Studies of Finnish in North America and Scandinavia
Part I

Jarmo Lainio

During the 1980s and 1990s a vitalization in studies of Finnish among Finnish-speaking emigrants and minoritites, i.e. Finnish 'abroad', has emerged. This has been a consequence of several factors coinciding.

First, the earlier paradigms of Fennistics and Finno-Ugristics have been challenged by other, more recent theories and views on language from the 1970is and onward. It has thus become possible to cope with the special linguistic circumstances in minority language situations in more accurate ways.

Secondly, the role of language as an important factor for minority identity and cultural maintenance has become more apparent due to international sociopolitical influences, among which first and foremost the revitalization of minorities should be mentioned. The ideological changes influenced state level decision-making as well, and thus the attitudes of majority populations. In parallel, the general political turbulence following the student revolts during the late 1960s also influenced linguistics at a general level: interest in dominance patterns connected to language as a means of power grew rapidly (Newmeyer 1986), and has until the early 1990s been of major importance.

Docent Jarmo Lainio, Department of Finnish, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Thirdly, interest among individual researchers — which partly is a result of the second factor — stemming from the Finnish-speaking minorities themselves, has increased considerably.

Fourthly, the interest in crosslinguistic comparisons within contrastive analysis, universal features in language and typology has re-occurred or grown among non-Fennists and non-Finns (both majority and minority representatives). For example, some interest among (mostly general) linguists has been shown Finnish as a language differing typologically from Indo-European languages (Luthy 1973; Campbell 1980; Skousen 1987, 1991; Sridhar 1988; Campbell & Muntzel 1989; Comrie 1989; Maher 1991; Källström 1992a, 1992b; cf. also Ringbom 1987).

To a high extent the question of educational achievement among immigrant children has contributed further to this trend, both as a matter of bilingual education and within second language acquisition studies, where Finnish has been the first language. This has been a matter of interest especially in Sweden, lately also in Norway. Recently, as a fairly rapidly growing field of interest, studies on Finnish as a second language has developed in Finland, which may in due time connect to studies abroad in a constructive way.

Below I will try to give a brief account of some of the studies and roughly describe the theoretical characteristics of

language contact studies of Finnish outside Finland. The excursion will partly be based on earlier overviews by Lainio (1991, 1993) for the North American scenario and for immigrant Finnish in Sweden, and by Wande (1994), for the North Scandinavian situation. Among other literature used, the updated overview of Virtaranta (1993) has been useful. In addition, studies not referred to in these overviews are included. Earlier overviews by Ureland & Clarkson (1984) and Ureland (1987) also give an overarching picture of studies on language contacts throughout history in the Scandinavian area.

In Finnish there is also a volume of articles on 'foreign Finns', Ulkosuomalaisia (1982), which includes general and linguistic papers on various groups of Finnish-speakers abroad, from a Finland Finnish perspective. The directions and interests of these works are in various ways complementary to the ones presented here. For the North American context, the Finn Forum conferences (e.g. Karni et al. eds, 1988) have added mainly historical and social science reports on especially the trans-Atlantic situation, even though linguistic accounts have been included. In many cases, the linguistic topics have been more elaborated upon in other publications by the same writers.

Finnish as a first language in second language acquisition studies has been treated in overviews by, e.g. Hyltenstam & Arnberg (1988), Hyltenstam (1989), Hammarberg (1991), and Viberg (1991; cf. also Voionmaa 1993) for Sweden. Corresponding studies and overviews have not been made in the other settings discussed here, to my knowledge. On the contrary, the Norwegian Kvens are for example not even recognised as a separate ethnolinguistic group in an overview of the educational policies concerning bilingualism in Norway (Hvenekilde 1993:174). Adult Finnish-speakers in the US with English as their second language have been studied by Pietilä (1989). These are only to a minor extent integrated in the present description of Finnish outside Finland. However, studies on Finnish-English bilinguals will be closer integrated here (e.g., Lauttamus 1991; Halmari 1993a, 1993b, 1993c; Hirvonen 1993; Hirvonen & Lauttamus 1994).

Aims of the overview

The main objectives of an overview of the kind I have been aiming at are both its practical and theoretical values. Firstly, it could offer possibilities to describe more extensively especially the minority varieties/Finnishes and their developments on a global scale. It could give insights to what characteristics have been found in them at various stages of change and/or shift. Secondly, it could give information about which types of studies have been done in the different settings and which may be worth replicating in another setting. Thirdly, it should give rise to caution as regards the use of terms like American Finnish, Norwegian Finnish, Sweden Finnish etc. — are they compatible terms, and, have they been based on similar assumptions and linguistic descriptions?

As a consequence of a review of this kind, it may also be possible to address the question of whether the Finnishes discussed are developing into their own language level systems. Last but not least, important from a minority perspective is that it could be of some support to know that the case the individual researcher is dealing with, is not a unique dilemma, but has characteristics in common with

other settings, for the better and for the worse. As a by-product the overview may show to non-linguists, that linguistics is a matter of multifaceted perspectives on language.

