

**FINGLISH:**  
**In between two Languages,  
Language Debates, and  
Classification Norms**

**Britta Nolte**

**Web Reports 71**

**Institute of Migration**

**2011**



Institute of Migration

Eerikinkatu 34

20100 Turku

Finland

Internet:

[www.migrationinstitute.fi](http://www.migrationinstitute.fi)

## **Wissenschaftliche Prüfungsarbeit**

gemäß §12 der Landesverordnung über die Erste Staatsprüfung für das Lehramt an Gymnasien vom 07. Mai 1982, in der derzeit gültigen Fassung

Kandidatin **Britta Nolte**

der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität in Mainz

Fach: **Englisch**

Thema: **Finglish: In between two Languages,  
Language Debates, and Classification Norms**

Erstgutachter/In: Prof. Dr. phil. Günther Lampert

Zweitgutachter/In: Mr. Henry R. Daniels

Abgabedatum: **11. April 2011**

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank all those who made this thesis possible. First of all, I want to thank Hannele Jönsson-Korhola (University of Helsinki), Maisa Martin (University of Jyväskylä), and Timo Lauttamus (University of Oulu) for their advice and for providing me with their own works, which would otherwise not have been accessible to me, and which were indispensable for this thesis. Secondly, I want to say thanks to Jarno Heinilä from the Institute of Migration in Turku for all his support during my research. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Günther Lampert (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) and Mr. Henry R. Daniels (Université de Bourgogne) for the mentoring of this thesis and its continuation.

I would like to show my gratitude to my former Finnish teacher Elvi Nurmela. Without her good teaching of Finnish grammar and her continuous help I would never have been able to write a thesis about this subject matter. Moreover, I want to thank her for her valuable support in the run-up to this thesis. In this context, I would also like to express deep gratitude to Iris Dagbagli, Alisa Pulkkinen, and Eila Yliruikka. Their helpfulness has been amazing, and this thesis would not have been possible without their help.

Last but not least, I am indebted to my family and friends, who supported me in one way or the other and thus contributed to the completion of this thesis. I am very lucky that I can rely on good friends, whose helpfulness does not know any “borders”. Above all, I want to thank my parents for their constant support, their confidence in me, and their unconditional love. I am more than grateful to know that I can always count on them.

## Table of Contents:

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. THE ENGLISH-FINNISH LANGUAGE CONTACT IN NORTH AMERICA.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. THE PECULIARITY OF THE ENGLISH-FINNISH LANGUAGE CONTACT WITH REGARD TO THE STRUCTURAL INCOMPATIBILITY.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. FEATURES OF SPOKEN FINGLISH.....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1. Lexical Influence.....	12
4.1.1. The Impact of English on Finnish First Names and Surnames.....	12
4.1.2. Adaptation of English Borrowings to the Finnish Morphological and Phonological System.....	14
4.1.2.1. Stem Formation.....	14
4.1.2.2. Consonant Cluster Simplification.....	16
4.1.2.3. Stress Adjustment.....	16
4.1.2.4. Devoicing.....	17
4.1.2.5. Merging of Palatal and Alveolar Fricatives.....	17
4.1.2.6. Lenition of Affricates.....	18
4.1.2.7. Interdental Fricatives Replaced with Stops.....	18
4.1.2.8. Labials.....	18
4.1.2.9. Gemination.....	19
4.1.2.10. Tense and Non-tense Vowels.....	20
4.1.2.11. Spelling Pronunciation.....	21
4.1.2.12. Post-consonantal Glides.....	21
4.1.2.13. Vowel Harmony.....	21
4.1.2.14. Consonant Gradation.....	22
4.1.3. Affected Types of Words.....	22
4.1.4. Reasons and Semantic Types of Borrowings.....	23
4.1.5. Effects.....	25
4.2. Semantic Interference and Idioms.....	25
4.2.1. Semantic Interference with Expletives and Swear Words.....	26
4.2.2. Semantic Interference Based on Lexical Interference Specimens.....	27

4.2.3. Semantic Interference of Finnish Forms with English Idiomatic Content.....	27
4.3. Morphosyntactic Interference.....	28
<b>5. EMIGRANT LETTERS AS BASIS FOR LINGUISTIC STUDY.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>6. THE MATERIAL AT HAND WITHIN THE LARGER CONTEXT OF AMERICAN-FINNISH RECORDS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>7. ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN FINGLISH.....</b>	<b>36</b>
7.1. Lexical Interference.....	36
7.2. Semantic Interference.....	38
7.2.1. Lexical Interference Specimens.....	39
7.2.2. Finnish Structures Filled with English Semantic Content.....	40
7.2.3. Semantic Interference from English Words with two Finnish Counterparts.....	43
7.3. Morphosyntactic Interference.....	46
7.3.1. The Formal Subject <i>se</i> .....	47
7.3.2. Prepositions and Adverbs.....	49
7.3.2.1. <i>Jälkeen</i> and <i>sitten</i> .....	49
7.3.2.2. The Inner and External Locative Cases.....	51
7.3.2.3. Postpositions and Adverbs Indicating a Location.....	54
7.3.2.4. Reinforcement of Postpositions and Adverbs.....	56
7.3.2.5. Interference with the Case Government.....	57
7.3.2.6. Interference with the Indication of Time.....	58
7.3.2.7. Further Prepositional and Adverbial Interference.....	59
7.3.3. Relative Pronouns / Relative Clauses.....	63
7.3.4. Question Clauses.....	65
7.3.5. Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs.....	66
7.3.6. Case Elision.....	67
7.3.7. References to Time.....	70
7.3.8. Insertion of Articles.....	73
7.3.9. Case Government.....	73
7.3.10. Regularization.....	77
7.3.11. Word Order.....	77
7.3.12. Influence from English Sentence Structures.....	80

7.3.13. Morphological Changes.....	81
7.4. English Interference Concerning Specific Written Features.....	83
7.4.1. Capitalization.....	83
7.4.2. Compounds Written as one or two Words.....	84
7.4.3. Accentuation through Quotation Marks.....	84
<b>8. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>AFFIDAVIT.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	

## 1. Introduction

In the context of the globalization and localization of English, much has been said about the threatening influence English as a lingua franca has on local speech communities and identities. Recently, the rise of World Englishes as new, localized varieties of English has also come into focus. Within this debate, other language phenomena appear that are often neglected because of these two main tendencies of interest. One of these language phenomena is Finglish – “a mixture of English and Finnish” (Hellstrom 1979:1) spoken by Finnish immigrants and their descendants in North America from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Finglish can be seen as a localized form of English within a linguistically Finnish-dominant environment (as most Finnish immigrants settled in proper Finnish communities) that emerges within socially English-dominant surroundings, e.g. North America. (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 55)

This particular language contact is marked by a very unique feature, namely structural incompatibility. Finnish, as an agglutinative language, differs enormously from English, a rather analytic or isolating language. Being a speaker of both languages and aware of the different language types, I could not imagine how English could have possibly had such a great impact on Finnish, when I first heard about Finglish. However, many sources give evidence of the great impact the socially-dominant English language has had on the structurally incompatible Finnish language, with the final outcome of Finglish. Therefore, this paper contributes the knowledge gained about this particular language phenomenon as a result of the localization of English in a Finnish linguistic environment to the current discussion about the globalization and localization of English.

During my research on Finglish, it struck me that linguistics had for a long time neglected this language contact as a valuable testimony of the clash of two different language types. Only from the mid-1960s onwards has research systematically been done on this field, with most of the results being published since the mid-1980s. In this context, the works of Hannele Jönsson-Korhola, Maisa Martin, and Pertti Virtaranta can be seen as milestones of the analysis of the English-Finnish language contact in North America. While Virtaranta composed the first American-Finnish dictionary, Martin focused on the Finglish morphology and phonology, and Jönsson-Korhola examined the American-Finnish syntax. Apart from Martin’s and Jönsson-Korhola’s work, most researchers have focused on the lexical impact of English on Finnish, with some of them even arguing that Finglish is no more than the simple inclusion of English lexical items into Finnish (cf.



Karttunen & More 1974: 4). Concluding from numerous samples, Finglish seems to be much more than merely a lexical interference from English on Finnish. However, it is difficult to find an appropriate term for classifying Finglish, and most researchers also avoid this problem of terminology. Finglish is usually described as either a language phenomenon or a “language mixture of Finnish and English” (Mattila et al. 2008). The question can be raised whether Finglish could be considered code-switching, a mixed language, an interlanguage, a dialect, or even a language of its own.

This paper gives an overview on Finglish that is as complete as possible, trying to determine what exactly constitutes this language mixture. Furthermore, it approaches the question of what to name this particular language phenomenon by focusing on the research that has already been done in this field and comparing it to my own study on written Finglish in emigrant letters. As most of the research on this topic has concentrated on spoken Finglish, it will be interesting to see, on the basis of written samples, in how far this language phenomenon was rooted in the linguistic awareness of its speakers.

Methodically speaking, one can say that the 66 letters which are used in this study were exemplarily chosen out of the 6,000 letters stored at the Institute of Migration in Turku. These letters are collected in files of about 100 letters each according to the region where they were sent. Although this organization does not play a role for the survey at hand, I looked through 20 files from different regions and selected some letters that seemed particularly interesting to me by focussing on letters from the second (and third) generation. As an analysis of more or even all letters would exceed the frame of this survey, the chosen letters can only stand representatively for common features of written Finglish. This study thus approaches the question of the peculiarity of Finglish and of the linguistic awareness of its speakers by exemplarily analyzing a small corpus of chosen letters out of the enormous collection of Finnish emigrant letters from North America.

In order to provide my survey on Finglish, I will first give a historical outline about the English-Finnish language contact in North America that rendered the emergence of Finglish possible, before having a look at the structural incompatibility of English and Finnish. On this basis I will display the main lexical, semantic, and morphosyntactic influences from English on the Finnish language system which have been examined by researchers on the basis of spoken Finglish samples. After explaining the role of emigrant letters in linguistic study and presenting the material at hand, I will contrast the research on spoken Finglish with my own analysis of written Finglish. Since much research has already been done on lexical influence, my study will focus on semantic and morphosyntactic

interference. By taking into consideration its spoken and written appearance, the survey will give a complete overview on Finnish and can therefore account for the development of this language variety and it might give some indication of the right term for this phenomenon.

## **2. The English-Finnish Language Contact in North America**

Throughout the period from the 1880s to the 1920s, called the Great Wave of immigration, more than 300,000 Finns left Finland in order to immigrate to the US and Canada. Although the first Finnish migration to North America had already taken place in the 17<sup>th</sup> century when the New Sweden colony had been established, Finnish immigration to America only became popular in the late 19<sup>th</sup> / early 20<sup>th</sup> century for social and economic reasons. (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 28, Martin & Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 11, Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 55)

The Finnish emigrants left from all parts of their home country. However, most emigrants came from the Province of Vaasa (52% according to Kero 1986) in western Finland and from the North Finnish provinces of Oulu, Lapland and Pohjois-Satakunta. Once arrived in North America, the immigrants mainly settled in the region around the Great Lakes where the landscape resembled that of their home country. Thus, most of them lived in small Finnish communities, so called Finn towns and Finn villages, in Minnesota, Upper Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio and Ontario. Besides the Great Lake region, Finnish immigrants also settled along the East coast in the states of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Nonetheless, there were also several Finnish communities along the West coast in Washington, Oregon and California. In later years a lot of Finnish migration to Florida from Finland, but also from the Northern US states, took place. (Martin & Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 14-15)

Finnish immigration to North America was motivated by several push and pull factors. The predominant reason was the economic situation in Finland. Many Finns lived in poverty, the population was constantly growing, and there were not sufficient jobs for everybody, neither in the dominating agricultural sector, nor in the less-developed industrial sector. Therefore, the majority of the emigrants dreamed of making a living from working on their own piece of land in America. Among the political factors one can name the growing skepticism of the Grand Duchy as part of the Russian Empire with its new conscription system. A lot of Finns thus longed for more freedom and independence,

which they sought to find in the United States. Additionally, there were a number of social and personal reasons that provoked Finnish emigration: some were escaping from personal conflicts within their families or communities, others hoped to find a spouse, and many were simply looking for an adventure and new excitement in their lives. (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 389-390, Mattila et al. 2008)

Although most of the Finnish immigrants “came typically from poor, rural backgrounds” (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 55), they were extremely literate. They usually found work relatively easily because “they were young and energetic” (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 55) – 70% of the immigrants were between 15 and 34 years old according to Jönsson-Korhola (2003: 392). The majority of the men worked in the agricultural domain, in the mining industry, or in lumber camps in order to make money to afford their own homesteads. Finnish immigrant women were mainly maids and cooks, or they found work in the light industry. Concerning the environment, the Finnish immigrants not only used to marry within their “ethnic group”, but also

showed a strong tendency to band together: in hundreds of Finn towns and villages they created a Finnish subculture, in which it was possible to carry on a wide variety of social, work-related, and economic activities exclusively in Finnish. There were churches, athletic clubs, temperance societies, workers’ societies, choirs and theatre groups. There were trade unions, co-operative stores, dairies and banks. There were Finnish newspapers, dozens of them, and literature was both published and read in Finnish. (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 55-56)

Due to the almost exclusively Finnish environment of the immigrants, the Finnish language in North America survived for a long time, rendering the emergence of Finglish possible. Finnish and English met every day at work so that the immigrants had to learn English at least to a certain extent. The result was a mixture of both languages that first appeared in the work domain. Finnish mine workers, for example, used to call their language “mainiengelska” (Mattila et al. 2008) which means “Mine-English” and refers to the numerous English borrowings from the field of mining that were mixed into the Finnish language. Soon, however, Finnish and English were interwoven to a high extent and the mixture was spoken in all spheres of life so that in the 1920s, Matti Nisonen, Professor at Suomi College in Hancock, Michigan, “proposed that it be called Finglish” (Mencken 1936: 676). Due to the nativization of English borrowings, semantic and grammatical structures, he considered the Finnish language to be “so greatly modified in the United States” (Mencken 1936: 676) that he found it appropriate to give this particular language phenomenon its own name. (Mattila et al. 2008, Mencken 1936: 676)

Although numerous newspapers in North America and letters from Finnish speakers to their relatives in Finland give evidence that Finnish existed also in a written form, it was “at its strongest in spoken language” (Mattila et al. 2008). The oral character of Finnish also explains the multiple variants of many Finnish words, as no standard ever existed and thus, no evaluation of correctness or falseness. Finnish developed constantly and spontaneously. Depending on the speaker’s Finnish dialect, his knowledge of the Finnish and English language, the situation and the community, Finnish was applied individually (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 409). Nevertheless, Finnish always occurred in the same framework with many common features so that Finnish speakers in Canada and the US are usually considered as one group speaking the same language variety. This is mainly due to the similar conditions in the new environment on both sides of the border. Moreover, many Finnish-Americans moved from the US to Canada and vice versa. Some even moved several times during their lifetime, so that most Finnish immigrant families had relatives both in the US and in Canada. (Martin & Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 11)

Additionally, American Finnish was often considered “to be corrupted by contact with English, while the language in Finland, supervised by a national academy, is taken as the standard” (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 3). For that reason the term *Finglish* used to have a negative connotation. It was only later from the 1960 / 70 onwards, when research was done on this topic, that Finnish started to be treated in a more neutral way and its existence was finally seen as a valuable testimony of the clash of two structurally different languages. (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 3-4)

The emergence and maintenance of Finnish over two to three generations seems to be due to the slow assimilation of the Finnish immigrants into the American society. The first generation of Finns in America was monolingual at the beginning, and as intermarriages were more or less inexistent, the immigrants spoke only Finnish at home. Contact with the English language occurred mainly at work, where Finnish started to evolve. First generation Finns usually never acquired fluency in English. In contrast to the first, the second generation was usually bilingual, speaking Finnish or rather Finnish and English. They grew up at home speaking Finnish, but learned English at school or from their older siblings. From then on, most of them spoke predominantly English. However, Finnish was still spoken at home, even though some second generation children started to speak English to their parents. After World War II, intermarriages were common and the complete assimilation of Finns took place. Therefore, the third generation of Finnish Americans mainly knew Finnish only from their grandparents and spoke it very

imperfectly. Their mother tongue was English and some of them did not even learn Finnish at all. Thus, it is “actually debatable whether Finnish in America survives even three generations” (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 56). If assimilation had taken place faster and Finnish-Americans had spoken English in their environment right away, it is likely that Finnish would never have emerged as such a distinct phenomenon that developed over many decades. (Martin & Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 17-20, Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 56-57)

### **3. The Peculiarity of the English-Finnish Language Contact with regard to the Structural Incompatibility**

Finnish is an agglutinative language, which means “that words and morphemes are run together to form long compounds and constructions” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 104). In contrast to Finnish, English is a rather analytic or isolating language with most morphemes being free morphemes. In spite of this, it still has a few syntactic remains, such as the plural morpheme *-s*. Due to their structural differences, Finnish and English are quite incompatible. (Lauttamus 1999: 97)

Finnish has a complex case system with fifteen cases that are expressed by suffixation and that are totally alien to English. However, Finnish hardly has any prepositions or postpositions as “[t]he various case-endings in Finnish compare with the corresponding prepositions and postpositions in other languages”. Furthermore, “the adjective attribute is inflected in the same number and case as the main word” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 104-105). The numerous inclination and also derivation processes require a stem vowel to which the different suffixes can be attached. For this reason, most of the Finnish words end in a vowel in contrast to English. (Mencken 1936: 676-677)

In other respects, too, English and Finnish words differ morphologically and phonologically. Hellstrom states that “[t]he use of consonants is more limited than in Indo-European languages” (1976: 86-87). In Finnish, there are no consonant clusters at the beginning or at the end of a word. Moreover, only few words end in a consonant with the consonants being restricted to <l n r s t>. Except for [v], Finnish has no voiced obstruents. The English consonants <b f> are completely alien to Finnish and also <d g> are “considered to be foreign”, although they sometimes appear “in noun declensions of standard written Finnish” (Hellstrom 1976: 87). In contrast to the English aspiration of [p t k], these stops are “lax and unaspirated” (Hellstrom 1976: 87) in Finnish. Moreover, [p t k]

and other combinations containing these stops are additionally affected by consonant gradation, a form of mutation in which the above-mentioned consonants change between strong and weak grades if they occur at the beginning of a word stem's last syllable and a syllable-closing suffix is added. Furthermore, Finnish is characterized by a "relative paucity of consonants in running text (ninety-nine consonants for every hundred vowels)" and by "quantitative differences for both consonants and vowels" (Hellstrom 1976: 86).

Finnish and English also differ with regard to their vowel systems. The Finnish vowel system is divided into three front vowels <y ö ä>, three back vowels <u o a>, and two neutral vowels <i e>. The distribution and occurrence of these vowels is "determined by vowel harmony: back and front vowels cannot cooccur, but <i> and <e> can cooccur with either group" (Hellstrom 1976: 86). Usually the first syllable of a word determines the vowel pattern for the entire word. Additionally, diphthongs can be seen as a simple combination of the above-mentioned vowels. (Hellstrom 1976: 86)

In contrast to the complex stress patterns in English, Finnish stress is always on the first syllable of a word (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 109). Another difference is the conjugation of verbs which is "very complicated, involving a great many different endings" (Mencken 1936: 677) in Finnish. According to their stem types, Finnish verbs are classified into six groups which undergo different conjugation processes. Last but not least Finnish and English also differ structurally with regard to the passive voice. Finnish passive constructions have "no subject but only an object, whereas in English, for instance, the subject may be expressed by the agent in a passive sentence structure" (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 105). In English, some structures have a "passive impersonal meaning expressed by the use of 'you', 'one', 'we', or 'they' " (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106). Finnish does not know this kind of constructions at all. Therefore, a corresponding equivalent would be expressed "by using the impersonal verb in the third person singular without pronoun" (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106).

The Finnish-English language contact in North America is especially interesting because of the clash of two structurally completely different languages. One can understand how two structurally related language influence each other and merge. However, it is difficult to imagine "the assimilating process that is going on between English and Finnish in America, although they are two extremely different tongues" (Sahlman 1949: 22-23). All those differences mentioned above must obviously have led to lexical, semantic, and grammatical interference, and it is clear that "Finnish has been influenced in many ways by American English" (Sahlman 1949: 22) despite the structural

incompatibility. Therefore, it is interesting to see how exactly English had an impact on Finnish in North America, which gave rise to Finglish.

#### **4. Features of Spoken Finglish**

In the following, main points of lexical, semantic, and morphosyntactic influence from English on spoken Finglish will be illustrated on the basis of findings from other researchers studying the spoken emergence of Finglish.

##### **4.1. Lexical Influence**

As Hasselmo stated in 1963, “ ‘two languages cannot exist side by side...without one being influenced by the other’ ” (1963: 136). The most obvious influence when the contact between two languages is as “persistent and unavoidable” (Hellstrom 1979: 7) as it was the case with Finnish and English in North America, is a strong lexical one. Because English was “*socially dominant* over Finnish,” but Finnish was “*linguistically dominant* over English” (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 58), an enormous amount of English lexical items was borrowed into the Finnish language system. This paper will not make any differentiation between the various types of loans such as loanwords, loanblends, loanshifts, or importations, because this distinction is not primarily important for the survey of Finglish at hand. Therefore I will use the neutral terms borrowings and loan words for all types of borrowings in general.

Another lexical impact of English on Finnish / Finglish that can be observed and will be treated in this chapter is the influence the English language exercised on Finnish first names and surnames.

##### **4.1.1. The Impact of English on Finnish First Names and Surnames**

During the English-Finnish language contact in North America, not only the Finnish language system itself was affected by the strong influence of the English language, but English even had an impact on the names of the immigrants. In his dictionary, Virtaranta gives an explanation for the changes that were carried out. He argues “that Finnish surnames, structurally alien to English and generally long, are often a burden — both on their bearers and on their environment” (1992: 39). Although the Finnish immigrants

usually lived in Finnish communities, contact to English-speaking Americans and other immigrants was unavoidable, especially in the domain of work. As the Finnish language and consequently also the Finnish names were so different from their English counterparts, it was probably more or less impossible for outsiders of the Finnish communities to pronounce and memorize them. Hence, it is obvious that changes were made in order to facilitate the multicultural existence on the North American continent. (Virtaranta 1992: 31, 39)

In Finland, many surnames are compounds. In America, the first element of these compounds was usually clipped to make Finnish names shorter: *Parta Mustaparta*, *Salo* < *Hirvisalo* (Virtaranta 1992: 39). In certain cases, however, the final element of the compound could be omitted: *Kurki* < *Kurkimäki*, *Honka* < *Honkaniemi* (Virtaranta 1992: 39). A lot of Finnish last names typically end in *-(i)nen*. This type of surname was generally shortened at first and then spelled according to the English pronunciation: *Hackray* < *Hakkarainen*, *West* < *Vesterinen* (Virtaranta 1992: 39). (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 437, Virtaranta 1992: 39)

Additionally, last names that were not compounds and also did not end on *-(i)nen* were frequently Anglicized: *Lane* < *Laine*, *Patlow* < *Päätaalo* (Mencken 1936: 492). In other cases, certain Finnish surnames became Americanized due to the confusion of Finnish [p] and [t] with their voiced counterparts [b] and [d], as these voiceless plosives are pronounced “somewhere between the English *b* and *p* and [...] somewhere between the English *t* and *d*”. (Mencken 1936: 493) That is why the Finnish name *Pelto* was often written as *Beldo* in North America (Mencken 1936: 493). Once the Finnish names were changed, most of the immigrants decided to stick to the American versions. (Mencken 1936: 492-493)

Sometimes, surnames were also translated from Finnish into English: *Churchill* < *Kirkkomäki* (Virtaranta 1992: 39), *Newlake* < *Uusijärvi* (Mencken 1936: 492). In many cases, last names were first shortened and afterwards translated: *Hill* < *Mäki* < *Lähteenmäki* (Mencken 1936: 492)

According to Mencken, about 20% of the Finnish immigrants had Swedish last names and thus many Finns in North America also tended to change their names after the Swedish model, which is to say that *-son* is added to the fathers first name: *Jackson* < *son of Jaakko*, *Anderson* < *son of Antti* (1936: 492). (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 437, Mencken 1936: 492)



Finnish first names are often replaced with their corresponding English counterpart: *Charles* < *Kalle*, *Mary* < *Maija* (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 438, Mencken 1936: 506). In this context, Mencken observed that “Finns abandon their native given-names much more willingly” than other immigrants (1936: 506). He also noted that most children born by Finnish parents in North America were immediately given English names. Interestingly, some Finnish immigrants were unable to pronounce their adapted English names and thus readapted them to the Finnish phonological system: *Sali* < *Charley* < *Kalle*, [*Lisi*] (the informant chose the American spelling, but readapted the pronunciation) < *Lizzie* < *Liisa* (1936: 506).

