

ARTICLE

Making a difference – ausbau processes in Modern Written Finnish and Kven: How a group of loanwords marks a divergence between the Kven language and Modern Written Finnish

Leena Niiranen

Department of Language and Culture, UiT – The Arctic University of Norway, P.O. Box 6050, Langnes, N-9037 Tromsø, Norway
Email: leena.niiranen@uit.no

(Received 17 May 2021; revised 20 June 2022; accepted 23 June 2022; first published online 26 July 2022)

Abstract

Ausbau processes increase differences between two close written language varieties. Finnish and Kven are considered two ausbau languages today, in contrast to an earlier view which considered Kven to be a dialect of Finnish. In this article, ausbau processes are illustrated by comparing the use of *eera* verbs, a group constituting international and Scandinavian loanwords in the two languages. Most *eera* verbs were purged from Modern Written Finnish and they are expressed via other means today. By contrast, Kven accepts *eera* verbs in the same way as Old Written Finnish. Purism – perceived as avoidance of certain linguistic elements – is the explanation behind ausbau processes in this case, and purist attitudes reflect the identities of language planners. *Eera* verbs represent a small corner of language, yet their use differentiates Kven from Modern Written Finnish, and underscores the independence of Kven as a separate language.

Keywords: ausbau processes; codification of Modern Written Finnish; einbau processes; Kven; language planning; loanwords; purism

1. Introduction

Written varieties of languages are often designed through language planning. That is why they become different from other close varieties. Consequently, different ausbau languages are created. Kloss (1967) introduced the terms *abstand* and *ausbau language* to distinguish between linguistic and sociological definitions of language. In this article I discuss the separation of Kven and Finnish, which represent two ausbau languages (Söderholm 2010). The process of distinguishing between them is illustrated using a special type of loanword formed with the suffix *eera*, such as in the verb *studeerata* ‘to study’. These Scandinavian or international

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nordic Association of Linguists. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the same Creative Commons licence is included and the original work is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use.

loanwords were codified in Finnish in the 1920s, resulting in these loans being implemented differently in Modern Written Finnish (MWF¹) compared to Early Modern Finnish (EMF), Old Written Finnish (OWF), Finnish dialects, and the Kven language. Purism was the main ideology involved in the codification. This article also discusses connections between purism and language identity.

Kvens are a Finnic group who moved to Norway from Finnish-speaking areas in Sweden and Finland primarily during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They established permanent settlements in the areas currently belonging to the northernmost county of Norway, today called Troms and Finnmark. They have had the status of a national minority in Norway since 1999, and their language – previously regarded as a dialect of Finnish – received the status of a national minority language in 2005.

My aim is to answer the following questions.

- (a) Are *eera* verbs in oral and written Kven the same as those found in OWF or Finnish dialects, or do they represent parallel loans?
- (b) How do these lexemes illustrate language divergence between these two ausbau languages?
- (c) How do ausbau processes reflect the language identities of those involved in language planning?

Section 2 discusses ausbau processes in language planning. Section 3 deals with data and methods. Section 4 presents the group of loanwords in focus – *eera* verbs – and describes and compares their use in Finnish and Kven. In Section 5 I will discuss how *eera* verbs illustrate the divergence processes between the two ausbau languages Kven and Finnish, and how these processes reflect language identities. Section 6 presents the conclusions.

2. Language planning and the creation of ausbau languages

In Section 2.1 I discuss the relationship between language planning and the nation state. In addition, this section gives an overview of the procedure of language planning. Section 2.2 goes on to describe processes in language planning in general terms. Section 2.3 presents corpus planning in MWF, while Section 2.4 discusses status and acquisition planning in MWF. In addition, it describes the attempts to spread MWF among the Kvens. Section 2.5 discusses processes that led to the creation of Kven, a language separate from Modern Finnish, and Section 2.6 looks at the replication of *eera* verbs in Finnish and Kven.

2.1 Language planning and a nation state

Special interest in language planning arose during the time of nationalism in the nineteenth century. Gellner (1983) emphasizes the connections between nationalism and a modern state. Developing a standardized written variety, a national language, was part of state building. In a modern state, a common language for all citizens became more important than it had been in the past because many activities were based on written information. The shift from an agrarian society to an

industrial production society demanded a higher level of education for its citizens. One important goal in schools was to teach a common written standard (Wright 2004:42, 64).

Furthermore, a national language was a tool for creating a national identity. Anderson (1983) places special emphasis on the role of print capitalism, a phenomenon which had emerged by the time of modernism, and which was important in spreading national languages to readers. Reading in a national language created ‘an imagined community’, a feeling of belonging to a nation.

During the same period, many minority languages were repressed (May 2003:213). Minority language users often gave up their own language for the benefit of the national language because mastery of the latter was seen to be connected to possibilities for work and status in society (Pietikäinen et al. 2010:7). Minority languages were used in oral communication in private life, but written standards were not developed. Minorities started to receive recognition first after the 1950s (Wright 2004:189), leading to interest in also creating a written variety for those languages that had previously only been in oral use.

Language planning activities include corpus planning, which refers to the planning of a standardized written variety; status planning, referring to the use of language in society; and acquisition planning, referring to implementing the standardized variety in society (Cooper 1990:45). In Haugen’s model, acquisition planning or implementation is included in status planning. Corpus planning includes codification, which refers to corpus planning procedures, and elaboration, referring to functional development of the standard (see Vikør 2007:104). The goal of language planning is social change (Cooper 1990:34–35).

Language planning is concerned most often with written language. However, oral and written language varieties are not separate entities, but rather are intertwined, and influence each other (Coulmas 2013:9). Language planning can also lead to language change, as a written standard can influence spoken language (Jahr 1989).

2.2 Processes in language planning

Kloss (1967) presented the concepts of *abstand* and *ausbau* languages. These concepts were launched to solve the difficulty of defining the concepts of language and dialect. *Abstand* languages are distinct languages due to internal criteria, like structural and lexical differences. By contrast, an *ausbau* language is a variety which is consciously made different from a close variety, and with the aim of it being used for literary expression. Therefore an *ausbau* language has a written standard. Without reshaping, a language could be seen as a dialect of another language. An *ausbau* language is a social concept, in contrast to an *abstand* language which is a linguistic concept.

Coulmas (2013:52–53) also stresses that a written variety is important for the creation of different languages. A dialect continuum, such as continental West Germanic, Romance, and Slavic, ‘is divided into language by virtue of writing’ (Coulmas 2013:52). The creation of a written variety means that the distance between spoken varieties is enhanced via *ausbau* processes.

On the other hand, Fishman (2008:18) concludes that the concepts of *ausbau* and *abstand* are ‘not really on one and the same dimension’. An *abstand* language is an

'already recognized distancing between two varieties' (Fishman 2008:18), while an *ausbau* language is a result of human agency in language planning. Therefore it is a consciously made distinction. The true contrast of *ausbau* (building away from) should be with *einbau* (building toward), that is to say making a language more like another language.

Vikør (2007:168–170) mentions the process of constructing a language to look more like another language as one possible alternative in language planning. According to him, however, it is more usual that two or more language varieties are both constructed to look more like each other. Modifying only one language variety unilaterally to resemble another is rare. He mentions pan-Scandinavism as a period when the goal was to make Scandinavian languages more similar to one other. In addition, attempts were made to bring the two varieties of Norwegian, *Bokmål* and *Nynorsk*, closer to each other. Nonetheless, none of these processes were successful.

Also Tosco (2008:5, 12) points out that *einbau* is not a usual process in language planning, because making a distinction is crucial in language standardization processes. He thus agrees with Coulmas (2013:52) that making a distinction between two varieties through writing is the most important process in language planning, even though Tosco also considers varieties without a written standard as being languages.

Purism is a process that creates differences between varieties. More broadly, purism involves avoiding all undesirable elements within a language, or more narrowly, avoiding only foreign elements. Linguistic purism has been involved in structural, ideological, pedagogical, and metalinguistic issues (Langer & Nesse 2012:610). When focusing on language structure, the idea is that foreign elements will spoil a language containing such elements; therefore it is important to replace foreign elements with elements with origins within the language.

According to Joseph (2004:13), national identities shape national languages, not only the other way round, as Anderson (1983) suggests. Language planning involves human agency. Purism reflects the identities of those engaged in language planning. During the time of nationalism, purism often targeted a language which had a hegemonic position over a language trying to occupy a similar position (Langer & Nesse 2012:612). In addition, purism often targeted loanwords replicated from such a language. In this way, linguistic purism can be seen as a type of identity work: when foreign elements or other elements that do not coincide with the identity of those who are engaged in language planning, such elements are removed (Thomas 1991:43–47; Wright 2004:57).

Language is an important tool for preserving the culture and identity of its speakers. In recent years, linguistic minorities have also looked for recognition for their cultures and languages (Wright 2004). Many minority languages are endangered, but they are still important identity symbols for their speakers. Oral language use is the most important prerequisite for a language to survive, as Hyltenstam & Milani (2003) suggest. Still, sometimes language shift of an endangered language has been almost or totally completed. New speakers can be created only using a written variety. Language revival can thus be based on written sources, such as the revitalization of Cornish based on written documentation (Hornsby 2015:121). Therefore written language can be considered an important tool in

preserving an endangered language. Written language, then, forms a basis for identification for people interested in revitalizing their language.

2.3 Principles of corpus planning in MWF

A new situation for the Finnish language was created when Finland was separated from Sweden in 1809. In the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland, over 80% of the population spoke Finnish, not Swedish (Häkkinen 1994). However, Swedish and Finnish had a different status, because only Swedish was the language of the elite, while Finnish was mainly in oral use. Even though many people could read it because the Lutheran church promoted reading ability, not many were able to write in Finnish (Engman 2016:92; Laine 2019). A political movement called Fennomania started demanding that Finnish ought to receive a status similar to Swedish in Finland (Jutikkala & Pirinen 2003:308–317).

OWF, the written form of Finnish created in the Reformation period, was established in order to translate religious literature (Häkkinen 2015). Even though some law texts were translated from Swedish into Finnish, they were not published until 1759 (Häkkinen 1994:99). Therefore juridical language in Finnish did not develop in the same way as religious language during Swedish rule (Pajula 1960:123).

Remarkable changes were made in OWF between 1820 and 1870, a period called ‘Early Modern Finnish’ (EMF). Paunonen (1992) points out that even though the common goal for Fennomans was to promote Finnish as the national language, there was disagreement about the strategies for creating the modern written standard. The dominant approaches in the nineteenth century are called the ‘vernacular approach’ (in Finnish *kansankielisyyskanta*), and the ‘grammar approach’ (in Finnish *kieliopillisuuskanta*). The first approach defended the view that dialects formed the basis for the written standard, while the second approach promoted the written standard elevated above the dialects (Kolehmainen 2014:56–58).

The grammar approach was the approach that garnered the most support. Especially important was the fact that Elias Lönnrot changed his mind and started supporting the grammar approach in the 1830s. He at first supported the vernacular approach, but later decided that modern Finnish ought not to diverge too much from OWF. As the publisher of the *Kalevala*, Lönnrot had authority, and his opinion influenced the result: modern Finnish kept its old basis, even though language features, mostly vocabulary items, from Eastern Finnish dialects were also incorporated into it (Pulkkinen 1972:23).

The result of language planning in the nineteenth century is that MWF is a compromise between different dialects. It is a constructed variety, not used orally in any Finnish dialect area, but instead is common to all Finns who speak different dialects (Paunonen 1992:170). MWF is different from OWF not only because it was elevated above the dialects but also because many features in OWF resulting from language contact with Swedish over the centuries were removed from MWF. Purism with national ideological considerations, connected to the grammar approach, was one of the attitudes that characterized Finnish language planning not only during the nineteenth century but also in the 1920s and 1930s. However, a functional view of language with a focus on language as a means of communication also

received more support in Finnish language planning during the twentieth century (Rintala 1998:58–60). Purism is visible especially in the invention of neologisms created to substitute Swedish loans in MWF (Paunonen 1992:165–166).

2.4 Dissemination of MWF and the Kvens

The intention of status planning was to develop MWF for use in higher education and in all levels of administration. The language law of 1863 declared that the Finnish language would be developed as an official language during the next 20 years in all arenas concerning the Finnish-speaking population (Paunonen 1992). Still, it was not until 1890 that extended use of MWF among a large portion of the Finnish-speaking population was first reached (Engman 2016:95). Not until 1902 were Finnish and Swedish made equal languages in the courts and among local authorities (Häkkinen 1994:55).

