

Larisa Leisiö

## Integration and Gender Assignment in Finland Russian

### Abstract

Integrated in Finland Russian syntax, Finnish and Swedish noun insertions demonstrate their grammatical categories and, in particular, gender, with Russian targets of agreement. Otherwise, the insertion can be integrated explicitly, word-internally. In explicit integration, the form of the insertion is aligned to a particular Russian declension type. In gender assignment, speakers follow semantic or structural strategies. The choice of strategy of gender assignment is determined by the language preference of the speaker and the semantic and structural characteristics of the insertion. The variety of Finland Russian spoken by a particular informant also affects the style (explicit or implicit) of integration and the pattern of gender assignment.

### 1. Preliminaries

This paper is concerned with the gender assignment of Finnish and Swedish nouns in Finland Russian morphosyntax. The speakers are so-called Old Finland Russians, i.e., those Russian speakers who came or whose ancestors came to Finland at the latest at the time of the October Revolution and the Civil War in Russia, from 1917 up to the 1920s.

#### 1.1. Background of the speakers

Finland Russian data are extracted from tape-recorded research interviews. Most of the interviews were made in the 1980-1990s within two linguistic and socio-historical projects<sup>1</sup>. The interviewees belong to one of the following three groups:

---

<sup>1</sup> The projects were concerned with the retention of old Russian norms and interference, as well as with the socio-biographic history of the Finland Russians. The presupposed language for the interviews was Russian. The interviewees were mostly Finnish researchers with a high proficiency in Russian. The presupposed language of the interviews was Russian. The interviews were non-structured and open-ended, and they were arranged by appointment

(1) those descended from Russian merchants, civil servants or military officers who came to Finland mainly during the 19<sup>th</sup> century (after 1809 when Finland became the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland within the Russian Empire), and sometimes even earlier (1712-1809) to the so-called Old Finland, the former south-eastern part of Sweden Finland which then belonged to the Russian Empire; (2) the children of Russian immigrants who came to Finland during the Revolution and the Civil War in Russia (1918-20s), as well as those summer residents of the Karelian Isthmus (south-eastern Finland) who remained at their summer residences when the border between Russia and Finland was closed (1918); (3) (children of) the inhabitants of four Russian villages on the Karelian Isthmus. The ancestors of the latter had been transported to the Isthmus from the Jaroslavl' or Kostroma region in the 1710s and had retained the characteristic features of a Northern Russian dialect for generations. The largest village was Kyyrölä. In Kyyrölä, there was also an Orthodox church, for a long time the only one in the Russian villages. For that reason the speakers of all the four villages have often been referred to as Kyyrölä Russians. The Kyyrölä villages were surrounded by Finnish speaking villages for more than 200 years before the evacuation (1939 and 1944) from the Karelian Isthmus, which territory was ceded to the Soviet Union. There was a traditionally numerous Russian speaking population on the Karelian Isthmus. Kyyrölä Russians had connections with both Finns and Isthmus Russians but perceived an internal homogeneity. Kyyrölä speakers form the first corpus of the data. Kyyrölä Russians differ from the speakers accounted for above under groups (1) and (2). These groups mostly include persons with an urban background and urban way of life even while some of them live or have lived in the country. Although there are several tightly knit subgroups among them, together they have never formed a compact group

---

(usually by phone) and conducted in the informants' homes. The main part of the interview consisted of storytelling by the interviewee with short questions from the interviewer interspersed in the narrative. The duration of one interview varied from twenty minutes to three hours, an average duration being 40-50 minutes.

I did not participate in those projects but have already acquainted myself with the tape-recorded material. The data in my research also includes those tape-recordings which I made at the end of the 1990s. All the interviews were open-ended and non-structured. For more details on the data see Leisiö 2001. I have also briefly described the data in Leisiö 2000.

comparable to the Kyyrölä Russians. These speakers are considered in the second corpus of the data<sup>2</sup>.

Kyyrölä Russians have been Finnish citizens since 1811, and were included in the administrative system of the country. Especially in south-eastern Finland, administrative matters could be dealt with in Russian up to the October Revolution, 1917. Many men from the Russian villages used to earn their living seasonally from construction and painting contracts outside the villages. Their employers were often Finns, and thus the male population of the Kyyrölä villages spoke Finnish. The female population was mostly monolingual. After the Revolution and Finland's independence, contacts between the Finns and Kyyrölä Russians intensified. The administrative language outside the community became Finnish. Some Finnish teaching was organised at the schools in Kyyrölä in 1920. Since the beginning of the 1930s primary school education has been entirely in Finnish. The military used Finnish. Conscripted Kyyrölä men, illiterate in Finnish, attended a short-term Finnish army elementary school. The evacuation during World War II (1939, 1944) and subsequent loss of their place of residence started a process of language shift among Kyyrölä Russians. Those born after 1924 who went to the Finnish school in Kyyrölä continued their education in Finnish or Swedish after the evacuation. As a result of the evacuation Finnish or Swedish became their everyday language. Russian was only spoken at home and with close acquaintances. Most of those who reached marriageable age in the 1940-50s married Finns. Consequently, they have never even spoken Russian at home, usually the last bastion of a minority language. Nor do the children born to mixed marriages speak Kyyrölä Russian.

In the 1980-1990s (the time of the data collection) the Kyyrölä speakers spoke Finnish, although those women born in the 1900-1910s considered their Finnish poor. Among persons born between 1900-1924, all the male speakers spoke Finnish well. Both the men and women born at that time still spoke Russian fluently.

At the moment when the data were collected neither Kyyrölä speakers nor speakers in the second corpus formed a speech community. Up to the evacuation

---

<sup>2</sup> Earlier (Leisiö 2000 and 2001) I have regarded Kyyrölä speakers as being dialectal and other speakers as non-dialectal.

Kyyrölä speakers had been a focussed speech community<sup>3</sup>.

In both corpora, there are first and non-first generation speakers. Non-first generation speakers are those who are child bilinguals, and who have grown up in the other-language environment with its own niche for both (or all three) languages, Russian being limited to home and close non-formal circles. First generation speakers are often adult biliguals, or have had the opporunity of using Russian widely in their childhood and adolecence and have received a formal education in Russian.

## 1.2. Gender assignment in language contact

Like monolingual gender assignment (Corbett 1991: 7-8), multilingual gender assignment is based on semantic or formal information about the noun. Although called by various names, these two basic principles were identified in the research on gender assignment in various multilingual situations.<sup>4</sup> A typical piece of semantic information is the physiological gender of the referent. Inserted in L1, the nouns of L2 are allocated to a particular gender according to their animate referent or according to their *semantic* equivalent in L1. *Formal* gender is determined by the phonological or morphological shape of the inserted noun.

Baetens Beardsmore (1971) reported that the gender assignment of Flemish nouns in Brussels French depends on the degree of acculturation and correlates with the amount of interference in the language system of a particular speaker. Some bilingual speakers with considerable interference showed variations in gender assignment for the same word. Nevertheless, this author emphasised (ibid.: 158) that the internal linguistic features of the languages in contact affect gender assignment more than socio-cultural characteristics.

---

<sup>3</sup> A speech community is "a social group which may be either monolingual or multilingual, held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set off from the surrounding areas by weaknesses in the lines of communication" (Gumperz 1962/1968: 483). The characteristics of a social group and its language as focussed (vs. *diffuse*) are based on a number of features, dense and multiple social networks being of the most importance (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 115-116).

<sup>4</sup> For instance, Poplack, Pousada, and Sankoff (1982) for Puerto-Rican Spanish in New York City and Montreal French, Correa-Zoli (1973) for American Italian, Clyne (1967) for Australian German, and Beardsmore (1971) for the spoken French in a Flemish/French bilingual situation in Brussels.

The decisive importance of linguistic factors was also pointed out by Shana Poplack, Alicia Pousada and David Sankoff (henceforth 'Poplack et al.') (1982), who investigated cross-linguistic gender assignment in two corpora, Puerto-Rican Spanish in New York City and Montreal French.

### 1.2.1 Codeswitching and borrowing

In a monolingual society there are a number of foreign words which are considered borrowed. Bilingual groups and communities can also have such borrowings from L2 in L1, along with codeswitching. It was suggested that the distinction between borrowing and codeswitching is based on morphological and social distinctions in the treatment of the other-language elements.

