

Timo Lauttamus

Fuzzy Switch and Loan Types in the Languages of Finnish Americans

1. Introduction

The aim of the present paper is to focus on *code-switching* and *borrowing* in the languages of Finnish Americans, i.e. English and American Finnish, and to suggest a model which enables us to account for the structural parallels of code-switching and borrowing as patterns best described as "fuzzy". Wardhaugh (1992: 116), for one, argues that "code-switching and borrowing are different phenomena". It has, however, hardly ever been quite clear where or at which level(s) of language we can find this difference between the two (cf. Romaine 1995: 142-161; Halmari 1997: 165-190). What will be suggested in this paper is that, although code-switching and borrowing can be seen as different processes from the *functional* point view, it is far more difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between their various structural realizations.

In view of this approach, which is perhaps best described in terms of contact linguistics, such phenomena as borrowing and code-switching must be seen as processes which are largely sociolinguistically determined. How can we then characterize the functional distinction between the two? It is commonly recognized that *code-switching* behaviour is constrained by a variety of social factors, such as the speaker's solidarity with listeners, setting, choice of topic, and perceived social and cultural distance (Wardhaugh 1992: 106; Romaine 1995: 125), or that code-switching is "ultimately a matter of conversational interpretation, so that the relevant inferential processes are strongly affected by contextual and social presuppositions" (Gumperz 1982:68), or that "a change in the

social situation" motivates code-switching (Torres 1989: 420), whereas the motivation of the speaker to *borrow* items from another language is, for example, to make up for a lexical gap in the native language lexicon. Romaine (1995: 143) argues that, in general, fluent bilinguals do not switch or mix to fill lexical gaps, while evidence from the English of marginally bilingual first-generation Finnish Americans shows that borrowing is commonly used in this function (Lauttamus 1990). Romaine (*ibid.*) further argues that one of the most common discourse functions of code-switching is to repeat the same thing in both languages", which is also corroborated by our data. Given that code-switching and borrowing may be seen as functionally different processes, at least in the case of fluent bilinguals, it is, however, important to acknowledge that, from the *structural* point of view, the realizations of the two processes can be described on a linguistic continuum and they merit, therefore, a more detailed study as non-discrete categories.

If we accepted this contention, that code-switching and borrowing are functionally different whereas some of their structural realizations may overlap, we would be in a better position to understand why so many efforts to categorize the structural realizations of code-switching and borrowing have, by and large, been less successful than we could have anticipated at the outset. The research literature (cited and discussed by, e.g. Andersson 1993; Romaine 1995; Halmari 1997) shows that there is no agreement on reliable criteria for distinguishing code-switching from borrowing, although many of the researchers working with a contact-linguistic framework contend that these processes be theoretically different phenomena.

Two of the theoretical assumptions that underlie the approach advocated in the present paper are therefore as follows. First, borrowing and code-switching as language contact phenomena can only be accounted for in terms of a holistic model which incorporates not only structural linguistic factors but also various psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors (cf. Romaine 1995: 121-122). Second, borrowing and code-switching should be seen as two

opposite poles on a *structural* linguistic continuum. In particular, their structural realizations should be described as gradient categories rather than as discrete ones from the synchronic point of view (Lauttamus 1990, 1991, 1992; Andersson 1993; cf. also Haugen 1953, 1956). Along the lines of our work, Myers-Scotton (1993) regards borrowing and switching as related processes which can be accounted for in terms of one single model. In spite of the holistic approach we advocate, this article nevertheless focuses its attention on the structural characteristics of code-switching and borrowing.

2. Defining the Finnish-English Language Contact in the United States

The characterization of the types of language contact among Finnish Americans is not an easy task. This is due to the fact that Finnish Americans are in general quite heterogeneous in their bilingualism (cf. Martin 1988). It should be noted that the data described in the present article is mostly elicited from elderly immigrants ("old-timers") who were in their 60s to 90s at the time of the interviews and who had hardly any knowledge of English upon arrival in America. It is therefore likely that recent immigrants may show a somewhat different code-switching and borrowing behaviour because of their proficiency in English at the time of immigration. However, an attempt will be made to describe a pattern which might best characterize the *maintenance* of the ethnic language by the Finnish immigrant generation ('first generation') and the subsequent *shift* from American Finnish into American English by the second generation. The following generalizations can be made on the basis of Lauttamus & Hirvonen's (1995: 57) description (based on Karttunen 1977).

On the one hand, the first-generation Finnish Americans can be seen as monolinguals. As Lauttamus & Hirvonen (1995: 57) point out, this immigrant generation "will typically go on speaking their old-country language at home as long as they live, and carry on most

of their social life in that language". On the other hand, they can also be seen as "marginally bilingual, as most of them can communicate successfully in English in some situations at least", although "Finnish is clearly their dominant language". In general, these speakers of English can therefore be regarded as *non-fluent* bilinguals with a considerable degree of L2 (English) fossilization, and as L2 learners with varying success in learning English (cf. Hirvonen 1982, 1988, 1993; Pietilä 1989).

