

In: Greg Watson and Pekka Hirvonen, eds. 2006. *Finno-Ugric language contacts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 157–177.

Contact effects in Toledo, Ohio, Hungarian: Quantitative findings*

Anna Fenyvesi
University of Szeged, Hungary

1. Introduction

The study of the linguistic effects of contact between American English and Hungarian in the Hungarian language use of Hungarian immigrants to the United States and their descendents has produced several comprehensive and detailed descriptive works since the early 1990s. These studies have all focused on traditional Hungarian-American communities – i.e. the predominantly working class communities living in the formerly industrial cities south of the Great Lakes, from Chicago to New York City. The language use of Hungarian Americans was studied in South Bend, Indiana, by Kontra (1990), in Detroit, Michigan, by Bartha (1993), and in McKeesport, Pennsylvania, by Fenyvesi (1995). All these studies used as their primary source of linguistic data tape-recorded and transcribed sociolinguistic interviews and provide descriptions of all the linguistic subsystems of this contact dialect of Hungarian – its phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon – identifying several dozen linguistic features and various types of borrowed lexical items. In addition, a dictionary of Hungarian American speech from the Calumet region (southeast of Chicago), Vázsonyi (1995), provides further insight into the lexicon of American Hungarian.

In this paper, I present the first set of quantitative findings on contact effects in the language use of Hungarian Americans on the basis of a questionnaire administered in a Hungarian community in Toledo, Ohio. These findings, as we will see, (i) confirm the effects of language contact that were previously discussed in the interview-based studies in the case of several linguistic features, (ii) demonstrate the effect of contact in some features that previous studies did not touch upon, and (iii) shed some light on the issue of nonstandardness of American Hungarian language use.

2. The study

2.1. Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the current study are that since Hungarian Americans live in a situation of bilingualism in American English and Hungarian, their Hungarian will show the linguistic influence of English. More specifically, they will exhibit linguistic behavior that is less standard than that of monolingual Hungarians' in linguistic variables where one variant is standard and the other nonstandard, bearing the influence of Indo-European languages in general or of American English in particular.

2.2. Methodology

The linguistic data discussed in this paper was gathered with the help of a questionnaire originally designed for the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary project (Kontra 1998), aiming to provide an insight into the sociolinguistic and linguistic aspects of the Hungarian language use in the countries surrounding Hungary (i.e. Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania, Yugoslavia, Slovenia, and Austria), where sizeable Hungarian minority populations live in bilingual situations. A control group (n=107) of monolingual Hungarians from Hungary was used in the project to produce a great amount of comparable quantitative linguistic data that show systematic differences between Hungarian used in Hungary versus its neighboring countries (see Cserniczkó 1998, Göncz 1999, Lanstyák 2000 for comprehensive treatments of the Hungarian used in Ukraine, Yugoslavia, and Slovakia, respectively, and forthcoming papers, in English, by Cserniczkó, Lanstyák and Szabó Mihály, Göncz and Vörös, and Benő and Szilágyi N.).

The questionnaire consists of 74 questions inquiring about sociolinguistic details of the respondents' social and linguistic background, as well as their use of Hungarian and of their other language. These questions use a total of 324 sociolinguistic variables. Interspersed with the sociolinguistic questions, there are 58 linguistic questions in the questionnaire, using

tasks such as sentence completion, sentence correction, and selection of one of two sentences (or alternative phrases in a sentence) that is more acceptable to the respondent. The linguistic variables used in the tasks are of three kinds. First are what have been termed as 'Universal variables', i.e. variables that are found in all dialects of Hungarian. These are typical sociolinguistic variables that stratify speakers along traditional social variables such as level of education, age, sex, etc. Second are 'Universal Contact variables', that is, variables whose nonstandard variant is due to contact between Hungarian and another language and which are found in varieties of Hungarian both in and outside Hungary. These are linguistic features that show the effect of Hungarian with other Indo-European languages that it has been in contact with. Third are 'Contact variables', linguistic variables that exist only in bilingual communities outside Hungary as a result of the influence of the community's other language. The Universal variables and Universal Contact variables used in the present study all come from the original questionnaire (the tasks containing them are numbered 501-644).

The questionnaire was supplemented with 12 questions containing Contact variables typical of only American Hungarian. The tasks containing these are numbered 700-712. The questionnaire was minimally modified to fit the context of Hungarian American life – for instance, in the question inquiring about how often the respondent visited Hungary, the possible answers were changed from 'daily', 'weekly', 'monthly' etc. to 'more than once a year', 'once a year', 'once every two or three years' etc. – but apart from such minor adjustments was left the same to insure comparability.