#### **4.1.2. Adaptation of English Borrowings to the Finnish Morphological and Phonological System**

The English lexical items – whether first names that were too difficult to pronounce or any other borrowing – had to be phonologically and morphologically nativized “to a certain extent in order to facilitate their subsequent role in a new and different linguistic system,” namely Finnish (Hellstrom 1979: 7). Thus the numerous loan words from the English language had to undergo different word-formation and pronunciation processes which Karttunen and Moore sum up in fourteen principles:

##### **4.1.2.1. Stem Formation**

Being an agglutinative language, Finnish derivation and inflection are mainly performed by means of suffixation. Due to the different language type of the English language, English nouns often end in a consonant. This is why a stem vowel has to be attached to the English loan base during the adaptation process of English loan words to the Finnish / Finnish morphological and phonological system. In most of these cases – 80,6% according to Maisa Martin (1989a: 125) who examined Virtaranta’s American-Finnish dictionary *i* becomes the stem vowel within Finnish nouns: *pilli* < *bill* (Virtaranta 1992: 26). The second frequent stem vowel is *a* (also *ä*) which is, with 8,1%, clearly less productive and can only appear with other back vowels according to vowel harmony: *puuka* < *book* (Virtaranta 1992: 26). (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 5, Martin 1989a: 125, Virtaranta 1992: 26)

In this context, one should also mention the principle of singularization. Many English nouns are often used only in the plural. Finnish treats the plural *-s* as a singular form and nativizes the English plural forms by adding a usual stem vowel: *pikkelsi* < *pickles* (Hellstrom 1979: 42). There are only a few exceptions in which no stem vowel is added to loan words ending in a consonant. This is only the case with some words ending in *-s*: *pisnes* < *business*, *nais* < *nice* (Hellstrom 1979: 43). However, throughout the declension process of these words, a vowel is attached to the stem so that the suffixes can be added. (Hellstrom 1976: 91, Hellstrom 1979: 42-43, Virtaranta 1992: 27)

The English agentive suffix *-er* is mainly substituted with *-ari* and in some cases also with *-eri*: *loijari* / *loijeri* < *lawyer* (Virtaranta 1992: 36). The preference for the replacement with *-ari* can be explained by the numerous agent nouns borrowed from Swedish in the emigrants' language that ended in *-ari*: *lääkäri* < *läkare* (*SW*) (*doctor*) (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 6). Furthermore, numerous “derivatives in *ari* are supported by the existence of a parallel *a*-stem contacting verb” (Virtaranta 1992: 36): *friisari* < *freezer* / *friisata* < *to freeze* (Virtaranta 1992: 36). (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 6, Virtaranta 1992: 36)

Most English loan verbs were adapted to the contracting morphological verb class in which *a* becomes the stem vowel and the infinitive ends in *-VtA* with most of these verbs ending in *-ata*. Martin points out that in Standard Finnish, only 11% of all verbs belong to the contracting verb class, whereas in American Finnish, 85% of all verbs were adapted into this class (1990: 69). At first sight, this adaptation process is astonishing, as this verb type is considered to be one of the most difficult ones due to its complexity of inflection which is characterized by “several sound changes in the junction of the stem and suffix (*vasta/t/a:vasta/a/n:vasta/n/nut:vasta/t/koon*)” (Martin 1990: 70). In contrast to this verb type, inflection of the dominating Standard Finnish verb class with 58% ending in *-VA* is much easier: “*puhua:puhun:puhui:puhunut:puhukoon*” (Martin 1990: 70). This verb class, however, appears only with 10% in American Finnish. The preference for the contracting word class can thus not be explained with the simplicity of inflection, but rather with the “paradigmatic stability within the set of personal forms” (Martin 1990: 70). That is to say that, in contrast to the *-VA* class, there is neither a change of the stem within the present and past forms, nor a vowel change in the past tense. Martin states that this consistency is important “if the verb stem is previously unknown in the language”, as it (the verb stem) thus “remains easily recognizable in various forms” (Martin 1990: 70).

(Hellstrom 1976: 91, Hellstrom 1979: 42-43, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 5-6, Martin 1990: 68-71, Virtaranta 1992: 36-37)

#### 4.1.2.2. Consonant Cluster Simplification

In Standard Finnish, only one consonant at the beginning of a syllable is accepted. Thus, there are no consonant clusters at the beginning of words unlike in English. That is the reason why English consonant clusters have to be simplified by eliminating consonants from the left to the final consonant of the cluster. Examples are: *rinkki* < *drink* or *touvi* < *stove* (Hellstrom 1976: 89). This process of consonant dropping is natural in Finnish and occurs for example when intolerable consonant clusters arise by declination (*lasta* < *laps* + *ta* → “child”, partitive, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 6). However, Virtaranta and Martin point out that there are exceptions to this rule as a result of the various Finnish dialects and thus different varieties of same loan words exist: *striitti* - *triitti* - *riitti* < *street* (Martin 1989a: 66). The doublets and / or triplets can on the one hand be traced back to western dialects of Finnish which are highly influenced by the Swedish language. Consequently, consonant clusters of obstruents and resonants are general and acceptable in these dialects. On the other hand, the existence of consonant-clustered varieties can also be attributed to those Finnish immigrants who acquired a good level of English, and therefore introduced and tolerated these unnatural varieties. (Hellstrom 1976: 89-90, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 6-7, Martin 1993a: 92-93, Martin 1989a: 66)

In contrast to word initial consonant clusters, word internal clusters are generally tolerated, as they can also occur in Standard Finnish, although new combinations appear in Finnish: *lipstikki* < *lipstick*, *aiskriimi* < *ice cream* (Hellstrom 1976: 90). However, internal clusters that are difficult to pronounce are broken up to make the word acceptable: *hanteli* < *handle*, *enteri* < *entry* (Martin 1993a: 93). This is also a typical feature of western Finnish dialects which thus naturally influenced the consonant cluster reduction. (Hellstrom 1976: 89-90, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 6-7, Martin 1993a: 92-93)

#### 4.1.2.3. Stress Adjustment

Finnish is a language with initial word stress. In order to integrate an English word that does not have initial stress into Finnish structures, “either [...] the stress is moved to the first syllable [...], or [...] the unstressed initial syllable is deleted (Fenyvesi & Zsigri 2006:

131). Fenyvesi and Zsigri demonstrate that out of the 164 Finglish words from Virtaranta's dictionary (cf. Virtaranta 1992) that had an English source word without initial stress, 135 were created by shifting the stress: *'väkeesi* < *va'cation*, *'Kalifornia* < *Cali'fornia* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 7). Only in 29 words, was the unstressed first syllable omitted which is, in 90% of the cases, a syllable consisting of only a vowel: *'pointmentti* < *a'ppointment*, *'kaanami* < *e'conomy* (Fenyvesi & Zsigri 2006: 135). As Fenyvesi and Zsigri rightly point out, these two strategies can also lead to doublets or even triplets (Fenyvesi & Zsigri 2006: 132): *'pout* – *'äpaut* – *'öpaut* < *a'bout* (Fenyvesi & Zsigri 2006: 135 / Mattila et al. 2008). (Fenyvesi & Zsigri 2006: 131, 132, 134-136, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 7, Mattila et al. 2008)

#### 4.1.2.4. Devoicing

As mentioned above (cf. p. 10 of this paper), [v] is the only voiced obstruent in the original Finnish alphabet. That is why [b d g] in English loan words are generally devoiced to [p t k] in order to integrate them into the Finnish phonological system: *köölfrentti* < *girlfriend*, *loki* < *log* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 7, Martin 1993a: 91). However, as Martin points out, depending on the English knowledge of the Finglish speaker, voiced varieties might also be tolerated which is another reason for the numerous doublets: *peipi* – *beibi* < *baby*, *tivitentti* – *dividentti* < *dividend* (Martin 1993a: 91). According to Van Coetsem (1995), it is also possible to speak of a continuum of “*integratedness*” from “a less integrated element” e.g. *beibi* to a “more integrated one” e.g. *peipi* (Hirvonen & Lauttamus 2000: 49). (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 7, Martin 1993a: 91)

#### 4.1.2.5. Merging of Palatal and Alveolar Fricatives

The English voiceless palato-alveolar fricative [ʃ], the voiceless alveolar fricative [s], and the voiced alveolar fricative [z] are substituted by the Finnish voiceless alveolar fricative [s]: *saueri* < *shower*, *saletti* < *solid*, *raasia* < *to raze* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 7, Martin 1993a: 91). An exception constitutes the palato-alveolar fricative [ʒ]. There are only a few examples of Finglish words whose English source word contains [ʒ], but in those cases it was replaced by [ts]: *kraatsi* < *garage*. (Sahlman-Karlsson 129)

#### 4.1.2.6. Lenition of Affricates

Since Finnish does not know any affricates, the sounds [tʃ] and [dʒ] have to be replaced by other consonants depending on the position in the English loan word. In syllable-initial position, the plosive is usually not pronounced, and the affricate is thus often replaced by [s]: *sipmunkki* < *chipmunk*, *manaaseri* < *manager* (Martin 1993a: 92). In those cases, “where the affricate can be distributed as two segments across syllable boundary, the stop is often retained” (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8) and the affricate is replaced by [ts]: *kuitsineeri* < *questionnaire*, *pitsata* < *pitch* (Martin 1989a: 75, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8). In this context, the word *vegetable* seems to present special difficulties due to the [t] following the affricate. Thus, several variants exist: *vestapuli* - *vestepuli* - *vetsetapuli* - *vetstapooli* – *vetsypooli* (Martin 1989a: 76). Although the variants containing [ts] are in conformity to the general rule, the variants with [st] are more common. The word *suggestion* presents another problem. The general substitution with [st] has sometimes even been furthered to [k]: *sakstesteni* (Martin 1989a: 76). (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8, Martin 1993a: 92, Martin 1989a: 75-76)

Moreover, the affricate [dʒ] is devoiced before a long vowel and is then substituted by [t]: *Jutiini* < *Eugene* (Hellstrom 1976: 90). When [n] follows [dʒ], the affricate becomes the long fricative [ss]: *orenssi* < *orange*, *pinssata* < *pinch* (Hellstrom 1976: 91, Karttunen & Moore 8). Furthermore, [dʒ] is often substituted by [j] which can be contributed to the English spelling: *job* > *japi*, *jewel* > *juveeli* (Martin 1989a: 66). (Hellstrom 1976: 90-91, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8, Martin 1989a: 66)

#### 4.1.2.7. Interdental Fricatives Replaced with Stops

The interdental fricatives [θ] and [ð] are substituted with the plosive [t]: *pörttei* < *birthday*, *törsti* < *thirsty*, *tats inaf* < *that's enough* (Hellstrom 91, Martin 1993: 91-92, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8).

#### 4.1.2.8. Labials

The voiceless labiodental fricative [f] does not belong to the original Finnish alphabet and is therefore substituted by other sounds, depending on the position in the English loan word. In initial position, it is usually replaced by the labial obstruent [v]: *voresti* < *forest*

(Hellstrom 1976: 91). In medial position, English [f] often becomes Finglish [hv]: *Viladelhvia* < *Philadelphia* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8). As [f] and [h] are phonetically similar, [f] might also become [h], when it appears at the end of a syllable: *häähvei* < *halfway*, *sahti* < *shaft* (Martin 1989a: 76). Furthermore, it is even substituted with the plosive [p] in some words: *preitti* < *freight*, *hääpnähääp* < *half and half* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8). However, speakers of Western Finnish dialects with early contact to Swedish are not only used to the foreign [f], but also more likely to accept it in the new loans, especially in medial position: *offiisi* < *office*, *toffi* < *tough* (Hellstrom 1976: 91). This linguistic behavior gave rise to more doublets: *Viladelhvia* – *Filatelfia* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8). (Hellstrom 1976: 91, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8, Martin 1989a: 67, 76)

Finnish also does not know the English labial glide [w] which is therefore replaced by the voiced labial fricative [v]: *vorkkia* < *to work*, *veitari* < *waitor* (Martin 1989a: 67). Within a consonant cluster, [w] can also become [u], [o], or [v]: *huiski* < *whisky*, *skoussi* – *koussi* – *koassi* < *squash*, *skvääri* < *square* (Martin 1989a: 67). (Hellstrom 1976: 91, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8, Martin 1989a: 67, 76)

#### 4.1.2.9. Gemination

In Finnish, geminate consonants appear with a high frequency, due to the phonemic status of consonant length. Hellstrom points out that in Finglish, however, “there are no phonotactic constraints [...] that would require gemination” and thus the reason for gemination in English loan words might lie “in how Finglish speakers interpret those phonetic aspects of English that seem foreign to them.” (Hellstrom 1979: 46) In this context, syllable structures and the English stress play a major role. Due to the English stress pattern, the final consonant of an English loan word is often attracted into the penultimate syllable in Finglish words when stem-formation takes place. Nonetheless, this process renders gemination necessary, as only initial syllables in Finnish / Finglish can begin with a vowel. Thus, a consonant at the beginning of non-initial syllables is needed, which is achieved through the process of gemination. Hellstrom notes that gemination usually affects only those English words whose final consonant is either a voiceless plosive ([p t k]) or a voiceless fricative ([f s]), and which are “preceded by a short stressed (primary or secondary) vowel or diphthong,” because these foreign units seem “phonetically more tense” to the speakers of Finglish “than their own relatively lax, unaspirated counterparts.” (Hellstrom 1979: 48) Consequently, gemination is applied to

bridge this gap: *rekki* < *brake*, *rippi* < *trip* (Hellstrom 1979: 46-47). (Hellstrom 1979: 46-48, Martin 1989a: 67-69, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8-9)

Even if the voiceless plosive or fricative follows a nasal or liquid, gemination occurs: *trämppi* < *trämp*, *lunssi* < *lunch* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8, Hellstrom 1979: 49). Furthermore, gemination can, in some cases, also have been influenced by the English spelling, as Martin points out: *komissioni* < *commission*, *trimminki* < *trimming* (1989a: 68). Another reason for gemination is semantic distinction which, in Finnish, is often necessary: *paati* < *bath* vs. *paatti* < *boat* (Hellstrom 1979: 50). Additionally, Karttunen states that geminate loan words have “the advantage of not becoming opaque in regular Finnish consonant gradation, when a non-geminate consonant not only weakens but also assimilates to the preceding resonant: *mp* → *mm* whereas *mpp* → *mp* [...]” (1974: 8-9) Gemination is thus a means of keeping the Finnish language as simple as possible within the framework of the complex Finnish language. (Hellstrom 1979: 49-50, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 8-9, Martin 1989a: 67-69)

#### 4.1.2.10. Tense and Non-tense Vowels

In contrast to English, Finnish and thus also Finnish do not know any distinction between lax and tense vowels. In Finnish, there is only a distinction between short and long vowels, and Hellstrom thus concludes that “Finnish speakers are compelled to resort to both consonant and vowel length to maintain the necessary phonetic and semantic distinctions.” (1979: 45). Therefore, a lax vowel in monosyllabic English words is replaced with a short vowel in Finnish and, additionally, the following consonant undergoes gemination (cf. chapter 4.1.2.9.): *kitti* < *kid* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9). English tense vowels are usually realized as long vowels or diphthongs in Finnish followed by a short consonant: *piiri* < *beer*, *keimi* < *game* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9). (Hellstrom 1979: 44-46, Hellstrom 1976: 91, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9)

In this context it is important to mention that English diphthongs are often simplified. The first vowel of the diphthong is usually adopted and the glide is replaced with vowel length: *keeki* < *cake*, *fooni* < *phone* (Hellstrom 1979: 45). In spite of this, sometimes English diphthongs are also adopted: *kaunteri* < *counter* (Hellstrom 1979: 45). In some cases, consonant length replaces the glide. The first part of the diphthong is adopted and just as in the case of monosyllabic words, gemination occurs: *rosseri* <

*grocery* (Hellstrom 1979: 45). (Hellstrom 1979: 44-46, Hellstrom 1976: 91, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9)

Furthermore, short vowels in English frequently develop into long vowels in Finnish due to the English stress pattern. Stressed syllables in English are interpreted as longer than non-stressed syllables by Finnish speakers and thus the actually short vowels of stressed syllables are replaced with long vowels in Finnish: *alkohoolikki* < *alcoholic*, *automäätikki* < *automatic* (Martin 1989a: 120). (Martin 1989a: 119-120)

#### 4.1.2.11. Spelling Pronunciation

In Finnish, vowels are either front or back in respect to vowel harmony. As the reduced English schwa [ə] cannot clearly be ascribed to one of these categories, it poses a problem in the adaptation of English loanwords into Finnish. The problem is usually solved by spelling pronunciation which means that in the Finnish words, the formerly reduced vowel is pronounced according to its spelling in English: *sysseli* < *chisel*, *peikoni* < *bacon*, *aitia* < *idea* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9). (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9)

#### 4.1.2.12. Post-consonantal Glides

The English semi-vocalic glides [j] and [w] are substituted by full syllabic Finnish vowel [i] and [u]. If the post-consonantal [j] follows an initial consonant and precedes a long [u], the adapted loan word will generally have an [i] as replacement: *piuti* < *beauty*, *miuli* < *mule* (Virtaranta 1992: 35). The post-consonantal [w] is usually substituted by a [u]: *kuitata* < *quit* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9). However, sometimes it might also be replaced by a [v]: *kvalifaijata* < *qualify* (Martin 1989a: 167). (Virtaranta 1992: 35, Karttunen & Moore 1974: 9, Martin 1989a: 167)

#### 4.1.2.13. Vowel Harmony

As shown before (cf. p.11 of this paper), the Finnish phonological system is strongly influenced by vowel harmony. When adapting English loan words to Finnish, vowel harmony is generally respected: *moukata* < *smoke*, *känslätä* < *cancel* (Hellstrom 1976: 90). Hellstrom even argues that there is no violation of vowel harmony in Finnish (1979: 43). Karttunen & Moore point out that this phenomenon takes place only word-internally



and cannot be applied across word boundaries (1974: 9). That is why words such as *haartätäkki* < *heart attack* (Hellstrom 1976: 91) cannot be counted as violation of the vowel harmony principle, as it is certainly a compound that would be treated as two separate words in Finnish. Yet, other researchers illustrate that some Finnish words violate the principle because of the English pronunciation: *äpaut* < *about*, *söpraissi* < *surprise* (Mattila et al. 2008). (Hellstrom 1976: 91, Hellstrom 1979: 43, Karttunen & Moore: 9-10, Mattila et al. 2008)

#### 4.1.2.14. Consonant Gradation

One typical feature of Finnish is consonant gradation; it plays an important part in the morphological system of the language, with about 21% of all Finnish words being affected, according to Martin (1989a: 184). Concerning English loanwords in Finnish, however, the principle of consonant gradation is frequently violated. This is especially the case with short consonants that would undergo a complicated, qualitative gradation process in Standard Finnish: *roki* → *rokin* vs. *roen\** < *truck* (Hellstrom 1979: 69). (Martin 1989a: 171-184)

In contrast to short consonants, geminated consonants are usually graded, as their quantitative gradation processes are generally easier: *taitti* → *taitin* < *tide* (Virtaranta 1992: 25). The tendency that the complicated, qualitative consonant gradation is not extended to loanwords in contrast to the simpler, quantitative consonant gradation process is still valid nowadays – qualitative consonant gradation is not productive within loanwords any more; only the quantitative consonant gradation is applied. (Martin 1989a: 177, 184)

Moreover, depending on the language knowledge of the speaker, different alternatives with gradation and without gradation can be found: *ploki* → *plokin* / *ploin* < *block* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 10).

#### 4.1.3. Affected Types of Words

The Finnish-English language contact is not only characterized by the clash of the two languages, but also by the fact that English and Finnish are “structurally quite incompatible” (Hellstrom 1979: 30). It is thus logical that

most of the loan words in American Finnish are lexical words, viz. nouns (78.1%), verbs (13.0%) and adverbs (4.0%). The proportion of grammatical (‘functional’) words such as pronouns (0.1%), postpositions (0.0%), and interjections (0.3%) to lexical words is thus very small indeed. (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 62)

The adaption of English nouns and verbs to the Finnish morphological and phonological system can be attributed to “a sufficient degree of naturalness when “Finnicized” ” (Hellstrom 1976: 90), which means that, following the fourteen linguistic principles mentioned before, English loan nouns and verbs can be nativized into Finnish with only few difficulties. The lack of borrowed adjectives (2,1% according to Virtaranta 1992: 33) might be caused by the impossibility of assimilating English adjectives to Finnish structures. In this context Hellstrom points out that adjectives such as *wonderful* can scarcely be nativized by Finnish speakers and, as a consequence, will not be adopted (1976: 90). Moreover, the laconic inclination of Finnish speakers who are also said to use only few adjectives in their mother tongue might be another factor that contributes to the inexistent Finnish adjectives (Hellstrom 1976: 90). The lack of functional words, especially of prepositions can clearly be ascribed “to the structural discrepancies between the two languages” (Hellstrom 1979: 33). As a matter of fact, Finnish hardly knows any prepositions at all.

Among the Finnish borrowings, one also finds phrases (2,0% according to Virtaranta 1992: 33), many of which consist of several words in English, but are treated as one word in Finnish: *aitunnou* < *I don't know* (Karttunen & Moore 1974: 4). Those phrases have a high rate of occurrence in spoken Finnish.

#### **4.1.4. Reasons and Semantic Types of Borrowings**

Most loan words denote objects, persons, and actions “that are encountered daily either at work or at home” (Hellstrom 1976: 90). Borrowings are thus related to the frequency of exposure in the immigrants’ environment. Hellstrom states that the main reason for persistent borrowing was “a need to designate unfamiliar objects and ideas not encountered by the immigrants prior to coming to this country; i.e., so called lexical gaps emerge” (Hellstrom 1979: 13). These lexical gaps did not only concern new kinds of employment or machines, but also unknown flora and fauna, medical terms, social relationships, and nationalities. As the Finnish language in North America was isolated from the Finnish spoken in Finland, these gaps were filled with borrowings from English. For example, most of the Finnish immigrants knew only a limited number of foreigners and thus only few nationalities before coming to America. In their new environment, they were suddenly faced with unknown nationalities for which they had no terms. Therefore, they adopted the

English expressions: *airismanni* < *Irishman* (Virtaranta 1992: 38). (Hellstrom 1976: 90, Hellstrom 1979: 13, Virtaranta 1992: 37-38.)

Another reason for the borrowing of English lexical items is that “speakers sometimes find themselves in a situation where their native terms tend to have inadequate semantic differentiation for the needs imposed by the new environment” (Hellstrom 1979: 14). This explains why Finnish speakers tend to use the English loan words *haussi* < *house* and *ruuma* < *room* instead of their original Finnish counterparts *talo* and *huone* (Virtaranta 1992: 38). It seems that the corresponding Finnish words have a broader sense of meaning:

Finnish *talo* also refers to a farmstead and farmhouse, while *huone* can also be used with reference to a separate structure, a cabin, farmhouse living room, etc. (Virtaranta 1992: 38)

Yet, in some cases English terms might have been perceived as inadequate to express certain Finnish concepts. That is why some English words that seem to qualify for adoption into Finnish (e.g. due to their frequency of occurrence) are nonetheless hardly ever used. Precisely due to an extension of meaning of the English word *family* (in Finnish: *famel(l)i*, *fämil(l)i*, *vameli*, *vamili*) which includes not only the family in a narrow sense, but also relatives, and certain groups (e.g. a group of languages), Finnish speakers often stuck to their original Finnish word *perhe* denoting only a family in the narrow sense (Virtaranta 1993a: 82). (Hellstrom 1979: 14, Virtaranta 1993a: 82-83, Virtaranta 1992: 38)

The immigrants’ language had been affected by many Swedish borrowings prior to their departure to North America. Since Swedish and English are related, both belonging to the Germanic languages, some words are very similar. Therefore, certain words such as *äpyli* < *apple* (AE) / *apple* (SW) or *peti* < *bed* (AE) / *bädd* (SW) used by Finnish speakers cannot clearly be attributed to either a Swedish or American English origin (Virtaranta 1992:34, Sahlman 1949: 15). In this context, Sahlman proposes that “the English cognates have reinforced the use of the original Swedish borrowings” (1949:16). The mutual influence of both languages on the Finnish language thus constitutes another reason for the adoption of borrowings. (Virtaranta 1992: 33-34, Sahlman 1949: 15-16.)

More reasons might be the frequency of occurrence of English words in everyday life, especially in names (*hilli* < *hill* pro *mäki*, *Superiorleeki* / *-leiki* < *lake* pro *järvi*), and the complicated Finnish declensions (*mäellä* < *on the hill* pro *hillillä*). Moreover, the fact that a wide range of Finnish synonyms for a special term owing to the numerous regional dialects provoked the adoption of one general English loan word. The meaning of Standard

Finnish *metsästää* < *to hunt* was expressed with several dialectal varieties in Finland and thus the general English loan verb *huntata* was adopted (Virtaranta 1992: 38-39).

#### 4.1.5. Effects

The numerous borrowings in Finnish often lead to homonymy “when a new lexical item is borrowed from English and then fitted phonologically and morphologically to the Finnish patterns.” (Martin 1989b: 2-3.) Consequently, these homonyms are likely to cause a “semantic confusion” (Hellstrom 1979: 15). That is why in many cases, “native terms are supplanted by borrowed words” (Hellstrom 1979: 15): the Finnish verb *hukata*, from the English verb *to hook*, substitutes the Finnish *hukata*, meaning *to lose*, and is only used in the new, English context (Martin 1989b: 3). The Finnish verb *luusata*, from the English *to lose*, then takes over the meaning of the original Finnish *hukata* (Virtaranta 1992: 117).