The acquisition planning of MWF was realized through expanded possibilities for obtaining education in Finnish. The school law of 1866 gave municipalities responsibility for primary teaching, which was important when inculcating writing ability among the common people (Tommila & Salokangas 2000:68). Finnish has been used as a medium of instruction in secondary schools since 1858. In addition, printed materials in Finnish increased greatly in number. In the middle of the nineteenth century, about half of Finnish publications still represented religious literature, but gradually, other genres were published in higher numbers (Leino-Kaukiainen 1989:330, 339–340).

The Fennoman newspaper *Suometar* reached readers all over the country already in the 1850s (Kokko 2021). Its popularity in the countryside is explained by letters sent in by contributors living around the country. Kokko (2021:11) estimates that the Finnish press reached some 10% of the Finnish-speaking population over 15 years old already by 1860. He points out that *Suometar* and its readers can be seen as an instantiation of Anderson's 'imagined communities' (1983).

As newspaper circulation grew towards the end of the nineteenth century as the Fennomans were mobilizing as a political movement, newspapers became everyday reading material among common people as well. In 1900 there were about twice as many newspapers and magazines being published in Finland in Finnish compared to Swedish (Leino-Kaukiainen 1989:343–46; Tommila & Salokangas 2000:52–57).

Newspapers in the nineteenth century included both fiction and non-fiction texts in addition to news and opinion pieces. Fiction texts were often translated, but also original Finnish texts were published in serial form. Thus, when reading newspapers, readers became accustomed to other genres besides the religious one that had previously dominated Finnish publications (Leino-Kaukiainen 1989:345–346; Mäkinen 2007:315).

New genres were also circulated to Finnish readers through schools and libraries. The school law from 1866 already recommended that libraries should be established in schools. Fennomans were involved in establishing libraries for Finnish readers, and one of their organizations especially, *Kansanvalistusseura* (The Finnish Lifelong Learning Foundation) was important in the development of libraries for common people in Finland (Mäkinen 2007:320).

Fennomans were also interested in the dissemination of written Finnish among Finnish-speaking minorities outside Finland. Kvens were already acquainted with religious literature in OWF. Beside bibles, hymn books, and catechisms, Kvens read other religious texts. In particular, collections of sermons such as that of Wegelius (1747–1749) were well known among them. Kven children learned to read in Finnish in Norwegian schools at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century using bilingual books, including mostly religious texts (Niiranen 2011, 2019).

Some attempts to spread written Finnish among Kvens occurred at the end of the nineteenth century. The Finnish Literature Society, the central society of the Fennomans, sent David Skogman to Norway to collect linguistic and folkloristic material in 1865. During the same year, he transferred hundreds of books in MWF to Tromsø (Ryymin 2004:104). A Finnish newspaper named *Ruijan Suomenkielinen Sanomalehti* was established in Vadsø, the cultural centre of the Kvens, at the end of the nineteenth century. It was published only for a short period of time between March and December in 1877 due to a lack of subscribers, and resistance from Norwegians. Newspapers published in northern Finland also had Kvens as subscribers, as some Kvens sent letters to the editor to them (Ryymin 2004:132–135). A private library which included literature in Finnish was founded in Vadsø in 1880. Yet, when ethnographer Samuli Paulaharju and his wife Jenny, both of whom collected folkloristic material among the Kvens, visited Vadsø in the 1920s, only ‘a stack of dusty books in the attic’ remained (Niiranen 2019:35). In 1927–1934, the Finnish nationalistic organization Akateeminen Karjala-seura (Academic Karelia Society) sent Finnish books to Johan Beronka, a Kven priest in Vadsø, with the aim of distributing literature in Finnish within the Kven population (Ryymin 2004:262–263).

Despite such attempts, MWF never attained a strong position among the Kvens. The Norwegian authorities did not support reading in Finnish. For example, the municipal library in Vadsø had very few books in Finnish, most of them religious in nature (Niiranen 2019:36). To support the development of reading in Norwegian, authorities sent free Norwegian magazines to Kvens (Eriksen & Niemi 1981: 241–243). In addition to the policies typical of the time prioritizing national languages, an explanation for the assimilation policies toward Kvens was the anxiety that Norwegian authorities felt towards Fennomian nationalism. They feared it could lead to Finnish territorial expansion (Eriksen & Niemi 1981; Elenius 2002:105). National ideology and the implementation of assimilation policies characterized Norwegian schools at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. The educational goal for minority children became to learn Norwegian only (Sollid 2020:86–87). Bilingual school books that earlier were in use among Kven children in Norway were not printed after 1884 (Dahl 1957:248). Starting in 1936, Finnish was forbidden in schools by school law (Niemi 2010:44).

2.5 Processes in Kven language planning

Kven received the status of a language in 2005. It is a national minority language in Norway protected by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages on level II (Lindgren 2009:118). Before this recognition as a language, the Norwegian

government had ordered a report to be written by Hyltenstam & Milani (2003) to clarify the question of whether Kven should be considered a language of its own. In contrast to the earlier view toward Kven in Finnic tradition, Hyltensam and Milani concluded that Finnish and Kven can be considered distinct languages.

Mutual understanding is one criterion for deciding whether two varieties are two different languages or not (Tosco 2008). Kven and Finnish are most often described as being mutually understandable, having a distance comparable to that between Norwegian and Swedish (Lindgren 2009:107). Kven is especially close to the Far North Finnish dialects. Finns from northern Finland who worked in the fishing industry in northern Norway in 1960–1980 communicated easily with Kvens (Karikoski & Pedersen 1996:47–51). However, understanding is not always reciprocal. The standard language can be more difficult for those who are only used to a local dialect, compared to the other way round (Hyltenstam & Milani 2003:18). Standard Finnish especially is often mentioned as being difficult for Kvens who are not accustomed to it (Andreassen et al. 2001).

In diglossia, the written and spoken varieties are different and have distinct functions in society (Wright 2004:60–61). One variety is used in everyday language contact, while the other is used in writing and formal situations. In language planning, MWF was elevated above the dialects and became distinct from them. In addition, official spoken Finnish was also influenced by the written variety. The differences between written and spoken Finnish are not usually seen as diglossic. However, Coulmas (2013:55) mentions Finnish as an example of diglossia. He explains this to be a result of a historical process: standard Finnish was created to be used in writing. Kaartama (2018) points out that there exists a huge difference between standard written Finnish and the spoken Finnish used in modern playwriting. Sinnemäki & Saarikivi (2019:58) also comment that there is a large discrepancy between written and oral Finnish today, a situation which creates problems, for example, for those second language speakers of Finnish who lack much contact with written Finnish.

Finnish was introduced in the 1970s in Norwegian schools after a pause of some 30 years. However, because the teaching was in MWF, parents and grandparents were unable to help children with their language learning. This was the case for example in Børselv in Porsanger municipality, which became a centre for the Kven revitalization movement (Söderholm 2006:36). Therefore the diglossia between MWF and spoken Kven served as an important argument for creating a distinct written variety for Kven.

Another argument for the creation of the Kven language is the identity of its speakers. Those who argued for the Kvens having their own language felt that the standard Finnish language was a foreign language in Norway. It was not a language that could be used to express the identity and culture of the Kvens; consequently, a distinct written variety was needed (Hyltenstam & Milani 2003:49). However, not all Kvens agree, as some organizations representing Kvens also support the use of MWF as the written variety for Kvens (Sollid 2020:89–90).

The written variety of Kven is based on Kven dialects, and therefore it is different from MWF (Söderholm 2010). The Far North Finnish dialects, close to Kven, form a dialect of their own among Finnish dialects. They are mixed dialects, including features from both Western and Eastern Finnish dialects (Paunonen 1991).

Influence from the contact language Sámi means that the Far North Finnish dialects also have features that distinguish them from other Finnish dialects. Moreover, loans from Norwegian and newer loans from Sámi borrowed in Norway makes Kven distinct from Far North Finnish dialects (Lindgren & Niiranen 2018).

The establishment of a written variety has as its goal the elevation of the status of Kven (Hyltenstam & Milani 2003). In language planning, there were choices to be made between making Kven more like modern Finnish, or more like Meänkieli, a minority language in Sweden with many similarities to Kven. The Kven language council decided that Kven should resemble Meänkieli, not MWF (Keränen 2018:184). Those who started the language revitalization of Kven were also inspired by the Meänkieli revitalization movement. Therefore two processes can be identified in Kven language planning: not only *ausbau* processes concerning MWF but also *einbau* processes related to Meänkieli.

2.6 Replication of *eera* verbs into Finnish and Kven

Replication of loanwords refers to sound–meaning pairs that are borrowed from a source language into a recipient language (Matras 2009). Many Germanic (especially Swedish) loans were borrowed into Finnish, and adopted into a conjugation type called ‘contracted verbs’ (Häkkinen 1997a:47). *Eera* verbs are a subgroup of this verb type.

However, many loan verbs of this verb type are completely integrated; consequently, it is not possible to perceive that they have a foreign element. In contrast, *eera* verbs can easily be noticed as loans, because the element *eera* is borrowed from Swedish. Wohlgemuth (2009:95, 98) calls such an element a ‘loan verb marker’, as the element is used exclusively when foreign verbs are replicated in a language. In Finnish, *eera* verbs are borrowed most often from Swedish; however, the ultimate sources for these verbs are other European languages, such as German, French, Latin, or Greek. Therefore these international loans represent a common European language heritage in Finnish as well as in Kven.

When the Kvens arrived in Norway, they already had *eera* verbs in their vocabulary. Still, *eera* verbs in Kven can also be loans from Norwegian replicated using the model of Swedish loans which form an analogical model also for loans replicated from Norwegian. This makes it difficult to distinguish between Swedish and Norwegian loans in Kven (Lindgren & Niiranen 2018:200). The distribution in Finnish dialects and in Meänkieli is one criterion used to decide if *eera* verbs can be considered borrowings from Swedish. Still, the same verbs found in Kven and Meänkieli can also be parallel loans.

Loanwords are phonologically integrated into the receiving language as a rule, and they can also undergo different semantic changes (Häkkinen 1997b:24–27). *Eera* verbs are also phonologically adapted when replicated in spoken language, and semantic changes sometimes occur. In earlier studies of Scandinavian loans in MWF or in Finnish dialects the focus has not been on *eera* verbs (Grönholm 1988, Häkkinen 1997a). The little that has been written about them is connected to Finnish language planning (see Section 4.1.3). Verbal loans from Scandinavian in Kven were presented earlier in Lindgren & Niiranen (2018).

Table 1. Number of *eera* verbs in Kven corpora

| | Oral verbs, total | Oral verbs, different | Written verbs, total | Written verbs, different | Different verbs in oral and written material |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Lindgren n.d. | 31 | 31 | | | |
| DMA, Eastern Finnmark | 3 | 2 | | | |
| DMA, Nordreisa | 4 | — | | | |
| Teaching videos, MJ | 3 | 3 | | | |
| Oral, total | 41 | 36 | | | 36 |
| NoKor | | | 87 | 87 | 81 |
| Beronka 1922 | | | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Nilsen-Børsskog 2004 | | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Teaching materials, Söderholm 2007 | | | 18 | 18 | 13 |
| Total | | | 111 | 108 | 132 |

DMA = The Digital Morphology Archives.

MJ = Meidän joukko: Grunnkurs i kvensk [Our gang: An elementary course in Kven].

NoKor = Norwegian Korppi.

3. Data and methods

The verbs in this study including the suffix *eera* have been collected from different corpora; see the Appendix for more details. Most *eera* verbs used in oral Kven come from a word list compiled by Anna-Riitta Lindgren in the 1970s in Nordreisa municipality (Lindgren [n.d.](#), *A List of Kven Verbs*). Many of these verbs also occur in the Word Archive of Finnish Dialects (SMSA). Some verbs in oral Kven were found in the Digital Morphology Archives (DMA) in the Language Bank of Finland, while some were collected from videos produced as teaching materials in Kven at the University of Tromsø (MJ).