The overview does not claim to be complete or maximal, neither as regards the divison of studies nor the treatment of the studies mentioned. Another delimitation has been made: I have concentrated on studies dealing with natural spoken language, even if some other studies directly connected to the study of spoken language have been referred to. The general starting point is thus the linguistic product of spontaneous speech, which is a primary mode of linguistic communication, especially in a minority situation. Furthermore, though a few studies not published as monographs or in periodicals and anthologies are mentioned, mainly reports available to the large public are included.

It is my hope, that an overview of this kind could give a contribution to a total account of studies done with Finnish as a contact language outside the source country. With the aid of this it would later be possible to draw conclusions on a larger scale for descriptions and possible predictions regarding the future route of studies of Finnish, both as a minority and a majority language.

Setting of studies

1. *Geographical and historical settings of minority Finnishes*

Before the various kinds of studies of Finnish in minority contexts are discussed, it may be useful to try to classify the fields and studies according to some general characteristics and to situate them in their national contexts. I will start with this task (see Table 1).

Three groups of Finns have lived within the borders of Norway, the oldest one of which is the Kvens in northernmost Norway. Their history is that of an extensive migration of Finns from Northern Sweden and Finland, dating back to the late 17th century and later. The present-day population of Finnish-speaking Kvens is estimated at about 1,500–3,000, of the 20,000–60,000 persons who are believed to have Kven ancestry (Andreassen 1992:39; Lindgren 1993a:21–22).[1] In the so-called Finn forests, both on the Norwegian (especially in the Solør region) and Swedish side (especially in the Värmland region), migrants of mainly east Finnish, Savo origin, and their descendants lived highly isolated for several centuries. It is believed that at the most about 40,000 Finns were living in these forestial regions (Iversen 1959:4, fn. 4). In 1953 only five older speakers of Forest Finnish were left in Norway (op. cit.: 4). The third Norwegian group consists of recent immigrants from Northern Finland, especially to the fishing industry in Northern Norway. The amount of recent immigrants has been estimated at several thousands in the 1980is (Anttonen 1986).

The autochthonic groups of Finns and their descendants in Sweden, which would have included the mentioned Forest Finns, counts about 20,000–40,000. Around 1950 there were still 40 speakers of VäFi left (Mägiste 1960:4), and 30 years later, the last known speaker of VäFi passed away (Virtaranta 1986:111). All of the present-day Finnish-speakers of an autochthonous ancestry are Tornedalians, with their roots in Northern Sweden. This minority came into being through the split of Sweden in 1809, when the eastern part was ceased to Russia.

The largest group of Finns in Sweden, and probably also compared to other

Table 1. Potential populations of speakers in studies of Finnish outside Finland

Country	Recent Immigrants	Ethnic Minority of Imm. Descent	Assimilated Minority	Autochthonic Minority
Norway	Immigrant Finns/ (Norwegian Finns)	Kvens	Forest Finns	Kvens
Sweden	Immigrant Finns (Sweden Finns)	Sweden Finns	Forest Finns/ Värmland Finns	Tornedal Finns
Canada	Vancouver[2] (Canadian Finns)	Canadian Finns	early 1st/2nd gen. immigrants	
USA	Florida, New York, Oregon, California, (American Finns)	American Finns	early 1st/2nd gen. immigrants	

cases elsewhere, can be found among the post-war migrants and their descendants, who have concentrated their habitations to central Swedish industrial towns and the capital Stockholm. Stockholm has had a continuous habitation of Finns for about five or six centuries, not in the sense that they would make up a continuous Finnish ancestry to our day — this line was possibly broken during the first decades of this century — but in the sense that there have always been Finnish migrants in Stockholm during this period. The amount of persons of Finnish origin in Sweden (including the second generation) is about 301,600 (in 1993; Wande forthc.b), among which 20–25 per cent are likely to be Swedish-speaking Finnish migrants.

In Canada there were (in 1980), according to the Census of Canada 1986, 40,565 persons with a Finnish origin for both parents, and 51,770 with a multiple (Finnish and other) ethnic background (total = 91,340). About 25,000 of these have reported a non-official language as their mother tongue, i.e., most likely Finnish. A majority of these have lived in Ontario, and at present a notable amount can be found in British Columbia.

According to an overview by Kultalahti (1989:15–16, data from 1980) most people with a Finnish background in the USA live in Michigan, Minnesota, California, Washington, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, New York, Oregon, Illinois, Ohio and Florida. There were (in 1980) about 616,000 persons with a Finnish ethnic background in the USA (op. cit.:12). By summarizing Kultalahti's data, covering all states, a total of 29,172 persons born in Finland are found. The largest amount of Finnish migrants still alive and born in Finland (4,539) live in California. The oldest habitations are to be found in Michigan (111,702 with Finnish background, and 2,292 born in Finland (data from 1980) and Minnesota (98,783 with Finnish background, and 1,959 born in Finland (data from 1980).

