

The affectedness of the verbal complex in American Hungarian

Anna Fenyvesi

Portland State University, USA, and University of Szeged, Hungary

fenyvesi@lit.u-szeged.hu

In: Anna Fenyvesi & Klára Sándor, eds. *Language contact and the verbal complex of Dutch and Hungarian: Working papers from the 1st Bilingual Language Use Theme Meeting of the Study Centre on Language Contact, November 11-13, 1999, Szeged, Hungary*. Szeged: JGyTF Press, 94-107, 2000.

Abstract

This paper discusses the features of the verbal complex in American Hungarian which have been shown to be affected by borrowing and/or attrition, as well as the features which seem to be surprisingly impervious to change, offering possible solutions as to why some parts of the verbal complex are heavily affected while others are not. Following Thomason & Kaufman (1988:21), borrowing is defined as the 'incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language'. Drawing on Dorian (1981:8), Mühlhäusler (1977), and Thomason (In preparation 13), attrition is defined as 'overall simplification and/or reduction of linguistic characteristics involved'.

1. Introduction

In this paper I give an overview of the features of the verbal complex in American Hungarian which are different from Hungarian as spoken in Hungary. I will also discuss features which are, quite surprisingly, unaffected by change. Lastly I'll offer some tentative speculations as to why some parts of the verbal complex are heavily affected while others are not.

Descriptions and analyses of American Hungarian (henceforth abbreviated as AH) have been offered in an ever growing number of publications in the past two decades (Kontra & Nehler 1981a and 1981b, Kontra 1985, Kontra & Gósy 1988, Kontra 1990, 1990/1995, 1993a, Bartha 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1995, Fenyvesi 1995a, 1995b, 1995/1996, 1998b) and have shown AH to be different in a wide range of features from the Hungarian spoken in Hungary (henceforth HH), that is, from Standard Hungarian as well as the Hungarian regional dialects. The most important areas of differences in the verbal complex between AH and HH seem to be the following: (i) marking of definiteness/indefiniteness of object, (ii) preverbs, (iii) the imperative, and (iv) regularization of irregular stems. The most strikingly unaffected part of the

verbal complex is person/number marking, which is highly complex in HH and is retained fully in AH.

In discussing the features in which the verbal complexes of HH and AH are different, I will be considering the possible cause of the difference and assign it to three possible categories: features due to borrowing from American English (AmE), those due to language attrition, and those due to the combined effect of borrowing and attrition in cases of multiple causation. Following Thomason & Kaufman (1988:21), I define borrowing as the 'incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language'. Drawing on Dorian (1981:8), Mühlhäusler (1977), and Thomason (In preparation 13), I treat attrition as 'overall simplification and/or reduction of linguistic characteristics involved'.

In the discussion below, I will be heavily relying on my own description of AH as spoken in McKeesport, PA, published in its entirety in Fenyvesi 1995a. The McKeesport data is from 20 speakers: 4 immigrants (2 of them from 1956, and one each from the late 1960s and the early 1980s), and 16 second-generation people (15 of them the children of turn of the century immigrants, and one the son of a 1956 immigrant). The McKeesport community that I investigated is a typical old Hungarian-American settlement in that it is almost exclusively working-class community where language shift follows the most usual 3-generational pattern of US immigrants: the children of the US-born second-generation are usually monolingual English-speakers. (For further details of the McKeesport community and the subjects, see Fenyvesi 1995a:3-7.) For my comprehensive description of McKeesport AH I used 15-20 minute segments from interviews with my 20 subjects, which amounts to 220 pages of transcripts.