Most of the verbs found in written materials are included in a Kven corpus called Norwegian Korppi (NoKor). The corpus includes administrative, fiction, non-fiction, religious texts, and news from the end of 1990s to 2020. This corpus is small, including only some 330 000 words. Most of the *eera* verbs occur in non-fiction texts. In total, 87 verbs were found in this corpus. The rest of the verbs were found in teaching materials (Söderholm [2007](#)), Nilsen-Børsskog's novel ([2004](#)), and in Beronka ([1922](#)). *Eera* verbs found in oral and written texts are lemmatized to get an overview of lexemes in the Kven material.

More verbs were found in written sources compared to oral sources. When the same lexemes in different corpora are counted only once, there are 108 verbs in the written sources, and 36 in the oral sources. Twelve of the same lexemes occur in both types of sources, so the total number of different *eera* verbs in the Kven corpora is 132, as seen in Table 1.

The method for determining whether *eera* verbs already belonged to the speech of Kvens when they moved to Norway, or if these verbs are loans from Norwegian, is a comparison of *eera* verbs in Kven corpora with OWF, Finnish dialects, and Meänkieli.

The *eera* verbs in OWF were checked in the dictionary (VKS), which contains words used in written documents during 1540–1810, when Finland was under Swedish rule. This electronic dictionary is not yet complete and only contains words from *a* to *papuruoka* (in June 2020) in the first part of the alphabet. Hence another source, Jussila (1998), was used to supplement those verbs that do not occur in VKS. This source includes words used in written Finnish during the same time period as VKS. I have collected all *eera* verbs from these two sources including the information about the documents where they were used. I sometimes also used The Corpus of Early Modern Finnish (VNSK) to ascertain information about *eera* verbs.

Eera verbs in Finnish dialects are listed in the Dictionary of Finnish Dialects (SMSK). This electronic dictionary is not yet complete either but covers words only from *a* to *lööveri*. As a supplement, the Digital Morphology Archives (DMA) was used. I have also used the Word Archive of Finnish Dialects (SMSA) to obtain additional information about *eera* verbs in Finnish dialects. I also used the Meänkieli dictionary (MKS and MKS 1992) to determine which *eera* verbs are used in Meänkieli in Sweden.

To discover whether *eera* verbs signify a difference between Kven and MWF, *eera* verbs used in the Kven corpus were compared to those found in standard and non-standard Finnish today. To compare *eera* verbs in Kven with standard MWF, I used the electronic dictionary of the Institute for the Languages of Finland (KS). Furthermore, in order to compare these verbs to modern non-standard Finnish, I used online data, a large corpus (Aller Media Oy 2019) which reveals how people write Finnish in informal contexts today. A written instead of an oral corpus was chosen because *eera* verbs are not frequent in oral corpora, for example in the Syntax Archive of Finnish dialects (LA).

The Swedish source words for *eera* loans were checked in the Swedish Academy Dictionary (SAOB), and Norwegian sources in *Bokmålsordbok* (BO) or in the Dictionary of the Norwegian Academy (NAOB). The Dictionary of Modern Finnish (NSS), the Finnish etymological dictionary *Suomen sanojen alkuperä* ‘The origin of Finnish words’ (SSA), Rapola (1960), and the Digital Museum (DM) were used when I needed help clarifying specific questions. The vocabulary of Kven has not yet been codified, but the Digital Kven–Norwegian Dictionary (KD) represents a kind of codification as of now. However, this dictionary does not include all the verbs used in the Kven text corpus of Norwegian Korppi (NoKor). I wrote short word articles about all *eera* verbs in the Kven corpora with information found in the sources mentioned above.

4. *Eera* verbs in Kven compared to Finnish

In the following sections I present *eera* verbs first in Finnish, then in Kven, and afterwards I compare the use of these verbs in the two languages.

4.1 *Eera verbs in Finnish*

4.1.1 *Eera verbs in the Old and Early Modern Finnish written languages*

Loan verbs including the suffix *eera* have been used since the time of the first published texts in Finnish. The dictionary of OWF (VKS) includes 93 *eera* verbs from the letters *a* to *o*. In addition, the book *Vanhat sanat* ‘Old words’ (Jussila 1998) includes 40 *eera* verbs between the letters *p* and *ö*. In total 133 *eera* verbs can be found in these sources. Already in Westh’s codex, a manuscript from around 1540 housed in the Helsinki University Library, the verb *disputeerata* ‘to argue’ is used (Jussila 1998, s.v. *disputoida*). Mikael Agricola, who published the first printed books in Finnish between 1543–1552, also used some *eera* verbs (VKS, s.v. *dikteerata* ‘to speak’; Jussila 1998, s.v. *profeteerata* ‘to predict’; s.v. *studeerata* ‘to study’).

Most *eera* verbs used in OWF come from legal documents translated from Swedish in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Besides law texts, other regulations – such as announcements from the King of Sweden to his Finnish-speaking subjects – were often translated and even printed (Häkkinen 1994:100–101). In the eighteenth century especially, Swedish regulations included loanwords – among them *eera* verbs – from French and Latin – and translators into Finnish sometimes added an explanation in Finnish for words they assumed might not be well known to Finnish readers (Pajula 1960:86–87).

Religious texts, the largest genre of texts in Finnish during the Swedish period, seem not to include very many *eera* verbs. *Eera* verbs used by Agricola have already been mentioned. In the first bible translation of 1642, only two verbs occur (VKS, s.v. *disputeerata* ‘to argue’; Jussila 1998, s.v. *visiteerata* ‘to visit’). Other religious texts such as the sermon collections of Ericus Eriici (Sorolainen) in 1621 and 1625 and Wegelius in 1747 only include a very small number of *eera* verbs (see VKS, Jussila 1998).

Nonetheless, during the time of OWF a model for integrating these verbs into the Finnish written language was already well established. *Eera* verbs were still frequently used in EMF. For example, in the *Oulun Wiikko-Sanommat*, a newspaper which was published in Oulu during the nineteenth century, verbs such as *arenteerata* ‘to rent’, *studeerata/tuteerata* ‘to study’, *tapitseerata* ‘to wallpaper’, *värdeerata* ‘to estimate the price’ and *äkseerata* ‘to exercise’ are found (VNSK). *Eera* verbs occur in many Finnish word lists and dictionaries published during the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, during this period *eera* verbs were also substituted by Finnish lexemes in certain cases.

4.1.2 *Eera verbs in Finnish dialects*

Naturally, many *eera* verbs are found in Western Finnish dialects, especially those that have been in contact with Swedish-speaking areas. For example, Grönholm (1988), who studied Swedish loans in the Turku dialect, mentions 48 different *eera* verbs. In addition to the western dialects, *eera* verbs also occur in Eastern Finnish dialects, even though these dialects are not considered contact dialects with Swedish.

The Dictionary of Finnish Dialects (SMSK) includes over 300 *eera* verbs, though the dictionary does not yet cover the entire alphabet. Some *eera* verbs can be found across many Finnish dialects. Under Swedish rule, contacts between monolingual

Finnish speakers and Swedish-speaking people, who were authorities or land-owners, were not uncommon, even outside the Swedish dialect contact areas. Military service also resulted in contact between Finnish-speaking soldiers and Swedish-speaking officers. Military command words in the Swedish army were first in Finnish. However, from 1689 onward Swedish was used as a command language among Finnish-speaking soldiers as well (Engman 2016:110). One common verb in many Finnish dialects is *äkseerata* < *exercera* (Swe.) << *exercere* (Lat.) (SSA, s.v. *äkseerata*), most probably because it is a military term, meaning ‘to exercise, drill’. In addition, *eera* verbs could be transferred to Finnish dialects through written sources. Official announcements were read aloud to people in services and parish meetings (Laine 1997:294). An example of such a verb is *studeerata*, also found in many Finnish dialects. Oral forms of this verb such as *tuteerata* and *tutierata* arose when this Swedish loan verb was replicated in Finnish dialects (DMA).

4.1.3 *Eera* verbs in MWF

The question of how to treat *eera* verbs in the standard Finnish written language was discussed from the end of the nineteenth century onward until these verbs were codified in the 1920s. In 1873, August Ahlqvist, professor of Finnish from 1863 to 1888, wrote that these verbs were already well integrated into the Finnish language. Therefore *eera* verbs could be used in the same way in written standard Finnish as they were used in Finnish dialects (Ahlqvist 1873:63–64). Ahlqvist represented the grammar approach in Finnish language planning, which was connected to purism (Paunonen 1992). However, he was not interested in making changes to already established items, and when such elements and purism were in conflict, he defended preserving elements that were already integrated into the language (Häkkinen 2008:102–103).

Even so, the discussion of how these verbs ought to be integrated into modern Finnish continued. These verbs were not held in high regard by those involved in Finnish language planning at the beginning of the twentieth century. Finnish linguist E. A. Tunkelo wrote an article about *eera* verbs in 1910, calling them ‘a disgusting derivational type’ (Tunkelo 1910:130). Martti Airila (1915:86), another Finnish linguist, defended the use of the originally Finnish derivative ending *oi* as a means of integrating these verbs into MWF. Airila’s arguments were based on purism. He criticized these verbs for being too long and of foreign origin. He called them ‘inelegant’ and ‘disgusting’. Airila’s arguments against *eera* verbs demonstrate how different considerations of purism (Langer & Nesse 2012:610) are intertwined: his view represents both structural purism, as he wanted to eliminate a foreign element and replace it with an originally Finnish suffix, and also national ideological purism, as the target of his purism is a suffix loaned from Swedish, but also metalinguistic considerations, since his argument for eliminating *eera* verbs was based on an aesthetic evaluation, or what might be considered ugly and unsuitable in Finnish, based on his own preferences. That is why he declared war against these verbs in the Finnish language in his article.

In the 1920s the Finnish Language Council suggested that verbs ending in *eera* should be replaced by the derivational suffix *oi*, which is Finnish in origin. *Eera* verbs were last regulated in 1929, when it was proposed that long verbs of more

than three syllables should get the Finnish suffix *oi* instead of *eera*. Shorter verbs, however, could be replicated by the *eera* suffix. Many *eera* loans were also substituted by words of Finnish origin; such verbs were most often neologisms (Kolehmainen 2014:374).

4.2 *Eera verbs in Kven*

This section presents verbs found in Kven sources. I will demonstrate how these verbs are adapted into Kven and discuss the differences between replication in the oral and written varieties of the Kven language. I will also examine the question of whether *eera* verbs in Kven are loans from Norwegian or Swedish.

4.2.1 *Eera verbs in oral Kven*

There are 36 different *eera* verbs found in the oral language. Verbs in oral sources were collected mostly from the Nordreisa dialect (Table 1). The high number of these verbs is a result of the fact that Lindgren, who collected the material, lived in this village for a longer period of time and was able to record many examples of these verbs (see Lindgren 2014). I assume that more *eera* verbs compared to what can be found in the dialect corpora were also used in other Kven villages. Grönholm (1988), who found many *eera* verbs in the Turku dialect, collected her material via many different methods, which may explain the high number of these verbs in her material.

In this section I present loans found only in oral sources. Because 12 of the verbs are used in both types of sources, there are 24 verbs that can only be found in oral sources, for example the following verbs.

- (1) a. *parpeerata* ‘to shave’ < Nor. *barbere* id. (BO) / < Swe. *barbera* id. (SAOB)
- b. *fotografeerata* ‘to take a photo’ < Nor. *fotografere* id. (BO)
- c. *kryteerata* ‘to flavour’ < Nor. *krydder* ‘a spice’ (BO)
- d. *uppereerata* ‘to operate’ < Nor. *operere* id. (BO)

In the example in (1a), both Norwegian and Swedish could be the source languages, as loans from Norwegian are replicated on the analogical model of earlier Swedish loans (see Section 2.5). Therefore, since the Norwegian source verb ends in the vowel *e*, it is replicated like a Swedish model verb ending in the vowel *a* in Kven. However, this verb does not occur in the Meänkieli dictionary (MKS), and therefore it is possible that Norwegian is the source language. Example (1b) most probably is a loan from Norwegian, as *fotografeerata* belongs neither to Finnish dialects (SMSK) nor to Meänkieli (MKS).

Example (1c) seems to have been replicated from a Norwegian noun. In OWF and in the Western Finnish dialects, the verb *kryydätä* ‘to flavour’ is used (SSA, s.v. *ryyti*). *Kryydätä* is a loan from Swedish *krydda*; but *kryteerata* is not found in Finnish dialects.