Hasselmo (1974: 144) and Poplack (1980: 584-85) propose that code-switching can be identified according to the type of integration at the phonological, morphological and syntactic levels. According to Poplack, if all these three levels manifest integration, then the item should be considered a borrowing.

According to Poplack, Wheeler and Westwood (1987: 37), in addition to the structural criteria of an established loan, there are also social criteria — recurrence in the speech of an individual and dispersion in the community. If structural-level-based criteria are satisfied, but not those of recurrence and dispersion, *nonce borrowing* is in question, the morphological and syntactic role of which "is equivalent to that of established loanwords" (ibid.). These scholars note that both recurrent and dispersed insertions ("established loanwords") and those non-recurrent ("nonce borrowings") play an equal morphological and syntactic role.

### 1.2.2. Codeswitching and language mixing

Henceforth I will use the notions of codeswitching and language mixing as defined by Peter Auer (1999). Both *codeswitching* and *language mixing* are a juxtaposition of two languages within the same discourse and the same syntactic syntagm. In codeswitching, this juxtaposition is interpretive (i.e., meaningful for the participants in the interaction) indexing of some aspects of the situation (discourse-related codeswitching) or of the features of the participants (participant-related codeswitching). In *alternational* codeswitching, "a return

after the switch into the previous language is not predictable" (Auer 1999: 313). Cases in which the switch covers a syntactic structure of language B, typically a content word, belong to *insertional* codeswitching. *Language mixing* is the juxtaposition of two languages which has no interactional meaning. Language mixing can also be insertional and alternational. (ibid.: 310, 313-315.)

In gender assignment *noun insertions* which constitute either insertional codeswitching or language mixing come into consideration.

### 1.2.3. Change of intralinguistic gender assignment

Gender assignment is connected to other language-contact phenomena (cf. Beardsmore 1971: 141). The possibility of intralinguistic gender vacillation should be taken into consideration.

Language contact can induce a change of the gender category. Investigating the trilingual situation in the Indian village of Kupwar, Gumperz and Wilson (1971: 155-156) report that the language of Kannada, with semantic gender, has affected the gender of the two other languages spoken in the village, Marathi and Urdu. Marathi and Urdu have semantic and morphological gender criteria. Kupwar Marathi and Kupwar Urdu have aligned with Kannada, changing their gender assignment principles into semantic ones: in both Kupwar Marathi and Kupwar Urdu semantic assignment is used for nouns with human referents whereas other nouns are neuter in Kupwar Marathi and masculine in Kupwar Urdu.

## 2. A grammatical background

### 2.1. Semantic and grammatical agreement in Russian

Gender is a syntactic category related to agreement. Agreement is "a formal relationship between elements, whereby a form of one word requires a corresponding form of another." (Crystal 1980/1996: 13). The element which determines the agreement is called the *controller*. The *controller* assigns agreement categories to the *target*. The features determined by the controller are *agreement categories*. The controller, targets and the relationship between them

specify the *domain* of agreement<sup>5</sup>. Gender is one domain of agreement, the others being number, person, and case.

**Table 1a.** Gender distinction in declension (see appendix for abbreviations)

<i>belyj dym, kon'</i>	white.masc smoke <sub>masc</sub> , horse <sub>masc</sub>
<i>moj papa</i>	my.masc father <sub>masc</sub>
<i>beloe pole</i>	white.neut. field <sub>neut</sub>
<i>belaja kryša, lošad'</i>	white.fem roof <sub>fem</sub> , horse <sub>fem</sub>

DECL. GENDER	C A S E					
	NOM	GEN	ACC*	DAT	INS	LOC
I neutr.	<i>bel-oe pol-e</i>	<i>bel-ogo pol-ja</i>	<i>bel-oe pol-e</i>	<i>bel-omu pol-ju</i>	<i>bel-ym pol-em</i>	<i>bel-om pol-e</i>
I masc.	<i>bel-yj dym</i>	<i>bel-ogo dym-a</i>	<i>bel-yj dym</i>	<i>bel-omu dym-u</i>	<i>bel-ym dym-om</i>	<i>bel-om dym-e</i>
II masc.	<i>moj papa</i>	<i>mo-ego pap-y</i>	<i>mo-ego pap-u</i>	<i>mo-emu pap-e</i>	<i>mo-im pap-oj</i>	<i>mo-em pap-e</i>
II fem.	<i>bel-aja kryš-a</i>	<i>bel-oj kryš-i</i>	<i>bel-uju kryš-u</i>	<i>bel-oj kryš-e</i>	<i>bel-oj kryš-ej</i>	<i>bel-oj kryš-e</i>
III fem	<i>bel-aja lošad'</i>	<i>bel-oj lošad-i</i>	<i>bel-uju lošad'</i>	<i>bel-oj lošad-i</i>	<i>bel-oj lošadj-u</i>	<i>bel-oj lošad-i</i>
pl.	<i>bel-ye dym-y kryš-i pap-y lošad-i pol-ja</i>	<i>bel-yh dym-ov kryš pap lošad-ej pol-ej</i>	<i>bel-ye dym-y kryš-i pol-ja anim.: bel-yh lošad- ej, kon-ej, (mo-ih) pap</i>	<i>bel-ym dymam kryšam lošadj-am pol-jam papam</i>	<i>bel-ymi dym-ami kryš-ami lošad'-mi pol-jami pap-ami</i>	<i>bel-yh dym-ah kryš-ah lošadj-ah pol-jah pap-ah</i>

<sup>5</sup> I apply the terminology suggested in Gazdar et al. (1985).

Russian has three genders. A noun is a controller and assigns agreement categories to the targets, which are adjectival modifier, relative and personal pronoun, and the verb in the past tense. Russian gender agreement can be both semantic and morphological. Semantic agreement is determined by the meaning of the controller while morphological agreement is determined by the declensional type of the controller. Semantic strategy works for sex-differentiable nouns, which are allocated to feminine or masculine according to the physiological gender of their referents. Table 1 shows gender distinctions for the three declension types.<sup>6</sup>

In the plural forms of targets, gender distinction is neutralised. In singular oblique cases, the distinction between masculine and neuter is neutralised, and only a distinction between feminine and non-feminine is retained. This is schematised in the following table:

**Table 1b.** Gender distinction in declension, generalised.

'+' means gender distinction present, '-' means gender distinction lacking.

		NOM.Sg.	other cases Sg.	Pl
GENDER	fem.	+	+	—
	masc.	+	—	—
	neut.	+	—	—

Although basically morphological and semantic, gender allocation has extensive phonological correlations: in the nominative singular, nouns ending in a hard consonant and *-j* are always masculine (*stul* 'chair<sub>masc</sub>', *boj* 'battle<sub>masc</sub>'), nouns ending in *-a* (inanimate) are always feminine (*škola* 'school<sub>fem</sub>'), and nouns ending in *-o*, *-e* and *-mja* are neuter (*nebo* 'sky<sub>neut</sub>', *more* 'sea<sub>neut</sub>', *vremja* 'time<sub>neut</sub>'). Nevertheless, nouns ending in a palatal consonant (graphically expressed by the soft sign, literated here with an apostrophe) and in consonants /ž/, /š/, /č/, /šč/<sup>7</sup> are either masculine or feminine, cf. *bol'* 'pain<sub>fem</sub>' — *boli.GEN* and *noľ* 'zero<sub>masc</sub>'

<sup>6</sup> Cyrillics transliterated according to ISO system.

<sup>7</sup> In the ending of feminine nouns these four consonants are followed by the soft sign, which has no phonological significance, only an orthographic one.



— *noľja*.GEN, *noč'*'night<sub>fem</sub>' — *noči*.GEN, *mjač'*'ball<sub>masc</sub>' — *mjača*.GEN.

## 2.2. Borrowings and vacillation in gender

According to the oldest tradition of borrowing in Russian (approximately up to the early 1800s), foreign nouns were declined, and if necessary, were morphologically adapted, so that they fitted into one of the Russian declension types (Černyšev 1914-15: 116-117). The habit of not declining foreign loans started in the first half of the nineteenth century in upper class circles, among those who could speak foreign languages and thus were conscious of the foreign origin of these words. Still, there were only a few indeclinable nouns during that period. The growth of the indeclinability of nouns intensified during the Soviet period, and is considered to be one aspect of the general growth of the analyticity observed in the Russian of the 20th century. (Comrie et al. 1996: 117-18.)