2. What is affected in the American Hungarian verbal complex?

2.1. Definite vs. indefinite conjugation

HH has two conjugations throughout its entire verbal paradigm: the indefinite conjugation (used with an indefinite object or no direct object) and the definite conjugation (used when the verb has a definite direct object). The two conjugations offer parallel suffixes for each person and number, and these suffixes can be similar but most usually not identical between the two conjugations for the same person/number.¹ In present tense the paradigms are as follows, as exemplified by *csinál* 'do', a verb requiring back vowel suffixes under Hungarian vowel harmony, and *fest* 'paint', a front vowel verb:

(1) present tense paradigms:

	Indefinite:		
1SG:	<i>csinállok</i>	<i>festek</i>	1PL: <i>csinálunk</i> <i>festünk</i>

2SG:	<i>csinálsz</i>	<i>festesz</i>	2PL:	<i>csináltok</i>	<i>festetek</i>
3SG:	<i>csinál</i>	<i>fest</i>	3PL:	<i>csinálnak</i>	<i>festenek</i>

Definite:

1SG:	<i>csináлом</i>	<i>festem</i>	1PL:	<i>csináljuk</i>	<i>festjük</i>
2SG:	<i>csinálod</i>	<i>fested</i>	2PL:	<i>csináljátok</i>	<i>festitek</i>
3SG:	<i>csinálja</i>	<i>festi</i>	3PL:	<i>csinálják</i>	<i>festik</i>

Thus, in effect, the person/number marking suffixes are also encoded for definiteness, and are best regarded as person/number/definiteness markers.

The rules for what constitutes a definite vs. an indefinite direct object are rather complex in HH. An indefinite object is a noun phrase (i) with an indefinite article or no article; (ii) premodified by a numeral or a quantifier (but not the definite article); (iii) first or second person accusative pronoun; (iv) an interrogative pronoun such as *ki* 'who', *mi* 'what', *milyen* 'what kind', *mekkora* 'what size', *hány* 'how many', and *mennyi* 'how much'; (v) the indefinite universal pronoun *minden* 'everything' and indefinite demonstrative pronouns such as *ennyi* 'this many/much', *annyi* 'that many/much' etc.; (vi) a noun phrase containing any of the pronouns in (iv) and (v) as an attributive modifier, (vii) a sentential object with an indefinite anticipatory pronoun such as *annyi* 'that much' in the main clause. A definite object is (i) a proper noun with or without the definite article; (ii) a noun phrase with a definite article; (iii) a possessive noun phrase; (iv) a third person pronoun; (v) the demonstrative pronoun *ez* 'this' or *az* 'that'; (vi) a reflexive pronoun, the reciprocal pronoun (*egymás* 'each other'), a nominal possessive pronoun (*enyém* 'mine', *övé* 'his/hers' etc.); (vii) an interrogative, definite partitive, or universal pronoun marked by the *-ik* unique identification suffix, e.g. *melyik* 'which one' etc.; (viii) the universal pronouns *mind* 'all' and *valamennyi* 'each (one)'; (ix) a noun phrase containing any of the pronouns in (v)-(viii) as a premodifier; (x) a sentential object not containing the anticipatory pronoun *annyi* 'that much'. (Complete definitions of the definite vs. indefinite object can be found in Fenyvesi 1998a:321-327.)

2.1.1. American Hungarian: the mixing of definite and indefinite conjugations

In AH a mixing of the two conjugations has been reported in several sources: in Kontra (1990) for South Bend, Bartha (1993a) for Detroit, and Fenyvesi (1995a:39-44) for McKeesport. Kontra (1990:83-84) mentions the mixing of the definite and indefinite conjugations in the South Bend data as a feature which occurs once in the speech of one early-20th-century immigrant, rarely in the speech of 1956 immigrants, and more frequently in the speech of second-generation speakers (only 3 out of his 16 subjects of this generation do not have this feature at all). Bartha

(1993a:134) mentions the presence of this feature in Detroit, but does not provide details as to its frequency or distribution between speakers from different generations.

The McKeesport data contain 46 examples in which one conjugation is used where HH would have the other. Such examples occur in the speech of every second-generation speaker except one, and in that of one first-generation speaker. In 18 cases the definite conjugation is used where HH would have the indefinite, and in 28 cases the situation is the reverse. The 18 cases of inappropriate (for HH) definite conjugations fall into the following categories: a verb with no object (2 cases), a verb with an object which is a NP with an indefinite article or no article (3 cases), a 1st person pronoun object (6 cases), an indefinite universal pronoun object (1 case), an indefinite partitive pronoun object (2 cases), and an infinitival clause without an object (4 cases). The 28 examples of inappropriate (for HH) indefinite conjugation fall into the following categories: a verb with a proper noun object (1 case), with a NP object with the definite article (8 cases), a covert 3rd person object (5 cases), a demonstrative pronoun object (4 cases), a reflexive pronoun object (1 case), a reciprocal pronoun object (1 case), an infinitival clause having an object with a definite article (1 case), and a sentential object (7 cases). Some illustrations from the McKeesport corpus are as follows:²