The example in (1d) demonstrates that the first vowel in the Norwegian source verb is replicated in oral Kven using /u/. However, the pronunciation according to NAOB (s.v. *operere*), is [ɔpøre:rə]. In addition, the plosive *p* is lengthened in Kven.

Because this verb is not used in Finnish dialects or in Meänkieli, it seems to be a loan from Norwegian.

The verb *remusteerata* from oral Kven means ‘to talk about something / try to organize something one cannot rely on’ (SMSA, s.v. *remusteerata*). It is not possible to find a source verb for this verb. It is an example of how *eera* verbs in Kven sometimes also get pejorative/negative meanings in the same way that Grönholm (1989) suggests certain Swedish loans received pejorative meanings in the Turku dialect.

4.2.2 *Eera verbs in written Kven*

The following verbs are examples of *eera* verbs used in written Kven.

- (2) a. *deriveerata* ‘to derive’ < Nor. *derivere* id. (BO)
- b. *mobiliseerata* ‘to mobilize’ < Nor. *mobilisere* id. (BO)
- c. *programmeerata* ‘to programme’ < Nor. *programmere* id. (BO)
- d. *kamufleerata* ‘to camouflage’ < Nor. *kamuflere* id. (BO)

Specific terminology often includes international words in all languages. For example (2a), a grammatical term, is an international word loaned through Norwegian. Nevertheless, the same verb is used in Finnish, but in the form *derivoida*. This verb was already known in OWF with the same meaning (VKS, s.v. *deriveerata*). Yet Norwegian is the most likely source language. Other grammatical terms like *gemineerata* ‘to geminate’ and *aspireerata* ‘to aspirate’ can also be considered international loans replicated through Norwegian.

Besides specific grammatical terms, there exist more general terms used in written sources, such as example (2b), which was used in a newspaper text (NoKor). Other verbs used in the Kven newspaper are *refereerata* ‘to refer’ or *revitaliseerata* ‘to revitalize’. Example (2c) refers to modern technology. Another such verb is *digitaliseerata* ‘to digitize’. Example (2d) occurs in Alf Nilsen-Børsskog’s novel (2004), referring to activities during the Second World War.

All these examples demonstrate that Norwegian orthography is used when verbs are replicated in written Kven. For example, voiced plosives are used and not replicated with voiceless plosives as in the oral examples (compare example 1). However, some verbs in the written sources follow the oral pronunciation of Kven. For example, a form such as *tirikeerata* ‘to direct’ is found in written sources, replicated from the Norwegian verb *dirigere* ‘to direct’ (BO), although Norwegian orthography is not followed.

4.2.3 *Eera verbs common to both oral and written Kven*

In total, 12 verbs are used both in oral and written sources in Kven. I will pay special attention to how these verbs are replicated in these materials.

- (3) a. *orkaniseerata* (oral); *organiseerata* (written) ‘to organize’ < Nor. *organisere* id. (BO)
- b. *pansyneerata* (oral); *pensioneerata* (written) ‘to retire’ < Nor. *pensjonere* id. (BO)

- c. evakkoteerata (oral) ‘to evacuate’ < Kve evakko ‘evacuee’ (KD) < Fin. evakko id. (KM)
 evakko + teera + ta
 N + DERIVATIVE + 1.INF.
- d. evak(k)ueerata (written) ‘to evacuate’ < Nor. evakuere id. (BO)

There is a difference as to how these verbs are replicated in oral and written language. In oral Kven, the verbs are integrated phonologically. For example, since voiced plosives do not occur in Kven, the voiced velar *g* is replicated as a voiceless *k* in the example in (3a). By contrast, the voiced velar is used in written sources in accordance with Norwegian orthography.

In the example in (3b), the Norwegian verb *pensjonere* ‘to retire’ is adapted into oral Kven as *pansyneerata*, reflecting the way this verb is pronounced in Norwegian. The written form by contrast follows Norwegian orthography. However, the written form is also adapted to Kven orthography, since the consonant combination *nsj* is not used in Kven.

Eera verbs are sometimes also derived from a noun, as in the example in (3c). The noun *evakko* ‘evacuee’ can be found in the Kven dictionary. It is possibly a loan from Finnish, though this word in Finnish was spread first in 1940 according to information on the website of the Institute for the Languages of Finland (Kotus). In the NNS, this word is mentioned as being used in the oral language (NNS, s.v. *evakko*). The verb in Kven is formed using *teera* as a derivative suffix.

In the written language, this verb is replicated from the Norwegian verb (example 3d). It is replicated using either a long consonant *k*, most likely following pronunciation in oral Kven, or a short *k*, following Norwegian orthography.

4.3 Eera verbs in Kven compared to Finnish

In this section I will compare *eera* verbs in Kven to those found in Finnish. First, in Section 4.3.1, I compare verbs in Kven and those in OWF and in Finnish dialects, paying special attention to verbs found in both. In Section 4.3.2, I compare *eera* verbs found in Kven and MWF, both in the standard and non-standard language.

4.3.1 Eera verbs in Kven compared to OWF and Finnish dialects

Thirty-two *eera* verbs found in the Kven corpus occur in OWF or in Finnish dialects, or in both. Twelve of these occur in OWF (Table 2), but not in dialects, nine are found in Finnish dialects, but not in OWF (Table 3), and eleven are verbs common to Kven, OWF, and Finnish dialects (Table 4).

The verbs listed in Table 2 are well-known international verbs. All except one of these verbs are found only in written Kven. In addition, most of them – except *leveerata* and *palsameerata* – are used either in the Kven newspaper or in the Kven grammar. They are probably replicated from Norwegian, even though they also occur in OWF.

The verb *leveerata* occurs in teaching materials (Söderholm 2007). It is replicated from Norwegian, and not from Swedish, where this verb has a longer stem (SAOB, s.v. *leverera*). The verb *palsameerata* is found in Beronka (1922:99). The text is a

Table 2. Verbs common to Old Written Finnish and Kven but not found in Finnish dialects

| Types of corpora | Number of verbs | Examples |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Only in spoken Kven | 0 | |
| In both spoken and written Kven | 1 | interesseerata 'to be interested' < Nor. interessere seg for id. |
| Only in written Kven | 11 | deriveerata 'to derive' < Nor. derivere id. klassifiseerata 'to classify' < Nor. klassifisere id. kommuniseerata 'to communicate' < Nor. kommunisere id. leveerata 'to deliver' < Nor. levere id. noteerata 'to notify' < Nor. notere id. palsameerata 'to embalm' < Nor. balsamere id. presenteerata 'to present' < Nor. presentere id. protesteerata 'to protest' < Nor. protestere id. refereerata 'to refer' < Nor. referere id. registreerata 'to register' < Nor. registrere id. spesifiseerata 'to specify' < Nor. spesifisere id. |
| Total | 12 | |

Table 3. Verbs common to both Kven and Finnish dialects

| Types of corpora | Number of verbs | Examples |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Only in spoken Kven | 3 | planteerata 'to plant' < Swe. plantera id./< Nor. plante id. seppereerata 'to separate' < Nor. seperator 'separator' spaseerata 'to walk' < Nor. spasere id./< Swe. spatsera id. |
| In both spoken and written Kven | 3 | diskuteerata/tiskuteerata 'to discuss' < Swe. diskutera id. hunteerata 'to think' < Swe. fundera id. särveerata 'to serve' < Swe. servera id. |
| Only in written Kven | 3 | agiteerata 'to agitate' < Swe. agitera id. /< Nor. agitere id. fundeerata 'to think' < Swe. fundera id. tapiseerata 'to wallpaper' < Swe. tapitsera id. |
| Total | 9 | |

bible narrative in Kven about Joseph and his brothers. Could it possibly be a verb in Kven because it was used in the Finnish bible which Kvens knew? The verb is mentioned in VKS (s.v. *balsameerata*), but it seems not to have been used widely. Beronka (1922:97) mentions that this text is based on the bible history of Vogt, a sample of texts that were used in Norwegian schools (Niiranen 2011:63–64). The verb *palsameerata* thus also seems to have been replicated from Norwegian.

Table 4. Verbs common to Kven, Old Written Finnish, and Finnish dialects

| Types of corpora | Number of verbs | Examples |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Only in spoken Kven | 5 | akuteerata 'to ponder, think' < Swe. ackordera 'to agree'/ Nor. akkordere id. komanteerata 'to adjust' < Nor. kommandere 'to command' munteerata 'to clothe' < Swe. montera id. takseerata 'to assess' < Swe. taxera id. värtteerata 'to value' < Swe. värdera id. |
| In both spoken and written Kven | 3 | sortteerata 'to sort' < Swe. sortera id. studeerata 'to study' < Swe. studera id. äkseerata 'to exercise' < Swe. exercera id. |
| Only in written Kven | 3 | aresteerata 'to arrest' < Swe. arrestera id./Nor. arrestere id. hantteerata 'to handle' < Swe. hantera id. justeerata 'to adjust' < Swe. justera id. |

The verb *interesseerata* is used in spoken Kven in the Raisi dialect, and it is also used in written Kven (NorKo). *Interesserata* is not used in any Finnish dialect, but it occurs in Meänkieli (MKS, s.v. *interesseerata*). However, it is most probably a parallel loan from Swedish to Meänkieli, and from Norwegian to Kven.

Table 3 lists verbs common to Kven and Finnish dialects which do not occur in OWF. Only the two verbs *fundeerata* and *hunteerata* have a wide distribution in Finnish dialects, and they can also be found in Meänkieli. These verbs occur in Western Finnish dialects, with *fundeerata* also found in Eastern Finnish dialects (SMSK, s.v. *funteerata*).

Verbs like *diskuteerata* (SMSK, s.v. *diskuteerata*) and *plantteerata* are known in some Finnish dialects, as well as in Meänkieli (MKS 1992, s.v. *tiskuteerata*, *plantteerata*). The verb *planteerata* occurs in the Turku dialect (Grönholm 1988). It is probably a Swedish loan; however, it could also be derived from the Norwegian verb 'plante' (BO) using *eera* as a suffix. The verbs *spaseerata* and *särveerata* are seldom used in Finnish dialects (SMSA, s.v. *spaseerata*, *särveerata*). *Spaseerata* is found in Värmland, and the form *paserata* is found in the Turku dialect. It is replicated from the Swedish dialect form in Finland *spasera* (Grönholm 1988:115). *Särveerata* is found in some Western Finnish dialects, for example in the Turku dialect (Grönholm 1988:161). Only *särveerata* is found in Meänkieli (MKS). It is thus possible that Swedish is the source for this loan; instead *spaseerata* most likely is replicated into Kven from Norwegian.

Agiteerata can be found both in Finnish dialects and in Meänkieli (SMSK, s.v. *agiteerata*; MKS, s.v. *akiteerata*). However, it is marked as a new word in SMSK; thus it could also be a Norwegian loan. *Tapiseerata* is used both in Finnish dialects (see DMA) and in Meänkieli (MKS 1992). Still, wallpapering as a phenomenon is rather modern. Häkkinen (2013, s.v. *tapetti*) mentions that wallpapering first became widespread among common people in the twentieth century. Because of the *i* in the second syllable, the source language seems to be Swedish, as the form *tapitsera* is also found in Swedish (SAOB, s.v. *tapitsera*; see also Section 4.1.1). The Finnish verb has even lost the consonant *t*.

The verb *seppereerata* seems to be replicated from a Norwegian noun. The verb *separeerata* is used in Finnish dialects, replicated from Swedish (SAOB, s.v. *separera*). By contrast, the Kven verb seems to have been adapted from the noun *separator* because of the vowel *e* in the verb stem. Although the Digital Museum in Norway uses this word (DM), it cannot be found in BO.

Table 4 lists the verbs common to Kven, OWF, and Finnish dialects. Some of these verbs seem to have been replicated from OWF into Finnish dialects. Most obviously this is the case with respect to verbs that have a wide distribution in many Finnish dialects, including outside the Swedish dialect contact area in Finland. Some of these verbs belong to military language. *Munteerata* means originally ‘to clothe a soldier’. In both Finnish dialects (SMSA, s.v. *munteerata*) and in Meänkieli it means ‘to clothe’. *Äkseerata* refers to a military drill and is found in many Finnish dialects with this meaning (SMSA, s.v. *äkseerata*), but is also found with the transferred meaning of ‘to throw a tantrum’ or ‘to conspire’.