Loanwords are allocated to gender on the same principles as Russian nouns. Morphological gender can be applied if the form of the loanword fits the Russian declension type. Only in this case can the noun be declined. Otherwise it is indeclinable. Semantic gender assignment works for sex-differentiable nouns: *sēr* is masculine declinable (the first declension type for masculines) and *miss* feminine indeclinable. Animate loan nouns and personal names that end in a consonant and refer to a male are declined, e.g., *u molodogo mistera Džonson-a* 'at young.masc.GEN mister Johnson.GEN', cf. *u molodoj missis Džonson* 'at young.fem.GEN missis Johnson'. Many indeclinable nouns align with the gender of their hyperonym, i.e., *kol'rābi* 'kohlrabi' is feminine according to the hypernym *kapusta* 'cabbage<sub>fem</sub>', *Tajms* 'Times' is feminine in alignment with the hypernym *gazeta* 'newspaper<sub>fem</sub>'; *Gobi* 'the Gobi' assigns feminine according to the hypernym *pustynja* 'desert<sub>fem</sub>', *hindi* 'Hindi' is masculine, aligned with *jazyk* 'language<sub>masc</sub>'. The residue of semantic and morphological bases is neuter in CSR for inanimate and masculine for sex-indifferent animate nouns: *ralli*<sub>neut</sub> 'rally' and *flamingo*<sub>masc</sub>.

In the 1800s and at the beginning of the 1900s many inanimate indeclinable masculine and feminine loans became neuter.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The period of vacillation was in the 1920s and early 1930s. For some nouns the period of vacillation was much longer (Comrie et al. 1996: 108-109).

### 2.3. Gender assignment, declension and morphological integration in non-standard Russian<sup>9</sup>

In non-standard Russian speech, foreign loans are declined and morphologically integrated to a much greater degree than in CSR, in line with the old tradition (Comrie et al. 1996: 118-119). Although neutral in standard speech, many loans acquire other genders in non-standard varieties. Feminine is especially frequent. Most of these nouns end in an unstressed *-o*, which, due to vowel reduction, is pronounced in the same way as the unstressed /a/. This fact explains the feminine assignment. For instance, *povidlo*<sub>neut</sub> 'jam' is pronounced *povidla*, like the feminine *škóla* 'school'. The re-allocation of these neuters to the feminine is considered to be the result of *ákanje*<sup>10</sup> (Comrie et al. 1996: 109). In regional dialects to the west of Moscow and some dialects bordering on non-Russian populations, nouns neuter in CSR are allocated to the masculine (Kasatkin 1989: 82).

### 2.4. The category of gender in Finnish and Swedish

Finnish has no gender category. In Swedish, nouns are divided into utrum (common) and neuter. The singular indefinite articles are *en* for the common gender and *ett* for the neuter gender, and the singular definite articles are *den* for common and *det* for neuter. Personal pronouns show a natural gender distinction for humans, *han* 'he' for male persons and *hon* 'she' for female persons, while *den* and *det* are personal pronouns for non-human referents. Gender is manifest in the noun phrase by the demonstrative pronoun, the preposed indefinite or definite article as well as by the form of the adjective (1a, 1b) or of the noun (1c, 1d):

1. a. *en grön färg*  
a.com green(com) färg<sub>com</sub>
- b. *ett grönt hus*  
a.neut green.neut house<sub>neut</sub>
- c. *den gröna färg-en*  
the.com green.def color<sub>com</sub>def

<sup>9</sup> 'Non-standard' also covers dialect speech.

<sup>10</sup> *Ákanje*, the term formed of the verb *akat'* lit. 'to point /a/', means the merging of /a/ and /o/ into a low back unrounded vowel in unstressed syllables after non-palatalised consonants.

- d. *det gröna hus-et*  
 the.neut green.def house<sub>neut</sub>.def  
 (Corbett 1991: 124-125)

In the plural, the gender has no syntactic manifestation, rather gender is shown by the noun ending: *de gröna färg-er-na* 'the.def green.def color.Pl<sub>com</sub>.def'

The origin of the common gender as a combination of the earlier masculine and feminine is reflected in the fact that animates are usually common and inanimates neuter. For instance, most nouns referring to human beings, plants, animals and, in gross, concrete objects usually belong to the common gender, although a few of them are neuter (*ett barn* 'a child', *ett fruntimmer* 'a female person', *ett vittne* 'witness', *ett djur* animal', *ett får*, *ett lamm* 'a sheep', *ett träd* 'a tree' etc.). Many material nouns and several types of abstract nouns are neuters. Other parts of speech when substantivised acquire the neuter gender, e.g., originally active participles *ett gående* 'walking<sub>neut</sub>', *ett påstående* statement<sub>neut</sub>'. Nevertheless, those substantivised participles which refer to persons are common, e.g., *en studerande* 'a student', *en handlande* 'tradesman'. (Amnell & Pinomaa 1974: 29-31.)

For animate common nouns a trace of feminine-masculine distinction is retained: animate nouns with a final *-a* have female reference. Although some nouns with a final phoneme other than *-a* can refer to female, there are no *-a* final nouns with male reference. In addressing formula the target of definite nouns with male referents always takes an *-e* ending instead of the usual *-a* (2e-2h). In a non-addressing context, the attribute modifier of the nouns referring to males can get either *-a* or *-e* ending (2c, 2d).

- 2.
- |                                   |                   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. <i>den unga flicka-n</i>       | the young girl    |
| b. <i>den gamla häst-en</i>       | the old horse     |
| c. <i>Den gamla/gamle man-nen</i> | the old man       |
| d. <i>den unga/unge pojke-n</i>   | the young boy     |
| In addressing:                    |                   |
| e. <i>unga fröken</i>             | young girl        |
| f. <i>Unge prins Erik</i>         | young Prince Erik |
| g. <i>Unge man</i>                | Young man         |
| h. <i>Bäste Erik</i>              | Dear Erik         |

Thus, gender categories in Swedish and Russian have certain parallels in the

neuter assignment as well as in the feminine association of the *-a*-final nouns with personal reference.

### 3. Data analysis<sup>11</sup>

#### 3.1. Intralinguistic gender affiliation

In the present data, gender differences were basically retained. Only one third generation speaker (M1968) showed some degree of disruption of this category manifesting pervasive masculine assignment for CSR feminines. In his speech, nouns which are masculines in CSR always assigned masculines to their targets, and the few neuters he used in the interview assigned neuters.

In the speech of another third generation speaker, an *-a*-final noun with male human reference assigned the feminine once.

#### 3. F1967 (IR<sub>f</sub>)

--- *storona moej papy oni s- vse finny byli;*

--- side my.GEN.fem father<sub>masc</sub>.GEN they all Finns were;

'As for my father's relatives, they all were Finns'.

This speaker exhibited characteristically constant control over her speech, very careful language use, including the avoidance of the other-language elements, and virtually lacked non-grammatical passages.<sup>12</sup> In the above extract, the noun *papy* 'father.GEN' is in a syntactically peripheral position, being a genitival modifier. The physiological gender of the referent is not as prominent as it would be in the position of the subject or object. What is at work here is a preference for formal criteria for gender assignment over semantic criteria. A similar occurrence was also found in the speech of a dialect informant, dial. F1932.

---

<sup>11</sup> Informants are indicated according to gender (F, M) and year of birth, e.g., F1923. The speakers of the first corpus (Kyyrölä) are indicated as dial., e.g., dial. M1910. In each corpus, the persons of the same gender and year of birth are distinguished by a letter index, e.g., M1910a. IR stands for interviewer. Subscript 'f/m' indicates the gender of the interviewer, and the number distinguishes different interviewers of the same gender.

<sup>12</sup> Although not non-grammatical, there were, nevertheless, non-native features in her Russian in the phonological shaping of the words, rhythm and intonation as well as expressions which, although grammatical, sound 'clumsy' to a native speaker.

In Russian, some borrowings gradually changed their gender assignment from masculine to feminine at the end of the 18th century. These old gender assignment patterns have been retained in diaspora language transmission.

In the Kyyrölä corpus, there were occurrences of concrete neuter nouns being allocated to the masculine. Outforcing of the neuter by the masculine in Kyyrölä Russian was reported by von Prushevsky (1962: 214-15) on the basis of data collected in 1949.