Definite conjugation instead of indefinite:

no object:

- (2) *az öreg-ek meg-hal-t-ák*
 the old-PL PVB-die-PAST-3PL.DEF
 'the old people died' (HH: *meg-haltak*)

object with no article:

- (3) *biznisz-et tanul-t-a a (:college:)-ba*
 business-ACC study-PAST-3SG.DEF the college-INE
 'He studied business at college.' (HH: *tanult*)

1st person personal pronoun object:

- (4) *mindég az hí-t-ák engem, igen, Dani bácsi*
 always that call-PAST-3PL.DEF me yes Dani uncle
 'yes, they always called me that, Uncle Dani.' (HH: *hívtak*)

- (5) *(:hunky:)-nak fog-ják hí-ni minket*
 hunky-DAT FUT-3PL.DEF call-INF us
 'they will call us Hunky.' (HH: *hívni*)

indefinite universal pronoun:

- (6) *de nem ért-ed minden-t*
 but not understand-2sg.DEF everything-ACC

'but you don't understand everything' (HH: *értesz*)

indefinite partitive pronoun:

- (7) *ha valaki hív-ja valaki-t másik nev-en*
 if somebody call-3SG.DEF somebody-ACC other name-SUP
 'if somebody calls somebody else other names' (HH: *hív*)

infinitival clause without an object:

- (8) *nem tud-t-uk el-ér-ni oda*
 not be.able-PAST-1PL.DEF PVB-get.INF there
 'we couldn't get there' (HH: *tudtunk*)

Indefinite conjugation instead of definite:

proper noun object:

- (9) *Ilonká-t tanít-ott de nem éngemet*
 Ilonka-ACC teach-PAST.3SG.INDEF but not me
 'he taught Ilonka, but not me' (HH: *tanította*)

object with a definite article:

- (10) *be-zár-t-ak a gyár-t.*
 PVB-close.down-PAST-3PL.INDEF the factory-ACC
 'they closed down the factory.' (HH: *bezárták*)

demonstrative pronoun object:

- (11) *az-t-at el-árul-t-unk*
 that-ACC-ACC³ PVB-sell-PAST-1PL.INDEF
 'we sold that' (HH: *elárultuk*)

reflexive pronoun object:

- (12) *össze-szed-t-ünk magunk-at*
 PVB-get-PAST-1PL.INDEF ourselves-ACC
 'we got together' (HH: *összeszedtük*)

reciprocal pronoun:

- (13) *egymás-t üt-ött-ünk.*
 each.other-ACC hit-PAST-1PL.INDEF
 'we were hitting each other.' (HH: *ütöttük*)

infinitival clause with a definite object:

- (14) *apá-m szok-ott olvas-ni az újság-ot*
 father-1SGPx used.to-3SG.INDEF read-INF the newspaper-ACC
 'my father used to read the newspaper'

sentential object:

- (15) *és mond-t-unk* *megy-ünk* *a stór-ba*
 and say-PAST-1PL.INDEF go-1PL.INDEF the store-ILL
 'and we said we were going to the store'

Even though there are more examples where the indefinite conjugation is used instead of the definite than the other way around, no general tendency in this direction can be clearly established. Certain object types, however, seem to be more likely to cause a breakdown in the definite/indefinite rule: 1st person pronouns, infinitival clauses (both problematic for 5 speakers), objects with definite articles, demonstrative pronoun objects (problematic for 7 speakers altogether), and sentential objects (problematic for 5 speakers). Among speculations as to why these would be more problematic the following could be suggested.