It is questionable whether recent, first-generation immigrants can — objectively and subjectively — be referred to as belonging to an established minority. Kvens and Tornedalians do not, as far I can see, receive new speakers from the outside, though many Finnish migrants have been integrated into these groups, especially into the latter one. Furthermore, at least 'Sweden Finns' and 'American Finns' have a semantic

load, which does not readily include recently arrived newcomers. Most of these populations are generally considered to speak their respective Finnish languages (or varieties) — Kven Finnish, Sweden Finnish, American Finnish etc. — except for Tornedalians, who in addition to Tornedal Finnish (or its correspondents in different languages) nowadays refer to their language as 'Meän kieli', i.e. 'our language' (cf. Thomas 1991, for the tendency to use this concept in recent minority language settings).

Throughout the paper I will refer to the varieties involved as 'languages'. The use of 'dialect' may possibly be defended when each of the cases is individually compared to source country Finnish (hereafter Finland Finnish, FiFi), but when they are compared to each other, several criteria point in the direction that they can be objectively called different languages, with the exception of Sweden Finnish. At least some criteria, such as mutual comprehension, belonging to one nation-state or the same political system, identification with the same speech community, and even the linguistic norms adhered to, hint at the possibility that they are now evolving as separate languages, if their speech communities do not face language shift or language death.[3] Their connection to each other is mainly one of indirect contact, mediated by FiFi, but they share the common experience of a minority status language in contact with an Indo-European language.

The question of where to situate the Kvens is not easily settled. Though formed by immigrants from Northern Sweden (including Tornedalen) and Northern Finland no later than the at turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, their habitations today in Northern Norway constitute local historical minorities. No doubt do they form an ethnolinguistic minority, but they are also developing into an autochthonic regional minority. One main difference as compared with the Tornedalians is the span of time in their present area. An additional problem in the Norwegian setting is that the Kvens to a high extent have been trilingual, with Sami languages as the third component. For recent immigrants to Norway from Finland, this is regularly not so. In this paper the Kvens will be treated under the heading 'Autochthonic minority'.

The term 'ethnic minority' mainly refers to the role of language and the awareness of it among the populations in question. Accordingly, the populations could also be termed ethnolinguistic or linguistic/language minorities. Though there are obvious differences between the Scandinavian contexts, where language is of primary importance for Finnish ethnicity and minority aspirations, and the North American context, where language is no longer considered the main factor of ethnic consciousness, I will use ethnic for all contexts.

The classification above could be complemented by some additional, on-going studies of linguistic relevance from Germany (Tuominen 1986) and France (Fernandez-Vest forthc.), both of which could be included as recent immigrant populations of the Atlantic neighbourhood.[4] Since major results from these projects are inaccessible thus far, they will be left out of the study. (For a world-wide presentation of Finns abroad, see Korkiasaari 1989, and regarding language contact in Australia, see Hentula 1987, 1988).[5] There are, most likely, other minor studies to be found in various linguistic periodicals. In addition, also Finland could be included, since there are recent studies of return migrant-children in school tests (e.g.

Pääkkönen 1993), and studies considering school accommodation and language-connected issues.

Finnish as a second language is a field booming at the moment, but few larger studies have been completed (Grönholm 1993, Muikku-Werner 1993, Sundman forthc., being the only extensive studies thus far; for overviews, see Sundman 1992, Latomaa 1994). They do not, however, regard spoken language use. The influence of return migrants from the USA and Canada on FiFi during the earlier decades of this century presents itself as a potential object of study, but in addition to general inference of English impact (Sajavaara & Lehtonen 1980, 1981, Pulkkinen 1984), only scattered remarks (see Virtaranta 1993) and minor studies of influences on dialect vocabularies have to my knowledge been made.

Some articles on Finnish vocabulary development were published in a special issue of Virittäjä (1981). Other possible directions of extensions would be descriptions of Finnish dialects that have been in contact with Swedish dialects in Finland for centuries (e.g. Grönholm 1988; Tandefelt 1988; Paunonen 1990, 1993a). A vast field of study would be Fennistics in Finland, which for more than a century worked within the puristic tradition, with an outspoken purpose to eliminate traces of foreign influence, especially Swedish. Swedish influence has thus been treated extensively, as a negative impact. As Paunonen (1993a) has pointed out, however, the striving for purism sometimes blindfolded the attempts: internal inherent variation has at times been banned as foreign influence.

2. Linguistic framework in the studies

Table 2 is an attempt to summarize the traditional levels of language descriptions. Under 'Other' we find some approaches which cannot be easily characterized according to the traditional division in the table (e.g. conversational or discourse analysis). Though further levels of grammar (such as pragmatically and semantically oriented) could be labeled, this has not been done since they have not been generally represented, with the main exception of some second language studies (e.g. Viberg 1985; Voionmaa 1993). From the point of view of the language users, it is doubtful whether they have benefitted much from the results of the traditional linguistic studies in their bilingual communicative encounters in the minority language contexts. Onomastic studies could, had not the criterion of spoken language been used, add several contributions to this classificatory table.