Among Kyyrölä non-first generation speakers there were a few cases of gender converging in oblique cases:

4. dial. M1925:
  - a. *na ètom storone*  
on this.masc.LOC side<sub>fem</sub>.LOC
  - b. *na finskoj storone*  
on Finnish.fem.LOC side<sub>fem</sub>.LOC
  - c. *v bronevom avtomășine*  
in armoured.masc.LOC car<sub>fem</sub>.LOC
  - d. *lentočnaja mașina*  
belt.fem machine<sub>fem</sub>.NOM

The ending of the 2nd (-*a*-final feminines and -*a*-final animate masculines) and 1st declension (neuters and C-final masculines) types is identical in the locative. This fact is responsible for triggering the demonstrated masculine agreement of the target in (4a) and (4c) above. Sometimes the correct gender assignment was retained, cf. (4b). In the nominative, in which the gender distinction is the most prominent, feminine assignment was always retained by the speaker, cf. (4d).

### 3.2. Interlinguistic gender affiliation

Insertional codeswitching was the language-alternation type mostly observed in the data. The other-language items were often marked as participants' competence-related: preceded and/or followed by a hesitation marker, self-repair-initiation (formulated search for Russian equivalent), self-repair (introducing Russian equivalent) or the formulation of a competence assessment. Sometimes insertions had discourse- and participant-related meaning: they marked a change in the participant constellation, focussed a central item in the narrative, provided coherence to the preceding turn, etc.

Even when flagging the other-language items for their foreign provenance, speakers usually integrated them in Russian morphosyntax. Sometimes the same speaker changed the degree of integration of the same item in the same conversation.

An L2 noun may be adapted in L1 morphologically and phonologically, thus, word-internally.<sup>13</sup> In this case the form of the insertion is reshaped to align to a gender pattern and particular declension of the recipient language. Adapted word-internally, the noun predictably controls agreement equally with nouns of the respective pattern in the recipient language. Otherwise, the noun may be used in its foreign, L2, shape. In this case it can be integrated syntactically and can show gender and other agreement categories on the targets of agreement. I will refer to word-internal integration as *explicit* (in the sense that it is demonstrated in the form of the word) and to word-external, syntactic, integration as *implicit*.<sup>14</sup>

### 3.2.1. Semantic strategies

The gender of the insertion referring to a person was always aligned with the *physiological* gender of the referent, even if the insertion was marked for its foreign provenance. Another pattern of the semantic strategy was *analogical*: the inserted noun aligned the gender of the Russian semantic equivalent or hypernym. In this pattern, the domain of agreement is actually formed by the Russian equivalent, which is a controller of agreement, and the target. The gender is assigned according to the morphological criteria pertinent to the Russian equivalent.

Speaker F1916c allocated the Finnish *yksiö* 'bed-sitter' to the feminine, following the gender of the Russian hypernym *kvartir-a* 'flat<sub>fem</sub>'. The gender and case of the inserted noun are shown in its adjectival modifiers in the NP *v takoj*

<sup>13</sup> I do not mean Russian accent in the pronunciation of Finnish words, but changes more intensively affecting the word. A Russian accent is usual in the speech of adult Russian-Finnish bilinguals. Mother tongue accent is usual for adult bilinguals generally. In his doctoral thesis, Nils Hasselmo (1961: 53-54) showed that first generation American-Swedish speakers when switching still used a Swedish phonic pattern. Hasselmo called this phenomenon "ragged switching".

<sup>14</sup> Distinguishing these two styles of integration, Poplack, Pousada and Sankoff (1982) analysed nouns whose shape is adapted according to a gender pattern of the recipient language distinct from those whose gender assignment is shown only syntactically (ibid.: 16, Table 3).

*malen'koj yksiö* 'in such.fem.LOC small.fem.LOC **bed-sitter**' ('in such a small bed-sitter').

Speaker F1898a allocated the Finnish noun *asia* to the neuter, which is demonstrated by the form of the pronominal modifier *kakoe*. The Russian equivalent of the Finnish insertion is neuter *delo*.

The form of the Russian word sometimes determined gender assignment, even if the Russian equivalent was momentarily forgotten.

5. F1917 (IR<sub>FI</sub>) (F1917 is a habitual speaker of Russian, who also speaks Finnish and Swedish.)

- 01 F *ključ vešali vsegda, u dveri, naverhu (.) byl ee byl (2.0) **naula**.*  
the key used to be left, by the door, above (.) there was.masc *ehm* was.masc  
(2.0) **a nail**.
- 02 IR *mm,*
- 03 F *ʔkak èto po-russki? °*  
°what is it in Russian?°
- 04 IR *da, kak žè-hh **naula** po-russki hhh-da nu-hhh*  
yes, what is the Russian for **nail** *hhh*
- 05 F *gvozd'!*  
*nail<sub>masc</sub>!*
- 06 IR *mm,*
- 07 F *i na ètot gvozd' vešali vsegda ključ.*  
and the key used to be left on this nail.
- 08 IR *mm,*

The speaker demonstrates missing a term (line 01): she repeats the past masculine verb form *byl* 'was', hesitates trying to recall a missed Russian item and follows with the Finnish *naula* 'nail' (line 01). The hesitation is indicated with silent pauses before and after the verb forms and the voiced pause *ehm* between them. The past masculine form of the verb points to the masculine controller of the agreement. Although not recalled, the Russian equivalent *gvozd'*<sub>masc</sub> determines masculine assignment. Continuing with a metalinguistic sequence, the speaker recalls the Russian for 'nail' (line 05) and returns to the main line of her story (line 07).

Another speaker, dial. M1928 cannot recall the Russian for 'sock':

6. dial. M1928a (IR<sub>15</sub>) (the speaker is telling the interviewer an episode from his childhood)  
 01 M --- *vot pozabyl v suk-to v sučok*  
 --- PRT ((I)) have forgotten in the bough<sub>masc</sub>, bough<sub>dim.masc</sub>  
 02 IR *v nosok!*  
 in the sock<sub>masc</sub>!

The Finnish for 'sock' is *sukka*, and the Russian *nosok*. In Russian, *suk*, the diminutive form of which is *suč-ok*, is a 'bough'. The speaker contaminates the Finnish and Russian noun for 'sock', joining the stem of the Finnish noun and suffix of the missed Russian *nosok*. The Finnish stem bears the lexical meaning, and the Russian suffix determines the morphological shape and, consequently, the gender. Like the preceding example, this one illustrates the deeper entrenchment of the system morpheme in comparison of the content morpheme. The interviewer, a Russian monolingual, guessed the missed noun (line 02) due to the correct morphological form introduced by the speaker.

The Finnish compounds structured as modifier + head often assigned gender analogically, according to the semantic equivalent of the head, which is the hypernym of the compound. For instance, *kansakoulu* (lit. 'folk school') 'primary school' assigned the feminine to its target, following the Russian *škola* 'school<sub>fem</sub>'. The analogical pattern is often followed by those informants who habitually speak Russian. The problem with ascribing this pattern is that the researcher cannot always be sure that his/her equivalent coincides with the equivalent of the speaker.

### 3.2.2. Structural strategies

According to the *structural* strategies, the final phoneme of an inserted Finnish or Swedish noun is equated with a certain Russian gender marker: consonant-ending insertions assign the masculine, inserted nouns with a final vowel *-a* or *-ä* assign the feminine and nouns with a final *-o, -ö, -e* the neuter.

Following a structural strategy by the speaker does not necessarily mean that s/he does not know the equivalent or hypernym. In (7a), at first introduction the Finnish compound for 'model house' was preceded with the Russian *pervyj dom* 'the first.masc house<sub>masc</sub>'. Apparently not satisfied with the Russian quasi-equivalent (cf. the preceding hesitation *hm*), the speaker introduced the Finnish



*mallitalo*. On repetition of the insertion (7b), the speaker allocated it to the neuter (according to the final *-o*) and did not mark it for foreign provenance:

7. F1920e (IR<sub>FI</sub>)
- a. èto takoj byl hm pervyj dom, **mallitalo**  
 it such.masc was.masc hm first.masc house **prototype house**  
 'It was a model house.'
- b. èto potomu što èto bylo **mallitalo**. —  
 this because it was.neut **a prototype house**  
 Fi *mallitalo* 'prototype house'

Speaker F1904 allocated the Finnish *mökki* 'summer house' to the feminine. First introduced, the insertion was in subject position and assigned the feminine gender to the past verb form *byla* 'was'. The Russian analogical pattern can be suggested as the criterion for this assignment, cf. the Russian feminine equivalent *dača*. The same gender is demonstrated by this insertion at the second occurrence, in which it appeared in genitive position in QP: *dve mökki* 'two.fem **summer-house**', 'two summer houses'. (Numeral *dva.nonfem/dve.fem* 'two' assigns the genitive to the noun and agrees with the noun in gender.) At first glance, the same analogical pattern is used in this case, too. On the other hand, a structural strategy cannot be excluded from consideration, since the final *-i* of *mökki* can be easily reanalysed as the Russian feminine singular genitive ending of the *-a* final feminines (the 2nd declension), cf. the Russian equivalent QP *dve.fem dáč-i<sub>fem</sub> GEN*.