The questionnaire was administered to 24 Hungarian Americans in Toledo, Ohio, in January 2001. For the purposes of the analysis discussed in this paper, 6 of the respondents were excluded from the sample: one due to a low proficiency in Hungarian that rendered her results unanalyzable, and five others because they grew up in bilingual communities (in Vojvodina, Yugoslavia, or Hungarian immigrant communities in Germany or Brazil) and, thus, the effect of contact with languages other than English on their Hungarian could not be excluded. Three of the 18 respondents were second generation Hungarian Americans, the rest immigrants. Of the latter, one was a post-World War II immigrant (a Displaced Person, or DP), eight were immigrants of the 1956 revolution, and the remaining six immigrated in the 1960s or later. One respondent had 6 years of schooling, 2 finished primary school, another 6 had some secondary education beyond primary school, 4 finished secondary school and had at least some tertiary schooling, and 5 had completed college degrees. Two-thirds of the respondents had a working class background, and one-third white collar backgrounds.

The original control group of 107 Hungarians from Hungary was used for all the linguistic tasks except for the 12 questions containing Contact variables. A control group of 24 monolingual Hungarians was used for the latter.

Due to the low number of respondents in the Hungarian American sample and the control group for the questions with Contact variables, the current study examines differences in language use only along one social variable, namely, place, that is, United States vs. Hungary. It, thus, investigates how living in Hungary vs. in the United States (in bilingualism in English) makes speakers' Hungarian different. The differences are hypothesized to be due to language contact with English in the case of Hungarian Americans.

2.3. The Toledo community

The community of the Birmingham neighborhood of Toledo where the study was conducted is a typical example of a traditional Hungarian American community. It was founded by Hungarian immigrants of peasant and working class backgrounds in the late 19th century. It had its heyday in the decades before World War II. Despite absorbing later immigrants (DPs after World War II, '56-ers, and others), the community went through a steady decline in the late 20th century due to a closing of the local steel industry and the migration of the younger generations elsewhere that followed it. The size of the Hungarian community is hard to estimate because virtually none of its members actually live in the old neighborhood any more, but they are loosely connected to it through shopping at the Hungarian bakery and meat market, membership in the Hungarian club, and going to church and attending social gatherings at St. Stephen's parish (Polgár 2001: 11). For a detailed account of the sociolinguistic aspects of this community based on the sociolinguistic questions of the same questionnaire, see Polgár (2001).

3. Findings

The answers of the Hungarian American respondents to the linguistic questions of the questionnaire used differ in a statistically significant way from those of monolingual Hungarians from Hungary in several linguistic features: focus-related characteristics such as word order and the use of nonemphatic overt pronouns; analytical vs. synthetic constructions; converbs; possessive suffixes; singular or plural reference; and various kinds of agreement.

3.1. Focus-related features

The neutral word order of the constituents in a Hungarian sentence is subject–verb–object/complement, and emphasis is expressed through the syntactic movement called focus-movement of the emphasized constituent into the syntactic position preceding the inflected verb (Kenesei et al. 1998: 161). In American Hungarian, focus-movement has been demonstrated to be completely lacking in some cases and violated in various ways in others (Kontra 1990: 75-79 and 82; Bartha 1993: 138; Fenyvesi 1995: 75-80). In the present study, focus-movement was tested through the task in (1), where respondents had to choose the phrase they considered better fitting in the sentence:¹

(1) [608] *Itt van még Péter?* – *Itt, de már*
 here be.3SG still Peter – here but already{...}

(1) *készül men-ni* (2) *men-ni készül*
 prepare.3SG go-INF go-INF prepare.3SG

"Is Peter still here?" "Yes, but he is preparing to go."

The variant which is listed first and contains an emphasized but not preverbal infinitive (and which also parallels its English counterpart) is considered nonstandard in Hungarian as used in Hungary (NSH), while the one listed second, with the preverbal emphasized infinitive is standard (SH). As Table 1 demonstrates, American Hungarian (US) respondents chose the nonfocussed, more English-like variant in statistically significantly higher number of cases than did Hungarians from Hungary (HU).

Table 1. Responses to task 608, focus-movement.

