognitive reasons alone can explain cases of interference where speakers import the discourse organization from the language in which they feel most comfortable into a language in which they have a lower level of competence. However, the question remains: why are Tatar-dominant and balanced bilingual speakers – who actively demonstrate that they prefer speaking Tatar – importing Russian discourse organization and evaluation into Tatar? A third hypothesis, which requires a significant amount of additional research in order to be tested, suggests that in addition to their iconicity and lack of salience for language filtering, dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words may be used because of the additional discursive and

pragmatic force that comes from their association with a language of prestige and power. This hypothesis is based on several considerations. The first comes from work by Jane Hill and Kenneth Hill on *Mexicano*, a “syncretic code” based on Nahuatl and Spanish with both a discourse of purity and varying levels of language mixing. They suggest that hispanization “evokes the power and prestige of Spanish-speaking society, and lends dignity and force to Nahuatl utterances” (Hill and Hill 1980a: 122). In addition, they found a correlation between the expression of stance and the use of the dominant language; the more evaluative a narrative was, the more Spanish and hispanicisms were found in that narrative (1980a, 1980b).

“Analysis of narratives shows that the highest rates of hispanization are consistently found in what Labov (1972) calls ‘evaluation’: the aspects of narrative discourse through which the speaker shows why his narration is worthy of the attention of the hearer...Generally, in types of discourse hispanization and switching is dominant in evaluative and explanatory material and apparently lends dignity, force, and convincingness to the utterance by its presence” (Hill and Hill 1980b).

Hill and Hill found that speakers of *Mexicano* generally used a level of hispanization commensurate with their prestige level, and suggest that low-prestige men and women “monitor down” their rate of hispanisms (1980a: 128); note that this type of verbal hygiene is the reverse of what we see among young Tatar speakers.

Another phenomenon suggesting that dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words are being code-mixed for additional power and emphasis is their use in double-marking. In Asia Minor Greek, we saw the phrase [pék poli kaló] ‘very very good’ (example 4.99), where *poli* is the native Greek intensifier ‘very’ and Turkish *pek* ‘very’ is used for additional intensification. Persian *ägär* ‘if’ is used to double-mark conditionality in Tatar, introducing a clause where the verb is already in the conditional, and Persian *gärchä* ‘although’ is used to double-mark concession, introducing a clause where the verb is in the concessive form created by the combination of the

conditional affix *-sA-* and the enclitic *DA* ‘also’. Young Tatars will periodically double-mark their evaluation of degree by using the phrase *dazbe kbätta* ‘even’, where both Russian *dazbe* ‘even’ and Tatar *kbätta* ‘even’ are used, and also often double-mark their greetings and leave-takings, saying “*Sau bul. Poka.*” ‘Bye. Bye.’ This double-marking suggests a phenomenon similar to monolingual cycles of emphatic markers, where one intensifier becomes semantically bleached and thus not sufficiently emphatic, and a new as-yet-unbleached intensifier is chosen (as can be seen in the set of English words used as intensifiers, e.g., *awfully, terribly, horribly, bella* (dialectal) and *wicked* (dialectal)). Semantic bleaching, where a word loses its semantic power, is part of the process of grammaticalization. Is it possible that there is an analogous “bleaching” of power in low-prestige and contracting languages, here a bleaching of pragmatic and discursive force rather than semantic? In monolingual cases of semantic bleaching of intensifiers, speakers use native resources to generate new intensifiers with sufficient power. Perhaps, and this is at present mere speculation, for speakers of contracting minority languages the native resources of the language are no longer sufficiently powerful due to the loss of what Bourdieu calls “symbolic capital,” and they turn to the resources of the dominant language instead, as it has increased its symbolic capital at the expense of the contracting language. Many of the dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words found in the examples given in Chapters Three and Four are words that would be emphasized prosodically in monolingual English discourse: for example, in Asia Minor Greek we find: “**Would that** I had not killed my daughter” (example 4.90); “**Come**, bring your youngest daughter” (example 4.91); “**No**, I will not sell him” (example 4.105). Perhaps Greek speakers, instead of using native means of emphasis and stress, sometimes used discourse-pragmatic terms from Turkish to lend their statements sufficient power and force.

A fourth and final hypothesis is that the code-mixing of dominant-language discourse-pragmatic words is one way of creating a “syncretic code” that constructs a desired identity

without explicitly violating a prevalent discourse of purity. The term “syncretism” was originally used by Kurylowicz to describe linguistic structures that suppress oppositions, and was first adapted to the study of bilingualism by Jane Hill and Kenneth Hill in their work on Mexicano. Both the Mexicano analyzed by Hill and Hill (1980a, 1980b, 1986) and the Indonesian “language salad” analyzed by Errington (1998) are described by them as syncretic codes, defined as a “‘mixed’ usage which suppresses the social relevance of oppositions between systems and in which the provenances of talk’s elements...are interactionally muted” (Errington 1998: 9). Cotter interprets her Irish speakers’ insertion of English discourse markers into otherwise Irish radio performance as “foregrounding the bilingual foundation upon which interlocutors build their discourse” (1996: 188) and “as a linguistic marker of bilingual identity” (ibid. 195). Perhaps Tatar-preferred style is used in private conversations because the entirely de-Russified Tatar on-stage style would be inappropriate due to its associations with the “performance” of Tatar identity, which is appropriate for public speaking and conversations with outsiders, but not for conversations among friends, where it might be perceived as artificial, overly formal, or distancing. If de-Russified Tatar is construed as a “performed” style that is inappropriate and code-switching is also inappropriate for the audience or situation, perhaps the code-mixing of Tatar-preferred style can be interpreted as due, in part, to audience design. Because there is no code-mixing of content words, this style does not saliently violate the explicit discourse of purity found in the Tatar community, but perhaps the code-mixing of discourse-pragmatic words references the bilingual foundation of the speakers and acknowledges that they are *choosing* to speak Tatar although they are fully capable of navigating their way through a Russian-dominant world.