There is further evidence of a reanalysis of the final vowel as a case-gender ending. Speaker F1902a reanalyses the final *-u* of the Finnish noun *kinkku* 'ham' as the feminine form of the accusative singular in the accusative NP *cel'nu-ju kinkku* 'whole.fem.ACC **ham**', cf. *dača.NOM - daču.ACC*. The Russian equivalents of the Finnish *kinkku* 'ham' are the masculine *okorok* and the feminine *vetčina*, but we still cannot be sure if the speaker had in mind the feminine equivalent noun or any equivalent at all.

The same speaker reanalysed the final *-i* of *tontti* as a feminine ending of the genitive singular in QP *dve tontti* two.fem **plot** 'two plots'.

Both F1902a and F1904 who provided evidence of reanalysis had had a minimal education in Russian and both spoke a non-standard variety, although not a regional dialect.

The trilingual speaker M1892 who had spoken mostly Finland Swedish in the two decades preceding the interview, affiliated the insertion *tont* (<Sw. *en*

*tomt* 'plot') to the masculine and integrated this noun explicitly: *dva tónta* two.masc plot.GEN 'the two plots', cf. Russian *zont<sub>masc</sub>* — *dva.nonfem zontá.GEN* 'an umbrella'. The final *-a* corresponds to the ending of the Russian genitive of the 1st-declension masculine singular nouns.

The gender affiliation of these two nouns, Fi. *tontti* and Sw. *en tomt*, the former being a Finnish borrowing of the latter, gives a hint that as the result of the application of the structural pattern to Finnish insertions, the feminine gender would prevail, whereas for the Swedish insertions the masculine would be more frequent.

In all the cases of its occurrence in Kyyrölä Russian, the Finnish noun *hotelli* 'hotel' was allocated to the feminine<sup>15</sup>. Telling a story, the dialectal speaker F1928a used this insertion in three times: in the NP *po hotelli* along **hotel**.DAT 'from one hotel to another' ([8] line 01)<sup>16</sup>, *v tretjej hotelli* in third.fem.LOC **hotel** 'in the third hotel' ([8] line 03), and *v ètu hotél* 'in this.fem.ACC **hotel**' ([8] line 04). In the first and the second occurrences the Finnish noun is integrated implicitly, showing the grammatical categories of the case and gender in its modifiers. In the second case the final vowel of the insertion *-i* can be supposed to be reanalysed as the marker of the locative of the feminine singular (the 3rd declension), cf. *detál'<sub>fem</sub> NOM* — *v detáli.LOC* 'in a detail'. This consideration is supported by the third occurrence, in which the insertion is explicitly integrated as the nominative/accusative form of the palatal feminine ending (the 3rd declension). The integration of *-lli*-final Finnish insertions as *-l'*-final Russian feminines (the 3rd declension) results from phonetic interference: in the speech of second generation Kyyrölä Russians [l] is alveolar, like the Finnish [l], and not a dental velar as in CSR<sup>17</sup> (see Leisiö 1994: 71 and 1998: 175). Thus, it approaches the Russian palatalised [l']. Nouns with a final palatalised [l'] are often feminine, not only in non-standard speech, but also in CSR (*detal'<sub>fem</sub>* 'detail', *rol'<sub>fem</sub>* 'role', *model'<sub>fem</sub>* 'model').

<sup>15</sup> The CSR for 'hotel' is the feminine *gostinica*. The French loan, *otél'*, which was used up to the 1920-1930s and is now making its return, has been allocated to the masculine in standard speech.

<sup>16</sup> In the PP *po* + DAT with the meaning 'from one to another' the preposition *po* can collocate only with plural nouns.

<sup>17</sup> In some areal Russian dialects there is a palatal pronunciation of [l], although not in the Russian dialect from which Kyyrölä Russian originated.

8. dial. F1928a (IR<sub>FI</sub>, F's mother and sister are present)
- 01 *da; vot one s ètim, s policejskim po hotelli.*  
yes; so they with this, with the policeman along **hotel**.  
'She and the policeman visited one hotel after another.'
- 02 *v odnoj sprosilu netu, v drugoj netu,*  
in one.fem.LOC asked.3Pl no, in the other.fem.LOC no  
'They asked in one hotel after another - there was nobody with that name'
- 03 *a v tretjej hotelli rouva N. est'.*  
and in the third.fem.LOC **hotel** Mrs N. is  
'At last they found Mrs. N in one of the hotels.'
- 04 *i vot oni s policejskim tudy, v ètu hoteL. ---*  
and so they with the policeman there, to this.fem.ACC **hotel**.  
'And they went to that hotel.'

### 3.2.3. The pattern of suffix analogy

Morphological strategies include the pattern of suffix analogy. Cognate suffixes are rarely met in Russian and Finnish and more often in Russian and Swedish. Insertions which had cognate suffixes in Russian showed the same gender assignment as the Russian nouns with the corresponding suffix. In the Swedish noun *ett regemente* (definite form *regementet*) 'regiment', the suffix *-mente* is close to the Russian loan suffix *-ment* (cf. the masculines *kompliment* 'compliment', *monument* 'monument', *assortiment* 'assortment' etc.). This similarity triggered masculine assignment and the explicit integration of the Swedish noun in the speech of F1900b: *celyj regimént* the whole.masc **regiment** (note also phonemic adaptation: /e/>/i/ in the unstressed second syllable). Later the same speaker morphologically integrated this insertion in the plural, *èti regimény* 'these regiments'. The plural declination indicates an advanced degree of nativation (see a discussion below).

### 3.2.4. Mixed strategies: homophones

The Finnish nouns which had a Russian homophone assigned the same gender as the latter. Such bilingual homophones were usually semantically close. The same pattern worked in the case of an inserted compound whose last component was an auditorily close Russian equivalent. For instance, a dialect speaker

M1928c allocated the Finnish nouns *putkimiina* 'tubular mine' and *latumiina* 'track mine' to the feminine, since the second component of these nouns, *miina*, has the homophonous Russian equivalent *mina* 'mine<sub>fem</sub>'.

The Swedish for 'school', *en skola*, auditively and even more graphically resembles the Russian equivalent *škola*, which is feminine. This Swedish insertion and all compounds with the final component *-skola*, e.g. *flickskola* 'girl-school' (F1917), were feminine.

The auditive shape of the Finnish *nimi* 'name' is close to its Russian equivalent, *imja*, which is neuter. This Finnish insertion was allocated to the neuter by the dialectal F1907b.

### 3.2.5. The loanword pattern

Gender allocation according to the loanword pattern is outside of both semantic and structural strategies. Applying this pattern, most speakers followed the residue-to-masculine model normative in Russian at the beginning of the 20th century.

Speaker F1902c showed a masculine allocation of the Finnish *muisto* 'souvenir': *takoj muisto* such.masc **souvenir** (Russian *vospominanie<sub>neut</sub>*). Speaker 1910b allocated the Finnish nouns *kansaneläke* 'state pension' (Russian *pensija<sub>fem</sub>*) and *sisu* 'guts' (Russian *stojkost'<sub>fem</sub>*) to the masculine: *étot kansaneläke* 'that.masc state pension', *vot kakoj sisu u nee!* 'she has such.masc guts'.

### 3.2.6. Stability in gender assignment

In the period in which Kyyrölä community was focussed and a part of it was monolingual, Finnish words frequently used in the community were phonologically and morphologically integrated and they belonged to the community's lexical repertoire. The community having become dispersed, these words have lost their recurrency. In the data, bilingual Kyyrölä speakers of non-first generation indicated the Finnish provenance of such loans, although using them in the earlier integrated form. Consider how a second generation speaker treated the earlier established loan *kasi<sub>fem</sub>* 'bag' (Finnish *kassi*):

9. dial. F1928a (IR<sub>n</sub>, F's mother and sister are present)

- 01 IR *net ne spešite; sadites' požalujsta;*  
don't hurry, sit down please
- 02 F *snesu moju kauppaka- hhh kauppakas'i; ja tol'ko što s raboty prišla*  
I'll carry my.fem.ACC **shopping-hhh shopping-bag**; I just came from work  
'I will carry my shopping bag home. I am on my way back from work.'

