ZSOLT PÁL DELI

University of Szeged
deli.zsolt.pal@stud.u-szeged.hu
wildrover67@gmail.com

A quantitative analysis of four linguistic variables in the language use of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Britain has always been a target of immigration. It has been proven that migration causes language contact. The objective of the present paper is to investigate the language contact situation resulting from the bilingualism of Hungarians living in the United Kingdom and Ireland to observe how contact with English influences their Hungarian. The present study conducted in the United Kingdom and Ireland, involving 200 participants, explores the use of some linguistic variables by the Hungarian immigrant community resulting from bilingualism. In order to observe the effects of English on the Hungarian language use of the participants, two groups were formed. Group 1. involved people having lived there for a shorter period of time, and Group 2. involved people having lived there for a longer period of time. A modified and digitized version of a questionnaire was administered, previously used in the project called the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary. It is hypothesized that English exerts a detectable effect on the Hungarian language use of the immigrant community.

Keywords: bilingualism, language contact, language use, migration, word order

1. Introduction

Britain has always been a target of immigration, and it has been proven that migration causes language contact. Few published studies have systematically explored the language contact of English and Hungarian in the United Kingdom and Ireland. The aim of this paper is to investigate the language contact effects of English on Hungarian in the UK and Ireland, resulting from the bilingualism of the Hungarian immigrant community. In the focus of the current study are four linguistic variables related to the use of Hungarian case suffixes. A quantitative analysis was carried out in order to see whether the results would confirm earlier outcomes. It is assumed that English exerts a detectable effect on Hungarian, as it is confirmed by previous studies conducted in the Carpathian basin and in a number of other countries in the world. The research results are compared and contrasted in a quantitative way, and major sociolinguistic background information is also presented.

2. Language contact

2.1. Previous language contact research

People have always arrived in Britain in great numbers for several reasons, mostly in the hope of a better quality of life or escaping oppressing political systems. According to Grosjean (2010), the primary driving force for migration are economic and political, and it inevitably entails languages getting into contact with each other, and language contact produces bilingualism and multilingualism. As a result of contact situations, languages may influence each other, producing changes in their linguistic systems, affecting lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects alike. Thomason (2001) described the results and mechanism of language contact in detail. Moreover, the linguistic outcomes of language contact are well-framed by a number of authors (see Haugen, 1950; Weinreich, 1953; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Thomason, 2001, 2010; Winford, 2003; Sankoff, 2004; Fenyvesi, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Heine, 2005; Matras, 2009, 2010). Kontra (1990) in Indiana, Bartha (1993) in Michigan, Fenyvesi (1995) in Pennsylvania and Polgár (2001) in the state of Ohio conducted research to investigate the outcomes of language contact situations of immigrant Hungarian communities. The only comprehensive overview of contact effects in different varieties of the same language to date titled *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* (Fenyvesi, 2005a) investigated varieties of Hungarian from linguistic, sociolinguistic and typological points of view in countries such as Slovakia (Lanstyák and Szabómihály, 2005), Ukraine (Csernicskó, 2005), Romania (Benő and Szilágyi N., 2005), the Csángós of Romania (Sándor, 2005), the former Yugoslavia (Göncz and Vörös, 2005), Austria (Bodó, 2005), the United States of America (Fenyvesi, 2005a), and Australia (Kovács, 2005). Forintos (2008) also discussed the English-Hungarian language contact situation in Australia, and subsequently she directed studies in Canada, New Zealand and South Africa (Forintos, 2011). Huber (2016) researched the language use of the immigrant community in Canada, while Benkő (2000) analyzed British Hungarian in the United Kingdom among immigrants and their descendants living in London.

2.2. The role of migration in the formation of language contact

Migration-caused language contact is a vital aspect in the formation of bilingualism in the world, including English-Hungarian language contact in the United Kingdom. In 2004, Hungary joined the European Union, which raised a great interest in people to move to Western European countries to work. A considerable number of people left Hungary in search of a new life in the British Isles, too. This opened a new chapter in the migration pattern of the Hungarian population. According to the ONS Migration Statistics (2018), the United Kingdom has a net inward migration from

foreign countries in the hundreds of thousands, being one of the four countries with such status in the EU.

2.3. The sociolinguistic background of Hungarians in the UK

A small number of people arrived in the 16th century, and after the Second World War; but, approximately, 25,000 immigrants were admitted in the United Kingdom as political refugees following the 1956 revolution in Hungary. A great number of Hungarians fled their homeland occupied by the communist Russian army. They spread all over in Western European countries and in the United States. It gave them a new start and opportunity.

Based on the 2001 census in the UK, there were about 13,000 Hungarian-born people in the UK (Office for National Statistics, 2001), while this number reached 52,000 in 2011 (Office for National Statistics, 2011), covering England and Wales, and 80,000, scattered in all countries of the United Kingdom (Office for National Statistics, August 2015). The University of Oxford's Migration Observatory signposts an even greater figure: 96,000 people for the year of 2015, with the number of Hungarian migrants having doubled in a period of only four years. The exact number of Hungarians living in Ireland is far less clear. The Central Statistics Office (2016) reported the Hungarian immigrants to be somewhere between 1,000 and 10,000.

3. Background to the linguistic variables
3.1. Linguistic typology

Linguistic typology is a field of linguistics that deals with the structural classification of languages, creating typological groups, constructed on similar linguistic patterns, structures and systems. Prominent authors (see Greenberg, 1966; Comrie, 1981; Ramat, 1987; Croft, 1990, and Moravcsik, 2013) extensively discuss how typological systems work in the field of linguistics. In relation to Hungarian, there have been a number of linguists who have highlighted the typological features of Hungarian, including de Groot (2005: 351-370) and Thomason (2005: 11–27).

3.2. Agglutinative morphology in Hungarian

Indo-European languages belong to the synthetic group of languages. According to Bakró-Nagy (2006: 272-273), these languages include inflectional and agglutinative languages. Uralic languages, Hungarian included, are considered to be agglutinative; however, no languages belonging to this group are purely agglutinative: specific features, more characteristic of other groups such as analytic ones may also be present in agglutinative languages, and this is also true vice versa.

Hungarian has very complex morphological processes, manifested in suffixation, including a considerable number of case endings denoting a variety of semantic and syntactic functions. Kenesei et al. (1998) state that the process of suffixing in Hungarian involves the creation of morphological cases, and Hungarian nouns always carry a case marking at the end of the words, expressing certain functions in sentences such as time, place, movement, instrument and others.