	HU	US
608 NSH <i>készül menni</i>	9 (8.4%)	10 (55.6%)
SH <i>menni készül</i>	98 (91.6%)	8 (44.4%)

Chi Square = 26.5684, p<.001; statistically significant

Hungarian is a *pro*-drop language, i.e. personal pronouns in the subject position appear only if they are emphasized. It also allows the *pro*-drop of object pronouns if the identity of the object is unambiguous. (Since English is not a *pro*-drop language, it requires both subject and object pronouns to be overt.) A lack of subject *pro*-drop has been shown to exist in American Hungarian (see references above at the discussion of lack of focus-movement in American Hungarian), although a lack of object *pro*-drop has not been so far demonstrated. Nonemphatic overt pronouns were tested in sentences in (2) and (3) in this study: in (2) the overt marking of the second person object is not required in standard Hungarian as spoken in Hungary due to the fact that the verb with the *-lak* suffix identifies it unambiguously; whereas in (3) it is coreferential with an antecedent in the main clause. In the two tasks, respondents had to choose the sentence or phrase, respectively, which they considered more acceptable.

(2) [515] (1) *Tegnap lát-t-alak a tévé-ben.*
 yesterday see-PAST-1SG.2OBJ the TV-INE
 (2) *Tegnap lát-t-alak téged a tévé-ben.*
 yesterday see-PAST-1SG.2OBJ you.ACC the TV-INE

'I saw you on TV yesterday.'

(3) [615] *Találkoz-t-am Hedvig-gel, s hogy ve-gy-en nek-em egy*
 meet-PAST-1SG Hedvig-INS and {...} that buy-IMP-3SG DAT-Px1SG a

kifli-t.
 croissant-ACC

(1) *meg-kér-t-em* (2) *meg-kér-t-em* *ő-t*
 PVB-ask-PAST-1SG PVB-ask-PAST-1SG s/he-ACC

'I met Hedvig and asked her to buy me a croissant.'

In both tasks, Hungarian Americans chose the English-like sentence or phrase containing the overt object pronoun in statistically significantly higher numbers than monolingual Hungarians in Hungary did (see Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Responses to task 515, nonemphatic overt object after *-lak*.

	HU	US
515 NSH <i>látalak téged</i>	23 (21.9%)	9 (50%)
SH <i>látalak</i>	82 (78.1%)	9 (50%)

Chi Square = 6.3014, p<.025 statistically significant

Table 3. Responses to task 615, nonemphatic overt object after antecedent.

	HU	US
615 NSH <i>megkértem őt</i>	29 (27.4%)	11 (61.1%)
SH <i>megkértem</i>	77 (72.6%)	7 (38.9%)

Chi Square = 6.3014, p<.025 statistically significant

3.2. Analytical vs. synthetic constructions

Hungarian is an agglutinative language which in many details of its grammatical system and word structure uses more synthetic constructions than most Indo-European languages. In some cases, two different variants of a lexical item exist, where the one employing a synthetic construction is the standard one, while the analytical one is regarded nonstandard. The latter are considered the result of the long-term influence of Indo-European languages that Hungarian has been in contact with, e.g. German and various Slavic languages.

The use of analytical vs. synthetic constructions had not been discussed in connection with American Hungarian in any previous study.

Such pairs of items have been tested in the current study through derived forms (preferred in the standard) that have nonstandard counterparts that employ analytical forms. In the test sentences, given in (4) and (5) below, the forms *buszozás* 'traveling by bus' and *szépítkezett* 'she beautified herself' are the derived, synthetic ones, and *utazás busszal* and *szépítette magát* are the analytical ones where the instrument and reflexivity are expressed by separate phrases, an instrumental phrase and a reflexive pronoun, respectively. As we can see from the English equivalent sentences, English in both cases uses analytical constructions analogous to the nonstandard Hungarian ones.

(4) [507] (1) *Un-om már ez-t a sok utazás-t busz-szal.*
 be.tired-1SG EMPH this-ACC the much traveling-ACC bus-INS
 (2) *Un-om már ez-t a sok busz-oz-ás-t.*
 be.tired-1SG EMPH this-ACC the much bus-VDER-ADDER-ACC

'I am very tired of all this traveling by bus.'

(5) [613] A *tükör előtt hosszan*
 the mirror before for.long {...}

(1) *szépít-ett-e* *magá-t* (2) *szépítkez-ett*
 beautify-PAST-3SG self-ACC beautify.REFL-PAST.3SG

'She beautified herself in front of the mirror for a long time.'