Other verbs found both in OWF and Finnish dialects seem to have been derived from legal decrees or other juridical documents. *Justeerata* was used in many legal decrees in the eighteenth century (VKS, s.v. *justeerata*). It is widely used in Finnish dialects with the meaning of ‘to adjust’ (SMSK, s.v. *justeerata*), and is also found in Meänkieli. Other similar types of verbs are *sortteerata*, *takseerata*, and *värtteerata*.

Studeerata is a verb which has been used in OWF since the first texts appeared in the 1540s. Therefore it has a wide distribution in many Finnish dialects as well as outside the contact area with Swedish (DMA, SMSA). In Finnish dialects, *studeerata* has many extended transferred meanings such as ‘to read’, ‘to be curious’, or ‘to stare’.

Akuteerata and *aresteerata* are only found in Western Finnish dialects, while *hantteerata* has a wider distribution (SMSK). These are examples of verbs that were most likely replicated into Finnish dialects from Swedish dialects, and not via documents written in OWF. *Hantteerata* could also be a loan from Swedish into Kven, while the other two verbs could also be loans from Norwegian.

Komanteerata occurs in VKS (s.v. *kom(m)endeerata*) with the meaning ‘to lead military forces, etc.’. In Finnish dialects and in the Meänkieli dialect area, the meaning of this verb is ‘to give orders, to command’ (SMSK, s.v. *komenteerata*); however, the Kven verb is used with the meaning of ‘to adjust sails’. The verb in Kven is probably a loan from Norwegian because of the vowel *a* in the second syllable.

4.3.2 Eera verbs in Kven compared to standard and non-standard Modern Finnish

First I will compare *eera* verbs used in Kven to those found in the dictionary published by the Institute for the Languages of Finland (KS) to determine if it is possible to find verbs common to Kven and standard MWF.

Table 5 gives the result of the comparison with KS. For the most part only short *eera* verbs in Kven have a counterpart in MWF. Other *eera* verbs are either formed using the suffix *oi* in standard Finnish, or are substituted by neologisms, or they are just missing (see Section 4.1.3 and Kolehmainen 2014:374). Table 5 presents a comparison between all these verbs in Kven and KS, and between verbs found in written Kven and KS. Even though oral Kven includes some specific verbs like *remusteerata* (see Section 4.2.1), a verb that does not have a counterpart in

Table 5. *Eera* verbs in Kven compared to KS

| Kven verbs compared to KS | Number of verbs (N)/% | | | | Example |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------|------|---|
| | All N | % | Written N | % | |
| same verb | 9 | 6.8 | 8 | 7.4 | justeerata 'to adjust' |
| <i>eera</i> /oi | 59 | 44.5 | 51 | 47.2 | opereerata/operoida 'to operate' |
| different verb or missing | 64 | 48.5 | 49 | 45.4 | fotografeerata/valokuvata 'to take a photo' |
| | 132 | 100 | 108 | 100 | |

KS = Dictionary of Contemporary Finnish.

Table 6. Finnish neologisms with meanings corresponding to *eera* verbs in Kven in the Finnish newspaper corpus (Kansalliskirjasto 2011). Numbers of uses of each neologism in Finnish in the newspaper corpus

| | Finnish neologism | First time used in corpus | 1840–1860 | 1860–1880 | 1880–1900 | 1900–1920 | 1920–1940 |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| presenteerata OWF 'to present' | esitellä | 1848 R | 1 350 | 13 681 | 35 923 | 60 853 | 28 541 |
| studeerata OWF 'to study' | opiskella | 1848 R | 4 | 90 | 5 308 | 26 509 | 32 239 |
| fotografeerata EMF 'to photograph' | valokuvata | 1853 R | 0 | 1 | 1 284 | 6 907 | 8 634 |
| isoleerata EMF 'to isolate' | eristää | 1845 R | 7 | 34 | 901 | 15 407 | 13 795 |
| interesseerata 'to be interested' | kiinnostaa | 1859 Kansalliskirjasto | 3 | 0 | 36 | 86 | 22 567 |
| publiseerata 'to publish' | julkaista | 1836 R | 411 | 9 311 | 89 422 | 234 360 | 175 755 |

R = Rapola 1960.

OWF = Old Written Finnish.

EMF = Early Modern Finnish.

MWF, all *eera* verbs in Kven and those that occur only in written sources demonstrate an almost identical pattern when compared to verbs in KS. Less than half the verbs in Kven, 45–49%, are verbs that do not occur in the standard form of MWF, represented by KS. Verbs formed by *oi* in Finnish are also different from Kven verbs, and comprise between 44% and 47% of the verbs in Finnish and Kven. Consequently, *eera* verbs distinguish between these two varieties.

Table 6 presents some Finnish neologisms created in the nineteenth century expressing the same meanings as some of the *eera* verbs in Kven, and demonstrates

how the use of these verbs increased from 1840 to 1940 in the Finnish newspaper corpus.

Neologisms created during the period of EMF substituted many earlier *eera* verbs in OWF and EMF. Increased possibilities for reading texts in Finnish representing different genres (see Section 2.3) helped to spread neologisms among the people. Newspaper reading increased during the latter half of the nineteenth century, and newspapers became everyday reading among the common people as well (Leino-Kaukiainen 1989, Mäkinen 2007, Kokko 2021). Neologisms in newspapers and other texts were shared with readers and became established not only in written but also oral language.

Some *eera* verbs, such as the verbs *interesseerata* and *publiseerata* in Kven, are found in neither OWF nor EMF. During EMF many other different expressions in Finnish were suggested for translating the Swedish verb *intressera seg (för)* ‘to be interested’ (VNSK). However, not all suggestions were adopted, since they did not achieve collective acceptance among language users (Häkkinen 2000:257). *Publiseerata* also was not used in OWF; the prefixed verb *ulosantaa* was used instead. Such verbs were common in OWF (Häkkinen 1994:488).

The neologistic verb *kiinnostaa*² is only used a very few times at the beginning of the twentieth century in the Finnish newspaper corpus during the nineteenth century, and its use first expands in the period 1920–1940. However, it can be found in the DMA and in LA (s.v. *kiinnostaa*), which demonstrates that written language impacted oral Finnish, because this verb in Finnish dialects comes from the written language.

The verb *kiinnostaa* is not used in Kven. However, other neologisms such as *eristää* and *opiskella* can be found in KD. These verbs were used more often during the last decades of the 1800s compared to *kiinnostaa* which may explain why these neologisms can be found in Kven.

Eera verbs were also compared to non-standard written Finnish. All *eera* verbs in Kven were compared to a large Korppi-corpus called ‘Internet discussions’ (Aller Media Oy 2019). Table 7 presents the results of this comparison.

Table 7 demonstrates that over 50% (68 of 132 verbs) of the verbs used in Kven are more or less used in non-standard Finnish. However, the *eera* verbs most often used – over 1000 times in group (a) – are those belonging to standard written Finnish, which are all short *eera* verbs (see Section 4.1.3). All verbs in this group can be found in KS. The verb *fundeerata* is marked as ‘playful, dialectal’ in KS. The popularity of this Western Finnish dialect verb in modern non-standard Finnish is possibly connected to former president of Finland Mauno Koivisto, who was born in Turku and often used some features of this dialect in his oral language. This particular verb is especially often connected to him (Heikkinen 2017).

In group (b), the verb *aplodeerata* can also be found in KS, even though it is a ‘long’ *eera* verb. It is possible that this verb with its connection to cultural activities was well established and continued to be used also after these verbs were codified. The verb *äkseerata* is found in KS, but it is stylistically marked as ‘old-fashioned’. *Hunteerata* ‘to ponder, think’ is a dialect word, a variety of *fundeerata*, and does not occur in KS.

Table 7. *Eera* verbs in Kven compared to non-standard written Finnish (Aller Media Oy 2019)

| Number of verbs in the Kven corpus | Number of Kven verbs compared to frequencies of these verbs in the Finnish corpus | Examples | Frequency of use in the corpus |
|------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 4 | (a) 1001– | noteerata ‘to note’ siteerata ‘to quote’ parkkeerata ‘to park’ fundeerata ‘to think’ | 37 145 32 186 14 933 2 609 |
| 10 | (b) 101–1000 | aplodeerata ‘to applaud’ äkseerata ‘to exercise’ hunteerata ‘to think’ | 470 294 168 |
| 12 | (c) 11–100 | analyseerata ‘to analyse’ serveerata ‘to serve’ studeerata ‘to study’ | 92 86 19 |
| 42 | (d) 1–10 | protesteerata ‘to protest’ takseerata ‘to assess’ okkupeerata ‘to occupy’ | 6 4 2 |
| 64 | (e) 0 | | |
| Total 132 | | | |

In group (c) verbs like *analyseerata* are found. In standard MWF such verbs are formed with *oi* like *analysoida*, with 44 554 occurrences in the same corpus. A verb with *oi* thus has many more uses in non-standard Finnish compared to an *eera* verb. The verb *serveerata* can be found in KS, but it is marked as ‘colloquial’. The loan *särveerata* is not common in Finnish dialects (see Table 3), and *serveerata* could be a newer loan from Swedish. The verb *studeerata* ‘to study’ – used already in the first texts written in Finnish (see Section 4.1.1) – is still in use. However, the modern Finnish verb *opiskella* with 421 749 uses has supplanted it almost completely.

The verbs in group (d) are most often – 30 verbs out of 42 – verbs like *protesteerata* having a corresponding verb formed with a suffix *oi* in the KS dictionary. Also, some verbs without any parallel *oi* verb are used, such as *okkupeerata*. This verb is not used in OWF, but Finnish verbs having the same meaning were used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Therefore it seems that *okkupeerata* in non-standard Finnish is a new loan from Swedish. *Takseerata* is a verb found both in Finnish dialects and in OWF (Table 4), and it is also used occasionally in non-standard Finnish.

5. Discussion

In this section I will bring together the answers to the research question, and discuss how *eera* verbs create a distinction between MWF and Kven. I will focus on ausbau processes which create differences between these two varieties. In addition, I discuss how ausbau processes reflect the identity of those involved in language planning. Lastly, the question of whether einbau processes can also be part of the language planning of Kven is discussed.

5.1 Differences and similarities in the use of *eera* verbs in Kven and Finnish

Many *eera* verbs are found in written Kven, where these verbs are often international words replicated via Norwegian and often refer to modern phenomena or represent specific terminology. In a similar way, modern vocabulary items consisting of noun loans in Kven are often international loans replicated via Norwegian (Utvik 1996:262). The need to enlarge vocabulary and to use specific terminology is therefore one explanation for why *eera* verbs are often used, especially in written Kven.

In most cases it is not possible to decide if an *eera* verb is a loan from Swedish or a parallel loan from Norwegian. However, what is clear is that the analogical model for replicating these loans from Swedish is used even when verbs were replicated from Norwegian (see Section 2.5).

However, some *eera* verbs in Kven most probably belonged to Kven dialects already before the Kvens moved to Norway. For example, the verbs *fundeerata* and *huntteerata*, both meaning ‘to think’, are replicated from Swedish. Some verbs seem to have been replicated from the written language into Finnish dialects, as they have a wide distribution in these dialects outside the Swedish contact areas. For example, the verbs *justeerata* ‘to adjust’, *takseerata* ‘to assess’, and *äkseerata* ‘to exercise’ represent juridical or military language, and they are also found in OWF. These verbs are found in Kven dialects, most likely because they also occur in Finnish dialects. Religious texts written in OWF that Kvens read only contain a few *eera* verbs (see Section 4.1.1). However, in certain cases a written source for some *eera* verbs in Kven could be newspapers published during the period of EMF. Some Kvens subscribed to Finnish newspapers (Ryymin 2004:132–135), and the use of *eera* verbs was still common during the EMF period (see Section 4.1.1).

Eera verbs are replicated differently in oral compared to written Kven. In oral use, these verbs are replicated as they are pronounced. For example, voiced plosives, which do not exist in Kven, are substituted by voiceless plosives (*diskuteerata* versus *tiskuteerata* ‘to discuss’). In the written language, *eera* verbs most often follow Norwegian orthography, demonstrating that *eera* verbs are loans in Kven, but sometimes an oral pronunciation is also used in written Kven. It is a future challenge for those who work with the codification of written Kven as to how *eera* verbs ought to be replicated in written Kven.