There are other types of endings that do not express case functions, but on those occasions they participate in additional derivational processes. Clearly identifiable and separable morphemes, where each affix represents a single grammatical function, are typical features of agglutination (Moravcsik, 2013), while the majority of Indo-European languages express such functions mostly with the use of prepositions.

3.3. Case inflections in Hungarian

One of the inflectional categories of Hungarian nouns is the use of cases. As a result of a regular and creative morphological process, which is a typical feature of agglutinative languages, new elements may be added to existing morphological forms without changing the stem of the word (Kiefer, 2006: 58).

There have been certain views as to the number of cases in Hungarian. The contradiction arises from the fact that the categorization of the complex system of the various categories of affixes are not always so straightforward to separate and label (Antal, 1977: 55–56). Moravcsik (2003: 116) notes that drawing the line between markers of true case inflections and adverb-forming derivational affixes produces ambiguity.

Antal (1961, 1977: 74), lists 17 cases. Kiefer (1995: 51), to some extent, agrees with Antal's (1961: 27–50) statement about the criticism of the traditional case description; however, he proposes to replace Antal's distribution criteria with other syntactic criteria, yet acknowledging that Antal's theory works in the majority of the cases. As a result of his analysis, Kiefer augments the system with the essivus-modalis case *emberül* 'as a man', and identifies 18 Hungarian cases (Kiefer, 1995: 57).

4. Hungarian in English-speaking countries
4.1. Background to the study in the United Kingdom

To date Benkő's (2000) MA thesis is the only available source of research that deals with the linguistic results of English-Hungarian language contact in the United Kingdom. According to Benkő (2000: 33-34), especially as the result of the effect of British English or language attrition, the undisputable language contact effect of case replacements can be detected in the language use of people living in London.

4.2. Background to the study in the United States

Fenyvesi (1996: 1) conducted research on morphological changes in the United States. She argues that it is a well-observable phenomenon that languages that come into contact with American English undergo changes in the use of the case system of the given language. Languages either possessing inflectional or agglutinative characteristics might develop two typical features in the system of their case marking, one of them being the replacement of case affixes, and the other one being the complete loss of certain cases due to the influence of language attrition. On many occasions, the nonnominative case forms are replaced with the nominative case; which, in flexional languages, means the loss of case marking in most circumstances; and, in agglutinating languages, such as Finnish, it means the return to the use of the bare stem, abandoning the complete loss of case marking (Fenyvesi, 1996: 2-3). Another interesting connection to be observed is the simultaneous appearance and occurrence of the SVO word order instead of the SOV word order (Fenyvesi, 1996: 6).

Until Fenyvesi's (1996) study, a detailed analysis of the use of case suffixes among the Hungarian immigrant community in the United States had not been conducted, apart from Bartha's (1993: 135) study, which noticed the absence of the marking of the accusative case in Detroit.

4.3. Background to the study in Australia and Canada

The majority of contact linguistic research to date in Australia has been conducted by Kovács, who (2005) discusses the language contact situation on the continent, stating that with the arrival of the British population, the long-lived tradition of multilingualism in Australia ended, and the local languages came into contact with English. Prior to that, hundreds of aboriginal languages had been spoken. Since a considerable number of Hungarians has moved to Australia over the years, Hungarian came into contact with English spoken in Australia as well. In Fenyvesi's (2005) edited volume, Kovács analyzes the sociolinguistic background of the Hungarian-speaking community in Australia and describes the typical features of the language use of Australian Hungarians.

Forintos (2008, 2011, 2015) also carried out research that she published in her book *Aspects of language ecology. English-Hungarian language contact phenomena in Australia*, examining the English-Hungarian language contact situation as it is embedded in its natural environment and influenced by various social factors in Australia. Moreover, her research in language contact included the Hungarian communities in Canada, South-Africa and New Zealand.

Huber conducted field work collecting data in Canada and published an article (2016) on the use of analytical structures in which he discussed his findings among

Canadian Hungarians. He also researched Hungarian as a heritage language in the speech community of Hungarians living in Hamilton, Ontario (Huber, 2013).

5. The purpose of the study

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the language contact effects of English on Hungarian in the UK and Ireland from a quantitative perspective. In the focus of the current study are four linguistic variables that were used in earlier studies especially in the Carpathian Basin.

6. Research questions and hypothesis
6.1. Research questions

Research question: Does the English of the immigrant community in the United Kingdom and Ireland influence the Hungarian language usage of the group as a result of language contact?

6.2. Hypothesis

The occurrence of bilingualism and multilingualism is a natural phenomenon in the world (Grosjean, 1982, 2008). Therefore, language contact is everywhere, and it may cause people to become bilingual, and where people interact using different languages, language contact produces linguistic changes (Fenyvesi, 2018). It is hypothesized that in the contact varieties of Hungarian for the linguistic variables under examination, the nonstandard forms are preferred to a greater degree than the standard forms and constructions that are more representative of the monolingual language use of the Hungarian speech community in Hungary (Kontra, 2005). Therefore, it is assumed that, for the variables discussed, the findings of the English-Hungarian language contact situation in the United Kingdom and Ireland will confirm earlier results.

7. Methodology
7.1. The participants and their sociolinguistic background

Two hundred immigrants (N=200) from the United Kingdom and Ireland form the participants of the study. They are bilinguals speaking English and Hungarian and grew up in Hungary, speaking Hungarian as their first language. The participants are equally divided into two groups, a group of immigrants having lived there for a longer period of time, or the older group (GB/IRE-OLD, N=100), and another group of immigrants having lived there for a shorter period of time, or the newer group (GB/IRE-NEW, N=100).

The participants have been randomly selected from a data base collected with the help of a questionnaire created in Google Forms, which was distributed among

immigrants in the United Kingdom and Ireland during the summer of 2019. According to basic categories as independent non-linguistic variables, 11 members of the GB/IRE-NEW group come from villages or smaller settlements, 1 from a farm, 18 from capital cities and 70, the majority of the whole group, from towns. 71 participants are located in England, 1 in Northern Ireland, 16 in Ireland, 11 in Scotland and 1 in Wales. 80 of them are women, and 20 of them are men. Regarding the GB/IRE-OLD group, the numbers are the following: 15 members come from villages or smaller settlements, 2 from a farm, 17 from capital cities and 66, the majority of the whole group, from towns. 71 participants are located in England, 14 in Ireland, 10 in Scotland and 5 in Wales. 79 of them are women, and 21 of them are men.