The fact that 1st and 2nd person pronouns function as indefinite objects whereas 3rd person pronouns function as definite ones is a marked characteristic of HH, even if it is logical in that there is inherent definiteness of the former as speaker and hearer, so that it is redundant to mark them as definite is concerned (see Comrie 1977 for a discussion). The loss of such a marked feature is hardly surprising. Although no examples of this loss with 2nd person objects occur in the McKeesport data, this is more likely to be the result of the interview situation – the subjects were talking about themselves rather than about the 2nd person hearer, i.e. the researcher – and not because of an asymmetry between 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

Definiteness/indefiniteness marking in infinitival clauses might be more complicated than in simple sentences because it does not appear on the verb that the object NP is internal argument of, i.e. the infinitive, but rather one syntactic level up, on the nonadjacent tensed verb. The examples of NPs with the definite article and demonstrative pronoun phrases as objects are very surprising, since these two categories are probably the most overtly definite. The fact that sentential objects are obligatorily definite (even if the embedded clause has no object or has an indefinite object) might be complicated because they are so much unlike infinitival clauses, a structure to which they are similar because both involve embedding.

One very curious detail about the mixing of the two conjugations in AH is that even when the conjugations are mixed, speakers choose the suffix corresponding to the right person/number from the other conjugation. So, even though the definiteness/indefiniteness marking is undergoing change, the person/number marking is wholly retained. This, in effect, means that coding of verbs for person/number/definiteness is splitting in AH to separate person/number and definiteness marking, or, rather, nonmarking for the latter.

The partial breakdown of the HH rules for the definite and indefinite conjugations is partial rule loss because of language attrition which simplifies the language in that it shows a tendency towards free variation in definiteness marking not governed by the HH rules any more.

out-wash-INF the car-ACC
 'to wash the car' (HH: *meg-mosni*)

- (23) *csak mikor be-lepőd-öm*
 only when in-surprise-1SG.INDEF
 'only when I get surprised' (HH: *meg-lepődöm*)

These two kinds of examples discussed can be attributed to two different causes. The first type (exx. 20-21) clearly shows the effect of AmE in the AH forms. In the second type (exx. 22-23), however, no such effect can be shown. I will, therefore, attribute these to the effect of language attrition.

2.2.1.4. Replacement of preverb–verb constructions

In the McKeesport corpus, in 7 cases involving four verbs, an AH preverb–verb construction replaces a HH verb or preverb–verb construction with which it is not connected in any way, but which is a syntactic and lexical calque on an English phrasal verb.

- (24) *rá-tesz-em a rádióműsort*
 onto-put-1SG.DEF the radio-program-ACC
 'I put on the radio program' (HH: *be-kapcsolom*)

- (25) *a kórház-ból le-te-tt-ek*
 the hospital-ELA down-put-PAST-3PL.INDEF
 'they laid me off at the hospital' (HH: *el-bocsátottak*)

This feature can be attributed to the effect of AmE on AH, since in all of the cases the source of the AH form is an English phrasal verb.

2.3. The imperative

Hungarian marks imperative mood with a-*j* suffix on the verb between the stem and the person/number/definiteness marker. The suffix often assimilates phonologically. The imperative marker is used in Hungarian to express imperative and subjunctive functions and, therefore, occurs in every person and number.

2.3.1. American Hungarian

2.3.1.1. Loss of imperative

In AH, the loss of the imperative suffix (i.e. its replacement with the zero indicative forms) has been reported for both South Bend by Kontra (1990:71-72) and for McKeesport. In the McKeesport corpus it occurs 7 times in examples such as the following two:

(26) *mond-t-ák az egyik szomszéd-nak, ügyel rá*
 said-PAST-3PL.DEF the one neighbor-DAT look.after-3SG.INDEF PVB
 'they told one of the neighbors to look after it' (HH: *ügyelj rá*)

(27) *nem volt ott senki aki tanít-ja õk-et*
 not was there nobody who teach-3SG.INDEF they-ACC
 'there was nobody to teach them' (HH: *tanítsa*)

The lack of the imperative is a case of multiple causation, with the influence of AmE as one causal factor (since it also has zero marking for the imperative) and rule loss in language attrition as the other.