The speaker indicates the foreign provenance of the item *kauppakas'i* (Finnish *kauppakassi* 'shopping bag', lit. 'shop bag') with a false start and a burst of laughter (line 02). Nevertheless, the noun retains the gender and adapted shape of the period of its recurrency in the Kyyrölä community. Compared to its source, the Finnish noun *kassi*, the Russian loan lacks the geminate and the *i*-preceding consonant is palatalised: /kassi/>/kas'i/. The first part of the compound, *kauppa-*, is not phonologically changed. Phonological integration would have affected the geminate /p:/, *kauppa*>*kaupa*. The noun *kási* belongs to established loans, while the compound *kauppakassi* does not.

### 3.2.7. An interplay of social and linguistic factors

The treatment of insertions varied according to the speaker's sociolinguistic background and the shape of the insertion. These factors determining the degree of integration and the pattern of gender assignment will now be discussed.

The Russian feminine nouns typically have *-a*-ending. Consequently, the Swedish *-a*-final and Finnish *-a/-ä*-final nouns are the most favourable for structurally based feminine assignment and further explicit integration.

Some speakers took advantage of the phonological shape of the insertion, and others did not. In (10) the speaker answers the question (written in Finnish): 'Has Russian been an advantage or a disadvantage for you in Finland?'<sup>18</sup>

10. The question (written in Finnish):  
*Onko venäjistä ollut Teille Suomessa hyötyä/haittaa?*  
'Has Russian been an advantage or disadvantage for You in Finland?'  
Finnish *hyöty* 'profit, benefit', *haitta* 'trouble, disadvantage'

<sup>18</sup> A questionnaire in Finnish was sometimes given to interviewees. The speakers were supposed to answer the questions in Russian. Finnish questions in the questionnaire often triggered off insertions.

F1920d (F's husband and IR<sub>F3</sub>)

**hyöty-ä** bylo nogo, **hajt-y** nikogda nikakoj.  
**advantage.PAR** was.neut much, **disadvantage.GEN** never none.fem.GEN  
 'There were many advantages and no disadvantages.'

Explicit integration:

*haitta* > *hajt-a*, -y.GEN, cf. Russian *mama<sub>fem</sub>* — *mamy.GEN* 'mother'.

The answer followed the question written in the questionnaire and in this way formed the second part of the *question-answer* adjacency pair. The first pair part sets up a strong expectation concerning the form and often the contents of the second pair part (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). In a metalinguistically unmarked adjacency pair the language should be the same. In our case, this condition conflicts with the language of interaction. The speaker resolved this conflict by answering in Russian while quoting the focal items of the question in the original language. She integrates one insertion explicitly and the other one syntactically. In the Finnish *haitta* 'disadvantage', the geminate /tt/ is reduced to /t/, and the final -a is reanalysed as the Russian morphological ending of feminines. The insertion is declined: *haitta.NOM* — *hait-y.GEN*. The other insertion, the Finnish, *hyöty* 'advantage', is syntactically integrated. The syntactic position of this insertion requires the genitive, *pol'zy bylo mnogo* 'advantage.GEN was.neut much'. The speaker uses the insertion in the form of the Finnish partitive, in this syntactic context functionally similar to the Russian genitive. The phonological shape of these two insertions determines the treatment of each of them. The final -a of *haitta* fitted the Russian second declension and prompted integration in explicit style. The insertion *hyöty* does not fit any of the Russian declension types. Consequently, the speaker functionally aligned this insertion within Russian syntax.

Answering the same question, the non-habitual second-generation speaker M1935 used the same insertions. He preceded them with hesitation markers. He also allocated the insertion *haitta* to the non-feminine: *nikakogo ee haitta ne bylo* 'none.nonfem.GEN *er disadvantage* was not' ('There was no disadvantage'). The non-feminine assignment emphasised the foreign provenance of the insertion. Together with the preceding hesitation, the gender allocation indicated the insertion as a metalinguistically repairable item. The non-feminine assignment is an especially prominent marker of the foreign provenance because the final -a of the insertion aligns with the Russian feminine.

The two preceding examples show that gender allocation depends on the speaker's language preference. Speaker M1935 did not use Russian habitually at an informal level, although he used this language at work for his professional needs. During the interview he monitored the metalinguistic side of his speech. For speaker F1920d Russian is her preferred language and the bilingual material smoothly serves her communicative requirements.

In the speech of the habitual Russian speakers generally, the morphological shape of the insertion affected gender assignment. Within one and the same turn a trilingual speaker referred to an 'overcoat' with the Finnish noun (plural referent) in (11a), and with the explicitly integrated Swedish noun (singular referent) in (11b) and (11c):

11. F1914a (a table talk between friends, two women and a married couple)
- a. nigde net normal'nyh **ul'steri**; ni **ul'steri** netu---  
 nowhere no normal.Pl.GEN **overcoat**, PR Tn **overcoat** no---  
 'There are no normal overcoats (from Swe *en ulster*, Fi *ulsteri*), there are neither overcoats ---'
- b. u Kuusinen byl **tvidul'ster** takoj  
 at Kuusinen's was.masc **tweed-overcoat** such.masc  
 'At Kuusinen's (clothing store chain), there was one tweed overcoat.'
- c. ne mogu --- najti normal'nogo, človečeskogo  
 PR Tn can.1Sg ---to find normal.nonfem.GEN, human.nonfem.GEN  
**ul'stera**  
**overcoat.nonfem.GEN**  
 'I cannot find an ordinary acceptable overcoat.'

The consonant-final Swedish insertion can be equated with a Russian masculine noun of the first declension. The insertion is declined in the genitive singular (11c). Were the Swedish noun used for plural reference in (11a) it would have been declined in the genitive plural, in other words, it would have appeared in the form *ulster-ov*. The explicit declination for the plural would be a too far extended degree of Russianising for the trilingual speaker, sensitive to the origin of the insertions. To avoid such over-nativisation, the speaker used the Finnish noun, the form of which did not prompt explicit integration. Shoji Azuma (1993: 1090, en 2) suggested that "a noun stem and its plural marker are retrieved as one unit from the mental lexicon without parsing." This suggestion provides a

psycholinguistic basis for the linguistic behaviour demonstrated in (11a). A suffix analogy provides a considerable closeness to the Russian structure and, consequently, allows plural declination, cf. the example with the Swedish insertion *regiment* discussed earlier.

The Finnish and Swedish palatal [j] is closer to the Russian palatalised [j'] than to its hard version, the velar [k], and for this reason prompts phonological adaptation: in the forms /ul'ster/ and /ul'steri/, the Russian palatalised /j'/ has replaced the Finnish and Swedish /j/.

### 3.2.8. Statistics

The following table shows the numbers of occurrences of gender assignment for each of three genders for Finnish and Swedish insertions by 83 speakers, 32 from the first corpus and 51 from the second corpus.

**Table 3.** Gender affiliation of noun insertions in the two corpora. <sup>19</sup>

Corp	tokens	types	%types	fem	% fem	masc	% masc	non-fem	% non-fem	neut	% neut	vac(masc. & fem. masc. & neut.)	% vac
I	211	199	100	99	49.7	64	32.2	7	3.5	27	13.6	2	1
II	185	175	100	61	34.9	72	41.1	11	6.3	29	16.6	2	1.1
Total	396	374	100	160	42.8	136	36.4	18	4.8	56	15	4	1

<sup>19</sup>The abbreviation 'vac' stands for vacillation. Vacillation means that the same noun assigns a different gender in different occurrences in the same speaker's production. 'Nonfem' means that gender is assigned to the target in the non-nominative case, in which there is no distinction between the masculine and neuter gender of the 1st declension. The numbers are calculated separately for each corpus and then for both corpora together. In the column 'tokens', all the occurrences of gender-assigning insertions are calculated. In the column 'types', the same insertions assigning the same gender in the speech of the same informant are taken as one. The number of types for all three genders is taken as 100% and the percentage for each gender is shown. Each column showing the number of types is followed by a column showing the same number as a percentage.