As can be seen in Tables (4) and (5), the analytical forms are chosen by the Hungarian American respondents more often than by the monolingual control group in statistically significant ways.

Table 4. Responses to task 507, synthetic vs. analytical instrumental phrases

	HU	US
507 NSH <i>utazást busszal</i>	21 (19.6%)	12 (66.7%)
SH <i>buszozást</i>	86 (80.4%)	6 (33.3%)

Chi Square = 17.5472, p<.001 statistically significant

Table 5. Responses to task 613, synthetic vs. analytical reflexive phrases

	HU	US
613 NSH <i>szépítette magát</i>	21 (20%)	9 (50%)
SH <i>szépítkezett</i>	84 (80%)	9 (50%)

Chi Square = 7.4990, p<.01 statistically significant

3.3. Converbs

The Hungarian adverbial participial verb form, or converb, as it has been termed more recently (Haspelmath and König 1995), used with the copula, has a passive orientation and is the closest (and only) equivalent of the English passive construction. Its use is very restricted in standard Hungarian: it can only be used with telic verbs (i.e. verbs that express a result) and there are other restrictions on its use as far as agentivity, number of arguments, and momentariness (de Groot 1995).

A more frequent use of converbs in the copula construction has been noted for American Hungarian before (Fenyvesi 1995: 89-90) but not studied in any depth. In the current study, two tasks focussed on the use of this construction: both contained nontelic transitive verbs, *beszél* 'speak' and *használ* 'use', which, in standard Hungarian, would not be used in this construction, but whose English equivalents would be perfectly acceptable sentences. In both tasks (given in 6 and 7 below), specifically designed for the Toledo study and not included in the original Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary study, respondents had to judge sentences and correct them if they considered them not correct. (In standard Hungarian, instead of the converb with the copula, an unspecified third person plural verb form, *beszél-ik* speak-3PL 'they speak' and *használ-ják* use-3PL 'they use', respectively, would be used.)

(6) [701] A *magyar nyelv szép, de csak akkor,ha szépen van beszél-ve.*
 the Hungarian language beautiful but only then if beautifully be.3SG speak-SCVB
 'The Hungarian language is beautiful, but only when it's spoken beautifully.'

1) correct
 2) not correct; it's better this way:

(7) [707] *A mi család-unk-ban a magyar még sok-at van használ-va.*
 the we family-Px1PL-INE the Hungarian still much-ACC be.3SG use-SCVB
 'In our family, the Hungarian language is still used a lot.'

- 1) correct
- 2) not correct; it's better this way:

As Tables (6) and (7) show, more than half of the Hungarian American respondents accepted the nontelic use of converbs in the copula construction in both tasks, while only a small number of monolingual Hungarians from Hungary did.

Table 6. Responses to task 701, converb *beszélve*.

	HU	US
701 NSH <i>van beszélve</i>	2 (8%)	14 (78%)
SH <i>beszélük</i>	22 (92%)	4 (22%)

Chi Square = 21.0336, p<.001 statistically significant

Table 7. Responses to task 707, converb *használva*.

	HU	US
707 NSH <i>van használva</i>	3 (13%)	11 (61%)
SH <i>használják</i>	21 (87%)	7 (39%)

Chi Square = 10.9375, p<.001 statistically significant

3.4. Possessive suffixes

To express possession, Hungarian, like other Finno-Ugric languages, uses personal possessive suffixes attached to the thing possessed. These are obligatory in expressing the possessor of a thing possessed both in the noun phrase (*autó+m* car+Px1SG 'my car') and in the possessive *have*-construction (*van egy autó+m* be.3SG a car+Px1SG 'I have a car'), although at least in certain regional dialects of Hungarian in Hungary the possessive suffix can be deleted in the *have*-construction (Kiss 1982).

The loss of personal possessive suffixes in both the possessive noun phrase and the *have*-construction has been widely demonstrated for American Hungarian (Kontra 1990: 72 and 85-86, Fenyvesi 1995: 66-70) and ascribed to the influence of English, which does not have possessive suffixes. Two tasks involving possessives in the *have*-construction were included in the present study, both requiring respondents to judge a sentence as correct or not, and correct it if they considered it incorrect. In both, possessive noun phrases without personal possessive suffixes are given: standard Hungarian would require *autó+ja* car+Px3SG and *fürdőszobá+m* bathroom+Px1SG, respectively.