Moreover, according to Hellstrom, the substitution of native words by borrowing might be stopped when “either one acquires new semantic content” (1979: 15). Hence, semantic differentiation is another effect of borrowing. Sahlman illustrates that the Finnish verb *hilseillä* which could neutrally be used in the sense of *to scale off*, *to peel*, *to peel off*, could only be used in Finnish concerning dandruff after the borrowed verb *piilata* < *to peel* (for example in reference to peeling paint) had entered the language. (Sahlman-Karlsson 1994: 28)

Semantic differentiation might also take place in terms of an extension of meaning, as it is the case with the Finnish verb *katkaista* whose nativization process was probably “motivated by a semantic connection with a Finnish word” : *katkaista* pro *\*katata* < *cut* (Martin 1989b: 3). In proper Finnish, the verb *katkaista* “can only be used for cutting a long item shorter or into two parts” (Martin 1989b: 4). Yet, the Finnish verb *katkaista* which is derived from the English verb *to cut* is used in all kind of contexts, for example “for cutting down trees or cutting out a picture” (Martin 1989b: 4), just like its English counterpart. (Hellstrom 1979: 15-16, Martin 1989b: 2-4)

#### 4.2. Semantic Interference and Idioms

In addition to the semantic interference that arises from homonymy (cf. chapter 4.1.5.), “there is the introduction of new semantic structures (semantic interference) which very often are referred to as special idioms of a language” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99). Idioms

are actually language specific and their “meaning is often ambiguous or even obscure” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99) when adopted literally into another language. Therefore, paraphrasing and reconstruction of idioms is often indispensable to transfer them and their meanings from one language into another. However, there are also certain idioms that can be translated directly. Sahlman notes that “idioms which make sense in literal translation seem to enter into Finnish from American.” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99) In her study “Specimens of American Finnish”, she compiles a table of this kind of idioms, out of which I will cite and explain some examples.

#### 4.2.1. Semantic Interference with Expletives and Swear Words

Expletives and swear words are, of course, specific in every language and thus cannot be transferred literally, although they often have “idiomatic counterparts” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 101) in other languages. English expletives and swear words had an impact on Finnish speakers due to the high frequency of occurrence in the immigrants’ new surroundings in North America. That is why the immigrants integrated these new semantic features into the Finnish language system: *tsii* < *gee*, *mai koni* < *my goodness* (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 101, 102). While the term *my goodness* still has an idiomatic counterpart in Finnish (*hyvänen aika*, which literally means *good time*), there is no expression in Finnish that could express the English *gee* idiomatically (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 101, 102). Thus English semantic content that would be incomprehensible for Finnish speakers in Finland is introduced to the Finnish language system in order to convey a new, appropriate semantic meaning.

Just like expletives, swear words with a language specific meaning were also adopted from English into Finnish by the immigrants in order to be able to express themselves adequately in the new surroundings: *sanovapits* < *son-of-a-bitch*, *hellova* < *hell of* (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 102). One of Sahlman’s informants explained that the Finnish idiomatic counterpart “*helvetti* was much more terrible than ‘hell’ ” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 102), which demonstrates, according to Sahlman, “that words partly are what the connotations are” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 102). The fact that idiomatic counterparts in two languages have different connotations according to the speakers explains the need of integrating semantic features from one language into the other one in order to express what the speaker really intends to say.

#### 4.2.2. Semantic Interference Based on Lexical Interference Specimens

Sahlman states that semantic interference in Finglish is often based on items which are actually lexical interference specimens, but they are elements that are common to the two languages in reciprocal action, i.e., English and Finnish, whereas Finnish stands aloof with elements of its own. (1976: 101)

An example would be the expression *The line was busy*. English (E) – *Laini oli pisi*. American-Finnish (AF) – *Puhelin oli varattu*. Standard Finnish (SF) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 100). Finglish shares the same semantic features with English (and is thus able to express what is appropriate in the new surroundings), whereas Finnish is only able to express a corresponding idiomatic counterpart. A lot of Finglish idioms are based on this kind of semantic interference. (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 100-101)

#### 4.2.3. Semantic Interference of Finnish Forms with English Idiomatic Content

In addition to the aforementioned types of semantic interference, there can also be

a literal translation of the basic units and also often the same word order which then yields in the receiving language a new semantic structure often very odd and alien to the native speaker. (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99)

This type of semantic interference often occurs when English idioms contain the verb *to take*, which is very frequent in English: *Take care of yourself*. (E) – *Ota huolen itsestäsi*. (AF) – *Pidä huolta itsestäsi / Voi hyvin*. (SF) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99). In this case, no English lexical item interferes semantically with the Finnish language. However, another phenomenon can be observed: Finnish forms are filled with English semantic content. In this context, John E. Rantamaki states that

[m]any Finns who don't actually mix English words into their Finnish speech use forms that are idiomatically more English than Finnish. (Quoted in Mencken 1936: 676)

Finglish uses the literal translation of the verb *to take*, which is *ottaa*, whereas in Standard Finnish the verb must be *pitää*. It seems that there is a predominance of English idioms that are built on the verb *to take* which then interfere semantically with Finglish: *Take the train!* (E) – *Ota juna!* (AF) – *Mene junalla!* (SF, mennä = *to go*) or also *Take your time!* (E) – *Ota aikaa!* (AF) – *Ei ole kirettä / Älä kiirehdi!* (SF, *There is no hurry / Don't hurry*) (Sahlman, 1949: 23, Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 100).

Nevertheless, there are also other idioms which do not involve a form of the verb *to take*, but that still contain Finnish forms with English semantic content: *We had a good*

*time.* (E) – *Meillä oli hyvä aika.* (AF) – *Meillä oli hauskaa.* (SF, partitive of *nice, pleasant, funny*) or also *to get a cold* (E) – *saada kylmää* (AF) – *kylmettyä* (SF) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1949: 100,101). Although all of the examples mentioned above contain only grammatically correct Finnish forms, “[m]ost of them would be unintelligible for a person speaking Finnish who is not familiar with English and above all Finglish” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1949: 101) due to the English semantic interference. (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 99-103, Sahlman 1949: 23-24)

Last but not least, one should mention that there are still more constructions that are literal translations from the English language keeping the same word order and thus interfering semantically with Finnish. However, as these constructions intervene with the Finnish syntax, I will analyze these kinds of interfaces within the context of morphosyntactic interference.

### 4.3. Morphosyntactic Interference

With the ongoing language contact situation of English and Finnish in North America, Finglish syntax and grammar evolved differently from the Standard Finnish base. As the grammatical system always constitutes the framework for the functioning of a language, grammatical changes take place only slowly and are not as dominant as lexical influences. The first generation of Finglish speakers usually used the Finnish grammatical framework. However, from the second generation onwards, morphosyntactic interference, due to the English grammatical system, became obvious and gave rise to interesting new structures (Larmouth 1974: 356-366). These morphosyntactic changes were often considered as incorrect versions of Finnish (cf. Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 114). However, one could also argue that Finglish just adapted to its surroundings to suit the expressive needs of its speakers. In the new surroundings, Finnish-Americans felt the need to express things they could not say within the Finnish grammatical framework, or otherwise, certain grammatical issues and distinctions of Finnish were no longer necessary to convey the implied meaning.

As mentioned above (cf. p. 10 of this paper), in Finnish, adjective attributes are inflected according to the same number and case as the nouns to which they refer. In Finglish, however, there are cases where adjectives are not inflected at all. This is especially the case with adjectives that are borrowed directly from the English language with no counterparts in Finnish, and which are morphologically very different from

Finnish words: *Ne ostivat semmosen ”pre-fabrikeitid” haussin* (AF) – *They bought one of those prefabricated houses* (E) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 104). The term *pre-fabricated* is structurally so different from Finnish words that it would be very complicated to make it fit into the Finnish derivational system. The immigrants also did not know pre-fabricated houses in their home country, so they had no other Finnish term they could use (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 104). However, the incongruence did not interfere with the meaning and that is why inflectional disagreement was acceptable in Finglish. Moreover, incongruence affects “the subject, verb, and object” which “do not necessarily agree with each other the same way they do in Finnish grammar” (Mattila et al. 2008): *Paljon suomalaisia menivät Suomeen.* (AF) – *Paljon suomalaisia meni Suomeen.* (SF) – *Many Finns went to Finland.* (E) (Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 105). The example shows that the subject and the verb do not agree. This feature can be ascribed to the English influence on Finnish. In English, some quantifiers, such as *many*, require a plural subject and, consequently, also a plural verb. Contrarily, in Finnish the quantifier *paljon* requires the partitive case which is always expressed with the singular (Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 105). Thus, with Finglish adapted to the English structure, the subject-verb agreement is no longer coherent.

Another area of grammatical interference is the passive voice. Finnish and English passive constructions differ greatly, especially concerning the role of the actor. In Finnish, “sentences that do not indicate the actor are often put in the passive voice, but as soon as the actor is known, the sentence must be in the active” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 107). Motivated by the English constructions, Finglish breaks these structures allowing an impersonal construction with an agent: *Se on hyvin tehty siltä.* (AF) – *Sen hän teki hyvin.* (SF) – *It’s well done by her.* (E) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 107). The Finglish *siltä*, which corresponds to the English *by her*, clearly displays an agent “which is incompatible with the Finnish passive voice” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 107). Finglish was also influenced by English structures with passive impersonal meaning containing *you* or *one*. Instead of “putting the verb form in the third person singular and omitting the pronoun” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106) as in Standard Finnish, Finglish translates these structures literally: *Sinä et koskaan tiedä.* (AF) – *Ei koskaan tiedä.* (SF) – *You never know.* (E) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106). These constructions became very popular in Finglish and occurred with high frequency, just like in English. Therefore, Sahlman-Karlsson even considers the adoption of the English passive impersonal meaning as “the most spectacular feature entering into Finglish” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106).

English prepositions were also a source of morphosyntactic interference which



is apparent in such cases where the structure in Finnish consists of an agglutinated form with various case-endings and suffixes added, but where Finglish employs the use of prepositions which make the structure intelligible but not genuinely Finnish or “correct” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 105).

The English prepositional system must have reinforced the use of “pre-, postpositions and adverbs like *päällä*, *päältä* and *päälle*, all three different cases of the English ‘on’ (upon)” which “are much more frequent in Finglish than in Finnish where they are actually condemned in normal style” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 105): *Pane se rapun päälle*. (AF) – *Pane se rapulle*. (SF) – *Put it on the step*. (E) (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 105). Sometimes, Finnish postpositions were used as prepositions due to the influence of the English word order: *jälkeen ohjelman* (AF) – *ohjelman jälkeen* (SF) – *after the program* (E) (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 436). Many of the Finnish postpositions require the genitive case, which is often elided in Finglish: *Mies on kanssa poika*. (AF) – *Mies on poijan kanssa*. (SF) – *The man is with the boy*. (E) (Larmouth 1974: 359). Moreover, English prepositions also had an impact on the Finnish case government. Finglish verbs often govern certain grammatical cases that are semantically close to the corresponding English expressions: *Se tuntui minulle, että* (AF) – *Minusta tuntui, että* (SF) – *It seemed to me that* (E) (Jönsson-Korhola 1989: 198). Whereas in Finnish the verb *tuntua* governs the elative case, it demands the allative case in Finglish due to the semantic proximity to the English preposition *to* (cf.: *Annan sen (lahjan) hänelle*. (SF) – *I give it (the present) to her*. (E)).

The last example illustrates still another point of morphosyntactic interference: after the English model, a subject, namely *se* (equalling the English *it*), is introduced in Finglish sentences that would be subjectless in Finnish (cf. *se tuntui minulle* (AF) pro *minusta tuntui* (SF)). Also in Finglish existential clauses, the *se*-subject interferes with regard to the English dummy subject construction: *Se oli kaks ruumaa (= huonetta) siinä huoneessa (= talossa)*. (AF) – *Talossa oli kaksi huonetta*. (SF) – *There were two rooms in the house*. (E) (Jönsson-Korhola 1989: 69). Whereas in Finnish existential clauses the word order is always adverb-verb-subject, English places the subject first and thus needs the dummy subject in order to express the existence of a previously unmentioned subject. In Finglish, the English construction is simply imposed upon the Finnish one. (Jönsson-Korhola 1989: 69, 75)

Another considerable morphosyntactic change from Finnish to Finglish concerns the case system. Larmouth states that often “Finnish cases are simply elided (or replaced by the unmarked ‘nominative’ form), especially in syntactic structures which are strongly congruent with English” (1974: 357). One striking example is the Finnish necessity

sentence that always demands the subject to be in the genitive case. However, after the English model, Finnish necessity clauses were expressed in the nominative case which had also been common in some Finnish dialects: *Hän pitää nyt olla neljä vuotta tässä maassa.* (AF) – *Hänen pitää nyt olla neljä vuotta tässä maassa.* (SF) – *He must have been in this country for four years now.* (E) (Jönsson-Korhola 1993: 105). Nevertheless, elision affected all types of cases and the result could sometimes be a totally new construction with a distinct meaning: *Jussi ole puuka.* (AF) – *Jussilla on kirja.* (SF) – *Jussi has a book.* (E) (Larmouth 1974: 358). Finnish does not have a distinct verb equating to the English *to have*. Therefore, the counterpart of the English *to be, olla*, is used in the adessive case. When eliding the adessive case, the Finnish sentence would mean exactly the same as: *Jussi is a book* (*Jussi on kirja* (SF)). For this reason, Finnish speakers “have substituted the form *ole* for 3 sg. *on* in this environment” (Larmouth 1974: 358). The verb form *ole* is actually part of the Finnish negation and cannot appear within a positive sentence in Standard Finnish. In Finnish, however, “its role is expanded [...], such that *Jussi on puuka* means ‘John is a book’ and *Jussi ole puuka* means ‘John has a book’ (Larmouth 1974: 358). The new constructions were structurally much more similar to their English counterparts, which is the reason why they became so popular.

Furthermore, Finnish replaces relative pronouns with interrogative pronouns which is, according to Larmouth, “a clear example of interference from English”: *Minä näin se mies kuka osti se huone.* (AF) – *Minä näin sen miehen joka osti sen huonen.* (SF) – *I saw the man who bought the house.* (E) (1974: 363). The relative pronoun *joka* is substituted by the interrogative pronoun *kuka* which equates to the English *who*. Besides, there is evidence that

the rules for inclusion of relative pronouns have also shifted towards English. In standard Finnish as well as in first-generation Finnish, optional deletion of relative pronouns in particular environments is not allowed; but such deletions do occur in succeeding generations, and in precisely those environments where optional deletion is allowed in English. (Larmouth 1974: 364)

These optional deletions concern relative pronouns “in the allative, the inessive, and the accusative cases, and in all three cases the equivalent form in English allows the elision of *to/for whom, who(m), and when*” (Larmouth 1974: 364): *Sievä tyttö (kuka) mina näin oli suomalainen.* (AF) – *Sievä tyttö jonka mina näin oli suomalainen.* (SF) – *The pretty girl (whom) I saw was Finnish.* (E) (Larmouth 1974: 364). It is noticeable that the case-endings of the interrogative and relative pronouns are maintained which might be due to the fact that “English pronouns are also inflected for case” (Larmouth 1974: 364).

Morphological changes in Finglish mainly concern consonant gradation and the verb conjugation. On the one hand, in Finnish, a short <k> in the strong grade disappears in the weak grade, whereas it is retained in Finglish: *lakit* pro *lait* (SF nominative: *laki*, E: law; Martin 1993b: 97). On the other hand, the short <k> does not appear in Finglish when a word changes from the weak grade to the strong grade: *koen* pro *kokeen* (SF nominative: *koe*, E: test; Martin 1993b: 98). Moreover, confusion of words ending in *-i* but having an *i*- or an *e*-stem frequently occurred so that in some cases the *e*-stem was not recognized and in others the words were declined according to the *e*-stem although they had an *i*-stem: *kielit* pro *kielet* (SF nominative: *kieli*, E: language), *tukeja* pro *tukia* (SF nominative: *tuki*, E: support, Martin 1993b: 98).

Concerning the conjugation of verbs, it is striking that many verbs are not conjugated in Finglish according to the Finnish pattern, but all persons receive, like in English (except for the third person singular), the same form taken from the third person singular: *minä kantaa* pro *minä kannan* (E: I carry), *me sai* pro *me saimme* (E: we get), *me ei saa* pro *me emme saa* (E: we do not get) (Martin 1993b: 98). Moreover, the Finglish imperfect indicative generally has the *si*-marker which appears in Finnish verbs only rarely: *kasvasin* pro *kasvoin* (E: grew) (Martin 1993b: 98). It seems that Finglish was aiming for some regularity that would correspond to the English regular past tense forms ending on *-ed*. The preference for the *si*-marker can be explained with the numerous English loan verbs ending on *-ata*. In Standard Finnish, verbs with this ending build their past tense on *-si*. Since the Finnish conditional is also built on a form containing *si*, namely the *isi*-marker, Finglish speakers frequently tend to mix the conditional and imperfect forms: *haluaisin* pro *halusin* (E: I would like, I wanted). It is understandable that a confusion of certain verb forms and a simplification of verb conjugation and consonant gradation took place in Finglish, as Finnish in America was isolated from the Standard Finnish and because it was exposed to the constant influence of the English language that was morphologically very different. (Martin 1993b: 97-98)

## 5. Emigrant Letters as Basis for Linguistic Study

In corpus linguistics, the analysis of letters has come into focus, because letters can “shed much light on important issues, linguistic and otherwise” (Dossena & Tiekens-Boon van Ostade 2008: 7). This importance is due to the following properties and conditions of this text type, as Arja Nurmi and Minna Palander-Collin state:

A letter has a specific form, it is sent to a recipient, and its function is to communicate information and to maintain social relations across space and time. Often a letter serves a multiple purpose combining several goals. While written, letters nevertheless represent real interaction between individuals, and the linguistic features of personal letters are often said to be close to spoken language. (2008: 21)

Although letters are frequently considered to “offer us a potential window into more informal and colloquial language” (Kytö & Romaine in Dossena 2008: 8), one should be aware of the fact that “the language of letters is not the equivalent of speech” and, moreover, they “only reflect vernacular usage to a limited extent, because the conditioning of written norms is reflected in such texts” (Dossena & Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008: 8).

Obviously, the linguistic register used in a letter depends much on the type of letter. In business letters, for example, one will hardly expect informal language usage. In personal letters, however, features reflecting spoken language are more likely to be found. Nevertheless, even among personal letters, the social context is crucial to the linguistic choices. Dossena and Tieken-Boon van Ostade explain that in former times, “emigrants, for instance, typically wrote to one member of the family with news for everybody else and possibly on behalf of other relatives too” (2008: 9). Language and style of this type of writing have probably been influenced by the emigrants’ awareness that their letters did not merely transmit personal messages and were thus read in broader circles.

Furthermore, most of the emigrants, even with poor educational backgrounds, must have known that their language variety, isolated from the standard and influenced by the language of the new surroundings, differed at least to a certain extent from the language their relatives spoke back in their home countries. Thus, they were generally conscious “of the existence of different linguistic norms” (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008: 65), which presumably had an impact on their writings. In order to maintain close ties with relatives and friends over long distances, the emigrants had to make sure that they were understood by trying to focus on the standard language as common means of communication. However, especially for later generations and emigrants who had been spending a long time away from their home countries it became increasingly difficult to make a distinction between the standard norms and their own language varieties, which, like Finnish, were mainly spoken varieties. Therefore, it is not surprising to find at least some “important evidence of informal colloquial usage, and perhaps even on what the language of speech may have been like” (Dossena & Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008: 8) in the letters of emigrants.

Thus, caught between written norms and spoken emergence, emigrant letters can be considered an important testimony for linguistic analysis “as the study of interaction in writing provides valuable insights into the linguistic choices of people” (Dossena & Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008: 7).

## **6. The Material at hand within the Larger Context of American-Finnish Records**

With Finglish predominantly arising as a spoken language variety, much research has been done on the speech of Finnish-Americans. Mainly during the 1960s to 1980s, researchers such as Pertti Virtaranta and Hannele Jönsson-Korhola interviewed and recorded altogether about 660 hours of spoken language by approximately 1,000 Finnish-Americans, of which 60-70% belonged to the first immigrant generation. This data has been the basis of many different studies on Finglish. (Jönsson-Korhola 2003: 414 – 418).

Nevertheless, in order to be able to classify a language phenomenon like Finglish, it is necessary to analyze written samples of American-Finnish over several generations, too. As stated above (cf. chapter 5.), norms of writing are always reflected in written records. Therefore, a written source can provide insight into the language awareness of the author. Jönsson-Korhola noted, for example, that American-Finnish writings were often close to Standard Finnish (2003: 411). Selma Siiri Sahlman examined in her article “The Finnish Language in the United States” a newspaper sample of the *New Yorkin Uutiset* from the year 1947 in order to “throw some light upon the question of how English usage has affected Finnish in the United States of America” (1948: 16). One can assume that even at that time, journalists were educated people with a good knowledge of their mother tongue, articles were proofread before being published, and furthermore, newspapers strived for a high language level adapted to the standard. However, the analyzed article clearly shows English interference which leads to the conclusion that the author was not aware of his language differing from the (Finnish) standard. So especially written sources offer valuable clues to the question in how far the English language has really merged with the Finnish language in North America, particularly with regard to grammatical changes that take place only slowly.

Different written sources of American-Finnish are available to us nowadays: newspapers, magazines, fictional literature, diaries, biographies, and of course thousands of emigrant letters. In contrast to the other records mentioned, letters are the only written

sources that are more spontaneously written, as Jönsson-Korhola observes (2003: 413). Nonetheless, as previously mentioned (cf. chapter 5.), emigrants were generally aware of the differing language varieties at least to a certain degree, which might have influenced the linguistic choice in the letters. Jönsson-Korhola also points out that the language of these emigrant letters naturally differs in respect to the writer's age, his educational background, his Finnish dialect, the recipient, the purpose of the letter, and the time when it was written (2003: 413). Moreover, she mentions that the most obvious interference can be found in the vocabulary of the letters, but she also admits that the language of these emigrant letters has not been examined sufficiently (2003: 413).

The number of American-Finnish letters in Finland which are still preserved nowadays is about 25,000 – 30,000. About 18,000 of these letters can be found as copies on microfilms at the University of Turku, with the originals stored either at the University of Turku or Helsinki. Another 6,000 original letters are collected in the Institute of Migration in Turku. The remaining 1,000 – 6,000 letters are privately owned (Sallinen 2002: 14). The survey at hand is based on 66 letters from the 6,000 letters kept at the Institute of Migration. Its purpose is not only to analyze, on the basis of these written samples, the peculiarity of Finglish, but also to find out in how far Finglish was rooted in the linguistic awareness of its speakers, and thus trying to answer the question of how to classify this particular language phenomenon.

Not all of the sample letters contain information about the year they were written, the place from which they were sent, and the author. Nevertheless, one can generally say that the letters at hand date from 1920 to 1963, with the majority written from the mid 1940s to the early 1960s. The letters were sent from both, Canada (Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia) and the United States of America, namely from the Great Lakes region, the East coast, and to some extent from the West coast. The writers were predominantly females (out of 55 letters in which the gender of the author could be determined, 49 were written by female writers) who often wrote on behalf of the whole family. Most of the writers belonged to the second generation of Finnish-Americans; only a few letters originate from first or third generation.

This paper will not go into detail on the background information of the letters and writers. The Institute of Migration keeps information cards about the authors of the letters. These cards, however, are often incomplete so that we do not have the same type of information for the writers and letters. Yet, these details are not necessary for this survey. The main focus lies on the linguistic analysis of written American-Finnish material which

has not been examined closely, and which takes not only the first generation of Finnish-Americans into consideration. Thus, it exemplarily wants to discover general traits of Finnish by approaching the masses of American-Finnish emigrant letters. A closer analysis of all the background information would exceed the frame of this work.

## 7. Analysis of Written Finnish

In the following part I will analyze the English interference displayed in my corpus of Finnish emigrant letters. As the lexical influence from English on the Finnish language in North America has already been studied extensively, this survey will focus on the morphosyntactic and semantic changes in Finnish, and it also takes specific written interference features into consideration. Nevertheless, I will give a short overview of the main points of lexical interference in the written Finnish corpus at hand.

### 7.1. Lexical Interference

In their study on American-Finnish, Karttunen and Moore state that it “is not any change of syntax or phonology” which makes Finnish differ from Standard Finnish, “but just the substantial body of loan vocabulary which has augmented and sometimes replaced native Finnish vocabulary” (1975: 4). Interestingly, the corpus at hand shows only little lexical interference from English. Although displaying morphosyntactic and / or semantic interference, many letters do not contain a single English lexical item, whether as direct loan word or as loan translation. Moreover, only very few writers make extensive use of English borrowings, whereas most writers incorporate English lexical items to a minor extent.