The vast majority, that is, 91 subjects were born in Hungary, 6 in Romania, 2 in Slovakia, and 1 in Serbia in the GB/IRE-NEW group. Almost all subjects, 98 people were born in Hungary, 1 in a country not given in the questionnaire, and 1 in Serbia in the GB/IRE-OLD group.

The arrival time of 65 of the participants in the GB/IRE-NEW group is between 2010 and 2015, and 35 people arrived in the given countries after 2015. The arrival time of 71 of the participants is at the early part of the 2000s, while 4 arrived between the '50s and the '70s, 6 in the '80s and 18 in the '90s.

Regarding the distribution of the age groups of the respondents, 57% are 18-35, 38% are 36-50, and 5% are 51-65 years old in the GB/IRE-NEW group. 35% of the members of the GB/IRE-OLD group fall into the age group of 26-40, 47% are 41-50, 9% are 50-55, and 9% are 56-75 years old.

The data on education reveal that 6% of the GB/IRE-NEW group did not attend any schools outside of the UK or Ireland, while this number is 2% for the GB/IRE-OLD group, and 63% of the newer group received a college degree outside the UK or Ireland, and 37% got a college degree in the older group outside the UK or Ireland. The rest in both groups attended various schools, predominantly secondary schools, secondary vocational schools, and vocational schools. The majority of the GB/IRE-NEW group (90%) attended schools in Hungary at least as part of their education, while 6% in Romania, with the remaining 2% in Slovenia, and 1% in Serbia and Canada respectively, and 73% of them finished school within the past 10-20 years. For the GB/IRE-OLD group, the place of education is Hungary for 98% of the participants, with the remaining 2% being unnamed, and 78% finished school within the past 15-30 years.

Among the GB/IRE-NEW group, 8% received college education in the UK or Ireland, and this figure is 31% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. 61% of the respondents in the former group did not get any education in the UK or Ireland, while this number is 31% in the latter group. 7% participated in postgraduate education in the GB/IRE-

NEW group, and 8% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. The number of respondents having graduated from secondary schools in the UK or Ireland is 2% in both groups respectively, and 20% went on to pursue either vocational education or attended various courses among the newer immigrants, and this figure is 28% among the older immigrants. In both groups, the majority of the people finished the last school within the past 5-10 years (GB/IRE-NEW group – 89,95%; GB/IRE-OLD group – 81,25%).

The occupational status of the respondents shows a rather varied picture indeed. A large number of jobs and professions are named, of which I would like to highlight only some notable points, based on the four categories proposed for analysis by Kontra (2003: 63). (1) Professional people and managers; (2) People with other intellectual careers; (3) Skilled workers and self-employed people; (4) Other unskilled (manual) workers. For the GB/IRE-NEW group the percentages of the four categories are the following: (1) – 8%, (2) – 33%, (3) – 34%, (4) – 25%. The breakdown for the GB/IRE-OLD group is (1) – 16%, (2) – 36%, (3) – 26%, (4) – 22%.

Replying to the question of 'What nationality are you?', 2% of the respondents claimed to be Irish, 96% Hungarian, and 2% other unnamed nationalities in the GB/IRE-NEW group, while 7% British, 84% Hungarian, and 9% claimed to belong to nationalities unnamed by the respondents. 100% of the members of both groups considered their native language to be Hungarian, and the native language of all the participants' mother and father is Hungarian in both groups.

7.2. Data collection
7.2.1. The questionnaire
The questionnaire used is a modified version of the SHOH questionnaire (Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside of Hungary project), which was first used in the second half of the '90s for the investigation of language contact situations in the Carpathian Basin involving a number of countries such as Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania, Austria, the former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Prekmurje, the latter now belonging to Slovenia). The purpose of the research team was to construct a survey suitable for systematic data collection with the potential to be repeated under various circumstances and in different countries (Kontra, 2005: 34, cited in Fenyvesi, 2005a).

The questionnaire has two parts. The first, non-linguistic part of the questionnaire, contains the independent variables, while the second part of the questionnaire contains the dependent, linguistic variables.

7.2.2. The types of tasks
The participants of the study were administered pairs of sentences to test the linguistic variables. Tasks *513, 531, 623, 535, 537, 512* and *609* are included in the

present paper in pairs of sentences, and the respondents were asked to circle the letter corresponding to the sentence that they considered to be the more natural sounding of the two options presented. The representations for the texts are given in interlinear morphemic glosses (IMG) in order that the grammatical structure of the Hungarian sentences can be easily followed, together with the meaning of the original sentences.

8. Results and discussion

The results for the linguistic variables under investigation in the language use of the immigrant communities are presented. The overall statistical results regarding the choice of standard versus nonstandard options can be seen in the tables, broken down into the variables and tasks under analysis. It includes the percentages for each group of people, the new (GB/IRE-NEW) and the old (GB/IRE-OLD) immigrants, the monolingual Hungarian group (HUN), and earlier results for the Hungarian minority groups in the Carpathian Basin (CAR) are given in order to observe in what ways languages other than English influence Hungarian language usage as a result of language contact in those speech communities.

An important note is that during the era of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, historical Hungary accommodated a population of diverse ethnic background, with various languages spoken; however, the Peace Treaty of Trianon in 1920 resulted in the loss of two-thirds of her land, and millions of people got stuck in their new countries and became citizens overnight (Kontra, 2005: 29). Therefore, the neighboring countries of Hungary have a significant number of Hungarians that form minorities, and during the acculturation process, the Hungarian language of these communities is affected by the dominant language surrounding them (Thomason, 2005: 11). The majority of these people still speak Hungarian as their native language even though they live in a country where Hungarian is not an official language, the only exception being Slovenia where it is declared in the constitution, with an estimated population of less than 10,000 speakers (Thomason, 2005: 11). In one task, the outcome from the study in Toledo, USA (Fenyvesi, 2006) is also included (task *531*).

8.1. The *valószínűleg, hogy* 'probably that' variable

The linguistic literature first paid attention to the phenomenon in 1971; however, the appearance of this type of language construction can be traced back to much earlier times in the 19th century by prominent Hungarian writers (É. Kiss 2010: 224). Even though it has been part of the Hungarian language for about two hundred years, its use is still considered somewhat irregular by linguists, and it is often stigmatized. Kontra (2003), based on his sociolinguistic research, claims that the use of this "ongoing syntactic merger" (Kontra, 1998: 23), is widespread in the Hungarian-

speaking community, and more than half of them consider it to be as correct use, with one quarter of them using it on a regular basis (cited in É. Kiss, 2010: 225).