(8) [709] *Képzeld, az apám-nak van egy új autó.*
 imagine-IMP.2SG the father-DAT be.3SG a new car
 'Imagine, my father has a new car.'

- 1) correct
- 2) not correct; it's better this way:

(9) [711] *Nek-em van egy fürdőszoba is.*
 DAT-Px1SG be.3SG a bathroom also
 'I have a bathroom, too.'

- 1) correct
- 2) not correct; it's better this way:

Hungarian American respondents accept the nonstandard forms without the possessive suffixes statistically significantly more often than do monolingual speakers from Hungary – see Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8. Responses to possessive noun phrase, *autója/autó*.

	HU	US
709 NSH <i>autó</i>	0 (0%)	3 (13%)
SH <i>autója</i>	24 (100%)	15 (87%)

Chi Square = 4.3076, p<.05 statistically significant

Table 9. Responses to possessive noun phrase, *fürdőszobám/fürdőszoba*

	HU	US
711 NSH <i>fürdőszoba</i>	1 (4%)	5 (28%)
SH <i>fürdőszobám</i>	23 (96%)	13 (72%)

Chi Square = 4.6828, p<.05 statistically significant

3.5. Generic reference in the singular vs. plural

In generic reference to many items of the same kind, Hungarian uses the singular, rather than the plural, like Indo-European languages tend to. Plural reference in such cases does occur in Hungarian used in Hungary as well, but its usage is considered nonstandard. The issue of generic reference in the singular vs. plural has not been investigated in any study of American Hungarian to date.

Two tasks tested singular vs. plural usage of this kind in the current study, given in (10) and (11), in both of which respondents had to choose the sentence that they considered as better. In both cases, the variants with the singular forms (*banánt* 'bananas', and *függönyt* 'curtains' and *szőnyeget* 'rugs') are standard.

- (10) [505] (1) *Néz-d, milyen szép banán-ok-at árul-nak az üzlet-ben!*
 look-IMP.2SG what.kind beautiful banana-PL-ACC sell-3PL the store-INE
 (2) *Néz-d, milyen szép banán-t árul-nak az üzlet-ben!*
 look-IMP.2SG what.kind beautiful banana -ACC sell-3PL the store-INE

'Look, what beautiful bananas are being sold in the store.'

- (11) [511] (1) *Eb-ben az üzlet-ben nemcsak függöny-t, hanem szőnyeg-et is lehet vásárol-ni.*
 this-INE the store-INE not.only curtain-ACC but rug-ACC also possible buy-INF
 (2) *Eb-ben az üzlet-ben nemcsak függöny-ök-et, hanem szőnyeg-ek-et is lehet vásárol-ni.*
 this-INE the store-INE not.only curtain-PL-ACC but rug-PL-ACC also possible buy-INF

'In this store not only curtains but rugs are sold, too.'

In their responses to the test items, Hungarian Americans favored the English-like plural forms (i.e. the nonstandard forms) to a statistically significantly higher degree than did the monolingual Hungarian control group, as Tables 10 and 11 show, even though the latter also

had relatively high acceptance rates of the nonstandard plurals, especially in the case of task 511.

Table 10. Responses to singular vs. plural reference, *banánt*.

	HU	US
505 NSH <i>banánokat</i>	13 (12.1%)	6 (33.3%)
SH <i>banánt</i>	94 (87.9%)	12 (66.7%)

Chi Square = 5.3643, p<.025 statistically significant

Table 11. Responses to singular vs. plural reference, *függönnyt* and *szőnyeget*.

	HU	US
511 NSH <i>függönnyöket, szőnyeget</i>	47 (43.9%)	15 (83.3%)
SH <i>függönnyt, szőnyeget</i>	60 (56.1%)	3 (16.7%)

Chi Square = 5.3643, p<.025 statistically significant

3.6. Agreement

Agreement is a syntactic domain where American Hungarian has been reported to be different from Hungarian used in Hungary, in four kinds of cases: between subjects and verbs, between attributive quantifiers and nouns, between nouns and predicative adjectives, and between relative pronouns and their antecedents. In all four of these categories, agreement like what would be found in Hungarian used in Hungary is lacking (Kontra 1990: 80-81, Fenyvesi 1995: 80-85).

The current study tested agreement between attributive quantifiers and nouns, as well as agreement between subject or object and its complement. (The latter kind of agreement has not been investigated for American Hungarian yet.)