In those cases, where Finnish borrowed lexical items from English, either as direct loans or as loan translations, there were apparently two main reasons: On the one hand, those words are borrowed which have a high frequency of occurrence in the environment of Finnish-Americans. On the other hand, when the speakers were faced with unknown ideas or things, lexical gaps had to be filled with English loans. Among the direct loans in my corpus that can be traced back to the frequency of exposure in everyday life are items, such as: *fameli* (AF) – *perhe* (SF) – *family* (E) (22), *kaara* (AF) – *auto* (SF) – *car* (E) (13), *hilli* (AF) – *mäki* (SF) – *hill* (E) (39), *misis* (AF) – *rouva* (SF) – *Mrs* (E) (39), *keeki* (AF) – *kakku* (SF) – *cake* (E) (27). Some loan translations which enter Finnish for the reason of frequent encounter are: *suksitella* (AF) – *hiihdellä* (SF) – *to sky* (E) (1), *isotyttär* (AF) –

*tytärin tytär* (SF) – *granddaughter* (E) (15), *kaasu asema* (AF) – *bensa-asema* (SF) – *gas station* (E) (37). Direct loans which had to fill lexical gaps are, for example: *dormitory* (AF) – *asuntola* (SF) – *dormitory* (E) (6), *elki* (AF) – *hirvi* (SF) – *elk* (E) (14). Among the respective loan translations are: *ilmakenta* (AF) – *lentokenttä* (SF) – *airport* (E), *pedin tekiä* (AF) – *sisäkkö* (SF) – *bedmaker* (E) (54).

The examples show that most of the borrowings were adapted to the Finnish morphological and phonological system. The adaptation process apparently allowed the integration of the loan words in the Finnish grammatical system. Thus, nearly all loan words were declined just like Finnish words:

*Betty teki oiken sievän ison keekin* (AF) – *Betty teki oikein sievän ison kaukun* (SF)  
– *Betty made a real big, nice cake* (E) (2)

The example illustrates that the loan word *keeki* is declined in the accusative (*keekin*) which is demanded by the Finnish morphosyntax in this context. Yet, the corpus also displays instances of code-switching, where a word or a phrase is directly taken from English to Finnish without undergoing any morphological and phonological changes. Consequently, those lexical items are not integrated in the Finnish grammatical framework:

*vielä ymmärrät English* (AF) – *vielä ymmärrät englantia* (SF) – *you still understand English* (E) (7)

*I don't know koska* (AF) – *En tiedä, koska* (SF) – *I don't know, because* (E) (7)

It would be interesting to see under which circumstances code-switching occurs in written Finnish. Nevertheless, a closer analysis would exceed the frame of this thesis.

Furthermore, the corpus shows that Finnish is not a homogeneous phenomenon. Finnish loan words, for example, can be spelled in several ways depending on the writer and his knowledge of English: *familyn puolesta* (7), *famelin puolelta* (22) (SF: *perhe*, E: *family*). Also, when new words had to be invented to name a formerly unknown object, more than one variety can frequently be found: *ilmakentta* (57), *ilmalaiva kentä* (56) (SF: *lentokenttä*, E: *airport*, literally: *airfield*, *airship field*).

When the first Finnish immigrants arrived in America, airplanes did not yet exist so that Finnish-Americans had to invent their own word to denote the new machine: *ilmalaiva* (AF) – *lentokone* (SF) – *airplane* (E, literally: *airship*) (4). Nonetheless, Finnish-Americans also developed new words which were not inspired by the English language, but which became necessary in the English surroundings. As previously explained (cf. chapter 2.), the Finnish immigrants used to stick together in their own villages, which rendered the emergence of Finnish possible. They thus distinguished themselves by their



language and their local origin. The distinction from other Americans apparently became very important, for which the following proper Finnish words give evidence: *omanpaikanen* (12), *toiskielinen* (3). *Omanpaikanen* comes from the Finnish words *oma* (*own*) and *paikka* (*place*) and denotes somebody who comes from the same locality as the speaker. *Toiskielinen* is built on the words *toinen* (*other*) and *kieli* (*language*) and is used to talk about somebody who speaks another language as mothertongue than the speaker himself.

The material at hand also illustrates that some Finnish words underwent a change of meaning in Finglish. For instance, the word *kirja*, which denotes a book in Standard Finnish, was frequently used in the sense of *kirje* (*letter*):

*Koitan lähettää kuvia ensi kirjassa.* (AF) – *Yritän lähettää kuvia ensi kirjeessä.* (SF) – *I try to send pictures in the next letter.* (E) (54)

*Äiti on saanu niin monta kirjaa Suomesta* (AF) – *Äiti on saanut niin monta kirjettä Suomesta* (SF) – *Mom has got so many letters from Finland* (E) (3)

With the introduction of the loan word *puuka* (13) from the English *book*, *kirja* was no longer needed in that sense. Yet, the declension of *kirja* is much easier than the one of *kirje* which might explain why *kirja* underwent the change of meaning.

Last but not least, one should mention the numerous English salutations which the Finglish letters contain. As seen above (cf. p. 23 and chapter 4.2.1. of this paper), in spoken Finglish a lot of phrases and swear words were borrowed from English to Finglish. Those expletives and swear words are typical of spoken language and consequently do not appear in my corpus of written Finglish. Yet, it seems that the salutations in written language constitute the counterparts to phrases in spoken language. Among the English salutations in Finglish letters are the following expressions: *Dear Sanna-Maija* (7), *Dear Alma ja Esa* (18), *Sincerely* (6), *Love to all* (41), *Goodbye* (43), *Yours truly* (61).

## 7.2. Semantic Interference

My corpus of written Finglish displays numerous features of semantic interference, which will be analyzed in the following. In contrast to spoken Finglish, no semantic interference from expletives and swear words could be found, as those expressions are typical of spontaneous and colloquial speech. Also semantic interference from lexical items is very low due to the minor lexical influence from English in the emigrant letters. However, semantic interference of Finnish forms filled with English semantic content and of English

words with two Finnish counterparts can frequently be observed in written Finglish. This section will only cover semantic influence which does not additionally involve morphosyntactic interference. Other instances will be treated in the chapter on morphosyntactic interference.

### 7.2.1. Lexical Interference Specimens

As explained above (cf. chapter 4.2.2.) Sahlman-Karlsson observes in her study “Specimens of American Finnish” that semantic interference in spoken Finglish frequently occurs concerning lexical items which are common to English and Finnish. My corpus of written Finglish displays only few instances where English idioms are transferred into Finnish on the basis of lexical specimens. Some examples are:

*häneen tulee fluu* (AF) – *hän vilustuu / kylmettyy* (SF) – *he gets the flu* (E) (32)

*alimme me kappale aikaa* (AF) – *olimme muutama kerta* (SF) – *a couple of times, we were* (E) (27)

*täällä otetaan kaikista kuva record'tia varten* (AF) – *täällä otetaan kaikista kuva pöytäkirjaan merkittäväksi / ihan vain tiedoksi* (SF) – *here they take a picture of everybody for the record* (E) (7)

The examples illustrate that Finglish displays the same semantic elements as English, which means that Finglish adapted to the English-speaking surroundings, and was therefore able to fulfil the changed expressive needs of its speakers. In contrast to English and Finnish, Standard Finnish possesses its distinct idioms and can thus only express a semantically similar content with its own lexical items.

The rare appearance of this type of semantic interference in written Finglish can be explained with the linguistic awareness of the writers. As already mentioned (cf. chapter 5.), the writers generally knew that their language differed, at least to a certain extent, from the Finnish standard. When writing to their family and friends in Finland, they thus had to make sure that they were understood by trying to focus on Standard Finnish as much as possible – as their linguistic awareness enabled them. As a writing process is less spontaneous than speaking, the writers generally thought more about their use of language. Therefore English lexical items and idioms could still be identified as foreign and, consequently, appear less frequently in written Finglish than in its spontaneous spoken counterpart.

### 7.2.2. Finnish Structures Filled with English Semantic Content

Much more frequent than interference from English lexical items in the material at hand is semantic interference from English idioms expressed within the Finnish grammatical framework. Numerous examples of the corpus show that especially English idioms dealing with the state of health were literally translated and thus semantically taken over to Finnish:

*Minä olen hyvä* (AF) – *Minä voin hyvin.* (SF) – *I am good.* (E) (1)

*etta pian on parempi* (AF) – *että hän paranee pian* (SF) – *that she's better soon* (E) (19)

*huonsa terveydesä* (AF) – *huonossa kunnossa* (SF) – *in bad health* (E) (40)

Although all of these Finnish examples display correct Finnish grammatical forms, they all contain English semantic content. In the third example, Finnish and Finnish even make use of the same grammatical structure (inessive). Yet, whereas Standard Finnish employs the word *kunto* (*shape*), Finnish uses *terveys* following the English *health*. Hence, unlike Finnish, English and Finnish have the same idiomatic features. The high occurrence of semantic interference concerning health issues can be explained by their frequent references in everyday situations. Asking about someone's well-being and discussing somebody else's state of health has always been a central topic among relatives, friends, or working colleagues. References to health are thus omnipresent in everyday speech. Consequently, the immigrants and their descendants were constantly exposed to these kinds of English idioms which then entered naturally, and probably also unconsciously, into their own language.

Besides health issues, references to weather also often appear in everyday speech and were therefore subject to semantic interference in Finnish:

*Joko olette pääsyt yhtään kuivumaan.* (AF) – *Joko siellä on poutailma* (SF) – *Did you get to dry off at all* (E) (8)

*meillä oli vesi-sadet* (AF) – *meillä satoi vettä* (SF) – *we had rain showers* (E) (9)

The examples show that the Standard Finnish way of talking about weather conditions differs greatly from the English expressions (literally translated: *Is there dry weather yet, it rained water at our place*). Finnish employs correct Finnish grammatical structures filled with the English semantic content.

Another main point of semantic interference, which Sahlman-Karlsson already noticed in spoken Finnish, are idioms employing the verb *to take*. As could already be

seen with references to health, semantic interference in Finglish seems to be related to a certain extent to the frequency of exposure in the Finnish-Americans' new surroundings. English has a large variety of idioms containing a form of *to take*. Hence, this English semantic content was frequently taken over into Finglish. A lot of English expressions employ the verb *to take* in reference to time and space. Finglish makes use of the corresponding Finnish verb *ottaa*, whereas Standard Finnish has to use specific, distinct verbs and expressions, and is thus not able to express the same semantic content:

*se otti vaan 2 tuntia mennä minneapolis (AF) – vei vaan 2 tuntia mennä Minneapolisiin (SF) – it took just 2 hours to go to Minneapolis (E) (4)*

*nopein posti ottaa 4 viikkoa (AF) – nopein posti kestää 4 viikkoa (SF) – the fastest post takes 4 weeks (E) (30)*

*otan ajan (AF) – varaan aikaa (SF) – I take the time (E) (47)*

*Heikin kirjekin ottaa tilaa (AF) – Heikin kirjekin vie tilaa (SF) – Heikki's letter takes also space (E) (37)*

Within the frame of the Finnish grammar, Finglish shares the same semantic features with English. Finnish, however, can only express a corresponding semantic content by employing verbs such as *viedä* and *kestää* (*to last*).

Moreover, there are various other expressions where Finglish uses a literal translation of the English *to take* and thus incorporates English semantic content:

*otat äitistä hyvän huolen (AF) – pidät äidistä hyvää huolta (SF) – you take good care of mum (E) (42)*

*olet ottanut huoli (AF) – olet huolehtinut (SF) – you have taken care (E) (42)*

As the idiom *to take care* has a high frequency of occurrence in English, it is not surprising that it interfered semantically with Finglish. Its Standard Finnish counterpart can either be expressed with the phrase *pitää huolta* or with the verb *huolehtia*. Thus, Finnish stands alone with elements of its own, whereas Finglish employs a form that corresponds idiomatically to the English expression.

Apart from expressions containing a form of *to take*, many English idioms are built on the verb *to get*, which is another source of semantic interference in Finglish:

*minä tietysti saan enempi aikaa kirjoittaa joulun jälkeen (AF) – minulla tietysti on enemmän aikaa kirjoittaa joulun jälkeen (SF) – of course I get more time to write after Christmas (E) (12)*

*ei he saanut niin paljon aikaa töistensä (AF) – he ei saaneet niin paljon vapaata töistensä (SF) – they didn't get that much time off from work (E) (9)*

*kaikki tulee niin kuivaksi (AF) – kaikki kuivuu niin paljon (SF) – everything gets so dry (E) (62)*

Depending on the context, the literal translation of *to get* is either *saada* or *tulla*. Whereas in Finnish, one can *get more time* or *get time off from something* like in English, in Finnish one can only *have more time* (personal pronoun in the adessive + *olla* + *aikaa*) or *get free* (*saada vapaata*) *from something*. Moreover, the third example illustrates once more that Finnish often has a distinct verb for a special situation (*kuivua*), whereas English and Finnish idioms employ a general verb (*to get / tulla*) and a specifying predicative (*dry / kuivaksi*).

Further semantic interference can be found in the transfer of certain English adverbial expressions into Finglish:

*hyvän* joukon yli kaksi tuhatta mailia (AF) – *koko* joukon yli kaksituhatta mailia (SF) – *a good deal of more than two thousand miles* (E) (33)

het niin *hyvin* tykkäs teistä (AF) – he *kovasti* tykkäsivät teistä (SF) – *they liked you so well* (E) (39)

Minun Suomi on vain ”*joka-päiväästä*”. (AF) – Minun suomi on vain *arkipäivästä*. (SF) – *My Finnish is just everyday Finnish*. (E) (49)

Sydän vika on *koko* hyvä (AF) – sydänvika on *aika* hyvä (SF) – *his heart disease is all good* (E) (62)

The examples show that, although the Finnish and English expressions do not differ greatly, Finglish chooses a semantic content which perfectly matches the English one in order to express precisely what is appropriate in the English environment. Moreover, the last example illustrates the tendency to replace the Finnish *aika* or *melko* (*quite, fairly*) with *koko* following the English expressions *all + adjective* and *a whole lot of* (cf.: *Täällä on koko paljon työtömiä*. (AF) – *Täällä on aika / melko paljon työtömiä*. (SF) – *Here, there are a whole lot of unemployed*. (E) (4)).

Also the English way of asking about how something is doing interferes semantically with Finglish:

*Kuinka* työt ovat siellä. (AF) – *Kuinka* työtilanne on siellä? (SF) – *How are the jobs over there?* (E) (4)

*Kuinka* Köpin vatsa katari on? (AF) – *Miten* on Köpin vatsakatarrien laita? (SF) – *How is Köpi’s stomach catarrh (doing)?* (E) (62)

In Standard Finnish it is only possible to ask how a situation (*työtilanne* – *working situation*) or a state of affairs / status (*laita*) of something is doing. Finglish, however, goes structurally and semantically along with the English mode.

Finally, semantic interference in Finglish can be observed in numerous literal translations from typical everyday English idioms:

*heillä on hyvää aikaa* (AF) – *heillä on hauskaa* (SF, partitive of *nice, pleasant*) – *they have a good time* (E) (16)

*Toivon että tämä kirje lappu tapaa sinun tervenä* (AF) – *Toivon että tämän kirjeen saadessasi voit hyvin* (SF, corresponding to: *I hope that you are fine when you get this letter.*) – *I hope this letter will find you well* (E) (11)

*sinä olit niin hyvää niille* (AF) – *sinä olit niin ystävällinen heille* (SF, *ystävällinen* – *friendly*) – *you have been so good to them* (E) (28)

*Se on kuin linnaa!* (AF) – *Se tuntuu vankilalta!* (SF, *tuntua* – *feel*) – *It's like a prison!* (E) (7)

*mutta laki on että* (AF) – *mutta lain mukaan* (SF, corresponding to: *according to the law*) – *but the law is that* (E) (7)

*hänen piti heittää työ paikkansa* (AF) – *hänen piti jättää työpaikkansa* (SF, *jättää* – *abandon*) – *he had to drop / throw away his job* (E) (40)

The Finnish examples are idiomatically English, although they display only correct grammatical Finnish forms. It is questionable whether or not those kinds of idioms are actually intelligible to a Finnish speaker without knowledge of English. In contrast to semantic interference from English lexical items, this type of semantic interference entered into Finnish rather unconsciously because of the high frequency of exposure. As all expressions contain correct grammatical Finnish forms, they could not be identified as clearly foreign by the speakers / writers, unlike the lexical items. In my Finnish corpus, the enormous occurrence of idioms and expressions which interfere semantically with English can be explained by the fact that the writers were no longer conscious about the expressions containing English idiomatic content. Hence, they were mainly not able to avoid English semantic content in their letters.

### **7.2.3. Semantic Interference from English Words with two Finnish Counterparts**

Semantic Interference in Finnish can also be observed in cases where English has one word with two Standard Finnish counterparts. Thus, whereas Finnish makes a specifying distinction depending on the context, the English expressions have a broader meaning covering several contexts. It seems that Finnish-Americans have been influenced by the semantically broad use of English words so that the Finnish distinctions became more and more obsolete. Hence, Finnish often makes use of words which are semantically not appropriate in Standard Finnish. Yet, when taking a look at the English and Finnish counterparts the Finnish meaning becomes clear.

One striking point of interference is that the Finnish noun *suomi*, which denotes *Finnish* as a language, takes over the meaning of *suomalainen* (*Finnish* as adjective):

**Suomen suklaatia** (AF) – **suomalaista suklaata** (SF) – **Finnish chocolate** (E) (9)

**suomen puukon** (AF) – **suomalaisen puukon** (SF) – **a Finnish knife** (E) (14)

**kaksi Suomen Pappia** (AF) – **kaksi suomalaista pappia** (SF) – **two Finnish priests** (E) (61)

The examples show that *suomi* developed the additional meaning of *suomalainen* and consequently it functioned as a noun and as adjective in Finglish.

Another frequent point of interference is the Finglish usage of the verb *tykätä* in contexts requiring conditional forms of *haluta* in Standard Finnish:

**Mina tykkan kiita** (AF) – **Minä haluaisin kiittää** (SF) – **I would like to thank** (E) (29)

**tykkäisin siellä elää** (AF) – **haluaisin elää siellä** (SF) – **I would like to live there** (E) (40)

**Miun tytot tykkäisivät tietää** (AF) – **Minun työtöt haluaisivat tietää** (SF) – **My girls would like to know** (E) (52)

Depending on the context, both Finnish verbs correspond to the English *to like*. Whereas English has only one verb at its disposal, Finnish makes a distinction between the expressions *would like* which can only be expressed with the conditional of *haluta* and *to like something* expressed with *tykätä*. When not used in the conditional, *haluta* corresponds to the English *to want*. It seems that Finnish-Americans simplified the semantic content of these two verbs. Thus, after the English model, *tykätä* also took over the meaning of *would like*, whereas *haluta* was only used in contexts demanding *to want*.

Also the distinction of meaning of certain other verbs got lost in Finglish. One verb received the additional semantic content of another one with the outcome that it was semantically conforming to the corresponding English verb:

**han voi nyt lentta oikein hyvin** (AF) – **hän osaa nyt lentää oikein hyvin** (SF) – **now he can fly really well** (E) (29)

**me nähtäis millä systeemilla se työskentelee** (AF) – **me nähtäisimme millä systeemilla se toimii** (SF) – **we see with which system it works** (E) (61)

The first example shows how in Finglish, the verb *voida* (in SF *can* in the sense of *to be able to*) covers the semantic slot of the Finnish *osata* (*can* in the sense of *to know how*). With its additional meaning, the Finglish *voida* thus equates to the English *can*, which can be used in both senses. In the second example, the verb *työskennellä* (*to work* in the sense of *to be employed*) takes on the additional semantic content of *toimia* (*to work* in the sense of *to function*) following the English verb *to work* with its broad meaning.

Another Finglish shift in meaning with the outcome of a simplification occurred with *pitkä* taking over the meaning of *kauan* following the English adjective *long*:

*kirje on tullut jo pitkän aikaa sitten* (AF) – *kirje on tullut jo kauan aikaa sitten* (SF) – *the letter has already come a long time ago* (E) (54)

*kiitos kirjeestäsi jonka saimme jo pitkä aika sitten.* (AF) – *Kiitos kirjeestäsi jonka saimme jo kauan aikaa sitten.* (SF) – *Thanks for your letter which we got already a long time ago.* (E) (64)

Although *pitkä* and *kauan* can both be translated to *long* in English, *kauan* always has a temporal meaning, whereas *pitkä* is used in all other contexts (for example in reference to length). Finglish strived for a simplification and thus *pitkä* took over the semantic content of *kauan* so that *kauan* was no longer necessary and *pitkä* became semantically conformed to its English counterpart *long*.

Moreover, many English prepositions have several counterparts in Finnish. That is why the distinction between the different meanings became lost in Finglish. Thus, postpositions and adverbs are used in a way that they would make sense in English, but not in Standard Finnish:

*on vain poiki kattua minun konttorista* (AF) – *on vain vastapäätä minun konttoria* (SF) – *it's just across the street from my office* (E) (29)

*Ei ole ollu pahoja pyryjä eikä kovia pakasia täällä ympäri.* (AF) – *Ei ole ollut pahoja pyryjä eikä kovia pakasia täällä päin.* (SF) – *There haven't been any bad storms or very low temperatures around here.* (E) (4)

The first example illustrates the confusion between the postpositions *poikki* and *vastapäätä* which both mean *across* in English. Whereas in Standard Finnish *poikki* can only be used when talking about a movement in the sense of *across / through* (cf.: *Tyttö juokse kadun poikki.* (SF) – *The girl runs across the street.* (E)), in Finglish it is used in cases where Standard Finnish requires *vastapäätä* to describe a state. Moreover, it is striking that *poikki* is used as a preposition instead of a postposition, and the genitive, which would be required in Standard Finnish, is left out. Yet, this type of interference will be covered in the next chapter. The second example illustrates that the Finglish writer chose a direct translation of the English expression *around*, namely *ympäri*. Standard Finnish, however, indicates the location with a semantically different structure by using the adverb *päin* which corresponds to the English *towards, in the direction of*. Thus, in order to conform to the English semantic, Finglish uses an indication of a location that does not make sense in Standard Finnish, but that fits perfectly into the English way of expression.

Moreover, Finglish shows instances of semantic interference from the English *over*, as its several counterparts in Finnish led to confusion in Finglish:



*me saame minun työpaikasta kirjeitä aivan **yli** maailma (AF) – me saamme minun työpaikassa kirjeitä aivan **joka puolelta** maailma (SF) – at my work we get letters from all **over** the world (E) (29)*

*se pahiin oli **ylä** (AF) – se pahin oli **ohi** (SF) – the worst was **over** (E) (44)*

In the first example, confusion arises over the equivalent of the English *over* with a local meaning. Depending on the context, both *yli* and *joka puolella* can be translated with *over*. Nonetheless, in Finnish *yli* can only be used in the sense of “*over + number*” (cf.: *Talo maksaa yli 500.000 euroa. (SF) – The house costs over 500.000 euros. (E)*). To express the location *from all over the world*, *joka puolelta* (literally: *from every side*) must be used. It seems that Finglish does not make any distinction between the different meanings so that *yli* can additionally be used to indicate a location. In Standard Finnish it is also indispensable to make a distinction between the postposition and adverb *yli* and the adverb *ohi*, which can all signify *over* in English. Whereas *ohi* refers to time, the adverb *yli* can only be used in a numeral context and the postposition *yli* has a local meaning. In Finglish the distinction between the different equivalents of *over* apparently got lost and the Finnish expressions can be used one way or the other in Finglish, as displayed in the second example.

The material at hand also displays an instance where the confusion of two English prepositions was apparently transferred to the Finnish / Finglish language:

*kaasu aseman **ohella** (AF) – bensa-aseman **vieressä** (SF) – **beside** the gas station (E) (37)*

In this example, there seems to be confusion of the English prepositions *beside* and *besides* and their Finnish counterparts. The writer used the equivalent of the English preposition *besides* (*ohella*) instead of the correct postposition *vieressä* corresponding to the English *beside*. It is likely that the writer was not aware that *beside* has a local meaning (in the sense of *next to*), whereas *besides* can only be used in the sense of *in addition to*. The confusion arising from the English language was then transferred to Finglish, which explains why the postposition *ohella* is used in a local context that cannot be understood in Standard Finnish.

### 7.3. Morphosyntactic Interference

The written Finglish samples show enormous morphosyntactic influence from English on the Finnish language in North America, with a large spectrum of different points of interference, which I will examine hereafter. In this context, it is also important to mention

the possible impact of Finnish dialects on the adoption of certain English structures. The frame of this paper does not allow for an analysis of dialectal influences. Nevertheless, it should be said that some structures corresponding to certain English constructions (such as the introduction of the formal subject *se*) were common in Finnish dialects. The English language might therefore have caused a reinforcement of the dialectal usage to a certain extent. Yet, the degree to which Finnish dialects had an impact on the adoption of certain English structures remains unclear.