These findings and hypotheses clearly invite additional research and analysis. Particularly desirable is a broad typological study of code-mixing and lexical borrowing in a variety of

contact situations. Is the three-stage model of hierarchical borrowing described here true for all types of contact situations? What role does discourse-pragmatic functionality play in borrowings from substrates, or between languages with a much less severe asymmetry of power and function? If increased discursive and pragmatic force via association with the dominant language is indeed a motivation for code-mixing of discourse-pragmatic words, this predicts that different patterns of code-mixing and borrowing will be found in different sociolinguistic contexts. We would then expect that in contact situations with a less marked asymmetry of power and prestige, we would find more code-mixing and borrowing of discourse-structuring words than of evaluative words, as the “iconicity” of boundary-creation merely reflects that the words are in a different language, regardless of the relative prestige of the languages. If code-mixing and borrowing of discourse-pragmatic words is essentially the same for typologically different contact situations, then the “additional force” hypothesis can be discounted. Additional research on the Tatar-Russian contact situation is also desirable, in particular on the structural relationship between the code-mixing in Tatar-preferred style and the code-switching found in other “mixed” Tatar-Russian styles. A thorny obstacle to be surmounted is the difficulty of recording code-switched conversations: due to audience design and style-shifting requirements, the presence of both the fieldworker and her recording equipment prevents code-switched performance by the politically and culturally active young Tatars cited in this dissertation. Additional research on Tatar language ideologies and indexicality in linguistic performance could test the validity of the “syncretic code” hypothesis for Tatar-preferred style, which posits that the code-mixing of Russian discourse-pragmatic words found in this style may be used to construct an identity that is desirable to young urban Tatars, that of bilingual speakers who are comfortable in both the Tatar and Russian worlds but choose to live in Tatar.

Additional work is also required to map out more precisely the relationship between structural and lexical borrowing of the sort found in the contracting languages described here and language attrition. One goal of endangered language theory is to find structural innovations that are inherently symptomatic of language death, innovations that would not be found in a “healthy” language. Organizing and commenting upon minority-language discourse with a dominant-language metalinguistic code does indeed seem to be a form of language attrition, where the dominant language is making inroads in a linguistic functional domain rather than a social functional domain. This dominant-language discourse organization appears to be one sign of linguistic “tip” (Rouchdy 1989) in favor of the dominant language and another means of contraction of a minority language’s stylistic options. Myers-Scotton suggests that code switching is an “important mechanism for ‘deep borrowing’ and shift phenomena” and is “involved in language death” (1992: 33) – here, “the dying language need not have *lost* features so much as substituted those of the ‘invading’ language” (ibid. 52). The Tatar of young bilinguals, even the most ideologically devoted and competent speakers, seems to demonstrate a preference for Russian-style constructions over “characteristically Tatar” constructions, thus leading to the reduction of stylistic options. For example, if Russian *potomu chto* ‘because’ becomes the preferred means of expressing causality, or causes Tatar *chönki* ‘because’ to become the preferred construction since it is syntactically identical to the Russian, it will be at the expense of the other 27 Tatar causative constructions and aid in the loss of semantic and register distinctions. Moreover, youth Tatar in urban environments has no slang or characteristic “youth speech” innovations: Russian slang and interjections, many of which are discourse-pragmatic in function, already fill that gap.

Errington (1998: 98-100) notes that there are various approaches to the study of language contact and contact phenomena. Weinreich (1953) focussed on individual bilingualism,

in particular, on the ways that the grammar of a first language shapes the acquisition of a second language and causes “interference.” For Weinreich the locus of contact is the individual. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) moved the locus of study from the individual to groups in contact that were broadly contextualized both socially and historically. Their focus is on “borrowing,” both lexical and structural, and on the correspondence between intensity of pressure from a dominant group and amount of linguistic influence found in the minority language. Errington labels Weinreich’s approach “cognitive” and Thomason and Kaufman’s “collective.” His own fieldwork led him to focus on another locus of language contact: face-to-face interpersonal interactions that index the broader socio-cultural context. In this dissertation, I have used all three of these approaches and loci of language contact: the individual is the focus in the analysis of style-shifting, which is one form of intra-speaker variation. Style-shifting in turn is motivated and explained by audience design, a theory based on the study of interpersonal interactions. Additionally, the Tatar data that forms the basis of my analysis comes from interpersonal interactions in a variety of channels, both oral and written. These interpersonal interactions are always understood within the larger socio-cultural and political context within which they take place.

In conclusion, the examination and analysis of Tatar in post-Soviet Tatarstan demonstrates that social factors – often given only the most cursory treatment in studies of language contact – are integral to understanding the motivations for and pathways of contact-induced change. Tatar linguistic performance and the Russian-influenced structural innovations found in this performance can only be understood by analyzing all levels of language contact: intraspeaker variation and style shifting, interpersonal interactions, and higher-level social structures, ideologies, and practices, in particular, Tatar nationalism and the discourse of purity that is an integral part of this nationalism.