Hungarian used in Hungary requires singular (rather than plural) agreement on nouns after numerals or quantifiers. American Hungarian, however, has been shown to allow English-like plural agreement in such cases: *sok mesé+k* many story+PL 'many stories' and *tizennégy év+ek* fourteen year+PL 'fourteen years' are typical examples. The task in the present study testing this kind of agreement involves a quantifier followed by a plural noun, given in (12):

(12) [710] *Sok magyar-ok jön-nek a fesztivál-ra augusztus-ban.*
 many Hungarian-PL come-3PL the festival-SUB August-INE
 'Many Hungarians come to the festival in August.'

- 1) correct
- 2) not correct; it's better this way:

As Table 12, shows, half of the Hungarian American respondents favored the sentence with the nonstandard, English-like agreement, while none of the monolingual Hungarians accepted it.

Table 12. Responses to task 710, quantifier noun agreement.

	HU	US
710 NSH <i>magyarok</i>	0 (0%)	9 (50%)
SH <i>magyar</i>	24 (100%)	9 (50%)

Chi Square = 15.2727, p<.001 statistically significant

Standard Hungarian requires singular agreement in subject and object complements even when the subject or object is plural, while plural agreement also exists but is considered nonstandard in Hungarian used in Hungary. The latter is believed to be due to the influence of Indo-European languages Hungarian has been in contact with in Hungary. This kind of agreement was tested in two tasks, given in (13) and (14), where respondents had to choose one of two variants to fit the sentence. In both, the variant in the singular (*komolynak* and *tűzoltónak*) is standard.

(13) [601] A *képviselő-k az ok-ok-at tart-ott-ák.*
 the representative-PL the reason-PL-ACC {...} consider-PAST-3PL

- (1) *komoly-ak-nak* (2) *komoly-nak*
 serious-PL-DAT serious-DAT

'The representatives considered the reasons serious.'

(14) [611] A *fű-k még tavaly jelentkez-t-ek*
 the boy-PL still last.year sign.up-PAST-3PL {...}.

- (1) *tűzoltó-k-nak* (2) *tűzoltó-nak*
 fireman-PL-DAT fireman-DAT

'The boys signed up to be firemen last year.'

In task 601, as Table 13 shows, there is a statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of speakers. However, unlike all the other cases in this study, here Hungarian Americans exhibit a more standard linguistic behavior than monolingual Hungarians from Hungary. The reason is clearly that, in English, singular agreement is called for in the corresponding sentence, since adjectives cannot be pluralized at all.

Table 13. Responses to task 601, agreement in object complement

	HU	US
601 NSH <i>komolyaknak</i>	32 (29.9%)	1 (5.6%)
SH <i>komolynak</i>	75 (70.1%)	17 (94.4%)

Chi Square = 4.7021, p<.05 statistically significant

The responses to task 611, again, show (see Table 14) the pattern seen in all but the previous case so far: there is a statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents, with a greater proportion of Hungarian Americans than monolingual Hungarians choosing the nonstandard, English-like form with the plural agreement.

Table 14. Responses to task 611, agreement in subject complement

	HU	US
611 NSH <i>tűzoltóknak</i>	16 (15.1%)	8 (44.4%)
SH <i>tűzoltónak</i>	90 (84.9%)	10 (55.6%)

Chi Square = 8.4919, p<.005 statistically significant

4. Discussion

As the results presented in section 3 above demonstrate, the Hungarian usage of Hungarian Americans differs in a statistically significant way from that of monolingual Hungarians from Hungary in a whole range of morphological and syntactic features. In most

of the features in question, the contact-induced variant (i.e. the one paralleling its English counterpart) is the one which is nonstandard in Hungarian as used in Hungary. In as much as this is true, it is also true to say that Hungarian Americans are more nonstandard than Hungarians in Hungary – proving the main hypothesis of this paper to be true. But an important distinction is elucidated by the results of task 601 (see 13 above), testing singular vs. plural agreement in object complement adjectives. Here it is the standard variant of the Hungarian variable that the English counterpart of the sentence parallels. Again, according to the hypothesis of the paper, the linguistic behavior of the Hungarian American respondent is due to the effect of English, but with the opposite result than in the case of all the other variables. In this case, Hungarian Americans exhibit more standard language use than Hungarians in Hungary, and their standard linguistic behavior is reinforced by the English counterpart of the variable, paralleling the standard variant. This clearly shows that the nonstandardness of the Hungarian Americans in the case of the other variables cannot be viewed in itself, separately from the fact that in those cases the nonstandard variant is reinforced by the English counterpart of those variables. Thus, instead of saying that the language use of Hungarian Americans is very nonstandard as far as these variables are concerned, it is more accurate to say that it is nonstandard as a direct effect of English in these variables. Or, to put it another way, their language use is nonstandard in these cases because nonstandard usage happens to correspond to contact-induced usage. Such contact-induced nonstandardness is, in my opinion, important to separate from nonstandard usage where language contact plays no direct effect, for instance, in the case of Universal variables, which exist in all varieties of Hungarian spoken inside and outside of Hungary.