The characterization of the language contact described above also implies that Finnish is *linguistically dominant* over English, whereas English is socially dominant over Finnish, at least "in some situations". Using the formalism proposed by Van Coetsem (1988, 1990, 1995), one of the two transfer situations can therefore be specified as *sl* to *RL*. In this situation English is the source language (*sl*) and Finnish the recipient language (*rl*). The *RL* (Finnish) speaker acts as the agent of the transferring action, and the recipient language is the linguistically (but not socially) dominant one.¹ Characteristic of this transfer situation ('*rl* agentivity') is *lexical borrowing* whereby loan words are phonologically and morphologically adapted to the patterns of the *rl*. The levels of phonology, morphology and syntax ('morpho-syntax') of the American Finnish spoken by the old immigrant generation seem to be in general resistant to interference from American English (Martin 1988; Virtaranta 1992; cf. Thomason & Kaufman 1988). All this is entirely expected because vocabulary, which is the least stable component of the *rl*, is affected in *rl* agentivity, whereas a more stable component of *rl* grammar (e.g. phonology) is usually left intact (Van Coetsem 1988: 36, 1995: 67-68).² The crucial feature is, however, that the first-generation Finnish Americans still maintain their own native language.

¹ Note the use of capitalization to indicate linguistic dominance.

² Van Coetsem (1995: 67-70) discusses the *stability gradient of language*, which can be regarded as "a gauge for establishing the general effect that each transfer type has on the RL". In most general terms, the phonology and morpho-syntax are more stable than the lexicon.

Although American Finnish is a heterogeneous dialect of Finnish, a common core (a set of common lexical, phonological and morphosyntactic characteristics) is still present in all of its varieties and idiolects. As Martin (1988) points out, it is this fact that justifies the application of the name 'American Finnish' to all the varieties.

With the emphasis on the linguistic *outcome* of the contact, the kind of transfer type which prevails among the first-generation Finnish-born Americans is therefore best described as a type of language *maintenance* whereby foreign elements or features are incorporated into a group's (linguistically dominant) native language (RL) by speakers of that language. The outcome of the incorporation of foreign elements is that "the native language is maintained but it is changed by the addition of the incorporated features" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37). This statement implies not only *adaptation* but also *integration*. Within Van Coetsem's (1988: 9) framework adaptation should not be confused with integration: "adaptation is an adjustment to the native *rl* which does not modify that language", whereas integration is "incorporation into the native *rl* of something that modifies that language". This distinction can be exemplified by the English word *stove*, which has (at least) two variants in American Finnish: *toovi* and *stouvi*. The former follows the phonological pattern of the Finnish vernacular, in that it does not allow consonant clusters in native words in initial position (adaptation), whereas the latter modifies the *rl* phonological pattern by retaining the *sl* consonant cluster (integration). With adaptation the RL thus preserves its existing phonological structure. Van Coetsem (1995: 79) also points out that *integratedness* is a continuum: a *less integrated* element (such as *stouvi*) may become a *more integrated* one (such as *toovi*). Since Martin (1988) demonstrates that the phonological and morphological patterns of many features incorporated into American Finnish deviate from standard Finnish or the Finnish vernacular, it is reasonable to assume that those features are integrated into, rather than adapted to, the recipient language.

In contrast to lexical borrowing typical of language maintenance, the interference from Finnish into the English spoken by the first-generation Finnish Americans does not begin with vocabulary but with sounds (phonology) and (morpho)syntax. This pattern of interference from *SL* in *rl* is characteristic of language *shift* ('SL agentivity' or 'imposition'; Van Coetsem 1995: 65-66). As Thomason and Kaufman (1988:145) suggest, (interference through) *shift* can also be used to refer to situations involving second language acquisition where learners demonstrate imperfect learning as they study a second language, although "they may not actually shift to the TL [i.e. *rl*]". The authors further state that learners' errors are to a considerable degree comparable to "shift-induced language change". Evidence from the English spoken by the first-generation Finnish Americans demonstrates that the phonological and morphosyntactic patterns often deviate from standard (American) English in the manner typical of 'learner language' or *interlanguage* (cf. Pietilä 1989: 152-189; Hirvonen 1988, 1990). This corroborates the view that the immigrant generation can also be regarded as English learners in a naturalistic setting.

Table 1. The two transfer types and the linguistic levels predicted to be affected by interference in the (American) Finnish – (American) English language contact among the 1st generation (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 59).

| | English (L2) → Finnish (L1) <i>sl</i> → <i>RL</i> <i>MAINTENANCE</i> | Finnish (L1) → English (L2) <i>SL</i> → <i>rl</i> <i>SHIFT</i> |
|--------------|--|--|
| lexicon | + | - |
| phonology | - | + |
| morphosyntax | - | ± |

Symbols used: "+" = strong, "±" = moderate *or* unclear, "-" = weak interference. *RL*, *SL*, as opposed to *rl*, *sl*, indicates linguistic dominance.