For the sake of simplicity, the populations in North America have been collapsed into one group (see discussion about this in the forthcoming Part II). Borders between different Finnish populations in North America are even more difficult to establish than for the Scandinavian countries.

As could be expected (table 2), the traditional aspects of language study have been well represented, i.e. phonology, morphology and lexicon. Syntax has been less studied, just as the 'Other' category. The list is further to be cautiously interpreted: some studies have included minor aspects of the linguistic level in question, others have attempted broad generalizations.

The 'Other' category is scarcely represented among the minority studies. In my view, it is also more difficult to generalize at the present stage of development, from single informant studies on discourse analysis and conversation analysis, such characteristics that could be said to be

Table 2. Linguistic studies on Finnish according to the grammatical level studied

Level of language Country/Population	Phonology	Morphology	Syntax	Lexicon	Other
Norway					
Autochthonic	X[7]	X	X	X	-
Assimilated	X	(X)	(x)	X	-
Immigrants	(x)	X	X	X	-
Sweden					
Autochthonic	X	X	X	X	(x)
Assimilated	X	(x)	-	X	(x)
Ethnic Min.	X	X	X	(x)	X
Immigrants	X	X	(x)	(x)	X
Canada					
Ethnic Min./ (Immigrants)	X	X	(x)	(x)	(x)
USA					
Ethnic Min./ (Immigrants)	X	X	X	X	(x)

(Here and below, footnotes refer to studies representing each combination. Brackets '(x)' indicate that the representation is questionable, or, studies have not been completed to date.)

representative and valid for a whole population, or even a sample of it.

Regarding the linguistic paradigms that have been represented, dialectology has been a starting point for studies in all countries, also for those who may be considered sociolinguistic in design. This is natural, since Fennistic sociolinguistics has oftenmost meant that methods and ways of presenting data in dialectology (have been altered to a small degree, when adaptated for sociolinguistic studies. Regularly the linguistic features studied have been the same or similar (for a recent overview, see Juusela 1994).[6]

Another direction that has been well represented is studies on the lexicon, which partly is based on its strong scholarly tradition both at Finnish and Scandinavian universities. Within this tradition several fields of study have been represented: onomastics (Norway, ToFi, VäFi, AmFi), semantic fields (Kvens, ToFi; Hirvonen 1993; Voionmaa 1993), and dictionaries.[8] The latter entails dictionaries of AmFi (Virtaranta 1992), Gällivare/Jellivaara Finnish (=GäFi; Winsa 1992), ToFi (Kenttä & Wande 1992), and SweFi (dictionaries of the Sweden Finnish Language Board, and word lists in its periodical Kieliviesti).

Most of the extensive studies included share some properties in their view of language. In practice this means that basically structuralistic traditions are recurrently represented. Purely structuralistic studies are, however, difficult to find, though Lindgren (1993a) may be considered to be one example.

Autonomous linguistics was not very successful in establishing itself in the source country, Finland, one consequence of which has been that studies on minority Finnishes have generally lacked this feature, as long as the majority of researchers originated in Finland. The Chomskyan tradition has been poorly represented both in Finland and in Sweden during the 1970is and 1980is. This tendency has been obvious in lan-

guage contact and spoken language studies, partly due to the inherent contradiction between the Chomskyan concept of 'ideal speaker/hearer' and variable language performance, such as speech.

The problems become multiplied when two or several even more variable contact languages are the objects of study. Some studies have included the Government & Binding aspect, however, in settings where the tradition has been fairly strong, as in Norway (Trosterud 1991, 1994) and in the US (Larmouth (1974) and Halmari (1994) are inspired by this tradition). The striving in many originally American linguistic paradigms to find evidence for universal tendencies is not only typical for post-Chomskyan traditions, but also for some directions of sociolinguistics: Shana Poplack and her colleagues (Poplack et al. 1987) have conducted some research on Canadian Finnish, which dealt with code-switching. These studies contain features of typology and claims on universality (cf. Part II).

Reasons for discussing typology as a separate direction are not difficult to find. For example, markedness theory has been of some explanative value in language contact studies, but it has been rather vaguely represented in the Scandinavian context, except in second language acquisition studies (e.g. Hyltenstam 1992) and contrastive typology studies (e.g. Källström 1992b). Results from typological considerations would also be of help for classifications of the state of art for Finnish in the various minority language settings. It would tentatively be of interest to situate the Finnishes in some kind of typological spectrum or continuum as well. In my view there is another important reason, namely that typology as such would benefit from using the kind of spoken language data and generalizations that have been presented in studies of language contact of Finnish and of Finnishes in minority settings. Especially in those cases when typologically oriented studies aim at describing the dynamicity of gross language contact patterns, would variationist studies be ofsupport for conclusions on directionality and ongoing changes (see also Aitchison 1991; McMahon 1994).