The most stigmatized Universal variable, according to Kontra (1995: 64), is the use of the indicative forms of *t*-final verbs in Hungarian: the standard variant is the indicative form, whereas the nonstandard form is identical with the imperative form of the same verb. Two tasks – given in (15) and (16) below – were included in the questionnaire to test this variable – one to test verbs like *válogat* 'choose' ending in a vowel + *-t*, the other for verbs like *elhalaszt* 'postpone' ending in a sibilant + *-t*, a distinction demonstrated to be vital by Váradi and Kontra (1995).

(15) [628] *Ha Péter rosszul váloga... meg a barát-ai-t, pórul*
 if Peter badly choose PVB the friend-PxPL.3SG-ACC discomfited
jár
 go.3SG
 'If Peter chooses his friends badly, he'll soon be discomfited.'

(16) [629] *Mi-nek ez a halogatás?! Nem szeret-em, ha valaki el-hala...*
 what-DAT this the delay not like-1SG if somebody PVB-postpone
a döntés-ek-et.
 the decision-PL-ACC
 'Why this delay? I don't like it when somebody postpones making decisions.'

The results on the two tasks show – in Tables 15 and 16 – that Hungarian Americans are more nonstandard in a statistically significant way only on one of them (task 629) but not the other (task 628).

Table 15. Responses to task 628, indicative of *válogat*.

	HU	US
628 NSH <i>válogassa</i>	4 (3.9%)	2 (12.5%)
SH <i>válogatja</i>	97 (96.1%)	14 (87.5%)

Chi Square = 2.0702, $p < .25$ not statistically significant

Table 16. Responses to task 629 indicative of *elhalaszt*.

HU US

629 NSH <i>elhalassza</i>	16 (15.7%)	11 (73.3%)
SH <i>elhalasztja</i>	86 (84.3%)	4 (26.7%)

Chi Square = 24.4807, p<.001 statistically significant

If we consider the results of another Universal variable of Hungarian, the only slightly stigmatized *n*-deletion in the inessive case suffix *-bAn* (which makes the nonstandard variant identical with the illative case suffix *-bA*), again, we find that the results are not statistically significantly different in Hungary and among Hungarian Americans. The sentence testing this variable is given in (17), the results of the task in Table 17.

(17) [531] *Ott van egy szék a szoba sark-á-ba.*
 there be.3SG a chair the room corner-Px3SG-ILL
 'There is a chair in the corner of the room.'

Table 17. Results to task 531, *n*-deletion in inessive.

	HU	US
531 NSH <i>sarkába</i>	48 (45.3%)	12 (70.6%)
SH <i>sarkában</i>	58 (54.7%)	5 (29.4%)

Chi Square = 3.7548, p<.1 not statistically significant

These results clearly show that nonstandard linguistic behavior is certainly there in the usage of Hungarian by Hungarian Americans. This is, of course, hardly surprising, especially if we consider the fact that a greater part of the speakers of the traditional Hungarian-American communities – the Toledo community among them – are working class speakers. But the results also indicate that there is a difference in the extent of the nonstandardness between Universal variables on the one hand and Universal Contact variables and Contact variables on the other hand such that Hungarian American speakers are more nonstandard than Hungarians in Hungary in the latter kind of variables. This, in a way, is hardly surprising, since there is no reason to expect more nonstandard linguistic behavior in their case as far as Universal variables are concerned, while the fact that they live in a situation of bilingualism in English and Hungarian would certainly make us expect more nonstandard usage when it comes to variables due to language contact.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have reported on the results of a quantitative study investigating the effect of language contact between American English and Hungarian in the speech of Hungarian Americans from Toledo, Ohio. The results confirm the influence of English in a range of variables where it was identified in detailed descriptions of American Hungarian before, such as focus-related features, possessive suffixes, converbs, and agreement after numerals. The findings demonstrate, for the first time, the presence of the influence of contact in a number of other variables: in various analytical constructions, in the use of plural in generic reference, and in agreement features other than after numerals.