The transfer types characteristic of the first generation are depicted in table 1. The section under *maintenance* represents the levels affected by interference from English in Finnish. As noted above, it

is primarily the level of vocabulary that is affected in the transfer situation described as *sl* to *RL*. In contrast, the section under *shift* represents the levels affected by interference from Finnish in English. The English spoken by the first-generation Finnish Americans is primarily affected in its phonology [+], to a lesser extent in its morphosyntax [±], while lexical interference is only weak [-] (cf. Pietilä 1989: 135, 190-201; Lauttamus 1990: 36-44, 1991: 35). That lexical interference from Finnish in English is weak could be explained as follows. The restricted variety of the English spoken by the immigrant generation is almost invariably used for out-group communication only. Given that (American) English is socially (but not linguistically) dominant over Finnish, massive lexical interference from Finnish would therefore be less desirable for successful communication with monolingual English speakers. The direction of lexical interference is thus from the socially dominant language into the socially subordinate one (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1995: 60).

As Lauttamus & Hirvonen (1995) argue, from a synchronic point of view the transfer situation *SL* to *rl* described above, along with other comparable interlanguage situations, contains features of *shift with interference*. A distinction must, however, be made between the synchronic description of the transfer situation and the actual *outcome* of the shift. As evidenced by Lauttamus & Hirvonen's (1995) description, the second-generation Finnish Americans generally shift from the ethnic language into American English during their teen years. This enables them to become fluent bilinguals and achieve a virtually native-like competence in English (cf. Martin 1988; Pietilä 1989). Given the fact there is no evidence of any extensive Finnish interference in the English of the shifting speakers leads to the conclusion that the second-generation Finnish Americans represent one of the most typical cases of *shift without interference*, viz. that of "urban immigrant groups of European origin in the United States" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 120) who maintain their own ethnic languages for the first generation, while their children and grandchildren shift into the English of the

community as a whole with hardly any interference from the original languages.

3. Data and Discussion

Given that the structural features and degree of integration into the recipient language are used as critical parameters in the analysis of code-switching and borrowing, evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism in North America supports the division of the corresponding switch and loan types into four (non-discrete) categories: (a) *code-change* and (b) *code-mix* on the one hand, and (c) *integrated loan* ('nonce loan') and (d) *adapted loan* on the other hand. All these categories will be defined and operationalized in more detail in the discussion of examples (1) to (18). It will also be suggested that these switch and loan types are best regarded as representing categories (prototypes) which have (more or less) invariant cores but indeterminate, or "fuzzy", boundaries. It should be noted that, in marginal bilingual communities, code-switching, borrowing and their structural realizations are essentially such language contact phenomena that belong to the domain of *speech* ('parole', 'performance') rather than to the level of *language* ('langue', 'competence'). It is therefore debatable whether it is useful to maintain any sharp distinction between *langue* and *parole* in the description of code-switching and borrowing, either.

Table 2. A model for the description of code-switching and borrowing (cf. Lauttamus 1991: 45).

| CODE-SWITCHING | | BORROWING | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|
| OPERATIONAL GRAMMAR | | | |
| CODE-CHANGE | CODE-MIX | INTEGRATED LOAN | ADAPTED LOAN |
| SL | SL ~ RL | RL ~ SL | RL |

Adapting the model proposed in Lauttamus (1990, 1991), table 2 shows how the two processes, code-switching and borrowing, should be regarded as the opposite poles on a (structural) linguistic gradient running from *code-changes* to fully *adapted loans*. On the one hand, code-switching, as Poplack (1980: 583) suggests, is "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent". This definition implies that code-switching can take place not only intersententially or intrasententially but also within a single constituent. In addition, it suggests that there are two grammars **sequentially** operational on a given structure. On the other hand, borrowing refers to a process whereby "some lexical and/or structural property is integrated into a language (RL) from another language (SL)" (Lauttamus 1991: 40). The term *loan* is here used to refer to those lexical items where both form and meaning are borrowed with at least some integration into or adaptation to the morphosyntactic and phonological system of the recipient language. Table 2 also illustrates how the notion of *operational grammar* can be used to describe which of the two grammars, the source language (SL) or the recipient language (RL) grammar, is operational on each linguistic category.