The interest in this field and regarding the Baltic area has been constantly increasing during recent years (e.g. Dahl et al. 1992; Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992; Tommola 1992). Data including more than single informants should be preferred to such where typological conclusions are made on the basis of single language users, at least regarding threatened languages, when a language shift process could have caused attrition among the remaining speakers of that language. The obvious risk of making inferences from single informantsi data could possibly be minimized then (cf. Dorian 1978; Schmidt 1985). This risk and problem are at hand, for example, in studies concerning American Finnish (Lehtinen 1966; Larmouth 1974), Värmland Finnish (cf. Taipale-Miesmaa forthc.; Taipale forthc.) and Kven Finnish in Norway (Lindgren 1993a). As a consequence of this, Lindgren (1993a) has excluded semi-speakers from her analysis.

Intermittent words

This first part has set the stage for the studies reviewed. In a second part the characteristics of the various studies will be presented. This includes the approaches of scholars, time perspective of studies, whether reseachers have had an in- or outgroup perspective on the language contact situation, what kinds of informants have been studied, and a

countrywise summary of the state of art. These aspects are not only relevant for linguistic and theoretical evaluations of the studies, but they are related to the status of the languages involved, and thus important for their evaluation among the speakers of and listeners to these Finnishes. This in turn, influences the potential functions of the languages. In the second part a conclusive discussion will be given as well.

References

Aitchison, Jean 1991. Language Change: Progress or Decay? (Second edition.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Almqvist, Ingrid; Cederholm, Per-Erik & Lainio, Jarmo (eds.) 1990. Från Pohjolas pörten till kognitiv kontakt. (Stockholm Studies in Finnish Language and Literature 6.) Department of Finnish, Stockholm University.

Andreassen, Irene 1992. Det finske målet på Nordkalotten med hovudvekt på Nord-Sverige og Nord-Noreg. Mål og makt 3:32–45. Oslo.

Anttonen, Marjut 1986. Nord-Norges nya finska immigranter. **In:** Kulturer i Norr, 69–78. Svanberg, I. & Lindin, L. (eds.) (Nord-Nytt 26.)

Axelsson, Monika & Viberg, Åke (eds.) 1991. Nordens språk som målspråk. Stockholm University: Centre for Research on Bilingualism.

Berge, Kjell Lars & Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt (eds.) 1991. Storstadsspråk och storstadskultur i Norden. (MINS 34.) Department of Nordic Languages, Stockholm University.

Campbell, Lyle 1980. Towards new perspectives on American Finnish. **In:** Ikola, O. (ed.) Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Pars VI, 341–51. Turku: Suomen kielen Seura.

Campbell, Lyle & Muntzel, Martha, C. 1989. The Structural Consequences of Language Death. **In:** Dorian, N. (ed.), Investigating Obsolescence, 181–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Census of Canada 1986 1989. Profile of Ethnic groups. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Comrie, Bernard 1989. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. (Second edition.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Dahl, Östen; de Groot, Casper & Tommola, Hannu (eds.) 1992. Future Time Reference in European Languages II. (EUROTYP Working Papers, Series VI, No. 3.) European Science Foundation. Department of Linguistics, Stockholm.

Dahl, Östen & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria 1992. Language typology around the Baltic sea: A problem inventory. Papers from the Institute of Linguistics (PILUS), 61. Stockholm: Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University.

Dorian, Nancy 1978. The fate of morphological complexity in language death: Evidence from East Sutherland Gaelic. Language 54:3, 590–609.

Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) 1993. Immigrant Languages in Europe. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Fernandez-Vest; Jocelyne M.M. (forthc.) Kontrastiv diskursanalys franska/finska. **In:** Wande, E. (ed.) (forthc.)

Grönholm, Maija 1988. Ruotsalaiset lainasanat Turun murteessa. Turku/Åbo: Åbo Academy Press.

Grönholm, Maija 1993. TV on pang pang – Verbisanaston kehitys toisen kielen kirjoittamisessa. Rapporter från Pedagogiska fakulteten vid Åbo Akademi, nr 4. Institutionen för lärarutbildning.

Halmari, Helena 1993a. Code-switching as an evaluative device in bilingual discourse. Issues in Applied Linguistics 4.1: 91–118.

Halmari, Helena 1993b. Intercultural business telephone conversations: A case of Finns vs. Anglo-Americans. Applied Linguistics 14.4: 408–430.

Halmari, Helena 1993c. Structural relations and Finnish-English bilingual code-switching. Linguistics 31.6: 1043–1068.

Halmari, Helena 1994. A government approach to Finnish-English intrasentential code-switching. (Unpublished Ph.D. diss.) Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Hammarberg, Björn 1991. Forskning om svenska som andraspråk i Sverige. **In:** Axelsson, M. & Viberg, Å. (eds.) 1991, 49–81.