One overall observation that the results reported on in this paper permit is that, when compared to their linguistic behavior on Universal variables, the nonstandard usage exhibited by Hungarian Americans proves to be more prominent in the case of Universal Contact variables and Contact variables than in the case of Universal variables.

Bibliography

- Bartha, C. 1993. *Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolingvisztikai megközelítései* [Sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian-American community]. Budapest: *Kandidátusi* dissertation.
- Benő, A. and S. Szilágyi N. Forthcoming. 'Hungarian in Romania'. In Fenyvesi, A. (ed.)
- Csernicskó, I. 1998. *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)* [The Hungarian language in Ukraine (in Subcarpathia)]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Csernicskó, I. Forthcoming. 'Hungarian in Ukraine'. In Fenyvesi, A. (ed.)
- de Groot, C. 1995. 'The Hungarian converb or verbal adverbials in *-va/ve*'. In Haspelmath, M., and E. König (eds.) *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 283-311.
- Fenyvesi, A. 1995. 'Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian' *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:1-117.
- Fenyvesi, Anna, (ed.) Forthcoming. *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: Studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Göncz, L. 1999. *A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban)* [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (in Vojvodina)]. Budapest and Novi Sad: Osiris Kiadó, Forum Könyvkiadó, and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Göncz, L., and O. Vörös. Forthcoming. 'Hungarian in the former Yugoslavia' In Fenyvesi, A. (ed.)
- Haspelmath, M., and E. König (eds.) 1995. *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kenesei, I., R. M. Vago, and A. Fenyvesi. 1997. *Hungarian. (Descriptive Grammars)*. London: Routledge.
- Kiss, J. 1982. *A rábaközi Mihályi nyelvjárásának hang- és alaktana* [The phonology and morphology of the regional dialect of Mihályi, Rábaköz region]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- 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. 1992. 'Class over nation – linguistic hierarchies eliminated: The case of Hungary' *Multilingua* 11:217-221.
- Kontra, M. 1995. 'Does the educational level of speakers matter in Hungarian language use?' In Viereck, W. (ed.) *ZDL-Beiheft 77: Verhandlungen des Internationalen Dialektologenkongresses Bamberg 1990*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 60-69.
- Kontra, M. 1998. *The Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary (Final Report to the Research Support Scheme)* Budapest: Linguistic Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. MS. <http://e-lib.rss.cz/diglib/pdf/22.pdf>
- Lanstyák, I. 2000 *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában* [The Hungarian language in Slovakia]. Budapest and Bratislava: Osiris Kiadó, Kalligram Könyvkiadó, and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Lanstyák, I., and G. Szabó Mihály Forthcoming. 'Hungarian in Slovakia' In Fenyvesi, A. (ed.)
- Polgár, E. 2001. *Language Maintenance and Language Shift: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of a Hungarian-American Community*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged MA Thesis.
- Váradí, T., and M. Kontra. 1995. 'Degrees of stigmatization: *t*-final verbs in Hungarian' In Viereck, W. (ed.) *ZDL-Beiheft 77: Verhandlungen des Internationalen Dialektologenkongresses Bamberg 1990*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 132-142.
- Vázsonyi, A. 1995. *Túl a Kecegárdán: Calumet-vidéki amerikai magyar szótár* [Beyond Castle Garden: An American Hungarian dictionary of the Calumet region]. Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány.

* Thanks are due to Etelka Polgár for conducting the data collection in Toledo.

¹ In each of the tasks from the questionnaire, the original number of the task is preserved in square brackets and is used in reference to the sentence throughout this paper. Throughout this paper, the following abbreviations are used in the glosses: 1SG – 1st person singular, 2OBJ – second person object, 2SG – second person singular, 3PL – third person plural, 3SG – third person singular, ACC – accusative case, ADER – adjective derivational suffix, DAT – dative case, EMPH – emphasis discourse marker, IMP – imperative marker, INE – inessive case,

INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental case, PAST – past tense marker, PL – plural marker, PVB – preverb, Px1PL – first person plural possessive, Px1SG – first person singular possessive, Px3SG – third person singular possessive, PxPL – suffix indicating plurality of possession, REFL – reflexive suffix, SCVB – simple converb (adjectival participle), SUB – sublative case, SUP – superessive case, VDER – verb derivational suffix.