### 7.3.1. The Formal Subject *se*

The Finnish syntax often requires subjectless clauses which thus begin with a verb (cf.: *Sataa vettä* (SF) – *It rains* (E, literally *Rains water*)). In contrast to Finnish, the English structure needs a subject, as the example illustrates. In the Finglish corpus at hand, there seems to be a strong tendency to introduce the subject *se*, which is the equivalent to the English *it*, in sentences that would not have a subject in Standard Finnish. In my material, the English structure is predominantly used when the sentence contains a form of *to be* (*olla*) as the main verb. The outcome is a syntactic structure that corresponds to the English *it is- / it was- / it would be*-beginning of a sentence:

***Se on*** *niin hanka-laa saada työtä* (AF) – ***On*** *niin hankala saada työtä* (SF) – ***It is*** *so difficult to get work* (E) (7)

*kyllä se oli hauska saada suomesta lahjoja* (AF) – *Kyllä, oli hauska saada lahjoja Suomesta.* (SF) – ***Yes, it was*** *nice to get presents from Finland.* (E) (14)

***se olis mukavaa kun näkisin teidät vielä*** (AF) – ***olisi mukavaa kun näkisin teidät vielä*** (SF) – ***it would be*** *nice if I saw you again* (E) (53)

The corpus shows nineteen instances in which the formal subject *se* was introduced. Although one can also find this type of sentence structure in Finnish dialects (Jönsson-Korhola 1989: 68), the numerous appearances in Finglish suggest clear interference from English which might also have reinforced the dialectal usage.

Another point of interference from English, which Jönsson-Korhola also noticed in spoken Finglish (1989:75), is a sentence structure with the formal subject *se* matching English expressions with *it seems*:

***Ei se tunnu mahdolliselta että*** (AF) – ***Ei näytä / vaikuta mahdolliselta, että*** (SF) – ***It doesn't seem*** *to be possible that* (E) (8).

Apart from the added subject, the Finglish sentence contains the verb *tuntua* which, in other constructions, often equates to the English verb *to seem* (*minusta tuntuu* (SF) – *it*

*seems to me* (E)), but which cannot be used in this context in Standard Finnish. However, as the expressions *it seems to me / minusta tuntuu* are very popular in English and in Finnish, it is not surprising that the verb was also taken over into Finglish when imposing the English structure upon the Finnish one.

Jönsson-Korhola noticed that the usage of the formal subject in Finglish often appears, just like in English, in constructions concerning time, weather, and distances (1989: 73). The findings in my material do support this observation:

*Se on ollut niin pitkä aika* (AF) – *On ollut niin pitkä aika* (SF) – *It has been such a long time* (E) (29)

*se on oiken laamin ulkona* (AF) – *ulkona on oikein lämmin* (SF) – *it is really warm outside* (E) (29)

*sillä se on siksi pitkä matka* (AF) – *koska matka on pitkä* (SF) – *for it is a long journey after all* (E) (10)

The examples show that Standard Finnish often requires a different word order than English. With the Finglish examples following the English word order with a formal subject, the English influence on the Finglish syntax becomes obvious.

In contrast to the studies on spoken Finglish, the survey at hand does not show any interference with English existential clauses. The English infinitive clauses, however, seem to intervene in the Finglish syntax in my material:

*se otti vaan 2 tuntia mennä minneapolis.* (AF) – *Matka Minneapolisiin vei / kesti vaan 2 tuntia.* (SF) – *It took only 2 hours to go to Minneapolis.* (E, literally: *The journey to Minneapolis takes / lasts only 2 hours.*) (4)

*nyt se vain otta 10 minutia meiden kotista paasata tyo paikan* (AF) – *nyt matka meidän kodista työpaikalle kestää vain 10 minuuttia* (SF) – *now it only takes 10 minutes to get to work from our home.* (E, literally: *now the journey from our home to work lasts only 10 minutes*) (29)

Although many infinitive clauses often begin with the infinitive, English also allows extraposition constructions as shown in the examples above. In these cases, the infinitive is dislocated to the end of the sentence and a dummy subject, namely *it*, is introduced in extraposition at the beginning of the sentence. The English construction thus contains two subjects (cf. Jönsson-Korhola 1989: 76). The examples illustrate that Finglish absorbs the infinitive construction from the English language.

Finally, the corpus shows the English impact of the formal subject on expressions complying with the English phrase *it's just (that)*:

*Se vain on hyvä asia että* (AF) – *On vain hyvä asia, että* (SF) – *It's just a good thing that* (E) (62)

*vaan on se kumminkin jotain että aika kuluu paremmin* (AF) – *sen avulla vain aika kuluu paremmin* (SF) – *at least, it's just something to pass the time better* (E) (45)

*Se vain siittä, että ei tarvitse* (AF) – *Vaan ei tarvitse* (SF) – *It's just that you don't need to* (E) (11)

Finnish does not know an expression that would correspond to the English phrase *it's just that*. Nevertheless, a similar semantic content can be expressed simply with the words *vaan* or *vain* (in English *just, only*) or a subjectless construction with the verb *olla* (*to be*) combined with *vaan / vain*. As seen in the other examples above, Finglish uses the English syntax containing a formal subject filled with Finnish words.

### 7.3.2. Prepositions and Adverbs

With English and Finnish belonging to different language types, it is obvious that these two languages dispose of different morphosyntactic devices. Whereas English often makes use of prepositions or adverbs, Finnish either employs agglutinated forms or postpositions. The strong English use of prepositions seems to be one of the main sources of interference in Finglish. Compared to Standard Finnish, my Finglish corpus shows an increased usage of pre- and postposition, of adverbs, and of structures corresponding to English prepositional constructions.

#### 7.3.2.1. *Jälkeen* and *sitten*

Particularly the Finnish postposition *jälkeen* (*after*) is used in new and different morphosyntactic contexts in Finglish. First of all, it often functions as a preposition in Finglish, whereas it can only be used as a postposition in Finnish:

*jälkeen Joulun* (AF) – *joulun jälkeen* (SF) – *after Christmas* (E) (26)

*jälkeen sodan*(AF) – *sodan jälkeen* (SF) – *after the war* (E) (36)

*joka ilta jälkeen 12* (AF) – *joka ilta klo 12 jälkeen* (SF) – *every evening after 12 p.m.* (E) (17)

This prepositional usage of an actual postposition can clearly be ascribed to the English influence on the Finnish language in North America. Moreover, just like most of the Finnish postpositions, *jälkeen* requires the genitive case in Standard Finnish. In Finglish, however, the genitive is often left out and *jälkeen* is thus used like its English counterpart *after*:

*minä olen syntynyt 3 kuuta jälkeen kun he pääsivät tänne. (AF) – minä olen syntynyt 3 kuukautta sen jälkeen kun he pääsivät tänne. (SF) – I was born 3 months after they came. (E) (3)*

*Sain sen paljon jälkeen kuin oliin pannu net joulu kortit – Sain sen paljon sen jälkeen kuin olin pannut ne joulukortit. – I got it long after I had posted the Christmas card. (46)*

Modern English has only traces of grammatical cases left. Therefore a complex prepositional system compensates what used to be expressed in Old English by grammatical cases. As the Finnish speakers were permanently surrounded by a language which does not have grammatical cases, it is not surprising that they started to ignore certain cases in their own language after the English model.

The material at hand also shows an instance in which *jälkeen* was replaced in Finnish with the adverb *sitten* which usually means *then, ago, afterwards* in English:

*sitte, kuin olen viimeksi kirjoittanu (AF) – sen jälkeen kun olen viimeksi kirjoittanut (SF) – after I wrote last / since I wrote last (E) (61)*

As the example shows, the expression *sen jälkeen kun*, can be translated with the prepositions *after* or *since*. In Standard Finnish, *sitten* can also function as a preposition requiring the genitive case:

*Ei olle satanut lunta enää paljon sitte joulun. (AF) – Ei ole enää saatanut paljon lunta sitten joulun / joulun jälkeen. (SF) – It hasn't been snowing a lot any more after / since Christmas. (E) (47)*

This construction is not very popular in Finnish. Nevertheless, it is grammatically correct and its English translation corresponds to the prepositions *after* and *since*, just like the expression *sen jälkeen kun*. It seems that the writer of letter 61 got confused with the different Finnish constructions which have the same equivalent in English. Yet, it is also possible that Finnish shows a tendency to replace *jälkeen* with *sitten*, which would also reinforce the prepositional use of *sitten*.

This thesis could be supported by another tendency that seems to have developed in Finnish, namely the tendency to substitute the Standard Finnish *sitten* in expressions corresponding to the English *ago* with the partitive of the Finnish noun *aika* equating to the English *time*:

*joku viikko aikaa (AF) – joku viikko sitten (SF) – some weeks ago (E) (12)*

*pari vuotta aikaa (AF) – pari vuotta sitten (SF) – a couple of years ago (E) (39)*

*kolme vuotta aikaa (AF) – kolme vuotta sitten (SF) – three years ago (E) (62)*

At a first glance, the replacement of *sitten* with *aikaa* does not have a direct connection to any interference from the English language. However, this structure also does not appear in

Finnish dialects and is thus unique to Finglish, which can be proved with an entry in Virtanranta's dictionary of American-Finnish. With seven instances in my corpus, the structure occurs with a high frequency. An explanation might be the possible shifting of the meaning of the word *sitten*. If *sitten* is increasingly used in Finglish in contexts where *jälkeen* would have to be employed in Standard Finnish, a new term for the Standard Finnish *sitten* would be necessary in order to avoid confusion. The word *aika* might then have been chosen due to its semantic relation to time or possibly also its phonetic similarity to the English term *ago* (both words consist of two syllables, begin with an <a>, and with the common devoicing of [g] both terms would be pronounced with a [k]). Nonetheless, it is only possible to make speculations. The existence of this substitution is certain; its reasons, however, remain unclear and would need further examination.

### 7.3.2.2. The Inner and External Locative Cases

Further interference from English is found especially concerning the usage of the inner and external locative cases in Finglish. Although these six cases in Finnish vaguely correspond to certain English prepositions, they cannot always be translated one-to-one, as the two language systems obviously function in totally different ways. Finglish speakers, however, often use the locative cases in a way directly complying with the English prepositions by thus ignoring the distinct Finnish features. One of these Finnish peculiarities is, for example, that not all place and country names can be used with the inner locative cases (inessive, elative, illative) which would correspond one-to-one to the English prepositions indicating locations: *Helsingissä* / *Suomessa* (SF) – *in Helsinki* / *in Finland* (E), *Helsingistä* / *Suomesta* (SF) – *from Helsinki* / *from Finland* (E), *Helsinkiin* / *Suomeen* (SF) – *to Helsinki* / *to Finland* (E). Standard Finnish requires the external locative cases (adessive, ablativ, allative) for some place names. Often these places are somehow related to water (for example headlands), yet there is no rule. Thus, in order to express *in / from / to Rovaniemi* (*niemi* (SF) – *headland* (E)) in Standard Finnish, the external locative cases *Rovaniemellä* / *Rovaniemeltä* / *Rovaniemelle* have to be used, literally meaning *on / from (off) / onto Rovaniemi* in English. Finglish generally ignores the distinction between those place names demanding the inner locative cases and those which demand the external locative cases. After the English model, also those places that would require the external locative cases in Standard Finnish are used with the inner locative cases:

*Kaustisessa* (AF) – *Kaustisella* (SF) – *in Kaustinen* (E) (56)

*Minun serkku Kaustisesta* (AF) – *Minun serkku Kaustiselta* (SF) – *My cousin from Kaustinen* (E) (59)

With English not really knowing grammatical cases, much less a difference between inner and external locative cases for locations, it is obvious that this distinction became superfluous in Finglish and that thus the more common mode of expression corresponding to the English way was generally adopted.

Another particularity of Finnish is that in order to express certain actions not only the location, but also the direction has to be indicated, whereas in many Indio-European languages only the location is expressed. In those cases, where Standard Finnish requires the ablative or elative to indicate the location and the direction, Finglish necessitates the adessive or inessive to express the location only. Thus, Finglish goes along with the English structures. In my corpus, interference concerns especially those expressions containing the adverbs *täällä* (*here*) and *siellä* (*there*):

*Sodan aikana täällä sai ostaa villa lankaa* (AF) – *Sodan aikana täältä sai ostaa villa lankaa* (SF) – *During the war one could buy wool threats here* (E, literal translation: *During the war one could buy wool threats from here*) (3)

*hän saa siellä apua* (AF) – *hän saa sieltä apua* (SF) – *there, he gets help* (E, literal translation: *from there, he gets help*) (62)

*hän aikoo myydä sen kiinteimistön siellä Floridassa* (AF) – *hän aikoo myydä sen kiinteistön sieltä Floridasta* (SF) – *he plans on selling the estate there, in Florida* (E, literal translation: *he plans on selling the estate from there, from Florida*) (66)

Although the Finglish structures are intelligible to Finnish speakers, they seem unnatural in Standard Finnish surroundings. In the English surroundings of North America, however, the indication of the location and the direction seems to have become superfluous, so that the English model was adopted.

The Finglish relative clauses constitute another source of interference with the locative cases. As Finnish has no prepositions, the relative pronoun has to be inflected in the right case in order to express the appropriate meaning. Finglish is obviously influenced by the English way of building relative clauses. Two tendencies are noticeable: On the one hand, inflection of the relative pronoun takes places ignoring the distinction between the inner and the external locative cases. On the other hand, inflection occurs based on the English preposition that stands with the relative pronoun, thus disregarding the Standard Finnish requirements:

*muistakkas sinä sitä hillii josa Säापakan ja Kainun talot oli* (AF) – *Muistat sinä sitä mäkeä jolla Säापakan ja Kainun talot oli* (SF) – *Do you remember that hill where Säापakan's and Kainun's houses were* (E) (39)

*Company jolle hän oli työssä (AF) – Yritys, jossa hän oli työssä (SF) – The company for which he worked (E) (7)*

In the first example, the Standard Finnish sentence requires the relative pronoun *joka* in the adessive due to the distinction between inner and external locative cases: The house can only be *on* the hill (expressed with the adessive) and not *in* the hill (expressed with the inessive). In English, however, both locations can be expressed with the relative pronoun *where*, although a prepositional structure would be possible, too. The Finnish sentence clearly shows interference from English, as *jossa* (inessive of *joka* corresponding to the English *where*, as in *the room where I sleep = in which*) is used instead of the Standard Finnish *jolla* (adessive of *joka* corresponding to the English *where*, as in *the hill where the houses are = on which*). It seems that in Finnish, *jossa* has become the general equivalent of the English *where* and is no longer seen as merely an inflected form of the relative pronoun *joka*, but as its own, fixed vocabulary.

The second example shows that the Finnish inflection of relative pronouns is no longer oriented towards the Standard Finnish mode of expression, but towards the English prepositional system. In Standard Finnish, the expressions *olla työssä / töissä* or *työskennellä* equating to the English *to work* always go along with a locative case. Thus, one can only work *in* a company, but not *for* a company. Finnish does not have any fixed rule. Oriented towards the English prepositional system, it adapted to its new surroundings in order to express what was appropriate there.

Further impact from English on the Finnish usage of the locative cases can be seen in instances, where the two languages would naturally use completely different structures, but where Finnish adopts the English mode of expression:

*han vie minun meidän vaunussa kotia (AF) – hän vie minut meidän autolla kotiin (SF) – he brings me home in our car (E) (29)*

The example illustrates that Finnish uses the inessive to comply with the English preposition *in* indicating a location. In Standard Finnish, however, the ablative is required. In this example, the ablative has no locative function, but it is used to indicate the instrument. The Standard Finnish structure thus corresponds to the English expression *to go by car*. The locative cases can only be used to express a state (*something or someone is in the car – joku / jotain on autossa*). As soon as the sentence expresses a movement, like in the instance mentioned above, the means must be indicated. In contrast to Finnish, English neglects the instrument and allows the locative just like English.



The corpus also displays one instance which clearly shows interference, but which cannot be traced back to a certain expression in English:

*Hänessä tehtiin joku vuosi sitten hirveän suuri leikkaus vatsassa* (AF) – *Hänelle tehtiin joku vuosi sitten hirveän suuri vatsaleikkaus* (SF) – *Some years ago, they did a terribly big surgery on his stomach* (E) (66)

The example shows two instances (*hänessä*, *vatsassa*) where the inessive is unnaturally used in reference to Standard Finnish. Literally translated the sentence means: *In him they did a terribly big surgery in his stomach some years ago*. In Standard Finnish, the sentence structure demands the allative (*hänelle*), which does not have a real locative meaning in this case, but is used in the meaning *to somebody*. Concerning the second instance, Finnish would not make use of a locative structure at all: *vatsaleikkaus* (*stomach surgery*) *pro leikkaus vatsassa* (*surgery on the stomach*). In English a prepositional structure is possible. Yet, the preposition *on* does not have an equivalent in English or Finnish, as it is not used with a local meaning. Possibly the writer decided for the inessive and thus for a locative when trying to find an expression corresponding to the English *to do an operation on someone*. Moreover, as seen above, English possesses many expressions containing the preposition *in*, which might explain the writer's overuse of the corresponding Finnish locative.

Further interference from an English preposition with the Finnish syntax when indicating a location occurs when the verb *käydä* (*to go, to visit*) is used:

*hanelle käy paljon vierraitta* (AF) – *hänellä käy paljon vieraita* (SF) – *a lot of guests come / go to her (place)* (E) (29)

In Finnish, *käydä* governs the inessive or adessive. Unlike in Finnish, the English counterpart *to go* implies a movement / a direction. That is why the preposition *to* follows the English expression. Finnish obviously has been influenced by the English structure and thus makes use of the allative instead of the adessive to indicate the direction.

### 7.3.2.3. Postpositions and Adverbs Indicating a Location

Further interference from English on the Finnish language in North America can be seen in the use of postpositions and adverbs which indicate a location and which have apparently been influenced by English preposition. For instance, my corpus displays confusion of two Finnish postpositions (*ohi*, *ohitse*) which both have the same meaning in English (*past, by*), but are used in different grammatical contexts:

*Joko se uusi tie teidän **ohi** on valmistunut?* (AF) – *Joko uusi tie teidän **ohitsenne** on valmistunut?* (SF) – *Is the new street **past** your house already done?* (E) (8)

In Standard Finnish, it is not possible to use *ohi* with a possessive suffix. In those cases that require a possessive suffix *ohitse* must be used. In contrast to Finnish, English does not have possessive suffixes at its disposal. Possession is expressed by means of possessive pronouns which, to some extent, correspond to the genitive forms of the Finnish personal pronouns. Whereas in Standard Finnish, the example requires a possessive suffix and therefore the postposition *ohitse*, the writer uses a construction conforming to the English structure: the genitive of the personal pronoun *te* corresponding to the English possessive pronoun *your* + the postposition *ohi* equating to the English preposition *past*. It is not surprising that the use of possessive suffixes in Finnish became more and more elided in the English surroundings and consequently the distinction between *ohi* and *ohitse* got lost.

The material also contains an instance where the English indication of a location is directly taken over into Finnish:

*Onko Pentin työ maa nyt **lähempänä koto**?* (AF) – *Onko Pentin työmaa nyt **lähempänä kotoa**?* (SF) – *Is Pentti's building site now **closer to your home**?* (E) (8)

The example shows that the writer wrote the nominative form *koto* instead of the partitive form *kotoa* which would be necessary in Standard Finnish. Of course, this could simply be a careless mistake. When taking a look at the English structure, however, another explanation is possible: English uses the preposition *closer to* in order to indicate the location followed by the object *home*. Finnish uses the same structure with the adverb *lähempänä* and the object *koto*. In Standard Finnish *lähempänä* requires the partitive *kotoa*. It is thus possible that the writer has been influenced by the English construction which led him to elide the partitive case.

Moreover, after the English model, Finnish uses adverbs and prepositions to indicate a location in cases, where Standard Finnish does not allow such an indication:

*otta meitta hanen kansa **ylos** lentamaan* (AF) – *otta meidät mukaansa **lentämään*** (SF) – *he takes us **up** to fly with him* (E) (29)

Whereas in English, and consequently also in Finnish, it is fine to give the direction (*up*) in addition to the verb *to fly*, Finnish does not allow for such a construction. The verbal noun *lentämään* is self-sufficient.

### 7.3.2.4. Reinforcement of Postpositions and Adverbs

In English, prepositions have a high frequency of occurrence. Therefore it is not surprising that this strong use of prepositions reinforced the usage of postpositions and adverbs in Finglish which have a semantic and structural proximity to the English expressions. The Finglish structures are thus not necessarily considered wrong in Standard Finnish, but they might seem unusual and additionally certain postpositions occur much more frequently than they normally do:

*hän asuu tuola hillin **päällä** (AF) – Hän asuu tuolla mäellä. (SF) – He lives **on** that hill. (E) (39)*

*kiitos Joulu kortin **Etestä** (AF) – kiitos joulukortista (SF) – thanks **for** the Christmas card (E) (42)*

In the first example, the writer chose the postposition *päällä* (*on, upon, on top of* (E)) to express the location *on* the hill instead of the adessive, which would be used in Standard Finnish to express an external location. The construction with *päällä* allows a very similar sentence structure to English, which is why this preposition became so popular in Finglish, although it is rather disapproved in Standard Finnish. The writer of the second example also chose a construction with a postposition (*edestä* (SF) – *for, on behalf of* (E)) instead of using an agglutinative structure with the relative. Although this construction is possible in Standard Finnish, it is very uncommon. Apparently, the usage of the postposition *edestä* increased due to the influence of the English prepositions.

Another postposition that was reinforced in Finglish is *varten* which corresponds to the English preposition *for, for the purpose of*:

*täällä otetaan kaikista kuva record'tia **varten** (AF) – täällä otetaan kaikista kuva pöytäkirjaan merkittäväksi / ihan vain tiedoksi (SF) – here they take a picture of everybody **for** the record (E) (7)*

The Finglish construction shows a direct adoption of the English expression *for the record* with the postposition *varten*. In contrast to Finglish, Standard Finnish preferably makes use of an agglutinative structure with the translative which corresponds to the English *for (a / the) something*: *toistaiseksi* (SF) – *for the time being* (E), *läksyä maanantaiksi* (SF) – *homework for Monday* (E). The use of the Finnish postposition *varten* in Finglish was obviously influenced by its structural proximity to the English preposition *for*.

Other postpositions which became very popular in Finglish are *läpi*, the equivalent of the English *through*, and *ohi* corresponding to the English *past, over*:

*Ja olen 19v. kun olen koulua läpi* (AF) – *Ja olen 19v kun olen päättänyt koulun.* (SF) – *And I am 19 years when I'm through school.* (E) (7)

*Tavallisesti ne menevät High School'in läpi täällä, mutta* (AF) – *Tavallisesti täällä päätetään lukion, mutta* (SF) – *Normally, they go through High School here, but* (E) (7)

*Arvo alkaa pian olla ohi niiden kohtausten* (AF) – *Arvo alkaa pian toipua niistä kohtauksista* (SF) – *Arvo is soon past those attacks / Arvi starts to get over those attacks soon* (E) (11)

Instead of a postposition, Standard Finnish uses a different verb (*päättää* (SF) – *to terminate, to finish (off)* (E) / *toipua* (SF) – *to recover,* (E)) which corresponds semantically to the English structure *to be / get / go through* or *to get over / to be past*. Structurally, however, the two constructions are totally different. In the English surroundings, Finnish chooses a structurally similar construction to English to express what is appropriate in this new environment. Generally speaking, one can say that Finnish tries to adapt to the English language semantically and structurally. In the course of this adaptation, the English prepositional system especially reinforced the usage of postpositions, such as *päällä, edestä, and läpi*.

### 7.3.2.5. Interference with the Case Government

Strong interference from the English prepositions can also be found with regard to the Finnish case government. Standard Finnish verbs often govern grammatical cases with no direct equivalent in English. Finnish, however, adapts to the English language by governing grammatical cases which are semantically close to the English structures. In Standard Finnish, the Finnish case government would be considered simply wrong. Nevertheless, in the English surroundings, it makes perfect sense given the semantic proximity to the corresponding English expressions.

One typical instance where interference with the case government occurs is the verb *ajatella* (*to think*). In Standard Finnish, this verb governs the partitive case, because it expresses an ongoing process. The atelic action renders the partitive necessary. In Finnish, *ajatella* governs the relative case due to its proximity to the English prepositional construction:

*pitää vähän ajatella tästä kirjestäkin* (AF) – *pitää vähän ajatella kirjen kirjoittamista / tätä kirjettä* (SF) – *I have to think a bit about / of what to write in this letter.* (E) (13)

*minä ajatellen teistä* (AF) – *minä ajattelen teitä* (SF) – *I think of you* (E) (50)

*Olen monta kertaa ajatellu sinusta* (AF) – *Olen monta kertaa ajatellut sinua* (SF) – *I've thought of you many times* (E) (52)

In the English surroundings, the distinction between an atelic and telic action was no longer relevant concerning the verb *ajatella*, but it became important that a similar semantic content could be expressed as in English. In this respect, the relative case matches the best with the English preposition *of*.