The section at the bottom of table 2 shows how the intermediate space, covering the categories *code-mix* and *integrated loan*, is characterized by interaction of the two grammars: in code-mixes it is mainly the SL grammar that is operational on the mixed item within a RL constituent, while the RL grammar mainly operates on integrated ('nonce') loans.³ It seems that in the Finnish-English bilingual setting *morphology* is the most universal indicator of the degree of grammatical integration as far as code-mixing and 'nonce' borrowing are concerned. Morphological integration as a good criterion for distinguishing borrowing from code-switching is not,

³ Note the use of capitalization to indicate the grammatical "dominance" of the two languages. 'Nonce' borrowing usually "involves the use of single lexical items which are syntactically and morphologically, but not always phonologically integrated" into the RL (Romaine 1995:153).

however, recognized by all researchers (cf. Romaine 1995: 144). Halmari (1993: 1047, 1997: 70), for one, regards examples such as (1) as a *code-switch*:⁴

- (1) Mää oon sii-nä *green costume-i-ssa*.
 I am it-INE -INE
 'I am in that green costume'

The SL (English) phonology operates on the "switched" elements (in italics), apart from the Finnish stem formant /i/, which facilitates pronunciation, and the Finnish case (inessive) morpheme {ssa}, which are assigned to the otherwise unintegrated English stem {costume}. That the case-assignment rule fails to apply to the premodifier *green* (as opposed to the determiner *sii+nä* and the head of the NP, *costume+i+ssa*) is the reason why Halmari (1993, 1997) considers (1) a "switch" rather than loan: in Standard Finnish it should be assigned a case (*green+i+ssä* [INE]).⁵ It will be remembered, however, that it is only the adjective premodifier *green* in the NP that is not inflected. Is it then possible that *green costume+issa* behaves in the same way as a compound noun from a psycholinguistic point of view? It is not unreasonable to claim that a structure such as this is not only processed but also recognized as a single unit. This kind of pattern in borrowing transfer is very common among first and second-generation (marginally bilingual) Finnish Americans, e.g. *music haal+i+in* [ILL] 'into the music hall', *granddaughter+i* [NOM], *highway+n* [GEN], *Lutheran kirkko+on* [ILL] 'to the Lutheran Church', *highskoulu+sta* [ELA] 'from high school', *two Irish maan+i* [NOM] 'that Irishman', *canoe trip+i+llä*

⁴ The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ACC - accusative; ADE - adessive; COND - conditional; DET - determiner; ELA - elative; ESS - essive; GEN - genitive; ILL - illative; INE - inessive; INF - infinitive; NOM - nominative; PAR - partitive

⁵ Another reason for regarding *green costume+issa* as a switch is, of course, that it shows phonological unassimilation (Halmari 1997:179).

[ADE] 'on a canoe trip'. In the present article, examples such as these, which clearly lend support to the idea of a structural linguistic continuum, are treated as *integrated* ('nonce') *loans* with a varying degree of morpho-syntactic and phonological integration into the RL. Both grammars are operational in an integrated loan, RL Finnish morphology and SL English phonology, contributing to the final product *siinä green costume+issa* (NP).

As table 2 suggests, both code-switching and borrowing are used as "cover" terms (signifying 'processes') for *code-change/code-mix* and *integrated loan/adapted loan*, respectively. More generally, the evidence presented in Lauttamus (1990: 48) strongly suggests that "the two polar categories [code-change as opposed to adapted loan] on the continuum can be operationalized in linguistic terms on the basis of the notion *operational grammar*, whereas the definition of the distinction between code-mixing and nonce-borrowing in the intermediate space will depend on the nature of the language contact situation and typology of the languages". It is a characteristic of Finnish, an agglutinative language, that it relies heavily on inflectional morphology, whereas English is highly analytic. The typological distance between the two languages may therefore have an impact on the nature of code-switching and borrowing in a contact situation.

The data used in the present article has been elicited from the two corpora collected by Pekka Hirvonen: (1) the "Florida" corpus (1979-80), containing interviews in English with 36 mostly elderly Finnish-born adults, and (2) the "Minnesota" corpus (1988-89), containing interviews in Finnish with 53 elderly informants. References will also be made to other comparable data, representing first-generation speakers of either English or American Finnish (e.g. Pietilä 1989; Poplack *et al.* 1987). An application of the model described here to the description of code-switching and borrowing in the English of Finnish Australians is reported by Watson (1998). There is no doubt that our data shows effects of old age on the language development of the informants.

In terms of the approach advocated in the present article, the distinctions can be made as exemplified below. On the one hand, (i) **code-change** (2) to (4), can be distinguished from (ii) **code-mix**, as in (5) to (7), the symbol "-" indicating an audible pause:

- (2) It's a saying goes that er when you have no mother you you have no father - and still I - I could er -

kuinkas sen nyt sanoisi englannin
 how it+ACC now say+COND English+GEN
kielellä er kunnioittaa?
 language+ADE er respect+INF
 'how would one say it in English now er respect?'

- (3) You had to be here five years before you can

hakea - mikä se sanotaan?
 apply+INF what it+NOM is said
 'apply - how do you say it?' (Pietilä 1989: 195).