Hentula, Hannele 1987. Kielentutkijana Australiassa 26.9.1986–19.1.1987. Siirtolaisuus/Migration 1, 32–37. Turku.

Hentula, Hannele 1988. Remarks on the Research of the Finnish Language and its Vocabulary in Australia. Paper given at the TISSMA conference in Melbourne, 29.8.–2.9.1988.

Hirvonen, Pekka 1993. The Return of the Klörkki: more about the old-country words in American Finnish. **In:** Suojanen, M.K. & Kulkki-Nieminen, A. (eds.), 19. Kielitieteen päivät Tampereella, 8.5.–9.5.1992, 81–96. Tampereen yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja, 16. Tampere.

Hirvonen, Pekka & Lauttamus, Timo 1994. Amerikansuomen kielikontaktit. **In:** Jääskeläinen, V. & Savijärvi, I. (eds.), Tieten tabtoen, 169–184. Studia Carelica Humanistica, 3. Joensuun yliopiston humanistinen tiedekunta. Joensuu.

Hvenekilde, Anne 1993. Norway (N). **In:** Ammon, U., Mattheier, K. & Nelde, P.H. (eds.) Mehrsprachigkeitskonzepte in den Schulen Europas, 174–186. Sociolinguistica. Internationales Jahrbuch für Europäische Soziolinguistik. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Hyltenstam, Kenneth 1989. Svenska som andraspråk – Forskning och undervisning i Sverige. **In:** Nuopponen, A. & Palmberg, R. (eds.), Special Languages and Second Languages: Methodology and Research, 27–49. AFinLA Yearbook. Vaasa.

Hyltenstam, Kenneth 1992. Non-native Features of Near-native Speakers: On the Ultimate Attainment of Childhood L2 Learners. **In:** Harris, R.J. (ed.) Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals, 351–368. Elsevier Science Publishers.

Hyltenstam, Kenneth & Arnberg, Lenore 1988. Bilingualism and education of immigrant children and adults in Sweden. **In:** Bratt Paulston, Christina (ed.), International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education, 475–513. New York, Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

Iversen, Ragnvald 1959. Finsk på norsk grunn. Relikt-studier. Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskabs skrifter for 1958. Bind II, nr 6. Trondheim.

Juusela, Kaisu 1994. Variation as a theme in Finnish dialectology and sociolinguistics in recent years. Fenno-Ugrica Suecana 12, 1–54. Stockholm.

Karni, Michael; Koivukangas, Olavi & Laine, Edward, W. (eds.) 1988. Finns in North America. Proceedings from Finn Forum III, 5–8 September 1984, Turku, Finland. Migration Studies C9. Institute of Migration, Turku.

Kenttä, Matti & Wande, Erling 1992. Meän kielen sanakirja. Tornedalsfinsk ordbok. Aapua: Kaamos.

Kieliviesti. Ruotsinsuomalaisen kielilautakunnan tiedotuslehti. Tukholma/Stockholm.

Korkiasaari, Jouni 1989. Suomalaiset maailmalla. Suomen siirtolaisuus ja ulkosuomalaiset entisajoista tähän päivään. Turku: Siirtolaisuusinsituutti/ Institute of Migration .

Kultalahti, Olli 1989. Finns in the USA: Patterns of Immigration and Settlement since 1900. Siirtolaisuus / Migration 3, 11–23.

Källström, Roger 1992a. Hennes nyai bilarihennes. **In:** Widmark, G., Källström, R., Hagåsen, L. & Hultman, T.G., Svenska i harmoni, 31–59. Ord & Stil, Språkvårdssamfundets skrifter 23. Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren.

Källström, Roger 1992b. Språktypologiska perspektiv på kongruens i svenskan och finskan. **In:** Axelsson, M. & Viberg, Å. (eds.) Nordens språk som målspråk. , 162–171.

Lainio, Jarmo 1991. Från finsk landsbygd till mellansvensk stadsbygd. **In:** Berge, K.L. & Kotsinas, U-B. (eds.) 1991, 108–44.

Lainio, Jarmo 1993. Sweden Finnish. **In:** Extra, G. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) 1993, 21–53.

Lainio, Jarmo (ed.) (forthc.) Tutkielmia kielikontakteista sosiolingvistiikan näkökulmasta / Studier om språkkontakter ur sociolingvistisk synvinkel. Working Papers 2. Department of Finnish, Stockholm University.

Larmouth, Donald W. 1974. Differential Interference in American Finnish Cases. Language 50:2, 356–366.

Latomaa, Sirkku 1994. Paper given at the conference Nordens språk som andraspråk, March 1993 in Oslo.

Lauttamus, Timo 1991. Borrowing, code-switching and shift in language contact: Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. **In:** Ojanen, M. & Palander, M. (eds.) Language Contacts East and West, 32–51. Studies in Language, N:o 22. University of Joensuu.