É. Kiss (2010) analyzes this structure of adverb+conjunction in Romanian-Hungarian and concludes that it is probably an effect resulting from language contact. Its use is regarded as a language error, a kind of contamination that does not fit into the grammatical system of Hungarian and possibly an equivalent of a Romanian construction. É. Kiss (2010) agrees with Bowern's (2008) assumptions on syntactic borrowing, and contradicts the mainstream view of some generative grammarians' approach, according to which the influence of language contact on the changes of syntactic structures in other languages is minimized. A number of authors such as Meillet and Sapir claimed the existence of linguistic constraints on linguistic interference (Thomason, 1988: 13); however, it has been known since Thomason (1988: 14) that syntactic borrowing is possible, and that such constraints simply fail. Not even Weinreich, one of the most authoritative researchers of language contact, in his foundational book *Languages in Contact* published in 1953, gives an explanation to the types of contact-induced changes and under what circumstances they can happen. "As far as the strictly linguistic possibilities go, any linguistic feature can be transferred from any language to any other language" (Thomason, 1988: 14). Bowern (2008, cited in É. Kiss, 2010: 223) comes to a similar conclusion and states that language contact plays a profound and significant role in syntactic changes. Task *513* (Table 1) examines the *valószínűleg, hogy* 'probably that' variable.

8.1.1. (1) [513]   – *valószínűleg, hogy* 'probably that' variable
(1) *Valószínűleg   külföld-re   fog-nak   költöz-ni.*
    Probably   abroad-SUB   FUT-3PL   move-INF
(2) *Valószínűleg,   hogy külföld-re   fog-nak   költöz-ni.*
    Probably   that abroad-SUB   FUT-3PL   move-INF
'They will probably move abroad.'

The results for this variable in task *513* (Table 1) show that the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups differ from the HU and CAR groups in that they prefer the SH variant to a greater extent, and there is no difference between the figures of the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups. There is a striking similarity between the HU and CAR groups as reflected in the results. There is a 18,9% difference between preference of the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups and the HU group for the SH Hungarian variant, while this difference compared to the CAR group is 16,8%. As Table 1 demonstrates, 92% of the immigrant speech community in the UK and Ireland chose the SH variant.

Table 1. Responses to task 513, *valószínűleg, hogy* variable.

513.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *valószínűleg, hogy*	28 (26,9%)	8 (8%)	8 (8%)	206 (24,8%)
SH *valószínűleg*	76 (73,1%)	92 (92%)	92 (92%)	624 (75,2%)

8.2. The inessive/illative and the illative/inessive cases variables

The study of inessive *-ban/-ba* '-in/-to' variable have recently been in the center of attention by linguists. One of the interior local cases (bVn) is a case suffix answering the question of 'where', referring to the location of being inside, the equivalent of the English preposition 'in', while the other one is also a case suffix (bV), but answering the question of 'to where', referring to a movement, the equivalent of the English preposition 'to'. The inessive variable (bVn) has two variants: [bVn] and [bV], and the illative (bV) variable has two variants as well: [bV] and [bVn]. What happens is that either the use of the standard Hungarian inessive norm is violated, and the nonstandard slightly stigmatized illative variant is used, or the standard Hungarian illative norm is violated, and the nonstandard inessive hypercorrected variant is used (Kontra, 2003: 67).

Kontra (1998) states that the inessive standard variant *-ban/-ben* 'in' and the hypercorrected variant of *-ban/-ben* 'in' are identical on the surface; however, their established use is diverse. Although the hypercorrected version might seem more sophisticated, language educators consider its use a gross error. Tasks *531, 623,* and *535* and *537* deal with the inessive/illative, and the illative/inessive variables respectively.

The nonstandard variants are commonly stigmatized versions, whose ordinary use is more widespread in regional dialects or everyday spoken language, and normally they are not accepted or allowed in written Hungarian tradition in accordance with the codified standard taught to native speakers in schools. Generally speaking, they are more alien to sophisticated and educated language users of Hungarian-born speakers (Göncz, 1999: 156-157).

In Hungarian language classes it is taught to native speakers of Hungarian that instead of sentence (1) with the illative case suffix, sentence (2) should be used with the inessive case suffix as a traditional standard Hungarian practice.

8.2.1. (1) [531] – the inessive/illative case *-ban/-ba* '-in/-to' variable

(1)   *Ott   van   a   szék   a   szoba sark-á-ba.*
       there   be.3SG the   chair the   room   corner-Px3SG-ILL

(2)   *Ott   van   a   szék   a   szoba sark-á-ban.*
       there   be.3SG the   chair the   room   corner-Px3SG-INE

'The chair is in the corner of the room.'

8.2.2. (2) [623] – the inessive/illative case *-ban/-ba* '-in/-to' variable

(1)   *Középiskolá-nk-ba   sok   szakképzetlen   pedagógus   tanít.*
       high.school-Px1PL-ILL   many   unqualified   teacher   teach.3SG

(2)   *Középiskolá-nk-ban   sok   szakképzetlen   pedagógus   tanít.*
       high.school-Px1PL-INE   many   unqualified   teacher   teach.3SG

'Several teachers teach without qualifications in our high school.'

According to Nádasdy (2003), Hungarian spoken in Hungary is gradually losing the inessive case suffix *-ba/-ben* 'in', which is especially true for the oral language use. He notes that the practice of using the inessive case suffix, expressing a fixed locative meaning of *in*, started to disappear about one-two hundred years ago, and now we can witness its presence predominantly in written language use. It is being replaced by the illative case suffix *-ba/-be* 'to'.

The collected data (Table 2) for tasks *531* reveal that most participants preferred the standard monolingual Hungarian version (SH); however, the nonstandard (NSH) alternative was chosen in a much greater proportion in the HU and CAR groups respectively. The acceptance of the SH variant is less prevalent in the USA group than in any other groups. Fenyvesi (2006) explains that the predominantly nonstandard linguistic behavior among Hungarian Americans in the Toledo community reflects the expected nonstandardness of the immigrants, the majority of whom are working class people, as a result of language contact. As for task *623* (Table 3), it can be concluded that the results of the HU and GB/IRE-NEW groups are practically identical, only 1% being the difference, and none of the respondents in the GB/IRE-OLD group selected the nonstandard option. The CAR group preferred the nonstandard usage to a significantly greater extent than any of the other groups, which indicates a 10-11% difference compared to the HU and GB/IRE-NEW groups respectively, and a 16,1% difference compared to the GB/IRE-OLD group.