Another common change of case government due to the English influence occurs with the verb *kuulla* (*to hear*). Whereas this verb requires the relative case in Standard Finnish, it governs the ablative in Finglish:

*on hauska kuulla teiltä sukulaisilta* (AF) – *on hauska kuulla teistä sukulaisista* (SF) – *it is nice to hear from you relatives* (E) (20)

*Sain hältä kuulla* (AF) – *Sain hänestä kuulla* (SF) – *I heard from her* (E) (37)

*hän on saannu kuulla vähän sinultaki* (AF) – *hän on saanut kuulla vähän sinustakin* (SF) – *he has heard a bit from you as well* (E) (40)

In Standard Finnish, *kuulla* governs the relative to indicate origin. In contrast to Finnish, the English equivalent *to hear from somebody* focuses on the person. Finglish emulates the English concept by demanding the ablative case which corresponds semantically to the English preposition *from* (as provenance of a person) (cf.: *Sain sen (lahjan) häneltä*. (SF) – *I got it (the present) from her*. (E)).

Another typical instance of the changing case government in Finglish because of the influence of English prepositions constitutes the verb *tuntua*, corresponding to the English verb *to seem*:

*Minulle tuntuu* (AF) – *Minusta tuntuu* (SF) – *It seems to me* (E) (48)

When used in this sense, *tuntua* governs the relative case in Standard Finnish. Finglish, however, requires the allative in order to express semantic content equating to the English *to somebody* (cf. p. 30 of this paper).

### 7.3.2.6. Interference with the Indication of Time

The English use of prepositions also affected the Finglish indication of time. Standard Finnish has its own case to specify when (day, weekend, month, year, season) something happens – the essive. In contrast to Finnish, English uses prepositions, adverbs, or adjectives to indicate time. Finglish, again, adapts the English mode of expression to the Finnish framework:

*ei tarvitse ajaa niin pitkälti yhdessä päivässä* (AF) – *ei tarvitse ajaa niin pitkälti yhtenä päivänä* (SF) – *you don't have to drive that far **in** one day* (E) (62)

*tällä ajalla* (AF) – *tänä aikana* (SF) – *during / at this time* (E) (66)

In the first example, Finglish uses the inessive which corresponds directly to the English preposition *in*, although Standard Finnish requires the essive in this case. Thus, the English content is expressed within the Finnish grammatical frame. Also in the second example, Finglish avoids the essive. In Finnish, there is no expression which corresponds directly to the English prepositions *during* and *at* in this case. Nevertheless, the Finglish expression *tällä ajalla* can be traced back to English prepositional influence, when regarding how the preposition *at* (indicating time) is frequently translated into Finnish: *at the moment* (E) – *tällä hetkellä* (SF). The example shows that in certain cases the adessive corresponds to the English *at*. The Finglish writer apparently oriented himself towards this structure when adapting to the English expression.

Sometimes, an indication of time in English can be expressed by several grammatical constructions in Finnish. In these cases, Finglish tends to make use of the structure which is closer to the English expression:

*katsella Suomea viitessä viikossa* (AF) – *katsella Suomea viiden viikon ajan* (SF) – *to see Finland **in** five weeks* (E) (56)

The Finglish inessive-structure *viitessä viikossa* directly corresponds to the English construction with the preposition *in*. Although the inessive-structure is also considered correct in Standard Finnish, Finnish would generally prefer a genitive-construction (*viiden viikon ajan*). The prepositional construction of English, with its direct equivalent in Finnish, obviously reinforced the inessive-structure.

### 7.3.2.7. Further Prepositional and Adverbial Interference

My corpus of written Finglish still displays numerous instances of interference from English prepositions and adverbs in all kinds of contexts. One example is the impact of English prepositions on those Finglish structures where the essive would occur in Standard Finnish, just like with the indication of time (cf. chapter 7.3.2.6):

*on päässyt takaisin Saksaan yhdessa kappaleessa* (AF) – *hän on päässyt takaisin Saksaan yhtenä kappaleena* (SF) – *he has come back to Germany **in** one piece* (E) (9)

The example illustrates once more that Finnish avoids the *essive* which has no equivalent in English. Yet, the English structure with the preposition *in* is directly transferred to Finnish within Finnish grammatical framework.

Finnish has only a few prepositions at its disposal, but all of them require the noun to be in the partitive case. In Finnish, however, the partitive tends to be elided because of the structural proximity to the corresponding English construction:

*ilman syntymä todistus* (AF) – *ilman syntymätodistusta* (SF) – *without a birth certificate* (E) (34)

In the example, the preposition *ilman* (*without*) is used in the nominative (*syntymätodistus*) instead of the partitive (*syntymätodistusta*) which would be necessary in Standard Finnish. As English does not have a case system, English prepositions do not demand any specific construction unlike Finnish prepositions and postpositions. English also does not know any structure corresponding to the Finnish partitive. Therefore, it is comprehensible that the partitive required by the Finnish preposition *ilman* was ignored in Finnish following the English prepositional construction.

Another point of interference constitutes the English preposition *with* which has several counterparts in Finnish (*kanssa, mukaan, muakana*). In Finnish, the distinction between the different counterparts apparently got lost and the *kanssa* gets into general use:

*otta meitta hanen kansa ylös lentamaan* (AF) – *otta meidät mukaansa lentämään* (SF) – *he takes us up to fly with him* (E) (29)

*vielä oli 2 sen tytästä kanssa* (AF) – *2 hänen tytästä oli vielä mukaan* (SF) – *2 of her daughters still were / came (along) with her* (E) (23)

The first example illustrates that Finnish makes use of the direct equivalent of the English *with him* (*hänen kanssa*). In Finnish, however, *mukaansa* (*mukaan* + possessive suffix) has to be used in this context as a movement is indicated (*ottaa mukaansa* (SF) – *to take along with him* (E)). *Hänen kanssa* is used in contexts without movement concerning two comparable things (cf.: *Puhun hänen kanssa.* (SF) – *I talk with him.* (E)). The second example shows the same type of interference: the one-to-one translation of the English *with* (*kanssa*) is used in a context that requires *mukaan* in Finnish. English does not know this kind of distinction. Therefore, it is comprehensible that it became irrelevant in Finnish.

Many Finnish constructions which display prepositional interference are direct translations from English. Within the Finnish grammatical frame, they maintain the same word order and consequently share the same semantic features. As these constructions

have an impact on the Finglish syntax, this interface will be treated in this present morphosyntactic context:

*hänen pitää olla erikoisen hyvällä ruoka järjestelmällä* (AF) – *hänellä pitää olla erikoinen hyvä ruokavalio* (SF) – *he has to be on a particularly good meal plan* (E) (66)

*olen ollut oikein hyvässä terveydessä* (AF) – *olen ollut oikein terve* (SF) – *I've been in real good health* (E) (18)

*Eugene [...] menee viimeselle vuodelle.* (AF) – *Eugene [...] opiskelee viimeistä vuotta.* (SF) – *Eugene [...] goes for the last year.* (E) (10)

*päästä tasolle näiden kirjeiden kanssa* (AF) – *päästä tasolle näiden kirjeiden kirjoittamisessa* (SF) – *to get even with those letters* (E) (66)

In the first example, the Finglish construction *hyvällä ruokajärjestelmällä* is conforming to the English expression *to be on a meal plan*. The preposition *on* is transferred to Finglish by means of its one-to-one counterpart – the adessive. This syntactic structure is not possible in Standard Finnish, which can only make use of a construction corresponding to the English: *He has to have a particularly good diet*.

Also the second example illustrates that Finglish has a different syntax than Finnish which can (in this case) be traced back to the influence of the English preposition *in*. The English expression *to be in good health* has been translated directly into the Finglish *hyvässä terveydessä* with the inessive. Whereas Finnish only allows the structure verb (*olla* – *to be*) + adjective (*terve* – *healthy*), Finglish chooses the construction verb (*olla*) + adjective in the inessive (*hyvässä*) + noun in the inessive (*terveydessä*), which corresponds to the English structure. In the third example, the Finglish structure goes along with the English one, too. The preposition *for* is expressed with the allative, which is frequently used to translate this preposition: *Kirjoitan runon hänelle.* (SF) – *I write a poem for her.* (E). Finnish, however, can only express a semantically similar content with a totally different syntax, literally meaning *he studies the last year*. In the fourth example, the postposition *kanssa* seems to have been reinforced in Finglish due to its frequently-appearing English counterpart *with*. English has a lot of expressions containing the preposition *with*. Finglish adopts these expressions by trying to directly take over the English structure: *to get even with* (E) – *päästä tasiolle kanssa* (AF). In contrast to Finnish, Standard Finnish possesses a different (agglutinative) structure that does not contain a pre- or postposition and which literally means: *to get even in the writing of those letters*.



Another interesting point of interference constitutes the preposition *of* which does not have a direct equivalent in Finnish:

*meillä on ollut tässä vähän kiirestä* (AF) – *meillä on ollut tässä vähän kiirettä* (SF)  
– *we have had a bit of stress here* (E) (10)

The example shows that Finglish adopts the English expression *a bit of* using the adverb *vähän* (*a bit*) followed by the noun *kiire* (*stress*) in the elative case (*kiirestä*). Many English constructions containing the preposition *of* are translated with the elative into Finnish: *Mitä tiedät hänestä?* (SF) – *What do you know of him?* (E), *Tämä tuoli on tehty puusta.* (SF) – *This chair is made of wood.* (E). Whereas Standard Finnish requires the partitive because we deal with an uncountable noun, Finglish emulates the English prepositional structure by making use of the elative.

The material at hand shows another instance that might be traced back to interference from the preposition *of*:

*Iidalla niitä on kaksi.* (AF) – *Iidalla on kaksi lasta.* (SF) – *Iida has two of them.* (E)  
(11)

The Finglish sentence, as written in the letter, does neither make sense in Standard Finnish nor in English nor translated into English, as it uses the partitive of the Finnish pronoun *ne* (*niitä*; *they* referring to things (E)). Yet, the sentence gains meaning when replacing the partitive with the elative (*niistä*). With the elative, the sentence would correspond to the English structure *two of them* (*kaksi niistä*). It is possible that the partitive form *niitä* simply was a spelling mistake, or that the writer confused the declension of *ne* with the more frequently used declension of *se* (it): *sitä* (partitive), *siitä* (elative) vs. *niitä* (partitive), *niistä* (elative). Of course, it remains speculation whether or not the writer really intended to use the elative, but mistakenly spelled the partitive. Nonetheless, several facts speak for this thesis – the frequent interference from the English preposition *of* in Finglish, the similarity of the partitive and elative form of the pronoun *ne* which can quickly be confounded, and the sentence structure which would make perfect sense in Finnish with the elative but which does not make sense otherwise.

The following example can be considered a special case of prepositional interference:

*näyttääkö tule-van hyvä vuosi viljasta ja muusta* (AF) – *näyttääkö tulevan hyvä viljavuosi ja muuten* (SF) – *does it look like it will be a good year for the grains and for everything else* (E) (5)

The Finglish writer used an elative construction which comes close to the English prepositional structure, whereas Standard Finnish simply uses a compound in the

nominative (*viljavuosi*). Yet, the preposition *for* generally does not correspond to the elative case, but rather to the allative. It seems that, influenced by the English prepositional construction, the writer made use of a so called Finnish elative clause, but changed the word order after the English model. The elative clause always denotes a change that affects the subject: *Minusta tulee opettaja*. (SF) – *I will be / become a teacher*. (E). In Standard Finnish the elative clause always follow the structure: elative + *tulla*-verb in the third person singular (*become*) + subject. When changing the word order of the Finnish example above, it corresponds to a Finnish elative clause (although this example would not make sense in Finnish): *Viljasta ja muusta tulee hyvä vuosi*. This construction semantically corresponds to the English structure (*It will be a good year for the grains and for everything else*). With the change of the word order it also adapts structurally to the English expression.

### 7.3.3. Relative Pronouns / Relative Clauses

Finnish also shows clear interference from English concerning the usage of relative pronouns. Standard Finnish possesses two relative pronouns – *joka* and *mikä*. The relative pronoun *joka* always refers to the preceding word, which can be a noun or a pronoun, and applies to human beings, animals, or things. In contrast to *joka*, the relative pronoun *mikä* always refers to the preceding sentence or clause, and it can refer to a pronoun that points to a thing. Due to its restrictions of use, *mikä* is less frequently used than *joka*. Aside from being a relative pronoun, *mikä* is also a Finnish interrogative pronoun referring to things. The English counterparts *who* and *which* classify as both relative pronouns and interrogative pronouns. Unlike in Finnish, the English relative pronouns clearly refer to either a preceding person (*who*) or thing (*which*). Yet, *which* can also refer to a preceding clause or sentence.

In Finnish, the relative pronouns *joka* and *mikä* seem to function in the English way. Thus *mikä* is always used when referring to a preceding word that denotes a thing just like the English *which*:

*Kiitos kirjeestänne **minkä** sain tänään.* (AF) – *Kiitos kirjeestänne, **jonka** sain tänään.* (SF) – *Thanks for your letter **which** I got today.* (E) (53)

*Sain sen kirjeen **minkä** sinä laitoit* (AF) – *Sain sen kirjeen, **jonka** sinä laitoit* (SF) – *I got the letter **which** you sent* (E) (58)

*kaikkia paikkoja **mitä** näin Suomessa* (AF) – *kaikkia paikkoja, **joita** näin Suomessa* (SF) – *all the places **which** I saw in Finland* (E) (58)

The example show that forms of the relative pronoun *mikä* are used in contexts which require *joka* in Standard Finnish, as the relative pronoun refers to a preceding word and not to a preceding clause. Nevertheless, the use of *mikä* in Finglish directly corresponds to the usage of *which* in English. The English interference is obvious and might even have been reinforced by the fact that *which* and *mikä* are both relative and interrogative pronouns (cf.: **Which** letter did you get? The letter, **which** you sent. (E) – **Mikä** kirje sait? Kirje, **minkä** laitoit. (AF) – **Mikä** kirje sait? Kirje, **jonka** laitoit. (SF)).

Moreover, there seems to be a tendency of confounding *joka* and *mikä*, as both relative pronouns can correspond to the English *which* depending on the grammatical context:

*hän saikin tämän omaisuuden myytyä jo ennen joulua joka oli aivan odottamatonta* (AF) – *hän saikin tämän ominaisuuden myytyä jo ennen joulua, mikä oli aivan odottamatonta* (SF) – *he got that property sold already before Christmas, which was pretty unexpected* (E) (66)

The example illustrates how Finglish makes use of the relative pronoun *joka* although *mikä* would be necessary in Standard Finnish, as the relative pronoun refers back to the preceding sentence. As, apart from *mikä*, *joka* can also equate to the English *which* (when referring to a preceding word), and as most Finglish speakers / writers came from poor educational backgrounds, it is likely that they were not completely aware of the grammatical rules and therefore just chose any equivalent of *which* that came into their mind.

Another point of interference from the English relative pronouns concerns the inflection of the Finglish relative pronouns. As already stated above (cf. p. 52 of this paper), relative pronouns have to be inflected like any other pronouns and nouns in Finnish to convey the appropriate meaning. Since English does not have inflections, English relative pronouns are either combined with a preposition or do not need any specific marker at all in order to express what corresponds to the different Finnish cases. The examples on pp. 48 and 49 already showed one way how the use of English prepositions in relative clauses affected the inflection of Finglish relative pronouns. Further interference especially concerns those cases, where English has no marker to distinguish between singular and plural, whereas Standard Finnish requires different inflections for the different grammatical numbers:

*kirjeet jossa sanoivat* (AF) – *kirjeet, joissa sanoivat* (SF) – *letters in which is said* (E) (26)

*Meidän tutavat joka tulivat* (AF) – *Meidän tutavat, jotka tulivat* (SF) – *Our acquaintances who came* (E) (28)

Both examples show that Finnish uses the relative pronouns in the singular (*jossa, joka*), although they refer to preceding nouns in the plural (*kirjeet* vs. *kirje*, *tuttavat* vs. *tuttava*). This behavior can clearly be traced back to the influence of the English relative pronouns which do not possess a distinct marker for the singular and the plural. Thus, *which* and *who* can be used referring to things / persons in the singular and plural. Finnish merely adopts this model and thus simplifies the usage of relative pronouns.

#### 7.3.4. Question Clauses

Just as the Finnish relative pronouns show interference concerning the marker for the grammatical number, the English language has also influenced the inflection of the Finnish interrogative pronouns in indirect question clauses:

*Olen kirjatatunt kuvien tää ketä ne ovat.* (AF) – *Olen kirjoittanut kuvien takapuolelle keitä niissä on.* (SF) – *I wrote on the backside of the photos who they are / who is on them.* (E) (55)

The example shows that Finnish uses the singular form *ketä* instead of the plural form *keitä* which would be necessary in Finnish. Thus, again, Finnish adopts the English model which does not have a marker to distinguish between a singular and a plural form, but just uses the pronoun *who*.

Interference from English on the Finnish language in North America can also be noticed concerning the syntax of question clauses. In direct questions, Finnish uses the interrogative particles *-ko / -kö* to transform any word into an interrogative, besides interrogative pronouns. These interrogative particles are also used in indirect questions, where they are added to the verb, corresponding to the English structure with the conjunctions *if* and *whether* (cf.: *En tiedä asuuko hän Suomessa.* SF) – *I don't know if he lives in Finland.* (E)).

Finnish adopts the English syntax of indirect questions by introducing the conjunction *jos* which equates to the English *if* in affirmative sentences:

*kysyin niilta jos hän asuu Canadassa* (AF) – *kysyin niiltä asuuko hän Kanadassa* (SF) – *I asked them if he lived in Canada* (E) (6)

*ei hän oikeen ollu varma vielä jos het jautaa tulla sinne Suomeen asti* (AF) – *hän ei oikein vielä ollut varma tulevatko he sinne Suomeen asti* (SF) – *he still hasn't been sure if they'll come to Finland* (E) (39)

In Standard Finnish, it is not possible to use *jos* in indirect question. The agglutinative structure with *-ko / -kö* has to be used. Finnish thus possess two different structures with the same meaning (*if*) in English. The examples illustrate that Finnish annuls this distinction by generally adopting the construction which corresponds directly (structurally) to the English one due to its use of a conjunction (*jos / if*). Thus, compared to Finnish, the Finnish syntax of question clauses is simplified.

Another simplification resulting from the impact of the English language is the general usage of the conjunction *tai*, equating to the English *or*, in Finnish affirmative clauses and in question clauses:

*tai onko Kauko jo heidän vienyt?* (AF) – *vai onko kaukokaipuu jo heidät vienyt?* (SF) – *or has the wanderlust already taken them away?* (E) (8)

Standard Finnish makes a distinction between the conjunctions *tai* and *vai* which both correspond to the English conjunction *or*, but which are used in different contexts. Whereas *tai* is used in affirmative sentences referring to an inclusive *or*, *vai* is employed in question clauses as exclusive *or*. The example points out how Finnish uses *tai* in a context that clearly requires *vai* in Standard Finnish as we deal with a question clause. In the English surroundings this distinction became superfluous and consequently no more specific marker was employed in this kind of question clause, just like in English.

### 7.3.5. Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs

A similarity between English and Finnish is that adverbs are generally formed in both languages by adding a respective suffix (*-ly* (E), *-sti* (SF)) to the adjectives. Nevertheless, both languages have, of course, their own exceptions to this common rule. One of these exceptions in English is that the adverb to the adjective *fast* is also *fast* and not *\*fastly*. Interestingly, this exception is transferred into Finnish:

*aika menee nopeaa* (AF) – *aika menee nopeasti* (SF) – *time goes (by) fast* (8)

*Eiko se aika kulu nopeaa* (AF) – *Eikö aika kuluu nopeasti* (SF) – *Doesn't time go by fast* (10)

*ilmaposti kulkee nopeaa* (AF) – *ilmaposti kulkee nopeasti* (SF) – *airmail goes fast* (E) (56)

*joulu meni [...] liijan nopeaa* (AF) – *joulu meni [...] liian nopeasti* (SF) – *Christmas went by [...] too fast* (E) (14)

The examples show that Finnish uses the adjective *nopea* in contexts which require the adverb *nopeasti* in Standard Finnish as the verbs *mennä*, *kulua* and *kulkea* (all

corresponding to the English *to go (by)*) are modified. Unlike in English, the forming of the adverb to the adjective *nopea* is completely regular. Therefore, the numerous examples clearly illustrate the interference from English.

The corpus also shows an instance where Finglish follows the English rule of using adjectives / adverbs by ignoring a Finnish exception. In Finnish, the adjective *enempi* (*more* (E)) generally stands on its own. In connection with other words, the adverb *enemmän* has to be used: *Vähempi on **enempi**.* (SF) – *Less is **more**.* (E) vs. *Söin **enemmän** puuroa kuin hän.* (SF) – *I ate **more** porridge than he.* (E). Finglish, however, uses *enempi* with nouns, which is, as mentioned above, restricted to the adverb *enemmän*:

*minä tietysti saan **enempi** aikaa kiriottaa joulun jälkeen* (AF) – *minulla tietysti on **enemmän** aikaa kirjoittaa joulun jälkeen* (SF) – *Of course I get **more** time to write after Christmas* (E) (12)

Whereas the example requires the adverb *enemmän* in Standard Finnish, it demands the adjective *more* in English. Finglish goes along with the English construction and accordingly employs the adjective *enempi*.

The word *more* generally constitutes a point of interference as it has several counterparts in Finnish, depending on the context. In Finglish, the context is often neglected and thus any expression corresponding to the English *more* can be used:

*enempi kuin kolme kukauttaa* (AF) – *yli 3 kuukautta sitten* (SF) – *more than 3 months ago* (E) (28)

The Finglish writer of this example chose the adjective *enempi* instead of the adverb *yli* (corresponding to the English expression *more than*), which are both counterparts of the English *more*. Nevertheless, in Standard Finnish, only *yli* would be considered grammatically correct in this context. Apparently, the Finglish writer was no longer conscious of the distinction between the Finnish adjective *enempi* and the adverb *yli*, as English possesses only one counterpart.

### 7.3.6. Case Elision

As already seen above (cf. pp. 55 and 60 of this paper), in connection with the influence from English prepositions, the partitive often is elided in Finglish. Elision occurs quite frequently in Finglish and concerns especially those cases which have no equivalent in English. Therefore, the partitive is not only elided related to prepositions, but also in many other structures that require the partitive in Standard Finnish:

*En oiken muista sinun **veli** ja Elsin **veli nimi** (AF) – En oikein muista sinun **veljeä** ja Elsin **veljen nimeä** (SF) – I don't really remember your **brother** and Elsi's **brother's name** (E) (24)*

*Eihän **se** vielä ole kaikki tehty Tamperrelle asti? (AF) – Eihän **sitä** vielä ole tehty kokonaan Tampereelle asti? (SF) – Is **it** still not all done till Tampere? (E) (8)*

*vielä ymmärrät **English** (AF) – vielä ymmärrät **englantia** (SF) – you still understand **English** (E) (7)*

The first example illustrates how the partitive is left out with regard to the object of the verb *muistaa* which governs the partitive case in Standard Finnish because of the ongoing process it denotes. The Finglish construction thus corresponds to the English one, which does not have any specific markers. Also in the second example, Standard Finnish requires the pronoun *se* to be in the partitive (*sitä*) because of its reference to the incompleteness of the action. With no correspondence in English, the use of the partitive became superfluous in Finglish and led to its elision. The third example shows another tendency of Finglish: Often, when code-switching occurs, the English words are not adapted to the Finnish grammatical system and thus the cases which are necessary in Finnish are elided in Finglish. In Standard Finnish the verb *ymmärtää* governs the partitive. Nevertheless, with the insertion of the English word *English*, the partitive is left out.

Another case which is frequently elided in Finglish is the accusative. In Finnish, all objects always have to be marked – either in the partitive, or in the accusative. English generally has no specific markers for its objects with the exception of the personal pronouns. Hence, it is not surprising that the marking of the accusative object in Finglish often is elided by adopting the English structures:

*panen sinulle **kuva** minusta. (AF) – Panen sinulle **kuvan** minusta. (SF) – I send you a **picture** of me. (E) (1)*

*jos sinä antaisit äitilles **joku rulla** (AF) – jos sinä antaisit äidillesi **jonkun rullan** (SF) – if you would give Mom **some spools** (E) (3)*

*Olemma saanu jo **vastaus** että kaksi on jo tullu perille. (AF) – Olemme saaneet jo **vastauksen**, että kaksi on jo tullut perille. (SF) – We already got the **answer** that two of them have already arrived. (E) (3)*

*olen ajatellut että ostan **se** nyt tänä kevännä (AF) – olen ajatellut että ostan **sen** nyt tänä kevänä (SF) – I've thought that I'll buy **it** now this spring (E) (26)*

*lähetin **se** paketin (AF) – lähetän **sen** paketin (SF) – I sent **that** package (E) (26)*

All of the examples show that no object marking in the accusative takes place in Finglish, although it would be required in Standard Finnish. In the last example the object is only partially marked: The noun *paketti* (*package* (E)) is marked with the accusative (*paketin*), yet the accusative form of the corresponding demonstrative *se* (*that* (E)) is elided.