- (4) But you know they notice right away that my English not so er

sujuvaa you know (PH Yeah) - *ei oo sujuvaa.*
 fluent+PAR not is fluent+PAR
 'fluent ... it ain't fluent'

It is characteristic of code-change, such as (2) and (3), that the SL (Finnish) grammar and lexicon are operational on the switched item which, in most cases, consists of a whole clause functioning as a *communication strategy* (cf. Pietilä 1989: 194-197; Lauttamus 1990: 6-9, 32-36). In (4), the code-change *ei oo sujuvaa* is triggered by the preceding code-mix *sujuvaa*, with the partitive case ending in *-a*. All these examples show that code-changes take place **between** surface constituent boundaries but the exact switch site may vary considerably.

- (5) And then er there was a backyard you know and the mans you know they they were erm that time so many Finnish - fellows they have to learn you know that er

piika - työtä
 housemaid work+PAR

- (6) Well we make - er - like - er - all kinds of - er - *kalasoppaa* [fish soup+PAR] and *kalalaatikkoa* [fish casserole+PAR] you know - Finnish casserole - er - fish casseroles like they make in Finland (Pietilä 1989: 198.)
- (7) He was er er *ehdokkaana* [candidate+ESS] for presidency too but he didn't get any votes.
'as a candidate'

As opposed to code-changes, in code-mixes, such as (5) to (7), however, the *head* or *prepositional complement* (as in 6) of the RL phrase is characteristically replaced by a SL lexical item (usually a noun) which retains the SL morphological and phonological form, e.g., the partitive case ending in *-tä* or *-a*, as in (5) and (6), or the essive case ending in *-na*, as in (7).

- (8) They don't making those *autos* (ka) - isn't it funny I forgot it? ['cars'].
- (9) But they still have *joulupuuros* ['Christmas puddings'] and everything - and *rusinasoppas* ['raisin soups'] (Pietilä 1989: 197).
- (10) [...] but er twenties and thirties were - were the worst time when when they (PH Well) they were really after the *lahtariis*. [a derogatory nickname, meaning 'slaughterers', given to the 'white' (as opposed to 'red') soldiers in the Finnish Civil War].

On the other side of the continuum, we can distinguish between (iii) **integrated** ('nonce') **loan**, as in (8) to (10), where the SL-origin item follows the morphosyntactic (the plural ending *-s*), but **not phonological**, pattern of the RL, and (iv) **adapted loan**, which is fully established, not only morpho-syntactically but also phonologically and lexically, in the RL, so that the item in question may also be accepted by the community as a whole (cf. e.g., Poplack *et al.* 1987: 52). It is thus difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether any of the cases reported in Lauttamus (1990) or Pietilä (1989) meet the requirements of adaptation proposed for an adapted loan. This leads to the conclusion that adapted loans, in the sense

described above, are not common in the *SL (L1) → r/l (L2)* transfer type ('imposition' or 'shift'), and may not be a valid category in language shift. There is, in fact, no evidence of any phonologically adapted loan in our English data. This finding is entirely predictable because English (RL, L2) is socially dominant over Finnish (SL, L1). It also accords with the general fact that only a small percentage of the borrowings in the speech of bilinguals are ever fully integrated into the RL at the systemic level.

Similar cases of code-change, code-mix, and integrated loan also occur in the other type of contact situation, i.e. English (L2) → Finnish (L1), which was described above as an *sl (L2) → RL (L1)* transfer type ('borrowing transfer' or 'maintenance') in table 1. Examples (11) to (12) represent the category of **code-change**:

- (11) Ja se oli se nuorempiki veli -
 And it was it+DET younger+clitic *kin* brother -
 ei kaikista nuorin veli - se asuu tuol'
 not all+ELA youngest brother he lives that+ADE
 leikillä kans'-, Heart Lake'lla, joka on ää - niinku
 lake+ADE also Heart Lake+ADE who is er like
half-brother they sa- say or whatever you want call it -
 'And there was also this younger brother, not the youngest of them all, he
 also lives by that lake, Heart Lake, who is er like ...'

- (12) Niin siellä oli tuota, kätilö, joka oli
 So there was um, the midwife who was
head of the district who has not practiced for twenty years, and
there she was sillä oli se vauva kädessä
 it had it+DET baby hand+INE
 'So there was um, the midwife who was ... she had the baby in her arms'
 (Poplack *et al.* 1987: 38.)

Examples such as these clearly support the common view that code-changes are, in general, multi-word fragments (mostly clauses or whole phrases), which follow the lexical, phonological and morphosyntactic rules of the source language. Accordingly,

code-changes are not integrated into the RL but the SL grammar operates on them.