The instantiations of gender assignment in the first corpus outnumber those in the second. Generally, dialect speakers alternate languages more often than non-dialect speakers.

In the first corpus (32 speakers), there were 211 tokens of other-language nouns, of which 199 gender assignment types. Of the type occurrences, there were 99 feminine (49.7%), 64 masculine (32.2%), 7 non-feminine (3.5%), 27 neuter (13.6%), and 2 occurrences of vacillation (1%). In the second corpus (51 speakers), the gender of the Finnish and Swedish noun insertions was manifest for 185 tokens, of which 175 different types. Of these types, there were 61 feminine assignments (34.9%), 72 masculine assignments (41.1%), 11 non-feminine assignments (6.3%), 29 neuter assignments (16.6%) and 2 cases of vacillation (1.1%), one between masculine and feminine and one between masculine and neuter.

The non-dialect speakers (the second corpus) more often assigned masculine than feminine, the former outnumbering the latter by 11 (the non-feminines are not included in the masculine). In the Kyyrölä corpus, feminine exceeded masculine by 35. On the whole in this data, there were 374 gender assignments (types), feminine constituting 42.8% and masculine 36.4%. Non-feminine constituted 4.8% of cases and neuter 15%.

The following table accounts for insertions with human reference. In both corpora together, there were 36 such nouns, and they were gender-affiliated according to the physiological pattern of semantic strategies. As can be seen from the table, the number of male referents exceeded that of female referents.

**Table 4.** Distribution of feminine and masculine gender assignment between insertions with human referents and insertions with non-human referents.

Corpus	human ref.		non-human ref.	
	fem	masc	fem	masc
I	0	7	99	57
II	7	22	54	50
Total	7	29	153	107

If nouns with human referents are excluded from the total, the outnumbering of feminine assignment in the data increases, rising to 46 cases.

The structural strategy can be more or less unambiguously identified in the case of feminine assignment (final *-a/ä* of the insertion). Structurally based feminine gender assignment is shown in the table below. Structural-and-semantic feminines, i.e., those *-a/ä*-final insertions having a feminine Russian equivalent, are counted as structural.

**Table 5.** Structurally based feminine assignment.

Corpus	total fem	structural fem
I	99 (100%)	53 (53.5%)
II	61 (100%)	23 (37.7%)
Total	160 (100%)	76 (47.5%)

Dialectal speakers assign structural feminine more frequently (53.5% of all the feminine affiliations in the Kyyrölä corpus) than non-dialect speakers (37.7% of all the non-dialect feminine affiliations). Nevertheless, the totals for semantic feminine assignment is considerable in both corpora (38 cases in the second corpus and 46 cases in the first corpus).

Swedish gender-assigning nouns only occurred in the second corpus, in which Finnish items are still much more frequent. The following table shows the gender total for Swedish nouns.

**Table 6.** Assignment of gender of Swedish nouns in the second corpus.

Number of types	fem	masc	neut
39 (10 hum.)	11 (1 hum.)	25 (9 hum.)	3

Of 39 instantiations of gender assignment, 11 are feminine, 25 masculine and 3 neuter. In all there are 10 nouns with human reference, 9 of which masculine.

Morton Benson (1960: 167-168)<sup>20</sup> reported that in American Russian, borrowed nouns whose phonological shape fitted the Russian declension type were allocated to a respective gender and regularly declined. Structural strategies were mostly used. Consequently, masculine gender assignment prevailed, since

<sup>20</sup> The author described the informants as native Russian speakers representing both old and new waves of immigration (ibid.: 163). Thus, this study apparently covered only first generation American Russians.

most English words end in a consonant. Sometimes the feminine ending /a/ was added to nouns with Russian feminine equivalents: /kára/ (although sometimes also /kar/) 'car', /fárma/ 'farm', /kórna/ 'corn' (on foot) (cf. CSR *mašina* 'car<sub>fem</sub>', *ferma* 'farm<sub>fem</sub>', and *mozol'* 'corn<sub>fem</sub>').

Similar results were obtained in research on Australian Russian by Ludmila Kouzmin (1973: 89, 94): structural strategies were decisive, and the majority of the English nouns were allocated to the masculine. Semantic strategies often resulted in feminine assignment. Some of the nouns allocated to the feminine also received a feminine ending: 'wife' /vájfa/, 'girl' /g'örla/, 'teenager' /t'inédžerka/ 'brush' /bráška/, cf. CSR *ščетка* 'brush', etc. (ibid. 92).

On the basis of this comparison, it is clear that the structure of the superordinate language affects the gender assignment of the inserted nouns in proportion to the degree of the following structural strategies. The structural strategy is overwhelming in Kouzmin's corpus, while in the corpora of the present study this strategy is not so influential, although it is more characteristic of dialect than of non-dialect speakers. On the other hand, the qualitative analysis of the present data also provided evidence that the structure of the languages in contact is not decisive, and that other factors, socio-cultural ones in particular, are at least as important.

## 4. Findings and discussion

### 4.1. Intralinguistic gender assignment

In the present data codeswitching was constrained by the type of interaction, the reasearch interview. Although the interviews were informal and the language was not explicated as an object of interest for the researcher, the interviewees, especially those who did not use Russian habitually, felt some metalinguistic pressure and tried to avoid the other language. Even when marked for their foreign provenance, insertions are often adequately integrated into the Russian syntax. Sometimes the application of a loanword gender assignment pattern was considered a marker of foreign provenance. Repeated by the same speaker, insertions were usually less marked and more integrated than at first introduction. The Kyyrölä Russians, especially the women, more so than the speakers in the second corpus tended to use insertions smoothly, without marking their foreign provenance. Instability of gender assignment and various strategies applied by

speakers with different backgrounds are characteristic in a language-shift situation.

In Finland Russian we observed examples of the ousting of semantic criteria by structural criteria (cf. [3]) and a case of masculinisation of gender assignment, both in the samples of third-generation speakers. Another observed tendency was the merging of genders in alignment with the declension ending. More generally, for Russian in contact with a superordinate genderless synthetic language, the first change will be the loss of semantic gender in semantic - grammatical competition, since grammatical criteria are more salient, and they are always the most weighty factors in the categorisation of the superordinate language. The last step in final attrition of the category of gender will result in a masculine form (the least marked one, Jakobson 1959/1971) for the targets.

In contact with a superordinate synthetic genderless language, a flexional gender language (subordinate) will supposedly change its gender category in the following direction:

GENDER DISTINCTIONS	semantic/structural	structural	no gender (pervasive masculine agreement)
CONTACT STAGE	starting point	stage I	stage II

These changes are possible in a situation of language maintenance in which the focussed speech community has close-knit social networks functioning in the subordinate language.

Muusa Ojanen (1985: 152) reported masculine to be the form for Russian borrowed adjectives in Karelian. This evidence can be considered as supporting the prediction expressed above.

#### 4.2. Pattern-determining factors

For habitual Russian speakers, the linguistic and semantic characteristics of the insertion are significant for the choice of gender assignment and integration pattern. The transparent Russian equivalent and the human referent evoked semantic strategies, while the *-a/ä-* or consonant-final insertion and analogically suffixed insertion prompted application of structural strategies.

Re-analysing the last vowel of the insertion as a gender ending and especially as a case-gender ending can be treated as a first step towards an explicit, word-internal, integration. Nevertheless, it may be that the second step will never be taken, since the need for explicit integration is socially constrained: only habitual speakers of Russian need integration of this kind.

Although declined for case, the insertion is not necessarily declined for number. This sensitivity to foreign origin is a distinctive feature in bilingual borrowing/codeswitching processes compared to monolingual borrowing. On the other hand, gender assignment by suffixal analogy is a passport into the fully fledged Russian declension system, including the plural declension.

First-generation speakers who used Russian more often than the other language(s) often preferred a semantic strategy to a structural one in such case that these two had linguistically equal possibilities. In the preceding research on interlingual gender assignment too, the pattern of semantic equivalent was observed to be frequently applied by first generation speakers. Michael Clyne (1967: 42-47) reported the same strategy among first-generation Australian Germans and mentioned other research in which the same observation had been made: assigned by first-generation German immigrants to the USA (Sachs 1953) and England (Hennig 1963), and also demonstrated in German newspapers in Canada and Australia (Wacker 1965), the gender most often followed a German semantic equivalent. First-generation Arabic-French Moroccan bilinguals also followed a semantic strategy (Bentahila and Davies 1983: 327-28).