Table 2. Responses to task 531, the inessive/illative case *-ban/-ba* '-in/-to' variable

531.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR	USA
NSH *sarkába*	48 (45,3%)	7 (7%)	3 (%)	381(46,6%)	12 (70,6%)
SH *sarkában*	58 (54,7%)	93 (93%)	97 (%)	436(53,4%)	5 (29,4%)

Table 3. Responses to task 623, the inessive/illative case *-ban/-ba* '-in/-to' variable

623.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *Középiskolánkba*	6 (5,8%)	5 (5%)	0 (0%)	130 (16,1)
SH *Középiskolánkban*	98 (94,2%)	95 (95%)	100 (100%)	679 (83,7)

8.3. The illative/inessive cases variables

8.3.1. (1) [535] – the illative/inessive case *-ba/-ban* '-to/-in' variable

(1) *A szerződő fel-ek a megállapodás-t közjegyző előtt írás-ban*
The contracting party-PL the agreement-ACC notary before writing-INE
foglal-t-ák.
contain-PAST-3PL

(2) *A szerződő fel-ek a megállapodás-t közjegyző előtt írás-ba*
The contracting party-PL the agreement-ACC notary before writing-ILL
foglal-t-ák.
contain-PAST-3PL

'The contracting parties have put the agreement in writing before the notary public.'

8.3.2. (2) [537] – the illative/inessive case *-ba/-ban* '-to/-in' variable

(1) *Már dél lesz, mi-re meg-érkez-ünk a szülőváros-om-ba*
already noon be.FUT.3SG what-SUB PVB-arrive-1PL the native.town-Px1SG-ILL
a család-om-hoz.
the family-Px1SG-ALL

(2) *Már dél lesz, mi-re meg-érkez-ünk a szülőváros-om-ban*
already noon be.FUT.3SG what-SUB PVB-arrive-1PL the native.town-Px1SG-INE
a család-om-hoz.
the family-Px1SG-ALL

'It'll be noon by the time we arrive at my family's house in my native town.'

Based on Benkő's investigation (2000: 35-37), it is noteworthy to mention some peculiarities of Hungarian as spoken in London. Sometimes the inessive case is used instead of the suppressive case for expressing non-locative functions in sentences, or the superessive case is used instead of the inessive case. For, example, the superessive *(-on/-en)* in the sentences *a rádión* 'on the radio', and a *TV-én* 'on TV', are clearly instances where the standard preposition is used for expressing the

function of the superessive case in English, while it would be absolutely unacceptable, nonstandard Hungarian usage. In a similar fashion, in sentences such as *Édesapád Magyarországban született*? 'Was your father born in Hungary?', the interior case suffix (*ban/-ben*) 'in' is used, which is normal usage in English, but it is not accepted in standard Hungarian, where the superessive case suffix (*on/-en*) 'on' should be used by native speakers of Hungarian. As Benkő concludes (2000), the use of the inessive case suffix is the consequence of the direct influence of British English on the Hungarian language use of the immigrant community living in London.

Benkő (2000: 38-39) also demonstrates how the inessive case is used in place of the illative case. Hungarian speakers of English residing in London often show a preference for the inessive case where the illative case is used in Standard Hungarian. For example, she quotes two sentences: *Moziban szeretek járni* 'I like going to the cinema', and *Kati megy a színházban egyszer egy hónapban* 'Kate goes to the theatre once a month'. In the former sentence standard Hungarian practice only allows the version *moziba* 'to the cinema', and *színházba* 'to the theatre', the use of the illative case suffix; nevertheless, in the sample sentences the inessive case, nonstandard in Hungarian in Hungary, is used: 'I like going in the cinema', and 'Kate goes in the theatre once a month'.

Similarly, instead of the inessive case, the illative case might be used: *Londonba drága a tömegközlekedés?* 'Is public transportation expensive in London?', or *Ma jó programok vannak a TV-be* 'There are good programmes on TV today.' Here standard Hungarian would use *Londonban* 'in London', and *TV-ben* 'in TV', which indicates the use of the inessive case endings in both sentences, and not 'to London' or 'to TV', in which sentences the illative case is used.

As we can see from the figures (Table 4) for sentence *535*, the nonstandard variant is preferred to a proportionally greater extent in the HU and the CAR groups than in the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups. The data for task *537* (Table 5), indicate that the majority of the respondents accept the SH option in the HU and CAR groups, and the vast majority of the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups chose the SH option with a 99%-97% result respectively. Therefore, the nonstandard hypercorrected version is hardly acknowledged among Hungarians in the United Kingdom or Ireland, irrespective of whether the immigrants arrived there more recently or a longer time ago.

Table 4. Responses to task 535, the illative/inessive case *-ba/-ban* '-to/-in' variable (hypercorrection).

535.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *írásban*	61 (57%)	9 (9%)	12 (12%)	524(65)
SH *írásba*	46 (43%)	91 (91%)	88 (88%)	282(35)

Table 5. Responses to task 537, the illative/inessive case *-ba/-ban* '-to/-in' variable (hypercorrection).

537.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *szülővárosomban*	44 (41,1%)	1(1%)	3 (3%)	388 (47,8)
SH *szülővárosomba*	63 (58,9%)	99 (99%)	97 (97%)	424 (52,2)

8.4. Case endings with place names

Kontra (1998: 19) mentions this phenomenon as "mental maps and morphology". There is a considerable variation in the language use of Hungarians regarding the case suffixes of place names (Göncz, 1999: 153). Even Hungarian grammars and practical guides are rather inconsistent in their approach, not giving a definite and satisfying solution as to when the various cases should be used to express local semantic functions. Referring to place names of towns and cities and geographical regions, Hungarian uses case endings, which can be divided into two groups, (1) surface cases: the superessive case, *-n/-on/-en/-ön* to express 'on, at rest', the delative case *-ról/-ről* to express 'off, motion from', and the sublative case, *-ra/-re* to express 'onto, motion to' in English, and (2) interior cases: the inessive case *-ban/-ben* for 'in, at rest', the elative case, *-ból/-ből* for 'out of, motion from', and the illative case -ba/-be for 'to, motion to' (Göncz, 2005: 233; Fenyvesi, 1998: 235). Most Hungarian place names, including cities, towns and villages attach surface case suffixes, the other ones, however, add interior case endings, while all the ones abroad take interior cases (Fenyvesi, 1998: 236). There is no definite consensus on which case suffixes should be used with geographical place names; and, since there is a substantial number of exceptions to the above rules, and the answer we can provide is far from being straightforward, careful consideration should be taken before drawing final conclusions. Yet, certain rules can generally be applied for place names.