2.3.1.2. Replacement of indicative by imperative

There are 10 examples produced by five second-generation McKeesport speakers in which imperative endings appear on verbs that require indicative in HH, as in 28-29:

(28) *mikor kedd-en gyü-jj-ünk a tészta-t csinál-ni*
 when Tuesday-SUP come-IMP-1PL.INDEF the noodles-ACC make-INF
 'when we come here to make noodles on Tuesday' (HH: *gyüviünk, jöviünk*)

(29) *de a gyerek-ek hamar ért-s-ék egymás-t*
 but the child-PL quickly understand-IMP-3PL.DEF each-other-ACC
 'but children understand each other quickly' (HH: *értik*)

This feature, which can be regarded as development of free variation between indicative and imperative forms due to the loss of the imperative rule, can be attributed solely to the effect of language attrition.

2.4. AH regularization of irregular verb forms

In 5 examples in the McKeesport corpus a regularization of irregular verb forms happens. For instance, the highly irregular verb *van* 'be' is regularized in one case each in the data of two second-generation speakers. In both cases the present tense 2SG form *vagy* is reanalyzed as the stem of the verb and receives the regular 2SG and 3PL indefinite endings, respectively:

- (30) *te vagy-sz az én csitri-m*
 you be-2SG the I little.girl-1SGPx
 'you are my little girl' (HH: *vagy*)
- (31) *sok csárdás-ok is vagy-nak*
 many csárdás-PL also be-3PL
 'there are a lot of *csárdás* dances, also' (HH: *vannak*)

The source of this regularization is clearly language attrition, through the loss of the rules governing the irregular forms.

3. What isn't affected?

In this section I will discuss one very striking feature of AH which concerns a grammatical phenomenon within the verbal complex which is not affected, namely the person/number marking.

As I have demonstrated in section 2.1.1.1 above, even in cases then the definiteness marking is lost in AH and the HH definite and indefinite conjugations are mixed, the person/number marking on the verbs remains intact and is used in accordance with HH rules. The same is the case everywhere else in the verbal morphology of AH: I have not found a single example either in my own 220-page McKeesport corpus, or in Kontra's South Bend transcripts or publications, or any reference to it anywhere in Bartha's work. This is, I believe, highly surprising for at least two reasons. First, Hungarian has a very rich morphology for person/number marking, which one would expect to be vulnerable to change when in contact with a language like English which employs one single person/number marker, the present tense 3rd person singular *-s*. And second, the similarly rich nominal morphology of Hungarian has been shown to exhibit extensive changes in both the case marking system (Fenyvesi 1995/1996) and in the use of possessive suffixes (Kontra 1990:85-86 and Fenyvesi 1995a:66-70). Despite the fact that both the case system and the person/number marking are very rich in Hungarian and also despite the fact that the corresponding AmE inflectional morphology is very simple, it nevertheless is the case that the former is greatly affected in AH while the latter seems completely impervious to change.

Even more curiously, the same, i.e. lack of affectedness of person/number marking and greatly affected case morphology, is reported for some other immigrant languages: for American Greek (Seaman 1972), American Polish (Lyra 1962), American Czech (Henzl 1982, Kuc4era 1990), American Slovak (Meyerstein 1959), American Serbo-Croatian (Albin & Alexander 1972), and American Russian (Polinsky In press). Only one extensive description on any of these languages, Jutronic3 (1971:100-101) on American Serbo-Croatian, mentions two examples of

mixing of person/number markers: one where a 3PL form is replaced by 3SG and another where 1PL is replaced by 3PL.

As a counter-example to all of these immigrant languages, however, American Dutch exhibits a very different state of affairs: its person/number marking in verbs is heavily affected (see Smits 1996 and also Smits, this volume), while the case system is hardly affected at all (Caroline Smits, personal communication 1999). The great degree of affectedness of the person/number marking in American Dutch verbs is especially interesting since the Dutch system employs 2 or 3 different endings (3 suffixes in present tense: zero for 1SG, *-t* for 2SG and 3SG, and *-n* for plural; and 2 in preterit: *-tel-de* for singular and an additional *-n* for plural) and is thus relatively simple compared to Hungarian and the other European languages mentioned above, the immigrant varieties of which do retain those systems intact.⁴ As Dutch employs no case markers, case marking is of course not affected at all in American Dutch, but the marking of plurals on nouns and that of attributive adjectives is (Smits 1996:75-83).