Examples (13) and (14) represent the category of **code-mix** rather than that of code-switch:

- (13) Ja suomalaiset, niil' oli paha nimi [laughs] siinä,
 And the Finns, they+ADE had a bad name it+INE
 siihen aikaan, ne joutu *black list*
 it+DET, ILL time+ILL, they got blacklist
 'And the Finns, they had a bad reputation in, at that time, they were
 blacklisted'
- (14) Mä laitoin oikein ison semmosen
 I made really big+ACC like
aluminum pan lihapullia
 aluminum pan meatballs+PAR
 'I made a really big like aluminum pan of meatballs' (Poplack *et al.* 1987:
 39.)

It should be noted that Poplack *et al.* (1987: 51) regard cases such as (14) as code-switches, characterized by a "total lack of inflection on nouns". The NP *black list* in (13) and the intra-NP compound *aluminum pan* in (14) would normally require inflection in Finnish, the allative of *black list* 'mustalle listalle', instead of the nominative 'musta lista', and the genitive of *pan* 'pannun', instead of the nominative 'pannu', respectively. The lack of obligatory morphological inflection indicates that the item is not in agreement with the Finnish case-assignment rule and should therefore be considered a code-mix rather than a nonce loan. The evidence reported in Poplack *et al.* (1987), Pietilä (1989) and Lauttamus (1990) shows that most cases of code-mix (and those of nonce loan for that matter) involve single lexical items (nouns).

Examples (15) and (16) represent the category of **integrated loan** while (17) and (18) exemplify that of **adapted loan**. In contrast to the 'shift' (imposition) situation, adapted loans are by far the most common type of loan in the 'maintenance' (borrowing transfer)

situation, particularly among the second-generation speakers in our corpus.

- (15) Ja ne asu miesten *dormitoryssa*,
 And they lived men+GEN dormitory+INE
 mutta o, koulun miehiä ei ollu
 but oh school+GEN men+PAR not be+past tense
 'And they lived in men's dormitory, but o (?), there were no men of schooling'
- (16) Misis K. oli *housekeeperina*.
 Mrs K. was housekeeper+ESS
 'Mrs K. was the housekeeper' (Poplack *et al.* 1987: 38.)
- (17) You know, niinku *ränttiä*, muute' me
 You know, like rent+PAR, by the way (?) we
 viistoista *taalaa* maksamma *kuuränttyä*
 fifteen buck+PAR pay *monthly rent*+PAR
 'You know, like rent, by the way (?) we pay fifteen dollars monthly rent'
- (18) Ja sitte tuo, joka oli *petiruumana*
 And then that which was *bedroom*+ESS
 tuolla no, sitte ku Rälfi tuli vanhemmaksi
 there well, then when Ralph became older
 me laitimme sille *petiruuman*, se oli *kitsinä*
 we made him *bedroom*+ACC, it was *kitchen*+ESS
 ennen
 before
 'And then that which was the bedroom there well, then when Ralph became older we made a bedroom for him, it used to be the kitchen'

Examples (15) and (16) show that integrated ('nonce') loans are both morphologically and syntactically (but not phonologically) integrated into the RL, whereas adapted loans, as in (17) and (18), are also phonologically fully integrated into and adapted to the RL. So the category *adapted loan* is valid in language maintenance. However, it seems that adapted loans are less common among today's more recently arrived Finnish Americans.

There are some cases, however, which, in our view, even more clearly support the structural continuum.⁶ This is exemplified in (19), which represents one single turn:

- (19) Joo, sillon ei ollu vielä *freeway* niin, sitte,
 Yeah, then not was yet *freeway+Ø*, well, then,
 sen jälkeen, sillon ne rupes rakentaan *freewaytä*
 it+GEN after, then they began build+INF *freeway+PAR*
 'Yeah, then there was no freeway, well, then, after that, then they began building the freeway'

The first item *freeway* in (19) shows no obligatory case-marking (partitive), whereas the second item *freewaytä* follows the standard Finnish morphological case-assignment rule. In the approach proposed here the first occurrence is analyzed as a code-mix and the second one as an integrated ('nonce') loan. It seems that the speaker is able to move along the "switch"- "loan" cline until the item gradually consolidates itself (becomes more integrated). Halmari (1997: 49) regards a word such as *freeway* as a borrowing, because it has no good Finnish counterpart. She argues, however, that otherwise the determining factor which differentiates a code-switch from a borrowing is, in fact, *phonological unassimilation*, instead of morphological unassimilation (p. 179). In this view, both items in (19) should be regarded as 'switches', because neither of them are phonologically assimilated to the RL. Halmari (1997: 181) further argues that "from the point of view of theory formation" it would be "more satisfactory that the language of one speaker in one speech situation could be accounted for within one coherent framework". As noted above, the idea of a structural continuum advocated in the

⁶ Examples (19) and (20) have been elicited from 1st generation Finnish-born informants (G1F02 and G1M08, respectively). There is some evidence to suggest that those instances which violate Finnish morphological rules (as the first item *freeway* in [19]) might be a sign of "beginning or ongoing deterioration" in the informants' command of Finnish morphology (Halmari 1997: 153).

present article results in two different analyses of the items in (19), and it may therefore have less explanatory power from a theoretical point of view. However, given that our theory involves gradience, it is also conceptually natural to obtain these two analyses which show non-discrete categories.