One peculiarity of Finnish constitute the verbs *pitää* and *tykätä* meaning *to like*, *to be fond of* which both govern the elative case. As the elative has no local meaning in this context, these structures do not have any equivalent in English. Consequently, the elative is frequently left out in English when *pitää* or *tykätä* are used:

*ei se pidä han sitä koulua* (AF) – *hän ei pidä siitä koulusta* (SF) – *he doesn't like this school* (E) (24)

*ettei han pidan [...] rippikoulua* (AF) – *ettei hän pidä [...] rippikoulusta* (SF) – *that he doesn't like [...] the confirmation class* (E) (24)

In the two examples, the corresponding noun phrases to the verb *pitää* are both in the partitive (*sitä koulua*, *rippikoulua*), which is not due to wrongful case government but to the fact that the object in negative clauses always stands in the partitive in Finnish.

Another case which is frequently elided in English is the translative which has no direct equivalent in English:

*pakkaa tulla puoli Engliskaa.* (AF) – *Tahtoo tulla puoliksi englantia.* (SF) – *It tends to get partly in English.* (E) (54)

In Standard Finnish, the translative is generally used to describe a change of state. In this context, the verb *tulla* is often employed. In English, the change of state is expressed with the verb only (*to get*, *to become*, *to turn*). In Finnish, however, this change can only be expressed through the government of the translative. In contrast to Finnish, English ignores the translative after the English model.

English case elision also occurs with the locative cases when writing about American places. English displays a tendency to insert the English place names without adding the respective locatives to the foreign word:

*se otti vaan 2 tuntia mennä minneapolis.* (AF) – *Vei vaan 2 tunti mennä Minneapolisiin* (SF) – *It just takes 2 hours to go Minneapolis.* (E) (4)

*Me asumma 40 mailia Cleveland* (AF) – *Me asumme 40 mailia Clevelandista* (SF) – *We live 40 miles from Cleveland* (E) (6)

*Elma-Lou meinaa mennä ensi syksynä yliopilaaseen Cleveland, Western Reserve Medical College* (AF) – *Elma-Lou meinaa mennä ensi syksynä yliopistoon Clevelandiin, Western Reserve Medical Collegeen* (SF) – *Elma-Lou plans on going to university in Cleveland, at the Western Reserve Medical College* (E) (6)

*Elle asuu Phoenix arizona ja Elsi Chicago Illinois* (AF) – *Elle asuu Phoenixissa, Arizonssa ja Elsi Chicagossa, Illinoisissa* (SF) – *Elle lives in Phoenix, Arizona and Elsi in Chicago, Illinois* (E) (21)

Like English, Finnish uses foreign place names without any grammatical marker. Yet, English expresses the location and direction by means of prepositions. With the elision of the locative cases, which correspond to the English prepositions, Finnish no longer



expresses a location or a direction, but therefore the name of the place remains in the same form as in English.

Just like the partitive example mentioned above (cf. p. 69 of this paper), elision of locative cases takes place in Finglish with regard to code-switching:

*Hän asu siellä tytöin **dormitory**.* (AF) – *Hän asuu siellä tyttöjen **asuntolassa**.* (SF)  
– *She lives there, **in a girls' dormitory**.* (E) (6)

In this example, the English element *dormitory* is directly taken over into Finglish without any grammatical adjustment. Apparently, to some writers the inserted English elements seemed too foreign to adapt them to the Finnish grammatical framework. Therefore case elision occurs.

Moreover, it seems that elision of locative cases also occasionally affected structures without foreign elements:

***Tama kontri** on melkein kaikki hedelmiä ja täälä on lammas farmia kanssa.* (AF) –  
***Tässä maassa** on melkein kaikki hedelmiä ja täällä on myös lammasfarmia.* (SF) –  
***In this country** there are nearly all kind of fruits and there are also sheep farms.*  
(E) (54)

Finglish obviously went along with the English structure *this country* (*tämä kontri*) by leaving out the inessive. Thus no suffix is used to indicate the location. Yet, the Finnish grammatical system does not possess any other equivalent of the English preposition *in*. Due to the elision after the English model, the Finglish sentence does not express a location grammatically.

### 7.3.7. References to Time

Interference from English also affected the indication of time in Finglish. With the two languages being structurally so distinct, the English way of indicating time sometimes differs enormously from the constructions Standard Finnish uses. In many cases, Finglish takes over the English structures, which leads to grammatically unacceptable structures in Standard Finnish:

*keski Tammikuun aikana* (AF) – *tammikuun puolivälissä* (SF) – *during mid-January* (E) (9)

*Eilen tuli **kaksi viikoa** kun olen ollut kotona* (AF) – *Eilen tuli **kaksi viikkoa kuluneeksi** kun olen ollut kotona* (SF) – *Yesterday it has been **two weeks** that I have been at home* (E) (58)

*Vuosi viime joulukuukautta* (AF) – *Viime vuoden joulukuussa* (SF) – *A year ago last December* (E) (45)

The first example illustrates how Finglish adopts the English structure within the Finnish grammatical framework. The expression *mid-January* is taken over with the aid of the prefix *keski-* (*keski tammikuu*). The preposition *during* is expressed with its direct counterpart *aikana*. The Finglish structure differs from the English one only in as far as the necessary genitive structure and thus a different word order are kept from Finnish. In contrast to Finglish, Standard Finnish has its own expression equating to the English *during mid-month-structure* or *in the middle of-month-structure*: month in the genitive + *puolivälissä* (*puoli* (SF) – *half* (E), *väli* (SF) – *distance, interval* (E)).

Although the English and the Finnish structures in the second example are pretty similar, the Finglish construction would be considered incorrect in Standard Finnish. In order to express that until that point in time two weeks have passed by, Finnish necessitates the construction with *tulla kuluneeksi* (*tulla* (SF) – *to come* (E), *kulua* (SF) – *to pass by* (E)). Thus the Standard Finnish construction conveys the following meaning: *Yesterday the point in time came when two weeks had passed by during which I have been at home*. Even if the English and the Standard Finnish structure differ only in one word, *kuluneeksi* is indispensable to convey the appropriate meaning. This indispensability is annulled in Finglish so that the Finglish structure corresponds one-to-one to the English one.

In the third example, the writer tried to emulate the English clause *a year ago last Christmas* by transferring the syntax into Finglish. Finglish thus has the same word order as English, although the writer did not make use of the word *sitten* which corresponds to the English *ago*. Unlike Finglish, Standard Finnish requires an agglutinative structure literally meaning *in last year's December*.

Moreover, when the English reference to time is transferred into Finglish, elision of grammatical cases can occur:

*Elaine on nyt toinen vuosi yliopilassa.* (AF) – *Elaine on nyt toista vuotta yliopistossa.* (SF) – *Elaine is now in her second year at university.* (E) (6)

The example shows that Finglish uses the expression *toinen vuosi* in the nominative, thus going along with the English *second year*. The partitive, which is required in Standard Finnish because of the ongoing process (the second year has not yet been completed) is omitted. Nevertheless, English still uses a preposition for which Finglish has no equivalent when the grammatical case is elided. It seems that, just as with the elision of locative cases, in Finglish, it does not matter if a sentence is grammatically incomplete, as long as it is structurally close to its English counterpart.

Sometimes Finglish invents own expressions within the Finnish grammar by emulating an English expression:

*Tässä **toisella viikolla** laitoin paketit (AF) – **Muutama viikkoa sitten** laitoin paketit (SF) – **The other week** I sent the packages (E) (36)*

Finglish uses the adjective *toinen*, corresponding to the English *other*, to express semantically the same content as in English. Furthermore, Finglish makes use of the adessive which is, as previously explained (cf. chapter 7.3.2.6.), frequently used to indicate time. Although the expression *toisella viikolla* is grammatically correct in Standard Finnish, it is semantically unintelligible. In this context, Finnish makes use of a structure corresponding to the English *some weeks ago*, as it does not possess an expression that corresponds semantically to the English *the other week*.

Many English references to time consist of several words composed to one fixed expression. Finglish sometimes ignores these compositions and only takes over a part of them:

*käyn koulua **nykyaikoina** (AF) – käyn koulua **tällä hetkellä** (SF) – I go to school **at present** (E) (7)*

The example shows that the Finglish writer chose the expression *nykyaika* emulating the English *at present*. Yet, the word *nykyaika* is the equivalent of the English *present* in the sense of *modern times*. The expression *at present*, however, corresponds to the Finnish expression *tällä hetkellä*. As prepositions do not play an important role in Finnish, the Finglish writer possibly neglected the preposition *at* when transferring the expression *at present* into Finglish and therefore chose an equivalent which has a totally different meaning in Standard Finnish.

Since the English and the Finnish expressions of indicating time are so different, it seems that the Finglish writers got confused with the numerous Finnish references to time:

*en ole nyt aivan **nykysin** kuullu (AF) – en ole nyt aivan **viime aikoina** kuullut (SF) – I haven't heard (from him) now **recently** (E) (40)*

In the example, the writer uses the word *nykysin* corresponding to the English *nowadays*, *today* instead of the expression *viime aikoina* which is the equivalent of the English *recently*, *lately* and which is necessary in the context of the example. Surrounded by the English language without any new input from Standard Finnish, Finglish speakers apparently became confused with the Finnish references to time and their counterparts in English.

### 7.3.8. Insertion of Articles

One main difference between English and Finnish are articles, which play a big role in English, but do not exist in Finnish. It seems that due to the frequent appearance of the article *the* in English, Finglish emulates the English structure by inserting the pronoun *se*. Although *se* functions as a demonstrative pronoun in Standard Finnish, in Finglish it is used in contexts which do not require a demonstrative and in which English would use an article:

*Joko se uusi tie teidän ohi on valmistunut?* (AF) – *Joko uusi tie teidän ohitsenne on valmistunut?* (SF) – *Is the new street past your house already done?* (E) (8)

*kun se Maakunta Kuoro tulee* (AF) – *kun maakunta kuoro tulee* (SF) – *when the countryside choir comes* (E) (59)

*siksi meillä oli se alku kesä hyvin* (AF) – *koska meillä oli hyvä alkukesä* (SF) – *because the beginning of summer was good* (E) (63)

All of the examples show how Finglish inserts the pronoun *se* before its nouns as a definite article corresponding to the English article *the* in contexts where Standard Finnish requires the noun only.

Moreover, it looks like Finglish, overuses the pronoun *se* as a definite article when emulating the English use of articles. Thus *se* is inserted before certain nouns which do not stand with a definite article in English:

*Eiko se aika kulu nopeaa* (AF) – *Eikö aika kuluu nopeasti* (SF) – *Doesn't time go by fast* (E) (10)

*vaikka se kevät pitkitteli* (AF) – *vaikka kevät pitkitteli* (SF) – *although spring lasted so long* (10)

The expressions *time* and *spring* are both abstract nouns and therefore do not stand with the definite article. The Finglish writer, however, used the pronoun *se* as an article, although it would neither be used in English, nor in Standard Finnish. With a linguistic background that does not know any articles, it is not surprising that Finglish speakers got confused with the usage of articles in English contexts, which explains the exaggeration of *se* as article.

### 7.3.9. Case Government

Due to the different grammatical constructions of English and Finnish, the English language generally had a big impact on the Finglish case government, not only with regard

to prepositions (cf. chapter 7.3.2.5.). Compared to English, Finnish possesses a very complex system of case distinctions. In the English surroundings these distinctions became unnecessary in some contexts. Hence, Finnish case government tends to simplify the complex case system by adapting to the English structures and replacing especially those cases which do not have equivalents in English. Therefore, Finnish case government can be considered a mode of adaptation to the new surroundings and not a wrongful application.

Standard Finnish makes a distinction between five different infinitives. Although the first infinitive generally corresponds to the English infinitive, some Finnish verbs govern the third infinitive which has no direct equivalent in English. Oriented towards the English structures, these verbs govern the first infinitive in Finnish:

*kun suomen kieli **pakkaa olla** niin kankiaa minulle (AF) – kun suomen kieli **pakkaa olemaan** niin kankea minulle (SF) – as the Finnish language **tends to be** so awkward to me (E) (3)*

*minä **pystys** enään niin pitkiä matkaa **kulkia** (AF) – minä en **pystyisi** enää **tekemään** niin pitkä matka (SF) – I am not **able** any more **to make** such a long trip (E) (39)*

The examples show how Finnish emulates the English infinitive structure by using the first infinitive (*olla, kulkia*) instead of the third infinitive (*olemaan, tekemään*). The change of government seems a logical step of adaptation to the English surroundings where no equivalent to the third Finnish infinitive exists.

Also the different ways of indicating a location in English and in Finnish had an impact on the Finnish case government. As stated above (cf. chapter 7.3.2.2.) Finnish makes a distinction between three inner locative cases which are frequently expressed with different prepositions (*in, to, from*) in English. Nevertheless, in certain structures indicating a location English employs a gerund and thus does not need a preposition, whereas Finnish still needs to govern the corresponding locative case to convey the appropriate meaning:

*hyvät lapset, jotka **ovat** paikalla **antamaan** apua (AF) – hyvät lapset, jotka **ovat** paikalla **antamassa** apua (SF) – good children who **are** around **giving** help (E) (45)*

In Standard Finnish, the verb *olla* governs the inessive (*antamassa*) when indicating a location as it answers the question where something is. In the Finnish example, the writer chose the illative (*antamaan*) which would indicate the direction to which something / somebody goes. In English, both structures can be expressed with the gerund. Only a different verb is necessary (cf.: *good children who **come** around **giving** help (E) – hyvät lapset, jotka **tulevat antamaan** apua (SF)*). As the English constructions do not make a

distinction between the place and direction where an action takes place, the rules of Finnish locative case government became flexible so that its forms became mutually exchangeable.

Moreover, some Finnish constructions indicate a location, whereas their English counterparts display different structures that are only semantically similar. In these cases, Finnish verbs govern those cases which are close to the English expressions by ignoring the locatives:

*olimme justiin muuttanut taloa* (AF) – *olimme juuri muuttaneet uuteen taloon* (SF)  
– *we had just moved **house*** (E) (10)

The Finnish construction shows a direct translation of the English expression *to move house*. In Finnish the verb *muuttaa* (*to move*) can only be used with the illative or allative, thus always indicating the direction of the movement. In Finnish, *muuttaa* governs the partitive – probably to indicate that a process is going on. Although English does not know partitive constructions, the Finnish structure is semantically and structurally much more similar to the English one than it would be when governing a locative.

As English does not have any structure equating the Finnish partitive, it is not surprising that many changes in Finnish case government concern those verbs that normally require the partitive case:

*Karen kansa tykä [...] autaa minun siivoa.* (AF) – *Karenkin tykkää [...] auttaa minua siivoamaan.* (SF) – *Karen likes [...] to help **me** cleaning.* (E) (22)

*Äiti on muistutanut minun kirjota* (AF) – *Äiti on muistuttanut minua kirjoittamaan* (SF) – *Mum has reminded **me** to write* (E) (13)

Although the verbs *auttaa* (*to help*) and *muistaa* (*to remind*) govern the partitive in Standard Finnish, Finnish orients itself towards the direct object of the English phrase and thus demands the accusative.

In Finnish, the meaning of the verb can be determined by the case it governs. Thus, Finnish sometimes employs one verb which governs different cases to convey what English expresses with two different verbs. For instance, when the verb *antaa* is used with the allative, it corresponds to the English *to give something to somebody*. In contrast, when employed with the genitive + infinitive, *antaa* equates the English *to let, to allow*. Whereas in Standard Finnish the government of the grammatical case of *antaa* is crucial for conveying the appropriate meaning, Finnish makes a generalization of the more frequent *antaa* + allative structure so that this structure can express two meanings:

*Annoimme kaikille Joulu vieraille vähän maistaa Suomen suklaatia.* (AF) – *Anoimme kaikkien jouluvieraiden vähän maistaa suomalaista suklaata.* (SF) – *We let all Christmas guests taste some Finnish chocolate.* (E) (9)

*annan sinulle tietää* (AF) – *annan sinun tietää* (SF) – *I let you know* (E) (39)

The Finglish writers made use of the allative but with the meaning of the genitive + infinitive structure. This generalization led to a simplification of the complex Finnish case government, which was more suitable for the new linguistic surroundings.

Unlike in English, not only verbs affect case government in Finnish, but also some Finnish nouns govern certain cases. Changes in Finglish government occur according to the corresponding English structures:

*Se on paljon huolta minulle* (AF) – *Siitä on paljon huolta minulle* (SF) – *It means a lot of worries for me* (E) (19)

The noun *huoli* (*worry*) governs the relative (*siitä*) in Standard Finnish. In Finglish, however, it employs the nominative (*se*) so that it corresponds to the English structure with a dummy subject (*it*). Thus, through the change of government in Finglish, a subject is introduced in a sentence that would be subjectless otherwise. By using the nominative instead of the relative, the Finglish construction corresponds structurally to the English one.

Sometimes, in Finnish, several words (e.g. a verb and a postposition) which govern different dependents happen to be in one phrase so that the government of the one word blocks the government of the other word. In Standard Finnish, the case government of the verb generally has priority over the government of postpositions. In Finglish, however, it seems that the more frequently appearing expression takes precedence:

*vain naureskellessa kaikkien noiden kärsimysten tähden* (AF) – *vain naureskellessa kaikkille noille kärsimykselle tähden* (SF) – *just sneering because of all those sufferings* (E) (11)

In Standard Finnish, the verb *naureskella* (*to sneer*) governs the allative. It is not a verb that occurs with high frequency in everyday speech. In contrast, the postposition *tähden* (*because of*) requiring the genitive is frequently used in Finnish. Normally the allative case, governed by the verb *naureskella* would take priority over the genitive demanded by *tähden*. Yet, as Finglish was isolated from Standard Finnish, it is only logical that it relies on the more frequently-occurring structure which is consequently more present in the speaker's consciousness. Moreover, in the English phrase the verb obviously cannot govern any case, but a preposition is used. Therefore, by giving priority of government to the postposition, the Finglish speaker underlines the structural proximity to the English sentence.

### 7.3.10. Regularization

As many of the interferences mentioned above illustrate, Finnish is inclined to simplify the complex Finnish grammatical system by annulling certain Finnish distinctions and generalizing grammatical processes. This simplification also includes a regularization of irregular forms. The corpus shows several instances where the *t*-accusative of the personal pronouns was replaced with the regular *n*-accusative:

*tai onko Kauko jo heidän vieny? (AF) – vai onko kaukokaipuu jo heidät vieny? (SF) – or has the wanderlust already taken them away? (E) (8)*

*jos sitten pieninä paloina hänen sieltä tuodaan takaisin kuin kaatuu (AF) – jos sitten hänet sieltä tuodaan pieninä paloina takaisin jos sattuu kaatumaan. (SF) – if then he'll be brought back from there in little pieces if he falls (E) (9)*

*han vie minun meidän vaunussa kotia (AF) – hän vie minut meidän autolla kotiin (SF) – he brings me home in our car (E) (29)*

In the examples, the pronouns *heidän*, *hänen*, and *minun* actually all take the form of the genitive. So, one could think that the examples are instances of changing case government from the Standard Finnish accusative to the genitive. Nonetheless, there is no reasonable explanation why the verbs *viedä* and *tuoda* should govern the genitive case in Finnish.

Yet, when having a look at the Finnish accusative forms, another explanation seems more logical. Finnish accusative objects are generally marked with the case suffix *-n*. Besides this *n*-accusative, the *t*-suffix is used to form the plural accusative and the accusative of the personal pronouns. Furthermore, rarely an unmarked accusative is used (which is not addressed here, as no instances of interference were found). The *t*-accusative of the personal pronouns thus is a peculiarity of Finnish. Within the English surroundings, where grammatical cases do not play a role, Finnish seems to strive for more regularity of its forms. With the *n*-accusative being the common form of accusative objects, it seems more likely that the examples above show a regularization process of the accusative forms. The exceptional *t*-forms of the personal pronouns were apparently replaced with the regular *n*-forms, which helped to simplify the application of the accusative.

### 7.3.11. Word Order

In contrast to English, Finnish has a rather free word order, which means that the word order can change according to the emphasis that is intended. Yet, the general word order of English and Finnish in basic clauses is S-V-O (subject-verb-object). As soon as a basic



clause contains an adverbial, the English word order normally differs from the Finnish one. In Finnish the word order usually follows the structure SVAO (subject-verb-adverbial-object) or sometimes SVOA (especially with adverbs of place). In English, the word order varies greatly according to the type of adverb / adverbial that is used. Interference in Finnish arises especially when English takes the SVOA structure (for example with linking adverbs or adverbs of time), whereas Standard Finnish needs SVAO:

*Kirjoitin hänelle ja annoin kaikki uutiset sinun kirjeestä **myös**.* (AF) – *Kirjoitin hänelle ja annoin **myös** kaikki uutiset sinun kirjeestä.* (SF) – *I wrote him and gave him all news from your letter **as well**.* (E) (9)

*ja täällä on lammas farmia **kanssa*** (AF) – *ja täällä on **myös** lammas-farmia* (SF) – *and there are sheep farms, **too*** (E) (54)

*Meidän nuorin tyttö meni ilmalaivalla Detroit **viimme keväänä**.* (AF) – *Meidän nuorin tyttö meni **viime keväänä** lentokonella Detroitiin.* (SF) – *Our youngest daughter went to Detroit by airplane **last year**.* (E) (6)

*Hän saa hanen lupakirja **pian*** (AF) – *Hän saa **pian** lupakirjansa* (SF) – *He gets his license **soon*** (E) (29)

The examples show that the different Finnish writers adopted the English word order SVOA in contexts requiring the SVAO-structure in Standard Finnish. Whereas English adverbials of time, such as *last year* and *soon*, and linking adverbs, such as *too* and *as well*, are usually found in end position, their Finnish counterparts *viime keväänä*, *pian*, and *myös* generally stand after the conjugated verb. Thus, in those cases, where the English word order differs from the Finnish one, Finnish adjusts to the English structure.

Finnish has numerous types of sentences with no direct counterparts in English. These types of sentences are each characterized by a special and fixed word order. In English, those special types of sentences apparently became lost and the English sentence structure generally takes over. With the impact of English on the Finnish language in North America it was increasingly difficult to keep up the peculiarities of Finnish.

One special type of Finnish sentences is the relative clause, which always manifests a change of state. Its typical word order follows the structure AVS with the adverbial in the relative case. English has no structural equivalent of this sentence type. In contrast to the Finnish relative structure, the change of state is expressed with the verb only. Thus, English displays a typical SVC (subject-verb-complement)-structure. Finnish merely adopts the English word order:

***ne** tuli niin pehmosia ja hyviä.* (AF) – ***Niistä** tuli niin pehmosia ja hyviä.* (SF) – ***They** got so soft and good* (E) (17)

Interestingly, by changing the word order to the English SVC-structure, Finglish not only annuls the relative clause, but consequently also changes its subject (from *pehmosia ja hyviä* to *ne*). The Standard Finnish adverbial hence develops into the subject of the Finglish sentence.

Another particular type of sentence in Finnish is the generic clause which typically has no subject as either anybody could be the agent of the action or the action cannot be controlled by anybody (e.g. weather). Its word order is AVP (adverb-verb-predicative) with the adverbial being an adverbial of time or place. As English sentences always need a subject, the English structure that is used to express a corresponding content is SVPA. Finglish again, takes over the English structure and consequently introduces a subject:

*se on oiken laamin ulkona* (AF) – *ulkona on oikein lämmin* (SF) – *it's really warm outside* (E) (29)

Parallel to the English construction, Finglish makes use of a dummy subject (*se*) to be able to emulate the English word order. By doing so, the generic clause gets eliminated.

The corpus also shows an instance where a generic sentence is only partially changed and no subject is introduced:

*Oli viime kuussa aika lämpimiä päiviä.* (AF) – *Viime kuussa oli aika lämpimiä päiviä.* (SF) – *There were pretty warm days last month.* (E) (15)

The English equivalent of the Finglish sentence constitutes a typical existential clause with the dummy subject *there*. In the Finglish sentence, the generic clause with its AVP structure was annulled by changing the order of the adverbial (*viime kuussa* (*last month*)) and the verb (*oli* (*was*)). Thus, by placing the verb before the adverbial, Finglish parallels the English existential clause, although no subject is introduced. This might be due to the fact that, in contrast to the dummy subject *it* (*se*), there is no direct equivalent of the dummy subject *there*. So, by changing the position of the verb, the writer possibly wanted to equate the English *there is*. Interestingly, the writer did not change the position of the adverbial and the predicative to the English word order. Thus the structure corresponds only partly to the English SVPA. Yet, one has to keep in mind that Finglish developed out of a language contact situation with no set of fixed rules or uniformity, which might explain the mixture of English and Finnish word order in this case.

### 7.3.12. Influence from English Sentence Structures

Not only did English influence the elimination of certain Finnish types of sentences, but it also led to an imposition of certain English sentence structures. As already seen above (cf. p. 74 of this paper), the English and the Finnish use of infinitive structures differ greatly. Moreover English often uses gerund structures which are alien to Finnish and can only sometimes be translated with the third infinitive. The infinitive and gerund structures especially caused interference in Finglish and led to the rise of a new syntax which would not be accepted in Standard Finnish.