One tentative reason why the person/number marking is unaffected in all the above immigrants languages except for American Dutch is that, after all, the persons (singular vs. plural) and numbers (1st through 3rd) are the same in English and all these languages, so English does not offer a system that could cause a disruption when used in the bilingual language situation of the immigrant communities. (In connection with American Hungarian in McKeesport, it is also important to add that in Western Pennsylvania even the second person plural pronoun, *you'uns*, is distinct and is commonly used in the local regional and nonstandard varieties and fully recognized by all standard speakers.) In contrast, the case systems of the immigrant languages are not 'supported' in a similar way by any parallel system in English either in its case system or in prepositions that would closely correspond to the cases in meaning.

Why in American Dutch the person/number marking of verbs is nevertheless greatly affected despite the same AmE pronominal system, is a question that cannot be answered at this point but would certainly merit further investigations. One possible clue to an explanation could be that because in Dutch there are three different suffixes distributed between the six person/number slots and the correspondence between suffixes and person/number slots is not one-to-one, the system is less resistant to erosion than systems with one-to-one correspondences between the two like the other immigrant languages.

4. Conclusion

In this paper my main goal has been to give an overview of differences in the verbal complex between HH and AH and discuss the causes for these differences, and offer speculations as to why other parts of the verbal morphology are unaffected.

The main conclusion that emerges from the comprehensive picture of the verbal complex of AH is that borrowing and language attrition proceed in parallel fashion, in some cases inseparably from each other in cases of multiple causation, rather than as necessarily independent processes or where one of the processes is subordinated to the other (borrowing as part of attrition or vice versa) as is often suggested for language contact situations involving language loss.

As to the big picture, why person/number marking is impervious to change in AH while other parts of the verbal and nominal inflectional morphology are not, at present there does not seem to be a good solution. The answer may lie in the even bigger picture, that of crosslinguistic patterns of change in immigrant languages, but surely as of now, it remains to be found.

Notes:

¹ The only exception is in the past tense, where the definite and indefinite first person singular suffixes are identical: *csináltam* (csinál+t+am do+PAST+1SG) 'I did' and *festettem* (fest+ett+em paint+PAST+1SG) 'I painted' are ambiguous as to definiteness/indefiniteness.

² The following abbreviations are used in the glosses throughout this paper: ABL 'ablative case', ACC 'accusative case', DAT 'dative case', DEF 'definite conjugation', ELA 'relative case', FUT 'future auxiliary', ILL 'illative case', IMP 'imperative', INDEF 'indefinite conjugation', INE 'inessive case', INF 'infinitive', PAST 'past tense marker', PL 'plural', PVB 'preverb', Px 'possessive marker', SG 'singular', and SUP 'superessive case'.

³ The double accusative on the demonstrative is a feature of Hungarian regional as well as non-standard dialects.

⁴ The case seems to be, in Roeland van Hout's words at the Szeged conference, that 'the less a language has, the more it can lose, and vice versa'.

References:

- Albin, Alexander, & Ronelle Alexander. 1972. *The speech of Yugoslav immigrants in San Pedro, California*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Bartha, Csilla. 1993a. *Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolinvisztikai megközelítései*. [Sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian-American community.] Budapest: *Kandidátusi* dissertation.
- Bartha, Csilla. 1993b. Megjegyzések a lexikai kölcsönzésről [Remarks on lexical borrowing]. In: *Emlékkönyv Fábián Pál hetvenedik születésnapjára* [Festschrift for Pál Fábián on the occasion of his 70th birthday]. Budapest: ELTE Mai Magyar Nyelvi Tanszék, 26-35.
- Bartha, Csilla. 1993c. 'Mindég csak magyarul beszélünk ALL THE TIME' – Magyarnak lenni 'túl a Kecegárdán' ['We speak Hungarian ALL THE TIME': On being Hungarian 'beyond Castle Garden']. *Magyar nyelvőr*, 117(4):491-495.
- Bartha, Csilla. 1995. A nyelvvesztés néhány rendszerbeli szimptomája amerikai magyarok nyelvhasználatában [A few structural symptoms of language loss in the language use of Hungarian Americans]. In: Krisztina Laczkó, ed. *Emlékkönyv Szathmári István hetvenedik születésnapjára* [Festschrift for István Szathmári on the occasion of his 70th birthday]. Budapest: ELTE Mai Magyar Nyelvi Tanszék, 34-44.
- Bartha, Csilla, & Olena Sydorenko. This volume. Changing verb usage patterns in first and second generation Hungarian-American discourse.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Subjects and direct objects in Uralic languages: A functional explanation of case-marking systems. *Études Finno-Ougriennes*, 12:5-17.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1981. *Language death: The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fenyvesi, Anna. 1995a. 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. 1995b. How assimilation affects assimilations: The loss of some phonological processes in American Hungarian. Paper presented at the Symposium on Language Loss and Public Policy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, June 30-July 2, 1995. .
- Fenyvesi, Anna. 1995/1996. The case of American Hungarian case: Morphological change in McKeesport, Pennsylvania. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43:381-404.
- Fenyvesi, Anna. 1998a. Inflectional morphology. In: István Kenesei, Robert M. Vago, & Anna Fenyvesi. *Hungarian*. (Descriptive Grammars Series). London and New York: Routledge, 191-351.

- Fenyvesi, Anna. 1998b. Patterns of borrowing and language attrition: American Hungarian in McKeesport, Pennsylvania. In: Casper de Groot & István Kenesei, eds. *Papers from the Amsterdam conference: Approaches to Hungarian 6*. Szeged: JATE Press, 229-249.
- Henzl, Vera. 1982. American Czech: A comparative study of linguistic modifications in immigrant and young children speech. In: Roland Sussex, ed. *Slavic languages in emigré communities*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc., 33-46.
- Jutronic3, Dunja. 1971. *Serbo-Croatian and American English in contact: A sociolinguistic study of the Serbo-Croatian community in Steelton, Pennsylvania*. State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University Ph.D. dissertation.
- Kontra, Miklós. 1985. Hungarian-American bilingualism: A bibliographic essay. *Hungarian Studies*, 1:257-282.
- Kontra, Miklós. 1990-1995. Changing names: Onomastic remarks on Hungarian-Americans. *Journal of English linguistics*, 23(1-2):114-122.
- Kontra, Miklós. 1990. *Fejezetek a South Bend-i magyar nyelvhasználatból*. [The Hungarian language as spoken in South Bend, Indiana]. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete.
- Kontra, Miklós. 1993. The messy phonology of Hungarians in South Bend: A contribution to the study of near-mergers. *Language Variation and Change*, 5:225-231.
- Kontra, Miklós, & Gregory Nehler. 1981a. Ethnic designations used by Hungarian-Americans in South Bend, Indiana. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, 53:105-111.
- Kontra, Miklós, & Gregory L. Nehler. 1981b. Language usage: An interview with a Hungarian American. *Hungarian Studies Review*, 8(1):99-117.
- Kontra, Miklós, & Mária Gósy. 1988. Approximation of the standard: A form of variability in bilingual speech. In: Alan R. Thomas, ed. *Methods in dialectology*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 442-455.
- Kučera, Karel. 1990. *Cesky jazyk v USA* [The Czech language in the USA]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.
- Lyra, Franciszek. 1962. *English and Polish in contact*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Ph.D. dissertation.
- Meyerstein, Goldie Piroch. 1959. *Selected problems of bilingualism among immigrant Slovaks*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Ph.D. dissertation.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1977. *Pidginisation and simplification in language*. Canberra: Pacific linguistics.
- Polinsky, Maria. In press. Russian in the US: An endangered language. In: Evgeny Golovko, ed. *Russian in contact with other languages*. Oxford: Oxford: University Press.
- Seaman, David P. 1972. *Modern Greek and American English in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Smits, Caroline. 1996. *Disintegration of inflection: The case of Iowa Dutch*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Smits, Caroline. 1999. On the efficacy of 'surface regularity' in disintegrating languages: The shape of verb forms in Iowa Dutch. This volume.

Thomason, Sarah G. In preparation. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey, & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.