Lehtinen, Meri 1966. Analysis of a Finnish-English bilingual corpus. (Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis.) Indiana University.

Lilius, Pirkko & Saari, Mirja (eds.) 1987. The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Lindgren, Anna-Riitta 1993a. Miten muodot muuttuvat. Ruijan murteen verbintaivutus Raisin, Pyssyjoen ja Annijoen kveeniyhteisöissä. University of Tromsø: School of Language and Literature.

Lindgren, Anna-Riitta 1993b. English Summary of Miten muodot muuttuvat. (How Forms Change.) University of Tromsø: School of Language and Literature.

Luthy, Melvin 1973. Phonological and Lexical Aspects of Colloquial Finnish. Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, 119. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Maher, Julianne 1991. A crosslinguistic study of language contact and language attrition. **In:** Seliger, H.W. & Vago, R.M. (eds.) 1991, 67–84.

McMahon, April M.S. 1994. Understanding Language Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muikku-Werner, Pirkko 1993. Impositiivisuus ja kielellinen variaatio. Julkisten keskustelujen käskyt ja kysymykset kielenopetuksen näkökulmasta. University of Joensuu Publications in Humanities, 14. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

Mägiste, Julius 1960. Vermlannin sammuvaa savoa. Kielennäytteitä vuosilta 1947–1951. Helsinki: SKS.

Newmeyer, Frederick, J. 1986. The Politics of Linguistics. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Nordlyd. Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics. Tromsø.

Paunonen, Heikki 1990. 'Se on hän suomeksi.' Huomioita kaksikielisten helsinkiläisten suomesta. **In:** Almqvist, I. et al. (eds.) 1991, 190–214.

Paunonen, Heikki 1993. Vähemmistökielestä varioivaksi valtakieleksi. Helsinkiläissuomen historiasta ja nykymuuntelusta. Helsingin kaupungin kouluviraston julkaisusarja A1: 1993/Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskuksen tutkimuksia 1993:5. Helsinki.

Pietilä, Päivi 1989. The English of Finnish Americans with reference to social and psychological background factors and with special reference to age. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis. Ser. B, Tom. 188. Turku.

Poplack, Shana; Wheeler, Susanne & Westwood, Anneli 1987. Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. **In:** Lilius, P. & Saari, M. (eds.) 1987, 33–56.

Pulkkinen, Paavo 1984. Lokarista sponsoriin. Englantilaisia lainoja suomen kielessä. Helsinki: Otava.

Pääkkönen, Irmeli 1993. Återinvandrade elevers problem i modersmålet. **In:** Språk i Norden 1993, 69–79. Løland, S. et al. (eds.). Nordisk språksekretariats skrifter 15. Oslo: Novus forlag/Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Ringbom, Håkan 1987. The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Sajavaara, Kari & Lehtonen, Jaakko 1980. English Influence on Modern Finnish: Sociolinguistic Aspects. **In:** Ikola, O. (ed.), Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Pars III, 387–96. Turku: Suomen kielen seura.

Sajavaara, Kari & Lehtonen, Jaakko 1981. Anglismit nykysuomessa. Virittäjä, 289-306.

Schmidt, Annette 1985. Young people's Dyirbal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seliger, Herbert, W. & Vago, Robert, M. (eds.) 1991. First Language Attrition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sintonen, Teppo 1992. Etnisyyden muuntuminen Kanadan suomalaisten siirtolaisten keskuudessa. Siirtolaisuus/Migration 1/1992, 4–9.

Skousen, Royal 1987. An analogical description of morphological variation in Finnish. **In:** Lilius, P. & Saari, M. (eds.) 1987, 337–335.

Skousen, Royal 1991. Analogy and Structure. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sridhar, S. N. 1988. Cognition and Sentence Production: A Cross-linguistic Study. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Sundman, Marketta 1992. Finska som andraspråk i Finland. **In:** Axelsson, M. & Viberg, Å. (eds.) 1992, 82-101.

Sundman, Marketta (forthc.) Tvåspråkighet och språkfärdighet hos barn i Finland. (Manuscript.) Turku/Åbo.

Taipale-Miesmaa, Riitta (forthc.) Vad för slags finska är värmlandsfinskan? **In:** Wande, E. (ed.) (forthc.a.)

Taipale, Riitta(forthc.) Klusilerna berättar om värmlandfinskans sista fas. **In:** Lainio, J. (ed.) (forthc.)

Tandefelt, Marika 1988. Mellan två språk. En fallstudie om språkbevarande och språkbyte i Finland. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Multiethnica 3. Uppsala.

Thomas, George 1991. Linguistic Purism. London: Longmans.

Tommola, Hannu 1992. The Marking of Future Time Reference in Finnish. **In:** Dahl, Ö.; de Groot, C. & Tommola, H. (eds) 1992, 12–28.

Trosterud, Trond 1991. Lokalkasus og preposisjonar i finsk, kvensk, samisk og norsk. Norsk Lingvistisk Tidskrift, 50–78.