Some *eera* verbs in oral Kven are not examples of loan verbs, but seem to be derived from a noun using *teera* as a derivative suffix. Such an example is *evakko-teerata* ‘to evacuate’ and *krytteerata* ‘to flavour’. This demonstrates that the suffix (*t*) *eera* has developed a function as an independent derivative suffix in Kven.

Common *eera* verbs occurring in both languages are in the minority. Such verbs are almost exclusively short *eera* verbs which are acceptable in MWF. Verbs derived with the original Finnish suffix *oi* have supplanted many *eera* verbs in MWF. Many *eera* verbs were substituted by neologisms during the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century in MWF. One such example is the verb *opiskella* ‘to study’ which replaced the *eera* verb *studeerata*. This verb is used in Kven today, and it was used in OWF from the middle of the sixteenth century. It is also found in many Finnish dialects. Even though the verb *studeerata* is still used to some degree in non-standard written Finnish, the neologism *opiskella* is

used much more frequently. Other neologisms have also become widespread in use in Finnish, demonstrating that language planning was successful. The changes that were made in MWF impacted the oral use of Finnish as well – neologisms can even be found in Finnish dialects – which makes oral Finnish closer to MWF (Andreassen et al. 2001; see also Jahr 1989). In addition, a further distinction between Kven and MWF is created because some of the common verbs in Kven and MWF are stylistically marked in the latter, either as ‘old-fashioned’, ‘colloquial’, ‘playful’, or ‘dialectal’. However, they are used neutrally in written Kven. Therefore the difference in the use of *eera* verbs demonstrates a difference between the two Ausbau languages MWF and Kven.

5.2 *Ausbau processes, purism, and language identity*

Finnish neologisms are not found in Kven because of the few contacts that Kvens had with the developing MWF. This was because of the resistance from the Norwegian authorities towards both the oral and written use of minority languages. In addition, the reading tradition in Finnish among Kvens was religious, including mostly texts written in OWF (see Section 2.3). Therefore MWF was considered to be a strange and difficult variety to read among those Kvens used to reading OWF (Niiranen 2019).

A parallel kind of situation can be found among Tornedalians. The Finnish language was removed from schools at the end of nineteenth century, and reading in Finnish was no longer supported by the Swedish authorities (Elenius 2001:324). For example, all Finnish books were removed from the libraries in northern Sweden during this same time (Huss 1999:80; Winsa 1999:422). Even though Tornedalians learned to read and write in Finnish before the 1880s (Huss 1999:81; Elenius 2001:325–327), they never became acquainted with MWF.³

Both Norwegian loans, and Swedish loans which were removed from MWF, can be found in spoken Kven (Andreassen et al. 2001). Thus their use is characteristic to Kven, and they are also found in written Kven. Furthermore, vocabulary items such as *eera* verbs highlight a difference between Kven and MWF, and are therefore connected to language identity. In the same way, Swedish loans are seen as a part of Meänkieli expressing its cultural and linguistic tradition (Lainio & Wande 2015:127).

In contrast, loans are considered the main goal for purism in national language planning (Thomas 1991:68). In Finnish language planning, the target of purism was especially loans from Swedish (see Section 2.2). This attitude was present when *eera* verbs were codified in MWF (see Section 4.1.3), reflecting the identity of those who were involved in language planning. Purist attitudes towards Swedish in Finnish language planning still in the 1920s and 1930s can be explained by the disagreement between the use of Finnish contra Swedish for example in higher education, especially at the University of Helsinki (Rintala 1998:55).

The purist attitude towards the derivational element *eera*, loaned from Swedish, can be compared to the purism in Nynorsk towards words including Low German prefixes or suffixes (like *an-*, *-heit* and *-else*) which were considered foreign in Nynorsk. This was because these prefixes and suffixes are used in Danish and Bokmål, and Nynorsk purism targeted these competing languages. Still, these

prefixes and suffixes are in reality not foreign because words including them have been used in Norwegian dialects for centuries (Brundstad 2003:54). In the same way, *eera* verbs are used not only in OWF, but have also been used in Finnish dialects for a long period of time. However, they were considered to be foreign elements because they have a visible loan verb marker (see Wohlgemuth 2009:95, 98 and Section 2.5) and therefore are easily noticed as loans in Finnish. Even though Finnish purism targeted Swedish, many loan translations from Swedish were accepted in Finnish (Häkkinen 1994:453–455). Loan translations were adapted into the written language already by Agricola, and many loan translations can be found in MWF (Rintala 1998:55; Hakulinen 2000). As Thomas (1991:70) points out, loan translations can be tolerated when loan words from the same language are not accepted.

However, not all Finnish linguists agreed that *eera* verbs ought to be substituted with a Finnish derivative suffix, or by neologisms. August Ahlqvist supported preserving *eera* verbs in Finnish (Section 4.1.3). J. J. Mikkola, a professor of Slavic languages, also argued that originality was more important in Finnish language planning than expediency (Häkkinen 1994:518). Mikkola especially criticized the fact that international loans were being avoided in Finnish language planning. He pointed out that the Finnish language culturally is closer to Swedish than it is to such languages as Hungarian or Mordvin, even though these languages are in the same language family as Finnish (Rintala 1998:59).

One question is whether neologisms created during the language planning of MWF can be accepted in Kven. The criterion for acceptance used here is if the neologisms are found in the digital dictionary KD or not. It seems that some but not all neologisms have been adopted into Kven. Verbs like *kiinnostaa* ‘to be interested’, *julkaista* ‘to publish’, and *valokuvata* ‘to photograph’ are not found in KD; instead, loans from Norwegian are used. On the other hand, some neologisms such as *opiskella* ‘to study’ can be found in KD.

Avoiding elements can also be described as purism (Langer & Nesse 2012:610). A parallel case for avoiding Finnish neologisms in Kven is when High German neologisms are not accepted in Yiddish, which Hornsby (2015:69) calls purism. The purist attitudes of those involved in language planning are directed towards a language having a position of dominance in society (Langer & Nesse 2012:612). MWF has been the dominating variety over written Kven, for example in education. The Kven language is still a contested language, even among the Kven minority itself (Sollid 2020:89–90). It is important to make a distinction between Kven and MWF because this highlights the status of Kven as an independent language. The use of *eera* verbs in Kven and the avoidance of Finnish neologisms may therefore better express the identity of those involved in Kven language planning.

Language planning in MWF and Kven belong to the different time periods. The language planning of MWF described in this article is connected to the national language planning during the nineteenth century and also at the beginning of the twentieth century. By contrast, Kven language planning first started in 2007 (Keränen 2018), with the goal being to revitalize the Kven language, not to develop a national language. Thus both the time of the language planning and the goal for it are different. This also reflects how the codification of *eera* verbs are realized in these two languages.

Nonetheless the conclusion is that the identities of those involved in language planning are reflected when languages are reshaped, as Joseph (2004:13) suggests. In particular, purist attitudes reflect the identities of those involved in language planning both in national language planning but also in the planning of minority languages. Therefore *ausbau* processes reflect language identities. The avoidance of elements in both Kven and Meänkieli targets neologisms in MWF. Even though these vocabulary elements are created using inherited elements in Finnish, they are considered foreign elements in both Kven and Meänkieli.

5.3 *Einbau processes in language planning*

Eera verbs demonstrate not only a distance between Kven and MWF but also a similarity between Meänkieli in Sweden and Kven in Norway, based on the dialect background of the Far North Finnish dialects. In addition, the Meänkieli project also has as its goal making this language a variety distinct from MWF (Lainio & Wande 2015:126). Recently, it has been suggested that Kven and Meänkieli could have a common written language (see Koivulehto 2021) because of the low number of language users and the fact that Meänkieli and Kven share so many similarities. In the following I discuss the possibilities for *einbau* processes between Kven and Meänkieli. There are two important concerns to take into account. One is connected to the question of how national borders separate language identities, and another to the high symbolic value of a minority language as an identity marker.

There are many examples of a single written standard used in more than one nation state. Lutheran Ingrian Finns, in contrast to Kven and Meänkieli speakers, use the Finnish standard language as their written standard because it was adopted by them during the nineteenth century (Nevalainen 1991:162–164; Söderholm 2010:41). Swedish was an established written standard in Finland already before Finland became a part of Russia. Therefore the Swedish standard is still used in Finland. Many immigrant minorities use the same standard as in their home country, like the Finnish immigrant minority in Sweden.

However, the creation of a new shared written variety across national borders may encounter difficulties. An example of a failed *einbau* process is the attempt to make the Scandinavian written standards closer to each other in the 1850s and 1860s (see Section 2.1). This is understandable as these languages, especially Swedish and Danish, were already established as identity markers for their speakers by that time (Vikør 2000:108–111). In contrast, standard German was already established in Switzerland before the time of nationalism in the nineteenth century (Barbour 2000:161). The use of standard German is ‘a matter of convenience rather than identity’ (Barbour 2000:162), whereas Swiss German, based on dialects, represents the language of identity.

Einbau processes on written standards inside the same nation state have also proved to be difficult. When Norway came under Swedish rule after its separation from Denmark in 1814, it became important to develop a Norwegian written standard. The process led to two national standards, Nynorsk and Bokmål. The first one is based on Norwegian dialects, and the second one is an *ausbau* variety of Danish. Some attempts were made to merge them together, but failed. Both standards

represent national identities of Norwegians but in a different way. The use of Nynorsk is especially connected to regional identities in western Norway (Vikør 2000:111–117)

Another example of the difficulty in merging close varieties inside the same nation state is the standardization of South Estonian dialects. In the sixteenth century, two written forms of Estonian were created, based on the southern dialects in Tartu and the northern dialects in Tallinn. However, the variety of Tallinn was standardized as a national language during the nineteenth century, and the Tartu standard disappeared from use (Pajusalu 2010). The standardization process of Võru, one of the South Estonian dialects, started at the end of the 1980s (Pajusalu et al. 1999:87–89). In addition, written varieties of two other South Estonian dialects, Mulgi and Setu, were created. The identities of Võru and Setu are connected to different Christian denominations, as Võru speakers are Lutherans, while Setu speakers belong to the Orthodox church and live both in Estonia and Russia. Efforts to develop a common South Estonian standard for writing at the end of twentieth century failed. Instead, three different varieties are in use, reflecting the identity of speakers of these different dialects (Pajusalu 2009:101–2, 2010:111–12).

When language use decreases, a minority language often receives a heightened symbolic value, and the main function of the minority language then becomes to express the identities of its speakers (Hornsby 2017:93). A common problem in the standardization of minority languages is therefore how to create standards that reflect different identities. Minority speakers often have difficulties accepting that their oral variety is not reflected in the written variety. Kvens also want a standard language that reflects their spoken variety. Speakers of eastern Kven dialects have been especially reluctant to accept a standard based on the Porsanger dialect area (Lane 2015:276). The descriptive grammar of Kven (Söderholm 2017) takes this into account by presenting alternative forms from different dialects. Meänkieli speakers also do not agree on which dialect should be selected as the basis for standardization (Lainio & Wande 2015:135). Hence speakers of different dialects of Kven and Meänkieli want to see their dialect reflected in the written variety. To achieve a shared standard for Kven and Meänkieli may also be difficult because these varieties belong to different national states, which also create separate identities.

Language was an important tool for identity in the creation of national standards in the nineteenth century. Through ausbau processes the specific characteristics of the variety created via language planning was highlighted when compared to competing varieties. When already established as an identity marker, a standard can also be accepted as a common standard used in different nation states. By contrast, since MWF never became established among the Kvens, many Kvens reject it as their written variety. Instead, the written standard based on Kven dialects became the symbol of minority identity.

6. Conclusions

Eera verbs represent a small corner of language, yet the differences in the use of these verbs in Kven and Finnish demonstrate how ausbau languages are created.

Long *eera* verbs were expunged from MWF – in spite of the fact that these Swedish and international loans had earlier been used in written Finnish for many centuries. How these verbs were codified in MWF at the beginning of the twentieth century reflects national ideological purist attitudes among those engaged in language planning.

The modern vocabulary of MWF did not take root among the Kvens because of Norwegian assimilation policies towards minorities. MWF was first disseminated widely in Finland starting around 1890 (Engman 2016:95) through schools, libraries, and newspapers. At about the same time, bilingual school books that had earlier helped Kven children learn to read in their own language were no longer printed. The aim of assimilation policies was to remove not only the use of oral Kven but also a competing written language.