A preference for the pattern of semantic equivalent is a consequence of a strong entrenchment of the L1 vocabulary. The semantic strategies of interlingual, L2-L1, gender assignment are to be found in the establishing of semantic equivalence between nouns of L2 and L1. After this semantic operation the formal principles of intralingual L1 gender assignment start to function. In the speech of non-habitual speakers the metalinguistic monitoring of their own speech often resulted in the application of a loanword pattern which was at the same time a marker of the foreign provenance of the insertion.

Among the Kyyrölä speakers (the 1st corpus), feminine was more frequent than masculine. In the second corpus, masculine assignments outnumbered feminine to some extent. Of all the feminines in both corpora, more than a half in the dialect corpus and less than a half in the non-dialect corpus were assigned morphologically.

Compared to the second corpus speakers, the first corpus speakers more often integrated insertions explicitly, adapting the shape of the other-language word to correspond to one of the Russian declension types, or they used the insertion in the other-language morphosyntactic form, functionally adequate in this particular syntactic context. These characteristics of the dialect corpus are connected (1) to a preference observed in non-standard varieties of Russian for the declension of the loanwords indeclinable in the standard variety and (2) to the fact that Kyyrölä Russians until recently formed a focussed speech community which needed functioning bilingual material.

An almost complete lack of 'established loans' in the data is a feature characteristic of the language-shift situation in which both the dialectal and non-dialectal speakers live today. A more or less stable status for loans is possible in a community in which there are monolingual members and which has stable networks with Russian as the language of interaction. The process of the *re-affiliation* of earlier established loans was observed in the first corpus: the Kyyrölä speakers born from the late 1920s onwards pronounced established loans close to their Finnish origins of these loans and marked them for foreign provenance. This re-affiliation is a consequence of the community's having acquired total bilingualism and of the lack of networks to keep the loans recurrent.

According to Poplack et al. (1982: 9), "any differences in gender assignment which do emerge are language-specific, and not due to social or stylistic differences." This is in line with Beardsmore (1971: 158) who concludes that although socio-cultural factors play a part in gender assignment, internal features of the languages are more important. On the other hand, Weinreich (1953/1967) points out that the choice of whether to integrate a foreign item or not is dependent on individual psychological and socio-cultural factors. The communities considered by Poplack et al. and by Beardsmore are comparatively stable. For his part, Weinreich drew his conclusions from research which was mostly based on data from short-term immigrant communities. This difference in the backgrounds of the language groups under study explains these different conclusions. Short-term communities are often unstable and disperse, which determines the instability of their language and, in particular, their gender assignment patterns. For this type of community the social factor is the most important of all, and it overrides the linguistic criteria of the gender assignment.

## Appendix

### Abbreviations:

NOM nominative, GEN genitive, ACC accusative, LOC locative, or prepositional case. PAR partitive, DAT dative, Pl plural, Sg singular, masc masculine, fem feminine, nonfem non-feminine, PRT particle, neut neuter, INS instrumental, com common, def definite, Fi Finnish, Ru Russian, Sw Swedish.

### Explanations:

- For neuters (the 1st declension type) and consonant-ending singular feminines (the 3rd declension type), the accusative form is identical with the nominative. The singular *-a*-final nouns (the 2nd declension type) have a distinct form of the accusative. All plural nouns and the first declension singular masculine nouns have the accusative form which coincides with the nominative for inanimates and with the genitive for animates. The accusative of the target of the animate controller coincides with the genitive, while the accusative of the target of the inanimate controller coincides with the nominative.
- In the endings, the *-i/-y-* and *-e/-o-* are variations used after palatal and non-palatal consonants respectively.

### Conventions:

The transliteration of conversational extracts is mostly adopted to the Russian written norms, but sometimes special features of pronunciation are shown. Underlined syllables bear sentence stress. A string in UPPER CASE is uttered louder (or more emphatically) than its surroundings. When appearing together with Russian, Finnish is **in bold face**. Swedish is additionally indicated with another font. Strings other than English are written in *italics*.

(.)	micropause (shorter than 0.2 sec)
(1.0)	measured pause (1 sec)
[	overlap of two turns
°on°	a sequence pronounced in a quieter voice than the surroundings
>on<	faster tempo than the surroundings
<on>	slower tempo than the surroundings
ska-	incomplete word
(?--)	inaudible sequence
<i>hhh</i>	laugh (in English translations, non-verbal voicing is shown in italics; in transliterations, normal face is used for the indication of laugh and voiced pauses, since the transliterations are written in italics)
=	one turn is immediately followed by the next (latching)

Punctuation marks indicate intonation:

?	A rising intonation
.	A falling, final intonation.

!	A sharp fall.
,	An intonation of continuation (weak rising)
;	An even intonation at the end of an intonation unit
:	Attenuation of the preceding sound
/	A sharp rise at the non-end of an intonation unit
\	A sharp fall at the non-end of an intonation unit

## References:

- Amnell, I.-B. & M. Pinomaa (1974) *Kurs i svensk grammatik 1*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Auer, Peter (1999) From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3, 309–333.
- Azuma, S. (1993) The frame-content hypothesis in speech production: evidence from intersentential code switching. *Linguistics* 31, 1071–1093.
- Beardsmore, H. B. (1971) A gender problem in a language contact situation. *Lingua* 27, 141–159.
- Benson, M. (1960) American-Russian speech. *American Speech* 35, 163–174.
- Bentahila, A. & E. Davies (1983) The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua* 59, 301–330.
- Clyne, M. (1967) *Transference and Triggering*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Černyšev, V. I. (1914-15) *Pravil'nost' i čistota russkoj reči*. 2nd ed. St Peterburg: M. Merkušev.
- Comrie, B., G. Stone & M. Polinsky (1996) *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Corbett, G. (1991) *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Correa-Zoli, Y. (1973) Assignment of gender in American-Italian. *Glossa* 7, 123–128.
- Gumperz, J. & R. Wilson (1971) Convergence and creolization. A Case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian Border in India. In D. Hymes (ed.) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasselmo, N (1961) *American-Swedish: A study in Bilingualism*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Hasselmo, N (1974) *Amerikasvenska*. Lund: Esselte Studium.
- Hennig, J. (1963) Zum grammatischen Geschlecht englischer Sachbezeichnungen im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschungen* 19, 54–63.
- Jakobson, R. (1959/1971) The gender pattern in Russian. In R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings, II*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kasatkin, L. L., ed. (1989): *Russkaja dialektologija*. Moskva: Prosveščenie.
- Kouzmin, L. (1973) *The Russian Language in an Australian Environment: A Description Analysis of English Interference in the Speech of Bilingual Russian Migrants*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Melbourne.
- Leisiö, L. (1994) *Finländskij russkij: nekotorye fonetičeskie, leksičeskie i grammatičeskie*



- čerty*. Unpublished Licentiate thesis, University of Tampere.
- Leisiö, L. (1998): Muuan venäjän murre Suomessa. *Nordlyd* 26. Working papers on language and linguistics, Tromsø University, 168–180.
- Leisiö, L. (2000) The word order in genitive noun phrases in a diaspora Russian. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4, 301–326.
- Leisiö, L. (2001) *Morphosyntactic Convergence and Integration in Finland Russian*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Ojanen, M. (1985) *Adjektiivikategoria venäläis-lyydiläisissä kontakteissa*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- 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., A. Pousada & D. Sankoff (1982) Competing influences of gender assignment: variable process, stable outcome. *Lingua* 57, 1–28.
- Poplack, S., S. Wheeler & A. Westwood (1987) Distinguishing language contact phenomena: evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. In P. Lilius & M. Saari (eds.), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 6. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.
- Sachs, E. (1953) The gender of English loanwords in the German of recent immigrants. *American Speech* 28, 256–70.
- Von Pruschewsky, B. (1962) Nekotorye osobennosti krasnosel'skogo govora. *Scando-Slavica*, tomos VIII, 201–219.
- Wacker, H. (1965) Die Besonderheiten der deutschen Schriftsprache in Kanada und Australien. *Duden Beiträge* 17. Mannheim.
- Weinreich, U. (1953/1967): *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Contact address:

Larisa Leisiö

Mäntymäentie 10

FIN-37800 Toijala

Finland

e-mail: larisa.leisio@uta.fi