Trosterud, Trond 1994. Ruijansuomen sidontasuhteita. Nordlyd 20, 86–97.

Tuominen, Pirjo-Liisa 1986. Tutkimuskohteena saksansuomalaisten kieli. Siirtolaisuus/Migration 1, 35–36.

Ulkosuomalaisia, 1982. Laaksonen, Pekka & Virtaranta, Pertti (eds.). Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 62. Helsinki: SKS.

Ureland, Sture P. & Clarkson, Iain 1984. Introduction. **In:** Ureland, P.S. & Clarkson, I. (eds.) Scandinavian Language Contacts, 1–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ureland, Sture 1987. Language Contact Research in Northern Scandinavia. **In:** Mac Eoin, G., Ahlqvist, A. & hAodha, D. (eds.) Third International Conference on Minority Languages: General Papers, 43–73. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Vol. 8, 1–2.

Viberg, Åke 1985. Lexikal andraspråksinlärning. Hur polsk-, spansk- och finsktalande lär in svenskans placeraverb. SUM-rapport 2. Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism.

Viberg, Åke 1991. Nordens språk som andraspråk ur ett tvärspråkligt perspektiv. **In:** Axelsson, M. & Viberg, Å. (eds.) 1991, 133–161.

Virittäjä. Kotikielen Seuran Aikakauslehti. Helsinki.

Virtaranta, Pertti 1986. Utforskningen av språk och traditioner i mellersta Skandinaviens finnskogar. **In:** Huovinen, S. (ed.) Värmlandsfinnar, 81–113. Kulturfonden för Sverige och Finland. Stockholm.

Virtaranta, Pertti 1992. A Dictionary of American Finnish. Turku: Siirtolaisuusinstituutti/Institute of Migration.

Virtaranta, Pertti 1993. Amerikansuomen tutkimuksesta. **In:** Virtaranta, P. et al.1993, 21–34.

Virtaranta, Pertti; Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele; Martin, Maisa & Kainulainen, Maija 1993. Amerikansuomi. Tietolipas 125. Helsinki: SKS.

Voionmaa, Kaarlo 1993. On the Semantics of Adult Verb Acquisition. (Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics 12.) Department of Linguistics, University of Göteborg.

Wande, Erling 1994. Fennistisk forskning utanför Finland. Nordlyd 20, 10–44. School of Languages and Literature, Tromsø University.

Wande, Erling (ed.) (forthc.a.) Finska varieteter utanför Finland. Stockholm Studies in Finnish Language and Literature 9. Stockholm: Department of Finnish, Stockholm University.

Wande, Erling (forthc.b.) Sweden. Article No 123. To appear in: Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Vol. Kontaktlinguistik/ Contact Linguistics/Linguistique de Contact, Goebl, H., Nelde, P.H., Stary, Z. & Wölck, W. (eds.). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Winsa, Birger 1992. Jellivaaran suomen sanakirja. Aapua: Kaamos.

Notes

1) Like in other cases, the number of speakers and/or members of the Finnish ethnic communities in this study varies considerably, depending on which criteria have been adopted for their estimation. The figures for immigrants are even more complex, since figures based on citizenship, country of birth, and parental background, often differ greatly. The use of objective vs. subjective (e.g., identification with one group) factors shows a similar variable outcome.
2) The main areas with a noticeable immigration during the first years of the 1990s from Finland are especially British Columbia, with Vancouver, and the largest cities, such as Toronto (Sintonen 1992:8).
3) Though this mainly concerns spoken language, the orthographies of Kven Fi, ToFi and to some extent AmFi, differ slightly from FiFi in practice regarding phonological features introduced by recent loan words. It seems that SweFi does not share this development as yet. (These matters are discussed more in detail in Lainio forthc. (cf. reference in footnote 6).
4) A significant common factor for these studies, as well as for much of the Norwegian ones, is that a majority, if not all, of the to-be informants (and the researchers), are women, one reason being that this is representative of the population at large. When generalizing the results this should, however, be recognized, since it may have had a bearing on the general picture evolving from the studies.
5) As could be heard at the annual Finnish Applied Linguistics meeting (AFinLA) in 1994, there are ongoing studies also concerning Australian Finns (paper by Gregory Watson).
6) The fact that for example phonology has been extensively studied both in dialectology and in sociolinguistic studies is natural, since they both study variable representations in language, and the effect of external factors (e.g., geographic and social) on language variation and change. Phonology as a linguistic system is more closed as a system than most other ones, and therefore better suited than for example syntax for studies with this aim.
7) For practical reasons all references to studies included in the tables are not given here. The interested reader can find them in a modified version of these two papers: Lainio, Jarmo (forthc.) Studies of Finnish in North America and Scandinavia – A Classified Bibliography. Working Papers 3. Department of Finnish, Stockholm University.
8) Both Iversen (1959) and Mägiste (1960) contain general lexical items as well.