Eera verbs are found not only in the OWF language but also in Finnish dialects and in non-standard written Finnish where linguistic features from the oral language are used. The largest difference concerning the use of these verbs is thus between MWF and written Kven. It is possible to conclude that these verbs differentiate between two written varieties of two Finnic languages, MWF and Kven. This difference highlights the independence of Kven as a language, not as a dialect of Finnish.

Because Kven has an important symbolic value for its speakers, einbau processes between Kven and Meänkieli seem unlikely. The development seems rather to be proceeding towards more differentiation between written varieties as different groups want to have their own language features represented in the written language. An explanation for why einbau processes are not usually found in language planning (Tosco 2008:5, 12) is exactly because of the focus on the language variety of one's own group representing identity.

Notes

1. Abbreviations: OWF = Old Written Finnish (1540–1820), EMF = Early Modern Finnish (1820–1870), MWF = Modern Written Finnish (1870–); Nor. = Norwegian, Swe. = Swedish, Fin. = Finnish, Lat. = Latin.
2. *Kiinmostaa* occurs in the newspaper corpus in a paper called 'Tähdenvälejä' 1842. However, according to the National bibliography of Finland, Tähdenvälejä came out first in 1942. This occurrence must therefore be a mistake in the corpus (Heinonen 2018:42).
3. Differences in minority policies in Norway and Sweden are discussed by Elenius (2002).

References

- Ahlqvist, August. 1873. Pieniä tietoja ja muistutuksia [Small bits of information and reminders]. *Kieletär* 5, 63–64.
- Airila, Martti. 1915. Eerata-loppuiset verbit suomenkielessä [Verbs ending in eerata in Finnish]. *Virittäjä* 19, 86.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Andressen, Irene, Leena Huss & Anna-Riitta Lindgren. 2001. Om kvenske/finske språkforhold sammenlignet med Tornedalen [About Kven/Finnish language conditions compared to Tornedalen]. In Miia Mikkonen, Helena Sulkala & Harri Mantila (eds.), *Tutkielmia vähemmistökielistä Jäämereltä Liivinrantaan* [Publications of the Department of Finnish, Saami and Logopedic], 164–197. Oulu: University of Oulu.

- Barbour, Stephen.** 2000. Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg. In Stephen Barbour & Cathie Carmichael (eds.), *Language and Nationalism in Europe*, 151–167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beronka, Johan.** 1922. *Syntaktiske Iagttagelser Fra de Finske Dialekter i Vadsø Og Porsanger* [Syntactic observations from the Finnish dialects in Vadsø and Porsanger]. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad.
- Brundstad, Endre.** 2003. Standard language and linguistic purism. *Sociolinguistica* 17(1), 52–70.
- Cooper, Robert L.** 1990. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, Florian.** 2013. *Writing and Society: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Helge.** 1957. *Språkpolitikk og skolestell i Finnmark 1814–1905* [Language policies and school in Finnmark 1814–1905]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Elenius, Lars.** 2001. *Både finsk og svensk: Modernisering, nationalism, och språkförändring i Tornedalen 1850–1939* [Both Finnish and Swedish: Modernization, nationalism, and language change in Tornedalen 1850–1939]. Umeå: Kulturgårns Norr.
- Elenius, Lars.** 2002. A place in the memory of nation: Minority policy towards the Finnish speakers in Sweden and Norway. *Acta Borealia* 19 (2), 103–123.
- Engman, Max.** 2016. *Språkfrågan: Finlandssvenskhetens uppkomst 1812–1922* [The language question: The origins of Finland-Swedishness]. Helsingfors: Finska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Eriksen, Knut Einar & Einar Niemi.** 1981. *Den finske fare: Sikkerhetsproblemer og minoritetspolitikk i nord 1860–1940* [The Finnish danger: Security issues and minority policies in the north 1860–1940]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Fishman, Joshua A.** 2008. Rethinking the *Ausbau–Abstand* dichotomy into a continuous and multivariate system. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2008 (191), 17–26.
- Gellner, Ernest.** 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grönholm, Maija.** 1988. *Ruotsalaiset lainasanat Turun murteessa* [Swedish loanwords in the Turku dialect]. Åbo: Åbo Akademis Förlag.
- Grönholm, Maija.** 1989. Ruotsalaislainojen pejorointuminen Turun murteessa [The pejoratization of Swedish loanwords in the Turku dialect]. *Sananjalka* 31, 103–125.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen: Suomen kirjakielen historia* [From Agricola to Modern Finnish: A history of the Finnish written language]. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 1997a. Kuinka ruotsin kieli on vaikuttanut suomeen? [How has Swedish influenced the Finnish language?]. *Sananjalka* 39, 31–53.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 1997b. *Mistä sanat tulevat: Suomalaista etymologiaa* [Where do words come from: The etymology of Finnish words], 2nd edn. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 2000. Suomen kirjakielen sanaston vakiintuminen: Esimerkkinä suomalaiset linnunnimet [The standardization of vocabulary in the Finnish written language: Finnish bird names as examples]. In Matti Punttila, Raimo Jussila & Helena Suni (eds.), *Piipiakielestä kirjakieleksi* [From Piplia to a literary language], 254–278. Helsinki: Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 2008. *Suomen kielen historiaa 2: Suomen kielen tutkimuksen historia* [History of the Finnish language 2: The history of research on the Finnish language]. Turku: Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics, University of Turku.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 2013. *Nykysuomen etymologinen sanakirja* [The Etymological Dictionary of Modern Finnish]. Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa.** 2015. *Spreading the Written Word: Mikael Agricola and the Birth of Literary Finnish*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. <https://oa.finlit.fi/site/books/10.21435/sflin.19>.
- Hakulinen, Lauri.** 2000. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* [The structure and development of the Finnish language], 5th edn. Vantaa: Tummavuoren Kirjapaino.
- Heikkinen, Vesa.** 2017. Fundeeraaja: Näkymiä Mauno Koiviston kielenkäyttöön [Views on Mauno Koivisto's language use]. *Kotus. Viikon Vinkit* 15 May 2017. [https://www.kotus.fi/nyt/kotus-vinkit/viikon_vinkkien_arkisto_\(2015–2019\)/viikon_vinkit_2017/fundeeraaja.24246.news](https://www.kotus.fi/nyt/kotus-vinkit/viikon_vinkkien_arkisto_(2015–2019)/viikon_vinkit_2017/fundeeraaja.24246.news) (accessed 1 January 2021).
- Heinonen, Petri.** 2018. *Tekniikan ja teknologian käsitteiden ensimmäiset 120 vuotta: Tekniikan ja teknologian käsitteet, teknologinen determinismi, tekno-optimismi sekä -pessimismi Suomessa vuosina 1880–1999* [The first 120 years of the concepts of engineering and technology: The concepts of engineering and technology, technological determinism, techno-optimism, and pessimism in Finland 1880–1999]. MA thesis, University of Helsinki. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:huilib-201803281560> (accessed 12 February 2021).