Finnish does not possess a grammatical structure which directly corresponds to the English gerund, although it can frequently be translated with the third infinitive in Standard Finnish (cf.: *I go **swimming*** (E) – *Menen **uimaan*** (SF)). Yet, not all gerund structures correspond to the third infinitive in Finnish. Finglish shows a tendency to use the third infinitive in contexts which require the gerund in English, but which necessitate different constructions in Standard Finnish:

*ne olivat hyviä **hyppään***. (AF) – *He olivat **hyviä** / He **hyppäsivät hyvin***. (SF) – *They were **good at jumping***. (E) (1)

*min on nin huono Suomallainen **kirjoittaman***. (AF) – ***Osaan kirjoittaa suomeksi niin huonosti***. (SF) – *I'm so **bad at writing** in Finnish*. (E) (24)

The Finglish examples show clear interference from the English structure *to be good / bad at + gerund*. Standard Finnish does not have a similar structure at its disposal. Therefore, in the first example, Finnish can only express that the ski jumpers *were good* or that they *jumped well*. In the second example, Finnish has to make use of a different verb (*osata – to know (how) / can*) to express a semantic content similar to the English expression. Finglish apparently allows a new syntax after the English gerund-model: *olla (to be) + hyvä / huono (good / bad) + third infinitive*.

The corpus also displays an instance where Finglish makes use of a first infinitive following an English gerund structure:

*Ei ole yöllä ollu vielä **vorkia*** (AF) – *Ei vielä ollut yöllä **päällä***. (SF) – *It still hasn't been **working at night***. (E) (44)

The example illustrates that Finglish allows constructions of verb (preferably *olla (to be)*) + infinitive (first or third) to correspond structurally and semantically to English gerund structures, whereas Standard Finnish can only express a similar semantic content with a structure of its own: The heating has not been **on** (*päällä*).

Finglish does not only use the infinitive following English gerund structures, but also in the style of English infinitive constructions:

*Arvo ja mieheni Antero ovat saaneet enimmän sairauksista kärsiä.* (AF) – *Arvo ja mieheni Antero ovat kärsineet enemmän sairauksista.* (SF) – *Arvo and my husband Antero got to suffer from more diseases.* (E) (11)

The writer has clearly been influenced by the English structure *to get to suffer from something*. In Standard Finnish it is not possible to employ a structure with *saada* (to get) + infinitive. In contrast, the verb *saada* is superfluous and the verb *kärsiä* is sufficient to convey the appropriate meaning. Finglish, however, directly takes over the English structure and thus expands its syntax following the English infinitive construction.

### 7.3.13. Morphological Changes

The corpus at hand displays morphological changes especially with regard to consonant gradation, noun declension, and verb conjugation. In Finnish when one of the plosives [k p t] is at the onset of the ultima in a stem and the syllable is closed by suffixation, [k p t] undergo consonant gradation. In the process of a qualitative consonant gradation from the strong to the weak grade, [t] and [k] frequently change to their voiced counterparts [d] and [g] which do not appear in Finnish words otherwise and are thus considered to be rather alien. In Finglish [t] and [k] are often retained in words which would require a gradation to the weak form in Standard Finnish: *äitille* pro *äidille* (SF nominative: *äiti*, E: *mother* (3)), *en tietä* pro *en tiedä* (SF infinitive: *tietää*, E: *to know* (56)), *kaupunkillen* pro *kaupungille* (SF nominative: *kaupunki*, E: *city* (55)), *kenkät* pro *kengät* (SF nominative: *kenkä*, E: *shoe* (62)).

Moreover, Finnish words ending on *-e* undergo a reverse consonant gradation process from the weak to the strong grade, with [k] and [t] frequently changing to [kk] and [tt]. In these cases, Finglish tends to maintain the weak form: *lääkeet* pro *lääkkeet* (SF nominative: *lääke*, E: *medicine*, (65)), *osoiteen* pro *osoitteen* (SF nominative: *osoite*, E: *address*, (65)).

The declension of words ending on *-e* generally seems to be affected by change in Finglish. Unlike other words ending for example on *-a*, *-o*, or *-u*, where the stem equally ends with the corresponding letter, the stem of this type of words ends on *-ee* and not just on *-e* (cf: *talo* – *talon* (E: *house*), *hame* – *hameen* (E: *skirt*)). Finglish seems to simplify the

declension by sticking to the single *-e*: *kirjesta* pro *kirjeestä* (SF nominative: *kirje*, E: *letter*, (19)).

Morphological changes can also be observed concerning words ending on *-i* but having an *e*-stem. It is likely that in many cases the *e*-stem was either not recognized or the *i*-stem declination was applied for reasons of simplification: *Suomia* pro *Suomea* (SF nominative: *Suomi*, E: *Finland*, (56)), *korttia* pro *kortteja* (SF nominative: *kortti*, E: *card*, (2)).

Furthermore, with so many different types of nouns, Finnish Americans sometimes confused certain declension forms: *sydän halvaudeen* pro *sydänhalvaukseen* (SF nominative: *sydänhalvaus*, E: *heartstroke*, (54)). In this case, instead of using the *us*-declension with the stem being *ukse*, the writer applied the declension of nouns ending on *-uus* with the stem being *-uude*.

Further confusion arose regarding the gradation of certain adjectives, which is often highly irregular in Finnish: *pisimpi* pro *pidempi* (SF adjective: *pitkä*, E: *tall*, (66)). In this case, the Finnish writer made use of a comparative form on the basis of the Finnish superlative form of *pitkä*: *pisin* (*the tallest*).

In regard to Finnish verb conjugations, especially the verb *olla* (*to be*) was affected by morphological changes. In Finnish, *olla* is an irregular verb as the forms of the third person singular and plural differ from those of the other persons: *olen*, *olet*, *on*, *olemme*, *ollette*, *ovat*. Finnish displays a tendency to regularize the conjugation of *olla*:

*kankas [...] ole* niin kaunista (AF) – *kangas [...] on* niin kaunista (SF) – *the fabric [...] is so pretty* (E) (2)

*kintaat [...] olevat* saman värisiä (AF) – *kintaat [...] ovat* samanvärisiä (SF) – *the gloves [...] are identical in colour* (E) (9)

By replacing *on* with *ole* and *ovat* with *olevat*, the complex Finnish morphosyntax was once more simplified in Finnish.

Especially when negated, Finnish verbs are often conjugated after the English model with all persons receiving the same form which is, in Finnish, taken from the third person singular:

*ei he saanut* (AF) – *he eivät saaneet* (SF) – *they didn't get* (E) (9)

*ei me ole vielä käyny* (AF) – *emme ole vielä käyneet* (SF) – *we haven't gone there yet* (E) (62)

Although less common, this phenomenon can also be observed when no negation takes place: *he asuu* pro *he asuvat* (E: *to live*, (57)), *het jautaa* pro *he joutavat* (E: *to make it*,

(39)). Hence, conjugation in Finglish constitutes another step of regularization and thus also of simplification.

The corpus shows also numerous instances where possessive suffixes, which would be required in Standard written Finnish, are left out so that the structure resembles the English one:

*Kenneti katkaisi hänen jalka* (AF) – *Kenneti katkaisi hänen jalkansa* (SF) – *Kenneti broke his leg* (E) (28)

*Emma tati myö hanen tallon* (AF) – *Emma tätti myö hänen talonsa* (SF) – *Aunt Emma sells her house* (E) (41)

*ja sinun toinen veli* (AF) – *ja sinun toinen veljesi* (SF) – *and your other brother* (E) (2)

It is debatable whether or not this phenomenon can be ascribed to influence from the English language. Whereas Mencken states that the impact from English on Finnish led to the decay of possessive suffixes (1936: 677), Sahlman argues that “the same process seems to take place in Finland” and that a rather poor educational background might have caused the omission (1949: 17-18). Indeed, especially in spoken Finnish the omission of possessive suffixes has become very common so that this general tendency might have influenced the linguistic choices of the writers. Moreover, the fact that many Finnish Americans were educationally not well-versed in the Finnish language possibly had an impact on the elision of possessive suffixes in written Finglish. Yet, the high frequency with which the omission occurs in Finglish argues for the fact that the English way of indicating a possession has, at least to a certain extent, influenced the Finglish decay of possessive suffixes.

#### 7.4. English Interference Concerning Specific Written Features

Due to its written form, my corpus of Finglish still displays a supplementary level of interference which includes features, such as capitalization, expressions written as one or two words, and accentuation through quotation marks. The material at hand shows English interference concerning all of these specific written features.

##### 7.4.1. Capitalization

In Finnish all words except for proper nouns (such as countries, cities, and names) are uncapitalized. The English capitalization rules, however, differ from the Finnish ones, and

apparently the Finnish capitalization of certain types of words has affected the Finglish writing:

*jälkeen Joulun* (AF) – *joulun jälkeen* (SF) – *after Christmas* (E) (26)

*keski Tammikuun aikana* (AF) – *tammikuun puolivälissä* (SF) – *during mid-January* (E) (9)

*hän oppi Englannin niin pian* (AF) – *hän oppi englantia niin pian* (SF) – *he learnt English so fast* (E) (65)

*Suomen suklaatia* (AF) – *suomalaista suklaata* (SF) – *Finnish chocolate* (E) (9)

In English church festivals or bank holidays, the name of months, languages, and adjectives referring to nationalities are all capitalized. Finglish obviously took over this capitalization to a certain extent.

#### 7.4.2. Compounds Written as one or two Words

Many expressions are often written in two words in English, but in one word in Standard Finnish. Finglish tends to adopt the English way of writing these expressions:

*kiitos Joulu kortin Etestä* (AF) – *kiitos joulukortista* (SF) – *thanks for the Christmas card* (E) (42)

*Minä tykkään suksi hypyystä.* (AF) – *Minä tykkään mäkihypyystä.* (SF) – *I like ski jumping.* (E) (1)

*työ maa* (AF) – *työmaa* (SF) – *building site* (E) (8)

*juveli kaupassa* (AF) – *kultasepäliikeessä* (SF) – *in a jewelry shop* (E) (8)

All of the examples show that Finglish follows the English way of writing certain compound words as two words instead of the Finnish way of writing the compounds as one word.

#### 7.4.3. Accentuation through Quotation Marks

Some of the Finglish writers made use of quotation marks to mark English elements in their letters:

*vieras “runni”* (AF) – *vieras joukko* (SF) – *guest run* (E) (38)

*Minun Suomi on vain “joka-päiväästä”.* (AF) – *Minun suomi on vain arkipäivästä.* (SF) – *My Finnish is only everyday Finnish.* (E) (49)

The examples show that the writers were conscious about using English loan words. It seems that the quotation marks were used to indicate that they did not know the

corresponding Standard Finnish expressions, and therefore they wanted to call for their addressees' attention when reading the passages.

## **8. Conclusion**

This survey on Finglish, has illustrated how English, as an isolating language, influenced the agglutinative Finnish language system. During the ongoing localization process of English in the Finnish communities within the socially English-marked North American surroundings, a distinct language phenomenon emerged, namely Finglish. Although Finglish predominantly emerged in spoken language, the numerous emigrant letters account for its equal appearance in written language and they give insight into the linguistic choices of Finnish Americans. Only after analyzing spoken and written Finglish, it is possible to make substantiated assumptions of the rootedness of this phenomenon in the awareness of the speakers.

In comparison to spoken Finglish, my corpus of written Finglish displays only minor lexical interference from English, although the semantic and morphosyntactic interference is equally high. These findings contradict the view of researchers, such as Karttunen and Moore, who argue that Finglish is not characterized by morphosyntactic changes, but by the mere insertion of a large amount of English lexical items in the Finnish language (cf. Karttunen & Moore 1974: 4). Most of the English borrowings were adapted to the Finnish morphological and phonological system, and could therefore easily be integrated into the Finnish grammatical framework by declination, inflection and conjugation. Only a few instances of code-switching, with English lexical items standing unintegrated within Finnish sentences, could be found. The high discrepancy between lexical interference in spoken and written Finglish can be explained with the characteristics of emigrant letters and the language awareness of the writers. On the one hand, the letters reflect written norms, and therefore, clearly English lexical items entered less spontaneously than in spoken language as the writers thought more about their choice of words. On the other hand, the writers' awareness that their language differed to some extent from the standard language in Finland influenced the linguistic choice in the letters. In order to make themselves understood by relatives and friends in Finland, Finnish Americans had to focus on the standard language as common means of communication. Hence, it is logical that lexical items, which could clearly be identified as English by the writers, were avoided to guarantee a success in communication. Moreover, in some case



where the writers could not avoid English lexical items, they marked them with quotation marks in order to indicate that they did not know the appropriate Finnish expressions.

The fact that Finnish Americans were able to eliminate English lexical items from their writings for the most part, whereas they were obviously incapable of avoiding semantic and morphosyntactic interference, shows that certain characteristics of Finglish were deeply rooted in the subconsciousness of the writers. Thus, Finnish Americans apparently were either not conscious of their grammar and expressions differing from the Standard Finnish counterparts, or they were aware of certain differences, but were incapable of applying the Standard Finnish grammar which was alien to them. Against this background it is also clear that Finglish cannot be considered as incorrect mastery of the Finnish language. On the contrary, it should be seen as a language phenomenon emerging from an adaptation process and having its own set of linguistic rules which enabled the speakers to express what was appropriate in the new environment.

Connected to the occurrence of lexical interference is semantic interference based on lexical specimens. Hence, spoken Finglish displays enormous interference built upon English lexical items, whereas written Finglish shows only very few instances of this type of semantic interference. Another difference constitutes semantic interference with swear words and expletives, which are typical of spoken language due to their spontaneous and colloquial character, and can therefore be frequently observed in spoken Finglish. In written Finglish this type of interference is more or less inexistent. However, written Finglish shows various English salutations which are typically used in letters. Concerning semantic interference of Finnish forms with English idiomatic content owing to literal translations, the findings in spoken and written Finglish seem to be equally high and even same examples could be found (for example expressions with the verb *ottaa*, cf. pp. 27 and 41 of this paper). The corpus of written Finglish additionally contains semantic interference from English words with two Finnish counterparts, which has not been mentioned by researchers for spoken Finglish. In those cases, a shift of meaning frequently occurs during which the one Finnish word additionally takes on the semantic content of the other word. Consequently, the word with the additional meaning receives the same meaning as its English counterpart and can be used in the same semantic contexts.

The findings of morphosyntactic interference from English on written Finglish generally correspond to the findings on spoken Finglish. Above all, interference from the English use of prepositions and adverbs can be observed. Moreover, in both varieties of Finglish interference from English led, among others, to case elision, changes in case

government and in the usage of relative pronouns, and to the introduction of a formal subject. Morphological changes in spoken and written Finglish mainly concern consonant gradation, declension, and verb conjugations. One important grammatical aspect in which spoken Finglish differs from written Finglish is the use of the passive voice. Whereas spoken Finglish displays a strong impact from English passive structures, which Sahlman-Karlsson even considers the most striking morphosyntactic change in Finglish (cf. p. 29 of this paper and Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 106), my corpus of written Finglish does not contain one single instance of interference from the English passive voice. Given that grammatical changes take place only slowly and therefore do not occur that frequently, my material displays not only numerous instances of morphosyntactic interference, but also a wide range of different points of interference from the insertion of articles over a change in word order to new sentence structures. The findings clearly show a tendency towards regularization and simplification. Apparently, it was too difficult and in certain contexts also superfluous to keep up the complex Finnish grammatical framework with its numerous cases and complicated inflections, declensions, and conjugations. Simplifying the Finnish grammar by taking over certain English aspects was an unconscious, but successful mechanism to keep the own language alive in the English environment. It is likely that the Finnish language would have been extinguished quickly in the English-speaking surroundings due to its high degree of difference if it had not been changed to make it suitable for the new environment.

Because of its written form, my corpus still displays an additional level of interference concerning specific written features which can obviously not be found in spoken Finglish. It could be observed that capitalization rules shifted from Finnish to English rules in Finglish. Hence, Finglish writers tended to capitalize languages, nationalities, festivals, and months after the English model. Furthermore, in those cases, where a compound is written as two words in English, but only as one word in Finnish, Finglish goes along with the English way of writing. The findings from the analysis of written Finglish clearly show that Finnish Americans were aware of their language differing from Standard Finnish, which can be seen in the reduced usage of English lexical items and their marking when the appropriate Finnish terms could not be found. Whereas the writers could identify English lexical elements without any difficulty, morphosyntactic changes apparently were internalized and therefore could not be avoided, as my analysis has illustrated. Thus this paper has shown that Finglish cannot simply be considered a variety of Finnish that merely includes English lexical items, but, taking the semantic and

morphosyntactic characteristics into account, it becomes clear that Finglish has its own distinct features and that English and Finnish have inseparably merged with each other on the American soil. However, the question of how to name this language phenomenon appropriately still remains.

It seems that Finglish cannot be classified exactly according to common concepts such as code-switching, mixed languages, or interlanguages. This is due to the fact that Finnish Americans, as shown in this work, range from primarily monolingual Finnish speakers over English-Finnish bilinguals to predominantly English speakers. Thus, Finglish exceeds the concept of code-switching, code-mixing, and mixed languages which all refer to bilingual settings only. Additionally, Finglish cannot be considered a proper interlanguage, as Finglish did not emerge on the way to full proficiency in English. As I have depicted, it was rather a natural language contact phenomenon that arose to fulfill the expressive needs of its speakers.

Finglish might possibly be considered a dialect of Finnish, as Lauttamus states (1999: 91). Finglish generally fulfills the norms of a dialect, because it can be seen as a “form of a language that is spoken in one area with grammar, words and pronunciation that may be different from other forms of the same language” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary 2005: 420). It bothers me, however, that the term *dialect* apparently does not take into consideration the enormous and predominant English influence. It seems to me that the mixing of English lexical, semantic, and morphosyntactic items with the Finnish language system would not be revealed, but rather be played down. Moreover, “[t]he Finglish of America and the Finnish of Finland have gone separate ways” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 122). Many American Finns therefore “consider it [Finglish] a language of their own” (Sahlman-Karlsson 1976: 114).

It is debatable whether or not Finglish can be called a distinct language, but it is obvious that Finglish incorporates many features of the aforementioned common concepts without completely fitting into one of them. Although it would be interesting and obviously necessary to do more research on this topic, a closer analysis of this classification problem would exceed the frame of this paper. For now, the problem shall be solved with an explanation by Tracey V. Wilson who argues that each of the immigrant groups in North America “has, even for a very brief and disorganized moment, [...] produced a kind of hybrid, in-between language.” (2006) Sahlman as well, seems to see Finglish in a similar way. She considers it to be “an inter-stratified language, a means by

which the Finns try to bridge the gap between their native language and the language of their adoption” (1976: 114).

On the basis of this survey and within the limits of this paper Finglish might be called an in-between language – not only in between the native Finnish language and the English language of adoption, but also in between different concepts of language classification – having emerged from a particular language contact that has often been neglected in linguistic research and that hopefully finds its place in the debate on the globalization and localization of English.

## References

### 1. Corpus

66 letters from approximately 6,000 American-Finnish letters kept at the Institute of Migration in Turku. Shelf mark: Lahjoitus 7/1985, 1-35.

### 2. General References

Dossena, Marina and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2008) "Introduction". In: Dossena, Marina and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data (Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication 76)*, 7-19. Bergamo: Peter Lang.

Fenyvesi, Anna and Gyula Zsigri (2006) "The Role of Perception in Loanword Adaptation: The Fate of Initial Unstressed Syllables in American Finnish and American Hungarian". *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 19: 131-146.

Hasselmo, Nils (1963) "The Swedish immigrant community in transition". In Iverne J. Dowie and Ernest M. Espelie (eds.) *Language in Exile*, 136. Rock Island: Augusta Press.

Hellstrom, Robert W. (1976) "Finglish". *American Speech* 51.1: 85-93.

---. (1979) *Finglish*. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Hirvonen, Pekka and Timo Lauttamus (2000) "Codeswitching and language attrition: Evidence from American interview speech". *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 13: 47-74.

Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele (1989) *Amerikansuomen kaasusyntaksin erityispiirteitä*. Licentiate thesis. Turku: Finnish Department, Åbo Akademi.

---. (1993) "Lauserakenteesta toisen ja kolmannen polven kielenkäytössä". In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 102-127. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

---. (2003) "Pussaa se peipipoki kitsistä petiruumaan: Suomalaiset ja suomen kieli Amerikassa". In: Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele and Anna-Riitta Lindgren (ed.) *Monena suomi maailmalla: Suomalaisperäisiä kielivähemmistöjä*, 386-448. Helsinki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Karttunen, Frances and Kate Moore (1974) "Finnish in America: Two Kinds of Finglish". Paper presented at the winter meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York.

Kero, Reino (1986) *Suomen siirtolaisuuden historia osa I*. Turku: Turun Yliopiston Historian laitos.

- Kytö, Merja and Suzanne Romaine (2006) "Adjective Comparison in Nineteenth-Century English". In: Kytö, Merja; Rydén, Mats and Erik Smitterberg (eds) *Nineteenth-Century English*, 194-214. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Larmouth, Donald Wilford (1974) "Differential Interference in American Finnish Cases". *Language* 50.2: 356-366.
- Lauttamus, Timo (1999) "Fuzzy switch and loan types in the languages of Finnish Americans". *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 12: 87-109.
- Lauttamus, Timo and Pekka Hirvonen (1995) "English interference in the lexis of American Finnish". *The New Courant* 3: 55-65. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Martin, Maisa (1989a) *Amerikansuomen morfologiaa ja fonologiaa*. Unpublished licentiate thesis. University of Jyväskylä.
- . (1991) "American Finnish - a degenerate or creative language? Interpretations of linguistic changes as reflectors of social attitudes". *Finnish Americana* 10. New Brighton: 18-23.
- . (1993a) "Äänneopillisia havaintoja". In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 90-96. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- . (1993b) "Muoto-opin seikkoja" In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 97-101. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- . (1990) *On the Morphological Distribution of English Loan Verbs in American Finnish*. Paper presented at Congressus Septimus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 7/3B, Debrecen: 68-71.
- . (1989b) *What is so funny about American Finnish?*. Paper presented at The Learned Societies Conference, Laval: 1-7.
- Martin, Maisa and Hannele Jönsson-Korhola (1993) "Amerikansuomalaiset ja heidän kieliolonsa". In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 11-20. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Mattila, Katri; Munukka, Helmiina and Sanni Pulkki (2008) '*Finglish*' and the Finnish-American People. Tampere: Department of Translation Studies, University of Tampere. <http://www.uta.fi/FAST/US1/P1/finglish.html>, 21.06.2010
- Mencken, Henry L. (1936) *The American Language*. New York: Knopf, 4th ed.: 492-493, 506, 675-680.
- Nurmi, Arja and Minna Palander-Collin (2008) "Letters as a Text Type: Interaction in Writing". In: Dossena, Marina and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data (Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication 76)*, 21-50. Bern: Peter Lang.

- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (2005).
- Rantamaki, John E. quoted in Mencken, Henry L. (1936) *The American Language*. New York: Knopf, 4th ed.: 676.
- Sahlman-Karlsson, Siiri (1994) "Some Observations on Finglish in Florida". In: Sahlman-Karlsson, Siiri *Three Studies of American Finnish*. Umeå: Meddelanden från Institutionen för Finska vid Umeå universitet.
- . (1976) *Specimens of American Finnish: A Field Study of Linguistic Behavior*. Acta Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 11. Umeå: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Sahlman, Selma Siiri (1949) "The Finnish Language in the United States". *American Speech* 24.1: 14-24.
- Sallinen, Susanna (2002) *Finnen in der Neuen Welt 1865-1914: Amerika-Briefe als Spiegelbild der ersten Auswanderergeneration*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Dokortitels, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid (2008) "Letters as a source for reconstructing social networks: The case of Robert Lowth". In: Dossena, Marina and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data (Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication 76)*, 51-76. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Van Coetsem, Frans (1995) quoted in Hirvonen, Pekka and Timo Lauttamus (2000) "Codeswitching and language attrition: Evidence from American interview speech". *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 13: 49.
- Virtaranta, Pertti (1992) *Amerikansuomen sanakirja. A dictionary of Finnish American English*. Turku: Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.
- . (1993a) "Sanalainojen aihepiireistä". In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 74-83. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- . (1993b) "Sitaattilainoja, fraaseja, sanontoja". In: Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa and Maija Kainulainen *Amerikansuomi*, 128-158. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Wilson, Tracy V. (2006) *How Spanglish Works*.  
<http://people.howstuffworks.com/spanglish.htm> (accessed on Feb. 21, 2011)

### **Affidavit / Eidesstattliche Erklärung**

Hiermit versichere ich, **Britta Nolte**, dass ich die wissenschaftliche Prüfungsarbeit für die Erste Staatsprüfung für das Lehramt an Gymnasien selbstständig ohne fremde Hilfe verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Hilfsmittel verwendet habe. Diese Erklärung schließt auch die im Internet zugänglichen Daten ein. Die Stellen der Arbeit, die dem Wortlaut oder dem Sinn nach anderen Werken entnommen wurden, sind unter Angabe der Quellen der Entlehnung kenntlich gemacht. Die Arbeit ist noch nicht veröffentlicht oder in gleicher oder anderer Form an irgendeiner Stelle als Prüfungsleistung vorgelegt worden.

---

Ort, Datum

---

Unterschrift