Research results suggest that using the inessive and illative cases can reveal various geographical differences. For example, the use of the nonstandard case suffixes is more commonly associated with speakers whose residence is in the countryside. On the other hand, the forms regarded as the standard are preferred in the capital city of Budapest. Göncz (1999) points to the noteworthy positive correlation between the level of parental education and the standard use of case suffixes. In addition, the various task types administered to respondents may also

influence the answers given. For example, grammaticality judgment tasks are more sensitive to stigmatization than tasks of a productive nature.

8.4.1. (1) [512] – case endings with place names

(1) *Koszovó-ban folytatód-nak a tárgyalás-ok az albán-ok és a szerb-ek*
  Kosovo-INE continue-3PL the negotiation-PL the Albanian-PL and the Serb-PL
  között.
  between

(2) *Koszovó-n folytatód-nak a tárgyalás-ok az albán-ok és a szerb-ek*
  Kosovo-SUP continue-3PL the negotiation-PL the Albanian-PL and the Serb-PL
  között.
  between

'Negotiations continue between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo.'

8.4.2. (2) [609] – case endings with place names

Az egyik ismerõs-öm   fi-a   ..... volt   katona.
the one acquaintance-Px1SG son-Px3SG {…} be.PAST.3SG soldier

  (1) *Craiová-n*   (2) *Craiová-ban*
    Craiova-SUP   Craiova-INE

'A friend of mine's son served in the army in Craiova.'

Either surface cases or interior cases are attributed to place names (Göncz, 2005: 233-234), and Göncz (1999: 154) referring to Grétsy and Kovalovszky (1983: 775-677) states that there are two observable governing rules by language cultivators concerning the preference of speakers for either surface cases or interior cases. According to this rule, inside historical Hungary, surface cases are used, while outside of it, interior cases are favored in a much greater proportion, and foreign place names such as *Londonban* 'in London' generally take interior cases as well (Göncz, 2005: 233-234). Kontra (1998: 19) confirms this earlier finding and argues that in the geographical region of historical Hungary, predominantly the surface cases are preferred, while Hungarian speakers in regions that belonged to Hungary before the Peace Treaty of Trianon in 1920, primarily use the interior cases. It seems that there is a dichotomy of differentiating between the concepts of 'home' and 'abroad' (Kontra, 1998: 19). Nonetheless, there are also some exceptions to the rule, since city and town names in Hungary may also take interior cases as it is illustrated in the town names of *Badacsony*, *Debrecen* or *Sopron,* only to mention a few. Conversely, a number of city and town names previously belonging to historical Hungary might take surface cases: *Arad* (Arad, Romania), *Kassa* (Košice, Slovakia) or *Szabadka* (Subotica, Yugoslavia) (Fenyvesi, 1998: 241). In the questionnaire, two of such place names are mentioned, namely, *Kosovo*, whose location is in the former

Yugoslavia, and *Craiova*, located in Transylvania, in Romania (Göncz, 2005: 233-234).

According to Fenyvesi (1996: 16), as far as the use of the locative case referring to place names is concerned, 'in-cases', that is, the inessive case for denoting location, or 'on-cases', that is, the superessive case for denoting location are used with various degrees of frequency both within Hungary and other countries where Hungarian is spoken. Generally speaking, approximately, 80% of Hungarian place names are associated with the surface case of the superessive 'on-case' (e.g. *Budapesten* 'on Budapest'), while 20% mostly receive the interior inessive 'in-case' (e.g. *Veszprémben* 'in Veszprém'), with all the foreign city and town names taking the interior inessive 'in-case' (e.g. *Párizsban* 'in Paris'). Fenyvesi (1996: 16) draws the conclusion that the case usage of place names among Hungarian Americans differs from standard Hungarian norm.

Responses to task *512* (Table 6) show that there is a very convincing preference of choosing the standard options by the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups, with a 94-96% result respectively. Even though the majority of the respondents in the HU and the CAR groups favored the SH variant as well, the extent to which they did so is less than for the previous two groups in the United Kingdom and Ireland. The answers to task *609* (Table 7) reveal a more balanced distribution among the respondents of the various speech communities, in that three of the groups for the HU, the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups selected the SH alternative in the average range of 67,6%. On the other hand, the SH version *Craiovában* 'in Craiova' was selected by a little more than half of the respondents (51,7%), an almost 15% difference compared to the average of the other three groups.

Table 6. Responses to task 512, case endings with place names

512.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *Koszovón*	21 (19,6%)	6 (6%)	4 (4%)	285 (34,3)
SH *Koszovóban*	86 (80,4%)	94 (94%)	96 (96%)	545 (65,7)

Table 7. Responses to task 609, case endings with place names

609.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH *Craiován*	34 (32,1%)	31 (31%)	34 (34%)	387 (48,3)
SH *Craiovában*	72 (67,9%)	69 (69%)	66 (66%)	413 (51,7)

Previous studies (Lanstyák &Szabómihály, 2005; Göncz, 1999, 2005; Csernicskó, 1998, 2005; Benő & Szilágyi N., 2005; Sándor, 2005; Göncz & Vörös, 2005; Bodó, 2005; Fenyvesi, 2005; Kovács, 2005; Kontra, 1998, 2005) demonstrated that in many cases, nonstandard structures are preferred to standard varieties to a greater degree

in situations where language contact is present. Earlier research (Kontra, 2003: 57-63) states that a variety of connections between independent, non-linguistic and dependent, linguistic variables exist. For example, Kontra (2003: 57), referring to Chambers (1995: 7), notes that it is social class, sex and age that primarily define social roles, and education and occupation are significant determinants of social class. In a similar way, Kontra (2003: 58) states that it is a widely accepted view that the level of education and language use are interconnected. However, it is only true if educational systems try to preserve the standard in order to exclude speakers of the nonstandard. The connection between education and social status are especially prevalent in Hungarian society, and they are important indicators of social status (Kontra, 2003: 59). The more educated people are, the less nonstandard forms they prefer (Kontra, 2003: 87), and women use more prestige variants than men in Western European and English-speaking countries (Kontra, 2003: 60). Studies conducted in various speech communities show that conservativism in language use becomes stronger with the advancement of age, too (Kontra, 2003: 61).