Example (20) shows how the degree of phonological assimilation may vary in one single speech situation.

- (20) Ei ollu enn- + ennää hevusia sillon että
 Not was m- more horses then that
 (I: Ja mitä ne käytti sitten?) (I: `And what did they use then?')
Trakia vain (I: Aha) *fire truckia*.
 'trak'+i+PAR only *fire truck*+i+PAR
 Joo, minäki ajoin *faijeritrukia*
 Yeah, I+too drove 'faijeritruk'+i+PAR
 kolmekymmentäyks vuotta
 thirty-one years
 'There were no horses then any more ... only a truck ... fire truck. Yeah,
 I also used to drive a fire truck for thirty-one years'

It can be suggested that the RL (Finnish) speaker in (20) attempts to *imitate* the phonological structure of the SL lexical item (*fire*)*truck* to the best of his ability; there is hardly any phonological *adaptation* (assimilation) at first, but then the speaker follows a natural tendency to adapt the word *fire truck* and tries to meet some of the requirements of his native language phonological system: *faijeritrukia*. Van Coetsem (1995:77) argues that *adaptation* and *imitation* are in an either-or relationship. However, an example such as (20) shows that from a synchronic point of view the same lexical item may show features of both operations, imitation and adaptation. As a result, we have to describe *fire truckia* as a (morphologically) integrated loan, but how should we describe *trakia* or *faijeritrukia*, which show morphological integration into the RL but **not** complete phonological assimilation (*trakia*, *trukia*) or unassimilation (*faijeri*) to the original native vernacular? It seems to us, then, that also phonological assimilation varies along a continuum, and neither can phonological unassimilation be regarded as an either-or criterion. In

our theoretical framework, both items are regarded as 'loans' rather than 'switches'.

To complement the structural linguistic discussion of interference between the two languages, the focus should also be placed on the psycholinguistic aspects of lexical interference. Consistent with the argument in Poplack *et al.* (1987) and Lauttamus (1990), the distinction between code-switching and borrowing is also reflected in speech processing, mainly in the linguistic programming and neurolinguistic control of speech production. The evidence reported in Poplack *et al.* (1987), Pietilä (1989), and Lauttamus (1990) supports the view that in the Finnish-English bilingual settings (shift) code-switching is often forced on a speaker who has difficulties in speech processing. It should be remembered, however, this suggestion does not, by any means, apply to all bilingual settings. Our informants, and those of Pietilä's (1989), are only marginally bilingual, elderly speakers of Finnish and English. The difficulties or problems met by these speakers are usually transmitted to the listener by means of a number of cues, such as discourse particles (gambits such as *you know* in examples [4, 5, 6]), hesitation phenomena (pauses, filled pauses, fillers, elongated syllables, repetitions, as in [2, 4, 5, 6]) and repairs. It is our firm belief that the number of these discourse phenomena, hesitation phenomena in particular, is larger than what is usually expected in monolingual or bilingual speech. Pietilä (1989: 221) found a very significant difference between her elderly and younger adults in hesitation phenomena. Lauttamus (1990:27) suggests that an excess of these discourse phenomena reflects not only general language attrition but also the informants' insufficient proficiency in English. It is likely that the mode of discourse found among these informants may also be associated with the way a *marginal bilingual*, or a language learner, processes speech. In addition, our data (Lauttamus & Hirvonen 1998) suggests that an increasing number of code-changes and code-mixes across the three generations may reflect the slow attrition process of American Finnish, which will eventually die as the number of the "old-timers" in America dwindles.

4. Conclusion

It is reasonable to argue that language contact phenomena such as borrowing and code-switching can only be described in terms of a holistic framework which incorporates various structural linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors. Evidence from Finnish-English marginal bilingualism supports the view that code-switching and borrowing should be regarded as gradient phenomena on a structural linguistic continuum. This is supported by the fact that a considerable number of our examples show a varying degree of morphological integration and phonological adaptation in the items investigated even within a single speaker turn. Our data also suggests that code-switching and borrowing behaviour may not be constrained by one single grammar among marginal bilinguals but, in fact, by two operational grammars, particularly in code-mixing and nonce borrowing. However, many of the issues discussed in the article still remain unresolved until our data is investigated more systematically and removed from the individual level to the level of the whole speech community.

In Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) terminology, the two transfer types, *maintenance* and *shift*, can be paralleled by the two processes, (interference through) *borrowing* and (interference through) *shift*. It is, however, debatable whether such a strict dichotomy is justified on empirical grounds. Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism shows that 'nonce' borrowing (realized structurally as integrated loans) occurs in both language maintenance and shift-like situations. We must therefore conclude that the term *borrowing* itself should be used in reference to (synchronic or diachronic) transfer in general, and that the two basic transfer types, maintenance and shift, should be applied to the description and prediction of the linguistic *outcome* of the language contact rather than to the (synchronic) transfer situations themselves.

References

- Andersson, P. (1993) Finns and Americans in Sweden: Patterns of Linguistic Incorporation from Swedish. In Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Immigrant Languages in Europe*, pp. 249-269. Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halmari, H. (1993) Structural Relations and Finnish-English Code-switching. *Linguistics* 31: 1043-1068.
- Halmari, H. (1997) *Government and Codeswitching: Explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haugen, E. (1953) *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Reprinted in 1969. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.]
- Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Publications of the American Dialect Society 26.
- Hirvonen, P. (1982) Aspects of Fossilized Interlanguage: The English of Finnish Americans. In T. Fretheim & L. Hellan (eds.), *Papers from the Sixth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, pp. 260-268. Trondheim: Tapir.
- Hirvonen, P. (1988) American Finns as Language Learners. In M. Karni, O. Koivukangas & E. Laine (eds.), *FINNS IN NORTH AMERICA: Proceedings of Finn Forum III, 5-8 September 1984, Turku, Finland*, pp. 335-354. Turku: Institute of Migration.
- Hirvonen, P. (1990) Phonological and Morphological Aspects of Finnish Language Attrition in the United States. A paper presented at the International Congress of Dialectologists, Bamberg, July 29 - August 4, 1990.
- Hirvonen, P. (1993) Return of the Klörkki: More about the Fate of Old-country Words in American Finnish. In M. Suojanen & A. Kulkki-Nieminen (eds.), *19. Kielitieteen päivät Tampereella 8. - 9. toukokuuta 1992*, pp. 81-96. Folia Fennistica & Linguistica 16. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Karttunen, F. (1977) Finnish in America: A Case Study in Mono-generational Language Change. In B.G. Blount & M. Sanches (eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*, pp. 173-184. New York: Academic Press.
- Lauttamus, T. (1990) *Code-switching and Borrowing in the English of Finnish Americans in an Interview Setting*. Studies in Languages 20. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

- Lauttamus, T. (1991) Borrowing, Code-switching, and Shift in Language Contact. In M. Ojanen & M. Palander (eds.), *Language Contacts East and West*, pp. 32-53. Studies in Languages 22. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Lauttamus, T. (1992) Lainaaminen ja koodinvaihto: havaintoja amerikan-suomalaisten kielistä. *Virittäjä* 1992: 3-16. (English summary: Borrowing and code-switching in language contact: observations on the languages of Finnish Americans.)
- Lauttamus, T. & Hirvonen, P. (1995) English Interference in the Lexis of American Finnish. *The New Courant* 3: 55-65. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Lauttamus, T. & Hirvonen, P. (1998) From Finnish to English and Back Again: Code-switching in the Speech of Three Generations of Finnish Americans. A paper presented at When Languages Meet: Symposium on Language Contact and Change. Australian Linguistic Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 10-11 July 1998.
- Martin, M. (1988) Amerikansuomen morfologiaa ja fonologiaa. An unpublished Licentiate Thesis at the University of Jyväskylä.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993) *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pietilä, P. (1989) *The English of Finnish Americans with Reference to Social and Psychological Background Factors and with Special Reference to Age*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja, Sarja B, Osa 188. Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- Poplack, S. (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Poplack, S., Wheeler, S. & Westwood, A. (1987) Distinguishing Language Contact Phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English Bilingualism. In P. Lilius & M. Saari (eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics in Helsinki, August 18-22, 1986*, pp. 33-56. The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics 6. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. (Also *World Englishes* 8 [1989]: 389-406.)
- Romaine, S. (1995) *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thomason, S.G. & Kaufman, T. (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Torres, L. (1989) Code-mixing and Borrowing in a New York Puerto Rican Community: A Cross-generational Study. *World Englishes* 8: 419-432.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988) *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Van Coetsem, F. (1990) Review of Thomason and Kaufman (1988), Lehiste (1988), and Wardhaugh (1987). *Language in Society* 19: 260-268.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1995) Outlining a Model of the Transmission Phenomenon in Language Contact. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 84: 63-85.
- Virtaranta, P. (1992) *Amerikansuomen sanakirja / A Dictionary of American Finnish*. Turku: Institute of Migration.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1992) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. [Second ed.]. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Watson, G. (1999) Sveitsi's ja valttis: Code-switching and Borrowing in the English of Finnish-Australians - a Continuum. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 12 (this issue).

Contact Address:

Timo Lauttamus
English Department
University of Oulu
P.O. Box 1000
90401 Oulu, Finland
timo.lauttamus@oulu.fi