- Hornsby, Michael.** 2015. *Revitalizing Minority Languages: New Speakers of Breton, Yiddish and Lemko*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Hornsby, Michael.** 2017. Finding an ideological niche for new speakers in a minoritised language community. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 30(1), 91–104.
- Huss, Leena.** 1999. *Reversing Language Shift in the Far North: Linguistic Revitalization in Northern Scandinavia and Finland (Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 31)*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth & Tommaso Milani.** 2003. Kvenskans status: Rapport for Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet og kultur- og kirke departementet i Norge [The status of Kven: A report for the ministry of local government and the ministry of culture and church affairs in Norway]. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kilde/kkd/hdk/2003/0003/ddd/pdfv/193348-kvenrapport_hyltenstam_slutversion_oktober.pdf.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon.** 1989. Language planning and language change. In Leiv Egil Breivik & Ernst Håkon Jahr (eds.), *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*, 99–113. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph, John E.** 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jussila, Raimo.** 1998. *Vanhat sanat: Vanhan kirjasuomen ensiesiintymiä* [Old words: The first occurrences of words in Old Written Finnish]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Jutikkala, Eino & Kauko Pirinen.** 2003. *A History of Finland*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Kaartama, Tiina.** 2018. Diglossia and playwriting in Finnish. *Études Finno-Ougriennes* 49–50, 1–12.
- Karikoski, Elin & Aud-Kirsti Pedersen.** 1996. *Kvenane/dei finskætta i Noreg: Språk, kultur og tilhøvet til nyinnvandrarar* [The Kvens/those of Finnish descent in Norway: Language, culture, and the relationship to new immigrants]. Tromsø: Institutt for Språk og Litteratur, University of Tromsø.
- Keränen, Mari.** 2018. Language maintenance through corpus planning: The case of Kven. *Acta Borealia* 35(2), 176–191.
- Kloss, Heinz.** 1967. ‘Abstand languages’ and ‘ausbau languages’. *Antropological Linguistics* 9(7), 29–41.
- Koivulehto, Liisa.** 2021. Kirjakielten yhistäminen ei oikhein innosta [Little enthusiasm about combining written languages]. *Ruijan Kaiku* 22 February 2021.
- Kokko, Heikki.** 2021. From local to translocal experience: The nationwide culture of letters to the press in mid-1800s Finland. *Media History* 28(2), 181–198.
- Kolehmainen, Taru.** 2014. *Kielenhuollon juurilla: Suomen kielen ohjailun historiaa* [The history of Finnish language planning]. Vantaa: Finnish Literature Society.
- Laine, Tuija.** 1997. Viralliskjulkaisu [Official publications]. In Tuija Laine (ed.), *Vanhimman suomalaisen kirjallisuuden käsikirja* [Handbook of the oldest Finnish literature], 283–303. Vammala: Finnish Literature Society.
- Laine, Tuija.** 2019. From learning the catechism by heart towards independent reading. In Kaius Sinnemäki, Anneli Portman, Jouni Tilli & Robert H. Nelson (eds.), *On the Legacy of Lutheranism in Finland: Societal Perspectives* (Studia Fennica Historica 25), 138–154. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Lainio, Jarmo & Erling Wande.** 2015. Meänkieli today: To be or not to be standardised. *Sociolinguistica* 29(1), 121–140.
- Lane, Pia.** 2015. Minority language standardisation and the role of users. *Language Policy* 14, 263–283.
- Langer, Nils & Agnete Nesse.** 2012. Linguistic purism. In Juan Manuel Hernández Campoy & Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 607–625. Hoboken: John Wiley.
- Leino-Kaukiainen, Pirkko.** 1989. Suomen kielen käytön yleistyminen [Increasing use of the Finnish language]. In Päiviö Tommila & Marita Pohls (eds.), *Herää Suomi: Suomalaisuusliikkeen historia* [Wake up Finland: The history of Finnish national movement], 329–346. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila.
- Lindgren, Anna-Riitta.** 2009. Kvensk i Norge [The Kven Language in Norway]. In Tove Bull & Anna-Riitta Lindgren (eds.), *De mange språk i Norge: Flerspråklighet på norsk* [The many languages of Norway: Multilingualism in Norwegian], 107–124. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Lindgren, Anna-Riitta.** 2014. Litt for den etniske renessansen: Feltarbeid blant kvener på slutten av 1960-tallet [Shortly before the ethnic renaissance: Fieldwork among Kvens in the late 1960s]. *Ottar* 303, 34–40.
- Lindgren, Anna-Riitta & Leena Niiranen.** 2018. Morphological integration of Scandinavian and Saami verbal borrowings in Kven and their impact on contact-induced language change. In Marjatta Palander, Helka Riionheimo & Vesa Koivisto (eds.), *On the Border of Language and Dialect*, 191–221. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Mäkinen, Ilkka.** 2007. Lukemisen historia [The history of reading]. In Anja Kervanto Nevanlinna & Laura Kolbe (eds.), *Oma maa ja maailma* [Your country and the world] (Suomen kulttuurihistoria 3), 310–323. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Matras, Yaron.** 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- May, Stephen.** 2003. Language, nationalism and democracy in Europe. In Gabrielle Hogan-Brun & Stefan Wolff (eds.), *Minority Languages in Europe: Frameworks, Status, Prospects*, 211–232. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nevalainen, Pekka.** 1991. Silmäys Inkerin kirkollisiin oloihin 1704–1917 [An overview of ecclesiastical conditions in Ingria 1704–1917]. In Pekka Nevalainen & Hannes Sihvo (eds.), *Inkeri: Historia, kansa, kulttuuri* [Ingria: History, nation, culture], 159–166. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Nilsen-Borsskog, Alf.** 2004. *Kuusuvaaran takana: Elämän jatko 1* [Behind Kuusuvaara: Continuation of life 1]. Indre Billedfjord: Idut.
- Niemi, Einar.** 2010. Kvenene – Nord-Norges finner: En historisk oversikt [The Kvens – Northern Norway's Finns: A historical overview]. In Anne Bonnevie Lund & Bente Bolme Moen (eds.), *Nasjonale Minoriteter i Det Flerkulturelle Norge*, 33–52. Trondheim: Tapi Akademisk Forlag.
- Niiranen, Leena.** 2011. Finsk som andrespråk i norsk skole: Fagets historie og dagens utfordringer [Finnish as second language in Norwegian schools: The history of the subject and its challenges today]. *NOA – Norsk Som Andrespråk* 27(1), 59–80.
- Niiranen, Leena.** 2019. Kveenien omakielisen lukemisen traditio ja sen merkitys kielen säilymiselle [The tradition of reading in Finnish among Kvens and its significance to language maintenance]. *AFinLAN Vuosikirja* 2019, 19–41.
- Pajula, Paavo.** 1960. *Suomalaisen lakikielen historia pääpiirteittäin* [The history of Finnish legal language in outline]. Porvoo: Werner Söderström.
- Pajusalu, Karl.** 2009. The reforming of the southern Finnic language area. In Jussi Ylikoski (ed.), *The Quasiquicentennial of the Finno-Ugrian Society* (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran toimituksia/Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 258), 95–107.
- Pajusalu, Karl.** 2010. Kolme sukupolvea eteläviron elvyttäjiä [Three generations revitalizing South Estonian]. In Hanna Lappalainen, Marja-Leena Sorjonen & Maria Vilkuna (eds.), *Kielellä on merkitystä: Näkökulmia kielipolitiikkaan* [Language matters: Perspectives on language policy]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Pajusalu, Karl, Eva Velsker & Ervin Org.** 1999. On recent changes in South Estonian: Dynamics in the formation of the invasive. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 1999 (139), 87–103.
- Paunonen, Heikki.** 1991. Till en ny indelning av de finska dialekterna [Toward a new classification of Finnish dialects]. *Fenno-Ugrica Suecana* 10, 75–95.
- Paunonen, Heikki.** 1992. Kielettären koulijat [Improving language]. In Aarre Nyman, Maija Länsimäki & Valma Yli-Vakkuri (eds.), *Yhteiskunta muuttuu, kieli muuttuu: Nykysuomen seuran 10-vuotisjuhlakirja* [Society is changing, language is changing: 10th anniversary book of the Society of Contemporary Finland], 150–175. Juva: Werner Söderström.
- Pietikäinen, Sari, Leena Huss, Sirkka Laihala-Kankainen, Ulla Aikio-Puoskari & Pia Lane.** 2010. Regulating multilingualism in the North Calotte: The case of Kven, Meänkieli and Sámi Languages. *Acta Borealia* 27(1), 1–23.
- Pulkkinen, Paavo.** 1972. *Nykysuomen kehitys: Katsaus 1800-luvun ja 1900-luvun kirjakeleeseen sekä tekstinäytteitä* [The development of Modern Finnish: An overview of the written language in the 19th and 20th centuries with text excerpts]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Rapola, Martti.** 1960. *Sanojemme ensiesiintymiä Agricolaista Yrjö Koskiseen* [First occurrences of our words from Agricola to Yrjö Koskinen]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Rintala, Päivi.** 1998. Kielikäsitys ja kielenohjailu [Language ideology and language planning]. *Sananjalka* 40(1), 47–65.
- Ryymim, Teemu.** 2004. 'De nordligste finner': Fremstillingen av kvenene i den finske litterære offentligheten 1800–1939 [‘The northernmost Finns’: Representations of Kvens in the Finnish literary public 1800–1939] (Speculum Boreal 6). Tromsø: Institutt for Historie, University of Tromsø.
- Sinnemäki, Kaius & Janne Saarikivi.** 2019. Sacred language: Reformation, nationalism, and linguistic culture. In Kaius Sinnemäki, Anneli Portman, Jouni Tilli & Robert H. Nelson (eds.), *On the Legacy of Lutheranism in Finland: Societal Perspectives* (Studia Fennica Historica 25), 39–68. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Söderholm, Eira.** 2006. Kainun kielen systematiseraaminen [The systematization of the Kven language]. In Hannakaisa Holmi & Helena Sulkala (eds.), *Tutkielmia vähemmistökielistä Jäämereltä Liivinvrantaan: Vähemmistökielten tutkimus- ja koulutusverkoston raportti VI* [Dissertations on minority languages from the Arctic Ocean to Liivinvranta: Report of the Research and Education Network for Minority Languages VI], 34–48. Oulu: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy.
- Söderholm, Eira.** 2007. *Aikamatka*. University of Tromsø.
- Söderholm, Eira.** 2010. The planning of the new standard languages. In Helena Sulkala & Harri Mantila (eds.), *Planning a New Standard Language: Finnic Minority Languages Meet the New Millennium*, 27–53. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Söderholm, Eira.** 2017. *Kvensk grammatikk* [Kven grammar]. Original title: *Kainun kielen grammatikki*, Finnish Literature Society 2014. Translated by Philipp Conzett. Cappelen Damm Akademisk. doi: [10.23865/noasp.24](https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.24).
- Sollid, Hilde.** 2020. Kvenene/norskfinnene i Norge [The Kvens/Norwegian Finns in Norway]. In Bengt-Ove Andreassen & Torjer A. Olsen (eds.), *Urfolk og nasjonale minoriteter i skole og lærerutdanning* [Indigenous peoples and national minorities in school and teacher education], 83–94. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Thomas, George.** 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. Harlow: Longman.
- Tommila, Päiviö & Raimo Salokangas.** 2000. *Tidningar för alla: Den finländska pressens historia* [Newspapers for all: The history of the Finnish press]. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Tosco, Mauro.** 2008. Introduction: *Ausbau* is everywhere! *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2008 (191), 1–16.
- Tunkelo, E. A.** 1910. Vastenmielinen johdannastyypin [-eera] [A disgusting derivational type [-eera]]. *Virtittäjä* 14, 130.
- Utvik, Hanne Elin.** 1996. *Norske ord i finsk språkdrakt: En studie av nyere skandinaviske substantivlån i kvensk/ruijafinsk tekstmateriale med hovedvekt på norske lån* [Norwegian words formed in the Finnish language: A study of newer Scandinavian noun loanwords in Kven/Ruija Finnish texts with the main focus on Norwegian loanwords]. MA thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Vikør, Lars.** 2000. Northern Europe: Languages as prime markers of ethnic and national identity. In Stephen Barbour & Cathie Carmichael (eds.), *Language and Nationalism in Europe*, 105–129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vikør, Lars.** 2007. *Språkplanlegging: Prinsipp og praksis* [Language planning: Principles and practices], 3rd edn. Oslo: Novus.
- Winsa, Birger.** 1999. Language planning in Sweden. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20(4–5), 376–473.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan.** 2009. *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wright, Sue.** 2004. *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix: Sources of data

- Aller Media Oy.** Suomi24 virkkeit-korpus 2001–2017, Korp-versio 1.1 [tekstikorpus] [The Suomi24 Sentences Corpus 2001–2017, Korp version 1.1]. Language Bank of Finland (Kielipankki): <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2020021803>.
- Beronka, Johan.** 1922. *Syntaktiske Iagttagelser Fra de Finske Dialekter i Vadsø Og Porsanger* [Syntactic observations from the Finnish dialects in Vadsø and Porsanger]. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad.
- BO = Bokmålsordbok.** *Bokmålsordbok: Definisjons- og rettskrivningsordbok* [Bokmål Dictionary]. University of Oslo in collaboration with the Language Council (Språkrådet). <https://ordbokene.no/>.
- DM = Digitalt museum** [The Digital Museum]. <https://digitaltmuseum.no/search/?aq=descname%3A%22Separator%22&context=owners>.
- DMA = Digitaalinen muoto-opin arkisto** [The Digital Morphology Archives]. Language Bank of Finland: <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2016032102>.
- Jussila, Raimo.** 1998. *Vanhat sanat: Vanhan kirjasuomen ensiesiintymiä* [Old words: The first occurrences of words in Old Written Finnish]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Kansalliskirjasto.** 2011. Kansalliskirjaston sanoma- ja aikakauslehtikokoelman suomenkielinen osakorpus: Kielipankki-versio [tekstikorpus] [Finnish sub-corpus: Language Bank version of the National Library's collection of newspapers and magazines]. Language Bank of Finland: <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2016050302>.
- KD = Kvensk–norsk ordbok** [The Digital Kven–Norwegian Dictionary]. Giellatekno. <https://sanat.oahpa.no/fkv/nob/>.
- Kotus = Kotimaisten kielten keskus** (Institute for the Languages of Finland). [https://www.kotus.fi/haku?42743_f\[0\]=Ajankohtaista&searchterms=evakko](https://www.kotus.fi/haku?42743_f[0]=Ajankohtaista&searchterms=evakko).
- KS = Kielitoimiston sanakirja** [Dictionary of Contemporary Finnish]. www.kielitoimistonsanakirja.fi.
- LA = Lauseopin arkiston murrekorpuksen: Helsinki-Korp-versio [tekstikorpus]** [Syntax Archive of Finnish Dialects: Helsinki-Korp version]. University of Turku Department of Modern Languages and Translation Studies, and Institute for the Languages of Finland. Language Bank of Finland: <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2016040702>.
- Lindgren, Anna-Riitta.** n.d. (unpublished) *A List of Kven Verbs*. The author has a copy.
- MJ = Meidän joukko: Grunnkurs i kvensk** [Our gang: An elementary course in Kven]. <https://kvensk.uit.no>.
- MKS = Meänkielen iso sanakirja I–IV (A–S)** [The Big Dictionary of Meänkieli]. Överkalix: Barents.
- MKS 1992 = Meänkielen sanakirja** [The Dictionary of Meänkieli] (Tornedals ordbok). Luuleä: Kaamos.
- NAOB = Det norske akademis ordbok** [The Dictionary of the Norwegian Academy]. <https://naob.no/ordbok/>.
- Nilsen-Børsskog, Alf.** 2004. *Kuusuvaaran takana: Elämän jatko 1* [Behind Kuosuvaara: Continuation of life 1]. Indre Billedfjord: Idut.
- NoKor = Norwegian Korppi [Kven texts]**. http://gtweb.uit.no/f_korp/.
- NSS = Nykysuomen sanakirja I–VI** [The Dictionary of Modern Finnish]. Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- Rapola, Martti** 1960. *Sanojemme ensiesiintymisiä Agricolaista Yrjö Koskiseen* [First occurrences of our words from Agricola to Yrjö Koskinen]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- SAOB = Svenska akademiens ordbok** [The Swedish Academy Dictionary]. <http://g3.spraakdata.gu.se/saob/s>.
- SMSA = Suomen murteiden sana-arkisto** [The Word Archive of Finnish Dialects].
- SMSK = Suomen murteiden sanakirja 1–8** [The Dictionary of Finnish Dialects 1–8] (Kotimaisten kielten keskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 30). Institute for the Languages of Finland. <http://kaino.kotus.fi/sms>.
- Söderholm, Eira.** 2007. *Aikamatka*. University of Tromsø. The author has a copy.
- SSA = Suomen sanojen alkuperä: Etymologinen sanakirja** [The origin of Finnish words: An etymological dictionary]. 1992–2000. Helsinki: Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus & Finnish Literature Society.
- VKS = Vanhan kirjasuomen sanakirja** [The Dictionary of Old Written Finnish] (Kotimaisten kielten keskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 38). Institute for the Languages of Finland.
- VNSK = Varhaisnykysuomen korpus: Kielipankki-versio [tekstikorpus]** [The Corpus of Early Modern Finnish: Language Bank Version]. Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus. Language Bank of Finland: <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-20140730147>.

Cite this article: Niiranen L (2024). Making a difference – ausbau processes in Modern Written Finnish and Kven: How a group of loanwords marks a divergence between the Kven language and Modern Written Finnish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 47, 159–191. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000117>