In the following paragraphs, some of the factors potentially related to the effects of non-linguistic variables on linguistic variables are presented concerning the variables discussed in the present paper.

Regarding education, 10% (N=10) of the respondents never attended schools in Hungary, one of them went to school in Canada, another one in Serbia, two finished schools in Slovakia, and 6 participants in Romania in the GB/IRE-NEW group, and 7 of them graduated from a university. It is noteworthy to remark how the respondents who did not receive their education in Hungary answered the questions concerning the preference of standard or nonstandard options.

The results are broken down into tasks, countries of education and choices between standard (SH) and nonstandard (NSH) options. Since there are 100-100 participants in both groups, the numbers given indicate the percentages as well. Task *513*, Romania: SH – 4, NSH – 2; Slovakia: SH – 2, NSH – 0; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *531*, Romania: SH – 5, NSH – 1; Slovakia: SH – 2, NSH – 0; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *623*, Romania: SH – 6, NSH – 0; Slovakia: SH – 1, NSH – 1; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *535*, Romania: SH – 5, NSH – 1; Slovakia: SH – 1, NSH – 1; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *537*, Romania: SH – 5, NSH – 1; Slovakia: SH – 2, NSH – 0; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *512*, Romania: SH – 5, NSH – 1; Slovakia: SH – 2, NSH – 0; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Task *609*, Romania: SH – 1, NSH – 5; Slovakia: SH – 1, NSH – 1; Serbia: SH – 1, NSH – 0; Canada: SH – 0, NSH - 1.

2% (N=2) of the respondents in the GB/IRE-OLD group never attended schools in Hungary; however, they did not intend to name the countries of their education. One respondent graduated from a university, and the other one finished a course in the United Kingdom. They preferred the SH variants for *623*, *537*, *512* and *609*, and for tasks *513* (the total number of NSH answers is 8), *531* (the total number of NSH answers is 3) and *535* (the total number of NSH answers is 12) the SH and the NSH variants were split between the two participants.

One interesting finding is that the country of education seems to be a noticeable factor affecting linguistic preferences in the language use of the immigrant community in the United Kingdom and Ireland.

7 out of 10 participants in the GB/IRE-NEW group obtained a university degree in a country outside Hungary. In task *513* (Table 1)*,* out of the 100 respondents of the GB/IRE-NEW group, 8 chose the NSH variant, 2 of whom were educated in Romania. In task *531* (Table 2), the total number of answers for the NSH variant is 7, and 1 respondent was educated in Romania. In task *535* (Table 4), 1 out of 9 who selected the NSH variant was educated in Romania. In task *537* (Table 5), one respondent educated in Romania preferred the NSH variant, being the only participant in the total of 100. In task *512* (Table 6), the total number of answers for the NSH variant is 6, and 1 respondent was educated in Romania. In task *623* (Table 3), one respondent educated in Slovakia preferred the NSH variant, the total number of answers for the NSH variant being 5. In task *609* (Table 7), 31 respondents preferred the NSH variant, of whom 7 people were not educated in Hungary: 1 went to school in Canada, 1 in Slovakia and 5 in Romania.

This result might be an indicator of language contact related to the effect of the dominant language of the country of education such as Romanian or Slovakian. Furthermore, higher educational levels tend to indicate the use of standard variants to a greater extent, and such speakers are probably more likely to preserve standardness in their language use with a more conscious attitude. The results of the research did not detect any convincing evidence for a notable language contact effect in either of the groups in the linguistic variables discussed.

9. Conclusion

In this paper I have investigated how the language use of immigrant communities in the United Kingdom and Ireland is influenced by the English language they are exposed to. The linguistic investigation is centered around on the potential preference of nonstandard forms or standard variants.

Previously, the questionnaire had been used in the countries of the Carpathian Basin, where the phenomenon of nonstandardness is more prevalent, but tasks of the questionnaire were administered in other English-speaking countries, and results

obtained in the USA, and Canada, among others, confirm that nonstandard language use is more prevalent where language contact is present.

The four linguistic variables of this paper reveal that the respondents in the United Kingdom and Ireland prefer the standard variants to a greater extent in comparison to the other groups; therefore, these somewhat contradictory results call for further analyses that might give a more detailed and satisfactory answer to this outcome.

Education, prestige and consciousness to use standard Hungarian might be factors involved. In addition, the size of the Hungarian population, their colorful domains of language use and social cohesion, together with their daily habit of digital language use are all possible factors that can influence the use and preservation of their native language in the British Isles. For example, the relatively new realm of social media practices may contribute to the maintenance of minority languages (Fenyvesi, 2014, 2015; Huber, 2013), and additional research is needed to discover sociolinguistic insights among British and Irish Hungarians, leading us to a deeper understanding of the Hungarian-English language contact situation in the United Kingdom and Ireland.

References

Antal L. (1961) A Magyar esetrendszer. [The Hungarian case system]. *Nyelvtudományi értekezések* 29. 57-77.

Antal L. (1977) *Egy új magyar nyelvtan felé*. [Towards a new Hungarian grammar]. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.

Bakró-Nagy M. (2006) Az uráli nyelvek tipológiai jellemzése. [Typological characteristics of the Uralic languages]. In: Kiefer F. (ed.) *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 267–287.

Bartha Cs. (1993) *Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolingvisztikai megközelítései*. [Sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian-American community]. Budapest: Kandidátusi dissertation.

Benkő A. (2000) *An analysis of British Hungarian: Some morphological features of Hungarian as used by Hungarian immigrants and their descendants in London*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged: MA Thesis.

Benő A. & Szilágyi N. S. (2005) Hungarian in Romania. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 133-162.

Bodó Cs. (2005) Hungarian in Austria. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 241-267.

Bowern, C. (2008) Syntactic Change and Semantic Borrowing in Generative Grammar. In: Ferraresi, G. & Goldbach, M. (eds.) *Principles of syntactic reconstruction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chambers, J. K. (1995) *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Comrie, B. (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Croft, W. (1990) *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Csernicskó I. (1998) *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)*. [The Hungarian language in Ukraine (Subcarpathia)]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó és MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.

Csernicskó I. (2005) Hungarian in Ukraine. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 89-132.

de Groot, C. (2005) The grammars of Hungarian outside Hungary from a linguistic-typological perspective. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 351-370.

É. Kiss K. (2010) Valószínűleg, hogy Román kontaktushatás. [Probably that Romanian contact effect]. In: É-Kiss K & Hegedűs A. (eds.) *Nyelvelmélet és kontaktológia*. Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék – Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék. 223-237.

Fenyvesi A. (1995) Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics* 3. pp. 1-117.

Fenyvesi A. (1996) The case of American Hungarian case: Morphological change in McKeesport, PA. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43/3-4. pp. 381-404.

Fenyvesi A. (ed., 2005a) *Hungarian Language Contact Outside Hungary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fenyvesi A. (2005b) Hungarian in the United States. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 265-318.

Fenyvesi A. (2006) Contact effects in Toledo, Ohio, Hungarian: Quantitative findings. In: Watson, G. & Hirvonen, P. (eds.) *Finno-Ugric language contacts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag. 157-177.

Fenyvesi A. (2014) Endangered languages in the digital age: Supporting and studying digital language use in them. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 38. 255–270.

Fenyvesi A. (2015) Multilingualism and minority language use in the digital sphere: the digital use of language as a new domain of language use. In: *Linguistic and cultural diversity in cyberspace*. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference (Yakutsk, Russian Federation, 30 June ‐ 3 July, 2014). Moscow: Interregional Library Cooperation Centre. 126-131.

Fenyvesi A. (2018) Language contact. In: Körtvélyessy L. (ed.) *Language typology: Preliminaries and principles.* Rzeszów, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. 145-152.

Forintos É. (2008) *Aspects of language ecology. English-Hungarian language contact phenomena in Australia*. Veszprém: Pannonian University Press.

Forintos É. (2011) The Language use of the Hungarian Communities in Canada and South-Africa. Bulletin of the *Transilvania.* University of Brasov. Series IV. *Philology and Cultural Studies* 4/53.1.

Forintos É. (2015) Semantic Aspects of Australian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos: Journal of Space and Humanities IV*. 1. pp. 109-122.

Göncz L. (1999) A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban). [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (Vojvodina)]. Budapest/Újvidék: Osiris – Forum Kiadó.

Göncz L. & Vörös O. (2005) Hungarian in the former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Prekmurje). In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 187-240.

Greenberg, J. H. (1966) *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2008) *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2010) *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haugen, E. (1950) The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. pp. 210-231.

Heine, B. (2005) On contact-induced syntactic change. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 58. pp. 60–74.

Huber M. I. (2013) *Intergenerational transmission of Hungarian as a heritage language in Canada: The macrosociolinguistics of the Hungarian community in Hamilton, Ontario.* Szeged: University of Szeged, BA Thesis.

Huber M. I. (2016) Analitikus szerkezetek egy kanadai magyar beszélőközösség nyelvhasználatában. [Analytical structures in the language use of a Canadian speech community]. In: Váradi T. (ed.) *Doktoranduszok tanulmányai az alkalmazott nyelvészet köréből*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 31-44.

Kenesei I. Vago, R. M. & Fenyvesi A. (1998) *Hungarian* (Descriptive grammars series). London: Routledge.

Kiefer F. (1995) A magyar főnév esetei. [The case endings of the Hungarian noun]. In: Keszler B. (ed.) *A mai Magyar nyelv*. ELTE Manuscript. Budapest: Nemzeti tankönyvkiadó. 51-58.

Kiefer F. (2006) Alaktan. [Morphology]. In: Kiefer F. (ed.) *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 54–79.

Kontra M. (1990) Fejezetek a South Bend-i Magyar nyelvhasználatból. [The Hungarian language as spoken in South Bend, Indiana]. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet.

Kontra M. (1998) *The Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary* (Final Report to the Research Support Scheme). Budapest: Linguistics Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. MS. http: //e-lib.rss.cz/diglib/pdf/22.pdf

Kontra M. (ed., 2003) *Nyelv és társadalom a rendszerváltáskori Magyarországon.* [Language and Society in Hungary at the Fall of Communism]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Kontra M. (2005) Contextualizing the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside of Hungary project. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary*: *studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 29-46.

Kovács M. (2005) Hungarian in Australia. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 319-350.

Lanstyák I. & Szabómihály G. (2005) Hungarian in Slovakia. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 47-88.

Matras, Y. (2009) *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. (2010) Contact, convergence and typology. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 66-85.

Moravcsik, E. A. (2003) Inflectional morphology in the Hungarian noun phrase: A typological assessment. In: Plank, F. (ed.) *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 13-252.

Moravcsik, E. A. (ed., 2013) *Introducing Language Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nádasdy Á. (2003) Ízlések és szabályok. [Tastes and rules]. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó. 213-216.

Office for National Statistics. August (2015) Population by Country of Birth Estimates. Frequently Asked Questions.

Polgár E. (2001) *Language maintenance and language shift: A sociolinguistic analysis of a Hungarian-American community*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged, MA Thesis.

Ramat, P. (1987) *Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: de Gruyter.

Sankoff, G. (2004) Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In: Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, P. & Schilling-Estes, N. (eds.) *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell. 638-668.

Sándor K. (2005) The Csángós of Romania. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 163-186.

Thomason, S. G. & Terence, K. (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thomason, S. G. (2001) *Language Contact: An Introduction.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S. G. (2005) Typological and theoretical aspects of Hungarian in contact with other languages. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 11-28.

Thomason, S. G. (2010) Contact explanations in linguistics. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 31-47.

Weinreich, U. (1953) *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Winford, D. (2003) *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Internet sources

Central Statistics Office (Ireland) https://www.cso.ie/en/index.html

Office for National Statistics: (UK) https://www.ons.gov.uk/

The Migration Observatory (UK) https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/

Appendix
Abbreviations used for the interlinear morphemic glosses

1SG	first person singular
3PL	third person plural
3SG	third person singular
ACC	accusative case
FUT	future tense
ILL	illative case
INE	inessive case
INF	infinitive
PAST	past tense
PL	plural
PVB	preverb
PX	possessive suffix
SUB	sublative case
SUP	superessive case

Internet link to the questionnaire:
https://forms.gle/RU8ByqCgyvYhAtVd8